By contrast, it is the native speaker's *grammatical competence* which enables him to understand that *he* in the sentence *He thinks that John is wrong* cannot be interpreted as referring to the same person as *John*. Since Chomsky has devoted himself primarily to the study of language structure ,rather than language use, he has focused almost exclusively on the task of attempting to characterize *grammatical* ,rather than *pragmatic competence.*

The native speaker's *grammatical competence* is reflected in two different types of *intuitions* which the speakers have about their native language(s):(i) intuitions about sentence *well-formedness* ,and (ii) intuitions about sentence *structure.* The term *intuitions* is used here in a technical sense which has become standardized in Linguistics: to say that a native speaker has *intuitions* about the *well-formedness* and of the *structure* of sentences ,we mean that he has the ability to make judgments about whether a given sentence is well-formed or not ,and about whether it has a particular structure or not. Unlike traditional grammars ,which "concentrate on *grammaticality* (i.e. on telling you how to form grammatical phrases and sentences)"(4), A. Radford (1997) says that "work on grammar within the Chomskyan paradigm tends to focus much more on explaining *ungrammaticality* (i.e. on explaining why certain types of structures are ungrammatical)." (A. Radford, 1997:4) Only by explaining *ungrammaticality as well as grammaticality* in a a language will the grammar acquire *descriptive adequacy.* To only describe *grammaticality* ,the grammar only acquires *observational adequacy.*

These *intuitions* about sentences cover different aspects of language such as *Phonology* (=the study of sounds and sound systems), *Morphology* (=the study of how morphemes (grammatical units smaller than the word) are combined together into words), *Syntax* (= the study of how words are combined together to form sentences),and *Semantics* (= the study of