Every social community reproduced by the functioning of institutions is imaginary, that is to say, it is based on the projection of individual existence into the weft of a collective narrative.

—ETIENNE BALIBAR, “The Nation Form”

3 • THE HAREM AS GENDERED SPACE AND THE SPATIAL REPRODUCTION OF GENDER

Irvin Cemil Schick

The word harem denotes both the female members of a household and the dedicated spatial enclosure in which they live. The practice of identifying people by the space wherein they dwell or work is not particularly unusual: one speaks of Highlanders, Europeans, shantytown dwellers, office workers, scullery maids, stable boys, and so on. But with the harem, it is not the case that a spatial term is simply used as a qualifier for certain individuals; instead, one and the same word denotes both a space and a category of people—and that is rather unusual. This singular fact offers an important hint about how to approach the harem conceptually, as this chapter does, in the context of recent theoretical work on the social construction of space and its relation to gender, as well as recent sociological and ethnographic research on spatiality as the lived experience of women in various societies.

As is well known, the Arabic root ḥ-r-m, from which harem is derived, conveys the notion of a taboo: it generally refers to prohibition, unlawfulness, veneration, sacredness, inviolability.¹ One word derived from this root is hurnat, which refers to something held holy and revered, something
which is one's duty to honor and defend, and in particular a man's wives and family. Another word derived from the same root is harim, which refers to those parts of a house or property whose use is forbidden to all but the rightful owner, such as a well. Certain classical Arabic dictionaries define it specifically as "the part of the house into which one enters and upon which the door is closed," and it is in this sense of the private quarters of a home that the women's apartments came to be known as the harem.

This root has thus provided Arabic speakers with an axis for the inside-outside dichotomy that is present in some form in virtually all human societies. The harem was contrasted to the central courtyard (wasat al-dar in the Maghrib, hawsh in the Mashriq) in which social activities involving visitors took place. In Turkish, these two spaces were known as harem (or haremlik) and selâmlik; in Persian, andarun and birun. But the presence of an inside-outside dichotomy and the overlay of gender upon that dichotomy are two very different matters. Contrary to received opinion, the relegation of Muslim women to the internal half of a bisected space is not clearly mandated by the Qur'an; indeed, although derivatives of the root b-r-m occur no fewer than eighty-three times there — referring to dietary laws, prohibitions during the pilgrimage, the holy months, and the sacred precincts of Mecca in which it is forbidden to kill — not once does a derivative refer to women or women's quarters. Rather, this principle is based upon a particular reading of the so-called Verse of the Veil, which says, in part: "And when you ask them [feminine] for something, ask from behind a hijab [veil/curtain]; that makes for greater purity for your hearts and for theirs." Although commentators usually agree that "them" in this verse refers specifically to the Prophet's wives, they have often generalized it to all Muslim women and have taken this verse to ordain that men and women must be spatially segregated. The Verse of the Veil is, incidentally, the origin of the word purdah — literally meaning curtain or veil in Persian — that denotes female seclusion in India.

The degree to which sexual segregation is fundamental to Islam has been the subject of some debate. For example, Fatima Mernissi has argued that the Prophet's home in Medina "created a space in which the distance between private life and public life was nullified, . . . in which the living quarters opened easily onto the mosque, and which thus played a decisive role in the lives of women and their relationship to politics." However, there are prophetic traditions (hadiths) that suggest that this practice did not last.
One, for instance, describes how the Prophet stretched a curtain between Safiyya and the people to emphasize that she was his wife; another relates how 'Aisha refused to admit the brother of her foster uncle into her apartment following the revelation of the Verse of the Veil, until the Prophet gave her leave on the grounds of kinship. Whatever the situation may have been at the beginning, it is known that sexual segregation was increased following the death of the Prophet, both under the leadership of Caliph 'Umar b. al-Khattab (r. 634–44 CE), known for his strict views concerning women, and as a result of the growing influence of peoples with whom the Arabs came into contact through military conquest.

I have just used the term sexual segregation. I did so as shorthand, for the sake of convenience, but the term is in fact inexact. As is evident from the hadith concerning 'Aisha and the brother of her foster uncle, the principle is not based on sex alone. Adult men and women are allowed to share a common space if they are forbidden (mahram) from marrying each other by virtue of kinship—based on consanguinity, colactation, marriage, or sexual union, as explicitly stipulated in the Qur'an. However, it is forbidden (barām) for men to enter a space occupied by women other than their kin. Thus, although the universalizing grand paradigm of "rigidly demarcated and mutually impenetrable territories of male versus female inhabi-
tancy" has been convincingly challenged by a number of recent studies, this much is nevertheless true: since most men and women are not each other's kin, the effective consequence of the Verse of the Veil in the way it was interpreted by later commentators was often the creation of two relatively distinct—if not necessarily reciprocally hermetic—subspaces, one occupied primarily by men, the other primarily by women.

Indeed, while the word harem is generally associated in the Western mind with polygyny, an image reinforced by accounts of the countless wives and concubines who supposedly peopled the households of men like the Abbasid Caliph Harun al-Rashid (r. 786–809 CE) and the Mughal emperor Akbar (r. 1556–1605 CE), the admittedly scanty quantitative data we have pertaining to the common people do not support this view. A demographic study conducted by Alan Duben and Gem Behar, for instance, has revealed that in late Ottoman Istanbul, only 2.29 percent of all married men were polygynous; among those, furthermore, the average number of wives was only 2.08. Other surveys likewise indicate that the proportion of polygynous households in North Africa and South Asia did not exceed 5 percent. Thus, the harem was much more likely to be a monogamous (albeit ex-
tended) family’s domestic quarters than a space dedicated to housing multitudes of women. In sub-Saharan Africa, on the other hand, although a much higher proportion of households (Muslim or not) are polygynous—sometimes over 40 percent—haremss are uncommon. There, communal ownership of land and the predominance of women in agricultural work make polygyny widespread, but seclusion impractical; by contrast, individual ownership of land and the predominance of male-dominated plow farming in Eurasia and North Africa make seclusion possible, but polygyny undesirable.14 This underscores the fact that the term harem primarily denotes a principle of spatial organization, a system of female seclusion, rather than just polygyny by another name.

Although boundaries could be permeable, and the activities in which men and women engaged within their respective subspaces were not necessarily mutually exclusive, these subspaces were not in any sense symmetric or similarly configured. An apt analogy might be an archipelago in the midst of an ocean, where the islands collectively represent the subspace devoted to women, and the sea the subspace devoted to men. The women’s subspace included harems, public baths, saints’ tombs and shrines, recreational areas, cemeteries, and so forth; movement between them was carefully regulated, most notably by the practice of veiling, which allowed women to remain ritually “inside” while physically “outside.” Although the space in which men circulated was also modulated—notably by homes, mosques, dervish lodges, workplaces, markets, baths, and the like—men were clearly far less restricted than women from the standpoint of spatial dynamics. And, of course, they were not monitored, nor required to veil themselves, when going from one place to another. In short, the subspaces pertaining to men and women were not only separate, they were also unequal.15

A question naturally follows: how did this bisected and fundamentally asymmetric spatial arrangement affect the lives of the men and women who inhabited it? More specifically, how did the dissimilarity of their respective subspaces influence the relationship between men and women? What impact did it have on their social differentiation—that is, on the construction and reproduction of gender? Feminist geographers have long stressed the mutually constitutive nature of space and gender, arguing that the differences in the ways men and women experience geography are not only a consequence of gender differences, but are also productive of them.16 Clearly, there is every justification to interpret the concept of geography in the broadest possible sense, encompassing spatial structures that are not
only natural but also artificial, not only physical but also imagined. When viewed in this context, it becomes evident that the harem system has provided a spatial basis for gender difference in many Muslim societies; and since spatial differentiation often coexists with power differentiation, it has as well been implicated in the production and perpetuation of power asymmetries along gender lines.

Let me now turn to the role of the harem in the spatial production and reproduction of gender. I draw my inspiration in part from Teresa de Lauretis, who coined the Foucauldian term technology of gender to describe the discursive instruments and strategies by means of which gender is socially constructed and reconstructed.\textsuperscript{17} In that sense, I will argue that the harem was and is a technology of gender. In other words, by conceptualizing it primarily as a socially constructed space, often more imagined than physical, I shall attempt to analyze the harem as a site of gender construction. More concretely, I will ask in what manner the spatial configuration called the harem taught female children how to be Muslim women and male children how to be Muslim men. I will not answer this question here, but I will at least make an effort to state the terms of the problem as explicitly as I can.

In taking this somewhat more abstract, not to say theoretical, point of view, I will occasionally venture into a discussion of the relationship between space and gender in non-Muslim societies. This is emphatically not to deny the specificity of the harem system and its cultural and religious ties to Islam. However, it is my belief that many past studies of the harem have suffered from a bit of particularism, and that a certain amount of conceptual cross-pollination would not be such a bad thing at this juncture. We all know, of course, that until frighteningly recent times, Western scholars insisted on viewing the rest of the world through highly Eurocentric lenses. Whether approached from a Christian point of view, as heathens and heretics in need of salvation; from a colonial point of view, as inferior races in need of stewardship and civilization; or from a developmentalist point of view, as primitive savages in need of social and technological modernization, people not of European descent were inevitably represented and analyzed not on their own terms but on those of the Western scholars. During the last three decades, a countercanon has taken shape that aims to overturn many of these preconceived notions and to adopt new paradigms more in line with the realities under study. Needless to say, this is a most welcome development. However, an unintended consequence has been the relative
neglect of the exciting theoretical innovations that have recently emerged in cultural theory. I am pleading for a small adjustment, not a whole pendulum swing, to give these innovations their due. A great deal of fascinating feminist analysis has been conducted in the fields of cultural and human geography; yet, although quite relevant to the problem at hand, applications to the institution of the harem have been few and far between.18

At the heart of the spatial constructionist approach lies the notion that space is more than either a neutral medium for social practices or their passive resultant; rather, it is and must be analyzed as “an active, constitutive, irreducible, necessary component in the social’s composition.”19 Space is constructed through social practices and bears the imprint of the power relations that characterize them; in turn, space inflects social practices, reproducing society and reaffirming the power relations that organize it. As Edward Soja elegantly put it: “The generative source for a materialist interpretation of spatiality is the recognition that spatiality is socially produced and, like society itself, exists in both substantial forms (concrete spatialities) and as a set of relations between individuals and groups, an ‘embodiment’ and medium of social life itself.”20

Likewise, Doreen Massey, a pioneer feminist geographer, suggests that the spatial should be viewed not as purely physical but in terms of the social relations it comprises: “Instead . . . of thinking of places as areas with boundaries around, they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings, but where a large proportion of those relations, experiences and understandings are constructed on a far larger scale than what we happen to define for that moment as the place itself.”21 And “spatial differentiation, geographical variety, is not just an outcome: it is integral to the reproduction of society and its dominant social relations.”22

This is, indeed, the key issue. Just as society is not homogeneous, just as the social is partitioned and stratified along the lines of class, gender, race, sexuality, generation, ethnicity, religion, and myriad other factors, so too is space. Moreover, “unequal social relations are both expressed and constituted through spatial differentiation.”23 Michel Foucault dubbed such spatial variegations “heterotopias,” arguing that they are defined by particular mechanisms of opening and closing, and change as society changes in ways that mirror its aspirations and fears.24 The analysis of heterotopias takes us a long way toward understanding the power structures underlying society, for power is intrinsically spatial just as spatiality is imbued with power.25

In an interesting study of place and transgression, Peter Stallybrass and
Allon White have written that "the grouping together of sites of discourse, the acceptance and rejection of place, with its laws and protocols and language, is . . . a coding of social identity." 26 The construction of the self, then, is at the same time the construction of a network of places which are constituted by and simultaneously reproduce social cleavages such as gender (e.g., domestic and public), race (e.g., suburb and inner city), or class (e.g., club and pub). More generally, according to Shirley Ardener, "societies have generated their own rules, culturally determined, for making boundaries on the ground, and have divided the social into spheres, levels and territories with invisible fences and platforms to be scaled by abstract ladders and crossed by intangible bridges with as much trepidation or exultation as on a plank over a raging torrent." 27

Spatial differentiation would have been innocent enough, and hardly worth our attention, if it were not for the enormous difficulty entailed in passing from one subspace to another, and if it were not for the fact that heterotopias provide metonymic road maps that greatly facilitate the oppression of one group of people by another. 28

This is precisely the topic of David Sibley's incisive analysis of the intimate connections between spatiality and the construction of "outsider groups." As this is a cornerstone of my argument, I am taking the liberty of quoting Sibley at length:

Space is implicated in the cultural construction of outsiders in two respects. First, marginal, residual spaces . . . confirm the outsider status of the minority. They may be places which are avoided by members of the dominant society because they appear threatening—a fear of the "other" becomes a fear of place . . . The labelling of places as threatening confirms the otherness of the minorities with whom the places are associated, and relegation to marginal spaces serves to amplify deviance . . . A second role for space in the constitution of the outsider group concerns the arrangement of spaces in the built environment. Spatial structures can strengthen or weaken social boundaries, thus accentuating social division or, conversely, rendering the excluded group less visible. In order to understand the role of space in this process, it is necessary to think about space in relation to the exercise of power. Space represents power in that control of space confers the power to exclude . . . [S]pace is an integral part of the outsider problem. 29

Although Sibley's main focus is the spatial manifestations of racial and sexual difference in Britain, the relevance of his analysis to the case of space
and gender in general, and to the harem system in particular, should be clear—if not positively striking. Indeed, since one of the main organizing principles in most societies is gender, it stands to reason that social differentiation along the lines of gender should influence the configuration of space, and that spatial structures should in turn produce and reproduce gender difference, as a pair of examples illustrates.

Consider first the case of the Renaissance architect and theoretician Leon Battista Alberti (1404–72), whose *On the Art of Building in Ten Books* has been immensely influential in European architectural theory. Referring to ancient Greece, he writes that it was "the custom . . . for certain parts of the house, where the women resided, to be out of bounds to all but closest kin. And certainly, to my mind, any place reserved for women ought to be treated as though dedicated to religion and chastity; also I would have the young girls and maidens allocated comfortable apartments, to relieve their delicate minds from the tedium of confinement. The matron should be accommodated most effectively where she could monitor what everyone in the house was doing. But in each case we should abide by whatever may be the ancestral custom." 30

Note that although Alberti drew his inspiration and legitimacy from antiquity, where the gynaeceum was the norm, he was writing during the fifteenth century. Replace "matron" with "eunuch," and this might just as well be an Orientalist account of a harem. More to the point, the residence as conceived by Alberti is meant not only to *house* women but to *define* them—that is, to transform sexual difference into gender difference. As Mark Wigley notes in his stimulating analysis of Alberti’s writings on family and gender, the passage above "participates in the production of the artifact 'woman' by high discourse." 31

As a second example, consider the emergence and development of suburbia in Britain during the nineteenth century. Prompted by a desire to spatially separate work and home, according to Robert Fishman’s *Bourgeois Utopias*, this process was heavily imbricated with changing conceptions of gender and resulted in the spatial isolation of women and their sequestration within the domestic sphere, as well as the domestication of reproductive labor and the elision of communal strategies for dealing with it. 32 Moreover, Fishman demonstrates that this process was driven by the evangelical movement, which set forth the ideal of a “truly Christian family” as a unit turned inward upon itself and held together by strong emotional ties managed by women, a safe haven from the abrasive daily existence of the
male provider. The contradictions between premodern London and "the Evangelical ideal of the family provided the final impetus for the unprecedented separation of the citizen's home from the city that is the essence of the suburban ideal."33 Reviewing this process, Don Mitchell concludes that "once the ideal had been established, and once the family had been remade to fit the landscape even as the landscape was remade to fit the new family, suburbia exploded, becoming, as it were, the only option for respectable middle-class life. And this respectability . . . was predicated on the sequestration of women in the domestic sphere. Definitions of femininity—and masculinity—were predicated on finding a spatial form that policed the divide between public and private spheres."34

The two examples I have just discussed show how female sequestration was theorized and practiced not in the Muslim world, but in Christian Europe. Let me emphasize once again that I am not for a moment losing sight of the specificity of the Islamic context. The issue I am struggling to address is simply this: we know that the institution of the harem exhibits great variability across both history and geography. Is there anything to be learned from analyses of other gendered constructions of space to help us explain this variability?

For example, Mitchell mentions "the divide between public and private spheres," and this is one of the frameworks within which the harem has been studied. There is in fact good reason to think of the dichotomous spatial arrangement of harem and selâmlık (or andarun and birun) as representative of a private/public cleavage: after all, the harem or andarun was an inner sanctuary for both male and female members of the household, while the selâmlık or birun was a public stage for welcoming and entertaining guests of both sexes. At the same time, as demonstrated in several studies, women routinely engaged in social, economic, and even political activities from behind harem walls, suggesting that the word private in the sense commonly given it in the Western context today fails to capture the full range of experiences in which women participated there.35

But perhaps it is Western ideas of private and public that need revision, as already argued by several scholars. For instance, Nancy Duncan points out that although the distinction between these two domains is deeply rooted in culture and enshrined in the law, "it is nevertheless unstable and often problematically conflated with related distinctions such as that between domestic or familial autonomy and public spheres."36 Likewise, Lynn Staeheli notes that "there is no necessary reason why actions that are in-
tended to affect broad economic, social, or political relations must be taken in public spaces," and shows that alternative spatial configurations have emerged, blurring the traditional boundaries between public and private: "The shifting constructions of public and private become something to be explained, rather than dismissed."37 Never mind how we might feel about it, the received idea that the public sphere is masculine, worldly, and important, and the private sphere feminine, local, and trivial is simply not sustainable when all the empirical evidence is weighed.

The private/public dichotomy is far from a historical invariant, and the role of spatial practices and representations in its development deserves careful scrutiny. Wigley writes that in the centuries following Alberti's theorization of gendered space, a new sense of privacy was gradually produced... by redefining the spaces of the house into a complex order of layered spaces and subdivisions of spaces that map a social order by literally drawing the lines between hierarchies of propriety... A new kind of space emerged in which distance is no longer the link between two visible objects in space but is the product of a mask whose surface is scrutinized for clues about what lies beyond it but can never simply be seen... Architecture was used to effect it as the agent of a new kind of modesty and in so doing played an active part in the constitution of the private subject. It clothed the body in a way that redefined it, at once constructing the body as dangerous and containing the threat.38

Some noteworthy parallels exist here between aspects of spatial differentiation in Europe and the concentric spatial configuration (prevalent in many Muslim societies) that constructs the harem as the center—sometimes feminine, and sometimes sacred.39 The system of embedded courtyards at the Topkapı Palace described by Janeen Lad in this volume is a good example of such a concentric spatial configuration.

Here again, spatial differentiation is not innocent. As Duncan points out: "The public/private dichotomy (both the political and spatial dimensions) is frequently employed to construct, control, discipline, confine, exclude and suppress gender and sexual difference preserving traditional patriarchal and heterosexist power structures."40

As the above makes clear, the role of the body in the conceptualization of private and public is quite central to the argument. Indeed, Don Mitchell lays it out very eloquently: "Social space is experienced bodily. It follows,
then, that the production of space . . . at the same time serves to produce certain kinds of bodies. Such an abstract idea makes sense, however, only if we understand ‘bodies’ to be both the physical embodiment of particular people, and a culturally constructed set of ideas and ideals about what is bodily proper for men and women. That is to say, there is an intimate relationship between the social construction (and policing) of space, the cultural construction (and policing) of gender, and the ways we comport ourselves, the experiences we have, and, at least to some degree, the very morphology of our physical bodies.”41

And the effect goes both ways. John Allen writes that “it is the vast array of spatial practices, from the routine walks and rhythms which endow a place with meaning to the coded gestures, styles and mannerisms which prescribe a certain use for it, that puts both us and power in place.”42 When we imagine space as socially constructed, therefore, we must not think only of ideas, signs, and symbols; space is constructed also through bodily practices, and, needless to say, space in turn conditions bodily practices. At least for contemporary societies and perhaps for historical ones as well, this suggests a promising approach to analyzing the harem as a site of production and reproduction of gender.

A nice example of this approach, though in a Hindu rather than a Muslim context, is the ethnographic work of Seemanthini Niranjana, which focuses on “the spatial axis underlying everyday practices, as well as societal or group reproduction,” and on “the ‘acts’ within which women define their lives and the arenas, events or qualities that mark bodies as female.”43 Niranjana concludes that: “Perceptions of and injunctions surrounding female bodies and female morality . . . are central to the negotiation of space, specifying how identities are consolidated and lived in the course of marking the boundaries of movement and the ‘limits’ of women’s honour . . . [A] very strong spatial narrative governed the lives of people . . . [M]uch of what was said of femininity, sexualization and the female body, as well as the activities of women, was all embodied in this idiom . . . [T]he body, and the modes in which it inhabits space, itself comes to be deployed as a medium through which the ‘female’ is constituted.”44

Closer to home, Pierre Bourdieu’s classic study of the Kabyle house surely needs no introduction.45 Though it has been used and abused in more ways than one cares to remember, generalized beyond the bounds of reason and common sense, and criticized for causes both valid and not,46 this essay was pathbreaking in its attention to the ways in which systems
of bodily practices and "incorporated dispositions"—what Bourdieu would later call *habitus*⁴⁷—for related to habitus. He paid special attention to the sexualization and gendering of certain elements of the Kabyle house, and how they were correlated with the practices of the men and women who lived there.

More recently, Traki Zannad Bouchrara conducted ethnographic fieldwork among Tunisian townswomen (*beldia*), in which she carefully choreographed their corporal dynamics within the traditional home as compared to male corporal dynamics in the public sphere. Noting that "there exists between the human body and urban space a dialectic that, beyond signifying forms, beyond the palpable and the observable, also features a dimension that has the quality of the signified and the symbolic,"⁴⁸ she describes a certain complementarity and skew-symmetry—which she characterizes as driven by centrifugal and centripetal forces—between the private and public spaces.

Abdessamad Dialmy, for his part, studied spatial and sexual practices in Morocco. Noting that "built space plays the role of the signifier of a reality of a non-spatial nature," he set forth four modes of relationship between space and sexuality—symbolic, lexical, territorial, and functional—and conducted a field survey focusing on the latter two. As he points out: "The inferior condition of woman is written and signified by the nature and placement of the space which is reserved for her. The same goes for 'male domination,' which is likewise transcribed by the superiority of the masculine places."⁴⁹

There is a rich and growing literature concerning the ways in which women have historically experienced space, and do so today.⁵⁰ This literature provides both inspiration and practical hints for studying the harem as a site of gender construction and reproduction.

In conclusion, and as unlikely as the connection between the subject of this volume and the political situation in the world today may seem, we may draw upon the ongoing debates concerning seclusion and veiling within the Islamist political movement—both in Muslim countries and in the Islamic diasporas in the West—to suggest that this focus of debate can and must be viewed as an aspect of spatial politics, as a contest over the restructuring of space. Discussing radical Islamist movements such as FIS (Front Islamique du Salut, or Islamic Salvation Front) in Algeria, Dialmy argues:

The resurgence of Islam as a factor of spatial organization returns to the fore the territorial mode as a weapon of combat in the quest for identity
... The Islamist movement cannot remain silent or indifferent before the problematic of space, and particularly that of women's consumption of public space. But can it, despite the progress of modernity, reclaim sexual segregation as a fundamental principle for the social organization of space? ... The commingling of the sexes, which can no longer be circumvented, will henceforth be undermined by the veil and by the organized separation of the sexes at the university, on the beaches, in the bus.51

Indeed, as Massey writes: "Particular ways of thinking about space and place are tied up with ... particular social constructions of gender relations ... [C]halling certain of the ways in which space and place are currently conceptualized implies also, indeed necessitates, challenging the currently dominant form of gender definitions and gender relations."52

In sum, like any social institution, the harem is in essence a representation; and like the history of any social institution, its history is largely that of its representation. But representations of the harem have been multiple and often contradictory, its portrayal ranging from a microcosm of Oriental despotism and the locus of phallocratic oppression, on the one hand, to a space of female autonomy in which Muslim women are able to engage in social, economic, and even political activities unhindered by male domination, on the other hand. Rather than searching for the true essence of the harem in religious texts or historical practices, it may be more fruitful to conceptualize it primarily as a socially constructed space, often more imagined than physical, and to focus on how it has functioned to produce and reproduce gender. Feminist geographers have long stressed the mutually constitutive nature of space and gender, arguing that the differences in the ways men and women experience geography are not only a consequence of gender differences, but are also productive of them. Segregation reproduces itself, as spaces of otherness become not only repositories of others, but producers of alterity as well. At the same time, this necessarily means that the harem is also a site of resistance; indeed, the ongoing political struggle over veiling and seclusion can be viewed as an aspect of spatial politics, a contest over the restructuring of space.
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