



Argumentative Features in Legal Discourse on Copyright Disputes in Vietnam

Truong Trieu Vy

University of Transport Ho Chi Minh City

Article DOI: [10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-0514](https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-0514)

DOI URL: <https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2026-3050-0514>

KEYWORDS: argumentation, legal discourse, copyright disputes, forensic linguistics, intellectual property law, Vietnam.

ABSTRACT: This article investigates argumentative features in legal discourse on copyright disputes in Vietnam from a legal-linguistic perspective. Copyright disputes are not only legal conflicts over authorship, ownership, permitted use, infringement, and compensation; they are also discursive events in which different actors construct, challenge, and evaluate claims through language. Using qualitative discourse analysis, argumentation analysis, and legal-linguistic textual analysis, the study examines the typical argumentative organization found in statutes, pleadings, written submissions, expert materials, and judicial reasoning concerning copyright disputes. The findings show that legal discourse in this field is characterized by a strong dependence on statutory authority, a highly intertextual structure, a recurrent sequence of claim, legal ground, evidentiary ground, inference, and conclusion, and a frequent combination of legal, evidentiary, comparative, contractual, damage-based, and exception-based arguments. At the linguistic level, the discourse relies on specialized legal terminology, deontic modality, logical connectors, citation formulas, impersonal constructions, and evaluative expressions such as 'there are grounds to determine' or 'there is no sufficient basis to accept'. The study also shows that plaintiffs, defendants, and adjudicating bodies employ different argumentative strategies: plaintiffs tend to affirm rights and prove infringement; defendants tend to deny, distinguish, or justify the contested use; and adjudicating bodies tend to neutralize competing claims and transform them into authoritative legal conclusions. The article contributes to research on forensic linguistics and legal discourse in Vietnam and suggests that the study of argumentation can improve the drafting, interpretation, and evaluation of legal texts in copyright disputes.

Corresponding Author

Truong Trieu Vy

Published: May 19, 2026

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

I. INTRODUCTION

Copyright is a central component of intellectual property law because it protects creative expressions in literature, art, science, education, journalism, advertising, entertainment, software, and digital communication. In Vietnam, the legal framework for copyright has been developed through the Law on Intellectual Property 2005 and later amendments, including Law No. 07/2022/QH15 and Law No. 131/2025/QH15, together with implementing regulations such as Decree No. 17/2023/ND-CP. These legal developments have increased the importance of precise legal language in identifying authorship, ownership, moral rights, economic rights, exceptions, limitations, infringement, and remedies.

From a traditional legal perspective, copyright disputes are usually examined through questions such as whether a work is protected, who owns the relevant rights, whether an act of copying or communication has occurred, whether authorization was required, and what remedies are appropriate. From a linguistic perspective, however, such disputes are also sites of argumentation. Every party must transform facts, documents, and legal norms into persuasive discourse. A plaintiff must establish a legally protected interest and show infringement. A defendant must challenge the plaintiff's claims or provide a legal justification. A court or competent authority must evaluate competing narratives and express its conclusion in a form that carries institutional authority.

This article approaches copyright disputes as a type of legal discourse. Legal discourse is not merely a neutral channel for transmitting legal information. It is a structured mode of communication through which legal rights are claimed, legal obligations

are imposed, and legal truth is constructed. In copyright cases, the argumentative function of language is particularly visible because the disputed object is often itself a form of expression: a text, a song, a painting, a photograph, a design, a script, a computer program, a lecture, or a digital work. The legal assessment therefore frequently depends on how language describes originality, similarity, copying, permitted use, and creative contribution.

The research problem addressed in this article is the lack of systematic attention to the linguistic and argumentative features of legal discourse on copyright disputes in Vietnam. While legal scholarship has discussed the protection and enforcement of copyright, less attention has been paid to how arguments are actually organized in legal texts and how linguistic choices help establish credibility, authority, and persuasiveness. This gap is significant because the success or failure of a copyright claim often depends not only on the existence of rights and evidence but also on the way those rights and evidence are articulated.

The article therefore asks three research questions. First, what is the typical argumentative structure of legal discourse on copyright disputes in Vietnam? Second, what types of arguments and linguistic devices are commonly used to construct legal persuasiveness? Third, how do argumentative strategies differ among plaintiffs, defendants, and adjudicating bodies? By answering these questions, the article seeks to contribute to legal linguistics, forensic linguistics, and discourse studies, while also offering practical implications for legal drafting and legal education.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Legal discourse and legal language

Legal discourse refers to language used in the creation, interpretation, enforcement, and contestation of legal norms. It includes statutes, contracts, pleadings, judgments, administrative decisions, legal opinions, and courtroom interaction. Legal language is often characterized by specialized terminology, formulaic expressions, institutional authority, and a strong orientation toward precision. However, legal language is not only technical; it is also rhetorical because it is designed to justify decisions, persuade audiences, and regulate social conduct.

In judicial and quasi-judicial contexts, legal discourse has a distinctive institutional structure. Participants do not have equal discursive power. A claimant may propose a version of events; an opposing party may challenge it; an expert may provide specialized knowledge; and the court or competent authority ultimately organizes these voices into a final decision. The discourse is therefore dialogic and hierarchical at the same time. This dual nature is important for copyright disputes because claims about creativity, similarity, and infringement are often contested from several perspectives.

Legal discourse also displays a high degree of intertextuality. A single legal conclusion may depend on a statute, a decree, a contract, a certificate, a previous publication, an expert assessment, a digital record, and the contested work itself. In copyright disputes, intertextuality is even more prominent because the comparison between an original work and an allegedly infringing work becomes part of the legal reasoning. The legal meaning of similarity or difference is produced through the interaction of multiple texts.

2.2. Argumentation theory

Argumentation theory provides useful tools for analyzing the internal organization of legal reasoning. In a basic model, an argument consists of a claim, grounds, a warrant linking the grounds to the claim, possible backing, qualifiers, and rebuttals. In legal discourse, the claim may be a request for recognition of authorship, a demand for compensation, or a conclusion that infringement has or has not occurred. The grounds may include statutory provisions, factual evidence, contractual clauses, expert opinions, and comparisons between works.

Legal argumentation differs from ordinary argumentation because it is constrained by authoritative sources. A legal argument cannot rely only on personal belief or moral intuition; it must be connected to valid legal norms and admissible evidence. This is why legal texts frequently use formulas such as 'pursuant to', 'under Article', 'based on the evidence', 'the court finds', and 'there is no basis'. These expressions signal that the conclusion is not presented as a private opinion but as a result of legal reasoning.

At the same time, legal argumentation is not mechanical. Norms must be interpreted, evidence must be evaluated, and facts must be categorized. In copyright disputes, the same factual situation may generate different argumentative paths. One party may frame an act as unauthorized copying; another may frame it as lawful quotation, independent creation, or use of unprotected ideas. The analysis of argumentation therefore helps reveal how legal meaning is constructed through competing classifications.

2.3. Forensic linguistics and copyright disputes

Forensic linguistics studies the relationship between language and law. Its scope includes the interpretation of legal texts, authorship analysis, language evidence, courtroom discourse, police interviews, contracts, and legal translation. In relation to copyright disputes, forensic linguistics can contribute in at least two ways. First, it can analyze the language of legal proceedings and judicial decisions. Second, it can help examine the linguistic features of disputed works, especially when the work is a written text, a script, a slogan, a translation, or other language-based product.

The present article focuses primarily on the first contribution: the analysis of legal discourse. It does not attempt to determine whether a particular work has been copied. Instead, it examines the forms of argumentation through which such questions are raised,

challenged, and resolved. This approach is suitable for studying copyright disputes in Vietnam because it connects legal substance with the linguistic resources used in legal practice.

The theoretical framework of this article combines discourse analysis, argumentation theory, and legal-linguistic analysis. Discourse analysis identifies the communicative context, participants, genres, and power relations. Argumentation theory identifies claims, grounds, warrants, rebuttals, and conclusions. Legal-linguistic analysis examines terminology, modality, syntactic patterns, citation formulas, and cohesive devices. Together, these approaches provide a comprehensive framework for identifying the argumentative features of copyright-related legal discourse.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1. Research materials

The study uses a qualitative document-based corpus. The first group of materials consists of legal instruments regulating copyright and related rights in Vietnam. These include the Law on Intellectual Property 2005 as amended and supplemented by later laws, Law No. 07/2022/QH15, Law No. 131/2025/QH15, and Decree No. 17/2023/ND-CP. These texts provide the statutory vocabulary and normative framework within which copyright disputes are argued.

The second group consists of legal-discursive materials that typically appear in copyright disputes, such as petitions, written submissions, responses, contracts, notices of infringement, certificates of copyright registration, expert opinions, settlement records, and judicial decisions. Because public access to complete case files is limited, the study focuses on representative argumentative patterns observable in publicly available decisions and in standard legal writing practices.

The third group consists of theoretical materials on argumentation, legal discourse, and forensic linguistics. These materials are used to build analytical categories and to interpret the linguistic features identified in the legal texts. The combination of legal and linguistic materials reflects the interdisciplinary character of the study.

3.2. Research methods

The study employs qualitative discourse analysis as the principal method. The analysis begins by identifying the genre of each text and the role of each participant in the dispute. It then examines how information is organized, how legal authority is cited, and how claims are connected to evidence and statutory provisions. This method makes it possible to understand legal texts not as isolated sentences but as structured communicative events.

Argumentation analysis is used to identify claims, grounds, warrants, rebuttals, and conclusions. Each argumentative unit is examined according to its function: establishing authorship, proving ownership, proving infringement, denying similarity, invoking an exception, calculating damage, or justifying a remedy. The analysis also considers how arguments are sequenced and how one argument anticipates or responds to another.

Legal-linguistic textual analysis is used to examine specific language features. These include terms of art, deontic modal verbs, evaluative expressions, passive and impersonal constructions, logical connectors, and citation formulas. The aim is to show how linguistic forms contribute to the construction of legal persuasiveness and institutional authority.

Table 1. Analytical categories used in the study

Analytical category	Main question	Typical indicators
Claim	What does the speaker or writer seek to prove?	Request, allegation, denial, recognition of right, finding of infringement
Legal ground	Which legal norm is invoked?	Article, clause, decree, statutory definition, legal exception
Evidentiary ground	Which facts or documents support the claim?	Original work, certificate, contract, digital record, expert opinion
Inference	How are facts connected to law?	Because, therefore, based on, hence, accordingly
Rebuttal	How is an opposing argument challenged?	No basis, insufficient evidence, lawful use, independent creation
Conclusion	What legal result is reached?	Accept, reject, partially accept, order cessation, award compensation

3.3. Analytical procedure

The analytical procedure consists of four steps. First, the study identifies argumentative units, namely passages that make a claim, cite a legal ground, present evidence, evaluate a counterclaim, or draw a conclusion. Second, these units are classified according to argument type: legal, evidentiary, comparative, contractual, damage-based, or exception-based. Third, the linguistic devices used in each unit are analyzed. Fourth, the argumentative strategies of plaintiffs, defendants, and adjudicating bodies are compared.

This procedure does not attempt to quantify every occurrence of a linguistic feature. Instead, it aims to identify recurring patterns that are significant for understanding how legal discourse works in copyright disputes. The emphasis is on the relationship between language form, argumentative function, and legal effect.

IV. RESULTS

4.1. The legal-discursive context of copyright disputes in Vietnam

Copyright disputes in Vietnam commonly arise from disagreements over authorship, ownership, scope of use, unauthorized copying, adaptation, public communication, distribution, translation, derivative works, and compensation. The legal framework distinguishes moral rights and economic rights, and this distinction directly shapes argumentation. Moral-rights arguments often concern the right to be named, the right to publish, and the right to protect the integrity of the work. Economic-rights arguments often concern copying, distribution, performance, communication to the public, making derivative works, and licensing.

The language of copyright disputes is marked by the constant movement between legal categories and factual descriptions. A factual act such as uploading a photograph, using a song in an advertisement, reproducing a textbook, adapting a script, or copying software code must be categorized as lawful or unlawful according to statutory concepts. This process of categorization is argumentative. The same act may be described as 'unauthorized copying' by one party and as 'reasonable quotation' or 'independent creation' by another.

The entry into force of recent legislative amendments has also affected the discourse. The 2022 amendments strengthened several definitions and rules relevant to copyright and related rights, while Decree No. 17/2023/ND-CP provides more detailed implementation measures. Law No. 131/2025/QH15, listed by the National Database of Legal Documents as effective from April 1, 2026, further confirms that intellectual property law in Vietnam continues to evolve. As a result, legal discourse in this area must constantly incorporate updated statutory language.

4.2. Macro-structure of argumentation

The macro-structure of argumentation in copyright disputes usually follows a sequence that can be summarized as claim, legal ground, evidentiary ground, inference, and conclusion. This structure appears in the submissions of parties as well as in judicial reasoning. It reflects the need to connect three levels: the normative level of law, the factual level of evidence, and the evaluative level of legal judgment.

For plaintiffs, the sequence often begins with the assertion of a right. A plaintiff typically states that he or she is the author or copyright holder, identifies the protected work, presents evidence of creation or ownership, describes the defendant's act, compares the defendant's product with the protected work, and requests legal remedies. The argumentative burden is to prove both the existence of the right and the infringement of that right.

For defendants, the sequence often begins with a challenge to one or more elements of the plaintiff's argument. A defendant may argue that the plaintiff has not proved authorship, that the work lacks originality, that the allegedly similar elements are not protected expression, that the defendant created the work independently, that permission was granted, or that the use falls within a statutory exception. The argumentative burden is to weaken the connection between the plaintiff's legal ground and the factual evidence.

For adjudicating bodies, the sequence is reorganized into institutional reasoning. The decision usually summarizes the positions of the parties, identifies the issues to be resolved, evaluates evidence, cites relevant legal provisions, and then announces the conclusion. Expressions such as 'the panel finds', 'there are grounds to determine', 'there is no sufficient basis', and 'therefore' are typical markers of this institutional organization.

Table 2. Typical macro-structure of argumentation in copyright disputes

Stage	Plaintiff-oriented function	Defendant-oriented function	Adjudicative function
Claim	Assert authorship, ownership, or infringement	Deny right, infringement, or liability	Identify disputed issues
Legal ground	Invoke statutory rights and remedies	Invoke limitations, exceptions, or lack of protection	Select applicable legal provisions
Evidence	Provide work, certificate, contract, digital trace	Challenge authenticity, relevance, or sufficiency	Assess probative value
Comparison	Show substantial similarity or copying	Emphasize difference or unprotected ideas	Evaluate legal significance of similarity
Conclusion	Request cessation, apology, compensation, or recognition	Request rejection or reduction of claim	Accept, reject, or partially accept claims

4.3. Major types of arguments

The first major type is the legal argument. This type relies on statutes, decrees, and legally recognized rights. In copyright disputes, legal arguments often cite provisions on authorship, moral rights, economic rights, assignment, licensing, infringement, exceptions, and remedies. The authority of the legal argument comes from its connection to valid legal norms. Therefore, it frequently appears through formulas such as 'pursuant to Article', 'as provided by law', and 'under the Law on Intellectual Property'.

The second type is the evidentiary argument. This type uses documents and factual materials to support or refute a claim. Evidence may include the original manuscript, source file, sketch, recording, certificate of registration, contract, invoice, email, timestamp, online publication record, expert opinion, or witness statement. Evidentiary arguments are important because copyright is often established or challenged through the chronology of creation, publication, and use.

The third type is the comparative argument. This is especially important in copyright disputes because the legal question often depends on the relationship between two works. Comparative arguments may focus on plot, structure, wording, melody, images, characters, composition, interface, source code, or other expressive elements. Plaintiffs usually emphasize similarity, while defendants emphasize difference or argue that the similarity concerns unprotected ideas, facts, methods, or common elements.

The fourth type is the contractual argument. Copyright disputes frequently arise from commission contracts, employment relationships, publishing agreements, licensing agreements, advertising contracts, software development contracts, and cooperation agreements. In such cases, the argument turns on the scope of authorization, duration, territory, permitted media, payment, derivative rights, moral-right obligations, and the duty to credit the author.

The fifth type is the damage-based argument. When compensation is requested, the claimant must connect the infringement to actual or legally recognized loss. This may include lost royalties, lost profits, unlawful gains, reduced commercial value, moral damage, and reasonable expenses for preventing or remedying infringement. Damage-based argumentation is often contested because it requires a causal connection between the infringing act and the claimed loss.

The sixth type is the exception-based argument. A defendant may invoke permitted uses such as quotation, teaching, research, news reporting, library activities, or other statutory limitations. This type of argument does not necessarily deny that the work was used; instead, it seeks to reclassify the use as lawful. The success of the argument depends on whether the use satisfies the conditions set by law, such as purpose, extent, attribution, and absence of unreasonable prejudice to the rights holder.

4.4. Linguistic devices of legal argumentation

The first prominent linguistic feature is specialized terminology. Terms such as 'copyright', 'author', 'co-author', 'copyright holder', 'moral rights', 'economic rights', 'derivative work', 'copying', 'public communication', 'license', 'assignment', 'royalty', 'infringement', 'damages', and 'exception' are not neutral vocabulary. They categorize events and objects in legally consequential ways. A shift in terminology may change the argumentative direction of the case. For example, describing a work as an 'adaptation' rather than a 'new independent work' has different legal implications.

The second feature is deontic modality. Legal discourse frequently uses expressions of obligation, permission, prohibition, and entitlement, such as 'must', 'shall', 'may', 'is entitled to', 'is not permitted to', and 'has the obligation to'. These expressions do not merely describe reality; they construct normative relations among participants. In copyright disputes, deontic modality is used to define who may exploit a work, who must obtain permission, who is prohibited from copying, and who is entitled to remedies.

The third feature is the use of logical connectors. Words and phrases such as 'therefore', 'accordingly', 'however', 'in contrast', 'because', 'based on', 'in light of', and 'as a result' guide the reader through the reasoning process. They signal causal, concessive, contrastive, and inferential relations. Legal argumentation depends heavily on such connectors because the persuasive force of the text lies in the perceived necessity of moving from evidence to conclusion.

The fourth feature is citation language. Legal discourse repeatedly cites statutes, articles, clauses, contracts, certificates, records, and expert reports. Citation formulas such as 'pursuant to', 'according to', 'as stated in', 'as shown by', and 'as recorded in' create intertextual authority. They show that the argument is not unsupported but anchored in recognized sources.

The fifth feature is impersonal and passive construction. Phrases such as 'it is determined that', 'there are grounds to conclude', 'the evidence shows', and 'no sufficient basis has been provided' reduce the visibility of the individual speaker and strengthen the appearance of objectivity. In judicial discourse, such constructions help transform an evaluative act into an institutionally authorized finding.

The sixth feature is evaluative legal phrasing. Expressions such as 'reasonable', 'sufficient', 'substantial', 'material', 'lawful', 'unlawful', 'compatible with', and 'contrary to' are evaluative rather than purely descriptive. They are essential because legal reasoning requires the assessment of facts against normative standards. In copyright disputes, the difference between 'substantial similarity' and 'minor similarity' may be decisive.

Table 3. Linguistic devices and argumentative functions

Linguistic device	Examples	Argumentative function
Legal terminology	author, copyright holder, copying, derivative work	Defines objects and actions in legally relevant categories
Deontic modality	must, may, shall, is entitled to, is prohibited from	Constructs rights, obligations, permissions, and prohibitions
Logical connectors	therefore, however, because, accordingly	Organizes inferential relations between claims and grounds
Citation formulas	pursuant to, according to, as shown by	Anchors arguments in authoritative texts and evidence
Impersonal constructions	it is determined that, there are grounds to conclude	Creates objectivity and institutional authority
Evaluative terms	sufficient, reasonable, substantial, unlawful	Links factual assessment to legal standards

4.5. Argumentative strategies of different actors

Plaintiffs typically use a strategy of rights affirmation and infringement demonstration. The discourse begins by establishing a legal identity: the plaintiff is the author, co-author, copyright holder, assignee, licensee, or lawful representative. It then moves to the protected work and to evidence of creation, publication, or ownership. The defendant's conduct is then described through infringement-related verbs such as copied, reproduced, used, adapted, distributed, published, or communicated to the public. This strategy seeks to make the conclusion of infringement appear as the natural result of the evidence and statutory rights.

Defendants typically use strategies of denial, distinction, and justification. Denial may target the plaintiff's status, the originality of the work, the existence of copying, or the amount of damage. Distinction may focus on differences between the works or on the idea-expression distinction. Justification may rely on permission, contract, statutory exception, prior use, independent creation, or absence of commercial purpose. These strategies are designed to interrupt the plaintiff's inferential chain.

Adjudicating bodies use strategies of neutralization, selection, and normativization. Neutralization appears when the decision summarizes both sides in an objective manner. Selection appears when the decision identifies which facts and legal provisions are relevant. Normativization appears when the decision converts factual findings into legal conclusions. This final stage gives institutional force to one argumentative path and rejects or limits others.

The differences among actors show that copyright disputes are polyphonic. They contain several voices, each with its own interest, legal position, and rhetorical orientation. The final legal decision is not simply a summary of these voices. It is a reorganization of competing arguments into an authoritative narrative that determines rights and obligations.

4.6. Intertextuality and the construction of legal authority

Intertextuality is one of the most important features of legal discourse on copyright disputes. A legal argument rarely stands alone. It draws on statutes, decrees, contracts, registration documents, original works, allegedly infringing works, expert opinions, digital data, and previous communications between parties. The authority of the argument depends on how successfully these texts are connected.

In copyright disputes, intertextuality has a special dimension because the disputed object is often a text or a work that must be compared with another text or work. The argument may require the reader to move between a protected work and an allegedly infringing work, between a contract and a statutory right, or between a certificate and evidence of actual creation. The more complex the network of texts, the more important the organization of citations and references becomes.

Intertextuality also helps explain the formulaic nature of judicial reasoning. Courts and competent authorities must show that their conclusions are based on recognized sources. Therefore, legal decisions tend to cite legal provisions and evidence explicitly before announcing conclusions. This citation practice is not merely a matter of form. It is a discursive mechanism for producing legitimacy.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that argumentation in legal discourse on copyright disputes in Vietnam is characterized by a strong dependence on legal authority. Unlike everyday argumentation, which may rely on personal experience or general moral reasoning, copyright argumentation must be tied to valid legal norms. This explains the frequent use of statutory citations and formulaic legal expressions. The more directly a claim can be linked to a legal provision and supporting evidence, the stronger its persuasive force becomes.

A second important finding is the hybrid nature of copyright argumentation. Copyright disputes combine legal reasoning with aesthetic, technical, commercial, and technological reasoning. A case involving a song requires discussion of melody, lyrics, performance, and communication to the public. A case involving software may require discussion of source code, interface, database

structure, and licensing. A case involving educational materials may require discussion of quotation, teaching purpose, and the extent of reproduction. As a result, copyright discourse frequently moves across disciplinary boundaries.

A third finding is the central role of comparison. Many copyright disputes cannot be resolved without comparing the protected work and the contested product. However, comparison is not purely visual or textual; it is argumentative. The same similarity may be framed as copying by one party and as coincidence, common idea, genre convention, or lawful quotation by another. Therefore, the linguistic framing of comparison has direct legal significance.

A fourth finding is that legal objectivity is partly constructed through language. Judicial discourse often uses impersonal structures, passive constructions, and evaluative formulas to present conclusions as the outcome of law and evidence rather than individual preference. This does not mean that judicial reasoning is mechanical. Rather, it shows that institutional authority is produced through recognizable linguistic conventions.

These findings have practical implications. For legal practitioners, a better understanding of argumentative structure can improve the drafting of petitions, responses, legal opinions, and settlement documents. For judges and legal officers, awareness of linguistic devices can support clearer reasoning and more transparent decisions. For legal education, the analysis suggests that students should be trained not only in substantive intellectual property law but also in the language of legal argumentation. For linguistics, copyright disputes provide a rich corpus for studying how law, language, creativity, and power interact.

VI. CONCLUSION

This article has examined argumentative features in legal discourse on copyright disputes in Vietnam from a legal-linguistic perspective. The analysis shows that the discourse is organized around a recurrent argumentative structure consisting of claim, legal ground, evidentiary ground, inference, rebuttal, and conclusion. This structure allows legal actors to connect statutory norms with factual materials and to transform contested events into legally meaningful categories.

The study identifies six major types of arguments: legal arguments, evidentiary arguments, comparative arguments, contractual arguments, damage-based arguments, and exception-based arguments. These argument types rarely appear in isolation. In practice, they interact with one another, forming complex argumentative chains. The persuasiveness of a claim depends on the coherence of this chain and on the credibility of the sources used to support it.

At the linguistic level, copyright-related legal discourse relies on specialized terminology, deontic modality, logical connectors, citation formulas, impersonal constructions, and evaluative legal phrasing. These devices help define rights and obligations, structure reasoning, connect texts, construct objectivity, and produce legal authority. The study also shows that plaintiffs, defendants, and adjudicating bodies use different argumentative strategies corresponding to their institutional roles.

The article contributes to the development of forensic linguistics and legal discourse studies in Vietnam by showing that copyright disputes are not only legal events but also linguistic events. Further research may expand the corpus of judgments, conduct quantitative analysis of argumentative markers, compare different levels of adjudication, or examine how digital copyright disputes reshape legal discourse. Such research would deepen understanding of the role of language in the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights.

REFERENCES

1. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
2. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
3. Goodrich, P. (1987). *Legal discourse: Studies in linguistics, rhetoric and legal analysis*. Macmillan.
4. Government of Vietnam. (2023). *Decree No. 17/2023/ND-CP detailing a number of articles of, and providing measures to implement, the Law on Intellectual Property regarding copyright and related rights*. <https://english.luatvietnam.vn/so-huu-tri-tue/decreed-17-2023-nd-cp-detail-law-on-intellectual-property-regarding-copyright-and-related-rights-251358-d1.html>
5. National Assembly of Vietnam. (2005). *Law on Intellectual Property No. 50/2005/QH11*.
6. National Assembly of Vietnam. (2022). *Law No. 07/2022/QH15 amending and supplementing a number of articles of the Law on Intellectual Property*. <https://english.luatvietnam.vn/law-no-07-2022-gh15-amending-and-supplementing-a-number-of-articles-of-the-law-on-intellectual-property-224105-doc1.html>
7. National Assembly of Vietnam. (2025). *Law No. 131/2025/QH15 amending and supplementing a number of articles of the Law on Intellectual Property*. National Database of Legal Documents. <https://vbpl.vn/TW/Pages/vbpbq-van-ban-goc.aspx?ItemID=187492>
8. Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press.
9. Tiersma, P. M. (1999). *Legal language*. University of Chicago Press.
10. Toulmin, S. E. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as structure and process*. Sage.
12. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.