

# A Reading of Feminism and Camp in David Henry Hwang's Play *M. Butterfly*

Min Zou<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, The University of Leeds, Leeds, The United Kingdom

Correspondence: Min Zou, School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, The University of Leeds, Leeds, The United Kingdom.

Received: July 20, 2023

Accepted: October 8, 2023

Online Published: October 29, 2023

doi:10.5539/ells.v13n4p30

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v13n4p30>

## Abstract

David Henry Hwang's influential theatrical production of *M. Butterfly* (1988) has been widely discussed in terms of postcolonialism, Asian representations, and the intersection of gender and race. The feminist connotation embodied in the work, however, is largely either ignored or criticized. Employing poststructuralist feminist thoughts of Luce Irigaray, Teresa de Lauretis, and Judith Butler, as well as camp feminist research, the article attempts to illuminate the play's undertones that defy patriarchal construction, gaze, and othering of women's bodies in dominant culture and knowledge. It shows that the characterization of Comrade Chin, Renee, and other main female characters in *M. Butterfly* confront stereotypical representations of women with subversive ones. Moreover, the play camps or plays with fetishized womanhood in an excessive and exaggerated manner. In this way, it lays bare the presumed femininity as an artifice produced via the male gaze, freeing female beholders from identifying with the object and watched position and allowing them to return the watching gaze as a subject.

**Keywords:** American Theatre, feminism, camp, *M. Butterfly*

## 1. Introduction

The 1988 Tony award-winning play *M. Butterfly* impressed the audience with its in-depth exploration of the intersection between gender and race, bringing troubles to biased and stereotypical perceptions of the East. Based on a 1986 espionage case between a French embassy officer and a Chinese opera singer who masqueraded as a woman, it parodies the representations of gender and race in Giacomo Puccini's opera *Madama Butterfly*, an influential Western classic. In Puccini's work, an Asian girl, Cio-Cio-San, submissively endures her Western lover's cruel treatment. *M. Butterfly*, however, allows for a reversal of power relations of male and female, white and yellow, through portraying how the white protagonist René Gallimard gets trapped by his own oriental fantasy of an Oriental Butterfly. As a Broadway hit representing the rising Asian American theatrical works, it was widely discussed for its attempt to critique the postcolonial imaginations of the East (Kondo, 1990; Moy, 1990; Lu, 2004). However, the play's exploration of the social construction of gender roles and femininity, which received less attention, also contains rich space for a feminist interpretation.

Having said that, considering *M. Butterfly* as a story between two men, it is unsurprising that previous feminist studies on the play tend to read it as problematic. As argued by Ilka Saal, "The few female characters who appear in minor, supportive roles are caricatured and ridiculed," thus showing a misogynistic bias (Saal, 1998, p. 642). Likewise, Gabrielle Cody criticizes the play for reinforcing the stereotype of passive and selfless Asian women. In an article titled "David Hwang's *M. Butterfly*: Perpetuating the Misogynist Myth," she writes, "Hwang gives us no alternative but to leave with the image of a dying woman on a floor, and the beauty of sacrifice in our minds" (Cody, 1989, p. 27). Though these critiques offer valuable insights, it would be pitiful if we fail to see that, first, the minor female characters effectively disturb the biased or reduced images of women; second, the female passivity staged in *M. Butterfly* is repeatedly the target of Hwang's playful parody. This research, therefore, attempts to explore the feministic space of the play based on poststructuralist-and-camp feminist studies. It intends to demonstrate the play's subversive potential in counteracting patriarchal norms and affirming women's subjectivity by shedding light on the gender transgression of its female figures. Furthermore, the study tries to enrich feministic scholarship on *M. Butterfly* by employing a noteworthy, yet neglected, lens of camp feminism. It reveals that the work's camp exaggeration of womanness serves as a mockery of the patriarchal gaze and allows for the shifting of the watching positions of female/male and object/subject.

## 2. Feminism and Camp

As a theoretical approach that emerged after the end of the 18th century, feminism, in a broad sense, is concerned with women's inferior and subordinated positions in patriarchal societies. Within feminist criticism, there are complicated and various branches that adhere to different ideas, focuses, and aspirations. Among them, poststructuralist feminism encourages rethinking the conception of female identity as a construction embedded in patriarchal discourses (Khan, 2005). Drawing from poststructuralist destruction of established knowledge, perceptions, and social systems, theorists of the field, such as Luce Irigaray, Teresa de Lauretis, and Judith Butler, challenge the authority of represented female bodies in literature, philosophy, and knowledge, which tend to be accepted as universal truths about women. As Teresa de Lauretis concludes, women as a gender "is (a) representation" and "the representation of gender is its construction," shaped by male-dominated languages and ideologies (1987, p. 3). The representation of women tends to be biased—many othered, objectified, desired, or feared female images are produced in service of male subjectivity rather than reflecting living women's bodies. This is well illustrated in a quotation from Simone de Beauvoir's influential feminist book *The Second Sex* (1949):

He [man] projects onto her [woman] what he desires and fears, what he loves and what he hates. And if it is difficult to say anything about her, it is because man seeks himself entirely in her and because she is All. But she is All in that which is inessential: she is wholly the Other (1949, p. 250).

Though not classified as poststructuralist feminism, Beauvoir's observation here (as well as in other parts of her work) reveals clearly how the "woman" is positioned as an inferior Other in Western religious, philosophical, cultural, and social discourses. This is typically reflected in social assumptions of the feminine as passive, weak, and ornamental (Stott, 1992, p. 62). Therefore, feminist critiques seek to empower female agencies and break away from male-centric gender stereotypes and limitations.

As a sensibility or style theorized after Susan Sontag's 1964 essay "Notes on Camp," camp offers a feministic lens for challenging patriarchal social orders and labels. In Sontag's articulation, camp expresses a "love of the unnatural: of artifice and exaggeration;" "To perceive Camp in objects and persons is to understand Being-as-Playing-a-Role" (Sontag, 1966, pp. 275, 280). In other words, camp pleasure lies in the over-display of presumed natural beings as artificial and performed. The playful manner of camp, which features exaggeration, humour, incongruity, and theatricality, undermines the seriousness and authority of established notions and identities, including patriarchal gender binarism. In the late twentieth century, camp was increasingly discussed and debated as an aesthetic and political strategy in Butch-Femme performances, musical films, drag shows, literature, and pop cultures.

Researchers represented by Pamela Robertson noticed the unique aesthetic style's feminist connotations. In the introduction of a 1996 monograph *Guilty Pleasure: Feminist Camp from Mae West to Madonna*, Robertson places camp "within the framework of feminism" (Robertson, 1996, p. 22). She writes, "Camp, as a performative strategy, as well as a mode of reception, commonly foregrounds the artifice of gender and sexual role through literal and metaphoric transvestism and masquerade" (Robertson, 1996, p. 14). Performing femininity as a deliberate masquerade, camp challenges the hegemonic naturalization of women's bodies and expressions, endowing female spectators with the subject positions of gaze. David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly* involves a reflection of idealized and objectified women representation, including the Oriental Madama Butterfly and the woman in girlie magazines. It challenges these representations with rebel female characters, subverting them via camp exaggeration and pretentiousness. Reading the play through the joint lens of feminism and camp, the study will delve into the play's transgressive female characterization and the rich camp sensibilities that enable a transcendence of oppressive gender discourses.

### 3. Rebel Women: Subverting Gender Roles

While it may make sense to complain about the limited stage time allocated to female characters in *M. Butterfly*, the play's representation of women is far from stereotypical. Rendered as assertive, dominant, and even aggressive, female roles such as Comrade Chin and Renee disturb the assumed male subjectivity that dominates in the patriarchal world, leaving deep impressions on the audience with their unconventional gender qualities.

#### 3.1 A Woman Carrying a "Stick": Comrade Chin and Suzuki

Comrade Chin is a key female figure in *M. Butterfly*. She works as Song Liling's communist coordinator, collecting and reporting intelligence information heard from the latter's French lover. In the early part of the play, she also enacts the role of Suzuki, the maid of Madama Butterfly. People may find that Chin is simultaneously controversial and attractive: controversial for the anti-homosexual power she speaks for, her jarring language and

hilarious rudeness (Note 1), and attractive for her speeches and acts uninhibited by gender restrictions. In Act One, Scene Five, when she acts as Butterfly's servant, her performance shows an evident deviation from the submissive Japanese woman she is supposed to act. In the scene, Suzuki played by Chin does not stay faithfully by her mistress' side, waiting together for the return of the latter's white husband. Instead, she speaks the truth by describing Butterfly's marriage as a deceitful charade and mocking Butterfly's innocence with vulgar and harsh words: "Look, it's finished! Kaput! Done! I mean, the guy was a woofer! Now, stop slathering when an American ship sails in, and let's make some bucks—I mean, yen! We are broke!" (Hwang, 1989, p. 12). She forces Butterfly to face reality and accept other men's courtship, "Now, what about Yamadori? Hey, hey-don't look away" (Hwang, 1989, p. 12). Her unexpectedly assertive and straightforward manners disrupt the notion of women constructed in sexist and orientalist imagination.

When staging as Song Liling's communist coordinator, Comrade Chin displays stronger incongruity against stereotypical femininity. As a Chinese proletariat revolutionist in the 1960s and 1970s, Chin is an egalitarian woman dedicated to her work. Her political and class identification inevitably shapes her gender expression. After the founding of New China, the status of Chinese women was significantly improved, and women were encouraged to be engaged in labour and political activities. Comrade Chin is an extreme example of this group who believed in the equality of men and women. As the coordinator of Song Liling, Chin tends to use simple and forceful words and is businesslike when she communicates with Song, interrogating him harshly if necessary. In fact, the title "comrade" itself has already erased her femininity and pushed her into a space beyond binary gender concepts.

An interesting scene later in the play's script witnesses Comrade Chin using a noteworthy metaphor of "stick." In Scene Two, Act Nine, the character interrogates Song for his political misconduct. After rebuking Song for his bourgeois identity and transgressive behaviour about homosexuality, Chin tries to find a tool to punish him and shouts, "Where's my stick?" (Hwang, 1989, p. 72). In front of the male-bodied Song, Chin's utterance has a profound connotation. Australian sociologist R. W. Connell has examined the constructed nature of the "hegemonic type of masculinity" and revealed its connections with violence, chauvinism, imperialism, colonial expansion, military forces, and so forth (Connell, 2005, pp. 185–199). The metaphor that a woman, in turn, obtains a "stick" serves as an ironic attack on the traditional phallogocentric ideology and discloses the discursive nature of masculinity. Aside from functionally carrying the attributes of violence and power, the "stick" also resembles the male totem, possessing the function of "pricking." Through endowing Chin with a "stick," this play blurs the stereotyped images of men and women.

Regarding Comrade Chin, apart from her engagement in marriage and motherhood, the character's feminine features have been nearly completely erased. Though bringing impact to the normative gender concepts, the figure seems to go to another extreme of gender stereotype. In the characterization of Renee, however, the two poles of gender traits are fused in greater harmony. She wanders freely between feminine allure and masculine aggression. Not only does she enjoy her female body, but she also behaves actively, expressing her standpoints and appeals toughly by making strong arguments. This portrayal perfectly echoes "the androgynous idea" of British writer Virginia Woolf. In an essay from her influential work *A Room of One's Own* (1929), Woolf articulates and affirms that "a great mind is androgynous," that "if one is a man, still the woman part of his brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her... It is when this fusion takes place that the mind is fully fertilized and uses all its faculties" (Woolf, 1977, p. 106). Renee and her derivative characters (Isabelle and magazine girl) have undoubtedly disturbed binary sexual norms and embody this thought.

### 3.2 A Woman in "Upper" Position: Renee, Isabelle, and the Magazine Girl

In *M. Butterfly*, Isabelle (Gallimard's first sexual partner), the girl in pornographic magazines, and Renee (the second secret lover of Gallimard) are played by the same person. Like the special connection between Suzuki and Comrade Chin, these figures also follow a stylized design of cross-referencing. Isabelle, Gallimard's first sexual partner, is another version of Renee. She "never wore underwear," adopting the "upper" position when making love with Gallimard, "bouncing up and down on my [Gallimard's] loins," "screaming, and breaking off the branches all around me [Gallimard], and pounding my [Gallimard's] butt up and down into the dirt" (Hwang, 1989, p. 33). Against the traditional expectations of women being passive, restrained, and reserved, Isabelle occupies the territory of active sex and requests sexual pleasure with aggressive, even violent, actions.

Moreover, these qualities are embodied in the characterization of Renee as well. Renee is a Danish student based in China, and she becomes Gallimard's secret lover after they meet at a party held at the Austrian embassy. Gallimard praises her for being "picture perfect. With a body like those girls in the magazines" (Hwang, 1989, p.

54). However, at the same time, he questions, “But is it possible for a woman to be *too* uninhibited, *too* willing, so as to seem almost too ... masculine? [Hwang’s emphasis]” (Hwang, 1989, p. 54). Renee possesses strong feminine charm and sexual desires, yet she does not refrain from displaying great initiative, reason, and rebellion: the typical features of masculinity that surprise Gallimard and upset him.

In the sixth scene of the second act, the two characters date again in a hotel. Renee towel-dries her hair after taking a shower. She comments casually about Gallimard’s penis before she starts to joke about several existing ways to refer to the organ:

GALLIMARD: I suppose I just say “penis.”

RENEE: Yeah. That’s pretty clinical. There’s “cock,” but that sounds like a chicken. And “prick” is painful, and “dick” is like you’re talking about someone who’s not in the room.

GALLIMARD: Yes. It’s a ... bigger problem than I imagined.

RENEE: I—I think maybe it’s because I really don’t know what to do with them—that’s why I call them “weenies.” (Hwang, 1989, p. 55)

What she says next also discloses and dismantles the power dynamics behind men’s fascination with a big phallus in an ironic way:

RENEE: Like, I think the reason we fight wars is because we wear clothes. Because no one knows—between the men, I mean—who has the bigger... weenie... And that’s what we call a civilized society. The whole world run by a bunch of men with pricks the size of pins. (Hwang, 1989, pp. 55–56)

According to the redefinition given by Renee, “war” and “power” become a childish game of men comparing with each other to see who has the “bigger weenie.” Her lines effortlessly reveal the underlying phallic worship in male-dominated politics with incisive criticism, manifesting a rebellion against this symbolic order. In her relationship with Gallimard, it is evident that Renee occupies the role of dominator. She boldly states her personal theory to Gallimard and breaks the myth of the represented women as a silent ornament.

Renee’s criticism of the connection between “phallus” (a symbol of masculinity and paternity) and privilege resonates with many poststructuralist feminists’ reflection, dialogue, and reformulation of Freud and Lacan’s psychoanalytic approaches. Criticizing phallogocentric presumptions in psychoanalysis (where meanings are given only through the criterion of phallus), the French feminists examine and endeavor to disturb the phallus’s symbolic status throughout Western thought within this research field (Tandon, 2008, pp. 77–78). According to Luce Irigaray, women’s subjectivity (instead of their representation) is always excluded from the prevalent phallogocentric symbolic order. Judith Butler summarizes this insight of Irigaray: “When those specular (and spectral) feminine figures are taken to be the feminine, the feminine is... fully erased by its very representation” (Butler, 1993, p. 36). Within the prevailing imaginations and narratives, a woman tends to be perceived as a “specular” image, which means the “phantasmatic notions” idealized in patriarchal discourses (Butler, 1993, p. 35). Utilizing her deceptive sexy and desirable appearance, Renee slips into a scenario where she can comment on patriarchal operating rules. She articulates Phallocentrism in an unreserved, comical, excessive manner, ultimately rendering it inherently absurd. This strategy of unsettling male authority echoes Irigaray’s writings. Butler states that “her [Irigaray’s] terms tend to mime the grandiosity of the [patriarchal] philosophical errors that she underscores,” and this practice constitutes an “insubordination” against “paternal language” per se. In doing so, Renee intervenes forcefully in the realm of patriarchal discourses with her presence as a living female subject and disturbs the stability of the Phallogocentric ideology.

The gender transgression of Chin, Renee, and other derivative characters in this play crosses the clear boundary between masculinity and femininity and overrides gender stereotypes. It suggests that women do not have to be passive and gentle; that they can display toughness in manner like Comrade Chin, who wields a “stick” that symbolizes the privilege of man; or they can also be as aggressive as Renee, who attempts to break free from the conventional marginalized position of women and express her subjectivity. The portrayal of these figures reminds the audience of the constructed nature and the fluidity of gender and sex, opening a new denotative space beyond the limited gender phantasmata.

#### 4. Negotiation of Females’ Object/Subject Positions

As *M. Butterfly* unfolds, the fixed position of female subjects as a gazed object is destabilized, which presents an underlying feminist campness. The play lays bare the watched, eroticized, and objectified position of women as they appear in mass media. Moreover, it subverts the asymmetric power relation via the gaze returned by female characters and their exaggerated camp performance of fetishistic female representation. One scene in the play

vividly portrays the patriarchal objectification of women epitomized in the “male gaze.” In Act One, Scene Nine, two white male characters, Gallimard and Marc, envision a perfect woman under their watchful eyes.

*They spot a light in a window.*

MARC: There! There, Rene!

GALLIMARD: It’s her window.

MARC: Late at night-it burns. The light-it burns for you.

GALLIMARD: I won’t look. It’s not respectful.

MARC: We don’t have to be respectful. We’re foreign devils

*Enter Song, in a sheer robe. The “One Fine Day” aria creeps in over the speakers. With her back to us. Song mimes attending to her toilette. Her robe comes loose, revealing her white shoulders* (Hwang, 1989, p. 25).

The scene dramatizes deliberately the working of the male gaze on female bodies. Many feminist media studies have pointed out an unequal way of watching in films or other cultural artifacts, where the woman is the object to be gazed at, while the man is the subject who enjoys the watched image. The “she” appearing as a representation is often sexualized, serving as a source of male desire and pleasure. In Laura Mulvey’s essay “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” (published in 1975), the “male gaze” issue is theorized. In the essay, Mulvey borrows Freud’s psychoanalytic theory, suggesting that the male gaze in cinema derives from the “fetishistic scopophilia” (Mulvey, 1999, p. 840). In Freud’s theorization on sexualities, women’s lack of a penis can cause male subjects’ unconscious castration anxiety. A certain part of women, such as the thigh, breast, and a female ornament, then possibly work for these men as a substitute for phallus; it alleviates their sense of anxiety and becomes a source of fetish. Mulvey associated this psychology with the fetishized and objectified women’s bodies on screen that bring erotic satisfaction to male viewers. Also, she illuminates that the camera’s role as the male gaze in male-dominated culture reflects how the controlling gaze of the looked body turns the latter into an object and provides sexual pleasure and enjoyment for the “peeping Toms” (Mulvey, 1999, p. 835).

In the aforementioned scene, Song, who here represents the eastern female body, is gazed at by Gallimard, Marc, and the audience through an evocative “window” with her “back” to “us.” With the aria “One Fine Day” strengthening an Orientalist connotation, her seductive skin and body are gradually revealed as her “robe comes loose.” The male gaze of the imaged female Asian body discloses the patriarchal practices of looking and their hegemonic forces in objectifying the Other. Considering that the working of the male gaze in cinema heavily relies on cinema’s function of providing the audience with “the sense of forgetting the world as the ego has subsequently come to perceive it” (Mulvey, 1999, p. 836), the representation of male gaze in literature and drama work may have a similar effect by inviting readers and spectators to an imaginary world where they “watch” the plots happening.

It is also worth noting that females in *M. Butterfly* are not always the objects of the male gaze; instead, there are some occasions when females become the controller and turn males into the object, which reverses, and thereby counterattacks, the convention of the male gaze. In act two, scene six, Gallimard and his superior, Toulon, discuss sensitive military intelligence, downstage, while Song Liling is shown upstage, dancing with and clipping flowers as if she were drunk. As the scene progresses, Gallimard frequently suspends his conversation, leaving Toulon “frozen” on stage, and runs upstage, keeping watch on Song’s actions with obvious suspicion. At the same time, Song pretends to be obsessed with her drunken dance, “slowly and deliberately clips a flower off its stem,” reassuring Gallimard of her submissive nature (Hwang, 1989, p. 57). When Gallimard looks at Song several times with a belief of being a controller, he is actually watched from upstage by his Butterfly, a Chinese male spy, masquerading as the little Asian woman “in a childlike trance” (Hwang, 1989, p. 57). The scene’s female beholders can shift their viewing position accordingly and become free to swing between the roles of subject and object.

Interestingly, in another example showcasing how female characters respond to a patriarchal gaze, the artificial image of the “window” reoccurs. In a fantasy scene of Act One, Scene Five, a “pinup girl in a sexy negligee” walks out of the “girlie magazines,” claiming that she is standing in front of a window, with blinds opened by her:

The “Love Duet” creeps in over the speakers. Special comes up, revealing, not Song this time, but a pinup girl in a sexy negligee, her back to us. Gallimard turns upstage and looks at her.

GIRL: I know you’re watching me.

.....

GIRL: I stand there, in the light, displaying myself.

GALLIMARD: No. She's—why is she naked?

GIRL: To you.

GALLIMARD: In front of a window? This is wrong. No—

GIRL: Without shame.

GALLIMARD: No, she must ... like it.

GIRL: I like it.

GALLIMARD: She... she wants me to see.

GIRL: I want you to see (Hwang, 1989, pp. 10–11).

It is not hard to find that Gallimard applies a similar way of “watching”: a peeping gaze from “upstage” and a female “object” with her “back to us” suggests she is in a way controlled by the secret watcher. However, her awareness of being watched differentiates her from the typical watched object and transforms her position into an active one. Furthermore, her character is constituted with excessive femininity, enjoying being watched and deliberately displaying her sexy body. In this way, the eroticized female embodiment in the scene is rendered as a camp masquerade, which is pretentious and artificial. The magazine girl’s camp performance invites the audience to reflect on gender as an unnatural being. It allows female beholders to shift from identifying with the female object to becoming active observers who interrogate and mock this representation. As Mary Ann Doane suggests, “The masquerade, in flaunting femininity, holds it at a distance. Womanliness is a mask which can be worn or removed,” the exaggerated femininity serves as a masquerade that alienates female readers from a masochistic position, thus reducing the patriarchal oppression (Doane, 1982, p. 81). The magazine girl’s conscious embrace of objectification highlights an irony towards male dominance. By controlling a man’s gaze and leading him to “see more,” this female character assumes an active position through the act of covert “watching.”

In addition, a camp sensibility embodied in artificiality, androgyny, and exaggeration can be traced in Song’s drag performance of “The Drunken Beauty” and Cio-Cio-San, an image also played by Gallimard in the play’s ending. In their performances, the artistic tension of androgyny and the discordance of biological sex and gender are stressed so as to remind female beholders of the performative nature of gender identity. The intentionally designed and recurring artificial stage props, including “a wash basin of water,” “kimono,” and “mirror,” also reinforce a camp sensibility, implying that the sex codes, which can be washed and made up, are imposed and consolidated by the gender norms (Hwang, 1989, pp. 79, 92). As argued by Pamela Robertson, camp performance as “a kind of parodic play between subject and object in which the female spectator laughs at and plays with her own image” enables female beholders to negotiate object/subject positions (Robertson, 1996, p. 13). The campness concerning drag performance encourages the audience, especially the female audience, to become actively engaged and to critically evaluate the dominant order.

## 5. Conclusion

The women conjured in cultural works and social discourses, like the target of parody in *M. Butterfly*—the Eastern beauty, tend to be a site affected by men’s desire and power. These representations and expectations generate gender norms about what a woman is supposed to be like, rendering invisible heterogenous female bodies and expressions. Inspired by poststructuralist feminist thoughts and camp feminism studies, the study finds that the 1988 production of *M. Butterfly*’s challenge to the gender hierarchy lies not only in the male protagonists’ reenactment and subversion of the opera “Madama Butterfly” but also in its female portrayal. This article focuses on the play’s disruption of idealized femininity and digs out its camp feminist undercurrents, which are neglected in previous feminist studies of the work. In the first half of the script analysis, the present researcher examines the gender transgression in the characterization of the main female characters, demonstrating their deviation from and interference with the patriarchal scripts of female roles. In the second part, the article further inquires how these scripted roles are presented as artificial and illusive through the play’s camp performance. It is argued that Hwang dramatizes women’s presumed object position and passivity as a fantasy under the male gaze. The eroticized female embodiments’ self-awareness and deliberate playing of their femininity, then, constitute a camp return to the watching eyesight, which allows them (and female beholders) to navigate between the object and subject positions.

The female configurations in *M. Butterfly*, though not the focus of its storyline, free the female body from a

position of passive femininity. Whilst being provocative with their “jarring” expressions of subjectivity and desire, Chin and Renee and their “shadows” bring discomfort to those eyes accustomed to accepted patterns of women. More importantly, they demonstrate more nuanced possibilities of gendered selves. Likewise, the work’s playful camp on exaggerated womanhood inflates gender identities and renders them as constructed roles. It subverts female subjects’ objectified and gazed position, breaking up the monolithic gender concepts into the unfixed aggregation of power, performance, desire, and discourses.

### **Acknowledgments**

I want to express my sincere gratitude to my academic mentors during my academic journey. Professor Helen Finch and Dr. Denis Flannery provided invaluable guidance throughout my PhD studies. I am deeply thankful to Associate Professor Du Lixia at Xi’an Jiaotong University for her support and encouragement during my Master’s project on *M. Butterfly*.

### **Authors contributions**

Not applicable

### **Funding**

This work was supported by China Scholarship Council-University of Leeds Scholarship.

### **Competing interests**

The author declares that she has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### **Informed consent**

Obtained.

### **Ethics approval**

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Canadian Center of Science and Education.

The journal’s policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

### **Provenance and peer review**

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

### **Data availability statement**

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

### **Data sharing statement**

No additional data are available.

### **References**

- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that Matter; on the Discursive Limits of “Sex”*. New York: Routledge New York.
- Cody, G. (1989). David Hwang’s *M. Butterfly*: Perpetuating the Misogynist Myth. *Theater*, 20(2), 24–27. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01610775-20-2-24>
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Beauvoir, S. (1949/2011). *The Second Sex* (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). Vintage.
- Doane, M. A. (1982). Film and the Masquerade: Theorising the Female Spectator. *Screen*, 23(3–4), 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/23.3-4.74>
- Hwang, D. H. (1989). *M. Butterfly*. New York: A Plume Book.
- Khan, F. (2005). Poststructuralist Feminist Discourse: An Over-view. *Journal of Research (Languages & Islamic Studies)*, 8(1), 15–26.
- Kondo, D. K. (1990). “M. Butterfly”: Orientalism, Gender, and a Critique of Essentialist Identity. *Cultural Critique*, 16, 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1354343>
- Lu, W. (2004). Simulation, Ambiguity, and Hybridity: A Postcolonial Interpretation from Madame Butterfly to *M. Butterfly*. *Foreign Literature*, 4, 86–91. <https://doi.org/10.16430/j.cnki.fl.2004.04.019>
- Moy, J. S. (1990). David Henry Hwang’s ‘M. Butterfly’ and Philip Kan Gotanda’s ‘Yankee Dawg You Die’:

- Repositioning Chinese American Marginality on the American Stage. *Theatre Journal*, 42(1), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3207557>
- Mulvey, L. (1999). Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. In L. Braudy & M. Cohen (Eds.), *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings* (pp. 833–844). New York: Oxford UP. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474473224-009>
- Robertson, P. (1996). *Guilty pleasures: Feminist camp from Mae West to Madonna*. Duke University Press.
- Saal, I. (1998). Performance and Perception: Gender, Sexuality, and Culture in David Henry Hwang's "M. Butterfly." *Amerikastudien/American Studies*, 43(4), 629–644. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41157422>
- Sontag, S. (1966). *Against Interpretation, and Other Essays*. New York: Dell Pub. Co.
- Stott, A. (1992). Floral Femininity: A Pictorial Definition. *American Art*, 6(2), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1086/424151>
- Tandon, N. (2008). *Feminism: A Paradigm Shift*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Dist.
- Woolf, V. (1977). *A Room of One's Own* (9th ed.). London: Grafton.

### Notes

Note 1. For more negative reviews of Chin's "jarring" speeches and acts, please see: Moy, J. S. (1990). David Henry Hwang's "M. Butterfly" and Philip Kan Gotanda's "Yankee Dawg You Die": Repositioning Chinese American Marginality on the American Stage. *Theatre Journal*, 42(1), 48–56; And Lee, Q. (1993). Between the Oriental and the Transvestite. *Found Object*, 2, 45–66.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).