

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Temporal Nonconformity

Being There Together as *Khwajasara* in a Time of One's Own

“Here in Pakistan, we say *khwajasara*,” Kajol, an office clerk, told me, sitting upright in the relative comfort and safety of the quarters of a non-governmental organization she worked for, walled off and tucked away in a sleepy middle-class neighborhood of Lahore. “We become *khwajasara* when a spirit, called *murid*, enters us,” she continued, placing her hand gently on her chest. “Once *murid* is within oneself, one feels very special about oneself and then one can consider oneself *khwajasara*” (Hamzić 2016, 156; Hamzić 2019, 49).¹ We become, when, once, then . . . These markers of an identitary process, of being “initiated into a temporal life of language” (Butler 1997, 2), and community, meant then, for Kajol—as they mean still and as they had meant before for members of her gender-nonconforming collective—a dis/orienting experience transgressing the sedimented notions of linearity and progress in time. Christian but partaking in *khwajasara* cosmology (which was, in turn, firmly located within the larger, popular Punjabi, Indic, and Muslim hieropraxis), born into a “low caste,” yet resituated within *khwajasara*’s own kinship system and a whirlwind of recent legal and civil society developments, Kajol was living her life within and between different temporalities. Having a spirit within herself, a community—often described as “traditional” in contradistinction with the emergent trans and queer senses of the self in Pakistan—and a “respectable” job, she embodied an increasingly complex web of temporal

1 directions, which characterize contemporary *khwajasara* lifeworlds, but
 2 are also, as we shall see, seemingly inextricable from *khwajasara* self-
 3 hood across time.

4 While this communal designation, also transliterated as *khwaja sira*
 5 or *khawaja sira*, of a feminine-presenting, gender-binary-defying South
 6 Asian subjectivity—more widely known as *hijra* (pl. *hijre*)—is nowadays
 7 peculiar to Pakistan, it conjures up and re/memorializes a much longer
 8 and wider Muslim and subcontinental past. *Khwajasara* of today claim an
 9 etiological link with *khwājasarā*’ or *khwājasarā*’i of yore, who were often
 10 designated male at birth but then castrated in their youth before being
 11 sold into Muslim imperial or other elite service. ² As their Persian title
 12 suggests, *khwājasarā*’ ordinarily, though not exclusively, served as guard-
 13 ians of the secluded women’s quarters (*zanāna*) at the Mughal and other
 14 South Asian courts. Twenty-first-century Pakistani *khwajasara* see this
 15 as their own past. As Bindiya Rana, a Karachi-based *khwajasara* leader,
 16 once told me, “We even have certain documents of our *khwajasara* ances-
 17 tors, when they received some tip or a reward from the Mughal emperor”
 18 (Hamzić 2016, 162). However, such claims have been largely dismissed
 19 as tenuous, not least because of the coexistence of elite—if oft troubled
 20 and derided for their “lack of manliness”—*khwājasarā*’ and the suppos-
 21 edly “less dignified” *hijrā* subjectivity throughout much of the eighteenth
 22 and nineteenth centuries, the latter ostensibly more resembling the con-
 23 temporary *hijre*, including Pakistani *khwajasara* (Hinchy 2013, 8; Hinchy
 24 2014, 277; Hinchy 2019, 23, 28, 148, 260).

25 In a similar manner, *khwajasara*’s pursuits of their own presents and
 26 futures are increasingly threatened by the enterprising gaze of neoliberal
 27 futurism (Pamment 2019b, 141–51; Mokhtar 2020) as well as neocon-
 28 servative “rescue” operations, seeking to extirpate *khwajasara* from their
 29 larger networks of solidarity and sociality, labeled by such operations as
 30 “lesbian, gay, and bisexual persons whose claim of rights has deeply di-
 31 vided societies” (Farhat et al. 2020, 31). Each relying on a crude, universal-
 32 izing use of transgender, albeit for different purposes, these disciplining
 33 attempts espouse what Elizabeth Freeman (2010, xxii, 3) has referred to
 34 as “chrononormativity,” or the hegemonic use of time to organize indi-
 35 vidual and collective human bodies toward certain elite goals, be it late
 36 capitalist “maximum productivity” or a forcibly homogenous time of the
 37 nation-state. The result is a *stretch* in *khwajasara*’s own temporal and com-
 38 munal practices, a disorienting demand in language, social and political
 39 life to conform to either the insipid nationalized notions of respectability

(*sharafat*) or to what Aniruddha Dutta and Raina Roy (2014) described as “the expanding category of transgender” in South Asia (320), in need of decolonization and dissent (Dutta 2019, 2).³

Such a stretch can cause damage—it can *distemporalize*. In a different context, Safet HadžiMuhamedović and I (HadžiMuhamedović and Hamzić 2019) have described distemporalization as a project of denial of time—a denial of historicity, futurity, or change, which is a significant element of various constructions of “otherness.” We have also taken distemporality to signify a refusal of, and intervention into, qualitatively specific temporal lifeworlds, such as that of *khwajasara*. And, as with the conscription into a politics of *sharafat* or a commodified, docile, “recolonizing” notion of transgender, such projects usually include a demand for a retemporalization into another “world,” be it of globalized gender regimes or an illusory “respectable” Pakistan.⁴

This chapter engages the temporality of *khwajasara* communal experience by examining not only the processes of distemporalization but also a variety of ways in which this Pakistani gender-nonconforming subjectivity has shared in the larger South Asian and Muslim memories and performance of gender and sexuality, while forging alongside a space and a time of their own. I have sought elsewhere (Hamzić 2019) to account for the specifically spatial aspects of *khwajasara* political, social, familial, and spiritual lives, focusing on *thereness*—a property of dwelling with kindred souls—such lives would entail. But, as I now argue, being there together for *khwajasara* has also meant a great deal of idiosyncratic, multidirectional time-making—oriented toward the pasts, the presents, the futures, and sometimes altogether different temporalities—often at odds with the time-making in their wider sociopolitical environments. This chapter revisits several tell-tale instances of such temporal diversity and nonconformity, asking how those relate to *khwajasara* knowledge-production about the self and the world in *thereness* and, also, in what ways they could contribute to the growing concern with temporality in critical subjectivity studies.

First, I turn to *khwājasarā*’ and *hijrā* historical subjectivities to account for the distemporalizing effects as well as some potentially productive tensions between present-day *khwajasara* and *hijra* views of the(ir) past and those of the(ir) historians. One needs to question whom such temporal interventions are *for* and how they travel, in meaning and intent, in a historical “postness” (Freeman 2010, xiv) of empire, colonial modernity, and Orientalism, or when rendered into a history of the present—a critical endeavor

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

1 that recognizes as futile any (empiricist) struggle to hold the meaning of
 2 gender and sexuality in place (Scott 2011, 1–22). Second, I briefly exam-
 3 ine a site of *khwajasara*'s present/future-making. At this site, *khwajasara*
 4 are literally made part of another, virtual world, but find ways to disrupt
 5 or “rewire” such transformation. There, as Omar Kasmani (2021) avers,
 6 an “ongoing futuring” (99) takes place, in which “not only locally specific
 7 meanings around gender variability are being pushed out and projected
 8 anew” (98) but “a register of new world making” (107) emerges, “making
 9 temporality a key character in this process” (106).⁵ Third, based on diver-
 10 gent *khwajasara* experiences of temporality and distemporalization as well
 11 as a range of decolonial queer, Black and trans/feminist *timely* studies, I
 12 ask how time matters differently in the postcolony.⁶ Or, more concretely,
 13 how do the selfhoods and bodies that matter and churn Pakistan's desires
 14 travel through multiple communal, national, and colonially induced for-
 15 mations of time? And what does such interruptive time traveling *do* to
 16 their senses of being present as they are?

17
 18
 19 PRESENTING THE PASTON BEING
 20 “BACK IN THE DAY”

21
 22 So many *khwajasara* stories of the(ir) past begin with an indeterminate
 23 time that is applied as a medicament to heal history's wounds (Freeman
 24 2010, 7), inflicted through generations on their body and soul. “Back in the
 25 day, only *khwajasara* knew what it meant to have good manners,” Saima
 26 told me, sitting among her *khwajasara* disciples (*chele*) in their lower-class
 27 household (*dera*) in Lahore. She recounted such time as a proof of respect
 28 (*izzat*) that *khwajasara* had enjoyed and as a didactic device, which was
 29 supposed to teach her young *chele* the value of good manners. “In Mughal
 30 times,” she continued, “*khwajasara* used to serve at the imperial courts,
 31 to educate people, to give them good manners, to teach them how to be
 32 well-behaved.” But, Saima sighed, turning to her *chele*: “Unfortunately,
 33 nowadays, *khwajasara* are ill mannered. They can barely help themselves,
 34 let alone teach the others” (Hamzić 2016, 280; Hamzić 2019, 36). Recalling
 35 these Mughal times (*Mughalan da wela*) was not so much about locat-
 36 ing societal *izzat* into the precise era of the Mughal Empire (1526–1540,
 37 1555–1857) as it was about recounting a Muslim and Indic spacetime *be-*
 38 *fore* colonialism and the violent dispossession of the historical subject
 39 positions (*khwājasarā*, *hijrā*) to which Saima and the other *khwajasara*

and *hijre* trace their communal histories. Or, as Bindiya Rana explained to me, “Once the white men came to India,” its previous rulers were “forced to take customs of the white men, and to receive all sorts of orders from them.” While previously “considered to be closer to God because they were a mixture of both genders,” in the colonial period “*khwajasara* were less and less sought after and they eventually had to [abandon Muslim elite service and] go and live among themselves” (Hamzić 2016, 159).

Rather than romanticizing or fixating on an imperial Muslim polity, Saima and Bindiya Rana’s stories were specifically told against the tides of the “official” histories that had relegated *khwajasara* and other gender-nonconforming subjectivities into a liminal, transhistorical space. Before the recent spike in *khwājasarā*’ and *hijrā* historiographies, which this chapter briefly considers, academic literature on *khwajasara* and *hijre* had variously described them as “hermaphrodite prostitutes,” “sex-perverted,” “sexo-aesthetic inverts coupled with homosexual habits” or even “abominable aberrations.”⁷ These studies carried on the same scorn for sexual and gender nonconformity that European writers since the eighteenth century accorded to South Asian *hijrā* and (at first to a lesser extent to) *khwājasarā*’ subject positions. And, to be sure, they mirrored the abuse and ridicule that so many *khwajasara* and *hijre* continued to experience in their immediate surroundings. To summon a different communal past meant to preserve a sense of self-dignity and *izzat*, which did not simply conform to the external expectations of *sharafat*. After all, quite a few of Saima’s *chele* engaged, among other professions, in sex work as well as kindergarten education (both within the confines of their *dera*), a practice that hardly squared with more mainstream, middle-class notions of respectability. Rather, for Saima and Bindiya Rana, “back in the day” was a time of their own, out of sync (Rao 2020, 27) with (post)colonial time, presenting and futuring an idiosyncratic decolonial register of *izzat* suffused with regenerative and didactic properties.

Besides, as much as their dwelling together—as kinfolk, as coworkers, and as a spiritual community—equipped *khwajasara* with exploratory senses of the subject (Hamzić 2019), it also provided for a plural understanding of the(ir) past. It included, for example, a sense of a *prenatal* temporality. Thus, Kajol told me, “If certain matters in the mother’s womb are mixed in a particular way, there comes a girl; with some other mixtures, a boy comes out. And with another special mixture, in which a spirit (*murid*) is involved, *khwajasara* emerges.” A *murid*’s intercession may have also made possible what Bindiya Rana explained as the link between a *khwajasara*’s

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

1 communal seniority—as a *bare* or *bare-bare guru* to other *khwajasara*—
 2 and her longevity. Some of the highly ranked *khwajasara*, she said to me,
 3 were “between 105 and 120 years of age” (Hamzić 2016, 281).

4 An *originatory* temporality was also often invoked, which among Paki-
 5 stani *khwajasara* was linked to the ancient Indian princess of an uncertain
 6 period, called Mainandi. As Kajol recalled:

7 It all started in India. It started with Mainandi. Mainandi was born
 8 *khwajasara*. A man came up to her and said, “Mainandi, you are so
 9 graceful. Can I be like you?” She said, “No! Please ask forgiveness from
 10 God! You cannot be *khwajasara*. You are *zenana*.” But he went to the
 11 field of sugarcanes and he sliced off one sugarcane. He sharpened it
 12 and, with it, he emasculated himself. Then he went back to Mainandi
 13 and said, “Look, I’m like you now! Am I not *khwajasara*?” But Main-
 14 andi was so depressed that she asked God for forgiveness and to open
 15 the earth beneath her. So, a crack appeared beneath her feet and swal-
 16 lowed her (160).⁸

17 This temporality comes forth not only as a link with an Indic past, but
 18 also as a long-time marker of difference in *khwajasara* cosmology and
 19 communities between those who are said to be born intersex those who
 20 are not but undergo ritual emasculation (*nirban*) and those who “imitate
 21 *khwajasara*” (*zenana*), even though such subdivisions are sometimes
 22 porous and overlapping (Pamment 2019a, 299). And it serves to remind
 23 *khwajasara* of the beauty of *nirban*, an initiation into the *khwajasara*
 24 lineage and a bodily, spiritual, and temporal re/turn. As Neeli Rana, a
 25 Lahore-based *khwajasara* leader, told me, “When a *khwajasara* becomes
 26 *nirban*, she sometimes takes Mainandi’s name. Because, once you become
 27 *nirban*, you also become very beautiful” (Hamzić 2016, 160). The special
 28 charisma (*baraka*) that *khwajasara* were widely seen to possess, endow-
 29 ing them with the powers to bless and curse, could also be linked to this
 30 originatory event and Mainandi’s intercession.

31 Finally, some Muslim *khwajasara* who had made pilgrimage to Mecca
 32 and Medina fondly recalled meeting *aghāwāt* there, whose Arabo-Turkic
 33 honorific suggests that they were—just like the historical *khwājasarā*⁹—
 34 designated male at birth but then castrated in their youth, and who, because
 35 of their unique *baraka*, served as the guardians of the tomb of Prophet
 36 Muḥammad in Medina as well as at the Great Mosque of Mecca, since
 37 about the mid-twelfth century (Marmon 1995, 31–112). While such meet-
 38 ings indeed could have taken place in or around these sanctuaries, of even
 39

greater importance is that *khwajasara* pilgrims thought *aghawāt* “to be just like themselves” and having a common gender and spiritual destiny, thereby completing “a trans-historical cycle of gender-variant thereness, across [the] spaces and times” (Hamzić 2019, 51) of Islamicate societies.⁹ And it is precisely within those societies that *aghawāt* of yore—some tellingly, of known South Asian origin (Lal 2018, 98)—built their senses of communal belonging and temporality.

Histories of Islamicate societies account for a complex web of genders and sexualities, or rather bodily characteristics, acts, and proclivities that are diversely read—and misread—as identitary patterns, communal practices, and distinct ways of being-in-the-world. *Aghawāt* and *khwājasarā* are but two out of myriad terms of art used in Muslim historical sources to record the affairs of castrated individuals—clumsily lumped together and described as “eunuchs” in most European accounts and translations—whose rise to prominence was often linked to a form of elite servitude. The popular euphemisms included a reference to bodily difference (such as *khiṣyān*, “the castrated ones”); types of military or domestic service (*khuddām*, *ṭawāshiyā*); and most commonly, honorifics (*aghawāt*, “sirs, lords”) (Hamzić 2019, 36–7). In the Delhi Sultanate (1206–1526), terms such as *majbūb* were used both “technically,” to connote “total” as opposed to “partial” penectomy, and as an insult (Jackson 1999, 73). In the Mughal Empire, particular professions, such as *nāẓir* (“superintendent”) or, indeed, *khwājasarā* (“master of the palace,” or more precisely, of the secluded *zanāna*), came to be equivalent with the subjectivity of castrated individuals, who often hailed from as far away as Abyssinia (Hamzić 2019, 36, 38; Bano 2009, 418).

Despite their high office, distinct *baraka* and awe (*hayba*) they reportedly commanded, these castrated individuals formed their own societies and networks of kinship and patronage—partly, no doubt, in search for a repose from outward hostilities, which often stemmed from their perceived bodily and behavioral difference. Examples of such hostilities abound, including distinct gender and sexual connotations. Thus, the terse Ḍiṣyā’ al-Din Barani, in his *Tāriḳh-i Firūzshāhi* (1860–1862 [1357]), regaled in calling his nemesis Kafur all sorts of names, from “mutilated” (*nāqṣī*) to “penetrated” (*mābūnī*), referring to Kafur’s alleged sexual relationship with the Delhi Sultanate ruler, ‘Ala’ al-Din Khalji, as “severed at the front, torn at the back” (*pīsh barīde*, *pas darīde*) (369, 391; Sarkar 2013, 50). In a similar manner, the *Mir’āt-i-Sikandarī* (Sikandar b. Muḥammad 1889 [c.1611]), recounted the abuse the independent sultan of Gujarat hurled

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

1 at Ḥujjat-ul-Mulk, his castrated ennobled subject: “O fool, what shall I
 2 say to you? If you were a man, I would have reviled you by calling you
 3 a coward; if you were a woman, I would have called you unchaste. You
 4 are neither man nor woman, but the bad qualities of both are present in
 5 you” (126). A few years earlier, envious of the Mughal *khwājasarā*’ I’timad
 6 Khan’s many successes, ‘Abd al-Qadir Bada’uni (1986 [1595]) resorted to
 7 a less direct form of critique, quoting in his *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh* an
 8 alleged *ḥadīth* against the counsel of women, the rule of boys, and the
 9 management of *khwājasarā*’ (2:63–64). Bada’uni’s gender bias is evident
 10 throughout his writings; for instance, in the *Najāṭ al-rashīd* (1972 [1581]),
 11 he warned “that men should refrain from dressing up like women and vice
 12 versa” (Majid 2010–2011, 250).

13 Castrated ennobled imperial servants were often—though not always—
 14 accused of “effeminacy,” which made them more recluse and possibly
 15 closer to other gender-nonconforming palace dwellers, such as “sober
 16 and active women”—as they are referred to in the *Ā’in-i Akbarī* (Abu’l
 17 Faḏl 1873 [c.1592–1602], 1:46–7)—who succeeded *khwājasarā*’ as inner
 18 guardians of the Mughal *zanāna*. They were, like them, often of foreign
 19 origin and seen as “manly” because of their refusal to veil and for being
 20 “highly skilled in the management of the bow and other arms” (Manucci
 21 1907 [c. 1708], 2:332). The term Muslim historical sources often used was
 22 “the effeminate” (Arabic: *mukhannath*, Persian: *mukhannaṣ*), which has
 23 a long and complex social and theological history and the same Arabic
 24 trilateral root *kh-n-th* found in the legal term *khunthā*, denoting an inter-
 25 sex person.¹⁰ For example, in the Delhi Sultanate, Minhaj al-Siraj Juzjani
 26 (1963–1964 [c.1259–1260]) identified the *mukhannaṣān* in his *Tabaqāt-i*
 27 *Nāṣirī* as one of social ills causing the sultan to become “entirely enslaved
 28 by dissipation and debauchery” (1:457). The term evidently did not apply
 29 solely to castrated individuals, but it *was* used against them, indicating
 30 that the boundaries between the “severed” (*khāṣī*) and “born that way”
 31 *aghāwāt*, *khwājasarā*’ and other gender-nonconforming subjectivities were
 32 not always so clear-cut. Indeed, in 1621, Emperor Jahangir (1980 [1627])
 33 recorded in his *Tūzūk-i Jahāngīrī* the arrival of castrated individuals who
 34 were gifted to him, noting that “one of these was a *khunṣa*, having both
 35 the male organ and the private parts of a woman” (373).¹¹

36 It is, of course, not possible to fully ascertain the effects of the mani-
 37 fold forms of institutionalized violence and sexual and gender bias on
 38 *khwājasarā*’ subjectivity formation. The available accounts of *khwājasarā*’
 39 were chiefly penned by elite men, who were sometimes their enemies or

who envied their beauty, education, wealth, or other perceived privileges. One exception is Bakhtawar Khan, a prominent *khwājasarā*' and historian at Emperor Aurangzeb's court, who penned such works as *Ā'ina-ye bakht*, *Bayāz*, *Riāz al-awliā*' and—most famously—the *Mir'āt al-ālam*, completed in 1667–1668. The *Mir'āt*'s preface recounts how fond the author was of historical studies, always wanting to write one, while the conclusion relates to various poets, including the author. But one cannot assume a deeper sense of the self from this or the other, largely impersonal, Bakhtawar Khan's works (1979 [1667–1668]; Elliott 1877, 7:145–65). It is, however, possible, that *some khwājasarā*' responded to the demands of an elite sense of propriety by assuming less ambiguous masculine positionalities. Thus, Jessica Hinchy (2018), who studied *khwājasarā*' in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Awadh, argues that "*khwāja-sarā*'i in Awadh displayed aspects of dominant forms of elite masculinity in order to secure the loyalty of followers, suggesting that androgyny was not the only interpretation" (151) of their gender identity, at least as far as Awadh is concerned.

As an elite subjectivity, *khwājasarā*' still left a much more indelible mark in Muslim historical sources than the *hijrā* subject position, which chiefly appeared elsewhere and more recently, that is, in the accounts of late-eighteenth-century European travelers, the East India Company's officials and, later, colonial administrators, medical doctors, and ethnologists (Hinchy 2019, 28–30). My purpose here is not to rehearse such encounters, or the language used to describe people who, at first, appeared to the European observer as "human beings called hermaphrodites," wearing "the habit of a female and the turban of a man." The same observer, then, in a manner typical for such accounts, was compelled "to examine some of these people: my visit was short, and the objects disgusting" (Forbes 1834, 1:359). Suffice it to say that such early colonial "knowledge" of the lower-class *hijrā* subject position gradually became the basis for similarly worded local accounts. Thus, a typical description in English, penned by Khan Bahadur Fazalullah Lutfullah Faridi (1899), alleged that *hijrā* communities "feign themselves women and some of them devote their lives to the practice of sodomy and gain their living by it" (21). This was in sharp contrast with the few remaining earlier non-European sources, such as the eighteenth-century legal documents, issued on behalf of Śahu I, the ruler of the Maratha Empire, which referred respectfully to its *hijrā* (Marathi: *hijḍā*) community and bestowed on it specific revenues and rights (Preston 1987).

1 Instead of returning, as it is repeatedly done, to the sites of colonial
 2 knowledge-production, I find it potentially more productive to engage
 3 with the recent surge in historical *hijrā* and *khwājasarā*' studies, which in
 4 a nutshell, challenge present-day *khwajasara* claims of a common ances-
 5 try with the historical *khwājasarā*'. The argument goes that because the
 6 historical *khwājasarā*' "presented themselves as masculine, [...] in con-
 7 trast to femininely dressed" historical *hijrā* communities (Hinchy 2019,
 8 23), the two "categories should not be conflated" (Hinchy 2013, 8). They
 9 performed "distinct social roles in the eighteenth and nineteenth centu-
 10 ries" (Hinchy 2014, 278) and, while the *hijrā* subject position continued
 11 its existence—though not without major legal and economic challenges—
 12 into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, *khwājasarā*' "did not sur-
 13 vive the historical transformations of colonial modernity in South Asia"
 14 (Hinchy 2018, 166).

15 Here, the challenge is to resist the seductive unidirectional meaning-
 16 making in the colonial archive and to question *how*—as Anjali Arondekar
 17 (2009) states—it "has emerged as *the* register of epistemic arrangements"
 18 (2), with a modest hope to propose, instead, "a different kind of archival
 19 romance" (1)—one that is cognizant of *any* archive's "fiction effects (the
 20 archive as a system of representation) alongside its truth effects (the ar-
 21 chive as material with 'real' consequences)" (4). I respond to this challenge
 22 by offering but a single insurrectionary vignette that *might* disrupt the
 23 logics of the (colonial/archival) extinction of *khwājasarā*'.

24 If, as it is often claimed, the gradual but certain decline in elite patronage
 25 forced *khwājasarā*' to disappear "into narrow alleys and streets of Delhi"
 26 (Lal 1988, 198) and other urban centers, where did they end up? What were
 27 their new sources of subsistence? Whom did they befriend and work with?
 28 One possible clue lies in Dargah Quli Khan's *Muraqqa' -i Dihli*, a riveting
 29 diary of his stay in Delhi from June 1738 to July 1741. Although in noble
 30 service, he quickly became an enthusiastic and enterprising chronicler of
 31 the city's life, across classes and professions, including its many entertain-
 32 ers. And it is there—among vivid descriptions of sex workers, dancers,
 33 mimics, and musicians—that the reader finds Taqi, a castrated individual,
 34 who is "a personal favorite of the Padishah and has access to His Majes-
 35 ty's private chambers," but who keeps a "gardenlike home" in the city in
 36 which, "like flowers of many colors, young men are always present." Most
 37 tellingly, "wherever there is a boy who is unhappy with the male apparel,
 38 Taqi's searching eyes spot him," and "wherever Taqi sees a soft and tender
 39 boy, the gardens envy such a discovery." Taqi, Dargah Quli Khan concludes,

“is the master and patron of all sorts of catamites because they know that Taqi has carried this art to new heights”; and Taqi is also, “the leader of all the castrated ones, who feel proud to be Taqi’s disciples” (Dargah Quli Khan 1993 [1738–1741], 97–98; Dargah Quli Khan 1989 [1738–1741], 155).

Could this be a rare account of a *khwājasarā*’ settling in a *hijrā* environment, transgressing the former boundaries of class and profession? Could it signal the way at least some *khwājasarā*’ gradually merged with the *hijrā* and other sexually and gender-nonconforming lifeworlds, rather than disappearing into oblivion? Taqi’s life story, traversing the spaces and subjectivities of an embattled and impoverished ruling class and those of a buzzing metropole, resonates with Bindiya Rana’s claim that, due to the major “social changes, *khwajasara* were less and less sought after and they eventually had to go and live among themselves. Before they used to live in the palaces; now, they were living in their own dwellings” (Hamzić 2016, 159). Such communal re/memorializations, after and in spite of systemic distemporalization, call for what Lisa Lowe (2015) has termed “history hesitant.” In historical research, she writes, “hesitation may provide a space, a different temporality, so that we may [...] reckon with the connections that could have been but were lost and are thus not yet” (98). Or, sometimes, such connections persist and they *are*, albeit within communal spaces and time-keeping practices that quietly resist hegemonic temporalities and their academic agents.

TRANS ON THE MOVE AND *KHWAJASARA*’S
WORLDING OF TIME

Having briefly come to Lahore for a range of activist meetings, Bindiya Rana was finishing up her lunch. “You know,” she told me between bites, “the governments in Pakistan change constantly—today it’s one person, tomorrow it’s someone else—and we wouldn’t want to be part of that environment more than we have to, really” (Hamzić 2016, 167). *Khwajasara*, of course, contested elections, successfully engaged the state legal system and organized protests and even the first Trans Pride March on December 29, 2018 (Hamzić 2019, 47–48), proving extraordinarily savvy in navigating the country’s political, social, legal, and religious landscapes. But this sense of an abject, volatile temporality of everyday politics seems to have guarded them from becoming too involved, resorting instead, to what Faris Khan has described as “a form of translucent citizenship—a mode of

1 belonging which involves not only demands for equal rights from the state
 2 but also the right to remain hazy to broader publics” (1–2). The temporal
 3 aspect of such “haziness” is important, too. In keeping workable distance
 4 from an unhomey time, *khwajasara* continue to *world* (habituate, struc-
 5 ture, materialize) a time of their own, a distinct set of timely orientations
 6 in politics, social work, and selfhood that, for a moment, might seem to
 7 chime well with some other, more hegemonic, systems of time-reckoning,
 8 only to quickly retreat to its separate domain.

9 I focus on a well-known example, “recent” inasmuch as it is proximate
 10 to the temporal locus from which the present text is wrought and from
 11 which its futural sensing takes place, which might offer a glimpse into *kh-*
 12 *wajasara* present/future-making. This glimpse is really just that—fleeting,
 13 speculative, momentary—pointing to the way a *khwajasara* political activist
 14 and *guru*, Neeli Rana, dealt with an external chrononormative demand on
 15 her time. It relates to the 2017–2018 #ChangeTheClap campaign, launched
 16 by the Pakistani office of a large international advertising agency, BBDO
 17 Worldwide, on behalf of the Asia Pacific Transgender Network, a trans-
 18 national nongovernmental organization. The key element of this social
 19 media campaign was a ninety-second video (“We Are APTN 2021a”), pro-
 20 duced by Rocketman Films, in which *khwajasara* are urged to change *tali*,
 21 their idiosyncratic hollow clap, into the more “respectable,” conventional
 22 clapping of applause. Other videos were also produced featuring trans
 23 and *khwajasara* activists and a trans model—all widely lauded online and
 24 endorsed by a range of Pakistani celebrities (“We Are APTN 2021b”; We
 25 Are APTN 2021c”; We Are APTN 2021d”; Saad 2021). The campaign’s final
 26 element was a Meta Messenger application, named Meeno Ji: The World’s
 27 First Transgender Bot, a virtual “transgender woman and a teacher by
 28 profession,” who was happy, as far as her coding allowed, to answer “any
 29 question you may have about transgender people” (@TheMeenoJi 2021;
 30 Pamment 2019b, 141–51; Mokhtar 2020).

31 It was, of course, only a matter of time before the neoliberal politics
 32 of transnational donorship, middle-class national “respectability,” and ad-
 33 vertising and entertainment industries combined to propose—or rather
 34 launch—a remodeled and retemporalized “ideal version” of *khwajasara*
 35 subjectivity, subsumed under the larger, hegemonically deployed notion
 36 of transgender. In her incisive analysis of the campaign, Claire Pamment
 37 (2019b) describes *tali* as a combative, differential performative, “its effects
 38 dependent on the spaces and temporalities upon which it is unleashed”
 39

(142), a quintessential *khwajasara* tool of self-signification, contact and resistance that may disrupt, rather than conform to, quotidian forms of social hostility and cisheteropatricarchal violence. The campaign robs the clap of its multiple performative possibilities, turning it instead into an implicitly stigmatizing gesture. Indeed, in the main video, “street” *khwajasara* protest and curse the (staged) violence that is inflicted on them, they are pushed around, called names, sneered at, and ejected from a “respectable” (*sharif*) neighborhood, but they are not allowed to speak. Instead, Kami Sid, described as “transwoman model,” wows her upper-middle-class audience on a catwalk and turns directly to the camera to ask, “Never thought people like us could get that far, right?” The idea is that changing the clap and changing (cis) people’s mindset, as Kami Sid explicitly suggests, are somehow inextricably connected. Other “respectable” figures—a “transwoman engineering student,” a “transman activist,” and a “transwoman social worker” briefly make appearances but do not speak. This social worker is none other than Neeli Rana, made up and dressed to impress, which clearly works because a man in the video gives up his seat on public transport for her (“We Are APTN 2021a”). As Pamment (2019b) suggests, the video explicitly confers approval on “these ‘deserving’ transgender subjects” at the cost of “street” *khwajasara* “who don’t conform to these images of class respectability or have access to formal education or jobs in the NGO sector or fashion industry” (146).

Meeno Ji, the Facebook Messenger bot, goes one step further in dis-temporalizing *khwajasara* and for that matter, the larger formations of trans in Pakistan too. The same “respectable” figures from the main video make their appearance once again, introduced as Meeno Ji’s friends, but not only that they cannot speak in their own voices—they are literally turned into cartoonish, vectorized images. What speaks, instead, when prompted, is a series of coded scripts, constructed out of the information available on various trans websites in the United States, which is largely useless to Pakistani trans or nontrans users of any class. Words such as “*khwajasara*,” “*tali*,” “the clap” or “*hijra*” are not part of its repertoire (@The MeenoJi 2021; Pamment 2019b, 147–48). Neeli Rana’s avatar is given a dignified, kind but serious, look; her black hair flowing down one side of her face, a golden earring shining on the other side.

For a while now, trans—as an identitary orientational aid, as a register of both difference and commonality with the re/claimed *khwajasara* or the formations of queer—is on the move in Pakistan. It has been enshrined

1 in law in a wide sense, “as per self-perceived gender identity.”¹² It inter-
 2 sects a variety of activist and communal political explorations and self-
 3 designations and it has reached deep into Pakistan’s social strata, where its
 4 variant transgender is sometimes (mis)used neoconservatively, to divest it
 5 from the larger queer Pakistani connotations (Farhat et al. 2020, 31). As
 6 Omar Kasmani (2021) has proposed, in an attempt to outline its futural
 7 shapes, trans in Pakistan “kicks off a capacious contact zone, triggers en-
 8 counters, and generates momentum with implications, which impact but
 9 also exceed local conditions” (107). The issue, however, is that some of
 10 these discursive and material moves can have serious distemporalizing,
 11 depoliticizing, and silencing effects on Pakistani *khwajasara*—and trans,
 12 nonbinary, and other gender-nonconforming—communities. In the ex-
 13 treme cases of neoliberal futurism, as with Meeno Ji and her friends, such
 14 moves can even *entirely displace* trans and *khwajasara* subjectivities with
 15 an Americanized bot, where all that is left is an avatar of the former self.

16 How then, do prominent *khwajasara* activists, such as Neeli Rana, ne-
 17 gotiate those demands on their time and subjectivity? Her appearances in
 18 the #ChangeTheClap campaign were not only in the main video, where
 19 she gracefully takes her seat on public transport, or as a virtual friend of
 20 the Meeno Ji bot, the latter commodification being, in fact, done with-
 21 out her prior knowledge or participation (Pamment 2019b, 148). She also
 22 speaks in a short black-and-white video, stylized as a personal testimony
 23 of “Neeli Rana, transwoman social activist” (“We Are APTN 2021d”). And
 24 it is in this video—despite its heavy editing and English subtitles, which
 25 often take away from the complexities she tries to convey—that her voice
 26 and a distinct *khwajasara* temporality break out of the campaign’s neo-
 27 liberal frame.

28 “*As-salamu alaikum*,” she says, introducing herself as a social activ-
 29 ist for “transgender community.” But later in the video, she clarifies that
 30 she works for a “platform she co-founded,” called Khawaja Sira (which
 31 she pronounces: *khwajasara*) Society. “It is Pakistan’s first organization
 32 where each staff member is from the *community*,” she says. The English
 33 subtitle translates this as “from transgender community.” But the use of
 34 this English word in *khwajasara*, trans and queer Pakistani contexts has
 35 been deliberately more ambiguous.¹³ She speaks of violence that she ex-
 36 perienceed at a wedding party. The context suggests that she was there,
 37 with other *khwajasara* to perform *badhai*, their traditional rituals of bless-
 38 ing. But fighting erupted, leading to severe violence against *khwajasara*.
 39

“They beat us all night, some were *raped*. I faced so much *violence* that I can never forget that night,” Neeli Rana continues, her voice firm but heavy. “When we went to the *police station* in the morning, they started blaming us for it. They said that we encourage people to have *sex* with us with all the *makeup* that we put on and the way we dress. That is when I thought that I will fight for myself. If I fight for myself, then I’m fighting for my *gender*. I’m fighting for my *community*.” The words in italics are all spoken in English. Neeli Rana’s re/memorialization and redress of a harrowing experience invoke the body’s own microtemporality, the act of speaking out that both comes deep from a *khwajasara* lifeworld and recenters it, and the language of an activist, imbricating, as it often does, multiple temporalities and senses of the self.

“People really need to change their attitude,” she says. “Clapping (*tali*) to mock or hurt someone is not acceptable. Even in Islam, our religion, it is not permitted to hurt someone like that.” But the people whom Neeli Rana invites to reconsider their behavior are *not khwajasara*. It is *those*, like children and men in the main video, who misappropriate *tali* to abuse *khwajasara*. There is no mention that *khwajasara* should change their clap, attire, makeup, or behavior. But she does finish assuming a communal “we,” ambiguous though as it may be, to provide her own reading of the context in which the campaign takes place and issue a call for more cross-sector and seemingly, cross-class understanding and collaboration. “If we start working with other people, then this *stigma* will be gone,” she says hopefully. “Whatever the profession. Whether it is drama, fashion or working in a factory or a company, if the *community* steps in, this *phobia*, this *transphobia* will start to dissipate and will eventually disappear.” This interpretation disorients completely the message of the main video. No longer are *khwajasara* silent victims or is their *tali*, when used *by* themselves, an “invitation to violence.” Quite the opposite, it is protesting and redressing the systemic violence of cisheteropatriarchal men and the police that animate Neeli Rana’s activist life. But there is a stretch, and it is temporal. It comes with a chrononormative demand on her time to produce a “legible,” widely “usable” account. What she has not said is implied in editing; what she has said is shortened, interrupted, and temporally rearranged to produce a desired outcome. That Neeli Rana still manages to channel a time and complex positionality of her own is a testament to her activist skills and ability to straddle sometimes starkly incongruent worldings of time.

SHAPESHIFTING TIMES AND POSTCOLONIAL
DISTEMPORALIZATION

In his meditation on time and Blackness, Achille Mbembe (2017 [2013]) has argued for an attention to the temporal effects of being and becoming, with time itself described as “that which one inevitably encounters on the path to subjectivity” (120), along with multiple and intersecting forms of domination, which—to endure—inscribe themselves on both the bodies of their subjects and on the spaces those subjects come to inhabit, “as indelible traces on the imaginary” (127). Thus, to experience time in the postcolony “is in part to know no longer where one stands in relation to oneself” (121). Such radical uncertainty is a fundamental effect of colonial and postcolonial distemporalization, dispossession, and erasure of certain formations of insurrectionary subjectivity, but it has also been turned, in the African novel and other decolonial temporal devices, into powerful communal dis/re/orientation aids. Or, as Kara Keeling (2019) has asked, “If we were never meant to survive *as such*, what do we do with ‘the time that remains’” (i)? These are not only invitations to *spend time* differently, in a decolonial otherwise, but to account for the ways of both losing and gaining a time of one’s own.

At the same time, queer and trans each have been hailed as proleptic devices, with queerness understood as a “mode of desiring that allows us to see beyond the quagmire” of the postcolonial present (Muñoz 2009, 1), while “the transgender body has emerged as futurity itself, a kind of heroic fulfillment of postmodern promises of gender flexibility” (Halberstam 2005, 18). Against such, all too prescriptive or hopeful ways of presenting and futuring subjectivity, critical scholarship has called for a renewed attention to the ways sexually and gender-nonconforming subjects inhabit categories of their own making, which are not inherently unidirectional (“progressive”) and can have both decolonizing and recolonizing effects (Halberstam 2005, 30; Rao 2020, 15). Such unruly inhabitations, in turn, point to a shapeshifting quality of both queer and trans, which not only get intersected and coconstituted by a whole host of other categories (race, class, caste, religion, language, nation, postcolony . . .) (Rao 12), but also of the contingency of such terms-of-art as “queer time” or “trans time.” If there are no such overarching one-times, if one can only speak of queer- and transforming temporalities (Cadwallader 2014), it becomes clearer that one’s focus should also shift to the multidirectional ways sexually and gender-nonconforming people habituate their own temporal diversity. In postcolonial contexts, such diversity is often materially and discursively

positioned against not one, but multiple, formations of chrononormativity, from the demands of late capitalist “productive subjectivity” to those of a cisheteronormalizing nation-state. And so, the strategies of embracing and preserving temporal nonconformity differ too, resulting in profoundly idiosyncratic worldings of time.

Thus, we have seen how *khwajasara*’s thereness affords a series of time-making practices and orientations: from an indeterminate, “back in the day” past, where they encounter the(ir) *khwājasarā*’ and *hijrā* histories; through originatory and devotional temporalities, which connect this gender-nonconforming community with the long arc of Indic and Islamicate subjectivity making; to the spacetimes of “today’s Pakistan,” where an “ongoing futuring” of *khwajasara* and trans subject positions is performed, exemplified in the ways Neeli Rana moves subversively through diverse—increasingly dispossessive and distemporalizing—demands on her subjectivity and time. I have argued that present-day *khwajasara*’s re/memorialization of the historical *khwājasarā*’ subject position should be taken seriously, not only as a form of resistance to systemic colonial and postcolonial distemporalization, but also as an act of hesitance, a critical distance, which in historical research can open up to a different temporality from which to think such distemporalization. As for *khwajasara*’s dealings with the demands of both neoconservative and neoliberal futurisms in an era when trans is on the move in Pakistan, I have called for more nuanced understandings of the individual and collective *khwajasara* agency and the art of being present as they are. Those futural dealings may be specific to Pakistan and its political moment in time, but they also reverberate across the subcontinent and beyond, bringing about novel configurations of social life.

NOTES

- 1 This chapter derives from my long-term fieldwork in Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan in the eventful 2010s, interruptive and multitemporal as they were, which made each visit unique and bristling with its own senses of communal directions, whether within *kwajasara*’s own networks, or the larger sexually diverse and gender nonconforming social and political formations. I am deeply grateful to each of my many interlocutors over/in time, whose names here either correspond to those they went by (always or in certain contexts) or are changed, if I were so requested. Many thanks to our editor Omar Kasmani too, for an entirely joyful and rewarding prepublication process.

- 1 2 For the transliteration of classical Arabic and Persian sources and their histori-
2 cal derivatives in this chapter, I used the IJMES (*International Journal of Middle*
3 *East Studies*) system, but I omitted the usual diacritics in personal names.
4 Diacritics were not used for the transliteration from present-day South Asian
5 languages. For the sake of clarity, I distinguished throughout between the his-
6 torical *khwājasarā*’ and *hijrā* subject positions and the contemporary *khwa-*
7 *jasara* and *hijra* communities.
- 8 3 There is a growing literature on the making of “respectable” *khwajasara* as
9 a national trope, which is related to but should not be confused with *khwa-*
10 *jasara*’s own demand for respect (*izzat*). See, for example, Pamment 2019b, 144;
11 Mokhtar 2020, 5; Khan 2019, 10; Hussain 2019, 335.
- 12 4 To use the term M. Jacqui Alexander has theorized in her critical writings about
13 Caribbean state nationalism; see for example, Alexander 1997. Moreover, for
14 the avoidance of doubt, it should be clear that I do not consider every discursive
15 deployment of “transgender,” in Pakistan or elsewhere in South Asia, to be he-
16 gemonic or temporally and politically damaging.
- 17 5 Kasmani focuses on futuring a capacious, asterisked, more-than-identity
18 trans* in Pakistan; my focus is on futuring *khwajasara*, that is, on specific com-
19 munal futurities that may or may not travel as far afield as the wider designa-
20 tion of trans or trans* in Pakistan.
- 21 6 For a recent study on a variation of this exact question, probing the timeliness
22 of the *queer* postcolony while seeking to provincialize the time of Western mo-
23 dernity, see Rao 2020, 1–32.
- 24 7 For a brief survey of the 1950s to 1990s subcontinental literature where these
25 labels come from, see Hamzić 2016, 158, 278, and Hall 1997.
- 26 8 For a similar recollection of this originatory narrative, see Abbas and Pir 2016, 163.
- 27 9 Marmon (1995) quotes a 1990 interview in the Saudi magazine *al-Yamāma* as, to
28 her knowledge, the latest evidence of the existence of *aghāwāt*. In this piece, an
29 official in charge of the “affairs of *aghāwāt*” reported that fourteen *aghāwāt* “still
30 served at the sanctuary of Mecca and seventeen at the sanctuary in Madina” (111).
- 31 10 Or rather a person of an ambiguous or intractable sex, translated as “her-
32 maphrodite” in most European sources. For a discussion on the long history of
33 *mukhannath*, see Hamzić 2016, 94, 97, 278–79.
- 34 11 Sarkar (2013, 45) notes that the latter part of the quoted text, in which Jahan-
35 gir explains how he knows that “one of these was a *khunṣa*,” was omitted from a
36 popular English translation of the *Jahāngīrnāma: Tūzuk-i- Jahāngīrī*.
- 37 12 §3(2), *Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act*, 2018. This right to self-
38 identify, removing the need for an earlier proposed gender recognition com-
39 mittee, was, of course, hard-won through the concerted efforts of a group of
khwajasara and trans activists and their feminist allies, which involved, inter
alia, an interaction with the Council of Islamic Ideology (Pamment 2019b, 149).
- 13 I am grateful to Naseeba Umar, a fellow researcher in the field, for a recent dis-
cussion on this topic.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, Qaisar, and Ghiasuddin Pir. 2016. "History of the Invisible: A People's History of the Transgendered Community of Lahore." *THAAP Journal* 6: 162–75.
- Abu'l Fazl. 1873 [c.1592–1602]. *Ā'in-i Akbarī*. Translated by Heinrich Blochmann, vol. I. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui. 1997. "Erotic Autonomy as Politics of Decolonization: An Anatomy of the Feminist and State Practice in the Bahamas Tourist Economy." In *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, edited by M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 63–100. New York: Routledge.
- Arondekar, Anjali. 2009. *For the Record: On Sexuality and the Colonial Archive in India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bada'uni, 'Abd al-Qadir. 1972 [1581]. *Najāt al-rashīd*. Edited by Sayyid Mu'in al-Ḥaqq. Lahore: Idārah-yi Taḥqīqāt-i Pākistān, Dānishgāh-i Panjāb.
- Bada'uni, 'Abd al-Qadir. 1986 [1595]. *Muntakhab al-tawārikh*. Translated by George S. A. Ranking, W. H. Lowe, and Wolseley Haig, vol. 2. Delhi: Renaissance Publishing House.
- Bakhtawar Khan. 1979 [1667–1668]. *Mir'āt al-'ālam: History of Emperor Awrangzeb 'Ālamgīr*, edited by S. S. Alvi, vols. 1–2. Lahore.
- Bano, Shadab. 2009. "Eunuchs in Mughal Household and Court." *Proceedings of the Indian Congress* 70: 417–27.
- Barani, Žiya' al-Din. 1860–1862 [1357]. *Tārīkh-i Firūzshāhī*. Edited by Syed Ahmed Khan. Calcutta: Aligarh.
- Butler, Judith. 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Cadwallader, Jessica Robyn. 2014. "Trans Forming Time." *Social Text Online*. July 10, 2014. https://socialtextjournal.org/periscope_article/trans-forming-time/.
- Dargah Quli Khan. 1989 [1738–1741]. *Muraqqa'-i Dihlī*. Translated by Chander Shekhar and Shama Mitra Chenoy. Delhi: Deputy Publications.
- Dargah Quli Khan. 1993 [1738–1741]. *Muraqqa'-i Dihlī*. Edited by Khaliq Anjum. New Delhi: Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu (Hind).
- Dutta, Aniruddha, and Raina Roy. 2014. "Decolonizing Transgender in India: Some Reflections." *Transgender Studies Quarterly* 1: 320–37.
- Dutta, Aniruddha. 2019. "Dissenting Differently: Solidarities and Tensions between Student Organizing and Trans-Kothi-Hijra Activism in Eastern India." *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal* 20: 1–20.
- Elliott, Henry Miers. 1877. *The History of India as Told by Its Own Historians*, vol. 7. London: Trübner.
- Farhat, Syed Nadeem, Muhammad Daniyal Abdullah, Shafei Moiz Hali, and Hamza Iftikhar. 2020. "Transgender Law in Pakistan: Some Key Issues." *Policy Perspectives* 17: 7–33.
- Faridi, Khan Bahadur Fazalullah Lutfullah. 1899. "Hījdās." In *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency: Gujarāt Population: Musalmāns and Pārsīs*, 21–22. Bombay: Government Central Press.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

- 1 Forbes, James. 1834. *Oriental Memoirs: A Narrative of Seventeen Years Residence in*
 2 *India*, vol. 1. London: Richard Bentley.
- 3 Freeman, Elizabeth. 2010. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Dur-
 4 ham, NC: Duke University Press.
- 5 HadžiMuhamedović, Safet, and Vanja Hamzić. 2019. “Distemporalities: Collisions,
 6 Insurrections, and Reorientations in the Worlding of Time.” Panel organized for
 7 the biennial conference of the Finnish Anthropological Society, Helsinki, Fin-
 8 land, August 29–30, 2019.
- 9 Halberstam, Jack. 2005. *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcul-
 10 tural Lives*. New York: NYU Press.
- 11 Hall, Kira. 1997. ““Go Suck Your Husband’s Sugarcane!”: Hijras and the Use of
 12 Sexual Insult.” In *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*, edited by
 13 Anna Livia and Kira Hall, 430–60. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 14 Hamzić, Vanja. 2016. *Sexual and Gender Diversity in the Muslim World: History,
 15 Law and Vernacular Knowledge*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- 16 Hamzić, Vanja. 2019. “The *Dera* Paradigm: Homecoming of the Gendered Other.”
 17 *Ethnoscripts* 21: 34–57.
- 18 Hinchy, Jessica. 2013. “Power, Perversion and Panic: Eunuchs, Colonialism, and
 19 Modernity in North India.” PhD diss., Australian National University.
- 20 Hinchy, Jessica. 2014. “Obscenity, Moral Contagion, and Masculinity: *Hijras* in
 21 Public Space in Colonial North India.” *Asian Studies Review* 38: 274–94.
- 22 Hinchy, Jessica. 2018. “Eunuchs and the East India Company in North India.” In
 23 *Celibate and Childless Men in Power: Ruling Eunuchs and Bishops in the Pre-
 24 Modern World*, edited by Almut Höfert, Matthew M. Mesley, and Serena To-
 25 lino, 149–74. London: Routledge.
- 26 Hinchy, Jessica. 2019. *Governing Gender and Sexuality in Colonial India: The Hijra,
 27 c.1850–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 28 Hussain, Salman. 2019. “State, Gender, and the Life of Colonial Laws: The *Hijras/
 29 Khwajasaras*’ History of Dispossession and Their Demand for Dignity and *Izzat*
 30 in Pakistan.” *Postcolonial Studies* 22: 325–44.
- 31 Jackson, Peter. 1999. *The Delhi Sultanate: A Political and Military History*. Cam-
 32 bridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 33 Jahangir. 1980 [1627]. *Jahāngīrnāma: Tūzuk-i- Jahāngīrī*. Edited by Muḥammad
 34 Hashim. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bunyād-i Farhang-i Irān.
- 35 Juzjani, Minhaj al-Siraj. 1963–1964 [c.1259–1260]. *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*. Edited by ‘Abd
 36 al-Ḥayy Ḥabibi, vol. 1. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Asāṭir.
- 37 Kasmani, Omar. 2021. “Futuring Trans* in Pakistan: Timely Reflections.” *Transgen-
 38 der Studies Quarterly* 8: 96–112.
- 39 Keeling, Kara. 2019. *Queer Times, Black Futures*. New York: NYU Press.
- Khan, Faris A. 2019. “Translucent Citizenship: *Khwaja Sira* Activism and Alternatives
 to Dissent in Pakistan.” *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal* 20: 1–22.
- Lal, Kishori Saran. 1988. *The Mughal Harem*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Lal, Ruby. 2018. “Harem and Eunuchs: Liminality and Networks of Mughal Author-
 ity.” In *Celibate and Childless Men in Power: Ruling Eunuchs and Bishops in the*

<i>Pre-Modern World</i> , edited by Almut Höfert, Matthew M. Mesley, and Serena Tolino, 92–108. London: Routledge.	1
Lowe, Lisa. 2015. “History Hesitant.” <i>Social Text</i> 33: 85–107.	2
Majid, Afshan. 2010–2011. “Women and a Theologian: The Ideas and Narratives of Abdul Qadir Badauni.” <i>Proceedings of the Indian Congress</i> 71:248–55.	3
Manucci, Nicolao. 1907 [c.1708]. <i>Storia do Mogor or Mogul India, 1653–1708</i> .	4
Translated by William Irvine, vol. 2. London: John Murray.	5
Marmon, Shaun. 1995. <i>Eunuchs and Sacred Boundaries in Islamic Society</i> . New York: Oxford University Press.	6
Mbembe, Achille. 2017 [2013]. <i>Critique of Black Reason</i> . Translated by Laurent Dubois. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.	7
Mokhtar, Shehram. 2020. “Mediating Hijra In/Visibility: The Affective Economy of Value-Coding Marginality in South Asia.” <i>Feminist Media Studies</i> 20:1–14.	8
Muñoz, José Esteban. 2009. <i>Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity</i> . New York: NYU Press.	9
Pamment, Claire. 2019a. “Performing Piety in Pakistan’s Transgender Rights Movement.” <i>Transgender Studies Quarterly</i> 6:297–314.	10
Pamment, Claire. 2019b. “The Hijra Clap in Neoliberal Hands: Performing Trans Rights in Pakistan.” <i>Drama Review</i> 63: 141–51.	11
Preston, Laurence W. 1987. “A Right to Exist: Eunuchs and the State in Nineteenth-Century India.” <i>Modern Asian Studies</i> 21: 371–87.	12
Rao, Rahul. 2020. <i>Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press.	13
Saad, Raja. 2021. “Pakistani Celebrities Showing Their Support for Transgenders #changetheclap.” YouTube. Accessed May 18, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XM3DBZM7o2I .	14
Sarkar, Nilanjan. 2013. “Forbidden Privileges and History-Writing in Medieval India.” <i>Medieval History Journal</i> 16:21–62.	15
Scott, Joan Wallach. 2011. <i>The Fantasy of Feminist History</i> . Durham, NC: Duke University Press.	16
Sikandar b. Muḥammad. 1889 [c.1611]. <i>Mir’āt-i-Sikandari</i> . Translated by Fazlullah Lutfullah Faridi. Dharampur: Education Society Press.	17
@TheMeenoJi. 2021. “Meeno Ji: The World’s First Transgender Bot.” Facebook and Facebook Messenger. Accessed May 18, 2021. https://www.facebook.com/TheMeenoji/ . <i>Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2018</i> (Pakistan).	18
“We Are APTN. 2021a.” “#ChangeTheClap.” YouTube. Accessed May 18, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vGsNPHj_ZdA .	19
“We Are APTN. 2021b.” “Kami Sid #ChangeTheClap.” YouTube. Accessed May 18, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M5pGawnwd-k .	20
“We Are APTN. 2021c.” “Mani #ChangeTheClap.” YouTube. Accessed May 18, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bIdmnlN3XIo .	21
“We Are APTN. 2021d.” “Neeli Rana #ChangeTheClap.” YouTube. Accessed May 18, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GyAoMogsmZM .	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28
	29
	30
	31
	32
	33
	34
	35
	36
	37
	38
	39