



varieties, N systematically moves to D (cf. El Moujahid, 1997; Ouhalla, 1997; and Ennaji, 2001). Here, I propose that the language allows for N-to-D movement to occur in three different modes, each giving rise to a particular order. Essentially:

- N can move as a head from its merge position all the way up to D. As illustrated in (5) this derivation gives rise to the N > DEM > Adj > POSS orders.

(5) avilu [ ~~avilu~~ nni [ ~~avilu~~ amelal [ ~~avilu~~ n dada]]]  
 bike DEM white OF dad  
*This white bike of dad*

- N can move with the NP that contains it. NP movement targets the Specifier positions of the highest AgrP (merged by the highest functional projection dominating NP) and from there, N moves to D. In Taqbaylit, NP movement is successive – NP moves through all the available Spec-AgrP’s –, and obligatorily of the roll-up kind – i.e. NP obligatorily pied-pipes remnant AgrPs to higher positions. As illustrated in (6), this derivation gives rise to the N > POSS > Adj > DEM.

(6) avilu [ ~~avilu~~ n dada amelal [ nni [ ~~avilu~~ n dada [ ~~amelal~~ [ ~~avilu~~ n dada]]]]]  
 bike OF dad white DEM  
*This white bike of dad*

- NP movement can stop in any intermediate Spec-AgrP and N-to-D movement follow. This derivation gives rise to the N > DEM > POSS > Adj order.

(7) avilu [ nni [ ~~avilu~~ n dada amelal [ ~~avilu~~ n ~~dada~~]]]  
 bike DEM OF dad white  
*This white bike of dad*

**Further empirical evidence** – Additional support for the argued derivation of Taqbaylit DPs comes from impossible modifier sequences. In constructions involving a demonstrative, an adjective and a possessor, the former cannot precede the demonstrative without the adjective (*hence* \*N > Poss > DEM > Adj).

(8) \*avilu n dada nni amectuh  
 bike OF dad DEM<sub>AMB</sub> small

Furthermore, when both a possessor argument and an adjective precede the demonstrative, the order in the sequence is obligatorily N > Poss > Adj > DEM (*hence* \*N > Adj > Poss > DEM):

(9) \*avilu amectuh n dada nni  
 bike small OF dad DEM<sub>AMB</sub>

These examples support the hypothesis that modifiers are merged in a fixed order in functional projections above NP and that these alternative orders follow a specific pattern.

### References

- Cinque, G. (1996) The ‘Antisymmetric’ Programme: Theoretical and Typological Implications. *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 32, No.2: pp. 447-464
- Cinque, G. (2000) *On Greenberg’s Universal 20 and the Semitic DP*. Ms. University of Venice.
- Cinque, G. (2005) Deriving Greenberg’s Universal 20 and its exceptions. *Linguistic Inquiry*, Volume 36, Number 3, p. 315-332
- El Moujahid, E.H. (1997) *Grammaire générative du Berbère : Morphologie et Syntaxe du Nom en Tachelhit*. Thèses et Mémoires, N.38. Publications de la Faculté des Lettre et des Sciences Humaines : Rabat.
- Ennaji, M. (2001) The Construct State in Berber in *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, (2002c) Vol 31, No 2.
- Fassi-Fehri, M. (1999) Arabic Modifying Adjectives and DP Structures in *Studia Linguistica*, Vol.53 Issue 2, pp. 105-154
- Ouhalla, J. (1997) Genitive Subjects and the VSO order. *Studies in Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*. Alexiadou, A. & Hall, A. (Eds). Linguistic Today 1