

# King Italos = King Atlas of Atlantis? A contribution to the Sea Peoples hypothesis

Thorwald C. Franke

*Independent Researcher, Germany*

## ABSTRACT

As a contribution to the hypothesis, that the Atlanteans are identical with the Sea Peoples who attacked Egypt around 1200 BC, the hypothesis is presented, that king Italos of the Sicels is identical with king Atlas of Atlantis, that the island of Sicily is identical with the island of Atlantis, and that the Sicels' central sanctuary of the Palikoi is meant by Plato's descriptions of the capital city of Atlantis.

## SEA PEOPLES FROM SOUTHERN ITALY

The 9000 years mentioned in Plato's Atlantis account cannot be taken literally. All ancient Greek authors shared the same wrong notion of the age of Egypt, when they considered Egypt to be older than 10000 or even more years (Franke 2006, p. 151 f.). So we have to find Atlantis within the known history of Egypt after 3000 BC.

It is reasonable to assume, that an event like the Atlantean invasion must have left traces in known history. Throughout the whole history of Egypt the attack of the Sea Peoples around 1200 BC is the most similar event to the events described by Plato in his Atlantis account: The Sea Peoples came from islands, their attack resulted in the devastation of the whole region of the eastern Mediterranean sea except Egypt, and their attack was finally stopped in Egypt. The idea to identify the Sea Peoples with the Atlanteans was first published by Spyridon Marinatos in 1950.

So the Sea Peoples invasion of Egypt is our first clue. Unfortunately, science has not come to a consensus, yet, who the Sea Peoples were and where they came from. Woudhuizen (2006) identifies in the Egyptian texts about the Sea Peoples three peoples as the initial driving forces of the Sea Peoples movement: The š3rdn (Sherden), the š3klš3 (Shekelesh) and the w3š3š3 (Weshesh). He identifies them with the Sardinians, the Sicels and the Oscans from Sardinia, Sicily and Southern Italy. So these islands are clearly candidates to be the island of Atlantis.

## AN EGYPTIAN HORIZONTAL SHIFT

But if the Atlanteans came from Southern Italy we have a problem, because there is clear evidence that for Solon, Herodotus and Plato the Pillars of Hercules have been situated at the straits of Gibraltar and not at the island of Sicily (Franke 2006, p. 111 f. and 125 ff.). We can solve this problem by realizing, that the phrase "Pillars of Hercules" is a Greek phrase. It was not contained in the original Egyptian Atlantis account. Therefore the Egyptian priest says most correctly to Solon: "... the straits which are by you called the Pillars of Heracles" (Timaeus 24e).

It is necessary to ask for an Egyptian horizontal shift: The original Egyptian text contained most probably a descriptive statement like "*straits in the west*". In the time of Solon this pointed to the straits of Gibraltar. But what did Egyptians want to describe with "*straits in the west*" at the time of the Sea Peoples invasion? Most probably it was the straits of Messina.

We have to be precise: For this hypothesis it is not necessary, that the Pillars of Hercules once had been situated at the straits of Messina, because we talk about the Egyptian point of view. But Egyptians are known to be poor navigators and so they adapted the geographical knowledge of their neighbour peoples. By this a Greek horizontal shift could have had influence on the Egyptian horizontal shift. The Greek horizontal shift happened some hundred years before Solon's time (Franke 2006, p. 126 f.).

### ORIGINAL OR TRANSLATED NAMES?

In his Atlantis account Plato tells us, that Solon translated the names mentioned in the Atlantis account from the Egyptian to the Greek language. He did so because he recognized, that the Egyptian scribes did the same from the Atlantean language – whatever this was – to the Egyptian language. So far only few attempts have been made to translate the Greek names back to the Egyptian language in order to get closer to a solution of the Atlantis problem (e.g. Frank 1978, Wright 2007).

But these attempts often fail before the step of translation: They cannot give a satisfying explanation of all the Greek names. Even those philologists, experts for the Greek textual heritage, who are strongly convinced that Plato invented the Atlantis account in order to tell the reader a symbolic story full of allusions, express frankly, that they have difficulties to explain all the Greek names (Nesselrath 2006, pp. 263 ff.). The name of king Azaes is even called "mysterious": A word usually not used by those who make fun of Atlantis researchers. This could mean, that not all of the names are Greek translations but original names.

Nesselrath interprets the name of king Atlas not to be meant as a translated name but to be meant as the original name, since there is a semantic parallelism to the sentence about king Gadeiros: From "Gadeiros" derives the name of the "Gadeirean" region, from "Atlas" derives the name of the "Atlantean" sea. Both regions are really called that way, so the names of both kings are considered to be original. Concerning Gadeiros Plato says explicitly, that this would be the original name.

### KING ATLAS = KING ITALOS?

Without any doubt it is worth to prove the idea that "Atlas" is not the translated but the original name. This means we have to find a king named "Atlas" in known history. Do we know him? If Woudhuizen (2006) is right with the hypothesis, that the Sea Peoples came from Southern Italy, we know at least one name of a Sea Peoples' king. It is the name of Italos, king of the Sicels. Let me present the hypothesis that the king of the Sicels with name resp. title "Italos" is identical to king Atlas of Atlantis.

### THE TRANSFORMATION TO ATLAS

Indeed it is reasonable that the name resp. title "Italos" has been transformed (not translated!) to "Atlas" on its way from the Siculean via the Egyptian to the Greek language. Let us have a look on the way of transformation.

Unfortunately we do not have the original Siculean name, but only the name "Italos" as mentioned in Thukydides' Peloponnesian War (VI 2). "Italos" is already the Greek transformation of the original name. Since the ancient Italian languages are closely related to each other, we start with

the corresponding Umbrian word "(v)itl.u" instead of the unknown Siculean name. Its meaning is "calf" or "son of a bull"; in modern Italian the word has transformed to "vitello", which simply means veal meat.

The leading Digamma "v" is usually omitted as in Thukydides' "Italos". Further research has to show whether this is justified in our case. The typical Italian masculinum symbol ".u" is replaced by the typical Egyptian masculinum symbol ".w", the so-called Waw, pronounced like "ou" in "you". Then we can transform the name directly from the ancient Italian into the ancient Egyptian language: itl.u => itl.w. Further research has to show, how to transform the "L", since an "L" is not known in the Egyptian language and thus often paraphrased by the "R" hieroglyph.

Now we come to the transformation (not translation!) from the Egyptian to the Greek language. During my studies of the ancient Egyptian language, to be precise: the so-called "Middle Egyptian" language of the Sea Peoples' time, I found, that Egyptian names beginning with a leading "I" are transformed into Greek almost always by replacing the leading "I" with a leading "A"! So far no Atlantis researcher recognized this rule, because until now all Atlantis researchers tried to translate the names back instead to transform them back. Some examples:

Imn	=> Amun
Itn	=> Aton
Inp.w	=> Anubis
Ich-msi.w	=> Amasis

Furthermore we have to consider, that the Egyptian masculine ending ".w" will be replaced by the typical Greek masculine ending ".s", as our examples show. So we have the transformation: itl.w => atl.s – and this is then easily completed to a name existing in the Greek language, to the name "Atlas", which is not meant to be the mythological titan Atlas known to Greeks but is meant to be a real king. Although Solon and Plato did not know who this king "Atlas" was, they did not identify – in contrary to popular belief – king Atlas of Atlantis with the mythological titan Atlas (Franke 2006, pp. 117 ff.; Nesselrath 2006, p. 267).

## SICILY'S GEOGRAPHICAL SITUATION

Let us have a closer look on Sicily as the island of Atlantis. The Egyptian horizontal shift solves another problem: Plato's Atlantis account contains – among others – the following geographical self-contradiction (Franke 2006, p. 229): On the one hand Atlantis is said to have ruled in Italy and Northern Africa before it invaded the region "*within the straits*". On the other hand Atlantis wanted to subdue "*at a blow ... the whole of the region within the straits.*" How could Atlantis subdue "*at a blow*" the "*whole*" region "*within the straits*" after Atlantis already had conquered the whole western Mediterranean sea?

This is easily explained if we localise the Atlantis straits at the straits of Messina and consider the sea "*within the straits*" to be the eastern Mediterranean sea only. Somewhere between 1200 and 800 BC an Egyptian horizontal shift must have happened, which accepted the western Mediterranean sea as an additional part of the "inner" sea and defined the sea to the west of the straits of Gibraltar as the new "outer" sea. So the Egyptian "*straits in the west*" shifted from Messina to Gibraltar.

And again this solves another problem: From Sicily you can navigate from island to island to the opposite continent (cf. Timaeus 24e), which is western Europe in this case. Of course the western Mediterranean sea is not much bigger than the eastern Mediterranean sea and of course the western Mediterranean sea is not fully surrounded by a continent. But it is likely that the perception of the western Mediterranean sea once had been like that: An unknown and far away region with much less islands than in the eastern Mediterranean sea does easily give the impression to be greater than it is.

Another surprising fact is that Sicily itself forms one side of the straits with the opposite part of the Italian mainland. This could explain why Plato's Atlantis account mentions only one region of one side of the straits to be named after Gadeiros. Why not two regions on two sides of the straits? Maybe because there is only one region on one side of the straits, since the other side of the straits is formed by the island of Atlantis itself.

An Egyptian perception could also be the reason for the well-known statement in Timaeus 24e: "... *the island was larger than Libya and Asia put together*". For Egyptians the world of their "traditional" enemies divided in two: To the west there were the Libyans, to the east there were the Asians. If an Egyptian scribe wanted to say, that an enemy was more dangerous than the "usual" enemies of Egypt, which was the case with the Sea Peoples' invasion, then he would have most probably said, that this enemy was "*more powerful than Libya and Asia put together*". If – what is likely – the statement "more powerful" in the Egyptian original had been expressed by the common word "*wr*", then the mistake is explained: "*wr*" is "big" in its basic meaning, but it is widely used in a metaphorical way.

Quite another more simplistic possibility is, that the Egyptians had no clear idea of the island and just guessed that it must have been a very big island, from which such a dangerous enemy came.

## PLATO'S WRONG ATLANTIS HYPOTHESIS

But didn't Plato mention the name "Gadeiros" and thus gave a clear indication for the straits of Gibraltar? Didn't Plato mention the assumed mud in front of the straits of Gibraltar? Didn't he connect the name of king Atlas with the name of the Atlantean sea?

We can explain these passages of the Atlantis account as typical premature conclusions resp. demythologizations of Plato. Let us consider a well-known example of such a Platonic premature conclusion from the Atlantis account: The demythologization of goddess Athena. Plato believes that the weapons of Athena show that in former times Athenian women had been warriors (Critias 110b f.) – which is clearly wrong.

In contrary to popular belief Solon and Plato did not know where Atlantis once really had been. Quite the contrary: Plato and Solon themselves had been the first who elaborated an Atlantis hypothesis! As we could see they based their localisation on the most probably wrong identification of the straits mentioned in the Egyptian text with the straits of Gibraltar.

Plato simply added some of his typical premature conclusions: He concluded that the assumed mud in front of the straits of Gibraltar derived from the sunken island (Timaeus 25d) and he concluded that the name of the king next to the straits would have been "Gadeiros" according to the name of the region (Critias 114b). We even can show Plato's additions in the Greek original text: Both conclusions look like "attached" to the actual statements of the said passages of the Atlantis account. And with the name of the sea Plato tried one of his typical demythologizations by replacing (not identifying!) the mythological titan Atlas by the king Atlas of Atlantis as the root of the name "Atlantean Sea" (Franke 2006, pp. 117 ff.; Nesselrath 2006, p. 267).

It is funny: Plato gave us the opportunity to identify king Atlas with king Italos by a semantic parallelism to his mistaken identification of king Eumelos with king Gadeiros. Plato was mistaken in a fruitful way!

## THE ISLAND ITSELF

Sicily does fulfil the description of Atlantis in many ways: All around Sicily there is a steep coast interrupted only by the plain of Catania. This plain is almost rectangular and is sheltered from northern winds by mount Etna. It does not open to the south as Plato describes, but it is located

"functionally" to the south: South of mount Etna, south of the straits of Messina. Maybe the Atlantis account suffers from a typical mistake of orientation like Herodotus' description of the orientation of the Thermopylean pass (Franke 2006, p. 55). For travellers coming from the eastern Mediterranean sea the plain of Catania is in the middle of the island as Plato says.

Sicily also combines a landscape of lovely hills with highest mountains: Mount Etna gives an explanation for this strange combination described by Plato: Mount Etna is higher than even mount Olympus in Greece. Its height is even more impressive since Etna is not accompanied by other mountains and is not far from sea like the Alps – it stands alone directly next to sea level!

The Mediterranean region as well as the volcanic soil provide a high fertility as described for Atlantis. Black volcanic basalts, red sandstone and white limestone combine to the typical colours of Atlantean rocks. Since Sicily is the world's leading sulphur supplier we have an opportunity to explain the *oreichalkos*. It could e.g. have been a sulphur compound like orpiment or realgar giving the typical firelike colour.

So far no traces of elephants have been found on Sicily for the period of the Sea Peoples invasion. Only the founding legend of the city of Catania tells of an elephant having protected the very first settlers in that region. Since the last pygmy elephants on Mediterranean islands died out latest 2400 BC this is theoretically possible but very unlikely to be true.

## NO DESTRUCTION OF ATLANTIS

Of course Sicily is not a sunken island like Plato's island Atlantis. But something is basically wrong with Plato's catastrophe of Atlantis. Ulf Richter (2007) wrote of the Atlantis tsunami disaster: "*But the mountains could not sink during a catastrophe like this ...! They must still exist today.*"

This is the reason why many Atlantis researchers reduced the catastrophe to the sinking of the city of Atlantis only. Sicily would provide the best conditions for such a catastrophe: There are big volcanoes on the island, next to the island and under water, and there are frequent earth quakes and heavy tsunamis. Remember only the earth quake followed by a tsunami in the morning of December 28th, 1908: Almost the whole city of Messina was destroyed and around 60000 people were killed from one moment to the other.

But this reduced catastrophic scenario provides no explanation why Plato wrote of the destruction of the *whole* island. Again the Egyptian perspective provides a solution: Egypt developed a very strict political theology: The role of the pharaoh is to annihilate the evil at its roots and thus to recreate the order of the world, identified with the goddess Ma'at. For this annihilation it is not enough to repel an attacking enemy at the borders of Egypt. Best fulfillment of the theopolitical role of the pharaoh is given, when there is no enemy left in the world.

We can see this political theology in many Egyptian texts, also in the pharaoh's words about the defeated Sea Peoples (Woudhuizen 2006, p. 52): "*I made the lands turn back from mentioning Egypt; for when they pronounce my name in their land, then they are burned up. ... I have taken away their land, their frontiers being added to mine. Their chiefs and their tribespeople are mine with praise, for I am upon the ways of the plans of the All-Lord*". And e.g.: "*I overthrew those who invaded them from (or: in) their lands. I slew the Denyen in (= who are in) their isles, the Tjeker and the Peleset were made ashes.*"

Concerning the islands of the Sea Peoples the Egyptians had a big problem: They could not fulfill the annihilation of the enemy in his homeland. The pharaoh had no fleet to go there and so he was not able to fulfill his theopolitical role. For the Egyptian culture this was an unbearable thought. But the Egyptian propaganda knew a solution for such cases: If the pharaoh could not go there and destroy the homeland of the Sea Peoples on behalf of the gods, then the gods themselves destroyed the island on behalf of the pharaoh.

We can find an allusion to this thought in the Egyptian texts about the Sea Peoples (Woudhuizen

2006, p. 52): *"It is Amon-Re who has overthrown for him the lands and has crushed for him every land under his feet; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands". And: "The Sherden and the Weshesh of the sea, they were made as those that exist not"*.

Here in these texts about the end of the Sea Peoples we can find all elements of the destruction of Atlantis: There is the highest God Amon-Re / he crushes and overthrows / lands and islands / he makes peoples as those that exist not. If Plato took theopolitical sentences like these for plain truth, this could have been the basis of his description of the punishing intervention of the gods and the final destruction of the island. This order of events, first a punishment, finally the destruction, corresponds also to the Sea Peoples' wars, who attacked Egypt several times.

Most interestingly the homeland of the Shekelesh (Sicels) is not mentioned in these texts about the Egyptian victory as far as they have been handed down to our time. What happened to their island? Maybe Plato had an Egyptian text about the end of the Shekelesh, lost today? And maybe Plato again applied his method of premature concluding and enriched his understanding of the Egyptian text by details he knew from the destruction of the Greek city of Helike?

## SICELS AND SICANI

Several peoples lived on Sicily in the time of the Sea Peoples invasion. From Spain the Sicani had immigrated. After the Sicani the Sicels had invaded the island and so the name "Sicilia" was born, which is still the modern name of the island: "Sicily". The Sicels brought the horse and hydraulic engineering to the island.

Thukydides (VI 2) reports that the Siculean invasion happened around 300 years before the first Greek settlements on the island, i.e. around 1100 BC. Modern scientists estimate the year 1400 BC, which is only some 200 years before the Sea Peoples invasion to Egypt.

The Sicels pushed away the Sicani into the inner parts of the island. This could explain the name of the Atlantean king Autochthon. Isn't it strange that one of the Atlantean kings is called "Autochthon"? A name is always a means of distinction. Thus the name indicates that the other nine kings were not autochthonous but immigrated to the island. Exactly this is the situation on Sicily: The Sicani came first and have been considered to be autochthonous by the Sicels, who invaded the island later. So king Autochthon most probably was king of the Sicani.

Like the Etruscans who immigrated to Tuscany and adapted their mythology and the places of birth of their gods to their new homeland, the Sicels soon integrated local sanctuaries into their religious beliefs as if the Sicels always lived on Sicily. It's not logic, it's religion.

## THE CENTRAL SANCTUARY OF THE SICELS

Do we can find the city of Atlantis on the island of Sicily? Plato wrote about its position on the island of Atlantis (Critias 113c): *"Towards the sea and in the centre of the island there was a very fair and fertile plain, and near the centre [sc. of the island], about fifty stadia from the plain, there was a low mountain"*. In contrary to popular belief and in contrary to some translators, who translate *"in the middle of the plain"* instead of *"in the middle of the island"*, the central sanctuary of Atlantis had not been near the coast. Cf. Critias 119d: *"... situated in the middle of the island, at the temple of Poseidon, whither the kings were gathered together every fifth and every sixth year alternately"*.

Again we have to deal with a self-contradiction in the Atlantis account: On the one hand the sanctuary is said to be in the centre of the island, on the other hand Plato describes a city near the coast. Or, at least, we always thought that Plato describes a city near the coast. Also Nesselrath (2006, p. 253) recognizes the uncertainties and the half-baked character of Plato's descriptions. A sound explanation for these problems would be, that Plato really relied on an Egyptian account, and

that he had difficulties to understand what the account wanted to say. If Plato invented the whole story he would not have inserted self-contradictions, or at least misunderstandings and uncertainties.

Be this as it may be: On the island of Sicily there is a place which corresponds to Plato's descriptions: Around 50 stadia from the south-western corner of the Plain of Catania, there is indeed a low mountain towards the middle of the island: It is the central sanctuary of the Sicels, the sanctuary of the so-called Palikoi. The place was later called Palike and is known today as the Rocchicella hill. It is to the west of the modern city of Palagonia.

With the knowledge of the situation on Sicily we can try to give another possible explanation for Plato's confusion. Plato talks of two canals: One leading from the city to the sea; surprisingly this canal has the same length as the distance of the city to the plain. And a second one running along the border of the plain. The Atlantis account gives no proper explanation why the canal at the border of the plain was built, and we have a hill in the centre of the island, far away from the sea. Maybe the solution is the following: The canal from the city hill leads to the sea, but not directly, but *indirectly*, by leading into the canal at the border of the plain: The canal is exactly of this length. Then the canal at the border of the plain had the function to connect the sanctuary with the sea. On Sicily we can identify the canal at the border of the plain with the Gornalunga river, which indeed looks very much like a canal. Further research has to investigate the hydraulic engineering work of the Sicels on the island.

## THE CULT OF THE PALIKOI

Let us check whether the Palikoi sanctuary corresponds to Plato's descriptions of the city of Atlantis. We can find a correspondence to god Poseidon in god Adranus, the highest god of the Sicels, a god of earthly powers like Poseidon. This Adranus procreated twin brothers at the hill of the Palikoi sanctuary, the so-called Palikoi twin brothers. There are also two geyser fountains, the so-called Palikoi fountains, considered to be the "brothers" of the Palikoi.

Plato writes about two sanctuaries in the city center of Atlantis: One for Poseidon alone, and one at the place, where Poseidon procreated the twin brothers with Cleito. Concerning the latter one Nesselrath writes convincingly that most translators are wrong when calling this place a "temple". According to Nesselrath Plato's text seems to describe something else, e.g. an open space surrounded by a wall (Nesselrath 2006, p. 328 f.). But wouldn't a grotto fit best to the activity of procreating twin brothers, like in the case of the Palikoi sanctuary?

Ancient texts report details of an oath taking ceremony at the sanctuary. Excavations brought to light evidence for bull cult (Maniscalco / McConnell 2003). Bull cult was widely known to Italian peoples, not to mention the meaning of the name "Italos". Furthermore we have to consider that the Sicani most probably immigrated from Spain, where bull cults had been popular, too (cf. Papamarinopoulos / Coseyan 2007). Excavations also revealed a dining facility. Pseudo-Aristotle even talks in dark words of ten dining coaches in connection with the sanctuary (Mirab. Ausc. 57). Maybe an allusion to ten kings? Indeed the sanctuary served as a kind of capital for the confederacy of Siculean cities.

## PROBLEMS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Most obviously there are no rings of water around Rocchicella hill, today. But paintings from the 18th century show open water in front of the hill. In ancient times, when the island of Sicily was widely covered by woods, the water balance of the island was three times higher than it is today. Furthermore three rivers flow together at the Rocchicella hill. So rings of water could have been there. Of course, further research has to follow.

Unfortunately the ancient texts and the excavated dining facility are not from the late bronze age, but from the iron age. There is clear evidence that the sanctuary had been in use already in the time of the Sea Peoples, but the details are uncertain. Of course we can assume that religious cults do not change too quickly over time, but we have to examine this more carefully.

Further questions are: Do e.g. the rock-cut tombs around the hill correspond to Plato's ship garages? Where was the bridge? How did the place change over time? How can we understand the distances given by Plato in stadia? Do the findings of Egyptology provide more explanations to us? Everybody is invited to contribute to this approach to make it one day an accepted scientific theory.

## HYPOTHESES ABOUT SICILY

In Atlantis research it is very difficult to say who was the first to present an idea. So far I could not find any Atlantis researcher who identified the historic island of Sicily with Atlantis although it is very likely that there has been one. There are some Atlantis researchers, who thought of a prehistoric island much larger than Sicily, i.e. a kind of "Greater Sicily", because of a lower sea level many thousands of years ago. But these are totally different hypotheses: They differ by far in time and place, provide completely different arguments, and they search for a sunken city south to Sicily, ignoring the known peoples and cultures and the archaeological sites on Sicily, especially the sanctuary of the Palikoi.

In 1779 the French Delisle de Sales thought of Atlantis as an island opposite Tuscany. He considered Sardinia to be a remaining part of Atlantis. Delisle de Sales rejected chronological speculations but obviously thought of a time long before the Sea Peoples invasion. Around 1850 the Russian Abraham S. Norov published the idea, that Atlantis had been an island in the eastern Mediterranean sea 3000 BC, including the islands of Cyprus and Sicily, i.e. a very long island.

In recent years Rosario Vieni wrote of Atlantis to the south of Sicily around 9500 BC. Massimo Rapisarda had similar ideas. Axel Hausmann localised Atlantis on the Plateau of Malta to the south of Sicily around 3500 BC. Sergio Frau identifies Sardinia with Atlantis, unfortunately by ignoring some basic principles of science (e.g. according to Frau the Pillars of Hercules had been located south to Sicily until the times of Eratosthenes, which is clearly wrong).

Furthermore there have been some Atlantis hypotheses considering Atlantis to be an invention by Plato constructed according to Plato's Sicilian experiences. But for them Sicily is not really Atlantis, but only a model for a fictional Atlantis. They, too, fully ignored the known peoples and cultures of Sicily and the sanctuary of the Palikoi.

Did Plato know the Rocchicella hill from his visits to Sicily? Maybe yes, maybe he heard of the Siculean revolt under Ducetius. But why should Plato make allusions to the Sicels? Why confusing things? Why inventing a historical tradition via Egypt? Why placing it to the straits of Gibraltar? The explanation of an invention inspired by the Sicels' central sanctuary makes no sense at all. If Plato knew the place he had no idea, that this was "his" Atlantis.

The basic ideas of this paper have been published in an uncertain and unscientific way already in February 2000 in the internet. On March 2nd, 2008, a first draft of this paper has been published in the internet. With the Atlantis 2008 conference in Athens the idea *Atlantis = Sicily / Italos = Atlas / City of Atlantis = Palikoi sanctuary* has now reached the status of a scientific hypothesis.

## DEDICATION

To the memory of M. Tullius Cicero, who – as righteous and respected quaestor of the three-cornered island – rediscovered Archimedes' forgotten tomb on Sicily.

## REFERENCES

- Frank (1978): Karl A. Frank, *Atlantis war anders*, Verlag fuer Sammler, Graz 1978.
- Franke (2006): Thorwald C. Franke, *Mit Herodot auf den Spuren von Atlantis*, Books on Demand, Norderstedt 2006.  
Cf. [http://www.atlantis-scout.de/atlantis\\_herodot.htm](http://www.atlantis-scout.de/atlantis_herodot.htm)
- Franke (2008): Homepage of the hypothesis, cf. [http://www.atlantis-scout.de/atlantis\\_sicily.htm](http://www.atlantis-scout.de/atlantis_sicily.htm)
- Maniscalco/McConnell (2003): Laura Maniscalco / Brian E. McConnell, The Sanctuary of the Divine Palikoi (Rocchicella di Mineo, Sicily): Fieldwork from 1995 to 2001, *American Journal of Archeology AJA*, Vol 107, No. 2, April 2003, pp. 145-180.
- Marinatos (1950): Spyridon Marinatos, *Peri tòn thrùlon tès 'Atlantidos*, *Cretica Chronica IV*, pp. 195-210, 1950.
- Nesselrath (2006): Heinz-Guenther Nesselrath, *Platon Kritias – Uebersetzung und Kommentar*; Vol. VIII/4 of *Plato's works – Translation and Commentary*, edited by Ernst Heitsch / Carl Werner Mueller on behalf of the Academy of Sciences and Literature in Mainz; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Goettingen 2006.
- Papamarinopoulos / Coseyan (2007): St. P. Papamarinopoulos / Ch. Coseyan, The Ritual of the Bull in "Atlantis" and its basic parallel in Iberia, in: Stavros P. Papamarinopoulos (editor), *The Atlantis Hypothesis – Searching for a Lost Land*, Book of Proceedings of the International Conference Atlantis 2005, Heliotos Publications, Santorini/Greece 2007, pp. 525-538.
- Regione Sicilia: Palike website: <http://www.regione.sicilia.it/beniculturali/dirbenicult/musei/musei2/engpalike.htm>
- Richter (2007): Ulf Richter, Plato's Atlantis was in a river delta, in: Stavros P. Papamarinopoulos (editor), *The Atlantis Hypothesis – Searching for a Lost Land*, Book of Proceedings of the International Conference Atlantis 2005, Heliotos Publications, Santorini/Greece 2007, pp. 451-466.
- Woudhuizen (2006): Frederik C. Woudhuizen, *The Ethnicity of the Sea Peoples*, Doctoral Thesis, Erasmus University, Rotterdam 2006. Cf. <http://hdl.handle.net/1765/7686>
- Wright (2007): Erick W. Wright, Intermediary embedded synonymy, integrated ambiguous homonymy and the Egyptian hieroglyphic inspiration for the Atlantis story, in: Stavros P. Papamarinopoulos (editor), *The Atlantis Hypothesis – Searching for a Lost Land*, Book of Proceedings of the International Conference Atlantis 2005, Heliotos Publications, Santorini/Greece 2007, pp. 101-111.

© 2008 COPYRIGHT by Thorwald C. Franke.

Copyright licence granted to the Atlantis Conference 2008 for scientific purposes.