

# **A Church's Unholy Alliance with the Four Temperaments**

by

**Martin and Deidre Bobgan**

Copyrighted 1992

EastGate Publishers  
4137 Primavera Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

## **Contents**

Introduction / Abstract

I. The Four Temperaments and Astrology

II. The Four Temperaments and Science

III. The Four Temperaments and the Bible

Conclusion

Responses to Myers Appendices I-V

End Notes

## INTRODUCTION

In our speaking and writing over the years, we have never singled out a specific church in relationship to false teaching. However, in this case, the church leadership is publicly united and supportive of a false teaching and has approved a paper espousing it. The church leadership has specifically responded to our book *The Four Temperaments* through a paper written by Brian Myers, Associate Pastor at Spring Branch Community Church (SBCC) in Houston, Texas. The SBCC Administrative Board, which includes the senior pastor, Roger Raymer, approves and supports his paper. That means Myers' paper has the official approval of the ruling and leading body of the church. It is our understanding that the false teaching we will address is not a small issue in the church, but is part of what it means to be a member of SBCC.

Our response to Brian Myers' paper follows his sequence. Myers' paper, dated November 15, 1992, has an Abstract, Introduction, Part I, II, and III, Conclusion, Notes, and Appendixes. However, for clarity, we start our paper with an Introduction followed by the Abstract. Also, our Notes are at the end. Our reply can be read part for part in concert with Myers' paper.

We are sorry that Myers did not consider many of the crucial problems with typologies, such as the four temperaments and DiSC, or with personality inventories and tests, such as the Personal Profile System (PPS), important enough to address in his paper. The following is a list of some of those serious problems (page references are for *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*):

- The subjective nature of temperament and personality types and tests (120-121)
- Superficiality and error intrinsic to such typologies and tests (123-124)
- Misplaced assumptions regarding such typologies and tests (124-125)
- Generalities appearing as specifics (125-126)
- False assumptions about consistency (126)
- The Barnum effect (173-174)
- The illusion of efficacy that occurs in temperament typologies (176-178)
- Illusory correlation and illusory thinking (178-179)
- Self-fulfilling prophecy (179-180)
- Bondage and legalism of such psychological systems (188-191)

We have not dealt with all the errors and problems with Myers' paper. In the future we may expand this paper and respond to problems with Myers' paper that are not addressed in this present version. Also, at some future time we may choose to publish this paper for a broader readership than SBCC.

## ABSTRACT

1. We demonstrate that Myers would no doubt not have written his paper had he spent more time in the library, had a better academic background in testing and measurement, known more about the history of psychology, had a better grasp of biblical doctrines, and, most of all, had not been so eager to support Ken Voges' false teaching. We want to make it clear that we are not inferring, as Myers does of us, that he is being devious at least or lying

at worst. We are saying that Myers distorts both science and the Bible because of his devotion to Voges. There are numerous instances of that in his paper. It is so often true that human relationships eclipse sound judgment and sound biblical application. A good example of this is the case of the three faculty members who left Dallas Theological Seminary because of their change of theology. Human relationships were quite instrumental in the theological shift.

2. Myers argues that, although the four temperaments are obviously linked to astrology, they are only an innocent, added part of that occult system. Our position is that the four temperaments are not only linked to astrology, but that they are an integral, occult part of it. There are virtually thousands of archaic documents. Many individuals, such as Galen, borrowed from others. And, many individuals, such as Galen, were seemingly contradictory at times. Some ancient authors had schools in which students wrote under their mentor's name.

We have looked through numerous books and translations and have read reports from various individuals who are experts, and we conclude that the four temperaments are an integral part of a total occult system called astrology. Can the four temperaments be dissociated from astrology? Sure they can. But, can they be dissociated from their occult roots? It is our conclusion, from much investigation, that they cannot for numerous reasons. The explanatory power of the four temperaments is similar to that of horoscopes and carries the same implications. The relationship of the temperaments to the horoscope is too good a fit; there are too many similarities. The bipolar nature of the four temperaments is just like that of horoscopes. Just as astrology is related to an external supposedly fixed system (the stars), the four temperaments are related to an internal supposedly fixed system (the genes). Finally, the four temperaments are presented as an integral part of astrology in *The Dictionary of Astrology*.<sup>1</sup>

In a book titled *Astrology: Do the Heavens Rule Our Destiny?* the authors, John Ankerberg and John Weldon, include a chapter titled "Psychological Factors that Make Astrology 'Work.'" They list eleven factors which we quote below—except that instead of the word *astrology* in each sentence, we use the words *the four temperaments theory*, and in a few instances we change other words to accommodate the meaning and grammatical structure. The reader could just as easily re-read the following and insert the words *Personal Profile System* or *Biblical Personal Profiles*.

- (1) The four temperaments theory seems to work because clients want it to work.
- (2) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it satisfies the human need for friendship, personal security, or dependence on others.
- (3) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it can help justify wrong behavior.
- (4) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it is made to appear as a science.
- (5) The four temperaments theory seems to work because temperament analyzers make interpretations that are, or can be made, universally applicable.
- (6) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it is applicable to almost every human situation in life.
- (7) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it changes a person's world view.
- (8) The four temperaments theory "works" because it traps people.
- (9) The four temperaments theory seems to work because temperament teachers always have "reasonable" explanations for failures.

- (10) The four temperaments theory seems to work because of temperament analyzers' attentiveness or seductiveness.
- (11) The four temperaments theory seems to work because it is increasingly a psychology.<sup>2</sup>

We recommend Ankerberg and Weldon's book. Read the explanation for each of the listed items above. They're very revealing.

3. Myers mentions that the men involved in the four temperaments were "the first rate scientists of their day."<sup>3</sup> It is also true that "the first rate scientists of their day" were involved in astrology. Any cursory examination of "the first rate scientists of their day" would establish that fact. Also, any superficial search of the literature would demonstrate that many of "the first rate scientists of their day" were involved in occultism, superstition, metaphysics, and much pseudoscience.

4. Myers would have the reader believe that the four temperaments were derived scientifically. Astrologers use Myers' same reasoning to justify their use of astrology. When reading Myers' paper, readers only need put in the word *astrology* in place of the four temperaments to understand an astrologer's defense of his system.

5. Myers says, "But the Bobgans selectively present their evidence in a way that borders on dishonest scholarship."<sup>4</sup> If there is dishonest scholarship it will certainly be seen by the reader as he reads both papers. Myers makes several inferences in the direction of "dishonest scholarship" to which we respond. Let the reader discern whether there is dishonest scholarship and, if so, which party is guilty. We do not accuse Myers of dishonest scholarship. However, he does twist the facts to fit his preconceived support of Voges.

6. Myers says, "There is tremendous support for typologies like the temperaments in the academic community, and especially for the Personal Profile System used by Ken Voges."<sup>5</sup> We prove that statement to be totally false. It would be accurate to say (and we demonstrate this) that there is almost **no** support for the four temperaments in the academic community, and especially for the Personal Profile System used by Voges.

7. Myers does not understand the issues involved in natural versus special revelation. While we do not wish to get into this topic here, we do wish to point out that the four temperaments always have been and are part of the metaphysical universe, not the physical universe. This error on Myers' part is quite serious and has implications for supporting other occult activities. There is a gigantic difference between finding helpful information in the natural world (e.g., through physics) and attempting to find truth in the supernatural world (e.g., through astrology).

8. At one point in his paper, Myers suggests that a written critique by Pastor Tommy Ice is "either true or slanderous."<sup>6</sup> When you read that in the context of what Myers says, you know he is suggesting slander. As we indicate later, Ice is evaluating what Voges has written, but not Voges himself. Myers fails to understand this distinction. Along with other gaps in his knowledge, Myers apparently does not know that slander has to do with what is spoken; whereas libel has to do with what is written. He means libel, but says, "slander," apparently because he does not know the difference. This is a common weakness in his paper.

9. Myers has twisted what we have written, used spurious logic, and made false and even libelous-sounding accusations. As we indicate later, Myers has inferred that we are devious at least and lying at worst. We show Myers' errors and refute his inferred libelous remarks. We would like to make it clear to Myers that we accept and even appreciate **substantiated** criticisms. However, when he suggests dishonest scholarship and infers that

we are being devious at least and lying at worst, we believe he has impugned our motives and actions. We demonstrate in our reply that Myers has given us plenty of opportunity to respond likewise.

10. Two main logical fallacies used by Myers in his paper are the straw man and the red herring. We describe them in this paper. We encourage the readers to see the straw men as they are erected by Myers and to “smell” the red herrings as they are spawned by him.

11. Myers has misread, misquoted, and misrepresented us as well as having misrepresented the academic literature and the Bible. Myers gives evidence of reading only part of our book and maybe spending one afternoon in a library before coming to his conclusions. As we shall demonstrate, the issue of the relationship between the four temperaments and astrology is complex, involving thousands of documents requiring much time in research—time apparently not spent by Myers. Along the way, we indicate Myers’ poor academics and poor thinking that lead to erroneous conclusions. Myers even goes so far as to quote one of us saying things we never said.

12. Myers’ paper is poorly written, as well as poorly researched. We are sorry to use the “sic” notation so frequently. However his misspellings, grammatical mistakes, and other errors often require such notation. If Myers plans to continue researching and writing, we suggest he obtain academic help for his research and editorial help for his writing.

13. In supporting the use of the four temperaments and the DiSC, which throughout his paper he refers to as the “DISC,” Myers argues in favor of adding a psychological supplement to biblical sanctification. What does this say about the sufficiency of Christ concerning sanctification and daily Christian living? Our concern about the four temperaments is not limited to the occult roots. We are concerned with psychological theories and practices that deal with the very nature of man, how he should live, and how he changes. Because such theories deal with the nonphysical aspects of the person, they intrude upon the very essence of biblical doctrines of man, including his fallen condition, salvation, sanctification, and relationship of love and obedience to God. Psychological theories offer a variety of alternative explanations about the human condition, but they are merely pseudoscience and speculation.

14. We have requested a debate to be held at Spring Branch Community Church between Ken Voges and Martin Bobgan. If Voges is unwilling to debate, then we request a debate between Brian Myers and Martin Bobgan. We hope there will be an affirmative response. There is a lack of common courtesy on the part of SBCC for not having responded by now.

---

<sup>1</sup>Fred Gettings. *Dictionary of Astrology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

<sup>2</sup>John Ankerberg and John Weldon. *Astrology: Do the Heavens Rule Our Destiny?* Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 1989, pp. 185-199.

<sup>3</sup>Brian Myers, “A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgans’ *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 15

---

## 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.”<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

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 <sup>9</sup>

He asks: “But DO those born under a certain sign actually share it’s [sic] corresponding temperament?”<sup>10</sup> 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 TRIPLICITY 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. . . .<sup>11</sup>

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*.<sup>12</sup>

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)<sup>13</sup>

**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.<sup>14</sup> (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!<sup>15</sup>

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.<sup>16</sup> (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.<sup>17</sup>

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.<sup>18</sup>

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?<sup>19</sup>

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.<sup>20, 21</sup>

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.<sup>22</sup>

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.<sup>23</sup>

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.”<sup>24</sup> 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)?”<sup>25</sup> (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.”<sup>26</sup> 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)?”<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> (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.*”<sup>29</sup> (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.”<sup>30</sup> 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.”<sup>31</sup>

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?”<sup>32</sup> 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.”<sup>33</sup> 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.”<sup>34</sup>

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.<sup>35</sup> (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.”<sup>36</sup> 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.”<sup>37</sup> 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.”<sup>38</sup>

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.<sup>39</sup>

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.”<sup>40</sup> 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.”<sup>41</sup> 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’s 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\*]<sup>42</sup>

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.”<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup>

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."<sup>45</sup>

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."<sup>46</sup> 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"<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> (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?<sup>49</sup>

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.”<sup>50</sup>

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.<sup>51</sup>

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*.<sup>52</sup>

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.”<sup>53</sup> 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.”<sup>54</sup>

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.<sup>55</sup>

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.<sup>56</sup>

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.”<sup>57</sup> 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.<sup>58</sup>

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.<sup>59</sup>

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.<sup>60</sup>

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."<sup>61</sup>

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.<sup>62</sup> (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.**<sup>63</sup> (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.<sup>64</sup> (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.’<sup>65</sup> (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.<sup>66</sup>

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.<sup>67</sup> (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.<sup>68</sup> (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.<sup>69</sup>

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.<sup>70</sup>

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."<sup>71</sup>

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.<sup>72</sup>

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.<sup>73</sup>

Therefore Jung divided people into four types: sensation types, thinking types, feeling types, and intuitives.<sup>74</sup> He then combined those types with introversion and extroversion.<sup>75</sup> 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.”<sup>76</sup>

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.<sup>77</sup>

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.”<sup>78</sup> 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.”<sup>79</sup> 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.)

- 
- <sup>7</sup>7. 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.
- <sup>8</sup>8. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, p. 31.
- <sup>9</sup>9. 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.
- <sup>10</sup>10. 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.
- <sup>11</sup>11. Fred Gettings. *Dictionary of Astrology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985, p. 125.
- <sup>12</sup>12. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, pp. 5-17.
- <sup>13</sup>13. Fred Gettings. *Dictionary of Astrology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985, pp. 24, 124-125.
- <sup>14</sup>14. Myers, p. 2.
- <sup>15</sup>15. 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.
- <sup>16</sup>16. 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.
- <sup>17</sup>17. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, p. 38.
- <sup>18</sup>18. *Ibid.*
- <sup>19</sup>19. 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.
- <sup>20</sup>20. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- <sup>21</sup>21. 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.
- <sup>22</sup>22. 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.
- <sup>23</sup>23. 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.
- <sup>24</sup>24. Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1992, p. 258.
- <sup>25</sup>25. Myers, p. 4.
- <sup>26</sup>26. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, Chapter 6.
- <sup>27</sup>27. 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.
- <sup>28</sup>28. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, p. 343.
- <sup>29</sup>29. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, pp. 344-345.
- <sup>30</sup>30. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, p. 344.
- <sup>31</sup>31. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability." *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975, pp. 343.
- <sup>32</sup>32. 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.
- <sup>33</sup>33. 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.
- <sup>34</sup>34. *New World Dictionary of the American Language*, Second College Edition. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

- 
- <sup>35</sup>35. 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.
- <sup>36</sup>36. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, p. 19.
- <sup>37</sup>37. 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.
- <sup>38</sup>38. Cecilia C. Mettler. *History of Medicine*. Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1947, p. 9.
- <sup>39</sup>39. Walter Kaufmann. *Philosophic Classics, Vol. 1: Thales to Ockham*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968, p. 14.
- <sup>40</sup>40. Edward Hussey, *The Presocratics*. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1972, p. 51.
- <sup>41</sup>41. 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.
- <sup>42</sup>42. Walter Kaufmann. *Philosophic Classics, Vol. 1: Thales to Ockham*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968, p. 16.
- <sup>43</sup>43. Walter Kaufmann. *Philosophic Classics, Vol. 1: Thales to Ockham*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1968, p. 4.
- <sup>44</sup>44. Cecilia C. Mettler. *History of Medicine*. Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1947, p. 9.
- <sup>45</sup>45. S. J. Tester. *A History of Western Astrology*. Suffolk, UK: The Boydell Press, 1987, p. 25.
- <sup>46</sup>46. 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.
- <sup>47</sup>47. 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.
- <sup>48</sup>48. 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.
- <sup>49</sup>49. 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.
- <sup>50</sup>50. Robert M. Johnson. *A Logic Book*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1992, p. 260.
- <sup>51</sup>51. *Ibid.*, p. 262.
- <sup>52</sup>52. 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.
- <sup>53</sup>53. 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.
- <sup>54</sup>54. 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.
- <sup>55</sup>55. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- <sup>56</sup>56. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- <sup>57</sup>57. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 28.
- <sup>58</sup>58. Frederick B. Artz. *The Mind of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. New York: Knopf, 1954, p. 241.
- <sup>59</sup>59. 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.
- <sup>60</sup>60. Lynn Thorndike. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, p.178.

- 
- <sup>61</sup>61. Lynn Thorndike. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, p.179.
- <sup>62</sup>62. Frederick B. Artz. *The Mind of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. New York: Knopf, 1954, p. 242.
- <sup>63</sup>63. 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.
- <sup>64</sup>64. 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.
- <sup>65</sup>65. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 178.
- <sup>66</sup>66. Rudolph E. Siegel. *Galen On Psychology, Psychopathology, and Function and Diseases of the Nervous System*. New York: S. Karger, 1973, p. 185.
- <sup>67</sup>67. "Biblical Personal Profiles." Minneapolis: Performax System International, Inc., 1985, p. 20.
- <sup>68</sup>68. 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.
- <sup>69</sup>69. 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.
- <sup>70</sup>70. 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.
- <sup>71</sup>71. 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.
- <sup>72</sup>72. C. G. Jung. *Psychological Types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971, p. 516.
- <sup>73</sup>73. *Ibid.* p. 518.
- <sup>74</sup>74. *Ibid.* 518, 519.
- <sup>75</sup>75. *Ibid.*, p. 523.
- <sup>76</sup>76. Keith Harary. "The Omni-Berkeley Personality Profile," *Omni*, September 1991, p. 50.
- <sup>77</sup>77. C. G. Jung. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Eniela Jaffé, ed. New York: Random House, 1965, p. 183.
- <sup>78</sup>78. 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.
- <sup>79</sup>79. 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.
-

## II. THE FOUR TEMPERAMENTS AND SCIENCE

Although this section is titled “The Four Temperaments and Science, Myers begins with a further comment about the four temperaments and astrology. He says, “While the Bobgans claim that the temperaments and astrology are totally inseparable. . . .”<sup>80</sup> Thus, before addressing the major topic of this section, we must clarify our position, lest the reader be confused by Myers. Please note that there are no quotation marks in the original around this statement. That is because we never made such a statement. This is one more attempt by Myers to misrepresent what we have said. It is one more example of poor scholarship on his part. Our position is that the temperaments and astrology were intricately and intimately together at one time, that individuals, such as Voges and Braund use the temperaments in the form of the DiSC, and that, by doing so, they are using one element of an overall system—astrology. Many individuals, including Larry Burkett, Tim LaHaye, Florence Littauer and SBCC’s own Ken Voges have separated the four temperaments from other elements of astrology. However, even when separated from the other elements, the four temperaments are still part of the occult.

Astrology is a very complex system. The daily horoscope as contained in local newspapers is one aspect of it and relies upon sun signs, such as Virgo, Leo, etc. However, there is no question that the sun signs are part of the whole, though used separately from the rest of astrology. In the same way, the four temperaments, though separated from the rest of astrology in usage, were still originally part of it.

Myers continues his sentence: “. . . they [Bobgans] argue that the temperaments and science are totally incompatible.” Once more there can be no quotation marks here since we have never said this. We do say that the temperaments are not a scientific concept just as Freud’s Oedipus Complex is not a scientific concept. However, both the temperaments and the Oedipus Complex can be put to the test of science with respect to claims made for each. These subtle differences are obviously beyond Myers’ level of understanding. However, we believe that the average reader will see the difference.

Myers complains about us quoting only part of an article from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*: Here is the part we quoted:

The popularity of typologies can be understood in terms of the fact that they offer an economical way of summarizing complex configurations of variables—a way of characterizing the whole person in terms of a small number of very broad categories. The critics of typological description, on the other hand, have long contended that the simplicity of the typology leads to inaccuracy, that the typical categories are artificial, and that the distinctive features of the individual are lost when one is lumped together with many other people with distinctive qualities of their own.<sup>81</sup>

In attempting to make it look as though we are only giving one side of a “scholarly debate,” Myers quotes further from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*:

In response [sic], it can be argued that every astute typologist (as Ken Voges is an astute typologist) knows that people vary quantitatively in psychological traits and that only a few fit typical categories well. Type has to be understood

as an ideal form or a point of reference useful for describing and understanding individuals to the extent that they approximate it. . . .<sup>82</sup>

The words in parentheses are obviously added by Myers. Myers makes no comments about this quote, but it is obvious that it is not a rebuttal to our earlier quote from the same work. The section quoted by Myers is actually supportive of our scientific view of typology. Note that “only a few fit typical categories well.”<sup>83</sup>

Myers says several times in his paper that we omit certain information with the inference that we are doing so dishonestly. We will confront this later. However, Myers did **not** quote the sentences that precede and follow what he quotes from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*. The sentences which precede his quote are:

Critics have also argued that no extant typology can claim to capture a truly basic set of categories, since each reflects the special interests of its creator. They have also contended that every typology assumes that relevant trait distributions are bimodal—that people tend to have either a lot of the trait that is central to a given type or very little of the trait. Most psychological traits, of course, are distributed unimodally, with relatively few people lying at the extremes that correspond to typical categories. In short, people do not fit neatly into types.<sup>84</sup>

The sentence Myers omits with an ellipsis, which immediately follows what he quotes is this: “It has often been recommended that typical categories be replaced with trait dimensions.”<sup>85</sup> The sentences Myers omits obviously do not support his position. We do not believe Myers has any dissimulation in mind. Perhaps he simply does not understand the author’s intent in saying that.

In describing the difference between types and traits, one text says:

Type theories usually group people into discrete categories (like introvert *or* extravert) and try to explain behavior on the basis of a few types. Trait theories assume that people vary on a *number of continuous dimensions, or scales*, each of which represents a *trait*. Thus, we could rate an individual on a scale of intelligence or emotional stability or aggressiveness, and so on. To arrive at a global description of personality, we would need to know how the individual is rated on a number of such dimensions.<sup>86</sup> (Emphasis in original.)

Though there is very little support for either types or traits in the academic literature, there is more support for traits than types. The PPS is designed to measure what Marston identifies as traits: Dominant, Influencing, Steadiness, Compliant. However, in practical application, the DiSC scales divide people into types: “High D,” High I, “High S, and “High C.” The patterns of the four so-called traits then become types. Then people are identified and described according to those categories. In addition to those four types, sixteen additional types are identified as combinations of the original four. The four DiSC categories and their combinations do line up with the four temperaments and their combinations. They are also used in the same way to identify and thereby understand people. Thus the DiSC model, while utilizing a test intended to measure traits, is fraught with shortcomings typical of typologies.

The second paragraph which Myers quotes from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*, but which we do not quote in our book, is this:

It should be noted that the imprecision of the typology is bound up with its simplicity. In principle, it is possible to achieve a high degree of descriptive precision with a typology, provided we are willing to sacrifice simplicity. If we wish to maintain comprehensiveness, we must cross-classify individuals in terms of a large number of very specific dichotomous variables (as DISC, properly administered, does).<sup>87</sup>

Again, the words in parentheses have been added by Myers. Note that it says, “the imprecision of the typology is bound up with its simplicity.” The paragraph does indicate that “**In principle**, it is possible to achieve a high degree of descriptive precision with a typology, **provided we are willing to sacrifice simplicity**.” (Emphasis added.) The DiSC is an imprecise, simplistic model. The PPS instrument used to categorize people according to the DiSC model is an extremely brief test with a high degree of simplicity. That is precisely why it is popular. If Voges and Braund abandoned the simplicity, they would lose potential customers, a most important consideration for those who profit from such tests.

The final sentence of the quote is another area of disagreement that we would have with Myers. The last sentence states: “If we wish to maintain comprehensiveness, we must cross-classify individuals in terms of a large number of very specific dichotomous variables.” Myers adds in parentheses: “as DISC, properly administered, does.” That is untrue. The DiSC is not even what is administered. Myers is confused about the system he defends. But even if he were to say, “as the PPS, properly administered, does,” he is still wrong. The PPS (with DiSC categories), is too brief to meet the qualifications of comprehensiveness. The PPS (with its DiSC typology) is a very short test (only 24 items!) that results in simplistic types with a small number of general dichotomous variables.

Myers’ desire to support a leader in his church often results in a sacrifice of truth for the sake of proving by fiat rather than fact. This is just one instance of that. Also this is one instance of Myers suggesting that we purposely (meaning deviously) left something out because it proves the opposite of what we claim. One of us has two degrees in mathematics and is a specialist in testing and measurement. What are Myers credentials for the above statements about the PPS and DiSC?

Following the above quotation from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology* is another sentence which Myers left out. It says: “In this way, we can derive complex typal categories that will be more univocally descriptive than any combination of scale scores resting on the same set of information.”<sup>88</sup> Here again we don’t think Myers is being devious. He possibly lacks the background to know what the sentence means. Suffice it to say that the DiSC does not qualify according to that omitted sentence.

Myers says:

The Bobgans quote various behaviorists [sic] who question personality testing (including the Behavioral Science Research Press). They sound fairly convincing. But we are not told that they stand on one side of a scholarly debate—on what may be the losing side.<sup>89</sup> (Emphasis his.)

This is false information. Criticisms of typologies are not solely the result of a disagreement between behaviorists and typologists.

To support his point, Myers quotes from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*:

Although it enjoyed a revival beginning in the 1960's, the study of temperament was long in disrepute in contemporary psychology because, given its association with inherited characteristics, it ran counter to the environmental emphasis of behaviorism.<sup>90</sup>

At one time the emphasis on behaviorism precluded interest in a lot of other aspects of psychology, including the humanistic and transpersonal. However, at the present time all forms of psychology are seen and described in the academic literature.

Now, to put Myers to the test, we ask that he obtain 100 copies of psychology texts normally used at universities. Go to the indexes and look up the word *temperament*. Then look up the word *typology*. Count the number of times you see those references and the number of pages devoted to those two terms. You will find **very, very** few. Now read what is said in the academic literature about the four temperaments. You will find that they are generally treated as simplistic, superstitious relics from the past.

Myers says:

The Bobgans don't tell us this, but the article goes on to defend such temperamental typologies. They cite only the first paragraph, which mentions the astrology-personality link we saw earlier.

The bulk of the article affirms the scientific basis for enduring traits in people (like the four temperaments).<sup>91</sup> (Emphasis his.)

As stated earlier, Myers does not know the difference between types and traits. The four temperaments are types, not traits.

When Myers says, "the article goes on to defend such temperamental typologies," he is wrong. The article is an academic report on personality types in general and on what some individuals have claimed about them. In no way does the author defend the four temperaments as a system. He only touches on the four temperaments in his brief historical overview of typologies. In fact, he says there are too many different typologies to cover in one article.

The following is another sentence Myers should quote from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*, but doesn't: "So pervasive is this approach to human personality that a comprehensive catalog of all known typologies would be very difficult to compile."<sup>92</sup> There are **numerous** typologies competing for attention, not just the four temperaments. In spite of the scant amount of attention paid to most of those typologies in academic literature, they often surface in pop psychology articles and books. See Chapter Six, "A Circus of Personality Types," from our book *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*.

If academic psychology thought more highly of the four temperaments, they would not be so extinct in the academic literature. It is true that the temperaments are very popular in bookstores, but so is astrology.

Myers' next remark, which follows the above-quoted sentence from him, is:

. . . and research done on identical twins since the article was written indicates that some of these traits are so basic that they are even inherited.<sup>93</sup> (Emphasis his.)

Once more Myers is confusing traits and types. In doing so, he is misrepresenting the article which he uses as his reference. The conclusion of that article ends with these words, which include a quotation from a researcher:

“A lot of people have the simple-minded notion that a gene turns on and magically blossoms into a behavior,” declares Gerald McClearn, a psychologist and twins researcher at Pennsylvania State University. “A gene can produce a nudge in one direction or another, but it does not directly control behavior. It doesn’t take away a person’s free will.” Even E. O. Wilson, the most radical sociobiologist, doesn’t believe that behavior goose-steps to the cadence of the genes. “Admitting that we are all influenced in different ways by our genetic coding doesn’t reduce our freedom to do what we want to do,” he says. The latest research clearly tips the scales toward the nature side—and that’s all it does. Researchers agree that people are creatures both of their genetic coding and of their cultural and environmental experience. All scientists are doing is learning the proportions of the recipe.<sup>94</sup>

If we were Myers and had left out this important piece of information, Myers would have inferred that we were devious or that we “selectively present [our] evidence in a way that borders on dishonest scholarship.” We make no such charges against him. We try to present the facts and let the reader decide.

The struggle between nature (genes) versus nurture (environment) as the basis for personality has been fought for a long time. There is evidence for nature predominating, nurture predominating, a combination of the two with neither predominating, and shades of all the above. But even among those who support nature as predominant, to the extent of personality determined by genetics, we have never found one expert touting the four temperaments.

Wedding the four temperaments to a predominantly nature view of personality is based on faith, not on scientific evidence. Look in a hundred academic books on the issue of nature versus nurture and even books supporting the nature view and just see the absence of the relationship to the four temperaments. The view often held by the nature-oriented view emphasizes traits, but not the four temperaments. It is a generalized view of traits and not one that promotes anything even close to the four temperaments.

Myers then tries to defend the Personal Profile System (PPS). We quote from our book our academic concerns with the PPS:

One of the most important volumes on tests is the *Mental Measurements Yearbook* (MMY). There is no mention of the PPS in the MMY until *The Tenth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. In that volume, the PPS is evaluated. This recent evaluation occurred years after *The Kaplan Report*. We quote from that review:

A serious concern with this instrument is its lack of reported research. While the authors state the instrument shows good reliability and

validity, they provide the user with virtually no data to support these claims.

The reviewer goes on to refer to and then challenge studies that are provided in the PPS manual. In conclusion, the reviewer says that “**the clear lack of data to support this instrument should preclude its use.**” (Emphasis added.) We did a literature search on the PPS and found other reviews that substantiated the MMY recommendation.<sup>95</sup>

For support of the PPS, Myers mentions *The Kaplan Report*. We say in our book:

In the Performax Product Catalog is a listing for *The Kaplan Report: A Study of the Validity of the Personal Profile System*. We obtained a copy of that report. It says:

Since 1972 the PPS has been widely employed. The market for this product is said to be growing daily. Hence, in 1982, PSII [Performax Systems International, Inc.] contracted with Kaplan Associates of Chevy Chase, Maryland for the conduct of a study to establish how the PPS compares as an assessment instrument with highly researched and valid psychological measuring instruments.<sup>96</sup>

Please notice that Performax, the company that owns and markets the PPS, contracted with a firm, Kaplan Associates, to conduct this study. We have read the report and have concerns and questions about it. It definitely does not establish the necessary validity for the PPS.<sup>97</sup>

Contrary to this, Myers believes that *The Kaplan Report* does establish the validity. This is an academic question that can be established by an academic exchange. The complexity of it is such that it does not belong in the current paper.

The key issue that can be dealt with in this paper is the fact that Kaplan Associates are hired consultants. They examined the PPS while being paid to do so by PSII. Myers says, “In 1982 Performax Systems International contracted with Kaplan Associates to conduct a study comparing the PPS instrument with other highly researched and valid psychological measuring instruments.”<sup>98</sup> There are two issues we wish to address in this quote from Myers. Does Myers understand the bias that normally occurs when a consultant is hired to do research for a company that derives profit for a product? *The Kaplan Report* itself tells why the marketers of the PPS employed them:

The more precise mission given Kaplan Associates was that of designing an experiment to examine the validity of PPS. It was expected that the finding of positive results will serve to attract and broaden the interest of professional users in the clinical, counseling, educational and industrial-psychological communities, the members of which, for the most part, have enormous respect and concern for valid psychometric tools.<sup>99</sup>

Let the reader interpret the meaning of that in the context of a commercial company with a commercial product (PPS) that hopes to increase sales by employing consultants (Kaplan Associates).

To make our point more strongly, let us remind the reader that tobacco companies hire consultants to do research on the effects of tobacco. These are high powered companies with high powered credentials. Should we believe the results of a “hired gun”? We think not. Myers knows the Kaplan Associates are a “hired gun.” Myers would be happy to have you believe them even though he would probably question the tobacco company consultants.

The second part of Myers’ sentence refers to comparisons of the PPS with “other highly researched and valid psychological measuring instruments.” He says these “other personality tests of confirmed validity validated PPS.”<sup>100</sup> (Emphasis his.) The important question is how valid were the other instruments and what do such correlations mean? The second issue of correlations and their meaning is too complex for this paper. However, the first issue has to do with the test comparisons. Myers mentions the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) as one of the “personality tests of confirmed validity.”

The National Research Council has evaluated the MBTI. The Council members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. In appraising the MBTI, the National Research Council says:

McCaulley (1988) estimates that the MBTI is used as a diagnostic instrument by 1,700,000 people a year in the United States, and Moore and Woods (1987) list the wide variety of organizations in business, industry, education, government, and the military that use it. It is probably fair to say that the MBTI is the most popular “self-insight, insight into others” instrument in use today. Unfortunately, however, the popularity of the instrument is not coincident with supportive research results.<sup>101</sup>

In other words, research results do not support Myers’ misplaced confidence in the MBTI! The Council’s particular concern is the **lack of validity for the MBTI**. In concluding the section on validity the Council states: “The evidence summarized in this section raises questions about the validity of the MBTI.”<sup>102</sup>

Regarding the MMY (*Mental Measurements Yearbook*) and the Kaplan report, Myers says:

But didn’t the Mental Measurements Yearbook [sic] reviewer see the report? Was the Kaplan study ever taken into account in the MMY evaluation? The Bobgans would have us believe it was. Just before they quote from the MMY review, they write this:

This recent evaluation [in the MMY] occurred [sic] years after The Kaplan Report.

Clearly the Bobgans want us to think that the reviewer must have seen the report—if she (Dr. Ellen McGinnis) wrote “years after” the review came out. . .

. But, no, the Bobgans would lead us to believe that “the clear lack of data to support this instrument” includes the Kaplan study.<sup>103</sup> (All emphases his.) This is a false inference by Myers and it borders on libel by attempting to get the readers to believe that we want them to think that the MMY reviewer saw the report. This is another example of what extreme means Myers is willing to use to defend Voges! To be blunt, he is accusing us of being devious at least and lying at worst. He makes the same inference elsewhere in his paper.

The facts are as follows. The Kaplan Report was published in 1983 but done earlier. The MMY was published in 1989. **To date there are no independent favorable academic critiques of the PPS. And the latest evaluation of the PPS in the MMY is 1989, which is years after the one done by the hired gun of Kaplan Associates!** We believe that an objective third party report in the MMY done years after the original hired gun report would carry more weight. We don't know if the MMY reviewer saw the Kaplan Report. **And neither does Myers!** As a matter of fact, she may have and ignored it because of the fact that the Kaplan Associates were hired by PSII.

Myers says:

And was the reviewer really as negative as the Bobgan's [sic] two quotes imply? Here's the sentence they left out just before their first quote:

The theoretical base of the Personal Profile System and its focus on increasing individuals' understanding of their own behavioral patterns in relationship to environmental factors have value in increasing personal effectiveness.<sup>104</sup>

Now here's the rest of the paragraph that is conveniently left out by Myers:

A serious concern with this instrument is its lack of reported research. While the authors state the instrument shows good reliability and validity, they provide the user with virtually no data to support these claims.<sup>105</sup>

What the reviewer is saying is that while the theoretical base has possible value there is no data to support sufficient reliability or validity for the instrument. Wow! Myers left out a **very** important part of the paragraph! Once more, we are not accusing him of being devious. Perhaps he does not understand what the test reviewer is saying.

Myers uses more of the same libelous-sounding approach when he says:

And here's the full sentence of their [Bobgans'] second slam-dunk partial quote:

While the theory behind this instrument holds promise in increasing individual's awareness of their behavioral styles in interactions with environmental conditions, the clear lack of data to support this instrument should preclude its use.<sup>106</sup> (Emphasis his.)

Again he infers that we purposely left something out and we did so dishonestly. But look at what the reviewer is saying: “the theory behind this instrument.” It is not the instrument, but the theory behind the instrument that “holds promise.” The bottom line is “the clear lack of

data to support this instrument should preclude its use.” Nothing devious here. And nothing to support Myers’ jaundiced point of view.

In addition, part one of the sentence (the part we left out) is gratuitous. It is totally unsupported by anything in the review. It is a personal opinion on the reviewer’s part; while evidence for the second part of the sentence is substantiated in the review. This may be the first and only test review Myers has ever read. This is obviously an area in which he is not trained. Reviewers sometimes do make gratuitous remarks along with their statistical analysis. There are volumes on standards for educational and psychological testing. Those trained in the field know the standards. Those were the standards the reviewer used to condemn the PPS. The reviewer’s generous comment about “the theory behind this instrument” had nothing to do with such standards. If Myers were to read more than just one review on tests, he might find this out, but he appears to be so desperate to prove us wrong and to defend Voges that he is willing to pepper his paper with such egregious remarks.

In the preceding example Myers uses the red herring approach. One logic book describes it this way:

The fallacy of red herring gets its name from the practice of using a herring, a particularly smelly fish when cooked, to divert hunting dogs from the scent of a fox. To commit the fallacy of red herring in an argument is to draw attention away from an issue by raising some other, seemingly related issue.<sup>107</sup>

The text advises:

To recognize the fallacy of red herring, look for an argument in which the speaker responds by directing attention away from the issue to other, seemingly related issues.

The above example does smell like an extreme case of red herring being putrefied by Myers.

- 
- <sup>80</sup>80. 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. 9.
- <sup>81</sup>81. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 23.
- <sup>82</sup>82. 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. 10.
- <sup>83</sup>83. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 24.
- <sup>84</sup>84. Ibid.
- <sup>85</sup>85. *Ibid.*
- <sup>86</sup>86. Ernest R. Hilgard, Rita L. Atkinson, Richard C. Atkinson. *Introduction to Psychology*, Seventh Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1979, p. 382.
- <sup>87</sup>87. 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. 10.
- <sup>88</sup>88. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 24.
- <sup>89</sup>89. 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. 10.
- <sup>90</sup>90. 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. 10.
- <sup>91</sup>91. 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. 10.
- <sup>92</sup>92. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 23.
- <sup>93</sup>93. 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. 10.
- <sup>94</sup>94. Stanley N. Wellborn, "How Genes Shape Personality," *U. S. News & World Report*, April 13, 1987, p. 62.
- <sup>95</sup>95. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, pp. 157, 158.
- <sup>96</sup>96. Sylvan J. Kaplan and Barbara E. W. Kaplan. "The Kaplan Report: A Study of the Validity of the Personal Profile System." Kaplan Associates, Chevy Chase, MD, p.3.
- <sup>97</sup>97. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, pp. 156, 157.
- <sup>98</sup>98. 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. 11.
- <sup>99</sup>99. Sylvan J. Kaplan and Barbara E. W. Kaplan. "The Kaplan Report: A Study of the Validity of the Personal Profile System." Kaplan Associates, Chevy Chase, MD, p.3.
- <sup>100</sup>100. 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. 11.
- <sup>101</sup>101. The National Research Council. *In the Mind's Eye* Daniel Druckman and Robert A. Bjork, eds. Washington: National Academy Press, 1991, p. 96.
- <sup>102</sup>102. Ibid., p. 99.

---

<sup>103</sup>103. 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. 12.

<sup>104</sup>104. Ibid.

<sup>105</sup>105. The Tenth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Jane Close Conoley and Jack J. Kramer, eds. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1989, p. 623.

<sup>106</sup>106. 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. 12.

<sup>107</sup>107. Johnson, op. cit., p.262.

---

### III. THE FOUR TEMPERAMENTS AND THE BIBLE

Myers asks: “Are there any Scriptural examples of “typifying” people, and would this give us permission to do it ourselves?” He responds by saying: “There are at least two systems, maybe more.”<sup>108</sup> Myers begins by confusing psychological types with spiritual gifts. However types and gifts are two entirely different ways of looking at people: one is secular and speculative (temperament types) and the other is biblical (spiritual gifts). A person with the gift of evangelism could feasibly be placed in various typology categories from any number of secular systems devised by men. The spiritual gifts come from God; the temperament categories come from unproven, extrabiblical sources.

Myers says: “God typifies people according to their spiritual gift. And they’re not always divorced from natural traits.”<sup>109</sup> Again, Myers confuses traits with types. Also, to say that “God typifies people according to their spiritual gift” makes it sound as though the spiritual gift intrinsically belongs to the person, rather than that spiritual gifts are given by the effectual working of God’s power and life in an individual.

We agree that spiritual gifts are “not always divorced from natural traits.” However, they are **often** divorced from natural traits—probably so that an individual will not become puffed up. There are numerous biblical examples from Moses on, as well as saints over the centuries. Spiritual gifts are dependent upon the indwelling Holy Spirit, rather than on a person’s natural traits.

The fact that there are so many different personalities who exercise one or more of the gifts is testimony enough that connecting personality types with gifts is an egregious error. We recognize a person’s gift by his fruit, not by his personality—by his ministry rather than by some personality category to which he has been assigned.

Myers confuses the idea of describing a person with typing a person. Descriptions do not equal types. If we describe a person as generous and kind, that is simply a description. We are not classifying him as a type and assume all kinds of other characteristics to be applicable. Indeed, certain characteristics may accompany one another, but that does not establish types. The Bible abounds with descriptions of people, but it does not set forth or support a system of types.

Myers presents a second supposed biblical support for using typologies. He contends that since biblical names had meanings, the name at birth was the individual’s type and that “the name was accurate (even predictive—shades of astrology??)”<sup>110</sup> (Emphasis his.) Let us analyze this and use one of Myers’ several examples.

Myers says:

Jacob, for instance—born “with his hand holding Esau’s heel”—was typed for life as “one who takes by the heel, or supplants” (Gen. 25:26). And indeed this told his life story: the tale of a man who would not let go.<sup>111</sup>

What is Myers saying here? Is he suggesting Jacob was named because of his personality or because of his manner of birth? We thought it was because of the manner of birth. However, let’s say that it’s because of his personality. Was the name the result of knowing who he would be when he grew up? Let’s say it was. Does this mean that a name is a way of discerning a person’s future personality? Or is this a matter of causing one to be the type of person like the meaning of the name?

It is obvious that many individuals in the Bible did not turn out according to their names and that for numerous others we do not have enough information to know whether they did or not. However, it is unlikely that the names used by Myers were either a discernment on the part of the namers or a deterministic label. More likely it was prophetic or the fulfillment of prophecy.

In all Myers' examples there is not one in which God typed people à la the four temperaments; nor is there even a hint of their use or presence. The way Myers and Voges inject the temperaments into Scripture and then discover them there is known as eisegesis. Almost anyone with almost any system can eisegete what they want out of Scripture by merely reading into Scripture what is not there in the first place.

Myers says:

A recurring theme of the Bobgan's [sic] book is that many evangelicals (especially Ken voges [sic]) are imposing a foreign system upon the Scripture.<sup>112</sup>

In the parentheses, Myers says "especially Ken voges [sic]." Myers is not only twisting what we have done, but pandering to the possibility that people in his congregation will get the impression that we are singling out Ken Voges. Please look at our book; we are critiquing a number of popularizers of the four temperaments teachings, including that of Voges. As a matter of fact we analyze the writings of Ken Voges and Ron Braund together. We list them in that order because they are listed in that order on their book. If Myers would have said "including," rather than "especially," he would have been correct. But throughout his paper, Myers puts a little spin on information in like manner, even though he should know better. Myers knows that we have evaluated the writings of a variety of individuals, because he lists them on page 1 of his paper. Incidentally, Myers' omission of Ron Braund (Voges' coauthor) on page 1 of his paper is a little puzzling.

Myers then says:

They [Bobgans] claim that Voges and Braun [sic] (his coauthor) "corrupt the Scripture with unproved, unscientific, and even paganistic [sic] philosophies of men;" [sic] and then they land the K-O blow by citing pastor Tommy Ice.<sup>113</sup>

Before we discuss Myers' treatment of Ice's statement, we must correct a false impression Myers gives here. Voges and Braund are not the subject of the predicate he quotes. Here is what we say:

However, **such systems** present competing views of who man is and how he changes, and **they** corrupt the Scriptures with unproven, unscientific, and even paganistic philosophies of men. Unless a personality theory originates from studying Scripture and reflects sound biblical theology, it will tend to divert attention away from God and His Word concerning who man is and how he is saved and sanctified. Such deviation will present an alternate means of salvation and/or sanctification in addition to and in opposition to God's clear Word on the matter.<sup>114</sup> (Emphasis added.)

The word *they* refers to its proper antecedent, which is “such systems.” Myers has a penchant for misreading, reading into things, and saying that we say what we do not say.

Now here is what Myers refers to as “the K-O blow by citing pastor Tommy Ice.” He writes the following as a quotation of Ice from our book:

Voges and Braund are imposing an external interpretative grid over the Bible. . . . an interpretative (unbiblical) [Myers added the word unbiblical and should have used brackets] framework. Since (they) rival the system in the Bible, in the Bible, their views are part of the apostasy that Christ, Paul, and the Apostles warned us to look out for within the Church.<sup>115</sup>

Myers cites page 83 from *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing* as the source for that quote. Please notice that the Ice quotation as it appears in our book is quite different:

Voges and Braund are imposing an external interpretative grid over the Bible which arrives at conclusions that various personalities of the Bible can be said to be illustrations of the DiSC system, thus giving the impression that this modern discovery of personality traits has always been there. I cannot see any difference, epistemologically, between using the DiSC grid as an interpretative framework for explaining the behavior of those in the Bible and that of the higher critical literary approaches of the Bible which produced things like the JEDP theory and two Isaiahs.<sup>116</sup>

First of all, Myers omits an essential part of what Ice is saying. Then he omits the end of a sentence and adds material not in the reference he cites. Where did Myers obtain that final sentence? It is not in our book.

Then after Myers misquotes Ice and us, he says:

These are very serious charges: both for the accused and the accusers. They are either true or slanderous. (Someday God will call someone to account.)<sup>117</sup>  
(Emphasis his.)

Myers evidently does not know that *slander* has to do with the spoken word and that *libel* has to do with the written word. He means *libelous*, but says “slanderous.” Either way, this is a false accusation.

Next comes a long, tedious, tangential section in which Myers attempts to justify the use of extrabiblical material. In this section, Myers does not address our specific concern about syncretizing an entire extrabiblical, psychological, theoretical system with Scripture. Instead, he takes the word *extrabiblical* away from our specific concern and gives examples of other instances of what he calls “extrabiblical.”

In building a case for using what he identifies as extrabiblical material, Myers erects a large umbrella, under which he hopes to protect the DiSC/BPP. A superficial reading might lead the reader to think that using extrabiblical material is not so serious after all. However, we are certain that more than a few conservative theologians would have some very serious questions about the examples and explanations Myers gives of so-called extrabiblical material.

Before responding to Myers' discussion on the word *extrabiblical*, we will once again state our concern in case Myers missed it. Our concern is not with using Greek loan words or figures of speech. Our concern with extrabiblical material has to do with importing psychological, religious or occult systems to explain the nature of man and how he is to live and change.

While we will not address all of what Myers lumps under the term *extrabiblical*, we will discuss a few of his items. Myers asks:

Is there any Scriptural precedent for using “extrabiblical paradigms,” ideas, or even terms? The examples literally abound—all already in the Bible, all under inspiration: all such “impositions”, [sic] rightly safeguarded, sanctioned (or at least precedented) by the Holy Spirit Himself. This will free us to ask the second question: can we (in any way) use the extrabiblical?<sup>118</sup> (Emphasis his.)<sup>119</sup>

Myers is saying here that much of what is already in the Bible is “extrabiblical” How so? Because the writers used the vocabulary and various figures of speech from the culture? Myers identifies as extrabiblical what is already in Scripture.

Myers even goes so far as to say that the Holy Spirit authorized the writers to borrow from pagan philosophies and Jewish legends. Is that what happened? All Myers gives for proof is a possible (but very problematic) interpretation of the word *logos* and a reference to 1 Corinthians 10:4: “And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.”<sup>120</sup> The first instance is simply a word existing in the culture. The second is a metaphor referring to the preincarnate Christ being with the children of Israel and supplying them both physical water and spiritual water.

Myers argues that when John used the word *logos*, he, “consciously imported into the Scripture (then redeemed for God’s use) a concept that stood for an entire paradigm.” Myers quotes the conservative theologian Leon Morris for support:

It would be impossible to use a term so widely known in Greek philosophy, in a writing in the Greek language, probably published in a center of Greek culture, without being mindful of the associations the term would arouse.<sup>121</sup>

Myers is quoting from a footnote which merely serves as a qualification of what Morris says in the text. Here is what Morris says in the main body of that text:

When John used the term *Logos*, then, he used a term that would be widely recognized among the Greeks. The average man would not know its precise significance to the philosophers (any more than his modern counterpart knows what the scientist understands by, say, “nuclear fission”). But he would know that it meant something very important. John could scarcely have used the Greek term without arousing in the minds of those who used the Greek language thoughts of something supremely great in the universe. **But, though he would not have been unmindful of the associations aroused by the term, his essential thought does not derive from the Greek background. His Gospel shows little trace of acquaintance with Greek philosophy and less of dependence upon it.**<sup>122</sup> (Emphasis added.)

As the reader can see, Morris's statement does not support Myers' argument. If we had merely quoted part of a qualifying footnote and ignored the main text in which the author presents his position, Myers would probably infer dishonest scholarship on our part.

Myers confuses using the Greek word *logos* with approving Heraclitus's philosophical ideas. Myers says:

. . . and if the Apostle John put his seal of partial approval on one of this philosopher's ideas, then even more it seems we have some promising (vs. poisoning) roots: the beginning of a sterling pedigree for the temperamental foursome.<sup>123</sup>

But did John "put his seal of partial approval on one of this philosopher's ideas"? There is no evidence of it—only vain speculation. Since the Bible uses language within culture, are we to conclude that it is appropriate for Christians to incorporate the various philosophies and religions of the culture as well? Did John use *logos* according to the current meanings, or did he specifically use *logos* in such a way as to incorporate the philosophical ideas of Heraclitus? Using loan words from the culture does not equal using the concepts or ideologies that may be associated with those words.

Is Scripture to be interpreted according to pagan religions and philosophy or does it interpret itself? Might John 1:1-2 be better interpreted with Genesis 1 and with Colossians 2:16, 17? Even if one might read John 1 with Heraclitus in mind, John's intent would have been to draw the reader **away** from the erroneous Greek concept of *logos* as an eternal principle of order. Jesus was not a principle of order, but a Person, the Son of God, without whom "was not anything made that was made" (John 1:2). Nevertheless, Myers seems to want to make John approve of Heraclitus so that he might be justified in endorsing and incorporating an entire system of pagan philosophy (the four temperaments).

We believe that every word, every allegory, every metaphor, every simile, and every other figure of speech in Scripture are inspired by God. We take the following passage literally and very seriously:

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works (2 Timothy 3: 16, 17).

The purpose of Scripture is not to approve some Greek philosophy or pagan religion, but rather to accomplish God's purposes. Myers seems to argue in favor of God borrowing from Greek philosophy and in favor of adding the four temperaments and the DiSC model to help accomplish what the Bible says it does.

Next Myers declares: "In 1 Cor. 10 he [Paul] imports a story from Jewish legend.<sup>124</sup>" This is the verse that is supposedly extrabiblical.

And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.

Myers then cites two commentators who give some credence to that notion. However, there are other theologians who disagree with that idea. For instance, Dr. S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.,

former Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at Dallas Theological Seminary, says:

**The same spiritual drink**, a fifth privilege, refers to the events mentioned in Ex 17:1-9 and Num 20:1-13 (cf. Num 21:16). The words **that spiritual rock that followed them** do not mean that Paul believed the rabbinical legend that a material rock followed the Israelites throughout their journey and that Miriam, above all others, possessed the secret of obtaining the water (cf. Godet, *op. cit.*, II, 56). Actually, the apostle says, that Rock was Christ, i.e., it was the visible means of the supply of water which came ultimately from Christ. . . . The literal sense of **that Rock was Christ** is no more to be pressed than is the literal sense of “I am the true vine” (Jn 15:1). The **was**, rather than is, may, however, point to Christ’s pre-existence (cf. II Cor 8:9; Gal 4:4).<sup>125</sup> (Emphasis in original.)

Thus Johnson refutes Myers’ argument.

Next Myers attempts to show that Paul “uses a system of interpretation that for the most part completely distorted the Scripture, and that was rooted in Greek philosophy.”<sup>126</sup> As evidence for this Myers quotes Galatians 4:24, 25 in which Paul uses allegory to teach the difference between the two covenants of law and grace. Myers declares that Paul was using “the allegorical (or Alexandrian) school of interpretation.”<sup>127</sup> Myers further declares:

Paul uses two technical terms from this school in the passage: “allegorically” and “corresponds to:” [sic] and the allegory itself has several parallels to Philo’s allegory of Hagar and Sarah. Philo was Paul’s famous contemporary (whom he surely read) and the founding father of [sic] allegorical school.<sup>128</sup>

It is amazing to learn from Myers that allegory is rooted in Greek philosophy. Use of allegory predates even ancient Greek philosophy. While the Greeks may have named it and have founded an “allegorical school,” they were not the originators of what they named or defined. There are examples of allegory in the Old Testament. The prophet Nathan used allegory to confront David (2 Samuel 12:1-9).

In Galatians 4:24, 25, Paul was not interpreting the OT text according to the usual manner of the Greeks. He was not overlooking the plain meaning of the text in search of hidden, esoteric meaning. Instead, he was inspired by the Holy Spirit to use the true history of Hagar and Sarah as a picture—an allegory—to teach the difference between the law and grace. Paul used allegory to teach, and that’s the purpose of allegory according to its definition:

. . . a story in which people, things, and happenings have a hidden or symbolic meaning: allegories are used for teaching or explaining ideas, moral principles, etc.<sup>129</sup>

Jesus used allegory when he taught by way of parables. Surely Myers would not suggest that Jesus was borrowing from Greek philosophy!

Next Myers introduces Paul’s use of the Greek word *musterion*, which is translated mystery. Myers says:

Back then the term “mystery” (*musterion*)—far more than *logos*—was almost universally known to have a very special meaning. It came direct from the “Babyloian [sic] mysteries,” or “mystery cults” far and away the most popular religion of Paul’s day: and one of the most licentious.<sup>130</sup>

Is Myers suggesting that Paul is borrowing more than the word and that he is borrowing something from the mystery cults when he uses that term? The very context of the verses in which Paul uses the word *mystery* argue against that idea. The mystery of the Gospel is a revealed mystery, not a hidden, esoteric mystery. Thus, if Paul made any reference at all to the mystery religions, he would have used the word polemically to show the vast difference between Greek religion and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Other Bible scholars relate Paul’s use of *musterion* to the Greek Septuagint, where it occurs in Daniel 2:19, 27, 29, as well as in other places.<sup>131</sup> Regarding mystery religions, Dr. Ronald H. Nash says:

Paul would never have borrowed from the pagan religions. All of our information about Paul makes it highly unlikely that he was influenced by pagan sources. He placed great emphasis on his early training in a strict form of Judaism (Phil. 3:5). He warned the Colossians against the very sort of things that advocates of Christian syncretism attribute to him—namely, letting their minds be captured by alien speculations (Col. 2:8).<sup>132</sup>

In using the word *mystery*, Paul is certainly not in any way whatsoever endorsing the mystery religions any more than he would have endorsed astrology and its four temperaments.

Doesn’t Myers see the difference between using vocabulary and using occult systems? Language is language. It exists in culture and it reflects culture. To say that the Bible borrows terms from the culture does not give license for importing philosophical, religious, occult systems. Myers offers no evidence that those who write about and teach the four temperaments and the DiSC model are simply using the language of the day to communicate the message of God.

If we use the arguments for using extrabiblical material by which Myers hopes to justify using the four temperaments and the syncretism of DiSC with the Bible in the form of BPP, then anything can presumably be added with impunity. Myers is right when he says, “Syncretism is the mother of much heresy.”<sup>133</sup> Using the DiSC along with the Bible is syncretism. Using the DiSC/BPP does not simply fall under the language of allegory or parallel. Myers’ so-called “clear Biblical precedent within Scripture for some creative parallelism” simply cannot justify the inclusion of a pagan occult system or a twentieth-century psychological derivative that does not qualify as science.<sup>134, 135</sup>

Myers further attempts to support the use of extrabiblical material like the four temperaments and the DiSC by citing Acts 17:23, 28.<sup>136</sup> However, when Paul referred “TO THE UNKNOWN GOD” and quoted pagan poets, he was not borrowing a pagan system. Nor was he using those examples to add to the doctrines of salvation and sanctification. Instead, Paul used them as points of contact to present the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Adding doctrines of the four temperaments or the DiSC does not constitute a point of contact, but an entire metaphysical system of attempting to understand and change people. Our concern is not with words in the Bible, or with allegories, or with points of contact. Our concern is with extrabiblical material that adds to the Gospel by presenting another philosophical,

psychological, religious way to understand and improve a Christian's spiritual growth and walk.

Myers' next paragraphs are about the importance of theology and how certain terms and ideas, such as the Trinity, were brought to Scripture. He says:

The history of orthodox theology is the story of unloading entire extrabiblical systems onto the text. . . . No one system is without faults, not one is infallible, but every system with a high view of Scripture shows different facets of God's truth through unique lenses.<sup>137</sup>

By this he seems to be trying to justify using the DiSC model as an aid to understanding Scripture as well. However, to imply that the DiSC and BPP are the same kinds of extrabiblical systems as systematic theology "with a high view of Scripture" is to wander far from the doctrines of the Sacred Text into the never-never land of the opinions of men. And once a person has taken that journey he may not realize how far his high view of Scripture has slipped.

Myers continues:

There is is [sic] no escaping theological questions; no getting at the Scripture without theological lenses. How can one even become a Christian without at least a vague notion of the trinity [sic] (the Father sending the Son to die for us, by the Spirit to live in us)? As we grow our goal is not to become lens-free (we'd be blind!)—but to try on different lenses as we "study to show ourselves approved;" [sic] to learn from each theological focal point; and perhaps to settle on a prescription that helps us see as through a glass least dimly.<sup>138</sup>

Thus Myers would like us "to try on different lenses" and "to learn from each theological focal point." Does he honestly believe it would be wise to do this, since "each theological focal point" might include any and all theological perspectives? Furthermore, from the context, it appears he would approve of the lenses of the four temperaments and the DiSC, as well.

We agree we need lenses to see, but we would prefer the lenses of Scripture—that we might more and more see Jesus through His Word—not through the DiSC/BPP model! That's the prescription we'll take—not the prescription Myers offers. We believe it is especially tragic when Christians view Scripture through faith in unproven psychological theories about the nature of man and how he is to live and change.

Myers says:

Finally, to think that all "external interpretative grids" (even those drawn from the secular world) are illegitimate betrays a startling ignorance not only of the Scripture, of church history, and of the interpretative process, but also of the gift of teaching and the role of the teacher.

If anything, we've seen that God's priority is to communicate—to reveal Himself to the world. Clearly we need supernatural illumination, but He knows we also need a lot of earthy—even some earth—language. Thus we've seen again and again the Spirit of God redeemed the common parlance of

Biblical men and women in order to speak through the known idioms and ideas (even ideologies) of Biblical times. . . .<sup>139</sup> (Emphasis his.)

These two paragraphs clearly reveal that Myers is erecting another straw man. As stated earlier, our concern is not with language or figures of speech.

Our concern is with those extrabiblical systems that subsume, subvert, supplant, or supplement the Gospel of Jesus Christ in such a way as to deny the sufficiency of Christ and the Word of God. Those extrabiblical systems are not biblical theology, science, logic, or even research psychology. They are that part of psychology that is metaphysical, religious, and based on opinions. They are that part of psychology that does not qualify as science. For a more complete understanding of our position, we suggest readers examine Chapters 2 and 3 of *PsychoHeresy: The Psychological Seduction of Christianity*.<sup>140</sup>

As for the Colossian heresy, we believe Paul was intentionally speaking in general terms in Colossians 2:8 to include all present and future extrabiblical faith systems, philosophical world views and occult religions. Throughout Colossians 2, Paul specifically addresses those heresies active in Colossae at that time. However, Colossians 2:6-9 is timeless and broad. While we still suspect that Paul may have had in mind some Greek ideas, such as the four elements and temperaments, we were and are only making the suggestion as to the possibility. We are not the only ones who have suggested that there could be a relationship between Colossians 2:8 and the four cosmic elements.<sup>141</sup> Even so, we would certainly not be as dogmatic as Myers is when he declares that Paul “imports a story from Jewish legend”! (See our Response to Appendix III.)

Suffice it to say, we still contend that using the four temperaments and the DiSC/BPP goes against Paul’s admonition:

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).

And Myers has not proved otherwise.

---

Notes, next page

- 
- <sup>108</sup>108. 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. 13.
- <sup>109</sup>109. 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. 13.
- <sup>110</sup>110. *Ibid.* p. 14.
- <sup>111</sup>111. *Ibid.*
- <sup>112</sup>112. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- <sup>113</sup>113. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- <sup>114</sup>114. Bobgan, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
- <sup>115</sup>115. Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- <sup>116</sup>116. Thomas Ice, "Personality Profiles: Help or Hindrance for Christian Living," unpublished paper.
- <sup>117</sup>117. Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- <sup>118</sup>118. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- <sup>119</sup>119. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- <sup>120</sup>120. *Ibid.*, p. 15-18.
- <sup>121</sup>121. Leon Morris quoted by Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- <sup>122</sup>122. Leon Morris. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971, pp. 116, 117.
- <sup>123</sup>123. Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
- <sup>124</sup>124. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- <sup>125</sup>125. Dr. S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., "1 Corinthians Commentary." *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962, p. 1245.
- <sup>126</sup>126. Myers, *op. cit.* p. 18.
- <sup>127</sup>127. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- <sup>128</sup>128. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- <sup>129</sup>129. *New World Dictionary, op. cit.*
- <sup>130</sup>130. Myers, *op. cit.* p. 18.
- <sup>131</sup>131. Lewis B. Radford. *The Epistle to the Colossians and the Epistle to Philemon*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931, p.205.
- <sup>132</sup>132. Ronald H. Nash. *Christianity & the Hellenistic World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984, p. 195.
- <sup>133</sup>133. Myers, *op. cit.* p. 20.
- <sup>134</sup>134. Sigmund Koch, ed. *Psychology: A Study of a Science*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959-63.
- <sup>135</sup>135. Karl Popper, "Scientific Theory and Falsifiability," *Perspectives in Philosophy*. Robert N. Beck, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1975.
- <sup>136</sup>136. Myers, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.
- <sup>137</sup>137. Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
- <sup>138</sup>138. Myers, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.
- <sup>139</sup>139. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- <sup>140</sup>140. Bobgan. *PsychoHeresy*.
- <sup>141</sup>141. Radford, *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 64, 224, 225.
-

## CONCLUSION

In his conclusion, Myers asks:

Do the Bobgans see what their hyper-reaction is leading to? What it's doing in churches across America? How it's dividing the Body—our own included?<sup>142</sup>

The Bible speaks of ones causing division as those bringing in doctrines “contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned,” not those exposing those false teachings.

Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences **contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned**; and avoid them (Romans 16:17).

We ask in reply: Will Myers and the Spring Branch Community Church leadership see, after reading our book and this response, how unbiblical and detrimental their position is? Will the leadership of SBCC see their error and repent? Will Ken Voges see his error and repent? Will the people in the congregation, who have supported this false teaching, see their error and repent?

Myers says:

Every teacher should open-handedly examine his doctrine before those who would question him—but even more before the One who will render him the stricter judgement [sic] (Jas. 3:1).<sup>143</sup>

We say “amen” to that and have offered to meet publicly with Ken Voges in an open meeting at SBCC.

Myers says, “We must beware that we do not limit Christ’s sufficiency.” There is no way to limit the sufficiency of Christ. He is always sufficient whether people rely on His sufficiency or not. However, adding the DiSC for understanding the nature of man and how he is to live reduces faith in the sufficiency of Christ for sanctification and Christian living. In their propagation and strong defense of the four temperaments and the DiSC, SBCC has not indicated full reliance on the sufficiency of Christ.

Myers says, “Through Him the heavens are still declaring the glory of the one Who spoke through Balam’s [sic] ass. Can’t he speak through PPS?”<sup>144</sup> God is sovereign. He can speak through whatever means He wishes. He could speak to a man in a bar or a brothel; but it’s doubtful He would want a man in either place or that a church should recommend either or incorporate either into its activities. We figure if God can speak though PPS, He can speak through astrology as well, but would He? By the way, what is Myers implying by comparing the PPS to Balaam’s ass?

Myers says:

Finally, for all their talk of extrabiblical methods for typing people, the Bobgans themselves use a rather extrabiblical method of fingering sin. They never confront in private those they critique in public.<sup>145</sup>

Myers' only Bible verse for his position on the matter is Matthew 18:15. Is that what Matthew 18:15 teaches? We think not.

Before addressing the biblical issue, please note that ours is not the only book that critiques an individual. *The Agony of Deceit* critiques a number of media evangelists and *Witch Hunt* critiques Dave Hunt and us. Myers apparently believes that such people as R. C. Sproul, C. Everett Koop, Walter Martin, and others were unbiblical for critiquing Christian leaders without talking with them privately first. Also, Myers must believe that Moody Press and Nelson were wrong to publish such critiques.

In addition, if Myers went to seminary he must know all about the theological criticisms that occur, including naming of names. Did he ever ask his professors why they did not follow his understanding of Matthew 18 before they critiqued the teachings of any other theologian in class?

Myers suggests, on the basis of Matthew 18, that confrontation should be done on a one-to-one basis. However, Matthew 18 applies to personal offenses and not doctrinal problems. In all cases of our work there is no intent on our part to offend anyone. We don't know these people whose writing we have evaluated, and they have never personally offended us.

The question is then: why publicly? If those whom we critique were not public with their work, it would be inappropriate for us to critique them publicly. If you wish specific Scripture regarding meeting publicly on doctrinal issues, read Galatians 2, particularly verses 11 and 14: "But when Peter was come to Antioch I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed. . . . But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all. . . ." While Paul was speaking of Peter's conduct, what Peter was doing had grave doctrinal implications. Therefore it needed to be public. Also in Acts, the Jerusalem council heard both sides of the issue of what was to be done about Gentile converts regarding circumcision. Both sides presented their case. See Acts 15.

If you stop to think about it, a book is as public as a live debate. But, a live debate presents both parties to be heard and the church can judge. The problem in the church is the lack of trust in the sufficiency of Scripture. Where is the Berean attitude today? Remember how Paul commended the Bereans for checking him out (Acts 17:10-12)?

Please look at the history of the church and you will see that public critiquing was always a part of the church. The various church councils were often heated debates between various men. What were the 95 theses on the Wittenberg door all about? Luther named and debated many men publicly so others could judge. Taken to an extreme, Myers' position would abort the Reformation, which we don't think he would like to do. It may be that Myers is not familiar with church history and is unaware of the debates. Scripture provides a basis for public disagreement in the church, and church history and practice demonstrate this was done from the very beginning.

What the Bible does speak out against, however, is division caused by elevating personalities (1 Cor. 1), infighting not having to do with essential doctrine but motivated by selfish desires—having one's own way (3 John), and division caused by heresy (Galatians 1 and 2 Peter 2). Our concern is doctrine, but this disagreement with SBCC seems to be the result of elevating personalities (Voges and Braund).

When we were asked to speak at a pastors' conference at the Metropolitan Tabernacle in London, we said that we would only speak if permitted to critique popular Christian leaders by name. Dr. Peter Masters, the pastor there, asked whom we would critique. We said Dobson, Crabb, Collins, Meier, and Minirth. After a brief pause on his end of the

phone, he said, “That will be just fine because they’re all Americans.” It certainly gave us another perspective on the matter.

We recommend Dr. Jay Adams’ book *Handbook of Church Discipline*. Adams says:

Some think that if one Christian differs with the writings or public statements of another Christian on a point of doctrine, without rancor or any problem between them as persons, he is wrong for stating the differences publicly before going privately to the brother with whom he disagrees. **That is a misconception.** First of all, there is no unreconciled condition between them; they simply differ. Secondly, therefore, there is no matter of church discipline involved. Thirdly, even if this were a matter of discipline, the first party spoke or wrote publicly—he put it before the church or the world; he did not speak privately. **For that reason it is appropriate for the second brother to write or speak as publicly as the first did in refuting what he thinks is a wrong interpretation of the Scriptures and which, therefore, he believes may hurt the church if he doesn’t.**<sup>146</sup> (Emphasis added.)

Yet Myers refers to what we do as a “sneak attack.”<sup>147</sup> Apparently he believes that the men mentioned above are also guilty of “sneak attack,” as well as the theologians who critique others without seeing them on a one-to-one basis. Add to this, Christian publications, such as *Christianity Today* and others who do not send negative book reviews or critiques to individuals prior to publication. If Myers is to be consistent, he would have to say that all of these men, magazines, and seminaries are guilty of “sneak attack.” And to be consistent, even Dr. Mike Kempainen is to be criticized as well because he did not confront us on a one-to-one basis before allowing his criticism of us to be added to Myers’ paper. And, Myers would have to criticize himself for having permitted it without meeting us on a one-to-one basis. And if Myers thinks that his phone call exonerated him from being guilty of critiquing us publicly without speaking to us first, we must mention the fact that his words on the phone did not even touch on the kinds of statements he made about us in his paper. Sound ridiculous? Of course! We have been publicly criticized by others. Yet we have never even hinted that anyone should contact us before going public.

Myers says:

And does he [Bobgan] really love mankind—does he really seek the public good who walks over his neighbor on his way to serve it? “But who is my neighbor?” the Bobgans ask. “We’ve never even met our targets! Are we our brothers’ keeper?”<sup>148</sup>

Myers called and spoke with me (Martin) regarding his paper. In response, no such questions were asked by me, nor did I use the term *targets*. **Myers made up those quotes!** I do not appreciate him misrepresenting me in this way.

We appeal to Myers to think in terms of how important these issues are to the church at large and to refrain from such misrepresentations in the future. This is an example of just how desperate Myers is to defend Voges, the four temperaments, and SBCC. We hope and pray that Myers does not present the Gospel in the same manner revealed in his paper.

In ending his paper, Myers says, “Now more than ever we must remember the Reformation dictum: In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in all things charity.”<sup>149</sup>

The teachings of Ken Voges are now official dogma at SBCC. These teachings violate the sufficiency of Christ orthodoxy of the church. According to the information given in Myers' paper, for SBCC, Christ's sufficiency includes the four temperaments, the DiSC model, and the Personal Profile System. But, any system that focuses on strengths and weaknesses of various temperament types is limited to reaching (at best) the greatest potential of what the Bible calls the "old man." In Philippians 1:6, Paul is not talking about people reaching their greatest potential through understanding themselves through temperament categories. He is talking about the Holy Spirit's work in each person through the process of sanctification, whereby believers are transformed into the image of Christ.

As much as psychologists attempt to utilize the wisdom of man to improve the natural man or to enhance the sanctification process, the theories and therapies of the world are both intrinsically and ultimately at odds with the Word of God and the Work of the Holy Spirit. There is no biblical mandate to understand ourselves according to four categories of traits in order to reach a so-called God-given potential. Great theological confusion arises when anyone attempts to mix godless systems of understanding the nature of man with what the Bible says about mankind and the dynamics of human behavior.

The one cry of the Reformation known to all is "Sola Scriptura." SBCC is now on record that it is not a Sola Scriptura church, even though it may give lip service to Sola Scriptura, as do many churches.

SBCC has a less than sufficiency of Christ doctrine and a less than Sola Scriptura position. We can only pray that the leadership of SBCC will repent of such a position and return to the sufficiency of Christ and His all-sufficient Word. We pray that Ken Voges will repent and be the first to lead SBCC to a truly sufficiency of Christ and sufficiency of the Word position. May God grant it!

---

<sup>142</sup>142. 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. 24.

<sup>143</sup>143. Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>144</sup>144. Ibid., p. 25

<sup>145</sup>145. Ibid., pp. 25-26.

<sup>146</sup>146. new footnote Jay E. Adams. *Handbook of Church Discipline*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervon Publishing House, 1986, pp. 34-35.

<sup>147</sup>147. Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>148</sup>148. Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>149</sup>149. Ibid.

---

**RESPONSE TO APPENDIX I:**

“A Rewrite of Voges & Braun’s [sic] page 35-38  
in Light of Bobgan’s [sic] Criticisms  
(Bobgan p. 86ff)”

by Dr. Mike Kempainen  
ThD, Dallas Theological Seminary”

Dr. Mike Kempainen rewrote and thereby improved a clearly unbiblical self-love teaching on the part of Voges and Braund. We are pleased that, as a result of our critique of Voges and Braund, this improvement has been made. However, we believe that at least one part of the rewrite is unbiblical. We do not wish to address that part in this paper.

Kempainen says in his concluding paragraph:

This is why it can help us to understand the temperament traits of others. It allows us to “love them”, [sic] (to meet their needs) with a more thorough understanding.<sup>150</sup>

If by “temperament traits,” Kempainen means the four temperaments, then we would disagree with him for all the reasons stated in our book and in this paper.

## RESPONSE TO APPENDIX II:

“Ken Voges on Abraham and Sarah:  
a Response to Bobgan’s [sic] Criticisms  
(Bobgan p. 80ff)”

Voges begins his response to our book by saying:

The DiSC behavior model is a **trait system** clustering together four scales of behavior: Dominant, Influencing, Steadiness, and Compliant.<sup>151</sup> (Emphasis his.)

As we explain earlier in this paper, the model is used as a type system akin to the four temperaments. Four types (with 16 subtypes) are created by clustering the four traits. Then extensive descriptions are added, which include numerous characteristics that are assumed to accompany the traits in various intensities. Furthermore, the instrument measures only four traits and then provides descriptions as if numerous traits had been measured.

Voges says:

In addition, the Personal Profile and Biblical Profile are **focused** instruments in that they measure both an individual’s behavior in a particular situation (Graph I) and their core behavior (Graph II).<sup>152</sup> (Emphasis his.)

The instrument may be intended to do so, but it is too brief and superficial to accomplish that.

We still contend that it is both pointless and misleading to identify people from the Bible according to the DiSC/BPP. Did those persons even take the test? No. Voges’s information is too limited to know how they would respond even if the PPS were valid. Please see pages 119-129 and 173-182 of *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing* for a detailed explanation of the problems with typing persons in the Bible.

One problem that is extremely evident in Voges’s response is that once a person is committed to a system, such as the DiSC, he will see everything according to that perspective. He will also tend to notice confirming evidence and not notice or reject nonconfirming evidence. Thus having assigned Sarah and Abraham to their respective categories, he will see whatever they do according to those categories. That is not proof for the system; that is evidence of commitment and faith. We discuss this issue earlier in our paper where we quote eminent philosopher of science Dr. Karl Popper.

To demonstrate the extent of Voges’s commitment, we quote him as follows:

I believe the four temperaments were a part of the creation of man by God and David gave credit to the Lord in Psalm 139:13 when he said, “The Lord formed my inward parts.”<sup>153</sup>

Voges has no evidence, aside from his say-so, that the four temperaments “were a part of the creation of man by God.” This is an extreme statement based upon no biblical evidence whatsoever. It is patently arrogant or naive of him to ascribe the four temperaments to the

“creation of man by God.” Read the sentence we quote above. Does the second part of the sentence have anything to do with the first part? Of course not! This is simply an assumption on the part of Voges and another example of eisegesis.

Voges goes on to compound his confusion by saying, “Jeremiah gave credit to the Lord in forming him in his mother’s womb. Jeremiah 1:5. Paul gave testimony to as [sic] similar thought. Galatians 1:15.” Evidently Voges is so caught up in a four temperaments view of mankind that any reference to a child in the womb means the four temperaments. You could look in hundreds of theology books and you will not find one reliable commentator who makes such a connection for these passages.

The four temperaments represent, at the very least, an invalid psychological system and, at worst, an occult system. As a psychological system, it is supposedly found in Scripture. However, apparently neither Voges nor Myers realizes that any psychological system can be found in Scripture if one wants to find it. A Freudian will find the id, ego, and superego somewhat similar to the Trinity. A Jungian will find the four Jungian preferences in the Bible and even be able to identify biblical saints and patriarchs according to them in the same manner as Voges and Braund do in their BPP. The truth is that through eisegesis one can find some evidence for almost anything silly or satanic in Scripture. But, if one begins with Scripture and exegetes properly, one will never come to a Freudian, Jungian, four temperaments, or DiSC conclusion. These psychological systems came from the worldly wisdom of men at least or from the occult wisdom at worst. We are warned about both in Scripture.

Nevertheless we fear that Voges may remain committed to the DiSC, the PPS, and the BPP. After all, he is the “author of the Biblical Personal Profile” and “field manager for PERFORMAX.”<sup>154</sup> With that kind of commitment, it may be too hard to change.

### RESPONSE TO APPENDIX III:

Dr. Mike Kempainen on Bobgan's Link of  
 "Elementary Principles" (Col. 2:8) with the Four Temperaments  
 (Bobgan p. 44ff)

Kempainen begins his paper by saying:

The fact that people are different and individual in personality and temperament cannot be disputed.<sup>155</sup>

We certainly hope that Kempainen does not think we are disputing that. Perhaps his first paragraph is simply an introduction to his discourse. However, it may leave anyone who has read *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing* with the idea that either he is erecting a straw man or he has not read our book, because we do talk about individual differences.

Our concern is not with observation and discussion about individual differences. Our concern is with typologies that identify a few traits and presume to assign people to categorical types. Such practice actually diminishes the nuances of personality differences. Individuals are put into categories, reduced to types, then described according to the types, and as a result are very often misunderstood. (See Chapter 7 of *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*).

Kempainen begins his second paragraph with the same kind of misunderstanding (or not knowing) what we have written. He says:

Martin Bobgan's linking of all temperament study and theory to astrology and the occult is both naive and incorrect.<sup>156</sup>

Kempainen is the one who is incorrect. We have **not** linked all temperament study and theory to astrology and the occult. Individual differences of temperament and personality can certainly be observed and studied apart from the occult. Does Kempainen think that the four temperaments and its derivatives are the only ways to study individual differences? If so, he is naive about this whole area of psychology and psychological testing.

Unfortunately Kempainen's argument follows a misunderstanding of what we have said, but it appears that in defending the four temperaments he draws a parallel between using the four temperaments and practicing baptism. He says:

The early Greeks were trying to explain the origin of the differences [among people], and used some primitive and pagan symbols to do this. Even though they linked these things together, this doesn't mean that evaluating personality is therefore connected with the occult! That is like saying that since the ancient mystery religions practiced forms of baptism, therefore baptism is a pagan custom and should be outlawed for believer [sic] in Christ.<sup>157</sup>

First of all, we have never said or implied that "evaluating one's personality is therefore connected with the occult"! We have said that using the four temperaments and the zodiac

are. Moreover, this is a strange argument for any theologian to make. If baptism were absent from the Bible, as the four temperaments of Greek astrology are absent, there would be no biblical justification for baptism. God has not commanded us to use the four temperaments and astrology. He has commanded us to baptize (Matthew 28:19). Kempainen's argument reveals a low view of Scriptural admonitions.

Kempainen continues his argument:

Many Christians who see the value of understanding the personality and traits of other people do so for the purpose of meeting that person's needs ("loving one another"). The assumption is that God gives each of us a certain personality at birth, for His own purpose. We don't create it, [sic] we merely recognize it so that the uniqueness of that person can be fully used for God.<sup>158</sup>

What does Kempainen mean—"that God gives each of us a certain personality at birth"? Since he does not elaborate, we don't know if he means a Freudian-type determinism or some general personality traits. We also don't know how fixed he thinks this personality might be.

Social psychologist Dr. Carol Tavris discusses the idea of constancy versus change in an article titled "The Freedom to Change." She discusses Freud and his psychoanalytic therapy and says:

Now the irony is that many people who are not fooled by astrology for one minute subject themselves to therapy for years, where the same errors of logic and interpretation often occur. . . . Astrologists think we are determined at birth (or even conception) by our stars; psychoanalysts think we are determined within a few years of birth by our parents (and our anatomy).<sup>159</sup>

Tavris goes on to discuss the research that opposes the idea of Freudian determinism. She cites the work of Dr. Orville Brim of the Foundation for Child Development in New York and says, "Most of Brim's career has been devoted to charting the course of child development and its relation to adult personality." She declares that Brim is convinced that "far from being programmed permanently by the age of 5, people are virtually reprogrammable throughout life." She quotes him as saying, "Hundreds and hundreds of studies now document the fact of personality change in adulthood."<sup>160</sup> She also quotes Brim as saying:

Social scientists are unable to predict adult personality from childhood or even from adolescence in any important way. We can't blame the methods anymore, and we can't say that people who don't fit the predictions are deviant, unhealthy or strange. They are the norm.<sup>161</sup>

In addition to Brim, Tavris discusses the work of Dr. Jerome Kagan, a professor at Harvard University. Kagan, together with Howard Moss, wrote a classic book in the field titled *Birth to Maturity: A Study in Psychological Development*. However, after further research, Kagan made an 180-degree turn in his ideas of child development. After taking a second look at *Birth to Maturity*, Kagan and Moss "could find little relation between psychological qualities during the first three years of life . . . and any aspect of behavior in

adulthood.” According to Tavris, “Kagan now believes that few of a baby’s attributes last indefinitely, unless the environment perpetuates them.”<sup>162</sup>

Brim and Kagan later wrote a book together titled *Constancy and Change in Human Development*. They say:

The view that emerges from this work is that humans have a capacity for change across the entire life span. . . there are important growth changes across the life span from birth to death, many individuals retain a great capacity for change, and the consequences of the events of early childhood are continually transformed by later experiences, making the course of human development more open than many have believed.<sup>163</sup>

In a personal letter to us from Kagan, he also indicated disagreement with a fixed-at-birth or fixed-early-life view of personality. He says, “In fact, what evidence there is, and there is a good amount of it, shows a continuing change in personality over the lifespan.”<sup>164</sup>

Kempainen says:

Astrology assumes that one’s personality is based on the date of birth, because of the particular clustering of the stars and planets. This assumption of origin is unscientific, occult and proven to be incorrect. However, this does not mean that we do not have discernable [sic] personality traits, or that we can’t use an understanding of them to serve God.<sup>165</sup>

We agree that individuals have discernible personality traits. However, the four temperaments are also “unscientific, occult and proven to be incorrect.”

Kempainen says:

Martin Bobgan makes some very dangerous and reaching assumptions in his study of the Greek word **stoicheia** in the New Testament.”

Kempainen deals with this issue in the balance of his paper. It was really silly and useless for him to do so. We presented an understanding of Colossians 2:8 under the word *may*, used a number of times. This section reveals more about Kempainen than about us. Why does he bother to respond to a brief section of our book in which we talk about possibilities rather than actualities? What motivates him to speak of “some very dangerous and reaching assumptions”? How are they “dangerous”? To business? To perpetrating faith in unscientific models of personality differences and invalid tests?

One would think Kempainen’s academic training would restrain him from such extreme nonsense when what we wrote was suggestive and not declarative. One would further think that in all of Kempainen’s academic training he would have encountered this possibility of interpretation.

Here is what Kempainen refers to as our “very dangerous and reaching assumptions.” He says:

In a very presumptuous [sic] linking of “could be” relationships Bobgan says, “Moreover, the apostle Paul may also have been warning against those principles and elements as they related to the four temperaments and astrology. . . . In using the word stoicheion, which can be translated “elementary principles” and

“elements,” which are basic to the four temperaments, Paul could actually have been warning against astrology and the four temperaments.”<sup>166</sup>

Now for the sake of the reader we will present the quotation in its entirety and within its context.

Concerning the word *stoicheion*, *The Expanded Vine's Expository Dictionary of the New Testament* says:

In the N.T. it is used of (a) the substance of the material world, 2 Pet. 3:10, 12; (b) the delusive speculations of Gentile cults and of Jewish theories, treated as elementary principles, “the rudiments of the world,” Col. 2:8, spoken of as “philosophy and vain deceit;” these were presented as superior to faith in Christ; at Colossae the worship of angels, mentioned in ver. 18, is explicable by the supposition, held by both Jews and Gentiles in that district, that the constellations were either themselves animated heavenly beings, or were governed by them.<sup>167</sup>

Thus, in the very same word lie the possibilities of the Greek teachings on the four elements and the four principles. Therefore, the *stoicheion* spoken of by Paul may, indeed, have been those “first principles” of Empedocles and Hippocrates (hot, cold, moist, and dry) as related to the elements (earth, air, fire, and water).

Moreover, the apostle Paul may also have been warning against those principles and elements as they related to the four temperaments and astrology. Could it be that Paul was specifically including the Greek philosophies of the four elements, the four principles or qualities, the four temperaments, and astrology in his warning? Indeed, the subject of worshipping angels in the same passage may be related to the occult significance of the four elements—earth, air, fire, and water—as they went beyond physical compounds of the earth and were thought of as spirit beings in themselves.

In using the word *stoicheion*, which can be translated “elementary principles” and “elements,” which are basic to the four temperaments, Paul could actually have been warning against astrology and the four temperaments, along with other philosophies and vain deceits. No doubt he was familiar with Greek teachings of humors, temperaments, and other aspects of astrology.

Even if Paul had not been familiar with such teachings, they nevertheless would fit into the general category of “philosophies,” “vain deceits,” and “rudiments of the world.” Paul urged Christians to continue their walk with the Lord on the same basis as their initial salvation. He wrote:

As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have

been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. 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. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power (Colossians 2:6-10).<sup>168</sup>

Kempainen says, “One error is to say that the ‘elements’ are basic to the four temperaments.” If that is an error, then historians have made the same error. They are basic in that the four elements are basic to the development of the four temperaments. Please refer to Chapters 2 and 3 of *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing* for an overview of the historical basis of the four temperaments.

Kempainen continues:

The second error is Bobgan’s assumption regarding Paul’s use of the word **stoicheion**. He correctly points out the root of the word and some of the usages that Vine lists, but then makes some incredible jumps to include the “four temperaments.”<sup>169</sup>

Kempainen then gives instances of where the word is used in the New Testament, 2 Peter 3:10, 11; Hebrews 5:12; Galatians 4:3, 9; and Colossians 2:8, 20. He continues:

While the word basically means a group or a row of things, the meaning evolved to refer to either (1) the physical elements, or (2) rudimentary instruction.<sup>170</sup>

Kempainen then quotes J. B. Lightfoot in reference to the term *stoicheion* in Galatians:

On the other hand a few of the fathers (Jerome, Gennadius, Perimasius) adopted the other sense, “elementary teaching.” This is probably the correct interpretation, both as simpler in itself and as suiting the context better. St. Paul seems to be dwelling still on the rudimentary character of the law, as fitted for an earlier stage in the world’s history. The expression occurs again in reference to formal ordinances, Col. 2:8 & 20. . . . In these passages the words of the context which are emphasized seem to show that a mode of instruction is signified by *ta stoicheia tou kosmou*.<sup>171</sup>

We appreciate Lightfoot’s care as a scholar. He is not dogmatic about his understanding of *ta stoicheia tou kosmou*. Notice how he uses such expressions as “probably the correct interpretation,” “seems to be,” and “seem to show.” The other scholar to which Kempainen refers, A. T. Robertson, exercises equal care with his opening word, “probably.”

Probably here Paul has in mind the rudimentary character of the law as it applies to both Jews and Gentiles, to all the knowledge of the word. . . all were in the elementary state before Christ came.<sup>172</sup>

Not all scholars agree, however. R. Alan Cole presents a different view of the meaning of *stoicheia tou kosmou* in Galatians 4:3. After mentioning various ways of translating those words, Cole says:

Most modern commentators, however, prefer to translate either as *elemental spirits of the universe*, or more fancifully as ‘signs of the zodiac,’ which often represented such spirits in popular belief. Earth, air, fire, water (‘the elements’) and the stars were often linked in the human mind with vague spiritual forces, as they are in astrology even today.<sup>173</sup>

We include this alternative view to show that interpretations are not always the final word. They are not inspired! There will be differences among theologians. And we are not alone.

But these quotations have to do with Galatians, not the verse from Colossians, about which Kempainen contends we make “very dangerous and reaching assumptions.” He again refers to Lightfoot. Kempainen says, “In Paul’s use of this phrase to the Colossians (2:8, 20) Lightfoot acknowledges that some early fathers understood it to mean the ‘heavenly bodies as marking the seasons, so that the observance of ‘festivals and new-moons and sabbaths’ was a sort of bondage to them.” However, Kempainen quotes Lightfoot to say that the idea of seasons, “festivals and new-moons and sabbaths” is “quite out of place here: for (1) the context suggests some mode of instruction.” We agree that Paul is speaking of avoiding certain forms of instruction in Colossians 2:8. So far, however, Kempainen fails to disprove that Paul’s warning does not either generally or specifically include some of the Greek teachings about the cosmos (which, of course, included the four elements and the four temperaments).

In his paper, Myers asserts that Paul was influenced by Philo and even supposes that he followed Philo’s method of interpretation. Yet, both Myers and Kempainen fail to make the connection between Philo and Paul regarding Colossians 2:8. In his commentary on Galatians, F. F. Bruce says:

Elsewhere Philo speaks of the Greeks who revere the four elements [*stoicheia*]—earth, water, air, fire—and give them the names of divinities (respectively Demeter, Poseidon, Hera, Hephaestus); in yet another place he says that “some have deified the four elements [*stoicheia*], earth, water, air and fire; others the sun and moon and the other planets and fixed stars.”<sup>174</sup>

Thus our assertion that Paul might have been aware of the teachings about the four elements, the four humors, and even the four temperaments may not be quite as far reaching as Kempainen declares.

Regarding the Colossian heresy (Colossians 2), L. B. Radford says:

Various attempts have been made to identify the Colossian heresy with more or less definite religious movements of the first century. The absence, however, of any clear evidence of any similar contemporary heresy in the apostolic mission field suggests or at least permits the idea that Colossianism was a local phenomenon, a reaction to a particular religious environment.<sup>175</sup>

Radford then sketches the religious environment of the Graeco-Roman world in general and then the Colossian Church. He says:

The worship of the *stoicheia*, the cosmic angels, at Colossae was clearly due not to a speculative tendency without any practical bearing, but to an essential interest of the religious life of the Hellenistic age. The Colossian heresiarchs apparently taught that, while the Gospel had brought relief from the sense of sin, it had not relieved men from the obligation of serving and conciliating the Elements to which they were subject from birth to death.<sup>176</sup>

Radford continues:

There is an intimate connexion between this angel-worship and the two other specific features of the movement, viz. the celebration of festival seasons and the observance of ascetic rules. This asceticism was probably prompted not merely by the need and duty of self-discipline as a condition of mystic vision, **but also perhaps by the current idea that the organs and constituents of the human body, composed as they were of the elements, must be kept pure in honour of the spirits in charge of the elements of the universe.**<sup>177</sup> (Emphasis added.)

Here we have both the four elements (earth, air, fire, and water) and the humors as composed of those elements.

Radford says:

In any case the Colossian heresy represents an attempt to create a still larger and wider syncretism, in which all that seemed to them essential in Christianity was to be combined with the purest elements of the existing syncretism. The Colossian heresiarchs were proud of their improved Christianity, their new Christian theosophy. They and their Colossian disciples had now to learn that it was not merely less than Christian; it was in vital conflict with all that was most essential in Christianity.<sup>178</sup>

**And that is the essence of what we contend is the problem of syncretizing the four temperaments with Christianity.**

It is amazing that Kempainen spends most of his paper refuting what we and some scholars suggest might be a possible interpretation of Colossians 2:8. He thus avoids the problem of turning to “philosophies and vain deceits,” of which the four temperaments and other pseudoscientific personality theories are. If Kempainen wants to justify Christians using the four temperaments, “he must do so outside the pages of Scripture.”

### **RESPONSE TO APPENDIX IV:**

“Dallas Theological Seminary Response to Thomas Ice’s Bobgan-like Arguments”

by Dr. John W. Reed

We hope that the title of Appendix IV, “Dallas Theological Seminary Response to Thomas Ice’s Bobgan-like Arguments,” was not selected by Dr. John W. Reed. He would know better than to suggest that his response represents Dallas Theological Seminary (DTS)!

This reminds us of when three faculty members at DTS became enamored with the Vineyard Ministries. Someone told us, “Dallas Theological Seminary has become Charismatic!” Of course what he should have said is that three professors at DTS have become charismatic. Same issue here. Whoever titled this section (probably Myers) should have titled it “A Response from Dr. John W. Reed.” This is one more example of misrepresenting.

Also, there is no mention of our name in Reed’s letter so the reference to “Bobgan-like Arguments” is spurious.

In his letter to Tommy Ice, Reed says:

I have found Ken’s instrument and support materials to be valid and meaningful in helping pastors understand their styles, in selecting and properly managing team members, and in pre-marriage and marriage counseling. Also, I have found no major inconsistencies with the Scriptures and Ken’s work. I respect your right to your opinions; however, I plan on continuing to use his materials in my courses and workshops.<sup>179</sup>

As the above example of the three faculty members indicates, professors can be wrong about important biblical matters. At the time and probably even now the faculty members (now ex-faculty members) could have written a similar letter about the Vineyard teachings. We believe that Reed is as wrong as those three faculty members about an issue that may be just as important.

Reed is wrong about the DiSC model being “valid,” and he is wrong that it has “no major inconsistencies with the Scriptures.” Reed’s use of those materials is wrong both scientifically and biblically. It is unfortunate that Reed is training pastors to go out and to believe in such unscientific and unbiblical material. We hope the students know better than their professor. Tommy Ice certainly did!

It may be that Reed is referring to face validity, rather than real statistical validity. If he is referring to the latter, as we have already shown, he is in error. If he is referring to the former, he is wrong again. In defining face validity, Dr. Anne Anastasi says face validity “is not validity in the technical sense; it refers, not to what the test actually measures, but to what it appears superficially to measure.”<sup>180</sup> If Reed tells his students and others about validity related to the DiSC model, then in all fairness, he should indicate his academic basis for such a decision, if indeed he has one.

**RESPONSE TO APPENDIX V:  
“SBCC’s Elders’ Response to Ken Voges”**

The elders at SBCC say to Voges:

We reaffirm that you have been faithful in rightly dividing the Word. We have prepared a detailed position paper on this matter which is available upon your request.<sup>181</sup>

It is sad when a leader in the church teaches false doctrine; it is sadder yet when the elders of the church defend and support that teaching of false doctrine. W. Phillip Keller wrote a book titled *Predators in Our Pulpits*. He was not only referring to pastors, but to all who occupy positions of leadership. The big problem is that the sheep are being led astray by the leadership.

If the elders are eager for the truth, they will invite me (Martin) to debate Ken Voges before the church community. We think anything less is unbiblical.

- 
- <sup>150</sup>149. Mike Kempainen, "A Rewrite of Voges & Braun's [sic] page [sic] 35-38 in Light of Bobgan's Criticisms (Bobgan p. 80ff)," in Myers, op. cit., Appendix I.
- <sup>151</sup>150. Ken Voges, "Ken Voges on Abraham and Sarah: a Response to Bobgan's [sic] Criticisms (Bobgan p. 80ff)," in Myers, op. cit., Appendix II.
- <sup>152</sup>151. *Ibid.*
- <sup>153</sup>152. *Ibid.*
- <sup>154</sup>153. Ken Voges & Ron Braund. *Understanding How Others Misunderstand You*. Chicago: Moody, 1990.
- <sup>155</sup>154. Mike Kempainen, "Elementary Principles" (Col. 2:8) with the Four Temperaments," in Myers, op. cit., Appendix III.
- <sup>156</sup>155. *Ibid.*
- <sup>157</sup>156. *Ibid.*
- <sup>158</sup>157. *Ibid.*
- <sup>159</sup>158. Carol Tavis, "The Freedom to Change," *Prime Time*, October 1980, p. 28.
- <sup>160</sup>159. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- <sup>161</sup>160. *Ibid.*
- <sup>162</sup>161. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- <sup>163</sup>162. Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Jerome Kagan. *Constancy and Change in Human Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 180, p. 1.
- <sup>164</sup>163. Letter on file.
- <sup>165</sup>164. Kempainen, "Elementary Principles," *op. cit.*
- <sup>166</sup>165. Kempainen, "Elementary Principles," *op. cit.*
- <sup>167</sup>166. We. E. Vine. *The Expanded Vine's Expository Dictionary of the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1984, pp. 352-353.
- <sup>168</sup>167. Bobgan, *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-47.
- <sup>169</sup>168. Kempainen, "Elementary Principles," *op. cit.*
- <sup>170</sup>169. *Ibid.*
- <sup>171</sup>170. J. B. Lightfoot, quoted by Kempainen, *Ibid.*
- <sup>172</sup>171. A. T. Robertson quoted by Kempainen, *Ibid.*
- <sup>173</sup>172. Alan C. Cole. *Galatians*, Revised Edition. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989, pp. 159-160.
- <sup>174</sup>173. F. F. Bruce. *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1982, p. 193.
- <sup>175</sup>174. L. B. Radford. The Epistle to the Colossians and the Epistle to Philemon, Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931, p. 62.
- <sup>176</sup>175. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
- <sup>177</sup>176. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
- <sup>178</sup>177. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
- <sup>179</sup>178. Dr. John W. Reed letter to Rev. Thomas D. Ice, September 28, 1992.
- <sup>180</sup>179. Anne Anastasi. *Psychological Testing*, Sixth Edition. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988, p. 144.
- <sup>181</sup>180. Thomas M. LaHouse, Administrative Board Chairman, SBCC, to Ken Voges, November 9, 1992.
-