

wind that will push water up into a wall will have a similar effect on people if they are walking into the main force of the wind. The only thing that can be done in the case of the computer simulations of the Exodus and Red Sea is to find a place where there is a mountain(s) in the middle so that the largest main force of the wind is blocked.

References:

Many more may be added

- (1) The Route of the Exodus by A. G. Weld page 238 in The Expositor July 1883 Vol. VI, as edited by Samuel Cox, Sir William Robertson Nicoll, James Moffatt:

<http://books.google.com/books?id=eTo2AAAAMAAJ&dq=sirbonis+red+sea+crossing+exodus+-sirbonis+-wyatt+-nuweiba&jtp=238>

- (2) Drews and Han: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-11383620>

- (3) Drews and Han:

<http://www.plosone.org/article/slideshow.action?uri=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0012481&imageURI=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0012481.g008> **Notes: Drews-Han Simulation at Lake Manzala**

Strong Points: The computer simulation verified the scripture but only partially because what the simulation needed was a better geographic location. The simulation partly showed that the actions of a 62 mph wind on the water described in the scripture will cause walls fences or edges of water if there is a bow of water pointing into the wind. With a bow of water the water will be pushed back and become A WALL of water extending on the right and left of lesser or greater heights depending on the wind strength. It also dries out a wide area of shore at the center of the bow for a length of time.

Problems: The 62 mph wind is a Force 10 on the Beaufort scale which is above force 9 which is said to be very difficult to walk against. So the people could not walk into the wind of Drews-Han and therefore the wall of waters on right and left could not occur while the Israelites were walking on dry ground. This violates Exodus 14:22. Other objections, the geography and water level may well have been different when and where the Red Sea parted. The Drews-Han "wall of water" height is not stated but appears not to be a wall but low fences. The route violates scripture. The Red Sea was not the Red Sea but the Yam Suph, 'reed sea', marsh excuse used for northern routes. The place names are imaginary. The Drews-Han simulation has the right idea of a bow of water Israel in the middle and it has pieces of the right mechanism to part the water. It just needs the right location and a more complete scenario that matches more scripture.

- (4) Biblical Archaeologists Review:

<http://www.biblearchaeology.org/post/2010/09/24/An-Appraisal-of-the-2010-Drews-and-Han-Wind-Setdown-Models-of-the-Exodus-14-Sea-Crossing.aspx#Article>

- (5) Beaufort Wind Scale: Royal Meteorologic Society

<http://www.rmets.org/weather/observing/beaufort.php>

- (6) EXEGETICAL AND CONTEXTUAL FACETS OF ISRAEL'S RED SEA CROSSING R. Larry Overstreet
TMSJ 14/1 (Spring 2003) 63-86 <http://www.tms.edu/tmsj/tmsj14d.pdf>

- (7) EXODUS The Route * Sea Crossing * God's Mountain by Gary Matheny

http://www.xulonpress.com/bookstore/bookdetail.php?PB_ISBN=9781613792971