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Part VI: The end of Atlantis

Abstract

Plato described the end of Atlantis very vividly in a single day and night due to earthquakes and floods and nobody believed him because all experts imagined the impossibility of the giant island’s continental size in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean to vanish in 24 hours. They did not care to understand that Plato meant three different geographic and geological entities all called by him Atlantis which were the giant island, the horseshow basin and the concentric crater. Following Plato’s text that giant island was identified as the peninsula of Portugal-Spain and its northern extend. They did not even care to interpret correctly a genuine myth’s kernel which belonged in the end of the Bronze Age considering the island’s change of meaning versus time from prehistory to history both for the Egyptian and the Greek language up to Solon’s visit in Egypt in the 6th century B.C. This, mentioned above negligence, produced delay in understanding a complex problem which required a very good geological background besides other trans-scientific knowledge in archaeology, philology, mythology and mathematics in order to be faced properly. The loss of a nature made multi-ringed crater, which Plato also called Atlantis, in Andalusia’s palaeo-coast in the end of the Bronze Age due to earthquakes, a tsunami and land slide constitutes the end of Atlantis.

1. Introduction

Following the new advances in understanding Plato’s text (Papamarinopoulos, 2010a, b, c, d, e) we reached Iberia’s coast.

There we identified the horseshow platonic basin as Andalusia’s basin. Our working hypothesis based on the homeric and non-homeric mythological tradition in connection with the Tartessian pre-historic culture is that in the river delta described by Plato in the 4th century B.C. as Atlantis’s delta which was also described by Steisichoros exactly in the same region in the 7th century B.C. a nature made multi-ringed feature once existed. Pre and post platonic ancient Greek writers presented symbolically as Poseidon’s act. Philostratus’s text, who lived in Roman times, survived the geological nature of this concentric multi-ringed feature in Iberia’s coast (Papamarinopoulos, 2010d).

2. Catastrophe by earthquakes and floods

Plato describes a catastrophe in a single night and day of the island at Gadiz. How can we explain such rapid catastrophe? If we compare the seismicity of Southern Europe and North West Africa over the last century with the corresponding one of the East Mediterranean and especially the Aegean Sea we can easily conclude that the latter exhibits much higher release seismic energy than the first. Figure 1 illustrates the position of epicenters of earthquakes with magnitude above 6 Richter on both ends of the Mediterranean.
But then how can we account Atlantis’ catastrophe? The answer came at the Melos International Symposium as thunder when Gutscher (2005) a C.N.R.S geologist pointed very clearly that the mechanism of Atlantis’, which Plato described, can be fully explained in terms of geology and seismotectonics at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean in the region west of Gibraltar. In his opinion the seismogenous fault called Gorringe Bank, situated about 6 degrees west of Gibraltar, produces earthquakes with a frequency of about 1,200-1,500 years with magnitudes above 8 Richter. The consequent of these giant earthquakes are tsunamis which eventually reach Morocco’s and Iberia’s coasts simultaneously and hit them with sea waves of 10-15 m heights and with horrible speeds. In Figure 2 the position of Gorringe Bank is shown.

Fig. 2: Gorringe Bank’s seismogenous fault (white arrow) position is shown exactly placed on the lithospheric contact (black line) between Africa and Eurasia. It is a possible source of the prehistoric earthquake which destroyed Atlantis.

Figures 3 and 4 show what Plato wrote about the main seismic event and its aftershocks and the tsunami which produced afterwards. The pictures illustrate what possibly happened in late Bronze Age which destroyed the Iberian culture of prehistoric Tartessos. The geoarchaeological studies in Andalusia’s Donana region were initiated recently.

In Figure 5 and 6 Lisbon’s (1755 yr A.D.) catastrophe by earthquakes and floods is shown respectively.

In Figure 7 Gutscher’s simulation study on the dynamics of a running tsunami in the end of the glaciated period is shown. His simulation is based on the Lisbon 1555 yr A.D. but it can be carried out at any time period based on the consequent chosen palaeocoast.

It shows very clearly what exactly happened in 1755 yr A.D. and is going to happens any time when a tsunami is generated at Gorringe Bank at the Atlantic Ocean’s bottom! It seems that Plato led us
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Fig. 3: The Lisbon 1755 yr A.D. earthquake is illustrated in the very region in which the platonic text leads us in the Atlantic Ocean.

Fig. 4: The Lisbon 1755 yr A.D. advancing tsunami, after simulation, is illustrated in the same region mentioned in Fig.3. The assumed prehistoric tsunami of the 12th century B.C. contained several waves producing several floods successively as the platonic text says in a day and night of misfortune and as the Lisbon 1755 A.D. demonstrated.

Fig. 5: The Lisbon’s 1755 yr A.D. seismic catastrophe (after Shrady, 2008).

Fig. 6: Lisbon’ 1755 yr A.D. tsunami is shown (after Shrady, 2008).
A simulation study based on of the 1755 yr. A.D. Lisbon’s tsunami was conducted by Gutsher (2005).

This region round Cadiz in Andalusia and his choice was not fortuitous for the position of his Atlantis because the coast of Andalusia is prone to giant catastrophic phenomena not related with its regular seismicity as Figure 1 clearly illustrates. The danger exists, hidden deeply in the Atlantic Ocean, and any prehistoric city existing in any of the coasts shown above would have been destroyed firstly by earthquakes and then by floods as Plato once described. But do we have any way to know the sequence of these events? The answer is positive and it is shown in Figure 8.

The reader can see two dated events in the stratigraphic column. The first in the top is the historically known 1755 yr A.D. event. Immediately below there is another one of 200 yr B.C. It remains a question if the third turbidite layer, counting from the top, is that which produced the catastrophe of late Bronze Age. Atlantis’ catastrophe presents a scenario explaining Troy’s, and Athens’ catastrophes too in the 12th century B.C. Troy was destroyed, after an extensive rain, by an earthquake. The Achaean’s camp destroyed by a tsunami originating from the sea coast as Homer described. Athens was marked by an extensive rain and by an earthquake and Atlantis was destroyed by earthquakes and a tsunami originating deeply from the Atlantic Ocean in a single night and day. The first two have occurred in the 12th century B.C. and they were confirmed. Troy’s and Atlantis’ tsunami remains to be proved.

3. The Atlantes

But even the war of the advancing Atlantes as Plato uniquely described was conducted within the late part of the 13th century and the very beginning of the 12th century B.C. It seems that Plato described the second round in which the Sea Peoples attacked Ramses the III Egypt as archaeological
studies have proved without a doubt. All these events are tabulated in the following order.

Plato allows the reader to understand that Solon’ initial informants had the strong impression that all attackers entered the Mediterranean basin through the Atlantic Ocean. Today we know that there had been two wars against Egypt and that some of the Atlantes originated from Anatolia. Others originated from Italy and Libya and some others possibly originate from central Europe.

Plato adds another point of interest in connection with Atlantis’ influence

Tim25.a.8-25.b.5

“And, moreover, of the lands here within the Straits they ruled over Libya as far as Egypt, and over Europe as far as Tuscany. So this host, being all gathered together, made an attempt one time to enslave by one single onslaught both your country and ours and the whole of the territory within the Straits.”

But what is the archaeological opinion about the events and war activities in the specified period toward the beginning of the 12th century B.C.? O’Connor (2000), for instance, discusses the event of 1208 yr B.C. when an aggressive coalition attempted to conquer Egypt in Pharaoh’s Menenptah 5th year. Egyptian sources describe the names of the participating coalition being Sherden, Tursha and Shekelesh. These names have been identified as Sardinians, Etruscans and Sicilians all living in the Atlantis’ zone of influence which is Tuscany in other words Italy. All these people fought together with Libyans against Egypt. We have double correspondence with the Platonic text since these two zones are mentioned in Critias. But there are also differences. The Egyptian sources mentioned two more people the Lukki and Ekwesh The first disagreement between archaeology and Plato’s account lies with the Lukki which are people living in Lykia in Anatolia. Anatolia was not mentioned as Atlantis’ zone of influence. The second possible disagreement in accordance with O’Connor is major because Ekwesh is the name of the Achaean Greeks! However, Iakovidis (2007) and Sandars (1978) fully disagree with O’Connor. Sandars (1978) in particular wonders how the Ekwesh could be Achaean when they appeared circumcised in accordance with the Egyptian sources. It is a well known fact that Europeans living in Asia or in Europe never practiced circumcision from prehistory to the historic period. The same scientist says that there is not any linguistic relation between the words Ekwesh and Achaean or even between Ekwesh and Ahiwaya. The latter was the name by which the Hittites called the Achaean.

Plato continues to describe how the Athenians managed to face the Atlantes alone. He describes it like this Tim25.c.1-25.c.6:

“And acting partly as leader of the Greeks (meaning the city of Athens) and partly standing alone by itself when deserted by all others, after encountering the deadliest perils, it defeated the invaders and reared a trophy; where it saved from slavery such as who dwell within the bounds of Heracles it ungrudgingly set free.”

Herodotus visited Egypt earlier than Solon but learnt nothing about the two assaults of the Sea Peoples against East Mediterranean. From Plato’s text one gets the conclusion that Solon’s informants had at least mentioned only one to him and associated it with Athenians. Was it possible that Plato had recorded the second assault of the Sea Peoples? The answer is positive because Achaean mercenaries were not in Egypt before 1208 yr B.C. There is not textual or any archaeological evidence supporting the case. Homer says that the Achaean arrived to Egypt after the Trojan War in other words after 1184 yr B.C. Consequently there was not any chance to have in Egypt a city such as Sais associated with Achaean earlier than 1208 yr B.C. Let us examine this second assault which occurred in Pharaoh Rameses the III 8th year. Wachsmann (2000) who studied the Egyptian sources mentioned the names Peleset, Sikala, Sheklesh, Denyen and Weshesh. Sandars (1978) explained in her study that the Deneyn
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were not the Achaeans known by a similar name but some peoples living close to Syria at Adana and they had been known to the Egyptians since the 14th century B.C. from the Amarna tablets. The Egyptians called their land Danuna, whereas they called Tanaja the country of the Achaeans which is Peloponnesus of course Banou (2000). We, therefore, conclude that the Achaeans did not contribute to either against or in favour of the Egyptians in the 1176 yr B.C. event. But the Sea Peoples lost the battle. This information is not mentioned in Plato’s documents. Consequently how and where did the Greeks manage to defeat the Atlantes since the Atlantes lost the war in Egypt and the Greeks did not face them in Greece or in Egypt? Marinatos (1950) interpreted Plato’s Atlantes as a Sea Peoples remote echo. He wrote that a war between Ionian Greeks and the Egyptians’ enemies in Sudan 30 years before Solon’s visit to Sais in the 6th century B.C., explained, partly the enthusiastic acceptance of Solon by them since was Athenian in other words Ionian. However, Marinatos (1950) said that it is possible that, 600 years earlier than this event of very early 6th century B.C., prehistoric Greeks after Troy’s capture, had a war activity outside of Greece against the advancing Atlantes. They did not defeat them entirely but they reduced their initial war capacity and when they reached Egypt, tired, they were defeated completely by Ramses III in the Nile. Both events are lacking historical confirmation in the Greek literature. For instance no celebrations were carried out for these victories in any Ionian city and jet for the 6th century B.C. war victory exists double archaeological evidence in Greek and Egyptian languages found in Egypt Gembaza (2010).

Iakovidis (2007) suggested that the Sea Peoples destroyed the prehistoric ports in Greece and Middle East and ruined indirectly the Achaeans’ economy. This military action is actually a type of easy looting and not a war strategy but nevertheless was effective. From this looting of the ports many countries suffered in 1176 yr B.C. One of them was Greece. This reminds us the platonic text about common suffering of Egyptians, Greeks and other peoples within the Mediterranean due to pressures by the Atlantes. Although the military victory of the Egyptians is clear the platonic text presents the Greeks as victorious somewhere! Assuming the correctness of the information a possible place where the Greeks could have been victorious is Atlantis itself. Our scenario requires an Achaean leader of the Greeks of Athenian origin to be in Egypt with his companions after the Trojan War. Foliot (1984) says that as we know from Homer Menelaos a warrior of the Trojan War, came to Egypt accidentally due to a storm occurred in the Aegean Sea. It is possible that a part of the victorious Achaeans of Athenian origin in Troy also came to Egypt after the Trojan war of 1184 yr B.C. and remained there at Sais. Zanger (1995) reminds us that Thucydides recounted how the survivors of the Trojan War spread all around the central and eastern Mediterranean. We could add that some of the Mycenaeans went to the West and even passed through the straits into the Atlantic Ocean as Homer says and Tziropoulou (2008) proved in her text. When the Sea Peoples moved against the Eastern Mediterranean in either 1176 or 1177 yr B.C., Athenian warriors, who were already at Sais, decided to go against them one of their own strategic place at Atlantis. This means that Solon was talking to Egyptians through interpreters or to spoken Greek Egyptians. The latter had extracted this information from their own archives as a result of a report of some survivors who had returned to Egypt 600 years before Solon’s visit and kept a record of what had happened during the war with the Atlantes in Atlantis. This scenario may explain the friendliness between Gadeirians and Athenians and between the Saitians and Athenians. We would like to clarify the reader that Sais was the city where the story began in the 6th century B.C. and Gadeira is the city which is very close to Andalusia’s coast where the story was ended. There, the assumed religious nature made circular center, once was flourishing. It vanished in the end of the Bronze Age. Between the two localities the connecting element paradoxically are the Athenians as Plato and Philostratus independently say!

For such a scenario to be proved detailed studies are required both in Sais and the coast of Andalusia. There possibly exists, the multi-ringed nature made religious center, with all possible proofs which
will either support or demolish the presented scenario.

Plato, however, describes the Athenian’s victory who built a victorious monument at Atlantis in the following way:

Tim 25.b.7-25.c.4

“For if stood pre-eminent above all in gallantry and all warlike arts, and acting partly as leader of the Greeks, and partly standing alone by itself when deserted by all others, after encountering the dead-liest perils, it defeated the invaders and reared a trophy;”

In other words Plato describes Mycenaean Athenians as leaders of the Greeks against Atlantis waging a campaign in which they were victorious. Similarly Mycenaean Peloponnesians being leaders of the Greeks campaigned against Troy. If the reader requests some other sources about what Plato describes he will find nothing among either historians’ texts or among any archaeological findings in the Mediterranean countries. It is therefore likely to think that Plato imagined this campaign and the victory of his prehistoric compatriots. The reader, however, knows that Plato described events in Timaeos and Critias for which the historian’s silence was characteristic and yet archaeology has proved his writings one by one.

But was it ever possible that Mycenaean Athenians could have been leaders of the Greeks? From the Mycenaean tradition we know King Eurystheus of Tiryns who got killed in a campaign against Mycenaean Athenians. Eurystheus was the king who had demanded from Heracles the realization of the twelve labors. The Mycenaean conflict, between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians which we have just described, is a remote echo of the struggle between tribes of Mycenaeans to impose on each other their will. We can not prove that Mycenaean Athenians were ever leaders of the Greeks but what Plato described seems not to be impossible within the evolution of the Mycenaean world. But Plato does not only describe the victory of the Greeks against the Atlantes but also a double catastrophe in the following way:

Tim 25.c.6-25.d.3

“But at later time there occurred portentous earthquakes and floods, and one grievous day and night befell them, when the whole body of your warriors was swallowed up by the earth, and the island of Atlantis in like manner was swallowed up by the sea and vanished;”

In other words after the victory of the Mycenaean Athenians against the Atlantes at a region in the Atlantic Ocean there was an unknown time span not defined by Plato. After that there was a catastrophe caused by earthquakes and floods in which the Greeks and the “Atlantes” got lost. Let us examine how Foliot (1984) evaluates these particular platonic events. She judges that the catastrophe was in two different places and not in one, as Plato implies. She explains that due to heavy rain and the occurred earthquake, a part of land at the Acropolis together with the Athenian warriors land slid killing most of them. We do not have any doubt about the severe earthquake. It has been proved and its consequence (broken pots) has precisely been dated as being in early 12th century B.C. For the rest we do not have any findings yet. The catastrophe in Andalusia’s coast in 12th century B.C. has not yet been documented.

Plato knew, that when he was 52 years old, Helike vanished in the Corinthian gulf after an earthquake and a tsunami but Peloponese remained intact. Plato knew what a volcanic catastrophe was because he witnessed himself an Aetna’s explosion during the years he was in Italy. Therefore he knew that a giant mass can not easily disappear even if it was connected with either catastrophe mentioned earlier. However, Atlantis’ common use for everything in his report induced unwanted confusion which lasted for centuries. But let us go further. Foliot (1984) believes she has the answer of the war of the Atlantes against the Athenians in Greece and she uses the Hellenic mythology to explain it. She identifies Athena’s victory against Poseidon in Attica and Hera’s victory over the same god in Argos. She identifies the At-
lantes with Poseidon and the Greeks with Athena and Hera respectively. But she fails in this interpretation because the Atlantes, in other words the Sea Peoples, as Marinatos (1950) first proposed they were, did not fight with the Greeks in Greece the way they did in Egypt. No traces of war activity were ever found in Greece in the 12th century B.C. On the contrary we have a very good record of what Ramses the III achieved in Egypt against the Atlantes. Plato’s view presents a major difference. Let us further examine Foliot’s (1984) view. She reminds us, as Homer says, that the Achaeans reached Egypt after the Trojan War where they were received warmly by the Egyptians. It is very possible that the Egyptians who felt the pressure of the Sea Peoples and the Libyans in 1208 yr B.C. received the victors of the Trojan War as mercenaries in order to increase their military capacity against their hostile neighbors. In accordance with Foliot’s (1984) scenario the Mycenaean Athenians settled in attractive Sais and organized a type of city. In other words several years before the second assault of 1176 yr B.C. of the Sea Peoples against Egypt, the Mycenaeans warriors had already been there. We remind the reader the Mycenaean Athenians with Menestheus as well as their leader had been at Troy with other Mycenaean just few years before. We also remind the reader of the fact that Menestheus a hero of the Trojan War was honoured in Gadeira by the hellenised Gadeirians as Philostratus has recorded in his text. Foliot’s (1984) scenario explains the friendliness of the Saitians to the Athenian Solon of the 6th century B.C. and the similarities between the Egyptian goddess Neith and Athena. In Plato’s text it appears that the discussion between Solon and the Saitian priests had no problems of conversation.

It appears that the priests knew particular details of the Acropolis of Athens of the 12th century B.C. If the people who discussed with Solon were only Egyptians then clear difficulties would have been in their conversation. However, the text does not mention any difficulty in conversation. We find very strange that Egyptian priests had interest for architectural details on the Acropolis of Athens and its eventful history in the 12th century B.C.

But since no war of the Atlantes and the Mycenaeans ever existed within Greece and/or Egypt, then is it possible that such a battle took place at Atlantis? And how the information of the catastrophe reached Egypt? Our scenario assumes a contingent of Mycenaean Greeks under Athenian leadership to travel from Egypt to Andalusia, a place already known to Mycenaean traders, and engaged in a war with the Atlantes. After the natural disaster at Andalusia some of the survivors came back to Sais and kept a record of what had happened there. The archives’ content in the 6th century B.C. were made known to Solon a compatriot, so to speak, of theirs. The victory did not remain in the tradition of the Athenians in the main land of Greece not only because there was not any eloquent poet, such as Homer, to write about but also because the informants remained only at Sais. Another Achaean victory which did not interest any poet was that of the first fall of Troy 30 years before the legendary Trojan War. In the Eastern part of Aphaea’s temple (490-480 yr B.C.) on the island of Aegina details of that first war against Troy are given with Ajax’s father, whereas in its Western part Ajax himself is shown, Kakridis (1986). Yet some tradition remained even in the absence of an epic poem. Although Plato’s story is differentiated with respect to the present day archaeological knowledge, we propose that his differentiation signals a parallel history within the turbulent 12th century B.C. unknown to science so far. It is not necessarily diametrically opposed to the existing archaeological knowledge in Egypt of the war of 1176 yr B.C.

However It contains exaggerations, mistakes and anachronisms which can be removed. The origin of the Peoples of the Sea remains enigmatic and the whole issue is still open. Betancourt (2000) for instance, does not accept the simplistic view that the Sea Peoples were Aegean Sea Peoples who left the Aegean Sea due to hardships and, en route to settle in Palestine, fought with the Egyptians and then became the Philistines of Middle East. Certainly their name is not included in the list of the names that attacked Egypt in 1176 yr B.C.
Wachsmann (2000) mentions the possibility that between the Sea Peoples there were warriors from central Europe! He says that “the bird-boat motif is not a symbolic device common to Mycenaean cultural realm. Notable in this regard, therefore, is a bird-boat-like depiction painted on the sherd of Late Helladic IIIIC krater sherd found in Tiryns” Wachsmann (2000) continues saying “The manner in which the bird-heads are positioned on the stem and stern of the ship form a sea going “bird-boat” As this motif is foreign to the Mycenaean world, we must conclude that the specific ship used by the Medinet Habu artists as a prototype for their five depictions of a Sea Peoples’ ship, was manned by a crew that held religious beliefs consistent with those of the Urnfield culture. Or, to put it plainly, the crew was likely to have been composed of Urnfield people.

In the following Table I the military activities of the Achaeans and of the Atlantes are tabulated versus time. We can not know if there was any military activity between the Achaeans and the Atlantes in Andalusia or even if there was any multi-ringed feature which was destroyed in its coast in the platoninc way. However, we know that some of Plato’s passages, for which no other independent sources exist, have been confirmed so far one by one by archaeology. Kunhe (2008) concludes that Atlantis is in the same place as the author of this study suggests. He believes that Plato knew the Medinet Habu archives and used them the way he liked. Kunhe’s (2008) view does not, however, explain the friendliness of the Saitian priests to Solon and the Athenians in general. Neither does he explain the Gadeirian’s friendliness toward the Athenians and nor the honoring by them of the Athenian Menestheus a hero of the Trojan War. He does not take into account that Gadeira was part of Atlantis and of course he does not connect it at all with the Athenians.

The same researcher does not take into account Homer who described the Achaeans’ arrival to Egypt after the Trojan War. Finally he equates Tartessos with the concentric formation. However, Tartessos, existed up to the Roman period and vanished smoothly due to the accumulations of continuous added sediments by Guadalquivir river. Some old authors have reached the same conclusion, as the present author, but without taking into account all the geomythological and geoarchaeological data available to them at the period of their publications Schulten (1924), Jessen (1925), Whishaw (1928), Wickboldt (2007), Kunhe (2008).

Table I. Achaean and Atlantean military operations in the 12th century B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>First fall of Troy by Ajax’s father and his companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>First assault of the Sea Peoples (Atlantes) against Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td>Beginning of the Trojan War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184</td>
<td>Second fall of Troy by Ajax and his companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184+</td>
<td>Achaean’s return to Greece. General instability is exhibited in Greece. Agamemnon’s murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184+</td>
<td>Achaean’s arrival in Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Second assault of the Sea Peoples (Atlantes) against Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Odysseus’ return to Cephalonia from Atlantis, (Papamarinopoulos, 2007a) and (Tziropoulou, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177+</td>
<td>Atlantis’ possible catastrophe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odysseus’ return from Atlantis in 1177 yr B.C. (Papamarinopoulos, 2007a), in the way Homer described it, indicate Achaean knowledge of the region. However, it illustrates that the sacred coastal cyclic feature was still functioning in spite of the beginning of the seismicity and before its complete annihilation. This means that after Odysseus’ return the Athenians got in conflict with the Atlantes. Since we do not have any tradition in Athens as a memory of that victory, we can either accept that Plato...
invented the war, the victory and the catastrophe at Atlantis or that a contingent of Achaeans with Athenians from Egypt as leaders did a military operation in Atlantis. The remaining survivors returned to Egypt and kept a record of the events. These particular archives remained in Sais for 600 years and were made known to Solon due to his Athenian origin in the 6th century B.C.

4. Conclusions

1. Atlantis’ catastrophe by earthquakes (main and aftershocks) and by floods in a day and night is explained in geologic terms fully as a very strong above 8 Richter earthquake which occurred possibly in Gorringe Bank’s seismogenous fault and a tsunami which followed within the same day. It remains to be proved by the dating of a particular turbidity layer found in cores extracted by marine geologists from the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean.

2. Taking into consideration the Hellenic mythology and an ostrich’s shell found in tombs of the Achaean period in Mycenae (Sandars, 1978), it is shown, that Libya was known, independently of Egypt, to the prehistoric Greeks. Similarly taking into consideration the Hellenic mythology and the amber jewelry originating from the Baltic and found in tombs of the Achaean period in Mycenae, it is indicated that Europe’s West coast was known. Moran (2003) proved that the Baltic amber was manufactured into jewelry in Britain. In addition the discovery of a Linear B tablet in Munich in Germany and the discovery of a Mycenaean sherd in Guadalquivir’s estuary indicate again some knowledge of the European Western coast by the prehistoric Greeks mariners. In the pre-cartographic period, before Herodotus world map, some general geographic notes were possibly kept from these areas due to the exchange of trade between Achaeans and Libyans and West and/or central Europeans.

3. Without being a historian Plato uses information originating possibly from Egypt, Greece and Italy. This information was not only confined to the Egyptian priests. He seems to describe the second assault of the Sea Peoples of 1176 yr B.C. in which all participants from different nations were called Atlantes by him. For Plato all originated west of the Gibraltar straits. Today we know that some originated from Anatolia. However, he correctly pinpointed Atlantis’ two zones of influence Italy and Libya. He was also correct that some of the Atlantes originated outside of the Gibraltar straits since some of them used boats with the Umfield’s culture symbol which was two birds at each edge of the boat (Wachsmann 2000). The platonic text “ignores” Ramses’ the III Egyptian victory against the Atlantes in Egypt and seems to know a Greek victory against the Atlantes. The same text describes a lethal end for victors and defeated ones by earthquake and flood. Is it possible that a parallel story was developed in Egypt with the massive part of the Atlantes and another one with the remaining Atlantes in their religious center? The researcher of the future will face three possibilities: Plato either imagined the Atlantes’ assault and the war between Achaeans and Atlantes at Atlantis, or knew the Egyptian archives and changed them in order to embellish the Greeks or he described a parallel truth unknown to historians which requires scientific attention and evidence. Marinatos (1950) explained the Egyptian priesthood’s enthusiasm when Solon in the 6th Century visited them because he knew that a Greek army composed from mercenaries of Ionian origin hit and destroyed fully the Egyptians enemies in Soudan 30 years before Solon’s visit. He proposed that something similar might have occurred with prehistoric Greeks after the Trojan War who fought against the Atlantes (Sea Peoples) outside of Greece and tired then before they reach Egypt in which got annihilated by Ramses the III. Both wars of 12th and 6th century B.C. do not have support of historians. However for the second there is double archaeological evidence in Egypt both in Greek and in Egyptian writings (Gembaza, 2010).

4. Critics who mentioned the antiquity’s sole negator, Strabo, with respect Atlantis neglecting to present Plato’s supporters in the same issue, like Crantor, Proklos, Poseidonius and others, do not offer service to science. Strabo and Doumas (2007) became victims of not taking into account the island’s
meaning evolution versus time in the Greek language, the common name Atlantis given by Plato to the
giant island, the horseshoe basin and the concentric scheme and of not understanding the tsunami’s
custom concept mentioned both by Homer in connection with the Achaeans camp catastrophe in Troad’s sea
cost in the 12th century B.C. and by Plato in connection with Atlantis catastrophe respectively in Spain
in the same 12th century B.C..

Dedication
To Athena, Alexander and Artemis
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