ELEMENTARY THEORY OF NUMBERS - W. J. Leveque

THEOREM 1-1.

If a is positive and b is arbitrary, there is exactly one pair of integers q, r such that the conditions

$$b = qa + r$$
, $0 \le r < a$,

9

hold. First, we show that (6) has at least one solution.

OMITTED

Proof:

To show the uniqueness of q and r, assume that q' and also are integers such that

$$b = q'a + r'$$
, $0 \le r' < a$.

Then if q' < q, we have

$$b-q'a=r' \ge b-(q-1)a=r+a \ge$$

ર્ત્

ن م and this contradicts the inequality r' < a. Hence q'

Similarly, we show that $q \ge q'$. Therefore q = q', and consequently r =r'. ▲

```
|-(FORMULA (B-Q1*A = R1 & R1 >= B-(Q-1)*A )
                                      -IMPLICITLY-SUPPOSE (B = Q*A+R & 0 <= R & R < A)
                                                                                                                         -(FORMULA (B = Q1*A+R1 & 0 <= R1 & R1 < A))
                                                            -SUPPOSE (B = Q1*A+R1 & 0 <= R1 & R1 < A)
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | & B-(Q-1)*A = R+A & R+A >= A))
|-DEDUCE B-Q1*A = R1
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |-DEDUCE B-Q1*A >= B-(Q-1)*A
                                                                                                                                                                                                          |-PROVE (Q1 >= Q & Q >= Q1)
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | -(FORMULA (Q1 < Q))
|-CONTRADICTION
                                                                                                                                                                    -PROVE (Q = Q1 & R = R1)
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | |-SUPPOSE Q1 < Q
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |-PROVE R1 >= A
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |-PROVE Q1 >= Q
                                                                                                                                                                                       |-PROVE Q = Q1
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |-HAVE
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      -THEN
                    -UNIQUENESS
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | |-WE
                                                                                |-ASSUME
                                                                                                                                               I-BREAK
                                                                                                       I-THAT
-SHOW
```

```
-DEDUCE (Q1 >= Q & Q >= Q1) => Q = Q1
                                                                                             |-DEDUCE R1 >= A <=> NOT(R1 < A)
                                                                                                                                                              |-DEDUCE Q1 < Q <=> NOT (Q1 >= Q)
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |-SHOW
|-(FORMULA (Q >= Q1))
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          -DEDUCE Q = Q1 => R = R1
                                                                                                                                             |-(FORMULA (Q1 >= Q))|
                                                               |-(FORMULA (R1 < A))
| |-DEDUCE R+A >= A
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           -(FORMULA (Q = Q1))
                                                                               |-DEDUCE R1 < A
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           -(FORMULA (R = R1))
                                                -CONTRADICTS
                                                                                                                                                                                             -PROVE Q >= Q1
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           -CONSEQUENTLY
                                                                                                                                                                                                               -SIMILARLY
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            -THEREFORE
                                                                                                                 |-BREAK
                                                                                                                               -HENCE
                               I-THIS
                 -AND
                                                                                                                                                                              -BREAK
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             -BREAK
                                                                                                                                                                                                                              I-WE
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           -BREAK
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           -AND
```

are used, stored in a concept hierarchy graph, to facilitate the proper acquisition and use. (Plummer, a visitor at the University of Texas, is finishing his PhD Thesis under Bundy at Edinburgh).

7 CONCLUDING REMARKS

Logic is emerging as a foundation for AI and all of Computer Science. The consequence of this is that some form of automatic reasoning is a requirement for most AI programs. Much of the research in ATP over the last thirty years is applicable to this need.

As these programs grow more complex, the corresponding inference problems will become more difficult, comparable in difficulty to the proof substantial theorems in mathematics.

We have reviewed the current research on automated reasoning and given a proposed classification of that work.

We note that some research areas, such as clause-compiling and parallel processing, are very exciting, and this is rightly so. But we wonder whether these efforts on fast implementation, which are very important in their own right, might divert us from the even more important areas (in the long run) of tactics and strategy.

Under tactics, we are especially hopeful about the work on *larger-inference-steps*, and the work on special purpose systems such as those for the use of rewrite rules.

We believe that more large scale experiments are needed, wherein researchers exercise their provers on worthwhile examples, rather than play with toy problems and/or a couple of harder problems (such as the Steamroller problem or the Intermediate Value Theorem).

What about Strategy? Are we to soon attain "over all" strategies for our provers? There has been some promising work on Analogy and Machine Learning; a little on Conjecturing, Abstractions, and using Examples to

guide proof discovery, but not much else.

We feel that fundamental progress will require advances in representing and accessing the knowledge used by human mathematicians. This knowledge includes examples, rules, heuristics, and motivations, in addition to the more commonly recognized declarative facts represented by axioms and lemmas. The experiments we have reported on demonstrate simplified approaches to representing one or more forms of mathematical knowledge, but the realization of an integrated truly powerful system remains for the future.

References

References

- [AN85] Ait-Kaci, H. and R. Nasr, LOGIN: A Logic Programming Language with Built-in Inheritance. Technical Report MCC-AI-068-85. Microelectronics and Computer Technology Corp., Austin, TX., July 1985. (To appear in Journal of Logic Programming.)
- [An86] Andrews, P. B., "An Introduction to Mathematical Logic and Type Theory: To Truth Through Proof", Academic Press, NY, 1986.
- [An80] Andrews, P.B., Transforming Matings into Natural Deduction Proofs, in 5th Conference on Automated Deduction, Les Arcs, France, (Bibel and Kowalski, Eds), Lecture Notes in Computer Science 87, Springer Verlaga, 1980, 281-292.
- [An81] Andrews, P.B., Theorem Proving via general matings, JACM 28 (1981) 193-214.
- [An84] Andrews, P.B., et al, Automating Higher Order Logic, In:[BL84] 169-192.
- [AOS3] Antoniou, G. and H. J. Ohlback, TERMINATOR; Proc of the 8th Int'l Joint Conf. on AI, Karlsruhe, West Germany, August 1983, pp 916-919.
- [Ap82] Appelt, D.E., Planning Natural-Language Utterances to Satisfy Multiple Goals, SRI International Tech Note 259, 1982.
- [Bay86] Bayerl, S., E. Eder, F. Kurfess, R. Letz, J. Schumann, An implementation of a PROLOG-like theorem prover based

on the Connection method; In: AIMSA'86 (P.Jorrand, ed.) North Holland, Amsterdam.

- [BB77] Ballantyne M. and W. W. Bledsoe, Automatic Proofs of Theorems in Analysis Using Non-Standard Techniques, JACM 24 (1977) 353-374.
- [BB82] Ballantyne, M. and W. W. Bledsoe, On Generating and Using Examples in Proof Discovery, Machine Intelligence 10 (Harwood, Chichester, 1982), pp. 3-39.
- [BBr73] Bledsoe, W.W. and P. Bruell, A Man-machine Theorem Proving System, Proc 3rd IJCAI, Stanford U., 1973; also in AI Jour 5 (1974) 51-72.
- [BCP86] Brock B., S. Cooper, W. Pierce, Some Experiments with Analogy in Proof Discovery, MCC Technical Report AI-347-86, October 1986.
- [BCP87] Brock B., S. Cooper, W. Pierce, Analogical Reasoning and Proof Discovery, submitted to CADE-9.
- [BH80] Bledsoe, W.W. and L. Hines, Variable Elimination and Chaining in a Resolution-Based Prover for Inequalities, Proc 5th Conf on Automated Deduction, Les Arcs, France, (Bibel and Kowalski, Eds), Springer Verlag, 1980, 281-292.
- [BHe85] Bledsoe, W.W., and L. Henschen, What is Automated Theorem Proving? In: Journal Automated Reasoning 1 (1985) 23-28.
- [Bi82,87] Bibel, W., Automated Theorem Proving. Vieweg Verlag, Braunschweig, 1982. 2nd Edition, 1987.

- [Bi87] Bibel, W., R. Letz, J. Schumann, Bottom-up enhancements of deductive systems; In: AI and Robotics (I. Plander, ed), North Holland (to appear).
- [Biu86] Biundo, S., et al, THE KARLSRUHE INDUCTION THEO-REM PROVING SYSTEM, Proc. CADE-8, Oxford (1986).
- [BKS85] Bledsoe, W.W., K. Kunen, and R. Shostak, Completeness Proofs for Inequality Provers, Artificial Intelligence 27 (1985) 225-288.
- [BL84] Bledsoe, W.W. and D. Loveland (Eds), Automated Theorem Proving: After 25 Years, American Math Society, Contemporary Mathematics Series, 19, 1984.
- [Bl71] Bledsoe, W.W., Splitting and Reduction Heuristics in Automatic Theorem Proving, Artificial Intelligence 2 (1971) 55-77.
- [B175] Bledsoe, W.W. and Mabry Tyson, The UT Interactive Prover. Memos ATP17A & ATP17B, Math Dep, Univ Texas, 1975, 1983.
- [B177] Non-Resolution Theorem Proving, Artificial Intelligence 9 (1977) 55-77. In Reading in Artificial Intelligence (Webber, Nilsson, Eds), Tioga, Palo Alto, 1981, pp 91-108.
- [B179] Bledsoe, W.W., A Maximal Method for Set Variables in Automatic Theorem Proving, Machine Intelligence 9 (1979) 53-100.
- [B183] Bledsoe, W.W., Using Examples to Generate Instantiations of Set Variables, Proc IJCAI-83, Karlsruhe, Ger., Aug 1983.

- [Bl84] Bledsoe, W.W., Some Automatic Proofs in Analysis, In [BL84], 89-118.
- [Bl86] Bledsoe, W.W. Some Thoughts on Proof Discovery. Proc. 1986 Sym. on Logic Programming, Salt Lake City, Ut., 1986, pp 2-10. MCC Tech Report AI-208-86, June 1986.
- [Bl86A] Bledsoe, W.W., The use of Analogy in Proof Discovery. MCC Technical Report AI-158-86.
- [Bla81] Blasjus, K., N. Eisinger, J. Siekmann, G. Smolka, A. Herold, and C. Walther, The Markgraf Karl Refutation Proceure, Proc. 7th Int'l Joint; Conf. on AI, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, August 1981, pp 511-518.
- [BM79] Boyer, R.S. and J.S. Moore, A COMPUTATIONAL LOGIC. Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [BM81] Boyer, R.S. and J.S. Moore, A verification condition generator for FORTRAN. In: The Correctness Problem in Computer Science (Boyer and Moore, Eds.), Academic Press, London, 1981.
- [BM82] Boyer, R.S. and J.S. Moore, Proof Checking the RSA Public Key Encryption Algorithm, ICSCA-CMP-37, U. of Texas, Sept 1982.
- [Bo71] Boyer, R.S., Locking: a Restriction on Resolution. PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1971.
- [Bo86] Boyer, R.S., Rewrite Rule Compilation, MCC Technical Report AI-194-86, June 1986.
- [Bo86a] Boyer, R. S., et al, Set Theory for First Order Logic: Clauses for Goedel's Axioms, JAR 2 (1986) p. 287.

- [Bor ?] (WWB get reference) Boring
- [Borr87] From HDA Description to Guaranteed Correct Circuit Designs, D. Borrione (Ed.), North Holland, IFIP, 1987.
- [Bu83] Bundy, Alan, The Computer Modelling of Mathematical Reasoning, Academic Press, 1983.
- [Buch83] Buchberger, B., G. E. Collins, R. Loos, "Computer Algebra, Symbolic and algebraic Manipulation," Springer Verlag 1983.
- [Car83] Carbonell, J. G., Learning by Analogy: Formulating and Generalizing Plans from Past Experience, Machine Learning, Michalski, Carbonell, Mitchell (eds.), Tioga Publishers, 1983, pp. 137-161.
- [Card82] Cardelli, L., "ML under Unix', Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill, New Jersey (1982).
- [Card86] Cardelli, Luca, "A Polymorphic Lambda-calculus with Type:Type", DEC SCR Report, Digital Equipment Corp., Palo Alto Calif.
- [Cho85] Chou, Shang-Ching, "Proving and Discovering Theorems in Elementary Geometries Using Wu's Method", Department of Mathematics, University of Texas, Austin (1985).
- [Cho86] Chou, Shang-Ching, "Proving Geometry Theorems Using Wu's Method: A Collection of Geometry Theorems Proved Mechanically", Technical Report 50, Institute for Computing Science, University of Texas at Austin, July 1986. (366 theorems)

- [Cho87] Chou, Shang-Ching, "Mechanical Geometry Theorem Proving", to be published by Reidel Publishing company, 1987.
- [CSS6] Chou, S. C. and W. F. Schelter, "Proving Geometry Theorems with Rewrite Rules", J. of Automated Reasoning, 2(4) 1986, 253-273.
- [CT82] Clark, K., and S.A. Tarnlund (Eds.) Logic Programming, 1982, Academic Press.
- [CL73] Chang, C.C. and R.C.T. Lee, Symbolic Logic and Mechanical Theorem Proving, Academic Press, 1973.
- [Coh87] Cohn, A.G., A More Expressive Formulation of Many Sorted Logic, JAR 3(1987) 113-200.
- [Co1] Colmerauer, a. [1973].
- [Cons85] Constable, R.L., Constructive Mathematics as a Programming Logic I: Some Principles of Theory, Annals of Discrete Mathematics 24 (1985), 21-38.
- [Cons86] Constable, R.L., et.al., Implementing Mathematics with the Nuprl Proof Development System, Prentice-Hall, 1986.
- [CoH85] Coquand, Th. and G. Huet, Constructions: A Higher Order Proof System for Mechanizing Mathematics, EUROCAL85, Linz, Springer-Verlag LNCS 203 (1985).
- [CREAS] Preliminary Proceedings of CREAS Workshop, Lakeway, Texas, May 4-7, 1987. Forthcoming Book: Resolution of Equations in Algebraic Structures, (H. Ait-Kaci, M. Nivat, Eds.), Academic Press, 1988.

- [Da83] Davis, M., The Prehistory and Early History of Automated Deduction, in [SW83].
- [deB80] de Bruijn, N.G., A Survey of Project Automath, in: To H. B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda Calculus, and Formalism, Eds. J. P. Seldin and J. R. Hindley, Academic Press 1980
- [deK84] de Kleer, J. and J.S. Brown, A Qualitative Physics Based on Confluences. Artificial Intelligence, 24 (1984) 7-83.
- [deK84A] deKleer, J., Choices without backtracking. AAAI-84, pp. 79-85.
- [Der87A] Derschowitz, N., "Completion and its Applications", [CREAS87].
- [Der87B] Derschowitz, N. "Termination of rewriting", Journal of Symbolic Computation, (in press) 1987.
- [Do79] Doyle, J., A Truth Maintenance System. Artificial Intelligence 12 (1979), 231-272.
- [Dix73] Dixon, J.K., Z-resolution: theorem-proving with compiled axioms, Jour ACM 20, (1973), 127-147.
- [Eis86] Eisenger, N., "What you always wanted to know about Clause Graph Resolution", CADE-8, 1986.
- [Ev51] Evans, T. "On multiplicative systems defined by generators and relations, I,", Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 47, pp 637-649, 1951.
- [Fay79] Fay, M., First order unification in equational theories, in Proceedings, 4th Conference on Automated Deduction, pp

- 161-167, Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 87, 1979
- [Fo80] Forgy, C.L.Forgy, RETE: A fast Algorithm for the many pattern/many object pattern match problem, Tech Rep 309, CMU, 1980.
- [Forb84] Forbus, K.D., Qualitative Process Theory, Artificial Intelligence 24 (1984) 65-168.
- [Ge59] Gelernter, H., Realization of a Geometry-theorem proving machine, Proc Inter Conf on Information, UNESCO House, Paris, 1979. Also in Computers and Thought (Feigenbaum, Feldman, eds.) McGraw-Hill, 1963, 134-152
- [GGS83] Genesereth, M.R., R. Greiner, and D.E. Smith, A Meta-Level Representation system, Stanford Memo HPP-83-28, May 1983. See also [MN87].
- [GM78] Gallaire, H. and J. Minker, Logic and Data Bases, Plenum, 1978.
- [GN87] Genesereth, M.R. and N.J.Nilsson, Logical Foundations of Artificial Intelligence, Morgan Kaufmann, 1987.
- [GMW82] Gordon M., A. Milner, C.Wadsworth, Edinburgh LCF: A Mechanized Logic of Computation, Springer-Verlag, LNCS 78, 1982.
- [Go80] Goguen, J., How to Prove Algebraic Induction Hypotheses without Induction, CADE-5, 1980.
- [Go87] Gordon, Michael, "HOL, A Proof Generating System for Higher-Order Logic," to appear in "VLSI Specification, Verification, and Synthesis"

- [Good85] Mechanical Proof about Computer Programs, in Mathematical Logic and Programming Languages, Prentice Hall International Series in Computer Science, 1985, (Eds: T. Hoare and J. C. Shepardson).
- [Gr69] Green, C., Theorem proving by resolution as a basis for question-answering systems, Machine Intelligence 4 (American Elsevier, NY 1969), pp 183-205.
- [Grb86] Greenbaum, S., Input transformations and resolution implementation techniques for theorem proving in first order logic, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, September 1986.
- [GP86] Greenbaum, S., and D. Plaisted, The Illinois prover: a general purpose resolution theorem prover, extended abstract, 8th Conf on Automated Deduction, July 1986.
- [Gre85] Greiner, R., Learning By Understanding Analogies, Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University, September 1985. Technical Report STAN-CS-1071.
- [Ha85] Hall, R.P. Analogical Reasoning in Artificial Intelligence and Related Disciplines, Irvine Computational Intelligence Project, University of California, Irvine.
- [HM86] R. Harper and K. Mitchell, Introduction to Standard ML, Laboratory for Foundations of Computer Science, University of Edinburgh (1986)
- [HR78] Harrison, M.C. and N. Rubin, Another Generalization of Resolution, JACM 25 (1978) 341-351.

- [Hi 87] Hines, L.M., Hyper-chaining and Knowledge-based Theorem Proving, submitted to CADE-9.
- [Hi88] Hines, L.M., Building-in Knowledge of Axioms, PhD Dissertation. Univiversity of Texas.
- [HN84] Henschen, L.J. and S.A.Naqvi, On Compiling Queries in Recursive First Order Databases, JACM 31 (1984) 47-84.
- [Hob85] Hobbs, J.R., and R.C.Moore, Formal Theories of the Commonsense World, Ablex Publishing Corp, Norwood, NJ, 1985.
- [Hod72] Hodes, L., Solving Problems by formula manipulation in logic and linear inequalities, Artificial Intelligence 3 (1972) 165-174.
- [Hu73] Huet, G.P., A Mechanization of Type Theory, Proc. IJCAI-73, 139-146.
- [HO80] Huet, G. and D. C. Oppen, Equations and rewrite rules: a survey, in R. Book (ed.) Formal Languages: Perspectives and Open Problems, Academic Press 1980, 348-405
- [Hul80] Hullot, J.-M., Canonical Forms and Unification, Proc. 5th International Conference on Automated Deduction, 1980, Springer LNCS 87, 318-334
- [Hun86] Hunt, Warren A., Jr., The Mechanical Verification of Microprocessor design. In [Borr87], 89-129.
- [IEEE-C25] IEEE Transactions on Computers, V C-25 no. 8, 1976 (Special issue on ATP).

- [Karl84] Karl Mark G. Raph (Siekmann et al), The Markgraf Karl Refutation Procedure, Seiki-84-08-K1, FB Inf., Univ. Kaiserslautern.
- [Kir87] Kirchner, C. "Computing unification algorithms", Proc. of the 1st IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, 206-216, 1986
- [Kli71] Kling, R. E., A Paradigm for Reasoning by Analogy, Artificial Intelligence, Vol.2, 1971, pp. 147-178.
- [KC86] Knoblock, T.B., and R.L.Constable, Formalized Metareasoning in Type Theory, LICS 86 (ed. by A.K.Chandra and A. R. Meyer), 237-248.
- [KB70] Knuth, D. and P. Bendix, Simple word problems in universal algebras Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra (J. Leech, ed.) Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970, pp 263-297.
- [Kon86] Konolige, Kurt, A Deduction Model of Belief, Morgan-Kaufmann Pub, 1956.
- [Kon86A] Konolige, Kurt, Resolution and Quantified Epistemic Logics, CADE-8, Oxford, England, 1986.
- [Kon86B] Geissler, C. and K. Konolige, A Resolution Method for Quantified Modal Logics of Knowledge and Belief, Proc Conf on Theoretical Aspects of Reasoning about Knowledge, 309-324, 1986.
- [Ko71] Kowalski, R. and D. Keuhner, Linear resolution with selected functions. Artificial Intelligence 2, 1971, pp 227-260.
- [Ko74] Kowalski, R., Predicate Logic as a Programming Language, Information Processing,

- [Ko75] Kowalski, R., A Proof Procedure using Connection Graphs, JACM, Vol.22 No.4(1975), 424-436.
- [Ko79] Kowalski, R. "Logic for Problem Solving", North-Holland NY, 1979.
- [La75] Lankford, D. S., Canonical Inference, Memo ATP-32, Automatic Theorem Proving Project, University of Texas, Austin, TX, December 1975.
- [LB77] Lankford, D.S. and A. M. Ballantyne, Decision procedures for simple equational theories with commutative-associative axioms: Complete sets of commutative-associative reductions, memo ATP-39, Automatic Theorem Proving Project, University of Texas, Austin, TX, August 1977.
- [LPS86] Lenat, D., M.Prakash, M.Shepherd, CYC: Using common Sense Knowledge to Overcome Brittleness and Knowledge Acquisition Bottlenecks, AI Magazine, VI, Winter 1986.
- [LF87] Lenat, D. and E.A. Feigenbaum, On the Thresholds of Knowledge, IJCAI-87.
- [LeV62] LeVeque, W. J., Elementary Theory of Numbers, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA., 1962.
- [Lif87] Lifschitz, V., What is the Inverse Method?, Memo, Stanford U. CS Dept, June 1987.
- [Lo68] Loveland, D.W., Mechanical theorem proving by model elimination, Jour ACM 15, 1968, pp 236-251.
- [Lo69] Loveland, D.W., A simplified format for the model elimination procedure Jour ACM 16 (1969) pp 349-363.

- [Lo78] Loveland, D.W., Automated Theorem Proving: A Logical Basis, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978, xiii + 405 pp.
- [Lo84] Loveland, D.W., Automated Theorem-Proving: A Quarter-Century Review. In [BL84].
- [Lo86] Loveland, D.W., Automated Theorem proving: mapping logic into AI, invited paper, Int'l Symposium on Methodologies for Intelligent Systems, Z. Ras and M. Zemankova, Eds., Knoxville, TN October 1986, pp 214-229.
- [Lo87] Loveland, Near-Horn PROLOG, CS-1987-14, Duke University, April, 1987.
- [LO82] Lusk, E.L. and R.A. Overbeek, An LMA-based theorem prover, ANL-82-75, Argonne Natl Lab, 1982.
- [LMO86] Lusk, E.L., W. McCune, and R.A.Overbeek, ITP at Argonne National Laboratory, CADE-8, Oxford, 1986, 697-698.
- [LO85] Lusk, E. and R. Overbeek, Non-Horn problems, Jour of Automated Reasoning 1 (1985)
- [LMO86] Lusk, E., W.McCune, and R.Overbeek, ITP at Argonne National Laboratory, 8th Int'l Conf on Automated Deduction, Oxford England, 1986, pp 697-698.
- [Macsyma] MACSYMA Reference Manual, Lab. for Computer Science, MIT, 545 Technology Square, Cambridge Mass 02139 (1983)
- [Martin-Lof 84] Martin-Lof, P., Intuitionistic Type Theory, Studies in Proof Theory Lecture Notes, Bibliopolis, 1984.
- [McC63] McCarthy, J., "Situations, Actions, and Causal Laws", AI Memo 2, Stanford University AI Porject, 1963.

- [Mas68] Maslov, S.J., The inverse Method for establishing deducibility for logical calculi, Proc Steklov Inst Math, 98, 1968.
- [McC69] McCarthy, J., P. Hayes, "Some Philosophical Problems from the Standpoint of Artificial Intelligence", in Machine Intelligence 4, Melzer & Michie eds., Edinburgh Univ. Press 1969 pp 463-502.
- [McA87] McAllister, D.A., ONTIC: A Knowledge Representation System for Mathematics, MIT AI Lab Tech Report 979, July 1987. PhD Thesis.
- [McC68] McCarthy, J., Programs with Common Sense, in Semantic Information Processing (Minsky, ed) MIT Press, 1968.
- [McC80] McCarthy, J., Circumscription A form of Non-monotonic Reasoning, Artificial Intelligence 13 (1980) 27-39.
- [McD79] McDermott, J., Learning to use analogies, IJCAI-79, 568-576.
- [MS84] McDonald, James, and Patrick Suppes. Student use of an Interactive Theorem Prover. In [BL84], 315-360, 1984.
- [Mi83] R. Milner, A Proposal for Standard ML, Report CSR-157-83, Computer Science Dept., Univ Edinburgh (1983); Also pub. in Conference Record of 1984 ACM Symposium on LISP and Functional Programming, Austin, Texas (Aug 1984)
- [ML1] Michalski, R.S., J.C.Carbonell, and T.M.Mitchell, Machine Learning (Vol 1), Tioga Press, Palo Alto, 1983.
- [ML2] Michalski, R.S., J.C.Carbonell, and T.M.Mitchell, Machine Learning (Vol 2), Tioga Press, Palo Alto, 1986.

- [ML86] The ML Handbook, Internal Document, Project Formel, IN-RIA (July 1985)
- [Mo69] Morris, J.B., E-resolution: extension of resolution to include the equality relation, Proc of the Int'l Joint Conf on AI, Washington, D. C. May 1969, pp 287-294.
- [Mor85] Moore, R.C., A Formal Theory of Knowledge and Action, in [Hob85].
- [Ne80] Nederpelt, R. P., "An approach to Theorem Proving on the basis of a typed lambda-calculus" CADE-5 pp182-194
- [NSS56] Newell, A., J.C.Shaw, and H.A.Simon, The Logic Theory Machine, IRE Trans Information Theory IT-2, 1956; also in Computers and Thought, McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- [Nil80] Nilsson, N.J., Principles of Artificial Intelligence, Tioga Press, Palo Alto, 1980.
- [NO78] Nelson, G. and D.C.Oppen, A Simplifier Based on Efficient Decision Algorithms, 5th ACM Sym on Prin Prog Lan (1978) 141-150.
- [Ohl87] Ohlback, H.J., Link Inheritance in Abstract Clause Graphs, JAR 3 (1987), 1-34.
- [Op1] Oppacher, F., and E. Suen, Controlling deduction with proof condensation and heuristics. School of CS, Carleton U., Ottawa, Ontario.
- [Pa87] Pace, Bill, A bibligraphy of Automated Deduction, TR-87-5400-08, I.P.Sharp Associated Limited, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, Jan 1987.

- [Pas87] Pastre, Dominique, MUSCADET: An Atutomatic Theorem Proving System using Knowledge and Metaknowledge in Mathematics, PhD Thesis, U. Paris.
- [Pau86] Paulson, L., Natural Deduction as Higher-Order Resolution, Journal of Logic Programming, 3(3), 1986, 237-258.
- [PRS86] Petrie, Charles J., David M. Russinoff, Donald D. Steiner, PROTEUS: A Default Reasoning Perspective. MCC-AI-352-86.
- [Pl81] Plaisted, D., Theorem Proving with Abstraction, Artificial Intelligence 16, 1981, pp. 47-108.
- [P182] Plaisted, D.A., A simplified problem reduction format, Artificial Intelligence 18 (1982) 227-261.
- [Pl87] Plaisted, D.A., Non-Horn Clause Logic Programming without Contrapositives, Memo. Dept CS, U. North Carolina, 1987.
- [Pl86] Plummer, D., Gazing: A Technique for Controlling the Use of Rewrite Rules in a Natural Deduction Theorem Prover, Department of Artificial Intelligence, University of Edinburgh, Ph.D. Thesis, Summer 1986
- [Ri83] Rich, Elaine, Artificial Intelligence, McGraw-Hill, 1983.
- [Ro65] Robinson, J.A., "A machine oriented logic based on the resolution principle" J. ACM 12 (1965) pp 23-41.
- [Ro65A] Robinson, J.A., Automatic deduction with hyper-resolution, Interat.J. of Computer Math 1 (1965) 227-234.

- [Ross86] Ross, K., Elementary Analysis: The theory of Calculus, Springer- Verlag, New York, 1986.
- [Rou75] Roussel, P., PROLOG: Manuel de Reference et d'utilisation, Groupe d'Intelligence Artificielle, Universite d'Aux-Marseille, Luminy, Sept 1975.
- [Ru85] Russinoff, David. An Experiment with the Boyer-Moore Theorem Porver: A proof of Wilson's Theorem, JAR 1 (1985) 121-139.
- [Sh86] Shankar, N., Proof-checking Metamathematics, Dept of CS, Univ. of Texas, 1986.
- [Sh87] hankar, N., A Machine-checked proof of Godel's Incompleteness Theorem, In: Proc. of Eighth Int'l Conf. on Logic, Methodology and Philosophy Computer Science Congress, to Appear.
- [Sho77] Shostak, R.E., On the SUP-INF Method for proving Presburger Formulas, JACM 24 (1977) 520-543.
- [Sho79] Shostak, R.E., A Practical decision Procedure for Arithmetic with function symbols, JACM 26 (1979) 351-360.
- [Si76] Sickel, S., Interconnectivity Graphs, IEEE Trans on Computers, C-25 (1976).
- [Sim84] Simon, D., A Linear Time Algorithm for a subcase of Secondorder Instantiation, 7th Conf on Automated Deduction, Napa, Ca, May 1984.
- [Sim88] Simon, D., Checking National Proofs, submitted to 9th Conf on Automated Deduction, 1988.

- [Smu85] Smullyan, R., "To Mock a Mockingbird", Alfred Knopf, NY, 1985.
- [SW83] Siekmann, J. and G. Wrightson, The Automation of Reasoning I,II, Springer Verlag, 1983.
- [SW79] Siekmann, J., Wrightson, G., Paramodulated Connection Graphs, Acta Informatica (1979)
- [Sla74] Slagle, J. "Automated Theorem Proving with Simplifiers, Commutativity, Associativity", J.ACM, 21, 622-642,(1974)
- [Sm87] Smolka, G., W. Nutt, J. Meseguer, J.A. Goguen, "Order Sorted Equational Computation", [CREAS87]
- [Smu68] Smullyan, Raymond, First Order Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1968.
- [SW86] Stanfield C., Waltz D., Toward Memory-Based Reasoning, Thinking Machines Report.
- [St81] Stickel, M. E., A unification algorithm for associative-commutative functions, J.ACM 28(3), pp423-434, 1981
- [St84] Stickel, M.E., A Case Study of Theorem Proving by the Knuth-Bendix Method: Discovering That $x^3 = x$ Implies Ring Commutativity, 7th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Napa, CA., May 14-16, 1984.
- [St85] Stickel, M.E., Automatic Deduction by Theory Resolution, Proceeding IJCAI-85, 1985, pp. 1181-1186.
- [St86] Stickel, M.E., A Prolog Technology Theorem Prover: implementation by an extended Prolog compiler, Eight Int'l Conf.

- on Auto. Deduction, Lecture Notes in C.S. 230, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, July 1986, pp 573-587.
- [Top79] Goldblatt, Robert, "Topoi: The categorial Analysis of Logic," North Holland, New York, 1979.
- [Ty81] Tyson, Mabry, APRVR: A Priority-ordered Agenda Theorem Prover, PhD Dissertation, U. Texas CS Dept, Aug 1981. See also Proc. AAAI-82.
- [Wal86] Wallen, Lincoln, Chapter on Modal Logic in Artificial Intelligence and its applications, Eds: A.G. Cohn and J.R. Thomas, John Wiley and Son, 1986.
- [Wa83] Walther, C., A many-sorted calculus based on resolution and paramodulation, Proc 8th Int'l Joint Conference on AI, Karlsruhe, West Germany, August 1983, pp 882-891.
- [Wa84] Walther, C., A mechanical solution of Schubert's steamroller by many-sorted resolution, Proceedings of the AAAI-84 Nat'l Conf on AI, Austin, TX August 1984, pp 330-334.
- [WaT85] Wang, T.C., Designing examples for semantically guided hierarchical deduction, IJCAI-85, pp. 1201-1207.
- [WB87] Wang, T.C. and W.W. Bledsoe, Hierarchical Deduction, JAR 3 (1987) 35-77.
- [WaH60] Wang, Hao, Toward Mechanical Mathematics, IBM J. of Research and Development 4 (1960) 2-22. Also see [SW83] 244-264.
- [War87] Warren, D.H.D., Implementing Prolog compiling predicate logic programs, DAI Research Reports 39, 40, University of Edinburgh, May 1987.

- [We77] Weyhrauch, R., FOL: A proof checker for first order logic, Stanford AI Memo AIM-235.1, 1977.
- [WH83] Wos, L. and L. Henschen, Automated Theorem Proving 19865-1970, In [SW83].
- [Wink76] Winker, S., An evaluation of an implementation of qualified hyperresolution, IEEE Transactions on Computers C-25, 8 (1976) 835-843.
- [Win80] Winston, P.H., Learning and Reasoning by Analogy, CACM 23(12), 689-703, 1980.
- [Wo65] Wos, L., G. Robinson, D.F. Carson, Efficiency and completeness of the set of support strategy in theorem proving, JACM 12 (1965) 536-541.
- [Wo67] Wos, L., G. Robinson, D. Carson, L. Shalla, The concept of demodulation in theorem proving JACM 14 (1967) 698-709.
- [Wo70] Wos, L., G. Robinson, Paramodulation and set of support, Symp. on Automatic Demonstration, Lecture Notes in Math 125, Spring Verlag, 1970, 276-310.
- [WoS4] Wos, L., R.Overbeek, E.Lusk, and J.Boyle, Automated Reasoning: Introduction and Application, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ., 1984.
- [Wo84A] Wos, L., R. Veroff, B. Smith, and W. McCune, The linked inference principle, II: the user's viewpoint, Proc. of the 7th Int'l Conf on Automated Deduction, Napa, CA May 1984, pp 316-332.
- [Wo87] Wos, L., Automated Reasoning: 33 Basic Research Problems, Prentice Hall, August 1987.

- [Wu78] Wu, "On the Decision Problem and the Mechanization of Theorem Proving in Elementary Geometry" Scientia Sinica Vol. 21, 1978 pp 157-179.
- [Wu84] Wu, "Basic Principles of Mechanical Theorem Proving in Geometries", J. of Sys. Sci. and Math. Sci 4(3) 1984, pp 207-235, republished in Journal of Automated Reasoning 2(4) 1986, 221-252.