

High Top Media

P.O. Box 2494
Cullowhee, North Carolina 28723
828.293.9797

May 5, 2004

Dr. Herman L. Hoeh
10530 Commerce Avenue
Tujunga, CA 91042-1539

Dear Dr. Hoeh,

Greetings from western North Carolina. I hope that you and Mrs. Hoeh are doing well. My health has not been what I hoped it would be but the folks at Mayo Clinic have me on the path to recovery. Due to a blockage I have lost about 1/3 of my kidney function but we hope that I will regain it with diet and exercise life style changes.

Am receiving well over 500,000 visitors a year to my www.bibarch.com website. The Perspectives section has allowed me to address various topics and I receive a reasonable flow of questions from viewers. I have attempted to answer these as I have knowledge to the best of my ability.

In any case, the Sacred Calendar as well as other calendars occasionally comes up. I am not involved in calendar wars as I still feel that the calculated calendar provides the best mathematical model for computation of the most probable dates for the biblical high Sabbaths and festivals in antiquity. The astronomy of the ancients was well developed as well as their timekeeping skills and to reason that the Levitical priests did not possess the mathematical and other skills needed to develop or administer a calculated calendar is a misnomer.

What I am writing you about is the matter of the leap years occurring before 142 AD, namely 2 5 7 10 13 16 18. I have not been able to verify this pattern in any of the extant literature. I discussed this with John Kossey and he admitted it was an assumption and he knows of no extant evidence either. I presume, also, that 142 AD was determined as significant on some historical basis (of which I am not familiar or privy).

I suspect the pattern was inferred by you to conform to a benchmark of 31 AD as the year of the Crucifixion. Your writings in the PT also point to your conclusion that the 70 Weeks Prophecy also requires a 31 AD Crucifixion. I realize you may have changed your mind on these matters.

In any case, it would be helpful to know why and how you came to the conclusion that the leap years before 142 AD were in that pattern. If you can refer me to scholarly sources or original texts it would be quite helpful.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Germano
President