1. About which of the following would Spinoza agree with Descartes, but disagree with both Avicenna and Porphyry?
   a. Non-substances are in substances.
   b. A substance is prior in being to any non-substance that is in it.
   c. A substance is defined by certain essential properties which make it what it is.
   d. A substance can have more than one essential property.
   e. Any essential property of a substance expresses its whole essence.
   f. None of the above.

2. About which of the following would Spinoza disagree with Descartes, disagree with both Avicenna and Porphyry?
   a. Non-substances are in substances.
   b. A substance is prior in definition/knowledge/conception to any non-substance that is in it.
   c. A substance is defined by certain essential properties which make it what it is.
   d. A substance can have more than one essential property.
   e. We know (one or more) substances only through their non-essential properties.
   f. None of the above.

3. Why might one consider Spinoza to be an atheist, even though he proves that God exists?
   a. As you can tell from the rest of his book, Spinoza really is an atheist. He inserts a proof into his book to avoid condemnation by the Church.
   b. Spinoza is a rationalist. Therefore, he doesn’t think we should believe something just because it says so in the Bible. But people believe that God exists only because it says so in the Bible.
   c. Spinoza is a rationalist. Therefore, he thinks that science can explain all natural phenomena. But people believe that God exists just because they want an explanation for natural phenomena which they don’t understand.
d. Spinoza’s definition of “God” seems completely wrong by traditional standards. So what he proves exists is not, or not clearly, God.
e. Spinoza’s definition of “God” looks OK by traditional standards, but what he thinks meets that definition is lacking some important characteristics which were traditionally ascribed to God (for example, that God is different than the world).
f. None of the above.