An Annotated Bibliography:

Critical Analyses of Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own*

I. Introduction

This annotated bibliography includes the critical essays on Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own* (1929) and illustrates transformation of critical points under each generation from arguments ‘inside’ of the work to those ‘outside’ of it.

Critics earlier simply argue the Woolf’s feminist theory and analyze activities within her mind. Most critics define *A Room of One’s Own* as one of the most indispensable texts of feminist theory as well as focus on Woolf’s sex-consciousness mainly defined as androgynous mind, her anger and self-contradiction caused by opposition to the traditional concept of gender, and her thoughts on women’s writing. Close analyses of the work enable us to understand Woolf’s intellectual and mental activity.

However, critical points later—after around the middle of 1990’s—become often connected to other thoughts outside of the essay by noting minor and peculiar parts. Critics often compare other literary works or thoughts to *A Room of One’s Own* for proving the relationship between them rather than applying to the work itself.
This bibliography reminds us the significance of *A Room of One’s own* as the pioneer work of feminist theory. That is, earlier criticism illustrates the variety of Woolf’s literary and mentally activity in her mind constructing the feminist. We now need to re-estimate *A Room of One’s Own* by appropriately focusing on the work itself: by seeing ‘inside’ of the essay again.

Materials collected are published from 1974 to present since another annotated bibliography has been already published: Robin Mahubar, *Virginia Woolf: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism, 1915-1974* (New York: Garland, 1976). These are searched bibliographical sources such as MLA International Bibliography (New York: MLA, 1922-), Book Review Digest (New York: Wilson, 1905-) and Humanities Index (New York: Wilson, 1975-) for a keyword “Criticism on Virginia Woolf’s *A Room Of One’s Own*.”
II. Abbreviations


PMLA *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*


VWM *Virginia Woolf Miscellany*

III. Primary Sources


   Represents Woolf’s literary imagination and her feminist criticism as mentioning the relationship between gender, money and writing a fiction. She requires a room and five hundred pounds a year for women’s writing.


   Shows the intricacies of Woolf’s creative process through the constant revision and reveals the way to develop the images and ideas into a work of feminist criticism and literary theory.
IV. Secondary Sources

[1970’s]


Examines Woolf’s creative notion as an artist. 
AROO is a beginning of a metaphorical exploration of her own mind and exposes her hidden nature and emotion. By separating and opposing masculine and feminine style of writing, Woolf positively accepts the definition of ‘feminine’ as reliable indication of identity and experience.


Indicates that Woolf’s androgynous vision is a response to the dilemma of a woman writer embarrassed, alarmed and rejected by her family, audience and class; starts by AROO a critical discussion to define and create a female literary history.

[1980’s]


Argues the contradiction between Woolf’s formal and ideological activity. While AROO discusses the
influence of women’s poverty on their art, it insists not only growing uneasiness between sexes but also the androgyny of past male writers, which causes the economic and artistic subjection of women.

6 Kamuf, Peggy. “Penelope at Work: Interruptions in A Room of One’s Own.” Novel: A Forum on Fiction 16 (1982): 5-18. Concludes the interpretation of AROO with a symbol of the space of interruption, which does not offer a refuge to anyone: the title promises a place of intermittent work and a book related to women’s thought and body, which has been frequently interrupted and prevented.

7 Folsom, Marcia McClintock. “Gallant Red Brick and Plain China: Teaching A Room of One’s Own.” College English 45 (1983): 254-62. Explains Woolf’s contempt for hierarchy and academic measuring as one of expressions of women’s styles, which is connected to her anger at patriarchal system as her characterization of men’s style. AROO as a teaching material offers to students women’s opportunity to live and write about a silenced woman.

8 Joplin, Patricia. “‘I Have Bought My Freedom’: The Gift of A Room of One’s Own.” VWM 21 (1983): 4-5. Confirms that most works of American feminist theory are indebted to AROO. Woolf breaks women’s silence and teaches us our own need, desire and feeling of lack in
AROO. We see real wisdom and high-mindedness moderately consisted by wit and irony and realize that Woolf has restrained by ‘range of the imagination’.


Defines AROO as the place and the space for the production of female culture. AROO gives the feminist critics through their sisterhood of scholarship a lesson that allowing male critics to universalize female artists’ stories domesticates and subjugates these women into the loss of the women’s history.


Notices that Woolf has realized in AROO that to convert readers from the intellectual and creative inferiority of women and construct a model of feminist criticism she needs an evidence of men’s exclusion of women from their literature, to which she alludes throughout AROO.


Mentions AROO as the first modern text of feminist
criticism for its concept of patient struggle to read the text of oppressed and silenced. AROO resolves moral and intellectual problems of voiceless women and excludes men by using Shakespeare as a barrier to the text for the male reader.

12 Lipking, Joanna. “The Manx Cat Again.” VWM 23 (1984): 2-3. Interprets the Manx cat in AROO as a symbol of women’s triumph of alliance and hazard to separation, and finds it ‘suggestive power’ by applying to Woolf’s earlier writings. The cat shows Woolf’s generative process and rule of penetration. The questions unanswered by the cat—about social relationships—become themes of her later books.


Suggests that AROO is about the rights and wrongs of higher education such as humanities rather than those of women. Woolf’s vision of academic professions expressed by angry sense of dispossession from male community of time is interpreted as humanist history.


Defines AROO in terms of Woolf’s questioning and self-contradictions as a standard for feminist literary critical theory, which is established by Woolf’s insistence on taking social and political factor as well as on transcending the traditional concept of sex.


Responses to Bell’s analysis of Woolf as a non-feminist writer who frightens American feminist readers by Marcus’ Woolf as a bogey frightens British male readers. Woolf’s description of the portrait of God in *Paradise Lost* as ‘Milton’s bogey’ criticizes the patriarchal God and the suppression of women artists in the misogynistic British culture.

Emphasizes that Woolf in AROO requires not having any children for women to write novels. Mary Hamilton in the ballad quoted represents Woolf herself as well as unfortunate mistress who murdered her own child. Woolf says in her diary that her fear instinctively killed her own desire for children, and Mary Hamilton identifies Wool’s irrational guilt feeling.


Analyzes Woolf’s vision of reality in AROO: Woolf defines and embodies the mind of androgynous artist. AROO as a process of creation for Woolf proves that her vision of art and her expression of it happen only within the creation of androgynous art.


Examines in AROO and TG Woolf’s anger and irony against the subjection of women by masculinity and subjugator of male audience; it is proved that the complexity of her sensibility does not allow a single work unsatisfactory solutions of self-expression.

20 Marcus, Jane. “‘Taking the Bull by the Udders’: Sexual
Difference in Virginia Woolf: A Conspiracy Theory.”


Defines Woolf’s concept of sex other than male and female as lesbianism and homosexuality as equal relationships and androgyny as privileged sexual and literary stance. Woolf in the Bloomsbury antifeminism writes from within the patriarchal community and seeks for her audiences’ assent and participation in the plot.


Argues that AROO praises sisterhood, seduces women readers and taunts the patriarchal law. Woolf’s narrative voice sexually and politically excites women artists by reminding fear of male reprisal of sexual and verbal transgression, and AROO instructs followers to read as women by thinking back their literary mothers.


Investigates the economy of sexual identity in AROO centered Woolf’s life and work including her feminist theory. Woolf opposing to modern appropriation of the
category of lesbian identity insists that merging sexual activity with sexual identity and the binary structure of gender stigmatize and regulate homosexuality.


Examines Woolf’s use of the traditional rhetorical strategies as a feminist essayist. She affirms her radical feminist theory by imitating and revising classical rhetoric to combine it to her own ideology. [DAI 49 (1989): 2653A]

[1990’s]


Analyses Woolf’s Judith Shakespeare as a symbol of the silenced and alienated woman as well as of a continuity of feminine experience. We should accept manuscript and coterie authorship and nontraditional literary forms as parts of female tradition.

25 Richards, Earl Jeffrey. “Sexual Metamorphosis, Gender Difference and the Republic of Letters: Or, Androgyny as a Feminist Plea for Universalism in Christine de Pizan and

Points out universalist vision of culture in *AROO*, which focuses on the imprisonment of individuals in artificial spiritual groups but not in the groups of gender differences. Woolf objects to the divisions breaking cooperation of the male and the female which disturb her quest for the androgynous mind.


Is not available as of September, 2002.


Notes that *AROO* discussing the connections between women and fiction cannot have any conclusion since the subject about sex is too controversial to end except by one’s own opinion. *AROO* is a beginning of a feminist interaction that has to be achieved in her other fictions.

Interprets AROO as a victorious estimation of women in Oxbridge culture in the relationship between that culture, men and war. Woolf disregards educated men and criticizes their vicious custom with enough confidence.

29 Mezei, Kathy. “Writing the Risk in, Risking the Writing.”
Sees Woolf’s risk in the writing in the sense of her ‘flight into androgyny,’ which Elaine Showalter criticizes her for. Woolf’s androgynous vision is interpreted as a response to the dilemma of women writers about risking rejection by her people.

Indicates that the discovery of the manuscript of AROO proves that Woolf did not actually give such lecture. An article on the actual lecture proves unmention to situation of women at Oxbridge, no reference to her androgynous mind, nothing fictional, comedic or satiric.

Notes that Woolf’s assessment of women’s tradition includes a struggle of anger, violence and rape, which is expressed as metaphoric objects in AROO. The room
is interpreted as a protected space created as refuge from violence.


Points out Woolf’s reference to modernism: she challenges the conventionalism of classical and realist art and seeks for the meaning of ‘truth.’ Woolf denies the concept of femininity as existing only in the relationship with masculinity and searches for other forms of expression by deconstructing the social division of gender.


Regards AROO as Woolf’s exploration of women’s position against the patriarchal discourse in a form of literary criticism. Woolf tries to change the term ‘discourse’ for preservation of female difference and giving women subjectivity, knowledge and power in the male-dominated society of sameness.

34 Daugherty, Beth Rigel. “Taking a Leaf from Virginia

Refers to Woolf’s experience of teaching working class student at a college. The student significantly helped her to shape her style of the writer-reader relationship in her essays: she empowers the audience by identifying herself with them.


Insists that saying ‘I’ as the act of impersonation divides postmodernists and feminists. Woolf’s ‘I’ is indeterminate and irrelevant for her composite figure, which undercuts an argument many feminists endorse as well as one many feminists resists. The writer is responsible not to an identity lay behind ‘I’ but to the concept of identity advocated by her rhetoric.


Suggests Woolf’s creation of her own polyphonic and capacious theory of the novel beyond its limit and masculine bias. Woolf by theory in AROO and example
in _O_ demonstrates the relationship between gender, writing and the patriarchal literary establishment.


Indicates that AROO is a critique of the epistemology of western science and its method of abstracting truth disembodied in every moment of life. Woolf is concerned that the reality of the emotions, the feminine, but is not distorted and imprisoned or colonized by masculine form.


Argues that one can simply become woman-manly or man-womanly for working on Woolf while feminists criticize a man for directing a play AROO. Since AROO describes preparing for the lecture on “Women and Fiction” rather than a transcript of it, a real speech is given in the play: the lecture itself but not representation of it.


Insists that Woolf writes a personal criticism without
compromising her privacy. She shows through the power of subjective reading in AROO the importance of the authoritative voice in personal writings, and her criticism makes her suppress her own feminist self.


Connects AROO with Morrison’s Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination in the sense of ‘otherness.’ Both admit that fiction by and about women has a lack in the essence, and the Room is where we gain freedom from the sexual and racial others, who hurt pure artistic process.


Read AROO as an analysis of writer’s anxiety and criticism influencing their self-esteem and creativity by replacing ‘women’ with ‘students.’ Woolf’s room of one’s own is reflected on classrooms as a psychological
and cultural space: an artificial context for writing.


Notices Woolf’s feminist criticism speaking only to female readers in *AROO* is a difficult rhetorical challenge as her dilemma for its boldness. Woolf’s interpretation of her experience and observation in the male-dominated academic community makes her from an uneasy outsider become a creative researcher and now enables her to articulate the new feminist insight.


Observes the reflection of Walker in Woolf. Walker re-creates Woolf’s female writers in *AROO* as her straggle African-American women in the 18th century. Both describe family as a metaphor for a miniature society, which deceives and abuses its members for
gender, class and race.


Examines female embodiment, which is shown as the anger and the lesbian sexuality implying ambivalence patriarchal restriction in AROO. Woolf’s fishing is interpreted as a metaphor for female creativity, and the patriarchal order in the fishing identifies the oppression against female self-expression.


Examines an element leading to the idea about the influence of the writing and friendship of another woman. Jane Harrison, through her intellect and mysticism, influenced the work as well as Virginia Woolf.


Explains Woolf’s use of spatial metaphor in AROO: ‘the room’ makes women’s existence socially and politically significant; ‘the room’ symbolizes an invigorating life for women as well as money does presence of reality; ‘the room’ under patriarchal convention causes lack of capital and private space for female writers and critic.


Examines the recent shift of concepts of androgyny from Woolf’s idea of ‘man-womanly’ and ‘women-manly’ to more generative combination of male and female thinking; however, profound communicators transcending the gender opposition is still born out of Woolf’s contribution to the development of the masculine and feminine communicative styles.


Demonstrates Woolf’s method of persuasion in AROO. Woolf regards her aunt’s legacy as the franchise of women and satirizes a major political figure through patriarchs and professors.

Rosenman, Ellen Bayuk. "A Room of One’s Own": Women Writers
and the Politics of creativity. New York: Twayne, 1995. Shows the way that AROO analyses the restraint on women’s both creative and self-defeating achievement in terms of Woolf’s concept of patriarchy and feminism. We can see a part of the context of Woolf’s own history in AROO, and its argument in the critical history has supported the essay itself.


unmentionable questions about sex.


Reads AROO as a text creating the new relationship between women’s history and letters with their economics as a legacy of war. Woolf ironically claims that the rhetoric of war causes a history of gender imbalance by refusing masculine warfare and defines the utopian vision of androgyny as an attempt to escape from the political issues.


Insists on Woolf’s invention of a new view of rhetoric of androgyny for both sexes as an outsider of the classical rhetorical tradition, and interprets Woolf’s exploration of places as representation of mental constructs and metaphors for the minds of their dominants.

McGill, Allyson F. “Living Voices: Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own* and Vera Brittain’s *Testament of Youth* in the Classroom.” *Re: Reading, Re: Writing, Re: Teaching Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Eileen Barrett and Patricia Cramer. Intro. Paul Connolly. New York: Pace UP, 1995. 259-65. Examines thematic similarities between AROO and *Testament of Youth*: women’s education; women as a pacifist; women as a writer; women as a friend. The restrained environment of Woolf’s female writers is applied to Brittain’s privileged girl of the middle class as well as modern female college students looking for their own place in their society, college community and their writing.

Compares Woolf moving androgyny towards the masculine with John Milton towards the feminine in terms of a feminist progress. Woolf defines marriage as fertilization and insists that true creativity comes not only from the two sexes fertilizing each other but also from each sex by itself.


Points out Woolf’s life related to the British imperialism. The story of her aunt’s legacy in *AROO* presents white women’s privilege in the empire, and of Judith Shakespeare identifies Indian in the sense that Woolf has denied Judith’s independence and higher form of life just as she did Indian women distinguished from English.


Analyzes Woolf’s rework in *AROO* on the ‘arrant feminist’ Rebecca West’s essay to form an aesthetic with gothic and sentimental narrative: Woolf builds up the modern androgynous concepts into more balanced sex-consciousness on its artistic subjectivity.
constructed by both feminine and masculine perspectives.

59 Shaw, Marion. "From A Room of One's Own to A Literature of Their Own." South Carolina Review 29 (1996): 58-66. Observes the transformation of critical reception of Woolf's feminism: critics first attack her excessive aesthetic; the illogicalness and inconsequentiality of her argument are indicated in 1940-50's; her 'feminine hypersensitivity' is criticized in 1960's; then, Woolf's questions in AROO start gaining respects; Elaine Showalter's A Literature of Their Own finally points out the important relationships between AROO and new feminism and feminist criticism in 1970's.


61 Rittenhouse, Wayne. "Dear Al: Ginny Woolf Writes Almost as Good as I Pitch (A Celebration of Virginia Woolf Through


While Woolf states in *AROO* that women in the West have been excluded from literary creation, Japanese women in the Heian period dominate the growth of earlier literature. Even though they are also socially and politically powerless, they can write because they have education, money and rooms of their own.


Defines Hilda Doolittle as another Judith Shakespeare and see similarities between AROO and her By Avon River: both focus on Shakespeare’s life with a figure of Judith, especially on her role as a sister, and the relationship between creativity and gender under the oppression by the patriarchal social structures.


Mention that masterpieces are created out of the experience as well as the relationship between a writer and reading texts. Since Woolf also has a strong view of the function of the female literary history, as their similarities in structure she not only models her literary mother Fanny Burney’s work but also rewrite it to seek for her own languages by that experience.

Ostriker, Alicia. “Chloe and Olivia Meet the Death of God.” Virginia Woolf: Texts and Contexts. Ed. Beth Rigel Daugherty and Eileen Barrett. Selected Papers from the Fifth Annual Conf. on Virginia Woolf, Otterbein College,

Points a contradiction between Woolf’s insistence on female writers as being different from the male and her on genius as androgynous. When we have a single solution for it, Chloe and Olivia in Woolf’s imaginary female-authored novel represent that women can be allies in their life and writing as well as rivals for love for men.


Applies the relationship between feminism and women’s studies to Woolf’s approach in AROO: the impossibility supplying a direct answer to the large feminist question on the women and fiction without her first answering a local question of the room of one’s own is structurally inherent in the development of feminism.


Suggests that Woolf’s presentation of Charlotte Brontë and Jane Austin in AROO is complicated by her ambivalence attitude towards the idea of the angle in the house. While Brontë is strong and equivocal presence as an exemplar of Woolf’s own anti-angelic anger in AROO, Austin best presents her angelic heritage.

Focuses on the influence on Woolf of three male writers of the past. Woolf freely experiments with the forms learned from the male literary canons and revitalizes them in her own style, and the interrelationships between four writers enable us to consider ways of feminine and masculine discourses interacting and enriching each other.


Connects Woolf with ancient and recent photospheres or psychoanalysists in the sense of quests for the rationality. AROO is interpreted as an evidence of emotional and libidinal works in the language and enables us to re-understand the term ‘writing,’ which is influenced by the relationship between the word and the body. [DAI 58 (1997):3562A]

Harvey, Kathryn. “Historical Notes on Woolf and the Women’s International League.” Virginia Woolf and the Arts. Ed. Diane F. Gillespie and Leslie K. Hankins. Selected Papers from the Sixth Annual Conf. on Virginia Woolf,
Explains the influence on the views in AROO and TG on peace, education and professional equality from the feminist pacifist movement WIL, which has a similar desire to Woolf’s feminist theory for women’s equal right.


Compares essayistic elements in AROO to Practical Criticism as an academic treatise. While Woolf enables us to shape our identities, subjectivities and the way to read literatures, Richards tries to turn literary studies into a science by investigating the techniques of reading.

Examines the similarities between AROO and Philip Sidney’s *Defense of Poetry* on their concerns with the political status and Ciceronian oratory. Both, despite their didactic argument and ironic practice, allow audience a narrative experience of co-creating texts’ meaning in the emotional connection.


Points out AROO as a book written by a woman for other women and its narrator’s insistence on woman-to-communication. Woolf claims that the male writer’s misogynistic resistance to female writers by denying their ability in producing art is caused by a need to protect his sense of superiority in the face of female excellence.


Focuses on Woolf’s promise of a second coming for Judith Shakespeare in AROO: Woolf anticipates re-discovering
lives of unknown forerunning women in the history as the resurrection of Judith.


Indicates the relationship between Woolf and Kingston in terms of female self as writers by oral mode of expression. Irony, pacifism and feminism in Kingston’s essay are defined as ‘Woolfian heritage,’ and both insist on the importance of forebears for female writers.


Defines translating AROO into Polish as assimilation but not reproduction since there is any direct similarity between Woolf and contemporary Polish feminist for their insistence on an artist as a human and not a woman.

Aronson, Anne. “Composing in a Material World: Women Writing in Space and Time.” *Rhetoric Review* 17 (1999): 282-99. Refers to Ursula Le Guin’s denying the needs of a locked room in *AROO* and interviews her students on their writing conditions as adult women: material conditions take significant roles on women’s internal lives as Woolf argues, and material constrains is a particular to women for their lack of economic and social privilege.

Wall, Kathleen. “Frame Narratives and Unresolved Contradictions in Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own*.” *JNT: Journal of Narrative Theory* 29 (1999): 184-207. Suggests that contradictions in the test can be interpreted as dialectics between content and form. Woolf’s narrative strategies not only quest for the truth but also establish a context to make several truths react with each other.

Kaivola, Karen. “Revisiting Woolf’s Representations of

Focuses on Woolf’s multiple vision of androgyny. Her presentation of androgyny in AROO includes intermingled qualities of gender, race and sexuality, which requires finding the other within the self, and idealized Romantic absorption of differences without forgetting inequality and pursuit of freedom.


Examines Woolf’s rhetorical and narrative strategies by using a theory of performance with the function of language and punctuation. She is interested in the representation of conditions and shows readers the process of showing itself.


Applies AROO to the Renaissance art of a memory palace in the mind: the reading room of the British Library in AROO symbolizes the patriarchal canon and of human knowledge as the components of the mind for our admiration as well as our scrutiny.

Insists on the connection between AROO as a work on a literary history and the sonnet tradition. Woolf interprets the sonnet as flexible and negotiable and in AROO introduces new female voices into the literary history: gender positions, exclusive systems and feminism.


Introduces Woolf’s definition of femininity in AROO: ownership of thought, independence and regeneration. Woolf tries to reconstructs the femininity through creation and writing as a way to occupy the public sphere of social constructions.

[2000’s]


Defines AROO as the indispensable reference for every feminist literary critic. Followers modernize and re-title AROO for books on subjects very remote from Woolf’s subject, just as they re-create Woolf as their own modernist reformulated by each generation.

Represents that Woolf relates her anger for reading to it for the limitation of women’s opportunities for experience in life. Since the emotion caused by the art of fiction is not distinguished from other experiences in life, she defines a novel in the sense of the connection to actual life.


Examines the political affect of feminism in 1920’s: Woolf’s wish for private space and independence for uneducated women in *AROO*, which is repeated in Kathleen Woodward’s *Jipping Street*. Both require women’s inner changes that seek for exclusion from the past—men’s worlds or mother’s lives—and resistance to the culture.


Indicates that feminist scholars have concentrated on defining a women centered literary history as often referring to *AROO* as a precedent for their own theories.


Notices Woolf’s looking-glasses image as the symbol of
social sexism reflecting. She frames the looking-glass as ambivalent and hostile cultural devices threatening a women's physiological well-being, and her theory and fiction shows her realism with the mirror assigning an aesthetic critique of mimeticism.


Points out Woolf’s extraordinary vision of politics: a weakness of AROO is that Woolf suppresses her ‘anger’ instead of using it as her creative energy, and her feminist theory does not allow women to share it with men.


Identifies in AROO and TG Woolf’s vision of Freudian psychoanalytic theory of sexuality and her interpretation of fascist principle, which is concerned with the patriarchal violence in terms of women’s inferiority complex in the gender hierarchy.


Focuses on Woolf’s ironic comments in AROO about women’s exclusion from Italian fascist literature and suggests that her discussion on fascist creation connects the concept of androgyny to the sense of anonymity, or ‘identitylessness.’
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