

Your name: \_\_\_\_\_

Your section day/time: \_\_\_\_\_

### Metaphysics Exercise 7

Phil. 93, Winter 2009. Due Tues., Feb. 10.

1. The Meditator looks into the causes of error because:
  - a. The conclusion of the Third Meditation, that God exists, is useless unless she can determine exactly when God would or would not allow her to go wrong.
  - b. The conclusion of the Third Meditation, that God exists, seems incompatible with the existence of any error at all.
  - c. The conclusion of the *cogito* argument, that the Meditator herself exists, would be thrown into doubt if it turned out that God is a deceiver.
  - d. It is not clear how a perfect cause could have an imperfect effect.
  - e. (a), (b) and (d).
  - f. (b) and (d).
  
2. It makes a difference whether error is due to a “pure negation,” rather than a “privation” (as those are defined on p. 100), because:
  - a. A pure negation, strictly speaking, has no cause. In particular, God cannot be blamed for causing a pure negation.
  - b. A pure negation is a thought, whereas a privation is a body. If the Meditator has privations, she must be a body.
  - c. Every finite thing is subject to pure negations.
  - d. If I am a thinking thing, I can make pure negations into assents by using my will to think (judge) that they are true for me.
  - e. (a) and (b).
  - f. (a) and (c).
  
3. Under what conditions does the Meditator conclude she can be certain because God is not a deceiver?
  - a. Never. Everything except her own existence, and the existence of God, is subject to doubt.
  - b. Only when she is awake. In dreams, an evil demon may be deceiving her.
  - c. Only when she perceives something by the natural light.
  - d. Only when she perceives something quantitative. Sense qualities may be deceptive.
  - e. None of the above.
  - f. (b) and (d).