

the 38 years, Numbers 20).

Psalm 91 gives an impressive counterpoint of those surviving the slaughter of the rebellious who would 'fall at their side'. But it would 'not come nigh' them. They would be preserved to enter the promised land, as Jehovah promised, despite 'pestilence', 'destruction', 'the arrow nor terror'. Maybe these were ways they died. Scripture is elsewhere silent. Rebellion falls from view at once in Scripture. The silence of the Lord following rebellion is deafening, for example, Adam after Eden. No, Psalm 90 is a wilderness generation psalm describing an exceptional situation by, for and about, those who knew.

C. A. Slater,
Cockermouth, Cumbria,
ENGLAND.

REFERENCES

1. Wieland, C, 1994. Decreased lifespans: have we been looking in the right place? *CEN Tech. J.*, 8(2):138–141 (p. 138).
2. Beasley, G., 1994. A possible creationist perspective on the Tyrolean (Oetztaler) Ice Man. *CEN Tech. J.*, 8(2): 179–191 (p. 185).

The Author Replies . . .

Attributing the authorship of the passage to David was erroneous — the correction is appreciated. Whatever the merits of this interesting exegesis, I have never understood the 'three score and ten' in this Psalm to be prescriptive, that is, setting limits on what man's lifespan should be, but descriptive. That is, simply stating what the situation generally is. The fact that some live longer is balanced by the fact that others live for a lesser time. Ignoring infant

mortality, the average adult age at death has hovered around 70 years for centuries.

There was no suggestion in my article that anyone is 'wrong or aberrant' for falling above (or indeed below) this average. I do agree though that it is commonly taken or regarded as if it were a divine limit.

I trust it is clear that the point of the article is independent of the correct exegesis of this Psalm, namely, that lifespans **have** decreased dramatically post-Flood and that there are serious reasons to reconsider the popular fixation on 'environment-only' explanations.

Carl Wieland,
Brisbane, Queensland,
AUSTRALIA.

QUOTABLE QUOTE: Do Scientific Ideas get Accepted on Merit?

'Let me put it this way, it's not just what you have to say that counts, it's who you are; it really is. And it's the way science works today and it's the way it's working this time [referring to Darwin]. The school you teach at, the affiliations you have, the people you know that back you. The reason I know S... [name], for example, is because I'm a relative newcomer in the field and I needed his plug (because he's at both Harvard and MIT and he's well known) — I needed his plug for my manuscript to get it at Cambridge, otherwise they wouldn't have even bothered to look at it.'

— Dr Michael Shermer, prominent American skeptic and anti-creationist, in a series of lectures on 'Evolution v. Creationism: The History of a Controversy' given at the Californian Institute of Technology in 1993 and available from the **US Skeptics Society**.