

This is significant because the act of **splitting the atoms** will separate the atom clouds

There have been several demonstrations of atom interferometers that do not en-
benefit of **splitting** with optical fields is the momentum of the split atoms is > 10 mm/s.

close area. The splitting and recombination mechanisms fall into a few broad categories:
and a few milliwatts of power is more than enough power to split the atoms. Another

physical gratings [104], magnetic field potentials [105], optical double well potentials
terms of simplicity and flexibility. The laser frequency requirements are not stringent

[106], dressed RF dressed potentials [107], and optical standing waves [99]. Several of
reproducibility. **Splitting** with an optical standing wave is a good **splitting** method in

these methods have drawbacks that would make it difficult to use these splitting methods
with RF dressed potentials is straight forward and has demonstrated coherent phase

in a broadly applicable device. Physical gratings require precise micro/nano machining,
and **splitting** with optical potentials does not exhibit phase reproducibility. **Splitting**

coherently splitting with magnetic fields requires precise control of the magnetic fields,
coherently **splitting** with magnetic fields requires precise control of the magnetic fields,

and splitting with optical potentials does not exhibit phase reproducibility. Splitting
in a broadly applicable device. Physical gratings require precise micro/nano machining,

with RF dressed potentials is straight forward and has demonstrated coherent phase
these methods have drawbacks that would make it difficult to use these **splitting** methods

reproducibility. Splitting with an optical standing wave is a good splitting method in
[106], dressed RF dressed potentials [107], and optical standing waves [99]. Several of

terms of simplicity and flexibility. The laser frequency requirements are not stringent
physical gratings [104], magnetic field potentials [105], optical double well potentials

and a few milliwatts of power is more than enough power to split the atoms. Another
close area. The **splitting** and recombination mechanisms fall into a few broad categories:

benefit of splitting with optical fields is the momentum of the split atoms is > 10 mm/s.
There have been several demonstrations of atom interferometers that do not en-

This is significant because the act of splitting the atoms will separate the atom clouds

and if properly configured could enclose area.

We have already argued why we need **splitting** literals in the above clauses, and why we need Ngr_1 instead of Ngr in type C2. In type C3 we have Ngr in place of the set Ngs that we had in Section 4, to take care of interactions between one-variable clauses and complex clauses. In type C4 the trivial literals involve predicates only from \mathcal{P} (and not

\mathcal{Q}). This is what ensures that we need only finitely many fresh predicates (those from \mathcal{P}) because these are the literals that are involved in replacements when this clause is resolved with a one-variable clause. The **splitting** steps that we use in this section consist of replacing a tableau \mathcal{T} by the tableau $\mathcal{T}(S)$ by clause C_2 where C is non-ground, $L \in \pm \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps we are going to use are of the following kind:

(1) replacing clause $C_1(x) = C \vee \pm P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ by clause $C_2(x) = C \vee \pm P(t_1, \dots, t_n, s[x])$ where C is non-ground, $L \in \pm \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps we are going to use are of the following kind:

(2) replacing ground clause $C_1(x) = C \vee \pm P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ by clause $C_2(x) = C \vee \pm P(t_1, \dots, t_n, s[x])$ where C is non-ground, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps that we use in this section consist of replacing a tableau \mathcal{T} by the tableau $\mathcal{T}(S)$ by clause C_2 where C is non-ground, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps that we use in this section

consist of replacing a tableau \mathcal{T} by the tableau $\mathcal{T}(S)$ by clause C_2 where C is non-ground, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps that we use in this section consist of replacing a tableau \mathcal{T} by the tableau $\mathcal{T}(S)$ by clause C_2 where C is non-ground, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps that we use in this section

consist of replacing a tableau \mathcal{T} by the tableau $\mathcal{T}(S)$ by clause C_2 where C is non-ground, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps that we use in this section consist of replacing a tableau \mathcal{T} by the tableau $\mathcal{T}(S)$ by clause C_2 where C is non-ground, $L \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The replacement steps that we use in this section

We are extremely pleased and honoured to present this new volume in the Contemporary Freud series.

Although the idea of **splitting** was introduced by Freud in his earliest works (1895, *Studies on Hysteria*), the concept had only been theoretically settled by him in much later contributions: in 1927, about fetishism, and finally in 1938, when he describes it as a defence mechanism that modifies the functioning of the ego to a similar extent, but in different ways, in the neuroses, perversions, or psychoses.

For Freud, this specific mechanism is connected with a defence in the face of a perception that traumatizes the ego, a perception

partly accepted and partly denied at the same time, which leads, in the mind, to the coexistence of two opposite attitudes, apparently not conflicting, but always linked with the castration complex and bisexuality. For Freud, the conflict takes place between the perception by the ego and the drive. The gap inscribed on the line of the **splitting** will thereafter be a source of fracture for all successive traumas. However, as underlined by Freud, it is not always

easy to decide which mechanism occurs—repression? suppression? and/or **splitting**?—when we are facing someone who adopts two

Captain Kirk's infinitive

Captain Kirk's infinitive

The infinitive in English has the form *to* + the base form of the verb, as in *to go*, and can

be used with an adverb such as *boldly*. At the beginning of each televised *Star Trek*

The infinitive in English has the form *to* + the base form of the verb, as in *to go*, and can

episode, one of the main characters, Captain Kirk, always used the expression *to*

be used with an adverb such as *boldly*. At the beginning of each televised *Star Trek*

***boldly go* ... This is an example of a *split infinitive*. Captain Kirk's teacher might have**

episode, one of the main characters, Captain Kirk, always used the expression *To*

expected him to say *To go boldly* or *Boldly to go*, so that the adverb didn't *split* the

***boldly go* ... This is an example of a *split infinitive*. Captain Kirk's teacher might have**

***infinite*. If Captain Kirk had been a Roman space traveler, speaking Latin, he would**

expected him to say *To go boldly* or *Boldly to go*, so that the adverb didn't *split* the

have used the expressions *ire* ("to go") and *audacter* ("boldly"). Now, in saying *Ire*

***infinite*. If Captain Kirk had been a Roman space traveler, speaking Latin, he would**

audacter* ... in Latin, *Capitaneus Kirkus* would not even have the opportunity to *split

his *infinite* (*ire*), because Latin infinitives are single words and just do not *split*.

audacter* ... in Latin, *Capitaneus Kirkus* would not even have the opportunity to *split

It would be very appropriate in Latin grammar to say you cannot *split* an *infinite*.

his *infinite* (*ire*), because Latin infinitives are single words and just do not *split*.

But is it appropriate to carry this idea over into English where the *infinite* form does

not consist of a single word, but of two words, *to* and *go*: If it is a typical feature of the

But is it appropriate to carry this idea over into English where the *infinite* form does

use of English that speakers and writers regularly produce forms such as *to boldly go*, *to*

not consist of a single word, but of two words, *to* and *go*? If it is a typical feature of the

***solemnly swear* or *to never ever say goodbye*, then we may simply wish to note that**

use of English that speakers and writers regularly produce forms such as *to boldly go*, *to*

there are structures in English that differ from those found in Latin, rather than think of

***solemnly swear* or *to never ever say goodbye*, then we may simply wish to note that**

the English forms as "bad" because they are breaking a rule of Latin grammar.