

That they will, if given the chance, excel at different sorts of work? Could it be that such popular sayings as "to each his own," "different strokes for different folks," and "do your own thing" express something that can be put to good use in everyday life?

There is much to be gained by appreciating differences, and much to be lost by ignoring them or condemning them. But the first step toward seeing others as distinct from yourself is to become better acquainted with your own traits of character. Of course, the best way to determine your traits of character is to watch what you actually do from time to time and place to place and in different company. There is no substitute for careful and informed observation. But self examination is quite foreign to most people, and so devices like this questionnaire can be useful in getting you started asking questions about your preferred attitudes and actions.

The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II

Decide on answer a or b and put a check mark in the proper column of the answer sheet on page 10. Scoring directions are provided. There are no right or wrong answers since about half the population agrees with whatever answer you choose.

- 1 **When the phone rings do you**
 ___(a) hurry to get to it first ___(b) hope someone else will answer
- 2 **Are you more**
 ___(a) observant than introspective ___(b) introspective than observant
- 3 **Is it worse to**
 ___(a) have your head in the clouds ___(b) be in a rut
- 4 **With people are you usually more**
 ___(a) firm than gentle ___(b) gentle than firm
- 5 **Are you more comfortable in making**
 ___(a) critical judgments ___(b) value judgments
- 6 **Is clutter in the workplace something you**
 ___(a) take time to straighten up ___(b) tolerate pretty well
- 7 **Is it your way to**
 ___(a) make up your mind quickly ___(b) pick and choose at some length

- 8 **Waiting in line, do you often**
 ___(a) chat with others ___(b) stick to business
- 9 **Are you more**
 ___(a) sensible than idealonal ___(b) idealonal than sensible
- 10 **Are you more interested in**
 ___(a) what is actual ___(b) what is possible
- 11 **In making up your mind are you more likely to go by**
 ___(a) data ___(b) desires
- 12 **In sizing up others do you tend to be**
 ___(a) objective and impersonal ___(b) friendly and personal
- 13 **Do you prefer contracts to be**
 ___(a) signed, sealed, and delivered ___(b) settled on a handshake
- 14 **Are you more satisfied having**
 ___(a) a finished product ___(b) work in progress
- 15 **At a party, do you**
 ___(a) interact with many, even strangers ___(b) interact with a few friends
- 16 **Do you tend to be more**
 ___(a) factual than speculative ___(b) speculative than factual
- 17 **Do you like writers who**
 ___(a) say what they mean ___(b) use metaphors and symbolism
- 18 **Which appeals to you more:**
 ___(a) consistency of thought ___(b) harmonious relationships
- 19 **If you must disappoint someone are you usually**
 ___(a) frank and straightforward ___(b) warm and considerate
- 20 **On the job do you want your activities**
 ___(a) scheduled ___(b) unscheduled

21 Do you more often prefer

___(a) final, unalterable statements ___(b) tentative, preliminary statements

22 Does interacting with strangers

___(a) energize you

___(b) tax your reserves

23 Facts

___(a) speak for themselves

___(b) illustrate principles

24 Do you find visionaries and theorists

___(a) somewhat annoying

___(b) rather fascinating

25 In a heated discussion, do you

___(a) stick to your guns

___(b) look for common ground

26 Is it better to be

___(a) just

___(b) merciful

27 At work, is it more natural for you to

___(a) point out mistakes

___(b) try to please others

28 Are you more comfortable

___(a) after a decision

___(b) before a decision

29 Do you tend to

___(a) say right out what's on your mind

___(b) keep your ears open

30 Common sense is

___(a) usually reliable

___(b) frequently questionable

31 Children often do not

___(a) make themselves useful enough

___(b) exercise their fantasy enough

32 When in charge of others do you tend to be

___(a) firm and unbending

___(b) forgiving and lenient

33 Are you more often

___(a) a cool-headed person

___(b) a warm-hearted person

34 Are you prone to

___(a) nailing things down

___(b) exploring the possibilities

35 In most situations are you more

___(a) deliberate than spontaneous

___(b) spontaneous than deliberate

36 Do you think of yourself as

___(a) an outgoing person

___(b) a private person

37 Are you more frequently

___(a) a practical sort of person

___(b) a fanciful sort of person

38 Do you speak more in

___(a) particulars than generalities

___(b) generalities than particulars

39 Which is more of a compliment:

___(a) "There's a logical person"

___(b) "There's a sentimental person"

40 Which rules you more

___(a) your thoughts

___(b) your feelings

41 When finishing a job, do you like to

___(a) tie up all the loose ends

___(b) move on to something else

42 Do you prefer to work

___(a) to deadlines

___(b) just whenever

43 Are you the kind of person who

___(a) is rather talkative

___(b) doesn't miss much

44 Are you inclined to take what is said

___(a) more literally

___(b) more figuratively

45 Do you more often see

___(a) what's right in front of you

___(b) what can only be imagined

46 Is it worse to be

___(a) a softy

___(b) hard-nosed

47 In trying circumstances are you sometimes

___(a) too unsympathetic

___(b) too sympathetic

48 Do you tend to choose

___(a) rather carefully

___(b) somewhat impulsively

49 Are you inclined to be more

___(a) hurried than leisurely

___(b) leisurely than hurried

50 At work do you tend to

___(a) be sociable with your colleagues

___(b) keep more to yourself

51 Are you more likely to trust

___(a) your experiences

___(b) your conceptions

52 Are you more inclined to feel

___(a) down to earth

___(b) somewhat removed

53 Do you think of yourself as a

___(a) tough-minded person

___(b) tender-hearted person

54 Do you value in yourself more that you are

___(a) reasonable

___(b) devoted

55 Do you usually want things

___(a) settled and decided

___(b) just penciled in

56 Would you say you are more

___(a) serious and determined

___(b) easy going

57 Do you consider yourself

___(a) a good conversationalist

___(b) a good listener

58 Do you prize in yourself

___(a) a strong hold on reality

___(b) a vivid imagination

59 Are you drawn more to

___(a) fundamentals

___(b) overtones

60 Which seems the greater fault:

___(a) to be too compassionate

___(b) to be too dispassionate

61 Are you swayed more by

___(a) convincing evidence

___(b) a touching appeal

62 Do you feel better about

___(a) coming to closure

___(b) keeping your options open

63 Is it preferable mostly to

___(a) make sure things are arranged

___(b) just let things happen naturally

64 Are you inclined to be

___(a) easy to approach

___(b) somewhat reserved

65 In stories do you prefer

___(a) action and adventure

___(b) fantasy and heroism

66 Is it easier for you to

___(a) put others to good use

___(b) identify with others

67 Which do you wish more for yourself:

___(a) strength of will

___(b) strength of emotion

68 Do you see yourself as basically

___(a) thick-skinned

___(b) thin-skinned

69 Do you tend to notice

___(a) disorderliness

___(b) opportunities for change

70 Are you more

___(a) routinized than whimsical

___(b) whimsical than routinized

Four NFs [Idealists]:

ENFJ [Teacher, pg. 149]
 INFJ [Counselor, pg. 152]
 ENFP [Champion, pg. 155]
 INFP [Healer, pg. 157]

Four NTs [Rationals]:

ENTJ [Fieldmarshal, pg. 196]
 INTJ [Mastermind, pg. 199]
 ENTP [Inventor, pg. 201]
 INTP [Architect, pg. 204]

If you have an X in your type label you should read the two portraits indicated, and choose the one more like you. For example, if your type label was ESXJ, then reading both ESTJ and ESFJ portraits may help you choose one or the other as more like you. Or perhaps your type label was XNFP. Here again reading both INFP and ENFP portraits may help you decide which type seems more like you. You will find individual portraits on the page number indicated in the list above, and extra scoring forms on pages 346 and 347.

However, if an X appears in the S-N scale (or even if the two scores are nearly equal) it is advisable to disregard the Temperament Sorter and turn to the Keirsey FourTypes Sorter on page 348. By completing this questionnaire you may be able to identify your basic temperament type—NF, NT, SP, SJ—and you can then scan the four variants of whichever type is indicated. By the way, having family or friends take the FourTypes Sorter can be a fascinating and enjoyable way to promote discussion on the topic of personality differences.

What the Myers-Briggs Letters Mean

Instead of naming her sixteen types of personality with descriptive words, Myers elected to label them with a combination of letters, chosen from four pairs of alternatives, E or I, S or N, T or F, J or P, as indicated above. The letters represent the following words:

E = Extraverted	or	I = Introverted
S = Sensory	or	N = Intuitive
T = Thinking	or	F = Feeling
J = Judging	or	P = Perceiving

Myers found these words in Jung's *Psychological Types*, but in adopting them she put her own spin on them. So let us consider what Myers actually meant in using Jung's words in *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*.

E = Expressive	or	I = Reserved
S = Observant	or	N = Introspective
T = Tough-minded	or	F = Friendly
J = Scheduling	or	P = Probing

Thus, if we look closely at her type descriptions, we discover that by

"extraverted" Myers meant having an "expressive" and outgoing social attitude; by "introverted" she meant having a "reserved" and seclusive social attitude.¹ By "sensory" Myers meant being highly "observant" of things in the immediate environment; by "intuitive" she meant being "introspective," or highly imaginative of things seen only with the mind's eye.² By "thinking" she meant being "tough-minded" or objective and impersonal with others; by "feeling" she meant being "friendly," or sympathetic and personal with others.³ By "judging" she meant given to making and keeping "schedules"; while, in the case of "perceiving" Myers apparently failed to notice that her mentor Jung had said that sensation and perception are identical, so she went her own way and opposed "perceiving" to "judging."⁴ However, little harm was done because when Myers said "perceiving" she actually meant looking around for alternatives, opportunities, and options, hence "probing" or exploring.

Myers regarded the eight letters and the traits they represent as the parts or elements of personality, independent of one another. In her view ESTJs, for example, are eager to express their views to others (E), are sensibly observant of their environs (S), are tough-minded (T), and are judicious in scheduling activities (J). In contrast are the INFPs, who maintain a quiet reserve (I), are introspective (N), are friendly (F), and are given to probing for options (P). Or take another pair, the ISFPs and ENTJs. Myers saw ISFPs as reluctant to exhibit themselves socially (I), as sensually observant (S), as friendly (F) and as opportunistic (P). On the other hand, the ENTJs are socially outgoing (E), are introspective (N), are tough-minded (T), and are given to making scheduling judgments (J). So here is a rather simple and literal way to spell out some easily observed differences between people. It is probably the apparent simplicity of this scheme that has caught the attention of millions of people around the world.

Myers presented all of her types as effective people. But we are effective in different ways, and are at our best when contributing what she called our special "gifts differing." For example, in some situations, such as those requiring the marshalling of forces, the ENTJ will be more effective than his or her opposite, the ISFP. But in different circumstances, such as when artistic composition is called for, the ISFP is in a much better position to succeed than the ENTJ. And this reversibility is thought to hold for all eight pairs of opposites. It is the social context that determines which kind of personality will be more effective.

The Contribution of Isabel Myers

During the last thirty years of her life, Isabel Myers handled the problem of individual differences with a freshness of vision not unlike that of the child (in the Hans Christian Anderson tale) who innocently exclaimed, "the emperor has no clothes on!" One reason Myers could do this was that she was not weighted down by the long history of bickering among anthro-

Myers seems to have had in mind when she discussed similarities among certain of her sixteen types, and so let us start with her observations.

Myers's Four Groups

Crossing paths with Isabel Myers got me in the habit of typewatching way back in 1956. Myers completed her book *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* in 1958 and published it in 1962, though Educational Testing Service had been using her questionnaire, the MBTI, for some years doing personality research in numerous colleges and high schools around the country, and this is where I first encountered her work.

I soon found it convenient and useful to partition Myers's sixteen types into four groups, which she herself suggested in saying that all four of what she referred to as the "NFs" were alike in many ways and that all four of the "NTs" were alike in many ways—although what she called the "STs" seemed to me to have very little in common, just as the "SFs" had little in common. However, four earlier contributors, Adickes, Spranger, Kretschmer, and Fromm, each having written of four types of character, helped me to see that Myers's four "SJs" were very much alike, as were her four "SPs." Bingo! Typewatching from then on was a lot easier, the four groups—SPs, SJs, NFs, and NTs—being light years apart in their attitudes and actions. This, then, is what Myers had to say about the four groups:

The SPs

Myers had SPs probing around their immediate surroundings in order to detect and exploit any favorable options that came within reach. Having the freedom to act on the spur of the moment, whenever or wherever an opportunity arises, is very important to SPs. No chance is to be blown, no opening missed, no angle overlooked—whatever or whoever might turn out to be exciting, pleasurable, or useful is checked out for advantage. Though they may differ in their attitude toward tough-mindedness (T) and friendliness (F) in exploring for options, and though some are socially expressive (E) and some reserved (I), all of them make sure that what they do is practical and effective in getting what they want.

Consistent with this view Myers described SPs as "adaptable," "artistic," and "athletic"—as very much "aware of reality and never fighting it"—as "open-minded" and ever "on the lookout for workable compromises"—as knowing "what's going on around them" and as able "to see the needs of the moment"—as "storing up useful facts" and having "no use for theories"—as "easygoing," "tolerant," "unprejudiced," and "persuasive"—as "gifted with machines and tools"—as acting "with effortless economy"—as "sensitive to color, line, and texture"—as wanting "first-hand experiences" and in general "enjoying life." So SPs, as seen by Myers, are very much

like one another and very much different from the other types, the SJs, NFs, and NTs.

The SJs

Myers had SJs, like SPs, observing their close surroundings with a keen eye, but for an entirely different reason, namely that of scheduling their own and others' activities so that needs are met and conduct is kept within bounds. Thus for SJs, everything should be in its proper place, everybody should be doing what they're supposed to, everybody should be getting their just deserts, every action should be closely supervised, all products thoroughly inspected, all legitimate needs promptly met, all approved ventures carefully insured. Though SJs might differ in being tough-minded (T) or friendly (F) in observing their schedules, and though they can be expressive (E) or reserved (I) in social attitude, all of them demand that ways and means of getting things done are proper and acceptable.

And so Myers described the SJs as "conservative" and "stable"—as "consistent" and "routinized"—as "sensible," "factual," and "unimpulsive"—as "patient," "dependable," and "hard-working"—as "detailed," "painstaking," "persevering," and "thorough." This too is a clear-cut pattern of action and attitude, highly unlike that of the SPs, NFs, and NTs.

The NFs

On the introspective side, Myers had NFs as friendly to the core in dreaming up how to give meaning and wholeness to people's lives. Conflict in those around them is painful for NFs, something they must deal with in a very personal way, and so they care deeply about keeping morale high in their membership groups, and about nurturing the positive self-image of their loved ones. Indeed, while they might differ from each other on how important judging schedules (J) or probing for options (P) is in acting on their friendly feelings, and while their social address can be expressive (E) or reserved (I), all NFs consider it vitally important to have everyone in their circle—their family, friends, and colleagues—feeling good about themselves and getting along with each other.

Thus Myers, an INFP herself, saw her fellow NFs as "humane" and "sympathetic"—as "enthusiastic" and "religious"—as "creative" and "intuitive"—and as "insightful" and "subjective." Again this is a distinct picture of attitude and action, showing NFs to be very much like each other and greatly different from SPs, SJs, and NTs.

The NTs

Also on the introspective side, Myers had NTs as tough-minded in figuring out what sort of technology might be useful to solve a given problem. To this end, NTs require themselves to be persistently and consistently rational in their actions. Though they may differ in their preference for judging schedules (J) or probing for options (P) as they tackle

problems, and though they can seem expressive (E) or reserved (I) around others, all NTs insist that they have a rationale for everything they do, that whatever they do and say makes sense.

So Myers described the NTs as "analytical" and "systematic"—as "abstract," "theoretical," and "intellectual"—as "complex," "competent" and "inventive"—as "efficient," "exacting" and "independent"—as "logical" and "technical"—and as "curious," "scientific," and "research-oriented." Here again is a unique and easily recognizable configuration of character traits, the NTs a breed apart, starkly different from SPs, SJs, and NFs.

Temperament, Character, Personality

Before I trace the history of these four underlying forms of personality, and set the Myersian groups into this larger and more ancient context, let me try to clarify the nature of temperament and character. What, we might ask, is this thing called "temperament," and what relation does it have to character and personality? There are two sides to personality, one of which is temperament and the other character. Temperament is a configuration of inclinations, while character is a configuration of habits. Character is disposition, temperament pre-disposition. Thus, for example, foxes are predisposed—born—to raid hen houses, beavers to dam up streams, dolphins to affiliate in close-knit schools, and owls to hunt alone in the dark. Each type of creature, unless arrested in its maturation by an unfavorable environment, develops the habit appropriate to its temperament: stealing chickens, building dams, nurturing companions, or hunting at night.

Put another way, our brain is a sort of computer which has temperament for its hardware and character for its software. The hardware is the physical base from which character emerges, placing an identifiable fingerprint on each individual's attitudes and actions. This underlying consistency can be observed from a very early age—some features earlier than others—long before individual experience or social context (one's particular software) has had time or occasion to imprint the person. Thus temperament is the inborn form of human nature; character, the emergent form, which develops through the interaction of temperament and environment.

I want to emphasize that temperament, character, and personality are configured, which means that, not only are we predisposed to develop certain attitudes and not others, certain actions and not others, but that these actions and attitudes are unified—they hang together. Thus, the SPs base their self-image on artistic action, audacity, and adaptability to circumstance, these three traits evolving together of necessity. Furthermore, these three traits, developing together as if out of a single seed, preclude the emergence of a self-image based on, say, empathy, benevolence, and authenticity, which are characteristics of the NFs. In the same way, the SJs base their self-image on reliability, service, and respectability, these three traits emerging together as a unified structure of personality. And again,

the unfolding of these three traits together weighs against developing a self-image based on ingenuity, autonomy, and willpower, which is characteristic of the NTs.

This notion of four distinct temperaments, inborn and unified, calls into question two major points of view in 20th century behavioral science. The first can be called the theory of hierarchical motivation. Abraham Maslow, a leading proponent of this theory, held that we are all motivated by a number of needs which displace each other as we satisfy them. We ascend, he said, from physical needs (food, clothing, shelter) to safety needs (security, protection, assurance), then on to social needs (love, friendship, belonging), and next to the need for self-esteem (valuing self, self-worth, pride). And a few of us—not really very many, he suggested—are able to arrive finally at what he called the "self-actualizing" stage of development, no longer motivated by the primary physical needs, nor by needs for safety, belonging, and self-esteem. Maslow seemed to believe that the fully-realized, enlightened, self-actualized personality is everyone's highest goal in life, and implied that those people who don't make it nevertheless have a latent need for self-actualization, which will break forth as a full-blown motive once they satisfy their more primary needs.

It certainly makes sense to say that in normal development many of us arrange our lives so that we satisfy our need for sustenance, for safety, for social ties, and that we then turn our interest to achieving self-esteem.

But beyond this point temperament theory counsels us to part company with Maslow and other hierarchists. For if people are fundamentally different, born with different needs and inclinations, then they might not all share the desire to take Maslow's last step into self-actualization. Perhaps not even most of them. Of course all must have self-esteem. Maslow was right in this. But as it turns out, most people base their self-esteem on something else entirely. Only those of one particular temperament, Myers's NFs, are concerned with becoming self-actualized—finding their true selves—and value themselves more in the degree they achieve this aim.

Thus it is not that self-actualization is a step beyond self-esteem; rather, it is but one path to self-esteem. There are other paths. Freud, for instance, was right when he said that physical pleasure is the way. But not for everybody, as he supposed, and not as an end in itself, but as a means to self-esteem. Those of the SP temperament prize themselves more when they live sensually and hedonically. Harry Sullivan was also right. The security of social status is important—for some at least, and in the service of self-esteem. Those of the SJ temperament hold themselves in higher regard when they attain a reputation as pillars of society. Likewise, Alfred Adler was right in that the quest for powers motivates us—some of us—and those of the NT temperament look upon themselves with pride as their technological powers increase. It is unfortunate that Maslow, himself an NF, saw the aims of the other three character types as merely arrested attempts at the NF goal of self-actualization.

The other point of view challenged by the four types theory says that not only do all of us have the same goals, but we also go through the same stages of growth and development. Reading the leading writers on maturation, we are counseled that all mature persons have certain attitudes and certain habits, and that all must take the same developmental steps to get there. Such a position was taken, sometimes explicitly and always implicitly, by investigators such as Gesell, Ilg, Ames, Erikson, Piaget, Sheehy, and Levinson, to name some of the more prominent contributors.

But this way of defining maturity will not do. A mature NF is strikingly different from a mature SP. Likewise, a mature NT is astonishingly different from a mature SJ. Just as the fox matures differently from the beaver, so does the dolphin mature differently from the owl. Just as the Lion wanted Courage to get on with life, so Dorothy wanted Security, the Tin Woodman wanted a Heart, and the Scarecrow wanted Brains. To use the same criteria of maturity for all kinds of creatures is to miss the entire point of this essay. Imagine a mother fox schooling a young beaver in the art of sneaking into a chicken yard and making off with a fat hen, and picture also the little beaver's astonished paralysis upon receiving such guidance. This, of course, is unimaginable, but as parents many of us encourage our offspring to emulate us, to be chips off the old block, to follow in our footsteps. The Pygmalion Project ascends to its greatest heights and generates its greatest intensity in pointing the young toward our own conception of maturity. None of the temperaments are above wanting to validate their own style, and so set about, unconsciously and involuntarily to be sure, to sculpt their young into the image of themselves.

Temperament will out in maturation as in all other domains of life, and so, again, we are asked to think of temperament as inborn, innate, inherent, and of character as exactly configured, as precisely patterned, as definitively systemic. SP or SJ, NF or NT, our traits of character entail each other and are bound together by a common origin and a common destiny. And it is not until these traits have developed that we can be said to have acquired our mature character, to have become a full-blown specimen of what we were meant to be, just as the tiny acorn becomes the mighty oak tree.

Let us now turn to a brief look at the history of those rather neglected studies of ethology, characterology, and personology.

Historical Overview

In the first part of the 20th century a good many writers essayed their views on temperament and character. Four of these, Adickes, Kretschmer, Spränger, and Fromm, agreed with each other, implicitly at least, in how they defined temperament and character types, and differed from men such as Apfelbach, Bulliot, James, MacDougall, Roback, and Sternberg, who elected their own categories.

Adickes, Kretschmer, Spränger, and Fromm saw the usefulness of an

ancient belief that came primarily from the early Greeks and Romans. It was the Roman physician Galen¹ who, developing the ideas of Hippocrates, proposed (around 190 A.D.) that it is neither the stars nor the gods that determine what we want and what we do; rather, it is the balance of our bodily fluids, the four "humors," as they were called. If our blood predominates Galen called us "Sanguine" or eagerly optimistic in temperament; if our black bile or gall predominates, then we are "Melancholic" or doleful in temperament; if our yellow bile predominates, then we are "Choleric" or passionate in temperament; and if our phlegm predominates, then we are "Phlegmatic" or calm in temperament. Thus, for the first time, in the West at any rate, our physiology was said to determine our attitudes and actions, and not the deities or the heavenly bodies. As Shakespeare would put it, writing many centuries later, "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in the stars but in ourselves." We might smile at this early view of human physiology, but at the same time we must acknowledge it to be a major departure from what had gone before. Our predispositions, said Galen, come in four styles, and from within and not from without.

Nearly six hundred years before Galen, Plato² had written in *The Republic* of four kinds of character which clearly corresponded with the four temperaments attributed to Hippocrates. Plato was more interested in the individual's contribution to the social order than in underlying temperament, and so he named the Sanguine temperament the "iconic" (artisan) character, endowed with artistic sense, and playing an art-making role in society. He named the Melancholic temperament the "pistic" (guardian) character, endowed with common sense, and playing a caretaking role in society. He named the Choleric temperament the "noetic" (idealist) character, endowed with intuitive sensibility, and playing a moral role in society. And he named the Phlegmatic temperament the "dianoetic" (rational) character, endowed with reasoning sensibility, and playing the role of logical investigator in society.

A generation later, Aristotle³ defined character in terms of happiness, and not, as his mentor Plato had done, in terms of virtue. Aristotle argued that there are four sources of happiness: "The mass of men," he said, find happiness either in "sensual pleasure" ("hedone") or in "acquiring assets" ("propraietari"), while some few find happiness either in exercising their "moral virtue" ("ethikos") or in a life of "logical investigation" ("dialogike"). Not surprisingly, Aristotle (a Rational himself) regarded logical investigation as bringing the truest happiness because it is the most self-sufficient, and the least dependent on external conditions.

In the Middle Ages the four temperaments theory appears to have been largely forgotten, if not disregarded,⁴ only to be rediscovered, like so many Classical ideas, in the European Renaissance, when interest in science and the physical nature of mankind revived. Thus, we see Geoffrey Chaucer (in 1380) describing a Doctor of Physic as knowing "the cause of every