

LINGUISTICS AND VIETNAMESE LINGUISTICS

VERB UNITS CONTAINING CAUSONYMY
IN THE VIETNAMESE DICTIONARY

PHAM VAN LAM* - NGUYEN BICH DIEP**

ABSTRACT: In linguistics in general and semantics in particular, causonymy is one of the interesting semantic relationships within the verb vocabulary. This article focuses on exploring verb units containing causonymy in Vietnamese dictionaries. The article aims to demonstrate some applications of causonymy research in the teaching and learning of Vietnamese today. The data for this study were collected from The Vietnamese Dictionary (edited by Hoang Phe). A total of nearly 200 lexical units containing causonymy are selected for detailed analysis and description. Through this paper, the authors aim to demonstrate several practical applications of researching causonymy Vietnamese language teaching and learning, which can be discussed more in the future. It is hoped that this study will serve as a small piece of the puzzle, contributing to clarifying an approach to verbs from the perspective of relational semantics

KEY WORDS: Causonymy; cause; effect; word pairs.

RECEIVED: April, 10th, 2026.

EDITED: June, 27th, 2026

1. Introduction

In linguistics, causonymy can be understood as the relationship between two events, encoded by two different linguistic expressions or phrases, where one event is the cause of the other; these events are primarily encoded by predicates. Causonymy exists from the word level to the text/discourse level. As a genuine semantic relationship within the vocabulary of a language, causonymy is considered one of the three main types of semantic relationships in the verb vocabulary system. In Vietnamese vocabulary, causonymy is expressed through pairs of words such as *to smash (đập)* - *to break (vỡ)*, *to see (tìm)* - *to find (thấy)*, *to open (mở)* - *to widen (rộng)*, *to pull (kéo)* - *to open (mở)*, *to shoot (bắn)* - *to hit (the target)(trúng)*, *to shoot (bắn)* - *miss (the target)(trượt)*, *to slip (trượt)* - *to fall down (ngã)*, *to have an exam (dự thi)* - *to pass exams (thi đỗ)*, *to fail exams (thi trượt)*, *to kill (giết)* - *to die (chết)*, *to grill (nướng)* - *to crispy (giòn)*, *to boil (luộc)* - *to be cooked (chín)*, *to dry out (sấy)* - *to be dry (khô)*, *to bray (tán)* - *to be pulverized (nhỏ)*, etc... In each of these pairs, the words (**bold**) on the left are the words indicating the cause, while the words on the right are the words indicating the effect.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Global Researches

Causonymy is an important type of relationship, present in all human activities, especially in the organization of reasoning, psychological reactions, the organization of vocabulary and grammar of language, the organization and expression of culture, etc. Causonymy is an important type of relationship present in all human activities and at all levels of language. This relationship has been studied for a long time from various scientific perspectives, such as philosophy, psychology, and

*Dr; Institute of Languages; Email: phamvanlam1999@gmail.com

**Dr; Phuong Dong University; Email: diep.nb@phuongdong.edu.vn

linguistics. Within linguistics alone, causonymy has been studied from many aspects: grammar, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse...

Globally, the general linguistic relationships that F. de Saussure proposed are all relationships derived from association. Linguists have focused on studying other important semantic relationships in the system of lexical units such as: causonymy, entailment, troponymy... such as Christiane Fellbaum [11]; Miller George (1998)[12] Vossen Piek, 1998[14]. In particular, when the theory of WordNet (Miller, George 1990[12]) came into existence, the study of semantic relationships has been given special attention and more systematic.

2.2. Vietnamese Researches

In Vietnamese linguistics, the study of causonymy at a general level is carried out indirectly in text grammar (Tran Ngoc Them, 1985), in syntactic research when classifying and describing predicate classes and sentence structure types (Nguyen Kim Than, 1977; Diep Quang Ban, 1989; Cao Xuan Hao, 1991; Nguyen Thi Quy, 1995...), and in vocabulary when describing the degree of semantic influence between the components in compound words (Ho Le, 1974; Do Huu Chau, 1981; Nguyen Thien Giap, 1985; Hoang Van Hanh, 1991...). In particular, in terms of syntax, this issue has been explored in depth by authors who have studied the logical-grammatical-semantic relationships in different sentence types, distinguishing conditional sentences from cause-and-effect sentences such as Nguyen Khanh Ha, 2008...

In particular, the causonymy was first named and studied by authors Pham Van Lam and Nguyen Phuong Thai when they built the Vietnamese Word Network (Pham Van Lam, 2014; Pham Van Lam and Nguyen Phuong Thai, 2015). The entire Vietnamese Word Network contains approximately 62,000 semantic relationships, including over 34,000 relationships between sets of noun synonyms, nearly 19,000 relationships between sets of verb synonyms, and nearly 9,000 relationships between sets of adjective synonyms. Causonymy only exists within sets of verb synonyms. In the Vietnamese Word Network, the research has only experimentally collected and processed a relatively small number of words with causal relationships. In the Vietnamese Word Network, the authors collected and labeled nearly 200 lexical units with causonymy, equivalent to 0.9% of the Vietnamese vocabulary (Pham Van Lam, Nguyen Phuong Thai, 2015).

2.3. The basic semantic relationships in verb units

In the vocabulary system of every language, causonymy is one of the three main types of relationships (along with troponymy and entailment) of the vocabulary belonging to the verb category.

2.3.1. Troponymy

Troponymy is the relationship between the hypernyms A and the troponyms B, where troponyms B is considered a way of performing the hypernyms A. Simply put, if we call A the hypernyms (superior word) and B the case word (subordinate word), then the term troponymy between A and B as a specific case relation, meaning that B is A in a specific way (Christian Fellbaum, 1998). It can be understood even more simply as B being a way of performing A. For example: going is a way of moving; inaugurating is a way of starting; walking and going; glancing and looking; scribbling and writing and stuttering and speaking can be understood as follows: Walking is a way of going; glancing is a way of looking; scribbling is a way of writing; stuttering is a way of speaking.

2.3.2. Entailment

Entailment is a relation that exists within the verb vocabulary. It is the relationship between two verbs, V1 and V2, where the action expressed in verb V1 can only exist if the action expressed in

verb V2 is presented. Specifically, the implication relation between verbs V1 and V2 arises when the structure "Subject + V1" logically leads to the structure "Subject + V2".

Clearly, the entailment between verbs is similar to the meronymy between nouns, but the meronymy is more appropriate for nouns than for verbs. Therefore, if the noun vocabulary class has meronymy, then the verb vocabulary class has an entailment. This is the relationship between words as in the following examples:

+ **snoring** (ngáy) implies **sleeping** (ngủ): In this case, V1 is **sleeping**, V2 is **snoring**. V2 can only exist when the action expressed in V1 occurs, it means that **snoring** can only exist when the action of sleeping occurs.

+ **scratching** (gãi) implies **itching** (ngứa): In this case, V1 is **itching**, V2 is **scratching**. V2 can only exist when the action expressed in V1 occurs, it means that scratching can only exist when the state of itching occurs.

2.4. Causonymy

Causonymy exists within the verb category. It's a relationship between two verbs, V1 and V2, where the action expressed in V1 is seen as the cause of the action expressed in V2. Examples:

convening (triệu tập) – **meeting** (họp) (the action V1 (to *convene*) is the reason and cause leading to the action V2 (to *have a meeting*));

to **kill** (giết) - to **die** (chết) (the action V1 (to *kill*) is the reason and cause leading to the action V2 (to *die*));

to **smash** (đập) - to **break** (vỡ) (the action V1 (to *smash*) is the reason and cause leading to the action V2 (to *break*));

to **look for** (tìm) - to **find** (thấy) (the action V1 (to *look for*) is the reason and cause leading to the action V2 (to *find*)). In these pairs of words, the first word expresses the cause, and the second word expresses the result.

The concept of causonymy in language is a broad concept, encompassing thought, psychology, culture, and more. Therefore, it is quite complex, multifaceted, and not easily defined. Consequently, conceptions of causonymy vary considerably across different scientific disciplines, areas of life, and regions of experience and culture. However, to begin with, we can understand it simply as the relationship between two related events in a specific situation, where one event is perceived as the first, causing the other as the second. In linguistics, causonymy can be understood as the relationship between two events that are encoded by two different linguistic expressions or phrases, in which one event is perceived as the cause of the other.

In language, causonymy exists from the word level to the text/discourse level. Unlike some relationships such as synonymy and antonymy, but similar to others such as hyponymy, troponymy, causonymy does not exist at the sub-word level. Because they exist from the word level to the text/discourse level, causonymy is the subject of study for many subfields of linguistics, such as semantics, syntax, text grammar, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, and pragmatics. Causonymy, as a semantic relationship existing at the word level, is the true object of study for semantics, and more broadly, for linguistics.

In language, while causonymy is logical and objective, the element of "subjectivity" can never be completely eliminated. This "subjective" element can be very general, nationalistic (as analyzed), or very specific, personal, and situational, as in specific lexical associations. For example, "to shoot"(bắn) is the cause of the result "to enter/to hit/to miss"... [the verb "to enter" is always included in the definitions of the verb "to shoot" in linguistic dictionaries and is the linguistic

information of the verb "to shoot"], but "to shoot" can lead to the result "to over/to pass/to cross/to deviate"... [these verbs can be considered, in some aspects, not part of the linguistic information of "to shoot," because they are situational...]. "To hit" is the result of verb indicating cause such as "to shoot," "to throw," "to test," "to kick"... etc. [with these verbs indicating cause, "to hit" is always present in their definitions], but no one can point out how many words in Vietnamese are the cause of the verb "to hit." The fact that "no one can point it out" is personal, situational, subjective, etc... so there may be very basic words, belonging to the positive vocabulary, that in our vocabulary associations we cannot easily assign as the cause of the verb "to hit," such as the word "to scratch" in the phrase "scratching the itch."

3. Methodologies

To complete this study, we used the main research method, which was semantic component analysis along with some common techniques in linguistic research. We carried out the following tasks:

- + To collect data to establish the main causal units by collecting lexical units from The Vietnamese Dictionary, which was edited by Hoang Phe and describing the system of causonym units.

- + To ensure scientific rigor, specific sample selection criteria were applied; lexical units were selected only if they explicitly denoted causonymy, functioned primarily as verbs or verbal phrases, and possessed stable semantic meanings within modern Vietnamese. Through this purposive sampling method, a total sample size of causonym units was established for comprehensive investigation.

Finally, the main research method we used was semantic component analysis along with some common techniques in linguistic research. Specifically, the analytical techniques employed included semantic feature matrix construction to isolate causal components, oppositional analysis to contrast active triggers with passive results, and statistical categorization to frequency-map these units across different semantic fields.

4. Findings and discussions

4.1. Findings

Specifically, the causonymy was first designated and investigated by Pham Van Lam and Nguyen Phuong Thai during the development of the Vietnamese WordNet (Pham Van Lam, 2014; Pham Van Lam & Nguyen Phuong Thai, 2015). Within the entire Vietnamese WordNet, there are approximately 62,000 semantic relations. This total comprises over 34,000 relations between noun synsets (synonym sets), nearly 19,000 relations between verb synsets, and approximately 9,000 relations between adjective synsets. The causonymy exists exclusively within verb synsets. In the initial phase of the Vietnamese WordNet project, we experimentally collected and processed a relatively small number of lexical items exhibiting causonymy. Furthermore, we compiled and annotated causonymy for nearly 200 lexical units, accounting for roughly 0.9% of the Vietnamese vocabulary (Pham Van Lam & Nguyen Phuong Thai, 2015). Below are examples of causonymy units starting with the letter "B" in the Vietnamese WordNet:

When a particular causonymy is lexicalized, that lexical pair should, theoretically, be recognized and treated as lexical entries in the macro-structure of linguistic dictionaries. The disyllabic lexical units in Vietnamese that are identified as having causonymy belong to those units in which both constituent elements have meaning, clearly defined with a synchronic sense. Below are some examples of causonymy compound words found in The Vietnamese Dictionary such as: *To corrode*,

to **erode**, to narrow, to expose, to suffocate, to **squeeze**, to distort, to suffocate, to let go, to loosen, to let loose, to let go, to **block**, to **cover**, to obscure, to anger, to **provoke**, to provoking, to clear, to defeat, to repel, to **knock down**, to stir up, to **strike down**, to damage, to drop, to break free, to **ambush**, to overturn, to **trample**, to push back, to **push strongly**, to **crush**, to clear, to open, to **stir up**, to overthrow, to strip bare, to expand, to submerge, to connect, to relax, to reassure, to extort, to **tease**... (ăn mòn, bào mòn, bó hẹp, bóc trần, bóp chết, bóp chặt, bóp méo, bóp nghẹt, buông lơi, buông lỏng, buông thông, buông xuôi, chặn đứng, che kín, che mờ, chọc giận, chọc tức, dả thông, đánh bại, đánh bặt, đánh bật, đánh đổ, đánh động, đánh gục, đánh hỏng, đánh rơi, đánh tháo, đánh úp, đảo lộn, đập đổ, đẩy lùi, đẩy mạnh, đè bẹp, khai quang, khai thông, khuấy động, lật đổ, lật trần, mở rộng, nhấn chìm, nổi lên, thả lỏng, trấn an, trấn lột, trêu tức...)

System of Verbs classified by Category

Category	Cause (Impact)	Effect (Resulting State/ Impact outcome)
Physical & Spatial Impact	To squeeze : Ép, nén chặt To crush : Nghiền nát, đè bẹp To trample : Giẫm đạp	To narrow: Bị thu hẹp lại To expand: Được mở rộng ra
Natural & Material Impact	To corrode : Ăn mòn hóa học (axit, rỉ sét) To erode : Xói mòn tự nhiên (gió, nước)	To erode: Bị bào mòn To submerge: Bị chìm ngập, nhấn chìm
	To push strongly : Đẩy mạnh, thúc mạnh	To repel: Bị đẩy lùi To push back: Lùi bước
Conflict, Opposition & Force	To knock down : Đánh ngã, quật ngã To strike down : Đánh gục, hạ gục To ambush : Phục kích, đánh lén	To overthrow: Bị lật đổ To overturn: Bị đảo ngược To defeat: Bị đánh bại
Psychology, Emotion & Communication	To provoke : Khiêu khích, kích động To tease : Trêu chọc, chọc ghẹo	To anger: Trở nên tức giận, phẫn nộ
	To stir up : Khuấy động, gây hấn	To relax: Được thư giãn, thả lỏng
	To encourage : Khuyến khích	To reassure: Được trấn an, yên lòng
	To block : Ngăn chặn, phong tỏa	To narrow: Bị thu hẹp lại
Control, Limitation & Freedom	anti-erosion : Phòng chống xói mòn	anti-erosion: Phòng chống xói mòn
	To let loose : Buông bỏ	To loosen: Trốn thoát tự do
	To open : Được mở ra	To break free: Được nói lỏng

		To let go: Thả lỏng:
Information State & Behavior	To strip bare : Lộ trần, bóc trần sự thật	To drop: Bị rơi rụng, sụt giảm giá trị
	To expose : Phơi bày, vạch trần To extort : Ép buộc, tống tiền	To distort: Sự thật bị bóp méo, biến dạng To drop: Bị rơi rụng, sụt giảm giá trị

If we call the lexical element indicating the cause A and the lexical element indicating the effect B, we see that the two-syllable units with causonymy all have a combination order of AB. This AB can only be a compound word with a main and subordinate element, a compound word with differentiating meanings, and not a compound word with coordinate or conjunctions. Of course, this way of speaking excludes the understanding of causonymy existing in expressions like "*falling (rơi)*" or "*breaking (vỡ)*". Considering the relationship between the two components, we see that the grammatically main element comes first, followed by the grammatically subordinate element; the semantically subordinate element comes first, followed by the semantically main element. In the general compound AB, the causal element A can be a predicate that retains its original lexical meaning, such as "*to squeeze*" in "*to squeeze to death*," "*to squeeze distorted*," "*to squeeze flattened*," etc., or A can be an element whose original specific meaning has been greatly obscured, such as "*to strike*" in "*to strike out*," "*to strike down*," etc. This second possibility is similar to many other lexical compounds, such as "*to break*," "*to shatter*," "*to wear down*," "*to damage*"... If we use troponymy to explain these types of compounds, we see that they can function as encompassing words of specific case, for example, "*to break*," "*to smash*"... As for element B, because it indicates the result, its meaning is always very clearly expressed, for example, "*to anger*," "*to fear*" in "*to tease*," "*to provoke*." Perhaps it is because of this clarity of meaning that researchers call such main-subordinate compound words "specialized compound words" in contrast to compound words with specific meanings.

In the causonymy compound words we found in The Vietnamese Dictionary, the causal element A is always an action predicate, mostly referring to human actions. The result element B has two possibilities: it can be a state predicate or a process predicate. B as a state predicate is more common than B as a process predicate. Statistically, in a study of 60 words, we found that 35 words (equivalent to 58%) had B as a state predicate. Examples include: *bundling, squeezing, distorting, suffocating, loosening, hanging down, covering, provoking, expanding* (*bó hẹp, bóp chặt, bóp méo, bóp nghẹt, buông lỏng, buông thông, che kín, chọc tức, mở rộng*). Only 11 words (18%) had B as a process predicate, examples include: *overthrowing, knocking down, dropping, striking down, knocking over, wearing away*...

The lexical elements of two-syllable compound words in The Vietnamese Dictionary that have causonymy are all meaningful, clearly defined, and capable of independence. Therefore, the causonymy in two-syllable compound words in The Vietnamese Dictionary can be identified using several specific identification frameworks. These are the frameworks: A causes/leads to/makes (consequence, result) B & B are the consequence/ result of A. This identification framework is applied specifically to real-functional causonymy. However, all of the causonymy units with illusory functions meet this framework. For example, in "*squeezing*," we have "*squeezing leads to distortion*,"

and "distortion is the result of (the action) squeezing". The next identification framework is that A can cause/lead B (consequence, result) and B can be a consequence/result of A.

This framework is specifically used for causonymy with a negative value, and therefore cannot be applied to causonymy with a positive value. Therefore, one can only say that teasing can cause anger, anger can be the result of teasing, but cannot say **killing can lead to death*, **death can be the result of killing*, because there is a definite, deterministic relationship between killing and death; *killing inevitably leads to death*. Causonymy items with a negative value are also often identified by a simple framework: A until/to/for B. Of course, this identification framework cannot be applied to causal relationships with a positive value. Therefore, one cannot say *"To kill until death."*

In the Vietnamese dictionaries, the cause element A and the effect element B often appear in the explanations for words with causonymy. The framework A is for B is commonly used to explain the meaning of words with a causonymy. For example, *to fatten up* is explained in The Vietnamese Dictionary as "to pat someone to get fat quickly". In the actual explanations of words with causonymy in The Vietnamese Dictionary, A and B could be linguistic elements present in the combination AB, or they could be synonyms of elements A or B in AB. For example, *to defeat* is explained as "to beat someone to lose, to cause them to fail completely".

In reality, one action can lead to multiple results; conversely, a result can also be produced by multiple actions. Causonymy items are n-m relationships. Similarly, in language, the causonymy between A and B is also a multi-valued n-m relationship. In the causonymy between lexical units, only those lexical units with real, necessarily causonymy (such as *kill* - *die* (*giết* - *chết*), *cut* - *sever* (*cắt* - *đứt*)) are one-to-one relationships [considered within closed lexical relationships], while all other types of lexical units with causonymy are multi-valued n-m relationships.

All lexical units with illusory causonymy, at the very least, are dualistic, meaning that one causes always leads to two results: a positive result (*to look for* (*tìm kiếm*) - *to find* (*thấy*), *to pass the exam* (*đỗ kỳ thi*) and a negative result (*to look for* - *not to find* (*không thấy*), *to fail the exam* (*trượt kỳ thi*)). In The Vietnamese Dictionary, words with causonymy include both instances where one action can produce multiple results and instances where a result is caused by multiple actions. In cases where one action causes multiple results, this action has a very general meaning, similar to the word (*to make/to cause*). For example, the word (*to pour*) in (*to pour down and to shatter, to drop, to damage*); the word (*to crush*) in (*to break, to distort, to kill, to squeeze tightly*).

Some words with causonymy that share common cause elements and have different effect elements can be considered as troponyms of the hypernyms; the hypernyms of these troponyms are the causal elements. In the examples just given, the hypernyms can be considered the words "to **make**" (*làm*) meaning "unfortunately causing an object to change its shape or position, encompassing words like in (*to knock over, to drop, to break* (*đánh vỡ, đánh đổ, đánh tan, đánh chết, đánh rơi, đánh hỏng*)); "to **make**" meaning "to actively use force to press down, causing the object to change its shape," encompassing words like in (*to crush, to distort, to break* (*đánh đổ, đánh rơi, đánh vỡ*)).

Such combinations always have a general meaning indicating the cause, "to cause," and a specific meaning indicating the result, such as in "to be broken", "to be fallen," etc. It is this meaning indicating the result that distinguishes the meaning of one word from another when they share a common cause element. In the case where a result can be caused by multiple different cause actions, the opposite is true. The specific meaning of each word will be determined by the meaning of the cause elements themselves; this meaning also reflects the way/method of carrying out or occurring the cause action. The meaning indicating the result is a common meaning for these words.

As mentioned, some words with causonymy can be combined on a semantic axis with the cause element preceding the effect element. When combined, they can be lexicalized and their meanings can be shifted to take on a new meaning. In The Vietnamese Dictionary, most compound words with causonymy have already undergone a semantic shift. For example, “to distort” refers to a specific physical action and requires a direct object indicating the object being affected, while “to be crooked” is an indirect object, indicating a specific physical state. In “distorting the truth” means “to make the truth inaccurate with malicious intent.” In “suffocating democracy” means to prevent development, gradually leading to its loss or death. In the context of stifling a movement from its infancy, “strangling” doesn’t mean physically crushing a specific object, but rather “making something unable to continue to exist or develop”.

4.2. Discussion

As mentioned, words with causonymy, when combined, can be lexicalized, meaning they acquire full lexical status like other so-called genuine words. These are words like “rebellion” (rebellion against colonialism), “connecting” (connecting loving hearts), “expanding” (expanding the scope of research), “narrowing” (narrowing the issue) ... Through our survey, we found that The Vietnamese Dictionary still lacks many words that inherently possess causonymy and have the status of genuine words. This can be considered an inconsistency in The Vietnamese Dictionary’s handling and collection of lexical units for inclusion in its macro-structure.

Below are some examples of words not included in The Vietnamese Dictionary; some words that are grammatically and semantically equivalent to those not included but are included in The Vietnamese Dictionary are placed in parentheses at the end of the examples: crush in crushing the enemy’s spirit (*to crush to death*), fail in failing an exam (*to fail*), fail a candidate, stand up in the people stand up against slavery (*to revolt*), stand up and steer the revolutionary ship, raise in raising knowledge (*to expand*), raise the level, smash in smashing the vanguard, smash the rhetoric, bend in bending the pen/truth (*to distort*), bend the logic, cut off in cutting off a relationship, the two have cut off each other (*to divorce*), cut off the supply line,...

4.3. Contribution of the Research

This research directly contributes to the development of Vietnamese semantics in general and Vietnamese lexical semantics in particular; it promotes specific, in-depth research on important semantic relationships at the word level in Vietnamese vocabulary.

In practical terms, the research directly contributes to clarifying the important lexical-semantic, grammatical, and usage characteristics of lexical units with causonymy relationships in Vietnamese vocabulary. Although the research results are not yet in-depth, they can be used as an important reference source and applied to tasks such as: building language resources organized according to semantic relationships, compiling dictionaries, teaching vocabulary, and developing linguistic thinking skills.

5. Conclusion

In linguistics, Causonymy can be understood as the relationship between two events encoded by two different linguistic expressions or segments, in which one event is perceived as the cause of the other; these two events may occur sequentially or simultaneously; these events are primarily encoded by predicates. Causonymy, as a semantic relationship at the word level, is the semantic relationship between a predicate indicating cause and a predicate indicating effect.

Causonymy are a crucial type of relationship present in all human activities, especially in the organization of reasoning, psychological responses, the organization of vocabulary and grammar in

language, the organization and expression of culture, etc. They form the basis and guide our actions, decision-making, problem-solving, and learning to take responsibility. They have been studied by many scientific disciplines and applied to various fields such as: assessing intellectual development, natural language processing, language education, and more.

REFERENCES

English

1. Christiane Fellbaum (1998), *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*, MIT Press.
2. Miller, George. A., (1990), *Nouns in WordNet*. In C. Fellbaum (Ed.), *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*, 23-46. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
3. Miller, K. J., (1998), *Modifiers in WordNet*. In C. Fellbaum (Ed.), *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*, 47-67. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
4. Vossen Piek (1998), *EuroWordNet: General Document* (version 3), University of Amsterdam.

Vietnamese

5. Diệp Quang Ban (1991), *Ngữ Pháp tiếng Việt (Vietnamese Grammar)*, Nxb Giáo dục, Hanoi.
6. Đỗ Hữu Châu (1981), *Cơ sở ngữ nghĩa học từ vựng (Fundamentals of Lexical Semantics)*, Nxb Giáo dục, Hà Nội.
7. Nguyễn Bích Diệp (2024), *Quan hệ cách trong động từ tiếng Việt (Troponymy in Vietnamese Verb)*, Luận án Tiến sĩ.
8. Nguyễn Thiện Giáp (1985), *Từ vựng học tiếng Việt (Vietnamese Lexicology)*, Nxb ĐHQGHN.
9. Phạm Văn Lam (co-author) (2014), “Tổng quan về mạng từ tiếng Việt (Overview of the Vietnamese Word Network)”, *Tạp chí Từ điển học và Bách khoa thư* (7), tr.16-27.
10. Phạm Văn Lam, Nguyễn Phương Thái (2015), *Hướng tới việc xây dựng mạng từ tiếng Việt (Towards building the Vietnamese Network)*, Viện Hàn lâm KHXH Việt Nam.
11. Phạm Văn Lam (2015), “Tổng quan về quan hệ nhân quả (Overview of causonymy in Vietnamese)”, *Tạp chí Nghiên cứu nước ngoài* (45), tr.21-34.
12. Hồ Lê (1974, 2003), *Cấu tạo từ hiện đại tiếng Việt (Word formation of modern Vietnamese)*. Nxb KHXH, Hà Nội.
13. Hoàng Phê (2008), *Từ điển tiếng Việt (Vietnamese Dictionary)*, Nxb Đà Nẵng – Trung tâm Từ điển học.
14. Nguyễn Kim Thản (1977), *Động từ tiếng Việt (Vietnamese verbs)*, Nxb KHXH, Hà Nội.

Một số đơn vị từ vựng động từ chứa quan hệ nhân quả trong Từ điển tiếng Việt

Tóm tắt: Trong nghiên cứu ngôn ngữ học nói chung và nghiên cứu ngữ nghĩa học nói riêng, quan hệ nhân quả là một trong số những quan hệ nghĩa thú vị của lớp từ vựng động từ. Bài viết tập trung tìm hiểu các đơn vị từ vựng động từ có chứa quan hệ nhân quả trong từ vựng tiếng Việt. Ngữ liệu của bài viết được thu thập từ *Từ điển tiếng Việt* (Hoàng Phê cb.). Có X [số lượng] đơn vị từ vựng trong đó có chứa quan hệ nhân quả được bài viết tập trung phân tích, mô tả. Qua bài viết, tác giả mong chỉ ra một số ứng dụng nghiên cứu quan hệ nhân quả trong việc dạy và học tiếng Việt hiện nay. Hi vọng rằng, bài viết là mảnh ghép nhỏ góp phần làm rõ thêm một hướng tiếp cận động từ dưới góc nhìn của ngữ nghĩa học quan hệ.

Từ khóa: Quan hệ nhân quả; nguyên nhân; kết quả; cặp từ.