**Inner aspect and negation: the internal structure of VP**

1. **Claim:** In Hungarian telicity is not represented in the syntactic structure in two verbal projections (against Ramchand (1998) and Ritter & Rosen (1998)) unless there is a perfective marker overtly realised as the head of VP internal temporal phrase called AspP. In Hungarian negation does not trigger ambiguity with telic events unless there is a perfective marker in the sentence. The interaction of negation with inner aspect (Verkuyl (1993)) is constrained by syntactic and not by semantic factors. The perfective marker is the head of a temporal phrase (AspP) sister to V10 that takes VP2 as its complement. The head of AspP temporally orders the two sub events encoded in VP1 and VP2 (Pesetsky and Torrego (2002)). In Hungarian V02 is projected only when the marker is present, otherwise only V01 is projected. Once AspP and VP2 are created they can be the domain for negation. Negation can be merged either over VP1 or over VP internal AspP. Otherwise the only available domain is VP1.  

2. **Data:** In Hungarian perfectivity is expressed by a perfective marker (1a), though telic events can be interpreted as perfective in past tense, even in those sentences in which there is no perfective marker (1b).

   (1) a. Janos megevett egy almat aztan elment.  
      János ate an apple then he left.
   b. Janos evett egy almat aztan elment.  
      ‘Janos ate an apple up then he left.’

   Sentences (1) entail that the whole apple is consumed by John before his leaving. In sentences (1) both events are telic. The verb ‘eszik’ eat is a verb of consumption combined with a quantized DP (Krifka (1992), Verkuyl (1993)). Telic event are complex events, they consist of two subevents in Pustejovsky (1990)'s lexico-semantic analysis. Ramchand (1998) and Rosen & Ritter (1998) argue that telic events are represented as two verbal projections, a Process phrase and a Result-state phrase. In their analyses it is predicted that sentences (2a) and (2b) are ambiguous as negation can have scope over the whole event or the result state of the event. This prediction does not hold for Hungarian. Sentences (2a) and (2b) are the negated versions of (1a) and (1b) respectively. The two available interpretations of sentence (2b) are that John started eating an apple, but did not finish it, or else, it may mean that no eating an apple event took place. While (2a) unambiguously states that there was no eating an apple event performed by John. As the data show, perfective events in negative sentences are ambiguous if the perfective marker is present; otherwise the sentence unambiguously means that there was no eating an apple event performed by John.

   (2) a. Janos nem evett egy almat.  
      Janos not ate an apple.
   b. Janos nem evett meg egy almat.  
      ‘Janos not ate pref. an apple’

   In Hungarian it seems that semantically complex events are not visible for negation unless the result state of the event is morphologically realised as a perfective marker.  

3. **The proposal:** I will propose that telicity is not represented in syntax, at all. What is represented is perfectivity in Hungarian, if the perfective marker is present. The presence of the marker shows that the perfective event is encoded in two different VPs and Asp0 is responsible for the temporal ordering of the two subevents represented in VP1 and VP2 respectively (4a) (Pesetsky and Torrego (2002)). When the marker is not present, no VP2 and no AspP are projected (4b). The marker in Hungarian is an overt realisation of Asp0 that takes VP2 (the result state) as its complement. Negation can see the internal structure of the perfective event if the subevents and their temporal ordering are encoded syntactically, that is both AspP and VP2 are projected, otherwise it only sees the whole event, that is VP1. Once AspP and VP2 are in the structure, it seems that negation can occur in two different positions in the VP (4).

   (4) a. Janos [VP evetti [NegP neg [AsP meg[VP2 egy almat ei]]]]
   b. János [NegP neg [VP evetti [AsP meg [VP2 egy almat ei]]]]

   It can either be merged to a head position of NegP that immediately dominates AspP as in (4a). In this reading the only the result state is negated or alternatively it can be merged to a head position of NegP that immediately dominates VP1 as in (4b) and the total event is negated. Telicity is simple read off by semantics on the basis of the interaction of the temporal properties of the verb, the type of the patient theta role (Dowty (1989), Krifka (1992)) and the quantificational properties of the internal argument (Verkuyl (1993), Krifka (1992)).