there at the same time as the Israelites were walking through it - at the same time, not later. Computer simulations of water parting either have wind too strong (62 mph, Beaufort Force 10) to walk into or too weak to make A WALL at the same time. Walking into a wind becomes fairly difficult at Beaufort Force 8 about 45 mph. Also objections same as A. above. R. Larry Overstreet (6) *"If one accepts the inerrancy of the Bible, locating Israel's crossing of the Red Sea in Exodus 14–15 any place other than the northwestern arm of the Red Sea (i.e., the Gulf of Suez) is practically impossible."* From the Bible and many non-biblical sources Overstreet opposes Red Sea crossing places based on Yam Suph meaning Reed Sea while strongly favoring the Upper Gulf of Suez as the only location agreeing with scripture. This then argues against crossing at any Mediterranean or northern lakes site and against any southern Sinai or Gulf of Aqaba site.

**C. Ballah Lakes and Lake Timsah:** These candidate locations depend on imaginative and speculative locations for campsite names Migdol, etc. Also, again the meaning of Yam Suph is doubtful. The water parted by wind would not have made A WALL, or, if making A HIGH WALL the retreating storm surge would have also piled the people into heaps. For more about Wind Set Down calculations see also, Brunt, Meteorologist's View: http://ed5015.tripod.com/BRedSeaCrossing.htm

**D. Great Bitter Lake:** Same problem here. Water parting mechanism. wind set-down either is too weak to create A HIGH WALL of water or it will be too strong and blow the people into a pile. This is a fatal flaw of most proposals. "Wind Set-Down" is the term for the action of wind from a beach pushing the water up and away from that shore, and "Relaxation of Wind Set-Down" is the surge of the water returning. Reference: http://earth.huji.ac.il/data/pics/wind_set-down(jcp).pdf

**E. Little Bitter Lake:** Timing and route turns fit scripture. Place names have imagined physical counterparts. Wind strong enough to make a wall of water on the right and on the left would still blow away the people.

**F. Bow Inlet - Little Bitter Lake to Bay of Suez:** Since 1869 the Lower Suez Canal has connected the south end of Little Bitter Lake to the Gulf of Suez. Previously it was sand and before that evidence of canals are shown on old maps. At the Exodus, about 1446 B.C., evidence indicates an arc of water, here called the Bow Inlet, existed at this location and appears to meet all biblical criteria of scripture, nature, faith and logic with evidence. See details in the Bow Inlet write up on Page 12 herein. Not only are ancient canals found in the lower Suez Canal area of old maps but recent maps also show specific Red Sea opening, crossing, and closing evidence. Archaeological digs are possible to confirm the Bow Inlet area as the actual Exodus Red Sea Crossing site. People and cattle had plenty of fresh water at the Bow Inlet until after the Red Sea crossing due to the Locust Plague discussed in the Bow Inlet write up. Bible place names are well indicated. A sandy ridge on the eastern shore fits Baalzephon the Egyptian 'Baal-Capuna' the site of pagan worship and Migdol fits as the large mountain Jebel Atiqa. Pihahiroth means 'mouth of the canal' with exactly matching digs shown on old maps at Gulf of Suez. Nostrils are Mitla and Giddi Passes. Bow Inlets north and south match mountain passes that are north and south exactly east. An east wind is naturally strong at the sides causing A HIGH WALL of water on both sides. Wind is blocked in the middle by a mountain, thus shielding the travelers in the middle and not piling them up into heaps. Fifty+ parameters of geography are perfectly crafted to part the Red Sea and bury the army. "the earth swallowed them" Exodus 15:12. Now what is the chance of that? Meteorological and geomorphology software now has an ideal geography to test an ideal Red Sea simulation. Many crossing theories J - M in this list cross the Bow Inlet as a route but assume it is just sand as was the case from about 1446 BC to 1869 AD.

**G. Nile River at Giza:** This theory by Matheny (7) holds that Goshen was West of Nile Delta and Route went initially west of Nile River and crossed at Giza. Problems: Nile too deep, no inlet bow, no trap, not Red Sea, Egyptians and Army Reserve on West side of Nile.

**H. Bay of Suez - Upper Gulf of Suez:** This area is a candidate of several crossing site theories using mechanisms of extra low tides, global warming lower water, tectonic plate shifts, and a cyclone or hurricane to lower the water. Tides, tectonic shifts, and global warming low water don't fit the Biblical "strong east wind" and again, cyclone winds strong parting the sea will pile-up people without a barrier in the middle.

**HH. Mid. Gulf of Suez:** Like G, plus the added problem of much greater depth and steep coral sides to the dry sea floor. Coral walls are not dry land and so disagree with biblical texts.