

Your name: _____

Your section day/time: _____

Metaphysics Exercise 3

Phil. 93, Winter 2009. Due Thurs., Jan. 18

1. As far as you can tell from our reading, which of the following statements would Aristotle and Plotinus *disagree* about?¹

- a. My former rat, Dr. Finkelstein was a sensible substance.
- b. A fire can be called a “substance” for (roughly) the same reason that a picture of a fire can be called a “fire.”
- c. Some characteristics of a sensible substance are essential: i.e., they cannot be removed while the substance continues to exist.
- d. Sensible substances are material.
- e. All of the above.
- f. (b), (c) and (d).

2. As far as you can tell from our reading, which of the following statements would Plotinus and Porphyry *disagree* about (in the above sense of “disagree”)?

- a. The problem of the categorical status of the differentiae arises for Aristotle because his theory of sensible substances is incorrect.
- b. The term “quality” applies univocally to the heat in water and the heat in fire.
- c. Heat in water is an accident; heat in fire is not an accident.
- d. There can never be a fire which is not hot.
- e. (a) and (c).
- f. (b), (c) and (d).

3. As far as you can tell from our reading, which of the following statements would Porphyry and Avicenna *disagree* about (in the above sense of “disagree”)?

- a. The problem of the categorical status of the differentiae arises for Aristotle because his theory of sensible substances is incorrect.
- b. The term “quality” applies univocally to the heat in water and the heat in fire.
- c. Heat in water is an accident; heat in fire is not an accident.
- d. There can never be a fire which is not hot.
- e. (b), (c) and (d).
- f. None of the above.

¹By “disagree” here I mean that one of them would assert the statement in question and the other would deny it. If they would both assert the statement (or would both deny it), but would mean different things by the words in it, then that counts as *agreeing* for these purposes.

4. After the bread has been sanctified for use in the sacrament of the Eucharist, it seems not to have changed, but (supposedly) the substance present is no longer the substance of the bread, but rather the body of Christ. According to St. Thomas, why is this *not* “deceptive”?

a. Our senses are untrustworthy. Far from deceiving us, God is trying to teach us a lesson: don’t trust your senses.

b. The lack of apparent change is not deceptive because the sensible qualities, which are accidents, really have not changed; only the substance of the bread (which is not sensible) has been replaced.

c. What we call “bread” is really just the accidents of bread (the substance of bread is hidden or “occult”). So when we believe our senses and think there is “bread” there, we are not deceived..

d. We ought not to believe our senses or our reason, because, as this case shows, they may go against faith. Only unbelievers and sinners, who follow sense and reason rather than faith, would be deceived.

e. We would be mocked by infidels if we were to chew up our Lord under his own proper appearance.

f. (b) and (c).