The Reciprocal Bond of Violence: Christian-Muslim Conflict at the Haram al-Sharīf 1095–1187

Gabriel Jessop-Smith

Abstract

Focusing on the period between the Council of Clermont in 1095 and the Siege of Jerusalem in 1187, this article explores the ways in which reciprocal Christian-Muslim conflict manifested itself at the Haram al-Sharīf in Jerusalem. Medieval Islamic *jihād* and the Christian Crusades were fatally linked in a historical continuum of conflict that was reciprocal and mutually independent.[1] Both traditions actualised their scriptural pasts, re-shaping and re-interpreting the Haram al-Sharīf where the events of sacralised history took place. Christian-Muslim tensions increased dramatically in this period, due to a complex interplay of faith narratives, sacred topography, and iconoclasm. Both faith systems attempted to assert their religious authority over the other at the Haram. This essay covers a chronological analysis of events around the site during this period, illustrating the historical continuum of the Christian-Muslim conflict. The first section is dedicated to an architectural analysis of the site as a declaration of Muslim authority. The second explores tensions surrounding the eschatological narratives that gave rise to the sacred topography of the First Crusade. Finally, it will account for the iconographic and topographic warfare committed during the sieges of 1099 and 1187, centreing on the Haram.

Keywords: Crusade, jihād, Christianity, Islam, Middle Ages, Jerusalem

Introduction

The Haram al-Sharīf (Temple Mount) in Jerusalem has a history of ancient sacrality and sacred architecture. It was the site of the Temple built by King Solomon with Yahweh as the architect/designer, described in the Old Testament book I Kings:

> The word of the Lord came to Solomon: "As for this temple you are building, if you follow my decrees, observe my laws and keep all my commands and obey them, I will fulfill through you the promise I gave to David your father. And I will live among the Israelites and will not abandon my people Israel." So Solomon built the temple and completed it. He lined its interior walls with cedar boards, paneling them from the floor of the temple to the ceiling, and covered the floor of the temple with planks of

Gabriel Jessop-Smith is a research student in Studies in Religion at the University of Sydney, Australia. Email: gjes7720@uni.sydney.edu.au.

[1] "By linking the crusades to jihād, Muslim authors drew attention to the interrelationship of jihād and crusading and the reciprocal bond between them. This linkage is a reminder that history often follows a course of alternate action and reaction. Jihād and crusade are fatally linked to each other as action is linked to reaction. There can be no crusade without jihād, and no crusade without counter-crusade, or jihād, making for a historical continuum that is reciprocal and mutually independent. Without heed for this intricate and complex interplay there is no explaining the tangled relations between Islam and Christendom." See Paul E. Chevedden, "The Islamic View and the Christian View of the Crusades: A New Synthesis", *History*, vol. 93, no. 2 (April 2008), pp. 189-190.

> juniper. He partitioned off twenty cubits at the rear of the temple with cedar boards from floor to ceiling to form within the temple an inner sanctuary, the Most Holy Place. The main hall in front of this room was forty cubits long (1 Kings 6: 11-17).

The *debir*, or Holy of Holies, was believed to be located on the foundation stone where the Biblical God accomplished the Creation. This is the Rock encapsulated in the Dome, the Qubbat al-Sakhra. Here Solomon built his Temple, which was to be destroyed and rebuilt after the return of the Israelites from Babylon to Israel during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.[2] When Caliph 'Umar ibn al'Khattab entered Jerusalem in 636 CE, he made his way to the Temple Mount and personally cleansed the Rock himself,[3] in a ritual purification which was to be repeated by the Kurdish leader Saladin more than half a millennium later. During that time the Dome of the Rock would be constructed and the Haram al-Sharīf would see the genesis of a holy war. 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān planned the construction of the Qubbat al-Sakhra[4] fifty years after its cleansing by Caliph Umar. It is possible that the structure itself was born of contention, a rivalry between al-Malik in Jerusalem and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zubayr in Mecca.[5] Some scholars argue that al-Malik sought an alternative to the Ka'ba in Mecca and built the Dome to transfer the political and religious centre of Islam to Jerusalem.[6] Later scholarship has argued that the Dome was instead intended to rival the Christian church on the Temple Mount.[7] Oleg Grabar suggests that through connections to their Judaic heritage, the Umayyad Caliphate established its authority with the construction of the Qubbat, while simultaneously declaring the authority of Islam.[8] Michelina Di Cesare observes that the Dome of the Rock is located in front of the Christian monument the Holy Sepulchre and overwhelms it as it stands on a higher position on the Temple Mount.[9] This becomes useful evidence when one reads accounts of Christian pilgrims being highly impressed by the visual dominance of the Dome. On one of his pilgrimages to Jerusalem, from 1480 to 1483, Friar Felix Fabri of Zurich was forced to rebuke his lay companions, who said of the Dome that there was "nothing more glorious or more beauteous within sight."[10] The Dome "wrenched the attention of the pilgrims from the Holy Places of the Christian Faith."[11]

Furthermore, historical work has analysed the late antique architectonic type of the *martyria* structure of the Dome of the Rock as being similar to the style of the Holy Sepulchre.[12]

---

[2] Michelina Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini" (The Dome of the Rock) in Jerusalem", *Aevum* Anno 88, Fasc. 2 (2014), p. 313.
[3] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the 'Templum Domini'", p. 314.
[4] Amikam Elad, "Construction Works on the Haram During the Umayyad Period", in *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic Worship: Holy Places, Ceremonies, Pilgrimage*, ed. Ulrich Haarmann (Amsterdam: Brill, 1994), pp. 23-24.
[5] Myriam Rosen-Ayalin, "The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Haram al-Sharīf: and Iconographic Study", *Qedem*, vol. 28 (1989), p. 14.
[6] Amikam Elad, "The Religio-Political Status of Jerusalem," in *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic Worship: Holy Places, Ceremonies, Pilgrimage*, ed. Ulrich Haarmann (Amsterdam: Brill, 1994), p. 158.
[7] Shelomo Dov Gotein, *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 147.
[8] Oleg Grabar, "The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem", *Ars Orientalis*, vol. 3 (1959), p. 44.
[9] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini", p. 315.
[10] H. F. M. Prescott, *Jerusalem Journey: Pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1954), p. 128.
[11] Prescott, *Jerusalem Journey*, p. 175.
[12] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini", p. 315.

This architectural similarity gives the Dome of the Rock a unique status as an Islamic structure based on a Christian prototype, and is evidence of a relationship to Christianity that was to influence Crusader perceptions of the site when the First Crusade armies stormed Jerusalem in 1099. In a detailed analysis of the decorations within the Dome, Myriam Rosen-Ayalin observes the 240-metre-long inscription running within the upper strip of the glass mosaic decoration ornamenting the outer face of the intermediate octagon of the building to be displayed largely in the spirit of anti-Christian polemic.[13] The script proclaims "Islam as the last divine Law, the oneness of God, the mission of Muhammed as His final messenger, [and] the status of Jesus as a man and a prophet."[14] Furthermore, in the late 1950's Grabar analysed the mosaic decorations of the inner face of the octagon, and interpreted the stylised depictions of a jewellery collection there as illustrations of *spolia* (spoils of war), symbolising the Muslim victory over the earlier Christian rulers.[15] Rosen-Ayalon has pointed to mosaics within the Dome depicting the Tree of Life as an Islamic substitute for the Cross, asserting that such overlapping beliefs engendered resentment.[16] This assertion of religious authority in architectural form would provide basis for later Crusader assumptions that the Dome of the Rock was associated with the antichrist.[17] Furthermore, there is evidence for the eschatological significance of the Dome for Muslims found in several Muslim apocalyptic books such as the *Fadā'il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas*.[18] This was a sentiment shared by the Christians, though they had rather different reasons for thinking that way.

Faith Narratives and Ritual Practises

Figure 1: Muhammad during the Mi'raj from the Jami al-Tawarikh circa 1307 (Wikimedia Commons).

[13] Rosen-Ayalin, "The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Haram al-Sharīf", pp. 12-14
[14] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini", p. 315.
[15] Rosen-Ayalin, "The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Haram al-Sharīf", pp. 14-15.
[16] Rosen-Ayalin, "The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Haram al-Sharīf", p. 62.
[17] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini"", p. 321.
[18] The *Fadā'il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas* applies apocalyptic concepts to the Dome of the Rock, saying, "The Dome of the Rock is the Temple… the throne of the Day of Judgement will stand on the Rock, and there will all congregate…" Rosen-Ayalin, "The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Haram al-Sharīf", pp. 60-61.

Ritual practises surrounding the Haram increased tensions between Muslims and Christians around 1000 CE. By the eighth and ninth centuries Christians were enacting complicated rituals which traced the events from the Last Supper to the crucifixion as chronicled in the New Testament. In response, Muslim shrines and oratories were built on the Temple Mount, which were utilised in devotions to recall key moments in the Isra and the *Mi'raj*, the Prophet Muhammad's esoteric Night Journey, a mystical ascent to heaven from the top of the Dome of the Rock.[19]

Figure 2: The Dome of the Rock (Al Aqsa Mosque) (Wikimedia Commons).

This narrative endowed the site with a strong sacrality for Muslims and gave it eschatological significance.[20] Tensions heightened to a point where Caliph al-Hakim, angered by the religiosity of the Christians, ordered the destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in 1007, reflecting Muslim-Christian tension rising to open antagonism.[21] Meanwhile, eschatological attitudes were growing in Europe. The date marking a thousand years since the birth of Christ was approaching, and Christendom was establishing apocalyptic connections with its Judaic heritage, far from the Haram. Pope Urban II adopted and applied the Old Testament sin-punishment-restoration cycle to Christian history, believing that this cycle was

[19] Alan Balfour, "Templum Domini," in *Solomon's Temple: Myth, Conflict, and Faith* (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, 2012), p. 147.
[20] Balfour, "Templum Domini", pp. 147-148.
[21] Balfour, "Templum Domini", pp. 152-153.

on the verge of completion.[22] A new territorialism of spiritual and apocalyptic concern was emerging. The *Gesta Dei per Christianos* (The Deeds of God Through the Christians) demanded the recovery of the lost lands of Christendom and the restoration the Church.[23] This included the recovery of ancient sees (for example, Jerusalem), and the re-occupation of Christian sacred sites, one of which was to be the Haram al-Sharīf.

Jerusalem became the physical and eschatological object of desire in the context of the First Crusade; both a historical Jerusalem of the promise to Abraham and a geographical Jerusalem of the Lord's tomb. God's promise of the *terra repromissionis* to Abraham was evocative of this new crusader context.[24] Al-Hakim's destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1007 had increased Christian hostility to Islam.[25] Pope Urban II's speech at Clermont in 1095, which is unusually well-preserved, being recorded by five authors who heard the speech delivered - Fulcher of Chartres, Robert the Monk, Guibert de Nogent, Balderic of Dol, and the *Gesta Francorum* (Deeds of the Franks)[26] - called Europe to arms, making direct reference to the "recovering of lost territory," with a visceral illustration of the Muslims destroying altars, "defiling them with … uncleanness," circumcising Christians and spreading the blood upon Christian altars, "[pouring it] into the vases of the baptismal font…"[27] The lead-up to the Crusades involved the defeat and capture of the Byzantine Emperor Romanes IV Diogenes by the Seljuk Turks under the command of Alp-Arslan at the Battle of Manzikert in 1071 CE. This placed the city of Constantinople in danger of capture, and the Emperor Alexius Comnenos, whose reign started in 1081, wrote to the Pope requesting an army to assist him to fight the Muslim Turks.[28] Thus, on both sides of the Muslim-Christian conflict, faith narratives established connections with Judaic heritage, promoting eschatological concerns which began to manifest in the form of violent sacred topography.

Violence at the Temple Mount: The Siege of 1099

In 1099, the Franks stood at the gates of Jerusalem. Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* provides a scene of iconographic warfare when a cross-bearing procession of priests and bishops circle the city.[29] The Muslims on the wall respond with mockery of the procession, bearing makeshift crosses which they begin to break, shouting "*frango, agip salip*" (Franks, is this cross good enough?).[30] An example of Christian sacred topographical perceptions, Tudebode's account is one of several relaying the massacre at the

[22] Chevedden, "The Islamic View and the Christian View of the Crusades", p. 195.
[23] Chevedden, "The Islamic View and the Christian View of the Crusades", p. 195.
[24] M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, "The Place of Jerusalem in Western Crusading Rites of Departure (1095-1300)", *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 99, no. 1 (2013), pp. 14-15.
[25] Balfour, "Templum Domini", p. 154.
[26] "Urban II (1088-1099): Speech at Council of Clermont, 1095. Six Versions of the Speech," *Medieval Sourcebook* (2024). At: https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/urban2-5vers.asp.
[27] Balfour, "Templum Domini", p. 155.
[28] John France, "Anna Comneno, the *Alexiad* and the First Crusade", *Reading Medieval Studies* X (1984), pp. 20-38.
[29] Edward Peters (ed.), "The Siege and Capture of Jerusalem (June–July 1099)", in *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, second edition (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), p. 246.
[30] Peters, "The Siege and Capture of Jerusalem", p. 246.

Haram al-Sharīf, which Latin pilgrimage narratives identified as the Temple of Solomon, the place where the antichrist would appear before the final Parousia of Christ.[31] It was there that crusaders responded to Urban's bloody image of forced circumcision at the Temple Mount. Frankish accounts of the rivers of blood that flowed at the Temple of Solomon during the siege of Jerusalem are vengeful and righteous. As one anonymous Christian eyewitness attests: "In the Temple and porch of Solomon men rode in the blood up to their knees and bridle reins. Indeed, it was a just and splendid judgement of God that this place should be filled with blood."[32] A feature of the eschatological narratives carried by the first crusaders was the appearance of the antichrist, who would appear in Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple of Solomon.[33] Christian crusaders, unsure of the Islamic structures at the Temple Mount, may have seen the Dome of the Rock as this rebuilt antichrist temple, with its familiar rotunda and paleo-Christian shrines.[34] Moreover, the al-Malik inscription would have been seen by the Christians as dedicated to a false god and as anti-trinitarian in its declaration of the oneness of Allah.[35]

Figure 3: "Taking of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, 15th July 1099" by Émile Signol (1847) (Wikimedia Commons).

The Christians held a pragmatic and polemical approach to the site and sought the obliteration of the Islamic history of the Temple Mount through recourse to biblical memories.[36] Faith

[31] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini"", p. 319.
[32] Francis Edward Peters. "Jerusalem Under the Latin Cross", p. 285 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), as cited in Balfour, "Templum Domini," p. 157.
[33] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini"", p. 321.
[34] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning", p. 321.
[35] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning", pp. 323-324.
[36] Di Cesare, "The Eschatological Meaning", pp. 317-318.

narratives, architecture and sacred topography fuelled Islamic-Christian conflict, culminating in a massacre at the Haram al-Sharīf. Following the Siege of 1099, the Dome of the Rock was named the Templum Domini (Temple of the Lord) and made the official residence of the Latin Patriarch of the city.[37] Urban's desire for *Gesta Dei Per Christianos* was achieved; the Haram al-Sharīf became a newly recovered see of the Latin Kingdom. Urban's successor Pope Paschal II (1099-1118) declared after the capture of the Holy City that the Eastern Church was now "to a large extent restored to the glory of its ancient liberty."[38] The massacre at the site served as a purification of the "long suffered blasphemies"[39] committed there by the Muslims: their various rituals, constructions, and decorations. Having performed this cleansing, the pilgrims set about converting the Dome into a Christian temple. An imam accounts for the takeover of the Haram, detailing that "the Franks stripped the Dome of the Rock of more than forty silver candelabra … a great silver lamp weighting 44 Syrian punds, as well as 150 smaller silver candelabra and more than 20 gold ones…"[40]

Numerous altercations and physical manifestations of Christian structures at the site began to take shape c.1115 in a construction project which spanned 27 years.[41] Above the Dome a cross was placed, and the Rock itself was paved with marble and an altar raised above it.[42] Latin inscriptions were placed over the Arabic ones and additional altars and baptistries were established.[43] A cloister was erected to the north of the Dome and the cathedral clergy was housed there.[44] This establishment of Christian structures and iconography saw its fullest manifestation in the adoption of the compound as headquarters for the Knights Templar, named after their chosen abode. The Templars converted the Temple Mount into a fortress territory from where they oversaw the expansion of their powers in the region; Christendom thus produced an armed militia to enforce Christianity's divine authority over both the Holy City and the region at large.[45]

The Emergence of the Latin Kingdoms in the Middle East

The Crusader kingdoms of the Holy Land developed after the first generation of settlers steered a society prepared at all times for war. Crusade historian Joshua Prawer observes that "constant vigilance had to be maintained against attack from without or revolt and sabotage from within … For almost a generation, it was the commanders who went to war, defended the frontiers, built the fortifications and made peace. Only after this settling-in did a machinery of government emerge from the war-oriented Crusader camps."[46] The Franks were always

[37] Balfour, "Templum Domini", p. 158.
[38] Chevedden, "The Islamic View", p. 195.
[39] Francis Edward Peters (ed.), "Jerusalem Under the Latin Cross," in *Jerusalem: The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 286.
[40] From F. Gabrieli *Arab Historians of the Crusades* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), p. 11, as cited by Peters, "Jerusalem Under the Latin Cross", p. 286.
[41] Balfour, "Templum Domini", p. 160.
[42] Meron Benvenisti, *The Crusades in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press 1970), p. 70.
[43] Benvenisti, *The Crusades in the Holy Land*, p. 70.
[44] Balfour, "Templum Domini", p. 160.
[45] Balfour, "Templum Domini", pp. 165-166.
[46] Joshua Prawer, *The World of the Crusaders* (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972), p. 83.

outnumbered by at least five to one, as mass migration from the West to the East did not eventuate. Civil relationship developed between the Franks and certain Muslim locals; the most often quoted example is Usāmah ibn Munqidh (c.1095-1188), from Shayzar in Northern Syria, whose writings included an autobiography, poetry, and topical essays.[47] Usāmah often curses the Europeans in his memoirs but reveals extensive friendly contacts with them. His upper-class viewpoint demonstrates similarities between the ruling classes of Muslim and Christian societies; they went to war against each other, made truces, had economic relationships, and even occasionally hunted together, and married into each other's families. One of Usāmah's most quoted passages concerns his devotional habits: "whenever I visited Jerusalem I always entered the Aqsa mosque, beside which stood a small mosque which the Franks had converted into a church. When I used to enter the Aqsa mosque, which was occupied by the Templars, who were my friends, the Templars would evacuate the little adjoining mosque so that I might pray in it."[48]

The rapid victory of the First Crusade was not sustained for long. The last Frankish presence in the Middle East, the garrison on the island of Ruad, fell in 1302, just over two hundred years after Jerusalem was conquered by the Crusaders in 1099 CE. During that time the Europeans adapted to a very different social, political, climatic, and ecclesiastical context. The Muslim world was urban in a way that feudal Europe was not, and knights therefore resided in cities rather than on country estates.[49] The countryside was controlled by the vast castles built by the military order of the Knights Templar, such as Krak des Chevaliers in Syria, Kerak in Jordan, Belvoir in modern Israel, Bodrum in Turkey, and Sidon Castle in Lebanon.[50] The King of Jerusalem was the feudal lord of the vassals who held great baronies like Galilee and Sidon; while the remaining three states – the County of Edessa, the County of Tripoli, and the Principality of Antioch – also acknowledged Jerusalem's supremacy.[51]

Jerusalem Surrenders to Saladin, 1187

On 3-4 July 1187 the Muslim army under the Ayyubid caliph Saladin annihilated the army of Guy de Lusignan, King of Jerusalem (reigned 1186-1192), at the battle by the Horns of Ḥaṭṭīn, in northern Palestine. Saladin captured King Guy and beheaded Raymond of Chatillon, as well as almost all captured Templars and Hospitallers.[52] Saladin's victorious army then marched on Jerusalem, where Queen Sybilla and Balian of Ibelin, one of only four survivors of Ḥaṭṭīn, awaited him. The city was filled with refugees and the wounded, and Jerusalem surrendered. Eighty-eight years after the Frankish capture of Jerusalem, the Muslims repeated the actions of the Christians. When in Balian of Ibelin negotiated with Saladin over the peaceful surrender of

[47] Paul M. Cobb, "Introduction," in *The Book of Contemplation: Islam and the Crusades*, ed. Usama Ibn Munqidh (London: Penguin Classics, 2008), pp. xi-xlviii.
[48] Usāmah ibn Munqidh, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usāmah ibn Munqidh*, trans. Philip K. Hitti (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929), pp. 163-164.
[49] Marwan Nader, "Urban Muslims, Latin Laws, and Legal Institutions in the Kingdom of Jerusalem", *Medieval Encounters*, vol. 13, no. 2 (2007), pp. 243-270.
[50] Ronnie Ellenblum, *Crusader Castles and Modern Histories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
[51] Denys Pringle, "Castles and Frontiers in the Latin East," in Keith J. Stringer and Andrew Jotischky (eds), *Norman Expansion: Connections, Continuities and Contrasts* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 227-240.
[52] John France, "The Battle of Hattin," *Medieval Warfare*, 7, no. 4 (2017), 25-33.

Frankish Jerusalem, Saladin reminded him that he intended to avenge the massacre of 1099.[53] In response, Balian threatened to "demolish the Rock and the Mosque al-Aqsa, and the other holy places."[54]

Figure 4: Saladin and Guy de Lusignan after battle of Hattin in 1187 (Wikimedia Commons)

The event at the Haram in 1099 had established its place within both Islamic and Christian narratives of Holy War, and Islamic-Christian conflict was manifesting in the form of exchanged bloodshed. In a curiously similar tale to Tudebode's telling of the mockery of the cross, Saladin paraded a cross upside down through Damascus following his victory at Ḥaṭṭīn in 1187.[55] Saladin's forces entered Jerusalem on the anniversary of the *Mi'raj* and rushed to the Haram to regain the Dome for Islam in a purification of the Christian pollutions echoing that of Caliph Umar's five hundred years ago, and that of the Christians' efforts in 1099. The structures of the Templars were dismantled; The golden cross atop the Dome was removed, dragged through the streets, and melted down at the Tower of David.[56] The marble covering

[53] Benvenisti, *The Crusades in the Holy Land*, 43.
[54] Benvenisti, *The Crusades in the Holy Land*, 43-44.
[55] Alan Balfour, "Templum Domini," 167.
[56] Alan Balfour, "Templum Domini," 168.

the Rock was dismantled, and the Temple Mount was purified with rose water. The first public Muslim prayer was held in the Hara after eighty-eight years of Christian rule.[57]

Conclusion

The Haram al-Sharīf in Jerusalem was witness to a historical continuum of reciprocal violence during the First Crusade. This article has followed a chronological analysis of the events at the Haram al-Sharīf between the Council of Clermont in 1095 and the Siege of Jerusalem in 1187. The Christian-Muslim reciprocity of violence in this period was fuelled by faith narratives, sacred topography, and iconoclasm. The meaning of the Dome of the Rock was contested by Muslims and Christians, with both faiths drawing on Davidic reminiscence to assert religious authority and employing violence and iconoclasm to obliterate the memory of the other from the site.

[57] Benvenisti, *The Crusades in the Holy Land*, 45-47.