Blocking and anti-blocking effects at the lexicon/semantics interface:
The case of French anticausatives

Géraldine Legendre
Johns Hopkins University

French has three subclasses of anticausatives alternating with transitives (e.g. transitive/intransitive *break*), which are defined by morphology. These include Class I (obligatory reflexive morphology with *se*, e.g. *se briser* 'shatter'), Class II (no *se*, e.g. *craquer* 'crack'), and Class III (optional *se*, e.g. *(se) casser* 'break'). In impersonal constructions as well as aspectual contexts traditionally used as diagnostic tests for telicity interpretive (anti-)blocking effects emerge, which point to an analysis relying on competition among expression/interpretation pairs. To take one example, it is not the case (contra Labelle 1992) that only reflexive-marked anticausatives have a completion interpretation in sentential contexts like *Le vase a mis moins de trois secondes à se briser* 'The vase took less than three seconds to shatter' (Class I). If the lexical entry does not include a reflexive-marked option (Class II) the relevant completion reading becomes available for the non-reflexive form. If the lexical entry offers two options, reflexive-marked or not (Class III), only the reflexive-marked form has the relevant completion interpretation. Such effects generalize to other aspectual contexts. Elsewhere, in non-aspectual sentences with the ambiguous (referential/non-referential) subject pronoun *il* 'he, there' (*Il a cassé plusieurs branches* 'He/*There broke several branches') interpretive blocking effects are observed whereby a transitive/causative, rather than an impersonal/presentational interpretation, is the only one available --if possible for a given morphological class. A formal analysis of both blocking and anti-blocking effects is provided in terms of bidirectional optimization.