taking into consideration the routine activities of the manuscript-making process itself. The reading also conflates Brontë's identity with her work—a fallacy that is traceable to earlier feminist studies, such as Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's landmark study *The Madwoman in the Attic*, which employ metaphors of illness (in the case of Gilbert and Gubar, "female schizophrenia" and "dis-ease") in an effort to identify the very real, adverse effects of patriarchal structures on nineteenth-century women writers.[56] The result in this instance is an argument that purports to be based on material evidence but that hinges on a literal psychological diagnosis of a woman author who surely deserves less armchair analysis—and instead more bibliographical attention—from her twenty-first-century critics.

Finally, Marin's study offers up an interpretation of the manuscript that is at odds with its material construction.[57] Marin argues that only two of the 28 excisions that Brontë made entailed any substitution with another text—evidence that leads her to conclude that Brontë was intent on merely eliminating passages from the novel.[58] Yet, of the 28 excisions that I have documented, 11 excisions entail textual changes, including substantial revisions that required either the recopying of leaves or the addition of new leaves that expanded the length of the manuscript. And so, by my calculation, 39% of the excisions present in the manuscript were made as part of a series of substantial, later-stage revisions or expansions to the manuscript—some of which actually increased its size, rather than reducing it. Brontë often excised the upper or lower portions of leaves owing to changes made to the content in the sections of leaves falling between them. These inserted leaves bear new writing that, at a casual glance, seem to be part of one continuous draft. When taking additional leaf removals into account along with partial-leaf excisions, there are a total of 41 instances of removals that entailed expansions. In short, when Brontë removed either full leaves or portions of them, it was often with the aim of introducing new or revised content.

3. Paper as Evidence

To investigate how a manuscript was composed and edited—and to identify any excisions or revisions made to it—requires a very close look at its physical structure. Although much evidence has been lost as a result of the way in which

56. Gilbert and Gubar, *Madwoman in the Attic*, 69, 71. Also see Mary Jacobus, review of *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* and *Shakespeare's Sisters: Feminist Essays on Women Poets*, by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *Signs* 6, no. 3 (1981): 519. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3173761. For more discussion about these points, see "Reading the Writing Desk," pp. 504, 512–13.

57. Marin's brief description of the manuscript considerably deviates from established documentation about it. In her analysis, Marin mentions 906 folios (see p. 27)—numbers that do not reflect either the Clarendon analysis (which she cites just once in her article) or the 896-leaf count of the British Museum and BL. Her count likely includes some combination of endpapers or fly-leaves inserted by bookbinders. In addition, Marin mentions 28 excisions (p. 27), but her footnote (p. 29) lists just 25 leaves bearing excisions—and this list includes five leaves that are entirely intact, per my own direct examination of the manuscript and also the study of the Clarendon editors: BM ff. 149 and 150, vol.1; BM ff. 9, 45, and 252, vol. 2. It is unclear how Marin identified these intact leaves as bearing excisions.

58. Marin, "Charlotte Brontë's Heron Scissors," 27.