EXHIBIT P

TABLE C: Applicant's disclaimer of "mere extensions" of instruction sets		
Location in Prosecution History	**Reference(s) Distinguished**	**Applicant's Distinguishing Argument**
Amendment and Response at 7, May 22, 1995 (Ex. H)	Lee, Agnew	"Claim 1 clearly disallows a *mere extension* of a single instruction set by stating: 'said first encoding of instructions independent from second encoding of instructions'. *Mere extensions* of instruction sets must have dependent encodings since otherwise one opcode could be used for two instructions. . . . [T]hese references show *mere extensions* to a single instruction set, such as for floating point instructions."
Brief on Appeal at 4, Aug. 29, 1995 (Ex. I)		[Although 386 and 486 processors were not cited by the examiner as prior art, the applicant used 486 as an example of an instruction set that was a "mere extension" of another instruction set:] "The 386 and 486 instruction sets do not meet claim limitations for separate instruction sets since the 486 set is a *mere extension* of the 386 set, having most opcode in common."