ChatGPT

Maximum Human Lifespan: Biological Limits and the Plausibility of Biblical Longevity Claims

Introduction

Humans have long been fascinated by the idea of extreme longevity. Ancient texts like the Book of Genesis famously attribute lifespans of **hundreds of years** to early figures – for example, Methuselah is said to have lived **969 years**, with other patriarchs such as Adam (930 years) and Noah (950 years) not far behind [1]. Such extraordinary ages starkly contrast with modern observations: the **longest documented human lifespan** on record is 122 years (achieved by Jeanne Calment of France), with the longest-lived man reaching 116 years [2]. This article examines what current science tells us about the **maximum human lifespan** and evaluates whether there is any biological or demographic basis to support **multi-century lifespans** like those in Genesis. We review the latest understanding of human longevity from genetics, cellular biology (e.g. telomere dynamics and DNA repair), evolutionary biology, and historical demography. In doing so, we contrast **scientific evidence** with the extreme ages from antiquity, to determine if lifespans on the order of 900 years have any grounding in biological reality. The focus is strictly scientific – we will not invoke supernatural or symbolic interpretations, but instead stick to what **empirical data** and current theories indicate about human longevity.

Biological Foundations of Human Longevity

Modern biology has revealed multiple factors that together set the limits of the human lifespan. Aging is a complex, multifaceted process driven by gradual accumulation of molecular and cellular damage over time. One fundamental constraint is the **Hayflick limit** – the intrinsic limit on cell divisions. Most human cells can only divide on the order of ~50 times before they enter a non-dividing aged state (cellular senescence) due to telomere shortening. Telomeres are protective DNA-protein caps on chromosome ends that erode slightly with each cell division. Eventually, critically short telomeres trigger a shutdown of cell proliferation. This mechanism is thought to place an upper bound on human longevity. In fact, Leonard Hayflick's studies on human cells led to the proposal that the **maximum potential human lifespan** is about **120 years**, corresponding to the point when too many cells have accumulated dangerously short telomeres and can no longer replicate [3]. Telomere shortening is one reason our tissues lose the ability to regenerate as we age. While the body does have some cells (like stem cells) that produce **telomerase** (an enzyme that can extend telomeres), in normal adult somatic cells telomerase is largely switched off after birth [4]. This means our cells gradually exhaust their replicative capacity. Notably, if telomerase is artificially activated in cells, they can continue dividing beyond the normal limit – a fact demonstrated in laboratory experiments [5]. However, this comes at a cost: unchecked telomerase activity (and abnormally long telomeres) raises the risk of cells becoming cancerous [6]. In essence, human biology strikes a balance – enough cell divisions for growth and reproduction, but not so many that cancer becomes rampant. This balance appears incompatible with life extending for several centuries under normal physiology.

Beyond telomeres, **DNA damage and repair capacity** play a critical role in aging. Over a lifetime, cells incur DNA damage from metabolic byproducts (like reactive oxygen species), environmental exposures, and random errors. The ability to repair this damage is thought to influence species' lifespans. Indeed, studies across mammals have found that **longer-lived species tend to have more robust DNA repair systems**. For example, a comparative analysis showed that humans (maximum lifespan ~120 years) and the exceptionally long-lived naked mole rat (which can live ~30 years, extraordinarily long for a rodent) both exhibit higher expression of DNA repair genes in their tissues compared to short-lived mice (maximum ~3–4 years) [7]. Such findings support the idea that efficient **genome maintenance** is a "longevity assurance" mechanism that evolved in long-lived species [8]. Conversely, when DNA repair processes fail or slow down, cells accumulate mutations and dysfunction, contributing to aging and age-related diseases (including cancer). Many theories of aging center on this accumulation of cellular damage; in fact, damage to DNA is considered a **central driver of aging** in most modern theories [9]. Features of cellular aging – such as the buildup of harmful DNA mutations, malformed proteins, and senescent (non-functional) cells – eventually compromise organ function. Together, these processes impose an effective limit on how long a human body can remain viable.

Genetic factors also influence longevity, although they operate within the broader biological limits described above. Twin studies suggest that about **20–30% of the variation in human lifespan is due to genetics**, with the remainder determined by environment and lifestyle [10]. No single "longevity gene" has been found that dramatically extends human life, but scientists have identified variants in certain genes that are more common in people who live to extreme old age. For instance, variants of the gene **APOE (apolipoprotein E)** and **FOXO3** consistently show up in studies of centenarians, hinting that they confer some protection against age-related diseases or promote cellular maintenance [11] [12]. The FOXO3 gene is involved in insulin/IGF signaling and stress resistance, pathways known to affect lifespan in animal models. People carrying the favorable variants of these genes have a higher likelihood of reaching their 90s or 100s, although the effect is modest – these genes might tilt the odds toward longevity by reducing risks of cardiovascular disease, dementia, or other major killers [12]. It's important to note that while such genetic factors help some individuals age more slowly or robustly, **none of them fundamentally overcome the aging process**. In other words, even the "best-case" genetic profile does not enable humans to live for several centuries. Instead, these longevity-associated genes tend to delay the onset of diseases or frailty, helping certain people reach the upper bounds of the species' lifespan (around 110–120 years) more often than others. The overall portrait from biology is that human longevity is **polygenic (influenced by many genes)** and strongly modulated by environmental factors – and that our cells and tissues inevitably deteriorate with age, due to intrinsic limits like telomere shortening and accumulated cellular damage.

Evolutionary Perspectives on Lifespan

From an evolutionary and comparative standpoint, the human lifespan is both remarkable and constrained. Humans actually live significantly longer than our closest primate relatives under natural conditions. Wild chimpanzees and other great apes, for example, **rarely live beyond about 50 years** [13]. Even in captivity with veterinary care, great apes only occasionally reach ages in their 60s. In contrast, humans (Homo sapiens) evolved a life history that includes a **much longer adult lifespan**. Paleo-demographic studies indicate that by the time of early modern humans (Upper Paleolithic era), there was a marked increase in the proportion of individuals surviving to older age compared to earlier hominins or apes [14]. Scientists hypothesize that our longer lifespan was favored in part due to the advantages of extended parenting and the "**grandmother effect**": older, post-reproductive adults can boost the survival of grandchildren by providing food and knowledge, thus conferring an evolutionary benefit to longevity. Over many millennia, humans evolved better maintenance and repair mechanisms than short-lived mammals, allowing more of us to reach age 70 and beyond. Our species also experienced reduced extrinsic mortality (death from predators, accidents, etc.) as culture and technology advanced, which further **uncovered our genetic potential for longevity**.

That said, the evolutionary process did not push the human lifespan anywhere near 900 years. Once past the reproductive and child-rearing ages, there is diminishing natural selection pressure to extend lifespan further. Most of the biological investment goes into ensuring survival through the reproductive years and a few decades afterward. It appears that by evolutionary design, the human body is **optimized for a lifespan on the order of a century**, not multiple centuries. In fact, researchers have noted that the **maximum human lifespan (~115–125 years)** has likely remained *static* since the emergence of modern humans [15]. Our Paleolithic ancestors had much harder lives on average – due to high infant mortality and harsh conditions – but if someone in the prehistoric era did manage to avoid accidents and infections, it's plausible they could have lived to a age approaching what we consider the human maximum today (albeit this would have been extremely rare) [16]. In other words, the **capacity for human longevity is ancient**, built into our species, and has not changed in thousands of years. What *has* changed drastically is the **average lifespan** (life expectancy), thanks to improvements in survival.

Life expectancy in ancient and pre-modern times was very low by modern standards – often on the order of 30 years or less at birth – but this was mostly due to very high infant and child mortality. Historical and archaeological evidence shows that in societies like Classical Greece or Ancient Rome, **half of all children died before adolescence**, which drags the average life expectancy at birth down to 20–30 years [17]. However, those individuals who did survive childhood had a decent chance of reaching their 50s or 60s [18]. Truly **old individuals (over ~70)** were rare in antiquity, but they did exist. The often-quoted low "average lifespan" of the past can be misleading – it doesn't mean people dropped dead at 30 en masse, but rather that so many died young that the statistical average was low. In reality, if a person in ancient Rome made it to age 30, they might live another 20–30 years [17]. This context is important when assessing claims of extraordinary longevity in antiquity. **No verified historical evidence** outside folklore suggests that people routinely lived beyond 100 in ancient times, let alone several hundred. In fact, surviving records and skeletal remains imply the opposite: early humans and pre-industrial populations had **shorter lifespans** on average than modern populations, and nothing indicates they had biological advantages that let them live longer than we do. If anything, the challenges of pre-modern life meant that far fewer individuals ever approached the **upper bound** of human lifespan that we observe today (around 100+ years). It is telling that in the Bible itself, outside of those early Genesis patriarchs, most figures are described with lifespans that align with normal human experience (for example, by the later books, lifespans of 70–80 years are common, which matches the known historical reality).

The Longest Verified Human Lifespans

In the modern era of record-keeping, we have been able to document the true outliers of human longevity – and none come anywhere near the ages of Genesis. The **oldest verified person in history** is Jeanne Louise Calment, who died in 1997 at the age of 122 years and 164 days [2]. Calment's lifespan is remarkable not only for reaching 122 (exceeding the next-oldest case by about 3 years), but also for being so well-validated – her birth and identity records were thoroughly confirmed. The second-oldest validated person (as of recent data) was Kane Tanaka of Japan, who lived to 119, and there have been a handful of other individuals who reached 117 or 116. For men, the record is 116 years (Jiroemon Kimura of Japan) [2]. These cases are extremely rare **supercentenarians** (people over 110). According to international longevity research groups, there are typically only a few dozen living supercentenarians in the entire world at any given time, and only one in a billion people will reach 110 years of age. Reaching age 100, while still relatively uncommon, is becoming more frequent as life expectancy rises and medical care improves; but *each* additional year past 110 becomes exponentially harder to achieve due to the steep rise in mortality risk at extreme ages.

An interesting observation from demography is that while **average life expectancy** has dramatically increased over the last two centuries (primarily due to reduced infant mortality and better health in adulthood), the **maximum lifespan** has not increased to the same degree [19]. Records from the 1700s or 1800s show a few rare individuals living into their 100s, similar to today. What has changed is that many more people now survive into old age, and thus we have more chances for individuals to push the envelope of longevity. But despite vastly more centenarians alive today, *no one has blown past Jeanne Calment's record*. This suggests that there may be a built-in **ceiling** or asymptotic limit to human lifespan under natural conditions. In fact, one statistical analysis published in *Nature* in 2016 argued that human lifespan appeared to peak around ~115 years in recent decades, implying a biological limit around that age unless new breakthroughs arise [20]. However, this conclusion sparked debate – subsequent studies pointed out that if you examine supercentenarian data, the **mortality rates seem to level off after a certain extreme age**. In other words, while the chance of a person reaching, say, age 110 is incredibly low, for those who *do* reach 110, the odds of seeing another birthday do not keep worsening as sharply as they did before. This phenomenon is called the **late-life mortality plateau**. A high-quality study of Italian supercentenarians in 2018 found that beyond age 105, the risk of death each year stopped increasing exponentially and plateaued at roughly a 50% annual chance of death [21]. This finding suggests there might not be a fixed *absolute* maximum human lifespan – theoretically, if mortality probability plateaus, a few hardy individuals could survive well beyond 120 by chance. Indeed, some demographers have argued that there is **no detectable cap** on human longevity yet, and that it might increase if more people reach extreme ages [21].

It's important to emphasize, however, that "no fixed limit" does *not* mean anywhere close to 900 years. It simply means we don't yet see a hard cutoff like a wall at 120; instead, the tail of the survival curve might extend a bit further if given enough people and continued improvements. Even the most optimistic scenarios based on current data predict only marginal increases in record lifespan. For example, one recent study used dynamic models of human resilience (how the body recovers from stress) to estimate an *upper bound* for humans in ideal conditions. The result was a projected maximum of **120 to 150 years** – essentially a range around 1.2 to 1.5 centuries, *not* multiple centuries [22] [23]. In that analysis, even if all major diseases were overcome, the human body's intrinsic "aging process" – a declining ability to return to equilibrium after perturbations – would lead to death by around 150 years at the latest [22]. Another 2021 demographic study in *Nature Aging* likewise concluded that without a radical alteration of biological aging, **radical life extension is unlikely**. The authors found that in the countries with the longest-lived populations, survival to age 100 is still expected to remain under 20% even for women (and much lower for men), and that **extending survival much beyond 110-120 would require fundamentally slowing the aging process** in a way not yet achieved [20]. In short, *current science indicates that the practical human lifespan limit is on the order of 120 years, maybe slightly more*, and there is no evidence of anyone naturally living far beyond that.

All documented claims of humans living significantly longer (such as anecdotes of 150-year-old or 200-year-old persons) have never been verified under rigorous scrutiny and often are due to errors or false records [24]. For instance, historical "longevity myths" abound – from ancient emperors to more modern era hoaxes – but upon investigation, these typically fall apart (cases of mistaken identity, exaggerated age for publicity, etc.). One classic example is the case of Sheikh Li Ching-Yuen, a Chinese herbalist purported to have lived over 250 years, which is often cited in popular media but is **not backed by credible evidence**. Gerontologists and record-keeping organizations like the Gerontology Research Group and Guinness World

Records instead rely on verified birth and death documents, and those confirm that **no human is known to have lived beyond 122 years**. This gap between 122 and the **900+ years** in Genesis is not a small difference of a few decades – it is an almost **order-of-magnitude** difference that would require a completely different biology.

Could Any Biology Support Multi-Century Lifespans?

Given what we know now, is there *any* scientific scenario or model in which a human (or human-like organism) could live for several centuries? Scientists have explored various ways to extend lifespan, but these are mostly aimed at modest gains (perhaps a few decades at most). Some animals in nature do exhibit multi-century lifespans, which at first glance might inspire hope that extreme longevity is possible. For example, the **Greenland shark** (a large cold-water shark) has been estimated to live **400 years or more** – one specimen was dated to about 392 ± 120 years, possibly making it over 500 years old [25]. Similarly, the **ocean quahog clam** (*Arctica islandica*) can survive for **five centuries** – a famous individual nicknamed "Ming" was determined to be about 507 years old [26]. Certain types of **turtles and tortoises** can live over 180 years, and **bowhead whales** (the longest-lived mammals) have been known to reach around 200 years. There are even creatures like the tiny **hydra** (a freshwater polyp) and the *Turritopsis* "immortal jellyfish" that biologists consider **biologically immortal** – they show no signs of aging and can, in principle, live indefinitely by continuously regenerating their tissues [27]. These examples demonstrate that **biology, in general, does not forbid extremely long lifespan**. However, the crucial point is that each of these species has very specific adaptations and life-history traits that permit such longevity, which humans emphatically do not share.

The Greenland shark and bowhead whale, for instance, are cold-adapted and have **slow metabolisms**, meaning their tissues accumulate damage much more slowly than those of warm-blooded, high-metabolism creatures. The quahog clam and giant tortoises have low body temperatures and a lifestyle that demands very low energy turnover, which correlates with slower aging. The hydra avoids aging by being mostly composed of stem cells that continually renew its body, a regenerative strategy entirely unlike that of complex animals like humans. In contrast, humans are warm-blooded mammals with relatively high metabolic rates, and our body plan is not built for continual regeneration of all parts. We undergo development, maturation, reproduction, and then senescence – a pattern governed by our evolutionary lineage. To achieve a **multi-century lifespan**, a human would have to fundamentally alter these biological parameters: dramatically slow down metabolic and cellular turnover rates, vastly improve DNA repair and protein homeostasis, avoid cancer and other diseases for centuries, and perhaps periodically rejuvenate tissues. As of now, **no known genetic or biomedical intervention can accomplish this** in any complex organism, let alone humans.

Researchers in biogerontology are working on various strategies to extend human healthspan and possibly lifespan – for example, through **caloric restriction mimetics** (drugs that mimic the life-extending effects seen when lab animals eat a very low-calorie diet), **senolytic drugs** (to clear out senescent cells), or even experimental gene therapies to tweak metabolic pathways like mTOR, sirtuins, or growth hormone signaling. Some of these interventions have extended the lifespans of mice by significant percentages (20–30% in some cases). But even if similar gains were achievable in humans, a 30% increase on the current record of 122 years is only around 160 years – nowhere near 900. Achieving a nine-century lifespan would require **eliminating or overcoming virtually every major mechanism of aging** known to science, and doing so consistently over many centuries. It is difficult to even conceive of this under our current understanding of biology. For instance, one would need to maintain telomere length for centuries without causing uncontrolled cell growth (cancer), keep the immune system robust enough to prevent infections for 900 years, and maintain neurological function (brain cells, which generally do not replenish, would have to survive centuries without neurodegeneration). These challenges illustrate how far beyond today's science the biblical lifespans are. In effect, a human capable of living 900 years would be a fundamentally different kind of organism than present-day Homo sapiens.

Biblical Longevity Claims in Scientific Context

When we compare the **biblical longevity claims** to the scientific evidence, the verdict is that such extreme ages have **no scientific support**. The Genesis accounts of people living 800–900+ years cannot be explained by any known biological mechanism. There is no genetic profile, no cellular trick, and no environmental condition that would allow a human being to age at 1/10th the normal rate (which is essentially what a 900-year lifespan implies, assuming they matured and aged proportionally slowly). In fact, all available evidence from human biology and demography runs contrary to these ancient claims:

- **Historical/Demographic evidence:** Nowhere in the extensive records of human history (spanning many cultures and thousands of years) do we find credible reports of individuals living beyond about 130 years. If early humans regularly lived for centuries, we would expect to see some trace of that in written records, skeletal remains, or genetic data, but we do not. Instead, we find that ancient populations had shorter lifespans, not longer. The extraordinary ages in Genesis appear unique to that text and are not corroborated by any empirical data. They are often considered **mythological or symbolic** numbers by historians. Scientifically, one might speculate if perhaps those ages were measured differently (for instance, counting months as years, etc.), but no consistent alternative interpretation has strong evidence, and most scholars view the numbers as part of a literary or theological tradition rather than literal biology.

- **Biological feasibility:** As outlined above, a human living 900+ years would face insurmountable biological problems. Key systems (cardiovascular, immune, nervous) would fail much sooner. For example, by age 100, even the healthiest individuals show a great deal of cellular senescence and organ degeneration; by age 900, without some magical prevention of aging, the body's systems would long have broken down. **Telomere theory alone** suggests that human cells simply could not keep replicating healthily for that long without intervention – by about 120 years most cells have hit their division limit [3]. Additionally, the accumulation of mutations in stem cells and critical cells (like neurons or heart muscle cells) over centuries would likely be incompatible with life. Some animals can replace lost or damaged cells very efficiently (e.g., some lizards regrow tails, hydra continuously renew cells), but humans have **limited regenerative capacity**. Our brain cells and heart cells, for instance, mostly last a lifetime and then wear out. No mechanism exists in humans to replace the brain in situ or keep it functional for 900 years; even if one could avoid Alzheimer's and other neurodegenerative diseases, the slow attrition of neurons and their connections over such a vast time would almost certainly lead to catastrophic failure of function.

- **Genetic mutations and cancer:** One of the biggest hurdles to extreme longevity is cancer. Cancer becomes more likely as we age because mutations accumulate and the normal checks on cell growth fail. Very few people avoid cancer if they live into their 80s or 90s, and it's often said that if anyone were to somehow live to 150, it's nearly impossible they wouldn't develop some form of cancer by then. The idea of living 900 years without dying of cancer is thus extremely implausible unless one posits an unrealistically perfect DNA repair and immune surveillance system. Humans would need a vastly enhanced ability to fix DNA errors (far beyond what even the longest-lived humans have) and to eliminate precancerous cells. Evolution hasn't given us that – presumably because we never needed to survive that long in the wild.

In sum, **current scientific knowledge provides no basis to accept the literal idea of 900-year-old humans**. Instead, it firmly indicates that the **human lifespan has natural limits** enforced by our biology. The consensus view in gerontology is that, absent technological or biomedical breakthroughs that fundamentally alter human aging, we will not see people living for multiple centuries. The extreme lifespans in Genesis therefore remain an outlier, explainable by religious or cultural context but not by science. While it's intriguing to ask hypothetically what it would take for a human to live centuries (as we did above), all such scenarios are squarely in the realm of speculation and science fiction at this point.

Conclusion

Modern science portrays human longevity as impressive but bounded. Thanks to advances in medicine, nutrition, and public health, many more of us now reach old age, and some individuals push into the **10th or 11th decade of life**. Yet even the healthiest lifestyles and best genes have yielded lives only about **one-tenth as long** as those ascribed to figures like Methuselah. The **longest human life reliably recorded is 122 years**, and analyses suggest that without radical innovation, we are unlikely to greatly exceed this record in the near future [22] [20]. Biological constraints – from our cells' telomeres to the architecture of our organs – impose a finite lifespan. The scientific evidence overwhelmingly supports that the **aging process is real and ultimately limiting**, even if we manage to delay it somewhat.

By evaluating genetics, cellular aging, evolutionary biology, and historical data, we find a coherent picture: **Human beings are not built to live for centuries**. Multi-century lifespans are observed in some cold-blooded or simple organisms, but not in mammals of our size and metabolic rate. The claims of extremely long-lived biblical patriarchs are not supported by any scientific data on human biology or demography. They remain, from a scientific perspective, **outside the realm of possibility** given what we know about how our bodies age. This does not dismiss the cultural or symbolic importance such stories might hold, but strictly in terms of biology, there is *no credible mechanism* to validate 900-year lifespans.

In conclusion, the **maximum human lifespan** documented by science is on the order of 120 years, and while scientists continue to study aging (with hopes of modestly extending healthy human life), there is no evidence or theory to suggest that humans could naturally live for several hundred years. The extraordinarily long lives in early Genesis should be viewed as part of **mythological or literary tradition** rather than literal biological history, since they conflict with everything we understand about human life. Our species' longevity is remarkable in its own right – we outlive most mammals and all other primates – but it still has a limit. Barring unforeseen breakthroughs that rewrite the rules of aging, **claims of 800- or 900-year lifespans must be regarded as incompatible with scientific knowledge** of human biology and longevity.

References:

- Calment, J. – Verified oldest human, died at 122 (record longevity) [2]
- Finch, C.E. (2010) – Evolutionary perspective: humans outlive great apes (rarely >50 years) [13]
- Hayflick, L. – Cellular aging and the Hayflick limit (~50 divisions, ~120-year max) [3]
- Ahmed et al. – DNA damage as central to aging; telomere shortening triggers senescence [9]

- MacRae et al. (2015) – Long-lived species (human, naked mole rat) have higher DNA repair capacity [7]
- Accardi et al. (2022) – Longevity genes (e.g. APOE, FOXO3) associated with reaching extreme old age [11] [12]
- "Life Expectancy" (historical data) – In ancient times, life expectancy at birth ~20–30 years due to high child mortality; very few lived beyond 70 [17]
- Sapiens Magazine (C. Cave, 2018) – Maximum human lifespan ~125 years has remained constant; eliminating major diseases would only add ~15 years to life expectancy [15]
- Nature Aging (2023) – Progress in life expectancy has slowed; without slowing biological aging, **radical extension is implausible** [20]
- Scientific American (Willingham, 2021) – Analysis suggests an effective human lifespan limit of ~120–150 years even with ideal health conditions [22]
- Barbi et al. (Science, 2018) – Found **mortality plateau** after age 105, implying no strict fixed limit (but extremely few reach those ages) [21]
- "Longevity Myths" – Documentation of extreme age claims (biblical and otherwise) as unverified; Genesis patriarchs ages (930, 969, etc.) are considered outside historical reality [1] [28]
- NIH News (2018) – People with abnormally long telomeres face higher cancer risk (trade-off in extending cell lifespan) [6]
- Wikipedia "Maximum lifespan" & "Oldest people" – General data on longevity records and species comparisons (e.g. Greenland shark ~400 years, Arctica clam 500+ years) [25] [26]

---

[1] [24] [28] Longevity myths - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Longevity_myths

[2] Oldest people - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oldest_people

[3] [4] [10] Nutrition and lifestyle in healthy aging: the telomerase challenge - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4761710/

[5] [9] [19] Telomeres and telomerase: basic science implications for aging - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11555075/

[6] Long telomeres may heighten cancer risks
https://www.nih.gov/news-events/nih-research-matters/long-telomeres-may-heighten-cancer-risks

[7] [8] DNA repair in species with extreme lifespan differences - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26729707/

[11] [12] How Important Are Genes to Achieve Longevity?
https://www.mdpi.com/1422-0067/23/10/5635

[13] Evolution in health and medicine Sackler colloquium: Evolution of the human lifespan and diseases of aging: roles of infection, inflammation, and nutrition - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19966301/

[14] Older age becomes common late in human evolution - PNAS
https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.0402857101

[15] [16] Did Ancient People Die Young? – SAPIENS
https://www.sapiens.org/biology/human-lifespan-history/

[17] [18] Life expectancy - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life_expectancy

[20] Implausibility of radical life extension in humans in the twenty-first century | Nature Aging
https://www.nature.com/articles/s43587-024-00702-3?error=cookies_not_supported&code=2351f62c-efd2-45e1-ad20-47e25ee80614

[21] There's no limit to longevity, says study that revives human lifespan debate
https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-05582-3?error=cookies_not_supported&code=8156250d-6062-4481-955c-8bb9574f5924

[22] [23] Humans Could Live up to 150 Years, New Research Suggests | Scientific American
https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/humans-could-live-up-to-150-years-new-research-suggests/

[25] [26] [27] Maximum life span - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maximum_life_span