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Abstract

This study offers a rare glimpse into the often hidden world of Islam and Muslims in the Americas as told from the perspective of an indigenous black Muslim born and raised in the United States. In addition to providing a theoretical and methodological critique of the Waves of Immigration (WOI) theory, the dominant theoretical perspective governing studies of Islam and Muslims in the Americas, this study also offers an alternative theoretical perspective designed to provide a more accurate and thorough portrayal of Islam and Muslims in the Americas.

Introduction

According to The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World (Esposito 1995), of the “three to four million adherents in the United States today … roughly a third of the Muslims in continental America are African Americans.” Stone’s study in The Muslims of America (Haddad 1991) estimates that African Americans are 30 percent of the American Muslim population. A Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) mosque study (CAIR 2001) also estimated African Americans to be 30 percent of the American Muslim population. Yet despite their significant numerical presence, African American Muslims have been marginalized in the literature on Islam in the United States. For example, except for Aminah McCloud’s African American Islam, to my knowledge no other major study has been published on mainstream (i.e., Sunni) Islam that has been written by an African American Muslim. Only a very small number of studies have been written by African Americans (e.g., Turner, Marsh, and possibly Barboza).
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This is especially tragic when one considers that at over one million strong, African Americans constitute the largest Muslim minority among Muslims in the United States.

According to the WOI theory, Islam was first introduced by enslaved Africans but failed to take root in the United States. Thus, Islam was not permanently established until 1893, when Alexander Russel Webb established the first mosque in North America. Subsequent to this, immigrant Muslims extended Webb’s initial efforts by permanently establishing Islam in this country during the twentieth century.

In recent years, prominent studies by Austin (1984), Diouf (1998), Quick (1996), Turner (1997), Muhammad (1999), Afroz (2000), Dannin (2002), and Lotfi (2002) have provided new grounds for challenging the assumptions of the WOI theory by definitively documenting the survival of mainstream Islam among blacks throughout the Americas. Yet unanswered by these studies is the lingering question of whether the type of Islam first introduced by Africans is the same mainstream Islam practiced by African Americans. It is my contention that the Islam practiced by African Americans today does not, by and large, come from immigrants, but rather from the tradition of Islam in black America first introduced by enslaved Africans.

This study is in three parts. The first part establishes the historical and numerical importance of African American Muslims, the second part offers a brief examination of the WOI theory, and the third part develops the hidden transcripts theory as an alternative to the WOI theory. Included therein is an example of how the hidden transcript theory illuminates history in a way that the WOI theory cannot.

African American Muslims

Although Muslims in the United States are usually associated with Arabs, an American Muslim is more likely to be African American than an Arab. This fact is obscured by the way statistics on American Muslims are routinely grouped, with Saudi, Iraqi, Egyptian, and other Arab Muslims pooled into a single broad category of “Arabs,” just as Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi Muslims (are classified as “South Asian,” regardless of their country of origin). African/black Muslims from various countries, (e.g., the United States, Nigeria, Senegal, or Somalia) are almost never pooled or grouped in this way. As a result, their number as a percentage of the total Muslim population in the United States is consistently underestimated and, therefore, underrepresented.
The question may arise as to who I mean by “African American Muslim.” Quite simply, I mean black Muslims born in the United States. I am not talking here about black immigrants. In fact, the whole immigrant-indigenous typology comes from the WOI theory, not from me. The important concern here is nationality. Simply put, blacks are the largest nationality of Muslims in this country. I prefer to think about Muslims through the prism of nationality, for it is a much clearer concept.

Black Africans have played a pivotal role in Islam since its very beginning. The first *muezzin* of Islam was Bilal, a black African man. Some writers, like Montgomery Watt, argue that Bilal may have been the first person outside Prophet Muhammad’s family to embrace Islam. The Prophet’s only adopted son was Zayd bin Harith, a former slave. Islam was practiced in Africa for more than a thousand years before it arrived in the Americas via slavery.

Sylviane Diouf and Sultana Afroz both argue that enslaved Africans played an important role in bringing Islam to the United States. The first enslaved people in this country were from Spain. These Spanish-speaking slaves were crypto-Muslims of African descent seeking to escape from Spain and the Spanish Inquisition. Diouf claims that “… far from making the African religious fervor disappear, slavery deepened it.” Muslim slaves hailed from such prominent African ethnic groups as the Hausas, Fulanis, Wolofs, Mandingos, Senegambians, as well as Muslims from “Guinea,” and those loosely described as either “Moors” or “Turks.” Therefore, the history of Islam in the United States cannot be separated from black Africans. This history, especially prior to the twentieth century, has been ignored by WOI theory proponents throughout the Americas.

When nationality is used to refer to a person’s country of origin, African Americans represent the single largest and oldest Muslim nationality in the United States. Yet, because definitions are not consistently applied in the literature on Islam in this country, misleading images of Muslims are often conveyed. Several major studies estimate black Muslims to be 30 percent of the estimated total of American Muslim population. However, African American scholars like Ali Mazrui offer higher estimates. According to him, 42 percent of all American Muslims are black Muslims.

If blacks constitute one-third of all American Muslims, this means that they number at least 1 million, if you believe the low-end estimates of a total of 3 million American Muslims often given by WOI theorists. Haddad cites a similar estimate of 3 million Muslims in her *Muslims of North America* study. Perhaps reflecting the subjectivity of such estimates, Larry Poston’s
chapter in Haddad’s *Muslims in America* (1991) estimates that there are 2 million black Muslims. I do not know of any other Muslim nationality (i.e., Jordanians, Egyptians, Saudis, Indians, or Pakistanis) who are described in the literature as numbering 1 or 2 million. In addition to this, events since 9/11 would lead most people to believe that Muslim immigration to the United States over the past 2 years has not increased dramatically and has probably decreased. Meanwhile, black “converts” to Islam, as Danin asserts, continues to account for “90% of all Muslim converts in the U.S.”

Long-time observers of the American Muslim population’s estimated size often find such estimates amusing. For instance, in response to the frequent questions regarding the number of Muslims in this country, Malcolm X was fond of saying in the 1950s and 1960s: “Those that say do not know, and those that know do not say.” This statement is still true today.

Given this background, it seems reasonable to ask why American Muslims are so consistently depicted as either foreigners or immigrants, while African American and other indigenous Muslims, including Latinos/Latinas, Anglo, and Native American Muslims remain virtually invisible to the public. I believe that Muslims are consistently depicted as foreigners and immigrants due to the climate of fear that presently exists. Since the public is afraid of foreign and immigrant Muslims, it is they, rather than indigenous Muslims, who attract the most attention. In addition, most Americans, even Muslim Americans, are unaware that Africans were the first to introduce Islam to the Americas centuries before the establishment of the United States as a nation.

A personal drama with a Pakistani colleague’s family illustrates this point. A colleague’s wife once embarrassed me when, consistent with Islamic etiquette (*adab*), she refused to shake my extended hand at a dinner party that included both Muslim and non-Muslim guests. Dramas like these are easy enough to accommodate. But when the woman’s daughter, a young well-educated professional at the same party innocently asked me “What prison were you in when you converted to Islam?” it became abundantly clear to me that even well-educated, well-intentioned Muslims could benefit from greater awareness of African American Muslims.

My colleague’s daughter never considered the possibility that I might have a background similar to her father’s, who is now deceased, even though her father and I both worked for the same academic institution as college professors. This encounter reminded me that sometimes progress moves at a “two steps forward, one step backward” pace. By this, I mean that just as it took nearly 30 years for the public to appreciate the value of
Malcolm X, an ex-convict and African American Muslim martyr, it may take additional years before others fully realize that all African American Muslims are not ex-convicts.

Before moving to the next section, a final word is in order concerning the authenticity of Islam among blacks in the Americas. The question of Islamic authenticity among blacks in Africa and throughout the African diaspora has long been recognized and challenged by scholars and practitioners alike. Diouf’s pioneering study, *Servants of Allah*, acknowledges how the practice of viewing Islam as an exclusively Middle East Arab religion ignores its role as an African religion and obscures an important aspect of Islam in this country. Nevertheless, like nearly all WOI theorists, Diouf believes that Islam among Africans, African Americans, and blacks – whatever one prefers to call them – failed to survive.

Daniel Pipes also raises the question of whether blacks are legitimately Muslim in his *Militant Islam Reaches America* (2002.) Pipes agrees with Diouf that although there are some signs of lingering Islamic influence, it failed to survive. Thus, he calls the idea of a surviving legacy of Islam among blacks “romantic.” Diouf, on the other hand, believes that such an idea is “ironic.” Comments by Smith and Haddad also imply that black Muslims may not be authentic in that some black Muslims “claim” an identification with Islam. The dust jacket to Robert Dannin’s book includes comments of praise from Smith and Haddad. In this praise, they refer to his subjects as activists and ex-slaves seeking redemption from society. But not once are these subjects referred to simply as Muslims. This is a consistent pattern in Haddad’s and other’s works. Thus, according to this perspective, there is no such thing as a surviving legacy of Islam among blacks in America.

The WOI Theory

Under the heading of “Islam in America,” *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World*, edited by John Esposito, outlines the following views of the WOI theory:

Perhaps as much as one-fifth of the Africans brought in the slave trade were Muslim. At first they might have attempted to practice their religion, but most were forced into conversion to Christianity. ... The virtual disappearance of earlier African Muslims in America because of intense persecution has been reversed in the twentieth century. ... This first “wave” … of immigration continued until World War I, after which
a second wave continued through the 1930s, ending with World War II. A third wave of Muslim immigration after World War II included many people from the elites of Middle Eastern and South Asian countries seeking education and professional advancement. A fourth wave of Muslim immigration to North America began in the mid-1960s and continues today.⁹

Reflecting a similar point of view, Daniel Pipes, a pro-Zionist appointed to the quasi-governmental Institute of Peace by President George W. Bush, agrees with Diouf, who asserts that “not one community currently practices Islam as passed on by preceding African generations.”¹⁰ Contrary to this view, however, African Americans belong to many Islamic groups throughout the United States and are visible worshippers in most of the major groups that organize the ḥajj prayer. These include the American Muslim Mission (AMA), formerly led by Warith Deen Muhammad, the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), and the Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA). Most contemporary African American Muslims trace their Islamic practice to the religion of their ancestors and, therefore, refer to themselves as reverts rather than converts.

But Pipes, whom one Washington Post book review describes as harboring a “hostility to contemporary Muslims,” dismisses this view as “romantic.”¹¹ Another proponent of the WOI theory, Sulayman Nyang, describes what he calls “the 60 year gap” (c.a.1870-1930) in which Islam is assumed to have disappeared from practice among African Americans.¹² In his view, “no institutions were created by the enslaved Africans and their descendants.” He notes that, “To the best of my knowledge, there is no evidence of any African Muslim slave family that survived slavery and maintained Islam as a way of life. This is why I call this period the 60 year gap between the African Muslim slaves and the African-American Muslims of this [20th] century.”¹³ For Nyang, “[t]he repressive nature of slavery, especially the peculiar institution of the American South, made it virtually impossible for any form of institutional Islam.”¹⁴

In a 2003 article that appears online as a courtesy of the Foreign Policy Institute, entitled: “America and Islam Go Way Back,” Philip Jenkins of Pennsylvania State University writes that “the Islam that was brought vanished quickly, it being difficult to keep up. ... So we have to be suspicious about some claims that are made about this [North American] part of the world. Things were different in South America, and in Brazil, where there were Muslim slave rebellions through the nineteenth century.”¹⁵
Even popular novelist James A. Mitchner has expressed similarly pessimistic views supporting the WOI perspective. In a book review of Alex Haley’s *Roots*, he dismisses the idea of an Islamic legacy among blacks as “an unjustified sop at contemporary developments rather than a true reflection of the past.” Koszegi and Melton also observe: “In North America that first wave [of Islam] was largely obliterated by the rigors of slave culture” and conclude by noting that “[a] new beginning for Islam then occurred with the career of Muhammad Alexander Russell Webb, an American convert who founded the first mosque in North America in 1893 in New York.”

Gutbi Mahdi Ahmed, a past president of ISNA offers a further pessimistic assessment of the prospect of a continuous Islamic legacy:

Islam first came to America very early (before Columbus with the slave trade and in the last century), but its arrival was in staggered waves, each time fading before it was solidly grounded. Whenever the second Muslim generation assumed the leadership and it seemed possible for Muslims to be integrated into American society, a new wave of fresh immigrants overtook the older wave. The Islamic presence was again a foreign presence of first-generation immigrant Muslims. Even when large numbers of indigenous Americans embraced Islam, they were unable to assume leadership of the Islamic movement and even failed to integrate into it. Nor could the immigrant Muslim[s] merge into the growing indigenous Muslim community.

Authors that avoid the use of absolute terms while assessing the prospect of an Islam legacy in the United States promote what might be called a “soft” WOI perspective. Such authors as Ahmed, who promote the soft perspective, use terms like “virtual disappearance,” “virtually impossible,” “failed to take root,” “faded” before becoming “solidly grounded,” and “largely obliterated.” By contrast, authors like Mitchener, who promote a hard WOI perspective, are more definitive in their rejection of a continuous Islamic legacy in the United States, and use absolute terms like “vanished quickly,” became “obliterated by the rigors of slavery,” “failed to survive,” and “unjustified sop.” But soft or hard, the message of the WOI theory remains clear: Early Islam in the Americas did not survive according to this perspective. The Islam in the Americas today (including that of contemporary African American Muslims) derives from twentieth century Muslim immigration rather than from the earlier indigenous Muslims or their descendants.
Yet this, on its face, contradicts Ahmed’s observation that indigenous American Muslims “failed to integrate into it [the Islamic movement]. Nor could the immigrant Muslim merge into the growing indigenous Muslim community.” Could it be that two, rather than merely one, Islamic legacies exit in the Americas? If so, then a viable fix for what appears to be the mis-application of the WOI theory might be to limit its applications in the future to the immigrant experience, as opposed to the very different indigenous Muslim experience in the Americas. But even if this is a viable “fix” for the problem, the indigenous Muslim experience still awaits a more thorough treatment by objective and, at the very least, more sympathetic scholars.

The WOI theory, however, is rather problematical. For example, in their search for evidence consistent with their preconceived worldview, WOI theorists limit their historical gaze to the twentieth-century United States, the primary destination for most Muslim immigrants to the New World. But because black Muslims have lived in the Americas since 1502 and quite arguably longer, nearly 4 centuries of Islamic history involving blacks are routinely ignored. Proponents of this theory also are notoriously sloppy in their use of language. For example, they routinely fail to distinguish between the United States and other sites of early Islam in the Americas, such as Brazil, Haiti, and Jamaica. As a result, generalizations like those that Esposito and Haddad treat as truisms applying to all Muslims in the United States are often only applicable to immigrant Muslims in this country.

Some writers are so accustomed to communicating in this way that their generalizations about Islam and Muslims in the United States would be unintelligible if their audiences were not already aware that they were referring to immigrant, rather than to all, Muslims in the United States. Esposito’s statement that “The Muslim world is no longer ‘out there.’ The Muslims are our neighbors, colleagues, and fellow citizens …” is a case in point. He clearly did not have indigenous black Muslims in mind when he made this over-generalization, because most blacks, despite their long history in the Americas, are not, by and large, the neighbors, colleagues, or perceived fellow citizens of whites or Muslim immigrants. Perhaps what Esposito really had in mind were the Muslims who he considers “real” Muslims, rather than sectarian or separatists merely “claiming an identification with the religion of Islam,” as he and his colleagues Haddad and Smith describe.

Proponents of the WOI theory cannot explain why conversion/reversion to Islam among African Americans continues to outpace Muslim
immigration as the leading cause of Islam’s growing number of adherents in the United States, or how blacks could retain any idea of Islam, however imperfect, when most blacks in the early twentieth century were poor, uneducated, and lacking in formal Islamic knowledge – were it not for a legacy. Nevertheless, Islam continues to be the fastest growing religion in the United States and Africa, as well as in the world, with African American conversion accounting for some 90 percent of all Islamic conversions in this country.22

The WOI theory promotes a serious inaccuracy in its implied assertion that religiosity diminishes and recedes under conditions of prolonged group persecution. In fact, empirical reality suggests that exactly the opposite phenomenon occurred in the United States. The experience of Islam among blacks in the Americas actually strengthened, rather than wilted, under the weight of persecution. Evidence of this is widely accepted, as it relates to the black church. Yet a similar experience, one that exists among blacks who embrace Islam and other non-Christian religious practices like Santeria, is rarely acknowledged. Dannin labels these phenomena “unchurched” religious influences.23 These unchurched religious influences are still visible in black Masonic lodges, storefront mosques, ghettos, plantations, prisons, barrios, and remote Maroon enclaves far removed from the gaze of white, immigrant, and official mainstream authorities.

Just as some Native Americans were able to preserve traditional culture from what most would consider genocide, Islam, as an element of African culture, would likewise survive despite slavery, Jim Crow, and discrimination. As an element of African culture, Islam would survive alliances between blacks and Native Americans, alliances that allowed blacks to live in separate, though closely linked, communities within well-known Indian territories and swamp regions located in Virginia, the Carolinas, Alabama, and Florida.24 Similar communities containing well-known Muslim groups and their descendants are found throughout Central America, the Caribbean, and South America.

Diouf reminds us that “Christianity became a relevant and important feature in the existence of Americans of African descent only in the nineteenth century, and singularly so after Emancipation” in 1863.25 If Diouf and the WOI theory are correct, then the practice of Islam and its institutions, in effect, vanished after being practiced by blacks for 1,000 years in Africa and roughly 350 additional years (1502-1863) in the Americas. However, this theory fails to explain how this sweeping conclusion was reached. Most scholars simply assume its validity without ever applying
any strict empirical tests. Similarly, such scholars as Diouf and Nyang merely point to the seeming absence of visible displays of Islamic practice or institutions in the United States and conclude that early Islam essentially vanished.

It is significant to note that few, if any, proponents of the WOI theory are African American Muslims with direct links to the community or culture that they believe has died. Thus, how would they know whether early Islam in the United States failed or not? Do they speak the community’s language, form part of it, live in it, and have direct access to it? Moreover, do they understand the community and would they be able to recognize Islam’s practice among its inhabitants in light of the fact that, historically, it has been hidden from public view in a conscious and deliberate attempt to facilitate its survival?

Might the deliberate effort to conceal Islam among African Americans help explain why whites, non-Muslims, and immigrants have such difficulty detecting it? If empirical observation is the hallmark of scientific analysis, then on what basis can WOI theorists legitimately claim that Islam among blacks has totally, moderately, or even minimally vanished? Was this vanishing actually observed, or has Islam’s hidden practicebeen misconstrued by WOI theorists?

Answers to the above questions are best provided by two distinct groups of observers: actual members of the community or communities in question (i.e., black Muslims) and those granted direct access to black or other indigenous Muslim experiences.

Hidden Transcripts

It is no coincidence that recent pioneering studies on Islam in the United States have chipped away at the WOI’s theory untested and nonempirical assumptions. In contrast to WOI theorists, these authors display varying degrees of access to the hidden transcripts of Islam in the Americas. Works by Diouf, Quick, Turner, Lotfi, Afroz, Muhammad, and Dannin provide important new insights into this country’s Islamic legacy.

Before integration emerged in the 1960s, social norms, economic disparities, and even local laws separated black and white American communities. Segregation placed outside observers of Islam at a distinct disadvantage, for white and immigrant observers were almost completely cut off from blacks. Even non-Muslim black scholars faced serious obstacles in gaining access to Muslim gatherings and groups.
However, the WOI theorists’ appropriation of black cultural products, such as claims to the legacy of Islam in this country, is nothing new. In fact, today this appropriation is so blatant that young entrepreneurs of black hip-hop culture go to great lengths to make it difficult for nonblack outsiders “to copy” this lucrative black art form. Black originators of black bebop cultural products mounted similar campaigns in the 1940s. But for producers of black hip-hop culture, keeping a step ahead of the appropriators of black cultural products is not just a matter of black pride – it is a matter of business necessity.

Academic scholarship displays few, if any, resemblances to business competition in the hip-hop business market. But if the subject of Islam and Muslims continues to be of intense public interest and, therefore, of growing market value, then, like the hip-hop industry, the prospects of opportunists emerging to appropriate further cultural products, despite their tenuous legitimate ties to such products, is bound to increase considerably. If this occurs, then setting the record straight about Islam and Muslims will no longer be just a matter of intellectual debate. Rather, it will become a matter of political and cultural necessity in the ongoing battle to win the hearts and minds of Muslims around the world.

For blacks, the current debate over Islam’s true legacy comes on the heels of perennial battles with the dominant society over the right of blacks to be treated as human beings endowed with a history, culture, and recognized contributions to society. But in the post-9/11 climate, the demonization of overseas Muslims and anti-immigrant sentiments, using the WOI theory as an explanation for the centuries-long experience of indigenous black Muslims in the Americas seems easier to debunk and is more difficult than ever to accept. In fact, this theory is more vulnerable than it has ever been before.

If Christianity could survive the Iron Curtain, then Islam could most certainly survive the so-called Cotton Curtain among black Muslims in the Americas. If Christianity could survive for nearly a century under brutal communist rule in such places as the former Soviet Union, for nearly 50 years in Cuba and under various authoritative Muslim governments (e.g. Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Indonesia, and Afghanistan), then Islam among blacks could survive in the Americas.

The arbitrary methodological approach of ignoring evidence of Islam in the Americas before the twentieth century and beyond the geographic pale of the American and English colonies projects an incomplete, and therefore false, image of Islam and Muslims in the Americas. It ignores the
roots of Islam in the Americas, especially in the United States, and marginalizes the very people most responsible for successfully, though perilously, delivering it in the first place. Hence, the WOI theory is a creature of its own methodological narrowness and, as a theoretical device, cannot explain important recent trends that have been underway among American Muslims for over a decade.

James Scott’s hidden transcripts theory represents a viable alternative theory, for it is well equipped to capture the subtle and decidedly secret quality of mainstream Islam among American blacks. The ability to recognize the survival of Islam in the Americas depends upon one’s access to Islam’s underground, backstage, and subversive domain (the “hidden transcripts”). Blacks have always had access to this backstage domain. It is a familiar place to them, because it is a place far removed from outsiders, one in which blacks have been forced to live. Islam survived for centuries and often flourished in these remote black domains. However, most non-black Muslims are largely unaware of them.

Dannin, author of Black Pilgrimage to Islam, is only one of a relatively small number of white, non-Muslims afforded personal access to black and often highly secluded Muslim communities. His personal access to what I call the “hidden transcripts of Islam in America,” afforded him access to several Muslim communities, including those led by El-Hajj Wali Acram of Cleveland, Ohio; Sheik Daoud Ghani, black leader of the Islamic community of West Valley, New York; and Imam Salahuddin, black leader of the Sankore Masjid at the New York State Penitentiary at Stormville, New York. Such communities are routinely ignored by WOI theorists, despite their importance in documenting the black Islamic legacy in the Americas.

Political and religious organizations also document the presence of black Muslims in the Americas. For example, White describes the presence of black Muslim members of the American Propaganda Islamic Movement, which was established by Budruddin Abdulla Kur, a wealthy Muslim from Bombay, to spread Islam among the uneducated American masses in 1873. “By 1891 every major city in the United States had branches of this group.” According to White, “by 1900 the organization had several hundred followers throughout the nation” although control of the group remained in the hands of foreigners. By 1913, “Praying Moors” within Noble Drew Ali’s Moorish American movement provided additional evidence of a surviving legacy of Islam among American blacks. By 1916, Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), which contained a significant number of black Muslims, also had emerged.
These episodes of mainstream Islam among black Muslims, introduced by White, contradict Nyang’s idea of a “sixty year gap” and challenge the assumptions of the WOI theory. According to White, “[b]y 1830 the majority of African Americans had lost their practice and understanding of and belief in Islam. It was not until the early twentieth century that Islamic practices resurfaced among various African American groups.”

White’s view no doubt reflects a soft WOI perspective, for it avoids the claim that Islam among blacks had entirely vanished. But an automatic, near knee-jerk WOI mindset in the literature on Islam in this country suggests that like White, others may be guilty of actually challenging, rather than supporting, the perspective they claim to endorse.

On a more positive note, while the struggle against abolitionism (of slavery) was an important element in American history, Africans had already adopted institutional remedies to resist it long before their arrival in the Americas. For example, a series of Tukolor Muslim jihads first emerged (c.a. 1769-76) to establish a series of anti-slavery Tukolor states (c.a. 1818-81) to check the spread of Muslim enslavement in West Africa. The enslavement of African Muslims in the Americas was, in part, the result of indigenous African Muslim struggles (jihads). But in their haste to shift blame for New World slavery from Americans to Africans, apologists selectively overlook these facts in an attempt to appear knowledgeable (if not genuinely concerned) about black history.

Ironically, Muslim jihads against slavery also helped promote political instability, which resulted in scores of African Muslim jihadists being enslaved and transported to the Americas. Indeed, the African civil wars that American historians allude to during the time of the Atlantic slave trade were more accurately Muslim jihads that delivered mostly male Muslim jihadists to the New World. Enslaved African Muslims transplanted Islamic political ideology and the institutions of jihad, *hijrah*, and *ummah* to the Americas — transplants that survive to this day. These three Islamic institutions of flight-separation (*hijrah*), struggle (jihad), and community (*ummah*) represent significant themes in the indigenous Muslims’ experience in the Americas. The collective and continuous history of black Muslim resistance against slavery, Jim Crow, and American oppression is what I have called the “hidden jihad in the Americas.”

As for Diouf’s claim that no communities linked to these Africans exist today, Florida offers ample evidence to refute this assertion. For instance, St. Augustine, North America’s oldest European city, continues to exist, including its large black section known today as Lincolnville (formerly Africville).
Another large black settlement on the Manatee River on the present site of Brandon, Florida, was known as Angola before it was destroyed. According to Rivers, “one white party also referred to it as the “sarrazota,” meaning “Runaway Negro plantation.” Present-day Sarasota, located near this site, remains very much in existence today. African and Indian Maroons from the area they called Musa helped form the original nucleus of the nearby town of St. Augustine. Spaniards from Cuba brought skilled black builders with them in 1653 to erect that city’s earliest structures. Some of these structures are still standing and remain popular tourist attractions.

Eventually, blacks, some of whom were Muslim, would populate other nearby cities of modern-day Florida. The twentieth-century black migration to the urbanized North would bring such quasi-Islamic leaders as Noble Drew Ali (North Carolina) and Elijah Muhammad (Sandersville, Georgia) north in search of jobs and respite from Klu Klux Klan terrorism. These migrants gave birth to such people as Wallace D. Muhammad and Malcolm X, both of whom would later help lead the mass adoption of Sunni Islam by black Muslims after 1975. But some, like members of my own family and that of Harry Dean, had already begun adhering more strictly to Sunni Islam long before 1975. In fact, one member of my own family appears to have begun studying and practicing Islam as early as the 1940s, an event that encouraged my own acceptance of Islam in the late 1960s. Others, like Cornelia Bailey, a descendant of Muhammad Saleh Bilali of Sapelo Island, Georgia, discovered that what she had inherited from her family was Islam. She became aware of this after reading *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*.

But perhaps the strongest evidence for the surviving legacy of Islam among blacks in the Americas is the case of Osman, “king of the swamp” and “the protector of escaped slaves,” described by Leaming (a white American and one-time follower of Warith Deen Muhammad) in his pioneering *Hidden Americans: Maroons of the Virginias and the Carolinas*. Leaming speculates that Osman may have been named after Umar, the second caliph of Islam, or Usman dan Fodio, the famous jihadist and slave liberator in what is today northern Nigeria. He describes Osman as a “Muslim” from a family that had been “zealous adherents of the Fulani-led revival of Islam and Holy War against infidelity and the oppression of the poor.” From his base deep within Virginia’s Dismal Swamp, Osman led a military force of Muslim and non-Muslim Maroons against Confederate forces from 1852-62. Osman’s Maroons formed a military alliance with the American government forces, liberating relatives and fellow Muslims from enslavement on nearby plantations. 
A History of Jihad in the United States

The WOI theory blinds us to significant aspects of American history. The alternative theory I am proposing, that of hidden transcripts, illuminates otherwise obscure aspects of the past. For instance, although the black church is often considered the heart of black resistance and the standard-bearer for social protest movements against discrimination, existing evidence suggests that the Islamic influence has been at least as influential. There is a history of jihad in America by Muslim slaves seeking freedom and justice.

Slave notices for runaway or fugitive slaves frequently disclosed the ethnic background of fugitives. Many came from Muslim ethnic groups (or if you like, tribes). Many with names like Musa, Ibrahim, and Akbar were identifiably Muslim. Others like the Yoruba and Coromanteees contained smaller, though no less significant, Muslim jihadists. Some, like Omar bin Said, memorized the Qur’an in Arabic by heart. According to Landers, others met in private homes. For example, in 1784, one man in St. Augustine, along with his countrymen, practiced “rites in the style of Guinea” that would appear to be Islamic.

In 1726, Spain founded the earliest free black town in North America for escaped slaves from the Carolinas. These fugitives agreed to become nominal Catholics and Spanish allies against their former English, and later American, slave masters. Variously described as Fort Mose, Fort Moosa, and the Negro Fort, the fort’s actual name was Musa. This name appears to have come from African and Indian refugees already living in the area. Spain exercised only nominal authority over it, as its residents still managed to display elements of their African and Indian cultures and practices. Musa, the Muslim name for Moses, connotes deliverance from bondage and slavery.

This fort, which played a vital role in the Spanish defense against the British, was led throughout its intermittent history by a Mandingo African captain and corsair, whose Christian name was Francisco Menendez. Mandingos were well-known in Africa and the Islamic world as world traders and travelers, fearless warriors, and fervent Muslims. Much work remains to be done in excavating the archeological site currently underway just 2 miles north of present-day St. Augustine. The quasi-independent status of Fort Musa and other similar settlements appear to have enabled Muslims within them to practice their religion freely. Other Maroon settlements like Musa among the Native Americans, the Spanish, the English,
and the French, facilitated the survival of the Islamic institutions of jihad, *hijrah*, and *ummah* in the Americas.

In spite of the fact that Muslims, Jews, and Africans who converted to Catholicism found more acceptance in Spanish society, Landers reminds us that “they were not totally free of suspicion” – and apparently for good reason. Afroz discloses how Muslims in the Caribbean continued to practice Islam secretly prior to emancipation, even as they made great strides in bringing slavery to a close. Contrary to suggestions in the literature on Islam in the United States, Americans were not always able to keep crypto-Muslims out of the country, as small vessels traveled to and from the mainland and the Caribbean to provide the Americas its very first “underground” railroad.

Even after the United States acquired Florida as a territory in 1819 and banned the continued importation of enslaved Africans into the country after 1820, illegal slave smuggling continued to deliver large numbers of enslaved Africans by way of Florida’s long and porous border. Enslaved Africans arrived at a time when Islamic jihads in Africa were on the rise. For example, studies by Rogers and Shillington document the rise of Tukolor jihads of the western Sudan. These jihads were inspired by anti-slavery Fulani jihads led by Uthman dan Fodio (c.a. 1804). Millions of Muslim jihadists were unwittingly captured and transported to the Americas as result of these West African anti-slavery jihads.

Inspired by Uthman dan Fodio’s example and, no doubt, the earlier enslavement of African Muslims in the Americas, Al-Hajj Umar from the Futo Toro region, in what is now Senegal, built a large following during the 1840s after a lengthy pilgrimage (hajj) to Makkah in 1826. His jihad sparked a spirited resistance, especially among the non-Muslim Bambara of upper Senegal. Al Hajj Umar spread Islam by force and promoted the capture and sale of non-Muslims in exchange for firearms.

Meanwhile to the south, in the Futa Jalon region of what is today Gambia and Sierra Leone, Samory Toure (1830-90) mounted his own jihad and became a formidable force among the Mandinkas. But instead of enslaving captured opponents, Samory incorporated them into his army and, as such, inspired widespread fame and loyalty by using Islam as a force for unity rather than one of division, as displayed in the case of Al Hajj Umar. Described as the “Napoleon of the Sudan,” by 1850 Toure had built a formidable well-armed force that included blacksmiths who not only imported firearms, but also manufactured them.
This was the historical context of Muslim enslavement in the Americas. Once in the Americas, those fortunate enough to escape enslavement often joined communities with significant numbers of earlier escapees and otherwise free persons of color. These people became known as Maroons and were found throughout Central and South America as well as what is now the southeastern United States. In fact, this region joins Central and South America as the most well-documented regions of enslaved Muslims in the Americas. For instance, Lotfi estimates that as many as one-third of all slaves in South Carolina, a major distribution point for slaves transported to North America, were Muslim. This phenomenon throughout the literature is viewed as a consequence of planters’ preference for Senegambians, who were known for their rice growing skills.

The intersection of these trends caused the flow of many seasoned African warriors into what is now the United States. Once in the region, they appear to have continued the antislavery jihads they mounted in Africa with varying degrees of success. Some joined forces with the Native American Indians in South America to form formidable communities, such as Palmares in Brazil. Others and their descendants joined the Seminole Indians and fought against the American forces led by Andrew Jackson. Of course, enslaved African Muslims were not the only people in the Americas to employ native religion as a tool of resistance against oppression. “Pueblo plains and Northwestern people,” according to Martin, “hid their religious societies for generations from condemning non-native authorities and priests.” But unlike the survival of religion among Native Americans, the survival of Islam in the United States remains the subject of debate.

Following the destruction of Fort Negro on July 27, 1816, on Prospect Bluff, located on Florida’s Apalachicola River, escaped slaves and refugee Indians established free black towns throughout eastern Florida. One of these towns was led by Abraham, a black Indian trader, scout, diplomat, and translator who Muhammad describes as a Muslim. Abraham is widely described in the literature as a spiritual leader and prophet by whites.

The famous slave uprising at Stono, North Carolina, is said to have shown signs of being orchestrated by militarily trained African fugitives. African warriors are described as marching under flags, with arms in hand and in military formation, determined to reach freedom in Fort Musa, a mere 50 miles across the-then American/Florida border. While much has been written about the presence of “black Indians,” far less attention has been given to other blacks living among Florida’s Seminole Indians. For
example, free black “allies” are described as living among the Seminoles and as, at least according to one author, thinking of themselves not as Indians, but “as Hausa, Mandingos, and Fulani” (i.e., African Muslims).51

These events are significant because African Muslim and Indian resistance against American forces in Florida caused the Seminole Indian wars to be widely regarded as the most costly Indian wars in American history. Moreover, the Seminoles were never completely defeated by the American government, which, after a time, simply decided to withdraw its troops.52 The WOI theory fails to acknowledge this relevant and important history. Yet African jihadists appear to have played a major role in the first and second Seminole Indian Wars, (1816-19 and 1835-38). Rivers describes these wars as “the largest slave uprisings in the annals of North American history.”53 Like their counterparts in Brazil that peaked in the Muslim-led slave rebellion in Bahia in 1835, these encounters appear to have been led by Hausa and, to a lesser degree, Yoruba Muslim jihadists.54 The fact that jihads in Florida and Brazil occurred in the same year (1835) may quite possibly be explained by the known circulation of a wathika, or “pastoral letter,” written in Arabic and transmitted to the Americas from Africa, exhorting enslaved African Muslims to remain steadfast to Islam and to embrace jihad.55

Conclusion

It would be a mistake to conclude that today’s Muslim immigrants have not played a significant role in shaping Islam and Muslims in the Americas. The dramatic increase in the number of Middle Eastern Arabs and others, including Muslims from the Indian subcontinent, emigrating to the United States has had a dramatic impact. Their knowledge of and links to authoritative sources of religious legitimacy, as well as the opportunities they provide for indigenous Muslims to travel and study in the Islamic world, have transformed Muslim life in the Americas for the better. But it is equally mistaken to reduce America’s seven-century Islamic experience to twentieth-century Muslim immigrants.

At least six conclusions can be derived from this study:

• More accurate portrayals of Islam and Muslims in the United States are needed, especially those that avoid depicting American Muslims as exclusively Arab, foreigners, and/or terrorists.

• More thorough and complete studies of Islam in the Americas are needed, especially those that reject the assumptions of the WOI
theory, the dominant paradigm governing studies of Islam in the United States for the last 2 decades.

• Scholars must devote greater attention to empirical studies of Islam and Muslims in the Americas that illustrate the diversity of political perspectives among Muslims and that defy simple stereotypical characterizations.

• Observers must offer more inclusive representations of Muslims in the United States in order to include authoritative studies of African Americans in particular, and indigenous Muslims like Latinos/Latinas and white American Muslims, in general.

• Scholars must improve their methodologies when studying Islam in the United States in order to go beyond the studies of twentieth-century Muslim immigrants that are designed to focus narrowly on American Muslims but cannot explain significant developments within the American Muslim community.

• There is a need for greater interdisciplinary studies of Islam in the Americas. Muslim scholars must seek to synthesize and connect their own disparate clusters of information if we are ever to achieve a full and clear picture of Islam and Muslims.
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Abstract

This paper deals with the issue of women’s full or partial access to the mosque from 610-925. This period is divided into two timeframes. The first, 610-34, consists mainly of the time in which the Prophet was active in Makkah and Madinah. The second, 634-925, is the period beginning with ‘Umar’s reign to the time when the Ḥadīth literature was written down and set into the well-known compilations. Two types of evidence are examined for both periods: material and textual records. Material records consist of the layout of the various mosques, where the existence or absence of dividing walls or separate entrances could be important clues. Textual records consist mainly of the Qur’an and Ḥadīth literature.

The Qur’an is used as a primary source for the first period, whereas the Ḥadīth literature is used as a primary source for the second period. The Ḥadīth is used to distinguish trends and directions in the Muslim community after the demise of the Prophet, rather than as a source of information on the Prophet himself. This avoids problems of authenticity, while not denying that much of the Ḥadīth may well be authentic. From the primary sources available for the first period, there does not appear to be any evidence of segregation; rather the evidence indicates that women had full access to the mosque. In the second period, three trends appear: a pro-segregation trend, an anti-segregation trend, and a trend that sought to prohibit women from going to the mosque altogether.
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Introduction

The early mosque was not only a place for prayer, but also a center for many other activities as well. It functioned as the school where people learned their religion, and the Parliament where the community discussed new laws and affairs of state. It was also the courthouse where judgments were passed, and the community center where families met their friends and neighbors and held their celebrations. In short, it was the hub and center of public life for the emerging Muslim nation.1

For women, the mosque meant access to almost every aspect of public life. Debarring or limiting their access means restricting their participation in public life. Gender segregation, as seen in most mosques today, is such a limitation, for it limits women’s full access. This both hampers their participation and can even shut them out completely. Segregation can be implemented either through a screen or a wall, or by distance, as happens when placing women behind men during the congregational prayers. This paper will provide a historical analysis of women’s physical access to mosques.

The status of women in Islam, especially with regards to such issues as marriage, inheritance, veiling, and seclusion, has received a great deal of scholarly attention.2 However, little has been written on gender segregation in the mosque. One should perhaps mention Nimat Hafez Barazangi, who has expressed the need for women to frequent mosques in her “Muslim Women’s Islamic Higher Learning as a Human Right: The Action Plan.”3 However, she does not address gender segregation. Other works include Nabia Abbott’s “Women and the State in Early Islam,” which provides a useful historical perspective on this issue during the early Islamic period.4 Also noteworthy is the work of two Islamic scholars. The first one is Muhammad al-Ghazali, a conservative scholar who advocated a better position for women.5 He severely criticized the widespread exclusion of women from the mosque and defended their right to participate, albeit behind the men and only if they had fulfilled their household chores. The second one is Ahmad Shawqi al-Fanjari, who specifically addressed segregation in his Al-Ikhtilāt fi al-Din fi al-Ta‘likh fi ‘Ilm al-ljima’. He promoted non-segregation and women’s participation in public life, including the mosque.6

In my historical overview, I deal with the period from the beginning of Muhammad’s career as a prophet in 610 until about 925, when many of the first textual sources were recorded. I then divide this period into two sub-periods. The first subperiod consists mainly of the time during which the Prophet was active in both Makkah and Madinah (610-32) and when the Qur’an, the foundation of the Islamic faith, was revealed. During this time,
religion was in the hands of one person, who was regarded by his followers as the ultimate religious authority. This can be viewed as a theocratic period, for the people believed that God was guiding them through the Prophet. It is also characterized as a prophetic or “ideal” period. The reign of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq (632-34) will be regarded as more or less a continuation of that time, since it was too short and he was too faithful to the Prophet’s example to allow any changes in women’s situation.7

The first major changes in the placement of women in the mosque took place during `Umar ibn al-Khattab’s reign (634-44), which initiated the second subperiod. By this time, most of the primary textual sources used in this study had been recorded. This was also a time of conquest, when Islam spread into new lands and Muslims interacted with many other peoples. Religion was now in the hands of a scholarly elite that had emerged over the years. In addition, this was a formative period for Islam, when many of its religious laws and doctrines were formulated. This time can be characterized as an “interactive” period, for many debates took place within the Muslim community. Using primary and some secondary sources relating to these subperiods, I will evaluate and contrast women’s access to the mosque.

To do this, we must examine the primary material and textual sources. The material record consists mainly of the mosques’ architecture. But since most early mosques have been changed and restructured, we cannot acquire a clear picture of the original layout from the material record alone. Therefore, textual sources also are consulted for they enable us to identify such physical and spatial features to determine if there were any walls or other barriers separating men and women, and whether they used separate entrances. These architectural features can provide important evidence about the nature of women’s presence and participation in early mosques.

Primary textual sources, mainly the Qur’an and Hadith literature, also provide a historical context. For the early period, our main record is the Qur’an. Although it does not contain a great deal of historical information, both western and Muslim scholars consider the Qur’an to be a useful source for information on the Prophet’s life and practice. In this study, the Qur’an will be used as a reflection of the first period’s sociocultural conditions as well as a means to discern prophetic narratives.

The Hadith literature is often used as a primary source for the Prophet’s directions and model behavior. However, the first compilations, which had been scrutinized by early scholars for authenticity, appeared only in the ninth century. This inadvertently raises questions of reliability. Western scholars hold views ranging from rejecting the entire traditional
On the other hand, Muslim scholarly opinion ranges from accepting the entire “canonical” corpus to subjecting it to rigorous criticism. The latter group has called attention to the problems associated with some of the traditions. Prominent advocates of the “canonical” corpus seem to have recognized some of these problems and, as a result, have attempted to solve them by “contextualization” and “interpretation.”

This study neither seeks to investigate the various reports’ authenticity nor the individual motives behind preserving or composing them. Rather, the material will be used as a reflection of the directions and inclinations of the people who retained and transmitted the Hadith literature. Thus, this literature will be limited as a primary textual source for the second period under investigation, rather than for the first. This approach will avoid any conflict over authenticity and, at the same time, will not deny the fact that much of the Hadith literature could well be authentic and contain accurate historical information on the Prophet.

Another textual source used in this study is Ibn Sa’d’s biographical dictionary, which contains important historical information on the periods of ’Umar and ’Uthman. Both Ibn Sa’d (d. 845) and the events he recounts belong to the second period under examination. One should perhaps also mention al-Azraqi, who belongs to the second period. His book, *Akhbar Makkah*, contains important information on the Makkan sanctuary.

**Women in the Prophetic Period**

During the first period (610-34), the most important material records include al-Haram al-Sharif in Makkah and the Prophet’s mosque in Madinah. Although Muslims believe that Muhammad was transported miraculously to Jerusalem’s al-Aqsa Mosque, this cannot be regarded as a material record because the physical mosque had not yet been built. The ancient Israelite temple, which some people believe existed prior to the al-Aqsa Mosque, had been destroyed centuries ago. Furthermore, the Prophet’s experience had a kind of spiritual character and cannot be regarded as material evidence. However, the al-Aqsa Mosque does figure in the textual record: Qur’an 17:1.

The most important material record for the Makkan period is Makkah’s al-Haram al-Sharif, the first mosque in which Muslims prayed. This sanctuary, which has its origins in the pre-Islamic period, continued and flourished after the advent of Islam. Al-Haram al-Sharif features the
ancient house. This is a simple apsidal structure consisting of an almost square-shaped room with an apse\(^1\) attached to it, known as hijr Isma‘il. Both Hagar and Isma‘il are reportedly buried there.\(^1\) The structure is located in a courtyard, in which prayers and other rituals are conducted. In the Makkah and Madinan periods, houses surrounded the courtyard\(^1\) and no barriers separated the men from the women. Even the sacred space was not enclosed by a wall.

The Qur’an is our main textual source for this period. However, it is more useful for the Madinan than for the Makkah period, since Makkah chapters (\textit{suwar}) have little to say about women in the sanctuary. During the Prophet’s early activity in Makkah, conditions were more or less a continuation of \textit{jahili} practices. Jawad ‘Ali, who deals with Makkah’s pre-Islamic religious practices,\(^1\) informs us that women made \textit{ra’\text{\textsuperscript{w}af} (ritual circumambulations around the Ka‘bah), sacrificed their animals to one of the deities, and that Qurashi women performed \textit{sa’\text{\textsuperscript{y} (running between the two hills of Safa and Marwah). Pre-Islamic rituals, however, could not be performed in clothes in which the pilgrim had sinned. The sole exception was for members of the Quraysh. If a pilgrim could not borrow clothes from a Qurashi, then he or she performed the rituals without clothes.\(^1\) This is why women preferred to perform their rituals at night. A verse of poetry that some of them recited was:

\begin{quote}
Today, some of it or all of it appears; \\
what appears of it, I do not consider permissible.\(^1\)
\end{quote}

For Muhammad, this sanctuary remained the principal mosque. Every Muslim, whether male or female, is required to perform this pilgrimage at least once if they can meet the relevant conditions. However, for most of the Prophet’s sojourn in Madinah, Makkah was at war with Madinah. Therefore, the Muslims did not have access to that sanctuary. When relations were reestablished between the two cities, Muslims began to perform the pilgrimage. Some of the pre-Islamic rituals continued (e.g., \textit{ra’\text{\textsuperscript{w}af and sa’\text{\textsuperscript{y}, and others were changed (e.g., the idols were removed and all pilgrims had to wear \textit{ih\text{\textsuperscript{t}am} clothes).\(^1\) Women’s access to every part of the mosque continued unchanged from \textit{jahili} times. Even today, women pilgrims have complete access to the mosque and can pray wherever and whenever they like.

The Prophet, after migrating to Madinah, built a second mosque there. This structure, which also functioned as his home, was a simple nearly square enclosure of approximately 56 x 53 meters with a single entrance. The \textit{qiblah} side had a double range of palm-trunk columns thatched with
palm leaves. Needy Companions had a lean-to toward the southeast, and Muhammad’s wives had rooms along the western perimeter.20 The prayers were conducted in the vast empty courtyard. Significantly, there appear to have been no walls or other barriers separating men and women, or any other known material evidence of gender segregation during the Madinan period.

The Qur’an also provides interesting evidence for women’s access to the mosque during this period. A close examination shows two kinds of verses that contain relevant information. The first kind consists of general verses that deal more or less with all Muslims. They are usually in the male plural, which, in Arabic, can include women. On the other hand, the female plural does not include men. The second kind are gender-specific and specify women, either by the female plural or by referring to a specific person (e.g., Mary). I will first examine the general verses and then the specific verses.

All Muslims are asked to pray in every mosque and to take their adornments:

Say: “My Lord has commanded justice and that you look toward (Him) at every mosque … (7:29)21

O children of Adam! Take your adornments to every mosque … (7:31)

Several verses talk negatively of those who prevent believers from mosques and warn them of severe punishments (e.g., 2:114, 8:34, 22:25, and 48:25):

Who is more unjust than one who prevents [believers] from celebrating God’s name in his mosques and strives to ruin them? It is not fitting that such should enter them, except in fear. Disgrace will be theirs in this world and an exceeding torment in the world to come. (2:114)

The above verses indicate the right and obligation of every Muslim to participate in the mosque’s activities. The context suggests that this applies to “the believers,” regardless of gender. The participation of women is not stated explicitly in the above verses. However, it is clearer in the gender-specific verses, to which I now turn.

Two verses specify women’s relationship to group prayers. The first is as follows:

The male believers and the female believers are each others’ allies. They enjoin good and forbid evil, establish prayers and pay the alms, and
obey God and his Messenger. Upon these God will have mercy. God is Almighty, All-Wise. (9:71)

The word awliya’, which I have translated as “allies,” signifies a close working relationship. It can also be translated as “friends, protectors, neighbors, or followers.” It comes from the root waliyā, which means to be near or adjacent to somebody or something. The same term is used to describe the relationship between the Muhajirun (Makkan immigrants) and the Ansar (Madinan helpers) (8:72) and between God and His “close ones” (10:62). The above verse signifies a togetherness in prayers as well as in enjoining good, forbidding evil, giving alms, and obeying God and his Prophet. These activities clearly have a public aspect to their fulfillment and are mandated for both men and women.

The second gender-specific verse is addressed to Mary, as follows:

O Mary! Humble yourself before your Lord, prostrate yourself, and bow down with those who bow down. (3:43)

The term used for “with those who bow down” is ma’a al-raki’in. Raki’in is the masculine plural form. It may or may not include women, but it must include men. The feminine plural would have been raki’at, which is not used in this context. So, Mary is ordered to pray with a group that includes men. Also interesting is the preposition ma’a, which means “with,” not “behind,” “away from,” or “segregated from” in any way.

Mary is also presented as praying in the miḥrab. In later Islamic times, the miḥrab came to mean a recess in a mosque indicating the prayer direction. However, this is not the Qur’anic meaning, since the miḥrab is connected there only with ancient Israelites: Mary, David, Solomon, and Zachariah (3:37, 39; 19:11; 38:21-22; and 34:13). In place of the mosque’s miḥrab, Solomon’s temple had the Holy of Holies, which housed the ark of the covenant. In non-Israelite temples, the Holy of Holies often contained the image of a deity.

Mary’s presence in what could possibly have been the Holy of Holies may have significant implications for female access to mosques. This is the inner sanctum to which only a select few, mainly highly placed priests or persons, had access. In other words, Mary would have been on a par with such figures as David, Solomon, and Zachariah. This warrants a closer investigation of how the Qur’an portrays Mary’s position in the temple, since Islam considers it a major mosque. As I will show below, Mary not only had a privileged position with full access to the mosque, but is depicted as not being segregated from men.
According to the Qur'an, Mary’s connection with the temple began before her birth. Her mother is portrayed as saying:

My Lord, I have consecrated by vow (nadhartu) to you what is inside my womb as a freed person (muharraran). (3:35)

The Arabic nadhara is equivalent to the Hebrew nadhar, which appears only in the qal form in the Old Testament and means “to make a vow.”22 N-z-r, a related root that appears only in the nifal form,23 means to dedicate oneself to a deity or to live as a nazirite.24 One such nazir/nazirite was Prophet Samuel, whose mother (Hannah) made a promise that resembles the one made by Mary’s mother. Hannah promised to give her as-yet-unconceived son as a nazirite (1 Samuel 1:11). He grew up ministering to the Lord in His temple at Shiloh (1 Samuel 2:18). In other cases, persons vowed to the temple were sold, and their price varied according to age and gender (Leviticus 27:2-8). The Qur’anic muharrar seems to mean a freed person. This implies that Mary’s mother was promising her unborn child would be a nazirite, part of the temple’s personnel, but would not be sold into slavery. The same root, N-z-r, is also used in Hebrew for consecrating or ordaining priests.25

Not a great deal is known about the ancient Israelite nazirites. Some seem to have been connected with the temple, as in the case of Samuel. The Old Testament also portrays him as a prophet who received revelation from the Lord (1 Samuel 3:1-21). If Mary was a nazirite like Samuel, she probably would have had access to the Holy of Holies. Samuel used to minister to the Lord in His temple at Shiloh, where the ark of the covenant was housed (1 Samuel 2:18). Solomon’s temple had not yet been built. After its construction in Jerusalem, the ark was moved to the Holy of Holies there.

Not everyone agrees that the Qur’anic miḥṭāb should be identified with the Israelite Holy of Holies. In fact, some scholars consider it to have been a private ladies’ chamber.26 However, both David and Zachariah are presented as having been inside the miḥṭāb. Zachariah is recorded to have prayed there privately and, after receiving revelation from the angels (3:39), going out to address his people (19:11). This would have been in the temple’s third compartment: the courtyard. David is also presented as being in the miḥṭāb, for two people scaled the wall and found him there (38:21-22). Thus, the Qur’anic miḥṭāb was probably not a ladies’ chamber.

Other than temples, the only known monumental architecture from ancient Israel is palaces. A palace would not fit the description as well as the temple, since Zachariah was not a king. Furthermore, it is unlikely
that he would pray in a palace sanctum, even if one were known to exist, and then habitually leave it to address the people. It is also unlikely that his people would be gathered in a room near the palace sanctum, waiting for the priest to address them. Thus, the ancient Israelite Holy of Holies appears to fit the Qur’anic miḥrāb best.

The Qur’an calls the Solomonic temple, which contains the Holy of Holies, al-Masjid al-Aqṣa (17:1, 7). The four schools of Sunni jurisprudence, along with the Shi’i Ja’fari school, consider al-Masjid al-ʿAqṣa to be the third holiest site after the Makkan and Madinan harams. Many Muslims make pilgrimage to it during politically safe times. That a woman is depicted as being present in its innermost sanctum means that she had full access to that masjid. She is also presented as not being segregated from men, since Zachariah entered the miḥrāb when she was there and talked with her (3:37). Thus, we can see that Mary’s example is a significant aspect of understanding the Qur’an’s position on women’s access to sacred space.

The other two high-ranking mosques are the Prophet’s mosque in Madinah and the Makkan sanctuary. In the Prophet’s mosque, his daughter Fatimah is thought to be buried next to him. If this is indeed the case, then it can be viewed as a material record of full, unbarred female access to this mosque. However, this tradition is disputed, and al-Baqi’ seems to be a more generally accepted burial place for her. Nevertheless, this tradition does indicate that the thought of a woman being buried there was acceptable.

According to Islamic tradition, Hagar was buried with her son Isma’il inside the Ka’bah, specifically in the apse, which is considered part of the sanctuary. This tradition also can be regarded as indicating full unbarred female access to that masjid’s innermost sanctum. Although this account dates back to pre-Islamic times, it was maintained and transmitted in the two periods under investigation until it was formally documented in the ’Abbasid era.

From the evidence, we can conclude that the material and textual records appear to support full female access to the major mosques during the Makkan and Madinan periods. Importantly, at the two earliest and most important Muslim shrines, there were no barriers separating women from men and no separate entrances. There also appears to be an indication that the thought of women being buried together with men in the inner sanctum was acceptable. The Qur’an testifies to the legitimacy of women’s using the miḥrāb and interacting with men in al-Masjid al-ʿAqṣa, the third major Muslim shrine. Both general and gender-specific Qur’anic verses
indicate that women had full access to the mosque and that praying next to men was considered normal and legitimate. Therefore, in the material as well as the textual sources dating to Islam’s “ideal” period, there appears to be no indication of gender apartheid; rather, evidence points to the conclusion that women had full access to the mosque.

Later Developments
In the second period, the Makkan sanctuary underwent some changes. `Umar ibn al-Khattab, the second caliph, bought the surrounding houses, tore them down, and surrounded the area with a wall. However, there were no walls or barriers separating men from women within the courtyard.

During his reign, Muslims conquered and spread into many countries. As a result, they founded garrison towns, each containing a mosque, an administrative office, and a dwelling for the commander-in-chief in the center. This points to the mosque’s importance in public life. In Basra and Kufa (Iraq), the mosques were almost exact reproductions of the Prophet’s mosque. In Fustat (Egypt), however, there was one important difference: multiple entrances. Although there is no evidence of partitions separating men from women, it is possible that women could have used separate entrances.

Perhaps the most important mosque built during this period is Jerusalem’s al-Aqṣa mosque. It too was initially a simple rectangular structure, much like the Prophet’s mosque. This mosque seems to be the first one to have a clear partition separating men and women, for there seems to have been three māqṣūrat (separate enclosures or compartments shut off by wooden lattices or even by balustrades) for women in 912/13. The first māqṣūrah, probably built during the early Umayyad era, was an enclosure near the miḥrāb that separated the ruler from the people. This was regarded as an innovation unique to the Islamic world and was condemned by some scholars. From this evidence, we can conclude that there could be an indication of gender segregation in the second period’s material record. However, it is unclear how widespread it was.

The most important textual source for the second period is the Hadith literature, which was mostly gathered and documented during the ninth century. The most famous “canonical” collections are those of Ibn Mājah (824-56), al-Bukhari (820-70), Muslim (817-75), Abu Dawud (817-89), al-Tirmidhi (d. 892), and al-Nasa’i (830-915). Each hadith comes with a chain of transmission identifying each transmitter, all the way back to the Prophet. These collections contain several traditions pertaining to women in the mosque. As discussed previously, neither their authenticity nor the transmit-
ters’ reliability are of concern here. Whether individuals fabricated some of
the reports or not is irrelevant, since they are not used as sources of infor-
mation about the Prophet, but rather as sources about the composers or the
transmitters. Thus, they are taken as reflections of social trends shortly after
the Prophet’s demise up to the time of their compilation.

The following are some of the relevant reports found in the Hadith
collections:

The Prophet said that a dog, an ass, and a woman interrupt prayer if they
pass in front of the believer, interposing themselves between him and
the qiblah.35

This hadith, which is found in some of the major Hadith collections,36
appears to be aimed at placing women behind men during prayer. How-
ever, other hadith contradict it. These seem to be of five types. The first
type is attributed to `A’ishah, who is said to have responded with the fol-
lowing words:

You compare us now to asses and dogs. In the name of God, I have seen
the Prophet saying his prayers while I was there, lying on the bed between
him and the qiblah. And in order not to disturb him, I did not move.37

`A’ishah’s tradition, with minor variations, is also found in many of
the major Hadith collections.38 She criticized the lumping together of
women with dogs and donkeys, both of which can be regarded as insults.
She brought evidence from her own experience with the Prophet to con-
tradict the report. Four more tradition types state the following:

The Prophet used to pray while carrying Umamah bint Zaynab, the
daughter of the Messenger of God, and Abu al-`As ibn Rabí’ah ibn
`Abd Shams. When he prostrated himself, he put her down; when he got
up, he carried her.39

The Prophet led them in prayer in al-Batha’. He prayed the two zuhr
rak’as, during which a goat was in front of him, and the two `asr rak’as,
during which a woman and a donkey were crossing in front of him.40

From `Abd Allah ibn `Abbas: “I came riding on a female donkey and
was approaching adulthood (ihlal) at that time, while the Prophet was
leading the people in prayer at Mina without any walls. I crossed in
front of some of the people in the row, came down and sent the donkey
to graze, and entered into the row. Nobody disapproved.”41
From `Ali ibn Abi Talib on the pulpit: “Oh people! I heard the Prophet (pbuh) say: ‘Only excrement can disrupt a man’s prayer.’ I do not shy away from telling you what the Prophet did not shy away from.” And he said the excrement is if he breaks wind or if he farts.42

The abundant reports of the first tradition, as well as the responses to it, portray a lively debate that seems to have started early in the interactive period. The traditions represent two conflicting views: The first places women behind men, so as not to interrupt men’s prayers, whereas the second affirms that women can pray in front of men. These conflicting reports reflect two distinct trends within the Muslim community. The people who transmitted or composed the first tradition can be seen as belonging to the pro-segregation group. One member of this group could be Abu Dharr, to whom the first tradition seems to be attributed. The people responsible for spreading the contrasting traditions, such as `A’ishah, can be viewed as opposing gender apartheid. However, the difference is not always clear-cut. For example, al-Bukhari reports both traditions. It is possible, therefore, that some transmitters did not belong to either group but were mainly interested in preserving the traditions.

Further traditions give a better picture of the liveliness of this debate. For example:

The better rows for men are the first ones, and the worst are the last ones; the better rows for women are the last ones and the worst are the first ones.43

The above hadith seeks to place women behind men in prayers. However, there are problems associated with this tradition. The first problem is related to interpretation. For example, al-Fanjari interprets it not as preventing women from praying next to men, but as a means to organize congregants in crowded situations.44 However, his interpretation is at odds with the example of the most crowded mosque of all: that of Makkah.

Among the evidence al-Fanjari cites is a tradition showing that a beautiful woman used to pray behind the Prophet and in front of other men.45 The context of that hadith is meant to explain a particular Qur’anic verse: “To us are known those of you who hasten forward, and those who lag behind” (15:24). It does not seem to be purposely aimed at delineating a woman’s place during prayer. I would argue that the tradition of the “beautiful woman” is not really aimed at legitimizing women praying in front of men, but seems to preserve a memory of them doing so.
Another problem is the “better than” formula. Perhaps the first hadith is expressed in the form of “better than,” rather than a clear prohibition because the memory of women praying in front of men during the Prophet’s time, as well as in Makkah, was too strong to be denied. The “better than” formula could be a means of introducing new practices and harmonizing them with the old practices. Since it is not a clear prohibition, it avoids the kind of thundering response seen above in some of the previously cited hadith.

A third problem has to do with how the first rows were perceived in relation to the latter ones. Some evidence points to the fact that the first rows were perceived as superior, especially the very first one, for God and the angels bless the first row and the first few rows. The Prophet used to ask forgiveness for the first row three times and for the second row only two times. Consequently, he urged the believers to move forward in the rows, fill them up, and not leave empty spaces.

To deny women access to the first row and the blessings of God and the angels seems unjust and not in keeping with the spirit of fairness that characterizes Islam. It is also in conflict with Sura al-Nahl, which addresses gender discrimination right from the moment a baby girl is born:

> When news is brought to one of them of the birth of a female, his face remains dark and he bottles it up. He hides himself from his people, because of the bad news he has received. Should he keep it in contempt or should he bury it in the dust? Alas, bad is their judgment. (16:58-59)

Those who keep women in contempt (i.e., a state of disempowerment) are sa‘ama yâhku‘mûn. God criticizes their judgment and pronounces it “bad.”

There also may be a problem of misplaced context in this hadith. Nothing in the text places it within the context of prayers. In fact, the Qur’an associates “row” (sâff) with battle rows: “God loves those who fight in his cause in a row, as if they were an ordered structure” (61:4), not with prayer rows. When reading this hadith together with the Qur’an, the first association would be with war. In other words, the Prophet encouraged women to stay behind the lines during battle. The connection with prayer (sâlât) comes at a later time, in the fiqh headings of the various Hadith compilations. The headings, which were used to categorize the traditions, are only organizational tools applied to the Hadith compilations, and thus stem from a much later date than the original hadith. Thus, one could argue that a tradition that originally arose in a context of war was later adopted for use in organizing prayers.
However, another tradition does place it in the context of prayer.

“Shall I direct you to that by which God grants remission from sins and increase in rewards?” They said: “Yes, O messenger of God.” He said: “To amply perform the ritual abolution over what is distasteful, the large number of steps to these mosques, to wait for the [following] ritual prayer after [having completed] the ritual prayer. There is not a man among you who goes out of his home, after having purified himself, and then prays the prayer together with the Muslims and then sits in the gathering and awaits the next prayer, but that the angels say: ‘O God, forgive him; O God grant him mercy!’ So when you stand up in prayer straighten your lines, complete them and fill the empty spaces, for I see you behind my back. When your leader says: ‘God is greater,’ then say: ‘God is greater.’ When he bows down, bow down. When he says: ‘God hears whoso praises him,’ then say: ‘O God, the praise is yours.’ The better rows for men are the front ones, and the worst are the last ones. The better rows for women are the last ones and the worst are the front ones. O women, when the men prostrate themselves, then lower your gaze, so you do not see the private parts of the men due to the tightness of their loincloths.”

The above version appears to be a composite hadith made up of smaller ones. If this is indeed the case, then the misplaced context belongs to the second time period.

Another tradition is also used to argue for women praying in the mosque behind the men.

The Prophet prayed in the home of Umm Sulaym. I got up together with an orphan behind him and Umm Sulaym [was] behind us.

But this tradition does not take place in a mosque and, as such, does not apply to women in the mosque. We do not know whether her position had anything to do with gender or if it was only because she got up after the others. In one version, she had invited the Prophet to lunch. Thus, she may have been clearing up. In another version, they were praying on a rug or a cover, so there may not have been enough room for her in the front row. One or even a few isolated incidents do not make a rule or a prescribed normative practice. It also is important to note that only a small group – four people – prayed that particular prayer, so the woman had access to the imām.

One of the rare mentions of women in a clan-type mosque is the Umm Waraqah tradition:
Umm Waraqah bint 'Abd Allah ibn al-Harith al-Ansari had collected the Qur’an, and the Prophet, may peace and blessings be upon him and his family and his Companions, had commanded her to lead the people of her area (dar) in prayer. She had her own mu’adhdhin, and she used to lead the people of her area (dar). It is unclear exactly what is meant by dar. According to Bulugh al-Amali, the commentary on Ibn Hanbal’s Hadith collection, the apparent meaning included the mu’adhdhin (a man who calls people to prayer), a ghulam (a male slave), and a jariyah (a female slave). However, this is disputed. The use of a mu’adhdhin indicates that a significant number of people were involved. Dar also could mean a larger territory (e.g., dar al-Islam, dar al-Harb, and dar al-Madinah).

The word dar appears in another tradition as well. It states that a woman, Umm Humayd, liked to pray with the Prophet in his mosque, but he responded to her as follows:

“I know that you like to pray with me, but your praying in your home (baytiki) is better for you than your praying in your house (hujratiki), and your praying in your house is better for you than your praying in your area (dariki), and your praying in your area is better for you than your praying in the mosque of your tribe (masjid qawmiki), and your praying in the mosque of your tribe is better for you than your praying in my mosque.” So she commanded that a mosque be built for her in the furthest and darkest corner of her home (bayt), and she used to pray there until she died.

The above hadith appears to outline a hierarchy of prayer areas, ranging from the most secluded to the most public. The smallest and most secluded place seems to be the bayt. Since Umm Humayd prayed in its furthest and darkest corner, most likely it was her home or her room. Judging by the homes of the Prophet’s wives, they seem to have been comprised of one room each. So Umm Humayd’s home also may have been comprised of one room. The next category, hujrah, could be the house in which several people, all belonging to one family, lived (e.g., the Prophet and his wives). This could have been a complex made up of several rooms surrounding a courtyard.

In the above context, dar probably refers to the area where the clan or extended family members lived. It also could have included several such complexes. The people inhabiting this area probably gathered to pray in the house of the person who led their group prayers. These could
have taken place in an enclosed area or a courtyard, which may or may not have included a roof, such as the Prophet’s mosque, which seems to have been architecturally the courtyard of his house. The next category would be the tribal mosque and then the Prophet’s mosque, which would have been the most public.

The above tradition seeks to keep women away from mosques altogether, not just to limit their space. This third trend within the Muslim community gained prominence over time. Notably, we can see the “better than” formula appears in this tradition as well. In addition, there are other problems associated with the above hadith, one of them being that of context. The above hadith could have come in the context of performing part of the prayers at home and the rest in the mosque. This also applies to men. An example of a hadith to that effect is as follows:

Allot your home some of your prayers, and do not turn them into graves.

A further problem is that this hadith is in conflict with a Qur’anic verse:

Those who commit fornication (fahīṣha) from your women, get four witnesses against them from among you. If they should testify, then confine them to homes until death claims them or God opens up a way for them. (4:15)

Confining women to the home was a legal punishment for fornication, provided that four witnesses testified to her guilt. Therefore, it can be argued that it would be illegal to implement such a punishment against an innocent woman. This is also in keeping with the character of Surat al-Nissa’. From its very first verse, a theme is established, that of a close bond with one’s kin (arḥam) and cautiousness in one’s relationships with them in order to safeguard oneself from God’s punishment (taqwā). Such hateful practices as polygamy, wife beating, and home imprisonment were severely restricted. The straight path was no longer wide open, but was narrowed down so that such practices could be used only in tightly defined, exceptional circumstances.

In the dynamic atmosphere of the interactive period, contradictory traditions certainly would be expected. For example, the following tradition narrates:

Do not prevent the female servants of God from the mosques of God.
This tradition is quite common in the books of hadith. 55 `Umar ibn al-Khattab and his family figure very strongly in the above tradition. `Umar seems to have disliked his wife’s going to the mosque and to have told her so. She is reported to have insisted on going unless `Umar prohibited her. But since he would not do this, due to the above hadith, she continued to frequent the mosque until his death. His son `Abd Allah also figures very strongly as a transmitter of the above tradition. In addition, there are reports of a dispute between him and his son Bilal, who seems to have prevented his wife from going despite the above hadith. 56

Ibn Sa’d mentions that `Umar ordered Sulayman ibn Abi Hathmah to act as a separate imam for the women in the mosque, while men prayed behind another imam. 57 This report records the first time that segregation was instituted in the mosque. It is possible to conjecture that since `Umar did not like his wife to go to the mosque but could not legitimately deny her access, he chose to implement segregation instead. Thus he was not prohibiting her, but rather was limiting her access. He also prevented the Prophet’s widows from going to the mosque in Makkah when he forbade them to perform pilgrimage. However, he seems to have relented before his death and allowed them to go. 58 Ibn Sa’d reports that when `Uthman came to power, he once again allowed women to pray together with men, but in a segregated manner: behind the men and held back until the men departed. 59

This information goes a long way in explaining the background for the debates over the place of women during prayer. If segregation was instituted so early in the Prophet’s mosque in Madinah, then this would have provided an impetus for the pro-segregation group. Another factor could have been a sense of propriety or the need to assert male supremacy. The placement of women in the Makkah sanctuary would have been a very strong contrast, and could have provided an impetus for the opposing group. Also, the memory of the prophetic practice and loyalty to it could have been a driving force. It is interesting to note that no hadith seems to try to explain why the situation in Makkah was so very different. This would be left for later scholars to address.

By the end of the third Islamic century, the pattern of Islamic society, especially among the higher classes, had changed markedly from what had prevailed during the first period. The system of total segregation and seclusion of women had been instituted, and women no longer had the right to participate freely in public life. 60
Conclusion

In light of the above, both material and textual sources indicate that changes took place during the second period. The material record (based on textual sources) indicates that women may have used separate compartments in the Jerusalem mosque. Women also could have been using separate entrances at other mosques. Ibn Sa`d’s report indicates that from the reign of `Umar, men and women were praying separately in the Prophet’s mosque. The situation in Makkah however, seems to have remained unchanged, especially during the pilgrimage season.

From this examination, we can see that the Hadith literature reflects a variety of trends. The first trend, I would argue, attempted to institute gender apartheid and legitimize the practice through select prophetic traditions. The second trend strongly opposed gender segregation on the grounds that it was not the Prophet’s practice. The third trend was an attempt to keep women from mosques altogether. Since it was phrased as a “better than” formula, rather than as a normative principle, it did not evoke a strong response. However, it did provide a basis for scholars to prevent women’s access to any mosque. The interactive period saw the institution and proliferation of gender segregation in the mosque.

The second and third trends reflected further developments away from the Qur’an and the Prophet’s normative practice. For example, it could be argued that if there were several rows between women and the imam, women could not engage in enjoining good and forbidding evil together with men, as outlined in 9:71. The mosque is the center of the Muslim community’s religious, cultural, and intellectual activity, and, as such, it should be possible to conform to God’s commands within it. However, by placing women behind men and erecting physical barriers, it becomes very difficult for both women and men to follow these injunctions. Therefore, it can be argued that segregation is an impediment to carrying out the wilayâh of Muslims, as described in 9:71.

The importance of wilayâh is illustrated by an incident that took place during the reign of `Umar. In a sermon at the mosque, `Umar wished to limit the amount of money (mahr) paid to women upon marriage. A woman publicly disagreed with him, stating that he had no right to do so, for a specific Qur’anic verse (4:20) stated otherwise. He admitted that she was right and that he was wrong. His idea of reducing the bridal money represented an injustice to women – one that was openly contested and challenged by a woman of that time.
The situation of women in the mosque toward the end of the first quarter of the tenth century contrasts starkly with that of the “ideal” period. The descriptions of the mosques’ layout and the Qur’an indicate women’s complete access and participation. Perhaps the Qur’an’s importance lies not only in the historical information it contains, but also in the authority that Muslims give it: As it is the word of God, it has precedence over any other source. Perhaps in it lies hope for the future of women in the mosque.
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