

iii) Third, although the predicate under each of the alternations in (1) is not completely deficient aspectually (i.e., it does not behave like predicates which fail both atelicity and telicity tests) the telic *in*-phrase is blocked even under inchoative readings.

Analysis. We start from the premise that unergative frames involve the conflation of a light predicate (V) with the DP object (Hale & Keyser 1992 a.o.) and the entire predicate projects the external argument (in Spec,vP). While this grasps the syntax of active *râde* (1a), it cannot account for the presence of reflexive pronouns (1b, c): why and where are the reflexive pronouns merged in such a frame? For clues, we consider the syntactic/semantic differences detectable in the relevant constructions; i.e., binding of anaphors (4) and intensification/exclamatives (5):

- (4) a. *Maria își râde de ea însăși.*
 Maria REFL.3.DAT laughs at her self ‘Maria is laughing at herself.’
 b. **Maria se râde de ea însăși.*
 Maria REFL.3.ACC laughs at her self
- (5) a. *Ce m-am mai râs de voi!*
 what REFL.1SG.ACC=have.1SG more laughed at you
 ‘I’ve been laughing so much on your account!’
 b. **Ce mi-am mai râs de voi!*
 what REFL.1SG.DAT=have.1SG more laughed at you

Dat reflexives can bind anaphoric pronouns inside PP, whereas Acc reflexives cannot. The latter may derive exclamatives and intensifiers, whereas the former cannot. Active *râde* can derive both structures. We relate these contrasts to the way various *operators on events* are implemented in the argument structure; i.e., either lexically (the properties of v) or functionally (see Ritter & Rosen 2000 for defining Voice as a delimiter). In our case study, the functional delimiters are the reflexive pronouns, which spell-out two distinct operators merged low (inside vP) – an Intens projection and an Appl projection. More specifically, (5a) indicates that Acc *se* has intensifier properties (see Golezdzinowska 2009 for inherent intensifier ‘se’ predicates across Slavic), spelling out an Intens head. We assume the structure in (6). The optionality of the PP (1b) indicates that it is merged as an adjunct to vP, hence deriving impossibility of binding (4b): (6)[_{vP}PP-*de ea însăși*_k[_{vP} *Maria*_k [_v *râde* [_{IntensP} <Maria> [_{Intens} *se*_k[_{vP} <*râde*> V/DP(conflated)]]]]]]] Another way of introducing an event operator is through ApplP (the Dat reflexive), which is in complementary distribution with *se* in this context. Impossibility of a possessive reading as well as the ban on a cooccurring (argumental) dative with this ApplP (**Maria și-a râs mamei* – Maria SEDAT laughed her motherDAT) indicates that it is not sister to V (Pylkkanen 2002, 2008), but a ‘higher’ ApplP, generated above the obligatory PP-goal, as in (7). The hierarchy allows for binding anaphors (4a), while competition for the θ-role explains the complementary distribution with IntensP. The ungrammaticality of (5b) indicates that the ‘delimitation’ function does not reside with v in this construction, but with ApplP, analyzed as functionally equivalent to IntensP. (7) [_{vP} *Maria*_k [_v *râde* [_{AppIP} <Maria> [_{AppI} *își*_k [_{vP} PP-*de ea însăși*_k[_v V/DP(conflation)]]]]]]] For (6)/(7), VSO in Romanian further involves movement of the subject to CP/TopP, and of the verb and preverbal clitic pronouns to T (V-oriented clitics).

Conclusions. These data illustrate a SE alternation paradigm which has not been previously analyzed in detail, and confirm that the split Agentive/Transitive (Armstrong 2013) is not typologically sufficient. The binding facts in turn also i) argue against complex predicate accounts which see SE as a predicate merged with V (see Armstrong 2013 for discussion); ii) demonstrate that event operators with non-argumental SE are not necessarily merged high, outside vP (as in Borer 2005, Sanz 2000, Boneh and Nash 2011, a.o.).