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Abstract: This essay traces the reception of Tartu semiotics in the Chinese-speaking world, including Mainland China and Taiwan. Our preliminary survey covers materials of three main categories: (1) research projects, (2) postgraduate degree theses, and (3) publications in Chinese and other languages. A number of common features in cross-cultural reception are identified, such as the temporal gap in theory travelling, the role of a third language mediating source and target languages, the phenomenon of negative influence, and the political interference with the introduction and reception of foreign cultural products. Because of its predominant interest in the dynamics of culture as sign system and inter-systemic dialogue, Tartu Semiotics is becoming increasingly attractive to the growing Chinese semiotic community.
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1 Introduction

Thanks to Professor Kalevi Kull, the Guest Editor of the Special section, we submit this solicited paper, which traces the reception of Tartu Semiotics in the Chinese-speaking world, including the Mainland and Taiwan. In the essay “Tartu Semiotics” is treated as a highly specialized, autonomous school of thought, hence capitalization is used in the word “semiotics”. As a preliminary survey, the study lays no claim to exhaustiveness, and its descriptive nature has prevented the joint authors from making more theoretical speculations and in-depth critical assessments. The survey covers a wide range of materials, which fall into three main categories: (1) research projects, (2) postgraduate degree theses or dissertations, and (3) publications in Chinese and other languages. A number of common phenomena in cross-cultural reception have been identified.
in our research, such as the belatedness in theory’s travelling and border-crossing, the intervention of a mediating third language between source and target languages, the ambivalent nature of negative influence, and the undesirable political interference with the transmission and consumption of cultural products imported from abroad. In the following pages, we shall first go over these features in the buildup of our petits récits of the Tartu School’s reception history in greater China.

The three co-authors have divided their labour in the following manner. Lei Han, Doctoral Candidate in Comparative Poetics at Fudan University, has researched on the materials on Mainland China over the past fifteen years or so, drafted Section 3, which outlines her experience of working on Tartu Semiotics, such as her translation of Peeter Torop’s essay, “Toward a Semiotics of Translation” (Torop 2000, Han 2013), and Appendix 1. Shuo-yu Charlotte Wu, Doctor in Translation Studies at Taiwan Normal University, has written Section 4 and prepared Appendix 2 on the materials in Taiwan. A happy coincidence is that whilst Lei Han has translated Torop, Charlotte participated in the Tartu Summer School in 2012 to work with Torop on semiotics of translation. The first author, Han-liang Chang, Professor Emeritus of Taiwan University and concurrently University Chair Professor of Comparative Poetics at Fudan University, has written Sections 1 and 2. For his earlier research on Tartu Semiotics, his former student and now Professor Juipi Chien of Taiwan University had prepared and presented a presentation to a Tartuan audience, including Torop and Kull, in January 2004.

2 Theoretical Reflections on Reception Studies

Kalevi Kull’s request for a survey of Tartu Semiotics in greater China amounts to a Herculean task laid on our shoulders, not only because of the unpredictable size of the task, but also because of the difficult nature of the assignment: Politics aside, one would have to reconcile two opposing mentalities, to incorporate empirical factualism into a more theoretically-informed critical discourse. We are fully aware that traditional positivistic studies of reception history (Rezeptionsgeschichte), dear to the French comparatists in the 1920s–50s under a different banner, were superseded by a more text-and-reader oriented version of Reception Studies, namely, Rezeptionsästhetik, following Hans Robert Jauss’s appropriation of his mentor Hans Georg Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics and its application to literary studies, especially in the domain of literary historiography. Nevertheless, we are of the opinion that whatever the
orientation, Reception Studies as a time-honoured academic discipline involves and often begins with chronology and chronicles. Accordingly, one will not fail to detect the universal phenomenon of “belatedness” in this or that theory’s travelling and reception across national and linguistic boundaries. Even though the very concepts of temporality and causality have been under vehement attack since the linguistic turn and epistemological divide in the early twentieth-century, there is no denying that, from an empirical point of view, the reception of cultural products follows the simple logic of time-sequence and that the trite metaphor of “influence” as “in-flux” or “a water course flowing into a destination from a source” still holds true (Primeau 1977).

In the case under discussion, the “source” is Tartu Semiotics, encoded in the natural language of Estonian or Russian or even German if and when Jakob von Uexküll is involved as a distant biological forerunner, and the destination, or “target” in the parlance of Translation Studies, is the Chinese language readership, which constitutes only a very small and segregated academic community professing a specialized version of semiotics. Members of this receiving community are invariably at the mercy of time in that they have come to know Tartu Semiotics long after its inception, expansion and transformation. In the mid-to-late 1970s, I [Chang] was quite alone in Taiwan doing Tartu-Moscow Semiotics with the aid of limited English translations. My sources included the pamphlets in the Russian Poetics in Translation Series prepared by Ann Shukman and Lawrence Michael O’Toole, a few journal essays published sporadically here and there, such as *Semiotica* and *New Literary History* (Lotman 1975, Lotman and Uspensky 1978), Daniel P. Lucid’s collection of essays (Lucid 1977), Thomas A. Sebeok’s introduction (Sebeok 1975), the first book by Juri M. Lotman presented to North American readers, *Structure of the Artistic Text* (Lotman 1977) in the Michigan Slavic Contributions Series, and Boris Uspensky’s *A Poetics of Composition* (Uspensky 1973). In the early 1980s I began to acquire materials for the Library of Taiwan University (NTU) and I believe that marked the turning point of local exposure to Tartu Semiotics, and more extensive reception began to take flight about the same time. For instance, Tim-hung Ku 古添洪 had a chapter devoted to Lotman’s *Structure of the Artistic Text* in his book published in 1984 entitled *jihao shixue* 记号诗学 (Poetics of Signs) (Ku 1984).

Second, from my own experience, where there were insufficient contacts between users of the two source languages, Russian and Estonian, and the target language Chinese, the recipient community’s intermediaries had to rely on the imperfect mediation of a third language, in this case, English. Although Russian was taught in China as the first foreign language during the early decades of the PRC, Russian Formalism and Soviet (i.e. Tartu-Moscow)
Semiotics were not introduced for reasons that were not entirely academic. In the late 1970s, when China opened her door to the West, the importance of Russian as a second language began to dwindle and its role was to be dramatically replaced by English. Meanwhile, across the Straits, again due to non-academic reasons, Russian has never become a major foreign language, and to date Estonian remains virtually unknown. Therefore, the belated reception of Tartu Semiotics has been deplorably compromised by language incompetence on the part of the recipients, including such ill-qualified intermediaries as researchers, teachers of higher learning like myself, and second-hand translators.

Third, the reception of Tartu Semiotics witnesses once again a permanent crisis in the history of Comparative Literature Studies, namely, what scholars in the 1960s and 70s termed as “negative influence” (Balakian 1962, Hankiss 1964, Weisstein 1973, Hermerén 1975, Primeau 1977, Chang 1992, 2000). Through critical elaboration in the sixties and seventies, the now obsolete term has obtained two distinct but related meanings. First, on the individual level, it refers to the phenomenon of a receiver’s “misreading” of his foreign sources, either intentionally for polemics or, more often than not, unintentionally because of his incompetence. A couple of years ago, I ran into a doctoral student working on her thesis, and to my no small surprise, she had completely misread the “primary” and “secondary” modeling systems, not out of ideological prejudice or metacritical sophistication, but as a result of poor education. Pushed by my query, she said that was what she had learnt from her mentor who, albeit a Slavist of anciens régimes, knew little semiotics. This kind of negative influence is defined from the perspective of the source text, where the recipient’s decoding results in misrepresentation or, if the effect was intended, in parody.

The second type of negative influence goes beyond the individual level and refers to the phenomenon of reception that involves the contact and interaction of two cultural systems. The receiver (e.g. Ku 1984), who plays the role of a mediator, introduces into his own culture a foreign concept or trend (e.g. Lotman’s “artistic text”), which is often adulterated through the mediator’s axiological transcoding process into a metatext, as a polemical strategy to debunk existing norms in his own tradition. Ku, a fellow postgraduate classmate of mine at NTU in the early 1970s, was originally from the Chinese Department of Fu Jen University, doing poetry in a very “traditional” way, but after moving to the UCSD where Umberto Eco had taught briefly as visitor, somehow turned to an Anglicized Russian model to tackle the traditional Chinese poetic texts he was dealing with. In this case, what the receiver deviates from is not the “original” alien message dispatched, say, by Lotman in
translation, but his native cultural heritage, his rivaling contemporaries, or the “normal science” of the time (Chang 2000). This close encounter marks the moment, in Lotman’s words, when “an act of explosion occurs” (Lotman 2004: 135).

According to Eco (1976), the addressee’s interpretation is affected by several “aberrant” factors, including his private codes, ideological biases, and “real patrimony”. Therefore, the decoded text (message-content) is not expected to coincide with the encoded text (message-expression). This is especially true in cross-cultural communication. As Eco puts it, “Sometimes the addressee’s entire system of cultural units (as well as the concrete circumstances in which he lives) legitimate[s] an interpretation that the sender would have never foreseen” (1976: 141). Other times, the sender’s message is received as noise, which produces a new culture. No longer confined to the earlier concept of “text”, Lotman now considers the matter from the perspective of thermodynamics and resorts to such a metaphor:

An explosive space appears: a cluster of unpredictable possibilities. The particles expelled by the explosion initially follow such close trajectories that they may be described as synonymous routes of one and the same language [...] But subsequent movement along different trajectories causes the particles to move further and further away from each other to the extent that variations of one object are transformed into a collection of different objects. (Lotman 2004: 135).

Lotman’s conclusion is that the dynamics of culture shows the mutual tension between, and constant transposition of, internal and external processes as well as gradual and explosive processes.

The above theoretical consideration serves as the guidelines to our reading of the materials collected from various sources. We have prepared two appendices to the essay in the original Chinese. The scholars represented here are all junior scholars who are either internationally recognized, like Juipi Chien, or just beginning to thrive in their fledgling careers, such as Han, Tang, and Wu. A quick glance of the References will tell the difference. I have therefore invited Lei Han of Fudan University and Charlotte Wu of Taiwan Normal University to write about their learning experiences. If I have missed other aspiring Chinese semioticians, either in my narrative account or in the Appendices, I must have done so unwittingly or out of ignorance and therefore crave their indulgence.
3 Tartu Semiotics and its Pertinence to Translation and Comparative Literature Studies in China — Reflections from Lei Han

At the turn of the New Millennium, as if subscribing to the law of anachronism, Chinese scholars in Translation Studies were still involved in the heated debate over the ontological status of translation and the “ontology” of Translation Studies. Although no consensus was ever reached — and could have been reached for that matter, the majority of them have agreed that a distinction should be made between the act of translation based on language transference and Translation Studies as an evolving academic discipline that has incorporated recent advances in Cultural Studies. Unfortunately, the debate has failed to consider the possible contribution of semiotics to translation, and has therefore missed the golden opportunity of addressing more effectively the dated issue of ontology through rethinking translation as sign system mutations.

The Tartu-Moscow School has provided us with food for thought, with a lucid description of the semiotic nature of translation and the role that language plays in heterogeneous sign systems. As such it is capable of leading the Chinese community of Translation Studies out of the impasse of their discussion to a new direction. Unfortunately, the fine tradition of rigorous theoretical speculations established by Juri M. Lotman in the 1970s and carried over to our days by Peeter Torop, among others, had remained unknown to Chinese traductologists until very recently. Meanwhile, fellow colleagues from across the Straits have long since paid serious attention to the theory and practice of Tartu Semiotics in the domain of Translation Studies, from Tee Kim Tong and Yiu Man Ma in the mid-1980s to Charlotte Wu in the early 2010s, all three were under the tutelage of Han-liang Chang in different times.

In the following, I refer to an essay and a book that can be regarded as the trial materials for my rite de passage to the Tartu School of Semiotics. To my mind, the essay and the book are of tremendous significance to both Translation Studies and Comparative Literature Studies in China.

Three years ago, when I was then an MA student majoring in Comparative Literature at Fudan University, I was assigned a job of doing some translation for a proposed volume on Western poetics. Since I was interested in Translation Studies, Professor Chang recommended to me Peeter Torop’s essay, “Towards the Semiotics of Translation”, and suggested that I render it into Chinese. At that time, I was still an uninitiated novice as far as poetics was concerned, but I fell in love with the material immediately after reading it. However, without any
previous training in semiotics, my experience of transcoding such a difficult text was exacting, to say the least, and indeed extremely excruciating. Fortunately, I had the privilege to consult Chang, now my doctoral supervisor, from time to time, so after more than a dozen revisions, the manuscript was finalized and accepted for publication and is forthcoming from the Capital Normal University Press (Han 2014). What Torop’s essay reveals to me is that it has clearly delimited translation, text, and semiosis, and has postulated a working and workable model for semiotics of translation, and I am convinced that what it reveals to me is revelatory to all the Chinese scholars mired in their perennially benighted metaphysical debate.

In his book *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* (Lotman 1990), Lotman redefines translation as a cultural mechanism and his argument challenges and undermines our preoccupation with translation as the technicality of language transference. Although there has been recently a popular notion of “Cultural turn in Translation Studies” among our local colleagues, it is nevertheless confined to the Procrustean bed of identity politics and tends to reduce Translation Studies to the ancillary role of handmaid to an Anglo-American version of Cultural Studies. Owing to language barrier, my reading of Lotman is heavily mediated and may sound superficial, but I must admit to having been inspired by his insights. Translation is here defined as an essential form of human thinking and action, where dialogue serves as another fundamental mechanism. It is perceived as the interaction between one semiotic entity and other semiotic entities within the framework of semiosphere, and only through translation are new messages generated. Therefore, translation is not only a clearly defined, explicit textual object for Translation Studies, but also a semiosic mechanism to be dealt with by Culturology. To me, it is a mechanism corresponding to the Peircean Interpretant in that it traverses all the domains of cultural activities and embraces the totality of culture, and, moreover, mediates the “ipseity” and “alterity” of culture, i.e. “culture” and “non-culture”. Judging from this perspective, such slogans as the “cultural turn in Translation Studies” and the “translation turn in Comparative Literature Studies”, made popular since the end of the last century, should give way to a new way of thinking and new praxis. Following Lotman, one could deal with, for instance, two separate but related domains of Translation Studies: one dealing with the contacts of natural languages and the novel messages engendered through such contacts; the other dealing with the coupling of heterogeneous sets of semiosphere and the possibility of cultural explosion.

Given that the main stream of Comparative Literature Studies in China is still Influence and Reception Studies, given that the bulwark of methodology remains factualism dear to the *Comparatistes* of the early 20th century, it is not
hard to imagine what kind of sea-change will take place with the introduction of Tartu Semiotics into the discipline. The Appendix I have prepared down below (Appendix 1) clearly indicates that the first step has been made — and on the right track too — though we are aware that the journey is long and the road treacherous. For our benefit, it is important that we learn from Lotman how to reconcile the top-down holistic model of semiosphere and the bottom-up atomistic model of linguistics (Chang 2003a). For those of us, myself included, who set as our task Reception Studies, we should know how to negotiate object-language and meta-language, primary and secondary systems, and how to travel safely between periphery and center, ipseity and alterity, lest we are locked in the prison house of language or lost in the ideology of the wilderness.

4 Images of Tartu Semiotics in Taiwan Observed by Charlotte Wu

The reception of Juri Lotman as well as the Moscow-Tartu school in Taiwan falls in diverse spheres of the local academic semiosphere with rather heterogeneous “expressions”. In the sphere of dissertations and theses, where young and novice scholars are also learning how to self-shape into the academic system, the reception of Lotman and Moscow-Tartu school is mostly indirect. There is so far only one unpublished dissertation discussing concepts related to Moscow-Tartu school (Chien, 2005). Hence, the influence of the school in most cases is indirect; that is, Lotman and Moscow-Tartu school are quoted rather than researched. As new foreign information, Lotman’s works are re-shaped with the interpretation of the following perspectives among thirty-four related dissertations: mostly from Education, Art and Design, Film Studies; relatively less from Comparative Literature as well as Translation Studies, and very rarely from Semiotics (four out of the thirty-four). In the sphere of Education Studies, Lotman’s article, “Text within a Text”, is the most frequently quoted one, where the concepts of “dialogic” and “univocal” ways of exchanging information are employed to examine the dialogues across teacher-student or peer interactions. With regard to Art, Design and Film Studies, the books The Structure of the Artistic Text, Semiotics of cinema and the article “The Origin of Plot in the Light of Typology” are referred to when such concepts as plot, narration or the formulation or evaluation of artistic structures are under discussion. In Comparative Literature Studies and Translation Studies, the keywords from Lotman are “texts” and “culture”. Therefore, the more frequently quoted works include The Structure of the Artistic Text, Analysis of the Poetic Text, “The Origin of
Plot in the Light of Typology”, *Universe of the Mind*, and “On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture” (Lotman and Uspensky 1978). The only work that actually discusses ideas from Moscow-Tartu school more thoroughly is from the discipline of Semiotic Studies. The unpublished dissertation, entitled “Umweltforschung as a Method of Inquiry: Jakob von Uexküll’s ‘Semiotics’ and Its Fortune Home and Away, 1920–2004” (Chien, 2005a), indicates an often ignored aspect of Tartu school in Taiwan, namely, biosemiotics. Hence, in addition to Lotman, works from Tartu-based scholars Kalevi Kull and Peeter Torop are also introduced in this dissertation. Chien continued to work on Uexküll’s legacy to later Tartu semioticians, and had published extensively in this area until she switched to art history a few years ago even though her approach remains semiotic (Chien 2004, 2005a, 2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2007b).

In another sphere of academy, journal publications of Taiwanese scholars, Lotman and the Moscow-Tartu school “talk” in a more direct way. Three articles discuss Lotmanian concepts of modeling systems and semiosphere, two in English by Chang and the third one in Chinese by Wu. They are entitled, respectively, “Is Language a Primary Modeling System?--On Jurij Lotman’s Semiosphere”, published in *Sign Systems Studies* (Chang, 2003), “Semioticians Make Strange Bedfellows! Or, Once Again: ‘Is Language a Primary Modeling System?’” featured in 2.2 (Chang, 2009), and the Chinese essay whose title can be rendered into English as “Translation and Semiosis in Semiosphere”, published in *Studies of Interpretation and Translation* (Wu, 2012). For the rest of the twenty-six journal articles from local journals, just like most of the cases in unpublished dissertations, Lotman’s works serve as references rather than the object of research. What is noteworthy in the sphere of journal publications is that there are three articles by Mihhail Lotman published in a local journal *Sun Yat-sen Journal of Humanities*, “Peirce, Saussure and the Foundations of Semiotics”, “The Renaissance as Semiotic Turn” and “The Paradoxes of Semiosphere”. Even though two of the articles are introductions to semiotics of a general nature, these articles marked the interactions between the Moscow-Tartu school and semiotic community in Taiwan. It should also be mentioned that personal contacts have a role to play in theory’s international travels. Thanks to the host Francis So, then of Sun Yat-sen University, the essays were published in the wake of Mihhail Lotman’s invited visit to the said University in 2001, under a NSC grant, on which occasion he made the acquaintance of Han-liang Chang, a long-time admirer of the Tartu School.

In this connection, mention must also be made of two leading journals’ special issues respectively in 1998 and 2005, both guest-edited by Han-liang Chang. The first one is a special issue on Chinese Semiotics of the English journal *Tamkang Review* 28.3 (Spring 1998) which features, among other things,
an essay by Chang’s student at NTU, Lee Hong-chung, who, at the Guest-Editor’s request, reviews two books, including Ku 1984, from the perspectives of Greimassian and Lotmanian semiotics (Lee 1998). The second tome is the special issue on “Biosemiotics: Nature in Culture or Culture in Nature?” of the prestigious Chung-Wai Literary Monthly 34.7 (December 2005). In his Foreword to the issue, Chang outlines the history of biosemiotics, referring in particular to Lotman (1989) and Kull (1999). Among other contributions to this unprecedented introduction to biosemiotics in the greater Chinese communities is the pioneering work of Geok Hui Yap, then a doctoral student of Chang’s at NTU, who applies the theories of Charles Sanders Peirce, Humberto R. Maturana, Francesco J. Varela, Siegfried J. Schmidt and Jesper Hoffmeyer, to construct a composite biosemiotic model for the national literature of Singapore. The scientific rigour of her approach is beyond peers. The essay was an excerpt from her doctoral thesis under Chang’s supervision, “Towards a Biosemiotic Model of National Literature: Samples from Singaporean Writers”, defended successfully in July 2005. It refers extensively to Tartu Semiotics, especially Jakob von Uexküll and Juri Lotman.

Thus the link, or in Lotman’s words, the “boundary” between the Taiwanese academic community and the Moscow-Tartu school, is arguably Chang. He has not only conducted research projects on modeling systems and biosemiotics, but also led his students to close contact with the Moscow-Tartu school. Two students of his, Juipi Chien of Taiwan University and Shou-yu Charlotte Wu of Taiwan Normal University, have visited Tartu in different times. The former, on behalf of Chang, made a presentation on Tartu Semiotics’ reception in China in the Department of Semiotics of University of Tartu on 14th January 2004, and the latter attended the Tartu School of Semiotics in 2012. Both have gained insights by discussing their research projects with Peeter Torop, Kalevi Kull, Mihhail Lotman, Boris Uspensky and other semiotic luminaries on their visits. Chien even made use of the Lotman Archives through the help of the Curator Riin Magnus. Wu, who has now completed her doctorate on the theoretical model of translation, is especially interested in the Lotmanian concepts of texts, modeling systems and their relevance to the concept of intertextuality in translation. Wu participated in the 10th Gatherings of Biosemiotics in Braga, where she met Kalevi Kull, and two other conferences, respectively in the Baltic cities of Imatra and Tartu, and thereby acquired direct exposure to Tartu Semiotics (Wu 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2012). The experiences of Chien and Wu, both advisees of Chang’s over the span of a decade in the New Millennium, show how Tartu Semiotics have taken root and borne fruit in Taiwan.
In reviewing the reception of Lotman and Moscow-Tartu school in Taiwan, we are also looking at the interactions within the larger framework of semiosphere, where connections between the foreign and the self are made, external information is transformed, and semiosis is generated through the indispensable element of human agents. Chang, a veteran semiotician who always stands on the frontiers between domestic and international academic communities, serves as a bridge between Taiwan and Tartu School. He has participated in quite a few of the Gatherings of Biosemiotics since its inauguration in Copenhagen 2001, where he met Kull. He has been a frequent contributor to the journal, *Sign Systems Studies*, founded by Juri Lotman and now edited by Torop, Kull, and Mihhail Lotman (Chang 2001, 2003a, 2003b, 2004, 2006, 2013). He also attended the 80th Anniversary of Juri Lotman in Tartu in March 2002, reviewed Edna Andrews’ *Conversations with Lotman: Cultural Semiotics in Language, Literature, and Cognition* in 43.1 in 2006, served as an External Assessor for the Estonian Science Foundation in refereeing a Lotmanian project, “Chronicle of Lotman’s Life and Work” submitted by Tatjana Kuzovkina in 2008, and helped with Peeter Torop’s education project at the Estonian Pavilion of the Shanghai EXPO in 2010. Now supervising half a dozen of doctoral students across the Straits on semiotics, he is gratified to see the young generation on both sides flourish and enter into closer personal academic contacts with Tartu Semioticians, in Copenhagen, Hamburg, Imatra, Prague, Syros, Braga, and Tartu, and on such local but at once international occasions as the Nanjing IASS Congress, which featured a special Panel on Tartu Semiotics organized and attended by none other than Mihhail Lotman and Kalevi Kull.
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Appendix 1

Chinese Materials of Tartu Semiotics during the Period of 1987–2012
Prepared by Lei HAN

I. CSSCI Articles of Reception and Application of Tartu-Moscow School（有关塔尔图-莫斯科学派的接受与应用的 CSSSCI 期刊）

2012

[1] 王永祥. 洛特曼符号学理论之渊源与发展——纪念洛特曼诞辰 90 周年, 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2012 年第 3 期
基金: 本文获得爱沙尼亚科学基金会(ETFgrantNo.8403)的资助和文化理论高级研究中心(CECT)的支持.同时,本文也是“江苏高校优势学科建设工程资助项目”(优势学科代码 20110101)的科研成果和 2009 年度教育部人文社会科学研究规划项目(项目批准号 09YJA740062)阶段性成果
基金: 本文系 2011 年度国家社科基金资助项目“20 世纪俄苏文学批评理论史研究”(项目批准号 11BWW001)的阶段性成果.该文同时为“江苏高校优势学科建设工程资助项目”(优势学科代码 20110101)的科研成果和“江苏省研究生创新研究计划”资助项目(项目批准号 CXZZll0863)的阶段性成果
[4] 彭佳 汤黎. 与生命科学的交光互影：论尤里•洛特曼的符号学理论, 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2012 年第 3 期
基金: 本文获 2011 年西南民族大学研究生学位点建设项目“外国语言文学”(项目编号 2011XWD-S0502)和西南民族大学中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金(项目名称“后理论”语境下国内西方文学理论研究,(项目编号 11SZYQN60)资助
基金: 教育部人文社会科学研究西部和边疆地区项目“超越现代与后现代——德勒兹差异思想及其对当代中国美学理论研究的启示”(12XJC751003)；广东省普通高校人文社会科学研究项目“西方思维批判与文艺学基础理论的更新及回归”(11WYXM003)的阶段性成果
2011

[8] 张艺. 本文内容的符号互文：《恩主》艺术中的符号与《反对阐释》，《俄罗斯文艺》，2011 年第 4 期
基金：2011 年江苏省社科基金项目资助课题《苏珊.桑塔格与诺斯替主义研究》（项目号 11wwc010）；江苏省 2011 年普通高校研究生科研创新计划资助项目《苏珊.桑塔格小说艺术构造“魔力”探索—“神”、“智”之间艺术“追求”的散点透视》（cxzz11-0862）的阶段性成果
基金：教育部人文社会科学重点研究基地 2006 年度重大课题《现代语言符号学》（06JJD740009）的阶段性成果
[10] 张良林 胡志红,传达符号学与意指符号学的差异——洛特曼文化符号学视角，《俄罗斯文艺》，2011 年第 2 期
基金：国家社会科学基金项目（05BZW011）
[12] 张艺.《恩主》艺术符号能指的形成与时空迷宫风貌：叙述主体的分化、“不可靠叙述”及本文的空间化，《俄罗斯文艺》，2011 年第 1 期
基金：本文系 2008 年南京师范大学外国语学院研究生科研课题项目“艺术符号互动的狂欢化‘营地’—《恩主》与《反对阐释》的互文性符号学阐释”（sflie08027）阶段性成果之一
[13] 周启超.“文本外结构”与文学作品的建构——尤里•洛特曼的文学文本/文学作品观，《南开学报》（哲学社会科学版），2011 年第 5 期
[14] 黄凯颖.《红楼梦》：“对立美学”的范本——从洛特曼的“对立美学”理论观看《红楼梦》的独特美学价值，《红楼梦学刊》，2011 年第 3 期
2010

[15] 王加兴. 俄国文学名著注释本对汉译的重要参考作用——以《叶甫盖尼•奥涅金》注释本为例. 《外语学刊》, 2010 年第 5 期

[16] 王燕子. 文本问题的差异与对话——巴赫金与洛特曼的文化符号学理论研究. 《内蒙古社会科学》, 2010 年第 5 期

基金：国家社会科学基金项目(编号 05BZW011)

[17] 张海燕 秦启文. 文化动力的生产机制——洛特曼文化符号学理论研究. 《西南大学学报》(社会科学版), 2010 年第 1 期

基金：重庆市哲学社会科学重大课题“重庆加快建设学习型社会、创新型城市研究”(CQZDZ--200604），项目负责人秦启文;西南大学博士科研启动基金项目(0709321),项目负责人张海燕

2009

[18] 张海燕. 文化诗学的对话——洛特曼与巴赫金的文化理论之比较. 《文艺理论研究》, 2009 年第 1 期

基金：本论文系西南大学博士科研启动基金项目(项目批准号为 0709321)

阶段性成果之一

[19] 郑文东. 文化比较需要一种工具语言——洛特曼关于工具语言的构想，《国外社会科学》, 2009 年第 1 期

基金：教育部人文社会科学研究 2006 年度规划项目(06JA75011-44033)

[20] 张海燕. 符号与叙事的自由嬉戏——洛特曼的电影符号学理论对电影叙事学的影响. 《江西社会科学》, 2009 年第 1 期

基金：本论文系西南大学博士科研启动基金项目(项目批准号为 0709321)

系列成果之一

2008

[21] 徐乐. 绘制二十一世纪契诃夫的文学联系图——俄罗斯的契诃夫研究新论. 《外国文学动态》, 2008 年第 6 期

[22] 穆馨. 论洛特曼的行为符号学，《北方论丛》, 2008 年第 6 期

[23] 赵爱国. 洛特曼“四维一体”符号学理论思想论略. 《外语与外语教学》, 2008 年第 10 期

基金：本文为 2005 年国家社科基金项目“20 世纪俄罗斯语言学遗产理论、方法和流派”的阶段性成果(项目编号 05BYY006)

[24] 程正民. 俄罗斯文艺学结构研究和历史研究的结合. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2008 年第 3 期
基金：本文为国家社科基金重点项目《20 世纪马克思主义文论国别研究》(编号为 OZAWW001)的阶段性成果之一

2007

[25] 周瑞敏. 论诗歌翻译的平行对照. 《河南大学学报：社会科学版》, 2007 年第 5 期
[26] 陈戈. 论洛特曼的文化互动理论. 《解放军外国语学院学报》, 2007 年第 4 期
[27] 郑文东. 洛特曼学术思想的自然科学渊源. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2007 年第 2 期
[28] 康澄. 洛特曼语言观的嬗变及其意义. 《解放军外国语学院学报》, 2007 年第 3 期
[29] 康澄. 独特的“洛特曼符号圈”与文化经典——谈九卷本洛特曼著作集. 《中国图书评论》, 2007 年第 5 期

2006

[30] 康澄. 文化符号学的空间阐释——尤里•洛特曼的符号圈理论研究. 《外国文学评论》, 2006 年第 2 期
[31] 赵蓉晖. 洛特曼及其文化符号学理论. 《国外社会科学》, 2006 年第 1 期
[32] 康澄. 洛特曼的文化时空观. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2006 年第 4 期
[33] 蔡晖. 洛特曼文化创新机制的微观研究——转喻的符号学分析. 《外语研究》, 2006 年第 1 期
[34] 郑文东. 符号域的空间结构——洛特曼文化符号学研究视角. 《解放军外国语学院学报》, 2006 年第 1 期

2005

[35] 王立业. 俄罗斯文化的三大盛事. 《外国文学动态》, 2005 年第 4 期
[36] 赵晓彬. 果戈理：东西方笑文化的集大成者——巴赫金和洛特曼论果戈理的笑. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2005 年第 4 期
[37] 耿海英. 接受与研究：洛特曼符号学在中国. 《郑州大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）, 2005 年第 6 期
[38] 康澄. 文本——洛特曼文化符号学的核心概念. 《当代外国文学》, 2005 年第 4 期
[40] 柏英. 从文化符号学角度看《钢铁是怎样炼成的》之争. 《解放军外国语学院学报》, 2005年第5期
[41] 萧净宇. 洛特曼符号学-美学阐释中艺术文本的特色. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2005年第2期

2004

[42] 袁顺芝. “致恰达耶夫”的符号学分析. 《外国文学研究》, 2004年第5期
[43] 王铭玉 陈勇. 俄罗斯符号学研究的历史流变. 《当代语言学》, 2004年第2期

2003

[44] 张杰 康澄. 叙事文本的"间离":陌生化与生活化之间—析洛特曼对《叶甫盖
尼•奥涅金》的研究. 《外国文学研究》, 2003年第6期
[45] 康澄. 结构与效果: 艺术的复杂性与生活的本然性—洛特曼论《叶甫盖尼•
奥涅金》的本文建构特征. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2003年第1期
[46] 赵晓彬. 洛特曼文化符号学理论的演变与发展. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2003年第3期
[47] М. Л. 加斯帕罗夫 王希悦 赵晓彬. 苏联60至90年代的结构主义诗学研
究——关于洛特曼的《诗歌文本的分析》一书. 《俄罗斯文艺》, 2003年第3期
[48] 赵晓彬. 洛特曼与巴赫金. 《外国文学评论》,2003年第1期

2002

[49] 王坤. 西方现代美学与艺术独立理论. 《中山大学学报》（社会科学版）, 2002年第6期
[50] 康澄. 试析洛特曼对《叶甫盖尼•奥涅金》的研究. 《外国文学研究》, 2002年第4期
[51] 张杰. 符号王国的构建: 语言的超越与超越的语言—巴赫金与洛特曼的
符号学理论研究. 《南京师大学报》（社会科学版）, 2002年第4期
[52] 李肃. 洛特曼文化符号学思想发展概述. 《解放军外国语学院学报》, 2002年第2期
2001

[53] 朱刘华. 巴赫曼文学奖评选活动尘埃落定. 《外国文学动态》，2001年第5期

2000

[54] 启超. “塔尔图学派”备受青睐. 《外国文学评论》，2000年第4期

1996

[56] 徐贲. 尤里•洛特曼的电影符号学和曼纽埃尔•普伊格的《蜘蛛女之吻》[J]. 《外国文学评论》，1996,(3)

1995

[57] 洛特曼, 王坤. 艺术文本的意义及其产生与确定[J]. 《文艺理论研究》，1995,(4)

1994

[59] 张冰. 尤•米•洛特曼和他的结构诗学[J]. 《外国文学评论》，1994,(1)

1992

[60] Ю.洛特曼, 远婴. 电影语言与电影符号学[J]. 《世界电影》，1992,(1)

1991


1990

[63] 樊锦鑫. 文学空间意象的垂向境界[J]. 《外国文学评论》，1990,(2)
[64] 徽周. 叙述学概述[J]. 《外国文学评论》，1990，(4)
1989

[65] 孙静云. 洛特曼的结构文艺学[J]. 北京大学学报(哲学社会科学版),1989,(5)

1988


1987


II. Samples of Non-CSSCI Essays （非 CSSCI 的相关文献枚举）

[1] 单红 吕红周. 俄罗斯符号学研究之洛特曼的文化符号学思想阐释. 《哈尔滨学院学报》, 2012年第9期

基金：天津外国语大学十二五科研规划 2011年度青年项目, 项目编号 11QN23


[3] 李薇. 作为结构和解构的文本. 《哈尔滨师范大学社会科学学报》, 2012年第1期

基金：教育部人文社会科学西部和边疆地区项目“超越现代与后现代——德勒兹差异思想及其对当代中国美学理论研究的启示”(12XJC751003)；广东省普通高校人文社会科学项目“西方思维批判与文艺学基础理论的更新及回归”(11WYXM003)；广东轻工职业技术学院社科课题“洛特曼差异美学理论与美育实践研究(SK201022)


基金：教育部人文社会科学西部和边疆地区项目“超越现代与后现代—差异思想及其对当代中国美学理论研究的启示”(12XJC751003)；广东省普通高校人文社会科学项目“西方思维批判与文艺学基础理论的更新及回归”(11WYXM003)


[6] 刘文娟. 《远离尘嚣》的文化符号学解读. 《文学与艺术》, 2011年第1期

[7] 王燕子. 交流性的后结构主义路径——洛特曼符号学理论研究. 《广东海洋大学学报》2010年第5期
基金：国家社科基金项目(05BZW011)

[8] 杨明明. 洛特曼论俄国现实主义. 《理论界》，2010 年第 8 期
基金：国家社会科学基金青年项目“布宁小说诗学研究”(08CWW006) 、
上海市浦江人才计划成果

[9] 田昊. 洛特曼的电影语言观和电影符号学. 《电影文学》，2010 年第 22 期
基金：本文系国家社科基金项目“洛特曼研究与中国当代文论新视角”研究成果(项目编号 05BZW011)

[10] 赵爱国. 谈洛特曼对文化符号学的理论建构. 《中国俄语教学》，2009 年第 3 期
基金：2005 年国家社科基金项目《20 世纪俄罗斯语言学遗产: 理论、方法和流派》的阶段性成果(项目编号:05BYY006)


[12] 张海燕. 他者视域中的电影符号学——兼论洛特曼的电影语言观. 《电影评价》，2008 年第 20 期
基金：本论文受西南大学博士科研基金项目资助, 项目批准号为:0709321


[14] 郑文东. 文化拓扑结构中神话思维的作用——洛特曼文化符号学视角考察. 《中国俄语教学》，2008 年第 2 期
基金：教育部人文社会科学研究 2006 年度规划项目阶段性成果, 课题名称是《文化符号域理论研究》, 项目批准号 06JA75011-44033

[15] 徐薇. 从重复性节律原则谈诗歌《安娜贝尔•李》的本文结构. 《江苏教育学院学报》 (社会科学版)，2008 年第 2 期

[16] 赵红. 作为普希金研究家的洛特曼. 《西安外国语大学学报》, 2007 年第 1 期

[17] 白春仁. 开拓结构与符号之路——洛特曼. 《中国俄语教学》，2006 年第 3 期

[18] 李英玉. 文化•符号学与翻译——洛特曼的早期创作活动. 《牡丹江师范学院学报：哲学社会科学版》，2006 年第 1 期

[19] 郑文东. 符号域：民族文化的载体——洛特曼符号域概念的解读. 《中国俄语教学》，2005 年第 4 期

[20] 赵晓彬. 文化•文本 认知——洛特曼符号学研究中的文化与人工智能问题. 《中国俄语教学》，2004 年第 3 期

[21] 黄玫. 洛特曼的生活和创造. 《齐齐哈尔大学学报》（哲学社会科学版），2003 年第 4 期
基金：黑龙江省教育厅基金资助

[22] 王坤. 西方现代美学的终结——塔尔图学派与洛特曼美学思想的价值与意义. 《北京科技大学学报：社会科学版》，2003 年第 1 期

[23] 黄玫. 洛特曼的结构主义诗学观. 《中国俄语教学》，2000 年第 1 期
III. Conferences Held in China on Tartu-Moscow School（中国大陆有关塔尔图-莫斯科学派的会议）
[1] 2005 年 5 月 31 日至 6 月 1 日的“全国洛特曼学术思想研讨会”，在北京外国语大学俄语学院与俄语中心举办

IV. Translations (译介图书)

V. Research Studies and Proceedings（研究专著与会议论文集）
VI. Research Projects on Lotman Studies Funded by National Foundation of Social Sciences (国家社科基金为洛特曼研究立项)


VII. Magisterial/Master or Doctor Theses（硕士、博士论文）

M.A.


Ph.D.

Appendix 2

Taiwanese Materials of Tartu Semiotics during the Period of
1975–2012
Prepared by Shuo-yu Carlotte Wu

I. Journal Articles

2012

[1] 吴硕禹. 翻译于义解圈之语义生成机制, 《翻译学研究集刊》, 第 15 期. 页 1–18

2010

[1] 古添洪. 精神分析记号学与古典梦诗研究, 《慈济大学人文社会科学学刊》, 第 9 期. 页 142–162

2007

[1] 郭美女. 从 Roman Jakobson 的传达模式探究布农族音乐的功能, 《师大学报》, 第 52 卷 1/2 期. 页 37–57

2005

[1] 简瑞碧. 一九二O 至五O年代德法的生物环境论争, 《中外文学》, 生物符号学专号, 第 34 卷第 7 期. 页 45–57
[3] 洪振耀. 从浪漫科学谈生物符号学. 《中外文学》, 生物符号学专号, 第 34 卷第 7 期. 页 85–109

2004

[1] 刘苑如. 《东度记》研究--由「愿」与「度」展开的诠释观点. 《中国文史哲研究集刊》, 第 24 期. 页 105–128
2003


2002

[1] 张锦忠. 在那陌生的城市--漫游李永平的鬼域仙境. 《中外文学》,第 30 卷第 10 期. 页 12–23

2001

[1] Lotman, Mihhail. The Renaissance as Semiotic Turn, 《中山人文学报》,第 13 期. 页 1-13

2000

[1] 陈健宏. 沈从文小说中的叙述模式与情况反讽. 《中外文学》,第 28 卷第 12 期. 页 41–107

1999

1998


1996


1994

[1] 古添洪. 理论•应用•“解”的诗想. 《中外文学》,第 23 卷第 3 期,页 35–37

1989


1988


1983

1981


1977


1975


II. Translations

[1] 简瑞碧译. 生命符号学是否已进入成熟期？玛切洛．巴比耶力着，《中外文学》，2005 第 34 期第七卷，页 11–26

III. Research Studies Funded by National Science Council


IV. Magisterial (Master) & Doctoral Theses

M.A.

[1] 何瑄. 论十九世纪上半叶俄国文学的哥德传统·发展、类型、流变. 政治大学: 政治大学, 2011
[17] 黄美仪. 漫游与女性的探索——李永平小说主题研究. 政治大学: 政治大学, 2004
[26] 郑佩旻. 普希金诗体小说《叶夫根尼•奥涅金》中之他人言语. 文化大学: 文化大学, 2000
[27] 林孟萱. 洛夫诗的用字及句式特色. 清华大学: 清华大学, 2000

Ph.D.