

## Chapter Thirty-three

The transcript was emailed to me later that evening, but I did not forward it immediately to Jessica Davis, as I had the transcripts of the opening statements. I didn't want her to post Clayton's testimony online before it was accompanied by my cross-examination.

On the newscasts that evening, clips of my press conference followed right after the reports from Yellow Brook. The late-night pundits picked up on the story of the trial. I couldn't stay up too late, but I caught a lot of it on the morning shows.

On MSNBC, Joe Bartholomew, a former Republican politician from Tennessee, went on a long rant in support of my assertion. One of the journalists he interviewed was Jessica Davis. She mentioned that people could read the full transcripts on her website. I also received a call from Joe's producers asking me to come on the show. Of course, I accepted.

When I arrived at the courthouse, there were a dozen demonstrators carrying placards with a variety of slogans. DEMOCRACY FOR ALL. HATERS BURN IN HELL. One of them was especially gratifying. REMEMBER DAVID GOLDFIELD! It was my battle cry.

Lavender Williams was waiting for me at the top of the steps, and we went up to the courtroom together. Back to the battlefield. I took my place at the lectern and faced the witness.

"Dr. Clayton, you testified yesterday – and here I quote you verbatim from the transcript – 'since we have already established that it was not written at the time it claims to have been written but many years later, we can view the Bible in the context of the political situation in Israel at the approximate time of its composition.' You also said that we can see how the various source documents serve the political goals of the different parties.

Am I quoting you correctly?"

"Yes."

"In other words, the knowledge that the Bible was anachronistic lends impetus to the reconstruction of the Hypothesis, about which we will soon hear testimony. Is that correct?"

"Yes, it is."

"Thank you. Now, suppose we could demonstrate that there are no anachronisms. Suppose we could furthermore demonstrate that the Bible really is a document of great antiquity written at more or less the time it claims to have been written. What would that do to the Hypothesis?"

"The Hypothesis is a proven fact, sir. The anachronisms are facts."

"If the Hypothesis is a fact, why is it only a hypothesis?"

"It was a hypothesis originally, and the name has stuck. It's not important. The Hypothesis is a fact."

"Dr. Clayton, humor me. It's just a hypothetical. Suppose we could indeed demonstrate that the Bible is a document of great antiquity written at more or less the time it claims to have been written. What would that do to the Hypothesis the defense is about to present to the court? Would it basically demolish the Hypothesis?"

"Well, I don't know if it would demolish it, but it might create a need for some ... adjustments."

"I see. Adjustments. No doubt. Very well then, let's take a closer look at your alleged anachronisms. You mentioned camels, didn't you?"

"Yes, I did. The Bible speaks about extensive use of camels in the Patriarchal age, which is about 2000 B.C.E., but archaeology has established that camels were not domesticated until close to 1100 B.C.E."

"And this is conclusive proof of anachronisms in the Bible?"

"It is."

"Conclusive proof?"

"Yes."

"Let's talk about this conclusive proof, Dr. Clayton. Have

archaeologists excavated the entire ancient world?”

“You mean every city, town and village?”

“That’s what I mean. Have they excavated all these?”

“Of course not.”

“How much have they excavated?”

“I don’t know. A small part.”

“Ten percent?”

“Less.”

“One percent?”

“Probably less.”

“So, we don’t really know what the other ninety-nine plus percent would reveal, do we?”

“I suppose not. But we can project from the parts excavated.”

“I see. Projections. So it appears that your definite statement that there were no camels in use before 1100 B.C.E. is a projection based on less than one percent excavation. How can you know that we wouldn’t find camels if we excavate some more?”

“It’s a reasonable assumption.”

“I see. A projection based on an assumption. Are you saying that there is an assumption of conclusive proof based on a projection based on an assumption?”

“I’m saying there were no camels back then. It’s a fact.”

This is how it went for the rest of the afternoon. Supposed anachronism after supposed anachronism. I cross-examined Dr. Clayton about all the ones he had described. Most of the questioning involved intricate details of ancient Hebrew text and grammar. I have not included them in my story, but I attached the trial transcript all the way at the end for those who may be interested in the full picture. By the end of the day, we were done. I was ready to send the transcripts to Jessica Davis.