| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

A Cognitive Analysis of "Power"

Miaomiao Zhang
School of Law and Humanities, China University of Mining & Technology (Beijing)
Corresponding Author: Miaomiao Zhang, **E-mail**: 1315775659@qq.com

| **ABSTRACT**

Cognitive linguistics, as a newly established method for the study of language that emerged in the 1970s, focuses on the study of general cognitive abilities and conceptual processes of human beings. With the development of society, many new lexical items and concepts emerge, and they all need to be encoded in the form of language expression. An economical and practical way is to give a word multiple meaning. Based on the prototypical theory of cognitive linguistics, this paper analyzed the semantic network and semantic distribution of the polysemous word "power." Fourteen senses of "power" used as nouns were collected from *the Oxford Advanced English-Chinese Dictionary (9th Edition)*, and connections between different senses were explored by analyzing the semantic features. Meanwhile, 100 sentences containing "power" were randomly extracted from the BNC corpus to figure out the distribution of different senses. It was found that the prototypical sense and extended senses of "power" revealed the characteristics of family resemblance, and extended senses centered on the prototypical sense and extended radially outward. Among the 14 senses of "power," the sense of "political right" is the most commonly used, while the senses of "multiplication" and "deity" are rarely used. Finally, some suggestions on the teaching of polyseme are put forward hopefully to offer valuable guidance for English learners.

| **KEYWORDS**

Prototypical theory; polysemy; power; semantic network; semantic distribution.

1. Introduction

Language change is a recurring and dynamic process. As a fundamental element of language, lexis manifests the dynamic change of language in terms of lexical form and meaning (Stoddard, 1929). In the long-term development process, the form and meaning of a word are influenced by social, geographical, or historical factors, and the meaning of a word gradually extends from one sense to multiple senses, thus forming the phenomenon of polysemy. The majority of words in English are polysemous, and a word in different contexts may usually represent different types of entities or different types of situations. Therefore, for learners of English as a foreign language, polyseme becomes a stumbling block on the way of learning.

With the emergence of cognitive linguistics in the 1970s, researchers apply cognitive processes, such as construal operation, categorization, image schemas, metaphor, and metonymy, to the exploration of the rules of word formation and the semantic system of a word.

Scholars at home and abroad have done extensive research on polysemous words to reveal the basic rule in the evolution of polyseme. Most scholars have adopted conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy to explain the mechanism of meaning extension, which breaks the tendency of formalized description in traditional semantics (Taylor, 2003).

In order to get a further understanding of polysemy, this paper focuses on the semantic meaning of the word "power" and sums up the types of usage features by referring to the definition of the *Oxford Advanced English-Chinese Dictionary (ninth edition)*. According to the *Oxford Advanced English-Chinese Dictionary (ninth edition)*, the noun "power" is just one member in a family of formally related words: power v., power adj., powerful, powerless, powerfulness, and powerlessness, and also semantically related to concepts like authority, control, force, energy and so on.

Based on prototypical theory, this paper finds a new way to explore types of usage features of a word by adopting a radiation table.

This study will expand the application scope of prototypical theory to some extent and provide new ideas and references for vocabulary teaching and learning. In the process of English vocabulary learning, the basic theories of cognitive linguistics can be used to help students understand the meaning of words and build a complete semantic network.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Prototypical Theory
In the 1970s, Rosch put forward a prototypical theory, which described the radial category structure based on the prototype and the theory of family resemblance. Since the 1970s, the theory has attracted extensive attention in cognitive linguistics. For example, it has laid the solid foundation for Lakoff's radial process, which leads to polysemy. The prototypical theory highlights the typically semantic characteristics of the word category. According to Rosch (1983), prototypical theory is a theory of categorization in cognitive science in which different semantic meanings are distributed in a hierarchical way; therefore, some semantic senses are closer to the initial or central meaning than others.

2.1.1 Overseas Research Overview
In the beginning, Wittgenstein (1953) proposed the theory of family resemblance by studying the definition of the word "game." He claimed that it was difficult to find a common feature for all forms of "game"; thus, semantic members belonging to the same word category had unequal status and fuzzy category boundary, and it was termed family resemblance. In other words, members of a category do not necessarily share one common feature; instead, they resemble one another in a continuum. For example, games of A, B, and C, D may share a feature, and C, D, and E, F share another feature, but A, B, and C, D and E, F have nothing in common. However, Wittgenstein just focused on the relationship between different meanings of a word, and he did not explore the cognitive process of word meaning extension.

Then, based on the family resemblance, Rosch (1975) carried out an empirical study on natural categories and proposed the concept of prototype. She argued that the prototype was the most representative member of a category, and the typical feature faded away with the range of categories extending. Taking the category of bird as an example, its central members, such as robin sparrow, have typical characteristics of flying, pointed mouths, and so on; its marginal members, such as ostrich duck, have fewer typical features. What's more, prototypical theory also points out that there is no absolute boundary between different categories, and some members may belong to several categories. For example, tomato belongs to both vegetable and fruit categories.

Lakoff (1987) applied prototypical category theory to linguistic research and asserted that polysemy was the product of human cognitive conceptualization and categorization. He affirmed the importance of categorization and proposed analyzing polysemy in three structures: chain type, radiation type, and the combination of chain type and radiation type.

Bores (2000), Evans (2006), and other scholars applied prototypical theory to teaching practice. They claimed that teachers should start with typical meaning and gradually introduce the marginal meaning of a word with the help of metaphor, metonymy, and image scheme. For example, the metaphorical meaning of color terms varies from countries to countries. In China, red represents jubilant affairs and revolutionary causes; in western countries, red primarily represents scary affairs and blood. Therefore, making clear various metaphorical meanings is conducive to bridging the cultural barrier and getting a further understanding of other cultures (Li, 2004)

2.1.2 Domestic Research Overview
Zhao (2001) claimed that categorization was the process of classifying human experience under the interaction of subjective and objective factors and advocated the application of metaphor and metonymy cognitive mechanism in lexis teaching.

Wang (2006) elaborated on the application of prototypical category theory in language analysis. He claimed that human cognition was formed on the basis of experience, which was categorized to form concepts, so categorization was the basis of concepts, and categories and concepts were the results of categorization. Wen (2013) compared the metaphorical cognition of "anger" between two language learners and found that English learners were likely to associate anger with hot liquid in a container (e.g., Anger is

heat.). In contrast, Chinese learners focused more on the impact of anger (e.g., rage and anger). She also offered some teaching operations under the guidance of prototypical theory to promote the quality of teaching.

2.2 Polysemy and Meaning Extension

When the meaning of a word is the reflection of more than one object or concept that is semantically related, it is called polysemy (Leech, 1981). The word "polysemy" comes from Greek, with the prefix "poly" meaning "many" and the suffix "semy" referring to "meaning." Polysemy has experienced a long time of historical change. The original meaning boasts of a high degree of generalization, and then the original meaning diverges into a new meaning in the process of development. After the new meaning comes into being, the old meaning will exist or die out, and the old and new meanings coexist in a word to form polysemy.

2.2.1 Overseas Research Overview

With the development of cognitive linguistics, linguists have made great achievements in polysemy research since the 1980s. Saussure (1980) proposed that language was an arbitrary system of signs, and there was no natural connection between signifier and signified. At first, people named things arbitrarily, but a lot of new things emerged with the development of society. In order to ease the burden of memory, people gave the same word more than one meaning, resulting in the polysemy phenomenon.

Lakoff (1987) applied the radial category to describe the metaphorical meaning of words. He claimed that polysemy was centered on the original meaning, and other senses derived outward, like rays from the original meaning. The extended senses were formed on the basis of convention, so motivation existed in the chain or radial category of meaning extension.

Taylor (1989) and Sweetser (1990) argued that Saussure paid too much attention to synchronic research, so there was no theory to explain the nature of polysemy. Therefore, they proposed that synchronic factors and diachronic development interacted to form multiple meanings. In the study of polysemy, both synchronic and diachronic perspectives should be considered.

Heine (1997) divided polysemy into three categories: structural polysemy, psychological polysemy, and genetic polysemy. Structural polysemy meant that different meanings were associated only with the same word form. Psychological polysemy emphasized that the degree of relevance between different meanings of a word was determined by the native speaker's intuition or consciousness. Genetic polysemy means that the different meanings of polysemy can be traced back to the same historical roots.

2.2.2 Domestic Research Overview

Zhang (1986) explained the semantic motivation of polysemy, which held that the relations between the lexical form of polysemous words and the original meaning were arbitrary, but there was a motivation relation between the lexical form and its derived one. For example, the relation between the lexical form of "soil" and its original sense of "the top layer of the earth" is arbitrary, while the relation to its derived meaning of "an area of land" is motivated since it is an expansion of its original meaning.

Shu (2000) suggested that polysemy was a process of extension initiating from the original meaning to derived senses through cognitive means, such as metaphor metonymy, and emphasized the importance of combining diachronic and synchronic research methods.

Lin and Yang (2005) verified the motivation of polysemous word extension by taking "eye," "warm," "face" as examples through diachronic and cognitive analysis of polysemy. For example, the original meaning of "eye" was either of the two organs on the face that you see with, from which the meaning of ability to see derived, from which the meaning of observation was derived. They found that the relationship between the form of polysemous words and any one of their senses was arbitrary, and the motivation only existed between the meaning of polysemous words.

Li and Wen (2006) took the noun "head" as a corpus to analyze polysemy from the cognitive perspectives of metonymy and metaphor. There were 12 senses of "head," among which the prototypical meaning is "the part of the body on top of the neck." Based on metaphor and metonymy, the other 11 senses were gradually expanded, such as "the mind or brain," "the top or highest part of something," "the position at the front of a line of people," etc.

To sum up, scholars at home and abroad have fully studied polysemous words, mostly focusing on the etymology, the relationships between different meanings, polysemy, and cognition. But, there is a lack of research on the developmental process of polysemous words. Therefore, this paper pays attention to the distribution of semantic variation of "power" under the guidance of prototypical theory and the construal of the radiation table of types of usage features.

3. Data Collection
Data collection is the prerequisite for further research of a subject. The quality of data statistics determines the quality of research, so it is of great significance to acquire high quality data.

3.1 Collection of Dictionary Meaning of "Power"
The dictionary meaning of "power" was collected from *the Oxford Advanced English-Chinese Dictionary (ninth edition)*. The word "power" can be used as a noun, verb, and adjective. In this study, only senses of "power" as a noun were collected and analyzed. According to the dictionary, "power" as a noun has 14 senses. The semantic relationships between the 14 senses were analyzed by means of semantic componential analysis.

3.2 Collection of Sentences from BNC Corpus
One hundred sentences containing the word "power" were retrieved from BNC corpus (https://www.english-corpora.org/), which included 100 million words of text from a wide range of genres, such as spoken, fiction, magazines, newspapers, and academic. In order to ensure 100 sentences were representative enough, 10 sentences were retrieved 10 times in sequence at an interval of 100 sentences in the BNC corpus. That is to say, 10 sentences of No.1 to No.10 in the corpus were retrieved the first time, then 10 sentences of No. 110 to No. 120 were retrieved the second time, and so on. Then, senses of "power" in each sentence were defined and classified by referring to the 14 senses of the *Oxford Advanced English-Chinese Dictionary (ninth edition)*. Finally, the sense distribution of "power" among the 100 sentences was calculated.

4. The Polysemy of "Power"
4.1 Semantic Network of "Power"
The deep prehistory of our language has nurtured little word-seeds that, over the millennia, have proliferated into widely differentiated families of vocabulary (Diller, 1978). In order to find out the relationships of different meaning of "power", we study the semantic process of "power" to clarify the meaning shift based on prototypical theory.

The 14 senses of "power" in the *Oxford Advanced English-Chinese Dictionary (ninth edition)*, examples, and the semantic features are shown in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1. The 14 senses of "power" and examples

SENSES	EXAMPLES	SEMANTIC FEATURES
(1) the ability to control people or things.	The aim is to <u>give people more power</u> over their own lives.	[ability] [to control] [people/things]
(2) political control of a country or an area.	They are hoping to <u>return to power</u>.	[political ability] [to control] [people/things]
(3) (in people) the ability or opportunity to do something.	I will do everything <u>in my power</u> to help you.	[personal ability] [to control] [people/things]
(4) a particular ability of the body or mind.	He had lost <u>the power of speech</u>.	[personal physical/ mental ability] [to do] [things]
(5) all the abilities of a person's body or mind.	At 26, he is at <u>the height of his powers</u> and ranked fourth in the world.	[personal physical/ mental abilities] [to do] [things]
(6) the right or authority of a person or group to do something.	<u>The powers of the police</u> must be clearly defined.	<u>[right/ official ability]</u> [to do] [things]
(7) a country with a lot of influence in world affairs or with great military strength.	<u>world powers</u>.	<u>[international ability]</u> [to <u>influence] [other countries]</u>
(8) (in compounds) strength or influence in a particular area of activity.	<u>economic power</u>.	<u>[ability] [to influence] [an area]</u>
(9) the influence of a particular thing or group within society.	<u>the power of the media</u>.	<u>[ability] [to influence] [society]</u>
(10) the strength or energy contained in something.	The ship was helpless against <u>the power of the storm</u>.	<u>[ability] [to influence] [things]</u>

(11) energy that can be used to operate a machine, to make electricity, etc.	engine power.	[physical ability] [to drive] [things]
(12) the public supply of electricity.	They've switched off the power.	[electrical ability] [to drive] [things]
(13) the number of times that an amount is to be multiplied by itself.	4 to the power of 3 is 64.	[times] [to multiply]
(14) deity: a good or evil spirit that controls the lives of others.	the powers of darkness (= the forces of evil)	[spirit] [to control] [lives]

As it has shown above, the 14 senses of "power" distinguish one from the others, but they have a common semantic feature — [ability]. According to prototypical theory, the prototypical meaning processes the most typical semantic feature of "power," and the semantic feature of the derived senses gradually fades away. The prototypical meaning of "the ability to do something" is the core meaning of "power" and the most common usage among different meanings. Besides, the prototypical meaning serves the function of deriving other meanings. Through the cognitive process of specialization, generalization, and metaphor, the semantic network of the word "power" is formed.

(1) Specialization: the process of narrowing down a relatively broad denotation to a relatively restricted expression. This is the most common process in the meaning of "power." In the above diagram, the prototypical meaning of "the ability to do something" narrows down to a particular field. "people's ability to do something" (Sense 3) emphasizes the human beings' capability rather than other objects. "The influence in a particular area" (Sense 8), "the energy to operate a machine" (Sense 11), and "the number of times" (Sense 13) specialize the ability to perform different functions, that is, to affect something (Sense 8), to run a machine (Sense 11) and to do a mathematical calculation (Sense 13). Sense 3 further restricts human ability to "the competence to manage something" (Sense 1) and particularly refers to "the somatic function" (Sense 4), such as the power of speech and the power of concentration. Sense 1 goes through the specialization process to indicate "the political power" (Sense 2). Sense 7 and Sense 9 also specialize in certain objects of influence, that is, the country and the society.
(2) Generalization: In contrast to specialization, the process of expanding from a particular meaning to a general meaning. "A particular ability of the body" (Sense 4) expands to the reference of "all ability of people" (Sense 5), such as "within your power," "the height of his power."

(3) Metaphor: the process of making a comparison of two concepts in that one is construed in terms of the other, and it is often described in terms of a target domain and a source domain (Hu, 2019). It is well known that a person who possesses the right would have the authority to give order to others, and that is the reason that Sense 2 derives Sense 6 via metaphor. "The authority" (Sense 6) is derived from the mapping of concepts from the concrete domain (the political right) to the abstract domain (the authority in a social background). Similarly, the mapping of "the management ability of human beings" (Sense 1) to "the superpower of god" acquired Sense 14.

Based on Table 4-1, the semantic process of "power" can be summed up in the following figure:

Figure 4-1. The semantic network of "power."

It is suggested above that the original meaning, "the ability to do something," dating back to the 13 century, is placed at the center, and all other senses are derived from the center in every direction, like a ray. The above analysis reveals that there is motivation and connection between the various meanings of "power." In the process of meaning development, it probably generally radiates outwards from the prototypical meaning, like the light. The derived senses are developed from the prototypical meaning through cognitive processes such as metaphor, specialization, and generalization.

4.2 Semantic Distribution of "Power"
In order to verify the extensive process of "power" in Figure 4-1, one hundred sentences retrieved from the BNC corpus would be classified into the 14 senses of "power." The result of the classification is shown in Table 4-2.

Table 4- 2. The distribution of 14 senses

	Sense	Frequency
1	(2) political control	21
2	(11) energy to operate a machine	16
3	(3) (in people) ability to do something.	15
4	(6) the right or authority	15
5	(1) control people or things	13
6	(7) country with a lot of influence	11
7	(12) the public supply of electricity	4
8	(8) influence in a particular area	3
9	(4) a particular ability of the body	1
10	(10) energy contained in something	1
11	(5) all the abilities of a person's body	0
12	(9) the influence within society	0
13	(13) the number of times	0
14	(14) deity	0
	TOTAL	100

As it has shown in Table 4-2, the semantic distribution of the 14 senses is rather uneven. "Political control" is the most frequent usage in the corpus, while the most atypical senses of "power," like "the influence within society," "the number of times," and "all the abilities of the human body" could not find their examples in the one hundred sentences. That is because the semantic distribution is not only related to the prototypical meaning but also has a close connection with our daily lives.

On the one hand, 14 senses directly deriving from the prototypical sense are more frequently used in language, while senses generated through several processes are seldom used. According to Table 4-1, the prototypical sense, Sense 2 and Sense 5, have two common semantic features— [to do] [things], so the difference between Sense 2 and Sense 5 is embodied in their expansion processes of the semantic feature [ability]. For Sense 2, the semantic feature [ability] is just limited to [political ability]. However, for Sense 5, the semantic feature [ability] firstly sets a limit to [personal physical/mental abilities], generating Sense 3, "person's ability to do something," and then [personal ability] in Sense 3 further narrows to [the particular ability]. Finally, the [the particular ability] expands to [all personal ability] in Sense 5. Therefore, Sense 5, which generates from the prototypical meaning through three processes (specialization-specialization-generalization), is less used than Sense 2, which generates from the prototypical meaning just through one process (specialization).

On the other hand, the semantic distribution correlates with culture. Language is a symbolic representation of a culture, and culture is closely bound up with language usage. For example, with the establishment of the social system, people were morally or legally entitled to do or to have something, so the concept of right came into being, and phrase chunks were literally of common usage in daily life, such as "a power struggle," "to balance the power," "to take the power," "to come to power," "to wield power," "to be in power," "to out of power." What's more, electronic products are universal in our daily lives, and the phrase to describe the situation of power are quite normal, like "power failure," "power supply," "power battery," "power plants", "power consumption," and so on. That is why Sense 2,11, 3, 6 rank the top 4 in the semantic distribution.

5. Strategies of Polyseme Learning
Wilkins (1972) claimed that without grammar, many things could not be expressed; without words, nothing could be expressed. Therefore, learning a language should give priority to lexical learning.

However, the current circumstances of English vocabulary teaching and learning are still not optimistic. On the one hand, English teachers who are influenced by traditional translation teaching methods attach importance to the spelling and pronunciation of vocabulary but ignore the characteristics of motivation, semantic transmutation in context, and cultural connotation of vocabulary (Huang & Wang, 2015). This kind of teaching method makes it impossible for students to be active English learners, which results in the expansion of the passive vocabulary size but misses the depth of vocabulary knowledge and free active vocabulary (Laufer & Paribakht, 1998).

On the other hand, the situation that students' knowledge about polysemy is not ideal. They may be familiar with one meaning of a polyseme, but they have not fully mastered the meaning of the polysemous word, let alone the semantic connections between the meaning of polysemy. Therefore, based on prototypical theory, English learners are provided with three strategies for learning polysemes to improve the efficiency of polyseme learning.

5.1 Vocabulary Expansion from Prototypical Meaning
Prototypical theory holds that the prototypical meaning prioritizes all other senses. In other words, the prototypical meaning is more prominent and easier to recognize in a category, and it also plays an important role in the derivation of other atypical senses. Accordingly, in polysemy teaching, teachers should focus on illustrating the prototypical meaning and then expand the related usages by means of association and collocation so as to deepen students' understanding of a polyseme.

Take the word "power" for example. It is known that the prototypical meaning of "power" is "the ability to do something," and teachers should call students' attention to various collocations of "power," such as "economic power," "pulling power," "will power," "political power," "physical power," "magical power." At the same time, it is crucial to give full play to students' imagination to associate all kinds of relevant to the mastery and control of power, such as "have the power," "in power," "with the power," "supply power," "harness power," "wield power" and so on. Meanwhile, its synonyms and antonyms are also inspired, such as ability, capability, competence, capacity, authority, faculty, strength, energy, impotence, impotency, and so on.

Through the brainstorming of the prototypical meaning, it is beneficial to activate students' original knowledge and promote their awareness of the semantic connection between words. By means of association and collocation, students can form a systematic knowledge about the prototypical meaning so as to lay a solid foundation of word extension and to promote their development of in-depth knowledge of vocabulary.

5.2 Meaning Determination of Polysemes in Reading

A word is given more than one meaning in order to ease the burden of human memory. It is the most economical and efficient way to express a new idea, but it also gives rise to ambiguity in the process of understanding a polyseme. Therefore, teachers can promote students' reading comprehension through context. Context is generally considered as constituted knowledge shared by the speaker and the hearer. The shared knowledge is of two types: the knowledge of the language they use and the knowledge about the world (Hu, 2019). In some tests, common questions for polyseme comprehension include "From the passage, we can infer that the word …is…", "What does the word…mean in this passage?", "Which of the following does the word…in line… refer to?" and so on.

For example, there is a sentence retrieved from a website (https://zhuanlan.zhihu.com/p/257041264), and what does the underlined word "power" mean in this sentence?

In an effort to ensure secure supplies, the world's big powers have vied to influence these states, not least in the Middle East, where America has roughly 60,000 troops.

It is well known that the prototypical meaning of "power" is "the ability to do something." Many students would interpret the sense of "the world's big powers" mistakenly as "many kinds of abilities in the world." To avoid mistakes, teachers should guide students in guessing the meaning in context. The adverbial clause "where America has roughly 60,000 troops" implies that America possesses a lot of influence in military strength to affect many states. Based on the knowledge about the political situation and the sentence structure, the adverbial clause goes further to illustrate the sense of "the world's big powers"; therefore, the sense of "power" as a "country with a lot of influence" emerges.

Therefore, different senses of a polyseme are not completely arbitrary and isolated but interrelated and motivated. The senses of a polyseme can be deduced from context based on the shared knowledge about language and the world. Hence, teachers should guide students in determining the exact meaning of a polyseme by referring to the context. It will not only be beneficial to master various and complicated senses of a polyseme but also reduce the burden on students' memory.

5.3 Application of Polysemes in Writing

Every word is a brick, laying a solid foundation for discourse writing. The appropriate usage of words will not only present a vivid image but also make a deep impression on readers. However, there are several obstacles for students to improve their writing skills, and the application of vocabulary may be the first to blame. For example, students are generally accustomed to choosing simplex, repeating the same word, and expressing monotonous images. Therefore, vocabulary training should be put on the agenda when teaching writing. It is necessary not only to use abundant vocabulary in writing but also to use vocabulary appropriately and vividly.

From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, polysemy can improve the vividness of writing. For example, metaphor is an imaginative way of describing something by referring to something else, which is the same in a particularly cognitive way. It could give writers the possibility to make a comparison between the abstract idea and the concrete entity in daily life. For example,
> *They may be able to skirt the subject to take on someone they do not like.*

In this sentence, "skirt" is a polyseme, and the meaning of "skirt the subject" should be interpreted as "to avoid talking about a subject, especially because it is difficult or embarrassing," which is derived through the structural metaphor from the prototypical meaning "a piece of clothing for a woman or girl that hangs from the waist." The word "skirt" vividly expresses the derogatory attitude of the writer and makes a deep impression on readers. Therefore, the full use of metaphorical words will present a concrete image of an abstract concept and is conducive to expressing the writer's attitude and opinion.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, polysemy is a very common phenomenon in language. This paper is based on a prototypical theory of cognitive linguistics that explores the meaning of "power" and provides some strategies for vocabulary learning. According to prototypical theory, senses of "power" could be divided into two aspects: the prototypical meaning and the atypical meaning. The prototypical meaning of "the ability to do something" is considered to be the most representative meaning of "power," which is easier for people to recognize and provides the base sense for other senses. While the atypical meanings, such as "people's ability," "rights and authority," and "the approach to do a mathematical calculation," are developed from the prototypical meaning by way of family resemblance through some cognitive processes, such as metaphor, metonymy, to form a semantic network.

What's more, the prototypical theory has contributed to vocabulary learning, reading comprehension, and composition writing. Within the various semantics, it is significant for English learners to be given a variety of approaches to achieve a breadth of sense

coverage (Zhang, 2010). Therefore, teachers should pay attention to the prototypical meaning primarily and be encouraged to expand their knowledge of the prototypical meaning through collocation association. Moreover, from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, context plays a significant role in acquiring the proper sense of polysemes, and metaphorical senses of a polyseme are conducive to describing a vivid image.

However, there are some limitations in the present study: (1) The study of "power" is not comprehensive. It is well-known that a word is a complete utterance that has a given sound, meaning, and syntactic functions (Hu, 2019). But, this paper only focuses on the meaning of a word and fails to pay attention to other aspects of a word. As Malinowski put it, "Without linguistic context, a word is just a fragment with no meaning" (Verschueren, 1999). Therefore, the sound and syntactic function of a word are also indispensable aspects to consider in the study of a word. (2) Those three strategies of learning polysemy are applicable to the common situation. As the saying goes, teach students in accordance with their aptitude. Of course, students' ability to use polyseme is determined by factors such as their vocabulary size and their ability to imagine or comprehend. Those factors, to a certain extent, would influence the choice of learning strategies for vocabulary.

All in all, language is a kaleidoscope, and even a single word reflects a complicated process of development. It is our duty to master every single word and make a full performance of a word.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Bores, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 553-571.
[2] Diller, K. (1978). *The language teaching controversy*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers.
[3] Evans, V. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
[4] Heine. (1997). *Cognitive foundation of grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[5] Huang, L. P. & Wang, J. C. [黄乐平、王俊超]. (2015). 建构主义视角下词汇教学模式新探索——兼论英语词汇教学的理据性和建构性. 外语学刊, *5*, 112-117.
[6] Hu, Z. L. [胡壮麟]. (2019). 语言学教程 (第五版). 北京: 北京大学出版社.
[7] Laufer, B., & Paribakht, S. (1998). The relationship between passive and active vocabularies: Effects of language learning context. *Language Learning*, *48*, 365-391.
[8] Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous thing: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
[9] Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics.* London: Pelicon Books.
[10] Li, Y. & Wen, X. [李瑛、文旭]. (2006). 从"头"认知——转喻、隐喻与一词多义现象研究. 外语教学, *3*, 1-5.
[11] Li, Y. [李燕]. (2004). 汉语基本颜色词之认知研究. 云南师范大学学报, *30* (2): 64-67.
[12] Lin, Z. J. & Yang, Z. [林正军、杨忠]. (2005). 一词多义现象的历时和认知解析. 外语教学与研究, *5*, 362-367+401.
[13] Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive reference points. *Cognitive Psychology*, *7*, 532-547.
[14] Rosch, E. (1983). Prototype classification and logical classification: The two systems. In Scholnick, E. F. (Ed.), *New trends in conceptual representation: Challenges to Piaget's theory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
[15] Saussure, F. de. [索绪尔]. (1980). 普通语言学教程 (高名凯译). 北京商务印书馆.
[16] Shu, D. F. [束定芳]. (2000). 现代语义学. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社.
[17] Stoddard, G. D. (1929). An experiment in verbal learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *20*, 453-457.
[18] Sweetser, E. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[19] Taylor, J. (1989). *Linguistic categorization prototypes in linguistic theory.* Oxford: Claradon Press.
[20] Taylor, J. R. (2003). Polysemy's paradoxes. *Language Science*, *25*, 637-655.
[21] Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.
[22] Wang, Y. [王寅]. (2006). 认知语法概论. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社.
[23] Wen, Q. F. [文秋芳]. (2013). 认知语言学对二语教学的贡献及其局限性. 中国外语教育, *2*, 23-31+79.
[24] Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigation.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
[25] Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching.* London: Edward Arnord.
[26] Zhang, J. L. [张建理]. (2010). OVER的双层多义网络模型. 浙江大学学报 (人文社会科学版), *35* (4), 179-188.
[27] Zhang, Y. F. [张韵斐]. (1986). 现代词汇学概论. 北京: 北京师范大学出版社.
[28] Zhao, Y. F. [赵艳芳]. (2001). 认知语言学概论. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社.