

I. THE FOUR TEMPERAMENTS AND ASTROLOGY

Brian Myers begins his paper with an attempt to wrest the four temperaments from astrology. He says: “The Bobgans claim that the four temperaments and astrology are inseparable—so those who play with the one are unwittingly toying with the other.”⁷ He backs up that assertion by quoting us:

Even though Christians who use the four temperaments today do so without the rest of astrology, the four temperaments are that feature of astrology made palatable for Christians.⁸

We do not say that the four temperaments and astrology are inseparable, but rather that they are a feature of the rest of astrology. Furthermore, we do not talk lightly about the use of the four temperaments as being playthings. It is serious business when one uses an extrabiblical source to understand the nature of man, why he is and how he is to change.

Myers then continues by charting the astrological triplicities with their corresponding temperaments:

Choleric:	Aries, Leo, Sagittarius
Melancholy:	Taurus, Virgo, Capricorn
Sanguine:	Gemini, Libra, Aquarius
Phlegmatic:	Cancer, Scorpio, Pisces ⁹

He asks: “But DO those born under a certain sign actually share it’s [sic] corresponding temperament?”¹⁰ Fred Gettings, in his *Dictionary of Astrology*, contends that they do.

In his attempt to prove that characteristics of the zodiac signs are not related to those of the four temperaments, Myers uses Ken Voges as an example. Myers alludes that although Voges is a Leo, he could not be a choleric. Thus we quote from Gettings concerning the fire triplicity (choleric) and Leo:

FIRE TRIPPLICITY These are the three signs derived from the element of fire, manifesting different aspects of the CHOLERIC temperament: Aries, Leo and Sagittarius. Fire may be visualized as a source of great heat, smouldering, ready to leap into high flame. Leo is a creative fire, sometimes radiating warmth as from a hearth, usually an illumination for others. . . . Each of the fire signs is impulsive and dynamic, sometimes over-confident or even brash and exhibitionist. . . . Leo is creative by imposing his own warmth on things of the earth—through the arts of painting and sculpture, for example. . . .¹¹

Whether Voges fits any of the above description is immaterial since all of these typologies are speculative, superficial, and fraught with the many problems we document on pages 5 through 17 in *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*.¹²

One can see the similarity of the sun sign characteristics with the choleric temperament teachings by looking at the following brief lists:

Fire Triplexity

expressive/destructive
 confident
 impulsive
 drive to egohood (Aries)
 selfish (especially Aries)¹³

Choleric temperament

active/aggressive
 confident
 quick to anger
 strong-willed
 inconsiderate

Myers uses a single example of Ken Voges in his attempt to disprove the four temperament/astrology connection. Myers asks:

Is Ken voges [sic] (Leo) a choleric? (Just ask Linda!) If not, then though the temperaments may be attached to the Zodiac in theory, they're not in fact related; and it might begin to look like a charge of guilt by association.¹⁴ (Emphasis his.)

Myers continually demonstrates poor logic throughout his paper and this is one of the numerous examples. A single example of Ken Voges with his astrological sign and assumed temperament type is really irrelevant. We can name numerous people who have been typed by the DiSC who are not the type indicated. Does that mean Myers would thus conclude, as he did using one example of Ken Voges, that the DiSC system is invalid? Statistically speaking, the DiSC system is invalid. However, logically speaking and using Myers' reasoning, the DiSC system becomes invalid.

From this one Ken Voges example, Myers concludes that the four temperaments are "not in fact related" to the zodiac. And if he wants to remain consistent, Myers (with his one example which he claims leads to his conclusion) must also conclude the DiSC invalid.

We don't wish to elaborate on this here, but if Myers believes he has proved "they're not in fact related," he is more ignorant about how astrologers use the system than he should be—and this after he supposedly researched the area. Astrologers do use the zodiac and many use the accompanying four temperaments and would be able to explain away Myers' one silly example.

Myers refers to a study to which we refer in our book—a study that examines the validity of astrology. Myers says:

They [Bobgans] use it to prove that astrology is bogus But they end up arguing in circles. After mentioning the study, they argue—almost in the same breath—that Eysenck's Personality Inventory (the basis of the study, itself based on the four temperaments) is invalid!¹⁵

Myers goes on to say:

How could this study be both highly critical and "highly problematical," both scientific and invalid? And how could he get to a valid conclusion about astrology (one which the Bobgans support) based on an invalid premise about personality (one which they do not support)? Clearly they'd like to have it both ways, depending on their agenda. This is typical of the Bobgans' arguments: a selective use of evidence to build what may be a house of cards.¹⁶ (Emphasis his.)

Myers very often displays dexterity in using information in most incredible ways! Here is a brief summary of what we were actually communicating: Eysenck did use a scientific procedure to put astrology to the test. As a part of that procedure he used an instrument called the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI). The EPI, we say in our book:

. . . has its own problems because of the highly subjective nature of introversion and extroversion. The same problems occur with the four temperaments. In fact, the four temperaments embody both the problems of astrological predictions of temperament and the problems of personality inventories, which we will discuss later.¹⁷

But the real reason Eysenck rejected the original study had nothing to do with the use of the EPI. As we say in our book, Eysenck himself concluded:

. . . the entire astrological effect [of the original study] was due to the subjects' expectation and familiarity with the characteristics associated with their Zodiac signs.¹⁸

Myers is only confused about this because he begins hell-bent to exonerate Voges and thus misreads and misrepresents what we say. Astrology has scientifically been tested in numerous ways and found wanting. What we have said in our book is accurate; what Myers says we say is a distortion. To test out Myers' conclusions about what we say, read Chapter 3 of *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing* and see the difference. Myers begins with an agenda (defend Voges!), selectively uses things from what we write, and then obfuscates. As we reveal his bias on issue after issue, let the reader come to his own conclusion regarding Myers' motivation.

By referring to Voges's personality in reference to Leo and the fire triplicity, Myers evidently believes he has clearly shown that the zodiac signs and the temperaments are not related psychologically, because he says:

But even if the Zodiac signs and the temperaments are not related psychologically, are they related spiritually?¹⁹

Myers failed to prove that they are "not related psychologically." He merely gave the erroneous Ken Voges example and made an assumption. This is one example of too many assumptions and too little proof in Myers' paper.

Myers then reveals his ignorance of astrology by making it synonymous with polytheism. While some who used astrology believed the stars were celestial beings, such belief was not a requirement for faith in astrology. Ancient Greeks who relied on astrology and taught the concept of "as above, so below" were not all polytheistic. Thus, Myers' argument that we are equating the four temperaments with polytheism does not hold. A more accurate assessment would be this. Some included a polytheistic faith in their use of astrology. The four temperaments are part of astrology. Some who used the four temperaments were polytheistic; some were monotheistic; some were pantheistic. Galen, whom we will discuss later, taught that there was one creative force: translated as demiurge or Nature.^{20, 21}

In our book we did not directly equate the four temperaments with polytheism. A system of understanding the nature of man does not have to be polytheistic to be unbiblical. Myers continues:

The Bobgans title their second chapter. “The Occult Origin of the Four Temperaments.” “Occult” here means astrology and its close relative, polytheism. They tell us it all began in ancient Greece with the four elements of Greek cosmology: Air, Fire, Earth and Water.²²

Here Myers demonstrates his illogical reasoning. If one says that astrology is part of the occult, it does not follow that the two are synonymous. If one were to use that kind of logic, one would have to say that since all dogs are animals, all animals are dogs. Then, Myers jumps to a further confusion: that we are in some way saying *occult* means *polytheism*. This reveals either poor reading or poor logic on his part.²³

Myers then says that “the Bobgans beg a nest of questions.” Myers nowhere in his paper shows that we have committed the logical fallacy of begging the question. Nowhere in his paper does he give the form of our begging the question, possibly because he does not know how to. For the benefit of the reader, we quote from a text on logic: “Begging the question is the fallacy of assuming as true the very point under question.”²⁴ It is a type of circular reasoning. This is one of many examples of Myers’ careless use of words and their meaning.

Myers asks, “Couldn’t the theoretical (four elements, four humors) just happened to have mirrored the actual (four temperaments)?”²⁵ (Emphasis his.) That statement certainly reveals Myers’ faith in the four temperaments. What “actual” four temperaments are there? They are as theoretical as the four elements and the four humors. They are as theoretical as the numerous typologies we describe in our chapter “A Circus of Personality Types.”²⁶ One can see that Myers is approaching this discussion with a firm bias.

He further asks, “And since when does an unscientific explanation (elements) invalidate an observable phenomenon (temperaments)?”²⁷ While Myers and others who believe in the temperaments also believe that the temperaments are “observable,” they do not realize they are observing through the lens of a theory.

Yes, we can observe the external expression of certain traits. We can categorize those traits into four temperaments. But, we are not observing a temperament (according to a four temperament model); we are observing the expression of one trait or another. Most people have at least some amounts of those traits, since they are human traits. Yet, the categories themselves are still theoretical. Myers should reread Chapter 7, “Typology Problems,” of *Four Temperament, Astrology & Personality Testing*. He appears to have bought into those errors of thinking that are typical of people who believe in such typologies.

Just because psychological systems and personality theories **seem** to explain the person and his behavior, that does not mean the explanations are accurate. When we consider that there are numerous competing systems, each of which pretends to explain personhood, something must be amiss. World-renowned scholar and philosopher of science Sir Karl Popper examined such psychological theories. He says:

These theories appeared to be able to explain practically everything that happened within the fields to which they referred. The study of any of them seemed to have the effect of an intellectual conversion or revelation, opening

your eyes to a new truth hidden from those not yet initiated. Once your eyes were thus opened you saw confirming instances everywhere: the world was full of *verifications* of the theory. Whatever happened always confirmed it.²⁸ (Emphasis his.)

At first glance this may look like promising evidence for using psychological theories like the four temperaments. However, Popper insists that constant confirmations and seeming ability to explain everything do not indicate scientific validity. What looks like a strength is actually a weakness. He says, “It is easy to obtain confirmations or verifications, for nearly every theory—if we look for confirmations. . . . Confirming evidence should not count *except when it is the result of a genuine test of the theory.*”²⁹ (Emphasis his.)

Popper further indicates that psychological theories such as Freud’s and others’ do not meet scientific requirements: “A theory which is not refutable by any conceivable event is nonscientific. Irrefutability is not a virtue of a theory (as people often think) but a vice.”³⁰ He concludes that, “though posing as sciences,” such theories “had in fact more in common with primitive myths than with science; that they resembled astrology rather than astronomy.”³¹

In his attempt to separate the four temperaments from astrology, Myers thinks he has very possibly separated the four temperaments from the four elements. Yet, most historians affirm the relationship. Thus we can understand why Myers backs off and asks, “And what’s wrong with being distant relations to the elemental foursome?”³² But, we would ask, where does Myers get the word *distant* to define the relationship between the elements, humors, and temperaments? Certainly not from the historians or academicians.

Myers is the one who would like to keep the relationship distant in order to make it appear that any relationship between the temperaments and the horoscope is merely coincidental and tangential. He certainly is motivated to make the temperaments pure and undefiled. Why? Because he believes in them? Because he would like to defend Voges at any cost?

Again, Myers accuses us of implying that the problem of the four elements is polytheism, perhaps because we indicate that Empedocles associated the elements with deities. Our problem with the four temperaments (which are related to the four elements) has to do with their relationship to astrology as a whole—not limited to those who worshipped the stars as particular deities. Whether astrologers or occultists are polytheists or monotheists makes no real difference. Their religious view of the universe is not acceptable to God.

Myers also makes another error in logic by saying, “They [Bobgans] say the Greeks later reasoned from elements to humors to temperament—thus the Bobgans infer an occultic origin (though twice removed) for the temperaments.”³³ The occultic origin is not inferred. It has been established through historical records. The idea of the temperaments being part of the occult has to do with their relationship to astrology. The relationship of the elements to deities is not the core problem. It is merely one piece of the history of the temperament theory, which Myers would like to defend. Perhaps a dictionary definition of *occult* would be helpful to Myers: “designating or of certain alleged mystic arts, such as magic, alchemy, astrology, etc.”³⁴

In his eagerness to defend the four temperaments and to wrest them from Empedocles, since he was a polytheist, Myers declares:

Empedocles did not discover this classical quartet of the elements—as the Bobgans imply. All scholars agree that the doctrine of the four elements was attributed to Heraclitus, who lived a generation earlier.³⁵ (Emphasis his.)

First of all, we are glad that Myers did not accuse us of saying Empedocles “discovered” the four elements, since we would not say that. Even so, most historical references to the four elements are associated with the name Empedocles. In our book, we were careful to say that Empedocles “taught that there were four primary elements in the known universe: fire, air, earth and water.”³⁶ We certainly hope that Myers was merely reporting what he looked up in the library and that he had no intention to discredit our research.

On the other hand, we are amazed that Myers would say, “All scholars agree that the doctrine of the four elements was attributed to Heraclitus.”³⁷ How many might **all** be, when many of the historical accounts of the four elements, four humors, and four temperaments do not even mention Heraclitus? It appears that the contribution of Heraclitus of Ephesus to a doctrine of the four elements was primarily fire. Medical historian, Dr. Cecilia C. Mettler says that Heraclitus “maintained that fire was the fundamental constituent of the cosmos.”³⁸

The two scholars whom Myers quotes and who must for him represent “all scholars” are Edward Hussey and Walter Kaufmann. Kaufmann makes an interesting statement. In speaking of the “so-called river fragments,” he says:

In the following section, the role assigned to fire is striking. Thales had considered water the basic principle; Anaximenes, air; now Heraclitus introduces fire.³⁹

Rather than presenting a closed system of four elements, Heraclitus was primarily interested in fire and change in the cosmos. Hussey quotes Heraclitus’ description of the cosmos as “fire ever-living, being kindled by measures and being quenched by measures.”⁴⁰ Heraclitus’ contribution primarily had to do with physical changes brought about by fire.

In his eagerness to attribute the discovery of the four elements and their qualities to Heraclitus, Myers hastily declares, “All scholars agree that the doctrine of the four elements was attributed to Heraclitus.”⁴¹ Such an erroneous conclusion may have come from a hasty reading of Hussey’s musings about a possible reconstruction of what Heraclitus might have taught concerning the four elements and the four qualities. Because of the limited amount of remaining documents of Heraclitus’ writings, Hussey refers to the writings of Theophrastus (approx. 372-287 BC) to determine what Heraclitus might have taught. Hussey is scholar enough not to make any definite claims. He says his reconstruction “seems to fit well with most of the evidence” and he admits his reconstruction “is based only upon plausibilities.”

Myers quotes the following sentence from Heraclitus’ writings:

Fire lives the death of earth, and air the death of fire; water lives the death of air, earth that of water. [76;F*]⁴²

However, Kaufmann, the author of the book in which this quotation appears, indicates: “An asterisk (*) indicates that the translation has been revised slightly—often, but not always, very slightly indeed, for purely stylistic reasons.”⁴³ Even if this were an exact translation, one sentence speaking of the relationship of fire, earth, air, and water does not equal a system of four elements making up the entire cosmos. Thus, Myers’ two historical references do not

even supply one scholar who would positively attribute the four elements and their properties to Heraclitus.

As for Empedocles' "quaternary system of elemental constitution," Mettler says:

. . . it is very probable that the system antedated not only Empedocles but also Pythagoras. Thus there is some evidence of its existence in Egypt before the time of the latter, though not in Greece, and it seems to have certain elements in common with the number system of the Babylonians and Chaldeans.⁴⁴

We did not want to get into the speculation of the four elements' connection to the Babylonians, even though that would further connect the four temperaments to Babylonian astrology. Nevertheless, the Babylonian connection certainly makes sense, since the twelve signs of the zodiac were, as one historian puts it, "the invention of the Babylonians."⁴⁵

Babylonian astrology was brought to the island of Cos, the home of Hippocratic medicine, and was thereby incorporated into the medicine of the day. Thus, the root of the four temperaments may indeed extend back to Babylon and Babylonian astrology. However, in our book, we wanted to keep the historical account as simple as possible and as accurate as possible. We contend that many scholars would say Empedocles taught a theory of the four elements, but not one scholar would categorically declare that Heraclitus discovered the four elements.

What is intriguing in Myers' argument over the discovery of the four elements is his unfruitful attempt to purify the four elements. And this is how he hopes to do that: by declaring Heraclitus a monotheist! But, what might that mean in Ephesus 500 years before Christ? Is Myers saying that anyone who is a monotheist is more credible than one who is a polytheist? Would he therefore believe a Muslim's theory of personality simply because a Muslim is monotheistic?

Myers further eulogizes Heraclitus by saying, "Heraclitus focused on the empirical, on what could be observed, on 'defining each thing according to its nature, and showing how it is' by first-hand observation."⁴⁶ That is all well and good, but that does not wrest the whole system of the elements, the humors, and the temperaments from astrology. The argument is tangential and fruitless. Myers' "sterling pedigree"⁴⁷ simply does not provide a "sterling pedigree" to the four temperaments.

Myers continues his attempt to purify the pedigree by saying:

Finally, they [we assume Myers is referring to the Greeks, though there is no antecedent for the pronoun] did not reason from elements to humors to temperaments: rather from the qualities (hot, cold, dry, moist) that made up the elements.⁴⁸ (Emphasis his.)

Myers then says Heraclitus focused on the qualities, as if that makes some point for the purity of the four temperaments system.

In our book, we list the qualities of the elements (see pages 21 and 24) along with the elements because those very qualities are what contributed to the development of the theory of the humors. All Myers seems to be accomplishing in such tangential argumentation is to show that he went to the library and read in some books.

At this point in his paper, Myers evidently thinks he has wrested the temperaments from the zodiac by their "fruits" (through his failed attempt to disconnect the four temperaments from the zodiac through his single example of Voges) and by their "roots"

(through his failed attempt to apply the so-called “sterling pedigree” of Heraclitus to the four temperaments).

Myers now begins his next argument. He attempts to show that even if astrologers did discover the four temperaments it should not matter. Why? Because Myers confuses physical science with metaphysical nonsense. He asks this series of questions:

But Isaac Newton was a believer in astrology. Does this invalidate the theory of Newtonian Physics? And Ptolemy was a believer, and Kepler, and Galileo, and Tycho Brahe. Does this automatically debunk everything they said? Even today can't a good scientist be an atheist?⁴⁹

While we don't want to complicate this paper by dealing with all the logical fallacies in Myers' paper, we do need to deal with his straw man fallacy. According to one logic text:

The *straw man* fallacy occurs when an arguer responds to an opponent's argument by misrepresenting it in a manner that makes it appear more vulnerable than it really is, proceeds to attack that argument, and implies that he or she has defeated the opponent. It is called the straw man fallacy because, rather than attacking the “real man,” the opponent sets up and knocks over a “straw man.”⁵⁰

After giving several examples, the text concludes:

To recognize the straw man fallacy, look for a response that misrepresents an opponent's argument in order to defeat it more easily. The arguer appears to be attacking the opponent's position, but in fact the arguer is attacking a misrepresentation of it.⁵¹

Myers commits the straw man fallacy by grossly misrepresenting our argument. He begins to build his straw man by confusing the natural world (physics) with the supernatural world (astrology). He compounds his error by inferring that our position is one that would reject a man's science if he were an occultist. This is a total misrepresentation of our view. If Myers were at all familiar with our work, he would know that we have quoted numerous atheists, but in the areas of their scientific expertise. We will turn to one now. Dr. Thomas Szasz, one of the best-known psychiatrists in the world, says that people's reasoning often becomes confused because they confuse the material and the immaterial such as physics and astrology. Szasz elaborates by giving examples of mind and brain and of issues and tissues. This is the error that Myers has made. And we have just used a well-known secular humanist who does have something to say in the area of logic.

Myers is probably not aware of it, but he is not only committing the straw man fallacy; he is also accusing us of the genetic fallacy, which is a form of the ad hominem fallacy. The genetic fallacy is one in which the individual committing it will not consider what another person says merely because of who he is or what he represents. We have had some well-known Christian researchers reject what the Nobelist Dr. Richard Feynman says about science merely because he is an atheist. When an atheist scientifically discovers something about the natural world (science), we will consider what he says from a scientific perspective. However, when an atheist or occultist “discovers” something about the

metaphysical world (four temperaments and astrology), we will reject it on the basis of the admonitions of Scripture.

Myers next argument revolves around the person of Claudius Galen. Here he attempts to prove that Galen's development of the four temperaments theory could not be related to astrology. Myers says:

The Bobgans conceded [sic] that "much of what Galen wrote did not (emphasis added) include astrology" (including his work on the temperaments); but they argue that he was a nonetheless believer in astrology, based on his *Prognostication of Disease by Astrology*.⁵²

Myers then declares that "one of the foremost experts on Galen, Rudolph Siegel, tells us that this work—attributed to Galen— was not authored by him."⁵³ This is a very important point to Myers, because he mistakenly thinks that our "main argument turns on the astrological beliefs of this one man."⁵⁴

Siegel declares that Galen:

. . . strongly opposed the popular belief that mystic powers interfere with human life. His teaching was seriously misinterpreted by medieval and later authors who related Galen's teleological concepts to the cosmological and astrological ideas of his contemporaries.⁵⁵

Siegel then cites the following from Galen in his attempt to illustrate Galen's so-called contempt for astrology:

The ancients sufficiently acquainted with nature asserted that the living organism resembles a small universe (*mikron cosmon*). In both [the *macrocosmos* and the *microcosmos*] you will find the same wisdom of the *demiourgos*, the craftsman.⁵⁶

Galen then indeed says how ridiculous it was for some of his contemporaries to take the idea so literally as to believe that the sun is in the body and that "the sun rises from the substance of the blood."⁵⁷ However, Galen's statement, "In both [the *macrocosmos* and the *microcosmos*] you will find the same wisdom of the *demiourgos*, the craftsman," reveals that he believed in a deity similar to Plato's—a demiurge. (Myers conveniently ellipses this portion of Galen's statement in his quotation.) Belief in a demiurge as creator does leave room for some mysticism and the inclusion of astrological thinking.

In describing the Middle Ages, historian Frederick Artz says:

Plato's *Timaeus* became a breviary for astrologers and magicians; the myth of the Demiurge, creating the world as a living organism, every part of which is intimately related to every other, came to be used as the great justification of ideas of the macrocosm and the microcosm and of the influence of heavenly bodies on the lives of men.⁵⁸

How closely Galen's demiurge resembled Plato's is not clear, but such ideas certainly flowed into the Middle Ages.

Determining authenticity of ancient texts can be difficult, to say the least. Since so many are attributed to Galen and since he contradicted himself and changed ideas through the years, it is very probable that certain texts may not seem as authentic as others. Those who question Galen's authorship are similar to those who argue convincingly, with much evidence, that Shakespeare did not write the plays attributed to him. Some argue that Christopher Marlowe wrote them and others contend that Ben Jonson was the man behind the pen. Even today, with all of the ghost writing going on among Christians, who knows who really wrote what?

Two medical/psychiatric historians, Dr. Franz Alexander and Dr. Sheldon Selesnick, describe Claudius Galen this way:

He was a great borrower: he plagiarized, synthesized, embellished, and copied. He utilized the mysticism of Plato, the Stoicism of Zeno, and the anatomical works of Herophilus and Erasistratus, and he had Epicurean tastes.⁵⁹

No wonder there are questions about what Galen wrote, practiced and believed!

An equally authoritative historian, Lynn Thorndike, gives credence to Galen's authorship of *Prognostication of Disease by Astrology*. Thorndike also reports that Galen ridiculed certain practices of astrology, such as Pamphilus' use of horoscopic herbs. Yet Thorndike says:

On the other hand, one of his [Galen's] objections to the atomists is that "they despise augury, dreams, portents, and all astrology," as well as that they deny a divine artificer of the world and an innate moral law to the soul. Thus atheism and disbelief in astrology are put on much the same plane.⁶⁰

Thorndike also refers to another work by Galen, "a treatise on critical days in which the influence of the moon upon disease is assumed." In that book Galen related the moon's phases in relation to conceptions and birth and "all beginnings of actions." Thorndike says that, in the treatise, Galen considered the moon's relationship "to the other planets and to the signs of the zodiac" and that "much astrological technical detail is introduced."⁶¹

Whether Galen was the author of all that is ascribed to him or not, those works continued to be used into the Middle Ages. Here is a description of the influence of astrology during medieval times.

The complexity of astrology was as great as that of alchemy. The sun, which moved regularly in a circle, controlled the more ordered events of nature, such as night and day and the four seasons. The planets, on the other hand, less certain in their motion, governed the more variable events in the world, the happenings that make life so uncertain. It was to the assessment of the factors governing these events, in a zone between the sure and the unsure, that astrology set itself. The signs of the zodiac were connected with the four elements, the four qualities, the four humors, and the four winds. The human body was divided into twelve sections each one under the control of one of the signs of the zodiac. The seven planets were connected with the seven days of the week, the seven ages of man and of the world. Everything in the life of man and of nature was believed to be governed by the stars. In making

predictions, astrology dealt with the following: *nativities*, **the determination of a person’s temperament from the positions of the constellations at the time of his birth**; *revolutions*, the predictions of general events, weather, crops, and political changes; and *elections*, the art of selecting the right moment to do anything from planting a bean to deposing a king.⁶² (Emphasis added.)

Whether Galen can be exonerated from involvement with the continued development of the temperaments along with astrology does not purify the temperaments, even though Galen codified them and wrote more about them. From what Alexander and Selesnick say about Galen being a “great borrower,” one might even suspect he merely borrowed from others in codifying the four temperaments. Alexander and Selesnick conclude their section on Galen by saying:

Galen transmitted to the medieval world some rays of Hellenistic culture. Nevertheless, **because he codified the primitive notions of his era, he also helped to retard the development of medicine for centuries.**⁶³ (Emphasis added.)

Conversely, Myers desires to present Galen as a man of science rather than one of superstition. Myers glowingly praises Hippocrates and Galen:

But it should not be surprising that Hippocrates and Galen—these fathers of modern medicine—these pioneers of the clinical diagnosis—these professionals in the science of naturalistic observation—should have discovered and detailed what may be the four fundamental temperaments of human nature. That they of all the ancients uncovered them supports rather than undermines their validity.⁶⁴ (Emphasis his.)

Wow! What a thrilling possibility! To find that they “should have discovered and detailed what may be the four fundamental temperaments of human nature”! Sorry, there is no support for the validity of what they “uncovered.”

Even Siegel, the same historian Myers quotes regarding the questionable authorship of *Prognostication of Disease by Astrology*, says of Galen’s descriptions of the temperaments:

Only in a few instances can we associate a Galenic temperament with our own observations. Thus, we read:

‘Warmer people are more hairy, less fat, have very reddish faces and blacker hair.’
 ‘The colder persons are hairless and fat; they feel cool to touch; the hair on their head is more reddish; they appear livid in cold surroundings, a color which the physicians compared to that of lead.’⁶⁵
 (Emphasis added.)

In other words, Galen’s so-called “scientific observations” and descriptions of the temperaments rarely fit contemporary observations. Galen only codified and embellished up to a point.

Concerning Galen's temperaments and constitutional types, Siegel further says:

Galen often classified the constitutional types by the prevailing humors instead of by qualities, even when he assumed a combination of more than two qualities. The union of warm and dry was deemed as characteristic of yellow bile; of cold and dry of black bile; of warm and moist of blood; of cold and moist of phlegm.

Like other physicians of his period, Galen assumed that yellow bile made people intelligent and sharp; that black bile rendered them steadfast and solid, whereas the phlegm appeared a useless humor. Unexpectedly, he defined blood as a humor which rendered people simple (*haplous*) and foolish.⁶⁶

Myers appears too eager to validate what cannot be scientifically validated. Irrespective of the relationship of the four temperaments to astrology, Myers cannot validate the four temperaments through acceptable scientific methods. They constitute a faith system, just like all of the other different personality theories, such as those of Freud, Jung, Adler, etc.

Myers then leaves the breathtaking peaks of praising Galen and stoops to accuse us of being the ones to link the PPS model to the four temperaments. Doesn't he read footnotes? We were simply quoting Voges and Braund. **They** are the ones who say:

The Greek words "Choleric," "Sanguine," "Phlegmatic," and "Melancholic" are **synonymous terms** to the DiSC and used by some Christian writers to identify the differences in behavior. Most known is Dr. Tim LaHaye.⁶⁷ (Emphasis added.)

Myers apparently denies what Voges and Braund themselves say about the terms being synonymous. Myers then declares:

Though the four types of each system (the PPS and the midieval [sic]) closely parallel eachother [sic], a quick study shows that they were independently arrived at.⁶⁸ (Emphasis his.)

A "quick study" is a superficial, nonscientific way of dealing with this issue. There are too many "quick studies" that lead to error. While the congruity may not have been intentional, anyone who has worked with traits and types is familiar with both and will tend to be influenced by his prior knowledge.

William Marston, the originator of the DiSC model, could not have been immune to those influences. Nevertheless, Myers returns to his mountain peak of praise and says:

Marston himself was an [sic] careful observer of men, and (not by chance?) he fleshed out his four types just like Hippocrates and Galen did: by observing physical characteristics of the human machine, both internal and external.⁶⁹

Would Myers agree that others who have devised personality typologies have done the same, even if their results and emphases are contrary to Marston's? Various people observe

various traits and arrange them according to their own theories. Are they less scientific in observation?

Myers is impressed by Marston's work because Marston used observation and measurement of emotional responses. He says:

Marston focused on a laboratory analysis of bodily emotional mechanisms, "a scientific description of emotional consciousness." He discovered his four types by empirical observation alone.⁷⁰

Myers evidently does not understand that a person can observe and record behavior as accurately as possible and yet have a faulty theory. Thus, we would have no confidence in the system based upon the evidence Myers gives. Why did Marston come up with four types rather than six or eight? We suggest Myers read Chapter 6 of *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing* for a bit of perspective on temperament and personality typologies. We disagree with Myers' assertion that Marston "discovered his four types by empirical observation alone."⁷¹

Myers ends his praise of Marston by saying, "To this day his work is considered a good theoretical basis for personality assessment." If Marston's work "is considered a good theoretical basis for personality assessment," why is it almost totally absent from the academic literature? Marston's book did go out of print. A condensed version of it is currently offered by Performax Systems International, Inc. (PSII). Remember, however, that PSII is the company that commercializes the PPS and would, therefore, have an interest in promoting it.

Once more we challenge Myers. Take one hundred academic texts on psychology. See if you can even find Marston's name. It's not there. We tried. Its almost total absence from the academic literature more easily proves Myers' zeal in protecting and defending Voges than seeking truth.

One of the interesting things told to us by one of the Performax promoters of the PPS is that it is related to both the four temperaments and the four personality preferences of the psychiatrist Dr. Carl G. Jung. Jung's typology consists of the extroversion/introversion dichotomy with four basic psychic functions. Jung originally divided people into three groups: introverted, extroverted, and normal. He said of the normal group:

. . . this group is the most numerous and includes the less differentiated normal man. . . . The normal man is, by definition, influenced as much from within as from without. He constitutes the extensive middle group, on one side of which are those whose motivations are determined mainly by the external object, and on the other, whose motivations are determined from within. I call the first group extroverted, and the second group introverted.⁷²

Now, however, Jung's abnormal categories have become household descriptives for everyone.

Jung also distinguished four basic psychic functions: sensation, thinking, feeling, intuition. From this he placed people into corresponding groups:

For complete orientation all four functions should contribute equally: thinking should facilitate cognition and judgment, feeling should tell us how and to what extent a thing is important or unimportant for us, sensation should

convey concrete reality to us through seeing, hearing, tasting, etc., and intuition should enable us to divine the hidden possibilities in the background, since these too belong to the complete picture of a given situation.

In reality, however, these basic functions are seldom or never uniformly differentiated.⁷³

Therefore Jung divided people into four types: sensation types, thinking types, feeling types, and intuitives.⁷⁴ He then combined those types with introversion and extroversion.⁷⁵ He used such classifications in working with neurotic individuals. Jung did not consider typing normal people to be useful and even believed that practice to be “a childish parlor game.”⁷⁶

Jung rejected Christianity and was heavily immersed in the occult to the extent that he had a spirit guide by the name of Philemon. In fact, much of what Jung wrote was inspired by disembodied spirits. In *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, Jung says:

Philemon and other figures of my fantasies brought home to me the crucial insight that there are things in the psyche which I do not produce, but which produce themselves and have their own life. Philemon represented a force which was not myself. In my fantasies I held conversations with him, and he said things which I had not consciously thought. For I observed clearly that it was he who spoke, not I.⁷⁷

It is out of this cauldron of occult practices, use of spirit guides, and familiarity with the four temperaments that Jung obtained his four preferences. It is interesting that the Performax representative connected the DiSC, the four temperaments, and the four Jungian preferences. Coincidental? We think not.

Myers says, “The Bobgans fail to cite or consult Marston’s work.”⁷⁸ We do refer to Marston’s work on page 77 of *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. It’s a bit presumptuous to say that we did not consult the work. We do have Marston’s book *Emotions of Normal People* and we have studied it. That is why we do not agree with Myers’ evaluation of Marston’s work. The book is theoretical and speculative from a secular, humanistic perspective. Furthermore, though Marston used the scientific method, his typology is not science any more than if one were to use the scientific method to investigate astrology and then conclude that astrology is science. By the way, does Myers have a copy of Marston’s book? Has he read it?

At the end of this section, Myers sums up his arguments as if he has made his case. Then he declares: “The temperaments aren’t unclean in themselves.”⁷⁹ He has categorically taken it upon himself to declare the four temperaments clean. By what authority and upon what basis?

The authority Myers appeals to is Scripture. But, he has to distort the meaning in order to apply it to the temperaments. He equates the temperament teachings with meat sacrificed to idols. Does he not understand that the doctrines of men are not the same as physical food? Paul understood that food itself was not contaminated through its use in pagan practice. However, Paul and the other apostles were concerned about doctrine. And that is what the four temperaments are. They are doctrines (teachings) connected with the doctrines (teachings) of astrology. Paul clearly warned:

Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (Colossians 2:8).

This verse clearly warns against following the ways of man in matters of life and faith.

Paul warned and he judged teachings. Judging a man's teaching is not the same as judging a person. We certainly hope Myers is not suggesting in his paper that we are judging people. We do not judge those who may be deceived by the four temperaments or other psychological typologies, but we do attempt to evaluate teachings according to the Word of God. And, because so many Christians who promote the wisdom of men appeal to science for justification, we also evaluate such teachings according to scientific standards.

We do not understand what Myers means when he refers to "the professional weaker brother." We do understand clearly, however, that Myers has concluded that "nothing is unclean in itself." What about "doctrines of devils"?

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. (1 Timothy 4:1-3.)

-
- ⁷7. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 2.
- ⁸8. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, p. 31.
- ⁹9. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 2.
- ¹⁰10. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 2.
- ¹¹11. Fred Gettings. *Dictionary of Astrology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985, p. 125.
- ¹²12. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, pp. 5-17.
- ¹³13. Fred Gettings. *Dictionary of Astrology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985, pp. 24, 124-125.
- ¹⁴14. Myers, p. 2.
- ¹⁵15. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, pp. 2, 3.
- ¹⁶16. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 3.
- ¹⁷17. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, p. 38.
- ¹⁸18. *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹19. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Branch Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 3.
- ²⁰20. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- ²¹21. Claudius Galen. *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*, Vol. 1. Margaret Tallmadge May, trans. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968, p. 263.
- ²²22. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 3.
- ²³23. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 3.
- ²⁴24. Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1992, p. 258.
- ²⁵25. Myers, p. 4.
- ²⁶26. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, Chapter 6.
- ²⁷27. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ²⁸28. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, p. 343.
- ²⁹29. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, pp. 344-345.
- ³⁰30. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, p. 344.
- ³¹31. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, pp. 343.
- ³²32. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ³³33. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ³⁴34. *New World Dictionary of the American Language*, Second College Edition. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

-
- ³⁵35. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ³⁶36. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, p. 19.
- ³⁷37. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ³⁸38. Cecilia C. Mettler. *History of Medicine*. Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1947, p. 9.
- ³⁹39. Walter Kaufmann. *Philosophic Classics, Vol. 1: Thales to Ockham*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968, p. 14.
- ⁴⁰40. Edward Hussey, *The Presocratics*. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1972, p. 51.
- ⁴¹41. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ⁴²42. Walter Kaufmann. *Philosophic Classics, Vol. 1: Thales to Ockham*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968, p. 16.
- ⁴³43. Walter Kaufmann. *Philosophic Classics, Vol. 1: Thales to Ockham*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968, p. 4.
- ⁴⁴44. Cecilia C. Mettler. *History of Medicine*. Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1947, p. 9.
- ⁴⁵45. S. J. Tester. *A History of Western Astrology*. Suffolk, UK: The Boydell Press, 1987, p. 25.
- ⁴⁶46. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 4.
- ⁴⁷47. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 5.
- ⁴⁸48. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 5.
- ⁴⁹49. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 5.
- ⁵⁰50. Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1992, p. 260.
- ⁵¹51. *Ibid.*, p. 262.
- ⁵²52. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 6.
- ⁵³53. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 6.
- ⁵⁴54. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 6.
- ⁵⁵55. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- ⁵⁶56. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- ⁵⁷57. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- ⁵⁸58. Frederick B. Artz. *The Mind of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. New York: Knopf, 1954, p. 241.
- ⁵⁹59. Franz G. Alexander and Sheldon T. Selesnick. *The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966, p.44.
- ⁶⁰60. Lynn Thorndike. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, p.178.

-
- ⁶¹61. Lynn Thorndike. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, p.179.
- ⁶²62. Frederick B. Artz. *The Mind of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. New York: Knopf, 1954, p. 242.
- ⁶³63. Franz G. Alexander and Sheldon T. Selesnick. *The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966, p.44.
- ⁶⁴64. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 7.
- ⁶⁵65. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 178.
- ⁶⁶66. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 185.
- ⁶⁷67. "Biblical Personal Profiles." Minneapolis: Performax System International, Inc., 1985, p. 20.
- ⁶⁸68. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 8.
- ⁶⁹69. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 8.
- ⁷⁰70. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 8.
- ⁷¹71. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 8.
- ⁷²72. C. G. Jung. *Psychological Types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971, p. 516.
- ⁷³73. *Ibid.* p. 518.
- ⁷⁴74. *Ibid.* 518, 519.
- ⁷⁵75. *Ibid.*, p. 523.
- ⁷⁶76. Keith Harary. "The Omni-Berkeley Personality Profile," *Omni*, September 1991, p. 50.
- ⁷⁷77. C. G. Jung. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Eniela Jaffé, ed. New York: Random House, 1965, p. 183.
- ⁷⁸78. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 8.
- ⁷⁹79. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 8.
-

[Title / Contents](#)

[Introduction / Abstract](#)

[II. The Four Temperaments and Science](#)

[III. The Four Temperaments and the Bible](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[Responses to Myers Appendices I-V](#)

[End Notes \(complete\)](#)