

While the completion in the Bears dialogue is a natural one, it certainly isn't the only felicitous response to the initiation. It is open to the responder to challenge the initiation in another way, but interestingly, it is also open to the initiator to retrench in certain ways, as in the following alternate extension of the discourse:

EX 1. (Teddy bears)

A: Bears are dangerous.

B: What about Teddy bears?

A: I didn't mean *all* bears.

A's retrenchment in [Teddy bears](#) strikes my ear as an acceptable response to B's challenge. It is similar to the data that Thony Gillies and Kai von Fintel analyze in regard to retraction of *might* claims. Consider the following, drawn from vonfintel2008 (p.81):

EX 2. (Keys)

A: The keys might be in the drawer.

B: (*Looks in the drawer.*) They're not. Why did you say that?

A: I didn't say they *were* in the drawer. I said they *might be* there – and they might have been. Sheesh.

Might claims are sometimes retracted when presented with countervailing evidence available in a different context from the original utterance. But as [Keys](#) makes clear, *might* claims are occasionally *resilient* in the face of such challenges. The felicity of the exchange in [Teddy bears](#) suggests that correctible initiations exhibit similar resilience.

DEF 1. (Resilience)

Generics are *resilient*. In certain contexts, it is appropriate for the utterer of a correctible to refrain from retracting it in the face of a challenge.

The exchange in [Teddy bears](#) reveals an additional interesting fact about disputative discourse. Even if it is appropriate for an initiator to refuse to retract a correctible, the challenge provided by the correction is no less appropriate. The flip-side of the resilience of correctibles is that they are also highly susceptible to challenge.

DEF 2. (Susceptibility)

Generics are susceptible to challenge. In certain contexts, it is appropriate for an initiator's interlocutors to challenge their attempted contribution.

The dual observations of *resilience* and *susceptibility* provide an interesting obstacle to an analysis of the semantics and discourse dynamics of disputative language. *Susceptibility* pushes us toward a more strict representation of the content of the initiation to make sense of why it is appropriate to offer a correction to it. That is, it seems that utterances **A** and **B** in [Teddy bear](#) represent a disagreement, and the most natural way to formalize disagreement is in terms of presentation of conflicting content.

But *resilience* pushes in the opposite direction. The **A**'s retrenchment, in so far as it is appropriate, naturally suggests compatibility between the initiation and the completion, which pushes us toward a less strict interpretation of the initiation content. Navigating between the rock of a correctible's tendency to elicit challenges and the hard place of their ability to withstand those challenges is a particularly interesting puzzle for a linguistic analysis of this type of discourse. But an adequate account should respect all of the observations catalogued above. To make them easier to refer to, all the observations are compiled below.