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.” 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.” 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??)” 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.

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.  

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.  

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 unproved, 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.  

(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.115

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.116

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.)117 (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 precedent) by the Holy Spirit Himself. This will free us to ask the second question: can we (in any way) use the extrabiblical?\(^{118}\) (Emphasis his.)\(^{119}\)

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.”\(^{120}\) 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.\(^{121}\)

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.\(^{122}\) (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.\textsuperscript{123}

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.\textsuperscript{124}” 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.,
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).  

(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.” 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.” 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.

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.

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 musteron, 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 “Babynoian [sic] mysteries,” or “mystery cults” far and away the most popular religion of Paul’s day: and one of the most licentious.130

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.131 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).132

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.”133 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.134,135

Myers further attempts to support the use of extrabiblical material like the four temperaments and the DiSC by citing Acts 17:23, 28.136 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.137

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 [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.138

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. . . . \textsuperscript{139} (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*.\textsuperscript{140}

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.\textsuperscript{141} 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.
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