

II)

A	the infallible clairvoyant believes that A
T	?
F	F

this depends on the definition of "believing" though. If you say that it is impossible to believe something without having thought about it, the first row becomes a "?".

II)

A B	A, B or B
T T	T
T F	F
F T	F
F F	F

(same as I)

III

A B	SUPPOSE A ; then B
T T	T
T F	F
F T	T
F F	?

it could be a counterfactual, so this one could be both

IV)

A B	SUPPOSE A ; then B
T T	?
T F	?
F T	?
F F	?

(same same as III)

Because the hypothetical world is based on reality:

Suppose the ~~rest of the~~ sky is fully black then you could still see the sun.

3.6

S : Many Students will be in Schopenhauer's lectures

H : At "Hegel's"

t : They are scheduled at the same time

E₁ : Hegel's lectures are interesting

E₂ : In Schopenhauer's

Initially you'd think it is formalised like this:

$t \rightarrow (H \vee S)$, $t, E_1 \rightarrow H, E_2 \rightarrow E_1,$
 $S \rightarrow E_2 \therefore H \wedge \neg S$

$$\frac{t \rightarrow (H \vee S) \quad + \quad |E_1 \rightarrow H| \quad |E_2 \rightarrow E_1| \quad |S \rightarrow E_2| \quad |H \wedge \neg S|}{t_1 + \underline{t_3 + t_2 + t_4} \quad + \quad t_{13} + t_5 \quad t_{11} + t_{12} \quad t_6 + t_7 \quad t_8 F \quad F_{10} + t_9}$$

So there is a counterexample,

so

However, "many students come to Schopenhauer's lectures or Hegel's lectures" does ~~not~~ contradict could be interpreted as an exclusive or, ~~as you should~~
~~suggest~~ ~~that other students~~ that there could not be many students ~~are~~ in both lectures:

	$t \rightarrow ((H \vee S) \wedge \neg(H \wedge S))$	$E_1 \rightarrow H$	$E_2 \rightarrow E_1$	$S \wedge E_2 \wedge \neg H \wedge \neg S$
1	$t_1 + \underline{t_6 + t_3 F_7} + t_2 + t_4 + \underline{t_8 F_9 F_9}$	$t + t_{10}$	$F_1 + F_{11} + F_{10}$	$F_1 + t_2 F_2$
2	$t_1 + \underline{F_6 + t_3 + t_7 + t_2 + t_4} + \underline{F_9 F_9 + t_9}$	$t + t_{10}$	$F_{11} + F_{10}, F_{13} + F_{12}, ? + F_{13}$	F

You only have to check these two because there are only two ways for an XOR to be true. So there are no counterexamples, so the assumption makes the argument valid.