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- ECO-REBEL: Professor Makkai, in the Introduction of the book *Ecolinguistics: ¿Toward a new **paradigm** for the science of language?* (London: Pinter, 1993) you say that the term "ecolinguistics" was suggested to you by Professor Einar Haugen at the Congress of Anthropological Sciences, in Chicago. When was that?
   - Adam Makkai: In 1972 in Chicago at the Hilton Hotel.

- ER: When did you begin associating the words "language" and "ecology"?

- ER: When did you use the term "pragmo-ecological linguistics" for the first time?
   - AM: Look at my homepage under <atlantis-centaur.org> and go to the English button, then under publications, you will see an article by that title. It appeared in Italian in the early 70-es in *Linguistica teorica ed applicata* [It is also published as "A pragmo-ecological view of linguistic structure and language universals", *Language sciences* v. 27, 1973, p. 9-23 [Editors of ECO-REBEL]).

   - AM: No, not at all.

- ER: Did you know about Claude Hagege's use of the term in 1985?
   - AM: I read Hagege's book but saw no mention of ecology in it. I may not have read carefully enough. Hagege is A-OK with me.

- ER: We do not understand why stratificational grammar (neurocognitive linguistics) did not succeed like generative grammar. It is entirely in line with the new way of seeing the world introduced by relativity theory and quantum mechanics as well with ecological thinking. So, why did generative grammar succeed, despite its totally (and avowedly) cartesian basis?
   - AM: For simple political reasons. Chomsky succeeded in selling his ideas to Vietnam War resisters. He is also a much better P.S. than Lamb. The MIT people used "Wissenschaftspolitik" to intimidate all opposition.

- ER: We can see that stratificational grammar is the right model to deal with the endoecology of language, i.e., the study of the language "structure" without ignoring its relations with its environment (to use your distinction between endoecology and exoecology of language).
   - AM: The strat people themselves ignored my book. Lamb is all tied up in the mechanics of brain neurology. It is like picking TV SDETS apart and not having a clue what the program writers had in mind.

- ER: It is true that the so-called "Non-linear phonology" uses the concept of tier that, in the end, is a stratam. Why didn't they take it over from Stratificational Grammar?
   - AM: Pick up a copy of *Readings in stratificational linguistics* (1973), edited by A. Makkai & D. Lockwood (Alabama University Press). This is a sad chapter in intellectual history and may well be a recapitulation of what went on in Greece 2.400 years ago between the "regularists" and the "analogists" (see *An introduction to linguistics*, by Francis Dinneen (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967).
- **ER:** Could you mention at least one difference between stratificational grammar and generative grammar?
- **AM:** SG is a better model to deal not only with the endoecology of language (grammar). It is also able to account for the interface endoecology/exoecology, i.e., the relations between language and its environment.

- **ER:** Thank you very much, Professor Makkai.
- **AM:** You're welcome.