

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL INTEGRATION OF THE PERSONALITY

Cătălin PÎRVU *

Abstract

Is the character of a person predetermined at birth by its own genetics and temperament, or does the individual rather develop the potentialities that are encouraged and never actualizes the ones that are discouraged by the environment and/or education?

The field of psychographics tries to answer these questions by determining constant categories of variations in attitudes, interests and opinions, but also temperaments on large groups of people, sorting by character types. These variables are the visible part of an invisible structure of psychological functions described for the first time by Carl Jung (1971).

The puzzle of psychographics sketched by authors such as Jung (1971), Myers & Briggs (1962) or David Keirsey (1998) is completed by the understandings in the fields of philosophy and metaphysics of Allan Watts (2014), or personal and universal mythology described by Joseph Campbell (2008) or Robert Moore and David Gillette (1991)

Keywords: character, temperament, education, metaphysics, philosophy, mythology, psychology, integration

Résumé

Est-ce que le caractère d'une personne est prédéterminé dès sa naissance par son propre tempérament et code génétique ou plutôt l'individu développe ses potentiels par l'encouragement et jamais ne les actualise, étant découragés par l'environnement et/ou par l'éducation ?

Le domaine de la psychographie essaie de répondre à ces questions tout en déterminant des catégories constantes de variations d'attitudes, intérêts, opinions et tempéraments des larges groupes de gens et en les sortant selon leur type de caractère. Ces variables sont la partie visible d'une structure invisible des fonctions psychologiques, décrite pour la première fois par Carl Jung (1971).

Le puzzle de la psychographie, esquissé par des auteurs comme Jung (1971), Myers et Briggs (1962) ou David Keisey (1998), est complété par les interprétations des champs de la philosophie et métaphysique selon Allan Watts (2014) ou par les interprétations provenant de la mythologie personnelle et universelle, selon Joseph Campbell (2008) ou Robert Moore et David Gillette (1991).

Mots-clés: Caractère, tempérament, éducation, métaphysique, philosophie, mythologie, psychologie, intégration

Rezumat

Este caracterul unei persoane predeterminat la naștere de către propriul său temperament și cod genetic, sau mai degrabă individul își dezvoltă acele potențialități care sunt încurajate și niciodată nu își actualizează acele potențialități care sunt descurajate de către mediu și / sau educație?

* Ph.D. Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, str. Caderea Bastiliei nr. 36, sector 1, Bucharest; phone: 0727260914; email: catalin.pirvu85@yahoo.com

Domeniul Psihografiei încearcă să răspundă la aceste întrebări determinând categorii constante de variații în atitudini, interese și opinii, precum și temperamente, pe grupuri mari de oameni, sortându-i după tipuri caracteriale. Aceste variabile sunt partea vizibilă a unei structuri invizibile formată din funcții psihologice și descrisă pentru prima dată de Carl Jung (1971).

Puzzle-ul psihografiei, schițat de autori precum Jung (1971), Myers și Briggs (1962) sau David Keirsey (1998) este completat de înțelegerile din câmpurile filosofiei și metafizicii de către Allan Watts (2014) sau de către înțelegerile venite din mitologia personală și universală, abordată de către Joseph Campbell (2008) sau Robert Moore și David Gillette (1991)

Cuvinte cheie: caracter, temperament, educație, metafizică, filosofie, mitologie, psihologie, integrare

1. Introduction

Are humans truly predisposed by their temperament towards developing a certain type of character and not another, or rather, depending on the influences of the environment and education, the character of the mature person becomes what it is encouraged to become? Can we box in a person's character in well defined and uniquely distinct categories, or is each person an unique combination of characteristics belonging to very distinct character categories?

It is proven that, although we belong to the same species, we are born different in many aspects. From infancy, when we had no self-awareness and the psychological environment did not yet have time to decisively put his imprint on our character, children exhibit different energetic and action tendencies. Some are less energetic, manifest themselves more discretely and do not actively seek other's company, while others seem to possess boundless energy and you can hardly keep them still in one single place for any considerable length of time. They shine in interaction and seem to charge themselves up on the attention they receive.

The energetic dimension of the personality looks to be a predisposition, something we are born into and that will accompany us for the rest of our lives, representing our internal motivation and our drive to choose some actions in the detriment of others. This energetic dimension is what we may call *temperament*.

The other dimension of personality is that of the habits of manifestation. Temperament is an energetic but also attitude configuration, but that energy, channeled through attitude needs an interface to interact with the environment. This interface is represented by actional habits. This configuration of habits is what we define as *character*.

Personality is formed by the interaction between temperament and character, between the internal energy caches and drives and the concrete modalities for manifesting it. From antiquity to the present day, thinkers, as well as medics have observed four grand personality types, each well individualized and very different from the other three types.

2. Functional approaches to temperament and character in philosophy and psychology

David Keirse (1998) traces the origins of temperament theory through history, discussing how Aelius Galenus, also known as Galen of Pergamon, born 130 AD in Pergamon Turkey and deceased in 200 AD in Rome, a well known surgeon and philosopher, named the four temperaments Sanguine, Melancholic, Choleric and Phlegmatic, and before him, in his work, *The Republic*, Plato spoke of similar characters referring to Artisans, Guardians, Idealists and Rationalists. Each of them has a well-defined structure which is individualized from the other three, and typically speaking, individuals fall largely into one of the categories, exemplifying many of the attributes of the character constellation to which they belong, and much less of the attributes of other characters.

The Medic Hippocrates (460–370 BC) was the first to introduce the four temperaments in the medical theory called Humorism, named after the humors (fluids) who were excessive or deficient in the body. He considers that certain emotional dispositions were caused by the excess or deficiency of bodily fluids (also called humors). These were blood, yellow bile, black bile and phlegm. Excessive blood gives the sanguine temperament, yellow bile, choleric, black bile, melancholic, and phlegm leads to the phlegmatic temperament.

The names Sanguine, Choleric, Melancholic and Phlegmatic came, though, not from Hippocrates, but from Galen (130-200 AD) in his dissertation *De Temperamentis* (Galen, 1981). He classified temperaments after the alchemical doctrine of hot / cold and wet / dry elements. Between these elements, there could also be balance, resulting nine total temperaments.

For example, an artisan will deeply cherish personal freedom for him and others, bending the rules to serve personal purposes, foregoing those responsibilities which would diminish his initiative or creativity and would force him to settle down and respect a schedule. A guardian, to the contrary, will appreciate the safety of a well thought out plan and a well-established routine and will put great effort in making a routine out of any activity to minimize effort. He will also enthusiastically assume management responsibilities and will put great efforts into respecting deadlines and keep promises. Idealists are not that much interested neither in respecting promises and deadlines, nor in personal freedom. They are secondary pursuits, the central place being occupied by benevolence, an empathetic and understanding attitude, and a sincere preoccupation for the motives, the motivation and the morale of the people they come in contact with. Rationals, on the other hand, are interested either in empathy and morale, nor routines and rules or creativity and artistic ability only insofar as they lead to their main focus: efficiency of operations based on empirical and logical data.

Each character has his own type of intelligence, and a worldview based on that type of intelligence. It will appreciate and pursue through his actions those kind of

behaviors that are directly linked to the values it can obtain with minimum effort by using their native intelligence. Actions belonging to other less acquired types of intelligence, which would consequently take more time and effort, will be mentally catalogued as being useless or worse, even dangerous, accentuating the bias of confirming one's own choices.

David Keirse (1998), continuing the work of Isabel Myers and Catherine Briggs (1962 / 1985) defines 4 types of intelligence:

- Tactical Intelligence – The Artisans
- Logistic Intelligence – The Guardians
- Diplomatic Intelligence – The Idealists
- Strategic Intelligence – The Rationalists

These types of intelligence are based on the original functional classification of Carl Gustav Jung. In his work published in 1921 (republished in 1971) *Psychological Types*, Jung undertakes pioneering work in the field of character type psychology and describes 4 types of polar characteristics that can be found in each of us and that combined lead to 16 psychological types. Myers and Briggs divide these functional types Jung was talking about in four major categories, grouped by the same common criterion. To these four categories, David Keirse also brings the temperamental component, associating the temperament type that the roman doctor Galen talked about in the past with Myers and Briggs's categories.

The psychological functions Jung is talking about are divided into the sensing function, the intuition function, the emotional function and the analytical thinking function. They are either directed at the external objective reality or at the internal subjective reality, depending on the generally extroverted or introverted attitude of consciousness.

“I name sensing all perception done through the sense organs, thinking the function of intellectual cognition and formation of logical conclusions, feeling a function of subjective evaluation, and intuition is perception by the means of the unconscious or perception of unconscious events” (Jung 1971, p. 518).

Sensing, intuition, feeling and thinking as functions, can either be oriented by the subject (introvertly) or by the object (extrovertly). Jung defined the introvert or extrovert attitude in the following terms:

“The introvert's attitude is one of withdrawing... he is always intending of withdrawing the libido from the object, as though to prevent the situation in which the object develops power over him. The extrovert, to the contrary, has a positive reaction to the object. He affirms his importance in such a way that his subjective attitude is always in relation to and even oriented by the object.” (Jung 1971, p. 330)

In addition to the four functions and two attitudes, there are two other variables that talk about lifestyles and information organizing styles. The two styles are Perceptive and Judging.

The Perceptive style prioritizes the information collection functions: Sensation and Intuition and maintains an open attitude toward possibilities. This style does not primarily want to reach conclusions or finalize tasks. It is way more preoccupied in information collection and presenting opportunities than in making the decision and implementing it. For those with a Perceptive lifestyle, always, either the Sensing or Intuition function will be extroverted, regardless of whether it occupies the primary function (for extroverted personalities) or auxiliary function (for introverted personalities). This type is flexible, adaptable, tolerant, creative, artistic, spontaneous, chaotic even but also impatient and unruly, and thus it may appear to more Judging types as being lazy and indolent, because he does not value as highly honoring commitments and respecting deadlines.

The judging style is in a powerful contrast with the perceptive one. He prioritizes not the gathering of information, but deciding on the information already possessed. If the danger for the Perceptive style is over-information, and flexibility to the point of having no backbone whatsoever, for the Judging style, the danger lies in under-information, and taking uninformed decisions, considering that although limited, the available quantity of information is more than enough to make a good decision. Those with a judging style will not only not object, but will actively prefer and seek routines, standard procedures and rules. They will be the first to adopt them and the first to warn and even administer correction to those who do not respect standard operating procedures. The judging style is best expressed through the decision making functions, be they of a feeling or thinking nature, which will appear in their extroverted aspect, either as a primary function (to extroverts) or as an auxiliary function (to introverts). This lifestyle type is stoical, decisive, meticulous, ordered, structured, focused and patient, but also rigid, inflexible, exacting, being prone to be perceived by more Perceiving personalities as domineering, invasive, rigid and inflexible. Judging personalities prioritize finishing tasks in due time, rather than how one gets to finishing it. Any method will do as long as it leads to the desired result, at the quality specified, within the prescribed time frame.

Myers and Briggs classified the 16 psychological types using pair combinations of 4 letters:

- E expresses a socially expressive attitude, while I stands for a socially reserved attitude
- S is for a physical-observing attitude towards reality, N for an Intuitive – Introspective attitude
- T expresses a rational determined and strong-willed attitude, while F a warm and friendly attitude
- J represents a scheduling style, devising plans and deadlines, while P is an active probing of options and alternatives style.

Although there are similarities to be had between the meanings Myers-Briggs and Jung gave to the functions, attitudes and lifestyles, they are not by any means identical. An expressive attitude is not the same thing as an extraverted attitude. An

introspective attitude is not at all the same thing that Jung was referring to when discussing the Intuitive attitude. The determination and strong will is not the same as using the cognitive – rational function and the perceptive lifestyle is not the same thing with an active probing of options style.

Myers and Briggs described the 16 character types in a rather simplistic way, describing each type in relation to the 4 letters associated with it. For example an ESTJ will have a socially expressive attitude (E), an observant attitude towards reality (S), will have strong will and determination (T) and an ordered mentality wanting to schedule, plan, devise and maintain rules (J).

All of these characteristics make the ESTJ a type well adapted to organizational management functions, where he can fully utilize his capabilities by issuing schedules to others (being socially expressive - E), observing and devising the activity of others (the observing function - S), using his will and determination to draw up and maintain an efficient direction for the institution he is leading (the willpower and determination function - T), and planning and enforcing the actions of subordinated hierarchies in the organization (the scheduling style - J).

By contrast, his opposing type, that is INFP will not be well equipped to leading an organization, because he is socially reserved (I), preferring to keep his emotions and thoughts for himself or for close groups of friends, he is introspective (N), preferring to work with that which only the soul can see, and not with clear-cut down to earth targets. He is warm and friendly (F) so will be prone to hearing the sentimental troubles of those in the organizations rather than use his willpower and determination to lead, and his style is to probe opinions by asking questions (P) rather than planning, organizing and giving directives.

Keirsey comes to add temperamental types over the classification of Myers and Brigs. Using a historical perspective, he identifies the types Myers and Briggs were talking about with the types described Plato, the roman medic Galen or Erich Fromm. In *Table 1*, I will reproduce the historical link that David Keirsey proposes to describe a regression line that details the four distinct character types.

Table 1

<i>Plato - 340 BC*</i>	Artisans	Guardians	Idealists	Rationalists
<i>Aristotle - 325 BC*</i>	Hedonics	Proprietary	Ethicists	Dialectics
<i>Galen - 190 AD*</i>	Sanguine	Melancholic	Choleric	Phlegmatic
<i>Paracelsus - 1550*</i>	Changing	Dutiful	Inspired	Curious
<i>Adickes - 1905*</i>	Innovative	Traditional	Doctrinaire	Sceptical
<i>Spränger - 1914*</i>	Aesthetic	Economic	Religious	Theoretical
<i>Kretschmer - 1920*</i>	Hippomaniac	Depressive	Hyperaesthetic	Anaesthetic
<i>Fromm - 1947*</i>	Explorers	Hoarders	Receptive	Negotiators
<i>Myers - 1958*</i>	Investigators	Organizers	Friendly	Calculated

Source: * D. Keirsey, *Please Understand me II*, 1998, p. 26

There have been critiques from the academic community that these suppositions do not represent scientific knowledge, because they cannot be tested, being thusly reduced to mere intuitive speculations which belong to the psychology of common sense rather than to a rigorous scientific method specific to the academic environment.

3. Metaphysics and Mythology – two approaches that attempt to integrate psychographics to the field of legitimate social sciences

Let us remember the eloquent, I consider, plea which philosopher Allan Watts (2014) makes in his discourse *Learning the Human Game*:

“You see, people go to you today, whereas before they went to clergy. The clergyman is a pretty hopeless case today, because people feel that if they go to him with a real problem, all that they will get is platitudes. [...] They know fundamentally that a clergyman is out to get you. He wants to enroll you in a community, in a church, so that you’ll be a regular contributor. They have a little more confidence in a doctor, or somebody associated with doctors, cause they know doctors want to get rid of their patients. The doctor doesn’t want to get you hooked on medicine, if he’s an honest doctor, but a clergyman wants to get you hooked on religion. So you people, who stand midway culturally, are looked to because you have the aura of science, and people say “Well that’s rather more objective, that’s a little safer, I feel I can risk this person, because he’s not out to get me in some hocus-pocus”, you see? So I’m afraid of that clergyman, because in the end, however understanding he is, he’s gonna wag his finger at me and say “Naughty, Naughty, Naughty, you mustn’t do that!” [...] They will pursue the psychotherapist to a certain extent and find that beyond a certain point, he collapses. Because he doesn’t know what to do with death. He has no metaphysical ground. The priest has too much Metaphysics, understanding on the level that the psychotherapist has competency. So therefore, to be truly effective, the psychotherapist needs a kind of deeper vision, and he hasn’t any reason to be afraid of it and to be feeling that this would injure his scientific respectability.” (Watts 2014)

With regard to the current subject, the analysis of character and temperament, we see that we are not facing a field measurable with the instruments of a classic science such as physics or chemistry. We need another system to account for the explicative power of such a construction and it cannot be as indubitable as let’s say a mathematical or physical argument, which can be verified by applying the accepted theorems and theoretical conventions.

Rather than being a normative research, the research done so far constitutes an exploratory research, in which the new domain of psychographics defines increasingly more exactly its paradigms and boundaries with each new exploration, with each new viewpoint on the same subject. Each author contributed a new perspective, as if you were looking at the same landscape from various angles. Each new angle puts all of the other angles in an unique perspective and the whole

picture can only be understood by taking into account as many of the available perspectives as possible.

This is in stark contrast to how scientific credibility is now structured. In today's day and age, there is no place for subjectivity, for pure intuition, unverifiable by classical empirical rigors. The only knowledge accepted as credible is the one which does not deviate from previous research widely accepted as true. Nothing new can come in if proving it requires making use of already agreed-upon laws. In the absence of a demonstration using an already tested method, that knowledge receives the label "speculation" and not "valid and valuable exploratory knowledge".

Personally, I want to integrate in this field of psychographics two thought systems which I didn't find in the specialty literature linked with the subject. On the one hand we have the theory of Joseph Campbell, the author of the book "*The hero with 1000 faces*" (Campbell 2008) and of many lectures on philosophy, religion but especially universal mythology. And on the other we have dr. Robert Moore and David Gillette's theory of the four archetypes of the mature Masculine as detailed in the book "*King, Warrior, Magician and Lover, Rediscovering the Archetypes of the Mature Masculine*" (Moore and Gillette 1991).

The Mythos series of speeches, available online is an important resource to come into contact with the entire philosophy of Campbell. He brought into the attention of the public the concept of Mono-myth, a primordial universal myth retold in movies, legends, religions from any culture in any time with different variations. The form differs, but, as with this undertaking, behind the myriad of forms there is always the same skeleton, a constant line of regression.

It is the myth of the hero's journey, of forming and perfecting character, finally the myth of higher and higher psychological integration. Each hero has a different biography, a different origin, different trials, different helpers and a different journey from anybody else. Each journey is perfect and it is unique. It is the journey Abraham Maslow named self-actualization. The highest destiny of every person, the ultimate purpose of life is to continuously self-actualize. Unlike the base necessities, whether biological, safety, belonging or self esteem which are ultimately finite in capacity and therefore quenchable, self-actualization is a continuous and unquenchable process. It is what today we call continuous learning and development, or what personal development authors such as Anthony Robbins for example call the philosophy of CANI (Constant And Neverending Improvement).

Joseph Campbell talks about this inner initiation journey in the terms of an archetypal journey. Archetypal in the sense that the same symbolic structure find itself in manifestations similar as essence but different in form scattered not only throughout all the corners of the world and all the ages, but also in the lives of each and everyone of us. As Mihai Eminescu in his poem Glosa says "Days go past and days come still, all is old and all is new". The substance is old, the form is always

new, there are other masks but always the same play being plaid, the variation belong to the domain of the form, not of the substance.

In the hero's journey, the protagonist always undergoes a process of integration. It is like his Self of the Hero is divided into hundreds of pieces, all of them belonging to him, but some being in a conscious state, while others only in an latent unconscious state. The latent parts, which are more in the beginning and less and less as the maturation process takes place, are brought to life through trials or initiatic interactions with other characters which have consciously developed those parts which in the protagonist are merely in latent form. For example, a character which is so flexible that apparently has no internal consistency or order, by interacting with a very structured and ordered character and by being forced by the circumstances to become more orderly or die, absorbs the same qualities into himself and becomes more ordered than he previously was. Or a discrete and fearful character, being faced with the situation of losing the life of someone dear if he does not take charge and become a leader of men, becomes himself less afraid, more confident and more vocal for the rest of his life.

The second theory, continuing the study of myths and archetypes comes from Robert Moore and David Gillette, authors of the book “King, Warrior, Magician, Lover, rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine”. The theory is about the four archetypes that one finds in every initiation story from any time. Basically, what they are doing is they are taking part of Joseph Campbell's work and applying it to the field of developing of a mature masculinity. Of course, these are not the only archetypes that exist, their number being immense. With all of these however, these four psychic structures are probably among the most encountered in universal myths.

We observe the four-fold structure of archetypes. Also four were the character and temperament types we talked about in the beginning of the article. Studying in deeper detail the symbolic universes of the four archetypes we discover functional similarities to the characters of the Guardians, the Artisans, the Idealists and the Rationals.

Even though there isn't a perfect similarity between categories, I think there are enough similarities between them to justify adding to David Keirse's table another line, so that in the end it looks like in *Table 2*.

As a type matures and develops, after perfecting it's own talents and abilities, self-actualization and psychological integrations require keeping the acquired abilities and using them to unlock and integrate the abilities of the contrary type. For example for the Guardian (Steward), the contrary type is the Rationalist (Wizard), and for the Artisan (Vigilante), the contrary type is the Idealist (Priest)

It is going to be very hard for a type to directly integrate the intelligence type of his contrary type, because, on the surface of things, the intelligence types seem mutually exclusive. Diplomatic Idealism will often sacrifice ripe opportunities to favor other people's feelings, being a hindrance to tactics who often times,

although unethical, could prove to be most profitable. Likewise, logistic rigor and planning can have a tunnel-vision which, for the sake of keeping established routines and historical stability may deny the long-term innovative efficiency of a strategic overview which could, for the sake of efficiency blow existing norms and age-old customs sky-high.

Table 2

<i>Plato</i> - 340 BC	Artisans	Guardians	Idealists	Rationalists
<i>Aristotle</i> - 325 BC	Hedonics	Proprietary	Ethicists	Dialectics
<i>Galen</i> - 190 AD	Sanguine	Melancholic	Choleric	Phlegmatic
<i>Paracelsus</i> - 1550	Changing	Dutiful	Inspired	Curious
<i>Adickes</i> - 1905	Innovative	Traditional	Doctrinaire	Sceptical
<i>Spränger</i> - 1914	Aesthetic	Economic	Religious	Theoretical
<i>Kretschmer</i> - 1920	Hippomaniac	Depressive	Hyperaesthetic	Anaesthetic
<i>Fromm</i> - 1947	Explorers	Hoarders	Receptive	Negotiators
<i>Myers</i> - 1958	Investigators	Organizers	Friendly	Calculated
<i>Keirse</i> - 1984	Dionysian	Demeterean	Apollonian	Promethean
<i>Proposal - The Integrated Consciousness</i> ¹	Vigilantes (Warriors)	Stewards (Kings)	Priests (Lovers)	Wizards (Magicians)

It seems almost impossible at a first glance for opposite types to peacefully and productively coexist, but reality is far from being like that. In truth, although it indeed necessitates a great deal of conscious will and effort, if the integration takes place, the opposing intelligence type becomes a solid foundation for the native intelligence, enhancing its freedom, expressivity and applications to unimaginable levels.

The easiest road to integration is not the direct one. It requires too large of an effort which can be experienced as psychological strain, especially to types who do not have even the basic functions well developed. The easiest road is through the connected type.

Guardians for example, concrete in the world to which they focus on and cooperative in their vision of the world will go towards integration toward the abstract and utilitarian world of the rationalists. The direct road would be burdensome and very energy consuming, but an initial itinerary toward the neighboring type of the Artisans, also concrete with respect to the world to which they focus, but oriented utilitarian, just like the rationalists is less energy consuming and therefore more feasible.

¹ The 4-fold classification of personalities using the Vigilante, Steward, Priest and Wizard framework is uniquely mine, but the King, Warrior, Magician and Lover belong to Moore and Gillette (1991). The authors never proposed a similarity between their classification and other previous classifications, but they designed the KMWL model as a stand-alone framework.

Using their baseline logistic intelligence, guardians can slowly start practicing the concrete utilitarian ways of the tactical intelligence. Practicing tactics and using the logistic support, in time they will become relatively proficient in concrete and utilitarian tactical operations. From here, the leap to the strategic intelligence of the rationalists becomes easier, because a guardian who has learned to sometimes apply utility in the place of consensus is more prone to understanding the utilitarian way of operating of a rationalist.

The ability to work with abstract and systemic information can be developed by the guardians through many years of practice. Thus, they can become slightly proficient in working with information which rationalists have been working with on a very high level since high school. From here, the step to the last type of intelligence, the diplomatic one, will be much facilitated, since the guardian has already learned to operate in the abstract big-picture world and through his own native skills he has a cooperative nature, thus integrating the diplomatic intelligence of idealists will come more naturally.

The concrete types (Guardians and Artisans) go towards integration in the direction of the abstract and vice-versa, the abstract types (Idealists and Rationalists) go toward integration in the direction of the concrete. The most natural road of integration, although not the only possible one is through the neighboring concrete type (for concrete types) or neighboring abstract type (for abstracts).

The process is never-ending, because, as we have discussed, self-actualizing is a continuous and insatiable need being in a constant state of expansion. There will always be something new to integrate, a new skill, a new development, a new point of viewing, understanding or acting upon the world.

4. Conclusion

The human character is an often paradoxical kaleidoscope which escapes the clear and unequivocal categorization of classic science. Although there exist some general tendencies and the definitions of character and temperamental types have remained the same for centuries, they can hardly fully describe the concrete reality of the data collected from day-to-day reality.

Although we need to label and categorize the character of persons we come into contact with in an as exact and non-paradoxical way as possible, the diversity of combinations between traits of artisans, guardians, idealists and rationalists is too great to be subject to exact statistical conclusions and predictions.

Still, although the paradox of impossibility in exactly defining the definitive attitude structure of the human character persists, the sphere of personal and universal mythology and research of the archetypes of the masculine and feminine offers a clearer picture of what it means to have a character in which all functional aspects of the psyche work in synergy, as an unified and integrated system.

References

1. Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces*. third edition. New World Library, Novato California.
2. Galen (1981). *Galenus Pergamensis De temperamentis, et de inaequali intemperie*. C.J. Clay.
3. Jung, C.G. (1971). *Psychological Types*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
4. Keirse, D. (1998). *Please Understand Me II*. Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
5. Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of Human Motivation. original in *Psychological Review* **50**(4), pp. 370-396.
6. Moore, R. and Gillette, D. (1991). *King, Warrior, Magician, Lover, rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine*. Harper Collins.
7. Myers, I.B. (1962). *Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
8. Myers, I.B. and McCaulley, M.H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
9. Myers, I.B. and Myers, B.P. (1995). *Gifts Differing – understanding personality type*. Mountain View, California.
10. Paracelsus (2010). *Four Treatises*. Edited by Henry E. Sigerest, ed. John Hopkins University Press.
11. Aristotel (2007). *Nicomachian Ethics*, translated by Traian Brăileanu. Antet, București.
12. Platon (2010). *The Republic*, Antet, București.
13. Robbins, A. (2012). *Unleash the power Within* (audiobook). Simon & Schuster Audio/Nightingale-Conant.
14. Watts. A. *Learning the Human Game*, available on https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wz_wiaTe5ug [accessed 14.08.2014].