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根據原定計畫進行步驟，第一年主要在收集英文為主之相關文獻，焦點在早期塔爾吐學派生物學家烏也斯庫爾（Jakob von Uexkull）及俄國生態學家維那斯基（Vladimir I. Vernadsky）資料之建立。為配合這部分工作，本人於九十一學年度上學期開設「佩爾茲符號學—圖示與生物學」課程，與博士生一起閱讀相關作品（見附件一）。本人與計畫合作人塔爾吐(Tartu)大學庫爾(Kalevi Kull)教授保持通訊，商得其同意參與其主持之自然符號學研討會，預定於六月八日至十日於芬蘭以馬它（Imatra）國際符號學院（International Semiotics Institute）舉行。摘要見附件二。該自然符號學研討會已延續三年，參與學者多為北歐之符號學者。再者，哥本哈根大學之霍夫邁爾教授（Jesper Hoffmeyer）亦接受本人與博士生之論文摘要（見附件三），預定於七月十一至十四日參與第三屆生命符號學國際研討會（3rd Gathering of Biosemiotics）。本人於2001年曾參與第一屆大會，發表論文”Naming Animals in Chinese Writing”，已於塔爾吐大學符號學系主編之期刊出版(Sign System Studies 29.2: 647-56)。此次第三屆大會則提供本計畫發展與演練的場所。以上皆準備充分，即將執行之際，國內爆發急性呼吸道症候群（SARS），影響國際合作之執行，上述芬蘭以馬它會議勢難成行，已報請貴會人文處修改計畫。然而，哥本哈根會議則維持不變，待會議結束之後，將檢附論文報告。

【附件一】Perice Study: Diagramming and Biology

課程說明：This project-related course is designed for upper-grade doctoral students interested in Peircean “semiotics.” It will enquire into the possible links between Peirce and Kant regarding the American philosopher’s concept of categories, especially iconicity and diagramming as opposed to symbol, and enquire into the relationship between Peircian semiotics and the rising discipline of biosemiotics. The course will use Eco 1999 as the guidelines for enquiry and students are requested to read chapters 2, 3, and 6 of the book before reading Kant and Peirce.

(A) Primary Materials


(B) Secondary Materials:


【附件二】Abstract for the Imatra Workshop on Semiotics of Nature, 10-14 June 2003

**On Thure von Uexküll’s Use of Saussure**

Han-liang Chang, National Taiwan University, changhl@ccms.ntu.edu.tw

Like other sciences, biosemiotics also has its time-honoured archive, consisting, among other things, of writings by those who have been invented and revered as ancestors of the discipline. One such example is Jakob von Uexküll. As to the people who ‘invent’ him, they are either, to paraphrase a French cliché, ‘agents du
cosmopolitisme sémiotique’ like Thomas A. Sebeok, or de jure and de facto progenitor like Thure von Uexküll. The archive I have in mind is the special issue of *Semiotica* 42.1 (1982) edited by the late Sebeok and introduced by Thure von Uexküll. It is in the opening essay that Thure von Uexküll tries to restore Jakob von Uexküll’s role as a precursor of semiotics by negotiating the Elder with Saussure and the linguistics-oriented ‘semiology’ in his wake. However, semiotic mapping, in the strictly ‘disciplinary’ sense, of Jakob von Uexküll is no easy task because he ‘knew neither Peirce nor Saussure and did not use their terminology’ (Thure von Uexküll, 1982: 2). Because Thure prefers to call his father’s science ‘general semiotics’ (*ibid.*), this paper tries to assess Thure von Uexküll’s semiotic configuration of Jakob von Uexküll in the said essay, probe into the force and limit of the linguistic analogy Thure draws with Jakob’s ‘biosemiotics’, and suggest an alternative Hjelmslevian reinforcement.

中文說明：Thure 生物符號學為晚近崛起之學問，在 Peirce 與 Saussure 符號學兩大傳統之外獨樹一支，後來學者重新發現先行者 Jakob von Uexkull 之貢獻，而他在二十世紀初未曾涉獵 Peirce 與 Saussure，但他獨創一體系龐大之動物生態符號系統，將其稱之為 Umwelt。後世學者探討這個概念多希望透過原有的符號學架構來進行，Jakob 之子 Thure，現任德國 Freiburg 大學醫學教授，早期使用 Saussure 座標探討 Jakob 著作，期望愈乃父驗明證身。本文探討索式符號學作爲後設規模系統的適切性，算是對早期生命符號學的解讀。

【附件三】Abstracts for the 3rd Gatherings of Biosemiotics, Copenhagen, 11-14 July 2003

**Notes towards a Semiotics of Parasitism**

Han-liang Chang, Professor of Semiotics, National Taiwan University  
changhl@ccms.ntu.edu.tw

The metaphor of parasites or parasitism has dominated literary critical discourse since the 1970s. Two prominent examples are Michel Serres in France and J. Hillis Miller in America. In their writings the relationship between text and paratext, literature and criticism, is often likened to that between host and parasite, and can be therefore deconstructed. Their writings, along with those by Derrida, Barthes, and Thom, seem to be suggesting the possibility of a semiotics of parasitism. Unfortunately, none of these writers has drawn enough on the biological foundation of parasitism and very little, if ever, has been produced in this regard. Curiously, on the other hand, even in biology, parasitism is already a metaphor through which the signified of an ecological phenomenon involving two organisms is expressed by the signifier of ‘[eating] food at another’s [side] table’. This paper will make some preliminary remarks on semiotics of parasitism, based on Jakob von Uexkull's notion of Umwelt and Maturana/Varela’s notion of structural coupling. It will look into the phenomenon of co-evolutionary process in community ecology. With reference to empirical history, the project will briefly survey the literary and medical praxis of the 17th century England where large number of creative writings referred to the phenomenon of parasitism, which was deeply embedded in religious practice (e.g., the Eucharist) and political life (e.g., the courtier ecology in monarchy) of the times. Finally, it will touch upon the possible ‘parasitic’ relationship between language and biology.
寄生、共生是生物學及生物演化史上頗為常見的生態現象，然而兩者之專門研究至七、八十年代仍成果有限，此為生物學家之共識。有趣的是，自七十年代開始，文學批評界喜歡使用寄生現象作爲暗喻，比較著名的兩位學者如法國的Michel Serres與美國的J. Hillis Miller，兩者將文學創作與批評之間的關係比擬為宿主與寄生物的關係，顯然已觸及寄生符號學之可能發展。可惜的是，除了Michel Serres之外，其他人文學者對生化科學了解相當有限，因而無法更深入討論寄生現象。寄生於希臘文中已是一個隱喻（metaphor），暗指兩生物個體相互依存之生態現象，Para-sitos即意指掠食他人之物。本文討論寄生現象之符號學意涵，主要以Jakob von Uexküll之構建世界（Umwelt construction）以及Maturana之結構偶合（structural coupling）為理論基礎，探討生態現象中兩個生物機體之共同演化過程。寄生學誕生於十七世紀之義大利，接下來於英國發展亦結合當時之醫學與新科學儀器之發明，玄學派詩人與劇作家喜歡使用寄生為作品中之暗喻，更反映當時王權政治生態、疾病流行、治療，以及宗教實踐上的想像。本文期透過人文學者的觀點重新檢視寄生作用於各種社會建制中所扮演的角色。

Diagramming as a Convergence of C.S. Peirce, Jakob von Uexküll, and E. Gombrich

Juipi Angelina Chien, Graduate Institute of Foreign Languages and Literatures, National Taiwan University
angie_chien@hotmail.com

According to my previous rapprochement of Gombrich and Lotman in the context of communication-modeling systems, schema presents several potential locations to be 1) a primary modeling system, as a precedent of natural language system, 2) at the center of semiospheres, as an abstracted end, and 3) at the margin of semiospheres, as a mechanism to model stimulus. These different locations reveal the ambiguous use of schema in different theoretical positions. One of the aims of this study is to explore schema as thirdness by coupling Peirce’s triadic categories and Jakob von Uexküll's Umwelt construction. I am going to argue that schema as thirdness in the Peircean and Uexküllian universe of signs is neither a primitive beginning nor an abstracted end but a set in the subject's mind, which is definitely a priori but still functions to mediate perceptual signs and operational signs. According to Uexküll, the collaborations of schema and direction signs are capable of shaping and constructing the functional circles. In this sense, schema is not directed to the outer world but already set in the animal egos to sustain ontological perfections. Another aim of this study is to pick up Ernst Gombrich’s Uexküllian tone in his study of the biological relevance of decorations. Gombrich made an obvious shift of theoretical positions from Art and Illusion to The Sense of Order; the former elaborates the concept of linguistic codes in visual communications while the later reinstates the man-made order in organizing the outer world. In the later context, schema as a source of stability and decorations as proofs of multiple adaptive advances portray art evolutions (Luhmann 2000). Based on the constant cycles among the subject's schema, perceptions, and actions (or the bifurcations among the Peircean categories) in phylogenic struggles, this study will also lead to an innervated rather than a linguistic approach to visual arts.