notational conventions as the basis for part of his critique of Halliday's alleged position on total accountability in the theory.

well	but	then	Ann	surely	wouldn't	the best idea	be to join the group
continuative	structural	conjunctive	vocative	modal	finite	topical	
textual			interpersonal				
Theme							Rheme

Fig. 1: Textual structuring of clause as Theme ^ Rheme

The general point about labelling is that where Halliday introduces 'unconventional' labelling to facilitate the interpretation of text, Huddleston tends to misinterpret this labelling with respect to the description of the grammar of English that Halliday actually offers. Huddleston never evaluates this labelling with respect to its analytical purpose.

Related to this is the problem that Huddleston makes no attempt whatsoever to evaluate IFG in terms of its central concern with an understanding of grammar and discourse. Moreover, Huddleston's own examples are of the traditional de-contextualized variety, even when he turns to Theme, in spite of Halliday's texts in IFG and in spite of Danes (1974), Fries (1981) and subsequent work inspired by Fries's findings (e.g., Thompson, 1985) and in spite of apparently independent work such as Chafe (1984). It is hard to see Huddleston's approach as other than seriously out of date in this respect.

Huddleston has himself produced an extremely valuable book on English syntax, which "owes a lot to Halliday's influence", as Hudson (1986: 794) puts it.[5] If one evaluates that work, it should surely be evaluated in terms of what it sets out to do -- at least primarily -- and not, say, as a resource for text analysis or indeed text generation by computer. It would simply be pointless and unfair to review his book as if it were intended as a resource of this kind.

3. How do we approach grammar?

The focus on the relationship between grammar and discourse just discussed is reflected in the way grammar is approached in IFG, both in terms of stratification and in terms of the rank scale: (i) the grammar is approached from above, from semantics, and (ii) the grammatical unit used as the starting point for this interpretation is the clause. (iii) In addition, the grammar is approached from more than one functional perspective.

(i) In terms of stratification. A functional grammar is a 'semanticky' one; the interpretation of the grammar presented in IFG is designed to bring out the **semantic naturalness** of grammar. This does not mean that that there are grammatical categories that are only semantically motivated, as Huddleston claims in his Section 4 (on grammaticalization). But it does mean that there is a large territorial expansion of grammar in relation to the ground covered by traditional grammar. The traditional territory is based largely on the attempt to make sense of overt 'Standard Average European' word categories such as case, number, person, agreement, and tense: it reflects those aspects of grammar that can been seen from these vantage points. However, if grammar is approached from the perspective of discourse semantics, more covert categories come into view -- categories such as Theme, Token, Value, the process type distinctions, and the relations of projection and expansion in the development of clause complexes. It becomes very clear that crypto-grammar (Whorf, 1956; Halliday, 1984, 1987) is part of grammar.

Huddleston resists this re-evaluation of what constitutes the territory of grammar, but without discussing the issue: for instance, he simply assumes that categories such as case and agreement are the only ones relevant to the identification of grammatical functions (his Section 4.1).

In general, Huddleston seems to have misunderstood the relationship between grammar and semantics in IFG. There is a very unfortunate slippage between grammatical labels and meanings on p. 164 of his review. Huddleston notes Halliday's observation that "grammatical labels are very rarely appropriate for all instances of a category -- they are chosen to reflect its central or 'core' signification". Note that this is an observation about **labels** -- how can we find a label that reflects the meaning of a grammatical category? (The problem of glossing categories is discussed at length in Halliday, 1984/88). However, Huddleston takes it as a statement about **meanings** in relation to grammatical categories; he continues later on: "If the meanings proposed for Theme and Subject had been intended to apply only to central instances, that should have been made clear at the time. But this would not have been consistent with treating these categories as simultaneously grammatical and semantic." Huddleston has thus simply missed and misrepresented Halliday's point about labels.[6]

(ii) In terms of rank. In IFG, grammar is approach from the grammatical unit that provides the clearest interface to context, discourse and meaning -- from the **clause** (cf. Halliday, 1982). That is, the starting point is the highest point on the rank scale and lower ranks are approached from above: the grammar is clause-based rather than word-based. This is quite natural if one wants to make functional sense of the grammar -- clauses differentiate many more types of contextually