

ATLANTIS

What Did Plato Actually Describe? Reading Atlantis as a Geographical Text Article 2

Manfred Kamp

Copyright ©
Manfred Kamp
www.edda-online.de

What Did Plato Actually Describe?

Reading Atlantis as a Geographical Text

Copyright © 2026 Manfred Kamp

Based on the research of Joachim Rittstieg (†2014)

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission of the copyright holder, except for brief quotations used in reviews or scholarly publications.

Printed in Germany

What Did Plato Actually Describe?

Reading Atlantis as a Geographical Text

Introduction

The story of Atlantis is usually approached as a question of mythology, philosophy or archaeology. There is another possibility: to read Plato's description as a geographical text.

In *Timaeus* and *Critias*, Plato does not merely describe an imaginary society. His account contains measurements, distances, topographical relationships, waterways, mountains, plains, springs and a detailed description of a central settlement.

Whether these details describe a historical landscape is uncertain. But they can nevertheless be examined as geographical information.

This approach forms the methodological basis of the Lake Izabal hypothesis.

The objective is not to assume that Atlantis existed and then search for confirmation. Instead, the question is whether the geographical information attributed to Plato can be translated into measurable criteria and compared with real landscapes.

The Problem of Ancient Measurements

One of the first difficulties is the ancient system of measurement.

Plato's descriptions use units such as the stadion, plethron and Greek foot. These cannot simply be treated as modern metres without making assumptions about their historical values.

The present study therefore uses approximate conversions:

Ancient unit Approximate modern equivalent used in the study

1 Greek foot	0.308 m
1 plethron	approximately 30 m
1 stadion	approximately 180 m

These conversions are methodological assumptions rather than claims of absolute precision.

A different interpretation of the ancient units could change individual measurements. For that reason, the geographical comparison should be understood as an approximate reconstruction rather than a modern survey.

The Principal Dimensions

The manuscript identifies several principal measurements from Plato's account for comparison with the Lake Izabal region.

They include:

- **Plain:** $2,000 \times 3,000$ stadia
- **Canal:** 50 stadia
- **Distance from the sea:** 60 stadia
- **Central basin:** approximately 23 km
- **Mountain system:** approximately 3,000 stadia
-

At the conversion used in the study, these dimensions correspond to very large geographical structures.

The plain, for example, would represent a territory approximately 360 kilometres by 540 kilometres if the stadion is taken as 180 metres.

The importance of these figures lies not in any single measurement.

The methodological question is whether several independent dimensions can be considered together.

From Individual Features to a Geographical System

A landscape can contain a mountain range, a lake, a river and a plain without having anything to do with Atlantis.

Such individual similarities are therefore weak evidence.

The more interesting question is whether the **relationships between features** correspond.

Plato's description involves a system:

- a large plain;
- mountains associated with the plain;
- an inland water body;
- waterways;
- access toward the sea;
- a central settlement;
- and specific spatial relationships between these elements.
-

The Lake Izabal hypothesis applies this systems approach.

Lake Izabal is therefore not examined merely because it is a large lake. It is examined because the lake forms part of a larger geographical system involving the Río Dulce, the Caribbean coast, surrounding lowlands and mountain systems.

The Importance of the Sea Connection

The relationship between the inland basin and the sea is particularly significant.

Lake Izabal is connected through the Río Dulce system toward the Caribbean.

From a geographical perspective, this provides a configuration in which an inland water body is connected to the sea through a navigable waterway.

The study does not claim that the Río Dulce is literally Plato's canal.

Instead, the comparison asks whether the spatial relationship described by Plato could be represented by an inland basin with navigable access to the sea.

This distinction allows the hypothesis to be tested without assuming the conclusion.

The Capital as a Geographical Problem

Plato's description of the capital introduces another level of complexity.

The central settlement is described through concentric arrangements of water and land, together with bridges, waterways and harbour facilities.

The Lake Izabal study therefore attempts a geographical reconstruction of the proposed capital region. Such a reconstruction must be treated as hypothetical.

At present, the manuscript does not contain archaeological evidence establishing a city with Plato's described architecture at Lake Izabal.

The reconstruction is consequently not presented as an archaeological discovery.

Its purpose is to establish a model that future investigations could test.

For example, if a particular configuration of submerged structures were predicted, bathymetric and geophysical surveys could determine whether corresponding anomalies actually exist.

Geography Before Archaeology

This distinction between geographical hypothesis and archaeological proof is essential.

Archaeology can establish human activity, structures, settlements and chronology.

Geography can establish whether a proposed location possesses the spatial relationships required by an interpretation.

The Lake Izabal approach begins with the second question.

Before asking whether Atlantis was built at a particular location, one can ask:

Does the landscape itself permit the geographical description to be reconstructed?

If the answer is negative, archaeological speculation becomes less meaningful.

If the answer is positive, archaeology can then investigate whether human activity corresponds with the proposed reconstruction.

Comparing Alternative Interpretations

The same method can also be applied to other Atlantis hypotheses.

The manuscript considers several commonly discussed alternatives, including Santorini, the Azores, Tartessos/Andalusia and Sardinia.

The purpose is not to establish a historical ranking of these interpretations, but to examine how different geographical settings correspond to the criteria derived from Plato.

The criteria considered include:

1. the size and configuration of the plain;
2. surrounding mountain systems;
3. an inland basin;
4. navigable access to the sea;
5. dimensional correspondence;
6. geological activity;
7. hot and cold springs;
8. evidence concerning large prehistoric mammals;
9. and mineral resources potentially relevant to Plato's *oreichalcum*.

The manuscript's comparative analysis concludes that the Lake Izabal region corresponds with a comparatively large number of these criteria within one geographical setting.

The study also explicitly notes that this comparison is simplified and should not be regarded as definitive.

The Question of Fiction

A fundamental alternative remains possible: Atlantis may have been a literary construction.

Plato's philosophical objectives are an important part of any interpretation of the story.

The absence of unequivocal archaeological evidence is compatible with a fictional interpretation.

At the same time, the detailed geographical and numerical character of the account raises a different question: whether some historical geographical information, cultural memory or earlier traditions could have contributed to Plato's narrative.

The geographical method does not resolve this question.

It simply makes it possible to formulate a testable comparison.

What Would Count as Evidence?

A geographical correspondence by itself would not prove Atlantis.

Stronger evidence would require independent observations.

For the Lake Izabal hypothesis, potentially relevant evidence could include:

- archaeological structures corresponding to the proposed capital;
- submerged remains with demonstrable human construction;
- securely dated settlement evidence;
- bathymetric structures corresponding to predicted geographical features;
- sedimentary evidence for major environmental change;
- geological evidence for relevant episodes of subsidence or seismic activity;
- and material evidence connecting the archaeological record with the cultural and technological characteristics proposed by the hypothesis.

Conversely, evidence inconsistent with the geographical reconstruction would weaken the hypothesis.

This is an important characteristic of the approach: the hypothesis is intended to be falsifiable.

The Limits of the Method

Ancient geographical descriptions contain uncertainties that cannot be eliminated.

The precise meaning of ancient units is not always certain.

Textual transmission can introduce difficulties.

Descriptions may contain literary elements.

Geographical terminology used by an ancient author does not necessarily correspond exactly to modern scientific terminology.

Furthermore, a modern landscape has changed through geological, hydrological and human processes.

Consequently, a direct one-to-one comparison between Plato's text and a modern map would be inappropriate.

The Lake Izabal study therefore treats the reconstruction as a model.

The model can generate predictions, but those predictions require independent testing.

From Ancient Text to Modern Investigation

The principal methodological sequence can therefore be summarized as follows:

Ancient text → measurable criteria → geographical reconstruction → comparison with real landscapes → testable predictions → archaeological and geological investigation.

This sequence differs from the traditional search for a spectacular object or a single archaeological discovery.

It treats Atlantis as a research problem in historical geography.

The question is no longer simply:

“Where is Atlantis?”

It becomes:

“Which geographical setting, if any, can accommodate the complete set of geographical relationships described by Plato, and can those relationships be independently tested?”

Conclusion

Reading Plato geographically does not establish that Atlantis was a historical place.

It does, however, provide a framework in which the geographical claims of the text can be separated from speculation.

The Lake Izabal hypothesis uses this framework by converting ancient measurements into approximate modern units and comparing the resulting geographical relationships with the landscape of eastern Guatemala.

The result is a hypothesis rather than a discovery.

Its value ultimately depends on independent evidence.

If future archaeological, geological and geophysical investigations identify evidence corresponding to the predicted features, the hypothesis would become stronger.

If such evidence is absent or contradictory, the hypothesis would have to be reconsidered.

That is the essential purpose of treating Atlantis as a geographical research question: not to prove an ancient story in advance, but to determine whether the landscape itself can support the description.