The history of the Holy Sepulchre, like that of many other important buildings in the history of mankind, is a chain, a sequence (‘ein Wechselspiel’, as Bredekamp put it for St. Peter in Rome) of construction, destruction, and re-construction. What is unique about the Holy Sepulchre, the Church of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, is that the major changes introduced by phases in its erection were echoed, propagated and amplified outside Jerusalem, in the Christian oecumene. Thus, modifications performed in reconstructions, such that usually affect only a building’s appearance or connection with the immediate vicinity, had in the case of the Holy Sepulchre far-reaching consequences.

The destruction of 1009, a very traumatic act was followed by two reconstructions: in mid eleventh century by the Byzantine emperor, and in the twelfth century by the Crusaders (Fig. 1). The resulting buildings, the later one still standing, were both highly unusual and original, even though they echoed the respective contemporary styles (Byzantine and Romanesque) common to their places of origin. The builders had to deal not only with the remains of the past but also with a topographical situation that compelled them to provide a compact and economical space for the appropriate architectural emphasis on the key loca sancta commemorated by the church as well as for daily liturgical functioning. While the fourth century Constantinian complex followed a pattern usual in early Christian cemeterial complexes in Rome, that of associating a central memorial building with a basilical martyrium, the structures that followed the disaster of 1009 had to invent themselves. They had to incorporate the Constantinian rotunda that had survived Persian invasion, earthquakes, fires, and El-Hakim; then they had to include the Golgotha Hill, and provide various groups of pilgrims with suitable altars and chapels for daily offices, and to get all these into a unified structure.

This situation, produced by a series of destructive events and finally by El-Hakim, engendered two unconventional buildings, entirely disparate but both revolving around the same component, the Constantinian rotunda (which underwent changes in elevation but not in general layout). Both the Monomachus and the Crusader Holy Sepulchre were much more than reconstructions: they considerably extended the series of loca sancta and the traditions commemorated in
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Fig. 1 Jerusalem, The Holy Sepulchre Church, Constantinian, Byzantine, Crusader ground plans.
the church, and combined contemporary architectural and decorative styles, Byzantine and Romanesque respectively, with local data. New architectural formulæ thus appeared that would in time become emblems of the Holy Sepulchre and of Jerusalem.

What I am going to do in this article is briefly introduce the two post-El-Hakim reconstructions of the Holy Sepulchre, dwelling on their most salient new architectural and cultic features (‘new’ with respect to the early Christian building); then I will try to show how these reconstructions led to the formation of an image of the Holy Sepulchre that in time became the core of Jerusalem reproductions elsewhere. It is especially in this last point that I see the greatest expression of ‘productivity’ associated with the Holy Sepulchre in the aftermath of El-Hakim’s destruction in 1009.

Some twenty years after the disaster, the Byzantine Emperor received permission to rebuild the Holy Sepulchre. Almost twenty more years passed before the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos’ building was consecrated in 1048 (as recorded by William of Tyre). Monomachos probably began work in 1042, immediately after becoming Emperor by marrying the reigning Empress Zoe.

The short-lived Byzantine building, which stood some 70–80 years, marked the transition from the early Christian to the medieval Holy Sepulchre, being decisive in the development of a compact structural concept, commemorating under one roof the main events to which the church was dedicated (Crucifixion, Entombment and Resurrection) as well as other events related to the Passion, while at the same time shaping a space for ritual celebrations, liturgy, and prayer.

The reconstruction of the rotunda appears to have adhered closely to the fourth century form. However, a major change took place in its functioning: it seems that for the first time in the history of the Holy Sepulchre church, the rotunda assumed the role of the main church for the formal service, in addition to its original role as a memorial building. For this purpose, a projecting bema and apse were added on the east, thus correcting the reversed orientation of the original. The apse is known from partial excavations and from still visible remains in the arch linking the rotunda and the Crusader church of the following century.

The porticoed courtyard also followed the plan of the fourth century triporiectus. At the centre of the courtyard was the omphalos marking the centre of the earth (incorporated later in the Crusader church). Along the eastern perimeter a series of chapels commemorated the events of Christ’s Passion, housing relics brought from elsewhere in the city: the Prison of Christ in the northeast corner,
identified as such since the ninth century; the Flagellation, the Crown of Thorns, and the Division of the Garments, between the Prison and Calvary. This portion of the complex is known only from medieval descriptions, having been replaced by the Crusader apse with radiating chapels, that took to themselves the dedications established by the Byzantine structure.

The importance of the Monomachos building goes far beyond the structural innovations it introduced in the building history of the Holy Sepulchre.

First, it invented a *via dolorosa* long before that of the Franciscans, a processional route that evoked the whole story of the Passion, beginning with the imprisonment of Christ and commemorating events not directly located in the area of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. In the version of the Typikon of Jerusalem used during the eleventh century, verses read aloud in the courtyard during the Good Friday service refer specifically to each event, and the proximity of the chapels and relics to the worshippers would have heightened the sense of a real presence at the commemorated Passion. At certain points the service introduced a dramatic re-creation of the events of the Passion. For example, at one moment the patriarch assumed the role of Christ, carrying the *timion stavron* (either a relic of the True Cross or a jeweled cross) on his shoulder, and by means of a cord around his neck he was led to imprisonment and then to Calvary. These processions had a practical reason: they took place within the compound of the church, the ‘sites’ of the Prison, the Flagellation, the Crown of Thorns, and the Division of the Garments having been transferred into the Holy Sepulchre because of the difficulties encountered by Christian worship elsewhere in the city. Nevertheless, when considering the far-reaching effect of these arrangements, it seems that the concentration of *loca sancta* in the Holy Sepulchre’s compound added considerably to its becoming the symbol of Jerusalem and the core of Jerusalem transplanted.

Secondly, by making the rotunda assume both functions, that of memorial and that of regular worship, the Monomachos building decisively contributed to mark the departure from the early Christian patterns of separation through form. Besides the local significance of this change (the fact that it led to the unified, oval layout of the Crusader Holy Sepulchre), the imposition of the two essential functions on the rotunda made it the model for self-sufficient, independent copies elsewhere: churches that conveyed the memory of Christ’s Tomb and Resurrection, while performing the regular churchly functions. Examples are Neuvy

St. Sepulchre and the St. Sepulchre in Cambridge. Moreover, this particular combination of functions in the Anastasis rotunda led to combinations of memorial and other liturgical functions such as baptism, as in the famous case of Pisa, one of the most accurate copies of the Holy Sepulchre rotunda.

Both these features, the historical and the liturgical, expressing the same tendency towards compactness and concision, were continued and perfected in the Crusader building. Instead of the courtyard and its chapels the Crusaders built a Romanesque choir with radial chapels and a domed transept. The choir with galleries echoes the rotunda on the east, thus giving the whole complex its particular oval layout. The eastern apse of the rotunda designed by the Monomachos architects was opened by an arch to mark the passage between the rotunda and the Crusader transept.

The main entrance to the complex is in the southern transept, so that upon entering the building the visitor is mid way between the rotunda and the Crusader choir.

The southern façade with its double portal, echoed on the upper level by double window openings, is a conglomerate of spolia and ad-hoc decorative elements, indebted in overall layout to Italian Romanesque but with strong local accents. The façade is flanked by a baptistery and a bell tower to the west and by the two-storey Golgotha Chapel to the east (Fig. 2). For the first time in the history of the Holy Sepulchre Church, Golgotha was commemorated in a building of its own, visible from the outside and independently accessed. The Calvary Chapel, or the Chapel of the Franks, at the upper level above the Golgotha rock, localizes the last events of Christ’s life, while below it is the Chapel of Adam, marking the burial place of Adam’s skull.

The stations made by Christ’s body after the Descent from the Cross are well defined in the Crusader building, allowing the pilgrim to re-live the last events in movement and prayer: the stone where the body was laid and lamented is sited in the southern arm of the transept, the tomb and place of the Resurrection are further to the west, at the centre of the rotunda. Thus, Calvary, the stone of unction and the Tomb were spatially emphasized and concretized in the Crusader Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The Crusader building is basically the one now standing. The changes it has undergone have not affected the structure and most of them are late, of the nine-
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teenth and twentieth centuries, so that the Crusader building was the one that aroused the fervour and thoughts of pilgrims during the Later Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the early modern era. Consistently, its spatial and liturgical patterns were those that influenced the many reproductions of the Holy Sepulchre and of Jerusalem outside the Holy Land, both pictorial and architectural.

However, as I have already suggested, the Byzantine Monomachos phase was in many ways decisive. It stood, even if for a short, but critical, period, that preceding and preparatory of the Crusades, and in the early days of the Crusader Kingdom. This meant that it was seen by many pilgrims and the Crusaders themselves in a period of religious and political effervescence, and in a period of intense connectivity between Europe and the Holy Land. Usually, its influence was rather indirect, working through the establishment of patterns and principles...
which were perpetuated in the Crusader building, with one famous exception, San Stefano in Bologna, where the direct impact of the Monomachus architecture is still clearly visible (Fig. 3).  

---

Although the main written source for the Bologna complex, the *Vita Sancti Petronii*, written in 1180,\(^\text{10}\) attributes its foundation to the fifth century, in the lifetime of the patron bishop of Bologna, archeological evidence points rather to the eleventh-twelfth centuries, as does the resemblance with the Monomachus building of the Holy Sepulchre. The copy of the Holy Sepulchre in Bologna, known as *Nuova Gerusalemme*, joined a pre-existent, early Christian basilica dedicated to SS. Vitale and Agricola. The rotunda of the Anastasis was translated into an octagon, but its location at the western end of the new complex remained faithful to the original, like the location of a model of the Tomb slightly west of center. The Holy Sepulchre’s original system of eight piers and twelve columns became an octagon with twelve interior columns. A heavily restored church of S. Giovanni Battista adjoins the south flank of S. Sepolcro, corresponding in location to the baptistery of the same dedication in Jerusalem.

East of the Bologna S. Sepolcro church is an arcaded courtyard known today as the Cortile di Pilato, referred to as *atrio in medio* in twelfth century sources. At the eastern end of the courtyard is a group of chapels dedicated to S. Croce. In the twelfth century the central chapel was called *Calvario* or *locus ad crucem*. It contained an imitation of the Mount of Golgotha and a cross which was said to have been constructed by St. Petronius from measurements he had taken of the True Cross. The distance between the tomb and the centre of the S. Croce chapel in Bologna is virtually identical with the distance from the Tomb of Christ to Calvary in Jerusalem (according to the *Commemoratorium de casis Dei*, the distance in Jerusalem was 41.6 meters while the distance at Bologna is 42 meters).

Although\(^\text{11}\) the shape and location of the eastern chapels is based on extant funerary chapels belonging to the same early Christian cemeterial complex to which the early basilica of SS. Vitale and Agricola belonged, this need not prevent us from referring to them as part of the Bologna-Jerusalem complex: they were certainly incorporated because they so well suited the concept of a copy of the Monomachus Holy Sepulchre in every possible aspect. They also suited the Byzantine medieval architectural style: the chapels turned the courtyard into an organizational focus of the complex, similar to St. Nicholas at Myra and St. George of Mangana in Constantinople. The satellite arrangement of chapels flanking the main church may be compared with the church at Yilanca Bayir just outside Constantinople, or the Theotokos of Lips in Constantinople. The alignment of the apses with the east facade reflects a practice common in Byzantium,

\(^{10}\) F. S. Lanzoni, Petronio Vescovo di Bologna: nella storia e nella legenda, Roma 1907.

also evident at the Theotokos of Lips and the Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{12}

After the twelfth century dedications were added to expand the association with the Holy Sepulchre complex and the city of Jerusalem. By the early fourteenth century the basin in the courtyard had been associated with the one in which Pilate washed his hands. A free-standing column in S. Sepolcro was identified with the Column of the Flagellation. A marker commemorating the site of the Denial of Peter is mentioned by some authors and a chapel representing the Prison of Christ was also included. An elaborate “Casa di Pilato” existed prior to the early sixteenth century in the upper church of S. Giovanni, reached from the courtyard by a stairway called the Scala Santa. Other dedications, not directly related to the Passion story, were added later, extending the scope of the Bologna complex and making it into a memorial complex of the Holy Land: such dedications are, for example, the Annunciation to the Virgin, the Probatica Pool, the Three Magi, or Christ’s appearance to the Magdalene.\textsuperscript{13}

Extremely significant and probably typical for a range of other medieval and late medieval cities, less documented than Bologna, the S. Sepolcro complex was already conceived in the twelfth century as the heart of a network of churches commemorative of Jerusalem: The \textit{Vita Sancti Petronii} of 1180 records that the saint constructed an artifical mount, on which a shrine called S. Giovanni in Monte Olivet was erected in imitation of the site of the Ascension of Christ. The shrine was believed to be the same distance from S. Stefano as the Church of the Ascension from the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. In its early stages, S. Giovanni in Monte was cruciform in plan, but the description suggests that the roof may have been partially open, like that of the Church of the Ascension in Jerusalem. The distances between the sites, supposed to be the same, vary by almost a kilometer. The \textit{Vita} also mentions a church of S. Tecla, built as a similitude of the Valley of Yehoshaphat and the Field of Aceldama, and a Pool of Siloam, of undetermined location. Topographically there is a correspondence with Jerusalem, where the Valley of Yehoshaphat is located between the Mount of Olives and the Holy Sepulchre. The Field of Aceldama, however, is in the Valley of Hinnom, and not in the Valley of Yehoshaphat. The Pool of Siloam, actually located in the Valley of Josephat, was not geographically established in the twelfth century text, although Yehoshaphat by the fourteenth century the name was associated with a well in the church of S. Sepolcro, said to have curative powers.\textsuperscript{14}
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The gradual accumulation of *loca sancta* around and within the Bologna complex echoing the Holy Sepulchre is thus similar to the process undergone by the Holy Sepulchre itself. The distribution of *loca sancta* throughout Bologna not only emphasizes the centrality of the Holy Sepulchre, fostering a procession-\al route that revolved around it; the network of *loca sancta* in Bologna was actually meant to turn Bologna into Jerusalem, into one of Jerusalem’s projections elsewhere.

It is difficult to establish the exact date of Bologna’s *Nuova Gerusalemme*. It can certainly be placed in the time of the existence of Monomachus’ building, perhaps close to the first Crusade, perhaps even earlier. Bologna has a long history of connections with the Holy Land, which provide an appropriate background to the flow of information: the local saint Bononius paid a visit to the Holy Land as early as the late tenth century after staying at the monastery of S. Stefano in Bologna. Members of Bologna’s leading families participated in the First Crusade. In these circumstances, it is understandable that such an updated and sophisticated Jerusalem complex was established in Bologna at a relatively early date: not only San Sepolcro, but the network of other Jerusalem *loca sancta* was begun in the twelfth century, although the process of accumulation continued at least until the fourteenth.

Bologna is unique in its specific reflection of the Monomachus Holy Sepulchre structures. The destruction of 1009 found an echo in Europe even before or during the Byzantine reconstruction. These copies concentrated on the rotunda, which was only partially destroyed by El-Hakim. Some of them anachronistically refer to the early Christian complex, by associating the circular structure with a preexistent longitudinal one. This was already the case in Konstanz in the tenth century. Bishop Konrad of Konstanz made three pilgrimages to Jerusalem. After the second, in 940, he built a rotunda, half the width of the real one, near his cathedral church. The rotunda was dedicated to St. Maurice, the patron saint of the Ottonian kings, the dedication being accompanied by a transfer of the saint’s relics from Reichenau to Konstanz sometime before 973, through the good offices of the Bishop of Augsburg, Ulrich I (who died, as Konrad himself, in 973). The centre of the round building was occupied by a gilded copy of Christ’s tomb.

---

This preceded the present Gothic tomb, dated on stylistic grounds to 1260. Since that time a transept has connected the rotunda to the bishop’s church.\textsuperscript{16}

Essentially an Ottonian structure of the beginning of the eleventh century, the rotunda of St. Michael’s church in Fulda goes back to earlier, Carolingian foundations, as is evident at the crypt level. Between 1075–1096, a single nave was added to the rotunda on the west, as well as two short transept arms, giving the building the form of a cross.\textsuperscript{17}

Two churches in the central western part of France dating from the first half of the eleventh century show a prominent rotunda connected to a basilica, like Fulda but on a larger scale. One is St. Sauveur in Charroux, poorly preserved and of uncertain date. Two available dates suggest the eleventh century: in 1045, the Charroux monks possessed ten relics of Christ’s and Mary’s lives and one relic of the cross; in 1096 Urban II consecrated the main altar.\textsuperscript{18}

Better documented, not far to the west of Charroux is Neuve St. Sepulchre.\textsuperscript{19}

The rotunda was added to a preexistent basilica in a first building phase, between 1045–1079. Eudes de Deols, who undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1026–7 was probably concerned in the foundation. Architectural incongruities and an analysis of the remaining capitals and column bases indicate several phases of building. The ambulatory and the galleries belong to a second phase, datable to the end of the eleventh or to the twelfth century. Prior to the addition of galleries, in the first phase, the rotunda had a flat roof and a dome very much resembling the Dome of the Rock (Fig. 4). The combination of Holy Sepulchre and Dome of the Rock is not necessarily accidental if we consider projections of the Holy Sepulchre not as isolated copies of a monument but as representatives of Jerusalem in its multi-layered history and religiosity. Reflecting the absorption of the Temple’s sanctity by the Holy Sepulchre, it is to be expected that this conflation


\textsuperscript{17} A. Laube-Rosenpflanzer – L. Rosenpflanzer, Kirchen, Klöster, Königshöfe: Vorromannishe Architektur zwischen Weser und Elbe, Halle 2007.


would be transmitted in the Holy Sepulchre’s projections in Europe. Not far from Neuvy, at Lanleff in Brittany, the copy still bears the name “Temple de Jerusalem”.

In spite of all the uncertainties regarding the circumstances of their building, these examples can be considered as responses to El-Hakim or to Constantine Monomachus. They may be understood as isolated survivors of a much larger movement commemorating the Holy Sepulchre through architectural projec-

Fig. 4 Neuvy-St. Sepulchre as in ca 1900 and The Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem
tions in reaction to the destruction or to the reconstructions that followed, projections that are dissimulated under later phases of construction or altogether forgotten. Many more appear towards the end of the eleventh century, in the wake of preparations for the Crusade, this is where enlargements such as those in Fulda or Neuvy most probably belong.

Once the Crusader Holy Sepulchre was completed (probably not before the early sixties of the twelfth century), its projections outside the Holy Land took two forms, the building of a rotunda and/or a representation of the three most prominent loca sancta of the church, separately but in one compound: the Calvary Chapel, the Unction/Lamentation stone and the Tomb aedicule. This was most probably the time when pilgrimage routes began to appear, linking European cities and monasteries to Jerusalem sites located just outside their own walls, sites that had the Holy Sepulchre at the centre.

Eichstätt provides an early (twelfth century) although only partially preserved illustration of two related developments connected with the projection of the Holy Sepulchre after the Crusader reconstruction.\(^{20}\) The present situation of the Eichstätt Holy Sepulchre offers no clue for such a supposition. A copy of the tomb aedicule approached through a rectangular chapel (of the angel) is located in a seventeenth century church (of the Capucins). It is well known, however, in the scholarly literature that the tomb, dated to the twelfth century, does not belong to its present, much later shelter. Written evidence shows that the tomb originally belonged to a Church of the Holy Cross which was part of a Irish monastery built in the twelfth century and destroyed in the sixteenth, when it had ceased to function. The tomb was removed from its original location at that time, the stones carefully numbered and stored in view of reconstruction at a new location. Until some fifteen years ago, it was not clear what the original church looked like. In 1994 a sixteenth century view in watercolour of the city of Eichstätt came to light, which gives us a good idea of the shape of the Holy Cross Church. The watercolour sketch, in the University Library of Würzburg, represents a big round church outside the city walls (Fig. 5). The tomb aedicule was most probably placed at the centre of this building, like the tomb in the rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

---

What we do not know is whether this building stood alone or was part of a larger complex. The name found in the written sources, the Church of the Holy Cross, indicates the existence of a Calvary church as well, which in most cases was built separately at a short distance from the structure commemorating the Tomb and Resurrection. It is possible that what we see in the succint watercolour of Eichstätt is the Tomb and Resurrection Rotunda (the Anastasis) to which the aedicule belonged, while the Holy Cross church mentioned in the sources is not shown, either because it was no longer extant or because of the carelessness or ignorance of the sixteenth century painter. The location outside the walls of the city might indicate the existence of a larger complex, as in Görlitz, including other Stations of the Cross and possibly also additional holy places, in which case Eichstätt would have been a very early if not the starting point of the custom of building Jerusalem complexes on the outskirts of medieval cities.

At a significant distance in time from Eichstätt, Görlitz, a city on the border between Germany and Poland, produced towards the end of the fifteenth century the earliest significant extant example of such a complex, although with no rotunda. Fairly accurate reproductions of the three main components of the Holy Sepulchre arranged in a topographical setting imitating Jerusalem were
obviously considered more appropriate for a representation of a processional Way of the Cross than a single large structure (Fig. 6).

The story of Jerusalem in Görlitz began as early as 1465:21 Georg Emerich, the forty year old son of the Görlitz mayor, made Benigna, the very young daughter of another prominent and rival family in the town, pregnant (*in domo patris!*), with no intention of marrying her. To get absolution, he undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and became a Knight of the Holy Sepulchre. However, during his long absence from Görlitz, the antagonism between the two families deepened and took on political dimensions, Benigna’s family becoming associated with the Hussite King of Bohemia, Georg Bizko, while Georg’s family, the Emerichs, took sides with the King of Hungary, Matthias I Corvinus, who also aspired to the Bohemian throne. In 1467 the war ended with a Catholic victory. Georg, in the meantime mayor himself, decided to support the building of a copy of the Holy Sepulchre in 1473, when a Görlitz citizen offered his garden outside

---

the town walls for the purpose, and the enterprise was encouraged by the Bishop of Meissen.

The Holy Sepulchre complex in Görlitz thus comprises three sites, commemorating three events: a two-storey building known as Die Kapelle zum Heiligen Kreuz, actually a Calvary; a tomb aedicule; and, between them, a late-Gothic sculptural Pieta group by Hans Olmützer. The distances between the three components correspond to the real distances in Jerusalem between Calvary, the Deposition and the Tomb. The Calvary and the Tomb also reflect the architecture of the respective structures in Jerusalem. The two storey building of the Holy Cross chapel is clearly inspired by the Crusader Calvary (see Fig. 2): the upper
part is the Golgotha Chapel, the lower one the Adam Chapel. The Golgotha Chapel could only be accessed from the outside, through an external staircase, again like the original.

The upper chapel suggests, through three holes in a stone block, the Crucifixion of Christ and the two thieves (Fig. 8). The place of Christ’s cross is marked by a crucifix and the inscription INRI on the floor. A deep slit in the chapel floor marks the way taken by Christ’s blood to Adam’s skull below; A corresponding slit in the Adam chapel’s wall indicates the flow of the blood.

The Tomb chapel is also structured in conformity with the original, but is a fifth smaller: there is a rectangular chapel of the angel containing a stone altar, from which a low opening leads to the actual tomb chamber. A lantern characteristically tops the aedicule (Fig. 9).

The importance of Görlitz consists in several aspects:

First, it is a relatively early, extant example of the distant impact of the Crusader Holy Sepulchre: close to faithful representation of the three loca sancta illustrating how they were incoroporated in the Crusader Holy Sepulchre – distinctly but harmoniously.

Secondly, Görlitz is a concise and one of the earliest if not the earliest extant projections of the centrality of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and the Holy Land translated into a pilgrimage route linking a European city with a Jerusalem site on its outskirts: The way to the Sepulchre starts at Pilate’s house, located beside the West portal of St. Peter’s church in the town (Fig. 10). The stations leading up the hill to the Sepulchre complex are marked by columns with images. From this hill, one can see a Mount of Olives with Gethsemane as well as a Kidron Valley, figured out by the Launitz river. The extension of the Holy Sepulchre’s core (Fig. 11) beyond events strictly connected to the way of the cross, commemorated over a large area of the town and its immediate surroundings, using the natural topography of the place, is a distant but still related reflection of the traumatic destruction of 1009 and mainly of what it caused from both the material and spiritual points of view.
Fig. 8a, b  Görlitz, Holy Cross Chapel, Interior  
(photos: Dr. Galit Noga-Banaï)
Fig. 9a, b  Görlitz, The Tomb
(photos: Dr. Galit Noga-Banai)
Fig. 10a, b Görlitz, St. Peter’s Church (photos: Dr. Galit Noga-Banaï)
Fig. 11 Görlitz, Engraving of 1719 (Monumente 3–4, 2005, p. 52)