

## Évaluations de mes écrits

On peut trouver des comptes-rendus, articles et chapitres consacrés à mes travaux dans de nombreuses Revues internationales et livres importants, dont *Dialogue*, *Mathematical Reviews*, *la Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, *Linguistische Berichte*, *la Revue des Sciences philologiques* (de Moscou), *Computational Linguistics*, *TTR*, *Philosophiques*, *Archiv fuer Grundlagen der Mathematik*, *la Revue québécoise de linguistique*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *la Revue internationale de philosophie*, *Semiotica*, *Philosophical Issues*, etc.

- L. Bolc a fait un compte-rendu de *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, dans le *Journal of Computational Linguistics* Volume 14, no 2, 1988. Selon Bolc, "This book is one of the more interesting recent publications on the application of logic in natural language description. Reading it will inspire further research on the logical structure of natural language and is highly recommended" (p.75).

- Francis Jacques a consacré à *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic* l'article critique « La parole-acte Des actes de langage à la logique illocutoire » dans le no 1 de *la Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, p 129-137, 1988. Sa première phrase: « La réflexion contemporaine sur le langage doit tenir compte d'un acquis qui semble définitif. » (p 129) Plus loin : « En 1985, lorsque les deux auteurs présentent les bases de la première logique formalisée des actes de langage, on a le sentiment que le fossé qui subsista longtemps entre les philosophes-logiciens et les philosophes dits de la langue ordinaire, tend à se combler substantiellement. En quoi leur livre fait événement. » (p 130) « Dès maintenant et pour la première fois apparaît une possibilité d'unification conceptuelle et formelle du vaste registre des élocutions qu'Aristote dans son *De Interpretatione*, avait laissé dichotomisé entre les phrases déclaratives et les phrases non déclaratives. » (p 136)

- N. Cocchiarella a consacré la dernière section de son chapitre "Formally Oriented Work in the Philosophy of Language" à mes contributions en logique illocutoire et pragmatique formelle dans l'ouvrage de Canfield (éd) *The Philosophy of Meaning, Knowledge and Value in the 20th Century*, tome X de la *Routledge History of Philosophy* paru en 1997. Il présente les résultats acquis de la sémantique formelle du succès et de la satisfaction de *Meaning and Speech Acts*. «In addition to a recursive characterization of the class of illocutionary forces, the new expanded framework, which some call *general semantics*, allows for a variety of new semantic notions not realizable in intensional logic alone... This enlarged framework is not at odds with Montague's intensional logic, but is really a conservative extension of the latter that simply adds a recursive theory of success and satisfaction to Montague's theory of truth. Of course, one important consequence of such an addition is that the primary units of meaning are not isolated propositions but illocutionary acts of the form  $F(P)$  ... The ideal language constructed in such a framework is intended to represent the *universals of language use*, i.e. both the formal and material universal features of both natural and scientific language. As governing the success conditions for the performance of illocutionary acts, the universal laws of this ideal language are viewed as reflecting *a priori* laws of thought, and as governing the satisfaction conditions of those acts, these same laws are viewed as reflecting *a priori* laws regarding the logical structure of the world. Clearly such a view brings us back to something like the *characteristica universalis* originally envisaged by Leibnitz. »(p 71) Sa conclusion finale: "In any case, the notion of a

*lingua philosophica* as an ideal language containing both an intensional and illocutionary logic is no longer merely a program but has already in many respects been realized"(p 72).

- John Searle fait une réplique fort élogieuse « Expanding the Speech Act Taxonomy to Discourse Reply to Vanderveken » à mon article « Illocutionary Logic and the Theory of Discourse dans le prochain numéro de la *Revue internationale de philosophie* : “Some years ago I expressed skepticism about the possibility of a systematic theory of conversation comparable to the systematic theory of speech acts that I and others have attempted to construct. (See *On Searle on Conversation* by John Searle et al, John Benjamin, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1992) I think Daniel Vanderveken is correct in regarding the argument there as a challenge to produce an adequate theory of conversation, and it seems to me that he is well on his way to meeting the challenge. In the case of speech acts, I had a well-developed theory of speech acts before I could attempt to do a serious taxonomy. What Vanderveken has done is take some elements of the theory together with some further developments that he and I worked out jointly in our book. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic* by Searle and Vanderveken, Cambridge University Press, 1985. I find the result fascinating and fruitful, and I hope he will continue to develop it in the years to come...”

- D. Zaefferer et E. Rolf traitent de *Meaning and Speech Acts* respectivement dans *Linguistische Berichte*, 150, p. 143-73, 1994 et le no 3-4 de *Semiotica*, 104, 1995. Le titre de l'article de Zaefferer: Wo Montague eine klaffende Lucke liesst. Zur bislang umfassendsten Ausarbeitung einer Sprechaktsemantik signifie : Là où Montague laissait une faille béante. A propos de l'élaboration jusqu'à présent la plus étendue de la sémantique des actes de discours. La conclusion de Rolf: "Vanderveken's *Meaning and Speech Acts* will (or should) become a standard work; it has to be taken as a basis for further enquiries by any one who is concerned with speech act theory. But since speech acts are really the primary units of meaning, anyone who is engaged in studying the meaning(s) of natural language sentences should take notice of the analyses Vanderveken has provided".

-Plusieurs ont souligné l'importance de mes travaux en intelligence artificielle :

Selon A. Kronfeld: "This is a very impressive work from a mathematical point of view. Can his formal work be used in A.I. and computational linguistics? I think so. Searle's and Grice's work on speech act theory, communication intentions, and implicatures was immediately recognized by computational linguists as important and relevant to the field... Well, Vanderveken offers a formal system that, in terms of its ability to capture concepts of communication, is far richer than anything we have seen so far...This is not an easy book to read. The second volume especially is not for the faint heart. If you have only a general interest in speech act theory, you are better off reading Searle. If, on the other hand, you are a hard core cognitive scientist with a solid background in mathematical logic, looking for new frontiers in your attempt to construct computational models of speech acts and computation, this is the book for you. It takes the basic insights of speech act theory and casts them in a way that may have potential for significant computational developments" *Computational Linguistics*, 19, no 2, 1993 (p 385-89).

Selon G. Sabbah: " ... c'est à ma connaissance un des travaux les plus achevés qui visent une formalisation des aspects sémantiques et pragmatiques. Il dépasse singulièrement les sémantiques usuellement utilisées en

IA pour aborder le sens profond et le traitement des intentions communicatives, grâce à une approche ayant des bases formelles solides rarement rencontrées par le passé" *AFIA* no 28, 1997

