Why?

Schlöder, J.J.; Breitholtz, E.; Fernández, R.

Published in:
SEMDIAL 2016 : JerSem

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (http://dare.uva.nl)
Abstract

Even casual dialogue contains instances of reasoning. A paradigmatic case is the usage of Why-questions that intuitively elicit a reason for something. We present a thorough analysis of Why-questions in dialogue from a rhetorical perspective. We specify the semantics of Why-questions, i.e., we define what the space of acceptable answers is, how this acceptability is itself up for further negotiation, and discuss some context-sensitive aspects of bare Why?. We formalise our model in a type-theoretical framework.

1 Introduction

Participating in a dialogue requires the interlocutors to reason about certain propositions and circumstances. On one hand, interlocutors are generally expected to back up the assertions they make with arguments, should this be required. On the other hand, the notion of relevance of an utterance is linked to reasoning: a relevant utterance is made for a reason, e.g., to provide or inquire about information pertinent to the purpose of the dialogue.

Such reasons are not always explicated by the interlocutors, but can be elicited by clarification questions (Jackson and Jacobs, 1980; Breitholtz, 2010; Schlöder and Fernández, 2015). The paradigmatic examples are Why-questions. We are interested in what constitutes the space of possible answers to such questions and how they are interpreted in a discourse. The following examples retrieved from the British National Corpus (BNC) (Burnard, 2000) exemplify the basic phenomenon.

(1) a. B: He’s in hospital.
   b. C: Why?
   c. B: Because he’s not very well
   (BNC, file KBF, lines 3394–3396)

(2) a. G: Do you want mum to come to Argos with me tomorrow morning?
   (three lines omitted)
   b. R: Why are you asking me?
   c. G: Cos you said you’d come to Argos with me.
   (BNC, file KC8, lines 191–196)

In (1), B makes an assertion and C asks for a reason that backs the truth of the proposition expressed in (1a); note that this need not entail that C is doubting the content of B’s assertion. We contrast this with what is happening in (2). There, G asks a question and R inquires about G’s reason for doing so. In both cases, the initial speaker then supplies a reason that is marked with the particle ‘because’. Here, we use the concept ‘reason’ intuitively—only if we can define what makes a reason, we can define what makes an answer to a Why-question.

A first observation is that the arguments expressed by the first and third utterances in (1) and (2) are logically incomplete: they indicate that the third utterance is a reason for the first, but not what warrants the inference. In classical rhetoric, such arguments are called enthymemes. An enthymeme is an argument of the form ‘p hence q’ which requires the listener to supply one or more underpinning premises. It has been observed that enthymematic reasoning is widespread in natural dialogue, and has been linked to clarification and cognitive load management (Jackson and Jacobs, 1980; Breitholtz and Villing, 2008). Therefore, we will analyse different types of Why-questions in terms of enthymematic reasoning to find out what the correlation is between rhetorical structure and different types of Why-questions.

The paper is structured as follows: In the next section, we will give an overview of existing work in discourse modelling related to reasoning, Why-questions and enthymemes. Afterwards, in section 3 we will further elucidate the dynamics of enthymematic reasoning with natural dialogue ex-
2 Reasoning in Dialogue

Many conversational phenomena like disagreement, misunderstanding, and clarification can be linked to enthymematic reasoning (Breitholtz, 2014a). Consider the example in (3).

(3) A: Let’s walk along Walnut Street
   It’s shorter
   (cited from Walker (1996))

This excerpt is uttered in the context of two colleagues on their way to work, where several routes are possible. Speaker A suggests to take one of them and provides a reason supporting this. The two propositions convey an enthymeme: an argument that relies on generally recognised facts and notions regarding how it is acceptable to reason. Enthymemes consist of two parts, a premise and a conclusion, as in the case of our example: 1

(4) \[
\text{If (Walnut Street) is shorter}\quad 
\therefore \quad \text{Let’s walk along Walnut Street}
\]

In this case the speaker counts on the interlocutor being able to supply something that underpins (3). That is, something that warrants its interpretation as an argument while simultaneously validating it. These kinds of underpinnings are often referred to as topoi in the literature on rhetoric and argumentation. Some topoi may be applied to various subjects, while others are specific to a particular subject. Ducrot (1980; 1988) and Anscombre (1995) talk about topoi as links between propositions that are necessary for the propositions to cohere in discourse. A topos that could be drawn upon to validate the argument in (3) could be something like 'if a route is shorter (than other options), choose that route'.

We refer to the topoi that are available to an individual as that individual’s rhetorical resources. On this view, speakers have access to a vast set of topoi which to a great extent mirrors the experiences they have had. Another important aspect of this view is that the topoi accessible to one individual do not constitute a monolithic logical system. In contrast to, for example, a representation of world knowledge, a set of topoi may contain contradictions or principles of inference which lead to contradictions.

These phenomena have also been discussed from the perspective of discourse relations; most notably in the SDRT framework (Asher and Lascarides, 2003). SDRT includes the discourse relations Explanation(\(\alpha, \beta\)) and Result(\(\beta, \alpha\)). These relations are assigned to \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) only if it is true in the underlying world model that \(\beta\) can be a cause for \(\alpha\). Because these inferences are done in a defeasible logic, SDRT can also account for the fact that sometimes \(\beta\) does not explain \(\alpha\) in spite of \(\beta, \alpha\), hence \(\beta\) being a valid form of inference.

SDRT also includes meta-discursive versions of these relations. These model the fact that sometimes speakers give reasons for making certain speech acts, as e.g., in example (3) where the speaker gives a reason for making a suggestion. A relation particularly interesting to us is Q-Elab(\(\alpha, \beta\)) that applies when \(\beta\) asks a question pertinent to the goal that the speaker of \(\alpha\) wants to achieve by uttering \(\alpha\). To our understanding, Why-questions broadly fall under this umbrella, but no such account of Why? has yet been elaborated.

We prefer the rhetorical approach over the discourse relations model for the following reason. As our analysis will show, inference patterns are dynamic in that they can be presupposed, accommodated, elicited and themselves be discussed. The SDRT account, as far as we understand it, is not amenable to such flexibility. In particular, the semantics of Q-Elab(\(\alpha, \beta\)) requires that the space of possible answers to \(\beta\) is fixed and known (Asher and Lascarides, 2003, Sec. 9.3.3). If \(\beta\) is a Why-question, we do not believe this to be the case. This is because the answer set to a Why-question depends on the available topoi. Since topoi are dynamic, so must be these answer sets.

An important consequence of this, as we see it, is that the acceptability of a given reason does not depend on an inferential relationship being correct (in some objective sense, e.g., in a model), but merely on it being subjectively acceptable to the interlocutors. Acceptability, in turn, depends on the rhetorical resources of individual speakers. 2

3 Analysing Reasons

We now describe how we model what counts as a reason, i.e., what counts as an answer to a Why-

---

1This distinguishes them from logical arguments or syllogisms which typically have three parts: A premise, a conclusion, and a rule sanctioning the inference.

2This also means that our interest in Why-questions differs from analyses that seek to elucidate what explanations are in philosophy of science (Bromberger, 1992; van Fraassen, 1980). Our reasons are dialogical phenomena, whereas their explanations are, roughly, about natural or physical laws.
question. We then discuss by way of examples how these questions are used and answered in dialogue and how they contribute to grounding. Then, we summarise our findings and present some interesting cases that fall outside our analysis.

3.1 Reasons

Certainly, the answers given by B and G in our initial examples (1) and (2) are not arbitrary. Not any utterance would be an acceptable answer to the Why-questions in these examples. Similarly, not every utterance that expresses ‘p because q’ is immediately acceptable to its addressee. We stipulate that q is a reason for p if there is a topos that validates the enthymeme q \rightarrow p. Stating that ‘p because q’, ‘if q, then p’ or answering ‘q’ to ‘Why p?’ expresses that q is a reason for p. Hence, such utterances presuppose that there is such a topos. Thus, addressees can either retrieve an appropriate topos from their set of rhetorical resources or infer and accommodate a new one.

The following examples provide evidence for this conception.

(5) a. J: I roasted it and we couldn’t eat it on the Sunday and
b. A: Could not? Why could you not eat it?
c. J: That was bull beef.
d. A: Oh right.
e. H: our second class beef, you see.
f. J: Then I, I put it in a saucepan and I stewed it the next day
(BNC, file K65, lines 284–299; some backchannel utterances omitted)

In (5c), J gives an answer to a Why-question, i.e., J gives what she construes to be a reason for ‘being unable to eat the roast’. Speaker A indicates that he accepts this as an answer, but H still elaborates in (5e). The additional information in (5e,f) suggests the following enthymeme:

(6) x is bull beef \hence J could not eat roasted x

\textbf{Topos: one cannot roast bull beef (but ought to stew it)}

This dialogue offers evidence for our claim that what makes (5c) an answer to (5b) is the more general statement indicated in (5e,f), i.e., the topos of (6). To an interlocutor that is unaware of this information, answering (5c) to (5b) would seem like a non sequitur. The following example is an explicit case in point. The second speaker explicitly mentions the principle that he takes to back the conditional statement in (7a).

(7) a. D: I’m self-funding my campaign, I tell the truth.
b. J: ‘I’m rich, therefore I tell the truth’ has [...] no cause and effect between the two.
(from Last Week Tonight, Feb. 29th, 2016)

The explication of the topos in (7b) suggests to us that J has interpreted D’s utterance as (8).

(8) D self-funds his campaign \therefore D tells the truth

\textbf{Topos: rich people tell the truth}

3.2 Contextual dependence of Why-questions

Based on this definition of what makes a reason, we now look into the context of Why-questions. We propose that the reasons elicited by these questions are dependent on (i) the current issue under discussion and (ii) the form of the question itself, i.e., its sentential or non-sentential character. The elicited reasons can be either factive (‘why p?’, given some proposition p under discussion) or meta-discursive (‘why are you saying p asking q / suggesting r?’, given some salient dialogue act). While any type of reason can be queried with a sentential Why-question, only a restricted set of possible reasons can be elicited by bare Why?

3.2.1 Factive reasons

In contexts where the current issue under discussion has arisen from an asserted proposition, Why-questions typically ask for a reason justifying the asserted content. For instance, example (5b) is a sentential form of such a factive Why-question and example (1b) from the Introduction is a bare factive Why?. We consider the following to be an appropriate reading of (1a,c).

\textsuperscript{3}This example is from the TV show Last Week Tonight. (7a) is an excerpt from a speech by Donald Trump; (7b) is John Oliver’s commentary.

\textsuperscript{4}Though (8) is not the only possible interpretation of (7a).

\textsuperscript{5}We call Why-questions ‘factive’ if they inquire about a claim and contrast them with those inquiring about an act. We do not claim that such questions are factive in the sense of factive verbs like know. One can pose a factive Why-question without presupposing the truth of the claim, e.g., ‘Why would this be true?’ Some prior work, e.g., Hempel (1965) or Hintikka and Halonen (1995), claims that a Why-question carries its core proposition as a presupposition (sometimes, e.g., Bromberger (1992), with the restriction that the content is in indicative mood, excluding ‘Why would...’ cases). The observations we make seem to cast doubt on this. Apparently, one can ask ‘Why p?’ without accepting p. An example is (25) below; see our discussion there.
(9) \[ x \text{ is not very well} \qquad \therefore \text{ } x \text{ is in the hospital} \]

Topos: unwell people go to the hospital

An interesting special case arises when the issue under discussion stems from a conditional statement. Then, Why? elicits a backing for an already stated premise–conclusion pair (i.e., it elicits a reason for the enthymeme itself). Simply put, asking for the grounds of a conditional statement elicits an underpinning premise, but the application of this premise is itself enthymematic.

(10) a. D: If you feel cold you’d be dead.
    b. C: Why?
    c. D: You just are. Part of you being alive is that you’re warm.

(BNC, file KBW, lines 11065–11068)

The utterance (10a) states an inferential relationship without giving grounds for the relationship. The Why? in (10b) asks for a reason for this relationship, i.e., for the premise in (11).

(11) \[ \therefore (x \text{ is cold} \therefore x \text{ is dead}) \]

Put differently, (10b) asks for a reason why \( x \) is cold is a reason for \( x \) is dead. Thus, we represent the content of (10a) as the enthymeme in (12) and (10b) as asking about the topos of (12).

(12) \[ x \text{ is cold} \qquad \therefore x \text{ is dead} \]

Topos: –

Then, the utterance (10c) supplies such a topos, so the nested enthymeme in (13) is a representation of what is under discussion after (10c).

(13) Living things are warm.

\[ \therefore x \text{ is cold} \]

\[ \therefore x \text{ is dead} \]

Topos: contraposition.

This in particular serves to illustrate the fact that enthymemes can be nested: In principle, this situation would now license the elicitation of a backing to support the enthymeme in (13) again (and so on). Already Lewis Carroll (1895) observed that one can always ask for what licenses an inference, then ask for what licenses the license etc. ad infinitum. Therefore, an adequate model needs to always assume that there is a topos in the context that the interlocutors do not explicate, but implicitly accommodate. The difference between (12) and (13) is that the topos implicit in (12) is explicated in (13)—but the explication again presupposes a new implicit inference pattern.

Similarly, in the next example, the asker of the Why-question is not able to accommodate the answer as a reason. So he questions the relevance of the answer with So what? (we will further discuss So what? in the next subsection).

(14) a. P: I was with Nanna and Adrian.
    b. R: No Daddy said you should be with Michelle and Mutty.
    c. P: (unclear) (pause) Why do I (unclear) Nan and Adrian?
    d. R: Well cos (pause) erm some of the questions are sort of, English questions.
    e. P: So what?
    f. R: Well Michelle’s not English.

(BNC, file KD0, lines 3624–3629)

The dialogue (14) is about assigning groups in some (not further specified) game. In (14e), speaker P indicates that he does not see what makes (14d) an answer to (14c). Then, in (14f), R supplies an additional premise that supports the following nested enthymeme.

(15) Michelle is not English

\[ \therefore \text{ there are some English questions} \]

\[ \therefore \text{ P should be with Michelle and Mutty} \]

Topos: Non-English people need help with English questions

The enthymeme in (15) particularly exemplifies the notion described above: Once elicited, a backing becomes a premise in a superordinate enthymeme that again requires an implicit topos to be interpreted.

3.2.2 Meta-discursive reasons

The utterance (2b) in the Introduction is an example of a Why-question asking for a reason justifying a linguistic fact. Such a meta-discursive interpretation is the only one available to bare Why? when the active issue under discussion does not stem from asserted content. In example (16) the active issue is a question and in (18) it is a suggestion. Here, rather than prompting a reason to justify a contextually provided proposition, the Why?’s can be glossed as ‘Why are you saying this?’ The answers in (16b) and (18b) raise the enthymemes in (17) and (19), respectively.

\( ^6 \) (16) is between a child (A) and its minder (B). A wants something, and B is wise to A’s attempt at manipulation.
(16) a. A: Do you love me (unclear)?
b. B: Why?
c. A: (unclear) I love you so much.
   (BNC, file KCM, lines 1057–1060)

(17) A loves B
   .\ A wants to know if B loves A
Topos: one wants to know if love is requited

(18) a. D: Oh I should keep the strawberries if I were you.
b. C: Why?
c. D: Strawberries are delicious.
   (BNC, file KBW, lines 9848–9850)

(19) D thinks strawberries are delicious
   \ D suggests to keep strawberries
Topos: one should keep delicious things.

When replying to assertions, bare Why? does not have this effect, as it is interpreted to ask for a reason for the asserted proposition being factual, as in (9). Instead, a sentential Why-question is needed to elicit a meta-discursive reason, e.g., ‘Why are you telling me this?’ Interestingly, meta-discursive reasons can be queried in these cases with non-sentential So (what)?, as exemplified below:

(20) a. C: Who are you going to snog on Saturday?
   \ (two lines omitted)
b. K: I don’t know.
c. C: Snog Phil.
d. K: No I’ve done him already (laugh).
e. C: So?
f. K: done it, been there, got the T-shirt.
   (BNC, file KPH, lines 1582–1588)

In (20e), C questions the relevance of ‘having done him already’ to the issue of ‘not snogging Phil’. We model this as the enthymeme in (21): C recognises that K is giving a reason for her rejection of the proposal in (20c), but cannot supply or infer a topos to validate the inference. The topos K supplies (by conventional implicature) in (20f) seems to be ‘repeated experiences are boring’.\footnote{A variety of online dictionaries (Urban Dictionary, Wiktionary, and The Free Dictionary) agree that ‘been there, done that, got the T-shirt’ conventionally means that the speaker is familiar with an activity to the point of boredom.}

(21) K has snogged Phil already
   \ K will not snog Phil
Topos: –

A Why? in place of (20e) would ask for a reason why K has already snogged Phil, i.e., it would ask for the missing premise in (22) (like in 1b).

(22) \ K has snogged Phil already

So (what)? is meta-discursive in particular when replying to an answer to an earlier question. That is, asking ‘Why are you saying this?’ of an answer is asking ‘How does this answer my question?’. This explains the function of ‘So what?’ in (14).

3.3 Reasons and grounding

As mentioned before, sometimes Why-questions function as clarification questions. We draw the conclusion that the dynamics of reasons we just discussed can be related to the grounding process. We begin by observing that sometimes the rejection of a premise in an enthymeme can leave the conclusion ungrounded, i.e., not mutually accepted by the interlocutors. The dialogue in (23) is a case in point.

   \ (pause) \ (three lines omitted)
b. M: You’re working, so you don’t need bacon.
c. J: I’m not working Monday.
d. M: Well you can go and get it.
   (BNC, file KCL, lines 405–411)

Here, M makes a proposal in (23a) and backs it with the enthymeme (24) in (23b).\footnote{The topos licensing the enthymeme is not clear to us.} J in (23c) denies the premise of (24). M in (23d) concedes that therefore the conclusion (23a) is defeated.

(24) J is working on Monday
   \ J does not need bacon on Monday

Also, loosely following the distinction between intention recognition and intention adoption of Schlöder and Fernández (2015), we observe that one can recognise a topos that validates an enthymeme without accepting the topos as valid (i.e., without adopting the topos in one’s private set of available topoi). This is shown in example (7), where J cites a topos that would support the enthymeme, but denies that it is valid.

With these preliminaries in place, we can consider an example where a Why? is asked before accepting an assertion.
We analyse this as follows. B makes an assertion in (25b) that is not immediately acceptable to C, so she asks for a reason in (25c). B supplies a reason in (25d), completing the enthymeme in (26).

(26) C got grade three honors

\[ \therefore \text{C will get junior and senior tap} \]

Then, in (25e), C denies that this is a valid inference. Apparently B concedes this: instead of arguing the point of (26) she is looking for a different premise that would allow her to infer the conclusion of (26). This evinces that the proposition asserted in (25b) is still not accepted by C, i.e., it is left ungrounded.

3.4 Summary of findings

Based on the evidence analysed in the preceding subsections, we summarise our findings on the dialogue dynamics of Why-questions as follows. We also include the question So (what)¿, which, as we have seen, serves to elicit reasons not available to bare Why¿. Our (informal) model goes like this:

(i) Why¿-questions, including bare Why¿, can have factive and meta-discursive readings.

(ii) The availability of these readings depends on context. In the case of a propositional antecedent, the meta-discursive reading is not immediately available to bare Why¿, but it can instead be obtained with So (what)¿?

(iii) A reason, i.e., an acceptable answer to a Why¿-question, is a proposition that connects enthymematically to the question’s antecedent.

(iv) In interpreting such an answer, the listener can either apply an available topos, accommodate the presupposition that there is such a topos, or elicit another tacit premise. The last case can again be modelled as asking for a reason for why the enthymeme itself is valid.

(v) To understand an enthymeme—or that something is given as a reason—it is not required to consider the underpinning topos valid.

3.5 Special cases

Our main interest in this paper is the elicitation, interpretation, and accommodation of reasons as a dialogical phenomenon. We note that while the interpretation of bare Why¿ is of interest to us, we cannot claim to model the phenomenon exhaustively. A particularly striking example is Ginzburg’s much discussed turn-taking puzzle (Ginzburg, 2012, Ex. 23, here as 27).

(27) A: Which members of the audience own a parakeet?
   b. B: Why? [Why are you asking?]
   c. A: Why am I asking this question?

Our account of what it means to give a reason, i.e., to answer a Why¿-question, straightforwardly accounts for all three cases in (27), but our informal discussion of bare Why¿ only accounts for (27b). As (27c) shows, the meta-discursive reading is available in the context of (27a), but, still, the bare Why¿ there has a factive reading. Modelling these differences would require a more sophisticated analysis of what is under discussion than we can provide here.

We used SCoRE (Purver, 2001) to systematically search for further counterexamples. The following two examples show further functions of Why that our analysis does not cover.

(28) a. D: You know why they can’t put more carriages on a train?
   b. G: Why?  

(29) a. U: Andy, do you want a cup of tea?
   c. M: Do you want one Nick?
   d. N: Why not?  

The Why¿ of (28b) is a reprise fragment of its antecedent and cannot be glossed as ‘Why are you asking¿’. This example indicates to us that the interpretation of bare Why¿ is at least sometimes elliptical. An elliptical account of Why¿ would also serve to disentangle the turn-taking puzzle (27). Such an account would be complementary to our discussion in that it would help to determine the proposition that a Why¿-question is about. From 

\[ \text{According to our search, the dialogue section of the BNC contains 2256 Why¿-questions, 858 (38%) of these bare Why¿.} \]

\[ \text{We manually surveyed a random selection of about 200.} \]

\[ \text{It seems possible that a grammar for elliptical Why¿ can also consider ‘are you asking¿’ as elliptical content and thereby predict meta-discursive readings as well. It seems unlikely, however, that ‘so (what)¿ is elliptical (we thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to us).} \]
that point onward, our account of what makes a reason would apply. In addition, the antecedent (28a) is also an embedded Why-question that does not prompt G to provide a reason. Here, we need to leave the embedding behaviour of Why-questions, elliptical interpretations and the relation to reprise fragments to further work.

In (29d), the speaker N seems to use Why not? to indicate that he would like some tea, i.e., as an agreement move.\footnote{Similarly, questions like ‘Why don’t you come in?’ are conventionally read as suggestions: the space of possible answers includes ‘Thank you’. However, if the suggestion is not followed, the literal Why-question can be answered by giving a reason, e.g., ‘I don’t want to impose.’} We believe that this function of Why not? is related to the function of Why? as a clarification question (see subsection 3.3). In the account of clarifying Why? of Schlöder and Fernández (2014), an addressee is assumed to accept a proposal if they have no reason not to. Hence, we interpret Why not? in contexts like (29) to mean that the speaker cannot think of a reason not to. Thereby, it implicates acceptance. A strikingly explicit example for this is (30).

(30) A: Do you agree with that?
G: I have no reason to disagree. Yes.

We note however that Why not? also can have the factive function we discussed in subsection 3.2.1 as long as its antecedent has negative polarity. Example (31) is a typical case.

(31) T: I’m not going to sleep.
C: Why not? (BNC, file KBH, lines 4408–4409)

4 Formal Modelling

In this section we will use a Dialogue Game Board (DGB) semantics cast in Type Theory with Records (TTR) to formalise the notions discussed in the previous section. We will take as our point of departure the model for analysing rhetorical reasoning in dialogue developed by Breitholtz (2014a). This account of enthymematic reasoning builds on the formal work on dialogue modelling by Cooper and Ginzburg (2012; 2015). The leading idea of this approach is that a theory of dialogue should be cognitively plausible as well as computationally feasible. TTR is put forward as a framework that is just that.\footnote{One particular advantage attributed to TTR is that it allows one to model natural language without appealing to (sets of) possible worlds. Possible world models are criticised for having both cognitive and computational problems; see for example Ranta (1994) or Chatzikyriakidis and Luo (2014), that our observations are structured and precise enough to be embedded in such a framework and be integrated in a well-developed dialogue semantics. Since the rhetorical model we employ makes frequent reference to both cognition and computation, e.g., when it comes down to the availability and retrieval of certain topoi by individual interlocutors, the TTR framework seems appropriate.\footnote{It is noteworthy, however, that the model we apply bears a strong connection to rather more conventional logics of default inference (Breitholtz, 2014b).}
We formalise this as the topos $\text{truth}'$. J points out that he considers a topos to be a possible backing for the enthymeme construction of 'he'. In uttering Why?, C inquires about the reason why this is the case. To answer, B searches her rhetorical resources for a topos that can underpin an inference $\varphi$ : $\psi$ satisfying these properties: $\psi$ can be used to conclude that someone is in the hospital, and $\varphi$ applies to $X$ in this context. Such a topos has the form of $T_1$ in (36).

$$T_1 = \lambda x: \text{Ind} \quad \begin{cases} \text{unwell}(x) & \text{hospital : in_hospital(r.x)} \end{cases}$$

This is, intuitively, a generally acceptable pattern of inference. So it is plausible that B can retrieve $T_1$ from her rhetorical resources. Informed by this topos, B then utters (35c), expressing the enthymeme in (37).

$$E_1 = \lambda x: \text{Ind} \quad \begin{cases} \text{unwell}(x) & \text{hospital : in_hospital(r.x)} \end{cases}$$

Now, the other speaker C, upon interpreting (35c), updates his game board to include $E_1$ as the enthymeme under discussion ('eud'), as seen on C’s game board in (38).

$$DGB_C = \begin{cases} \text{private : agenda : list(RecType)} \\
\text{topoi : list(Rec→RecType)} \\
\text{l-m : c : Assert(B,C)} \\
\text{ctnt : T_unwell} \\
\text{qud : list(Question)} \\
\text{moves : list(Iloc)} \\
\text{eul = [E_1] : list(Rec→RecType)} \\
\text{topoi : list(Rec→RecType)} \end{cases}$$

4.2 Factive reasons

Let us return to example (1), repeated here as (35).

(35) a. B: He’s in hospital.
   b. C: Why?
   c. B: Because he’s not very well

After B uttered (35a), C and B updated the latest move ‘l-m’ on their DGBs to include the claim that $X$ is in the hospital, where $X$ is the anaphoric resolution of ‘he’. In uttering Why?, C inquires about the reason why this is the case. To answer, B searches her rhetorical resources for a topos that can underpin an inference $\varphi$ : $\psi$. J counts someone who self-funds their campaign is rich among his rhetorical resources. This is the topos $T_2$ in (34).

$$T_2 = \lambda x: \text{Ind} \quad \begin{cases} \text{unwell}(x) & \text{hospital : in_hospital(r.x)} \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, to justify (32), one needs to apply (34) and (33) in succession. That is, we can compute $E_1$ by composing $T_1 \circ T_2$ and instantiating the individual $x$ as the person D. Note, however, that $T_1$ is probably not acceptable to most people, and it also seems likely that D had a different topos in mind for underpinning his statement.
Then, $C$ searches his resources for a topos of which $E_1$ is an instantiation. Let us assume here that he can retrieve the topos $T_1$ as well. Note that the domain of $T_1$ is a more general type than the domain of $E_1$. Thus, $T_1$ can be restricted to the function $E_1$, underpinning the enthymeme in (37).

### 4.3 Meta-discursive reasons

We also observed that Why-questions can have meta-discursive readings, i.e., asking for the justification of a linguistic fact. We model this as follows: factive Why-questions ask about the latest move’s content, whereas meta-discursive questions ask about the move itself.

In a game board semantics, the contents of the DGB are modified via update rules that link the progression of the dialogue (as recorded in ‘shared’) to the interlocutors’ beliefs and plans (as recorded in ‘private’). The function $U_{why}_j$ in (39) is an update rule for factive Why-questions: the interlocutor asks about a premise for an enthymeme.

Note that updating ‘l-m’ tacitly also updates ‘moves’. Now, for meta-discursive Why-questions, the interlocutor inquires about the move itself. For the case of a question in the antecedent, this is the function $U_{why}_m$ in (40).

(42)

$$E_1 = \lambda x : A \cdot \text{Ind } y : B \cdot \text{Ind } c_{\text{ask}} : \text{asked(r.x, ?love(r.y, r.x))}$$

Thus, after (41c), $E_1$ is now under discussion. That is, B has to evaluate whether he can accommodate A loving B is a reason for asking (41a). We attributed the topos ‘one wants to know if love is required’ to this example in (17). This can be formalised as $T_1$ in (43).

(43)

$$T_1 = \lambda x : \text{Ind } y : \text{Ind } c_{\text{ask}} : \text{want_to_know(r.x, ?love(r.y, r.x))}$$

Again we need to assume a tacit background topos. In this case, ‘if someone desires to know something, this is a reason for asking for it’. This is the topos $T_2$ in (44).

(44)

$$T_2 = \lambda x : \text{Ind } y : \text{Question } c_{\text{ask}} : \text{want_to_know(r.x, y)}$$

As before, computing $T_2 \circ T_1$ and restricting the domain to the proposition $\text{love}(y, x)$ for the individuals $x = A$ and $y = B$ yields $E_1$.

As said, this is on a certain level of abstraction. The constraint $c_{\text{ask}}$ differs from $c_{\text{hospital}}$ in (36) in that the former specifies a linguistic situation. The DGB allows us to be more precise about what such linguistic situations are. We may represent ‘asked(A, ?love(B,A))’ as the type in (45).

(45)

$$\text{list(Ind)}$$

### 5 Conclusion

We have conducted an analysis of the functions that Why-questions can have in dialogue and explained them from the perspective of enthymemes and topoi. Our discussion covers the phenomenon broadly, but there remain open questions related to embedded Why-questions and elliptical Why?. The cornerstone of our analysis is a definition of what counts as a reason, i.e., as an answer to a Why-question. We have formalised that notion in a TTR framework and formally described two examples for the major functions we have attributed to Why-questions in the informal analysis.

---

16Note that this is an example of a topos that appears generally reasonable, but fails to apply in many situations. E.g., when asking would be embarrassing or socially dispreferred.
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