Summary of Barometrical Observations

Robert H. West

To cite this article: Robert H. West (1893) Summary of Barometrical Observations, Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 25:2, 163-164, DOI: [10.1179/peq.1893.25.2.163](https://doi.org/10.1179/peq.1893.25.2.163)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/peq.1893.25.2.163>

Published online: 20 Nov 2013.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 3

View related articles [↗](#)

	Date, 1890.	Barom. at sea level 32°.	Aneroid Reading.	Same Corrected.	Altitude.
1	July 8th	29.71	23.60	...	6,600
2	July 8th	29.70	23.70	...	6,485
3	July 9th	29.69	23.68	...	6,500
4	July 10th	29.69	23.60	...	6,590
5	July 10th	29.73	27.33	...	2,400
6	July 12th	29.73	27.15	...	2,550
7	July 12th	29.70	25.23	...	4,700
8	July 14th	29.77	21.10	...	9,700
9	"	29.76	25.13	...	4,860
10	"	29.75	24.50	...	5,550
11	"	29.75	25.00	25.62	4,580
12	July 15th	29.75	22.48	22.62	7,865
13	July 16th	29.70	22.30	22.53	7,900
14	"	29.70	22.48	22.35	8,150
15	"	29.69	22.62	22.67	7,725
16	July 17th	29.66	24.67	24.72	5,200
17	"	29.65	25.00	25.05	4,800
18	July 18th	29.65	25.80	25.85	4,600
19	"	29.67	26.30	26.35	4,000
20	"	29.68	27.30	26.75	2,950
21	"	29.69	27.80	27.25	2,450
22	July 22nd	29.69	27.90	27.35	2,385
23	July 21st	29.65	25.80	25.35	4,600
24	July 22nd	29.57	27.70	27.15	2,450
25	"	29.57	27.55	27.00	2,600
26	"	29.57	24.00	27.45	2,150
27	July 23rd	29.60	28.54	27.99	1,600
28	July 24th	29.64	28.72	28.17	1,500
29	July 25th	29.74	25.90	25.35	4,600
30	"	29.74	27.00	26.45	3,375
31	July 29th	29.74	26.90	26.35	3,500
32	July 30th	29.73	28.40	27.85	1,900
33	July 31st	29.74	28.80	28.25	1,500
34	August 2nd	29.78	29.30	28.75	890
35	"	29.78	28.62	28.07	1,675
36	"	29.79	26.82	26.27	3,585
37	"	29.79	27.60	27.05	2,780
38	August 4th	29.79	28.50	27.95	1,850
39	August 6th	29.76	28.00	27.45	2,325
40	August 7th	29.67	27.33	26.78	2,950
41	"	29.70	21.33	20.78	10,210
42	"	29.71	21.26	23.71	6,440
43	August 8th	29.74	24.25	23.70	6,425
44	"	29.74	24.25	23.70	6,432

NOTES.

Nos. 8, 9 and 10 give results which are evidently too high.

Nos. 11, 12.—The aneroid fell at Rukhleh, after the observation there. It was compared with a mercurial barometer at Bludân, on July 15, and these two observations corrected accordingly. I also re-adjusted the instrument.

Nos. 13-17 are corrected in accordance with the comparison after the readjustment.

Nos. 18-41.—There was manifestly some great change in the adjustment which affected all these readings. Taking the heights of Deir 'Atīyah (No. 19), and the Cedars (41), determined by mercurial barometer, as correct, I have applied throughout a constant correction—0.55 inch, which brings all the observations into fair accordance with previous determinations.

N.B.—In making the reductions from the observations in this series, I have made a rough allowance for temperature by *assuming* a temperature for the upper station. It need scarcely be added that these results cannot be considered as at all exact.

ANCIENT JERUSALEM.

Acra North, not South of the Temple.

By Major-General Sir CHARLES W. WILSON, K.C.B., F.R.S. &c., R.E.

In the last *Quarterly Statement* the Rev. W. F. Birch has criticised some views on the topography of ancient Jerusalem which I ventured to put forward last summer; and has charged me with mistranslating Josephus.

I may at once say that, in my opinion, the *data* at present at our disposal are not sufficient to enable us to determine accurately some of the most important points in dispute. By comparing the historical materials with the local indications we can make guesses, more or less accurate, but, until the excavations made by Sir C. Warren are resumed, we cannot be certain. My guesses, the result of many years' study, unfortunately differ from the firm convictions of my critic, and I am sorry to say that, after reading his many admirable papers on the topography of Jerusalem, including the last, I am unable to accept all his conclusions.

To bring forward all the arguments for and against Mr. Birch's identifications would be to write a book, for which I have no leisure; and I can only notice here, and that briefly, some of his criticisms. In the first place, however, I must say a word for Josephus, in whom I am said to confide too readily. Josephus, whatever his faults may be, cer-