**Discuss the meaning of the following quote by Noam Chomsky:**

The concept "language" we use in daily life is different from that used in the study of the subject. The study subject of any scientific research should be clear and accurate, something with fixed definition and boundaries. But in ordinary life, language is not "coherent", the boundaries are obscure, hard to determine and always evolving. The language defined here is based on a very general idea of how it is used by its "native speakers". We may use the mother tongue of the residents to divide the map into different language speaking districts, grade a person’s language fluency into different levels (native speaker vs. second language learner), discuss the possible conflict between a word’s "official" meaning written in the dictionary and its common usage in daily life. The concept of language here may lead to paradoxes under certain extreme circumstances, which make them not suitable for studying the science of language. Chomsky suggests that this kind of obscure use of the concept "language" in daily life should simply not be used in the study, until the concept of "community norms" or "conventions" can be clarified in a coherent way, making the concept qualified as a study object.

It seems to me that the science of language is more of a formal science than a natural or social science in Chomsky’s description. In the fields of social science, the study object often cannot be extracted and put aside from, in this case, its speakers. However, Chomsky seem to encourage the separation of a more abstract, more precise definition of language and its capricious and varied users. He criticises the misappropriation of the meaning of language in ordinary life in the fields of science, anything that is not clear and coherent enough to study, including the social and political function of languages, the difference between native and nonnative speakers’ fluency and authenticity, the deviation of a language used by its speakers from its written rules in the dictionary, is discarded from the nature of language.

This brings controversy and criticism too. As a computer science student, I was amused when my teacher mentioned Chomsky in the course Formal Language and Automaton, comparing him to Alan Turing, von Neumann and such computer scientists. I find it interesting that Chomsky receive far less criticism and far more honour in the fields of computer science than that of linguistics. The “fathers of (modern) computer science”, however, hardly receives any criticism from the scientists after them. In the course Linguistics last term, it is suggested that linguistics is descriptive, not prescriptive. Its goal is to describe and explain the facts of languages, not to make rules about them. The job of computer scientists, especially the creators of programming languages, is similar to the job of grammarians. Computer scientists make rules for programming languages, and the computers that can "understand" these languages are also designed by them, so the users of these "languages" cannot deviate from these rules, otherwise the computers would not be able to interpret and execute. Neither grammarians nor linguists has such power to restrain the use of natural languages, however, as the speakers can always make their own rules. As long as they reach an agreement and can get the message through, the "language" spoken between them is changed. Linguists can only decide the number of people who agrees to this rule is needed before it can be seen as a common phenomena worth studying. So perhaps despite the fact that concept of language used by people in daily life is obscure and changeable, it should still be considered as part of the nature of language, as language is, eventually, defined by its users. We cannot make enough clarifications to study it now, so we must extract and simplify the concept, which is an imperfection.