	Acknowledgments
	One: Prolegomena
1.1	Epistemic notions
1.2	Statements v. sentences
1.3	Qualifications and limitations
1.4	The plan of this study
1.5	Symbolic notation
1.6	Formulas v. sentences
1.7	
	Two: Criteria of Consistency
2.1	The actualization of possibilities 16
2.2	Defending the rule (A.PKK*)
2.3	Further rules
2.4	Rules for the notion of belief
2.5	

vii

2.6	Consistency reinterpreted as defensibility 31	
2.7	Defensibility and analyticity	
2.8	The applicability of our results	ŀ
2.9	Defensibility and analyticity again 36	
2.10	An alternative interpretation	3
	Three: Model Sets and Model Systems	
3.1	Model sets	)
3.2	Model systems 42	2
3.3	The interrelations of our rules and conditions 43	3
3.4	Alternative conditions	1
3.5	The notion of belief 47	7
3.6	Knowledge and belief combined 49	)
3.7	Knowing that one believes 51	Ĺ
3.8	The argument from introspection 53	3
3.9	Knowledge, belief, and introspection 56	5
3.10	The self-sustenance of implications 57	7
3.11	Reductive arguments as abortive constructions of	
	counterexamples	7
	Four: Problems, Theorems, and Definitions	
4.1	Knowing that others know	
4.2	The transmissibility of knowledge 61	l
4.3	Knowledge and belief compared with respect to transmissibility	2
4.4	The difficulty of merely believing that you know 63	3
4.5	Moore's problem of saying and disbelieving 64	4
4.6	Our solution 6	7
4.7	Proof of the solution	9
4.8	Doxastic indefensibility	1
4.9	Doxastic implication	6
	The performatoriness of doxastic indefensibility 7	7
	<u>-</u>	

4.11	An analogue to Moore's problem for the notion of	
	knowledge	78
4.12	Epistemic indefensibility	79
4.13	Applications	80
4.14	Knowledge and belief compared	82
4.15	Introspectiveness as a symptom of an epistemic im-	
	plication	84
4.16	Thinking that one may be mistaken	88
4.17	An analogue to Moore's paradox for the second person	89
4.18	A generalization	92
4.19	The privileges of the first person	93
4.20	Comparing different solutions to Moore's problem .	95
4.21	The economy of our solution	98
	Five: Knowing that One Knows	400
5.1	The meaning of "knowing that one knows" is not clear	103
5.2	"Knowing that one knows" virtually equivalent to	
	"knowing"	104
5.3	On the history of the problem of "knowing that one	
	knows''	106
5.4	The basis of the equivalence	110
5.5	The limitations of a virtual equivalence	112
5.6	Virtual equivalence does not preclude a difference in	
	meaning	113
5.7	A comparison with double negation	115
5.8	The residual meanings of "knowing that one knows".	110
5.9	The choice between the residual meanings	121
5.10	Believing that one believes	123
	Six: Knowledge, Belief, and Existence	
6.1	Quantifiers in model sets	126
6.2	Eliminating existential presuppositions	128
	Knowing who	

6.4	Identity in model systems	132
6.5	The influence of epistemic implications	137
6.6	Referential opacity as referential multiplicity	138
6.7	The necessity of quantifying into opaque contexts	141
6.8	The prerequisites for quantifying into opaque contexts	144
6.9	The prerequisites for knowing who	148
5.10	The prerequisites as requirements of uniqueness	150
5.11	All men v. all known men	155
5.12	The condition (C.KK*) qualified	158
5.13	"Knowing who" behaves like "knowing that"	159
5.14	Laws of commutation	162
	A List of Frequently Mentioned Rules, Conditions,	
	and Sentences	169
	Index of Authors	175
	Index of Subjects	177