

Gendered Aggression in Caryl Churchill's *The Skriker* and *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You?*

Johanna E. Székelyhidi

Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

Abstract. *The Skriker* (1994), British playwright Caryl Churchill's contemporary classic, and *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You* (2006), a shorter, more recent play give profound insight into the dramatic and theatrical representation of gendered aggression. The way female, male and genderfluid characters enact violence subverts cultural understandings of gendered violence. In *The Skriker*, aggression is personal, acted out, sensory and bodily. In *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You*, it is global, achieved through dialogue alone, and it is rationalised. The two plays reveal the performativity of gender scripts through theatrical means.

Keywords: Contemporary British drama, Caryl Churchill, gender, aggression, verbal violence, performativity

Caryl Churchill entered the British theatrical scene in the 1970s. Her early works are mostly feminist plays relying on popular Brechtian theatrical methods. She gradually moved towards a more unique and experimental style as she started collaborating with fringe companies, such as Monstrous Regiment and Joint Stock. She is noted for her dialogue techniques, constant reinvention of form and incredibly varied body of work with more than fifty plays to date. Common themes concern gender, violence, trauma, and identity. Her plays are also unequivocally political, reflecting on current events from an anti-capitalist point of view.

At first glance, *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You* resembles a verbatim/tribunal play, [1] a form of documentary theatre with dramatised interviews concerning real-life events, which has been favoured as the main genre of British political theatre from the 1990s onwards (Rebellato, *Modern British Playwriting*, 41-42). In the Royal Court production of *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You*, [2] only two static characters appear on stage, a gay couple sitting on a sofa, whose rapid conversation focuses on violent and controversial events in the recent foreign policy of the United States. The American Sam and the British Jack [3] never leave their comfortable place, but the sofa they stay on is lifted upwards, reaching the ceiling by the end of the play. Therefore, Sam and Jack manage to quite literally rise above the complex moral dilemmas concerning the discussed political events, and they are allowed to just marvel at the beauty of global destruction.

Although the bombastic, fragmentary political dialogue resembles flashing headlines in the news, *Drunk Enough* is not based on witness accounts, real life interviews or personal documents, i.e., the preferred sources of tribunal/verbatim theatre. The inhuman acts described in the play are common knowledge, which makes them all the more horrible. Sam and Jack can be interpreted as the allegorical figures of Uncle Sam and Union Jack (Rebellato, "The Personal is Not Political," 35), an ordinary man falling in love with a country (Churchill, *Plays*

Four, 269), or an everyday couple: they could be anybody, since nothing personal is said about either them, the Bosnian War or the invasion of Iraq.

Sam and Jack having an intimately personal relationship is, however, significant. Following the renaissance of British queer drama in the 1990s, the focus was no longer on the tragedy of AIDS, a persistent sense of shame or the hardships of being closeted: the representation of LGBTQIA characters have adopted a more positive outlook (Sierz, 62). While the earlier trend preferred to treat queer characters as iconic figures representing their entire community, post-1990s drama slowly started to embrace them as individuals whose sexuality is only a part of their identity—not the sum of their entire being. The sexual orientation of Sam and Jack is not the main concern of *Drunk Enough*, but it plays a crucial role in how they define and enact masculinity through gendered aggression, which will be discussed in more detail later.

The earlier play, *The Skriker*, was written a decade before *Drunk Enough*; however, in Churchill's case, chronology is hardly a concern as there are no distinguishable trends in her varied body of work, save for the increasing minimalism of her post-2000s plays. Indeed, *The Skriker* is in sharp contrast with the minimalism of *Drunk Enough* with its more traditional dialogue, complex plot and busy stage, filled with twenty-six characters altogether. The main characters are Lily and Josie, teenage mothers who are driven to desperation by an ancient fairy and death portent called the Skriker. The play was completed in 1993 and signalled an era that saw an alarming increase in the number of teenage pregnancies (Sierz, 2). *The Skriker* reflects on this crisis, and comments on other contemporary issues such as global warming or high-profile child murders: we learn that Josie killed her ten-day old baby, believing it to be a changeling, thanks to the Skriker's influence. She was admitted into a mental hospital; when she is released, she warns Lily of the Skriker who is following her still, but Lily does not heed her words. When the Skriker promises to grant her wishes, she wishes for flowers and thus enters a dangerous bargain. As the Skriker has the ability to shapeshift, Lily does not realise the danger she is in. Josie tries to protect her, but her violent outbursts at supposed strangers just make her look unstable. Josie follows the Skriker to the Underworld, and following her return loses Lily's friendship. Left alone, Lily starts to realise the toxic influence the Skriker had on her life, and tries to make a deal: fearing for her newborn's life and Josie's safety, she volunteers to go to the Underworld and serve the Skriker if she spares her loved ones. However, when she returns to the human world, she finds out that decades have passed in her absence. The Earth has become near inhabitable. Lily turns to dust as her great-granddaughter screams at her in mindless rage. The environmental concerns implied by this striking apocalyptic vision, continuously referenced throughout the play, tend to be the focus of academic analysis surrounding *The Skriker*. The present paper endeavours, however, to widen the scope beyond the immediate eco-political message by exploring the representation of gender and violence in the play.

If imagined on a binary scale, *Drunk Enough* could be considered a “male play” (with young men discussing the conventionally masculine issues of politics and warfare) while *The Skriker* seems more like a “female play” with a focus on the interpersonal relationships and emotional journey of Josie, Lily and the Skriker. However, the Skriker's character alone challenges the gender binary.

Although she is referred to with female pronouns, the Skriker is a genderfluid entity who appears as various male and female characters, as well as a genderless object in the dramatic text. On stage, the Skriker's actor steps in and out of gender roles as she portrays an American woman, a little girl, a lonely man or, memorably, a sofa. Her fluidity creates an identity that cannot be defined according to the gender binary.

The casting of the character tends to bring attention to the genderfluid nature of the Skriker. In a Hungarian collaborative production between Katona József Theatre, one of Hungary's most famous artistic repertoire theatres, and the Budapest Puppet Theatre [4], Réka Pelsóczy wore a suit and combat boots, which were only briefly exchanged for a sequin dress for the Underworld scene; her hair was cut short, and the make-up made her face angular and aggressive. Maxine Peake from the Royal Exchange Theatre's production [5] had a similar appearance with her cropped hair, masculine clothes and feminine charm; as Queen of the Underworld, she donned a costume and wig resembling Elizabeth I, to then go back to her workman's overall. Both actresses possessed male and female characters; notably, in the Katona-Bábszínház production, the Skriker used actors and actresses as puppets, standing behind them. She would shift between talking in unison with the possessed person, talking over them or dubbing their speech. The ease with which the Skriker is moving between the categories of male and female problematizes the pre-supposed universality of gender and reveals it as something arbitrary and performative. Following Judith Butler, gender identity is revealed as nothing but performance: "there is no gender identity behind the the expression of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results" (34).

The pronounced performativity of the Skriker's gender identity presents an interesting contrast with the theatrical representation of the gender identity of Lily and Josie. In the Hungarian production, Lily is heavily (and visibly) pregnant, which draws the audience's attention to sex, not gender. Josie is likewise defined by motherhood: her murdered baby is present as *absence*, the negative image of the blooming life represented by Lily's round belly. This contrast problematizes the seemingly simple gender representation of Lily and Josie. Their gender performance is a double act. Lily has the role of the good girl from fairy tales helping the Skriker appearing as a beggar, while Josie acts as her wicked opposite, refusing the Skriker's wish for a hug. When the Skriker utters her first curse, gold comes out of Lily's mouth when she speaks; Josie is coughing up frogs (a reference to the French fairy tale *Diamonds and Toads* by Charles Perrault). Lily is kind and nurturing, while Josie is paranoid, aggressive, and prone to violent outbursts. In this interpretation, Lily and Josie are the same person split into two parts, the good and the bad, the nurturing and the destructive: a woman, a mother, divided into separate bodies. Therefore, the three female leads of the play all have problematised gender identities: the Skriker is a genderfluid entity, while Lily and Josie make up one woman together.

The role of good and bad is further complicated by the fact that Josie's postnatal depression explains (even though it does not excuse) her aggression and the murder of her baby. She goes against the gender script of the nurturing mother, whose figure is still present through Lily. The bad girl and bad mother, the female destroyer is also present in the cultural script as a counterpoint to the

culturally acceptable behaviour (similarly how the fairy godmother contrasts the evil stepmother), but through complicating Josie's motivations through mental illness, aggression, and the constant contrast with Lily, her character becomes far more complex than the bad girl Fanny from *Diamonds and Toads*.

The masculine gender identity of Sam and Jack in *Drunk Enough* is chiefly expressed through broken dialogue that consists of unfinished sentences. Their fragmentary political discussion becomes more than a simple conversation: this is the tool they use to construct their gender identity which lines up with gender scripts determining cultural understandings of masculinity. The choice of topics (warfare and politics), the style of the dialogue (broken debate) and the reluctance of discussing personal matters all point towards culturally determined gender roles. We learn that Jack cheats on his wife with Sam, but we never meet her on stage: her voice is not heard, her perspective is dismissed, she has no place, no significance and no name in the world Sam and Jack inhabit. Marginalised through the dialogue that speaks her into being, she is mentioned less and less, until she completely fades away. Although Sam and Jack are staying in a hotel on a lovescapade, intimacy is notably missing. A closer look at Sam and Jack's dialogue reveals how they construct masculinity through the language of aggression.

SAM: sitting around

JACK: no

SAM: so much to do because

JACK: thinking

SAM: no time for

JACK: all right I'm just

SAM: missing your

JACK: not at all

SAM: natural

JACK: get on with

SAM: because there's all this people we have to

JACK: ok so here's the bridge right here and the people there are people going across not soldiers just

SAM: North Korea

JACK: blow it up

SAM: there you go

JACK: don't want you to worry because I don't regret

SAM: death brigades

JACK: right behind us

SAM: in Guatemala... (Churchill, *Drunk Enough*, 12-13.)

Sam and Jack cannot talk about their relationship or emotions. The short, fragmented, roundabout attempts keep being pushed aside for the sake of politics. The tension is palpable at the beginning of their conversation, which could easily turn into an argument. They steer the conversation to politics to avoid a frank discussion. Jack is the one who suggests to "get on with [it]," (Churchill, *Drunk Enough*, 12) his annoyance evident, while Sam introduces their political conversation as if it was their duty to talk about it; thus, he justifies dropping the subject of their relationship with "so much to do" and "there's all this people we have to[—]" (Churchill, *Drunk Enough*, 12). They are in harmony when they

discuss foreign affairs, responding to each other instead of struggling with the uncomfortable topic of personal issues. Jack's suggestion to blow up North Korea is rewarded by encouragement. However, Jack's thoughts linger on the conversation they were trying to have, the things left unsaid. He reassures Sam that he has not regretted leaving his family for him, but this careful confession is ignored for the sake of Guatemalan death brigades. In response, Jack immediately joins the political conversation, abandoning his previous half-hearted attempt of relationship maintenance. Sam and Jack connect to each other intellectually, rather than emotionally. They follow a restrictive, binary gender script that developed through history where "men... rely on rationality because the principles governing society were created to support their needs, and those in control often advocate discipline and adherence to rules. Women's focus on relationships has developed in response to their relative disenfranchisement, because promoting relatedness and mercy are ways they can exert influence" (Porter, 42). They reinforce their idea of masculinity by designating a focus on relationships as feminine and foreign. They advocate a rationality that is closely connected to power, discipline, and aggression.

The fact that these two men are in a homosexual relationship is seemingly counter-script. Seemingly, since the playtext suggests that homosexuality in itself is not enough to subvert the patriarchal (and compulsory heterosexual [6]) understanding of masculinity. Sam and Jack have a highly conservative mindset; this conservatism seems to compensate for their 'liberal' sexual orientation. Sam represents the paradoxical figure of the Republican homosexual. Jack, ambivalent about politics and still struggling to come to terms with his own sexual orientation, is desperate to imitate Sam. Sam seduces Jack through hyperbolic and sensationalist political rambling in an attempt to make him into a partner who shares his conservative beliefs and never challenges him. He does not want discussions: he demands a conversation of echoes. Malkin links this behaviour to verbal violence: a character (Jack) is "converted" through language, "forced into pre-existing verbal molds which, implicitly or explicitly, implicate a ruling ideology" (8). Jack can only please Sam if he obediently internalises his conservative ethos. Therefore, their relationship does not challenge the patriarchal script, since it depends on the very same ideology: they are both performing patriarchal masculinity through dialogue. This ideology both preaches and constructs their gender identity, which is linked to aggression. They are devoted to their roles and refuse to challenge any aspect of the script.

Sam and Jack see aggression as innate to masculinity. Aggression is not limited to the topic and effect of their discussion. Their dialogue functions as verbal scenery: their words create—what they say appears in the mind of the reader/audience, filling the empty void of the page/stage. Their dramatic language is "one that acts physically upon its audience," provoking them and forcing them "to enter the exaggerated world of theatre" (Malkin, 3). Language here "functions as an element of the theatrical event, not as the focal subject at which the drama is aimed" (Malkin, 3). Sam and Jack use this dramatic language to conquer the world by whatever means they deem necessary.

SAM: [...] throw the prisoner out of the helicopter, show the prisoner another prisoner being thrown out of the helicopter, beating obviously, rape of course,

bright light, no sleep, simulate an execution so they think up to the last second they're going to die, play tape of women and children screaming in next room and tell prisoner it's his wife and children, sometimes it is [...] (Churchill, *Drunk Enough*, 33)

The reader/audience is forced to participate in the violence by conjuring up the sounds and images in their head. In scene three, Sam lists the countries to be bombed: Vietnam, Grenada, Korea, Laos, Guatemala, Cuba, El Salvador, Iraq, Somalia, Lebanon are destroyed one after the other in the reader/audience's mind. Jack notes, "it used to be a village and now [—]" (Churchill, *Drunk Enough*, 15), and Sam replies: "because we want it gone" (Churchill, *Drunk Enough*, 16). During this verbal apocalypse, Jack busies himself with a cup of coffee as Sam just goes on and on: China and Panama are next. He is compulsively listing all the countries the US have attacked or planned to bomb since the Vietnam war; by the end of his death toll, it feels like nothing is left of the Earth.

The two of them, however, are safe: white, middle-class men, the sons of major world powers, who lounge on a sofa and talk about bombings or the gruesome details of torturing political prisoners for fun. The aggression they enact is both passive and active: passive, since they are only talking about it, not committing the deeds themselves; and active, since on the stage, their words have the power to call these events into being and thus make them happen. This is supported by the recurring imperatives and the present tense when describing past events. Sam and Jack's parade of privilege and violent masculinity guarantees them both protection from harm and the means to do harm: to have power over the entire world.

Sam often uses first person plural when discussing politics, but he never clarifies who he means by *we*; he takes the universality of his identity for granted. If the universal is male, middle-class and white, then the only thing that can potentially place Sam into the category of the Other is his homosexuality. However, his relationship with Jack consists of reinforcing a universal idea of masculinity that is expressed through aggression. Sam and Jack perform gender through fascination with political aggression and verbal violence.

Theatrical adaptations further complicate Jack and Sam's gender-performance. In the Royal Court / Public Theatre production, props play a crucial role in performing patriarchal masculinity: they appear out of thin air as Sam and Jack are sitting on the floating sofa in button-down shirts and slacks. Invisible property masters hand them cigarettes, alcohol, even cocaine: the attributes of the Real Man, as self-destructive as their relationship is. The sofa itself can be seen as a symbolic prop of masculinity: it reminds one of Blair's *sofa government*. The former British PM preferred an informal, casual style of diplomacy, a key element of which was to have his guests lounge on comfortable sofas next to him. This idea connects to the tradition of English clubs: not anyone could enter these private, male circles, and likewise, only a select few had a place on Blair's sofa, despite the apparent welcoming camaraderie. The trend made it to the White House: President Bush left his writing desk to join his guests on cozy couches; one of his favourite visitors was none other than Blair.

The special relationship of Blair and Bush was a prominent feature of British foreign politics in the 2000s. Critics of *Drunk Enough* often interpret the play as

an allegory where Bush and Blair appear as a gay couple. [7] Rebellato is not fond of this interpretation (“The Personal is Not Political,” 34-35), and I would argue as well that such reading is overly simplistic, since the play’s questioning goes well beyond party politics, for instance, regarding gender, which the Blair/Bush reading completely disregards. Gender is a central issue in both *Drunk Enough* and *The Skriker*. Examining the link between aggression and gender is crucial to understand the deeper layers of conflict within the plays.

While Sam and Jack rise above the consequences of aggression both literally and metaphorically, *The Skriker* drags us down to the Underworld: Josie and Lily both follow the Skriker to hell. Their entrance to the Underworld is accompanied by an unbearably long and painful scream played through speakers both according to Churchill’s playtext and in the Katona-Bábszínház production. Then a blast of loud music is heard, and man-eating creatures from British folklore flock to the stage to sing. *Drunk Enough* does not use sound effects: the sound of explosions only reverberates in the audience’s consciousness as *words* fall like so many bombs. The insufferable cacophony of *The Skriker* had a different approach to aggression towards the spectators: the Katona-Bábszínház production starts with the creatures banging on iron rods, delighting in the intolerable sound and torturing the audience aurally for long minutes.

Chaos, the underworld, the *bodily* are associated with the feminine in Western tradition; but physical violence in women is seen as counter-script. “Women entering the realm of violence and achieving the ability to exact physical harm is an aberration,” Porter points out (5). She elaborates, “despite societal lip service to nonviolence, men engaging in violence is at least expected and thereby normalized, whereas women engaging in the same behaviors are viewed as aberrant” (46). The discourse surrounding female aggression is thoroughly gendered. Violent women are not seen to be in control, and the aggression associated with the feminine sex is seen as unreasonable, unpredictable, *theatrical*. “The ‘female’ has occupied a symbolic and social site deemed potentially uncontrollable... Female violence, it followed, was an... an eruption of not wholly disciplined subjects, partial outlaws.” (Elshtain, 169).

Churchill subverts such general concepts of gendered aggression in *Drunk Enough* and *The Skriker*. Although according to the patriarchal script men are active and women are passive, the reverse can be observed in these plays; furthermore, as it has been mentioned, *The Skriker* even goes beyond the gender binary. When all is said and done, Sam and Jack merely sit and *talk*, disregarding the effect their words can have on the audience. Their violence is verbal, not physical. Their verbal violence is always directed at *someone else*, and they themselves do not get damaged by it: if anything, it reinforces their relationship, saves them from several breakups, and serves as escapist bonding. [8] They enact verbal violence on the outside world, so they do not have to deal with the problems of their private life.

Aggression in *The Skriker* is presented quite differently: it is overwhelmingly active and often physical, subverting the gender script. Physical violence and bodily harm are closely linked to the character of Josie. She is haunted by the murder of her baby yet insists that Lily’s child must be put into the oven to test if she is a changeling. She keeps attacking the Skriker: she shoves and pushes her when the Skriker is disguised as a homeless person, wrestles her to the ground

and stuffs dirt into her mouth when she is in the body of a little girl and threatens her with a knife when she is disguised as a man. Her paranoia towards the disguised Skriker could be interpreted as personal (and somewhat justified) vendetta for tricking her into infanticide, but at the end of her arc, Josie moves beyond revenge and starts killing strangers. While Josie ending up a serial killer might seem to reinforce the concept of female violence as uncontrolled and psychotic, Josie is more clear-headed than ever: she has a plan. She becomes a killer to distract the Skriker from Lily. “I’ll do terrible things, I promise,” she tells her. “Just leave it to me. You don’t have to do anything. Don’t do anything. Please.” (Churchill, *The Skriker*, 48). Josie is motivated by a desire to keep Lily safe, although at this point they are no longer friends. If the Skriker’s attention is on Josie, Lily walks free. By the end of the play, Josie transforms from a psychotic aggressor to a violent saviour. The motivation of Josie’s murder spree is, paradoxically, female solidarity. The bad girl fights for the salvation of the good one: she is not afraid to get her hands dirty, and she will go to any length to save her former friend. Aggression at its most brutal thus becomes an expression of selfless love. Josie surpasses the gender script that can only describe her in the terms of aberration and insanity. While she never breaks free of her role as the Skriker’s victim, there is a sense of redemption in her character arc.

The Skriker’s connection to gendered aggression is similarly complex. As a genderfluid entity, she has no gender script to internalise or subvert. Her connection to aggression is expressed through the double role of perpetrator and victim. She finds a childlike delight in violence, which she relates through speech: her monologues, narrated in a nonsensical language, punctuate the play. She takes the role of chorus/narrator to narrate how she tricks and abuses humans, mostly young mothers. When she takes the girls to the Underworld, it is revealed that she feeds on human blood, thoughts, and dreams. She is a destructive parasite, possessive, jealous. Whether she disguises herself as male or female, she tends to play the victim: pretending to be Lily’s childhood friend, she invents a backstory implying that she was sexually abused; when she acts as Lily’s male admirer, she refers to a traumatic childhood. Her parade of victimhood is not all fiction. In the world of the play, the fairy-world has been poisoned by human activity. The Skriker is desperate to find out how humans make her sick and might be on a quest of revenge. She refers to an idolised past she cannot remember, where she might have been a more benevolent creature. She still possesses the power to grant wishes. Her destruction might be evil sadism or a morally more ambiguous quest of revenge for all the good humanity ruined. By divorcing aggression from the realm of gender, her character frames violence in more universal terms.

While academic interest tends to focus on the political aspects of *The Skriker* and *Drunk Enough*, the analysis of gendered aggression gives us valuable insight into the representation of gender and violence on the contemporary stage. *The Skriker* subverts the patriarchal script of gender through the introduction of a genderfluid character, exploring female violence through Josie’s arc, and counter-script motherhood performed as a double act. Aggression is an integral part of the gender performance of the three main characters. In *Drunk Enough*, masculinity is constructed through dialogue and it is closely linked to aggression. Gender roles are culturally determined and performed through the use of props and dialogue

that is laden with verbal violence. Churchill's innovative techniques push contemporary theatre beyond the gender binary and explore gendered aggression from a new, non-traditional angle.

Notes

[1] According to Rebellato's definition, the difference between tribunal plays and verbatim plays is that tribunal plays edit pre-existing interviews into plays, while verbatim plays conduct their own research. Tribunal plays were popular in the 1990s; in later decades, preference shifted to verbatim plays (*Modern British Playwriting*, 41-48).

[2] *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You*, play by Caryl Churchill, directed by James Macdonald, Royal Court Theatre, London, 10 November 2006. The play transferred to the USA in 2008, premiering in The Public Theatre, Manhattan, March 2008. The director and the stage design were unchanged.

[3] In recent editions (such as Caryl Churchill, *Plays Four*, Nick Hern Books, 2010) Jack is named "Guy;" however, in earlier editions (Caryl Churchill, *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You?*, Nick Hern Books, 2006) he appears as Jack. I chose to refer to him by his original name, since the confusion regarding whether he is ought to represent the Union Jack is addressed in the text.

[4] *Az Iglíc*, play by Caryl Churchill, directed by Gábor Tengely, Budapest Bábszínház Puppet Theatre, Budapest, 18 October 2013.

[5] *The Skriker*, play by Caryl Churchill, directed by Sarah Frankcom, Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester International Festival, Manchester, July 2015.

[6] Butler argues that gender is constructed as binary through the regulatory practice of compulsory heterosexuality to uphold a hierarchical binary (*Gender Trouble*, 24; 202).

[7] For example The Guardian (Michael Billington, "Drunk Enough to Say I Love You? Royal Court Theatre, London." *The Guardian*, 23 November 2006) or The Independent (Paul Taylor, "Drunk Enough to Say I Love You?, Royal Court Theatre, London: Satirical Tittle with an Odd Taste." *The Independent*, 24 November 2006); other examples are quoted in Rebellato's "The Personal is Not Political...", pp. 34.

[8] Interestingly, in director Benedict Andrews' production (*Betrunken Genug Zu Sagen Ich Liebe Dich?*, Schaubühne Berlin, December 2007, Berlin) the aggression gets physical as Sam and Jack abuse each other.

References

- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge Classics, 2006.
- Churchill, Caryl. *Drunk Enough to Say I Love You?* London: Nick Hern Books, 2006.
- Churchill, Caryl. *The Skriker*. London: Nick Hern Books, 1994.
- Churchill, Caryl. *Plays: Four*. London: Nick Hern Books, 2010.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Frankcom, Sarah, director. *The Skriker* by Caryl Churchill, performance by Maxine Peake, Royal Exchange Theatre, July 2015, Manchester International Festival, Manchester.
- Malkin, Jeanette R. *Verbal Violence in Contemporary Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Porter, Nancy Taylor. *Violent Women in Contemporary Theatres: Staging Resistance*. Illinois: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Rebellato, Dan. *Modern British Playwriting: 2000-2009. Voices, Documents, New Interpretations*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Rebellato, Dan. "The Personal is Not Political: Caryl Churchill's 'Drunk Enough to Say I Love You?'" *Western European Stages*, vol 19. no. 1, pp. 33-36.
- Sierz, Alex. *Modern British Playwriting: the 1990s. Voices, Documents, New Interpretations*. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.
- Tengely, Gábor, director. *Az Iglic* by Caryl Churchill, performance by Pelsőczy Réka, Katona József Theatre Company and Budapest Bábszínház Puppet Theatre, 18 October 2013, Budapest Bábszínház Puppet Theatre, Budapest.