

Your name: _____

Your section (circle):

Mon. Tues. Wed. Fri.

Metaphysics Exercise 4

Phil. 93, Winter 2007. Due Tues., Jan. 23.

1. As far as you can tell from our reading, which of the following statements would Porphyry and Avicenna *disagree* about? (As on last week's exercise: if they would both say that the statement is true, or would both say it is false, then that counts as "agreeing," even if they would mean different things by it.)

- a. There could never be a fire that does not feel hot, because heat is essential to fire.
- b. The term "quality" is used univocally when it is applied to the members of a certain genus (namely, the category, *quality*).
- c. The heat in a certain individual hot body of water and the heat in a certain individual fire are different individuals, but they are members of the same species.
- d. The differentia of fire is not "in a subject."
- e. (b) and (d).
- f. (b), (c) and (d).

2. Avicenna adds, to Aristotle's definition of "in a subject," the extra words: "another thing which has attained existence and species in itself." What effect do these extra words have?

- a. They make it clear that substantial form in matter is not "in a subject," because matter has not "attained existence and species in itself."
- b. They make it clear that not only accidents, but also differentiae, are "in a subject," because a species is defined by differentiae, so nothing "attains existence and species" without differentiae.
- c. They make it clear that three-dimensional continuous quantity in wax is not "in a subject," because wax does not "attain existence and species" without three-dimensional continuous quantity.
- d. They make it clear that fire is not a substance, because it does not "attain existence and species" without heat, which is an accident.
- e. (a) and (d).
- f. None of the above.

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

- a. We should not ask why fire can heat water; we should accept what our faith teaches: that God makes it do so by a miracle.
- b. Suppose this lump of wax is three inches wide. Then the three-inch-wideness is

an accident in the wax (a member of the genus of quantity).

- c. The indeterminate three-dimensional continuous quantity in this wax is an accident in this wax.
- d. There could (conceivably) be such a thing as a fire which is not hot.
- e. (c) and (d).
- f. None of the above.

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. Normally our reason would lead us to conclude, from the lack of apparent change, that the substance of the bread was still present—and that would be the right conclusion. In this special case, however, our reason is corrected by faith.
- 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. (a) and (d).
- f. (b) and (c).