

- 73 (whodunit) Here are ten statements.
- (i) Some criminal robbed the Russell mansion.
  - (ii) Whoever robbed the Russell mansion either had an accomplice among the servants or had to break in.
  - (iii) To break in one would have to either smash the door or pick the lock.
  - (iv) Only an expert locksmith could pick the lock.
  - (v) Anyone smashing the door would have been heard.
  - (vi) Nobody was heard.
  - (vii) No one could rob the Russell mansion without fooling the guard.
  - (viii) To fool the guard one must be a convincing actor.
  - (ix) No criminal could be both an expert locksmith and a convincing actor.
  - (x) Some criminal had an accomplice among the servants.

(a) Choosing good abbreviations, translate each of these statements into formal logic.

§ Here are some abbreviations.

$Cx = (x \text{ is a criminal})$

$Rx = (x \text{ robbed the Russell mansion})$

$Sx = (x \text{ had an accomplice among the servants})$

$Bx = (x \text{ broke in})$

$Dx = (x \text{ smashed the door})$

$Px = (x \text{ picked the lock})$

$Lx = (x \text{ is an expert locksmith})$

$Hx = (x \text{ was heard})$

$Fx = (x \text{ fooled the guard})$

$Ax = (x \text{ is a convincing actor})$

Now the statements are formalized as follows

- (i)  $\exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Rx$
- (ii)  $\forall x \cdot Rx \Rightarrow Sx \vee Bx$
- (iii)  $\forall x \cdot Bx \Rightarrow Dx \vee Px$
- (iv)  $\forall x \cdot Lx \Leftarrow Px$
- (v)  $\forall x \cdot Dx \Rightarrow Hx$
- (vi)  $\neg \exists x \cdot Hx$
- (vii)  $\neg \exists x \cdot Rx \wedge \neg Fx$
- (viii)  $\forall x \cdot Fx \Rightarrow Ax$
- (ix)  $\neg \exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Lx \wedge Ax$
- (x)  $\exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Sx$

(b) Taking the first nine statements as axioms, prove the tenth.

§ Lemma:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \top & (vii) \\
 = & \neg \exists x \cdot Rx \wedge \neg Fx & \text{duality (deMorgan)} \\
 = & \forall x \cdot \neg(Rx \wedge \neg Fx) & \text{duality (deMorgan)} \\
 = & \forall x \cdot \neg Rx \vee \neg \neg Fx & \text{double negation} \\
 = & \forall x \cdot \neg Rx \vee Fx & \text{material implication} \\
 = & \forall x \cdot Rx \Rightarrow Fx
 \end{aligned}$$

Now the main proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \top & (i) \\
 = & \exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Rx & \text{idempotence} \\
 = & \exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Rx \wedge Rx & \text{lemma and (ii)} \\
 \Rightarrow & \exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Fx \wedge (Sx \vee Bx) & (viii) \text{ and (iii)} \\
 \Rightarrow & \exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Ax \wedge (Sx \vee Dx \vee Px) & (v) \text{ and (iv)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow$	$\exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Ax \wedge (Sx \vee Hx \vee Lx)$	distributed
$=$	$\exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Ax \wedge Sx \vee Cx \wedge Ax \wedge Hx \vee Cx \wedge Ax \wedge Lx$	(vi) and (ix)
$=$	$\exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Ax \wedge Sx$	specialize
$\Rightarrow$	$\exists x \cdot Cx \wedge Sx$	

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://powcoder.com>

Add WeChat powcoder