

# 符号与传媒

## Signs & Media

12

2016 春季号  
Spring Issue 2016



四川大学符号学-传媒学研究所 主办  
Institute of Semiotics and Media  
Studies, Sichuan University

主编 曹顺庆 赵毅衡



四川大学出版社

中国知网(CNKI)来源集刊 中文科技期刊数据库来源集刊  
超星数字图书馆来源集刊 万方数据库来源集刊

# 符号与传媒

## Signs & Media

---

主编 曹顺庆 赵毅衡  
四川大学符号学-传媒学研究所 主办

---

总第12辑

12



四川大学出版社

责任编辑:黄蕴婷  
责任校对:欧风偃  
封面设计:墨创文化  
责任印制:王 炜

### 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

符号与传媒. 12 / 曹顺庆, 赵毅衡主编. —成都:  
四川大学出版社, 2016. 3

ISBN 978-7-5614-9325-0

I. ①符… II. ①曹… ②赵… III. ①符号学—文集  
IV. ①H0-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2016) 第 048614 号

### 书名 符号与传媒(12)

---

主 编	曹顺庆 赵毅衡
出 版	四川大学出版社
地 址	成都市一环路南一段 24 号 (610065)
发 行	四川大学出版社
书 号	ISBN 978-7-5614-9325-0
印 刷	郫县犀浦印刷厂
成品尺寸	170 mm×240 mm
印 张	14
字 数	280 千字
版 次	2016 年 3 月第 1 版
印 次	2016 年 3 月第 1 次印刷
定 价	36.00 元

---

版权所有◆侵权必究

◆读者邮购本书,请与本社发行科联系。  
电话:(028)85408408/(028)85401670/  
(028)85408023 邮政编码:610065  
◆本社图书如有印装质量问题,请  
寄回出版社调换。  
◆网址:<http://www.scup.cn>

## 编辑委员会

主 席：曹顺庆（四川大学）

委 员：（音序）

Paul Cobby, Middlesex University, UK

Lian Duan, Concordia University, Canada

Kalevi Kull, University of Tartu, Estonia

Mabel Lee, University of Sydney, Australia

Massimo Leone, University of Torino, Italy

Susan Petrilli, University of Bari, Italy

Eero Tarasti, University of Helsinki, Finland

Yiyang Wang, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

蔡秀枝（台湾大学）

丁尔苏（香港岭南大学）

傅修延（江西师范大学）

龚鹏程（台湾佛光大学）

蒋述卓（暨南大学）

李 彬（清华大学）

李凤亮（深圳大学）

李 杰（浙江大学）

乔国强（上海外国语大学）

申 丹（北京大学）

陶东风（中国人民大学）

王 宁（清华大学）

王一川（北京师范大学）

徐 亮（浙江大学）

杨慧琳（中国人民大学）

叶舒宪（中国社会科学院）

乐黛云（北京大学）

张 杰（南京师范大学）

张智庭（南开大学）

赵宪章（南京大学）

周 宪（南京大学）

朱国华（华东师范大学）

主 编：赵毅衡

副主编：赵星植 何一杰 薛 晨

编 务：陈文斌 李亮明 陆健泽

网络总监：饶广祥

封面创意：郭人瑞

《符号与传媒》2016年春季号·总第12辑

## Editor's Note

Revised since the eighth issue, *Signs & Media* has attracted the attention of semioticians from England, America, Italy, Finland, Sweden and Singapore. With the joint efforts of domestic and international semioticians, dozens of English papers have been published, and the communication space for Chinese semiotics has been expanded. The section entitled “General Narratology” in the last issue received a great deal of positive feedback from scholars with a focus on the narrative concerns of contemporary culture. To deepen this discussion, Paul Cobley and Zhao Yiheng co-host a section entitled “Narrative and Semiosis” in which they invite three semioticians from Korea, Russia and Estonia to respectively study the self, identity and their relationship with narration in different cultures.

In introducing international semiotic theory, we insist on promoting and developing Chinese traditional culture and classical literary theory. In the section “Semiotic Studies of *Book of Changes*”, four semioticians, Zhu Dong, Su Zhi, Wang Junhua and Wang Xiaonong, integrate contemporary and traditional Chinese semiotic thinking to open up a new field for semiotic exploration.

As always, contributors to the sections entitled “Semiotics of Communication” and “Theory and Application” devote themselves to widening the research vision, in this case from pictorial rhetoric to sports text, news narration, the cultural dimension of Chinese discourse and the secularisation of ideology. Advancing side by side, this rethinking of mature disciplines and breaking of ground in emerging fields jointly promote the prosperity and vitality of semiotics and communication.

As listeners and mediators, we keep working to record voices and expand the trajectory of all of these discussions, which is why we provide an annual report on the yearly developments in Chinese semiotics every spring. It is always so exciting to see so many new faces joining our march.

## 编者的话

《符号与传媒》自第八辑双语改版后，吸引了来自英国、美国、意大利、芬兰、瑞典、新加坡等国的多位国际符号学学者，发表了数十篇英文文章，他们与国内的符号学学者一道，拓展了中国符号学的交流空间。上辑“广义叙述学专辑”推出后，我们收到了学界积极的反馈。学者们对当代文化出现的“叙述化”问题的关注，持续推进着这一讨论。为此，本辑推出了由保罗·科布利（Paul Cobley）和赵毅衡共同主持的“符号叙述学专辑”，邀请了韩国、俄罗斯以及爱沙尼亚的三位著名符号学学者，从不同的文化视野对自我、身份及其与叙述之关系进行探讨。

在介绍国际符号学思想的同时，我们一直坚持推广和发扬中国古典文论以及传统文化。在本辑的“《周易》符号学研究专辑”中，祝东、苏智、王俊花与王晓农四位学者分别从易学元语言、《周易》与皮尔斯三分式、皮尔斯现象学以及文化标出性理论入手，融会现代符号学思想与中国传统符号学思想之源头，为符号学的探索提供了新空间。

“传播符号学专辑”与“理论与应用”的诸位作者一如既往地为我们开启开阔的研究视域：从对图像修辞、体育游戏文本的剖析，到对新闻叙述的反思；从中国话语的文化维度审视，到对意识形态世俗化的关注。成熟学科的重新思考与新兴研究领域的构建努力齐头并进，在见证学科不断完善拓展的同时，也体现着符号学与传媒学旺盛的生长力。

作为聆听与传递者，我们一直努力地记录这些对话的声音和成长的轨迹，这正是我们每年春季都会提交一份中国符号学年度发展报告的原因。回顾中国符号学的发展道路，我们很兴奋，每年都有许多人会加入我们的行列。

# 目 录

## 符号叙述学专辑

Introduction to the Special Section “Narrative and Semiosis”	Paul Cobley ( 1 )
Person, Dialogue and Love: The Narratives of the Self	Yunhee Lee ( 6 )
Entangled Memory and Historical Narratives in Intersemiotic Space: Dynamics and Interpretation	Anneli Mihkelev ( 26 )
Vyborg Local Identity: A Case Study of Self-Narrative	Valery Timofeev ( 43 )

## 《周易》符号学研究专辑

符号学视域下的易学元语言研究	祝 东 ( 56 )
《周易》符号系统中的表意三分关系	苏 智 ( 71 )
以三为体，以阴阳为用：《易经》与皮尔斯现象学	王俊花 ( 80 )
从文化符号学标出性理论看《易经》经文标出问题：以卦爻辞之占断专用辞为例	王晓农 ( 102 )

## 传播符号学专辑

营销沟通中图像修辞及其影响	李义娜 ( 114 )
体育与游戏传播的“伴随文本执着”	宗 争 ( 125 )

语境变迁下的“新闻”定义再思考：以符号叙述学为视角 ... 李 玮	(135)
“叙述危机”与“慢新闻” .....	王 强 (146)

## 理论与应用

从政治化到世俗化：意识形态研究的符号学转向 .....	冯月季 (153)
体育叙述学的基本问题 .....	王委艳 (161)
文化维度视角下的中国话语表达 .....	曾庆香 陈若璇 (173)
2015 年中国符号学年度发展报告 .....	赵宝明 (185)

## 书 评

多重意义的开放体系：读《皮尔斯：论符号》 .....	胡易容 (199)
动画传播中的符号学思维：评李涛《动画符号与国家形象》 .....	陆健泽 (204)
衔华佩实，自成一家：评杨义《中国叙事学》 .....	黄建清 (210)



# Contents

## Narrative and Semiosis

Introduction to the Special Section “Narrative and Semiosis” .....	Paul Cobley ( 1 )
Person, Dialogue and Love: The Narratives of the Self .....	Yunhee Lee ( 6 )
Entangled Memory and Historical Narratives in Intersemiotic Space: Dynamics and Interpretation .....	Anneli Mihkelev ( 26 )
Vyborg Local Identity: A Case Study of Self-Narrative .....	Valery Timofeev ( 43 )

## Semiotic Studies of *Book of Changes*

A Semiotic Interpretation of the Metalanguages of the Yi Studies .....	Zhu Dong ( 56 )
On the Triadic Relations of Signifying Modes in the Sign System of <i>Book of Changes</i> .....	Su Zhi ( 71 )
The Application of Three to Two: A Reflection on <i>Book of Changes</i> and Peirce’s Phaneroscopy .....	Wang Junhua ( 80 )
An Analysis of <i>Book of Changes</i> in Light of the Cultural Markedness Theory: With Reference to the Divinatory Judgment Terms in the <i>Gua-Yao</i> Statements .....	Wang Xiaonong ( 102 )

Semiotics of Communication

Pictorial Rhetoric of Marketing Communication and its Effect ..... Li Yina (114)

Co-textual Obsession of Sports and Game Communication  
..... Zong Zheng (125)

Rethinking the Definition of “News” in the Changing Context: From the  
Perspective of Semiotic Narratology ..... Li Wei (135)

“Narrative Crisis” and “Slow Journalism” ..... Wang Qiang (146)

Theory and Application

From Politicisation to Secularisation: The Semiotic Turn in Ideological Studies  
..... Feng Yueji (153)

Essentials of Sports Narratology ..... Wang Weiyan (161)

On Chinese Expression and Culture from the Perspective of Cultural Dimensions  
..... Zeng Qingxiang, Chen Ruoxuan (173)

2015 Annual Report of Chinese Semiotic Studies ..... Zhao Baoming (185)

Book Review

An Open System with Multi-meanings: A Review of C. S. Peirce: *On Signs*  
..... Hu Yirong (199)

A Semiotic Approach to Animation: A Review of Li Tao’s *Animation Signs and  
National Image* ..... Lu Jianze (204)

An Unique Style with Solid Thinking: A Review of Yang Yi’s *Chinese  
Narratology* ..... Huang Jianqing (210)

# 符号叙述学专辑 ● ● ● ● ●

## Introduction to the Special Section “Narrative and Semiosis”

Paul Cobley

DOI: 10.13760/b.cnki.sam.201601001

In the last two decades there have been some clear trajectories of narrative study. The cognitive and social sciences direction of narrative investigation, coupled with more traditional, literary-orientated theories of narrative, augmented by a nod to non-literary media, plus a dash of the more fashionable aspects of discourse analysis, has constituted “postclassical” narratology. The term was inaugurated by Herman (1997) and he notes that narrative theory has “undergone not a funeral or burial but rather a sustained, sometimes startling metamorphosis” (1999: 1; see also Alber & Fludernik, 2010; Nünning, 2003). “Postclassical narratology” has acknowledged the synchronic impulse of the “narratologie” bequeathed by the Paris and Tel Aviv schools, among others, while allowing some of the newer currents in narrative study to flourish.

Nevertheless, “postclassical narratology” has coalesced into a specific school, with certain delimited concerns in cognitive theory—“Theory of Mind”, “worldmaking” and other examples of what Roy Harris (2003) has called “cognobabble”, in preference to traditional designations of cognitive/emotional processes such as “empathy” (Keen, 2007). On its social science side, in part following the heritage of Labov and Waletzky (1968), it has tended to favour such

pursuits as reading off identities from “big” and “small” stories (Bamberg, 2006) of everyday discourse or attempting to trace the linguistic path of fictional constructs in “text world theory” (Werth, 1999).

Clearly, there has been a widespread backlash against some of the shortcomings of “classical” narratology, particularly in its failure to account for narrative’s dynamism, audiences and the vicissitudes of affect. The turn to the study of narrative *across media* that was inaugurated by narratology in the 1960s had had the profound effect of abolishing the value-laden concepts of “Art” and “Literature”, along with their Leavisite baggage of moral and spiritual enrichment. This is arguably its most cherished gift and there is some retention of the spirit of that gift in postclassical narratology’s lip service to “transmedial” narrative. Yet the true lineage from classical narratology to the present is, perhaps, semiotics—the birthplace of narratology.

As Structuralism spread through the human sciences in Europe and then into Anglo-American academia, so did the structuralist-orientated literary theory. Roland Barthes’ essay “Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives” (1977, [1966]) and Tzvetan Todorov’s *Grammaire du Décaméron* (1969), the latter of which actually coined the term “narratologie”, represented the birth of narratology proper. In the late 1960s and early 1970s these paved the way for works by names frequently associated with the narratological enterprise: Mieke Bal, Seymour Chatman, Dorrit Cohn, Gérard Genette and Gerald Prince. Narratology not only encouraged the study of narrative in general, as opposed to the “pure” study of, say, the novel or film, but also grew out of the structuralist imperative to subject different forms to a “neutral” method of questioning. Narratology therefore took encouragement from structuralism and, more broadly, the newly crystallising field of semiotics or the study of the sign in all its manifestations.

However, apart from a couple of decades during which semiotics was fashionable in the West (the 1960s & 1970s)—that being, not coincidentally, also the era of narratology—it has experienced a marginal position in the global academy. The reasons for this are overdetermined and this is not the place to go into them. However, it is sufficient to note, in broad stroke, that the academy has tended to favour the word; the academy’s glottocentrism, its bias towards all things linguistic as characterising the nature of humanity and the world in which we live,

has also been accompanied by neglect, in those instances when it is forced to consider multimodality, of the sheer breadth of sign action in the known universe. In relation to narrative theory, but also applicable to the academy in general, the glaring problem is that the marginalisation of semiotics has invariably entailed that supposedly expository perspectives have proceeded without a general theory of semiosis.

It was this issue that led to the formation of a roundtable on “Narrative and Semiosis” at the 11<sup>th</sup> Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies in Nanjing, October 2012. Arranged and chaired by myself and Professor Yiheng Zhao, himself the author of a landmark work in narratology (2013), the roundtable was a cross-cultural enterprise on intersemiosis, voice, cultural memory, collectivity and mediation, from whose papers the following selection is taken.

Exemplifying the kind of startling and thoughtful work that is being carried out on the margins, Yunhee Lee’s paper “Person, Dialogue and Love: The Narratives of the Self” is set within a strongly Peircean theory of semiosis. Focusing on a somewhat traditional text, although not necessarily one that is often cited in narrative theory—Montaigne’s *Essays*—she presents a complex argument about selfhood achieved through love. Undermining customary accounts of identity with their all-too-frequent individualist overtones, she shows how, through autobiographical narrative, the first-person perspective can connect the narrative self in a storyworld with the moral self in the real world. In order to “know oneself through the possible world of self-narrative”, she writes, “it is a prerequisite to love the other through the established self-narrative”. This might seem to be merely a recasting of the Christian edict to love one’s neighbour or an example of straightforward liberal dialogue; however, as Lee shows quite clearly, such a narrative must be based in a radical Peircean perspective whereby every person is like a “cluster of stars” or a “bundle of habits”, multiple within themselves but having no “absolute demarcation” from neighbouring clusters or bundles.

Two of the papers that follow also give accounts of the core topics of narrative and identity but, once more, do so from a most illuminating marginal position. Anneli Mihkelev’s paper, “Entangled Memory and Historical Narratives in Intersemiotic Space” is concerned with the working of narrative in texts that are interpreted as a mnemonic sign. The cultural memory that she uncovers concerns

Estonian literature, particularly during the Soviet period, when the specificities of tropes and figures such as Hamlet have social and geographical meaning beyond their usual literary historical co-ordinates. Thus, the article proposes “entangled memory”, where remembering is not just an act of recall but a complex process of interpretation.

The second of these two papers also deals with narrative and identity in the wake of the Soviet Union. In an extraordinary and original take on the topic, Valery Timofeev’s “Vyborg Local Identity” selects as its focus the sometimes controversial re-use of old graves. In a town which has had a chequered history in terms of local identity, Timofeev finds that local identity is bound to time and space, built around a (re-) learning of the past. At odds with customary accounts of identity, the paper persuasively argues that the people of Vyborg construct a narrative of their identity precisely because they are *not* self-determining in the usual way; rather, they are doubly-estranged, defamiliarized, “disconnected and cut off” in a fashion that makes the forging of their identity all the more surprising.

# References:

- Alber, J., & Fludernik, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Postclassical narratology: Approaches and analyses*, Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories: Big or small? Why do we care, *Narrative Inquiry*, 16: 1, 139 – 147.
- Barthes, R. (1977, [1966]). Introduction to the structural analysis of narrative. In S. Heath, (Ed. , & Trans. ), *Image-Music-Text* (pp. 79 – 124), Glasgow, UK: Fontana.
- Harris, R. (2003). *Mindboggling: Preliminaries to a science of the mind*. Luton, UK: The Pantaneto Press.
- Herman, D. (1997). Scripts, sequences, and stories: Elements of a postclassical narratology, *PMLA*, 112 (5), 1046 – 1059.
- Keen, S. (2007). *Empathy and the novel*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed. ). *Essays on the verbal and visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society* (pp. 12 – 44). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Nünning, A. (2003). Narratology or narratologies? Taking stock of recent developments, critique and modest proposals for future uses of the term. In T. Kindt, & H. -H. Müller (Eds. ), *What*

- is Narratology?* (pp. 239 – 275). Berlin, DEU: de Gruyter.
- Todorov, T. (1969). *Grammaire du Décaméron*. The Hague, NLD: Mouton.
- Werth, P. (1999). *Text worlds: Representing conceptual space in discourse*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Zhao, Y. (2013). *A General narratology*. Chengdu, CHN: Sichuan University Press.

#### Author:

Paul Cobley, professor in Language and Media at Middlesex University, president of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (2014 – 2019). His research fields are semiotics and biosemiotic studies.

#### 作者简介:

保罗·科布利, 英国密德萨斯大学传媒与表演艺术学院教授, 国际符号学协会主席 (2014—2019), 研究方向为符号学与生物符号学。

Email: p. cobley@mdx.ac.uk

## Person, Dialogue and Love: The Narratives of the Self

Yunhee Lee

**Abstract:** This paper uses Peirce's semiotic perspective to explore narrative ideas about identity and to examine the processes of self-formation through narration. The self is examined as an instance of semiosis that exists in three stages of consciousness, which correspond to Peirce's categories of phenomena: corporeal, social, and spiritual consciousness. I argue that social consciousness is a two-sided consciousness consisting of ego and non-ego. This consciousness is embodied in I-and-You relationships, which are the primordial forms of the narratives of self that are necessary for knowing, loving and narrating. That is, the act of loving another mediates the desire for wisdom, and love is required to know oneself. For this inquiry, I examine Montaigne's autobiographical writing, *Essays*, focusing on the friendship between Montaigne and La Boétie. This friendship illustrates dialogic love as a method for self-formation; that is, such friendships create a narrative dialectic through which the narrative self can acquire a personal identity as part of the communal self.

**Keywords:** self-consciousness, Peirce's semeiotic, Montaigne, narratives, person, autobiographical writing

### 个人、对话与爱：自我叙述

李允熙

**摘 要：**本文主要运用皮尔斯符号学原理来探讨关于身份问题的叙述理论，同时也考察叙述对自我的建构过程。自我作为符号过程实



体存在于意识的三个阶段，正好对应皮尔斯的三个现象范畴：肉体、社会与精神意识。笔者认为社会意识是一种双面的意识，由自我与非自我构成，该种意识通过“我和你”的关系得到体现。这种关系是自我叙述的基本模式，是了解、爱与叙述的基础。也即是说，爱别人的行为调节人对智慧的欲望，要了解自我则必须有爱。基于这个问题，笔者试图探讨蒙田的自传性作品《随笔录》，主要关注蒙田与埃蒂安·德拉博埃蒂间的友谊。这段友谊阐明了对话性的爱是一种构建自我的方式。也就是说，这种友谊创造了一种叙述话语，叙述自我通过这一话语能够获得个人身份，而这一个人身份则是群体自我的一部分。

**关键词：**自我意识，皮尔斯符号学，蒙田，叙述，个人，自传性作品

**DOI:** 10.13760/b.cnki.sam.201601002

*A person is in truth like a cluster of stars, which appears to be one star when viewed with the naked eye, but which scanned with the telescope of scientific psychology is found on the one hand to be multiple within itself, and on the other hand to have no absolute demarcation from a neighbouring condensation*

—C. S. Peirce<sup>①</sup>

## I . Postclassical Narratology and the Self

David Herman described postclassical narratology as a triangulation of narrative, media and mind (2010, p. 139). Alternative names for postclassical narratology are cognitive narratology and transmedial narratology. Both approaches extend narrative inquiry from structural narratives to dynamic narratives that represent both the mind and real-life experiences across different media. Accordingly, postclassical narratology is not limited to literary or verbal narratives and can examine not only the narrative representation of words, images and actions, but also those of the mind and lived experience.

In this respect, postclassical narratology concerns the interrelationship between the internal world and the external world. The basic premise of this approach is that narratives are the semiotic representation of the internal world projected onto the

<sup>①</sup> Quoted in De Waal (2013, p. 155).