



## **The Gospel According to Fairbairn**

Rhett-Lawson Mohajer and Tara Rava Zolnikov

Many Christians find religious texts as anchoring points in their lives. Not only do the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John provide a guideline to Christians on their road to religious maturity (Harrington, 2016) but also, according to Lathrop, they critique the communities (Dunkly, 2015). Other scholars like Adams (2013) approach the Gospels from a different angle by focusing on the comprehensive treatise of Jesus's life each Gospel provides and then exploring the general picture that the four of them depict. However, approaching the narrative of Jesus's life from a theological standpoint is not all but merely one approach an individual may choose to understand Jesus and his life. Thus, for example, while Archbishop (2002) approached the interpretation of the Bible as that which contributes to the church as a living being, Smith worked on Bultmann's commentary and offered a literary criticism of the Gospels (Bridges, 2009).

Finally, some attempted to interpret the life of Jesus from a depth psychology standpoint by understating the text as a psychic, rather than theological, reality because the theologian, historian, and psychologist approach the same topic from three different perspectives. It needs to be reiterated that indubitably, any psychoanalyst and scholar attempting to interpret biblical texts would and should, as is the aim of this paper, approach it from the standpoint of psychic reality and leave the theological reality to the theologian. The most well-known of the former group is Carl Jung's interpretation of Christianity (Jung, 1958/2011). Jung approached the topic not from the standpoint of a theologian, but of a psychologist and focused on the meaning inherent in Christianity and the Christ as a symbol in the Western culture (Stein, 1999).

In the aforementioned process, one of the tenets of Jung's argument was perceiving the experience of inner wholeness on the one hand and the one of God on the other as experiences to be of the same quality; hence, Dourley (1984) argued, one could interpret Christian symbols as ones reflecting the psychic reality. Jung's analysis of Christianity, notwithstanding its invaluable contribution to understating religious symbols, leaves some room for criticism including Clark's doubt about Jung's understanding of Christianity as it is believed and practiced in the eastern part of the world, his specific socio-cultural lens as Hillman underscores, and doubts about his motivations as Homans and Noll emphasized (Main, 2006). Finally, his analysis as presented in *Answer to Job* is an attempt to interpret the myth of creation, not the life of Jesus.

The latter is the focus of this paper using Fairbairn's theory of endopsychic structure. This theory is one of the most comprehensive theories of personality structure. Fairbairn's theory provides a vivid illustration of one's inner experiences and the individual's efforts to transmute and adapt to one's outer experiences (Scharff, 1996). The psychic reality from the epistemological vantage point is that which psychoanalysis strives to unearth, and as Freud explicated in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, it is a

depiction of the subjective fantastical experiences of an individual (De Mijolla et al., 2005). Fairbairn himself did apply his theory to non-clinical settings. For example, he explains the experiences of soldiers in *The War Neurosis-Their Nature and Significance* where he asserts as infantile dependence and the inherent qualities of an individual's defenses against bad objects couple, they trigger the breakdown of soldiers since the stress level needed to instigate a breakdown is not the same for two individuals (Fairbairn, 1994). Thus, he provided an example to indicate it was possible to use his theory of personality structure in addition to clinical setting (Celani, 1994; Celani, 2010) dream interpretation (Levy, 2014) to understand, for example, movies (Clarke, 2018).

It should be noted that in psychoanalytic interpretation, whether Freudian or Lacanian, the unconscious gains eminence over the conscious and the aim is to discover the covert meaning embedded in the text (Barry, 2017). Meanwhile, the existing theoretical axioms also prevail. For example, whereas Freudian psychoanalytic interpretation focuses on the psychoanalytic symptoms and psychosexual stages of development, namely oral, anal, and phallic, its Lacanian counterpart emphasizes Lacanian concepts of lack and desire, and developmental stages like the mirror stage (Barry, 2017). A psychoanalytic criticism of a text using Fairbairn's theory aligns with the same guidelines: particular attention to the impacts of the unconscious and unconscious motivations, the role part-objects and partial egos (the exciting, rejecting, ideal objects; and the libidinal, antilibidinal, and central egos) as defined in this theory play, and impact of repression, guilt, conditional badness, libidinal badness, and the cathexis between part-objects and their subsidiary partial egos.

Finally, in order to use Fairbairn's theory for interpreting texts, one needs to remain cognizant of its axioms: the universality of the split in the ego, the repression of the psychic splitting, and the libido's object-seeking predilection. (Fairbairn, 1944/1994; Fairbairn, 1994; Fairbairn, 1941/1994). These two are of the utmost prominence and have two direct consequences in the process of reading the gospels through the lens of Fairbairn's theory. Firstly, the split in the ego means not only are the egos of the readers of the gospels split but also the egos of the authors of it were split. In other words, regardless of the theological aspect of the life of Jesus, the person who documented it in each gospel was a human, hence with a split in his ego. Each reader is also a human and encounters the text with an ego that is inherently split. The part-objects and partial egos, consequently, exist in every encounter between the reader and the text. Furthermore, the object-seeking predilection translates to the need to search for the links between the two members of each dyad as one reads the gospels through the lens that Fairbairn's theory of personality provides.

### **Ego to Object Cathexis: Splitting of the Ego and the Object**

In every encounter between the ego and objects, the libidinal ego strives for constructing and instilling a relationship with the object (Fairbairn, 1946/1994). Furthermore, the link between the central ego and the ideal object is not repressed; whereas the cathexis between the internal saboteur and the rejecting object, as well as the cathexis between the libidinal ego and the exciting object, are repressed. Finally, the internal saboteur-rejecting object dyad only goes through the process of repression once (primary direct repression);

however, the libidinal ego-exciting object dyad is repressed twice, namely primary and secondary repression or direct and indirect repression (Fairbairn, 1946/1994; Fairbairn, 1994). The three levels of consciousness permeate the four gospels.

### **The Son and the Father: Birth to Crucifixion**

There exists an overt emphasis on the attachment between the Son, namely Jesus, to the Father in the Gospels. According to Matthew 3:17, “and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased” and Matthew 17:5 emphasizes, “while he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him” (King James Version [KJV], 1769/2014). Both of these verses emphasize the link between the Father and the Son from the standpoint of the Father; it should be iterated that Mark 1:11 also maintains the same perspective and the same hold for Luke 3:22, Luke 9:35. In these instances the authors of the verses has reported that which he has heard.

However, John maintains an outside perspective. In John 3:16 he contends, “for God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (KJV, 1769/2014). John further observed in John 5:26, “for as the Father has life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself” (KJV, 1769/2014). The third perspective, namely that of Jesus, is also available in the Gospel of John when in John 14:2 Jesus states, “in *my* [emphasis added] Father’s house are many mansions” (KJV, 1769/2014). Finally, Jesus Himself underscores the hypercathexis between Himself and the Father by declaring

ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come *again* [emphasis in the original] unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I said I go unto the Father: for my Father is *greater* [emphasis added] than I (John 14:28, KJV, 1769/2014).

It should be iterated that the word “greater” depicts a comparison of the hierarchical status of the Father and the Son; the word “better” would have indicated a qualitative disparity between the two.

Jesus disseminates the news that he would go to the Father and would return. This also plays a prominent role in understanding the hypercathexis. According to Matthew 26:39, “and he went a little further and fell on his face and prayed saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will but as thou wilt” and also in Luke 22:42 Jesus asks his Father, “... if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will but Thine be done” (KJV, 1769/2014). In these verses asking his Father to let him live, and let him survive; however, he also emphasizes that he is going to relinquish his life and submit to the will of his Father. The will of the Father does trump the will of the Son, as in most cases when the father and the son are not even capitalized. As the destitution comes forth, the individual feels “emptied of libido ... [and experiences an] imminent psychical death” (Fairbairn, 1944/1994, p. 113).

This reminds one familiar with the life and death of Jesus, specifically, the day of crucifixion. According to Mark 15:34, Jesus said, "... Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Afterward, "Jesus cried with a loud voice and gave up ghost" (Mark 15:37, KJV, 1769/2014). And according to Luke 23:46, "... when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said that, he gave up his ghost" (KJV, 1769/2014). Matthew 27:50 and John 19:30 also direct the attention to the above-mentioned moments. The two thieves crucified on the two sides of Jesus, one accepting him and attaching himself to him and the other one rejecting him is also of psychoanalytic significance which, however, the author needs to forgo as it would create a lengthy digression.

### **Judas Iscariot, the Authority, Jesus**

Notwithstanding the infrequent reference to the relationship between Judas Iscariot and the authority, compared to the association discussed in the section above, there are references to it. This aligns with the one level of repression, namely primary direct repression, as discussed above. Judas Iscariot appears in the Gospels almost exclusively either in the presence of Jesus, discussed later, or in the presence of the chief priests, or the symbol of the authority figure. According to Mark 14:10, "and Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests to betray him [Jesus] unto them," while Luke 22:4 also noted, "and he [Judas] went his way and communed with the chief priests and captain how he might betray him unto them" (KJV, 1769/2014). The same interaction between the chief priests and Judas Iscariot is also present in Matthew 26:14-16.

However, to qualify as the internal saboteur, this partial ego has to be rejected by the rejecting object and also be split off from the central ego. According to the Gospel of Matthew, Judas becomes remorseful at some point. Thus, Judas returns to the authority figures and confesses, "I have sinned in that I betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, what is *that* [emphasis in the original] to us? See thou *to that* [emphasis in the original]" (Matthew 27:4, KJV, 1769/2014). The translation of the same verse in the New International Version [NIV] emphasizes the brusque response of the chief priests and hence their rejection of Judas more emphatically: "what is it to us? They replied. That's your responsibility" (NIV, 1984). The rejecting object maintains a power distance only to make others be chagrined and to mortify from that position while the internal saboteur responds with hatred of the self and shame (Celani, 2010). Hence, the position of the chief priests related to Judas Iscariot becomes clear.

Moreover, in order for Judas Iscariot to be in the place of the internal saboteur, or the antilibidinal ego, not only does he have to retain a cathexis with the rejecting object but also he has to be the partial ego split off of the remainder of the central ego, namely Jesus. Indeed the connection between Jesus of Nazareth and Judas Iscariot is stronger than one might initially suspect. According to Mark 14:18, "Jesus said, verily I say unto you one of you which eateth with me shall betray me," and in verse 20 of the same chapter, "*it is* [emphasis in the original] one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish" (KJV, 1769/ 2014). Luke specifies a different angle by emphasizing that Jesus states, "the hand of him that betrayeth me *is* [emphasis in the original] with me on the

table” (Luke 22:21, KJV, 1769/2014). However, John 13:26 provides a yet more delicate depiction of the traitor: “Jesus answered, he it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot” (KJV, 1769/2014).

Furthermore, Judas has already explained to the authority figures he betrayed Jesus to that “whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he, hold him fast. And forthwith he came to Jesus and said: hail master; and kissed him” (Matthew 26: 48-49, KJV, 1769/2014). Mark in 14:44-45 and Luke in 22:47 reiterate the same notion. This places Judas Iscariot, as a disciple, fifth column, or internal saboteur in a unique position *vis-a-vis* Jesus. In short, not only Judas is the one disciple who kisses Jesus, but also Judas is the one who dips bread in Jesus’ dish, has his hand with Jesus on the table, and is fed by Jesus. There are no references to any man other than Judas Iscariot with whom Jesus has physical contact to the point of feeding him and being kissed by him.

Finally, Celani (2010) contended that as the central ego transforms as a consequence of its interactions with the ideal object, the structure of the internal saboteur diminishes. In other words, in the presenting case, one last condition for Judas Iscariot to be the internal saboteur split off of Jesus is to be diminished and eliminated in the process of Jesus’s final transformation. It needs to be noted that guilt, according to Fairbairn (1944/1994) is a defense on the part of the individual to accept oneself as conditionally or morally adverse, rather than perceiving the parent [the authority] as that which is unconditionally or libidinally adverse. Guilt is, Fairbairn (1949/1994) further asserted, is not but a defense the individual erects against interactions that involve the bad object. Indeed that which transpires within Judas’ psyche is not far from it. Judas places the blame on himself, not the authorities who crucify Jesus, and while remorseful and according to Matthew 27: 5, he “went and hanged himself” (KJV, 1769/2014). Thereby, Judas employs guilt as a defense, albeit unbeknown to himself as is the case with defense mechanisms. However, his life also ends right before the crucifixion of Jesus; hence, the elimination of the former and the transformation of the latter go together.

### **Mary Magdalene and Jesus**

Mary Magdalene is a curious figure in the gospels for a myriad of reasons including her identical name to the Virgin as well as her encounters with Jesus; thereby, she has provided the slate that receives a multitude of projections. However, in order to psychoanalytically understand her relation to Jesus one needs to comprehend if one is the split-off of the other if the two characters belong to one another. Despite the fact that Mary Magdalene does not give birth to Jesus and is not present at his birth, she is present at three other points of time which are of monumental prominence, namely performing miracles, crucifixion, and resurrection. Being present during manifestations of miracles, crucifixion, and resurrection translates to the presence of Mary Magdalene at the scenes that make Christianity discernible from other Abrahamic worldviews.

It should be iterated one needs to utilize the four Gospels as the four pieces of a jigsaw puzzle to have the full picture. For example, in Matthew chapter 26 a woman pours pricy perfume over Jesus; Mark chapter 14 and Luke chapter 7 echo the same lines.

According to John 11:1-2, Mary and Martha are sisters, and “it was *that* [emphasis in the original] Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair whose brother was sick” (KJV, 1769/2014). Thus, John’s verse is illuminating and it completes the picture. John contends the second scene of anointment six days prior to the Passover by Mary in chapter 12 of his gospel. These chapters underscore the woman who is a sinner and the woman who anoints Jesus are the same woman; Jesus emphasizes after the anointment scenes that she is the one who will be remembered forever. According to Luke chapter 8:2, the sinner is a woman, “Mary called Magdalene out of whom went seven devils” and according to chapter 10 of the same gospel, she is Martha’s sister whose home Jesus visits (KJV, 1769, 2014).

Furthermore, Mary Magdalene, according to Luke 7:38, uses her hair to wipe Jesus’s feet “and kissed his feet” (KJV, 1769/2014). Thereby, Mary Magdalene is the only individual other than Judas Iscariot who kisses Jesus. It needs to be reiterated the emphasis is on the verses from canonical gospels, leaving out the gospels of Mary and Philip, because as previously stated, the aim is not to explore the theological, historical, or socio-cultural impacts of the gospels and their characters, but rather solely focusing on the psychological aspect of the available narrative of the life of Jesus. Thus far, the act of kissing is that which Judas Iscariot and Mary Magdalene have in common with regard to Jesus. This level of physical closeness is an indication of a covert psychological, or unconscious, closeness.

Moreover, according to John 19:25, “now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother ... and Mary Magdalene” (KJV, 1769/2014). Matthew 27:56 and Mark 15:40 note the same. Hence, Mary Magdalene was also present at the Crucifixion scene. During the process of lifting repression, which entails resistance, in this case, Crucifixion and Jesus’s desire for the Father to spare his life if possible, the central ego becomes augmented as the partial egos reduce in size and join the central ego. Reinstating the capacity of the central ego of parts ceded to its subsidiary egos is one of the main aims of psychoanalysis (Fairbairn, 1044/1994). At this point, the pensive reader would argue and ask the following question: if Judas Iscariot is the internal saboteur (antilibidinal ego) and he is dead now so that the central ego, namely Jesus, transform, should Mary Magdalene who seems to be the libidinal ego be crucified, so that the two subsidiary egos, the two characters die for the transformation of the central ego to come to fruition?

This question is the most pertinent and the response is affirmative: one could expect Mary Magdalene to be crucified to die in some other way if it was not for the defense mechanism applied. Reversal, McWilliams (2011) contended, is the individual’s choice of recreating a scenario wherein one shifts positions from being a subject to being an object, the reverse also holds. In John 8:3 an unnamed woman was caught in the act of adultery and the crowd is about to stone her but Jesus (John 8:7) emphasizes that people should cast their stones only if they are not sinners themselves, which creates some anger toward himself; in John (8: 10-11) Jesus tells the adulterer that others stopped condemning her and neither does he. This is the reversal scene. Whether is the adulterous woman in John 8, the scene of the enactment of reversal using the psychoanalytic parlance, is directly proven to be Mary Magdalene or is a regressed ego of the perfect sinner with seven demons (explained above) that has gone through the process of final

split, passive and regressed, as Guntrip (1961/1996) depicts has no further bearing on this discussion from the psychoanalytic standpoint.

Finally, for the process delineated by Fairbairn to be complete, once the subsidiary egos are gone, the central ego should remain; however, one needs to account for the aforementioned psychoanalytic reversal, namely the switch between Jesus and Mary Magdalene. Thereby, the latter has to remain in lieu of the former. Moreover, the unification of the two has to be the first of the encounters if one is the split-off part of the other: that is if Mary Magdalene is the partial ego (libidinal ego) split off of the central ego, namely Jesus. Here, one needs to look at the biblical verses that illustrate that which transpired post-Crucifixion. John 20:14-17 illustrate a picture of the first conversation between Jesus and Mary Magdalene after the resurrection; however, according to Mark 16:9, not only does Jesus appear to Mary Magdalene but also he “appeared first to Mary Magdalene” (KJV, 1769/2014). In short, it is fascinating to see Mary Magdalene being the perfect sinner (7 indicates perfection) and the first to encounter Jesus joins the other two characters, Mary and Jesus, who can hold the tension of the opposites as the former is a virgin and a mother while the latter is the God and a human.

### **God the Father, Virgin Mary, the Authorities, and the Perpetuating Split**

There are three questions here: 1. Are the Jewish authorities of the time cast in the role of a part-object with a cathexis to the ideal object, namely God, because they crucify Jesus? 2. Does Mary as the immaculate perfect mother function as a part-object with a cathexis to God as the ideal object? 3. Why is the object split? Notwithstanding the fact that the answer to the first two questions is almost evident, as they are the sine qua non of the narrative, they fully depend on the explanation response to the third question. In other words, in offering a psychoanalytic interpretation, not a theological assessment, that Jewish people are the chosen people of God as it is in the books of Deuteronomy and Exodus, and Mary is one parent of Jesus while his other parent is God, are the two axioms. Thereby, one needs to find the answer to the third question first.

The kind of the main caregiver that is highly likely to instigate regression manifests clinginess and insouciance (Fairbairn, 1994), and thus, the resultant ambivalent object, from the ego’s standpoint, is the corollary of the frustration the assumably initial libidinal object exerts (Fairbairn, 1994). Here the complexity of the human-God dyad gains eminence. It is a profoundly mysterious relationship as in each dyad God prefers the name that comes first over the one that follows it: Abel-Cain, Noah and Abraham-humanity, Isaac-Ishmael, Jacob-Esau, Joseph-his brothers, and the Hebrews-individuals and groups from the Middle-East (Puchner et al., 2014). Furthermore, Puchner et al. (2014) asserted that God allows some of the characters he loves like Job and Joseph experience angst and torture, the issue which becomes the centerstage in the book of Job; thereby, the direct causal link between righteousness and reception of God’s blessing is perpetually subverted. Of all traumas, the greatest one, Fairbairn (1941/1994) maintained, is the frustration of one’s “desire to be loved as a person and to have his love accepted (p. 40).

Hence, the stories of the above-mentioned characters all direct one's attention to the greatest trauma, albeit the story of Job remains the epitome and the true embodiment of the greatest trauma. Since the ambivalence of the object is intolerable, splitting becomes the recourse from the endopsychic standpoint because the individual needs to bridle the presenting traumatic situation (Fairbairn, 1944/1994). Thus the object splits and hence, God, Jewish authority, and Virgin Mary. The subordinate position of the Jewish authority as well as the Virgin Mary to God, is the manifestation of the primary direct repression of the part-objects as explained in the previous section. At this point, the issue of the utmost prominence is to follow the destiny of the two part-objects: as part-objects, they need to dissipate.

First of all, demeaning and attacking are the hallmarks of the rejecting object dynamic (Celani, 2010). In the gospels, the authorities attempt to demean and attack Jesus, and finally crucify him; this is one of the main constructs of the life of Jesus according to the gospels. From a biblical standpoint, consequential to what Jesus goes through is the dissipation of that which makes Jews and their Gentile counterparts, the circumcised ones and uncircumcised ones, discernible (Colossians 3:11, Romans 3:29, Romans 9:24). In psychoanalytic parlance, as the cathexis between the partial egos and the reacting objects dissolves, the parts of the objects ceded to the part-object structure becomes part of the object. Furthermore, from the Christian perspective, perpetual virginity, immaculate conception, and assumption are the dogmas associated with Mary (Luzyte, 2013). While the unspotted goodness (Asbo, 2013) of the Virgin reminds one of the all-good characteristics of the exciting object, the assumption of Mary is the dissipation of the structure of the exciting object.

## **Discussion**

As Freudian interpretation aims to illuminate that which is embedded in the text covertly and Lacanian one pays particular attention to deconstruction by focusing on the meaning (Barry, 2017), a psychoanalytic interpretation using Fairbairn's theory, as presented above, focuses on psychic splitting and the process of coalescence of the split off partial egos and part-objects. In offering a Fairbairnian interpretation of the story of Jesus, the qualities inherent in partial egos (Judas Iscariot, Mary Magdalene, and Jesus) and part-objects (Jewish authorities of the time, Virgin Mary, and God), as well as the dissipation process of them, became clear. Thus, there are two important points one with a psychosocial value, namely the feminine, and the other with a psychotherapeutic value, the destiny of the psychic splitting. Although one can very correctly argue that from a biopsychosocial vantage point the psychosocial and the psychotherapeutic are ceaselessly interconnected.

The psychoanalytic study of the feminine side of the narrative, Mary Magdalene/Virgin Mary, reveals that these two figures undergo more intense psychoanalytic processes than their masculine counterparts, Judas Iscariot/the Jewish authorities of the time. As depicted in the former sections, whereas the masculine side only undergoes primary direct repression, the feminine side undergoes primary direct repression and secondary direct repression. Furthermore, defense mechanisms of reversal, in the case of Mary Magdalene, and developmentally archaic defense of denial for



centuries, in the case of the Virgin's Assumption, were also in operation. This psychoanalytic illustration is a reflection of the perpetual oppression of women in the course of history. Hence, of utmost prominence is seeing beyond the concrete biological facts as it would be too myopic and simplistic to deem patriarchy is merely giving the penis an eminent status over the vagina. The woman's body embodies psychic feminine qualities; these are human qualities.

The universality of bisexuality, in one way or another, is one of the tenets of various schools of depth psychology. Sigmund Freud was the pioneer in extrapolating Flies' notion of biological bisexuality to the purview of the psyche asserting in *The three essays on the theory of sexuality* that in every human femininity and masculinity coexist (Quinodoz, 2005). There Freud (1905/2017) broached the idea of psychic hermaphroditism. To Jung, the two archetypes of anima and animus exist in every individual regardless of sex as neither is specific to one gender (Kast, 2006). Jung depicts anima and animus as autonomous and stubborn (1959/1979). Winnicott maintained that being is the female element and doing the male element, both present in every human (Guntrip, 1969). Finally, Lacan even takes it further than Freud, who associated castration with one's biological disposition.

Lacan contends in the process of *sexuation* every girl and boy go through the process of symbolic loss as the result of the paternal metaphor, encountering analytic third, and both options of pursuing a phallic fragment or desiring it are available to girls and boys (Bailly, 2009). Thus, individuals are not females/males or women/men, rather the individual is either one who possesses the phallus or one that does not and Lacan further emphasized that one's relation to the phallus is irrelevant to one's anatomical sex (Lacan, 1975; Lacan, 1977). However, by attempting to create a one-to-one match between certain attitudes and human qualities on the one hand and the woman's body, the oppressive system strives for not only denigrating those human qualities but also degrading women who observably embody those qualities. In short, the system gives a specific concrete shape to certain qualities and once they have a concrete physical body, namely the woman's body, that becomes the target. This should be a reminder for the readers that despite the reader's biological sex and gender identity, whenever a woman is being oppressed, an existing human quality within the reader is being oppressed: oppressing a woman means oppressing the feminine in humanity.

Finally, a Fairbairnian interpretation of the life of Jesus discloses the reason for the soothing effect it provides many. Fairbairn (1944/1994) emphasized of the main aims of psychoanalytical therapy is to restore the capacity of the central ego by entrusting it with the ego capacity in the partial egos and to bring the two part-objects together [in the ideal object] and in direct contact with the central ego. In other words, one of the aims of psychoanalytical therapy is to bring together the exciting object/perfection/Virgin Mary and the rejecting object/rejection/Jewish authority and reinvest them back in the ideal object/God the Father which is in the purview of the influence of Jesus (the central ego) after the ego capacity ceded to partial egos, namely the internal saboteur/Judas Iscariot and the libidinal ego/Mary Magdalene has been restored. Thus, in reading the gospels the reader undertakes a journey of coalescing the splits whereby the split-off fragments of one's psyche manifest as characters that embody certain qualities. By the end of the story,

the capacity of the central ego is restored and its influential relation with the ideal ego becomes evident. Whether this restoration of the capacity is a restoration of Adam requires studying the psychic splitting in the story of Adam (God, Adam, Eve, Satan) which is beyond this essay. Whether that which can have a healing impact on psychic splitting has impacts beyond the domain of psychoanalysis is for the theologian to study.

## Conclusion

The story of Jesus depicts a picture of Fairbairn's theory of endopsychic personality structure comprising its six parts. The story begins with the split in the psyche and ends and illustrates the attempts of each partial ego and part-object to subdue them and diminish the gulf. If one desires to explore the story prior to the splitting inflicted on the psyche, one needs to go back and begin from before Job, Abraham, and Noah, to read the passages in the book of Genesis summarized in John 1: 1 about the beginning of the world. This essay also shows that Fairbairn's theory of endopsychic personality structure is as valuable as Freud, Lacan, and Jung's theories in providing an interpretation of stories, fairytales, myths, and sociopolitical human interactions. Thus, one can extrapolate its potential to interpret movies as well as real-life events like sociopolitical occurrences. For example, one could argue the an individual may perceive the political party one supports as the immaculate *perfect* [emphasis] one (exciting object) that one clings to (libidinal ego) while the opposition is an attacker on one's home (rejecting object) who allows immigrants/foreigners/refugees (internal saboteur) enter the country, a postulate which betrays the truth about the covert yet perpetuating psychic splitting

## References

- Adams, E. (2013). Parallel lives of Jesus: A guide to the four gospels: A journal of bible and theology. *Interpretation*, 67(3), 334. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.calsouthern.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.csu.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/parallel-lives-jesus-guide-four-gospels/docview/1476492189/se-2>
- Archbishop, D. T. (2002). The four gospels: Text as interpretation. *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 47(1-4), 101-110,399. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.calsouthern.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.csu.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/four-gospels-text-as-interpretation/docview/220262757/se-2>
- Asbo, K. E. (2013). *Passion and Paradox: The Myths of Mary Magdalene in Music, Art, and Culture*. [Doctoral dissertation, Pacifica Graduate Institute].
- Bailly, L. (2009). *Lacan: A Beginner's Guide*. Oneworld publications.
- Barry, P. (2017). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (4th edition). Manchester University Press.

Bridges, L. M. (2009). The fourth gospel in four dimensions: Judaism and Jesus, the gospel and scripture: A journal of bible and theology. *Interpretation*, 63(4), 418. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.calsouthern.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.csu.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/fourth-gospel-four-dimensions-judaism-jesus/docview/202705530/se-2>

Celani, D. P. (1994). *The Illusion of Love: Why the Battered Woman Returns to Her Abuser*. Columbia University Press publishing.

Celani, D. P. (2010). *Fairbairn's Object Relations Theory in the Clinical Setting*. Columbia University Press publishing.

Clarke, G. S. (2018). Fairbairn's Object-Relations-Based Psychology of Dynamic Structure, as a Synthesis of the Classical (Thesis) and the Relational (Antithesis) in Psychoanalytic Theory. *Thinking through Fairbairn: Exploring the Object Relations model of Mind* (pp. 165-182). Routledge Publishing.

De Mijolla, A., De Mijolla-Mellor, S. Perron, R., & Golse, B. (Eds.). (2005). *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 2 (P. Beitchman, J. Barque, R. Bononno, A. Brown, D. Collins, L. Gavin, J., G., Simmons, S. Leighton, D. Nicholson-Smith, S. Savaiano, P. Sutton, & G. Wells, Trans.). Thomson Gale Publishing.

Dourley, J. P. (1984). Jung's Ambivalence toward Christianity. *The Illness That We Are: A Jungian Critique of Christianity* (pp. 7-12). Inner City Books publishing.

Dunkly, J. (2015). The four gospels on Sunday: The new testament and the reform of Christian worship. *Sewanee Theological Review*, 58(3), 683. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.calsouthern.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.csu.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/four-gospels-on-sunday-new-testament-reform/docview/2049966722/se-2>

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). A Revised Psychopathology of the Psychoses and Psychoneuroses. *Psychoanalytic Study of Personality* (pp. 28-58). Brunner-Routledge Publishing (Original work published in 1941).

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). A Synopsis of the Development of the Author's View Regarding the Structure of the Personality. *Psychoanalytic Study of Personality* (pp. 162-179). Brunner-Routledge Publishing.

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). Endopsychic Structure Considered in Terms of Object Relationships. *Psychoanalytic Study of Personality* (pp. 82-132). Brunner-Routledge Publishing (Original work published in 1944).

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). Object Relationships and Dynamic Structure. *Psychoanalytic Study of Personality* (pp. 137-151). Brunner-Routledge Publishing (Original work published in 1946).

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). Schizoid Factors in the Personality. *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality* (pp. 3-27). Brunner-Routledge publishing.

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). Steps in the Development of an Object-Relations Theory of the Personality. *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality* (pp. 152-161). Brunner-Routledge publishing. (Original works published in 1949).

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1994). The War Neurosis-Their Nature and Significance. *Psychoanalytic Studies of Personality* (pp. 256-288). Brunner-Routledge publishing.

Freud, S. (2017). Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex. (G. S. Hall Trans.). *Sigmund Freud Collection, Vol. I-Six Books* (pp. 305-378). McAllister Editions publishing. (Original work published in 1905).

Gutrip, H. (1969). The Ultimate Foundations of Ego Identity. *Schizoid Phenomena, Object Relations and the Self* (pp. 243-271). International University Press publishing.

Guntrip, H. (1996). The Schizoid Problem, Regression, and the Struggle to Preserve an Ego. In D. E. Scharff (Ed.). *Object Relations Theory and Practice: an Introduction* (pp. 366-380). Jason Aronson Inc publishing. (Original work published in 1961).

Harrington, J., O.P. (2016). The four gospels: Following in the footsteps of Jesus. *The Catholic Library World*, 86(3), 186-187. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.calsouthern.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest.com.csu.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/four-gospels-following-footsteps-jesus/docview/1781592220/se-2>

Jung, C. G. (2011). *Answer to Job*. (R. F. C. Hull Trans.) Princeton University Press publishing. (Original work published in 1958).

Jung, C. G. (1979). The Shadow. (R. F. C. Hull Trans.). *Aion: Researchers into the Phenomenology of the Self, Vol. 9 Part II* (pp. 8-10). In H. Read, M. Fordham, & G. Adler (Eds.). Princeton University publishing. (Original work published in 1959).

Kast, V. (2006). Anima/Animus. *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology: Theory, Practice, and Applications* (pp.113-129). In R. K. Papadopoulos (Ed.). Routledge publishing.

King James Bible. (2014). *The Reformation Heritage KJV Study Bible*. Reformation Heritage Books publishing.

- Lacan, J. (1985). Feminine Sexuality in Psychoanalytic Doctrine. (J. Rose, Trans.). In J. Mitchell, & J. Rose (Eds.). *Feminine Sexuality* (pp. 123-136). W. W. Norton and Pantheon books publishing. (Original work published in 1975).
- Lacan, J. (1985). The Meaning of the Phallus. (J. Rose, Trans.). In J. Mitchell, & J. Rose (Eds.). *Feminine Sexuality* (pp. 74- 85). W. W. Norton and Pantheon books publishing. (Original work published in 1977).
- Levy, J. (2014). Fairbairn's Unique Contribution to Dream Interpretation. In G. S. Clarke & D. E. Scharff (Eds.), *Fairbairn and the Object Relations Tradition* (pp. 237-248). Routledge publishing.
- Luzyte, R. (2013). *A Theology of Mary: The Non-Christian Myth of Mary, the Shadow of Mary and an Individual Connection to the Divine Self through Mary*. [Doctoral thesis, The University of Stirling].
- Main, R. (2006). Religion. *The Handbook of Jungian Psychology: Theory, Practice, and Application* (pp. 296-323). In R. K. Papadopoulos (Ed.). Routledge publishing.
- McWilliams, N. (2011). *Psychoanalytic Diagnosis: Understanding Personality Structure in the Clinical Process* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press publishing.
- Puncher, M., Akbari, S., Denecke, W., Fuchs, B., Levine, C., Lewis, P., & Wilson, E. (Eds.). (2014). *The Norton Anthology: Western Literature* (9th ed., Vol. 1). W.W. Norton & Company publishing.
- Quinodoz, J. M. (2005). *Reading Freud: A Chronological Exploration of Freud's Writings* (D. Alcorn, Trans.). Routledge publishing. (Original work published in 2004).
- Scharff, D. E. (1996). The Major Trends in Object Relations Theory and Practice. *Object Relations Theory and Practice: an Introduction* (pp. 3-23). Jason Aronson Publishing.
- Stein, M. (1999). Introduction. *Jung on Christianity* (pp. 3-23). Princeton University Press publishing.

**Rhett-Lawson Mohajer** earned his Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) from California Southern University. His doctoral research “Duet with Fairbairn: Psychoanalysis, Music, and the Endopsychic Personality Structure,” was a qualitative research on the impacts of music improvisation on the endopsychic structure. He is an editorial board member at Dialogues in Health. He is a registered psychotherapist, a registered clinical counsellor, a psychoanalyst, and a musician.

**Tara Rava Zolnikov** earned a PhD in Developmental Science from North Dakota State University. She has published extensively in some of the world's most renowned public health and global health journals, including The Lancet Oncology, American Journal of Public Health, AIDS and Behavior, Science of the Total Environment, and many more. In 2017, she received the Editors Choice Reviewer of the Year Award at the American Journal in Public Health.