

The Lexical Eidos as an Invariant of a Polysemantic Word

S. Pesina, T. Solonchak

Abstract—Phenomenological analysis is not based on natural language, but ideal language which is able to be a carrier of ideal meanings – eidos representing typical structures or essences. For this purpose, it's necessary to release from the spatio-temporal definiteness of a subject and then state its noetic essence (eidos) by means of free fantasy generation. Herewith, as if a totally new objectness is created - the universal, confirming the thesis that thinking process takes place in generalizations passing by numerous means through the specific to the general and from the general through the specific to the singular.

Keywords—Lexical eidos, phenomenology, noema, polysemantic word, semantic core.

I. INTRODUCTION

SINCE phenomenologists are firstly interested in pure consciousness and transcendental subjectness, it's quite logical that a speaking person is scarcely studied by them: Natural language has not acquired the status of an independent object under study in transcendental phenomenology as phenomenological analyses are rested on logic, the content of which is based on transcendental subjectivity, and it doesn't require language at all. Actually not only consistency is common to philosophical thinking, but deep penetration to natural language by means of which the cognition of the external world is realized.

More often communicative situations encourage a person to language practice, a creative, problematic, risky language act, surrounded by the cloud of connotations, metaphors, associations, analogies, and allegories frequently creating the real context of misunderstanding. Herewith language words function in a foggy cloud of varied contexts playing the part of designation and communication as symbols requiring for its understanding and using an additional activity – interpretation. This symbolism attaches mystique to a word and secrecy to its meaning: not just an informativity, but emotive suggestivity – it is that the word taken at the limit in its uppermost guise is expected from.

The fact that subjective, emotionally evaluative, and connotative components are disregarded in phenomenology is possibly represented the one-sidedness of that approach: Thought unaccompanied by emotions is vain since sense doesn't exist in its pure form, it is nurtured by emotions. Each

perceived word, gesture, flavour, taste, image is immediately interpreted by sensations. In addition, the process of remembering of the new occurs, as a rule, against the background of the positive or negative, but sufficiently strong emotional impulse which “opens doors” in the new area of neural connections. In other words, language processes as well as thinking are closely connected to sensuous and emotional expressive analyzers involved as an effective support in the process of the language information reinforcing from the stream of impressions and their memory retention.

It should be noted that in the later works phenomenologists have turned attention to a certain subject which uses language and to intersubjective functions of the latter. Addressing the world of life issues (the recognition the right of common sense position) enabled phenomenologists to study language not only as an interpersonal communication medium, but the important instrument of research study. In this regard Husserl's work “The Origin of Geometry” is distinctive. It can set the pace of phenomenological analysis of notional developmental history of scientific concepts [1]. The author wonders by what means scientific knowledge in general and geometric knowledge in particular are given opportunity to become valid; why scientific knowledge having initially appeared in individual consciousness nevertheless becomes an intersubjective one. The analysis of this issue leads Husserl to the conclusion that person cognizes not only himself and the world at large, but is able to transfer his knowledge to other people.

Philosophers of phenomenology take language factor into account to a greater extent, treating language as an essential component of the world of life horizon, as a mean of the cognition and interpretation of the surrounding reality. It means that language intersubjective significance should be understood based on the reflection of subjectivity structures which define its nature and its functioning laws. The ontology of “Dasein” as a theory of extensionals consisting of language should represent methodological base for its ontology.

Thus, since everyday experience doesn't allow us to determine base language notional structures functioning, special methods are necessary which can act as an attempt to address the issue of notional structures “validity” and their components motivation.

II. LEXICAL EIDOS CONCEPT

The distinctive feature of an image of an individual is concreteness: it can be created in the human mind as a result of incorporating a variety of characteristics to form an image. The image of an individual can vary in the minds of different

S. Pesina is with the Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, 11-54, Metallurgov pr., Magnitogorsk, 455000 (phone: +7-904-810-0806; fax: +7-351-938-1669; e-mail: spesina@bk.ru).

T. Solonchak is with the Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University 38, Lenin pr., Magnitogorsk, 455000 (phone: +7-912-804-7889; e-mail: tanusha_mgn@mail.ru).

people, but it is always isolated and specific in the mind of one person at a certain time. Images of classes have both specificity and generality. Specificity, because these types of images appear as representations of a single object or are created based on a variety of different objects. Generality as a result of the fact that the image of the class has a more flexible range of incorporated distinguishing class features. The ideal image of a class occupies an intermediate position between the concrete concept of an individual and the abstract concept of the general. Appearing in the transition from a single reflection to the general, from the concrete to the abstract, from the finite to the variable, the image of a class combines understanding with reality and operationally provides two functions of understanding - to implement the conceptualization of things and to delineate the identity of a class.

It is possible to distinguish between linguistic and stylistic imagery, and with that, while using the stylistic approach in language, there forms, not only a logical, but an aesthetic way of thinking: An inadequate reflection of beings and objects, in which those features are consciously chosen and relayed, through which it is possible to transfer a given concept into a concrete pictorial form. The lexical approach aims at identifying the nature of imagery as a phenomenon inherent in words, in particular, its ability to reflect an imaginative vision of reality.

Speaking of imagery, it is impossible to ignore such a stereotypical mechanism of thinking as schematization. When distracted, non-object phenomena are conceptualized through an image and likeness of the material world and in the lexicon of imagery they take on a concretely sensuous form. Here develops the anthropomorphism of image perception - the commensurability of the surrounding reality with images and symbols that are easily understood by humans: images and symbols which become value based stereotypes. Indeed, straight is seen as being honest, true, while crooked is false; soft is seen as weak and good, while solid represents resoluteness and stubbornness. Reflecting the traditional ethno-cultural figurative representations embodied in language, this vocabulary conveys the value relation of man to himself and to the world around him.

Data on the types and characteristics of these images can be found in works focusing on experimental psychological research. Using this, M. A. Kholodnaya identifies the following fundamental variants in the imagery of words: No images, concretely associated images, object-structural images (the substantive, detailed image of a specified object, in which the subject focuses on any of the object's essential features), sensual-sensory images (emotional experience), generalized images (these are also the schemes in which the specified object is explained using a combination of highly generalized visual elements, such as vectors, points and geometric forms), conventional visual signs (maximally generalized images in the forms of alphabetic, numeric and algebraic symbols) [2].

As we continue to accomplish task related to linguistic philosophy main questions, semantic layer of different levels determination and definition of the most significant, essential,

and general semantic and mental properties, qualities, and mechanisms of consciousness we introduce the concept of **lexical eidos (LE)** based on the theory of eidos. Including "lexical" attribute we emphasize language essence of the given phenomenon and states that a discussion of specific speech material analysis comes next.

Firstly we'll define the nature of LE in the range of such notions as "closer" and "farther" of the center. Concentric structure has the community of monads, indeed. There's a central monad as a transcendental subject located in the centre of the community. Other monads are located at the periphery. The central monad is an original and main one. The same is true for the "primordial" layer of phenomena: these are phenomena directly available to transcendental Ego. There are purely universal objects: a number, a triangular, a human as such, beauty itself, but there are no purely individual objects such that have no universal component.

The further task in the frame of this paper is the determination of such universal components in the composition of universal objects semantically expressed by polysemantic words. It's necessary to define identification criteria of these universal objects, their semantic core in comparison with LE, state levels of representation and functioning of these phenomena.

Phenomenologists, especially in the later period, put a greater emphasis on the consciousness of personal perception, i.e. in what manner a reflecting person comprehends reduction as a transcendental ego. Thus, we try to give an answer in what way Ego as reduced to pure personal sphere inside of the "phenomenon of the world", reduced in the same way, correlates to Ego as a transcendental Ego.

This paper doesn't set a task to study the process in what way consciousness of self as a transcendental Ego occurs as a result of parenthesizing the entire remaining objective world. A human, being the pole of his varied pure experiences, is nevertheless identical to his own Ego.

We take as a basis the assumption that each transcendental phenomenological analysis can be carried out under the conditions of natural grounds refusing transcendental attitude. We also refuse purely psychological investigations in the field of transcendental personality theory as we consider this theory becomes attributing to psychology when transferring phenomenological analysis to the area of transcendental naivete.

We understand *Lexical eidos*, as a language essence, as an aggregate of the most significant universal semantic components which are intuitively defined in the course of phenomenological reduction and are unchanged in the stream of meanings variation composing the semantic formula of a word or a phrase; lexical eidos content is revealed at the level of scientific and logical consciousness [3], [4].

LE can be interpreted in terms of linguistics as an invariant associative notional complex assigned to a word in the consciousness of communicants, which is based not only on word semantic structure, grammatical formation, word-formative structure, and motivational connections, but existing one in the society of tradition usage. However in the process

of phenomenological reduction abstracting from grammatical, pragmatic, and morphologic connections takes place.

III. ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LEXICAL EIDOS

LE, being the model or formula of a word, manages the process of metaphoric meanings semiosis and is fundamental for concept formation. It can be decrypted as a universal construct, by means of which any articulation and therefore existential essence understanding by way of which person sees, understands, and speaks is possible.

LE represents the infinite in the finite that enables an individual to find a pivot in his phenomenal layer of consciousness. LE should be comprehended as an example of some pure possibility [5], [6]. In this regard Husserl's words which also fit the LE characteristics can be cited: "Eidos itself is a given in contemplation or available to contemplation universal – the pure, absolute, independent of any fact. It precedes all essences understood as words meanings; on the contrary they themselves should be formulated in accordance with eidos as pure notions" [7].

The conceptual framework for LE formation is contextual actualizations of meanings involved in a polysemant. LE includes the programme for all (or almost all) particular meanings of a word and, vice versa, each variant has subtle reference to a model which manages the process of transferred meanings semiosis. LE isn't of declarative, but dynamic, namely, procedural nature: the process of actualization of meanings by a speaker is conceived as sequential "assembly" of more complicated structures on the base of integral and differential components of the main meaning.

We understand words as a matter of practical necessity, level of language proficiency, general mental level, formed worldview. Therefore, frequently there is no need to thoroughly learn all meanings and possible meanings or usage of one or another word: when we use one or another word, its actualization doesn't occur to the full extent, i.e. all possible meanings and shades of meaning. In the process of perceiving, our consciousness, accompanied by contextual meanings decoding, can base upon LE among other things as a word generalized semantic invariant. Wittgenstein did write "when I am said *"cube"*, I know what it means. But is its usage appears in my consciousness at the full extent then?" [8]. Hence it appears that word correlation to all possible contexts is not the most effective way of language learning. This process can be dramatically simplified getting familiar with the word formula or its LE. On the other hand, LE can be discovered introspectively, studying usage and basing upon polysemant structure analysis. In our opinion, the polysemantic word system meaning of speech community is related to all actual meanings invariant, i.e. lexical core and lexical eidos.

In this respect we need more precise definition of differences of the polysemantic word semantic core from the LE. The latter functions at the level of language system (and it is postulated as "lexical") despite apparent connections with cognitive processes (for example, with conceptualization and categorization). Semantic core consists of the smaller bundle of components, it is associated with lexis functioning. Thus

semantic core is a linguistic essence, and LE is a philosophical one.

If we take as a basis context as meanings and senses in oral and written speech acts realization, LE can be certainly referred to zero context. We understand the latter not in terms of thinking as material consciousness properties (according to D. Searle), but in terms of linguistics: as a certain extracontextual general meaning, a semantic core.

At the level of language system in long-term memory polysemantic words obviously have single instant connection between form image and generalized invariant meaning. LE is formed as a result of the numerous manifestations of contextual meanings. It is formulated as a result of abstracting from everything that is psychic and those predicates of the objective world, the presence of which is personally conditioned. It's possible to suppose that invariant meanings of polysemantic words are systemically important units which demonstrate the non-reflectivity of the language system level in relation to the speech level. It should be noted phenomenology has always taken interest in such language system universal units revealing.

IV. LEXICAL EIDOS IN SPEAKING AND THINKING PROCESSES

Further it's necessary to define the role of LE in situations of speaking and thinking process proceeding. In the course of words actualization system meanings of their forms (LE) come into cooperation with system meanings of other words forms. When perceiving form the image of system form content equal to LE appears in consciousness, according to code. Further with regard to speech context the desired meaning of expression is being formed, during which consciousness derives a transferred meaning based on LE. As was repeatedly said above, abstraction (eidos) is formed on the base of numerous speech actualizations of main and transferred meanings. On the other hand, the polysemant is also formed around similar semantic and at the same time conceptual core from which, probably, random meanings are formed with minimal cognitive efforts. Studies show the more meanings a polysemant has, the poorer its lexical eidos is.

Polysemantic word LE existing and functioning is explained by the fact that person is able to comprehend an expression if only he has at least the most generalized, conceptual idea of referential situation described by the expression. If a listener doesn't see and doesn't know this specific situation, he has to reconstruct it on the base of his knowledge and eidetic meanings of words consisting of the expression [9]-[11].

V. EIDETIC ANALYSIS CARRYING OUT

The examples of eidetic analysis given by E. Husserl are simple enough. Thus, he writes that when perceiving a tree, abstracting from its individual characteristics and varying the properties that makes the tree remains a tree, it's possible to reveal its invariant meaning, that "prototype of tree" which is its essence, an "eidos". Then developing fantasy and varying the acquired eidos of the tree in imagination we can arrive to

the more general eidos – the eidos of a plant as it is. But the limit of progressive ideation is the regional area of being to which one or another subject under examination relates to. Further this area is also subjected to reduction and the “directivity” of consciousness itself or intention remains [12].

Similar essences are singled out using the method of free variation of subject properties imaginatively. For example, one or another subject is described, and then its description changes: one of predicates of description is added or dismissed. This operation is repeated regarding all characteristics of the subject that makes possible to find out whether the subject changes or remains as it was. If the predicate change leads to the subject change it is referred to its essential characteristics. Similar cogitative variation of subject properties helps to determine its essential and invariable features which comprise the subject essence (eidos).

Since edos of one region (category) fundamentally differ from the edos of other region, the characteristics of, for example, tree eidos cannot be characteristics of mineral eidos relating to inorganic nature. They're unified not by the specific meaning, but by the form only. If we free from eidos specific characteristics, it is possible to talk about absolutely empty form “something in general”, “form in general”.

As can be seen from the above, in the course of eidetic analysis we need to sequentially “parenthesize” all predicates given to the subjects of contemplation. At the same time it's necessary to include in description sense-making act of consciousness as the subject of description reducing them to pure transcendental activity in which they become meaning-bearing.

The essence of phenomenological clarification of language acts contained in descriptive description is that sense bearing accidents are excluded of these contents, the mechanisms of associative meanings adherence are clarified by means of noetic analysis. Associative meanings can be understood as meanings adherent in a new connection.

As can be observed from few attempts to carry out eidetic analysis to the end (properly speaking, almost nobody tried to do it), phenomenological eidetic analysis is carried out on material and with regard to one first meaning. Polysemy is virtually disregarded; it is almost taken out of the context.

Following attempt to determine LE will suppose due regard to both first meaning and remain reconceived meanings of a given polysemantic word. In our opinion, lexical eidos should involve base components of general nature and remaining meanings of a word, being an abstraction denoting “something in general”. In the process of analysis all features of special nature are parenthesized being reduced to pure abstraction, but the only difference being (in comparison with traditional eidetic analysis) its carrying out with regard to all meanings comprising a lexeme. It gives knowledge not only what one meaning in its pure state represents, but makes possible to get the eidetic (pure) formula of a word at large.

To define the *lexical* in the represented term of lexical eidos exactly means that the question is, firstly, language phenomenon, and, secondly, the word semantics. Thus, such LE should be the base of all meanings formation and include

minimal, but sufficient number of components necessary for all LSV identification of lexeme under study. In this regard LE precedes all given contextual realizations understood as meaning of a word [13], [14].

Nevertheless it's impossible to deny the leading role of the first main nominative underived and most frequently used meaning. This position is supported by the fact that language speakers provide exactly the first meaning of a polysemant when they are presented corresponding graphical or audio signifiers. However, the structure of polysemantic words is such that not many meanings are formed from the first one. The scheme of a word can be not radial, but chain or mixed when subsequent meanings formed from the previous ones. In this case it's extremely difficult to grasp that general sense which bonds all meanings of a polysemant preventing them from separating to homonyms.

To derive the polysemantic word LE which might be pure essence and comprise all meanings, the role of the first nominative underived meaning should be widened by means of comparison component. This next stage of generalization along with the first meaning represents that essential semantic core equal to the LE of a word, which, in our understanding, is the semantic invariant of all LSW of a polysemant [15].

To make the difference between Husserl's eidos and the eidos postulated in this study clearer, it makes sense to provide the analysis of the polysemant of *tree* on material of English language since English equivalents as a rule have more extensive network of figurative meanings and the LE will be presented more vividly.

Thus apart from the first meaning the word *tree* also includes seven figurative meanings (for example, “arterial or venous blood-vascular system of the body of an animal”, “computer system”, “genealogy”, “the network of telephone numbers”, etc.). If we carry our reduction in the spirit of phenomenology and abstract from specific and subjective components, it appears that all meanings of this polysemantic word including the first one are based on the same components - *a system, with many branches, in which every branch can be traced to a single origin.*

The figurative rethinking included in the *tree* lexeme is the result of processes of assimilation various objects to the tree. These assimilations occur in consequence of one of the situation non genuineness as compared objects are not congruent. Thus the basis of the metaphor *a family tree* is the similarity (in form) of scheme with all curves showing dependences with the structure (appearance) of the tree. Similar to the tree having a single trunk as a main supporting part and a crown consisting of branches and leaves, family tree represents transfer by similarity scheme of the tree arrangement: the numerous parts of the object originating from one common initial part. This meaning is based on the following core components: *a system, with many branches, in which every branch can be traced to a single origin.*

The basis of the *computer tree* word-combination is assimilation by the form of computer derivational system of information ordering to the structure of the tree. To the extent that each branch of the tree is connected with the trunk

through bigger initial branches and eventually with the root, to the same extent each information bit is connected with a single source by a certain signal. The semantics of *tree* including the most significant features suggests the presence of the same semes of the previous meaning: 'a system', 'with many branches', 'in which every branch can be traced to a single origin'.

In a figurative rethinking *tree of an animal body* the arterial or venous blood-vascular system of the body of an animal as multichannel branches from the single larger vessel or artery is also assimilated to a tree, i.d. to the trunk with extensive branches. The meaning is based on the same abstract components: *a system, with many branches, in which every branch can be traced to a single origin*.

Thus, it's possible to add to the derived bundle of abstract components a system, with many branches, in which every branch can be traced to a single origin the formulation of the *first* underived meaning (the significance of which was discussed above): a tall plant with a wooden trunk and branches, which is unbranched for some distance above the ground.

The first meaning was also obtained on the base of abstracting from insignificant characteristics given in definitions of more than twenty definition dictionaries of the English language (phenomenological reduction of transferred meanings semantics was also carried out on material of more than twenty definition dictionaries of the English language, but in view of limited possibilities attributed to the volume of work the introduction of the complete analysis does not seem possible). In this respect it should be noted that, for example, the component of the first meaning *unbranched for some distance above the ground* is included in this definition since it is distinctive relating to the phenomenon of *bush*, for example. The given formulation includes only central components necessary for this object identification at the level of an average language speaker.

Existing phraseological units are also included in the semantic phenomenological analysis, for example, *to be at the top of the tree*. The producing of the general sense of this phraseological unit occurs on the base of a person at the top of the tree. As long as, according to the features of the external world categorization by a person, up is always good, and down is bad, this image implies the following interpretation: "being at the top of a tree or some structure, a person occupies advantageous position". Direct and transferred meanings are motivated by the same notion: "the upper is the most advantageous position". The analysis results show that the main component of this phraseological unit is the first part of LE identical to the first meaning.

Since the English *tree* is a typical one-component polysemantic word, the obtained LE will be equal to the lexical prototype resulting from semantic analysis. Both in the process of phenomenological reduction and linguistic analysis focused on the search of invariants/semantic core/lexical prototype, the consciousness of a researcher addresses the analysis of what is actually contained in the pure experience as the matter of the perceiving (mental) and in what forms

meanings function and are stored, which are constantly assigned to the consciousness. Both phenomenological and linguistic descriptions deal with the same issues concerning in what way a subject is identified as "this subject", how objective meanings are born in the elementary acts of consciousness - in perceiving, in naming, in keeping in the consciousness, in its reappearance in the consciousness, in a perceiving, etc.

As we can see the acquired LE has no any components of subjective nature. Minimal abstracting from details made possible to point out the most significant components of LE of general nature, practically covering the semantics of all meanings of the word *tree*. According to the rule of eidetic reduction the experience accidentally gained from reality should be systematically parenthesized. De facto it is true for any pure philosophizing, as initially the kingdom of notion or the world of Ideas, as Plato wrote, consists only of the a priori essential structures of reality.

VI. EIDETIC ANALYSIS AND POLYSEMY

We have shown that phenomenological analysis can be based on natural language, rather than on ideal one. Natural language can be the carrier of the ideal meaning – edos representing typical noetic structures or essences. Herewith as if a totally new objectness is created - the universal, confirming the thesis that thinking process takes place in generalizations passing by numerous means through the specific to the general and from the general through the specific to the singular. Much depends on which of the meanings of the word is used, moreover, frequently used words are mostly polysemantic. As in cognitive linguistics, in the practice of phenomenological description meanings and contextual nuances play an important role and require the most in-depth analysis. From here it clearly follows that it is necessary to pay attention to the functioning of natural language and to give it the status of an independent object of study [16], [17].

It follows that one of the main obstacles to both the definition and operation of edos in the phenomenological analysis is multiple meanings of natural language. Figuratively speaking, language has to "spread" an infinite number of meanings to some sections of basic ideas of various objects and phenomena. In addition, phenomenologists, as well as linguists, face the challenge associated with polysemy – to define the necessary contextual features or meaning of the word.

VII. COGNITIVE VIEW OF THE PHENOMENON OF POLYSEMY

Among the causes of the expansion of the range of use of an existing word with fixed meaning, the main ones are extralinguistic ones. Various historical, social, economic, technological, and other changes in people's lives give rise to the need to generate new names. Notably the meanings perceived now as figurative, can eventually become direct or primary, and vice versa, especially as a result of the loss of direct meaning code (for example, the dictionaries

traditionally defined the first meaning of the English noun “coach” as “carriage”, now more dictionaries put the meaning “passenger coach” first, on the basis of use frequency). This process, called “semantic derivation” manifests itself as a tendency of language, the propensity to order symbol connections and relations with the need to reflect the endless contacts between objects. Furthermore, the technical and general progress leads to creation of neologisms: languages, in which the word formation is underdeveloped, are filling gaps in the vocabulary by adding new meanings to the existing word forms.

Principle of equality of words and meanings would turn sign in a fixed device, devoid of the ability to transfer movement from the specific to the abstract, from the literal to the figurative, from the particular to the general. If each character would perform only one function, the language would be just a collection of labels. At the same time, it is impossible to imagine a language, where signs would be so mobile that they wouldn't mean anything outside the specific situations. This implies that the nature of verbal sign must be both constant and mobile.

Thus, the language is a complex system, which functions not only for the simple naming of objects and phenomena, but for expression of the thoughts and feelings of people living in the modern world. In general, despite the fact that multiple words complicate the process of communication it is an effective mean to transfer the infinite diversity of human thoughts and feelings. Creation of separate denotation for each individual object, phenomena or class of objects, facts and phenomena would result in excessive amplification of the lexical system, which would make it very difficult to use. Polysemy is a linguistic economy. However, it should be noted that quite often polysemy studies excluded extra-linguistic factor from the linguistic research. Under this approach, the meanings are formed and interact on its own, without the involvement of human consciousness, and the polysemy is based on logical-conceptual, theoretical modeling of the connection between language and cognition [18]-[22].

VIII. POLYSEMY AND LEXICAL EIDOS

This research proposes a solution of the most complicated problem of understanding and operating of polysemantic words the use of which poses a grinding difficulty for phenomenological analysis (and others), since any consciousness – phenomenological or ordinary – cannot but ignore the fact that polysemy unfavours mutual understanding. The knowledge of LE or semantic formula of a word can help to avoid the necessity to keep in mind all figurative meanings. Each actualization of a meaning of a polysemantic word leads to the formation of some persistent knowledge. This means some ideal immanence which refers us to further significant interrelations of possible syntheses. It makes possible to talk about system language meanings (in contrast to speech context realizations fixed in dictionaries) including components of abstract nature covering the semantics of all derived meanings. In other words, the notion of a subject as it is and a subject similar to it (metaphor) is possible.

Let's exemplify it using the analysis of polysemy for the purpose of LE determination on the material of the Russian and the English languages. Thus, the word head has quite developed semantic structure and includes more than hundred meanings. The LE of this word, including both essential features of the main meaning and abstract substance of the word, can be formulated in the following way: head is the upper part of the human body that contains the eyes, nose, mouth, ears and brain or something resembling it (the top, round and/or the most important part of a larger object; the beginning or end of it). The definition part in bold it is supposedly the abstract scheme functioning in the consciousness of a language speaker as a result of numerous actualizations of more than hundred meanings.

Let's give examples in what way eidetic features are realized in remaining secondary meanings of this polysemant. For example, similar to the head as the main part in relation to the whole body, head of fire is its upper part, the hottest and the most active; head of a stick/roll paper/violin bow/cigar/arrow/spear/axe, etc. are also oriented in space as the head towards the whole body, i.e. they can occupy the upper position or be a beginning of an object depending on vertical or horizontal spatial arrangement. The head of a bed/grave is not just their beginning, but the most important part. The head of a stream/river, i.e. their origin is compared to a human head as a beginning (comparison by the orientation in space), etc. In other words, the actualization of one or another meaning of the word head occurs on the base of one or several components of abstract nature or total LE.

Each separate meaning refers us to regulative eidetic structure, denotes a universal rule to which the processes of categorization and conceptualization of surrounding reality possible within some defined in advance typicality are subject to.

The components of abstract nature are formed due to modified transcendental experience of what we see and describe some transcendently reduced cogito, but as reflecting subjects do not carry out natural supposing of being which is included in original direct perception of these meanings, taking place when direct plunging into the world. LE as a reflection of other order loses original mode corresponding to the direct act of contextual perception of a meaning.

The found abstract semantic core equal to LE helps to comprehend even the most difficult and semantically “distant” meanings derived from the first meaning which are given in dictionaries, but not always have explanations: beer head, milk head, bridge head, etc. If their base has the same invariant - something upper, important, a beginning of something - these meaning are comprehended and learnt simply: it is foam, cream, and the beginning of a bridge, correspondingly.

IX. LEXICAL EIDOS AS THE FORMULA OF A WORD

Thus, detected LE of the word *knee* apart from the most essential features of the first meaning *middle joint of the leg, where legs bends* includes an abstract essence: *a projection with an angular bent*. LE is embedded in all meanings of this

word, such as knee of a supporting (metal) structure, knee of a tree branch/timber, knee of a furniture leg, knee of a stair handrail, knee of a curve, etc.

The LE of the word *shoulder* – one of the two corresponding parts of the body at each side of the neck which join the arms to the trunk or a shoulder *a projection at an angle to anything near the top*. This LE is embedded in all meanings of this word, such as shoulder of a bottle/bolt, shoulder of a knife, shoulder of a hill/mountain, shoulder of a railroad/roadway. Due to LE the semantics of such meanings as shoulder of a fire, shoulder of a finger ring, shoulder of a letter/character, etc. becomes clear.

The LE of the polysemant *neck* – the part of the body which joins your head to the rest of the body or *a narrow part of anything often near the top*. This LE is embedded in all meanings of this word, such as neck of a bottle, neck of a land, neck of a guitar/violin, etc.

As a result the presence of “human origin” in the worldview is its main characteristics revealing the anthropocentric essence of the process of cognition by a person of the surrounding reality. At the moment of using the lexical eidos a word is a kind of being solidified in its unity and separates from the principal numerosity of its meanings. This numerosity is perceived as overtones of single solid and stable whole – an eidos.

The analysis of the given above point of view in regard to essence and specifics of linguistic world-image makes possible to define a hypothetic status of such phenomenon as LE and in what manner linguistic world-image is represented in it. Since the method of reality conceptualization typical of language is partially nationally specific, the most significant components of a meaning representing such world view are established in LE indeed. Defining them it's possible to detect the stereotypes of reflections by person consciousness of subjects and phenomena corresponding to both scientific and partially naive worldviews with account of the fact that the latter frequently has nothing naive except for refracted reflection of reality at a certain stage of human consciousness development.

Let's cite the analysis of several polysemantic words of other lexical semantic groups. Thus, the LE of the word *mountain* takes the following form: a part of the Earth's surface, larger than a hill with steep sides rising above the level of the adjacent land, or something like a mountain (a large amount/pile of something rising above the level of the adjacent place or someone much bigger than others). The features of abstract nature (in parentheses) are the base of such meanings as a mountain of food, a mountain of laundry, a mountain of trouble/work/evidence.

The LE of the word *coat (1)* is defined in the following way: a warm outer garment with long sleeves buttoned in the front covering at least the upper part of the body, or something like a coat (*an outer closely adhering protective covering*) (in comparison with such transferred meanings as lead coat of an atomic reactor, rubber or plastic coating of an offset printer, barrier coat of a pipe, etc.) The most “vague” meaning is peculiar to *coat (6)* – a layer of the substance covering

another. This derived meaning is a kind of gestalt and proposes a wide range of referents. The base of this meaning is assimilation of layer of some material – coat, which is also a cover “closely adhering” to the body surface. This meaning implies abstracting from both the composition of coating matter and the nature of coated surface.

For the polysemant *cloak* LE will be the following: a loose outer garment which fastens at the neck and covers most of the body or something like a cloak (*something that protects or conceals by covering*). Let's give transferred meaning identical to this LE: an organization which intentionally conceals something or keeps a secret, cloak of secrecy/hypocrisy/prejudice, etc.

The aggregate of defined components of abstract nature is not chaotic. The aggregate of subjects and notions standing for a polysemantic word meanings which, if we take into account their synthesis possibility, are always noematically interrelated, is also not chaotic in correlative regard. For this purpose we need to contemplate, discover the essence of things themselves. As a result carried out analysis acquires its transcendental base.

X. CONCLUSION

Thus, the research of phenomena for the purpose of finding out typical structures or essences (eidos), as well as significant connections between them supposes the use of two main stages of phenomenological reduction (deprivation of significance – exception of natural world, aesthetic and practical values of any form, and transcendently phenomenological reduction itself – movement towards “pure consciousness”, “pure subjectivity” by means of refraining from all scientific, historical understanding of human Ego and consciousness). Consequently the opportunity appears to pass several levels and get free of, for example, spatiotemporal determination of a subject by means of the reduction method and then to state noetic essence (eidos) of the subject using free fantasy generation. Herewith as if a totally new objectness is created – the universal. Eidos functions in regard to the given in the experiment transcendence of nature, culture, the world in general. In conformity with transcendent positioning everything that exists directly is taken as a phenomenon only, as sense which gains existence significance for a subject.

Carrying out the research task related to the study of semantic layers of different levels, ideal object revealing regardless of material substances, definition of the most significant, essential, and general semantic and mental properties, qualities and mechanisms of consciousness and basing on the theory of eidos we introduced the concept of *lexical eidos* interpreted by us as an aggregate of the most significant universal semantic components which are intuitively defined in the course of phenomenological reduction and are unchanged in the stream of meanings variation composing the semantic formula of a word or phrase; lexical eidos content is revealed at the level of scientific and logical consciousness.

LE can be interpreted in terms of linguistics as an invariant associative notional complex assigned to a word in the

consciousness of communicants, which is based not only on the word semantic structure, grammatical formation, word-formative structure, motivational connections, but existing in society of tradition usage. However, in the process of phenomenological reduction abstracting from grammatical, pragmatic, and morphologic connections takes place.

LE being the model or formula of a word manages the process of metaphoric meanings semiosis and is fundamental for the concept formation. It can be decrypted as a universal construct, by means of which any articulation and therefore existential essence understanding by way of which person sees, understands, and speaks is possible.

LE is formed as a result of the numerous manifestations of contextual meanings. It is formulated as a result of abstracting from everything that is psychic and those predicates of the objective world, the presence of which is personally conditioned. It's possible to suppose that invariant meanings of polysemantic words are systemically important units which demonstrate the non-reflectivity of the language system level in relation to the speech level. It should be noted phenomenology has always taken interest in such language system universal units revealing. Such abstraction as *eidos* is realized in numerous speech actualizations of main and transferred meanings. On the other hand, a polysemantic word is also formed around similar semantic and at the same time conceptual core from which, probably, random meanings are formed with minimal cognitive efforts. Studies show the more meanings a polysemantic word has, the poorer its lexical *eidos* is.

The LE acquired in the course of analysis have no components of subjective nature. Minimal abstracting from details made possible to point out the most significant components of LE of general nature, practically covering the semantics of all meanings of the analyzed words. According to the rule of eidetic reduction the experience accidentally gained from reality should be systematically parenthesized. De facto it is true for any pure philosophizing, as initially the kingdom of notion or the worlds of Ideas, as Plato wrote, consists only of a priori essential structures of reality.

REFERENCES

- [1] Husserl E. *Logic Investigations: in 3 volumes. 2nd volume.* Moscow: 2001.
- [2] Kholodnaya M. A. *Psychology of Intelligence: paradoxes of research.* – SPb.: Petersburg, 2002.
- [3] Pesina S.A. *Word semantic structure on the base of prototype semantics (on material of English nouns) / PhD thesis in Philology, St. Petersburg. 1999.*
- [4] Pesina S.A. *Lexical prototype as semantic core of polysemantic word (on material of English nouns of lexical-semantic group "Human body") / tutorial; Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, MSTU, Magnitogorsk, 2003.*
- [5] Pesina S.A. *Polysemantic word invariant in relation to prototype semantics / Proceedings of the State University of Orenburg, supplement "Human sciences" . 2005. №. 2, P. 57–63.*
- [6] Pesina S.A. *Linguistic world-image in philosophical and linguistic understanding / Proceeding of the Herzen University Journal of Humanities and Sciences, 2005. № 5 (10), P. 358-362.*
- [7] Husserl E. *Cartesian reflections.* St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2006.
- [8] Wittgenstein L. *Philosophical works. 1 part. Gnosis, Moscow, 2004.*
- [9] Pesina S.A. *Polysemy in a cognitive aspect. Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, Federal Education Agency, St. Petersburg, 2005.*
- [10] Pesina S.A. *Methodology of detecting semantic core of a semantic core of a polysemantic word of the modern English language / Proceedings of Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia. 2005. Vol. 5 (11), P. 51–59.*
- [11] Pesina S.A. *From the invariant of a polysemantic to a lexical prototype. In Cognitive linguistics issues. Tambov: Tambov State University, 2006. No. 2, P. 53-61.*
- [12] Husserl E. *Logic Investigations: in 3 volumes. 1st volume.* Moscow: 2001.
- [13] Pesina S.A. *Differentiation of language and speech in relation to prototype semantics. Proceedings of the University of Tomsk, 2006. № 291, P. 177–182.*
- [14] Pesina S.A., Arhipov I.K., Novikov D.N. *Organization and structuring method of dictionary entry based on the principle of prototype semantics. V International Conference, Languages in the Modern World. Moscow: KDU, 2006. P. 67–73.*
- [15] Pesina S.A., Avraamenko Y.I. *From intension to lexical prototype. Proceedings of interuniversity research and practice conference Linguistic education: actual problems, solutions. St. Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, 2007. P. 65–66.*
- [16] Pesina S.A. *Prototype treatment of vocabulary structure understanding. In History, philosophy, culture issues. Moscow, Magnitogorsk, Novosibirsk: Magnitogorsk State University, 2009. № 2(24): April-May-June, P. 570-575.*
- [17] Pesina S.A. *Cognitive approach to the language and thinking interaction]. Proceedings of the State University of Orenburg. Ontology, cognitive theory and philosophical anthropology issues. 2009. № 7 (101), P. 178–180.*
- [18] Pesina S.A. *Language as a subject of inquiry of phenomenologists and cognitive scientists: Proceeding of interuniversity scientific conference. St. Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, 2010. P. 209-211.*
- [19] Pesina S.A. *Phenomenological reduction and semantic core of meaning. Proceedings of the State University of Voronezh. Philosophy series 2010. № 2 (4), P. 151 – 160.*
- [20] Pesina S.A. *Representation of words in lexicon . The linguistics institute of the RAS, Tambov State University. The Russian association of linguists-cognitologists. Tambov: Tambov State University, 2010. P. 121–123.*
- [21] Pesina S.A. *Word in a cognitive aspect. Moscow: FLINTA: Nauka, 2011.*
- [22] Pesina S.A. *Specifics of philosophical and linguistic treatment of language main issues. Proceedings of Adygei State University. Regional, 2011.*

Svetlana Pesina, Dr of science, Professor. Born in 1962 in Magnitogorsk city (Russian Federation). In 1999 she defended her PhD thesis on philology at Herzen Russian State Pedagogical University (St. Petersburg) on «prototypical semantic structure of a word». In 2005 she defended her doctoral thesis on philology on «investigation of semantic structure of the word based on prototypical semantics». In 2007 she was awarded a title of a professor. In 2014 she defended her second doctoral thesis on philosophy on «A word in a communication process».

Area of her research is cognitive linguistics, philosophy of language, phenomenology, semiotics, communication theory, lexicography, translation. Author of more than 120 publications, including 4 monographs and 4 textbooks. Since 2009 – a dean of the Faculty of Linguistics and Translation, since 2005 – member of the Russian Association of Cognitive Linguists and a head of a scientific school «Cognitive semantics».