

“*Song’s of a New World:*”

The Revision of Gender and Restructuring of Narrative

in *M. Butterfly* (1988, 1993, and 2017)

Melissa Sturges

Theatre

Making Headlines on Stage and Off

The news story of the relationship between French diplomat Bernard Boursicot and Shi Pei Pu, a Peking opera singer, made even bigger headlines in 1988, when new playwright David Henry Hwang turned a news clipping into a full-length play. The news cycle would return to the subject to discuss the film adaptation in 1993 and Broadway revival in 2017, which featured a revised script. All are predisposed to discourse on gender and have been met with much critical discussion of the ways in which gender is performed and presented, especially the ways in which gender and race amalgamate. Yet, “When David Henry Hwang penned the damning and beguiling ‘*M. Butterfly*’ in 1988, meaningful explorations of the issues of gender assignment and identification were as invisible on Broadway as they were on television.”¹ I will argue that the various changes made to Hwang’s *M. Butterfly* in 2017 reflect and stem from a more theoretical and nuanced understanding of gender as proliferated by the work of Gender Studies scholars beginning in the late 1990s and early 2000s. The changes to the script and visual narrative both in the 1993 film and 2017 Broadway revival demonstrate an evolving world on gender. Moreover, they exemplify an elasticity of text, which is unique to the theatrical form, and this elasticity is justified by a cultural shift towards non-binary inclusivity and acceptance of gender fluidity. I will primarily use Annamarie Jagose’s theories on queerness and J. Halberstam’s trans theory, along with critical scholars who have examined *M. Butterfly* from a literary, cultural and

theatrical perspective, and primary narratives from David Henry Hwang himself, to analyze this play and its multiple versions in regards to queer, trans, critical race and feminist theories.

Comparing Gendered Worlds: 1988, 1993 and 2017

Hwang's original play (1988) and David Cronenberg's film adaptation (1993) came at the dawn of understanding queer studies as a definitive concept and an academic field. According to queer theorist Annamarie Jagose, "While the mobilization of queer in its most recent sense cannot be dated exactly, it is generally understood to be popularly adopted in the early 1990s,"ⁱⁱ thus, we can establish Hwang's work as one of the early attempts to deconstruct a new understanding of gender politics on stage in light of the dawning understanding of queerness. Through a unique form of narrative storytelling and gradual character change and melodramatic reveal, "*M. Butterfly* demonstrates that identities are interchangeable and accomplished in interaction. What counts is the proper performance of culturally prescribed and anticipated behavior, as well as its deliberate perception within cultural, sexual, and political normativity. Hwang examines this interaction of performance and perception with the help of the dramatic devices of apostrophe, cross-dressing, and play-within-a-play."ⁱⁱⁱ Gender was beginning to be understood as performative at the time *M. Butterfly* was written and staged and it is possible to see early deconstructions of gender lines, most notably the distinctions between masculinity and femininity and how normative patriarchal power structures can be inverted. The notion of gender fluidity is not fully addressed until the 2017 revival, but before I touch on that, I will first examine the treatment of gender in the original text and its film adaptation.

Beginning with the early iterations, David Henry Hwang's 1988 play, *M. Butterfly* and David Cronenberg's 1993 movie of the same name share some key similarities as both primarily explore the themes of ethnicity and gender, specifically regarding the association of the East with

femininity and submissiveness compared with the masculinized Western world. However, there are some glaring differences in content, theme and tone between these two texts. This is the first example of revisionary text playing off the critical and audience response to the 1988 play. Some of these changes may be attributed to the difficulties of translating a play into a screenplay or the fact that the twists and reveals of the original Broadway production were lost to the mainstream by this point, but this has more to do with Cronenberg's artistic decisions to make the film a graver, more melancholic adaptation of the otherwise witty and wry play. The result is an oversight of dramatic monologues, staging and breaking of the fourth wall for more realistic and literal settings as well as the elimination of certain scenes and characters and the addition of others. Cronenberg's adaptation focuses on the interplay between masculinity and femininity, centering in on how masculinity is figuratively upheaved as the relations between East and West are reversed and Song turns out to be the dominant figure. On the idea of gender-based power structures, Jagose notes that "before considering specific debates over the efficacy of queer, it is important to understand that those models of identity, gender, and sexuality which in a large part underwrite the queer agenda have changed, and to recognize the implications such changes have for the theorizing of power and resistance."^{iv} Thus, without overanalyzing the play or the film as queer pieces of art, we can discuss them regarding how they treat the passing on or the inversion of masculine or feminine-based power.

To understand the male-female dichotomy in this play/film, it is necessary to situate the masculine as West and the feminine as East. As simplistic as this sounds, it is the text's first foray into the world of intersectionality. To ignore this correlation is to do a disservice to the text and while I am specifically focusing on the gendered aspects in this essay, I cannot dismiss that

M. Butterfly, with its intersections of sexuality and colonialism, and its rewriting of Western myths about the East perhaps most easily understood through Edward Said's provocative term Orientalism, has received not only a Tony award, but numerous scholarly studies attempting to situate Asian and Asian American culture and masculinity, to critique the extended misogyny of the play, and to show (in one way or another) not only the play's brilliant investigation of the slippage of gender identity, but also its potential role as a critique of various cultural forms.^v

To elaborate on this, I will discuss the adaptation of several scenes at first from the play to the film, then from the 1988 original text to the 2017 revival.

The first manifestations of masculinity and femininity are realized during the introductory opera scene of Gallimard to Song. The film does away with the play's narrative introduction to *Madame Butterfly*, which sets up the relationship between the American officer and the young Japanese girl. The film eliminates characters such as Pinkerton, Sharpless and Suzuki, which make the initial *Madame Butterfly* scene less contextual and intellectual and more sensorial. As Song sings, the camera changes perspective between Song as Butterfly and Gallimard's reaction. The effect is to showcase Gallimard's immediate admiration for Song, which puts him in a position of male authority over her. However, since we know a male actor is playing Song, this authority is inverted. According to Judith Butler in "Imitation and Gender Insubordination," Song's sexuality might not even exist at all; it may only be an element of establishing power as Butler writes, "Can sexuality even remain sexuality once it submits to a criterion of transparency and disclosure, or does it perhaps cease to be sexuality precisely when the semblance of full explicitness is achieved."^{vi} Sexuality here functions as a ploy or an illusion; it is used as a tool for achieving an end.

In the following scene, Gallimard confronts Song. He explains his reaction to her performance, stating that it was the first time he's "seen the beauty of the story"^{vii} The film's interpretation of this scene remains relatively faithful as both the movie and the play emphasize Gallimard's sensual reaction to the performance and Song's critical response, which is to say: "It's one of your favorite fantasies isn't it? The submissive Oriental woman and the cruel white man."^{viii} She asserts that only because it is an Asian woman killing herself for a white man and not the other way around, Gallimard finds it beautiful. In both the play and the film Gallimard is directly challenged by Song's assertion, yet his pursuit of her reaffirms his dominant masculine drive. Masculinity/Femininity is equated with the relationship between "the Occident" and "the Orient" and it is assumed that Gallimard and Song enter a dominant/submissive relationship.

When Gallimard attends the Peking Opera, Song remarks on his being an "adventurous imperialist."^{ix} She tells him to "come another time and we will continue the process of education."^x From here, Song has hooked Gallimard and their affair essentially begins. Gallimard's pursuit of Song is attributed to both her femininity and her orientalism. However, cut from the film is Gallimard's response to Song's cryptic comment about the imperialist interest being mutual between them as he breaks the fourth wall and asks, "What was that? What did she mean, 'Sometimes...it is mutual'?"^{xi} The mutuality to which Song speaks refers to both her manipulation of him as well as Gallimard's interest in her. What sets the film apart from the play is the film audience's prior knowledge that Song is assigned male at birth. Whereas in the play Song was famously portrayed by B.D. Wong, using an alias to disguise his male identity and thus protecting the awe factor of the gender reveal, Cronenberg expects a level of familiarity of the play with his audience and the character is openly played by John Lone. Without the reveal factor, the audience becomes more invested in the transition, and questions arise as to

whether or not Song is a character in transition. Trans theorist J. Jack Halberstam writes, “The potentiality of the body to morph, shift, change, and become fluid is a powerful fantasy in transmodern cinema. The body in transition indelibly marks late twentieth and early twenty-first century visual fantasy,”^{xii} meaning that gender fluidity on screen was beginning to take heed during the time that this film came out. The film lends itself better to this kind of unraveling of identity as filmgoers have prior knowledge that theatergoers cannot access.

Gallimard’s “Perfect Woman”

The play takes place within the hypothetical walls of a prison, while the critical scenes of the film take place behind literal bars. After having appeared in court dressed as a man, Song confronts her former lover, Gallimard, in the back of a police car, demanding that he look at her in full. Song strips for Gallimard who has never before seen him fully nude and insists that Gallimard loved and still loves him. In the play Hwang elaborates for Gallimard: “I’m a man who loved a woman created by a man.”^{xiii} The sexual politics of their relationship are inverted in this scene. Drag is a key component in both the 1988 text and the film as Song is never fully considered female, but rather a man in women’s clothing. Thus, the relationship between Song and Gallimard is considered gay. This, along with the amalgamations I have discussed concerning race and sex, concurs with the notion that “Hwang’s dramatic strategy in *M. Butterfly*, where he uses clothing and nakedness (or a desire for it) to oppose East against West, homosexual against heterosexual, and Communist against capitalist.”^{xiv} According to Butler, “the professionalization of gayness requires a certain performance and production of a ‘self’, which is the constituted effect of a discourse that nevertheless, claims to ‘represent’ that self as a prior truth.”^{xv} Song fabricated a sense of self that Gallimard believed, yet this “self” was a lie. This demonstrates how traditional sexual politics are irrelevant here as Song destroys all notion of

what it means to be either masculine or feminine, gay or straight. Thus, the reading of this relationship as gay or straight is shrouded in the gender politics of the time. Moreover, “Song’s courtroom argument about the feasibility and believability of Gallimard’s self-delusion is as much an argument for the power of fantasy in constructing both sex and gender as it is for the type casting of Western male desire”^{xvi} The climactic court room scene and the emotional tumult that follows were the bread and butter of the 1988 play; they were the culmination of tensions and reveal of Song’s national, physical and emotional betrayal. Yet, they are thematically an inversion or perhaps a transgression on Western male authority. The character of Song in the 1988 play and film constructs and deconstructs herself as a female fantasy, exemplary of the ways in which gender is inherently performative. Gallimard’s self-delusion to which Rossini refers is his commitment to binarism.

Throughout the text, Gallimard repeatedly refers to Song as a feminine ideal or his “perfect woman.” This reading of Song as an orientalist idealization is supported by the compounding of the East with femininity and the West with masculinity. Whichever way we are to read Song’s gender identification or her sexuality, it is important to note the binarism of this model. According to Eng Beng Lim in his chapter on the “GAP” or the “Gay Asian Princess” trope, when we read this text or see it performed, “the politics of deformative legibility are in such a model contingent on conventional orientalist tropes and embodiments organized by the heterosexual dyad in the West, and centered on the white male. They are, in other words, restricted to binaristic positions of identification.”^{xvii} Lim argues for a stalemate in this script, which is supposedly about gender fluidity. That is not to say that Song isn’t a progressive character in gender studies, and certainly she is in intersectionality. Only to say that binarism appears to be the catchall in this reading. Nevertheless, Lim offers a counterpoint; if we are to

read into Song's fluidity, her changing pronouns and costumes, her inability to remain one fixed thing in the eyes of the beholder, then, "rather than taking an either/or position, we might see both Shi/Boursicot and Song/Gallimard (the characters in the play) as queer couplings with a signature Asian encounter traversing the slippery boundaries of fact/fiction, real/ theatrical, male/female, East/West."^{xviii} The idea that the perfect Asian woman is not what she seems is novel in the sense that it subverts binary gendered readings of this play, which is further explored in the revival.

While audiences knew significantly less about gender fluidity in 1988 than in, say, 2017. I return to Jagose with the idea that: "While there is no critical consensus on the definitional limits of queer—indeterminacy being one of its widely promoted charms—its general outlines are frequently sketched and debated. Broadly speaking, queer describes those gestures or analytical models which dramatize incoherencies in the allegedly stable relations between chromosomal sex, gender, and sexual desire."^{xix} Gender incoherency is a more defined factor in the original play, which suggests perhaps the inversion of masculine and feminine traits, or the film, which offers a reading insulated on patriarchal power reversals. Masculine/Feminine is a binary that is embedded within these earlier texts; it is indicative of a patriarchal power. The texts are governed by, "anatomical revelation and homosexual panic that unequivocally 'breaks off' expectations and illusion, 'the dream and the excitement.' Implicitly informing this panic is the physical denial of the lack that, in Laconian terms, figures sexual difference and that is constitutive of the stable binarism of patriarchal thought."^{xx} The revival suggests that indeterminate or non-binary gender can be something of the new normative.

Finally, the finale of the film is staged in a prison, with the inclusion of other prisoners to mimic the layout of an opera stage. As he does in the play, Gallimard adorns full makeup, nail

polish and traditional female oriental dress. This is the ultimate inversion of his masculinity. His suicide mirrors that of Madame Butterfly as he now associates with the female Asian woman who was willing to kill herself over an American man. Overall, this scene heightens the film's thematic assumption of the play's displacement of sexual and racial politics by emphasizing the ironic twist of fate that it is Gallimard, and not Song, who assumes the tragic role of Madame Butterfly. Moreover, "We are still left with the uncertainty as to whether Song has only played the role of a woman when perhaps he wished to maintain it, or whether Gallimard is gay or not or only wishes to be the ideal Oriental woman he fantasizes about. In the end, not only are their clothes not hiding gender and sexual identities, but even their skin and sexual organs fails to offer any impeachable proof as to what their sex is."^{xxi} Clearly breaking the mold on gender, the original play, complete with gender, but not biological sex inversions, offers a step in the direction of contemporary theories on queer and gendered cultures.

A More Complicated Understanding of Gender Fluidity

One of the key questions when reading *M. Butterfly* (1988) and even more evidently seeing it performed in 2017, is whether we the audience, with varied degrees of knowledge on gender theory, consider Song Liling to be a transgender character. The answer to the question is variable and is made even more complicated knowing what we do now about the definition of transgenderism. In a pre-show interview with David Henry Hwang, he states, "I mean, thirty years ago I didn't know that the term transgender existed. We're so much more aware of nonconforming gender identities and different forms of gender expression now. I wasn't sure if Song Liling was even a transgender character."^{xxii} When even the playwright doesn't know the details of a character's gender expression it is indicative of, if not a cultural quieting on the matter, then at the very least a general lack of understanding that the very notion of gender

identity can be nuanced or deviate from cis heteronormative standards. Ignoring the film for the time being as it is more or less a reiteration of the theory presented in the 1988 text, I will examine some of the key differences between the two Broadway productions, which came to the stage some three decades apart, in the hopes that the reader may better understand the cultural shift that necessitated script and visual change as well as situate each iteration of the text in terms of what the gendered world looked like in the 1980s as opposed to the 2010s.

The two texts, which are largely the same, but for the sake of this argument should be treated as opposed iterations of the same narrative, deal with the gender reveal in profoundly different ways. As most reviews put it in 2017, “It sure is a lot harder to view Song Liling, who is played on Broadway by Jin Ha, in mostly metaphoric terms, her gender fluidity flowing from political purpose with so little stage time devoted to personal explanation and story. The play also relied originally on suspense, schadenfreude and titillation: All have dissipated as our understandings of, and empathy for, the complexities of gender have deepened.”^{xxiii} Without being a member of the trans community, I cannot definitely say whether or not Song Liling is empathetic within that community, whether this is even a play about the transgender experience, or even what actor should play Song if this were the case. Nor do I believe that David Henry Hwang is able to stake any claims about the true transgender experience as a straight, cis man. I can, however, attest that the treatment of gender between these two texts is noticeably different and that deliberate attention has been paid to the increase in trans and queer scholarship when the revision of this play took place. Moreover, the timeliness of this revision in terms of its treatment of toxic masculinity is also something worth noting as it takes on new dimensions in direct address to the trans and non-binary community.

Before highlighting some of the ways in which this takes place, I turn back to Halberstam who lays out that “For some audiences, the transgender body performs a fantasy of fluidity so common to notions of transformation within the postmodern. To others, the transgender body confirms the enduring power of the binary gender system. But to still other viewers, the transgender body represents a Utopian vision of a world of subcultural.”^{xxiv} It may be argued that the 2017 revision adopts the more fluid model of understanding the transgender body on stage, while the 1988 version relegates the gender-swap or the “reveal” to a binary way of looking at gendered (even transgender) bodies. Regarding the “Utopian vision of a world of subcultural,” it is easy to be torn on where this play falls on the spectrum of mainstream versus subcultural. On the one hand, the 1988 production brought issues of gender to the Broadway stage when no one was speaking forthright about it. Even more so, the notion of gender inversion and deconstruction discourses on a “subcultural” topic in innovative ways that subverted dominant narratives on patriarchal binaries. After all, “Hwang does not simply rewrite the Butterfly story. Above all, he takes it apart and examines it thoroughly with the help of significant role reversals.”^{xxv} With regards to gender and racial conformity, *M. Butterfly* rescinds the hegemonic framework surrounding masculinity as power. Nevertheless, the play walks a fine and dangerous line with trans intersectionality and must be analyzed cautiously.

In 1988, B.D. Wong famously played Liling Song, disguising his identity and therefore placing dramatic pressure and emphasis on the “reveal” of Song’s gender. Perhaps it was for shock factor (this was mainstream Broadway after all), perhaps it was a more thoughtful meditation on the ways gender is subverted in the play through power relations as I have discussed regarding the film and the way femininity and masculinity are compartmentalized. Either way, the “reveal” gimmick is notably absent from the 2017 revival. Hwang, along with

director Julie Taymor, knew going into this revision that even a Tony winning and Pulitzer Prize finalist play would not gain any traction if the ending was spoiled, so to speak. Perhaps, that is a reduction of their intentions in the revising process, but it certainly was a factor. Moreover, new information had been discovered about the real-life affair between Bernard Boursicot and Shi Pei Pu, specifically regarding Shi Pei Pu's misgendering, that informed the decision to reveal Song's gender identity at the beginning of the play as opposed to the end. In the revival, based loosely on true events, Song was born the fourth daughter of a father who demanded a son from his wife. In a warped turn of events, Song assumes a male identity, despite being assigned female at birth, a sequence of events from history which Hwang said informed the theory behind the revival as "great confluence of an actual fact from the story serving the purpose of being more gender fluid and less gender binary than the original play."^{xxvi} Granted, Song's intentions and motivations are unclear. When we see her as a spy and not a lover or a performer, she is cast in a villainous light. Moreover, if we are to believe her narrative that her family forced her to present male, when she herself identified as female and gets to live that identity later in life, then is she truly transgender? The details are ambiguous, as is Song, and as is her gender identity. When Song assumes the Butterfly persona in her relationship with Gallimard, her gender becomes all the more ambiguous. However, in this version, it becomes clearer that conditioning as opposed to biological sex is the more determinative factor in gendered identity.

Hwang's additional scene (2017) plays out as follows:

SONG: When my mother became pregnant with me, she had already given birth to my three sisters. Father threatened to take another wife unless she produced a son. But sadly, I was born a girl.

GALLIMARD: What?

SONG: My mother begged my father and he agreed: They would dress me as a boy, and that is how I would live. For the rest of my life.

GALLIMARD: Wait. So you're telling me that you are...?

SONG: A woman. What you see onstage is who I really am.^{xxvii}

In summation, the revival presents a much more complicated layering of gender identities than the original. In 1988, Song was assigned male at birth and presumably dresses as a woman for the sake of espionage and the Gallimard affair. However, the above passage is deliberately misleading in the beginning of the play as it is revealed that Song was, in fact, assigned male at birth, but assumes a female identity in life, her career, and her relationship with Gallimard.

Where the 1988 performance omitted any details about the sexual nature of Song and Gallimard's relationship, the revival offers a detailed description of each sexual act from Song's perspective. By literalizing sex, the revival might actually detract from its more loosely constructed gendering of the characters and this moment has been subject to the most criticism out of anything else from this version.

Song's pronouns in the original version switch from "she/her/hers" to "he/him/his" after the reveal and when a costume change has taken place. The same is true for the revival; Song's pronouns change, which is not to say that pronouns are the sole indicator of gender identity. This might even be a temporal flaw to this text: the fact that Song's gender is repeatedly assigned based on the context of whether or not the "reveal" has happened. Song's expression of gender outweighs her biological sex in both the original text and the revival. Moreover, Song's gender expression is inherently performative; she is *dressed* as a woman, she *performs* as a woman in the Peking Opera; her "onstage" persona is that of the Butterfly, what Gallimard calls his "perfect woman." In 1988 already, we had verbiage to describe the performative nature of

gender, thus we can understand from original text that gender is subjective, that it can be subverted, and yet that it is binary. So when we look at *M. Butterfly* (1988), “The fantasy and its limitations are heavily invested with the possibility of gender slippage...In espionage, in theatre, in “modern China,” in contemporary culture, embedded in the very phrase “gender roles,” there is, as the play suggests, *only* passing. Trespassing. Border crossing and border raids. Gender here, exists only in representation—in performance.”^{xxviii} While Rossini makes a worthwhile point, gender is inherently performative, such a performance is an overly simplified construction of the various iterations of gender that have only just come into the mainstream as of recent. A contemporary analysis points out the ways in which gender cannot be configured based on suits, pronouns, or genitals. What Hwang does in 2017, albeit not perfectly, is attempt to reconcile the bold statement he made in 1988 with an even more adept cultural consciousness.

Returning to the idea of the “reveal” as narrative device in a story about a transgender individual, Hwang attests that if Song is a transgender character “a lot of the original play turned on the surprise reveal of Song’s physical sex. In that way, it’s similar to a movie that would come out a few years later called *The Crying Game*.” Thus, when revising, he quotes, “I felt that the surprise wouldn’t feel as surprising anymore. It would feel a little dated to rest that much importance on that particular reveal. Moreover, that reveal felt like a reinforcement of the gender binary in that it wasn’t acknowledging the range of gender identity and expression that we understand today.”^{xxix} Transgenderism is not necessarily gender confirmative, which the 2017 text assumes to confirm. Song’s gender cannot be simply surmised by the pronouns in the stage directions, but the character represents a spectrum of gendered possibility. Halberstam too mentions *The Crying Game* in his chapter, “The Transgender Look” (2013) as he analyzes the hero/fatally flawed dichotomy of its transgender protagonist. What Halberstam attests to, and

what I feel can be applied to, Song Liling as well is that “those bodies, indeed, that fail to conform to the postmodern fantasy of flexibility that has been projected onto the transgender body may well be punished even as they seem to be lauded.”^{xxx} In the 1988 edition of *M. Butterfly*, Song was more stoically male or female identifying, depending on what part of the play you were in. In the 2017 edition, Song’s identity is consistently in flux. Turning to an example in the play (2017), the following exchange occurs after Song strips outside the courtroom:

GALLIMARD: I think you must have some kind of identity problem.

SONG: Will you listen to me?

GALLIMARD: Why?! I’ve been listening to you for years. Don’t I deserve a vacation?

SONG: Why should it matter what I am?

GALLIMARD: Well, you must be something. Unless you’re nothing.^{xxxi}

The line that is different from the original text is when Gallimard insists that Song must be “something.” By something, we assume Gallimard means either male or female, but Song does not answer him. The provocation comes with the question of why a person should be defined by what gender they are assigned at birth, what traditional gender roles their clothing implies, or even what they believe their gender identity to be? The potency of this line does not go unnoticed, and, although brief, sums up the argument for Song’s gender fluidity.

What complicates this narrative, particularly in the revival where there is more primary source material to draw from, is that it is a true story. True stories are subjective and no one has all the facts on the case of the French diplomat and the Peking Opera singer. The revival, though ambitious, closed shortly after opening. It exists in book form in a much more digestible fashion,

but without Taymor's visual fantasy. *M. Butterfly* was easily ahead of its time in 1988, asking important questions about gender stereotypes and beginning a discourse on intersectionality. Yet, there is always place for an update in such a rapidly changing culture of argument and revision. Still, it's harrowing to think that thirty years later, we could use a refresher on toxic masculinity, East/West relations and the pliability of gender.

ⁱ Chris Jones, "In Revised 'M. Butterfly' On Broadway, Clive Owen Is No French Bureaucrat." *Chicago Tribune (Online)* 26 Oct. 2017.

ⁱⁱ Annamarie Jagose, *Queer Theory: An Introduction*, (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 76.

ⁱⁱⁱ Ilka Saal, "Performance and Perception: Gender, Sexuality, and Culture in David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly*," *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 43, no. 4 (1998): 633.

^{iv} Jagose, 77.

^v Jon D. Rossini, "From 'M. Butterfly' to 'Bondage': David Henry Hwang's Fantasies of Sexuality, Ethnicity, and Gender," *The Journal of American Drama and Theatre* 18, no. 3 (2006): 56.

^{vi} Judith Butler, "Imitation and Gender Insubordination," *Mainstream and Critical Social Theory: Collection: Classical, Modern and Contemporary* 8 (2001).

^{vii} David Henry Hwang, *M. Butterfly*, (New York: Penguin, 1988), 18.

^{viii} *Ibid*, 18.

^{ix} *M. Butterfly*, Directed by David Cronenberg, 1993.

Ibid.^x

^{xi} David Henry Hwang, *M. Butterfly*, (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), 22.

^{xii} J. Jack Halberstam, "The Transgender Look," *The Transgender Studies Reader 2*, (New York: Routledge, 2013), 120.

^{xiii} David Henry Hwang, *M. Butterfly*, (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), 55.

^{xiv} John S. Bak, "'Vestis Virum Reddit: ' the Gender Politics of Drag in Williams's 'A Streetcar Named Desire' and Hwang's 'M. Butterfly,'" *South Atlantic Review* 70, no. 4 (2005): 95.

^{xv} Judith Butler, "Imitation and Gender Insubordination," *Mainstream and Critical Social Theory: Collection: Classical, Modern and Contemporary* 8 (2001).

^{xvi} Jon D. Rossini, "From 'M. Butterfly' to 'Bondage': David Henry Hwang's Fantasies of Sexuality, Ethnicity, and Gender," *The Journal of American Drama and Theatre* 18, no. 3 (2006): 60.

^{xvii} Eng Beng Lim, "GAP Drama or the Gay Asian Princess goes to the United States," *Brown Boys and Rice Queens*, (New York: NYU Press, 2014), 139.

^{xviii} *Ibid*, 139.

^{xix} Jagose, 70.

^{xx} L. Grist, "'It's Only a Piece of Meat': Gender Ambiguity, Sexuality, and Politics in The 'Crying Game' and 'M. Butterfly,'" *Cinema Journal* 42, no. 4 (2003): 4.

^{xxi} Bak, 110-111.

^{xxii} Jen Gushue, "*M. Butterfly* from 1988-2017," *Howlround*, 28 Nov. 2017, <https://howlround.com/m-butterfly-1988-2017>

^{xxiii} Chris Jones, "In Revised 'M. Butterfly' On Broadway, Clive Owen Is No French Bureaucrat." *Chicago Tribune (Online)* 26 Oct. 2017.

^{xxiv} J. Jack Halberstam, "The Transgender Look," *The Transgender Studies Reader 2*, (New York: Routledge, 2013), 129.

^{xxv} Ilka Saal, "Performance and Perception: Gender, Sexuality, and Culture in David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly*," *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 43, no. 4 (1998): 629

^{xxvi} Jen Gushue, "M. Butterfly from 1988-2017," *Howlround*, 28 Nov. 2017, <https://howlround.com/m-butterfly-1988-2017>.

^{xxvii} David Henry Hwang, *M. Butterfly*, (New York: Plume Books, 2017), 32.

^{xxviii} Jon D. Rossini, "From "M. Butterfly" to "Bondage": David Henry Hwang's Fantasies of Sexuality, Ethnicity, and Gender, " *The Journal of American Drama and Theatre* 18, no. 3 (2006): 61.

^{xxix} Jen Gushue, "M. Butterfly from 1988-2017," *Howlround*, 28 Nov. 2017, <https://howlround.com/m-butterfly-1988-2017>

^{xxx} J. Jack Halberstam, "The Transgender Look," *The Transgender Studies Reader 2*, (New York: Routledge, 2013), 120.

^{xxxi} David Henry Hwang, *M. Butterfly*, (New York: Plume Books, 2017), 100.