forms (Section 4.2), resultative forms (Section 4.3), and hybrid forms (Section 4.4). Past perfectives are compatible with narrative progression and allow definite time adverbials; experiential forms, as the name suggests, allow the experiential reading but lack the resultative reading; resultative forms are characterized by the resultative reading and exclude a purely experiential reading; and hybrid forms show both experiential and resultative readings. With each group presenting their own combination of similar characteristics, we see the notion of a cross-linguistically valid category of the 'perfect' collapsing.

4.1. Group 1: Past Perfectives

As relevant background for this section, it is important to distinguish between the perfective/imperfective and the perfect/non-perfect aspectual distinctions. The perfective/imperfective distinction relates to whether, roughly speaking, the event time is included within the reference time (perfective) or the reverse (imperfective). A simple example of a past-tense perfective vs. a past-tense imperfective in English is given in (20).

(20)　a.　　She **wrote** her dissertation last year.
　　　b.　　She **was writing** her dissertation yesterday afternoon.

Perfect can co-occur with both perfective and imperfective aspects, as illustrated in (21) and as discussed by Pancheva (2003) and Rullmann and Matthewson (2018), among others.

(21)　a.　　She **has written** her dissertation.　　　　　　　　　　　　(perfect + perfective)
　　　b.　　She **has been writing** her dissertation.　　　　　　　(perfect + imperfective)

The forms in the first group we discuss share some semantic properties with the English present perfect, and some of them happen to share the classic morphosyntactic characteristics of the English perfect (being formed with an auxiliary and a past participle). Nevertheless we will argue that they are actually past perfectives with a usage more similar to that of the English simple past in (20a) than to the English present perfect as in (21); see also Mulder et al. (2022) 'this issue' and Zhao (2022) 'this issue'.

We will show that the forms in this group are not subject to the full range of semantic restrictions that apply to the English present perfect. In particular, they do not exhibit lifetime effects (i.e., they allow dead subjects), they allow the cancellation of a result state, they are compatible with narrative progression, and they allow definite time adverbials. We therefore argue that the forms in this group behave semantically as past perfectives.

Table 2 summarizes the data for this group of forms. Note that in each data table, we present the behavior of the English present perfect in the leftmost column for comparison. In Table 2, the English simple past is also presented in order to show that it patterns like most of the forms in this group.[12]

Table 2. Past perfectives.

READINGS and *Limitations*	eng	eng	nld	deu	fra-QC	por-BR	jpn
	Present Perfect	*Simple Past*	*Voltooid Tegenwoordige Tijd*	*Perfekt*	*Passé Composé*	*Pretérito Perfeito Simples*	*-ta*
EXPERIENTIAL	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Dead subjects possible	✗	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
RESULT STATE (POSSIBLE at UT)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Result state cancellable	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
RECENT PAST	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CONTINUOUS	✓	✗	(✓)	✗	✗	✗	✗
Narrative progression possible	✗	✓	(✗)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Definite time adverbial allowed	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓