



HAL
open science

Historical Earthquake Scenarios for the Middle Strand of the North Anatolian Fault Deduced from Archeo-Damage Inventory and Building Deformation Modeling

Yacine Benjelloun, Julia Sigoyer (de), H el ene Dessales, Laurent Baillet,
Philippe Gueguen, Mustafa Sahin

► **To cite this version:**

Yacine Benjelloun, Julia Sigoyer (de), H el ene Dessales, Laurent Baillet, Philippe Gueguen, et al..
Historical Earthquake Scenarios for the Middle Strand of the North Anatolian Fault Deduced from
Archeo-Damage Inventory and Building Deformation Modeling. *Seismological Research Letters*, 2020,
92 (1), pp. 583-598. 10.1785/0220200278 . hal-03012816

HAL Id: hal-03012816

<https://hal.science/hal-03012816v1>

Submitted on 28 May 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche franais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.

Seismological Research Letters

Historical earthquake scenarios for the middle strand of the North Anatolian Fault deduced from archeo-damage inventory and building deformation modeling --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	SRL-D-20-00278R2
Full Title:	Historical earthquake scenarios for the middle strand of the North Anatolian Fault deduced from archeo-damage inventory and building deformation modeling
Article Type:	Historical Seismologist
Corresponding Author:	Yacine Benjelloun, Ph.D. Institut De Physique Du Globe De Paris Paris, Ile-de-France FRANCE
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Institut De Physique Du Globe De Paris
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Yacine Benjelloun, Ph.D.
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Yacine Benjelloun, Ph.D. Julia de Sigoyer Hélène Dessales Laurent Baillet Philippe Guéguen Mustafa Sahin
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Manuscript Region of Origin:	
Suggested Reviewers:	Shmuel Marco, Ph.D. Professor, Tel Aviv University shmulikm@tauex.tau.ac.il Significant experience in archeoseismology Miguel Angel Rodriguez-Pascua, Ph.D. Researcher, Instituto Geológico y Minero de España ma.rodriguez@igme.es Significant experience in archeoseismology Manuel Sintubin, Ph.D. Professor, KU Leuven manuel.sintubin@kuleuven.be Significant experience in earthquake archeology Chris Gerrard, Ph.D. Professor, Durham University c.m.gerrard@durham.ac.uk Manager of several projects studying seismic events in the Middle Ages.

1 **Historical earthquake scenarios for the middle strand of the North Anatolian Fault deduced from**
2 **archo-damage inventory and building deformation modeling**

3 Yacine Benjelloun¹, Julia de Sigoyer², H el ene Dessales³, Laurent Baillet², Philippe Gu eguen², Mustafa
4 Sahin⁴

5 1 : Universit e de Paris, Institut de physique du globe de Paris, CNRS, F-75005 Paris, France

6 2 : Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Univ. Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS, IFSTTAR, IRD, ISTerre, 38000 Grenoble, France

7 3 : ENS, UMR 8546, Laboratoire AOROC-ENS, 75230 Paris, France

8 4 : Fen-Edebiyat Fak ltesi, Arkeoloji B l m , Uludag  niversitesi, Bursa, Turkey

9

10 Corresponding author :

11 Yacine Benjelloun

12 Institut de Physique du Globe - UMR7154

13 1, rue Jussieu

14 75238 Paris cedex 05, France

15 +33 (0)6 80 21 52 44

16 benjelloun@ipgp.fr

17

18

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 The city of Iznik (ancient Nicaea), located on the middle strand of the North Anatolian fault zone
23 (MNAF), presents outstanding archeological monuments preserved from the Roman and Ottoman
24 periods (1st-15th c. AD), bearing deformations which can be linked to past seismic shaking. In order to
25 constrain the date and intensity of these historical earthquakes, a systematic survey of Earthquake
26 Archeological Effects (EAE) is carried out on the city's damaged buildings. Each of the 235 EAE found is
27 given a quality ranking and the corresponding damage is classified according to the EMS98 scale. We
28 show that the walls oriented N-S were preferentially damaged, and that most deformations are
29 perpendicular to the walls' axes. The date of postseismic repairs is constrained with available
30 archeological data and new ¹⁴C dating of mortar charcoals. Three damage episodes are evidenced: (1)
31 between the 6th and late 8th centuries, (2) between the 9th and late 11th centuries AD, (3) after the late
32 14th century AD. The repartition of damage as a function of building vulnerability points toward a global
33 intensity VIII on the EMS98 scale. The 3D modeling of a deformed Roman obelisk shows that only
34 earthquakes rupturing the MNAF can account for this deformation. Their magnitude can be bracketed
35 between Mw 6 and 7. Our archeoseismological study complements the historical seismicity catalogue
36 and confirms paleoseismological data, suggesting several destructive earthquakes along the MNAF
37 since the first century AD. We suggest the fault might still have accumulated enough stress to generate
38 a Mw 7+ rupture.

39

40 **INTRODUCTION**

41 Documenting the calendar of past earthquakes in tectonically active regions is an important step to
42 determine their seismic hazard (Guidoboni and Stucchi, 1993; Bilham et al., 2001). In certain contexts,
43 the knowledge of Holocene earthquakes is the only way to estimate the magnitude range expectable
44 in a given area and the recurrence times between big earthquakes. Paleoseismological trenching
45 allows one to identify the last ruptures in the stratigraphy at a given point of the fault (McCalpin, 2009).

46 Historical seismology has been developed to build earthquake catalogues using written descriptions of
47 seismic events (Ambraseys, 2000, 2002). Whereas palaeoseismology is primarily concerned with the
48 source of earthquakes, historical seismology interprets the observable consequences in the form of
49 intensities felt at given locations.

50 Evidence of coseismic deformation found in the stratigraphy of archeological survey sites and on
51 ancient buildings has been increasingly described and used to complement earthquake catalogues
52 and, in some cases, quantitatively constrain earthquakes thanks to numerical modeling (Korzhenkov
53 and Mazor, 1999; Mazor and Korzhenkov, 2001; Hinzen, 2005). Although the interpretation of
54 archeological evidence is delicate because possible traces of earthquakes are rarely unambiguous,
55 this “archeoseismological” approach allows one to document past earthquakes in regions without
56 written archives, which extends the time scale of the catalogue (Karcz and Kafri, 1978). The
57 archeological record may also preserve smaller events that are poorly preserved in classical trenches
58 (Rapp, 1986).

59 In this study, we apply this archeoseimological approach to the city of Iznik (ancient Nicaea), located 3
60 km north of the active fault segments of the middle strand of the North Anatolian fault (MNAF, Fig. 1).
61 Since the beginning of the instrumental period, this fault strand has been characterized by a very low
62 seismicity and deformation rate (Özener et al., 2013; Öztürk et al., 2009). However, various datasets
63 documenting the pre-instrumental seismic activity strongly contrast with this modern quiescence. The
64 historical record of ancient earthquakes having affected Iznik (Fig. 2) contains no less than ten
65 destructive earthquakes during the last two millennia (Ambraseys and Finkel, 1991; Ambraseys and
66 Jackson, 1998, 2000; Ambraseys, 2000, 2002, 2009; Guidoboni et al., 1994). The compilation of the
67 paleoseismic trench data along the MNAF suggests the occurrence of at least four Mw 6+ earthquakes
68 during the last two millennia (Barka, 1992, 1993; Dogan, 2010; Ikeda, 1988; Ikeda et al., 1989; Özalp et
69 al., 2013; Yoshioka & Kusçu, 1994). Moreover, the region presents several archeological clues
70 suggesting past earthquake occurrence, such as the submerged basilica recently discovered in Iznik

71 Lake (Sahin & Fairchild, 2018), and the numerous traces of deformation and reconstruction on the
72 city's ancient buildings (Benjelloun et al., 2018). Despite this evidence of past earthquakes, more
73 precise data are needed to perform a reliable assessment of seismic hazard for the Iznik region.

74 The goal of this study is to use the ancient buildings in Iznik and its surroundings as records of past
75 seismicity. The compilation of many traces of potential earthquake damage provides a complementary
76 dataset to historical seismology and paleoseismology in order to discuss the level of seismic activity of
77 the MNAF during the last 2000 years. The dating of several independent buildings affected by
78 earthquake shaking, and their repairs, allows us to complement the earthquake catalogue. The
79 modeling of archeoseismic damage helps to discuss the epicenter location and strength of the
80 earthquakes responsible for the damage observable today in the city.

81

82 **TECTONIC CONTEXT OF THE STUDY: THE MNAF AND IZNIK'S SEISMIC LANDSCAPE**

83 The study area includes the city of Iznik and its close surroundings, in the southeast of the Marmara
84 Sea (Fig. 1 and 3a). It is located on the middle branch of the North Anatolian fault. The North Anatolian
85 Fault zone (NAFZ) is a major tectonic boundary accommodating the relative motion between the
86 Eurasian and Anatolian plates. It is a 1000-km long, right-lateral strike-slip fault crossing the northern
87 part of Turkey (Sengör, 1979). This fault zone is associated with a significant seismic hazard and with
88 several destructive earthquakes since the beginning of the Common Era (Fig. 2).

89 In its western termination, the NAFZ is divided into three strands (Fig. 1). The northern strand (NNAF)
90 continues along the strike of the main fault zone and crosses the northern part of the Marmara Sea
91 from Izmit Gulf to Gelibolu Peninsula. This strand was especially involved in the last seismic crisis that
92 occurred as a succession of ruptures migrating westwards, from Erzincan in 1939 to Izmit in 1999 (Stein
93 et al., 1997). The middle strand (MNAF) separates from the NNAF in the Akyazi district, borders on the
94 south two successive basins known as the Geyve-Pamukova Basin and Iznik Lake, reaches the Marmara

95 Sea through Gemlik Gulf and borders the southern shore of the Marmara Sea (Fig. 3a). With a relative
96 horizontal motion estimated around 5 mm/year with GPS (Ergintav et al., 2014), the MNAF shows a
97 deformation rate five times smaller than the NNAF (~20-25 mm/year) (Reilinger et al., 2006). The
98 southern strand (SNAF) separates from the MNAF near Iznik and continues southwestwards to Ulubat
99 and Manyas Lakes (Fig. 1).

100 In addition to the MNAF, smaller structures around Iznik Lake show morphological evidence of recent
101 activity. North of the lake, two oblique fault zones, the NW-SE striking Orhangazi fault (Fig. 3a) and the
102 ENE-WSW striking Boyalica fault, separate the basement rocks of the Armutlu block and the
103 Quaternary alluvia of the lacustrine plain (Öztürk et al., 2009). A small normal fault zone, the Elbeyli
104 fault, was described east of Iznik, forming a 7 km long scarp at the foot of a marble and schist massif,
105 cross-cutting in the south the eastern section of the Iznik aqueduct (Benjelloun et al., 2018).

106 The natural environment of Iznik presents cumulative expression of Holocene and historical coseismic
107 effects, such as faceted scarps (Fig. 3b), meter scale recent scarplets evidenced on land (Ikeda et al.,
108 1989) and in the bathymetry of Iznik Lake (Gastineau et al., 2020 PREPRINT), laterally offset
109 geomorphic markers (Ikeda, 1988; Sipahioglu and Matsuda, 1986; Yoshioka and Kusçu, 1994), and
110 transtensional basins (Dogan et al., 2015). This leads geologists to qualify the city's geological
111 environment as a "seismic landscape", as defined by Michetti et al. (2005). The most prominent
112 earthquake source for the Iznik region is the MNAF, which represents a 140 km long dextral fault zone
113 between Akyazi district and Gemlik. A rupture propagating along this whole section would correspond
114 to a $M_w 7.6 \pm 0.3$ earthquake (Wells and Coppersmith, 1994).

115

116 **ARCHEOSEISMOLOGICAL DATA COLLECTION**

117 The main principle of an archeoseismological investigation is to look for traces of past earthquake
118 deformation in archeological features, which are commonly called Earthquake Archeological Effects

119 (EAE; Rodriguez-Pascua et al., 2011). These EAE can be located on-fault, when an archeological
120 structure is crossed and deformed by an active fault. However, the most numerous archeoseismic
121 observations are located off-fault and concern buildings which have been deformed because of
122 coseismic ground motion. Finally, we include in EAE the evidence for postseismic reconstructions
123 which serve to repair a building damaged during an earthquake and/or to make it more resistant to
124 future earthquakes.

125 In Iznik and its surroundings, systematic archeoseismic observations were made on the visible ancient
126 remains (Fig. 4 and 5; for the complete list see Tables S2 and S3 in the electronic supplement). We
127 focused our observations on the critical buildings of the city, such as the aqueduct and the defensive
128 walls, which were especially important for its viability and were likely repaired as soon as damaged.
129 The types of inventoried EAE in Iznik include: wall facing collapses, wall warping, wall tilting, cracks,
130 unusual wall offsets, masonry dislocations, block rotations, block corner expulsions, block shifting,
131 damaged arches, dropped keystones, arch collapses, column tilting, expulsion of building corner, and
132 deformed pavement (Kazmér, 2014; Rodriguez-Pascua et al., 2011). To this dataset we also added
133 suspected traces of post-seismic repairs and reconstructions: presumed “seismoresistant” techniques,
134 buttresses, filling of damaged masonry with new materials, partial reconstruction of a damaged
135 building, filling of windows and crenellations, massive reuse of materials taken from older buildings.

136 Each individual observation was given an identification code. This code is composed of a prefix related
137 to the nature or category of building (AQ for the aqueduct, W for the defensive walls, C for the *intra*
138 *muros* buildings and O for the obelisk) and a number. For suspected post-seismic repairs and
139 constructions, an R is added at the beginning of the ID. The observations were geolocalized and the
140 nature of the associated deformation or reconstruction was reported. Whenever possible, we
141 measured the azimuth of the damaged wall, and the amount of displacement (lateral shift, vertical
142 drop, angle of tilting). For oriented deformations, we also measured the azimuth (i.e. axis of the
143 deformation, between 0 and 180°) and strike (i.e. direction between 0 and 360°) of the deformation.

144 In the following sections, when referring to the defensive walls, we use the naming conventions of
145 Schneider and Karnapp (1938) and Foss and Winfield (1986). Each tower is numbered from T1 to T114
146 starting from Yenisehir Gate in the south and progressing anti-clockwise (Fig. 6b). Each wall section is
147 numbered according to the adjacent towers (e.g. W1/2 for the wall section between T1 and T2).

148 For each EAE, we used a quality factor between 1 and 3, reflecting the probability of seismic origin of
149 the deformation versus other causes (e. g. anthropic damage, natural decay, soil instability). We assign
150 a quality 1 (good) when the seismic origin is the most probable scenario for the EAE and other
151 processes can be discarded. When the EAE can be associated with one non-seismic process in addition
152 to the seismic scenario, we assign a quality 2 (average). When the seismic origin is dubious because
153 many other processes may be invoked to explain the observed deformation, we assign a quality 3
154 (bad). The cases of damage were also classified on a damage scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1 corresponding
155 to very slight damage and 5 to complete destruction) and the buildings investigated were classified on
156 a vulnerability scale (Grünthal & Levret, 2001).

157 On several EAE, construction material (brick, mortar) was sampled in the original structures and the
158 repairs to constrain the date of damage. Carbonate concretion deposits on the aqueduct formed
159 during potentially coseismic massive leakage episodes were also sampled to date the associated
160 damage.

161

162

163 **DESCRIPTION OF THE BUILDINGS STUDIED**

164 ***The Roman obelisk at Elbeyli***

165 6 km north of Iznik, near the village of Elbeyli, stands a Roman obelisk built during the 1st century AD
166 (Fig. 6a and 7). The column is made of five triangular prismatic stones lying on a rectangular pedestal

167 (Fig. 7). Small offsets between the triangular stones suggest translation and rotation motions probably
168 during seismic shaking (Fig. 7b,c).

169 ***The aqueduct of Iznik***

170 The remains of two aqueducts are visible in the east of Iznik. One was discovered in 2019 outside of
171 the city walls, north of the graveyard. The other one, much better preserved, enters the city through
172 Lefke gate (Fig. 6). The best-preserved parts of this aqueduct extend along 600 m, starting from the
173 city gate, with an E-W orientation. 1 km east of the city, the aqueduct runs along the southern border
174 of a carbonate massif where its sources are located (Dereköy village, see Fig. 3a for location). The
175 aqueduct presents an underground section, 400 m long. The aqueduct of Iznik has only recently been
176 studied in detail by Benjelloun et al. (2018). Using a stratigraphic approach coupled with architectural
177 analogies, they concluded that the earliest phases visible were likely to belong to Justinian's period (6th
178 century AD), and identified major restoration works around the 11th and 13th centuries AD.

179 ***The walls of Iznik***

180 The defensive walls of Iznik are made of two belts surrounding the city (Fig. 6b). They were extensively
181 studied by Schneider and Karnapp (1938) and Foss and Winfield (1986) (the chronology of the
182 fortifications is presented in Fig. S1 in the electronic supplement). The inner belt was first built during
183 the 3rd century AD, after Gothic attacks in 256-257. The remains of these early walls can still be seen
184 at several points (Fig. 4b).

185 After an Arab attack in 727, the walls were partly rebuilt by Leo III (717-741). These reconstructions
186 mainly affected the eastern and southern parts. Another important reconstruction campaign followed
187 in 858 under Michael III, especially affecting the eastern and southern sides. After a period of peace,
188 the 10th and 11th century saw the walls damaged on several occasions, until the city was taken by the
189 Turks in the end of the 11th century. In 1097, the city was given back to the Byzantine ruler Alexios I
190 Komnenos, who carried out a few reconstructions (Fig. 4a). The last major reconstructions occurred

191 during the Lascaris and Palaeologue periods in the 13th century (Fig. 4c), with the addition of the outer
192 walls during the reign of John III Doukas Vatatzes (1222-1254 AD). Since 2018, important restoring
193 works have been carried out on the defensive walls, erasing most of the traces of previous damage
194 and reconstruction phases. Our observations on the walls were done before the beginning of these
195 works.

196 ***Intra muros buildings***

197 We inventoried several deformations and possible “seismoresistant” techniques in the Iznik theater
198 (Fig. 6b), built during the 2nd century AD, and spoiled significantly as a quarry in later periods.
199 Deformations were also described in Aya Sofia, a church built by Justinian in the 6th century AD,
200 restored in the 9th, 11th, and 13th centuries, and converted into a mosque by Orhan shortly after the
201 Ottoman conquest of 1331 (Brounoff, 1925; Schneider, 1943). We also found deformations and
202 technical innovations potentially related to earthquakes in several Ottoman buildings: Yesilcamii
203 mosque built in the late 14th century (Fig. 4e), Mahmut Celebi mosque built in 1442, and Murat II
204 hamam built in the first half of the 15th century (Fig. 4d). Other traces of damage were encountered
205 on a few Ottoman tombstones located in Candarli Hayrettin Pasa mausoleum.

206

207 **DAMAGE INVENTORY**

208 ***Location of the damage***

209 We inventoried 235 cases of damage (Fig. 5). The observations are especially dense on the inner walls
210 (almost 4 observations every 100 m in average) and the outer walls seem much less affected (less than
211 1 observation every 100 m on average). The damage observed is in general regularly distributed all
212 along the inner walls. In some areas the density of observations is much lower. This can be the case
213 when the remains have disappeared, such as in west of the city. In other areas, the dense vegetation

214 or the presence of private areas near the walls prevented the survey, such as in the northeastern
215 section between towers 46 and 50, and in the southwestern section between towers 95 and 104.

216 ***Azimuth of the damaged walls***

217 The relative repartition of the different wall orientations was compared to the relative number of EAE
218 found in these different wall azimuth ranges, no matter the azimuth of the deformation (Fig. 8a). The
219 results do not change significantly when data of lower qualities are included. If all the walls were
220 affected in the same way whatever their azimuth, the relative amount of EAE and the orientations
221 should present similar distributions. This is the case for the E-W and NW-SE oriented walls that show
222 a correspondence between the relative amounts of EAE and the lengths of the walls affected. By
223 contrast, we can see that the N-S oriented walls bear much more EAE than what could be expected
224 from their length: they contain a third of the walls' EAE whereas they represent only 12.7% of the total
225 wall length. Conversely, the NE-SW oriented walls are underrepresented in terms of EAE.

226 ***Oriented deformations***

227 105 of our observations present an oriented pattern (e. g. azimuth of collapse or expulsion). Most of
228 the oriented deformations show a strong correlation with the wall azimuth (Fig. 8b): they are either
229 perpendicular to the wall (out-of-plane) or parallel (in-plane). A clear, dominant, N-S azimuth appears,
230 representing 30% of the observations (Fig 8c). This actually mirrors the greater length of walls oriented
231 E-W (Fig. 8a). For almost all the azimuth ranges, deformations exist in both directions, but the
232 deformations oriented NE-SW are characterized by an exclusive NE strike of the damage.

233 ***Time constraints on the deformations***

234 The earliest EAE are found almost all around the inner walls and in the theater (Fig. 5b). The later
235 sections of the walls were also affected by several deformations. The aqueduct shows a significant
236 number of EAE from all periods. EAE from the Ottoman period were found especially intra muros on
237 the mosques and the bathhouse. It is expected that older buildings display a larger amount of damage

238 compared to more recent ones because they are more likely to accumulate damage from several
239 deformation episodes. As mentioned in the previous section, the amount of EAE seems much smaller
240 on the outer walls built in the 13th century, which is coherent with the fact that it is one of the latest
241 buildings of the Byzantine period.

242 The repairs were mainly dated relying on the age of the repaired structure and the technique used in
243 the repair. We could find repairs for all the major construction periods of the city, from the 9th century
244 to the Ottoman times (for the list, see Table S3 in the electronic supplement). For the earlier periods,
245 we could only find possible seismoresistant techniques of construction in the theater with the use of
246 polygonal imbricated ashlar (Garduño-Monroy et al., 2012; Hinzen and Montabert, 2017).

247 We were also able to date with ¹⁴C four charcoal samples from mortar filling the dismantled ashlar of
248 tower T57 base and one sample from the new masonry covering the rotated blocks of Istanbul Gate
249 (Fig. 4f, see Fig. 6b for locations). The ages obtained point toward repairs following a deformation
250 episode in the late 11th or early 12th centuries (Table 1). Finally, we tried to date the organic fraction
251 of carbonate concretions sampled on the aqueduct wall, but we obtained a very recent age. The link
252 between the external concretions and historical earthquakes is therefore unlikely.

253 Combining the ages of the affected walls and their repairs, we obtain many time ranges of different
254 widths constraining one or several events (Table 2). The narrower, distinct time intervals obtained for
255 possible earthquakes are (1) 527-787, (2) 858-1097, and (3) after the late 14th century AD. The first
256 interval corresponds to several good quality EAE but located in Aya Sofya only. The second interval is
257 constrained by one intermediate and one bad quality EAE in the walls, but also matches the ¹⁴C ages
258 of the sampled postseismic repairs. It is then probable that the associated damage observed on
259 Istanbul Gate and tower T57 belongs to this episode. The third interval is documented by one good
260 and two intermediate quality EAE in the walls. We can also mention a wider interval, between 730 and
261 1254 AD, including 12 good quality EAE that might belong to the two precedent intervals. Finally, the
262 Ottoman period presents 17 EAE, mostly of good quality, collected on four different buildings. The

263 earliest building, Yesilcamii, was built in 1378 AD, but the EAE observed on Celebi camii indicate a
264 deformation occurring after 1442 AD.

265 ***Vulnerability analysis and estimation of local intensity***

266 The investigated buildings were classified into three vulnerability classes A, B and C following the EMS-
267 98 framework (Grünthal & Levret, 2001). Class A includes the most vulnerable buildings, which use
268 rough rubble stones and a mortar of average quality. Class B includes the buildings using carefully cut
269 stones or terracottas, and a mortar of good quality. Class C includes more resistant buildings using
270 large ashlar. When the building presented visible defaults or weaknesses in its construction, we
271 lowered its vulnerability class by one rank (e.g. A instead of B). For each vulnerability class, we
272 computed the ratio of the total number of damage of a given grade observed over the length of the
273 walls considered (Fig. 9a). The damage repartition is quite similar for classes B and C with a maximum
274 for grade 2 (moderate) and limited damage for higher grades. The buildings of class A appear less
275 affected by individual cases of damage on their total length, but are characterized by a higher severity
276 of the damage, with a maximum for grade 3 (important non-structural damage and moderate
277 structural damage).

278 The assessment of building damage following an earthquake makes it possible to derive a local
279 intensity reflecting the severity of ground shaking. For that, the damage distributions obtained for
280 different building vulnerability classes is compared to empirical relationships (damage probability
281 matrices, DPM) linking, for a given intensity, the probability that buildings are affected by damage of
282 different grades (Fig. 9b; Riedel, 2015). In modern postseismic damage surveys, each building is given
283 one grade of damage. In our case, the number of individual buildings that could be surveyed is too low,
284 and long linear buildings like the defensive walls and the aqueduct cannot be considered “individual
285 buildings”. Therefore, we chose to assign a damage grade to each EAE and to consider the ratio of EAE
286 per linear meter of wall. It is difficult to directly compare our damage ratios with the DPMs because

287 our counting method should be first calibrated with modern earthquakes, but we can still obtain
288 qualitative estimates of intensity.

289 For vulnerability class A, we obtain a flat distribution for quality 1 EAE (Fig. 9a). When lower qualities
290 are included, we observe a larger peak for grade 3 damage and a significant representation of grade 1
291 damage. The grade 3 damage peak points toward a VII-VIII intensity, but our grade 1 damage is
292 overrepresented compared to the DPM in this range. For vulnerability class B, the obtained distribution
293 is more regular and insensitive to EAE quality, with a maximum for grade 2 followed by a progressive
294 decrease for bigger grades. This distribution is most compatible with an intensity VIII. For vulnerability
295 class C, we obtain a similar distribution to class B, with a clear maximum for grade 2 and much lower
296 ratios for the other grades. This suggests a VIII-IX intensity, with an overrepresentation of grade 4
297 damage compared to the DPM in this range. As a result, a minimal intensity VIII seems to account best
298 for the three damage distributions (Fig. 9b).

299

300 **MODELING OF THE DEFORMATION OF THE OBELISK**

301 The obelisk located north of Iznik was chosen to test numerically whether an earthquake rupturing the
302 MNAF is able to cause the displacement of the blocks, as is observed today. The constituting elements
303 of the obelisk were measured in order to build a 3D model of the obelisk (for the geometry of the
304 model, see Fig. S2 in the electronic supplement). The numerical model was built using a non-linear
305 transient finite-element analysis (Baillet et al., 2005). The marble blocks were assigned a Young
306 modulus of 50 GPa, a Poisson's ratio of 0.2 and a density of 2.7. Two values of Coulomb friction
307 coefficient between each block were tested at 0.5 and 0.7. We selected as input five three-component
308 ground acceleration signals, recorded during four real strike-slip earthquakes (for the list and
309 characteristics of these earthquakes, see Table S5 in the electronic supplement). The range of
310 magnitude of these earthquakes is Mw 5.9-7.3. The signals were selected so that the distance between
311 the recording station and the epicentre was in the same range as the distance between the obelisk and

312 the closest MNAF segments (5-20 km) and with a similar site effect category (site class C in Eurocode-
313 8). The acceleration signals were converted into displacement signals with two integrations. Before
314 each integration, we subtracted the mean and the trend to prevent a drift of the signals, and smoothed
315 the high-frequency peaks with a 4-order bandpass Butterworth between 0.1 and 20 Hz. The signals
316 were eventually resampled to the 0.5e-5 s time step of the numerical modeling approach. They were
317 then imposed at the base surface of the obelisk. In a second set of simulations, we applied the
318 earthquake signals twice in a row to reproduce examples of cumulative deformation (Fig. 10).

319 Most of the energy of the seismic signals is focused below 1 Hz for the Düzce earthquake and 4 Hz for
320 the others. The modal analysis of the modeled structure shows two main resonance frequencies at 7.8
321 and 7.84 Hz in flexional modes. The third mode corresponds to a frequency over 30 Hz, which is not
322 excited by the selected seismic signals.

323 The obelisk collapses only for the signal of Mw 7.3 Düzce earthquake (Table 3). For the other signals,
324 the obelisk still shows irreversible relative displacement between blocks. The most significant values
325 of displacement between adjacent blocks are obtained for the Mw 6.1 Azores Islands and Mw 5.9
326 Kyllini signals. At the end of the single-event simulations, these values are slightly lower than the
327 centimeter offsets observed on the field. The relative rotations obtained between adjacent blocks are
328 less than 1° and hardly reproduce the actual rotation component, clearly visible on the monument. At
329 the end of the double-event simulations, the obelisk remains standing for all events but Düzce, and
330 shows a cumulative deformation, which is twice the deformation of the single-event simulations. The
331 final values obtained for two Azores Islands events better reproduce the field observations.

332

333

334

335

336 **DISCUSSION**

337 ***Local intensity and associated earthquakes***

338 Our intensity estimation can be impacted by two biases. (1) Contrary to postseismic surveys, we did
339 not study a representative sample of the buildings that used to stand in Iznik in ancient and medieval
340 times. It is probable that the buildings still visible today are among the most resistant, and that the
341 more vulnerable buildings have disappeared and were replaced by modern constructions. The
342 empirical damage distributions suggest that the heaviest structural damage is concentrated on these
343 vulnerable buildings, while the more resistant buildings tend to mainly bear slighter damage (Fig. 9b).
344 Therefore, the successive cycles of repairs and reconstructions will tend to erase the traces of the
345 heaviest damage (grades 4 and 5), while the slighter damage will be preferentially preserved. This
346 selection bias will lead to underestimation of the intensity felt in Iznik during past earthquakes. This
347 means that we constrain a minimal intensity. (2) Our damage dataset results from the cumulative
348 effects of several earthquakes, and our qualitative comparison with the DPMs relies on the assumption
349 that these earthquakes produced similar damage distributions. This seems to be the case as the
350 obtained damage distributions are close to the empirical DPMs (Fig. 9). We can also assume that the
351 final curve will mostly reflect the bigger events, which leave most traces of damage. Our vulnerability
352 analysis may thus only constrain a minimal intensity, around VIII, for the biggest ruptures suffered in
353 Iznik in the last two millennia.

354 With an epicentre located on the fault segments 3 km south of the city on the MNAF segments, an
355 intensity VIII in Iznik can be produced by a Mw 6+ earthquake (Erdik et al., 1985). The deformations
356 observed on the obelisk suggest magnitudes over 6, probably between 6 and 7, in the case of events
357 rupturing the same segments south of Iznik, in agreement with the vulnerability analysis. However,
358 the modeling also shows that a stronger earthquake near Iznik would have destroyed the obelisk. We
359 may therefore rule out the occurrence of this kind of Mw 7+ event during the historical period for the
360 fault segments close to Iznik.

361

362 ***Historical seismicity scenarios***

363 The vulnerability analysis and obelisk modeling argue for a significant seismogenic potential of the
364 MNAF. In this section, we discuss the deformation episodes identified by archeoseismology and
365 examine together independent evidence gathered from the historical seismicity catalogues and
366 paleoseismic trenching studies.

367 *Possible deformations before the 6th century AD*

368 Although it was not possible to find repairs anterior to the 8th century AD, a part of the EAE affecting
369 the older buildings of Iznik may have been caused by earlier earthquakes. The historical catalogue
370 includes six events with damage reported in Nicaea (Fig. 2). Three events were attributed to the MNAF,
371 in 29-32 AD, 121 AD and 368 AD. The magnitudes estimated are around 7 and it seems that the 121
372 AD event was the strongest, possibly of $M \sim 7.4$. While the first two events are said to have caused
373 partial destruction in Iznik, the 368 AD event is said to have caused complete destruction. This last
374 description is likely exaggerated as several buildings from this period, such as the theater and the 3rd
375 century walls, are still standing today.

376 We also need to examine the possibility that Nicaea was affected by earthquakes rupturing the NNAF.
377 Historical descriptions do include such occurrences, e. g. in 358 AD, 362 AD and 478 AD with
378 magnitudes estimated between 6.8 and 7.4, but the precise nature and severity of the destruction
379 caused are difficult to determine (Fig. 2). A M_w 7.5 earthquake rupturing the fault segments crossing
380 Izmit Gulf may produce an intensity VIII in Iznik (Erdik et al., 1985). However, during the 1999 M_w 7.6
381 Izmit earthquake, intensities VI were reported in the Iznik area and the local seismic station recorded
382 a peak horizontal acceleration of 0.12g only (Celebi et al., 2000). Accordingly, the damage in Iznik was
383 slight: the chimneys of some houses fell down or were bent and a very small part of the defensive walls

384 collapsed (pers. comm. Cengiz Celik). Therefore, the earthquakes rupturing the NNAF are unlikely to
385 account for a significant part of our damage dataset.

386 *The 527-787 AD episode*

387 This period of time is associated with two historical earthquakes, both of them located on the NNAF
388 (Fig. 2). In 554 AD, a $M_s \sim 7$ earthquake severely affected Constantinople and Nicomedia (Izmit). Partial
389 damage is reported in Iznik, but by one source only. In 740 AD, a major M_s 7.1 event affected the
390 eastern part of the Marmara Sea and it is reported that “a single church survived” in Iznik which was
391 totally destroyed. For the same reasons as exposed above, this testimony cannot be taken literally. But
392 given that no other earthquake is known in the region, the EAE associated to this episode may result
393 from these earthquakes. It should be emphasized that our constraints for this episode are scarce and
394 limited to one building only.

395 *The 858-1097 episode*

396 Iznik was affected by war damage during this period of time. In the late 10th century, the Byzantine
397 general Bardas Skleros led a wide-scale rebellion in Asia Minor. In 978, he besieged Iznik and some
398 parts of the walls, especially the tower T106 in the southwest were heavily damaged (Holmes, 2005).
399 One century later, the city was temporarily seized by the Turks and was attacked by the Crusaders in
400 1097 AD. Most fights happened around the southern gate, damaging the walls and destroying tower
401 T106 (Cahen, 1948; Foss, 1996; Norwich, 1993).

402 Our evidence for this deformation episode includes good quality EAE and rebuilding on tower T57 and
403 Istanbul Gate in the northern section. The rebuilding closely postdates the only historical earthquake
404 documented in Iznik for this time interval, in 1065 AD. With a magnitude estimated at 6.8, it caused
405 widespread damage to churches, the city walls, and numerous houses. No other locality seems to have
406 been damaged, which suggests a local event rupturing the MNAF. Sediment cores recently sampled in
407 the southeastern part of Iznik Lake corroborate the occurrence of a seismic event rupturing the fault

408 segments south of Iznik during the 11th century AD (Gastineau et al., 2020 PREPRINT). We can consider
409 that our EAE dataset most probably includes the archeological signature of this event.

410 *The Ottoman episode (after 1330 AD)*

411 The traces of earthquake damage found on several Ottoman buildings indicate that Iznik was affected
412 by at least one significant earthquake since the 14th century AD. Three different scenarios can be
413 proposed.

414 (1) This damage may have resulted from earthquakes rupturing the NNAF. Several historical
415 earthquakes with damage reported at Iznik are known (Fig. 2). In 1754 AD, a strong Ms 7 earthquake
416 affected the region of Izmit on the NNAF, destroying a few houses in Iznik, apparently without
417 casualties. In 1878 and 1893 AD, two smaller earthquakes in the same area of the NNAF caused slight
418 damage in Iznik, but with much lower magnitudes, between 5 and 6. Finally, in 1894 AD, a Ms 7.3
419 earthquake ruptured the Izmit Gulf faults and caused liquefaction and landslides in the epicentral
420 region and widespread destruction between Istanbul, Gemlik and Sapanca. The effects in Iznik are not
421 well known.

422 (2) Another source of damage comes from a cluster of earthquakes that affected the SNAF and MNAF
423 west of Iznik in the second half of the 19th century (Fig. 2). Most of the activity extended between Bursa
424 and Gemlik, but it seems that some ruptures were also located closer to Iznik, probably along the faults
425 bordering the southern shore of Iznik Lake. The biggest earthquakes happened in the Bursa region and
426 did not affect the area east of Gemlik significantly. The other events correspond to much smaller
427 earthquakes, with magnitudes under 6. Only slight damage is mentioned in Iznik on March 3, 1893 AD.

428 (3) Interestingly, the Ottoman episode matches the paleoseismic evidence of two contemporary
429 ruptures (Fig. 2), sometime between the 12th and 18th century AD in Gemlik (Özalp et al., 2013), and
430 sometime between the 14th and 18th century AD in the west of Mekece (Ikeda, 1988). It can thus be
431 proposed that the Ottoman damage in Iznik was caused by one or several earthquakes rupturing the

432 MNAF segments between the 14th and 18th centuries AD. The trench data do not constrain the
433 magnitudes of these events, but the obelisk modeling argues against a Mw 7+ earthquake south of
434 Iznik, which suggests more moderate and/or distant events. The historical catalogues do not present
435 any mention of Iznik between the 12th and 18th centuries AD, but it can be questioned whether this
436 reflects a true period of seismic quiescence for the Iznik region. It is known that at the end of the 13th
437 centuries, Iznik suffered significant emigration because of the Ottoman conquests in Anatolia, so much
438 so that after the city was conquered, in 1331 AD, it was described as a ruined city only inhabited by
439 few people (Ibn Batuta, 2012). The city eventually lost its political and strategic importance, which
440 might explain why it disappeared from the archives of past seismicity. In comparison, important
441 centers like Bursa or Gemlik continued to suffer damage from repeated earthquakes, such as in 1419
442 AD. During this period of time, the historical catalogue also includes events which were felt in Istanbul
443 but with too little information to precisely locate the epicenter, e.g. in July 1402 and January 1656 AD
444 (Ambraseys, 2009).

445

446 **CONCLUSION**

447 Using an archeoseismological approach, we identified 235 traces of possible earthquake damage in
448 Iznik, and more than 100 of them can be attributed to seismic shaking with high confidence. The
449 different walls of the city, depending on their orientation or their age, show different patterns of
450 damage. The damage was more severe for N-S oriented walls, while NE-SW walls show less
451 deformation. The older constructions are also more affected than more recent walls. Three distinct
452 episodes of earthquake damage were identified, two before the Ottoman conquest of 1331 AD, and
453 one after. The dating of several repairs associated with earthquake damage enabled us to constrain
454 the time of occurrence of two individual events, between 527 and 787 AD, and between 858 and 1097
455 AD. While the latter event may correspond to the 1065 earthquake described by ancient sources, the
456 two others can be accounted for by different earthquake scenarios. We have estimated that the

457 damage observed corresponds to a minimal intensity VIII, most compatible with ruptures along the
458 MNAF segments of magnitudes above 6. The modeling of an obelisk a few kilometres north of Iznik
459 also suggests magnitudes over 6, but is incompatible with a stronger, Mw 7+ rupture along the MNAF
460 segments south of Iznik. This last result implies that the fault segments south of Iznik have not known
461 a big rupture for nearly two millenia, which corresponds to several meters of accumulated stress. This
462 study shows that in favourable contexts, archeoseismology can be used complementarily with
463 historical seismology and paleoseismology to refine past earthquake scenarios and contribute to a
464 better seismic hazard assessment.

465

466 **Data and Resources**

467 The bathymetric map of Marmara was made available by the EMODnet Bathymetry project,
468 (<https://www.emodnet.eu/bathymetry>), using the EMODnet Bathymetry portal (EMODnet
469 Bathymetry Consortium (2016): EMODnet Digital Bathymetry (DTM),
470 <http://doi.org/10.12770/c7b53704-999d-4721-b1a3-04ec60c87238>) funded by the European
471 Commission Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries. The large-scale topography of the
472 study area was obtained from the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission 1 Arc-Second Global (DOI:
473 /10.5066/F7PR7TFT). The bathymetry of Iznik Lake was provided by and can be obtained from the
474 Turkish General Directorate of Hydraulic Works (DSI). The raw acceleration signals can be obtained
475 from the Engineering Strong Motion Database (<https://doi.org/10.13127/ESM.2>; Luzi et al., 2020). The
476 EAE photos, the 3D displacement signals used as input for the obelisk modeling and the complete
477 output file can be obtained on the Zenodo repository at <https://zenodo.org/record/3966773>. The
478 maps of Figures 5 and 6 are from Google Earth satellite imagery. The diagrams of Figures 8 and 9 were
479 prepared using the Matplotlib 3.3.0 package for Python (<https://matplotlib.org/>; Hunter, 2007).
480 Supplemental Material for this article includes the lists of mentioned historical earthquakes and EAE,

481 additional information on the walls chronology and obelisk model, and the complete data of wall
482 orientations.

483

484 **Acknowledgements**

485 The authors thank the editors and the reviewer for their helpful comments and suggestions. This work
486 has been supported by the MISTRALS-ENVIMED program (NAFIGEA project), the INSU ALEAS program
487 (France), Labex OSUG@2020 (Investissements d'avenir – ANR10 LABX56, France), and ANR CE03-2019
488 Basiliznik-secrets. This study contributes to the IdEx Université de Paris ANR-18-IDEX-0001. We thank
489 the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism for allowing the field work. We are also grateful to Mustafa
490 Aktar and Cengiz Celik from Boğaziçi University Department of Geophysics, and to the students from
491 Bursa University Department of Archaeology for their help during the field data acquisitions.

492

493 **References**

- 494 Ambraseys, N. (2000). The Seismicity of the Marmara Sea Area 1800-1899, *J. Earthquake Eng.* **4** 377–
495 401.
- 496 Ambraseys, N. (2002). The Seismic Activity of the Marmara Sea Region over the Last 2000 Years. *Bull.*
497 *Seism. Soc. Am.* **92** 1–18.
- 498 Ambraseys, N. N. (2009). *Earthquakes in the Mediterranean and Middle East. A multidisciplinary study*
499 *of seismicity up to 1900*, Cambridge, 968 p.
- 500 Ambraseys, N. and C. Finkel (1991). Long-term seismicity of Istanbul and of the Marmara Sea region,
501 *Terra Nova* **3** 527–539.

502 Ambraseys N.N. and J. A. Jackson (1998). Faulting associated with historical and recent earthquakes
503 in the Eastern Mediterranean region, *Geophys. J. Int.* **133** 390-406.

504 Ambraseys, N. and J. A. Jackson (2000). Seismicity of the Sea of Marmara (Turkey) since 1500, *Geophys.*
505 *J. Int.* **141** F1.

506 Baillet, L., d'Errico, S., and Y. Berthier (2005). Influence of sliding contact local dynamics on macroscopic
507 coefficient variation, *Revue Européenne des Eléments Finis* **14** 305-321.

508 Barka, A. (1992). The North Anatolian fault zone, *Annales Tectonicae* **6** 164–195.

509 Barka, A. (1993). Kuzey Anadolu Fayı'nın Sapanca-Izmit ve Geyve-Izmit Kolları üzerinde Paleosismik
510 Arastirmalar. Technical report, TÜBİTAK, Istanbul. Proje No:YBAG- 4/7551.

511 Benjelloun, Y., de Sigoyer, J., Dessales, H., Garambois, S., and M. Sahin (2018). Construction history of
512 the aqueduct of Nicaea (Izmit, NW Turkey) and its on-fault deformation viewed from archaeological
513 and geophysical investigations, *J. Archaeol. Sci Reports* **21** 389-400.

514 Bilham, R., Gaur, V. K., and P. Molnar (2001). Himalayan seismic hazard, *Science* **293** 1442–1444.

515 Bronk Ramsey, C. (2009). Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates, *Radiocarbon* **51** 337–360.

516 Brounoff, N. (1925). L'église de Sainte-Sophie de Nicée, *Echos d'Orient* **24** 471-481.

517 Cahen, C. (1948). La Première Pénétration Turque en Asie Mineure, *Byzantion* **18** 5-67.

518 Celebi, M., Toprak, S., and T. Holzer (2000). Strong-Motion, Site-Effects and Hazard Issues in Rebuilding
519 Turkey: in Light of the 17 August, 1999 Earthquake and its Aftershocks, in *The 1999 Izmit and Düzce*
520 *Earthquakes: preliminary results* Barka, A., Kozaci, Ö., Akyüz, S., Altunel, E. (Editors), Istanbul Technical
521 University, 247-263.

522 Dogan, B. (2010). Kuzey Anadolu Fay Sistemi Güney Kolunun Geyve-Gemlik Arasındaki Kesiminin
523 Morfotektonik, Tektonostratigrafik ve Paleosismolojik Evrimi. PhD thesis, Istanbul Teknik Üniversitesi.

524 Dogan, B., Tüysüz, O., and F. B. Sanli (2015). Tectonostratigraphic evolution of the basins on the
525 southern branch of the North Anatolian Fault System in the SE Marmara Region, Turkey, *Int. J. Earth*
526 *Sci.* **104** 389-418.

527 Emre, Ö., Duman, T., Y., and S. Özalp (2011). 1:250.000 Ölçekli Türkiye Diri Fay Haritası Serisi, Bursa
528 (NK 35-12) Paftası. Seri No: 9, Maden Tetkik ve Arama Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.

529 Erdik, M., Doyuran, V., Akkas, N, and P. Gulkan (1985). A Probabilistic Assessment of the Seismic
530 Hazard in Turkey, *Tectonophysics* **117** 295-344.

531 Ergintav, S., Reilinger, R. E., Cakmak, R., Floyd, M., Cakir, Z., Dogan, U., King, R. W., McClusky, S., and
532 H. Özener (2014). Istanbul's earthquake hot spots: Geodetic constraints on strain accumulation along
533 faults in the Marmara seismic gap, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **41** 5783-5788.

534 Foss, C. (1996). *Nicaea: A Byzantine Capital and Its Praises*, Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

535 Foss, C., and D. Winfield (1986). *Byzantine Fortifications: An Introduction*, University of South Africa
536 Press, Pretoria, 298 p.

537 Garduño-Monroy, V. H., Benavente Escobar, C., Oliveros, A., Rodriguez Pascua, M. A., Perez Lopez, R.,
538 and J. L. Giner (2012). Evidence of past seisms in Cusco (Peru) and Tzintzuntzan (Mexico): cultural
539 relations, *3rd INQUA-IGCP-567 International Workshop on Active Tectonics, Paleoseismology and*
540 *Archaeoseismology*, Morelia, Mexico.

541 Gastineau, R., de Sigoyer, J., Sabatier, P., Fabbri, S. C., Anselmetti, F. S., Develle, A. L., Sahin, M.,
542 Gündüz, S., Niessen, F., Gebhardt, A. C. (2020). Active subaquatic fault segments in Lake Iznik along
543 the middle strand of the North Anatolian Fault, NW Turkey. Preprint at
544 <https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10504104.1>

545 Grünthal, G., and A. Levret (2001). L'échelle macrosismique européenne. *Conseil de L'Europe -*
546 *Cahiers du Centre Européen de Géodynamique et de Sismologie* **19**.

547 Guidoboni, E., Comastri, A., and G. Traina (1994). *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the*
548 *Mediterranean area up to the 10th century*, Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica.

549 Guidoboni, E. and Stucchi, M. (1993). The contribution of historical records of earthquakes to the
550 evaluation of seismic hazard, *Annals of Geophysics* **36** 201-215.

551 Hinzen, K.-G. (2005). The Use of Engineering Seismological Models to Interpret Archaeoseismological
552 Findings in Tolbiacum, Germany: A Case Study, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* **95** 521–539.

553 Hinzen, K. G., and A. Montabert (2017). Rectangular Blocks vs Polygonal Walls in Archaeoseismology,
554 *Annals of Geophysics* **60** S0443.

555 Holmes, C. (2005). *Basil II and the Governance of Empire, 976-1025*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

556 Hubert-Ferrari, A., Barka, A., Jacques, E., Nalbant, S. S., Meyer, B., Armijo, R., Tapponnier, P., and G. C.
557 P. King (2000). Seismic hazard in the Marmara Sea region following the 17 August 1999 Izmit
558 earthquake, *Nature* **404** 269-273.

559 Hunter, J. D. (2007). Matplotlib : A 2D Graphics Environment, *Comput. Sci. Eng.* **9** 90-95.

560 Ibn Batuta (2012). *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah: Texte Arabe, accompagné d'une traduction (Vol. 4)*.
561 Defrémery, C., Sanguinetti, B. R. (Editors), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

562 Ikeda, Y. (1988). Recent activity of the Iznik-Mekece fault at Corak stream, east of Iznik, in
563 *Multidisciplinary research on fault activity in the western part of the North Anatolian fault zone*
564 Honkura, Y., Isikara, A. M. (Editors), Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, 15-27.

565 Ikeda, Y., Suzuki, Y., and E. Herece (1989). Late Holocene activity of the North Anatolian fault zone in
566 the Orhangazi plain, Northwestern Turkey, in *Multidisciplinary research on fault activity in the western*
567 *part of the North Anatolian fault zone (2)* Honkura, Y., Isikara, A. M. (Editors), Tokyo Institute of
568 Technology, Tokyo, 16-30.

569 Karcz, I. and U. Kafri (1978). Evaluation of supposed archaeoseismic damage in Israel, *J. Archaeol. Sci.*
570 **5** 237–253.

571 Kazmér, M. (2014). Damage to Ancient Buildings from Earthquakes, in *Encyclopedia of Earthquake*
572 *Engineering* Beer, M., Kougioumtzoglou, I., Patelli, E., Au IK. (Editors), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

573 Korzhenkov, A. M. and E. Mazor (1999). Structural reconstruction of seismic events: ruins of ancient
574 cities as fossil seismographs, *Science and New Technologies Special issue* **1** 62–73.

575 Luzi, L., Lanzano, G., Felicetta, C., D’Amico, M. C., Russo, E., Sgobba, S., Pacor, F., and ORFEUS Working
576 Group 5 (2020). *Engineering Strong Motion Database (ESM) (Version 2.0)*, Istituto Nazionale di
577 Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV).

578 Mazor, E. and A. Korzhenkov (2001). Applied archaeoseismology: decoding earthquake parameters
579 recorded in archaeological ruins, in *The Makhteshim Country: A Laboratory of Nature* Krasnov, B. and
580 Mazor, E. (Editors), Pensoft Publishers, Sofia- Moscow, 123–149.

581 McCalpin, J. P. (2009). Field techniques in palaeoseismology - terrestrial environments, in
582 *Palaeoseismology* J. P. McCalpin (Editor), Academic Press, 123–149.

583 Michetti, A. M., Audemard, F. A., and S. Marco (2005). Future trends in paleoseismology : Integrated
584 study of the seismic landscape as a vital tool in seismic hazard analyses, *Tectonophysics* **408** 3-21.

585 Norwich, J. J. (1993). *Byzantium: The Apogee*, Penguin.

586 Özener, H., Yilmaz, O., Dogru, A., Turgut, B., and O. Gurkan (2013). GPS-derived velocity field of the
587 Iznik-Mekece segment of the North Anatolian Fault Zone, *J. Geodyn.* **67** 46–52.

588 Özalp, S., Emre, Ö., and A. Dogan (2013). The segment structure of southern branch of the North
589 Anatolian Fault and Paleoseismological behaviour of the Gemlik fault, NW Anatolia, *Bulletin of MTA*
590 **147** 1–17.

591 Öztürk, K., Yaltirak, C., and B. Alpar (2009). The Relationship Between the Tectonic Setting of the Lake
592 Iznik Basin and the Middle Strand of the North Anatolian Fault, *Turkish J. Earth Sci.* **18** 209–224.

593 Pondard, N., Armijo, R., King, G. C. P., Meyer, B., and F. Flérit (2007). Fault interactions in the Sea of
594 Marmara pull-apart (North Anatolian Fault): earthquake clustering and propagating earthquake
595 sequences, *Geophys. J. Int.* **171** 1185-1197.

596 Rapp, G. (1986). Assessing archaeological evidence for seismic catastrophies, *Geoarchaeology* **1** 365–
597 379.

598 Reilinger, R. E., McClusky, S. C., Vernant, P., Lawrence, S., Ergintav, S., Cakmak, R., Nadariya, M.,
599 Hahubia, G., Mahmoud, S., Sakr, K., Arrajehi, A., Paradissis, D., Al-Aydrus, A., Prilepin, M., Guseva, T.,
600 Evren, E., Dmitritsa, A., Filikov, S.V., Gomes, F., Al-Ghazzi, R., and G. Karam (2006). GPS constraints on
601 continental deformation in the Africa-Arabia-Eurasia continental collision zone and implications for the
602 dynamics of plate interactions, *J. Geophys. Res.* **111** V05411.

603 Reimer, P. J., Bard, E., Bayliss, A., Beck, J. W., Blackwell, P. G., Bronk Ramsey, C., Buck, C. E., Cheng, H.,
604 Edwards, R. L., Friedrich, M., et al. (2013). IntCal13 and Marine13 Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curves
605 0–50,000 Years cal BP, *Radiocarbon* **55** 1869–1887.

606 Rodriguez-Pascua, M. A., Pérez-Lopez, R., Giner-Robles, J. L., Silva P. G., Garduño-Monroy, V. H., and K.
607 Reicherter (2011). A comprehensive classification of Earthquake Archaeological Effects (EAE) in
608 archaeoseismology : Application to ancient remains of Roman and Mesoamerican cultures, *Quaternary*
609 *Int.* **242** 20-30.

610 Riedel, I. (2015). *Seismic vulnerability analysis of existent buildings. Loss estimation and uncertainty*
611 *analysis for deterministic earthquake scenarios*, PhD thesis, Université Grenoble Alpes.

612 Sahin, M., and M. R. Fairchild (2018). Nicaea’s Underwater Basilica, *Biblical Archaeological Review* **44**
613 30-38.

614 Schneider, A. M. (1943). Die römischen und byzantinischen Denkmäler von Iznik-Nicaea, *Istanbuler*
615 *Forschungen* **16**, 40 p.

616 Schneider, A. M., and W. Karnapp (1938). Die Stadtmauer von Iznik (Nicaea), *Istanbuler Forschungen*
617 **9**, 55 p.

618 Sengör, A. M. C. (1979). The North Anatolian Transform Fault: its age, offset and tectonic significance,
619 *J. Geol. Soc. London* **136** 269–82.

620 Sipahioglu, S., and T. Matsuda (1986). Geology and Quaternary fault in the Iznik-Mekece area, in
621 *Electric and Magnetic Research on Active Faults in the North Anatolian Fault Zone* A. M. Isikara and Y.
622 Honkura (Editors), Tokyo Inst. Technology, 25-41.

623 Stein, R. S., Barka, A. A., and J. H. Dieterich (1997). Progressive failure on the North Anatolian fault
624 since 1939 by earthquake stress triggering, *Geophys. J. Int.* **128** 594–604.

625 Wells, D. L., and K. J. Coppersmith (1994). New Empirical Relationships among Magnitude, Rupture
626 Length, Rupture Width, Rupture Area, and Surface Displacement, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* **84** 974-1002.

627 Yoshioka, T., and I. Kuşçu (1994). Late Holocene faulting events on the Iznik-Mekece fault in the
628 western part of the North Anatolian fault zone, Turkey, *Bull. Geol. Surv. Jpn.* **45** 677–685.

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636 Yacine Benjelloun
637 Institut de physique du globe - UMR7154
638 1, rue Jussieu
639 75238 Paris cedex 05, France
640 +33 (0)6 80 21 52 44
641 benjelloun@ipgp.fr
642
643 Julia de Sigoyer
644 Université Grenoble Alpes
645 ISTERRE
646 CS 40700
647 38058 GRENOBLE Cedex 9
648 Julia.de-sigoyer@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr
649
650 H el ene Dessales
651 AOROC – UMR 8546
652 45 rue d’Ulm
653 F-75230 Paris cedex 05
654 helene.dessales@ens.psl.eu
655
656
657
658

659 Laurent Baillet

660 Université Grenoble Alpes

661 ISTERre

662 CS 40700

663 38058 GRENOBLE Cedex 9

664 Laurent.baillet@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

665

666 Philippe Guéguen

667 Université Grenoble Alpes

668 ISTERre

669 CS 40700

670 38058 GRENOBLE Cedex 9

671 Philippe.gueguen@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

672

673 Mustafa Sahin

674 Uludağ University

675 Faculty of Arts & Science

676 Görükle Campus, 16059

677 Nilüfer, Bursa / TURKEY

678 mustafasahin@uludag.edu.tr

679

680

681 **Table 1:** Sample list and radiocarbon dating in Iznik. The dating was done by the LMC14/LSCE. The
 682 ages were calibrated with the Oxcal 4.2 program (Bronk Ramsey, 2009) using the IntCal13 calibration
 683 (Reimer et al., 2013).

Name	Location	Type	Carbon analyzed (mg)	%modern carbon	¹⁴ C date (yr BP)	¹⁴ C calibrated age AD
W5a1	Repair mortar on T57	charcoal	1.38	88.84716	950±30	1024-1155
W5b1	Repair mortar on T57	charcoal	1.25	89.00717	935±30	1026-1162
W5b2	Repair mortar on T57	charcoal	1.33	89.42842	900±30	1039-1210
W5a2	Repair mortar on T57	charcoal	0.09*	87.31807	1090±70	769-1046*
IZAQC2	Aqueduct concretion	tufa	0.79	102.37583		Posterior to 1950
W61b	Reconstruction Istanbul Kapi	charcoal	1.51	89.36830	905±30	1037-1207

*due to the very low carbon content, this age result has a low confidence level

Table 2: EAE constrained by post-seismic repairs, separated by quality categories.

Terminus post quem	Terminus ante quem	Q1*	Q1+Q2†	Q1+Q2+Q3‡
2nd c.	858	1	1	1
2nd c.	1330	1	1	1
3rd c.	858	5	5	5
3rd c.	1254	6	9	9
3rd c.	1185	2	2	2
3rd c.	1065	0	0	1
3rd c.	1097	11	15	16
3rd c.	1254	7	8	9
3rd c.	1330	0	2	2
527	787	3	3	3
730	1254	12	13	13
858	1097	0	1	2
858	1222	1	1	1
858	1254	0	1	1
858	1330	0	2	2

*Quality rank 1 (good). †Quality rank 2 (average). ‡Quality rank 3 (bad).

684 **Table 3:** Maximum displacements (in mm) and rotations (in °) obtained between adjacent blocks.

Earthquake (station)	Maximum relative displacement (mm)		Maximum relative rotation (°)	
	Friction 0.5	Friction 0.7	Friction 0.5	Friction 0.7
Düzce			Collapse	
Azores Islands	7	7	0.5	0.6
Patti Gulf (PTT1)	1.36	1.3	0.085	0.037
Patti Gulf (MLZ)	0	0	0	0
Kyllini	3	3	0.2	0.19

685

686

687 **List of Figure Captions**

688 **Figure 1:** Morphology and geometry of the NAFZ in the Marmara region. The active fault segments,
689 drawn in black, were taken from Emre et al. (2011) and Benjelloun et al. (2018). The $M_w > 6.5$
690 ruptures during the 20th century are shown in colors (Hubert-Ferrari et al., 2000; Pondard et al.,
691 2007). The main cities are located with dots. NNAF, MNAF and SNAF: northern, middle and southern
692 branches of the NAF.

693

694 **Figure 2:** Chronological frieze of Nicaea's history. The colors show the main historical periods of the
695 city: Roman (blue), Seljuk and Ottoman Turk (green) and Lascarid (yellow). The red stars correspond
696 to historical earthquakes having damaged the city according to historical descriptions, and the white
697 stars indicate the historical events for which the reality or amount of seismic damage is uncertain (for
698 the complete list, see Table S1 in the electronic supplement). The two bars under the frieze refer to
699 earthquakes identified in paleoseismological trenches done on the MNAF.

700

701 **Figure 3:** Field examples of active faulting in the vicinity of Iznik. (a) Shaded DEM of the MNAF
702 region, with the locations of the field photograph. The MNAF segments are mapped in red, and other
703 active faults in black. The lines in the lake correspond to a 5-m interval bathymetry (see Data and
704 Resources). The fault traces in Iznik Lake are taken from Gastineau et al. (2020 PREPRINT). (b)
705 Triangular facets (black arrows) at the southeast corner of Iznik lake. The vertical faulting component
706 of the MNAF is more visible in the landscape in the vicinity of Iznik Lake.

707

708 **Figure 4:** Examples of EAE in Iznik. The white arrows indicate the deformation azimuth and strike. The
709 quality category and identifier are indicated on each picture. (a) Tilted base of the defensive wall, the
710 upper part collapsed and was rebuilt in a very distinct masonry. (b) Conjugated cracks in a vaulted

711 passage of the inner defensive walls. (c) Tower T97, showing a simple terracotta structure from the
712 early 13th century. The crenellations (black dotted line) were blocked (red arrows) during the
713 following reign of John Vatatzes (1222-1254 AD). (d) Arch with imbricated ashlars, bearing traces of
714 damage and posterior cementation on Murat II hamam (early 15th c. AD). (e) Dropped central ashlars
715 on an arch of Yesilcamii mosque (late 14th c. AD). The damaged arches were later reinforced with
716 transversal iron bars, then wood beams. (f) Pushed and rotated ashlars of the inner Istanbul Gate;
717 note the posterior rebuilding in masonry (red arrows). (g) Collapse in the northwestern section of the
718 inner defensive walls.

719

720 **Figure 5:** Inventory and locations of the EAE in Iznik, classified by quality (a) and by age of the wall
721 affected (b).

722

723 **Figure 6:** (a) Satellite image of Iznik surroundings with the active faults drawn in red and the main
724 aqueduct in yellow. (b) Simplified map of Iznik. The historical city is delimited by a double belt of
725 defensive walls and used to be supplied with water by two aqueducts in the east. The other buildings
726 investigated and mentioned in the text are drawn in grey. The numbers refer to the nomenclature of
727 the towers used in the text, following Foss and Winfield (1986).

728

729 **Figure 7:** (a) General view of the obelisk near Elbeyli village. See Fig. 6a for location. (b, c) Detailed
730 views of rotated and offset blocks. The red arrows point to the parts of the pictures where the
731 deformation is most visible.

732

733 **Figure 8:** (a) Comparison between the relative distribution of wall length (bars) and quality 1 EAE
734 (line) for different wall azimuths. The percentages in length and EAE were computed on the total wall
735 length and total number of EAE of quality 1, respectively. For the other qualities, see Table S4 in the
736 electronic supplement. (b) Azimuths of the damage plotted against the azimuths of the wall affected.
737 Note the general correlations between the two values. This correlation is linear for the in-plane
738 deformations (i.e. parallel to the wall) and affine with a ± 90 shift for the out-of-plane deformations
739 (i.e. perpendicular to the wall). (c) Rose diagrams of the azimuths of damage observed in Iznik (118
740 EAE). Note the prominent N-S azimuths.

741

742 **Figure 9:** (a) Distribution of the damage of various grades for the three vulnerability classes of
743 buildings in Iznik. (b) Quantitative translations of the EMS98 damage classification according to
744 vulnerability class and macroseismic intensity, adapted from Riedel (2015). The vulnerability class A
745 to C correspond to the buildings studied in Iznik that use terra cotta, rubble and ashlar. The
746 probability distributions of the different damage grades are shown with different colors. For each
747 vulnerability class, we try to find the intensity which best replicates our observed damage
748 distribution (reported on the graphs as vertical bars). For example, for our vulnerability B buildings,
749 we observe a majority of D2 damage. This is compatible with an intensity VII or VIII. Then, the fact
750 that we have much more D3 than D1 damage rather suggests an intensity VIII.

751

752 **Figure 10:** Modeled N displacement (a), E displacement (b), and rotational displacement (c) of the
753 obelisk for the two-event simulation of the Mw 6.1 Azores Islands earthquake. The blocks are
754 numbered from base to top.

755

756

Figure 1







Figure 2








(a)




(b)





(a)








(b)




(c)









Historical earthquake scenarios for the middle strand of the North Anatolian Fault deduced from archeo-damage inventory and building deformation modeling

Yacine Benjelloun, Julia de Sigoyer, H el ene Dessales, Laurent Baillet, Philippe Gu e guen, Mustafa Sahin

Supplemental Material

Table S1: Catalogue of earthquakes with effects in Iznik and neighbouring areas. M_s =surface wave magnitude. For the magnitude and epicentre location, we provide the different ranges found among the references.

Table S2: Description of the damage EAE observed in Iznik area.

Table S3: Description of the repair EAE observed in Iznik area.

Table S4: Length of walls and EAE of different qualities for each wall orientation range. The percentages in length and EAE were computed on the total wall length and total number of EAE in each quality class respectively.

Table S5: Characteristics of the earthquake used for the simulations on the obelisk.

Figure S1: Summary of the construction history of Iznik walls, after Schneider and Karnapp (1938) and Foss and Winfield (1986). After the construction of the walls in the 3rd century AD, the successive interventions and restoration works are drawn in color. The state of the walls preceding each intervention is drawn in grey.

Figure S2: (a) Drawing of Iznik obelisk with the dimensions and arrangement of the different blocks as measured on the field. The western face is given as an example on the left. (b) 3D mesh of the obelisk used for numerical modeling. (c, d) First and second main vibration modes for eigen frequencies of 7.8 and 7.84 Hz respectively. The initial shape of the obelisk is drawn in black, and the distribution of motion in color.

Date AD	Affected localities	Effects in Nicaea/Iznik	Estimated Ms
29-32	Bithynia, Nicaea	Most houses destroyed, tax exemptions for damaged cities in Asia Minor and imperial donations for repairs	6-7
121	Bithynia, Nicomedia, Nicaea, probably Aoria	Great part of the city destroyed, publicly funded reconstruction, rebuilding of the fortifications	7.4, 7+
358	Bithynia, Nicomedia, Nicaea, Perinthus, Constantinople	Destruction ? (severity unknown)	7.4, 7+
362	Nicomedia, Nicaea, Constantinople	"a good part of the city was destroyed"	6-7, 6.8+
368	Bithynia, Nicaea	Complete destruction, "sea wave" (one source)	6-7, 6.8
478	Bithynia, Nicomedia, Helenoupolis, Constantinople, Nicaea	Damage ?, sea/lake wave	7.3, 7+
554	Constantinople, Nicomedia, Nicaea	Partly damaged ? (one source only)	7, 6-7
740	Eastern part of Marmara, Bithynia, Nicomedia, Praenetos (Karamursel), Nicaea, Constantinople	Complete destruction, "a single church survived"	7.1, 7+
1065	Nicaea	Almost complete destruction, Widespread damage on churches, the city walls and numerous houses	6.8
2 Sep 1754	Izmit, Istanbul, Geyve, Bursa, Izmir (felt)	A few houses ruined, no casualties	7, 7+
17 Sep 1857	Gemlik, Yalova, Bursa, Iznik (felt), Izmit (felt), Istanbul (felt)	Felt	5-6
7 June 1860	Bursa, Istanbul (felt)	Panic, collapse of a few walls, no serious damage	5-6
Nov 1860	Prusa (felt), Iznik (felt)	Several shocks occurring over a month	<5?
19 Apr 1878	Lake Sapança, Izmit, Labinia, Esmé, Adapazari, Akyazi, Bursa, Geyve, Iznik, Istanbul (felt)	Slight damage	5.5-6.1
3 March 1893	Iznik, Yenisehir (felt), Istanbul (felt)	Slight damage on a few buildings	<5?

10 Jul 1894	Adapazari, Istanbul, Sapanca, Izmit, Karamursel, Hersek, Yalova, Karaköy, Katirli, Gemlik, Mudanya, Iznik, Pendik, Bandirma, Bursa	Damage? (lack of details)	7.3
-------------	--	---------------------------	-----

References

1=Ambraseys (2002)

2=Ambraseys (2009)

3=Guidoboni et al. (1994)

4=Ambraseys and Finkel (1991)

5=Ambraseys (2000)

6=Ambraseys and Jackson (1998)

Lat	Lon	Quality of epicenter location	NAF strand involved
	40.5 30.4-30.5	poorly constrained	Middle (close to NAF junction?)
	40.5	30.1 well constrained	Middle
	40.7	30.2 well constrained	North
	40.7 29.8-30.2	well constrained	North
	40.5 29.5-30.5	well constrained	Middle
	40.7	29.8 very well constrained	North
40.7-40.8	29.5-29.8	well constrained	North
	40.7 27.7-29.6	well constrained	North
	40.4	30 not given	Middle
40.7-40.8	29-30.1	poorly constrained	North
	40.4	29.2 well constrained	Middle
	40.3	29.3 not given	South?
		not given	unknown
	40.7	30.2 not given	North
		not given	Middle?

40.7 27.5-29.6 very well constrained North

Sources	References
Phlegon (Olympiads, 2nd c. AD), Eusebius (Hist, 2-3rd c. AD), Hieron. (Hist, 4-5th c. AD), Orosius (early fifth century)	1, 2, 3
Eusebius (Hist, 2-3rd c. AD), Hieron. (Hist, 4-5th c. AD)	1, 2, 3, 4
Sozomen (5th c. AD)	1, 2, 3
Ammianus Marcellinus (4th c. AD), John of Nikiu (7th c.)	1, 2, 4
Idatius (Cons. Const., 5th c. AD), Socrates Scholasticus (5th c), Hieron. (Hist., 4-5th c. AD), John of Nikiu (7th c) and others	1, 2, 3, 4
One late source	1, 2, 3
Vit. Sym. Iun (6th-7th c AD)	1, 2, 3, 6
Theophanes (8-9th), Michael Syrianus	1, 2, 3, 4
Attaliates (11th), Scylitzes (from public records?)	1,2
BC Misc. PD (contemporaneous)	1, 2, 4
Perrey (1860)	2
Perrey (1862c, 1875a), Schmidt (1879)	2
Perrey (1862c)	2
Schmidt (1879)	1, 2, 4, 5
Rebur-Paschwitz (1895)	2

contemporaneous

1, 2

Damage EAE dataset

EAE ID	N	E	Location
AQ1	40.428672	29.729736	Arch N face
AQ2	40.428716	29.729896	Arch N face
AQ3	40.428716	29.730155	Wall N face
AQ5	40.428731	29.730457	Arch N face
AQ6	40.428781	29.730702	Wall N face
AQ7	40.428773	29.730776	Wall N face
AQ8	40.428767	29.730858	Wall N face
AQ9	40.428764	29.730921	Wall N face
AQ48	40.428764	29.730921	Arch N face
AQ10	40.428788	29.731086	Wall N face
AQ11	40.428739	29.731444	Wall N face
AQ12	40.42874	29.731493	Wall N face
AQ13	40.428713	29.731968	Wall N face
AQ14	40.428737	29.731699	Wall N face
AQ16	40.428705	29.732405	Wall N face
AQ17	40.428555	29.7356	Wall N face
AQ18	40.428524	29.736018	Wall N face
AQ19	40.428779	29.730635	Wall S face
AQ20	40.428719	29.730503	Wall S face
AQ22	40.428662	29.72996	Wall S face
AQ25	40.4286833	29.7302505	Wall S face
AQ28	40.42872	29.730365	Wall N face
AQ33	40.428713	29.730347	Wall N face
AQ34	40.428717	29.73037	Wall N face
AQ37	40.428742	29.73052	Wall N face
AQ38	40.428746	29.730554	Wall N face
AQ44	40.428405	29.736874	Reinforcement brick structure
AQ45	40.428655	29.729618	Arch
AQ46	40.4269	29.7388	Underground section
AQ47	40.4233	29.7418	Underground section
W1	40.4296	29.728884	Outer wall 45/46, outer facing
W2	40.429676	29.728791	Outer wall, outer facing
W3	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46 base
W4	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46 base
W5	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46 base
W6	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46 base
W7	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46 base
W8	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46 base
W9	40.429913	29.728396	Inner wall, T46
W10	40.430041	29.728097	W46-47
W11	40.431735	29.726386	Isolated ashlar wall section
W12	40.431735	29.726386	Isolated ashlar wall section
W13	40.431735	29.726386	Isolated ashlar wall section
W15	40.431735	29.726386	Isolated ashlar wall section

W16	40.431735	29.726386	Isolated ashlar wall section
W17	40.432509	29.725585	W52/53
W18	40.432822	29.725154	T53 base
W19	40.432822	29.725154	T53 base
W20	40.433132	29.724737	T54
W21	40.432959	29.724893	W53/54
W22	40.432959	29.724893	W53/54
W23	40.432959	29.724893	W53/54
W24	40.433132	29.724737	T54 base
W26	40.433321	29.724417	W54/55 inner wall
W27	40.433324	29.724601	W54/55 outer wall
W28	40.433731	29.724092	W55/56 outer wall
W29	40.433686	29.723945	W55/56 inner wall
W30	40.434126	29.723269	T57
W31	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W32	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W33	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W34	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W36	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W37	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W38	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W39	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W40	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base
W41	40.434402	29.722751	T58 eastern part
W42	40.434402	29.722751	T58 central part
W43	40.434402	29.722751	T58 eastern western part
W44	40.435115	29.722236	W59/60
W46	40.435342	29.721959	T61
W48	40.435383	29.722171	Outer wall in front of T61
W50	40.435628	29.721456	W62/63
W51	40.435894	29.721191	W63/64
W52	40.436003	29.721319	Outer wall in front of T64
W53	40.436131	29.721105	W64/65
W55	40.436225	29.721108	W64/65 and T65
W56	40.436454	29.72052	Istanbul Gate, inner door
W57	40.436427	29.720472	Istanbul Gate, inner door, inner facing
W58	40.436477	29.720354	Istanbul Gate, inner door, outer facing
W59	40.436448	29.720308	Istanbul Gate, inner door
W60	40.43647	29.720394	Istanbul Gate, inner door, outer facing
W61	40.436576	29.720927	T66
W62	40.436576	29.720927	T66
W63	40.436576	29.720927	T66
W64	40.436447	29.720995	W65/66
W65	40.436742	29.720384	Istanbul Gate, outer wall, west tower
W66	40.436742	29.720384	T68
W67	40.436506	29.720047	W68/69 outer facing
W68	40.436235	29.719516	W69/70 outer wall

W69	40.436235	29.719516	W69/70 inner wall, outer facing
W71	40.436235	29.719516	W69/70 inner wall, outer facing
W72	40.436235	29.719516	W69/70 inner wall, outer facing
W195	40.436027	29.71912	T70
W74	40.436042	29.718953	W70/71 outer wall, inner facing
W75	40.435916	29.718792	W70/71 outer wall, inner facing
W76	40.435916	29.718792	W70/71 outer wall, inner facing
W77	40.436042	29.718953	W70/71 outer wall, inner facing
W78	40.43568	29.718494	T71
W79	40.43568	29.718494	T71
W80	40.43568	29.718494	T71
W82	40.435075	29.717725	W72/73 inner wall
W83	40.434984	29.717525	W72/73 inner wall
W84	40.434931	29.717425	T73
W85	40.434811	29.717285	W73/74
W87	40.434563	29.71684	T74
W88	40.434563	29.71684	T74
W89	40.434494	29.716566	W74/75 outer wall
W91	40.432208	29.71437	W80/84
W92	40.429951	29.713724	T84
W94	40.427988	29.713183	T88
W95	40.427319	29.712449	W98/lake
W97	40.426883	29.713197	T90
W98	40.425862	29.71382	T92
W99	40.425793	29.713872	South Lake Gate, N side, inner face
W100	40.425793	29.713872	South Lake Gate, N side, inner face
W102	40.425567	29.713889	T94
W192	40.425567	29.713889	W94/95
W103	40.425567	29.713889	W94/95
W104	40.425567	29.713889	W94/95
W105	40.425567	29.713889	W94/95
W107	40.423719	29.716242	Corner of outer wall in front of T104
W108	40.423556	29.716381	W104/105
W109	40.423151	29.716195	W105/106 outer wall, outer facing
W110	40.422964	29.716464	T106
W111	40.422805	29.71671	T107
W112	40.422977	29.718715	T113
W113	40.42347	29.719166	Yenisehir central Gate, inner facing
W114	40.42347	29.719166	Yenisehir central Gate, inner facing
W115	40.42347	29.719166	Yenisehir central Gate, inner facing
W116	40.423557	29.719208	Yenisehir inner Gate
W117	40.423458	29.719218	Yenisehir central Gate, inner facing
W118	40.423436	29.719221	Yenisehir central Gate
W119	40.423419	29.719221	Yenisehir central Gate, outer facing
W120	40.423419	29.719221	Yenisehir central Gate, inner facing
W121	40.423256	29.719346	Outer wall in front of T1
W122	40.423256	29.719346	Outer wall in front of T1

W190	40.423256	29.719346 T1
W191	40.423256	29.719346 T1
W183	40.423324	29.719195 Yenisehir outer Gate
W123	40.423444	29.720843 W4/5, inner wall, inner facing
W124	40.423412	29.720966 W5/6, inner wall, inner facing
W125	40.423396	29.721499 W6/7, inner wall, inner facing
W126	40.423397	29.720636 T4
W127	40.423384	29.720794 W4/5, inner wall, outer facing
W128	40.423376	29.720968 T5
W130	40.423355	29.721288 T6
W131	40.423355	29.72157 T7 west corner
W132	40.423324	29.722092 W8/9
W133	40.423324	29.722092 W8/9
W134	40.423291	29.722828 W10/11
W135	40.423267	29.722987 T113
W136	40.423121	29.724184 T15
W137	40.423122	29.724185 T15
W138	40.423163	29.724557 T16
W139	40.423164	29.724558 T16
W140	40.423147	29.72488 T17
W141	40.423148	29.724881 T17
W142	40.423109	29.725546 T19
W143	40.42311	29.725547 T19
W192	40.42311	29.725547 W19/20
W144	40.423073	29.725906 T20
W145	40.423122	29.725974 T20
W146	40.423285	29.725959 W20/21
W147	40.42366	29.726168 W21/22
W148	40.423768	29.726252 W22/23
W196	40.424062	29.726438 T23
W150	40.424114	29.726442 W23/24
W151	40.424634	29.726782 T26
W152	40.424528	29.726733 W25/26
W153	40.424529	29.726734 W25/26
W158	40.424693	29.726793 W26/27
W159	40.425094	29.726994 W27/28
W160	40.425358	29.727153 W28/29
W162	40.428028	29.728775 T39
W163	40.428029	29.728776 T39
W164	40.427785	29.728624 T38
W165	40.427786	29.728625 T38
W166	40.427334	29.728366 T37
W168	40.426912	29.728086 T35
W194	40.426912	29.728086 T35
W193	40.426421	29.727916 T33
W170	40.427809	29.728558 T38, inner face
W171	40.42646	29.727753 T33, inner face

W172	40.426255	29.727625 T32, inner face
W173	40.425552	29.727225 T29, inner face
W175	40.425552	29.727225 W26/27, inner face
W176	40.425552	29.727225 W26/27, inner face
W177	40.424649	29.726709 T26, inner face
W178	40.424649	29.726709 W26/25, inner face
W180	40.423714	29.726154 T21, inner face
W181	40.423212	29.724522 T16, inner face
W182	40.423212	29.724522 T16, inner face
W184	40.436644	29.720502 Istanbul central Gate
W185	40.428902	29.729214 Lefke central Gate
W186	40.42885	29.729057 Lefke Gate western area
W187	40.42885	29.729057 Lefke Gate western area
W188	40.428959	29.729073 Lefke Gate western area
W189	40.428959	29.729073 Lefke Gate western area
C1	40.429817	29.726843 Yesilcamii, west wall
C2	40.429817	29.726843 Yesilcamii, west wall
C4	40.429861	29.726921 Yesilcamii, north wall
C5	40.429861	29.726921 Yesilcamii, north wall
C48	40.429861	29.726921 Yesilcamii, north wall
C6	40.428146	29.719755 Celebi Camii, north wall
C8	40.428146	29.719755 Celebi Camii, north wall
C9	40.428306	29.720615 II. Murhat Hamami, east wall
C10	40.42822	29.720528 II. Murhat Hamami, south wall
C11	40.429246	29.720232 Aya Sofya, north wall, inner facing
C12	40.429253	29.720228 Aya Sofya, NE room
C15	40.429213	29.720259 Aya Sofya, NE wall of nave
C17	40.429253	29.720228 Aya Sofya, NE room
C48	40.426283	29.717399 Terracotta building next to theater
C18	40.42645	29.716512 Theater, southern side
C19	40.42652	29.716529 Theater, entry corridor
C21	40.426367	29.71674 Theater, corridor wall
C23	40.426624	29.716357 Theater, western side
C24	40.426624	29.716357 Theater, western side
C25	40.426468	29.717228 Theater, SE side
C28	40.426468	29.717228 Theater, S corridor
C29	40.426786	29.716731 Theater scene, outer western vault
C32	40.426786	29.716731 Theater scene, inner western vault
C33	40.426774	29.717086 Theater scene, inner eastern vault
C35	40.426449	29.7169 Theater, inner corridor
C36	40.426463	29.716554 Theater, S side
C37	40.426794	29.717116 Theater, NE side
C39	40.426866	29.716992 Theater, NE side
C40	40.428964	29.731713 Candarli Hayretin Pasa, east room
C41	40.428964	29.731713 Candarli Hayretin Pasa, east room
C42	40.428964	29.731713 Candarli Hayretin Pasa, east room
C46	40.428969	29.731616 Candarli Hayretin Pasa, west room

C47	40.428969	29.731616	Candarli Hayretin Pasa, west room
O1	40.487589	29.701961	Obelisk
B1	40.42575	29.7095	Lake basilica

EAE description	Wall azimuth	Deformation azimuth
Important sinter deposit	90	
Collapsed facing	90	0
Collapsed facing	90	0
Sinter deposit	90	
Sinter deposit	90	
Collapse facing	90	
Large and deep collapse	90	0
Sinter deposit and collapse	90	0
Collapsed facing	90	0
Large and deep collapse	90	0
Collapsed facing + sinter deposit	90	0
Thick sinter deposit	90	
General wall warping northward	90	0
Thick sinter deposit	90	
Collapsed facing	90	0
Wall warping southward	90	0
Wall warping northward	90	0
Sinter deposit	90	
Tilted wall	90	0
Sinter deposit	90	
Sinter deposit	90	
Sinter deposit	90	
Top of wall warping northward	90	0
Tilted wall	90	0
Tilted wall	90	0
General wall warping northward	90	0
Destruction of top of structure	90	
Damaged keystone	90	
Vertical offset		
Vertical offset		
Collapsed part between cracks	135	
Significant crack at junction between tower and wall	135	
Expulsion of block corners, cracks	0	70
In-plane offset blocks	0	0
In-plane offset blocks	135	135
Out-of-plane offset blocks	135	45
In-plane offset blocks	135	135
Out-of-plane offset blocks	135	45
Cracks in terracotta masonry	135	
Expulsed block corners	135	
Anticlockwise block rotation + apparent offset	100	10
In-plane offset blocks	90	90
Dropped ashlar	90	
Anticlockwise block rotation	88	

Out-of-plane offset adjacent blocks	92	2
Expulsed block corners + out-of-plane shift	130	40
Expulsed block corners	130	
Expulsed block corner + in-plane offset	40	40
Facing collapse + cracks in core		
Out-of-plane block shift	130	40
Cracks in block	130	
Expulsed block corners	130	
Lower part of tower base is shifted outward	130	40
Significant crack with no vertical offset	130	
Crack	130	
Collapsed arch keystone	120	
Significant crack with no vertical offset	130	
Cracks	130	
In-plane offset blocks	40	40
In-plane offset blocks	40	40
In-plane offset blocks	130	130
Out-of-plane offset blocks	130	40
In-plane offset blocks	130	130
In-plane offset blocks	130	130
Out-of-plane offset blocks	130	40
In-plane offset blocks	40	40
Out-of-plane offset blocks	40	130
Cracks and structural collapse		
Multiple cracks		
Crack and facing collapse		
Tilted ashlar	0	90
Destruction of superstructure		
Sinistral offset of wall	130	40
Significant crack and lower facing collapse	140	
Expulsed block corner + crack	170	
Out-of-plane arch distorsion	170	80
Expulsed block corners	170	
Significant structural collapse		
Out-of-plane block shift	90	180
Out-of-plane shift + tilting	90	180
Anticlockwise block rotation	90	
Column collapse	90	30
Out-of-plane ashlar shift and rotation	90	0
General tilting	140	0
Facing collapse under window	140	50
Facing collapse under window	50	140
Superstructure collapse	140	50
Vault collapse		
Facing collapse	0	85
Cracks + collapse	53	
Wall offset	55	

Clockwise block rotation	55	
Significant crack + tilted masonry	55	
Superstructure collapse	55	135
Slight damage on blocks	55	
Partial out-of-plane facing expulsion	45	135
Offset and tilted arch	50	140
Oblique parallele cracks	45	
Tilted wall	45	135
Slightly expused angle	135	135
Partial collapse		
Collapsed blocks	135	45
Total destruction	45	135
Superstructure collapse	45	135
Facing collapse	45	115
Crack visible from both sides of wall	45	
Crack	45	
Collapse of western angle	135	45
Collapsed keystones on two successive arches	50	
Widespread destruction		
Parallel cracks		
Small crack initiated at window	10	
Apparent wall offsets	90	
Crack initiated at window	150	
Crack through beam holes		
Anticlockwise block rotation + expused block corner	0	
Block shifts + cracks	90	90
Expused block corner	0	
Expused block corner	90	
Block rotations	90	
Warped masonry + offset	90	0
Ashlar phase tilted southward + warping	90	0
Outward corner expulsion		
Collapsed blocks		
Facing collapse	0	90
Destruction of eastern part + cracks at window		
Partial destruction of superstructure		
Partial collapse around window	65	155
Collapsed blocks	90	0
Block expulsion	90	
Clockwise block rotation	90	
Block shift + rotation	96	
Shifted arch keystone	90	0
Shifted arch keystone	90	0
Damaged keystone	90	
Expused block corners	90	
Dropped central arch	90	
Southward tilting	90	170

Collapsed facing under window	0	
Collapsed facing at window	0	
Damaged keystones	90	
Large vertical crack	90	
Large vertical crack with offset layers	90	
Two "conjugated cracks" crossing arch	90	
Large structural collapse	90	0
Cracks and facing collapse	90	0
Expulsed block corner	0	
Sub-horizontal crack at base	135	
Anti-clockwise block rotation	90	
Cracks	90	
Facing collapse	90	0
Partial collapse	90	0
Total destruction		
Partial destruction of superstructure	0	90
Out-of-plane shift + tilting	110	0
Crack	0	
Crack	0	
Crack at base	0	
Crack	0	
Out-of-plane shift of window frame	90	0
Large crack with general shift of superstructure		45
Collapse of superstructure	90	0
Large vertical fissure		
Large vertical fissure + expulsion of upper fragment	10	100
Clockwise block rotation	19	
Partial collapse	19	110
Block and facing collapse	19	110
Slight damage on superstructure		
Cracked ashlar	19	
Large facing collapse	19	
Anticlockwise block rotation	19	
Out-of-plane shift	19	109
Large facing collapse	19	109
Superstructure collapse	19	109
Block collapse	19	109
Large crack and outward tilting	109	19
Large crack + facing collapse	109	
Large vertical crack	109	
Large vertical crack	19	
Large collapse + tension crack in superstructure	109	
Destroyed facing		
Crack	109	
Crack and facing collapse		
Large vertical, penetrative crack	19	
Two cracks, slight deformation of masonry	19	

Two vertical cracks	19	
Vertical crack	19	
Cracked and slightly dislodged block + facing collapse	19	
Cracked and shifted ashlar	19	135
Damaged arch + facing collapse	19	
Vertical crack, penetrative through masonry and base ashlar	19	
Left-lateral wall offset + slight wall warping	19	
Right-lateral offset of upper facing	90	0
Damaged arch keystone	90	
Shifted voussoir	90	
Large cracks and damaged voussoirs	0	
Lintel shift	0	0
Collapsed block	90	0
Shifted block	0	0
Shifted blocks	90	90
Dropped keystone	175	
In-plane offset blocks	175	175
Dropped and shifted keystones	85	175
In-plane offset blocks	85	85
Damaged voussoirs	85	
Shifted block	85	175
Cracked column capital		
Damaged voussoirs	175	
Damaged voussoirs	85	
Clockwise block rotation		
Deformed pavement		
Dislodged blocks	90	
Partial collapse of vaults	90	
Collapsed keystones	2	
Collapsed block	130	40
Dropped vault block		
Multiple cracks in block		
Expulsed block corners		
Out-of-plane block shift	0	90
Shifted keystone and voussoirs	25	115
Dropped vault block		
Shifted keystone and voussoirs	0	90
Cracked keystone	0	
Out-of-plane block shift	0	90
Dropped vault block		
Destroyed arch	90	
Collapsed block	90	0
Shifted stair block	90	0
Cracked gravestone	0	
Cracks + corner expulsion		
Horizontal crack of gravestone base		
Horizontal cracks	0	

Vertical crack + slight shift
Shifted and rotated blocks
Destruction

90

0

Deformation strike	Other measurement	Terminus post quem	Terminus ante quem
		1208	
	0	527	
	0	527	
		1097	
		1097	
		1097	
	0	1097	
	0	527	
		1097	
	0	1097	
	0	527	
		1097	
		1097	
		1097	
	0	527	
		527	
		527	
		527	
180		527	
		527	
		527	
		1097	
		527	
	dip 80S	527	
		1097	
		1097	
		527	
		1208	
	offset >50 cm	527	
	offset >50 cm	527	
		1222	
		1222	
		3rd c.	1254
	offset 5.5 cm	3rd c.	1254
	offset 4-4.5 cm	3rd c.	1254
45	offset 5-9 cm	3rd c.	1254
	offset 2.5-3 cm	3rd c.	1254
45	offset 2.5 cm	3rd c.	1254
		3rd c.	1254
		3rd c.	
	rotation 10°; offset 8-10cm	3rd c.	
	offset 5-9 cm	3rd c.	
	drop 6 cm	3rd c.	
	rotation 4°	3rd c.	

offset 3-4 cm each	3rd c.		
40 shift 3 cm	3rd c.		
	3rd c.		
	3rd c.		
		858	
40		730	
		730	
		730	
40		858	
		730	
		1222	
		1222	
	3rd c.		
	3rd c.		
shift 2 cm	3rd c.		1097
shift 4 cm	3rd c.		1097
shift 15 cm and 4 cm	3rd c.		1097
40 shift 3.5 cm	3rd c.		1097
shift 3 cm	3rd c.		
shift 3-4 cm	3rd c.		
40 shift 4 cm; dip 5-10°	3rd c.		
shift 2.5-3.5 cm	3rd c.		
310 shift 4 cm	3rd c.		
crack plane N060 dip 70E		1260	
crack plane N040 dip 60		1260	
crack dip > 80E		1260	
90 dip 5°	3rd c.		
		1208	
offset 15 cm		1222	
	3rd c.		
	3rd c.		
keystone offset 6 cm		1222	
		858	
		858	
180 shift 5 cm	3rd c.		
180 shift 6 cm; tilt 5°	3rd c.		
max rotation 20°	3rd c.		1185
30	3rd c.		
0	3rd c.		1185
0		858	
50		858	
140		858	
50		858	
		1222	
265		1208	
	3rd c.		
dextral offset 10 cm		1222	

		1143	
	3rd c.		
315		1143	
		730	
135		1222	
	dextral offset 20 cm	1222	
	crack dip 45° NE	1222	
	dip 85° NW	1222	
315		730	
		730	
45		730	
315		730	
315		1143	
295	3rd c.		
	crack dip 70W	3rd c.	
	crack plane azimuth 165	3rd c.	
225	3rd c.		
		1222	
	3rd c.		
	3rd c.		1330
		1260	
	left-lateral offset 40 cm	730	
	3rd c.		
	crack plane 030 65W	3rd c.	
	rotation 6°	3rd c.	1254
	shifts 1-11cm	3rd c.	1254
		730	1254
		730	1254
		730	1254
		1208	
	tilt 10°	730	1254
		1222	
	3rd c.		
		1222	
		1208	
	3rd c.		
155		858	
0	2nd c.		
	2nd c.		
	rotation 8°	2nd c.	
	rotation 5°	2nd c.	
	0 horizontal shift + slight drop	2nd c.	
180	2nd c.		
	2nd c.		
	2nd c.		
		1222	
170		1222	

	crack dip 80°	3rd c.	858
	slight vertical shift in masonry	3rd c.	1065
135		3rd c.	
		3rd c.	
		3rd c.	858
	offset 30-40 cm	3rd c.	
		3rd c.	1065
		3rd c.	
		2nd c.	858
180		2nd c.	
		3rd c.	1254
180		3rd c.	858
0		3rd c.	
270		3rd c.	
			1378
175			1378
175			1378
			1378
			1378
355			1442
			1442
			1421
			1421
	rotation 5°		527
			787
			1260
			527
			787
			1260
			1208
220		2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
270		2nd c.	
	tilt 5-10°; vertical shift 2.5-5 cm	2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
90	tilt 6°; drop 1-2 cm	2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
270		2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
		2nd c.	
0		2nd c.	
0		2nd c.	
			1387
			1387
			1387
			1387

left-lateral

1387

1st c

Vulnerability class	Damage grade	Non-seismic causing processes?	Quality rank	Ref (if other study)
B		3 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
B		3 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 War damage	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		2 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		2 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 War damage	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 War damage	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 War damage	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 War damage	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 War damage	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Soil instability, original construction	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		2 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 Man-made damage, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Original construction	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Original construction	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		2 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Soil instability	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
B		2 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 Recent, natural decay	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1	1	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Soil instability	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Soil instability	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		1 Original construction	2	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
B		4 Man-made damage	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
B		2 Recent, vehicles traffic	3	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
B		1	1	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
B		1	1	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
A		3 Original construction, natural decay	3	
A		3 Foundation failure, soil instability	3	
B		2	1	
B		2	1	
B		2	1	
B		2	1	
B		2	1	
B		2	1	
B		2	1	
B		3	1	
B		2	1	
C		2 Dubious context, man-made	3	
C		2 Dubious context, man-made	3	
C		2 Dubious context, man-made	3	
C		2 Dubious context, man-made	3	

C	2 Dubious context, man-made	3
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	4 War damage	2
B	2	1
B	2 War damage	2
B	2	1
B	2 Original construction	2
B	3	1
B	3	1
B	3 Man-made damage	2
B	3	1
B	2 War damage	2
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	2 Natural decay	2
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	2	1
B	5 War damage	2
A	1 Original construction	3
B	4 War damage	2
B	2	1
A	3 Vegetation	2
B	2	1
B	3 War damage	2
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	5 Dubious context, natural decay	3
C	2	1
B	2 Foundation failure, soil instability	3
B	3 War damage	2
B	3 War damage	2
B	5 War damage	2
A	4	1
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
B	2 Original construction	3

B	2	1
B	3 War damage	2
B	3 War damage	2
C	1 War damage, natural decay	3
A	3 Original construction	2
A	3 Foundation failure, soil instability	3
A	2 Natural decay	2
A	1 Soil instability	2
C	2	1
C	4 War damage, natural decay	3
C	2 War damage	2
C	5 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	3 War damage	2
B	3 War damage	2
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
A	4	1
B	5 Dubious context	3
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	2 Natural decay	2
C	2 Original construction	3
B	2 War damage, natural decay	3
B	2 War damage, natural decay	3
B	2	1
B	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
B	1 Original construction	2
C	1	1
A	3 Natural decay	2
B	2 War damage, natural decay	3
A	5	1
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
C	4 War damage	2
C	4	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	4	1
C	2	1
A	3 Soil instability	2
A	2 Soil instability	2

B	4 War damage	2
B	4 War damage	2
A	3 Natural decay	2
B	3 War damage	2
B	3 Original construction	3
B	3 Natural decay	2
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	2	1
B	3 War damage	2
B	2	1
B	3 War damage	2
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	5 Dubious context	3
B	4 Natural decay	2
B	2	1
B	3 Natural decay	2
B	3 Natural decay	2
C	3 War damage	2
C	3 Natural decay	2
B	2	1
B	4	1
B	4 War damage	2
B	3	1
B	3	1
B	2 War damage	2
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 War damage	2
C	1 Natural decay	2
B	2 War damage	2
B	4 Dubious context	3
B	2 War damage	2
B	2 War damage	2
B	2 War damage, natural decay	3
B	2 War damage, natural decay	3
B	2 War damage	2
B	3 Natural decay, war damage	3
B	3 War damage	2
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	4 War damage, natural decay	3
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
B	3 War damage, natural decay	3
B	3	1
B	2 Natural decay	2

B	3	1
B	3	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	3 Natural decay	2
B	3	1
B	1 Original construction	3
B	2 Dubious context	3
B	3 Natural decay	2
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	4 Natural decay	2
C	3	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2	1
C	2 Natural decay	2
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2 Soil instability	2
B	2	1
B	3 Natural decay	2
B	3 Natural decay	2
B	3 Man-made	2
B	2 Natural decay, original construction	3
B	2 Natural decay	2
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2 Natural decay, original construction	3
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2	1
B	2 Natural decay, original construction	3
B	3 Man-made	2
B	2 Man-made	2
B	2	1
B	2 Dubious context	3
B	2 Dubious context	3
B	3 Dubious context	3
B	3 Dubious context	3

B	2 Dubious context	3
C	2	1
B	5	1

Reconstruction EAE dataset

EAE ID	N	E	Location	Type
RC1	40.426492	29.716886	Theater, inner corridor	Reinforcement
RC2	40.429246	29.720232	Aya Sofya, N inner wall	Repair
RC3	40.429213	29.720259	Aya Sofya, NE wall of nave	Repair
RC4	40.429213	29.720259	Aya Sofya, N wall	Reinforcement
RC5	40.428306	29.720615	II. Murhat Hamami, east door	Reinforcement
RC8	40.42822	29.720528	II. Murhat Hamami, south door	Reinforcement
RC11	40.429817	29.726843	Yesilcamii, nort door	Reinforcement
RW2	40.42885	29.729057	Lefke Gate, SW area	Reinforcement
RW5	40.429913	29.728396	T46	Repair
RW6	40.434126	29.723269	T57 base	Repair
RW7	40.436477	29.720354	Istanbul inner Gate	Reconstruction
RW8	40.436235	29.719516	Outer wall in front of T61, inner facing	Repair
RW10	40.429951	29.713724	T84	Reconstruction
RW11	40.428476	29.713401	W87/88	Reinforcement
RW12	40.425793	29.713872	South Lake Gate	Reconstruction
RW13	40.425554	28.714165	W94/95	Reconstruction
RW14	40.425462	29.715602	T97	Reinforcement
RW18	40.423714	29.726154	T21, inner wall, inner facing	Repair
RW19	40.423212	29.724522	T16, inner wall, inner facing	Reconstruction
RAQ1	40.428735	29.730474	Close to arch 8, northern facing	Reconstruction
RAQ3	40.428728	29.731783	Aqueduct, northern facing	Reinforcement
RAQ4	40.42871	29.732231	Aqueduct, northern facing	Reconstruction
RAQ5	40.428702	29.732815	Aqueduct, northern facing	Reinforcement
RAQ7	40.4287	29.732951	Aqueduct, northern facing	Reinforcement
RAQ8	40.428403	29.736874	Aqueduct, northern facing	Reinforcement
RAQ9	40.428667	29.729747	Arch 7, southern facing	Reinforcement

Description	Date range	Ref (if other study)
Imbricated, polygonal blocks	2nd c.	
Pink mortar sealing	8th c.	
Terracotta and white mortar sealing	8th c.	
Walled windows	13th c. ?	
Seismoresistant technique on arch	Early 15th c.	
Seismoresistant technique on arch	Early 15th c.	
Seismoresistant technique on arch	Late 14th c.	
Walled opening	12-13th c.	
Light pink mortar on crack	12-13th c.	
Thicker terracotta masonry	12-13th c.	
Mixed terracotta+rubble masonry	1143-1180	
Bright mortar on wall offset	Early 13th c.	
Mixed terracotta+rubble masonry	Late 13th c.	
Buttress	Late 12th c.	
Terracotta masonry with yellowish pink mortar	Early 13th c.?	
Mixed terracotta+rubble masonry	12-13th c.	
Mixed terracotta+rubble masonry	1222-1330	
Mortar on wall offset		
Very similar style to surrounding walls		
Limestone and travertine rubble + marble spoils	Early 11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
Walled arch	6th-11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
Mixed materials (terracottas, spoils)	11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
Walled arch	6th-11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
Walled arch	6th-11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
Buttress-like brick structure	6th-11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)
New travertine facing over terracotta	6th-11th c.	Benjelloun et al. (2018)

Orientation	Length (m)	% Length	Q1	%Q1	Q1+Q2	%Q1+Q2
N-S	1124	12.7	25	30.8	45	31.3
NE-SW	2478	28.1	8	9.9	16	11.1
E-W	3319	37.6	29	35.8	54	37.5
NW-SE	1912	21.6	19	23.5	29	20.1

Q1+Q2+Q3	%Q1+Q2+Q3
53	26.5
24	12
88	44
35	17.5

Name	Date	Event location (lat;lon)	Event depth (km)	Moment magnitude	Station code	Station location (lat;lon)
Düzce	11/12/1999	40.81;31.19	10.4	7.3	8101	40.84;31.15
Azores Islands	7/9/1998	38.61;-28.57	10	6.1	HOR	38.53;-28.63
Patti Gulf	4/15/1978	38.27;15.11	22	6.0	MLZ	38.23;15.24
Patti Gulf	4/15/1978	38.27;15.11	22	6.0	PTT1	38.15;14.97
Kyllini	10/16/1988	37.93;20.92	25	5.9	ZAK1	37.79;20.90

Epicentral
distance (km)


5.3

10.7


12.5

18.3


15.7




Original 3rd century walls (Claudius Gothicus)




Komnenoi reconstructions (late 11th and 12th c.)



Isaurian reconstructions (c. 730)



Lascaris reconstructions (1208-1254)



Michael III reconstructions (c. 858)



Palaeologue reconstructions (1254-1331)

