① According to one account
'S Knows that p' is true if and only
if
    1) p is true,
    2) S believes p, and
    3) S has sufficient evidence for p.†

② Taking this account to be correct, for the
time being, consider the question of whether
one must Know that one knows p, if one
Knows p. According to the account, 'S knows
that 'S knows p' is true if and only
if
    4) 'S knows that p' is true
    5) S believes 'S knows that p', and
    6) S has sufficient evidence
        for 'S knows that p'.

†I am considering
it possible for
S to have
sufficient
evidence for p,
although, in fact,
p is false.

* put in
footnote
explaining
why this
is
supposed

Now let us suppose that S knows that p, and
consider whether or not S knows that 'S knows that p'.
The requirement (4) that 'S knows that p' is true
is meet since S knows that p by supposition. Also
the requirement (5) that S believes that
'S knows that p' is met since S believes that
'S knows that p' by supposition.* Thus the
only real concern is with whether or not
S has sufficient evidence for 'S knows that p!

and S believes that
S knows p, and S believes that
S knows p

and S has sufficient evidence that S believes p.

*X
footnote
about
verbal
errors

Clearly* S has sufficient evidence that 'S
knows that p ~~....~~ if ~~........~~ and only if
~~........~~

7) S has sufficient evidence that p is true,

8) S " " " " " S believes that p, and

9) " " " " " " S has sufficient
evidence that p.

The requirement (7) that S has sufficient evidence
that p is true is met since S knows that p by
supposition and S knows that p only if S has
sufficient evidence that p. The requirement (8) that
S has sufficient evidence that 'S believes p is
met by supposition. Thus the only real concern
is with whether or not S has sufficient evidence
for 'S ~~........~~ has sufficient evidence that p!
But this is indeed the case, due to the nature of
sufficient evidence. If S does not have sufficient
evidence to show that his evidence for p is
sufficient, then, after all, his evidence for p is
not sufficient. Thus, according to this account
of the meaning of "to know", if S knows that p and
S believes that 'S knows that p' and S has sufficient
evidence that 'S believes that p', then S knows
that 'S knows that p'.

Now, according to the argument just presented, S knows that 'S knows that p' if and only if.

10) S knows that p

11) S believes that 'S knows that p', and

12) S has sufficient evidence that 'S believes that p'.

However, clearly, a person who is using the expression 'I know that I know that I locked the door' is not saying anything equivalent to

13) I know that I locked the door,

14) I believe that 'I know that I locked the door'

and 15) I have sufficient evidence that 'I believe that I locked the door'.

A person making this statement is not concerned with (and not asserting) requirements (14) and (15). ~~⬛⬛~~ So what is the difference between 'I know I locked the door' and 'I know that I know that I locked the door?' Well, look at the manner in which this expression might be used. Someone casts doubt upon my statement that I know that I locked the door. I am ~~⬛~~ annoyed and say 'I know that I know that I locked the door'. The expression is used for emphasis. The difference between 'I know p' and 'I know I know p' is the same as the difference between 'I know p' and 'I <u>Know</u> p!' Thus 'Know' in

I know 'I know p' is not an epistemic
use of the word 'know.'