

## Transgender and the Literary Imagination: Changing Gender in Twentieth-Century Writing

A figure in the throes of a furious struggle is illuminated against the darkness by the intermittent flash of a photographer's bulb, the sounds of extreme human exertion and the slap of fists and feet against hard, damp surfaces testifying to an otherwise invisible contest between the human body and inanimate matter. In *Becoming an Image* (2012–) the performance artist Cassils applies the prowess and agility of a body disciplined by intensive training to the task of transforming a monumental block of clay. Capturing the artist in postures which are both frozen and fleeting, photographic documentation does more than simply record: it frames the audience's experience of the performance, imprinting images which are both arbitrary and forceful. One still image in particular uncannily evokes the traditions of classical statuary, depicting a human figure seemingly seated atop a battered pedestal in a posture of Promethean ambiguity: is this a body emerging out of the clay, moulded by a hidden hand? Or is this the figure of the artist, fixed to the rock in eternal punishment for the crime of creative presumption?<sup>1</sup> Originating as a commission by the ONE Archives in Los Angeles, home to a longstanding LGBTQ archive, *Becoming an Image* draws attention to what is neither seen nor recorded: it is a testament to the struggle to make an impression in the field of representation, to gain visibility in conditions of unseeing and to find a foothold in the institutions of cultural memory. Cassils's work speaks powerfully to the themes of this book, which examines questions of visibility, recognition and representation in relation to literary narrative. A key concern for this study is the way in which transgender lives – whether historical or fictional – have been 'authored by others': named, defined and appropriated in ways which obscure, displace or erase transgender

experiences, identities and histories. By revisiting twentieth-century narratives and their afterlives this book aims to examine the legacies of this representational history, exploring the extent to which transgender potential can be recovered and realised.

*Transgender and the Literary Imagination* examines a selection of literary fiction by British, Irish and American authors first published between 1918 and 2000, each text featuring a protagonist (and in some cases two) whose gender identity differs from that assigned to them at birth: George Moore's naturalistic novella set in an 1860s Dublin hotel, *Albert Nobbs* (1918); Angela Carter's dystopian feminist fantasy *The Passion of New Eve* (1977); Jackie Kay's contemporary fiction inspired by the life of a post-war jazz musician, *Trumpet* (1998); Patricia Duncker's historical novel based on the life of a nineteenth-century colonial military surgeon, *James Miranda Barry* (1999); David Ebershoff's historical fiction *The Danish Girl* (2000), based on the life of Lili Elbe, reputed to be the first person to undergo gender reassignment treatment. An interest in the intertextual relationship between these narratives and a range of source and adapted texts is central to this study, which explores memoir, biography, drama and film, including historical biographies of James Miranda Barry, Niels Hoyer's 1931 'memoir' of the life of Lili Elbe, *Man into Woman*, and Simone Benmussa's 1977 stage adaptation *The Singular Life of Albert Nobbs*; the afterlives of these narratives are explored with a special focus on contemporary film adaptation, specifically *Albert Nobbs* (directed by Rodrigo García, 2011) and *The Danish Girl* (directed by Tom Hooper, 2016). 'Transgender' is a term whose current meanings can be traced to its origins in the 1990s in a combination of contexts, including community formation, political activism and scholarly enquiry. The first decades of the twenty-first century have witnessed the entry of debates about transgender rights and representation into mainstream public discourse and popular culture.<sup>2</sup> In this context, this study returns to the narrative representations of an earlier era, examining how they reflect, shape or transform changing understandings of gender in the twentieth century and beyond. By identifying and analysing the narrative strategies and motifs which have characterised the representation of transgender lives in literary fiction prior to the twenty-first century, this book investigates the relationship between these narratives and dominant ideas about the origins, meaning and significance of conventional categories of sex and gender.

The American campaigner Virginia Prince (1912–2009) is widely credited as being the first to coin the term 'transgender'.<sup>3</sup> However, the publication in 1992 of Leslie Feinberg's pioneering *Transgender*

*Liberation: A Movement Whose Time Has Come* is seen by many as playing a pivotal role in establishing transgender as a concept referring to ‘an imagined political alliance of all possible forms of gender antinormativity’.<sup>4</sup> As T. Benjamin Singer writes:

Feinberg’s manifesto resonated with an early 1990s social imaginary that infused the category transgender with the collective energy of a social movement – enabling a range of different bodies to congregate underneath a single umbrella. Without this sense of political collectivity, it would not have been possible to visually render transgender as an umbrella instead of a continuum of gender-nonconforming identities and behaviours or as a particular mode of being.<sup>5</sup>

Singer notes that the ‘original purpose’ of the term, as conceived by Feinberg, was for ‘political advocacy’,<sup>6</sup> and from the late twentieth century onwards transgender activists and organisations have variously challenged conventional assumptions about sex and gender and campaigned for social and legal change.<sup>7</sup> While the term and its meanings have continued to evolve over the decades, it is worth reflecting on the distinctive characteristics of this formative formulation. Firstly, the adoption of the term ‘transgender’ represents a rejection of existing clinical terms and definitions, with their origins in medical and psychiatric discourse, and an assertion of the right to self-determination: in this way, it constitutes a refusal to be named by others and an expression of a developing sense of collective identity and agency. Secondly, the term embraces an identity grounded in the experience of transition, defying the pressures to conceal or deny a differently gendered past. In an essay which has proved a founding text for the field of transgender studies, ‘The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto’, Sandy Stone wryly observed that the ‘highest purpose of the transsexual is to erase him/herself, to fade into the “normal” population as soon as possible’.<sup>8</sup> To identify as transgender is to refuse the invisibility – whether social, political or cultural – which Stone describes. In *Second Skins: The Body Narratives of Transsexuality*, Jay Prosser conveys this conceptual shift in the following way:

If transsexual has been conceived conventionally as a transitional phase to pass through once the transsexual can pass and assimilate as nontranssexual – one begins as female, one becomes a transsexual, one is a man – under the aegis of transgender, transsexuals, now refusing to pass through transsexuality, are speaking en masse as transsexuals, forming activist groups, academic networks, transgender ‘nations’.<sup>9</sup>

Indeed, the emergence of ‘transition’ as ‘the vernacular term of choice’ for ‘describing the process or experience of changing gender’<sup>10</sup> is important here; where the phrase ‘sex change’ has acted to imply an irrevocable rupture effected by medical intervention, ‘transition’ foregrounds a durational experience without a single, fixed or finite destination. Finally, transgender is an inclusive category which provides space for a diverse range of gender identities. It is not simply equivalent to, nor a substitute for, ‘transsexual’ (a term referring to someone who seeks or has undergone gender reassignment treatment) but rather provides an organising ‘umbrella’ for a range of people who, in Talia Mae Bettcher’s words, ‘do not appear to conform to traditional gender norms by presenting and living genders that were not assigned to them at birth or by presenting and living genders in ways that may not be readily intelligible in terms of more traditional conceptions’.<sup>11</sup> This book does not seek to define, explain or delimit who counts as transgender in literary fiction but rather to examine the narrative strategies at work in the representation of characters whose lived gender identity or expression differs to that assigned to them at birth. In doing so it aims to examine how narrative conventions have shaped the ways in which characters with transgender potential are read, interpreted or understood in literary fiction in particular, and cultural representation more broadly.

The challenges of cultural intelligibility and the struggle for self-determination are especially evident in twentieth-century texts in the form of two recurring and closely related motifs: the prominence of modes of life writing and the persistence of tropes of forcible revelation. Life writing – both biography and autobiography – has proved an important genre in relation to transgender representation and has been the focus of key works on cultural representation in the field of transgender studies.<sup>12</sup> Jack Halberstam’s critique of transgender biography in his pivotal essay ‘Telling Tales: Brandon Teena, Billy Tipton, and Transgender Biography’ demonstrates the ways in which transgender lives have been forcibly ‘dismantled and reassembled’,<sup>13</sup> imposing normative assumptions about sex and gender and overwriting the reality of lived experience. By contrast, autobiography could be seen as a form of self-expression through which such misrepresentations might be redressed. The genre is given close consideration in Prosser’s *Second Skins*, where he proposes that ‘every transsexual, as a transsexual, is originally an autobiographer’.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the publication of a number of widely read transgender memoirs over the course of the twentieth century has shaped popular perceptions about the forms such life stories take. However, consideration of the contexts in which these

narratives have been produced draws attention to the specific discursive conditions of some transgender life writing. As Prosser argues: ‘The autobiographical act for the transsexual begins even before the published autobiography – namely, in the clinician’s office where, in order to be diagnosed as transsexual, s/he must recount a transsexual autobiography.’<sup>15</sup> The complex relationship between auto/biographical and fictional accounts of transgender lives will be examined in this book with reference to the narrative afterlives of James Miranda Barry (c. 1799–1865), Lili Elbe (1882–1931) and Billy Tipton (1914–89), with an emphasis on the extent to which these narratives perpetuate or resist the dynamic outlined in Halberstam’s essay. The narrative of forcible, and often posthumous, exposure is not only a recurring trope in historical biographies of transgender subjects but also extends across a range of cultural narratives. It is exploited in particular ways in visual culture, including film and television drama, where the spectacle of revelation has been used to achieve effects ranging from comedy to horror. This trope raises central questions to do with self-determination and representation, especially as it typically mobilises demeaning, pathologising or sensationalist meanings which negate the transgender subject’s self-definition. In an essay on what she terms the ‘reveal’ as a narrative device, Danielle M. Seid argues:

Structuring an audience’s knowledge of a character’s transgender status as a reveal can contribute to the perception that living a transgender life involves concealing ‘the truth’ of sexed bodies. The moment of the reveal provokes a struggle over the meaning of the trans body, a struggle in which the trans person often ‘loses’ to dominant discourses about trans lives, the conclusion being: that’s *really* a man. [emphasis in original]<sup>16</sup>

The protagonists who feature in the texts examined in this study are repeatedly subject to unwanted acts of revelation which rewrite their identity, typically reversing their lived gender identity: for George Moore’s Albert Nobbs, Patricia Duncker’s James Miranda Barry and Jackie Kay’s Joss Moody this takes the form of a posthumous exposure, whereas for Tristessa in Angela Carter’s *The Passion of New Eve* it instigates a series of events which conclude with her murder. The varying treatment of this theme will be examined in close detail, culminating with an extended exploration of Kay’s unravelling of the narrative dynamics of forcible exposure in her novel *Trumpet*. Drawing on the insights of leading scholars in the field of transgender studies, this book aims to provide new frameworks for the analysis of literary fiction as a significant form of cultural representation. More

specifically, by situating a selection of key texts in a range of historical, cultural and intertextual contexts, it will examine the following topics: questions of historical representation in relation to historical fiction; the influence of genres of transgender life writing, including memoir and biography; the legacies of Second Wave feminist critiques of transsexuals; the impact of narratives of gender crossing on the interpretation of transgender lives; the relationship between transsexual narratives and intersex bodies; the role of colonial contexts and discourses of 'race' in the construction of gender normativity. The sections which follow provide a more extended consideration of critical frameworks essential for the project of rereading representations of transgender in twentieth-century literary fiction: the first section addresses debates to do with transgender historiography; the second and third sections consider the relationship between transgender studies and feminism and queer theory respectively; the fourth and final section reflects on contemporary debates about the limits of identity politics. This introduction will conclude with an overview of the book structure, providing summaries of each chapter.

### Paradoxical Projects: Transgender Historiography

In a founding intervention in the field of transgender studies, 'The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto', Sandy Stone observes that 'it is difficult to generate a counterdiscourse if one is programmed to disappear'.<sup>17</sup> Historically, assimilation – whether coercive, strategic or desired – has served an important function as a means by which people perceived to be non-normative in terms of their sexed or gendered identity could seek to evade the social penalties of stigma, discrimination and prejudice. In this context, questions of visibility have proved a recurring preoccupation within the field of transgender historiography. Indeed, Halberstam has described transgender history as a 'paradoxical project' in that it 'represents the desire to narrate lives that may wilfully defy narrative'.<sup>18</sup> By contrast, a 'refusal to disappear'<sup>19</sup> is identified by Prosser as a defining characteristic of transgender identification in contemporary contexts, expressing as it does a collective affirmation of identity in defiance of a culturally coerced invisibility. The recovery of a hidden history has been an imperative for many identity politics movements seeking to redress a legacy of cultural misrepresentation. However, the relationship between the needs of contemporary rights movements and the evidence of historical record is a complex one, characterised by

the challenge of recovering minority histories from historical sources which may obscure or deny their existence. Moreover, the potential subjects of a transgender history can be subject to competing claims given that the historical practice of ‘gender crossing’ has acquired significant meanings in women’s, lesbian and gay, and queer historiography. Finally, the tensions between historically specific constructions of identity and the historical records of lived experience which predate them pose further questions of interpretation across time.

In a 2008 essay exploring narratives of female cross-dressing in late Victorian London, Katie Hindmarch-Watson articulates some of the concerns that have been expressed about transgender historiography: ‘The ahistorical transgender subject is the latest manifestation of a politically useful but historically problematic attempt to locate nonnormative gendered individuals within a grand narrative culminating in present-day transgendered lived experience.’<sup>20</sup> Firstly, there is a concern about the anachronistic imposition of contemporary categories of identity on past historical subjects; such a methodology is understood as ahistorical because it universalises current understandings without due regard for historical difference. Moreover, integral to this critique is a sense that retrospection is being put to improper use, with the historical past conjured as a mirror image of the present. Finally, the imposition of a linear, teleological narrative whose only destination is the present moment is at odds with the insights of postmodern historiography, with its emphasis on the textuality, contingency and multiplicity of historical narrative and its implication in uneven dynamics of power. It is interesting to note that this observation is situated in the context of a historical analysis of ‘female cross-dressing’. Indeed, the author acknowledges that this figure has been the object of interpretative struggles: ‘Usually, passing women are divided into those who, through their intimate and sexual relations with women, are considered the rightful subjects of lesbian history and those whose heterosexual relations remove them from the scholarship about sexual deviance.’<sup>21</sup> The question of who constitutes the ‘rightful subject’ of any historical enquiry – especially those concerned with gender or sexual minorities – is a potent one. The broader context of Hindmarch-Watson’s compelling historical analysis is worth further reflection. The allusion to feminist and lesbian feminist historiography reminds us that questions of identity, visibility and methodology are not unique to transgender history. To take lesbian historiography as one example, in their introduction to *Sapphic Modernities* (2007), Laura Doan and Jane Garrity suggest that ‘scholars in lesbian studies have been inordinately preoccupied with the question of “who counts” or “what is it that we count” in assigning modern categories

of sexuality (lesbian, bisexual, straight, etc.)', concluding that 'such questions are, in fact, at the crux of lesbian historiography'.<sup>22</sup> In their survey of lesbian historiography they note that leading scholars (such as Judith Bennett and Martha Vicinus) have emphasised the 'importance of avoiding ahistoricism by differentiating between questions that concern us now (the urge and desire to know for sure) and what the historical record allows us to conclude (what might never be known)'.<sup>23</sup> Foucault's hypothesis, outlined in his *History of Sexuality*, that homosexuality as a category of sexual identity – indeed the very idea of sexual identity as a category – is the effect of a unique confluence of legal, medical and psychological discourses in the late nineteenth century has been central to debates about lesbian and gay historiography. Some scholars, including in the field of lesbian history, have questioned the usefulness of Foucault's theories on the grounds that they appear to render invisible the historical existence of lesbians and gay men prior to the late nineteenth century. However, in other contexts, and especially within queer historiography, Foucault's insights into the discursive and historically specific production of sexed, gendered and sexual identities have significantly extended the field of historical enquiry. In her 2004 essay 'Queer Physiognomies: Or, How Many Ways Can We Do the History of Sexuality?', Dana Seitler describes how this historicising of categories of identity has informed queer perspectives on the past:

Ostensibly moving away from the assumptions of identity politics, queer theory has had as its promise a project that was less interested in 'discovering' stable sexual subjects from the past than in developing an understanding of the process of deviant subject formation that helped constitute the prescriptions for compulsory heterosexuality.<sup>24</sup>

Similarly, leading theorists in the field of transgender studies have offered strategies for reconstructing potential transgender histories without projecting contemporary categories on to the past. Indeed, in 'Telling Tales', Halberstam does not aim to name, identify or categorise the historical subjects of her essay, but rather to recognise their narratives as 'unresolved tales of gender variance that will follow us from the twentieth century to the twenty-first century: not resolved, not near, not understood'.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, for Susan Stryker 'transgender phenomena'<sup>26</sup> are not limited to questions of individual identification but rather extend to 'anything that calls our attention to the contingency and unnaturalness of gender normativity'.<sup>27</sup> In the following account Stryker gives some indication of the kind of locations in historical archives where the 'transgender phenomena' of the past



might be discerned: ‘appear[ing] at the margins of the biopolitically operated-upon body, at those fleeting and variable points at which particular bodies exceed or elude capture within the gender apparatus when they defy the logic of the biopolitical calculus or present a case that confounds an administrative rule or bureaucratic practice.’<sup>28</sup> Indeed, K. J. Rawson has argued that a history of transgender people may be dispersed across a range of sources, rather than residing in any single archive:

Prior to the development of ‘transgender’ as a discrete identity, a variety of state-sponsored materials – dress code laws, police documents, immigration reports, homicide records – provide a glimpse of the troubled meetings between gender-nonconforming people and the social and legal mechanisms that have attempted to define, control, and dictate gender norms.<sup>29</sup>

These ‘glimpse[s]’ of ‘troubled meetings’ are what the historian of transgender phenomena might be alert to, whether working in the medium of historical record or fictional reconstruction. David Getsy’s concept of ‘transgender capacity’<sup>30</sup> is immensely helpful in conceptualising a methodology conducive to transgender historiography and is defined as follows: ‘Transgender capacity is the ability or the potential for making visible, bringing into experience, or knowing genders as mutable, successive, and multiple.’<sup>31</sup> Getsy explains how recognition of ‘transgender capacity’ might be applied to historical methodology:

With regard to historical analysis, transgender capacity poses particularly urgent questions, since it is clear that there is a wealth of gender variance and nonconformity that has simply not been registered in the historical record. Without projecting present-day understandings of transgender identities into the past, one must recognize and make space for all of the ways in which self-determined and successive genders, identities, and bodily morphologies have always been present throughout history as possibilities and actualities.<sup>32</sup>

Hence, it is with these ‘unresolved tales’ (Halberstam), historical ‘glimpses’ (Rawson), and ‘possibilities and actualities’ (Getsy) in mind that this study approaches the question of historical existence within cultural representation and narrative, whether memoir, biography, fiction, drama or film. Within the field of literary criticism, characters whose gendered identity is at odds with prevailing assumptions about the relationship between sex and gender have historically tended to be the provenance of feminist, lesbian and gay and queer readings.<sup>33</sup>

For the purposes of this study, a focus on the ‘transgender capacity’<sup>34</sup> of the protagonists of each text will be the starting point for analysis. This is not to suggest that the protagonist – whether fictional or historical – should only be read as transgender, nor is it to preclude other readings of his or her gendered identity. Rather, these readings are offered as a counter discourse to dominant narratives (historical, literary and critical) which have either overlooked the transgender potential of the figure concerned or defined it in negative or disparaging terms. It is not the intention of this study to anachronistically impose contemporary categories of identity – themselves dynamic and subject to change – on to historical subjects which predate their emergence. Nor does it seek to judge historically contingent texts – and their authors – against protocols of address which they could not have anticipated. However, it does aim to examine a specific set of narrative strategies employed in the telling of lives which we might now wish to call transgender and to examine how these strategies both produce and deny different narrative possibilities. In her 2008 book *Transgender History*, Susan Stryker notes: ‘What counts as transgender varies as much as gender itself, and it always depends on historical and cultural context.’<sup>35</sup> This study will pay attention to the variety of contexts at work in the production and reception of the texts examined, including the period in which the narrative is situated (ranging from the British Empire in the early nineteenth century, to 1860s Dublin and early-twentieth-century Europe), the era in which the text was written and published (from 1918 to 2000), the cultural conditions in which adaptations for the stage and screen were produced, and the present moment from which the cultural productions of the last century – and their afterlives – are revisited. A historicising approach is also essential when considering the relationship between transgender representation and a critical framework which has played a formative role in the reception of transgender motifs in twentieth-century writing: feminism.

### The Empire Writes Back: Transgender and Feminism

The relationship between transgender and feminism is a complex one, especially in relation to feminist perspectives on literary and cultural representations of transgender bodies or identities. Composed of competing, and even contradictory, histories, politics and discourses, this relationship has taken different forms at different times. Four contexts are important to consider when attempting to unravel the

close but sometimes contentious relationship between feminism and transgender: firstly, a tradition of women's writing and feminist literary criticism which champions female-to-male gender crossing as an important metaphor for feminist subversion; secondly, a history of Second Wave feminist polemic which denounces male-to-female transsexuals as victims of sex role ideology and agents of patriarchal infiltration; thirdly, the impact of queer theory, and specifically Butler's theories of gender performativity, on feminist perspectives on transgender; finally, new efforts on the part of feminist and transgender theorists to confront past and current tensions and to renew and theorise a 'transfeminist' alliance. The influence of all contexts can be seen in the diversity of contemporary feminist positions both on the existence and rights of transgender people and on their representation in literature and culture.

Gender crossing – whether historical or figurative – has occupied a significant place in traditions of women's writing and feminist literary criticism. The existence of historical records and reports testifying to a long history of female-to-male gender crossing has proved an important source of inspiration for generations for women writers and feminist critics who have embraced the gender-crossing figure as symbol of feminist defiance. In her 1989 book *Amazons and Military Maids: Women Who Dressed as Men in Pursuit of Life, Liberty and Happiness*, Julie Wheelwright cautions against the 'temptation to claim these women as our feminist forebears',<sup>36</sup> given that their success was in many ways conditional on their compliance with gender convention, but does interpret their actions as indicative of a deep and systemic dissatisfaction with conventional gender roles: 'The thread that pulls these stories together is women's desire for male privilege and a longing to escape from domestic confines and powerlessness. Many vividly describe a lifelong yearning for liberation from the constraints they chafed against as women.'<sup>37</sup> Wheelwright's narrative rescues the female-to-male gender-crossing subject from the margins of history; no longer an exceptional, anomalous or aberrant figure, she is placed within a larger history of women's struggle for freedom and independence, providing an inspiring antecedent for future generations. For lesbian feminist historians, the female-to-male gender-crossing figure can further be placed within cultural histories of 'female masculinity'<sup>38</sup> as one of the ways in which women expressed their gendered and sexual identity; in this way a 'hidden history' is made visible and the gender-crossing subject claimed for a larger history of female same-sex desire and lesbian identity. In this kind of narrative, historical reality and historical metaphor combine

to produce a concept of gender crossing whose figurative uses have been extensively employed in traditions of women's writing and feminist literary criticism. Virginia Woolf's historical fantasy *Orlando*, first published in 1928, has played an important role in the tradition of women's writing and feminist literary criticism in which gender crossing as a symbolic trope is embraced as an expression of feminist defiance or subversion. Moreover, the novel's dedication to Vita Sackville West and its widespread interpretation as a tribute to Woolf's lover have meant that the novel has been situated in traditions of lesbian feminist writing. In this irreverent pastiche of historical fiction and biography, Woolf depicts sex as inessential and gender as culturally contingent; as a literary conceit, the character of Orlando combines the historical and the figurative in a way which was to have a lasting effect on traditions of women's historical fiction – including those embracing postmodern strategies – and on feminist literary criticism. In this way, Orlando's change of sex – as presented in a novel which lays claim to both historical reference and the licence of fantasy – has served as a kind of feminist literary prototype for the depiction of gender crossing as a metaphor for women's position in a patriarchal world and for female same-sex desire and lesbian identity. In these contexts, motifs of 'sex change' or 'gender crossing' are understood primarily as metaphors for women's experience, with the unintended consequence that the transgender potential of these narratives has often been overlooked or obscured.

In the tradition of women's writing and feminist literary criticism considered above, motifs of gender crossing or changing sex – whether historical or fantastical – are considered subversive in ways which are both playful and empowering. By contrast, the actual lived existence of some male-to-female transsexuals has been less celebrated in some feminist contexts. A series of public expulsions of transgender people from 'women only' cultural spaces in the US in the early 1970s, combined with the publication of Janice Raymond's *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She-Male* in 1979, had the effect of constructing transgender identity, especially in relation to male-to-female transsexuals, as a focal point for heated debates about what constitutes women's identity in feminist contexts. Male-to-female transsexuals form the principal focus of attention in Raymond's book, which offers a critique based on two major assumptions: that male-to-female transsexuals are intent on both colonising women's spaces (understood in terms of identities, bodies and communities) and appropriating women's power (aligned with women's creativity and attributed to reproductive capacity). In this context, male-to-female transsexuals are repeatedly figured

as intruders in disguise, seeking to penetrate and colonise ‘women’s mind, women’s space, women’s sexuality’<sup>39</sup> and to capture and usurp ‘female creative energy and power’.<sup>40</sup> Insistent throughout is the assertion that ‘Transsexuals are *not* women. They are *deviant* males . . .’ [emphasis in original]<sup>41</sup> and their actions are compared to rape and pornography, the principal objects of Second Wave critiques of male sexual violence and objectification. Raymond defines the ‘transsexual empire’ as ‘the medical conglomerate that has created the treatment and technology that makes anatomical sex conversion possible’.<sup>42</sup> Her argument that transsexual identity is the product of medical technology – an effect of modern science rather than the expression of individual agency – is one which challenges its authenticity and legitimacy: ‘Historically, individuals may have wished to change sex, but until medical science developed the specialties, which in turn created the demand for surgery, sex conversion did not exist.’<sup>43</sup> The implication is that medical science, long recognised in feminist, gay and lesbian critiques for its role as an agent of coercive normativity, conspires with the transsexual patient to enable them to fulfil an illusion of gender which only perpetuates patriarchal power. Where figurative gender crossing had been embraced in longstanding feminist contexts as subversive, the actual existence of male-to-female transsexuals was now denounced in ideological terms.

The third context is one which serves to explain the recuperation of the transgender subject within the field of feminist enquiry in the 1990s and beyond. Seemingly bypassing the problematic legacy of Second Wave feminist hostility to transsexuals, this ‘return’ is made possible by the impact of queer theory, and more specifically the influence of Judith Butler’s theories of performativity, on feminism. This definition reflects a period of theorising in the 1990s which equated the transgender subject with the subversion of binary categories of identity; aligned with radical politics, transgressive practice and deconstructive theory, ‘transgender’ is figured as a trope which exemplifies cutting-edge thinking about identity.<sup>44</sup> However, as we will see in the next section, this emphasis on transgender as a conceptual category exemplifying queer theories of subjectivity has been problematised; the transgender subject is arguably reduced to a metaphor in service to frameworks of identity which are not principally concerned with the experience and interests of transgender people.

Finally, recent decades have seen the emergence of new feminist scholarship on transgender which seeks to acknowledge and address the divisive legacy of some aspects of Second Wave feminism, to examine the affinities between transgender studies and feminism and to forge new alliances. Central to this movement is an understanding

of the importance of a relationship which is both self-reflexive and reciprocal, acknowledging a complex and controversial history (and present) at the same time as working to identify political affinities and potential alliances. In the face of what Talia Bettcher and Ann Garry describe as ‘unfriendly theorizing’,<sup>45</sup> these critics seek to emphasise the common cause which transgender studies and feminism share. In their introduction to a special issue of the feminist philosophy journal *Hypatia*, dedicated to transgender studies and feminism, Bettcher and Garry challenge the basis of some feminists’ hostility to male-to-female transsexuals by placing particular emphasis on shared experience: ‘Many trans women are well acquainted with the mechanisms of sexism and sexual violence to which they may fall prey, precisely because trans women are recognized as *women*’ [emphasis in original].<sup>46</sup> Similarly, in her 2003 essay ‘Feminist Solidarity after Queer Theory: The Case of Transgender’, published in the longstanding feminist journal *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Cressida Heyes argues that ‘many transgendered people are daily the victims of the most intense and public attempts to discipline gender in ways feminists have long criticized’.<sup>47</sup> However, beyond assertions of affinity and pledges of allegiance, this work is often characterised by a quality of critical self-reflexivity and an ethics of responsibility which is principally concerned with the impact of debates about the ‘proper subject’ of feminist activism and theory, past, present and future. Indeed, the use – and abuse – of transgender issues in feminist theory has become the object of significant theoretical reflection. Heyes acknowledges the ways in which debates about transgender have been employed as a kind of limit case in feminist theory: ‘Whether appropriated to bolster queer theoretical claims, represented as the acid test of constructionism, or attacked for suspect political commitments, transgender has been colonised as a feminist theoretical testing ground.’<sup>48</sup> Reversing the colonising metaphor which was used to such provocative effect by Janice Raymond, Heyes suggests that it is feminist theory which should be held accountable for acts of appropriation. The theoretical uses to which the transgender figure has been put in feminist theory are explored in detail in Vivian Namaste’s essay ‘Undoing Theory: The “Transgender Question” and the Epistemic Violence of Anglo-American Feminist Theory’, where she argues that

For nearly twenty years, then, Anglo-American feminist theory has been preoccupied with the ‘Transgender Question.’ This phrase – the ‘Transgender Question’ – refers to the ways in which feminist theory depends on looking at transsexual and transgendered bodies in order

to ask its own epistemological questions. Current discussions within Anglo-American feminist theory – notably the central question of considering how gender is constituted – take place primarily through citing transsexual and transvestite bodies. Anglo-American feminist theory asks the Transgender Question in order to go about its business.<sup>49</sup>

Namaste demonstrates the way in which feminist theory has relied on the concept of transgender to undertake its own enquiries. The ‘transgender question’ takes on a hypothetical status in this context, existing as a philosophical conundrum rather than a lived reality. In other words, transgender is constructed as the ‘other’ against which feminism defines and tests its own identity and boundaries: variously expelled and appropriated, the concept of transgender does considerable labour on behalf of feminist theorising and is hence the source of a significant but often unacknowledged intellectual debt. This work foregrounds the way in which feminist theory has been reliant on the construction of ‘others’, a tendency which has also been interrogated in relation to questions of race, class and sexuality amongst others. For many of the contributors to this debate, feminism’s capacity to engage with the questions posed by transgender studies is understood as crucial for its future. Gayle Salamon contends that feminism, ‘particularly but not exclusively in its institutionalized form, has not been able to keep pace with non-normative genders as they are thought, embodied, and lived’.<sup>50</sup> In this context she argues that such a project is vital:

Genders beyond the binary of male and female are neither fictive nor futural, but are presently embodied and live, and the discipline of women’s studies has not yet taken account of this. Until women’s studies demonstrates a more serious engagement with trans studies, it cannot hope to fully assess the present state of gender as it is lived, nor will it be able to imagine many of its possible futures.<sup>51</sup>

As we have seen, the relationship between feminism and transgender studies is a long and complex one, whose contrasting histories and competing positions encompass a range of motifs and debates, including: the role of ‘sex change’ or ‘gender crossing’ as figurative tropes in cultural representation; the competing claims of feminist, lesbian feminist and transgender historiography on the figure of the female-to-male gender-crossing subject; the continuing legacy of Second Wave critiques of transsexuals as complicit in patriarchal ideologies of gender; the relationship between Butler’s theories of performativity and pre-existing feminist perspectives on gender

crossing. These debates are central to this study, which examines the impact of a variety of feminist perspectives on the production, reception and adaptation of narratives about transgender lives, including Simone Benmussa's 1977 stage adaptation of George Moore's *Albert Nobbs* (1918) and Patricia Duncker's *James Miranda Barry* (1999), but with a special focus on Angela Carter's *The Passion of New Eve* (1977), which will be considered in the context of Second Wave feminist critiques of male-to-female transsexuals.

### Troubling Transgender: Queer Theory and Performativity

The methodologies and practices of queer theory are generally understood to have served as a formative origin for many aspects of transgender studies. Indeed, Heather Love identifies important affinities between queer theory and transgender studies when she writes that 'queer and transgender are linked in their activist investments, their dissident methodologies, and their critical interrogation of and resistance to gender and sexual norms'.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Prosser notes parallels consisting in 'Coming out; pride in marginality; a politics that deconstructs identity' and concedes that 'many of transgender's tenets *are* queer' [emphasis in original].<sup>53</sup> However, while transgender theorists have acknowledged the importance of queer theory as an enabling condition, they have also identified significant differences and critical tensions between the two fields. Susan Stryker's playfully and provocatively titled essay 'Transgender Studies: Queer Theory's Evil Twin' revives the imagery of Gothic doubling which she employed to such powerful effect in her landmark essay 'My Words to Victor Frankenstein above the Village of Chamounix: Performing Transgender Rage'. For Stryker, transgender studies exists in a productively critical relationship with its theoretical forebear:

If queer theory was born of the union of sexuality studies and feminism, transgender studies can be considered queer theory's evil twin: it has the same parentage but wilfully disrupts the privileged family narratives that favour sexual identity labels (like *gay*, *lesbian*, *bisexual* and *heterosexual*) over the gender categories (like *man* and *woman*) that enable desire to take shape and find its aim. [emphasis in original]<sup>54</sup>

Moreover, Stryker identifies two tendencies which problematise the conflation of queer and transgender: the first concerns the politics of assimilation and the second concerns the processes of displacement.



She suggests: ‘While queer studies remains the most hospitable place to undertake transgender work, all too often queer remains a code word for “gay” or “lesbian,” and all too often transgender phenomena are misapprehended through a lens that privileges sexual orientation and sexual identity as the primary means of differing from heteronormativity.’<sup>55</sup> In other words, the nominally ‘subjectless’<sup>56</sup> critique of queer theory often takes – or is assumed to take – gay and lesbian identity as its proper subject. Where assimilation entails implicit subordination, the second tendency makes use of processes of displacement, in a process by which gay and lesbian identity secures inclusion within normative structures through the expedient projection of non-normativity on to transgender ‘others’.<sup>57</sup> As Stryker puts it: ‘Most disturbingly, “transgender” increasingly functions as the site in which to contain all gender trouble, thereby helping secure both homosexuality and heterosexuality as stable and normative categories of personhood.’<sup>58</sup>

When considering the relationship between transgender and queer theory it is important to acknowledge the role played by readings of Judith Butler’s work on performativity, as outlined in her 1990 book *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, in establishing transgender as a ‘key queer trope’.<sup>59</sup> This phrase belongs to Jay Prosser, and his delineation of misinterpretations of Butler’s work, and its implications for transgender studies, is essential reading when considering how and why transgender has come to be conflated with queer theory through popular digests of Butler’s work. The tendency to read transgender lives – whether fictional or not – as illustrative embodiments of key queer concepts is both persistent and problematic. Indeed, it might be argued that this habitual interpretative reduction of transgender identities and bodies to exemplary ciphers for queer theoretical paradigms is currently one of the principal obstacles encountered when analysing representations of transgender in literary fiction. Prosser suggests that ‘in the cultural imagination [the] figure of the body as costume is surely welded most firmly to the transsexual’.<sup>60</sup> This trope is a popular one in literary and cultural studies indebted to theories of social construction. Metaphors of performance are often deployed to communicate a shift from thinking about the self as innate and fixed to thinking about identity as provisional and contingent; if the self is an unmediated expression of an inner essence, the subject is just one iteration of identity in specific historical, cultural and discursive conditions. The idea that we may be unknowingly performing a ‘role’ scripted by the dominant culture draws on the distinction between the actor and the performance

to suggest that the roles we play may not be of our own making.<sup>61</sup> According to this analogy, we are all actors; some may experience significant personal investment in their roles giving rise to a vivid sense of authenticity, where others may experience alienation resulting from constraint or coercion. Nevertheless, a recurring motif in the depiction of transgender people reveals that the insights of social construction theory are often unevenly applied. As Talia Mae Bettcher puts it, in her 2014 essay ‘Trapped in the Wrong Theory: Rethinking Trans Oppression and Resistance’: ‘Consider: If all the world’s a stage on which we all play a part, trans individuals play actors.’<sup>62</sup> While theories of social construction implicitly question the unexamined authenticity of all identity roles, transgender people are often assumed to exemplify this insight more fully than non-transgender people; to put it in other words (with apologies to George Orwell), if all genders are constructed, some are more constructed than others. Indeed, motifs of inauthenticity, deception and imposture have been used not only to question the legitimacy of transgender lives but also to rationalise prejudice, discrimination and violence against transgender people. In this context, Bettcher has noted that ‘if trans people are systematically subject to allegations of deception or pretense, the idea that sex and gender are constructs might seem especially threatening’.<sup>63</sup> This concern has prompted theorists such as Gayle Salamon to make significant efforts to clarify what theories of social construction can reasonably claim, with a view to contesting its misapplication and recovering its insights:

To claim that the body is socially constructed is not to claim that it is not real, that it is not made of flesh, or that its materiality is insignificant. To claim that sex is a social construct is not to claim that it is irrelevant, or invariant, or incapable of being embodied or reworked. To claim that our experiences of our sexed and gendered bodies are socially constructed is not to claim that our experiences are fictive, or inessential, or less important than our theorizing about sexed and gendered bodies.<sup>64</sup>

In her phenomenological study, Salamon seeks to reconcile social construction with lived experience, in contrast to other contexts where the former has been deployed to discredit the latter in relation to transgender lives: ‘What social construction offers is a way to understand how that felt sense arises, in all its historical and cultural variations, with all its urgency and immediacy, and to ask what it is, finally, that is delivered by that felt sense.’<sup>65</sup> It is notable that, in a 2014 interview with *The TransAdvocate*, Butler sought to clarify her

position on social construction and the lived experience of transgender people, denouncing the use of the former to deny the reality of the latter:

One problem with that view of social construction is that it suggests that what trans people feel about what their gender is, and should be, is itself ‘constructed’ and, therefore, not real . . . I oppose this use of social construction absolutely, and consider it to be a false, misleading, and oppressive use of the theory.<sup>66</sup>

Prosser cites Butler herself as commenting on the ways in which a relatively minor feature of her analysis in *Gender Trouble* has been deployed as the premise for persistent misreading: “‘there were probably no more than five paragraphs in *Gender Trouble* devoted to drag [yet] readers have often cited the description of drag as if it were the ‘example’ which explains the meaning of [gender] performativity” [brackets in original].<sup>67</sup> The logic by which ‘drag’ is equated not only with performativity but also with transgender is one which arguably has its origins outside of the rhetorical framework of Butler’s text: while some drag performers may also be transgender people, the gender identity of transgender people is not a drag performance. Prosser’s chapter ‘Judith Butler: Queer Feminism, Transgender, and the Transubstantiation of Sex’ can be situated in a larger body of work which has sought to remedy misreadings of Butler’s work, but it has special significance for transgender studies because it foregrounds the implications of the conflation of ‘queer’ with ‘transgender’. Prosser argues that the mistaken assumption that

gender performativity means acting out one’s gender as if gender were a theatrical role that could be chosen, led to the belief that Butler’s theory of gender was both radically voluntarist and antimaterialist: that its argument was that gender, like a set of clothes in a drag act, could be donned and doffed at will, that gender *is* drag. [emphasis in original]<sup>68</sup>

This assumption that gender can be subverted by individual acts of agency underestimates the very real and injurious constraints to which the expression of gender is often subject. For Prosser, the equation of transgender with performativity, and hence with subversive agency, is problematic for further reasons; in *Second Skins*, he argues for a return to the materiality of gender, observing that ‘there are transgendered trajectories, in particular *transsexual* trajectories, that aspire to that which this scheme devalues [straight gender]. Namely

there are transsexuals who seek very pointedly to be nonperformative, to be constative, quite simply, to *be*' [emphasis in original].<sup>69</sup> Prosser questions the 'assumption that transgender is queer is subversive'<sup>70</sup> and does so in a context in which he recognises the way in which 'transgender *gender* appears as the most crucial sign of queer *sexuality*'s aptly skewed point of entry into the academy' [emphasis in original].<sup>71</sup> It is essential to take this important observation into account when considering the critical reception of literary representations of transgender bodies and identities; in contexts where this misreading of Butler's theories of performativity is employed under the sign of queer theory (including feminist contexts), the transgender figure is read (and indeed written) as a metaphor for gender subversion rather than an expression of gender identity. Reduced to a rhetorical vehicle for analogical thinking about the meaning of normative gender, the relationship between the transgender figure and the actual or potential lived experience of transgender people is obscured. This is not to argue that metaphorical representation is inevitably problematic, nor is it to make a case for mimetic representation only in relation to transgender representation. Rather it is to draw attention to the particular purposes to which transgender figures have been deployed in literary fiction and literary criticism and to recognise that these purposes, while nominally subversive, may in fact be mortgaged to normative assumptions. As will be demonstrated, motifs of performance are evident in the texts examined in this study but often in ways which are more likely to reinforce the perception of transgender characters as 'actors' than to subversively reveal the performativity of all gender roles.

### Crossing the T: Identity Politics and the LGBT Umbrella

In the second decade of the twenty-first century transgender people, their rights and representation have acquired a new visibility in the public sphere as a consequence of the longstanding efforts of transgender activists. However, this visibility has taken a number of varying forms with different effects, ranging from the formal inclusion of transgender people in the equality and diversity policies and strategies of public and private bodies (including charities, NGOs and health care providers), to the prominence of some transgender people in popular culture and social media, especially in relation to celebrity, film and television drama, and fashion. In this context, the relationship between identity politics, discourses of rights and neoliberal agendas has been the subject of significant critical attention within the field of

transgender studies. In particular, reflection on the inclusion of transgender within an expanded lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender alliance, and on the relationship between LGBT politics and normative discourses, offers insights into the uses and limitations of identity politics in contemporary culture. The addition of transgender to the activist coalition of lesbian, gay and bisexual people – typified in the acronym LGBT – can be understood as an expression of solidarity and an extension of the benefits of collective action on the basis of common cause: the experience of prejudice, discrimination and violence shared on the grounds of sexual or gender non-normativity.<sup>72</sup> However, the inclusion of transgender as a category of identity within the LGBT umbrella has been the subject of critical debate in a number of contexts. Firstly, activists and theorists have expressed concern that the specific needs and interests of transgender people are confused, obscured and displaced through the apparent conflation of gender identity (transgender) with sexual identity (lesbian, gay and bisexual). Secondly, a broader critique of what has been termed (following Lisa Duggan) ‘homonormative’ trends in LGBT activism has raised questions about its investment in radical change. Finally, an emphasis on transgender people as the natural allies of lesbian, gay and bisexual people is thought to obscure alternative modes of alliance, including those to do with race, class and disability.

In an essay on the LGBT ‘umbrella’ in US contexts, Zein Murib observes that

The ubiquitous use of LGBT initialism across the various social, academic, and political discursive contexts . . . suggests that the constitutive categories of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender are equivalent, informed by similar experiences, and, as such, appropriate to collapse into a single category: LGBT.<sup>73</sup>

‘Equivalent’ and ‘collapse’ are key terms here. The logic of analogy – by which parallels are drawn between experiences of oppression by different groups of people – has the potential to identify collective experience and to mobilise an empowering sense of solidarity. However, the inclusion of transgender within the LGBT umbrella potentially serves to exacerbate public misunderstanding about what the term ‘transgender’ means: the alliance of gay, lesbian and bisexual people is founded on the organising category of sexual identity, but transgender is not a sexual identity.<sup>74</sup> The experiences of transgender people are not identical to the experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual people and there is a concern that those experiences which do not serve to bolster the strategic analogy may be

overlooked or marginalised. As Susan Stryker puts it in her essay ‘Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity’: “‘T’ becomes a separate category to be appended, through a liberal politics of minority assimilation, to gay, lesbian, and bisexual community formations.”<sup>75</sup> Stryker’s critique of the ‘liberal politics of minority assimilation’ can be placed in a broader context of critical debates about the political direction of mainstream LGBT activism, or what Stryker terms

the same developmental logic that transformed an antiassimilationist ‘queer’ politics into a more palatable LGBT civil rights movement, with T reduced to merely another (easily detached) genre of sexual identity rather than perceived, like race or class, as something that cuts across existing sexualities . . .<sup>76</sup>

Questions of assimilation, inclusion and appropriation are central to debates which focus on the impact of neoliberal contexts and the advent of homonormativity.

The term ‘homonormativity’ was first coined by Lisa Duggan in her 2003 book *The Twilight of Democracy? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. It describes a perceived trend in lesbian and gay activism, especially that pursued by mainstream advocacy organisations, which, in Stryker’s words, ‘does not challenge heterosexist institutions and values, but rather upholds, sustains, and seeks inclusion within them’.<sup>77</sup> While the term did not originate in transgender contexts, Stryker suggests that it serves a need ‘to name the ways that homosexuality, as a sexual orientation category based on constructions of gender it shared with the dominant culture, sometimes had more in common with the straight world than it did with us’.<sup>78</sup> Moreover, these norms are seen by critics of homonormativity as symptomatic of a historically specific neoliberal politics. This critique is central to David Valentine’s *Imagining Transgender: An Ethnography of a Category* (2007) and Dean Spade’s *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics and the Limits of Law* (2015). As Spade puts it, ‘the quest for inclusion in and recognition by dominant US institutions’ began to supplant ‘questioning and challenging the fundamental inequalities promoted by those institutions’.<sup>79</sup> Valentine provides the following overview of the new neoliberal consensus as it emerged in the United States in the late twentieth century:

In a time frame that maps onto the ascendancy of identity-based politics in the United States, since the early 1970s a broad (and sometimes contradictory) range of neoliberal policies have asserted

business rights over public life, increasingly privatized public services and public space, undercut labor and class-based progressive alliances, and reframed ‘rights’ in terms of a framework of consumption in the United States and beyond.<sup>80</sup>

This mapping of ‘identity politics’ against market-driven social change alerts us to the complex relationship – what Spade calls the ‘paradox of rights’<sup>81</sup> – between nominally radical social movements and the social and economic structures which frame them. Spade refers to ‘co-optation and incorporation’ as the ‘hallmarks of neoliberalism’ whereby ‘the words and ideas of resistance movements are frequently recast to produce results that disserve the initial purposes for which they were deployed, and instead become legitimizing tools for white supremacist, capitalist, patriarchal, ableist political agendas’.<sup>82</sup> For Spade, Valentine and others, an emphasis on individual and privatised experience and an embrace of normative institutions (such as marriage, the reproductive family and the military) are defining characteristics of homonormative politics. As Spade argues: ‘Trans resistance is emerging in a context of neoliberal politics where the choice to struggle for nothing more than incorporation into the neoliberal order is the most obvious option.’<sup>83</sup> One consequence of this insistence on integration is the assimilation of LGBT organisations within the political status quo; another is the consolidation of existing racial, class and other privileges. Firstly, there is an emphasis on similarity rather than difference. As Valentine suggests: ‘One of the primary sites of such institutionalization has resulted from the mainstream gay and lesbian activist claims that homosexual people are essentially the same as heterosexual Americans but for one fact of privately experienced and conducted sexual desire and practice.’<sup>84</sup> Such a strategy makes a case for the extension of privileges to an excluded group on the grounds that their inclusion will not compromise the status of existing social structures but rather consolidate and fortify them. Secondly, such a strategy assumes that sexuality is the only disqualifying characteristic suffered by LGBT citizens; as such it arguably serves to principally benefit those already privileged by gender, race, class or ability. Indeed, Spade argues that the LGBT rights agenda has ‘shifted toward preserving and promoting the class and race privilege of a small number of elite gay and lesbian professionals while marginalizing or overtly excluding the needs and experiences of people of color, immigrants, people with disabilities, indigenous people, trans people, and poor people’.<sup>85</sup> In this way the goal of homonormative strategies is implicitly to ‘restore privileges of the dominant systems of meaning and control to those

gender-conforming, white, wealthy gay and lesbian US citizens who are enraged at how homophobic laws and policies limit access to benefits to which they feel entitled'.<sup>86</sup> For Valentine, this strategy is 'effectively a claim to invisibility – a dense condensation of gendered, sexual, racial, and class normality'.<sup>87</sup> In other words, it takes for granted an 'invisibility' which only normative subjects can assume and which is unavailable to those who are 'marked' by gender, race, class or ability. By situating their critique of homonormativity in the broader context of neoliberal politics, these critics enable us to think beyond prevailing paradigms of identity politics and to place transgender rights in the context of global patterns of political and economic marginalisation and exploitation; as Stryker has argued: 'The current attention to homonormativity has tended to focus on gay and lesbian social, political, and cultural formations and their relationship to a neoliberal politics of multicultural diversity that meshes with the assimilative strategies of transnational capital.'<sup>88</sup> Indeed, the inclusion of transgender within the LGBT umbrella and the prevalence of homonormative strategies in leading LGBT organisations is considered problematic by Spade, Stryker, Valentine and others because of the ways in which it obscures commonalities of experience and potential political alliances with groups not principally defined by sexuality or gender. As Stryker observes:

Central issues for transgender activism – such as gender-appropriate state-issued identification documents that allow trans people to work, cross borders, and access social services without exposing themselves to potential discrimination – suggest useful forms of alliance politics, in this instance with migrant workers and diasporic communities . . .<sup>89</sup>

In her 2008 book *Transgender History*, Stryker similarly argues that: 'The restrictions on movement in the post-9/11 United States give transgender people more in common with immigrants, refugees, and undocumented workers than they might have with the gay and lesbian community.'<sup>90</sup> This issue is also pivotal for both Valentine and Spade. Valentine states: 'My central question here is: by identifying transgender people as experiencing discrimination or violence along the axis of gender identity, or describing gender-variant people through the framework of transgender, how are other kinds of social experience elided?'<sup>91</sup> Spade places particular emphasis on 'specific sites of intersection'<sup>92</sup> when he argues: 'Finding overlap and inspiration in the analysis and resistance articulated through women of color feminism, disability justice politics, prison abolition, and other



struggles against colonialism, criminalization, immigration enforcement, and capitalism has far more to offer trans people.<sup>93</sup>

Debates about the limits of identity politics are especially pertinent when considering two important but often overlooked motifs which have emerged in this analysis of twentieth-century narratives of transgender lives. The first is to do with the relationship between narratives of transsexual identity and intersex experience; the second is to do with the role played by normative categories of gender in constructions of 'race', including whiteness. To date, little critical attention has been given to the complex relationship between narratives of transgender identity and narratives of intersex experience. The potential affinity and common cause between intersex and transgender people has been acknowledged by critics including Iain Morland, who writes that 'both intersex and transsexuality raise the question of what kind of body one needs to have in order to claim membership in a gender and whether a person's sense of belonging to a gender is colored by the experience of living in a body that has been touched by medical technology'.<sup>94</sup> However, in the context of contemporary identity politics and activism, vigilance with regard to the problems arising from misleading conflation, both within activist contexts and within the public sphere, has been paramount. The possible inclusion of intersex people within the transgender umbrella has provoked concern that the needs and priorities of intersex people will be subsumed under those of transgender people, and that the equivalence suggested by the 'umbrella' will act to exacerbate public misunderstanding about intersex people. Historically, understandings of intersex, transsexual and homosexual people, including in the discourses of sexology, have been mobile and overlapping. Records indicate that James Miranda Barry and Lili Elbe may have been people with intersex variations; the treatment of this possibility in biographical and fictional accounts of Barry's life is considered in a postscript to Chapter 3, which serves as a prelude to a fuller treatment of this topic in Chapter 4, which examines how retellings of a life story central to the canon of transsexual life writing might serve to obscure narratives of intersex existence and experience.

The motif of border crossing is a longstanding one in transgender studies, with Halberstam noting that 'myths of travel and border crossings are inevitable within a discourse of transsexuality'<sup>95</sup> and Prosser examining 'transition as a geographic trope' which enables an understanding of 'transsexuality as a passage through space, a journey from one location to another'.<sup>96</sup> However, significant shifts

can be observed in the treatment of this trope in the twenty-first century. Where earlier studies emphasise the metaphorical parallels between the crossing of national borders and the ‘borders’ between sexed and gendered identities, more recent work has situated motifs of mobility within the global politics of the movement of peoples, whether forced or elective. Aren Aizura contrasts the economic and racial privilege which can often serve as a prerequisite for the geographical journeys sometimes required to access gender reassignment treatment with the forced displacement of disempowered subjects. From this perspective new light is cast on the use of metaphors of travel, border crossing and migration in transgender narratives:

trans theory has examined those figural ‘borders’ regulating traffic between genders rather than watching what happens to gender-variant people at real borders, appropriating the metaphor of the immigrant ‘without land or nation’ to understand transgender experience without considering that many trans people are, in fact, immigrants.<sup>97</sup>

This study seeks to make visible the processes of racial ‘othering’ and privileges of whiteness in narratives where mobility and migration are significant themes. In doing so it aims to redress the displacement or erasure of issues to do with race, nationality and migration in narratives about transgender subjects. The role of racial ‘othering’ in the construction of white femininity is evident in both Angela Carter’s *The Passion of New Eve* and David Ebershoff’s *The Danish Girl* but the colonial contexts in which James Miranda Barry’s white masculinity is situated in biographical and fictional accounts of his life are considered in more detail in Chapter 3. Joss Moody’s identity as a Scottish man of African heritage is central to the discussion of Kay’s *Trumpet* in Chapter 5; in this novel narratives of origin – whether national, racial, gendered or familial – are placed in question, defying any attempt to fix or reduce identity to a singular category.

## Chapter Overview

Chapter 1, “‘Two men, so dissimilar’”: Class, Marriage and Masculinity in George Moore’s *Albert Nobbs* (1918) and Simone Benmussa’s *The Singular Life of Albert Nobbs* (1977)’, examines a critically overlooked literary fiction by an Irish writer whose legacy has tended to be overshadowed by the modernist generation which succeeded him. Moore’s *Albert Nobbs* depicts the lives of not one but two female-bodied men working in a Dublin hotel in the 1860s. In striking contrast

to the more sensationalist accounts of transgender lives which came to dominate popular cultural representations in the decades following the Second World War, these characters are presented in a naturalistic fashion and neither pathologised nor demonised. Moore's novella provides an alternative origin for a literary history of transgender representation, one which focuses on lived experience and social reality rather than the motifs of historical travesty and speculative fantasy established by Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*, published ten years later. This chapter aims to articulate the 'transgender capacity'<sup>98</sup> of Moore's novella, and explore the insights it offers into the social and economic functions of gender through a focus on class, marriage and masculinity. Moreover, the afterlives of Moore's novella – specifically its adaptation for the stage and screen – provide an opportunity to track the changing ways in which transgender motifs have been treated across the course of the twentieth century and beyond. Simone Benmussa's 1977 stage adaptation, *The Singular Life of Albert Nobbs*, has been canonised as a classic of feminist theatre and reflection on its critical reception offers insights into the ways in which transgender motifs have been interpreted in Second Wave feminist contexts. More specifically, this chapter will investigate how narratives of women's gender crossing have come to displace the narrative's transgender potential, establishing a pattern of feminist appropriation which is replicated in very different ways in Angela Carter's *The Passion of New Eve* (1977) and Patricia Duncker's *James Miranda Barry* (1999).

Second Wave feminist perspectives on transgender motifs are the central concern of the second chapter, "'She had never been a woman": Second Wave Feminism, Femininity and Transgender in Angela Carter's *The Passion of New Eve* (1977)', which focuses on a novel by a writer whose reputation as one of the most innovative and influential authors of the late twentieth century is firmly established. The centrality of Carter's work to feminist literary culture is widely recognised and celebrated, as is her passionately combative engagement with the feminist orthodoxies of her time. Through a focus on the contrasting depictions of an involuntary transsexual, the eponymous Eve (who is subject to sex reassignment surgery without her consent), and an elective transgender person, Tristessa (who is refused medical treatment despite living as woman), this chapter aims to address the critical legacies of specific strands of Second Wave feminist critique. It will do so by placing the novel within the context of debates and controversies about the place of male-to-female transsexuals in the women's movement contemporary to the era of its writing and reception. Where other critics have

sought to incorporate Carter's work within later queer frameworks, most notably those informed by Judith Butler's theories of performativity,<sup>99</sup> this chapter aims to scrutinise the novel's relationship to competing feminist discourses of its time. Moreover, it will examine the impact of specific Second Wave feminist critiques – typified by Janice Raymond's *The Transsexual Empire* – on the critical reception of Carter's novel, focusing on the persistence of tropes which construct male-to-female transsexuals as agents of patriarchal constructions of femininity.

Where Carter's *The Passion of New Eve* provides opportunities to examine one of the more problematic legacies of Second Wave feminist perspectives on transgender motifs in literary fiction, Patricia Duncker's 1999 novel *James Miranda Barry* can be considered in a different tradition, one in which subversive narratives of women's gender crossing are prominent. Chapter 3, 'Playing the Breeches Part: Feminist Appropriations, Biographical Fictions and Colonial Contexts in Patricia Duncker's *James Miranda Barry* (1999)', examines a fictional reconstruction of the Irish-born and Scottish-educated colonial military surgeon James Miranda Barry (c. 1799–1865), whose life story has been irrevocably shaped by reports that he had been discovered after death to be female bodied. Barry has been the subject of a number of historical biographies but the narrative of strategic gender crossing which they have tended to adopt is notably absent in Duncker's depiction of Barry, which declines to disclose a definitive explanatory motivation or identification. However, a feminist narrative of gender crossing arguably emerges in displaced form in the novel through the expanded narratives of Barry's mother, Mary Ann, and imagined childhood sweetheart, Alice; in this novel Barry's gender identity serves as a vehicle through which women can express agency in a displaced manner and pursue ambition in a vicarious fashion. Barry's career took place in the theatre of empire but the racial politics of this era of British history are often overlooked in both biographical and fictional accounts of Barry's life; close attention to the treatment of colonial contexts will serve to demonstrate the role of white privilege and the construction of racial 'others' in these narratives.

Like Duncker's *James Miranda Barry*, David Ebershoff's 2000 novel *The Danish Girl* is a historical fiction based on the life of a real individual, Lili Elbe (1882–1931), reputed to be one of the first people to undergo gender reassignment treatment. The relationship between these fictions and their auto/biographical source texts merits

special attention, especially given the prominent role played by genres of life writing in the representation of transgender lives. The relationship between historical record, autobiographical accounts and historical fiction is further complicated by the possibility that both James Miranda Barry and Lili Elbe may have been intersex people. The ‘transgender capacity’<sup>100</sup> of the historical and fictional subjects of the texts examined in this study has provided the starting point for analysis in every chapter to date. By contrast, Chapter 4, ‘Two Beings/One Body: Intersex Lives and Transsexual Narratives in *Man into Woman* (1931) and David Ebershoff’s *The Danish Girl* (2000)’, seeks to examine the ways in which the conventions of transsexual life writing may have the effect of obscuring or erasing narratives of intersex existence. This chapter will examine the novel’s relationship to a formative source text, the generically hybrid auto/biography *Man into Woman: An Authentic Record of a Sex Change, the True Story of the Miraculous Transformation of the Danish Painter Einar Wegener (Andreas Sparre)* (1931), and its borrowing of the motif of ‘two beings’ in ‘one body’.<sup>101</sup> The implications of the novel’s reliance on the binary categories of identity prevalent in *Man into Woman* will be explored in relation not only to categories of sex but also to gender (especially femininity) and sexuality (specifically male homosexuality).

Posthumous exposure, often on the grounds of medical examination, has acted as the problematic vehicle through which a number of transgender lives have been bequeathed to history, with the perceived disparity between sex and gender serving as a pretext to forcibly rewrite the transgender person’s identity in public memory. When Jason Cromwell refers to the “‘Billy Tipton phenomenon’”<sup>102</sup> he evokes the memory of the American jazz musician who was subject to this fate on his death in 1989. Inspired by Tipton’s life story, Jackie Kay’s 1998 novel *Trumpet* explores the aftermath of a posthumous exposure but is notable for its purposeful thwarting of the narrative dynamics which conventionally accompany it. This novel will be examined in Chapter 5, ‘Blue Births and Last Words: Rewriting Race, Nation and Family in Jackie Kay’s *Trumpet* (1998)’, which will examine how, in its focus on a Scottish musician of African heritage and his relationship with his adopted mixed-race son, *Trumpet* questions the privileging of essentialising narratives of ‘birth’, including those to do with gender, nation, race and family. Where Angela Carter’s *The Passion of New Eve*, Patricia Duncker’s *James Miranda Barry* and David Ebershoff’s

*The Danish Girl* can be placed in the traditions of speculative fantasy and historical fiction respectively, *Trumpet* arguably returns to the realism of George Moore's early-twentieth-century novella and in doing so foregrounds lived experience over literary tropes. Its focus on gender normativity – Moody's masculinity is expressed in highly conventional ways in his role as husband and father within a heterosexual marriage – could be seen as anticipating twenty-first-century trends and this emphasis is also reflected in film adaptations of *Albert Nobbs* (2011) and *The Danish Girl* (2016).

Finally, Chapter 6, 'Never an Unhappy Hour: Revisiting Marriage in Film Adaptations of *Albert Nobbs* (2011) and *The Danish Girl* (2016)', returns to texts published at the opening and close of the twentieth century to examine their adaptation for the screen in twenty-first-century contexts. The retelling of transgender lives across different texts and contexts has been a recurring theme in this study; analysis of contemporary adaptations of twentieth-century texts will provide further opportunities to track the changing cultural meanings of these narratives. Released in a period in which the rights and representation of transgender people were attaining an unprecedented visibility in the mainstream media and popular culture, these films offer sympathetic portraits of their subjects but demonstrate an uneven engagement with contemporary understandings of transgender identity. The textual motif of 'two men, so dissimilar',<sup>103</sup> which draws attention to the differing personalities of Albert Nobbs and Hubert Page in Moore's novella, is all the more evident in the contrasting performances of Glenn Close and Janet McTeer in the 2011 adaptation *Albert Nobbs*. Benmussa's stage adaptation – in whose American premiere Glenn Close starred – is a crucial intertext for this adaptation, arguably shaping Close's interpretation of Albert as a tragically isolated cross-dressing woman. By contrast, the significant expansion of Hubert's character is achieved principally through the vehicle of his marriage to a milliner, with Hubert implicitly validated as the 'better man' in comparison with his abusive or absent male peers. Where Hubert's anticipated second marriage provides the resolution to the 2011 film, in the 2016 adaptation of *The Danish Girl* it is the protracted demise of the marriage between Einar Wegener (Eddie Redmayne) and Gerda Gottlieb (Alicia Vikander) which acts as the tragic heart of the drama, rather than Elbe's premature death. Moreover, *The Danish Girl* offers a largely normative depiction of femininity as the principal vehicle through which Elbe's gender identity as a woman is achieved, with the aesthetic conventions of period

and costume drama mobilised to construct Elbe's transition in terms of the imperatives of passing. The prominence of marriage within these film adaptations of twentieth-century texts will be considered in the context of contemporary debates about LGBT activism and neoliberal politics.

In her 2004 book *Undoing Gender*, Judith Butler provides a powerful indication of what is at stake in the struggle for legal, social and cultural recognition for transgender people when she observes that gender 'figures as a precondition for the production and maintenance of legitimate humanity'.<sup>104</sup> In a chapter entitled 'Doing Justice to Someone: Sex Reassignment and Allegories of Transsexuality', Butler considers the 'conditions of intelligibility by which a human emerges'<sup>105</sup> and asks the following questions:

What counts as a person? What counts as a coherent gender? What qualifies as a citizen? Whose world is legitimated as real? . . . Who can I become in such a world where the meanings and limits of the subject are set out in advance for me? By what norms am I constrained as I begin to ask what I may become? And what happens when I begin to become that for which there is no place within the given regime of truth?<sup>106</sup>

The first decades of the twenty-first century have witnessed a transformation in the terms of public debate about transgender people, a change which can be attributed to the actions and interventions of generations of transgender activists, theorists, writers and artists. This context casts into new relief the ethical responsibility of scholarship in the arts and humanities to examine the role that culture can play in perpetuating or challenging assumptions which impact on people's lives and well-being. At a time when questions of self-determination are at the forefront of campaigns for transgender rights and debates about cultural representation, it is vital to examine the role played by historical, literary and film narrative in shaping 'conditions of intelligibility'. Grounded in feminist scholarship, informed by the insights of queer theory and indebted to the work of pioneering studies in the field of transgender studies, this book examines the uses to which transgender motifs have been put in twentieth-century narratives and their afterlives. By exploring the extent to which these texts give visibility or voice to transgender histories and identities, this study aims to contribute new insights to the complex, dynamic and ongoing history of transgender 'becoming' in the field of cultural representation.

## Notes

1. *Becoming an Image Performance Still No. 2* (National Theatre Studio, SPILL Festival, London), 2013, photo: Cassils with Manuel Vason.
2. The 2006 Yogyakarta Principles on sexual orientation and gender identity have played a significant role in shaping global human rights discourses on transgender. The recommendations issued in the 2014 Amnesty International report, *The State Decides Who I Am: Lack of Legal Gender Recognition for Transgender People in Europe*, reflect the defining priorities of this movement, including: protection against discrimination and hate crime; the right to change legal names and gender markers on state-sanctioned identity documents; the abolition of prerequisites to legal recognition, such as the requirement to undergo medical diagnosis and treatment, to annul existing marriages or to meet minimum age requirements. See <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/EUR01/001/2014/en/>> (last accessed 15 January 2018).
3. Susan Stryker argues that Prince originally intended the term to serve as a 'conceptual middle ground between transvestism (merely changing one's clothing) and transsexualism (changing one's sex)'. 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 146. By contrast, when the term was taken up by activists, communities and scholars in the 1990s, it expressed a very different position in relation to gender normativity.
4. Stryker, 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 146.
5. Singer, 'Umbrella', *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly Special Issue – Postposttranssexual*, p. 260.
6. Singer, 'Umbrella', p. 259.
7. In the UK, for example, Press for Change was established in 1992 to campaign for legal equality for transgender people. In 2004 the Gender Recognition Bill allowed people to change their legal gender (providing they met predetermined criteria) and the 2010 Equality Act established gender reassignment as a protected characteristic under anti-discrimination legislation for the first time. In Ireland, Transgender Equality Network Ireland (TENI) was instrumental in securing the passage of the historic Gender Recognition Act in 2015.
8. Stone, 'The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto', in Stryker and Whittle (eds), *The Transgender Studies Reader*, p. 230.
9. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 11.
10. Carter, 'Transition', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 235.
11. Bettcher, 'Evil Deceivers and Make-Believers: On Transphobic Violence and the Politics of Illusion', p. 46.
12. For a discussion of transsexual memoir, including Jan Morris's *Conundrum* (1974), Mark Rees's *Dear Sir or Madam: The Autobiography of a Female to Male Transsexual* (1996) and Renée Richards's *Second Serve* (1983), see Prosser, *Second Skins*.



13. Halberstam, 'Telling Tales: Brandon Teena, Billy Tipton, and Transgender Biography', in Sánchez and Schlossberg (eds), *Passing: Identity and Interpretation in Sexuality, Race, and Religion*, pp. 13–14.
14. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 101.
15. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 101.
16. Seid, 'Reveal', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 177.
17. Stone, 'The Empire Strikes Back', p. 230.
18. Halberstam, 'Telling Tales', p. 15.
19. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 11.
20. Hindmarch-Watson, 'Lois Schwich, Female Errand Boy: Narratives of Female Cross-Dressing in Late Victorian London', p. 72.
21. Hindmarch-Watson, 'Lois Schwich, Female Errand Boy', p. 73.
22. Doan and Garrity, 'Introduction', in Doan and Garrity (eds), *Sapphic Modernities: Sexuality, Women and National Cultures*, p. 5.
23. Doan and Garrity, 'Introduction', p. 5.
24. Seitler, 'Queer Physiognomies', p. 81.
25. Halberstam, 'Telling Tales', pp. 35–6.
26. Stryker, 'Biopolitics', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 40.
27. Stryker, 'Biopolitics', p. 40.
28. Stryker, 'Biopolitics', p. 40.
29. Rawson, 'Archive', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 24.
30. Getsy, 'Capacity', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 47.
31. Getsy, 'Capacity', p. 47.
32. Getsy, 'Capacity', p. 48.
33. Reflecting on his interpretation of a novel widely regarded as a classic in the canon of lesbian writing, Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* (1928), Jay Prosser observes that 'the writing of transsexual history will surely depend upon performing retroactive readings of figures and texts that have been central to the lesbian and gay canon'. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 167.
34. Getsy, 'Capacity', p. 47.
35. Stryker, *Transgender History*, p. 19.
36. Wheelwright, *Amazons and Military Maids*, p. 9.
37. Wheelwright, *Amazons and Military Maids*, p. 19.
38. See Halberstam, *Female Masculinity*.
39. Raymond, *The Transsexual Empire*, p. 104.
40. Raymond, *The Transsexual Empire*, p. xxiii.
41. Raymond, *The Transsexual Empire*, p. 183.
42. Raymond, *The Transsexual Empire*, p. xiv.
43. Raymond, *The Transsexual Empire*, p. xv. A similar critical position is adopted by Bernice Hausman in her 1995 book *Changing Sex: Transsexualism, Technology, and the Idea of Gender*, which has become the focus of critique in subsequent years.
44. See for example Roen, "'Either/Or" and "Both/Neither": Discursive Tensions in Transgender Politics'.

45. Bettcher and Garry, 'Introduction', *Hypatia Special Issue – Transgender Studies and Feminism*, p. 2.
46. Bettcher and Garry, 'Introduction', p. 4.
47. Heyes, 'Feminist Solidarity after Queer Theory', p. 1,094.
48. Heyes, 'Feminist Solidarity after Queer Theory', p. 1,098.
49. Namaste, 'Undoing Theory', p. 12.
50. Salamon, *Assuming a Body: Transgender and Rhetoric of Materiality*, p. 95.
51. Salamon, *Assuming a Body*, p. 96.
52. Love, 'Queer', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 172.
53. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 173.
54. Stryker, 'Transgender Studies: Queer Theory's Evil Twin', p. 212.
55. Stryker, 'Transgender Studies: Queer Theory's Evil Twin', p. 214.
56. See Eng, Halberstam and Muñoz: 'the "subjectless" critique of queer studies disallows any positing of a proper subject of or object for the field by insisting that queer has no fixed political referent' [emphasis in original]. 'Introduction: What's Queer about Queer Studies Now?', p. 3.
57. See Valentine, *Imagining Transgender*, and Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*, for discussions of the relationship between the removal of homosexuality from, and the introduction of gender identity disorder to, the third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* in 1980.
58. Stryker, 'Transgender Studies: Queer Theory's Evil Twin', p. 214.
59. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 5.
60. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 62.
61. In a much quoted passage in *Gender Trouble*, Judith Butler describes gender as 'the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being' (pp. 43–4). Elsewhere, Butler describes gender 'as an act which has been rehearsed, much as a script survives the particular actors who make use of it, but which requires individual actors in order to be actualized and reproduced as reality once again'. 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory', in Conboy, Medina and Stanbury (eds), *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory*, p. 409.
62. Bettcher, 'Trapped in the Wrong Theory', p. 398.
63. Bettcher, 'Trapped in the Wrong Theory', p. 398.
64. Salamon, *Assuming a Body*, p. 76.
65. Salamon, *Assuming a Body*, p. 77.
66. 'Gender Performance: *The TransAdvocate* interviews Judith Butler', with Cristan Williams, *The TransAdvocate*, 1 May 2014, <[http://www.transadvocate.com/gender-performance-the-transadvocate-interviews-judith-butler\\_n\\_13652.htm](http://www.transadvocate.com/gender-performance-the-transadvocate-interviews-judith-butler_n_13652.htm)> (last accessed 15 January 2018).
67. Butler cited in Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 25.
68. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 28.
69. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 32.

70. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 29.
71. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 23.
72. In 2015 the leading UK lesbian, gay and bisexual rights organisation, Stonewall, published a report marking its formal commitment to trans inclusion. Reflecting on past practice and future strategy, *Trans People and Stonewall: Campaigning Together for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Equality* offers insights into the issues and opportunities presented by the LGBT alliance. See <[http://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/trans\\_people\\_and\\_stonewall.pdf](http://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/trans_people_and_stonewall.pdf)> (last accessed 15 January 2018).
73. Murib, 'LGBT', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 118.
74. David Valentine questions this assumption, which is foundational for most other transgender theorists and activists, in *Imagining Transgender*.
75. Stryker, 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 148.
76. Stryker, 'Transgender Studies: Queer Theory's Evil Twin', p. 214.
77. Stryker, 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 145.
78. Stryker, 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 146.
79. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 30.
80. Valentine, *Imagining Transgender*, p. 18.
81. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 10.
82. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 13.
83. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 18.
84. Valentine, *Imagining Transgender*, p. 63.
85. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 34.
86. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 92.
87. Valentine, *Imagining Transgender*, p. 55.
88. Stryker, 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 145.
89. Stryker, 'Transgender History, Homonormativity, and Disciplinarity', p. 149.
90. Stryker, *Transgender History*, p. 150.
91. Valentine, *Imagining Transgender*, p. 17.
92. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 1.
93. Spade, *Normal Life*, p. 12.
94. Morland, 'Intersex', *Postposttranssexual*, p. 114.
95. Halberstam, *Female Masculinity*, p. 165.
96. Prosser, *Second Skins*, p. 5.
97. Aizura, 'Transnational Transgender Rights and Immigration Law', in Enke (ed.), *Transfeminist Perspectives in and beyond Transgender and Gender Studies*, p. 135.
98. Getsy, 'Capacity', p. 47.
99. See Bristow and Broughton, 'Introduction', in Bristow and Broughton (eds), *The Infernal Desire Machines of Angela Carter: Fiction, Femininity, Feminism*.

100. Getsy, 'Capacity', p. 47.
101. *Man into Woman: The First Sex Change – A Portrait of Lili Elbe*, p. 24.
102. Cromwell, 'Passing Women and Female-bodied Men: (Re)claiming FTM History', in More and Whittle (eds), *Reclaiming Genders: Transsexual Grammars at the Fin de Siècle*, p. 53.
103. Moore, *Albert Nobbs*, p. 8.
104. Butler, *Undoing Gender*, p. 11.
105. Butler, *Undoing Gender*, p. 57.
106. Butler, *Undoing Gender*, p. 58.