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).