**Liz**

Liz wants to know whether Z.

One day Liz finds a paper whose authors are arguing that X; moreover, X entails Z. Now Liz knows and justifiably trusts the authors; moreover the paper is convincing. She therefore accepts, on the basis of the paper, that X is true. From this she infers that Z is true. However, exceptionally, the authors have made a subtle error which means that their methods were fatally flawed. In fact, X is not true at all.

By coincidence and unknown to Liz, another lab has recently used a completely different paradigm to successfully establish that Y. Since Y also entails Z, Z must be true.

Question 1: Would Liz say that Z is true if we asked her? Yes / No

Question 2: Does Liz know that Z is true? Yes / No

**Katie**

Katie is in her locked apartment writing a letter.

She puts the letter and her blue Bic pen down on her coffee table. Then she goes into the bathroom to take a shower. As Katie’s shower begins, two burglars silently break into the apartment. One burglar takes Katie’s blue Bic pen from the table.

But the other burglar absentmindedly leaves his own identical blue Bic pen on the coffee table. Then the burglars leave. Katie is still in the shower, and did not hear anything.

Question 1: Would Katie say that there is a blue Bic pen on her coffee table if we asked her? Yes / No

Question 2: Does Katie know that there is a blue Bic pen on her coffee table? Yes / No