1. In tree form, present a PM to which the Auxiliary Transformation T20 ('Affix Hopping') could apply, and present one to which T20 could not apply. For the PM that "fits" the rule, display a member of the set-theoretic PM which establishes the PM's eligibility to undergo the rule.  

2. Present an argument that be must never be a V. That is, show that something would go empirically wrong if be were introduced by a rule such as V → be. (Is the problem overgeneration, undergeneration, or both?)  

3. Show precisely why Negation T16 is ordered before Affix Hopping T20. What would go wrong if Affix Hopping (as stated in Syntactic Structures) were ordered before Negation (as stated in Syntactic Structures)? What would go wrong if these two rules were unordered (i.e., freely ordered) with respect to each other? Be explicit. Would there be overgeneration, undergeneration, or both?  

4. The present plural morpheme for regular verbs (in fact all verbs and 'verb-like things' except be) is phonetically null. Demonstrate empirically that there really is a morpheme introduced under C in these cases, rather than nothing at all. That is, show some incorrect prediction that would be made otherwise. (Would there be overgeneration, undergeneration, or both?)  

5. Show precisely how each of the following ungrammatical examples is ruled out. Or, to put the same question another way, for each example, state the minimal change in the grammar that would allow it to be generated. What are some other consequences of the suggested change?  

6. [In this exercise, do not use any examples you've discussed in other exercises in this group. Come up with new examples. In fact, try hard to come up with some new types of examples.] [[Basically, what I want you to see and show is that this is a very limited fragment of the grammar of English. Much more needs to be added for it to approach descriptive adequacy.]]