Geodynamic Reinterpretation Model for Ptolemy's *Germania Magna*

General Model Description, Cartometric Foundations, Extended Evidence Analysis, and Impact Hypothesis

v4 - corrected kaolin distance analysis; gazetteer table appended

Sven Mildner[1]

[1]Germania Magna Research Project, Briesnitzer Höhe 28, 01157 Dresden, Germany

Correspondence: `germania.magna@smi-web.de`

ORCID: `https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8248-4866`

How to cite this preprint:

Mildner, S. (2026). *Geodynamic Reinterpretation Model for Ptolemy's Germania Magna: General Model Description, Cartometric Foundations, Extended Evidence Analysis, and Impact Hypothesis.* EarthArXiv (Preprint).
`https://doi.org/10.31223/X5KB51`

This work builds upon and extends the following previously published preprint:

Mildner, S. (2025/2026). *A new interpretation of Ptolemy's Germania Magna: Employing computer-assisted image distortion of a medieval map by Donnus Nicolaus Germanus to examine post-glacial geodynamics in Europe.* EarthArXiv (Preprint).
`https://doi.org/10.31223/X5313T`

Related resource:

Mildner, S. (2026). *Mildner's Geodynamic Reinterpretation Model for Ptolemy's Historical Coordinates.*
`https://www.ancientmaps-geography.com`

Keywords: Ptolemy, Germania Magna, geodynamics, Caledonian Deformation Front, Trans-European Suture Zone, Český Kráter, Elster-Lusatia Block, Event-Dark-Earth, affine cartometric transformation, Donnus Nicolaus Germanus, Scandia, Doggerland, inversion tectonics, 536 AD crisis, Saale-Unstrut impact hypothesis.

Disclaimer and scope

This manuscript presents an interdisciplinary working hypothesis integrating cartometry, geodynamics, sedimentology, impact mechanics, and historical sources. It formulates concrete, falsifiable predictions and is intended to stimulate further empirical testing. It does not claim to constitute a definitive reconstruction, and has not been evaluated by peer review.

Version 4 Note: Compared to the previous version, only minor edits were made to the chapter numbering to improve clarity, leaving the substantive content unchanged.

Geodynamic Reinterpretation Model for Ptolemy's *Germania Magna*

General Model Description, Cartometric Foundations,
Extended Evidence Analysis, and Impact Hypothesis

Sven Mildner
Germania Magna Research Project
Briesnitzer Höhe 28 · 01157 Dresden · Germany
`germania.magna@smi-web.de`
ORCID `0009-0005-8248-4866`

May 2026

Contents

1. Abstract

This model proposes that the well-documented geodynamic and climatic disruption of the 6th century AD involved a reactivation of the ancient Caledonian Deformation Front (CDF) and the Trans-European Suture Zone (TESZ), most likely triggered by cosmic events in the form of impacts or airbursts. Large-scale inversion tectonics, driven by Alpine compressive forces, are argued to have caused substantial crustal deformation throughout *Germania Magna* during this period. Old extensional basins and zones of weakness were uplifted, folded, and shortened; with the Lausitz Block functioning as a rigid tectonic anchor, neighbouring crustal blocks — including the Fläming, Harz, and Thuringian Forest — underwent characteristic rotations and lateral displacements.

The proposed consequences of this deformation cascade include catastrophic flooding, regional firestorms, and the widespread deposition of a distinctive **Event-Dark-Earth (ED-E)** sediment horizon. Concurrently, the Oceanus Germanicus (North Sea) experienced a significant northward regression, fundamentally altering the coastline geometry and decoupling the ancient, more compact shape of *Germania Magna* from its present-day configuration. This geodynamic transformation is advanced as an explanation for the abrupt collapse of ancient settlement structures documented in the archaeological record.

The cartometric foundation of the model is a strictly affine transformation of Ptolemy's *Geographike Hyphegesis* (c. 150 AD), anchored on the invariant Rhine–Elbe baseline and yielding a fixed global scaling factor of ≈28 km per Ptolemaic degree of longitude. Residual analysis of the gazetteer reveals a statistically significant eastward displacement of the Elster-Lusatia Cluster ($\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -93.1\,\text{km}$, $t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$), which is incompatible with uniform cartographic measurement error and is interpreted as requiring a geodynamic, tectonic-block explanation. The extended evidence analysis and the Saale-Unstrut Fragment Impact Hypothesis develop these foundations in quantitative depth across Parts II–IV of this work.

Disclaimer

This manuscript presents an interdisciplinary working hypothesis integrating cartometry, geodynamics, sedimentology, impact mechanics, and historical sources. It formulates concrete, falsifiable predictions and is intended to stimulate further empirical testing. The model challenges aspects of current mainstream interpretation but does not claim to constitute a definitive reconstruction. It has not been evaluated by peer review.

2. Introduction: Scope, Method, and Positioning

The historical geography of *Germania Magna* — the territory east of the Rhine and north of the Danube described by Claudius Ptolemy in the *Geographike Hyphegesis*

(c. 150 AD) — constitutes one of the methodologically most demanding fields of classical studies and geodetic research. The currently paradigmatically influential reference model, the statistical-geodetic rectification of the TU Berlin group (Karlsen et al., 2011), explains deviations between Ptolemaic coordinates and modern topography primarily as measurement errors of ancient instruments or as transmission artefacts.

The present model opposes this concept with a fundamentally different approach. The **primary explanatory principle** is not the correction of errors in the ancient map itself, but the recognition that the **northern reference line** — the coastline of the *Oceanus Germanicus* — lay approximately 120 km further south during antiquity than today. Since medieval cartographers such as Donnus Nicolaus Germanus were unaware of this shift, they projected Ptolemaic coordinates onto an already geographically transformed landscape. The result was a systematic northward stretching of the map image, which inevitably produced a proportional eastward displacement of all eastern coordinates — thereby shifting the Ptolemaic *Vistula Fluvius* from its original Lusatian context all the way to the Polish Vistula.

Geodynamic processes (reactivation of the Caledonian Deformation Front [CDF], lateral extrusion, block rotations) represent a secondary, quantitatively investigated component. The present unified work is structured in four thematic parts:

- **Part I** (Sections 1–9) provides the general conceptual and interdisciplinary framework, including the Event-Dark-Earth hypothesis, the cartometric reidentifications, the impact structures, and the geodynamic chain-reaction model.

- **Part II** (Sections 10–16) establishes the cartometric transformation model in explicit mathematical terms and delivers the statistical residual analysis that demonstrates the $-93.1\,\text{km}$ eastward displacement as statistically irrefutable ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$).

- **Part III** (Sections 17–23) evaluates the geophysical evidence base — CDF reactivatability, anomalous North Sea subsidence, radial kaolin genesis, and the Storegga–Doggerland connection — using independently published datasets.

- **Part IV** (Sections 25–36) develops the Saale-Unstrut Fragment Impact Hypothesis, providing the impact-mechanical energy budget, the biaxial Bramsche–Český Kráter stress field, and the spatial correlation analysis of the 2024 Herzberg earthquake.

Part I

General Model Description: Foundations, Mechanisms, and Interdisciplinary Framework

3. The Event-Dark-Earth (ED-E) as Catastrophic Sediment Archive

Ancient and medieval chronicles are treated in this model not as mere myths, but as precise observation protocols of real catastrophic natural events. Reports such as those by Michael the Syrian or Cosmas of Prague are therefore read as contemporary descriptions of climatic and geodynamic phenomena that modern scholarship has often minimised or dismissed as allegories. By directly correlating these textual testimonies with the physical **Event-Dark-Earth (ED-E)** archive, their credibility as records of a genuine historical turning point in the 6th century is substantially strengthened.

3.1 Critique of the Gardening Theory

The conventional "gardening theory" for the origin of the dark soil layers is criticised on the grounds of its lack of social and economic plausibility during a phase of societal collapse. This theory assumes that populations in the 5th and 6th centuries devoted enormous labour resources to large-scale clearing, charcoal production, and systematic levelling in order to create garden plots — activities that appear entirely implausible in the face of the archaeologically attested settlement abandonment and demographic decline documented by Bemmann (2023) and Volkmann (2014). The conventional explanation is therefore considered explanatorily weak, because it requires numerous historically unattested auxiliary hypotheses to account for the uniform character of the layers.

3.2 The Gaberz Database and its Reinterpretation

A central empirical foundation is provided by Gaberz's (2014) diploma thesis *Dark Earth – die schwarze Schicht*, which catalogues dark, homogeneous soil horizons at numerous European sites in detail. Gaberz interprets them classically as the result of slow anthropogenic and natural processes (bioturbation, horticulture, settlement waste disposal). This model adopts her extensive database but reinterprets the **homogeneity** and the complete **absence of internal stratification** — features emphasised by Gaberz herself — as possible signatures of sudden, catastrophic deposition.

3.3 Falsifiable Predictions for the ED-E Horizon

As part of the testing framework, the following concrete, falsifiable predictions are formulated for an Event-Dark-Earth (ED-E) layer (Mildner, 2026):

P1. Chaotic homogeneity: Fine material and coarse debris chaotically mixed by high-energy processes, without internal lamination.

P2. Geochemical anomalies: Elevated Cl/Br ratios indicative of marine injections; elevated PAH content; anomalous cosmochemical markers (e.g., iridium, nickel, chondritic particle signatures).

P3. Heavy-mineral enrichment at the base ("soap effect"), consistent with hydraulic sorting by a high-energy flood pulse.

P4. Micromorphological evidence of impulsive mixing fabrics, absent in anthropogenic Dark Earth.

P5. In-situ thermal anomalies: Vitrifications or flash-heating signatures incompatible with domestic hearths.

P6. Synchronous abrupt collapse of the tree-pollen curve, temporally coincident with ED-E deposition — distinguishable from gradual anthropogenic clearing by its rapidity and absence of crop-pollen increase.

These features are explicit predictions of the ED-E catastrophe model and have not yet been confirmed as established findings in Gaberz's (2014) analyses. Targeted high-resolution micromorphological, geochemical, and palynological follow-up studies on existing Dark-Earth profiles are therefore required to test the hypothesis.

3.4 Palynology as Ecological Protocol

Palynology serves as a complementary "ecological protocol" that temporally and biologically validates the sediment data. While sediment analysis forensically demonstrates the physical character of the catastrophe, palynology records the biological consequence: an abrupt collapse of the tree-pollen curve in direct temporal association with the formation of the ED-E horizon. This rapid ecological "reset" is methodologically distinct from gradual anthropogenic clearing, which produces slower landscape changes accompanied by typical crop-pollen signals.

4. Reinterpretation of the 6th-Century Historical and Archaeological Record

4.1 The Collapse of the Thuringian Kingdom

The conventional scholarly narrative attributes the collapse of the Thuringian Kingdom in 531 AD primarily to Frankish military expansion (Gregor of Tours, c.575). In contrast, this model interprets this collapse as the direct result of a major geodynamic and climatic catastrophe. The archaeological record of central Germany after 531 AD shows no corresponding Frankish settlement structures, military installations, or significant Frankish elite presence in the core catastrophe-affected area. Cemeteries likewise lack numerical evidence of a Frankish population large enough to enforce sustained occupation. Supported by current archaeological assessments (Bemmann, 2023), the primary cause of the end of Thuringian rule is therefore attributed to a geodynamically induced environmental crisis. The full spatial analysis of the battle-of-the-Unstrut zone relative to the postulated Geiseltal impact structure is presented in Section 34.

4.2 Scandia: An Island Massif in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania

Scandia (Skandza) in this model is not the Scandinavian peninsula but a topographically limited island massif in present-day Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania. In pre-antiquity (Stone Age) this archipelago-like landmass was significantly larger and surrounded by shallow shelf seas. Geodynamic processes and relative sea-level fluctuations have gradually altered and partially submerged large parts of it.

This multi-phase geomorphological evolution is corroborated by Geersen et al. (2024)'s discovery of the *Blinkerwall*: a 971-metre-long submerged Stone Age hunting architecture made of 1,673 individual stones, built by late-Palaeolithic or early-Mesolithic hunter-gatherer groups during the Younger Dryas or early Pre-Boreal (c. 11,000–9,000 years ago), now lying at 21 m water depth in the Bay of Mecklenburg. The site was ultimately flooded during the Littorina transgression around 8,500 years BP. The demographic pressure mechanism (*vagina nationum*) described by Jordanes for the Gothic migration is thus consistent with the documented prehistoric land extent; the full RSL (relative sea level) documentation is presented in Section 23.

The catastrophic event of 525/536 CE triggered a sudden tectonic reactivation of the CDF, simultaneously flooding and compressing the North German coastal area while also causing uplift of the landmass, dramatically reshaping the coastline of *Germania Magna*. This accounts for the prehistoric hunting structures, the demographic pressure that drove the Gothic migration, and the later legendary tradition of Vineta as a "sunken city."

5. Cartometric Reinterpretation of Ptolemy's Map and Key Geographical Reidentifications

5.1 The Affine Transformation and the Global Scaling Factor

Apparent "errors" in medieval maps, including the Ptolemy map rendered by Donnus Nicolaus Germanus, are not scribal mistakes but faithful records of the pre-catastrophe landscape. A fixed global scaling factor of approximately 28 km per degree of longitude is applied, anchored on the invariant Rhine–Elbe baseline. The mathematical transformation is expressed as:

$$\lambda_{\text{local}} = \lambda_{\text{Ptolemaeus}} - (\Delta\lambda_{\text{Offset}} \times k) \tag{1}$$

where k compensates for historically conditioned stretching. The complete affine transformation — consisting of translation, rotation, and uniform scaling — aligns the ancient coordinates precisely with modern topography once tectonic shifts are accounted for. The minimisation objective for the least-squares adjustment over all n gazetteer points is:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \left[\Big(E_i - f(\lambda_i, \phi_i) \Big)^2 + \Big(N_i - g(\lambda_i, \phi_i) \Big)^2 \right] \tag{2}$$

where w_i represents the weighting according to Ptolemaic measurement accuracy.

The scaling factor of approximately 28 km per Ptolemaic degree is derived directly from Ptolemy's coordinates of the invariant Rhine–Elbe baseline and its eastward extension to the *Vistula Fluvius* (re-identified as the Lausitz river system). Ptolemy records:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Central mouth of Rhenus Fluvius:} \quad & \lambda = 27^\circ 00', \ \phi = 53^\circ 10' \\
\text{Mouths of Albis Fluvius (Elbe):} \quad & \lambda = 31^\circ 00', \ \phi = 56^\circ 15' \\
\text{Mouths of Vistula Fluvius (Lausitz system):} \quad & \lambda = 45^\circ 00', \ \phi = 56^\circ 00'
\end{aligned}$$

Modern geographic distances yield two independent baseline estimates:

$$k_1 = \frac{\approx 115\,\text{km}}{4^\circ} \approx 28.75\,\frac{\text{km}}{\text{degree}} \tag{3}$$

$$k_2 = \frac{\approx 490\,\text{km}}{18^\circ} \approx 27.22\,\frac{\text{km}}{\text{degree}} \tag{4}$$

Averaging these independent baselines produces the robust global scaling factor of ≈28 km per Ptolemaic degree of longitude. The full derivation, matrix solution, and parameter values are presented in Section 10.

5.2 Key Geographical Reidentifications

Key geographical reidentifications follow directly from the rectified grid (Mildner, 2025/2026, 2026):

The Vistula Fluvius as the Lausitz River System. The *Vistula Fluvius*, described by Ptolemy as a river with two major arms originating south of the *Asciburgius*

Mons and converging east of it, is identified as the Lausitz river system (Schwarze Elster–Spree–Oder) rather than the modern Polish Vistula. Projecting the *Vistula Fluvius* onto the modern Polish Vistula destroys mathematical consistency, forces massive local distortions that violate topological integrity, and eliminates predictive power for landmarks such as *Melibocus Mons* or structures in the Saxon Ore Mountains.

The Asciburgius Mons as the Fläming. The *Asciburgius Mons* is re-identified as the Fläming (not the Riesengebirge). Its distinctive "kink" on ancient maps matches the tectonic bend visible today and corresponds to a tectonic hinge massively consolidated by compressive forces of the Alps/Carpathian orogeny. This structural density created a natural baffle and barrier during transient events such as tsunami waves or impulse floods.

Scandia as an Island Massif in Mecklenburg. Scandia in this model is not the Scandinavian peninsula but a topographically limited island massif in present-day Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (see Section 4 and Section 23).

5.3 The Elster Cluster: Budorigum, Limis Lucus, Lugidunum, Stragona

The four Ptolemaic place names of the Elster Cluster — *Budorigum* (Doberlug-Kirchhain), *Limis Lucus* (Baruth/Mark), *Lugidunum* (Falkenberg/Elster), and *Stragona* (Herzberg/Elster) — show a highly significant systematic eastward displacement of $\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -93.1\,\text{km}$ relative to the affine model prediction ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$). This result is the cartometric cornerstone of the entire model, documented exhaustively in Section 13 and physically explained in Section 31.

Core Cartometric Result

The Elster Cluster is displaced **93.1 km eastward** relative to the affine model prediction ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$). This is incompatible with uniform measurement error and requires a geodynamic, tectonic-block explanation.

6. Cometary Signatures and Impact Structures: The Český Kráter

6.1 The Rajlich Structure

Rajlich (1992, 2007); Rajlich et al. (2009) documented a giant multi-ring astrobleme centred in the Bohemian Massif — the *Český Kráter* — with an outer ring scar reaching up to 600 km in diameter, an inner crater of approximately 300 km, and the largest detectable ring at about 540 km (farthest ring ≈270 km from the presumed centre). The northern sector is best preserved and filled with Proterozoic sediments, while the transitional cavity is preserved as a ≈40 km deep depression in the Moho discontinuity beneath a central hill near Mladá Vožice (Beránek et al., 1973; Hrubcová et al., 2005).

Allochthonous crater megabreccia blankets the Moldanubikum and Saxothuringikum, mixing fragments of upper- and lower-crustal rocks with mantle-derived material. Shock-metamorphic and ultra-high-pressure (UHP) evidence is abundant: recrystallised pseudotachylite breccia veins (longest: 3.5 km at Chrášťany, 60 m thickness); shocked quartz with planar deformation features (PDFs); microdiamonds; moissanite (SiC); coesite; and other UHP assemblages with sapphirine (Klokočník et al., 2010).

6.2 Younger Age Interpretation

The structural ring interpretation of Rajlich (2007); Rajlich et al. (2009) is accepted, but a substantially **younger age** is proposed for the relevant geodynamic event. The reasoning is cartometric: the Ptolemaic *Geographia* (c. 150 AD) documents the Elster Cluster in the eastern Harz foreland — not yet displaced by 93 km. The displacement must postdate 150 AD. The postulated date of ≈525–531 AD (most probable window: late November 530 to early 531 AD) is consistent with all available historical and natural-scientific evidence.

The apparent Palaeoproterozoic age (≈2 Ga) derived from detrital zircons and Proterozoic sediments is explained by **age inheritance**: radiometric dates reflect older enclosed fragments rather than the impact event itself. The full structural and mechanical analysis of the Tábor impact hypothesis is presented in Section 32.

6.3 GISP2 Ice Core Evidence and the Multi-Fragment Scenario

The GISP2 ice core (Abbott et al., 2014) records **four discrete chondritic particle horizons** in the window 533–540 AD — direct cosmochemical confirmation of a fragmented cometary source. This model invokes a Shoemaker-Levy 9 analogue: a fragmented cometary train producing multiple near-simultaneous impactors with different target zones across Europe. The multi-fragment scenario and its consequences for CDF reactivation are analysed in detail in Section 28.

The role of Halley's Comet (documented perihelion 530 AD) as a possible fragmentation source is discussed in Section 34 in the context of the full historical evidence table.

7. Impact-Triggered Fracturing, Secondary Volcanism, and Hydrothermal Activity Around the Český Kráter

The regional clustering of Central European kaolin deposits is strikingly non-random and follows tectonic depressions, grabens, and fault zones within and around the Bohemian Massif, as Jasmund & Lagaly (1993) illustrate in their map of kaolin deposits. Major concentrations occur in western/central Bohemia (Karlovy Vary granites, Plzeň/Podbořany arkoses), extending northward into Saxony (Kemmlitz district, Meissen area, Lusatia/Lausitz) and adjacent zones along the Ore Mountains (Erzgebirge/Krušné hory) deformation front.

Under this model, the Český Kráter's radial and concentric fractures served as long-lived conduits for magma ascent and CO_2-rich hydrothermal fluids, even hundreds of kilometres from the centre. These deep-seated weaknesses reactivated the Central German Fault Zone (CDF) and segments of the TESZ, channelling both Permian secondary volcanism and prolonged Cretaceous–Tertiary fluid circulation.

7.1 Permian Volcanic-Hydrothermal Precursor

Seyhan (1971) establishes the primary petrogenetic framework: kaolinisation is predominantly magmatic-hydrothermal, beginning during volcanic and magmatic activity itself through rapid pH fluctuations in acidic thermal solutions. Götze et al. (2024) provide direct evidence from the NW-Saxonian Basin (Kemmlitz rhyolite, ≈290 Ma): fluid-inclusion data indicate agate formation above 150°C, with silica mobilisation starting during the late volcanic stage. Trace-element signatures include high boron (29 ppm), germanium (>18 ppm), and uranium (>19 ppm) — evidence of intense fluid-rock interaction involving magmatic volatiles.

7.2 Tertiary Reworking and Economic Deposits

Schmitz (2008) documents the Tertiary reworking of this system into economic kaolinitic clay deposits in the same regions — Lusatia (Oberlausitz: Caminau and Wiesa granodiorite-kaolins) and the Geiseltal near Halle (Spergau Buntsandstein-kaolin and Roßbach clays). These clays are the fine-grained terrestrial relocated products of a thick Upper Cretaceous–Tertiary kaolinitic weathering crust developed on basement rocks. The statistical spatial analysis of this clustering (binomial distance test, $p \approx 0.018$ at $r = 270$ km) is presented in Section 20.

7.3 Shock Minerals as Structural Tracers

Shock minerals provide the "smoking gun" for the impact; their spatial alignment along the rectified grid (≈28 km per degree) confirms the physical relevance of the reconstruction and explains why kaolinisation intensity peaks where fracture density is highest.

8. The Geodynamic Chain-Reaction Model

8.1 Lithospheric Weaknesses and Tectonic Reactivation

The geodynamic model is underpinned by deep seismic and potential-field data, which confirm that the Caledonian Deformation Front (CDF) and the Trans-European Suture Zone (TESZ) served as long-lived lithospheric weaknesses, repeatedly reactivated by subsequent stress fields. Along the MONA LISA profile 3, Lyngsie & Thybo (2007) demonstrate clear crustal differentiation: Avalonia crust ($\rho \approx 2715\ \mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$) was obliquely thrust over the lower Baltica crust ($\rho \approx 2775$ kg m^{-3}) in a ramp–flat–ramp geometry spanning roughly 150 km.

Nielsen et al. (2007) link mid-Palaeocene North Atlantic rifting (≈62 Ma) to the later reactivation of the CDF/TESZ under renewed compression. Using an elastic spherical shell model ($E = 70$ GPa, $\nu = 0.25$, $T_e \approx 7$ km), they calculated the compressive force of Africa–Europe convergence as $\sigma_{\text{Africa-Europe}} \approx 3\text{–}4 \times 10^{12}$ N m^{-1}. Nielsen's work establishes the European lithosphere's mechanical sensitivity to plate-boundary stress propagation — precisely the framework invoked here.

For the transmission of stress from a source over distance r to the CDF, an exponential attenuation law applies:

$$\sigma_{\text{CDF}} = \sigma_0 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{r}{L_e}\right) \tag{5}$$

where $L_e \approx 700\text{–}1000$ km is the elastic relaxation length of the European plate. For $r \approx 450$ km (Český Kráter to CDF main trace), ≈59 % of the applied source stress would reach the CDF — sufficient for tectonic reactivation if the source stress σ_0 reaches a significant impulsive level.

8.2 The North Sea Central Graben as Compressional Syncline

While classical geology views the North Sea Central Graben as an ancient, purely extensional rift system, extreme NNE-SSW compressional forces are postulated to have caused sudden folding of the crust. In this scenario, the Central Graben acted as a syncline or marine foreland basin violently compressed and forced downward by orogenic folding to the north. This abrupt tectonic reactivation generated immense geological instability, acting as a massive shock that caused gigantic sediment masses to collapse — an event analogous to the Storegga Slide.

Arfai et al. (2018) confirm an anomalous Quaternary subsidence pattern in the northwestern German North Sea, with subsidence rates reaching 480 m/Ma. The residual unexplained subsidence of ≈180 m (≈17 %) is reinterpreted as the elastic crustal depression from compressional over-deepening. The volumetric estimate of tsunami sediment as a northward coastal migration driver ($V_{\text{required}} \approx 360$ km^3 $\approx 12.9\,\%$ of the Storegga slide volume) is detailed in Section 22.

8.3 The Biaxial Bramsche–Český Kráter Stress Field

The Bramsche Pluton (8.00° E / 52.42° N), the Geiseltal impact centre (11.73° E / 51.33° N), and the Český Kráter centre near Tábor (14.67° E / 49.42° N) define a structural corridor at approximate azimuth ≈ 120°/300° with a total length of ≈ 530 km. The biaxial loading between the boundary forces pre-loads the system to within 5 MPa of the

Coulomb failure threshold for pre-saturated Triassic sediments (Mildner, 2025/2026, Part 4, § 5). Under this pre-loading, the Geiseltal impact acts as a **cascade trigger** in a lithosphere already near failure — a physically far more economical model than a purely impact-driven displacement (cf. the energy budget in **Part 4, § 7.2**).

8.4 The Lausitz Block as Rigid Tectonic Anchor

The Lausitz Block (Lusatian Granodiorite, Neoproterozoic–Cambrian, 505–520 Ma) functioned as a **rigid tectonic anchor** that channelled and localised stresses, compelling neighbouring crustal blocks — including the Fläming, Harz, and Thuringian Forest — into characteristic rotations and bends. The Elbe Lineament (Elbezone), an ≈500 km long NW–SE-striking crustal boundary, served as the primary transmission channel for dextral block rotation. For a dextral rotation about the Senftenberg pivot (13.97° E / 51.54° N) with mean lever arm $\bar{R} \approx 138$ km, the rotation angle is:

$$\alpha = 2 \arcsin\left(\frac{93.1}{2 \times 138}\right) \approx 39.3^\circ \text{ (dextral, clockwise)} \tag{6}$$

The full kinematic analysis, energy budget, and priority drill tests are presented in Section 31.

8.5 The Storegga Slide and Doggerland

The Storegga Slide tsunami (Weninger et al., 2008) involved 2,400–3,200 km^3 of material, with run-up heights of 10–12 m on the Norwegian coast and ≈3 m in the southern North Sea. In the revised chronology presented here, the geodynamically triggered analogue of this event was not a prehistoric Stone Age phenomenon but a much more recent geodynamic chain reaction directly responsible for reshaping modern European coastal topography. A Mercator map (*Nova et aucta orbis terrae descriptio*, 1569) records a landmass in the *Oceanus Germanicus* as *Albionis Pars* ("Part of Britain"), which is read here as a transmission witness of a still-extant shallow shelf area captured in the ancient cartographic source tradition. Both the chronological conflict and the falsifiability criteria are addressed in Section 21.

8.6 Methodological Robustness: Against Rubber-Sheeting

The reconstruction is strictly constrained by an unyielding matrix of fixed global scaling, hydrology, geological curvature, and verifiable geochemical anomalies. The model relies on Bayesian modelling, spatial point-pattern analysis (Ripley's K-function), and spatial autocorrelation (Moran's I test). Coordinate residuals are treated not as statistical noise, but as tectonically induced signals.

The model is rigidly constrained by four simultaneous, independent constraints that no arbitrary digital distortion algorithm can satisfy jointly:

(1) **Geometric scaling rigidity:** $k = 28$ km/° derived from the empirically measurable Rhine–Elbe baseline.

(2) **Hydrographic topological constraint:** The identified river system must have two major source branches travelling >50 % of their northward course south of a specific mountain range, converging east of it — exactly fulfilled in the Lusatian Schwarze Elster/Spree system.

(3) **Cartographic curvature constraint:** The graphic bend of the *Asciburgius Mons* on the Germanus map must correspond to a geologically verified tectonic hinge zone.

(4) **Geochemical anchor:** *Budorigum* = Doberlug-Kirchhain falls on a stress metamorphism anomaly independently measurable from cartometry (see Section 14.2 and Section 35).

9. Summary of Part I: Conclusions

The general model framework presented in Part I establishes the following principal points:

1. **Cartometric foundation:** The affine transformation of Ptolemy's *Geographike Hyphegesis* with scaling factor $k \approx 28$ km per Ptolemaic degree of longitude reveals a statistically irrefutable eastward displacement of the Elster-Lusatia Cluster of $\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -93.1$ km ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$), incompatible with uniform measurement error.

2. **ED-E hypothesis:** The Event-Dark-Earth hypothesis offers a falsifiable, physically motivated alternative to the gardening theory for the ubiquitous Dark Earth horizons of the Migration Period.

3. **Historical convergence:** Four independent cosmochemical horizons in the GISP2 ice core (533–540 AD), dendroclimatic anomalies, Byzantine court chronicles, the Edessa flood chronicle, the settlement hiatus over the impact zone, and the simultaneous political collapse of the Thuringian Kingdom all converge on a catastrophic central European event in the window 525–540 AD.

4. **Geodynamic chain reaction:** Impact-triggered CDF reactivation, compressional syncline formation in the North Sea, and block rotation of the Elster-Lusatia domain constitute a mechanically coherent cascade that explains both the cartometric anomaly and the documented environmental collapse.

Part II

Cartometric Foundations, Residual Analysis of the Gazetteer, and Statistical Interpretation of the Systematic Offset Structure

10. Introduction to the Cartometric Model

The currently paradigmatically influential reference model, the statistical-geodetic rectification of the TU Berlin group (Karlsen et al., 2011), explains deviations between Ptolemaic coordinates and modern topography primarily as measurement errors of ancient instruments or as transmission artefacts.

The model developed here opposes this concept. The **primary explanatory principle** is not the correction of errors in the ancient map itself, but the recognition that the **northern reference line** — the coastline of the *Oceanus Germanicus* — lay approximately **120 km further south** during antiquity than today. Since medieval cartographers such as Donnus Nicolaus Germanus were unaware of this shift, they projected Ptolemaic coordinates onto an already geographically transformed landscape. The result was a systematic northward stretching of the map image, which inevitably produced a proportional eastward displacement of all eastern coordinates — thereby shifting the Ptolemaic *Vistula Fluvius* from its original Lusatian context all the way to the Polish Vistula. Geodynamic processes (reactivation of the CDF, lateral extrusion, block rotations) represent a **secondary**, here quantitatively investigated component.

11. The Cartometric Transformation Model

11.1 Scaling of the Ptolemaic Degree of Longitude

The core element of the rectification is an empirically determined, spatially fixed scaling factor k for the Ptolemaic degree of longitude. This is derived from the physical distance between the mouths of two invariant reference rivers — the Rhenus Fluvius (central mouth, $\lambda_P = 27.00°$) and the Albis Fluvius ($\lambda_P = 31.00°$), as well as the Vistula Fluvius ($\lambda_P = 45.00°$; identification: Oderberg, at the mouth of the reconstructed "United Vistula" into the *Oceanus Germanicus*).

The two independent baseline estimates are (Mildner, 2025/2026):

$$k_1 = \frac{d_{\text{Rh-El}}}{\Delta\lambda_{P,\,\text{Rh-El}}} = \frac{\approx 115\,\text{km}}{4°} \approx 28.75\,\frac{\text{km}}{°} \tag{7}$$

$$k_2 = \frac{d_{\text{Rh-Vi}}}{\Delta\lambda_{P,\,\text{Rh-Vi}}} = \frac{\approx 490\,\text{km}}{18^\circ} \approx 27.22\,\frac{\text{km}}{^\circ} \tag{8}$$

The weighted mean (weighted by baseline length in Ptolemaic degrees: 4° and 18° respectively) yields:

$$k = \frac{4 \cdot k_1 + 18 \cdot k_2}{22} = \frac{115 + 490}{22} \approx 27.5\,\frac{\text{km}}{^\circ} \tag{9}$$

For the back-transformation into geographic degrees of longitude at mean latitude $\bar{\phi} \approx 52.5^\circ$ N:

$$\frac{\Delta\lambda_{\text{mod}}}{\Delta\lambda_P} = \frac{k}{111.3\,\text{km}/^\circ \cdot \cos\bar{\phi}} = \frac{27.5}{111.3 \times 0.609} = 0.406\,\frac{^\circ_{\text{geogr.}}}{^\circ_{\text{Ptol.}}} \tag{10}$$

11.2 Affine Coordinate Transformation Model

The complete coordinate transformation from Ptolemaic to modern geographic coordinates is modelled as an **affine mapping**:

$$\lambda_{\text{mod}} = a_1 + a_2 \cdot \lambda_P + a_3 \cdot \phi_P \tag{11}$$

$$\phi_{\text{mod}} = b_1 + b_2 \cdot \lambda_P + b_3 \cdot \phi_P \tag{12}$$

with six coefficients to be determined. The minimisation functional for the least-squares adjustment over all n gazetteer points is:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \left[\left(\lambda_{\text{mod},i} - \hat{\lambda}_{\text{mod},i}\right)^2 + \left(\phi_{\text{mod},i} - \hat{\phi}_{\text{mod},i}\right)^2 \right] \to \text{ min} \tag{13}$$

Since exactly three invariant anchor points (Rhine, Elbe, and Vistula mouths) are available for calibration, the system of equations is exactly determined, and the three anchor points define the transformation parameters completely.

11.3 Solution of the System of Equations

Calibration points (coordinate values in decimal degrees):

Table 1: Invariant anchor points used for calibration of the affine transformation. Identifications after Mildner (2025/2026).

Point	λ_P	ϕ_P	λ_{mod}	ϕ_{mod}
Rhenus Fl. (central mouth)	27.00	53.167	6.750	52.250
Albis Fl. (mouth)	31.00	56.250	8.583	53.183
Vistula Fl. (mouth/Oderberg)	45.00	56.000	14.150	52.867

The linear system of equations for the longitude transformation reads in matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 27.00 & 53.17 \\ 1 & 31.00 & 56.25 \\ 1 & 45.00 & 56.00 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ a_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 6.750 \\ 8.583 \\ 14.150 \end{pmatrix} \tag{14}$$

The solution yields the following **transformation parameters**:

Fitted transformation parameters

$$\lambda_{\text{mod}} = -8.114 + 0.3989\,\lambda_P + 0.0770\,\phi_P$$

$$\phi_{\text{mod}} = +35.458 - 0.0167\,\lambda_P + 0.3244\,\phi_P$$

The **longitude scaling parameter** $a_2 = 0.3989$ corresponds in ground kilometres at $\bar{\phi} = 52.5°$ N:

$$k_\lambda = a_2 \cdot 111.3 \cdot \cos(52.5°) = 0.3989 \times 67.7 = 27.0\ \frac{\text{km}}{{}^\circ_P} \tag{15}$$

This confirms the stated value of $\approx 28\,\text{km}$ per Ptolemaic degree of longitude with a deviation of only 3.5 %. The **latitude scaling parameter** $b_3 = 0.3244$ yields:

$$k_\phi = b_3 \cdot 111.3 = 0.3244 \times 111.3 = 36.1\ \frac{\text{km}}{{}^\circ_P} \tag{16}$$

The pronounced asymmetry ($k_\lambda \approx 27$ vs. $k_\phi \approx 36\,\text{km}/°$) reflects the systematic latitude distortion in the Ptolemaic coordinate system for northern Europe.

12. Residual Analysis of the Gazetteer

12.1 Methodology

For all 22 non-calibration points in the gazetteer, the **prediction residuals** are calculated as:

$$\Delta\lambda = \hat{\lambda}_{\text{mod}} - \lambda_{\text{Mild}}, \qquad \Delta\phi = \hat{\phi}_{\text{mod}} - \phi_{\text{Mild}} \tag{17}$$

Conversion to ground kilometres at the mean latitude $\bar{\phi}$ of each point:

$$\Delta\lambda_{\text{km}} = \Delta\lambda \cdot 111.3 \cdot \cos\bar{\phi}, \qquad \Delta\phi_{\text{km}} = \Delta\phi \cdot 111.3 \tag{18}$$

The scalar total residual vector is the Euclidean norm:

$$r_i = \sqrt{\Delta\lambda_{\mathrm{km},i}^2 + \Delta\phi_{\mathrm{km},i}^2} \tag{19}$$

A negative $\Delta\lambda_{\mathrm{km}}$ indicates that the transformed prediction lies *west* of the identified location, i.e., the identified location is further east than the linear model predicts.

12.2 Results of the Residual Analysis

Table 2: Residual analysis of all gazetteer points. K = calibration point; Elster-Cl. = Elster Cluster; Cal. = calibration. Source of Ptolemaic coordinates and identifications: Mildner (2025/2026).

No.	Name / Identification	$\Delta\lambda_{\mathrm{km}}$	$\Delta\phi_{\mathrm{km}}$	r [km]	Group
K1	Rhenus Fl. – Hengelo/Enschede	0.0	0.0	**0.0**	Cal.
K2	Albis Fl. – NW Bremen	0.0	0.0	**0.0**	Cal.
K3	Vistula Fl. – Oderberg	0.0	0.0	**0.0**	Cal.
F1	Vistula main source – Königswartha	−61.5	+52.1	80.5	Lusatia
F2	Vistula western source – Königsbrück	−133.0	+67.4	149.2	Lusatia
F3	Chalusus Fl. – Havelberg	−74.5	+21.0	77.4	Coast
F4	Suebus Fl. – Neuruppin	−63.4	+16.4	65.5	Coast
F5	Viadua Fl. – Finowfurt	−32.3	+7.1	33.1	Coast
S1	Agrippinensis – Cologne*	−6.9	+73.0	73.3	Gallia Belg.
S2	Aliso – Haltern am See*	−20.9	−1.8	21.0	Gallia Belg.
S3	Budorigum – Doberlug-Kirchhain	−87.1	+26.9	**91.2**	Elster-Cl.
S4	Calisia – Calau	−38.2	+13.7	40.6	Lusatia-E
S5	Limis Lucus – Baruth/Mark	−78.2	+9.2	**78.7**	Elster-Cl.
S6	Lugidunum – Falkenberg/Elster	−109.5	+24.5	**112.2**	Elster-Cl.
S7	Stragona – Herzberg/Elster	−101.0	+11.8	**101.7**	Elster-Cl.
S8	Treva – Bremen	+26.6	−7.9	27.8	Coast-W
S9	Lirimiris – Bispingen/Soltau	−5.9	−24.6	25.3	Coast-W
G1	Asciburgius Mons NW – E. Magdeburg	−46.5	+17.6	49.7	Fläming
G2	Asciburgius Mons SE – Calauer Schweiz	−31.3	+18.7	36.3	Fläming
G3	Melibocus Mons W – Harz W	−23.3	−7.2	24.4	Harz
G4	Melibocus Mons E – Harz/Eisleben	−41.2	+39.1	55.2	Harz
G5	Sudete Mons W – Thur. Forest/Kassel	−19.8	−13.7	23.9	Thuringia
G6	Sudete Mons E – Thur. Slate Mts	+11.2	+71.6	72.5	Thuringia
G7	Sarmate Mons N – Lusatian Highlands	−93.9	−2.2	94.0	Lusatia
G8	Abnobae Mons W – Taunus	+11.2	+91.2	91.9	South

*Agrippinensis and Aliso derive from Gallia Belgica (Chapter 8) and were recorded under a different measurement system; their latitude residuals are evaluated separately.

13. Statistical Evaluation and Group Analysis

13.1 Regional RMSE Analysis

From the residual magnitudes, the root mean square error (RMSE) is calculated for each homogeneous subgroup:

$$\mathrm{RMSE}_G = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_G}\sum_{i\in G} r_i^2} \tag{20}$$

Table 3: Regional RMSE by point group. The Elster Cluster shows a RMSE 3.6 × larger than the coastal settlements, demanding a geodynamic explanation.

Group	n	RMSE [km]	Mean $\Delta\lambda_{\mathrm{km}}$
Calibration (river mouths)	3	**0.0**	0.0
Elster Cluster (S3,S5,S6,S7)	4	**96.8**	−94.0
Coastal settlements W (S8, S9)	2	**26.6**	+10.4
Coastal rivers (F3–F5)	3	**59.5**	−56.7
Fläming (Asciburgius Mons, G1–G2)	2	**43.0**	−38.9
Harz (Melibocus Mons, G3–G4)	2	**42.7**	−32.3
Thuringian Forest (Sudete Mons, G5–G6)	2	**54.0**	−4.3
Lusatia / Sarmate (G7, F1)	2	**87.3**	−77.7
Gallia Belgica (S1–S2)	2	**47.2**	−13.9

The factor of **3.6** between the Elster Cluster RMSE (96.8 km) and the coastal settlement RMSE (26.6 km) is incompatible with spatially uniform measurement errors and requires a geodynamic explanation.

13.2 t-Test for Systematic Eastward Offset

For the four Elster Cluster points, the $\Delta\lambda$ residuals in degrees are:

$$\Delta\lambda \in \{-1.258^\circ,\ -1.142^\circ,\ -1.583^\circ,\ -1.460^\circ\}$$

$$\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -1.361^\circ, \qquad s_{\Delta\lambda} = 0.198^\circ \tag{21}$$

One-tailed t-test ($H_0\colon \mu_{\Delta\lambda} = 0$; $H_1\colon \mu_{\Delta\lambda} < 0$):

$$t = \frac{\overline{\Delta\lambda}}{s_{\Delta\lambda}/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{-1.361}{0.099} = -13.7 \tag{22}$$

For $df = 3$, $t_{\text{crit}} = -7.45$ at $\alpha = 0.001$ (one-tailed). Since $|t| = 13.7 > 7.45$, H_0 is rejected at the **0.1 % significance level** ($p < 0.001$). The mean eastward offset in ground kilometres is:

$$\overline{\Delta\lambda}_{\text{km}} = -1.361^\circ \times 111.3 \times \cos(52^\circ) = -93.1\,\text{km} \tag{23}$$

Key statistical finding: Elster Cluster

The Elster/Fläming/Lusatia block is displaced systematically **≈93 km eastward** relative to the linear coastal-calibration prediction ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$). This is incompatible with uniform measurement error and requires a geodynamic, tectonic-block-offset explanation.

14. Geodynamic Interpretation of the Residual Patterns

14.1 The Elster Cluster: Signature of Tectonic Eastward Offset

The highly significant eastward offset is consistent with the hypothesis of a **regional, coherent crustal block offset**. Reactivation of the Caledonian Deformation Front generated an NNW–SSE directed compressional regime. Lateral extrusion of sedimentary masses from the northwest (towards the Cimbrian Peninsula) advanced accretionary wedges against the western flank of the Fläming. Since the Lusatian crustal block in the southeast (Senftenberg area) acted as a **fixed rotation pivot**, a **dextral rotation** of the Fläming massif occurred, displacing the western limb eastward — producing the ≈90 km eastward offset of today's Elster-Lusatia complex.

Geophysically, Deutschmann et al. (2018) document six polyphase reactivation episodes of the TESZ weakness zone from the Caledonian collision to Late Cretaceous inversion tectonics. Lyngsie & Thybo (2007) document a 150 km wide overthrust zone of Avalonian crust over the Baltica lower crustal shield — the deep-crustal geometry enabling such block displacement in geologically younger time.

14.2 Geochemical Verification: Anthracite at Budorigum

The residual of Budorigum (S3, $r = 91.2\,\text{km}$) falls precisely at the postulated tectonic hinge zone. Near-surface anthracite deposits at Doberlug-Kirchhain — anomalous for their depth, since standard deep-burial anthracite requires $T > 150\,^\circ\text{C}$ at several kilometres depth — are interpreted as direct evidence of **stress metamorphism** at the shear-zone upper boundary. The convergence of a purely cartometric residual vector with an independently measured petrographic anomaly at the identical geographic location constitutes a methodologically powerful cross-validation that cannot be attributed to coincidence.

15. Methodological Defence against Criticism

15.1 The Rubber-Sheeting Argument and its Refutation

The model is rigidly constrained by four simultaneous, independent constraints that no arbitrary digital distortion algorithm can satisfy jointly:

(1) **Geometric scaling rigidity:** $k = 28\,\text{km}/^\circ$ derived from the empirically measurable Rhine–Elbe baseline.

(2) **Hydrographic topological constraint:** The identified river system must have two major source branches travelling $> 50\,\%$ of their northward course *south* of a specific mountain range, converging *east* of it — exactly fulfilled in the Lusatian Schwarze Elster/Spree system.

(3) **Cartographic curvature constraint:** The graphic bend of the Asciburgius Mons on the Germanus map must correspond to a geologically verified tectonic hinge zone.

(4) **Geochemical anchor:** Budorigum = Doberlug-Kirchhain falls on a stress metamorphism anomaly independently measurable from cartometry.

15.2 Falsifiability and Scientific Status

The model is explicitly falsifiable through:

- Targeted archaeological deep drilling at newly calculated coordinates (Budorigum, Lugidunum).
- Micromorphological analysis of Dark Earth horizons against criteria P1–P6 of the Event-Dark-Earth test concept (Section 3.3).
- Independent OSL dating of the matrix phase of the Český Kráter (Rajlich, 1992).

16. Summary of Part II: Conclusions

1. **Scaling consistency:** The derived longitude scaling parameter $k = 27.0\,\text{km}/^\circ_P$ confirms the $\approx 28\,\text{km}/^\circ$ value within measurement precision.

2. **Statistically significant eastward offset:** The Elster Cluster shows $\overline{\Delta} = -93.1\,\text{km}$ ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$), incompatible with uniform measurement error and requiring a geodynamic tectonic-block explanation.

3. **Spatially autocorrelated residual structure:** Coastal RMSE $\approx 27\,\text{km}$ vs. Elster inland RMSE $\approx 97\,\text{km}$ (factor 3.6) — consistent with geodynamically controlled, non-uniform deformation.

4. **Geochemical convergence:** Cartometric identification Budorigum = Doberlug-Kirchhain coincides with anthracite stress metamorphism, providing a method-

ologically independent verification.

5. **Methodological superiority:** Four simultaneous independent constraints distinguish this model fundamentally from arbitrary map distortion.

Part III

Extended Evidence Analysis: CDF Reactivation, Radial Kaolin Genesis Around the Český Kráter, Correlation with the Storegga Slide, and Tsunami-Driven Coastal Migration

17. Synthesis of Evidence Chains: The Necessity of an Integrated View

The statistically secured findings of Part II — a highly significant eastward offset of the Elster-Lusatia Cluster of $\overline{\Delta}_\lambda \approx -93.1\,\text{km}$ ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$) and the geochemical convergence of the cartometric identification *Budorigum* = Doberlug-Kirchhain with the local anthracite stress metamorphism anomaly — demand a geophysical explanation that goes beyond purely statistical coordinate analysis. Four key publications (Nielsen et al., 2007; Arfai et al., 2018; Götze et al., 2024; Weninger et al., 2008) together with Kužvart (1992) and Geersen et al. (2024) provide methodologically heterogeneous but independently derived building blocks, systematically evaluated in the following sections and synthesised with the present model.

Particular attention is devoted to the Mercator map cited in the model, which shows a landmass named *Albionis Pars* in the *Oceanus Germanicus*, and to the hypothesis that a triggered tsunami may have contributed — through sediment deposition along the North German coast — to an additional northward migration of the coastline.

18. The Reactivatability of the CDF: Plate Stress Transmission According to Nielsen, Stephenson & Thomsen (2007)

18.1 Core Finding of the Study

Nielsen et al. (2007) demonstrated, through high-resolution nannoplankton chronostratigraphy of the Sorgenfrei-Tornquist Zone (STZ), a direct causal link between mid-Palaeocene North Atlantic rifting (≈62 Ma) and an abrupt, plate-wide synchronous change in the intra-European stress regime. Using an elastic spherical shell model ($E = 70\,\text{GPa}$, $\nu = 0.25$, $T_e \approx 7\,\text{km}$), they calculated the compressive force of the Africa–Europe convergence as:

$$\sigma_{\text{Africa-Europe}} \approx 3\text{–}4 \times 10^{12}\ \text{N}\,\text{m}^{-1} \tag{24}$$

The key conclusion for this model: *the European plate system can respond plate-wide and near-instantaneously to changes in plate boundary forces — without any thermal* *mantle plume being required.*

18.2 Relevance for CDF Reactivation

For the transmission of stress from a source (e.g., postulated impact structures) over distance r to a target (CDF), an exponential attenuation law applies:

$$\sigma_{\text{CDF}} = \sigma_0 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{r}{L_e}\right) \tag{25}$$

where $L_e \approx 700{-}1000\,\text{km}$ (elastic relaxation length of the European plate). For $r \approx 450\,\text{km}$ (Český Kráter to CDF main trace, NNW):

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{CDF}}}{\sigma_0} = \exp\left(-\frac{450}{850}\right) \approx \exp(-0.529) \approx 0.59 \tag{26}$$

Approximately **59 % of the applied source stress** would reach the CDF — sufficient for tectonic reactivation if σ_0 reaches the order of a significant impulsive source.

19. Anomalous Quaternary Subsidence: Arfai et al. (2018)

19.1 Data Findings

Arfai et al. (2018) determined in the northwestern German North Sea sector a maximum Quaternary sediment thickness of **1,045 m** with subsidence rates up to **480 m/Ma** — a $> 10\times$ increase over Cenozoic averages. Load-induced subsidence via the Airy isostasy model:

$$y_{\text{Airy}} = S^* \cdot \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_m} = 1045\,\text{m} \cdot \frac{2080}{3270} \approx 665\,\text{m} \tag{27}$$

Adding compaction of Neogene/Palaeogene strata (150−250 m):

$$y_{\text{total}} = 665 + 200 = 865\,\text{m} \tag{28}$$

The unexplained residual subsidence:

$$\Delta y_{\text{Residual}} = 1045 - 865 = 180\,\text{m} \quad (\approx 17\,\%) \tag{29}$$

Arfai et al. rule out renewed rifting, salt diapirism, and lithospheric buckling as explanations.

19.2 Reinterpretation

The North Sea Central Graben is postulated to represent not a classical extensional structure but a **compressional syncline** resulting from NNE-SSW directed folding — analogous to a foreland basin of an orogenic front to the north. The NNW-SSE orientation of the depocentre is consistent with a synclinal axis under NS compression, directly linking to Nielsen et al.'s (2007) flexural deepening framework. The 180 m residual subsidence would correspond to the elastic crustal depression from compressional over-deepening.

20. Radial Kaolin Genesis Around the Český Kráter

in Version 3 — revised crater rim definition, corrected binomial test, extended deposit inventory

Following corrections relative to v2 apply throughout this section:

1. The northwestern part of the **outer crater rim** of the Český Kráter (facing towards Germania Magna) is identified morphotectonically with the **Erzgebirge escarpment** (Erzgebirgsabbruch, ≈ 50.3–50.7° N), the fault-controlled mountain front along the German–Czech border, at a radius of ≈ 130–150 km from the crater centre. This is consistent with Rajlich's (1992) documented outer ring.
2. The relevant hydrothermal test boundary is the **farthest documented Rajlich ring** ($r \approx 270$ km), within which fluid pathways are confirmed.
3. The deposit inventory has been extended from $n = 8$ to $n = 14$ kaolin sites using all entries from the KML layer `possible Impact Structures` (version 18e).
4. A short section regarding the spatial relationship between the crater structures and the hard coal deposits along the rim zone was inserted.

20.1 Götze et al. (2024): Magmatic-Hydrothermal Genesis in NW-Saxony

Götze et al. (2024) demonstrate, from the Kemmlitz rhyolite (≈290 Ma, NW-Saxony), that agate-bearing lithophysae formed exclusively in a glassy pitchstone facies. Fluid-inclusion homogenisation temperatures document primary magmatic-hydrothermal silica mobilisation:

$$T_h^{\min} \in \{134\,^\circ\mathrm{C}\ (\text{Gröppendorf}),\ 157\,^\circ\mathrm{C}\ (\text{Börtewitz}),\ 177\,^\circ\mathrm{C}\ (\text{Mügeln})\} \tag{30}$$

Geochemical anomalies in the agates: $\mathrm{B} = 29$ ppm, $\mathrm{Ge} > 18$ ppm, $\mathrm{U} > 19$ ppm — values significantly exceeding host-rock backgrounds, pointing to chemical transport reactions (CTR) involving F/Cl, CO_2, and heated meteoric waters. Chondrite-normalised REE patterns show:

$$\frac{\mathrm{Eu}}{\mathrm{Eu}^*} = 0.004{-}0.16, \qquad \frac{\mathrm{Ce}}{\mathrm{Ce}^*} = 1.23{-}1.55 \tag{31}$$

— a classic hydrothermal formation profile (Götze et al., 2024). The Kemmlitz deposit itself lies ≈271 km from the Český Kráter centre and ≈**50 km north** of the Erzgebirge escarpment (outer crater rim proxy), placing it in the proximal extra-crater zone of maximum ring-fracture hydrothermal permeability.

Kužvart (1992) documents that tectonic predisposition (jointing, cataclasis, mylonitisation) opens rocks to kaolinisation at depths reaching **80–113 m** in tectonically stressed zones. Post-kaolinisation tectonic depressions (grabens) preferentially preserve deposits — a pattern directly consistent with the ring-fracture architecture of a large impact structure.

20.2 Structural Geometry: The Erzgebirge Escarpment as Crater Rim Proxy

In Mildner's model, the **Erzgebirge escarpment** (Erzgebirgsabbruch) — the pronounced NW–SE striking, fault-controlled mountain front along the German–Czech border at approximately 50.3–50.7° N — represents the **northern outer rim** of the Český Kráter (Table 4). This identification is supported by three independent lines of evidence:

1. **Geometric consistency:** The great-circle distance from the crater centre (Tábor, 14.67° E / 49.42° N) to the Erzgebirge crest line is ≈ 190–210 km — within the postulated outer crater radius of 125–150 km from the inner ring, yielding a total radius of ≈ 165–220 km, consistent with Mildner's outer crater diameter of 250–300 km.

2. **Rajlich ring concordance:** Rajlich's (1992) documented ring anomaly closest to 200 km from the centre aligns with the topographic and structural break of the escarpment. The farthest ring at ≈ 270 km corresponds to the ring-fracture system within which Kemmlitz and Caminau are situated.

3. **Structural character:** The Erzgebirge escarpment is a primary tectonic boundary (Variscan reworked under Alpine compression), not merely an erosional feature. It is precisely the type of pre-existing structural discontinuity that large impacts reactivate and exploit as ring-fracture conduits for hydrothermal fluids (Kužvart, 1992).

The consequence for the kaolin deposits north of the escarpment is geometrically clear:

$$d_{\text{deposit–rim}} \approx d_{\text{deposit–centre}} - r_{\text{outer}} \approx 265\,\text{km} - 220\,\text{km} = 45\,\text{km} \qquad \text{(Caminau)} \tag{32}$$

All economically significant Saxon and Lusatian kaolin deposits (Kemmlitz, Caminau, Meissen area) cluster within **40–55 km north of this rim**, precisely in the zone where ring-fracture conduits intersect the regional décollement at shallow crustal levels — the optimal position for ascending hydrothermal fluids to discharge and produce economic kaolinisation (cf. Kužvart 1992, p. 326: maximum kaolinisation depth in fracture zones 80–113 m).

20.3 Distance Analysis: Three-Zone Model

The structural geometry of the Český Kráter defines three concentric zones relevant to kaolin genesis (Table 4). Distances d_i are computed at $\bar{\phi} \approx 49.8°$ N:

$$d_i = \sqrt{(\Delta\phi_i \cdot 111.3)^2 + (\Delta\lambda_i \cdot 111.3 \cdot \cos\bar{\phi})^2} \tag{33}$$

Table 4: Structural zones of the Český Kráter used in the distance analysis (Mildner 2026 parameters).

Zone	Radius	Diameter	Character
Zone A: Inner crater	40–45 km	80–90 km	direct melt/breccia; UHP minerals
Zone B: Outer crater rim	130–150 km	250–300 km	= Erzgebirge escarpment; primary ring fractures
Zone C: Farthest Rajlich ring	≈270 km	≈540 km	outermost fluid conduit zone; kaolin clustering

Table 5: Distances of major Central European kaolin deposits from the Český Kráter centre and from the Erzgebirge escarpment (outer rim proxy). Zone after Table 4. **Bold**: Zone A or B (within outer rim). *Italic*: Zone C (within farthest Rajlich ring, $r < 270$ km).

Deposit / Region	ϕ (°N)	λ (°E)	d from centre (km)	d from rim[†] (km)	Zone
Plzeň Basin	49.75	13.40	**121**	inside	A/B
Znojmo	48.86	16.05	**105**	inside	A/B
Karlovy Vary	50.23	12.89	**184**	**30**	B
Podbořany / Kadáň	50.27	13.38	**167**	**25**	B
Ore Mts. N-margin ≈ rim	50.50	13.20	**196**	**≈0**	B
Schirnding / Hohenberg	50.08	12.23	*210*	**50**	C
Kreuzweiher	49.96	12.03	*218*	**60**	C
Hirschau / Schnaittenbach	49.53	11.96	*218*	70	C
Tirschenreuth	49.88	12.33	*210*	60	C
Kemmlitz / NW-Saxony	51.13	12.83	*271*	**50**	C
Lusatia / Caminau	51.38	14.23	*265*	**45**	C
Meissen-N (Ockrilla)	51.21	13.50	*240*	**40**	C
Meissen-S (Löthain)	51.14	13.40	*235*	**40**	C

[†] Distance from Erzgebirge escarpment (rim proxy, ≈ 50.5° N / 13.2° E); "inside" = deposit lies within outer crater boundary; "≈ 0" = deposit at rim itself.

20.4 Binomial Distance Analysis: Corrected for Extended Inventory

The null hypothesis tests whether the spatial concentration of major Central European kaolin deposits within the farthest Rajlich ring ($r = 270\,\text{km}$) is compatible with a uniform spatial distribution over the broader kaolin province of Central Europe ($R_{\max} = 450\,\text{km}$).

Test parameters (v2, $n = 14$):

- Reference radius: $r = 270\,\text{km}$ (farthest documented Rajlich ring).
- Universe radius: $R_{\max} = 450\,\text{km}$ (maximum plausible reach of any single kaolin genesis mechanism in Central Europe).
- $p_0 = (270/450)^2 = 0.360$
- Deposits within 270 km: Plzeň, Znojmo, Karlovy Vary, Podbořany, Ore Mts. N-margin, Schirnding, Kreuzweiher, Hirschau, Tirschenreuth, Kemmlitz, Caminau, Meissen-N, Meissen-S $\Rightarrow k = 13$ of $n = 14$.

$$P(X \geq 13 \,|\, n = 14,\, p_0 = 0.360) = \binom{14}{13}(0.360)^{13}(0.640) + \binom{14}{14}(0.360)^{14} \tag{34}$$

$$= 14\times(0.360)^{13}\times 0.640 + (0.360)^{14} \approx 14\times 3.63\times10^{-6}\times0.640 + 1.31\times10^{-6} \approx \mathbf{3.4\times10^{-5}} \tag{35}$$

Result: corrected binomial test (v3, $n = 14$)

At $r = 270\,\text{km}$, $k = 13$ of $n = 14$ major Central European kaolin deposits lie within the farthest Rajlich ring. The one-tailed binomial probability is $p \approx 3.4 \times 10^{-5}$ — **highly significant** ($p \ll 0.001$), substantially stronger than the v1 result ($p \approx 0.018$, $n = 8$, $k = 7$).

Of the 13 deposits inside the ring, **all 7 Saxon and Lusatian deposits** (Kemmlitz, Caminau, both Meissen sites, Schirnding, Kreuzweiher, Tirschenreuth) fall within **40–70 km north of the Erzgebirge escarpment** (outer crater rim), i.e. in the proximal extra-crater hydrothermal conduit zone.

Methodological caveat (retained from v2)

With $n = 14$ data points, this analysis still retains exploratory character. A robust test requires a complete inventory of all Central European kaolin deposits with a Ripley's K-function distance correlation test and Monte Carlo permutation tests, which are beyond the scope of the present data availability.

20.5 The Saale-Unstrut / Český Kráter Inter-Impact Corridor and Coal Deposits

A geographically notable feature visible in Table 16 is the position of the *Lugau-Oelsnitz* hard coal district ($d \approx 212$ km from the Český Kráter centre). This deposit lies:

- within the outer crater rim zone of the Český Kráter (Zone B, $d \approx 212$ km);
- ≈100 km SSE of the Saale-Unstrut outer ring boundary;
- in the **Vogtland–Ore Mountains zone exactly between the two postulated impact structures**, in direct spatial neighbourhood with the kaolin deposits of the Ore Mountains northern margin.

Together with the Freital/Döhlen Basin coal ($d \approx 240$ km from the Český Kráter centre) and the Doberlug-Kirchhain anthracite (≈66 km east of the Saale-Unstrut outer rim), these deposits define a spatially coherent belt running NW–SE between both impact structures (see also the distance data in Appendix A, Table 16).

In Mildner's model, the high-pressure shock and ground-wave pulses generated by the adjacent impacts or airbursts may have provided the mechanical energy equivalent for coalification that classical deep burial provides over geological time (stress metamorphism / dynamic coalification; cf. Section 14.2). This interpretation is consistent with the observation that all three coal occurrences listed above are anomalously shallow for their rank (anthracite and hard coal) relative to standard burial-depth curves, and that the saxonian deposits are spatially co-located with kaolin deposits that independently indicate hydrothermal activity within the Český Kráter fracture system.

A structurally significant observation concerns the **inter-impact corridor** between the two postulated impact structures. The nearest points of the outer rims of both structures define a zone approximately 100 km wide in the Vogtland–Ore Mountains region (see distance data in Appendix A.3):

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{SU-rim} \to \text{CK-rim}} &\approx d_{\text{Stolberg} \to \text{Tabor}} - r_{\text{SU,out}} - r_{\text{CK,out}} \\ &\approx 260\,\text{km} - 97.5\,\text{km} - 150\,\text{km} \approx \mathbf{12{-}100}\,\text{km} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where the range reflects the elliptical geometry of the SU structure (short axis vs. long axis). The **Lugau-Oelsnitz** hard coal district (12.73° E / 50.72° N) lies at:

- ≈ **50** km from the **SU outer rim**;
- ≈ **35** km north of the **CK outer rim** (Erzgebirge escarpment);

- directly within the inter-impact corridor in the spatial overlap zone of both shock-pressure fields.

Integrated result (v3): kaolin and coal spatial pattern

The spatial distribution of Central European kaolin and hard coal deposits defines a coherent radial pattern relative to the two postulated impact structures:

1. **Zone B/C kaolin** (40–70 km N of CK rim): Kemmlitz, Caminau, Meissen — hydrothermal fluid discharge through ring-fracture conduits.
2. **Inter-impact corridor coal** (Lugau-Oelsnitz, Freital, Oschatz): positioned between both outer rims, in the zone of maximum biaxial stress field overlap.
3. **Doberlug-Kirchhain anthracite** (≈66 km ENE of SU outer rim): interpreted as stress-metamorphic coalification at the Elster-Lusatia shear zone boundary — cartometrically co-located with the Budorigum residual anomaly ($r = 91.2$ km; Section 14.2).

This three-zone pattern is compatible with the combined shock-pressure and hydrothermal model, and provides a falsifiable spatial prediction: deposits at ca. $r < 50$ km from the CK rim should show elevated fluid-inclusion temperatures and anomalous trace-element signatures (B, Ge, U) relative to background, analogous to the Kemmlitz agates (Götze et al., 2024).

21. The Storegga Slide, Doggerland, and the Mercator Map Argument

21.1 Data Situation: Weninger et al. (2008)

Weninger et al. (2008) dated the Storegga Slide tsunami to:

$$^{14}\text{C age: } 7300 \pm 30\,^{14}\text{C-BP} \;\Rightarrow\; \text{cal. age: } 8100 \pm 100\,\text{calBP} \tag{37}$$

The slide involved 2,400−3,200 km^3 of material, with run-up heights of 10–12 m on the Norwegian coast and ≈3 m in the southern North Sea. Contemporary sea level in the southern North Sea stood at -17 ± 2 m MSL. Doggerland was undergoing continuous transgression (≈1.25 m/100 yr) and was, according to Weninger et al., catastrophically and finally flooded by this event.

21.2 The *Albionis Pars* Argument

A Mercator map (Gerhard Mercator, *Nova et aucta orbis terrae descriptio*, 1569 or later editions), records a landmass in the *Oceanus Germanicus* as *Albionis Pars* (“Part of Britain”). Rather than interpreting this as a Renaissance cartographic error, this is read here as a transmission witness of an early historical geographic reality: a still-extant shallow shelf area captured in the ancient cartographic source tradition.

This argument is supported by Weninger et al.'s (2008) documentation of Doggerland's extensive existence as a subaerially exposed, inhabited landmass ($n = 20$ dates, oldest ≈11,700 calBP) and by Geersen et al. (2024)'s discovery of the *Blinkerwall* hunting architecture at 21 m water depth — dated terminus post quem 9,143 ± 36 ^{14}C-BP.

The principal chronological conflict (Storegga ≈8100 calBP; Ptolemy ≈150 AD) is addressed through two working hypotheses: (a) the postulated 536 AD reactivation generated a new slide or sedimentation event in the northern North Sea; (b) parts of former Doggerland remained or recurred subaerially through tectonic uplift compensation.

Working hypothesis status

Both scenarios remain working hypotheses. Direct stratigraphic evidence for a post-150 AD tsunami or major slide in the northern North Sea is currently lacking. The hypothesis is falsifiable through high-resolution seismic profiles and isotope-stratigraphic boreholes covering the 5th–6th century AD transition.

22. Tsunami Sediment as a Mechanism of Northward Coastal Migration

A simple volumetric estimate tests the physical feasibility of 130 km-scale coastal northward migration through tsunami sediment progradation. Assumptions: coastline length $L = 400\,\text{km}$; progradation distance $\Delta x = 120\,\text{km}$; mean shallow-water depth $\bar{h} = 7.5\,\text{m}$.

Required sediment volume:

$$V_{\text{required}} = L \cdot \Delta x \cdot \bar{h} = 400 \times 120 \times 0.0075\,\text{km}^3 = 360\,\text{km}^3 \tag{38}$$

Fraction of total Storegga slide volume ($V_{\text{Storegga}} \approx 2{,}800\,\text{km}^3$):

$$\frac{V_{\text{required}}}{V_{\text{Storegga}}} = \frac{360}{2800} \approx 12.9\,\% \tag{39}$$

Volumetric estimate

Deposition of merely **≈13 %** of the Storegga slide volume in the southern North Sea / North German coastal zone would suffice to raise the seafloor by ≈7.5 m over a 120 km wide zone and a 400 km coastline — producing, on a sufficiently shallow gradient, the northward coastal migration described in this model.

The RSL index as a function of glacioisostatic adjustment $\delta_{\text{GIA}}(t)$, eustatic sea level

$\zeta(t)$, and tectonic vertical movement $\epsilon(t)$:

$$\eta(t) = \zeta(t) - \delta_{\mathrm{GIA}}(t) - \epsilon(t) \tag{40}$$

For the scenario postulated here — abrupt tectonic overthrusting of the Avalonian plate onto the Baltic Shield in the 6th century AD — $\epsilon(t)$ would increase by $\epsilon_0 > 0$ (uplift south of the CDF), immediately causing a negative RSL change on the North German side.

23. Prehistoric RSL Documentation and the Scandia Argument

Geersen et al. (2024) discovered the *Blinkerwall* in the Bay of Mecklenburg at 21 m water depth: a 971 m long, > 10,000-year-old Stone Age hunting architecture comprising 1,673 individual stones. The adjacent palaeolake peat wood was dated to 9,143±36 ^{14}C-BP (terminus post quem for the flooding); the final submersion occurred during the Littorina transgression (8.57–8.0 ka BP).

Two consequences for the Scandia hypothesis follow directly:

(1) **Greater land extent in prehistoric times:** The Scandia island massif was considerably more extensive during the Stone Age, supporting the demographic pressure mechanism (*vagina nationum*) for the Gothic migration.

(2) **Precedent for catastrophic transgression:** The Littorina transgression constitutes an analogue rapid-flooding event; a post-150 AD CDF-reactivated analogue would plausibly replicate the postulated coastal displacements.

24. Integrated Evidence Assessment

Table 6: Summary of evidence chains and their support strength for the geodynamic model.

Evidence Chain	Source	Support	Methodological Limitation
Lithospheric reactivatability of CDF/STZ	Nielsen et al. (2007)	**strong**	Different timescale (62 Ma vs. ≤1,500 yr)
Anomalous Quaternary subsidence NW North Sea	Arfai et al. (2018)	**moderate**	Arfai et al. exclude tectonics; reinterpretation here

Table 6 (continued)

Evidence Chain	Source	Support	Methodological Limitation
Magmatic-hydrothermal kaolin genesis NW-Saxony	Götze et al. (2024)	**strong**	Permian age (≈290 Ma); no direct 6th-century linkage
Tectonic predisposition of kaolin distribution	Kužvart (1992)	**strong**	Conventional interpretation: weathering; no impact reference
Radial concentration around Český Kráter	this analysis (binomial)	**exploratory** ($p \approx 0.018$)	$n = 8$; complete inventory required
Storegga / Doggerland and coastal migration	Weninger et al. (2008)	**indirectly supportive**	Time lag of ≈7,600 yr to postulated 536 AD event
Prehistoric RSL / Scandia	Geersen et al. (2024)	**strong**	Documents long-term RSL dynamics, not the historical jump

The synthesis yields: the available key publications provide **no direct falsification** of this model, supplying methodologically consistent mechanistic foundations for the postulated processes. At the same time, they impose terminological and methodological precision — particularly regarding the timescale problem and the absence of stratigraphic direct dating of a post-150 AD tsunami or CDF reactivation event — that the model's further development must address.

Part IV

The Saale-Unstrut Fragment Impact Hypothesis and the Eastward Displacement of the Elster-Lusatia Block: Crustal Stress Fields, Biaxial Tension along the Bramsche–Český Kráter Axis, and the Herzberg Seismic Event of 2024

25. Introduction to the Impact Hypothesis

Parts I–III established a statistically highly significant eastward displacement of the Elster-Lusatia Cluster of Ptolemaic place names, amounting to $\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -93.1\,\text{km}$ ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$), demonstrated that this result is incompatible with uniform cartographic measurement error, showed that the Caledonian Deformation Front (CDF) is mechanically reactivatable by remote stress transmission through the European plate (Nielsen et al., 2007), and identified the Český Kráter ring fracture system (Rajlich, 1992, 2007; Rajlich et al., 2009) as a geophysically verified structural element of the broader deformation field.

The present Part IV addresses three specific research questions:

1. Could a cometary fragment impact in the Saale-Unstrut Triassic Lands (postulated centre: Geiseltal-West, ≈11.73° E / 51.33° N; postulated date: late 530 or early 531 AD) have triggered the $-93\,\text{km}$ eastward displacement of the Elster-Lusatia Block?

2. Is a primary crustal rupture driven by opposing tensional forces along the Bramsche–Český Kráter structural axis — with the Saale-Unstrut impact acting as a cascade trigger into already critically pre-stressed crust — a physically more coherent mechanism?

3. Does the instrumentally recorded M_L 3.1 earthquake of 18 October 2024 near Herzberg (Elster) and Doberlug-Kirchhain, at a hypocentre depth of approximately 21 km, bear a geometrically and seismologically significant relationship to the residual stress field predicted by the block-rotation model?

26. Pre-Displacement Geometry, Geology of the Crustal Gap Zone, and the Circular Basin Structure of the Eastern Harz Foreland

26.1 Reconstructed Pre-Displacement Positions of the Elster Cluster

The affine transformation model (mean longitude scaling $k \approx 27.0\,\text{km}$ per Ptolemaic degree of longitude at $\bar{\phi} \approx 52.5^\circ\,\text{N}$) implies that the modern positions of the Elster Cluster are displaced $\overline{\Delta\lambda} = 93.1\,\text{km}$ ENE relative to their Ptolemaic positions. The pre-displacement positions are obtained by subtracting the cluster mean shift vector:

$$\Delta\lambda_{\text{shift}} = \frac{93.1\,\text{km}}{111.3\,\text{km}/^\circ \times \cos(51.7^\circ)} = \frac{93.1}{69.3} \approx 1.343^\circ \tag{41}$$

Table 7: Reconstructed pre-displacement positions of the four Elster Cluster localities (mean shift $\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -93.1\,\text{km}$ applied).

Ptolemaic name	Current identification	Current coordinates	Pre-displacement position
Budorigum	Doberlug-Kirchhain	13.556° E / 51.619° N	≈12.213° E / 51.619° N
Limis Lucus	Baruth/Mark	13.499° E / 51.993° N	≈12.156° E / 51.993° N
Lugidunum	Falkenberg/Elster	13.271° E / 51.607° N	≈11.928° E / 51.607° N
Stragona	Herzberg/Elster	13.232° E / 51.682° N	≈11.889° E / 51.682° N

The four pre-shift positions cluster in the zone 11.89–12.21° E / 51.62–51.99° N: the **Saale-Elbe confluence region**, encompassing the Halle–Merseburg–Bitterfeld triangle. The eastern boundary of the outer structural ring of the postulated Geiseltal impact (radius $R_{\text{out}} = 77.5\,\text{km}$, outer ring centre at Stolberg: 11.000° E / 51.570° N) lies at:

$$\lambda_{\text{E,ring}} = 11.000^\circ + \frac{77.5}{69.3} = 11.000^\circ + 1.118^\circ = 12.118^\circ\,\text{E} \tag{42}$$

The mean pre-shift longitude of the Elster Cluster ($\overline{\lambda}_{\text{pre-shift}} \approx 12.047^\circ\,\text{E}$) falls within approximately 7 km of this outer ring boundary. The pre-displacement Elster Cluster was therefore located **at or immediately inside the eastern rim of the outer structural ring** of the postulated impact structure — the position of maximum radial displacement potential.

26.2 Geology of the Crustal Gap Zone

A W–E geological transect at ≈51.5° N traverses the following principal formations (Table 8).

Table 8: Geological units in the Harz–Elbe-Elster crustal transect at ≈51.5° N.

Zone	Approx. λ	Principal formations	Mechanical character
Eastern Harz block	10.5–11.5° E	Devonian shales, greywackes, quartzites; Silurian phyllites; Carboniferous granites	Rigid, competent basement; behaves as coherent massif
Harzrand fault system	≈11.5° E	Major NW-SE Cretaceous inversion thrust; Subhercynian trough sediments	Active inversion zone; principal stress concentrator
Saale-Unstrut Triassic Lands	11.5–12.2° E	Buntsandstein, Muschelkalk, Keuper; Zechstein evaporites at depth; **Geiseltal Eocene lignite** (≈11.73° E)	Mechanically weak cover above Variscan basement; salt décollement at Zechstein level
Halle Volcanic Complex	11.5–12.0° E	Lower Permian porphyries and rhyolites (≈290 Ma); phreatomagmatic breccias	Thermally preconditioned; Moho seismicity at 25–29 km depth; primary fluid conduit
Halle Fault × L-R node	≈11.8° E	Intersection of conjugate fault arrays (NE-SW and NW-SE)	Double-weakened structural node; lowest effective cohesion
Leipzig Embayment	12.2–12.7° E	Eocene–Miocene lignite, sands, clays; Mesozoic record largely absent or eroded	Thin-skinned; regional décollement in Zechstein salt
Mulde-Elbe transition	12.7–13.1° E	Torgau-Dobritz Cretaceous Basin; Cenozoic cover	Pre-existing tensional basin; attenuated crust

Table 8 (continued)

Zone	Approx. λ	Principal formations	Mechanical character
Elbe Lineament	≈12.8–13.1° E	Major NW-SE magnetic/gravimetric lineament; polyphase reactivation since Paleozoic	**Primary crustal-scale discontinuity; probable rotation boundary**
Elster-Lusatia district	13.1–14.0° E	Lusatian Granodiorite (Neoproterozoic–Cambrian, 505–520 Ma); Lusatian Overthrust; Miocene brown coal; **anthracite at Doberlug-Kirchhain**	Ancient, rigid crustal block; coherent plate fragment

The mechanically decisive property of this transect is the presence of **Zechstein evaporite horizons** functioning as a regional décollement across the ≈70 km zone between 11.8–12.8° E, decoupling the sedimentary cover from the crystalline basement and permitting the Lusatian block to slide independently.

26.3 Visual Interpretation: The Circular Basin Structure of the Eastern Harz Foreland

The area bounded approximately by 11.0–12.5° E / 51.0–51.8° N displays a roughly circular topographic and drainage basin, with: the western boundary defined by the eastern Harz escarpment; the southern boundary by the Kyffhäuser quartzite ridge and the Unstrut valley; the eastern boundary by the Saale River valley; and the northern boundary by the Mansfeld Saline district. Within this basin, river systems (Saale, Unstrut, Wipper, Bode) radiate outward from a central lowland near the Geiseltal depression — a drainage pattern consistent with post-impact hydrological reorganisation. This feature is interpreted as a visually identifiable crater or caldera-like crustal rupture. The visual diameter of this basin (≈80–120 km) is precisely appropriate to account for the −93 km eastward displacement of the Elster Cluster from a starting position at the eastern rim of the structure. This interpretation is explicitly acknowledged as qualitative and awaits geophysical verification.

27. Impact Mechanics: Shock Pressure Field and Transmission Pathways

27.1 Contact Pressure and Projectile Parameters

For a stony impactor ($\rho_i = 3{,}000\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$, diameter $L \approx 2.5\,\mathrm{km}$) striking at $v_i = 20\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}}$ at $\theta \approx 25°$–$30°$ from horizontal, the contact pressure is (Melosh, 1989):

$$P_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}\,\rho_t\,c_t\,v_i = \tfrac{1}{2} \times 2{,}700 \times 6{,}000 \times 20{,}000 = 162\,\mathrm{GPa} \tag{43}$$

$$m_i = \rho_i \cdot \tfrac{4}{3}\pi\left(\tfrac{L}{2}\right)^3 \approx 2.45 \times 10^{13}\,\mathrm{kg} \tag{44}$$

$$\boxed{E_k = \tfrac{1}{2}\,m_i\,v_i^2 \approx 4.9 \times 10^{21}\,\mathrm{J}} \tag{45}$$

Pressure attenuation with distance (Ahrens & O'Keefe, 1977) for a granite target ($n = 2.5$):

$$P(r) = P_0\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^n, \quad r_0 = L/2 = 1{,}250\,\mathrm{m}, \quad n = 2.5 \tag{46}$$

27.2 Pressures at Key Structural Targets

Table 9: Shock pressure at principal geodynamic target structures (isotropic attenuation, Eq. 46).

Target structure	r	$P(r)$	Reactivation threshold	Assessment
Inner crater rim	16 km	120 MPa	—	breccia / suevite
Halle Fault × L-R	40 km	25 MPa	1–10 MPa	**reactivated**
Kyffhäuser block	46.5 km	18 MPa	10–25 MPa	**fractured**
Stolberg outer ring	57 km	10 MPa	1–10 MPa	**reactivated**
Elbe Lineament (Torgau)	90 km	3.5 MPa	1–10 MPa	at threshold
Elbe Lineament (Magdeburg)	85 km	4.1 MPa	1–10 MPa	at threshold
Senftenberg pivot	157 km	0.89 MPa	1–10 MPa	insufficient (direct)
CDF main trace	280 km	0.21 MPa	1–10 MPa	**insufficient**

27.3 Fault-Guided Wave Amplification

For seismic energy channelled along the Elbe Lineament ($n_{\text{guided}} \approx 1.5$; Aki 1979), at the Senftenberg pivot ($r = 157\,\text{km}$):

$$P_{\text{guided}}(157\,\text{km}) = 162 \times 10^3\,\text{MPa} \times \left(\frac{1.25 \times 10^{-3}}{157}\right)^{1.5} \approx 115\,\text{MPa} \tag{47}$$

With realistic dissipation (factor 10–30 for imperfect guidance), effective guided pressure at Senftenberg is ≈**4–12 MPa** — within or above the reactivation threshold for pre-weakened Lusatian Overthrust fault segments.

28. The Caledonian Deformation Front: Single Impact versus Multi-Fragment Activation

28.1 The CDF Activation Problem

The direct isotropic shock pressure at the CDF main trace ($r \approx 280\,\text{km}$) amounts to only $P \approx 0.21\,\text{MPa}$ — approximately one order of magnitude below the lower bound of 1 MPa for fault reactivation. Using the exponential plate-stress transmission formula (Nielsen et al., 2007) with elastic relaxation length $L_e \approx 850\,\text{km}$:

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{CDF}}}{\sigma_0} = \exp\!\left(-\frac{280}{850}\right) \approx 0.72 \tag{48}$$

If the source stress at 280 km is only 0.21 MPa, transmitted stress remains ≈ 0.15 MPa — far below threshold.

Key finding: CDF activation

A single Geiseltal fragment impact cannot directly reactivate the CDF. The Geiseltal impact contributes a Coulomb stress increment of ≈ 0.23 MPa — insufficient as a sole driving force, but representing ≈23–46 % of the lower threshold.

28.2 The Multi-Fragment Scenario and Independent Evidence

A Shoemaker-Levy 9 analogue is invoked: a fragmented cometary train producing multiple near-simultaneous impactors. This is corroborated by the GISP2 ice core (Abbott et al., 2014), which records **four discrete chondritic particle horizons** in the window 533–540 AD. CDF reactivation is achieved by the superposition of:

(a) Geiseltal fragment → Elbe Lineament activation → Lusatian Block rotation;

(b) Tábor / Bohemian Massif fragment (Section 32) → CDF pre-stress reinforcement from the SE;

(c) Impactor on southern African plate → accelerated Africa-Europe convergence → renewed northward stress pulse to CDF (Allan & Delair, 1997; Nielsen et al., 2007).

29. The Bramsche–Český Kráter Biaxial Stress Field as Structural Prerequisite

29.1 The Structural Axis and Pre-Loading

The Bramsche Pluton (8.00° E / 52.42° N), the Geiseltal impact centre (11.73° E / 51.33° N), and the Český Kráter centre near Tábor (14.67° E / 49.42° N; Section 32) define a structural corridor at approximate azimuth ≈120°/300° with a total length of ≈530 km. The biaxial loading between the two boundary forces:

$$\sigma_1 \text{ (Bramsche pull, NNW)} \approx 20\text{–}50\,\text{MPa} \tag{49}$$

$$\sigma_3 \text{ (Bohemian resistance, SSE)} \approx 10\text{–}30\,\text{MPa} \tag{50}$$

29.2 Reduction of the Coulomb Failure Threshold

Under the Coulomb failure criterion for pre-saturated Triassic sediments ($c_0 \approx 2\,\text{MPa}$, $\mu_s = 0.6$, $\sigma'_n \approx 5\,\text{MPa}$; Byerlee 1978):

$$|\tau|_{\text{crit}} = c_0 + \mu_s\,\sigma'_n = 2 + 0.6 \times 5 = 5\,\text{MPa} \tag{51}$$

The biaxial field pre-loads the system to within 5 MPa of this threshold. **The Geiseltal impact acts as a cascade trigger in a lithosphere pre-loaded to near-failure.**

30. The Elbe Lineament as Primary Transmission Channel

30.1 Structure and Geometric Alignment

The Elbe Lineament (Elbezone) is an ≈500 km long NW–SE-striking magnetic and gravimetric lineament (≈310°/130°) marking the crustal boundary between the Saxothuringian Zone (SW) and the North German-Polish Basin (NE). It intersects the impact shock-pressure field at r ≈85–90 km, where isotropic pressure (3.5–4.1 MPa) reaches the lower bound of wet-fault reactivation.

30.2 Geometric Consistency with Block Displacement

The NW-SE orientation of the Elbe Lineament is geometrically nearly **perpendicular** to the mean block displacement vector (ENE), which is mechanically optimal for a dextral transpressive rupture in a Riedel shear geometry (Tchalenko, 1970). Lyngsie & Thybo (2007) document a 150 km wide overthrust zone of Avalonian crust over the Baltica lower crustal shield at this boundary.

30.3 Reactivation of Pre-Existing Dextral Kinematics

The imposed displacement direction is consistent with pre-existing **dextral kinematic indicators** on the Elbe Lineament during Late Cretaceous inversion tectonics (Scheck-Wenderoth et al., 2008), meaning the impact reactivated a pre-existing kinematics direction — dramatically reducing the required trigger energy.

31. Crustal Rotation Kinematics: The $-93\,\mathrm{km}$ Block Displacement

31.1 Rigid Body Rotation

The four Elster Cluster residuals ($\sigma_{\Delta\lambda} = 0.198° \approx 13\,\mathrm{km}$, only 14 % of the mean shift) indicate rigid body block kinematics. For a dextral rotation about the Senftenberg pivot (13.97° E / 51.54° N) with mean lever arm $\bar{R} \approx 138\,\mathrm{km}$:

$$\alpha = 2\arcsin\left(\frac{93.1}{2 \times 138}\right) = 2\arcsin(0.337) \approx 39.3° \text{ (dextral, clockwise)} \tag{52}$$

31.2 Energy Balance and the Trigger-Drive Distinction

The torque required to mobilise the block against residual fault friction ($\sigma_{\mathrm{res}} = 3\,\mathrm{MPa}$; Byerlee 1978):

$$M_{\mathrm{req}} = \sigma_{\mathrm{res}} \times A_{\mathrm{fault}} \times \bar{R} = 3 \times 10^{6} \times 3 \times 10^{12} \times 1.38 \times 10^{5} \approx 1.24 \times 10^{24}\,\mathrm{Nm} \tag{53}$$

At 5 % mechanical transmission efficiency, the impact provides $\approx 2.45 \times 10^{20}\,\mathrm{Nm}$ — approximately 5,000× less than required for direct driving. The physically most self-consistent model is therefore: **the impact nucleates the initial fracture; the sustained biaxial stress field drives the block rotation over years to decades**, analogous to post-seismic stress relaxation following a mainshock.

32. The Český Kráter Impact at Tábor: Structure, Age Hypothesis, and Alpine-Carpathian Geodynamics

32.1 The Rajlich Structure and Younger Age Interpretation

Rajlich (2007); Rajlich et al. (2009) identify a multi-ring impact astrobleme in the Bohemian Massif with the following characteristics:

- **Outer ring diameter:** up to 540–600 km; up to nine concentric ring anomalies distinguishable
- **Inner crater diameter:** ≈300 km (northern portion preserved)

- **Moho depression:** up to 40 km depth beneath the central hill
- **Impact evidence:** shocked quartz (PDFs), pseudotachylite veins (longest: 3.5 km at Chrášťany, 60 m thickness), microdiamonds, moissanite (SiC), coesite, UHP mineral assemblages
- **Conventional age:** ≈2 Ga (Proterozoic)

The structural ring interpretation is accepted, but a substantially **younger age** is proposed. The reasoning is cartometric: the Ptolemaic *Geographia* (c. 150 AD) documents the Elster Cluster in the eastern Harz foreland — not yet displaced by 93 km. The displacement must postdate 150 AD. The postulated date of ≈525–531 AD (most probable window: late November 530 to early 531 AD) is consistent with all available historical and natural-scientific evidence. Under this interpretation, the conventional ≈2 Ga Rajlich age is attributed to inheritance of pre-existing zircon ages from the ancient Proterozoic basement.

32.2 Structural Parameters

Table 10: Structural parameters of the Tábor / Bohemian Massif impact hypothesis for the ≈530 AD event.

Parameter	This model	Rajlich reference	Notes
Impact centre	Near Tábor (14.67° E / 49.42° N)	Mladá Vožice (≈14.55° E / 49.52° N)	Rajlich likely more precisely surveyed
Inner crater diameter	80–90 km	≈300 km (N part preserved)	Sub-structure identified here
Outer crater diameter	250–300 km	540–600 km	Outer ring of 530 AD event within larger ancient ring
Long ellipse axis	≈100° WNW-ESE; Rajlich preferred	Multiple ring generations	Consistent with WNW approach vector
Approach azimuth	≈280° (from WNW)	Pre-crater faults at ≈020°–200° documented	WNW approach consistent with ellipse

32.3 The Alpine-Carpathian Bow-Shock Morphology

The orographic Alps–Vienna–Carpathians configuration is attributed to the **Tábor / Bohemian Massif impactor**. With a WNW approach vector (≈280°) and impact centre at Tábor, the crustal compression was asymmetric: the starboard side (SSW of the trajectory) contributed to the Alpine arc; the port side (NNE of the trajectory) contributed to the Carpathian arc; the Vienna Basin marks the structural apex of maximum compressional stress; and the Bratislava Gate (Thebener Pforte) represents the structural break-point.

32.4 Bavarian Dark Earth Horizons: Hydrodynamic Mechanisms

The *Dark Earth* destruction layers at Roman-period settlements in the Bavarian Danube region cannot be attributed to a Danube tsunami in the corrected hydrographic model. Two mechanisms are proposed:

Primary mechanism (direct impact or atmospheric airburst): Whether the relevant fragment detonated as an airburst at 30–40 km altitude or impacted in the Bohemian Massif, enormous volumes of water would be sublimated or excavated, which — condensing in the atmosphere — could generate catastrophic hydrometeors and lahars across the Bohemian Forest and Danube headwater region. The sublimation energy for a ≈0.5 km ice fragment:

$$Q_{\text{sublim}} = m_{\text{ice}} \times L_{\text{sublim}} \approx 2.6 \times 10^{11}\,\text{kg} \times 2.83 \times 10^{6}\,\text{J}\,\text{kg}^{-1} \approx 7.4 \times 10^{17}\,\text{J} \tag{54}$$

Secondary mechanism (hydraulic injection from the east): The Edessa chronicle (c. 525 AD) reports a flood "from the mountains, striking the walls, withdrawing, striking again" — physically consistent with a seiche oscillation or a mega-flash-flood. Far-field seismicity of the Tábor impact could have triggered such oscillations in the Pannonian Basin or displaced water masses through the Bratislava Gate northwestward into the Danube valley.

33. The Herzberg Earthquake of 18 October 2024: Spatial Correlation Analysis

33.1 Seismological Parameters

Table 11: Instrumental parameters of the Herzberg (Elster) earthquake, 18 October 2024.

Parameter	Value	Source
Date / UTC	18 Oct 2024, 10:50:52	BGR, USGS
Magnitude	M_L 3.1 (BGR) / 3.2 (Uni Jena)	Instrumental
Hypocentre depth	$\approx$21 km ($\pm$5 km; lower crust)	Uni Jena
Epicentre area	Herzberg (Elster) – Doberlug-Kirchhain	BGR
Prior seismicity	None in BGR instrumental catalogue	BGR
Historical analogue	Herzberg 1483, intensity IV (church tower collapse, urban fire)	City chronicle
Aftershocks	None detected (4 mobile stations, Uni Jena)	Instrumental

The 21 km hypocentre depth places the rupture in the **lower crust**, definitively excluding anthropogenic causes (mining-induced: <5 km; lignite flooding: <2 km). The absence of aftershocks is consistent with a **complete stress-drop event** on a small, isolated residual fault patch.

33.2 The Elliptical Deformation Model and Predicted Stress Maxima

The compression of the ancient circular Vistula meander ($R_0 \approx 28.4$ km; centre: Domsdorf, 13.61° E / 51.57° N) to an ellipse with semi-axes $a = 28.4$ km and $b = 14.2$ km yields:

$$e = \sqrt{1 - b^2/a^2} = \sqrt{0.75} = 0.866, \quad c = e \cdot a = 24.6\,\text{km} \tag{55}$$

The elastic stress concentration factor at the ellipse foci (Inglis, 1913):

$$K_t = 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{a}{b}} = 1 + 2\sqrt{2} \approx 3.83 \tag{56}$$

Stresses at the foci are **≈3.8 times the background field intensity** — the preferred nucleation sites for fault reactivation.

33.3 Distance Between Predicted Focus and Observed Epicentre

The second ellipse focus F_2, lying $c = 24.6\,\text{km}$ NNW of the ellipse centre:

$$\lambda_{F_2} = 13.610^\circ - \frac{24.6 \times \sin(15^\circ)}{69.3} = 13.519^\circ\,\text{E} \tag{57}$$

$$\phi_{F_2} = 51.570^\circ + \frac{24.6 \times \cos(15^\circ)}{111.3} = 51.783^\circ\,\text{N} \tag{58}$$

Predicted stress focus F_2

$F_2 \approx 13.519^\circ\,\text{E} / 51.783^\circ\,\text{N}$ (Nexdorf–Schilda area, north of Herzberg/Elster)

The BGR epicentre interpolated centroid (≈13.400° E / 51.650° N):

$$d(F_2,\ \text{EQ}_{2024}) = \sqrt{(8.2\,\text{km})^2 + (14.8\,\text{km})^2} \approx \mathbf{16.9}\,\text{km} \tag{59}$$

The combined model and localisation uncertainty is ≈ ±12–21 km; the 16.9 km discrepancy falls **within this combined uncertainty envelope**. The predicted focus F_2 was derived entirely independently of seismological data, making its spatial coincidence with the only $M_L > 3$ earthquake in the instrumental history of this area a non-trivial predictive result.

33.4 Recurrence Interval and Stress-Relaxation Cycle

The Herzberg city chronicle records a macroseismic event in 1483 (intensity $I \approx$ IV, church tower collapse, urban fire). The interval 1483 → 2024 is **541 years** — consistent with a residual tectonic scar accumulating stress slowly through Africa-Europe convergence (≈3–5 mm yr^{-1}; Nocquet & Calais 2004) and releasing it episodically.

34. Historical and Mythological Corroboration

34.1 Convergence of Independent Evidence Chains

Table 12: Independent evidence converging on a catastrophic central European event, 525–540 AD.

Evidence category	Source	Event / Observation	Spatial bearing
Cosmochemistry (ice core)	Abbott et al. (2014); GISP2	4 discrete chondritic particle horizons, 533–540 AD	Global; fragmented cometary source

Table 12 (continued)

Evidence category	Source	Event / Observation	Spatial bearing
Dendroclimatology	Multiple tree-ring records	Anomalous cold / dim years, 536–545 AD	N Hemisphere
Historical (court)	Procopius of Caesarea, *De Bellis*, c. 550	Sun "without rays, like the moon" for 18 months; harvest failures	Eastern Mediterranean
Historical (court)	Cassiodorus, *Variae*, c. 537	"Summer without heat"; anomalous solar dimming	Italy / W Mediterranean
Historical (ecclesiastical)	Michael the Great of Syria, *Chronicle* (12th c., citing earlier Syriac sources)	Fire from heaven; dark/black flood waters; bones and skeletons of wild animals appearing at the surface of the earth	SE Mediterranean, SW Asia
Historical (civic)	Chronicle of Edessa, c. 525 AD	Flood "from the mountains, striking the walls, withdrawing, striking again"	Mesopotamia
Astronomical	Halley's Comet, 530 AD	Documented perihelion; possible fragmentation debris	Near-Earth orbit
Political-historical	Gregor of Tours, *Decem libri Historiarum*, c. 575	Fall of the Thuringian Kingdom at the Unstrut, 531 AD	Directly above postulated Geiseltal impact zone
Archaeological	Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie Sachsen-Anhalt	Settlement hiatus, Halle–Köthen–Merseburg zone, 5th–6th c. AD	Directly above postulated inner impact structure
Archaeological	Elsterwerda excavations (1991–1994)	Abrupt termination of ≈200 iron-smelting furnaces and associated settlement	Elster Cluster domain

Table 12 (continued)

Evidence category	Source	Event / Observation	Spatial bearing
Ethnological	Volkmann (2014)	Abrupt culture collapse without gradual transition, 5th–6th c. AD	Oder-Saale domain
Seismology	BGR / Uni Jena (2024)	M_L 3.1, depth 21 km, no prior seismicity	Predicted ellipse focus F_2

34.2 The Chronicle of Michael the Great of Syria

The *Chronicle of Michael the Great* (Patriarch of Antioch, 1126–1199 AD; principal edition: Chabot 1899–1910), compiled from earlier Syriac and Greek sources, contains passages covering the early sixth century of specific relevance to this model.

On the flood waters. Michael the Great describes inundations whose waters appear dark or black. This is identified here as congruent with the **Event-Dark-Earth (ED-E) hypothesis**: a catastrophic flood wave carrying a suspension of carbonised organic material (lignite dust, charred vegetation, dark impact ejecta) would produce water of distinctively blackish appearance. The black sediment deposited by such an event — preserved as an anomalous dark soil horizon — constitutes the diagnostic ED-E marker layer, potentially distinguishable from anthropogenic Dark Earth by elevated PAH content, cosmochemical markers, and C isotopic signature.

On the bones and skeletons of wild animals. In the Syriac-to-French translation by Chabot (1899–1910), the Chronicle states: *"l'on vit des ossements et des squelettes d'animaux sauvages paraître à la surface de la terre"* — "one saw the bones and skeletons of wild animals appear at the surface of the earth." This passage is connected here with the **Geiseltal fossil fauna**: the Geiseltal (Sachsen-Anhalt) preserves an Eocene (≈44–47 Ma) mammalian assemblage of exceptional completeness. An impact excavating the Geiseltal Eocene lignite and associated fossiliferous horizons would have brought fossil remains to the surface, presenting themselves as the inexplicable "bones and skeletons of wild animals" described by Michael the Great. Whether these remains represent excavated ancient fossils or contemporaneous fauna killed by the impact cannot be resolved without systematic dating of the bone-bearing layer; both interpretations remain open.

34.3 The Thuringian Kingdom, the Nibelungenlied, and the Kyffhäuser Legend

The political collapse of the Thuringian Kingdom at the battle of the Unstrut (c. 531 AD) — documented by Gregor of Tours (*Decem libri Historiarum*) and Venantius Fortunatus (*De excidio Thuringiae*) — lacks verified archaeological evidence at the named battle sites. The Unstrut valley falls directly within the postulated inner structural ring of the Geiseltal impact.

The Kyffhäuser (11.07° E / 51.41° N) lies 46.5 km WSW of the Geiseltal impact centre; the shock pressure there:

$$P(46.5\,\mathrm{km}) = 162 \times 10^3\,\mathrm{MPa} \times \left(\frac{1.25 \times 10^{-3}}{46.5}\right)^{2.5} \approx 18\,\mathrm{MPa} \tag{60}$$

This substantially exceeds the compressive strength of Kyffhäuser limestone and sandstone (10–25 MPa), meaning massive rockfall, cavity formation, and a fire-glow apparition in the WNW sky would objectively have occurred. The cyclical awakening motif of the Kyffhäuser legend encodes the episodic seismic reactivation at recurrence intervals of ≈500–600 yr (Herzberg 1483; Herzberg 2024).

35. Integrated Plausibility Assessment

Table 13: Composite plausibility scores for the Geiseltal–Tábor multi-fragment impact model.

Assessment dimension	Sub-aspect	Score	Key limitation or supporting factor
Geometric coherence	Oblique impact axis (Bramsche–Geiseltal–Chemnitz)	4/5	Angular scatter ≈18° between axis segments
	Uprange structural offset: Stolberg 57 km WSW	4/5	Consistent with oblique-impact structural asymmetry
	Pre-shift cluster at outer ring boundary	4/5	Geometrically coherent; quantitatively verified
	Visual satellite circular basin, eastern Harz foreland	3/5	Qualitative visual estimate; requires geophysical verification
Impact physics	Direct shock pressure at Elbe Lineament (3.5–4.1 MPa)	3/5	At lower threshold; biaxial pre-loading essential
	Fault-guided transmission to Senftenberg (4–12 MPa)	4/5	Requires Elbe Lineament as coherent waveguide
	CDF activation by single Geiseltal impact	1/5	Insufficient; multi-fragment scenario required
	Multi-fragment scenario (GISP2 four-horizon evidence)	3.5/5	Supported by GISP2; causal chain not directly proven
	Biaxial pre-loading: Bramsche–Český Kráter field	4/5	Well-supported by structural geology on both endpoints
Geological evidence	Crustal gap geology: salt décollement, HVK, Leipzig Basin	4/5	Independently established; predicts block sliding mechanism
	Anthracite stress metamorphism, Doberlug-Kirchhain	4/5	Independent geochemical cross-validation

Table 13 (continued)

Assessment dimension	Sub-aspect	Score	Key limitation or supporting factor
	Elbe Lineament dextral kinematics (Late Cretaceous precedent)	4/5	Well-documented; pre-existing kinematics reactivated
Český Kráter model	Ring fracture system extends to Saxon-Lusatian domain	4/5	Outer ring NNW boundary at ≈50.7° N verified
	Direct impact at Tábor: younger age interpretation	2.5/5	Bold chronological revision; no independent dating yet
	Alpine-Carpathian bow-shock attributed to Tábor impactor	3/5	Morphologically plausible; requires numerical modelling
Historical record	GISP2 chondritic particle horizons, 533–540 AD	5/5	Direct natural-scientific confirmation of cosmic events
	Settlement hiatus over impact centre (Sachsen-Anhalt survey)	4/5	Archaeologically well-documented
	Fall of Thuringian Kingdom, 531 AD, at impact zone	3/5	Spatial coincidence strong; causation not proven
	Michael the Great: dark/black flood waters (ED-E relevance)	3.5/5	Interpretively consistent; translation requires verification
	Michael the Great: bones and skeletons of wild animals	3/5	Speculative but non-trivial interpretive connection
Herzberg 2024	Geometric coincidence $F_2 \leftrightarrow$ epicentre ($d = 16.9\,\text{km}$)	3.5/5	Within combined uncertainty; not statistically definitive alone
	Hypocentre depth 21 km: rules out anthropogenic cause	4/5	Diagnostically important

Table 13 (continued)

Assessment dimension	Sub-aspect	Score	Key limitation or supporting factor
	541-yr recurrence cycle (1483–2024)	3/5	Pattern consistent; single-interval comparison insufficient
Falsifiability	T1 shock-quartz drill programme	5/5	Definitive test; clear prediction
	T2 Bouguer anomaly ring survey	4/5	Executable; specific anomaly predicted
Cumulative score		**91/125**	**≈73 %**: increased through additional geometric evidence, correct attribution of Alpine bow-shock to Tábor impactor, and additional corroboration from Michael the Great

36. Overall Conclusions and Outlook

This Geodynamic Reinterpretation Model offers a coherent, falsifiable, and interdisciplinary framework that unifies cartometric, geodynamic, sedimentological, cosmochemical, and historical evidence. The principal conclusions across all four parts are:

1. **Cartometric foundation (Part II):** The affine transformation of Ptolemy's *Geographike Hyphegesis* with scaling factor $k \approx 27$ km per Ptolemaic degree of longitude reveals a statistically irrefutable eastward displacement of the Elster-Lusatia Cluster of $\overline{\Delta\lambda} = -93.1$ km ($t = -13.7$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 3$), incompatible with uniform measurement error.

2. **Geophysical plausibility (Part III):** The CDF and TESZ are demonstrably reactivatable by remote stress transmission; the anomalous North Sea subsidence and the Blinkerwall RSL documentation independently support the modelled processes.

3. **Impact-mechanical mechanism (Part IV)(v2 corrected):** The biaxial Bramsche–Český Kráter stress field pre-loads the lithosphere to near-failure; the Geiseltal impact nucleates fracture initiation (works possibly as additional cascade trigger; $E_k \approx 4.9 \times 10^{21}$ J); sustained biaxial stress drives the 39° dextral block rotation of the Elster-Lusatia Block over years to decades. The predicted ellipse focus F_2 falls within 16.9 km of the 2024 Herzberg earthquake epicentre ($M_L = 3.1$, hypocentre depth 21 km), within the combined uncertainty envelope.

4. **Kaolin clustering (v2 corrected):** $k = 8$ of $n = 9$ major deposits within 270 km of Český Kráter centre; $p \approx 0.013$.

5. **Historical convergence (Parts I and IV):** Four independent cosmochemical horizons in the GISP2 ice core (533–540 AD), dendroclimatic anomalies, Byzantine court chronicles, the Edessa flood chronicle, the settlement hiatus over the impact zone, and the simultaneous political collapse of the Thuringian Kingdom all converge on a catastrophic central European event in the window 525–540 AD.

6. **Event-Dark-Earth (Part I):** The ED-E hypothesis offers a falsifiable, physically motivated alternative to the gardening theory for the ubiquitous Dark Earth horizons of the Migration Period.

7. **Integrated assessment:** The cumulative plausibility score of ≈73 % (91/125) across all evidence dimensions reflects a model that is internally consistent and multiply constrained, while explicitly acknowledging the open questions that targeted empirical testing must resolve. The model does not claim to be a definitive

reconstruction, but presents a scientifically structured and falsifiable alternative to prevailing interpretations.

Priority Falsification Tests

T1 (decisive):

Core drilling <10 km from the postulated impact centre (Schnellroda–Geiseltal-West), with SHRIMP / Raman analysis for shocked quartz PDFs and suevite-facies breccia. Predicted result: >0.5 GPa shock signature.

T2 (rapid):

High-resolution Bouguer gravimetric survey (1:50,000 scale, 50 km radius of putative impact centre). Predicted result: circular negative anomaly of -20 to -40 mGal.

T3 (seismological):

8–10 permanent broadband stations in 20 km radius around ellipse focus F_2 (Nexdorf–Herzberg area). Predicted result: residual micro-seismicity cluster at 15–25 km depth, NNW-SSE oriented focal mechanism.

T4 (sedimentological):

Targeted micromorphological, geochemical (PAH, Cl/Br, iridium, Ni), and palynological re-analysis of Dark Earth profiles at sites in the affected zone against the ED-E predictions P1–P6 (Section 3.3).

T5 (geochronological):

Independent OSL / SHRIMP dating of the matrix phase and melt glass of the Český Kráter breccia to test the younger-age interpretation.

References

Abbott, D. H., Breger, D., Biscaye, P. E., Barron, J. A., Juhl, R. A., & McCafferty, P. (2014). What caused terrestrial dust loading and climate downturns between A.D. 533 and 540? In G. Keller & A. C. Kerr (Eds.), *Volcanism, impacts, and mass extinctions: Causes and effects* (GSA Special Papers, Vol. 505, pp. 421–438). Geological Society of America. `https://doi.org/10.1130/2014.2505(23)`

Ahrens, T. J., & O'Keefe, J. D. (1977). Equations of state and impact-induced shock wave attenuation. In D. Roddy, R. O. Pepin, & R. B. Merrill (Eds.), *Impact and explosion cratering* (pp. 639–656). Pergamon Press.

Aki, K. (1979). Characterization of barriers on an earthquake fault. *Journal of Geophysical Research, 84* (B11), 6140–6148. `https://doi.org/10.1029/JB084iB11p06140`

Allan, D. S., & Delair, J. B. (1997). *Cataclysm! Compelling evidence of a cosmic catastrophe in 9500 BC.* Bear & Company.

Arfai, J., Franke, D., Lutz, R., Reinhardt, L., Kley, J., & Gaedicke, C. (2018). Rapid Quaternary subsidence in the northwestern German North Sea. *Scientific Reports, 8*, 11524. `https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-29638-6`

Bemmann, J. (2023). In S. Brather (Ed.), *Die Dukate des Merowingerreiches* (pp. 421–458). De Gruyter. `https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111128818-014`

Beránek, B., Mayeróvá, M., Zounkóvá, M., et al. (1973). Results of deep seismic soundings along international profile VII in Czechoslovakia and Poland. *Studia Geophysica et Geodaetica, 17*, 205–217. `https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01626583`

Byerlee, J. (1978). Friction of rocks. *Pure and Applied Geophysics, 116* (4–5), 615–626. `https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00876528`

Cassiodorus, F. M. A. (c. 537 AD / 1894 ed.). *Variarum libri duodecim* (T. Mommsen, Ed.; Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi, Vol. 12). Weidmann.

Chabot, J.-B. (Ed. & Trans.). (1899–1910). *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)* (4 vols.). Ernest Leroux.

Deutschmann, A., Meschede, M., & Obst, K. (2018). Fault system evolution in the Baltic Sea area west of Rügen, NE Germany. *Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 469*, 83–98. `https://doi.org/10.1144/SP469.24`

Gaberz, S. (2014). *Dark Earth – die schwarze Schicht* [Diplomarbeit, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz]. UNIGRAZonline. `https://unipub.uni-graz.at/obvugrhs/content/titleinfo/239930`

Gault, D. E., & Wedekind, J. A. (1978). Experimental studies of oblique impact. *Proceedings of the 9th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference*, 3843–3875.

Geersen, J., Bradtmöller, M., Schneider von Deimling, J., Feldens, P., Auer, J., Held, P., Lohrberg, A., Supka, R., Hoffmann, J. J. L., Eriksen, B. V., Rabbel, W., Karlsen, H.-J., Krastel, S., Brandt, D., Heuskin, D., & Lübke, H. (2024). A submerged Stone Age hunting architecture from the Western Baltic Sea. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 121*, e2312008121. `https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2312008121`

Götze, J., Möckel, R., Pan, Y., & Müller, A. (2024). Geochemistry and formation of agate-bearing lithophysae in Lower Permian volcanics of the NW-Saxonian Basin (Germany). *Mineralogy and Petrology, 118*, 23–40. `https://doi.org/10.1007/s00710-023-00841-2`

Gregor of Tours (c. 575 AD / 1885 ed.). *Decem libri Historiarum* (W. Arndt & B. Krusch, Eds.; Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum, Vol. 1). Hahn.

Holsapple, K. A. (1993). The scaling of impact processes in planetary sciences. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 21*, 333–373. `https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ea.21.050193.002001`

Hrubcová, P., Środa, P., Špičák, A., Farnetani, C. G., Grad, M., Guterch, A., & Keller, G. R. (2005). Crustal and uppermost mantle structure of the Bohemian Massif based on CELEBRATION 2000 data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 110*(B11). `https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JB003080`

Inglis, C. E. (1913). Stresses in a plate due to the presence of cracks and sharp corners. *Transactions of the Institution of Naval Architects, 55*, 219–241.

Jasmund, K., & Lagaly, G. (Eds.). (1993). *Tonminerale und Tone: Struktur, Eigenschaften, Anwendungen und Einsatz in Industrie und Umwelt.* Steinkopff.

Karlsen, H.-J., Marx, C., & Lelgemann, D. (2011). Germania magna – ein neuer Blick auf eine alte Karte: entzerrte geographische Daten des Ptolemaios für die antiken Orte zwischen Rhein und Weichsel. *Germania, 89*, 115–155. `https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2011.96480`

Klokočník, J., Kostelecký, J., Novák, P., & Wagner, C. A. (2010). Detection of Earth impact craters aided by the detailed global gravity model EGM 08. *Journal of Geodesy, 84*, 681–692.

Kužvart, M. (1992). Kaolin deposits of Central Europe. *Clay Science, 8*, 319–327.

Lambeck, K., Smither, C., & Johnston, P. (1998). Sea-level change, glacial rebound and mantle viscosity for northern Europe. *Geophysical Journal International, 134*(1), 102–144. `https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-246x.1998.00541.x`

Lyngsie, S. B., & Thybo, H. (2007). A new tectonic model for the Laurentia–Avalonia–Baltica sutures in the North Sea: A case study along MONA LISA profile 3. *Tectonophysics, 429*, 201–227. `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2006.09.017`

Melosh, H. J. (1989). *Impact cratering: A geologic process.* Oxford University Press.

Mildner, S. (2025/2026). *A new interpretation of Ptolemy's Germania Magna: Employing computer-assisted image distortion of a medieval map by Donnus Nicolaus Germanus to examine post-glacial geodynamics in Europe* [EarthArXiv Preprint]. `https://doi.org/10.31223/X5313T`

Mildner, S. (2026). Mildner's Geodynamic Reinterpretation Model for Ptolemy's Historical Coordinates. `https://www.ancientmaps-geography.com/mildners-geodynamic-reinterpretation-model-for-ptolemys-historical-coordinates`

Nielsen, S., Stephenson, R., & Thomsen, E. (2007). Dynamics of Mid-Palaeocene North Atlantic rifting linked with European intra-plate deformations. *Nature, 450*, 1071–1074. `https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06379`

Nocquet, J.-M., & Calais, E. (2004). Geodetic measurements of crustal deformation in the western Mediterranean and Europe. *Pure and Applied Geophysics, 161*, 661–681.

PAGES 2k Consortium. (2013). Continental-scale temperature variability during the past two millennia. *Nature Geoscience, 6*, 339–346. `https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1797`

Procopius of Caesarea (c. 550 AD / 1914 ed.). *History of the Wars* (H. B. Dewing, Trans.; Loeb Classical Library). Harvard University Press.

Rajlich, P. (1992). *Bohemian circular structure, Czechoslovakia: Search for the impact evidence* [Conference paper]. Geoterra.

Rajlich, P. (1994). Circular and lozenge structure of the Bohemian Massif. *Jahrbuch der Geologischen Bundesanstalt, 137*(4), 647–660.

Rajlich, P., Beneš, M., & Cobbold, P. (1996). Wrenching of a continental lithosphere containing a circular resistant inclusion: Physical model experiments. *Jahrbuch der Geologischen Bundesanstalt, 139*(2), 215–232.

Rajlich, P. (2007). Český kráter. *Sborník Jihočeského muzea v Českých Budějovice, 47*(Supplement), 1–114.

Rajlich, P., Klokočník, J., & Kostelecký, J. (2009). Zpřesněná stavba Českého impaktního kráteru. *Sbor. Jihočes. Muz., 49*, 21–28.

Scheck-Wenderoth, M., Bayer, U., & Maystrenko, Y. (2008). Deep sedimentary basins of Germany. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Geowissenschaften, 159*(3), 421–426.

Schmitz, M. (2008). *Bedingungen, Prozesse und Stoffdynamik der Bildung tertiärer kaolinitischer Tonlagerstätten in Sachsen und Sachsen-Anhalt und deren Auswirkungen auf die anwendungstechnischen Eigenschaften der Rohstoffe* [Dissertation, Technische Universität Berlin]. `https://doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-1981`

Seyhan, Ǐ. (1971). Die Entstehung des vulkanischen Kaolins und das Andesit-Problem. *Bulletin of the Mineral Research and Exploration, 76*, 55–67.

Stein, R. S. (1999). The role of stress transfer in earthquake occurrence. *Nature, 402*, 605–609. `https://doi.org/10.1038/45144`

Tchalenko, J. S. (1970). Similarities between shear zones of different magnitudes. *Geological Society of America Bulletin, 81*(6), 1625–1640.

Thybo, H., & Nielsen, C. A. (2012). Seismic velocity structure of crustal intrusions in the Danish Basin. *Tectonophysics, 572*, 64–75. `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2011.11.019`

Venantius Fortunatus (c. 570 AD / 1881 ed.). *De excidio Thuringiae* (F. Leo, Ed.; Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi, Vol. 4). Weidmann.

Volkmann, A. (2014). Neues zur "Odergermanischen Gruppe": Das innere Barbaricum an der unteren Oder im 5.–6. Jh. AD. Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg. `http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:16-heidok-159188`

Weninger, B., Schulting, R., Bradtmöller, M., Clare, L., Collard, M., Edinborough, K., Hilpert, J., Jöris, O., Niekus, M., Rohling, E. J., & Wagner, B. (2008). The catastrophic final flooding of Doggerland by the Storegga Slide tsunami. *Documenta Praehistorica, 35*, 1–24. `https://doi.org/10.4312/dp.35.1`

A. Appendix: Complete Coordinate Gazetteer

A.1 Anchor Points, Settlements, Rivers, and Mountains

Previous correction in Version 3

This appendix provides all geographic coordinates used in the affine transformation and residual analysis, enabling full independent reproduction of every calculation in Sections 11–14 and 20. Coordinates are given in decimal degrees (WGS84 for modern positions; Ptolemaic degrees as transmitted in the *Geographike Hyphegesis* as read by Mildner 2025/2026). Distances d are computed as great-circle approximations at the stated mean latitude.

Table 14: Full gazetteer with Ptolemaic coordinates (λ_P, ϕ_P), modern Mildner identifications (λ_M, ϕ_M), and residuals ($\Delta\lambda_{\text{km}}$, $\Delta\phi_{\text{km}}$, r). K = calibration; EC = Elster Cluster; L = Lusatia; C = Coast; F = Fläming; H = Harz; T = Thuringia; S = South; GB = Gallia Belgica. All modern coordinates WGS84.

#	Ptolemaic name	Identification	λ_P (°)	ϕ_P (°)	λ_M (° E)	ϕ_M (° N)	$\Delta\lambda$ (km)	$\Delta\phi$ (km)	r (km)
K1	Rhenus Flu. (central mouth)	Hengelo / Enschede area	27.00	53.17	6.750	52.250	0.0	0.0	**0.0**
K2	Albis Flu. (mouth)	NW of Bremen	31.00	56.25	8.583	53.183	0.0	0.0	**0.0**
K3	Vistula Flu. (mouth)	Oderberg (Brandenburg / Oder)	45.00	56.00	14.150	52.867	0.0	0.0	**0.0**
F1	Vistula Flu. main source	Königswartha (Spree source area)	44.00	52.50	14.367	51.283	−61.5	+52.1	80.5
F2	Vistula Flu. western source	Königsbrück / Pulsnitz	40.17	52.67	13.883	51.267	−133.0	+67.4	149.2
F3	Chalusus Flu. (mouth)	Havelberg (Havel → Elbe)	37.00	56.00	12.067	52.817	−74.5	+21.0	77.4
F4	Suebus Flu. (mouth)	Neuruppin / Fehrbellin	39.50	56.00	12.900	52.817	−63.4	+16.4	65.5
F5	Viadua Flu. (mouth)	Finowfurt / Marienwerder	42.50	56.00	13.633	52.850	−32.3	+7.1	33.1

Table 14 (continued)

#	Ptolemaic name	Identification	λ_P	ϕ_P	λ_M	ϕ_M	$\Delta\lambda$	$\Delta\phi$	r
S1	Agrippinensis*	Cologne (Altstadt)	27.67	51.17	6.958	50.941	−6.9	+73.0	73.3
S2	Aliso*	Haltern am See	28.00	51.50	7.324	51.712	−20.9	−1.8	21.0
S3	Budorigum	Doberlug-Kirchhain	41.00	52.67	13.556	51.619	−87.1	+26.9	**91.2**
S4	Calisia	Calau (Niederlausitz)	43.75	52.83	13.960	51.743	−38.2	+13.7	40.6
S5	Limis Lucus	Baruth / Mark	41.00	53.50	13.499	51.993	−78.2	+9.2	**78.7**
S6	Lugidunum	Falkenberg / Elster	39.50	52.50	13.269	51.606	−109.5	+24.5	**112.2**
S7	Stragona	Herzberg / Elster	39.67	52.33	13.200	51.667	−101.0	+11.8	**101.7**
S8	Treva	Bremen (city centre)	33.00	55.67	8.939	53.036	+26.6	−7.9	27.8
S9	Lirimiris	Bispingen / Soltau area	34.50	55.50	10.010	53.107	−5.9	−24.6	25.3
G1	Asciburgius Mons NW	E. of Magdeburg / W. Fläming	39.00	54.00	12.283	52.167	−46.5	+17.6	49.7
G2	Asciburgius Mons SE	Calauer Schweiz / Senftenberg	44.00	52.50	13.933	51.583	−31.3	+18.7	36.3
G3	Melibocus Mons W	Harz W / Weser-Leine uplands	33.00	52.50	9.433	52.000	−23.3	−7.2	24.4
G4	Melibocus Mons E	Harz E / Eisleben	37.00	52.50	11.283	51.517	−41.2	+39.1	55.2
G5	Sudete Mons W	Thuringian Forest / Kassel area	34.00	50.00	9.583	51.233	−19.8	−13.7	23.9
G6	Sudete Mons E	Thuringian Slate Mts. / Lobenstein	40.00	50.00	11.533	50.367	+11.2	+71.6	72.5

Table 14 (continued)

#	Ptolemaic name	Identification	λ_P	ϕ_P	λ_M	ϕ_M	$\Delta\lambda$	$\Delta\phi$	r
G7	Sarmate Mons N	Lusatian Highlands / Zittauer Geb.	43.50	50.50	14.467	51.133	−93.9	−2.2	94.0
G8	Abnobae Mons W	Hoher Taunus (Grosser Feldberg)	31.00	49.00	7.867	50.017	+11.2	+91.2	91.9

[*] S1 and S2 derive from Gallia Belgica (Geographike Hyphegesis, Book 2, Chapter 8) and were recorded under a different measurement system. Their latitude residuals are evaluated separately and not included in the Elster Cluster *t*-test.

Transformation formulae (from Section 11):

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{mod}} = -8.114 + 0.3989\,\lambda_P + 0.0770\,\phi_P, \qquad \hat{\phi}_{\text{mod}} = +35.458 - 0.0167\,\lambda_P + 0.3244\,\phi_P$$

Residuals: $\Delta\lambda_{\text{km}} = (\hat{\lambda} - \lambda_M) \cdot 111.3 \cdot \cos\bar{\phi}$; d_{SU} oder andere Formeln passen sich hier an; $\Delta\phi_{\text{km}} = (\hat{\phi} - \phi_M) \cdot 111.3$.

A.2 Impact Structure Key Coordinates

Table 15: Key coordinates of postulated impact structures and structural elements used throughout the text. All modern coordinates WGS84.

Feature	λ (° E)	ϕ (° N)	Notes
Saale-Unstrut impact			
Inner crater centre (Schnellroda)	11.730	51.330	postulated; $\emptyset = 16$ km
Outer ring centre (Stolberg)	11.000	51.570	postulated; 195×160 km ellipse
Outer ring E-boundary	12.118	51.570	computed: $11.000 + 77.5/69.3° = 12.118°$
Český Kráter (Mildner parameters)			
Impact centre (near Tábor)	14.670	49.420	postulated; inner $\emptyset = 80$–90 km
Outer crater rim (250–300 km $\emptyset$)	—	—	$r = 125$–150 km
Farthest Rajlich ring (≈270 km)	—	—	ring-fracture hydrothermal zone boundary
Ore Mts. N-margin (outer rim proxy)	13.200	50.500	$d \approx 196$ km from centre
Caminau kaolin (within farthest ring)	14.343	51.337	$d \approx 265$ km from centre
Bramsche Pluton			
Bramsche Pluton centre	8.000	52.420	biaxial stress axis endpoint
Structural elements			
Senftenberg rotation pivot	13.970	51.540	$\bar{R} \approx 138$ km; $\alpha \approx 39.3°$
Elbe Lineament (mid-point)	12.000	51.900	NW–SE, ≈500 km length
CDF main trace (reference point)	11.000	54.200	$r \approx 280$ km from Geiseltal
2024 Herzberg earthquake			
Epicentre centroid (BGR)	13.400	51.650	M_L 3.1; depth 21 km
Predicted ellipse focus F_2	13.519	51.783	$d(F_2, \mathrm{EQ}) = 16.9$ km

A.3 Mineral Deposit Coordinates (from KML)

Table 16: Coordinates of mineral deposits referenced in the text and plotted in the geodynamic map (from KML layer `possible Impact Structures`, v. 18e, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.20201416, 14 May 2026). d_{CK} = great-circle distance to Český Kráter centre; d_{SU} = distance to Saale-Unstrut inner crater centre (Schnellroda). All coordinates WGS84.

Deposit / Site	λ (° E)	ϕ (° N)	d_{CK} (km)	d_{SU} (km)	Type / Remarks
Hard coal and anthracite					
Lugau-Oelsnitz	12.729	50.725	212	100	Hard coal; Vogtland corridor
Freital / Döhlen Basin	13.657	50.989	240	155	Hard coal; W of Dresden
Doberlug-Kirchhain	13.554	51.616	282	130	**Anthracite**; stress-metamorphic; = Budorigum
Barsinghausen	9.470	52.299	490	88	Hard coal; near Bramsche axis
Ibbenbüren	7.740	52.286	585	126	Hard coal
Hilter a.T.W.	8.125	52.169	540	106	Wealden coal
Bielefeld Revier	8.440	52.044	510	98	Hard coal
Oschatz	13.105	51.300	255	97	Hard coal occurrence
Kaolin					
Caminau (Upper Lusatia)	14.343	51.337	265	169	**Within farthest CK ring**; Zone B
Kemmlitz	12.993	51.227	271	101	**Marginal farthest ring**; Permian rhyolite
Meissen-N (Ockrilla)	13.501	51.211	240	137	Zone B
Meissen-S (Löthain)	13.400	51.144	239	133	Zone B
Karlovy Vary	12.879	50.230	184	86	Zone B; within outer crater rim
Hirschau / Schnaittenbach	11.961	49.543	218	186	Zone B
Tirschenreuth / Rappauf	12.327	49.882	184	155	Zone B
Kupferschiefer (copper shale)					
Sangerhausen (Thomas-M.-Schacht)	11.292	51.483	320	44	Zechstein, Permian
Mansfeld / Eisleben	11.589	51.602	323	36	Largest European Cu-Ag deposit
Mosbach	10.358	50.935	400	67	Kupferschiefer occurrence
Ilfeld (Lange Wand)	10.787	51.567	345	34	Kupferschiefer