



A Retroductive Disaster-Tracking Framework for Locating the Ark of the Covenant: A Self-Refuting Inquiry

Dr. Ka Lim Cheung

Independent Scholar, Hong Kong, China

kalimcheung0623@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4298-9686>

Abstract: This article proposes and then dismantles a new heuristic in Ark of the Covenant research: the Retroductive Disaster-Tracking Method (RDTM). Starting from the pattern in 1 Samuel 4--6, where illicit possession of the Ark is followed by cultic humiliation, bodily affliction, civic panic, and ritualized restitution, RDTM asks whether analogous patterns of misfortune around later claimants might serve as indirect locational evidence. After reconstructing this biblical disaster grammar, the study formulates RDTM as a form of retroduction and subjects it to methodological critique. It argues that the method conflates narrative theology with transferable historical causality, cannot be falsified, and collapses into confirmation bias and base-rate neglect. Testing RDTM against major Ark-location traditions, the article concludes that its value is deliberately negative: it clarifies why "disaster signatures" should not be treated as historical evidence in Ark research.

Keywords: Ark of the Covenant, Pseudo-Archaeology, Narrative Theology, Historiography of Biblical Archaeology, Indirect Evidence and Methodology



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

1. INTRODUCTION

Few biblical objects have generated as much sustained fascination as the Ark of the Covenant. In the Hebrew Bible, the Ark functions not merely as sacred furniture but as a concentrated symbol of divine presence, covenantal order, military peril, royal legitimacy, and cultic memory. In later Jewish, Christian, Ethiopian, and popular traditions, it becomes something more than a lost cult object: it becomes a mobile sign of unresolved authority. The problem of the Ark's disappearance after the First Temple period has therefore remained unusually fertile for textual criticism, theology, archaeology, comparative religion, and reception history.



Recent scholarship suggests two facts that must be held together. First, the Ark continues to matter as an interpretive node across multiple corpora and traditions. Thomas Römer's recent essay on "the mysteries of the Ark" demonstrates that the object remains central to questions about Pentateuchal memory, Deuteronomistic history, temple ideology, and later legend formation [1]. Kevin M. McGeough's recent monograph further shows that the Ark's afterlife extends well beyond ancient Israel into modern imaginings, where scholarly reconstruction, piety, nationalism, and fantasy continually overlap [2]. Second, there is still no consensus grounded in positive evidence regarding the Ark's final historical location. Even conservative archaeological syntheses acknowledge that many proposed locations exist but that none has been verified by persuasive material evidence [3].

This article enters that scholarly landscape by proposing, and then dismantling, a new line of inquiry. The proposed framework—the Retroductive Disaster-Tracking Method (RDTM)—asks whether the biblical pattern of disaster accompanying illicit possession of the Ark can be extended into a heuristic for later history. If the Ark retained the dangerous sacrality displayed in 1 Samuel 4–6, might patterns of unusual affliction around communities claiming to possess it supply indirect locational clues? The argument developed here is that the proposal is intellectually stimulating but methodologically untenable. Its principal value lies in pre-emptive critique. By formalizing the idea and exposing its weaknesses, the study seeks to foreclose its future reappearance as a seemingly novel but analytically sterile method. This study therefore aligns with broader attempts to clarify how biblical narratives generate and shape historical claims without simply reproducing their internal causality as historiography [4], [5]. Classic accounts of Old Testament theology and canon formation already wrestle with this tension between theological description and historical reconstruction, underscoring that scriptural representations cannot be straightforwardly converted into empirical laws or predictive mechanisms [6], [7].

Although no scholar has yet formalized RDTM under that name, the intuitive move it represents is familiar. Popular and semi-scholarly discussions of the Ark regularly treat war, plague, dynastic collapse, or civic instability around alleged custodians as though such phenomena possessed evidentiary force. The present article therefore does not claim to refute a coherent school of Ark research so much as to isolate and examine a recurring inferential temptation that surfaces whenever direct evidence is lacking. By making that pattern explicit and subjecting it to methodological scrutiny, the study aims to clarify why such appeals should not be mistaken for legitimate historical method.

The study proceeds in six stages. It first surveys the current state of Ark scholarship, noting the fragmentation between textual, archaeological, and reception-historical approaches. It then reconstructs the biblical disaster pattern that gives RDTM its initial plausibility. Third, it defines the method in explicit inferential terms. Fourth, it presents the analytical method and materials used to evaluate RDTM. Fifth, it subjects the method to a layered critique using epistemology, historiography, and biblical theology, and discusses the results of testing the framework against several major Ark-location traditions. Finally, it draws conclusions regarding the framework's negative contribution to the field.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The State of Scholarship on the Ark

The first question is how the Ark has been read as a literary and theological object within the biblical corpus itself.

2.1.1 Textual and theological scholarship

In mainstream scholarship, Ark research no longer centers on the antiquarian question “Where is it?” as an isolated puzzle. Instead, the dominant work treats the Ark as a textual and theological construct embedded in several literary strata. Römer's synthetic essay is especially important because it gathers the Ark's biblical trajectories into a single discussion: the wilderness shrine traditions, the Deuteronomistic narratives of Shiloh and Jerusalem, priestly memory, and the object's eventual disappearance from the Second Temple horizon [1]. That synthetic move is notable precisely because the field often remains partitioned into sub-specialties.

A second line of scholarship examines the Ark's role in broader covenantal and sanctuary ideologies. Work on covenant in early rabbinic literature, while not focused exclusively on the Ark, illuminates how post-biblical communities relocated sacred authority from central objects to textual, communal, and ritual forms [8]. Broader syntheses of ancient Israelite religion situate the Ark within a complex field of royal ideology, cultic practice, and popular devotion, rather than as an isolated fetish object [9]. Likewise, recent work on sanctuary schematics in the Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls highlights the degree to which sacred space could be imaginatively reconstructed even in the absence of original cult objects [10]. Studies of Deuteronomy's legal hermeneutics have further emphasized how authoritative traditions could be reconfigured through inner-biblical innovation, complicating any attempt to treat earlier cultic arrangements as normatively fixed or transparently recoverable [11]. Work on post-exilic identity formation in Ezra–Nehemiah likewise shows how questions of ethnicity, intermarriage, and communal purity were negotiated in the absence of any operative Ark, reinforcing the point that covenantal imagination could adapt to radically altered cultic conditions [12].

These studies matter because they contextualize the Ark's disappearance: sacred order did not cease when the object vanished; rather, the object's absence became productive for later religious imagination. More narrowly, treatments of the Ark in conservative and confessional scholarship continue to collect biblical references and survey proposed fates. Although such work is uneven in critical method, it remains useful as an index of recurring hypotheses: concealment beneath the Temple Mount, removal before the Babylonian destruction, translation to Egypt or Ethiopia, or complete loss [13]. The important point is that even where confidence in the biblical record is high, claims about the Ark's ultimate location remain evidentially weak. From different angles, literary-historical, canonical, and theological approaches converge on the conclusion that what can be securely described is the Ark's role within diverse textual strata and theological constructions, not a continuous empirical biography of the object itself [4], [5], [6], [7].

Yet the Ark cannot be approached only through texts, for the field also repeatedly turns to material remains and archaeological contexts in the hope of identifying traces of its historical trajectory.

2.1.2 Archaeology and the limits of material inquiry

Material evidence has not solved the problem. Archaeology can illuminate the settings in which Ark traditions were transmitted, but it cannot bridge the gap between textual memory and object identification without a securely attributable artifact. Recent syntheses of the archaeology of ancient Israelite religion underline precisely this distinction, emphasizing that excavated cultic assemblages clarify religious worlds without yielding direct identifications of particular biblical objects [14]. Recent geophysical work at Kiriath-jearim is a good example. The 2019 GPR investigation identified monumental retaining structures and lent support to the hypothesis of an Iron Age summit compound at a site central to Ark traditions in Samuel [15]. This is genuinely important for contextualizing Ark narratives, but it does not move scholarship closer to locating the Ark itself.



The same distinction applies to high-precision dating projects in the southern Levant more broadly. Radiocarbon-based chronologies can refine horizons of literacy, state formation, and destruction, yet such improvements do not yield positive evidence for the Ark's survival [16]. High-resolution radiocarbon work on Iron Age Jerusalem provides a concrete illustration: it sharpens our understanding of construction phases and political horizons on the Temple Mount without bringing us any closer to identifying an Ark-shaped artifact within those strata [17]. Recent discussions of absolute dating in relation to biblical history and world cultural heritage underscore the same point: refined timelines clarify regional historical frameworks without resolving the fate or whereabouts of specific cult objects [18]. Detailed iconographic work on Syro-Palestinian goddess cults has likewise shown how portable cult objects can mediate divine presence in multiple, shifting ways, warning against overly literal attempts to map specific theological functions onto single archaeological finds [19]. This distinction is often blurred in public discourse. Media and popular pseudo-archaeological treatments frequently convert contextual discoveries into claims about the Ark's whereabouts [20]. The field therefore needs methodological clarity: a site associated with Ark traditions is not evidence that the Ark is there, nor does the discovery of monumental architecture imply continuity of custody.

If archaeology can clarify the settings in which Ark traditions were transmitted, reception history explains why the Ark continued to acquire new meanings long after the loss of any verifiable cult object.

2.1.3 Reception history and comparative traditions

The Ark's post-biblical career is extraordinarily rich. Ethiopian traditions centered on Aksum and the Church of Mary of Zion remain the most famous living claim to the Ark's possession [21], [13]. Scholarly treatments tend to interpret these traditions not as historically demonstrable custody chains reaching back to Solomon, but as powerful constructions of royal and ecclesial legitimacy, especially as crystallized in the *Kebra Nagast* [21], [2]. Parallel attention has been paid to African analogues such as the Lemba tradition and the Ngoma Lungundu, which are valuable for the study of biblical reception, identity, and sacral portability even when they do not support historical claims about the original Ark [21].

Recent monographic work confirms that these trajectories deserve serious attention. McGeough's study frames the Ark not only as an ancient object but as a persistent engine of interpretation, capable of organizing fantasies of discovery across periods and genres [2]. That insight is crucial for the present article because RDTM belongs, in effect, to the history of Ark interpretation rather than to successful historical method.

These reception trajectories are not methodologically embarrassing curiosities to be brushed aside. They provide crucial evidence for how communities have negotiated questions of sacred presence, political legitimacy, and ecclesial identity in the absence of verifiable cult objects. In that sense, reception history supplies a positive research field in its own right, even when it cannot deliver the kind of provenance claims that location-focused Ark quests desire. These later trajectories matter for the present study not because they confirm the Ark's survival, but because they show how easily the object's absence itself becomes fertile ground for explanatory narratives.

2.2 The Biblical Pattern of Disaster

2.2.1 The Philistine episode in 1 Samuel 4–6

The disaster pattern underlying RDTM is drawn chiefly from 1 Samuel 4–6. The narrative sequence



is familiar: Israel loses the Ark in battle; the Philistines transport it to Ashdod; Dagon is humiliated before it; severe bodily afflictions strike the population; the Ark is moved from city to city; panic escalates; and restitution follows through ritualized return. Modern interpreters differ on particulars—especially the medical nature of the afflictions and the relationship between tumors and rodents—but the literary pattern is clear: illicit possession generates collective disorder [22], [23].

The force of the story lies in its combination of cultic, political, and bodily registers. Dagon falls, cities panic, bodies erupt, and the object cannot be domesticated by its captors. The Ark appears neither inert nor under human management [21], [13]. This same narrative grammar informs later episodes in which improper contact with the Ark proves fatal, such as the deaths associated with Beth-shemesh and the striking of Uzzah [24]. Yet the tradition also preserves a counterexample: Obed-edom's house is blessed when the Ark is hosted properly [25]. Critical reconstructions of David's career have long noted how these Ark narratives are woven into shifting portraits of royal legitimacy and cultic centralization, rather than serving as neutral reportage about a dangerous object roaming the countryside [26]. That contrast matters for everything that follows, because it introduces conditionality into the Ark's effects.

2.2.2 From narrative theology to historical heuristic

RDTM arises from taking this biblical pattern with unusual literal seriousness. If the Ark once produced civic-scale affliction among those who handled it wrongly, one might wonder whether later claimants to the Ark's possession should exhibit analogous historical signatures. The heuristic temptation is understandable. Where positive evidence is absent, interpreters often seek indirect markers. Disaster, if treated as the Ark's trailing effect, becomes a surrogate datum [21].

The difficulty is that biblical narratives do not present themselves as neutral datasets. They are theological narrations in which causality is already interpreted. The disasters in 1 Samuel are not merely events adjacent to the Ark; they are events read through a theological claim about YHWH's sovereignty over foreign cults and improper contact. Broader treatments of sin and its remedy in the Old Testament underscore the same dynamic, reading judgment sequences as theological expositions of covenantal breakdown and restoration rather than as transportable empirical patterns [27]. Any attempt to transform that literary-theological pattern into a historical detection method must therefore justify a translation from narrated divine causality to modern historical inference; the argument developed here is that such a translation cannot be sustained. The temptation to treat this narrative pattern as more than theology is understandable; the next step is to state that temptation in explicit form and examine whether it can function as a historical method.

2.3 Defining the Retroductive Disaster-Tracking Method

The proposed method can be stated formally. Let the following premises stand:

1. The original Ark survived the destruction of the First Temple and exists, or existed for some extended period, in a retrievable historical location.
2. The Ark retains the dangerous sacral efficacy attributed to it in 1 Samuel and related texts.
3. Illicit, irreverent, or improper custodianship of the Ark manifests in communal misfortune, bodily affliction, political crisis, or anomalous disaster.
4. Some communities or polities in later history have claimed, implied, or been associated with custody of the Ark.



5. Therefore, retrospective patterns of unusual misfortune around such communities may supply indirect evidence of the Ark's presence.

This is a form of retrodution or inference to a possible best explanation. It does not claim direct proof. Rather, it seeks explanatory convergence between a theological pattern in scripture and a historical pattern in later communities. In that limited sense, the method is more disciplined than pure fantasy. Yet discipline is not enough. A heuristic can still fail if its basic variables are undefined, its premises untestable, and its inferential structure unable to discriminate among alternatives. Formulated in this way, the method appears at first to offer a disciplined alternative to speculation. The difficulty is that a formally stated premise is not yet a workable historical inference.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative, text-based methodological critique rather than an empirical field investigation, since the object under examination (RDTM) is itself an inferential procedure rather than an artifact or dataset. The analytical procedure proceeds in three linked steps.

First, the biblical disaster pattern in 1 Samuel 4–6 and related passages is reconstructed through close reading of the narrative sequence, informed by established historical-critical and literary scholarship on the Ark traditions [22], [23]. This reconstruction supplies the raw material from which RDTM's five premises are formally derived.

Second, RDTM is stated as an explicit five-premise retroductive argument and evaluated against standard criteria drawn from the philosophy of history and epistemology of inference: falsifiability, discriminative power, sensitivity to base rates, chain-of-custody verifiability, and prior probability. Each criterion is applied systematically to the method as a whole rather than to any single Ark tradition in isolation, in order to test whether the inferential structure itself is sound independent of the specific case to which it might be applied.

Third, the method is applied as a diagnostic test to four major Ark-location traditions—the Ethiopian/Aksumite claim, the Temple Mount concealment hypothesis, the Mount Nebo/cave tradition, and African comparative analogues such as the Lemba Ngoma Lungundu—selected because they represent the principal categories of location claim recurring in the secondary literature (living-custody claims, in-situ concealment claims, legendary-relocation claims, and comparative-analogical claims, respectively). For each tradition, the analysis asks whether RDTM could, in principle, generate a determinate and falsifiable verdict, and whether the historical record independently constrains the pattern of “disaster” the method would need to detect. This comparative application functions as a form of stress-testing: it does not seek to confirm or disconfirm any individual tradition's historical claims, but to observe how the method behaves when confronted with the actual evidentiary landscape of Ark scholarship.

4. RESULTS

This section presents the outcomes of applying the five-criterion evaluation and the four-tradition stress test described in the Methodology section. Interpretation of these outcomes is reserved for the Discussion section that follows.

4.1 Outcome 1: Category confusion between theology and detection mechanism

Applying the criterion of categorical validity to RDTM's premises shows that the method treats a theologically interpreted narrative pattern as if it were an empirical law. The biblical texts narrate disasters as events already saturated with theological causality; no independent, non-theological data

confirm that the Ark “mechanically emits detectable misfortune” [28], [29]. The Ark's own textual profile is itself heterogeneous—functioning variously as war palladium, footstool, covenant chest, cultic center, and memory-symbol across different literary strata [28]—meaning that RDTM's single narrative template is already an unrepresentative basis for a general method.

4.2 Outcome 2: Unfalsifiability

Testing RDTM's premises against the falsifiability criterion shows that no possible historical outcome can disconfirm the hypothesis. Communal misfortune confirms “dangerous custody”; communal prosperity confirms “blessed custody” via the Obed-edom exception; mixed records permit alternation between the two readings [21], [2]. Applied to the Ethiopian case specifically, both periods of upheaval and periods of continuity have been shown to admit equally plausible RDTM-consistent readings, confirming that the method cannot generate a determinate verdict in at least one major real-world case [21], [2].

4.3 Outcome 3: Confirmation bias and base-rate neglect

Evaluating RDTM against a base-rate standard shows that any sufficiently long-lived polity accumulates enough war, disease, famine, and political collapse to satisfy the method's evidentiary threshold, regardless of Ark custody [30]. Because no independent baseline for “anomalous” misfortune is specified, this outcome holds uniformly across all four tested traditions, not merely the longest-lived ones [31].

4.4 Outcome 4: Indeterminate custody and temporal slippage

Applying the custody-verifiability criterion shows that none of the four tested traditions supplies a demonstrable, continuous chain of custody from the First Temple period to the present or to the claimed point of concealment. This holds for the Aksumite tradition, where public verification of the object is unavailable [21], [2], and for the Temple Mount hypothesis, where the relevant substructures cannot be excavated [3], [20]. In both cases, the resulting uncertainty in timing removes any fixed temporal window against which a “disaster signature” could be matched.

4.5 Outcome 5: Low prior probability of survival

Assessing RDTM against the prior-probability criterion shows that mainstream reconstructions of the late monarchic and exilic periods already favor the Ark's loss or destruction over its survival [13], [32]. Reassessments of demographic and cultic disruption during the exile further lower this prior [33], as does rabbinic memory of an Ark-less Second Temple [34]. RDTM's premises assume the opposite of this low prior, compounding rather than resolving the evidentiary deficit.

4.6 Outcome 6: Stress test against the four location traditions

Applying RDTM directly to the four selected traditions produced a uniform result: in every case, the method failed to generate a discriminating, falsifiable verdict, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of RDTM Application Outcomes Across Four Major Traditions

Tradition	Result of applying RDTM
Ethiopia/Aksum	Both prosperity and catastrophe confirm the hypothesis; no discrimination possible [21], [2]
Temple Mount	Endemic regional disaster cannot be distinguished from Ark-caused disaster [3], [20]
Mount Nebo/caves	Open-ended geography allows any local suffering to be retrofitted as corroboration [34]
African analogues (Ngoma Lungundu)	Comparative religious significance is convertible into false historical proximity [21]

As Table 1 illustrates, RDTM consistently yields ambiguous or unfalsifiable conclusions regardless of the specific historical context. The underlying reasons for this systemic failure, along with their broader implications for Ark scholarship, are evaluated in the following discussion.

5. DISCUSSION

The results above converge on a single interpretive point: RDTM fails not in one respect but along every axis by which a historical inference is normally judged, and it fails identically regardless of which Ark tradition it is applied to.

5.1 Theoretical implications

The category confusion identified in Outcome 1, combined with the unfalsifiability shown in Outcome 2, indicates that RDTM's defect is structural rather than a matter of insufficient data. No future accumulation of historical detail about Ethiopia, Jerusalem, or any other claimant could rescue the method, because its premises are designed to absorb any outcome as confirmation [21], [2]. This distinguishes RDTM from legitimate indirect-evidence reasoning in biblical archaeology, such as forensic analysis of Judahite inscriptions, where variables are defined narrowly enough to be wrong [35].

5.2 Contribution of a negative result

Outcomes 3 through 6 collectively show why “disaster signatures” have intuitive appeal but no evidentiary value: they exploit the same base-rate neglect and confirmation bias that make many pseudo-archaeological claims about the Ark persuasive to non-specialist audiences [20], [2]. By documenting this failure across four structurally different traditions—living-custody, in-situ concealment, legendary relocation, and comparative-analogical claims—the study demonstrates that the problem is not idiosyncratic to any single tradition but inherent to the inferential move itself. This supports the article's broader claim that negative methodological results deserve the same scholarly documentation as positive findings [31].

5.3 Relation to existing scholarship

The results reinforce, rather than contradict, the consensus surveyed earlier: textual, archaeological, and reception-historical approaches to the Ark already recognize that no positive evidence secures the object's final location [3], [13]. RDTM's failure is therefore best read as a cautionary case study

within that consensus, clarifying why appeals to indirect “disaster” evidence should not be treated as an exception to the field's general evidentiary caution.

5.4 Limitations and future research

Because this study is a qualitative, text-based methodological critique rather than a quantitative survey of historical disaster records, its conclusions describe the logical structure of RDTM rather than measuring, for example, the actual statistical frequency of calamity in each tradition. Future work could attempt a quantitative base-rate analysis of disaster frequency across the four traditions to further substantiate Outcome 3 empirically, although the unfalsifiability shown in Outcome 2 suggests that even such data would not rescue the method's discriminative power. The more productive direction, consistent with the broader argument of the article, is the development of explicit protocols distinguishing answerable questions (literary function, reception history, social meaning) from the currently unanswerable question of the Ark's present location [31].

6. CONCLUSION

The Retroductive Disaster-Tracking Method begins as a serious attempt to honor the internal logic of biblical narrative while extracting from it a historical heuristic. Its appeal is easy to understand: where direct evidence fails, interpreters seek residual signs. Yet the method does not withstand critical scrutiny. It confuses theological narration with transferable historical causality, resists falsification, succumbs to confirmation bias, depends on indeterminate custody chains, and presupposes the survival of an object that may well have been lost long before later traditions arose.

For that reason, the method should not be retained as a tool for locating the Ark. Its value is prophylactic rather than probative. It maps a temptation in Ark scholarship and then closes it off. In a field where imaginative hypotheses often outpace methodological discipline, a clearly documented dead end is itself a contribution.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Römer, “The mysteries of the Ark of the Covenant,” *Studia Theologica - Nordic Journal of Theology*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 169–185, 2023. doi: 10.1080/0039338X.2023.2167861.
- [2] K. M. McGeough, *Readers of the Lost Ark: Imagining the Ark of the Covenant from Ancient Times to the Present*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2025.
- [3] M. L. Steiner and A. E. Killebrew, Eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant: c. 8000–332 BCE*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
- [4] M. Z. Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1995.
- [5] D. M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011.
- [6] B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Fortress Press, 1979.
- [7] W. Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theology in Outline*. Atlanta, GA, USA: John Knox Press, 1978.
- [8] T. Novick, “Covenant and community in early rabbinic literature,” *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 117, no. 2, pp. 228–249, 2024. doi: 10.1017/S0017816024000075.
- [9] P. D. Miller, *The Religion of Ancient Israel*. Louisville, KY, USA: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.
- [10] J. J. Spoelstra, “Sanctuary schematics and temple ideology in the Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls: The import of Numbers,” *HTS Theologies Studies/Theological Studies*, vol. 78, no. 4, 2022. doi: 10.4102/hts.v78i4.7341.
- [11] B. M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1997.



- [12] K. E. Southwood, *Ethnicity and the Mixed Marriage Crisis in Ezra 9–10: An Anthropological Approach*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2012.
- [13] J. Day, “Whatever happened to the Ark of the Covenant?,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, J. Day, Ed. London, U.K.: T&T Clark, 2007, pp. 250–270.
- [14] A. Faust, Ed., *Archaeology and Ancient Israelite Religion*. Basel, Switzerland: MDPI AG, 2020.
- [15] Y. Darvasi, A. Agnon, and I. Finkelstein, “GPR mapping of buried monumental retaining walls at biblical Kiriath-Jearim near Jerusalem,” *STAR: Science & Technology of Archaeological Research*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 20–30, 2022. doi: 10.1080/20548923.2022.2089470.
- [16] T. E. Levy et al., “High-precision radiocarbon dating and historical biblical archaeology in southern Jordan,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 105, no. 43, pp. 16460–16465, 2008. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0804950105.
- [17] J. Regev et al., “Radiocarbon chronology of Iron Age Jerusalem reveals calibration offsets and architectural developments,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 121, no. 19, p. e2321024121, 2024. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2321024121.
- [18] T. E. Levy et al., “Absolute dating, the Bible, and world cultural heritage,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 121, no. 22, p. e2406594121, 2024. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2406594121.
- [19] I. Cornelius, *The Many Faces of the Goddess: The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddess Anat, Astarte, Qedeshet and Asherah, c. 1500–1000 BCE*. Fribourg, Switzerland: Academic Press Fribourg, 2004.
- [20] N. A. Silberman, “Archaeology, ideology, and the search for David and Solomon,” in *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period*, A. G. Vaughn and A. E. Killebrew, Eds. Atlanta, GA, USA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- [21] T. Parfitt, *The Lost Ark of the Covenant: Solving the 2,500-Year-Old Mystery of the Fabled Biblical Ark*. New York, NY, USA: HarperCollins, 2008.
- [22] N. Na'aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors: Interaction and Counteraction*. Winona Lake, IN, USA: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- [23] P. Borgman, *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
- [24] P. R. Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel': A Study in Biblical Origins*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.
- [25] K. G. Friebel, *Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's Sign-Acts: Rhetorical Nonverbal Communication*. Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- [26] S. L. McKenzie, *King David: A Biography*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000.
- [27] M. J. Boda, *A Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedy in the Old Testament*. Winona Lake, IN, USA: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- [28] R. Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Fortress Press, 1991.
- [29] K. Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*. Minneapolis, MN, USA: Fortress Press, 2012.
- [30] P. R. Davies and D. V. Edelman, Eds., *The Historian and the Bible: Essays in Honour of Lester L. Grabbe*. London, U.K.: T&T Clark, 2010.
- [31] L. L. Grabbe, *Can a “History of Israel” Be Written?* Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- [32] G. N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible 12. New Haven, CT, USA: Yale Univ. Press, 2004.
- [33] H. M. Barstad, *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah during the “Exilic” Period*. Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian Univ. Press, 1996.
- [34] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- [35] A. Shaus, Y. Gerber, S. Faigenbaum-Golovin, B. Sober, E. Piasetzky, and I. Finkelstein, “Forensic document examination and algorithmic handwriting analysis of Judahite biblical period inscriptions reveal significant literacy level,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 15, no. 9, p. e0237962, 2020. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0237962.