Question: Are all explanatory arguments also justificatory?

Responses:

- No—explanations are offered for conclusions you already believe, while justifications are offered for conclusions that you do not yet believe. Thus, the audience has a different epistemic (i.e., knowledge-related) relationship with the conclusion when one seeks an explanation as opposed to a justification, rendering it unnecessary for the explanatory argument to do justificatory work.

- But:
  - Perhaps an argument is explanatory in one place but justificatory in another. That is, the same argument, understood as a set of propositions, could do explanatory work in one context, given that the audience is in no need of convincing, but could do justificatory work in another where the audience needs to be convinced.
  - Perhaps it relates more to the intentions of the arguer—an argument is explanatory or justificatory depending on what work the arguer intends the argument to be doing. (Problem: might it be possible that the arguer thinks the audience seeks an explanatory argument when they are really after a justificatory one, delivers what he intends to be an explanatory argument, but the audience takes it to be justificatory and a compelling argument at that? If so, then perhaps it has less to do with the arguer’s intentions than the audience’s uptake.)
  - The explanatory argument should itself be justifiable. It is no explanation if it cannot in all its parts be justified. Yes, but this just establishes that explanations should be justifiable, and not that a given explanatory argument is itself also justificatory.
  - Others?