“As You Can See:” Brecht, Butler, and the Body in Caryl Churchill’s *Cloud Nine*
...theatrical art depends upon living and present mediators, actors and audience, for both its meaning and its existence. Dramatic literature is not complete until it is performed, and even if we know it only though reading, we experience it fully only if we conceive it ‘in the mind’s eye’ as staged... all dramatic literature is but outline and prologue to the complete art experience of performance (Wiles 2).

Wiles’ book *The Theater Event* sets out an important distinction often ignored by literary critics doing work in the theater. A play as a piece of literature is clearly a separate entity from its performance, and both warrant analysis. What Wiles points out, which many miss, is that these two aspects of a play mutually inform each other rather than being separate but related parts of a whole. The play is “not complete” until the performance is taking place, either in reality or conceptualization. Similarly, an analysis of a play should not be complete until the play is looked at both as literature and as performance. Looking at this theater event as a whole reveals contradictions, patterns, and themes that are obscured if one looks at the play only as literature or only as performance respectively.

Caryl Churchill’s play *Cloud Nine* demands a look through this lens defined by Wiles. Churchill deconstructs gender throughout the play both textually and performatively, revealing that the idealized performance of gender is just that: a performance. Textually, a reader is forced to confront contradictions between linguistic descriptions and narrative and performative truths revealing problematic realities of gender performances, even when those performances cannot be physically manifested (existing, at this point, only on the page). In the full theater event, the audience is forced to confront not only its understandings of gender, but its whole understanding of the narrative project and cultural norms. Since the audience sees actors playing parts outside of their traditionally assigned gender roles – a visual experience that even a reader who remains mentally aware of the gender assignments prescribed by the character list will never attain – and
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experiences a timeline that does not conform to realistic patterns, it must question its entire understanding of the play, its themes, and theater itself.¹

As set out in the introduction and character list (see appendix), *Cloud Nine* is a play in which the actors are not always meant to traditionally match the gender or race of the character they portray. Further, the actors do not play one character throughout the entire show but, rather, switch roles between Acts I and II. This nontraditional casting establishes an immediate contrast between the perceived identities of the characters as set out in the dialogue and their embodiment on the stage. The mismatching of (traditional) body and performance of the characters is a tactic of alienation, a technique defined by Bertolt Brecht, which forces the audience to question enacted societal norms as it sees them represented on the stage. By extension, this is meant to make the audience question the norms that they accept and expect in their daily lives. The theater, for Brecht, is not only a means of telling stories, but a means of showing the audience the momentary and flexible nature of all concepts through which we ground our society. In *Cloud Nine*, Brechtian alienation is used to reaffirm the fluidity of normative roles throughout history and in contemporary society, and also to present a critique of the theater arts themselves.

Brecht was a playwright and theatrical theorist of the early twentieth century. His plays often investigated issues of class and inequality throughout history, intending to highlight the pitfalls of capitalism and the potential of a communist society. Brecht sought to drive his audiences toward social action not only with the substance of his text, but also with the way in which his plays were presented as a theater event. Brechtian drama, for plays written by Brecht or others, is marked by the alienation effect – often called the A-effect or *Verfremdungseffekt* in

¹ The experience of an abnormal timeline also remains unique to the theater event since a timeline with gaps or irregularities is expected in the act of reading, but works against traditional norms – namely the Aristotelian unity of time – in theater.
its original German. The alienation effect seeks to make the audience perpetually aware that it is watching a play in a theater. This awareness allows audiences to take on a critical eye in relation to the events which they are viewing, rather than being passive observers. The A-effect thus shows a marked difference from the traditional Aristotelian drama preceding Brecht’s theater, which focuses on the audience’s empathy for the characters: “...Tragedy is an imitation not only of a complete action, but of events inspiring fear or pity...the effect is heightened when [events] follow as cause and effect” (Aristotle 70). Brecht challenged this idea both temporally, in denying cause and effect in a play’s action, and through alienating his audience from the characters with whom it would traditionally empathize. In Brecht on Theatre, he writes:

The spectator was no longer in any way allowed to submit to an experience uncritically (and without practical consequences) by means of simple empathy with the characters in a play. The production took the subject-matter and the incidents shown and put them through a process of alienation: the alienation that is necessary to all understanding. When something seems ‘the most obvious thing in the world’ it means that any attempt to understand the world has been given up (Brecht 71).

Through his alienation effect, Brecht sets up a relationship – in the audience’s mind – between the world of the play and the world at large. When audiences can no longer passively empathize with characters onstage, they learn to look at the theatrical and the real world through a lens that is questioning and open to possibility.

Brecht uses a variety of performative and literary techniques to create his alienation effect, from the use of visible, explanatory titles, to various songs and scenes in his plays, to the actor both representing his character and criticizing it at the same time:

The actor should refrain from living himself into the part prematurely in any way, and should go on functioning as long as possible as a reader... the actor’s attitude should be one of a man who is astounded and contradicts. Not only the occurrence of the incidents, as he reads about them, but the conduct of the man he is playing, as he
experiences it, must be weighted up by him and their peculiarities understood... (Brecht 137).

The audience should always be aware that the actor is playing a part and the actor should always be analyzing and commenting on his part as if he is “reading” it for the first time. As such, the actor should say his lines “not as if he were improvising it himself but like a quotation… At the same time he obviously has to render all the quotation’s overtones, the remark’s full human and concrete shape…” (Brecht 138). The actor’s role is a complex one in Brecht’s theater. He must represent the character such that one could believe a person would really behave in that way. At the same time, he must make it clear that he is recreating those believable actions, not living them, presenting his own opinion (as actor) on the character as he goes along. This compels the audience to investigate other alternatives the characters could take, just as the actor does. Consequently, the audience is to then turn around and see the inherent alternatives in all action within a societal framework.²

As a vital part of alienation to effect societal change, Brecht demanded the concept of historicization in all of his plays. Brecht would set his plays in historical time periods in order to remind his audience that society is ever-changing. Visibility of the differences between historical periods is vital to revealing the malleability of society:

...we must drop our habit of taking the different social structures of past periods, then stripping them of everything that makes them different; so that they all look more of less like our own, which then acquires from this process a certain air of having been there all along, in other words of permanence pure and simple.

² Walter Benjamin provides an eloquent account of the changes in theater brought about by the epic theater (particularly in relation to empathy and the audience’s relationship to actors and action) in his Illuminations: “…the art of the epic theater consists in producing astonishment rather than empathy... Epic theater allows for a circumstance which has been too little noticed... The abyss which separates the players from the audience...this abyss, of all elements of the theater the one that bears the most indelible traces of its ritual origin, has steadily decreased in significance. The stage is still raised, but it no longer rises from an unfathomable depth...” (Benjamin 150-154). Epic theater places actor and audience in a joint project in relation to the play they are watching, removing the theoretical (and often literal) space that had previously existed between them.
Instead we must leave them their distinguishing marks and keep their impermanence always before our eyes, so that our own period can be seen to be impermanent too (Brecht 190).

As Brecht points out, it is not just setting a play in the past which creates historicization, but setting the play in a past which is determinately presented as having different cultural expectations from our own. The constructs of history are not slightly varied versions of the present but have actively and radically changed; they must be shown to be foreign to our own societal expectations to show their inconsistency. History written to be normalized to the present will always be misleading. It is Brecht’s project to remind his audience that it is a falsified rewriting of the past to make it conform to the present. Since the use of history in Brecht’s plays reveals that norms that were once accepted just like our own are perpetually altered, the audience can see that our society is able to change as well and will one day seem strange. The culture presented in the piece is not presented as a comfortable adjustment of the contemporary world, but as an entirely different place where new rules apply.

Modern plays, for Brecht, are identified as “epic theater” and set themselves up in contrast to plays which follow Aristotelian theatrical theory, particularly in their relationship to temporality. Aristotelian theater obeys the unities of time and action: “…Tragedy endeavors, as far as possible, to confine itself to a single revolution of the sun … A well-constructed plot… must neither begin nor end at haphazard…[it] must imitate one action and that a whole, the structural union of the parts being such that, if any one of them is displaced or removed, the
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3 While asserting a similar point, Benjamin (who espoused similar political leanings to Brecht) insisted that efforts be made to keep history from being understood in terms of present conditions (a tendency he saw in traditional understandings of history): “In every era the attempts must be made anew to wrest tradition away from a conformism that is about to overpower it” (Benjamin 255). According to Benjamin, history is constantly being rewritten through the lens of contemporary society, which is controlled by the ruling class. To empower all people and propagate Marxist ideals, history must always be figured in the context of its own time period. Any understanding of history which does not reveal it as ever-changing and drastically other to the present is a project of control and manipulation perpetuated by the ruling class.
whole will be disjointed and disturbed" (Aristotle 60, 65-67). The coherent and truncated representation of time in the theater compels the audience temporarily to believe that the events could truly be occurring with few gaps of plot or timeline to remind spectators of the play’s artificiality. Epic theater, on the other hand, seeks to remind the audience of the constructed nature of the play. Each scene is a moment unto itself which need not inherently be linked to the others to create a coherent narrative. For Brecht, these disjoints in time foster further alienation and promote the understanding that time can be rewritten: “Non-aristotelian drama would at all costs avoid bundling together the events portrayed and presenting them as an inexorable fate, to which the human being is handed over helpless despite the beauty and significance of his reactions; on the contrary, it is precisely this fate that it would study closely, showing it up as of human contriving” (Brecht 87). Events in epic theater are linked only in that they are performed within the same theater event. All correlations between events and outcomes in the mind of the audience are constructed; it is that construct which epic theater resists. The epic theater, historicization, and the alienation effect created by acting technique, text, and technical aspects of the theater all combine to create an active audience that learns, through the theater, to question contemporary society.

Brecht’s theories mirror the structure illuminated in Wiles’ theory of the “theater event.” Some of Brecht’s techniques toward producing the alienation effect are a result of the play’s text – historicization, epic structure, the inclusion of songs which are of “a reflective and moralizing nature” – but they are only fully effective if combined with those aspects of the alienation effect which are unique to performance – the actors presenting the characters “in quotes;” titles for songs and scenes; music performed as a clear break in narrative action, rather than normalized into part of the world of the show (Brecht 85). To achieve the alienation effect that will compel
the audience to re-envision the outside world, one must experience it as part of a theater event. Brecht addresses the important interplay between text and performance in his analysis of his own play *The Threepenny Opera*: “The most successful demonstration of the epic theatre was the production of *The Threepenny Opera* in 1928” (Brecht 85). The importance of the theater event in Brecht’s imagining of the epic theater is clear from just this sentence. He does not define just the *The Threepenny Opera*’s text as the paragon of epic theater but emphasizes how it was represented in a specific production. In this analysis, Brecht focuses on the presentation and performance of the songs, the visible placement of the orchestra, and the lighting. He spends more time on analysis of production elements than on his own writing, only focusing on the content of a few moralizing songs and, more revealingly, Macheath’s double arrest at the end of the show. This plot point stands out for Brecht particularly because of its ability to textually assert a point that is a primary aim of epic structure; namely, that the drama “knows no objective but only a finishing point, and is familiar with a different kind of chain, whose course need not be a straight one but may quite well be in curves or even leaps” (Brecht 45). The alienating and affective power of Brecht’s plays cannot come from solely a correctly constructed text; the theater event is vital to the alienating project.

*Cloud Nine*’s structure and content utilize alienation techniques to reveal its own questions about the audience’s assumptions. However, in late-1970s London, Churchill’s focus was less on socioeconomic constructs and more on the politics of gender and sexuality. While Brecht used his theatrical techniques primarily as a Marxist critique of capitalist society, Churchill appropriates them to serve her more feminist aims. The play’s epic structure utilizes techniques of historicization and an unrealistic temporal flow. The Victorian time period of Act I presents the audience with a cultural reality decidedly distinct from its own, particularly in Hammel7
aspects of colonialism and strict domestic roles (which anticipate the structure of the nuclear family in the twentieth century). The family around which the play centers itself exists in a world with strict and, to a contemporary audience, almost mockingly hyperbolic gender roles. Similarly, the over-enthusiastic colonialism of Act I is a questionable concept for Churchill’s audiences. Both of these cultural spheres are presented as normative to the time, with no allusions to the contemporary society which would replace it. Churchill’s use of epic structure is most evident in the time change between Acts I and II, one which does not follow the rules of temporal reality. The audience must acknowledge the artificiality of the play because the progression of time between the two acts – one-hundred years – does not match the change in age of the characters – twenty-five years. The audience is forced to compare the Victorian era and contemporary society through their proximity in the play (with only an intermission dividing them). Brecht’s epic structure as used in Cloud Nine not only perpetuates alienation but also serves to illuminate historical changes over time.

Cloud Nine’s casting presents Churchill’s most obvious use of alienation. While epic structure and historicization illuminate the outdated and problematic assumptions of gender- and racial-roles in historical and contemporary societies, it is the cross-gender, cross-race, and multiple character casting which visualizes Cloud Nine’s primary theoretical claims. The concept that gender roles are an unfixed construct of society has been a central tenant of many feminist projects, but Cloud Nine uses the alienation effect to work past this point to mark a larger point about the categories of gender and self: that they emerge through performative acts.

Cloud Nine anticipates the theory of gender as performance as defined by Judith Butler. Cloud Nine is clearly concerned with traditionally prescribed gender roles of the nuclear family as acts of performance propagated by forces both within and outside of the home. But, for Butler, Hammel8
it is not just the roles traditionally carried out by particular genders that are performative, but the
genders themselves:

Gender is not passively scripted on the body, and neither is it determined by
nature, language, the symbolic, or the overwhelming history of patriarchy. Gender
is what is put on, invariable, under constraint, daily and incessantly, with anxiety
and pleasure, but if this continuous act is mistaken for a natural or linguistic
given, power is relinquished to expand the cultural field bodily through
subversive performances of various kinds (Butler 531).

Butler points out that gender is not a role that defines anyone – either personally or in
relationship to others within society – but is rather a series of acts carried out by an individual
specifically coded by society to be read as a unified gender. Gender, in fact, does not exist at all
prior to its enactment. Characters in Cloud Nine are constantly trying both to challenge and to
assimilate the actions which define their gender. In Act I, various extramarital and homosexual
affairs challenge Victorian social roles which seek to define gender regardless of any
performative action. In Act II, active questioning of gender and sexuality, and their relationship
to the formation of self, shows the characters’ internalization of the idea that gender is unfixed.
An understanding of Butler becomes central to an understanding of the play, allowing one to see
the realization towards which all the characters are working: that there is no self prior to the
social coding of the actions one performs. The characters’ definitive journeys force the audience
to distance itself from performed notions of gender. The lack of empathy in the epic theater
allows the audience to critically view these journeys, revealing that Butler’s theory is undeniable
throughout cultural and social experiences.

Churchill’s work is emblematic of the way in which Brecht can be used towards feminist
ends. Janelle Reinelt points out in her book After Brecht: British Epic Theater that “[w]hile
Brecht’s own representations of gender and sexual difference are subject to severe critique from
a feminist perspective, two aspects of Brecht’s theory transcend the historical and patriarchal limitations of his discourse” (Reinelt 82). For Reinelt, Brecht questions the assumptions of any traditional patriarchal society. While his aims may not be particularly feminist nor his female characters particularly liberated, the questioning of “closed systems of representation” allows for feminist questioning of patriarchy regardless of textual content (Reinelt 82). Elin Diamond takes this point to a further conclusion in her essay “Brechtian Theory / Feminist Theory: Toward a Gestic Feminist Criticism.” Diamond’s piece sets out a reading of Brechtian theory that directly correlates each Brechtian tactic of alienation with a feminist aim or criticism of society.

Furthering Reinelt’s assertion that Brecht can fit into a feminist framework, Diamond states: “I would suggest that feminist theory and Brechtian theory need to be read intertextually, for among the effects of such a reading are a recovery of the radical potential of the Brechtian critique and a discovery, for feminist theory, of the specificity of theater” (Diamond 1988:82). Brechtianism and feminism, for Diamond, can actually further each other’s aims, reradicalizing and redefining the other to make each more effective in contemporary society. While Diamond’s piece was written after Cloud Nine, Churchill’s play fits within its structure. For Diamond, the alienation effect can aid in understanding gender as a construction, specifically with the use of cross-dressing. Further, historicization can be used to put female identity (constructed as it may be) in historical context without romanticizing women as either subverted and helpless ingénues or emblems of female empowerment; showing a measured presentation that allows for womanhood to be seen as a construct of historical time.4

When Brechtian theory is mapped onto feminist critique, the interplay between Brecht and Butler in *Cloud Nine* becomes evident. The theater event of *Cloud Nine* combines Brechtian techniques with Butlerian cultural understandings to bring the audience to an alienated understanding of self. Certain connections and themes – particularly between characters as revealed through the body of the actor – are revealed only when one looks at the interconnected readings allowed by the full theater event. The theater event of the play and the play as literature mutually inform each other, as do the Brechtian and feminist projects, empowering the alienating purpose of the play to construct a gender-focused cultural understanding.

*Cloud Nine* opens with exposition in the form of a song, a common Brechtian tactic for presenting moralizing concepts. However, the song does not only alienate while satirizing gender stereotypes, but also provides vital exposition because of the peculiarities of the casting. The song ironizes the action of the play, since not one of the characters carries themselves throughout the play in the way that they are supposed to according to the song (perhaps with the exception of Victoria, who is literally played by “a dummy” in Act I and is therefore able to successfully perform the silent and subverted role she is given as infant and woman). The play begins with a call for the “sons of England” to “come gather in your pride” (Churchill 251). The play is immediately framed in two contexts (that of colonialism and that of gender), setting up the moral frames that the play will be challenging. Clive then discusses his wife, who is played by a man. Clive’s introduction of Betty states: “My wife is all I dreamt a wife should be, / And everything she is she owes to me” (Churchill 251). Betty’s identity as bodily masculine and performatively feminine becomes vital here. Betty’s male body reveals an underlying desire in Clive for masculinity in his partner through his admission that she is his ideal in a wife. Betty, as the exemplary woman with a male body, challenges Clive’s sexuality, and the play’s larger
understanding of the value of physical womanhood, since she — defined as the ideal woman in marriage — is not physically a woman at all. Clive claims some authority in creating Betty in her masculine body and feminine performance in the next line. Whether Betty truly owes Clive her femininity, her masculinity, or her wifehood is unclear, but Clive takes some responsibility in the creation of Betty’s self. Her role here, whatever its specific definition, is evidently malleable. Regardless of what she was before Clive, he was able to change her into his perfect wife. When Clive states that everything Betty is, she owes to him, he also claims his superior masculinity over Betty’s, subverting her autonomy whether he is looking at her masculine or feminine qualities.

Betty’s own introduction is presented entirely in terms of Clive and her subverted role in relation to the physically and performatively masculine characters around her: “I live for Clive. The whole aim of my life / Is to be what he looks for in a wife” (Churchill 251). Betty’s expression of what she wants to be does not emerge from an outside ideal of the superlative of wife, but in what Clive would personally want. She does not want to be the best wife nor the best woman, but what Clive “looks for.” Her identity is completely defined by his desire, which one sees from his previous lines is for a wife who performs womanhood while possessing underlying masculinity (represented in Betty by the actor’s body). Her identity is also framed by the male gaze: “I am a man’s creation as you see, / And what men want is what I want to be” (Churchill 251). Her short verse contains two distinct outsiders gazing on her to judge the effectiveness of her performance. First it is Clive, a synecdoche of manhood, looking for his ideal wife. In the third line, the audience is called upon to see her and judge her effectiveness as man’s creation (the repetition of a concept introduced by Clive, mirroring his words and world-view). The audience can, of course, also “see” that she is a man’s creation in that a male actor is creating her
as character. Her final line combined with this focus on the gaze draws attention to Betty’s masculine body, an unavoidable visual reality, as the object of masculine desire for “men,” in general, and for Clive as ironic paragon of manhood in the play. Betty only exists to please men and fulfill their desires, subverting her below Clive even as her male body elevates her above those women who lack it. However, this also links Betty and Clive in a common desire for connection to masculinity. Clive dreams of a wife like Betty, a woman inscribed in and by the male, while Betty wants to be wanted by men. Both of their verses show a desire for communion with masculinity as the ideal of self, companion, and object of desire.

Clive next introduces his servant, the only character in the play who is cross-race cast:

“My boy’s a jewel. Really has the knack. / You’d hardly notice that the fellow’s black” (Churchill 251). Clive’s introduction is a joke on the play’s casting; outward appearance does not always match the character the actor is portraying. Of course you would hardly notice that Joshua is black, the actor playing him is not. The implications of this are investigated in Joshua’s response: “My skin is black but oh my soul is white. / I hate my tribe. My master is my light. / I only live for him. As you can see, / What white men want is what I want to be” (Churchill 251-252). The lack of relationship between skin and soul is addressed here, combating traditional tenants of racism in which someone’s outward appearance, particularly skin tone, represented a defined fact or collection of facts about one’s inner self. Joshua’s final line mirrors Betty’s section of the introduction, claiming to want to be only what white men, represented by Clive, want. Both white women and black men only want to cater to the desires of the white men around them, a minority in Africa. Clive, as the representative of the white male, gets to control the ideal performance for all those around him.
The introduction of Edward, the not-quite-perfect son, shows Clive’s first moments of doubt in the play. He says, “My son is young. I’m doing all I can / To teach him to grow up to be a man” (Churchill 252). The use of “is” in the first sentence expresses the only certainty of identity Clive has about his son: that he “is young.” When talking about Edward’s manhood, “is” is replaced with “doing” and “teach,” words which express both an ongoing process and Clive’s uncertainty in the success of his intentions for his son. Even Clive sees that identity is constructed through a process of teaching and reinforcement of the status quo. Clive is anticipating Butler’s point that gender roles are constructed by the repetition and cultural understanding of various actions over time. For Clive, Edward is in the process of being defined as “man” – a process that he will never complete in Clive’s terms. However, Clive’s victories and losses over Edward’s gender performance have nothing to do with Edward’s inner desires. There is no bare self on which Clive is basing his choice to make Edward “a man.” Even though Clive’s influence is in progress, it is still an outside influence. There are no inherent desires in Edward that are shaping his gender identity as “man.” The audience is constantly reminded of this by the female body playing Edward which, through its own socially coded gender associations, serves as a symbolic representation of Edward’s undeniable and inescapable resistance to Clive’s expectations of manhood.

Edward’s response reasserts that he has not yet reached the definition of manhood his father desires in him: “What father wants I’d dearly like to be. / I find it rather hard as you can see” (Churchill 252). Edward’s verse – like Clive’s verse preceding it – contains a different grammar from the verses of Betty and Joshua. Betty and Joshua describe themselves as already being what Clive desires them to be (a mutual, fulfilled desire for all three characters). Edward still would “like” to become the son his father wants; but, unlike his mother and Joshua, he is as
of yet unsuccessful. The role of the gaze and the body of the actor are not lost in Edward’s verse though, which alters its use of the previously repeated “as you can see” to acknowledge that the body of the actor and the performance of character both do not match Clive’s desired role. Previously the phrase had been used ironically, the audience could not see the descriptions that were being provided for the characters and, rather, saw quite the opposite. There is a Brechtian acknowledgement in the actress playing Edward, who points out that her body does not match that of the “man” that Clive wants his son to be. The gaze of the audience is being redirected once again. “As you can see” was previously a phrase informing the audience that what they see in the body of the actor would not equate traditionally with the character the actor is portraying. Now Edward reminds the audience that in some cases, its gaze is not misleading. The body of the actress illustrates the character’s effeminate tendencies. This body maintains a different relationship to character from that of Betty or Joshua, for whom bodies represent the roles to which they are somehow aspiring. The audience is alienated even from the understanding of its own gaze. The conventions of visual understanding established in the first two verses are altered, denying the audience any conventions around which to center itself.

Edward’s subordination to more performatively successful characters is represented not only through the words he speaks, but how many words he is granted. Betty and Joshua, seen as perfect representations of Clive’s desires, are each given four lines with which to introduce themselves. Edward only speaks two lines. These lines, while truncating his voice, remain more subversive than those of Betty or Joshua in showing his difficulty in reaching Clive’s ideal. Edward’s lines show that these roles are not inherent to culture, but can be difficult to perform regardless of desire to do so. Edward’s female body and his unsuccessfully male gender performance are unlinked. The lack of pre-performative self is reinforced by Edward’s female
body, which visually affirms that a female has potential toward both male and female performances, yet in some cases can attain neither in a culturally satisfactory way.

The text shows Edward’s subversive, yet subverted power through the lack of lines he is allowed to speak. This is taken further in Clive’s introduction of the other three women of the household: “No need for any speeches by the rest. / My daughter, mother-in-law, and governess” (Churchill 252). These characters are distinct in their womanhood from Betty because they are women in the bodies of women. Their femininity is visible in both character performance and body, not allowing for man to intervene physically as with Betty. Since these women do not have lines, they are not given a chance to claim that they only want to enact Clive’s desires. Taking away their voices, an act meant to represent their subverted roles, actually prevents them from saying the very words which have most plainly taken agency away from the previously introduced characters. While Clive implies the insignificance of these characters and their words, their role may be thematically quite large. Diamond points out that these bodily and performatively female characters may offer a subversive and powerful representation of the female that the cross-dressed characters of either gender cannot. Since crossed-characters show either the bodies of men playing women or female bodies playing men, the fully recognizable woman is “absent” from these characters and the world of the play (Diamond 1985:278). The female characters, who are overlooked by Clive, are the only characters who offer the female in both body and cultural definition, reinserting the female into the world of the play and denying the man the right to exert physical or internal control.

While the non-cross-dressed female characters bring the historical female into the world of the play, the cross-dressed characters serve their own purposes in both the Brechtian and Butlerian frames. Cross-dressing alienates the audience by reminding it that actor and character
are not linked through the disjunction between body and defined gender. Diamond notes that the alienating use of the body in *Cloud Nine* is a specific tactic both in proving Butler’s claims about gender as entirely performative and Brecht’s beliefs that social norms must be challenged through use of the theater: “*Cloud Nine*...explores more fully the disciplinary methods of gender as a multivalent form of body control. The male playing Betty, the female playing her son Edward, foreground the ways in which culture, through its custodians in the family, discipline the body, force it to ‘emit signs’ of clear masculinity and femininity” (Diamond 1988:196). The role of the body in *Cloud Nine* is as the central, visual symbol around which the themes of gender and performance of self are focused. In Diamond’s reading, the need to perform gender as it is culturally prescribed is presented as an almost physical discipline of the body. Diamond’s interpretation reminds one of Butler’s point that gender as it is perceived in culture does not come from within the body, but is inscribed on the body through the acts we perform and the expectations of others. However, in the world of *Cloud Nine*, where the audience is being alienated from these cultural perceptions, the body of the actor becomes the one center that remains stable both in the eyes of the audience and throughout both acts of the play. The body of the actor is consistently present onstage, even as the character it is playing and that character’s gender changes. The body becomes a critical, yet relatively unnoticed, center of the play without which the themes of gender and identity construction in our society could not be investigated coherently. While the A-effect denies the audience almost all grounding, the body remains visually constant.

While the actor’s body provides some coherence to which the audience can adhere, the temporal discrepancies between character time and the larger timeline between the two acts disrupt the audience’s narrative expectations. The alienation effect seeks to prevent the audience
from believing that the events they are watching could actually be happening in real time before them; manipulation of the temporality on the stage is a pivotal way of achieving this goal.

However, audiences crave to rationalize and make real the events which they see in front of them: “...though the theatre emphasizes one temporality — a series of ‘presents’ — it assumes another — a story-line or narrative which is inferred by the spectator on viewing the dramatic representation. In fact theatre spectators probably conflate the two temporalities: while viewing action in the present, the spectator narrativizes the event, seeking its origins and telos as well as its causal relationship to other events” (Diamond 1985:276). Epic theater seeks to prevent this rationalizing of events from occurring without notice; an alienated audience is forced to confront all possibilities of past, present, and future for the characters and themselves. Diamond suggests that in a theater event, the audience is constantly trying to see what is not physically there, taking invisible events from the narrative it is creating and drawing them into the multiple “presents” that are being shown onstage. Even in epic theater – which does not have a unity of time – the audience can try to fill those gaps for themselves, resituating them in a world that is less alienated than the one being presented to them. Churchill, Diamond points out, exploits this tendency, and uses her realistically incompatible time jump to force the audience both to confront the desire they have to normalize the play they are watching and to recognize the fact that, in Cloud Nine, this is impossible.

The narrativizing tendency of the audience – or more broadly, the audience’s tendency to create links between technically separated events – is also manipulated through Churchill’s use of double casting between acts, an aspect of the play which is almost entirely an aspect of performance. The character list sets out which characters must be cross-cast, yet does not explain which actors should play a given character in each act. Churchill explains the double casting...
from the original production, as well as the impulses behind it, in her introduction but invites future productions to alter it as they will. The double casting between acts is a part of the performance event which is incapable of being specifically recreated in reading the play as literature.\(^5\) Given the audience’s tendency to create links wherever available, they will use the body of the actor as a cue to link the two characters that the actor plays. These bodies become the object on which the audience places its interpretive links — links which do not inherently exist in the text. For the sake of the following readings, I will use the double casting set out for the original production.

The double casting creates a particularly strong link between the Betty and Edward, whose actors switch roles between the acts. This creates an almost closed circuit for the two which allows no other bodies to enter and neither of the original bodies to leave the implied partnership. Both Betty and Edward have particular pressure from Clive to perform idealized roles of femininity and masculinity respectively. They are both marked in Act I — first through their cross-dressed bodies, but also by their actions in the text — as being unable to fulfill those ideals. Edward’s suffering in this respect is more apparent, marked from his first moment onstage as someone who finds it “rather hard” to “be a man.” Edward’s transgressive attachment to the doll is a physical indicator of his identification with femininity. However, it also foreshadows the somewhat-sexual and somewhat-bodily link that will develop between Edward and his sister in Act II:

Victoria: That should please mother.

---

\(^5\) Or, at least, if one wants to keep double casting in mind in the act of reading, one must keep all possibilities of double casting in one’s head since no specific character assignments are set out for each actor. In the performance event, a specific choice will be made by the performing company about the double casting and that is how spectators of this event will receive and understand it.
Edward: No listen Vicky. I’d rather be a woman. I wish I had breasts like that, I think they’re beautiful. Can I touch them?
Victoria: What, pretending they’re yours?
Edward: No, I know it’s you... I think I’m a lesbian” (Churchill 307).

Since Victoria is represented by a doll in Act I – separate from the one Edward is repeatedly found holding – Edward’s link with the doll (which is also supposed to be Victoria’s) anticipates the link he will find to her body in this exchange. By acknowledging that his mother would like that he likes women, Edward addresses Betty’s more traditional views of sexuality (harkening back to the expectations surrounding his sexuality in Act I). The quip also alludes to Edward’s past self which inhabited the female body who is now playing his mother. This whole exchange – contrary to a reading of the play where Act II represents reconciliation of self and sexuality – implies Edward’s desires to return to his role in Act I, which inhabited the body of a woman. The paradox of Edward’s gender, self-definition, and body is completed with his final line of the act, “I think I’m a lesbian.” His sexuality becomes as complex in this passage as his desired gender identity. One cannot tell if Edward wishes to possess the body of man or woman. His desires could lie in becoming what his mother is now (the woman he once was); what his mother was before (existing in his current body); or something completely outside of both identities altogether.

Edward’s relationship to Victoria and the doll are also reestablished here. Mirroring his relationship to the doll, Edward sees the body he desires as outside of himself and related to Victoria. He needs to possess and understand these bodies through his hands, constantly “minding” Victoria or the doll as a means to possess Victoria or her inanimate double (Churchill 265). Yet Edward cannot escape being repeatedly reminded that the doll and the body belong to Victoria, by his parents in Act I and by Victoria herself in Act II. Edward’s links to womanhood are perpetually denied. In Act I, Clive prevents him from acknowledging the female body in
which his character is located, insisting on a performance of masculinity for the perfect son. In Act II, he is chastised by Gerry for being too much “like a wife” – the same role Betty is compelled to perform in Act I in the body of the same actor – and is prevented from the physical connection with and possession of Victoria’s body, perpetually keeping Edward from addressing the femininity that entices yet eludes him (Churchill 306).

Edward seems to desire at least a partial return to his female body, even if it is associated with the pressure to perform the role of a perfect son. Betty’s transformation in Act II to the female body fosters similar confusion, which she seeks to reconcile through a communion with her own (new) body rather than seeking to find the old one or a different body with which to associate. After losing Clive, Betty seeks to rediscover her own identity and body:

“I thought if Clive wasn’t looking at me there wasn’t a person there. And one night in bed in my flat I was so frightened I started touching myself. I thought my hand might go through space... Afterwards I thought I’d betrayed Clive. My mother would kill me. But I felt triumphant because I was a separate person from them. And I cried because I didn’t want to be. But I don’t cry about it any more” (Churchill 316).

In Act I, Betty’s whole self-identity was defined by Clive’s desire or, as expressed in this monologue, by Clive’s gaze. Like Edward, she is struggling to shed the oppressive remnants of that identity, particularly the gender roles asserted by Clive. Yet her body, now in the body of a female actress, exists as completely separate from Clive and traditionally male influences. Her ability to separate her sense of self from Clive and her mother – who had violently defined what she thought her autoerotic sexuality (or lack thereof) had to be – allows her the freedom of self-definition, a freedom which is indicated by her physical discovery of her own body. Yet the separation from those who had previously enforced a predefined ideal of self on her is unsettling and causes her to react physically though tears. What allows her to overcome the tears is her
physical link to herself, her masturbatory examination of body. All of the conflicts of her past and future self are played out physically in her body; one that is not defined, bodily or culturally, by man.

Edward’s desire to return to the female body and Betty’s physical discovery raises questions of what allows for movement and play in self-identity. For both characters, there is an ideal of happiness associated with addressing and embracing bodily femininity – not any artificial cultural performance of the gender, but the physical realities of the female form. Developing sexualities also inform their drive towards the female body. In Act I, Edward is discovering his own sexuality as an alternative to Clive’s desires. While Clive insists that he be an emblem of manhood, Edward is driven towards a subversive – both because of gender and age – affair with Harry Bagley. In Act II, while he still does not fit into heteronormative patterns, Edward engages in homosexual and potentially incestuous relationships, yet no one is openly trying to control and manipulate Edward’s sexual choices. In Act II there is no one against whose influence Edward is fighting (having broken through his father’s influence by being openly homosexual). Similarly, Betty’s sexual awakening occurs as a rebellious act against Clive and her mother. The contented selfhood of Betty and Edward may lie in being able to sexually express oneself as a rebellious act, which requires having a force against which to fight. Finally, it is possible that for Edward and Betty, the salvation of self lies not in any theme in their lives, but in the body of the actress who plays each of them in turn. Each character feels a more fulfilled version of self when placed in the body of the woman rather than the body of the man. Betty and Edward’s satisfaction may not lie in any textual analysis at all, but in a reality that can only be achieved in the performance event when the characters are, in turn, placed in the body of an actress. For Edward, the female body allows him to resist his father’s insistence on idealized
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manhood. For Betty, the female body allows her to discover the sexual and bodily self that Clive’s control denied her physically and mentally.

A similar link to that between Betty and Edward is established between Joshua and Gerry. Each character only exists in one act, each serving as a foil to cultural norms unique to the time period of each act. Joshua, as the hyperbolically obedient servant, serves as an example of the ways one can cross towards and against power. Alisa Solomon’s article in *Crossing the Stage: Controversies on Cross-dressing* points out that crossing to traditionally lower or higher hierarchical roles determines whether a cross-dressed figure is parodying or critiquing gender roles. She acknowledges blackface as a related example of “a kind of dressing down by dressing up. Misogynist drag (which by no means includes all instances of male-to-female cross-dressing), like racist blackface, reassures, making fun of the socially subservient class by parodying it, always reminding the viewer that the power-granting penis remains – what a relief! – just beneath the skirts. This is slumming…” (Solomon 145). When looking at this analysis of crossing not just as a comment on gender, but also on race, Joshua becomes a particularly interesting subject. His blackface is merely implied by the text, but not visually actualized. In a sense, Joshua is both crossing below and above his prescribed cultural role. In the text, Joshua is an African servant who desires to be the white patriarch represented by Clive. However, in the theater event, one sees a white man playing this role, representing the opposite hierarchical cross and allowing Joshua to both parody and critique the colonialism and patriarchy around him. The body of the actor playing Joshua equates to what the character Joshua wishes to be, showing, as Brecht prescribes, that actor is not becoming the character, but presenting it “in quotes” for the audience to understand as a separate being. Performative desire, the body, and the implications of crossing come together in Joshua along multiple planes to create a character who almost exists
outside of the world of the play entirely. The body of the actor playing Joshua embodies his desired role (though his whiteness) in a way that Joshua never can. Similarly, the actor playing Joshua never comes close to looking believably like an African servant. The actor playing Betty dons a dress, Edward wears the clothes of a young boy, yet there is no indication that Joshua should be in blackface. It is only the words of the opening song and Joshua’s perpetual insistence the he wishes to leave his past behind that places him in his subversive role as black servant; his actions, desires, and body are constantly breaking that mold for the audience, giving him the most transformative power of any character in the play.

Of gender-crossing, Ferris writes: “Theatrical cross-dressing has provided one way of playing with liminality and its spectator/reading; a way of play, that while often reinforcing the social mores and status quo, carries with it the possibility for exposing that liminal moment, that threshold of questioning, that slippery sense of a mutable self. As spectators we are invited to read the transvestite body crossing the stage in more than one way” (Ferris 9). This quote establishes that cross-dressing is often critically understood to reinforce the norms of gender, playfully manipulating them only to allow those who cross (particularly those who are not transforming their bodies in a truly believable way, but rather dressing up as a caricature) to return to their expected gender role after the performance is complete. Men are allowed to return to their patriarchal power after having a romp in a hyperbolized and grotesque womanhood. But even with the reading of cross-dressing as playfully supportive of cultural standards, there still remains a chance for the cross to reveal the liminal space between genders where the lines between man and woman are not so clear, if only for a moment. Joshua and the actor playing him embody the representation of this liminal space, continually accessing moments of subverted and empowered identity but never fully attaining either.
One of the main difficulties in defining Joshua lies in concretely defining his internal desires. Joshua exists as a prime example of Bhabha’s interpretation of transgressive mimetic actions by colonized subjects in relation to their colonizers: "...mimicry emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge... colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference" (Bhabha 1984: 126). Colonizers attempt to create subjects who appear just similar enough to express familiarity and triumph in the colonizing project but remain different enough to show that the presence of the colonizers is not yet redundant. Joshua acts as a hyperbolization of this mimetic project, taking the role to such an extreme degree that it reveals the whole project to be ridiculous. Joshua’s incompatible differences to Clive are punctuated by moments of striking similarity between the two men. When Joshua tells Edward his tribe’s version of the creation story, we see the lengths to which Joshua must go to distance himself from his own customs (in order to fully enter the realm of the white colonizers): “Of course it’s not true. It’s a bad story. Adam and Eve is true. God made man white like him and gave him the bad woman who liked the snake and gave us all this trouble” (Churchill 280). This assertion of the Judeo-Christian creation myth shows Joshua’s appropriation of western religion – an important part of being defined as a member of this white culture – and his determination to reiterate the culturally-proper gender roles. While the myth of Adam and Eve asserts that man was created first, with woman created for his benefit and subsequently causing his downfall, Joshua’s tribe has a different understanding: “First there was nothing and then there was the great goddess. She was very large and she had golden eyes and she created the sun and the earth. But soon she was miserable and
lonely and she cried like a great waterfall and her tears made all the rivers in the world. So the
great spirit sent a terrible monster, a tree with hundreds of eyes and a long green tongue... And
then they had children which is all of us” (Churchill 279). In this myth, woman takes on the role
of Adam and, in some capacity, the role of god (though there is a great spirit of unspecified
gender who seems to be hierarchically above her). She both has the power to create and the mark
of being the primary ancestor to all the people of the world. The male figure of the tree is created
for her, yet tortures her until she flees (mimicking the disruptive role of Eve). For Joshua’s tribe,
the male and female roles of the creation myth are effectively switched. Joshua, however, insists
the myth is untrue and “bad,” attempting to establish his colonized role through subverting
women.

Joshua’s need to renounce all parts of his previous culture do not only apply to the larger
traditions and understandings of his tribe, but to ties as close as his immediate family as well:

Clive: Joshua, do you want a day off? Do you want to go to your people?
Joshua: Not my people, sir.
Clive: But you want to go to your parents’ funeral?
Joshua: No sir... My mother and father were bad people
Clive: Joshua, no.
Joshua: You are my father and mother (Churchill 284).

Joshua is so determined to be seen as like Clive that he renounces his parents, choosing instead
to be of Clive’s lineage. His desire to separate himself from the others of his tribe, particularly
from his parents, shows his desire to separate himself from the prescribed identity that comes
with his race and social standing. Unlike in the opening song where what Clive wants is what

---

6 This comparative look at male-centered and female-centered creation myths exemplifies the Butlerian concept that
gender has no set base in the body. The body, in these creation myths represented by both god (or god-like figures)
and whatever god’s first creation is, is genderless, made evident by the fact that different cultures see these entities
as differently gendered. It is only cultural understandings inserted into the stories that gender these figures. The
creation myths reveal the ways in which gender is culturally constructed from otherwise un-coded bases in our
society.
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Joshua wants to be, the desire for Clive to be "father and mother" to Joshua shows that Joshua wants to exceed the vision Clive has of him. Clive notes in his introduction that Joshua's performance of self undermines what Clive would assume are conventional indicators of blackness; but Clive still calls him "my boy," thereby enforcing Joshua's role as subordinated other and servant. Yet here Joshua indicates that he sees in himself a connection to Clive that is still subordinated, but that is granted much more cultural and individual power than that of a servant: the role of a son. By openly defining the role he wants to play, Joshua gains a control of self that is unseen in the other characters in Act I. Joshua's liminal role allows him to exist between powerlessness – as servant – and power – in the body of the white actor and as the obedient worker who is liked by his employer and household patriarch. This allows Joshua to create his own performance outside of the destructive cycles and definitions enforced by the Victorian society. He remains in a safe, liminal space by being a character that, in certain ways, many characters barely notice.

Joshua's ability to remove himself from oppressive performative confines manifests itself in the final moments of Act I in which he prepares to shoot Clive. It is an act of breaking away from the man that Joshua does not only claim to aspire to, but claims is part of his parentage. Joshua is able to once again remain unnoticed in his marginalized role by everyone except Edward (marginalized in his own right as son, the role that Joshua previously stated he wanted to enter), and is able to take literal power over the life of the man who has controlled his own for so long. The shot as it is fired – which the audience does not see – represents Joshua's liminal breaking away from all spheres which try to contain him; which, like the moment of Clive's death, cannot be seen. This action eliminates Joshua from the world of the play, sealing his fate as a liminal character that cannot exist within any coherent world the play has to offer. This
transgressive act which eliminates Joshua not only removes him, it removes Clive as well.

Neither Joshua nor Clive has a role in the post-colonial society. The remaining characters who can exist in that world are propelled into the temporally impossible Act II where, like Joshua in Act I, they all start to question the cultural confines of their prescribed performances of gender.

Through the time shift, it can be said that Joshua somewhat morphs into Gerry. Each of them is a character of a subverted class – Joshua the servant and Gerry the open homosexual – who manages through control of self-performance to exist almost completely outside any of the social norms which control and confine the other characters. Gerry, like Joshua, exists in a liminal space, finding his escape from Edward and all other oppressive influences in sexual encounters on trains. He is only able to find his fulfilled and free self when he is in movement from one location to another, existing in the limited and liminal time and space between stations. This space exists in a “six minute journey,” yet during that time Gerry creates a world where all rules of society and relationships disappear and where he can do what he pleases (Churchill 297). As he describes an encounter with a stranger he met on a train, Gerry’s resistance to definitions that aren’t made by the self becomes apparent:

“...You have to get away sometimes or you lose sight of yourself. The train from Victoria to Clapham still has those compartments without a corridor. As soon as I got on the platform I saw who I wanted... I felt wonderful. Then he started talking. It’s better if nothing is said. Once you find he’s a librarian in Walthamstow with a special interest in science fiction and lives with his aunt, then forget it. He said I hope you don’t think I do this all the time. I said I hope you will from now on... He said, ‘What’s your phone number, you’re my ideal physical type, what sign of the zodiac are you? Where do you live? Where are you going now? It’s not fair, I saw him at Victoria a couple of months later and I went straight down to the end of the platform and I picked up somebody really great who never said a word, just smiled” (Churchill 297-298).
Gerry begins by explaining how he avoids “losing sight of himself,” establishing the importance of self-definition for his character. Gerry also understands that this ability to self-define outside of the pressures of society requires “getting away.” One cannot stay stagnant to obtain self-definition, but must find movement and liminal spaces, as both Joshua and Gerry are able to do. But further to self-definition, the train is a place lacking in any definition. The only rules of the train are the timetable on which it runs; in between stations one may be exactly as one pleases. For Gerry, he wants to be no one, lacking in all identity except for that created by the sexual relationship established between himself and a stranger. Gerry shuns all questions about his career, address, lifestyle, and history, choosing instead to be defined only by what he desires sexually. The other person is incidental, an accident of location on the platform. Gerry explains that as soon as he knows about the identity of the other man in the outside world, the fantasy is shattered. When the man brings up his normal sexual behavior—“I hope you don’t think I do this all the time”—Gerry responds snidely, reminding the man, and the audience, that Gerry believes in redefinition. The identity on the train is one that always can and should exist outside of one’s personal history in any other space. Gerry loses interest in the stranger entirely when the stranger moves from the minor transgression of talking about himself to asking about Gerry. This man is trying to force Gerry to identify himself using the qualifiers of the outside world and Gerry will not allow it. This man cannot be a part of Gerry’s life in the train anymore—and was never viable for Gerry’s larger world—and is exchanged for someone who understands that the world of the train is just one of physicality linking bodies: a man who “just smiled.” Gerry’s identity, or lack thereof, on the train informs his self-satisfied performance of self outside of the train. Gerry chooses how he wants to define his own identity and takes measures to make it happen which lets him live outside of the rules of Act II’s world. He is...
unfazed by the definitions on relationships and self that Edward tries to enforce and because he is always able to access the liminal self that exists on the train. Joshua and Gerry both define and inhabit liminal spaces in which identity can be either controlled or eliminated entirely.

*Cloud Nine* is imbued with elusively defined characters who textually resist realistic and narrative understanding by audiences and readers. The Brechtian alienation in this play seeks to distance the characters and plots from normative reception. No character is able to attain a truly coherent definition of self and gender, so that the audience realizes how pertinent Butler’s readings of gender performance are to their own lives and selves. However, through the body of the actor, links and thematic truths start to develop in ways that cannot be comprehended in the text alone. Certainly, a reader of the play who is not experiencing the performance event can imagine the cross-casting since it is set out in the character list before the text of the play really begins. But the mind’s eye will never create the same unavoidable effect that seeing the body of the actor which constantly enacts those unwritten narrative and thematic connections does. Churchill herself has bemoaned a rewrite of the play for the New York production that moved Betty’s masturbation speech such that it offered “much surer affirmation of future possibilities for woman than [Churchill] had intended” (Keyssar 215). But while Churchill does not want to offer clear resolution in overcoming the oppression of enforced gender roles through the text of the play, the communion between body and self that is examined through the performance event of *Cloud Nine* does offer alternatives. While Butler and Churchill alike desire to end the oppression of the gender binary and enforced gender norms, *Cloud Nine* reveals that, through discovery of the body, one can find a positive self-definition. It will not necessarily be the culturally prescribed definition, but one that makes one feel connected to that body and confident.

---

7 The character list, interestingly enough, exists somewhat like Joshua and Gerry, in a liminal space that is part of the play, yet also exists outside of it, establishing its own rules that manipulate the world of the play.
of autonomy and authority in the performance it exudes — a performance that will almost always 
be more satisfying if it challenges, rather than conforms to, conventional alignments of identity. 
Mimicking the meeting of the Act I and Act II Bettys in the final moments of the play, the 
audience is left with the idea that the body one must inhabit — represented by the Act I Betty who 
is controlled by patriarchal forces — and the self that one has discovered and created outside of 
cultural expectations — the sexually liberated and bodily aware Betty of Act II — can come 
together. One can find reconciliation of body and self, it just need not (and, perhaps, should not) 
be through the performance upon which culture traditionally insists.
Appendix - Color Coded Character List for *Cloud Nine*

Characters are paired according to the prescribed doubling for each actor as set out in Churchill’s introduction.

Characters highlighted in yellow are cross cast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act One</th>
<th>Act Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Gerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edward</strong></td>
<td>Betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maud</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen / Mrs. Saunders</td>
<td>Lin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Bagley</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria – a dummy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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