(37)

A: Jones arrives at the airport after the scheduled departure time

W: the plane will wait for Jones

N: nobody notices that

The argument being made is:

$$
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
 & A \to W & \therefore & (A \land N) \to W \\
\hline
 & ?\ T\ F_5 & & T_3\ T_1\ T_4\ F\ F_2
\end{array}
$$

There is no counterexample so the argument seems valid. However, you could argue that the plane will ofcourse only wait for Jones (i.e. an implicit assumption) if they ~~kn~~ know that he is late, so you could argue that the argument should actually be formalised the following way:

$$
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
 & (A \land \neg N) \to W & \therefore & (A \land N) \to W \\
\hline
 & T_5\ F_8\ F_7\ T_6\ T\ F_9 & & T_3\ T_2\ T_4\ F\ F_1
\end{array}
$$

So in this case there is a counterexample and so the argument is not valid.

This, however, does not have to be the case, there could be some other ~~Rea~~ ~~Mecha~~ mechanism that will cause the plain to wait ~~th~~ which does not require anyone to know that Jones is late. So, in my opinion we should apply the principle of charity and assume the latter.

33

I)

A	Robin believes that A
T	?
F	?

II)

A	Robin knows that A
T	?
F	F → however, this depends on your definition of what it means to know something

III)

A	Robin knows that A, but it's not true that A
T	F → this is false because we just said that if something is not true, one cannot know it
F	F

Could be done as

A	(Robin knows that	A	$\land$	$\neg$	A)
T	?	T	F	F	T
F	F	F	F	T	F

~~How can we get different results?~~

~~that is because in this case, Robin would never~~

~~You could argue here that there should not be a question mark because in the event of A being true there is~~

a contradiction because

It is a contradiction, Robin would never believe A if A is false so both statements can't be true at the same time.