fact. Accordingly, the problem of linguistic variation within a speech community is more appropriately dealt with in a partially separate discipline called Socio-linguistics. This leaves the syntactician free from tackling this problem of linguistic variation within a speech community. This is why "for practical purposes most linguists describing a language of which they are native speakers rely on their own intuitions ;and thus the grammar they devise is essentially a grammar of their own dialect ,which they assume is representative of the language as a whole". (A. Radford ,1989: 10)

The third basic concept is related to the fact that it can often be very difficult to decide in what way(s) a sentence is ill-formed ,or indeed whether it is. This is because in making judgments of the perfectly well-formed sentences in a language the native speaker is assumed to have discarded all pragmatically odd sentences (i.e. which express ideas which do not conform to our view of the way the world is) and any influence on him from prescriptive grammar ,apart from performance limitations such as fatigue or boredom. It is to be noted that sentences that are pragmatically anomalous are regarded as unacceptable to the native speaker even though they may not be linguistically ill-formed, as shown by sentences 1:

1.

(i)My cat realizes that I'm a lousy cook.
(ii)My goldfish realizes that I'm a lousy cook.
(iii)My frying pan realizes that I'm a lousy cook.

Therefore ,we are assuming that we are working with ideal speakers who never make performance errors. That is, in order to arrive at the competence of the native speaker so that we could formulate a grammar of his language (which includes only the well-formed sentences of that language),we have to discard performance errors ,which may be due to pragmatic assumptions leading to the