Science, the Bible, and Human Anatomy

Robert D. Branson

Both young earth and old earth creationists maintain that their interpretations of Genesis 1–11 are scientifically valid because God inspired the account and God cannot lie. This article intends to test their basic presuppositions by examining how scientifically accurate the Bible is in describing human anatomy, specifically the kidneys and the heart. First, the Old Testament references to the kidneys are examined; then, those to the heart; and finally, the New Testament references to the heart, including statements of both Paul and Jesus. The results demonstrate that God inspired the writers of scripture to use the terms that were common to their wider cultures, even though they are not scientifically correct. Since God did not inspire the writers to write scientifically about the human body, this calls into question the assumption that the writer of the creation account was inspired to write scientifically about the rest of creation.

While young earth creationists (YEC) such as Ken Ham and old earth creationists (OEC) such as Hugh Ross continue to argue over the correct interpretation of the account of creation in Genesis 1–11, they have some fundamental points of agreement. (1) The account is historically correct because God inspired it. (2) God’s Word is inerrant and thus true. (3) The scripture is scientifically accurate because every word has been inspired by God and God cannot lie (Heb. 6:18). Both sides are continuing to produce literature arguing that their interpretation of Genesis 1–11 is correct and the other’s is false, or at least problematic. Where the two approaches disagree is at the starting point.

Young earth creationists start with a specific interpretation of Genesis 1–11 that includes a recent creation of the universe (6,000 to 10,000 years ago) and the laying down of the geological column during the flood. Scientific findings at odds with this position are either dismissed or reinterpreted. Old earth creationists accept that the Genesis account is inspired, but begin with the findings of science, for example, the earth was created 4.5 billion years ago, and then interpret the scriptures according to scientific findings. Both use claims of science to help prove that their interpretations are correct. Science and history are thereby intertwined to validate their interpretations.

A key question that challenges both positions is whether or not the biblical account, because it is inspired by God, must be scientifically accurate. For a test case, how scientifically accurate are the biblical claims about human anatomy, specifically the internal organs of the heart and kidneys?

Kidneys kělāyôt

Since the Hebrew word for kidneys (kělāyôt, always in the plural) is used in contexts that refer to humans only eleven times, we will examine it first. The function of the kidneys is to filter the blood and remove the wastes in the form of urine. The kidneys are never mentioned in the Bible with this function. Four major
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versions (NIV [2011], NAB, TANAKH, and NRSV) are reviewed to give a limited variety of translations for kēlāyōt (for complete listing, see appendix, p. 234).

The translations of kēlāyōt in Job 19:27 read “heart” (NIV, NRSV, TANAKH) or “inmost being” (NAB). In the other texts, kēlāyōt is most commonly translated “mind” or “heart.” However, the TANAKH three times uses “conscience” (Pss. 7:9 [10], 16:7, 139:13). Kidneys and heart (lēḇ) appear together or in parallel six times (Pss. 7:9 [10], 26:2, 73:21 (lēḇāḇ); Jer. 11:20, 17:10, and 20:12). The versions are not themselves internally consistent translating kēlāyōt both as “mind” and “heart” and lēḇ also as “heart” and “mind.” Proverbs 23:16 is perhaps the most unusual in that the versions read that the “inmost being” (NIV, NAB), “soul” (NRSV), or “heart” (TANAKH) will “rejoice.”

What conclusions can we draw from this brief survey? First, the versions never translate kēlāyōt literally. To do so would not make sense to a modern audience. They have to adjust their readings to make sense for a modern, scientific culture. Second, the Old Testament (OT) writers had no understanding of the function of the kidneys, and thus use the word kēlāyōt according to the context, with meanings other than the actual function of kidneys, and therefore nonscientifically.

Old Testament lēḇ(āḇ)
Next let’s look at lēḇ(āḇ), which occurs 853 times in the OT. The human heart is the organ that pumps blood throughout the body by means of the circulatory system. The heart is never mentioned in the Bible with this function.

Hans Walter Wolff begins his discussion of lēḇ by citing the account of Nabal’s death in 1 Samuel 25:37-38: “His heart died within him: he became like a stone. About ten days later the LORD struck Nabal, and he died” (NRSV).

The modern reader finds this confusing. In the first sentence he thinks that when the heart stopped beating the man died, and rigor mortis set in. But then he learns that Nabal went on living for another ten days.10

The writer was not thinking in a modern medical manner. The functions attributed to the “heart” actually take place in the brain. And while the beat of the heart is felt, there is no recognition that it is connected to the circulatory system or to the pulse.

Wolff continues by describing the acts of the heart, beginning with “the irrational levels of man.” A person’s mood or temperament arises in one’s heart (Prov. 23:17) and it is “the seat of certain states of feeling, such as joy and grief” (1 Sam. 1:8; 2:1; Prov. 15:13). Courage and fear are related to the status of the heart. Yahweh may strengthen one’s heart, that is, give courage (Ps. 27:14). Fear may overcome a person as the “heart ‘goes out’ (Gen. 42:28), it leaves him (Ps. 40:12) and drops down (1 Sam. 17:32).”11

A brief discussion of the desires and longings of the heart follows. A man is not to desire in his heart—that is, lust after—his neighbor’s wife (Prov. 6:25). “Just as the heart can ‘fall’ into despondency (1 Sam. 17:32), so it can also ‘rear up’ into arrogance” (Deut. 8:14; Hos. 13:6).12

Wolff notes that “in by far the greatest number of cases it is intellectual, rational functions that are ascribed to the heart—i.e., precisely what we ascribe to the head and, more exactly, to the brain; cf. 1 Sam. 25:37.” The heart is the place for understanding (lāda‘āt) and insight (bīn). Thinking (1 Sam. 27:1) and inner reflection (Gen. 17:17) take place in the heart.13

In a final section, Wolff describes how decisions of the will—the planning (Prov. 16:9), intentions (2 Sam. 7:3), and decision making (2 Sam. 7:27; Prov. 6:18)—all take place in the heart.

There are three other significant studies of lēḇ(āḇ) in addition to Wolff’s. Heinz-Josef Fabry’s work is the most thorough, surveying almost every occurrence of lēḇ(āḇ).14 Andrew Bowling’s article is also informative as it supports both Wolff’s and Fabry’s conclusions.15 Alex Luc does suggest that “the words have a dominant metaphorical use in reference to the center of human psychical and spiritual life, to the entire inner life of a person.”16 Luc does not identify in what way the words are metaphoric. He does, however, describe the functions of the heart in a similar manner as the other authors.17 Thus, the four studies of the use of lēḇ(āḇ) or “heart” in the OT are consistent with each other. The heart is the source of emotion, intellectual and cognitive functions, and decision making. No mention is made of it pumping blood throughout the body.
New Testament kardia

Let us now turn to the usage of kardia (heart) which occurs 148 times in the New Testament (NT). A major source here is that of Friedrich Baumgärtel and Johannes Behm in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. The first section written by Baumgärtel reviews the use of leb(ab) in the OT. The rest of the article, written by Behm, includes the use of kardia by Greek writers, its appearance in the LXX (Septuagint), its occurrence in Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism, and finally its usage in the NT. Behm notes that “the heart is the centre of the inner life of man and the source or seat of all the forces and functions of the soul and spirit as attested in many different ways in the NT.” He then lists four categories of the heart’s function, each followed by an inclusive listing of texts. The four categories are the following:

a. In the heart dwell feelings and emotions, desires and passions.

b. The heart is the seat of understanding, the source of thought and reflections.

c. The heart is the seat of the will, the source of resolves.

d. Thus the heart is supremely the one centre in man to which God turns, in which the religious life is rooted, which determines moral conduct.

Another source is that of T. Sorg’s article on “Heart” in the New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. After briefly reviewing the use of kardia in secular Greek, Sorg describes, again briefly, the OT uses of leb(ab) in their literal and metaphorical senses, the latter meaning “the seat of man’s intellectual and spiritual life.” Moving to the NT use of kardia, Sorg states that the heart is “the centre of physical life and man’s psychological make-up.” The “powers” of the spirit, reason, and will “have their seat in the heart.” The subsequent section of the article deals with the spiritual aspect of the use of kardia, how it is the center of spiritual life, its corruption by sin, and how God works to convert it to faith. Sorg’s analysis is not that different from that of Behm, in that the heart is the center of the person where intellectual, emotional, and spiritual life is rooted. While the spiritual life may, in some sense, be metaphorical, the heart is still, in the literal sense, the center of the person’s emotional, intellectual, and decision making function.

Why Not “Brain”

In what sense can the Hebrew and Greek words for the heart and kidneys be seen simply as metaphors or figures of speech, not literal locations of the intellectual life of a person? Both YEC and OEC accept that the Bible does contain metaphors and figures of speech. They are not ultraliteralists, maintaining that every word must be taken literally. It is possible that these usages are metaphors, as they are often so used in cultures influenced by the Bible. The heart is often referred to as the seat of emotion and thinking. We commonly hear such expressions as, “I love you with all my heart,” or “What does your heart tell you?” It would be helpful, however, if the Bible gave the metaphor’s referent, but it does not. In over a thousand usages, there is not one instance in which the word for heart or kidneys refers to or describes their physical functions. While the Israelites were aware that the head did house an organ, there is no word in the Hebrew Bible for the brain. This lack of knowledge of the function of the brain is in keeping with the other cultures in the Ancient Near East.

In Akkadian, the language used in Mesopotamia until the eighth century BC, there is a word for the brain, but in the literature there is no reference to its actual function. The Egyptians were aware of the existence of the brain as early as the seventeenth century BC. It is mentioned in the sixth case of the “Edwin Smith Surgical Papyrus.” However, its function was not known. During the embalming process, the lungs, intestines, stomach, and liver were preserved in canopic jars. The heart was placed back into the body to preserve it for judgment in the afterlife. The heart, being considered by the Egyptians to be the center of the person and seat of the emotions and intellect, was weighed against a feather representing the goddess of truth. The brain, however, was removed through the nose cavity and thrown away.

The Greek word for the head is kephalē; the word for the brain, enkephalē. This word does not appear in the NT. However, prior to and during the first century AD, there was a philosophical debate about the location in the body of its intellectual functions. Aristotelians and Stoics located them in the heart, whereas followers of Plato and some followers of Hippocrates located them in the brain. This debate was settled in the following century by the
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In his De placitiss Hippocratis et Platonis, he refers to his vivisections (live dissections) of animals such as pigs and monkeys, an alternative chosen since dissection of human bodies was forbidden by law. His experiments, at times done in public, proved that it was the brain by means of the nervous system that controlled the body as well as being the source for intellectual activity. His “scientific” demonstrations ended the philosophical debate as they proved that the brain, not the heart, was the location of the mind. His work, however, was accomplished in the century after Jesus’s life.

New Testament Writers: Cardiologists or Neurologists?

Troy Martin examines, in his article “Performing the Role of the Head: Man Is the Head of Woman,” the question of which party did Paul follow in locating the intellectual activity of the person, the cardiologists or neurologists? He cites five texts:

Romans 1:21, “For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or gave thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless heart (καρδία) was darkened.”

1 Corinthians 2:9, “What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart (καρδίαν) of a human conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him.”

1 Corinthians 4:5, “Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the hearts (καρδιῶν).”

2 Corinthians 3:15, “Yes, to this day whenever Moses is read, a veil lies over their heart (καρδιῶν).”

2 Corinthians 9:7, “Each one must do as he has determined in his heart (καρδία), not reluctantly or under compulsion, for God loves a cheerful giver.”

In each text, Paul identifies the heart as the location of thinking, purpose, lack of perception, decision making. Martin concludes, “These texts clearly place Paul on the side of the cardiologists.”

This same question may be asked about Jesus: was he on the side of the cardiologists or neurologists? In Matthew 15:18–19, Jesus says, “But the things which come out of the mouth come from the heart (kardias), and defile a man. For out of the heart (καρδία) come evil thoughts (such as) murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander” (cf. Mark 7:20–21). Mark 11:23 records Jesus saying, “Truly I tell you, if anyone says to this mountain, ‘Rise up and throw yourself into the sea,’ and does not doubt in his heart (kardia) but believes that what he says will happen, it will be done for him” (cf. Matt. 21:21). In Luke 5:22, Jesus confronts the Pharisees by asking, “Why are you thinking these things in your hearts (kardias)?” (cf. Matt. 9:4; Mark 2:8).35 Jesus’s statements reflect OT usage which views the heart as the place where mental functions take place. These texts clearly place Jesus on the side of the cardiologist.

It is at this point that we touch upon one of Christianity’s greatest mysteries. How could the one who is truly God have become also truly human? We know that Jesus was not only limited to time and space, having a human body, but was also limited in knowledge, that is, he was not omniscient. He did not know who had touched his garments to be healed (Mark 5:30–32; Luke 8:45–46), nor did he know the time of the coming of the Son of Man (Matt. 24:36; Mark 13:32).36 Jesus became incarnate as a first-century Jew who spoke Aramaic (Mark 5:41) and Hebrew (Luke 4:17–19), possibly also Greek (Matt. 8:5–7), functioned as a rabbi, and accepted that culture’s understanding of the function of the human body.

Conclusions

The ramifications of this study are significant. First, it has been demonstrated that the writers of both the OT and NT attributed the intellectual functions of the brain to the heart. God did not, by means of inspiration, correct their understanding of the human anatomy; rather, he adapted his message of redemption to the common, though often mistaken, understandings of the ancient cultures. Thus, even though the scriptures are inspired by God, they are not therefore necessarily scientifically accurate.

Second, the Bible’s references to the kidneys and the heart are not scientifically accurate. This does not necessarily mean that the Bible does not inerrantly address all matters of faith and practice. Nor does it mean that God lies. It does mean that God accommodates his message of salvation to the ability of humans to understand. Cultural factors such as language, view of the physical world, and political
practices are not overridden or corrected. While some statements may be scientifically and/or historically accurate, God’s purpose is to reveal inerrantly his work of redemption and his will for how his people are to live: namely, by faith and practice.

Third, Jesus’s references to the heart reflect a first-century understanding of its functions. This indicates that there was a real incarnation of Jesus as a first-century Jew. This does not mean that Jesus was not also truly God, for he walked on water, healed the sick, opened the eyes of the blind, and resuscitated the dead. The church has always rejected the extremes of Ebionism and Docetism, while confessing that Jesus was truly God and truly human. By extension, we should also understand that Jesus’s references to Moses and to Adam and Eve were in keeping with the accepted Jewish historical and literary traditions of that day, not divine statements asserting historical and/or literary facts.

Fourth, since the Bible is not scientifically accurate in its statements concerning the human body, it calls into question whether the account of creation should be understood as scientifically accurate. One could posit that God, having created the universe, inspired a scientifically and historically accurate account of creation while not supplying a scientific description of the human body. However, this leaves us with two different levels of inspiration: one scientifically accurate, the other reflecting a culture which based its understanding of the creation, including the human anatomy, on common observation—inevitably though it may have been. Further, why would God inspire an account of creation that contained information that would, millennia later, be discovered to be scientifically accurate, yet leave no clues to the scientifically understood function of human anatomy?

In the light of this study, the better choice appears to be that God utilized the cultural understandings of the people as a means of communicating his message of salvation. As the writers utilized the common concepts of the body, so the writer of the creation account made use of the cultures of the ancient Near East as a vehicle for a clear theological statement that there is only one God and that this one God is the Creator of all that exists. This would mean that interpretations of both the young earth and old earth creationists are faulty for they impose on the biblical text modern concepts not available to either the writers or the target audience of God’s revelation. The methods God used in creating the universe and its history are to be found by scientific inquiry, not by imposing on the texts of scripture interpretations inconsistent with its contextual settings.

Now the Bereans were of more noble character than the Thessalonians, for they received the message with great eagerness and examined the Scriptures every day to see if what Paul said was true.

Acts 17:11, NIV
Appendix: Kidneys (kēlāyôt)
(Translations of kēlāyôt are in italics)

Job 19:27, kidneys
NIV: How my heart yearns within me!
NAB: my inmost being is consumed with longing.
TANAKH: My heart pines within me.
NRSV: My heart faints within me!

Psalm 7:9 [10], hearts and kidneys
NIV: who probes minds and hearts.
NAB v. 10: who tries hearts and minds.
TANAKH v. 10: he who probes the mind and conscience …
NRSV: you who test the minds and hearts,

Psalm 16:7, kidneys
NIV: heart instructs me
NAB: heart exhorts me
TANAKH: conscience admonishes me
NRSV: heart instructs me

Psalm 26:2, kidneys and heart
NIV: examine my heart and mind;
NAB: search my heart and mind
TANAKH: test my heart and mind
NRSV: test my heart and mind

Psalm 73:21, heart and kidneys
NIV: When my heart was grieved
And my spirit embittered,
NAB: Since my heart was embittered
And my soul deeply wounded,
TANAKH: My mind was stripped of its reason,
My feelings were numbed.
NRSV: When my soul was embittered,
When I was pricked in heart,

Psalm 139:13, kidneys
NIV: For you created my inmost being;
NAB: You formed my inmost being;
TANAKH: It was you who created my conscience;
NRSV: For it was you who formed my inmost parts;

Proverbs 23:16, kidneys (heart in v. 17, but not parallel)
NIV: my inmost being will rejoice
NAB: And my inmost being will exult,
TANAKH: I shall rejoice with all my heart
NRSV: My soul will rejoice

Jeremiah 11:20, kidneys and heart
NIV: test the heart and mind,
NAB: searcher of mind and heart,
TANAKH: Who test the thoughts and the mind,
NRSV: who try the heart and mind,

Jeremiah 12:2, kidneys
NIV: but far from their hearts.
NAB: but far from their inmost thoughts.
TANAKH: But far from their thoughts.
NRSV: yet far from their hearts.

Jeremiah 17:10, hearts and kidneys
NIV: I the LORD search the heart and examine the mind,
NAB: I, the LORD, alone probe the mind and test the heart,
TANAKH: I the LORD probe the heart, Search the mind —
NRSV: you who test the minds and hearts,

Jeremiah 20:12, kidneys and heart
NIV: and probe the heart and mind,
NAB: who probe mind and heart,
TANAKH: who examine the heart and the mind,
NRSV: you see the heart and mind,
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