

A dialogue framework for enthymemes

Andreas Xydis

Department of Informatics, King's College London, UK

Abstract

In the first volume of OHAAI I presented my motivation and objectives for my PhD work on enthymemes and, specifically, I discussed how some locutions can help in handling enthymemes during argumentation-based dialogues (referred to as *dialogues* from now on), expressing and enriching systems which capture limited scenarios on how a dialogue can unfold. In this paper I go one step further by examining how an argument framework with the enthymemes moved in a dialogue (referred to as *dialogue framework* from now on) can be instantiated and I explain why a dialogue framework is important for achieving my PhD goal.

fewer papers concentrate on dialogue systems which accommodate enthymemes, e.g. [Black and Hunter, 2007], [Dupin de Saint-Cyr, 2011], [Hosseini et al., 2017] and [Prakken, 2005]. The first, third and fourth one deal with the backward expansion of enthymemes, i.e. how to question a premise ϕ of an enthymeme and provide a justification for ϕ during the dialogue. The second one extends these works by dealing also with the forward expansion of enthymemes, i.e. how to challenge the conclusion of an enthymeme E' (which means that an agent receiving E' believes that E' 's conclusion is not the claim of the intended argument Y that the sender of E' implies based on E') and provide the missing information between the top nodes of E' and the claim of Y (the claim of Y might be included in this missing information).

1 Introduction

As analysed in [Xydis, 2020], enthymemes (i.e. arguments with an incomplete logical structure) are more representative of real life dialogues. So if we are to provide normative support for human-human debate and enable AIs and humans to jointly reason, we need to investigate how to process enthymemes during dialogues.

When agents communicate using enthymemes, misunderstandings can occur due to enthymemes' lack of structure. This is why there are some works on enthymemes that explore how agents can formalise these incomplete arguments based on some shared knowledge, and whether it is possible for an agent to decode an enthymeme incorrectly, i.e. to construct a complete argument X based on an enthymeme E that the agent received, but without X being the intended complete argument that the sender of E meant. Examples of such works are [Black and Hunter, 2012, Hosseini et al., 2014, Hunter, 2007, Panisson and Bordini, 2017]. However,

In our paper [Xydis et al., 2020], we introduce a dialogue system with novel locutions, witnessed in real-life dialogues, which extends [Black and Hunter, 2007], [Dupin de Saint-Cyr, 2011], [Hosseini et al., 2017] and [Prakken, 2005]. Particularly, we address the backward and forward expansions of enthymemes employed during dialogues as well as the misunderstandings that may occur due to the use of enthymemes in dialogues. Table 1 shows the locutions used in our system and their meaning.

After discussing the first part of my research in [Xydis, 2020] (i.e. the locutions needed to develop a dialogue system which handles enthymemes), in this paper I continue by demonstrating how a dialogue framework can be instantiated based on the elements of a move made during a dialogue so that I can, later on, argue regarding the acceptability of enthymemes under the classic semantics presented in [Dung, 1995]. The overall goal of my PhD is to prove that there are circumstances under which the status of enthymemes in the dialogue framework at any stage

Locution	Meaning
assert	Assert an enthymeme.
why	Question a particular element of a previous enthymeme, which is a request for the other participant to provide a backward expansion on that element.
because	Provide a backward expansion on a questioned element.
and-so	Request a forward expansion of a previous enthymeme.
hence ^x	Provide a forward expansion of a previous enthymeme.
w.d.y.t.i.m.b.	Check the other participant's understanding of an enthymeme by asking "what did you think I meant by ...".
assumed ^y	Provide their own interpretation of an enthymeme.
meant ^y	Correct the other participant's interpretation of an enthymeme.
agree ^y	Confirm the other participant's interpretation of an enthymeme.

Table 1: Table of locutions, with variants for $x \in \{eq, fw\}$ and $y \in \{eq, fw, bw\}$, where *eq* stands for equal, *fw* stands for forward expansion and *bw* stands for backward expansion.

in a dialogue will correspond with the status of these enthymemes in the Dung argument framework instantiated by the contents of all the moves made at that stage in the dialogue.

2 Method

In my research, arguments are formalised within the *ASPIC*⁺ framework [Modgil and Prakken, 2013] since it allows for the evaluation of arguments using Dung's theory [Dung, 1995], for accessing the internal structure of arguments and for accommodating other existing argumentation formalisms, e.g. deductive argumentation [Bondarenko et al., 1997] and ABA [Besnard and Hunter, 2008]. Additionally, the *ASPIC*⁺ framework allows one to define their own way of constructing arguments into a given logic, and so it en-

ables the use of argument-trees [Hosseini et al., 2014] which preserve the principles of *ASPIC*⁺ and based on which the structure of enthymemes is defined (see [Xydis et al., 2020] for details on how we structure enthymemes).

To develop a dialogue framework, which is used as a tool to decide the acceptability of enthymemes under the complete, preferred, grounded and stable semantics, I explored how a bipolar argument framework is constructed [Cayrol and Lagasque-Schiex, 2005]. The reason was to capture the supporting relationship that two enthymemes can have in the same way as arguments do in a bipolar argument framework. In other words, the backward expansion E' of an enthymeme E and the forward expansion E'' of E in a dialogue are perceived as E' supporting E and E supporting E'' , respectively.

Capturing attacking as well as supporting relationships between enthymemes in my framework will, ultimately, help me in defining acceptability of enthymemes during a dialogue, something that I need if I am to achieve my main PhD goal.

3 Discussion

In this section, I define a dialogue framework that accommodates enthymemes and show how one can construct this dialogue framework based on the elements of a move made during a dialogue.

3.1 Elements of the dialogue framework

In [Xydis et al., 2020], we define a move made in a dialogue d (conducted between two agents P and O) as $m = (s, l, c, re, t)$, where s is the *sender* of m , l is the *locution* of m , c is the *content* of m , re is the move to which m replies and t is the move that m targets. The *sender* of m can be either P or O and the *locution* of m can be one of the locutions depicted in Table 1. The *content* of m can be either an enthymeme or a pair (E, ϕ) , where E is an enthymeme and ϕ is a premise of E , or the emptyset (\emptyset). Lastly, the *reply* of m is either a move made previously in d or \emptyset , as is the *target* of m .

When an agent makes a move m , whose content is an enthymeme and whose locution is not w.d.y.t.i.m.b. or assumed, that targets another move n' it means that the

content of m' is moved as a defeat against the content of n' . So we need a set A which keeps track of the enthymemes moved during a dialogue and a set T that keeps track of the defeat relations between the enthymemes moved during a dialogue.

However, since enthymemes do not have a complete structure, the participants might be mistaken regarding defeats. For example, a participant of a dialogue might move an argument X against a previously moved enthymeme E because she assumes that E was obtained by removing parts of an argument Y which X defeats¹. However, E is expanded by an argument Z which is not defeated by X . Therefore, we allow to the participants of the dialogue to question premises of enthymemes as well as defeat relations between enthymemes. We do so by adding two sets Q_P and Q_T , respectively.

Finally, since a participant of a dialogue can question premises of enthymemes and defeat relations between enthymemes, we expect from her counterpart to answer these questions by providing backward expansions of enthymemes on their challenged premises and forward expansions of enthymemes that have been moved as defeats against other enthymemes, but their defeat relationship is questioned. So, we add a set S that keeps track of enthymemes for which a backward or forward expansion has been provided in the course of the dialogue. Essentially, S represents a binary support relation between enthymemes.

Following the above, we define a dialogue framework DF as a tuple which includes the sets A, T, S, Q_P, Q_T described earlier. Formally $DF = \langle A, T, S, Q_P, Q_T \rangle$.

3.2 Constructing the dialogue framework

Every time an agent moves an enthymeme E during a dialogue, E is added to the dialogue framework, i.e. to the set A . When a move $m = (s, l, c, re, t)$ targets another move $m' = (s', l', c', re', t')$, where c and c' are enthymemes, the defeat relationship between c and c' is added to the dialogue framework, i.e. to the set T (this does not happen when l is either w.d.y.t.i.m.b. or assumed).

If an agent P makes a why move, whose content is (E, ϕ) , then ϕ is added to the dialogue framework as a

questioned premise of E , i.e. (E, ϕ) is added to Q_P . To remove (E, ϕ) from Q_P , the counterpart of P must reply with a because move, i.e. provide a backward expansion E' of E on ϕ . When this happens, a support relation between E' and E is added to the dialogue framework, i.e. the pair (E', E) is added to the set S .

An agent P can question the defeat relation (E, E'') in the dialogue framework, i.e. add (E, E'') to Q_T , if she makes an and-so or a w.d.y.t.i.m.b. move. To remove (E, E'') from Q_T , the counterpart of P needs to reply to an and-so move with a hence^{eq}, i.e. repeat E to show that the claim of her intended argument is part of E and there is no forward expansion of E that she needs to reveal. The pair (E, E'') can also be removed from Q_T if P replies to her counterpart's w.d.y.t.i.m.b. move with an assumed^{eq} and her counterpart replies with an agree^{eq} move, i.e. P was correct to assume that there is no backward or forward expansion of E'' that her counterpart implied and so the defeat relation (E, E'') should still stand.

If P replies to the and-so move with a hence^{fw} move whose content is E' , then a support relation between E and E' is added to the dialogue framework, i.e. (E, E') is added to S , since E' is a forward expansion of E . A defeat relation between E' and E'' is also added to the dialogue framework, i.e. (E', E'') is added to T . This is because as a forward expansion of E , E' may contain the claim of P 's intended argument.

Suppose that during a dialogue d an agent P asserts an enthymeme W , her counterpart O moves Z as a defeat against W , P moves U against Z and then O makes an and-so move to question the defeat relationship between U and Z . Then, P repeats U by making a hence^{eq} move and O answers with a w.d.y.t.i.m.b. move. P replies to the w.d.y.t.i.m.b. move with an assumed move, thus revealing what she understood based on Z . The content of the assumed move (call it Y) is added to the dialogue framework, but with no relationships to other enthymemes since O needs to either correct P or confirm that Y was correctly assumed based on Z . Note that Y can be either a backward expansion of Z or Z itself (meaning that P understood nothing more than what O revealed with Z). The dialogue framework at this stage is depicted in Figure 1.i.

If O replies with a meant move, it means that P 's assumption based on Z was mistaken and so O moves what she really meant based on Z (call this an enthymeme X).

¹ Note that in *ASPIC*⁺ an attack from argument X to argument Y may succeed as a defeat, contingent on preferences defined over the argument X and the targeted sub-argument of Y , if X 's claim conflicts with an ordinary premise or the consequent or name of a defeasible rule in Y .




Figure 1: i. The dialogue framework after an assumed move with content Y . ii. The effect of a meant move on the dialogue framework when the content of meant is: a) a backward expansion Z , b) a forward expansion of Z , c) equal to Z iii. The effect of an agree move on the dialogue framework when the content of agree is: a) a backward expansion Z , b) a forward expansion of Z . Note that straight arrows depict defeats between two enthymemes, whereas the broken arrows depict support relations between enthymemes.

In case O corrects P 's assumption by revealing a backward expansion of Z , the effect on the dialogue framework is the same as the effect of a because move on the dialogue framework (see Figure 1.ii.a). In case O corrects P 's assumption by revealing a forward expansion of Z , the effect on the dialogue framework is the same as the effect of a hence^{fw} move on the dialogue framework (see Figure 1.ii.b). Lastly, if $X = Z$ nothing changes in the dialogue framework (see Figure 1.ii.c). On the other hand, if O replies with an agree move, it means that P 's assumption based on Z was correct and this is why Y (which was the content of the assumed move that P made) gets connected with the rest of the framework. If Y is a backward expansion of Z , the effect on the dialogue framework is the same as the effect of a because move on the dialogue framework (see Figure 1.iii.a). If Y is a forward expansion of Z , the effect on the dialogue framework is the same as the effect of a hence^{fw} move on the dialogue framework

(see Figure 1.iii.b). In both cases a new defeat relation between U and X is added to the dialogue framework, since X contains the element which conflicts with U and so it justifies why U was moved against Z (the case where $Y = Z$, i.e. the locution of the move is agree^{eq}, is described earlier in this section and you can see this case in Figure 1.iii.c).

4 Conclusion

In this paper it was explained how to instantiate a dialogue framework with enthymemes, based on the locutions of moves made during a dialogue. This work is the continuation of my previous paper [Xydis, 2020] where I describe the locutions shown in Table 1. For details on the protocol of the dialogue and how the characteristics of a move change based on each locution see [Xydis et al., 2020]. To the best of my knowledge there is no other work that focuses on the development of a dialogue framework generated from a dialogue system which handles the backward and forward expansion of enthymemes and how to resolve the misunderstandings that they cause (a notable exception is [Prakken, 2005], but this work only addresses backward expansion of enthymemes). The work presented here is a vital part of my research, since it constitutes the basic tool I need to decide regarding the acceptability of enthymemes during a dialogue. The next step of my research is to find out exactly under which circumstances the status of enthymemes in the dialogue framework at any stage in a dialogue will correspond with the status of these enthymemes in the Dung argument framework instantiated by the contents of all the moves made at that stage in the dialogue. So far, I know that I need to restrict the participants into being *honest*, making *relevant* moves, not making *unnecessary* moves and play 'logically perfectly' (see [Prakken, 2005]). The final step of my PhD is to prove my conjecture.

Acknowledgements

The research described in this paper would not be possible without the help of E. Black, C. Hampson and S. Modgil.

References

- [Besnard and Hunter, 2008] Besnard, P. and Hunter, A. (2008). *Elements of argumentation*, volume 47. MIT press Cambridge.
- [Black and Hunter, 2007] Black, E. and Hunter, A. (2007). A generative inquiry dialogue system. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent systems*, pages 1–8.
- [Black and Hunter, 2012] Black, E. and Hunter, A. (2012). A relevance-theoretic framework for constructing and deconstructing enthymemes. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 22(1):55–78.
- [Bondarenko et al., 1997] Bondarenko, A., Dung, P. M., Kowalski, R. A., and Toni, F. (1997). An abstract, argumentation-theoretic approach to default reasoning. *Artificial intelligence*, 93(1-2):63–101.
- [Cayrol and Lagasquie-Schiex, 2005] Cayrol, C. and Lagasquie-Schiex, M. (2005). On the acceptability of arguments in bipolar argumentation frameworks. In *European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty*, pages 378–389.
- [Dung, 1995] Dung, P. M. (1995). On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial intelligence*, 77(2):321–357.
- [Dupin de Saint-Cyr, 2011] Dupin de Saint-Cyr, F. (2011). Handling enthymemes in time-limited persuasion dialogs. *Proceeding of International Conference on Scalable Uncertainty Management*, pages 149–162.
- [Hosseini et al., 2014] Hosseini, S. A., Modgil, S., and Rodrigues, O. (2014). Enthymeme construction in dialogues using shared knowledge. In *Proceedings of Computational Models of Argument*, pages 325–332.
- [Hosseini et al., 2017] Hosseini, S. A., Modgil, S., and Rodrigues, O. (2017). Dialogues incorporating enthymemes and modelling of other agents’ beliefs.
- [Hunter, 2007] Hunter, A. (2007). Real arguments are approximate arguments. In *AAAI*, volume 7, pages 66–71.
- [Modgil and Prakken, 2013] Modgil, S. and Prakken, H. (2013). A general account of argumentation with preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 195:361–397.
- [Panisson and Bordini, 2017] Panisson, A. R. and Bordini, R. H. (2017). Uttering only what is needed: Enthymemes in multi-agent systems. pages 1670–1672.
- [Prakken, 2005] Prakken, H. (2005). Coherence and flexibility in dialogue games for argumentation. *Journal of logic and computation*, 15(6):1009–1040.
- [Xydis, 2020] Xydis, A. (2020). Speech acts and enthymemes in argumentation-based dialogues. *Online Handbook of Argumentation for AI (OHAAI)*, 1:53–57.
- [Xydis et al., 2020] Xydis, A., Hampson, C., Modgil, S., and Black, E. (2020). Enthymemes in dialogues. *Computational Models of Argument: Proceedings of COMMA 2020*, 326:395–402.