

Simple Regular, old “Argument from Ignorance” (AI):

1. You don't know that you're not a BIV
 2. If you don't know that you're not a BIV, then you don't know that you have hands
- So, C. You don't know that you have hands

Adjusted, Somewhat More Complicated AI:

1. You don't know that you're not a BIV, and you can't come to know that you're not a BIV by deducing that you are not one from the claim that you have hands
 2. If you knew that you have hands, then, if you didn't already know that you're not a BIV, you would be able to come to know that you're not a BIV by competently deducing it from your supposed knowledge that you have hands.
- So, C. You don't know that you have hands

-Adjusted AI; adjusted first premise, adjusted second premise, conclusion:

You don't know you have hands, because if you did know you had hands, you'd be able to competently deduce from that that you're not a bodiless brain in a vat, and thereby come to know that you're not a BIV. But you don't know that you're not a BIV, and you can't come to know it in that way.

Closure, Single- and multi-premise closure, from simple to more advanced forms:

$K(p) \ \& \ p \Rightarrow q$	$K(q)$	$K(p_1) \ \& \ K(p_2) \ \& \ \dots \ K(p_n) \ \& \ (p_1-p_n) \Rightarrow q$	$K(q)$
$K(p) \ \& \ K(p \Rightarrow q)$	$K(q)$	$K(p_1) \ \& \ K(p_2) \ \& \ \dots \ K(p_n) \ \& \ K[(p_1-p_n) \Rightarrow q]$	$K(q)$
$K(p) \ \& \ CD(p \rightarrow q)$	$K(q)$	$K(p_1) \ \& \ K(p_2) \ \& \ \dots \ K(p_n) \ \& \ CD[(p_1-p_n) \rightarrow q]$	$K(q)$

Where $CD(p \rightarrow q)$ means: the subject has competently deduced q from p , and has thereby come to have the attitude of knowledge toward q , if they didn't have that attitude toward q already