

biographical narrative that it has overshadowed other evidence that the manuscript holds about the story of its own making.

A close study of the manuscript's paper and leaf and page numbering reveals that a number of expansions were made to the manuscript, as well as significant revisions (in the way of removed and recopied leaves). In all, Brontë added 51 leaves to the manuscript. This includes 22 leaves of new material that she incorporated into the manuscript while modifying her fair-copy manuscript—the most notable being a ten-leaf expansion to the chapter “Written in the Schoolroom” in volume 3 that I discovered as part of this study.⁴⁸ In addition, 29 leaves bear evidence of having been added to the manuscript by Brontë as part of a later stage of extensive revision and recopying.⁴⁹ The most significant group among these particular leaves are those that replaced Brontë's original first chapter, strongly suggesting that she revised and recopied it. This new evidence challenges the long-held scholarly belief that Brontë resolutely refused to modify her first chapter despite pressure from her publisher to alter it.⁵⁰ Lastly, I found that Brontë probably removed 32 leaves from the manuscript at various stages during which she copied and recopied it; many of these changes were part of an early state of the manuscript and its copy text, and they can be identified by studying Brontë's leaf numberings made in pencil within the manuscript. Some of these removed leaves were replaced with new, expanded material—most of which was copied out on fresh bifolia; in other instances, Brontë appears to have dropped substantial sections of text from the novel. All in all, including the 28 partial-leaf excisions, Brontë made 111 changes either to the leaf size or to the codicological structure of the manuscript, amounting to approximately 12% of its combined total of 896 leaves.⁵¹

This new data counters the findings of a 2013 article published in *Brontë Studies* that claims that Brontë's activities while revising *Shirley* were chiefly aimed at removing text from her manuscript. In her article, Ileana Marin interprets

48. Only eight of these 22 new leaves were identified by the Clarendon editors as definitively being part of any expansion to the manuscript—their focus being on the “late insertion of the ‘Femme Savante’ essay in chapter 27” (xxv; also see p. xxvii). The expansion to “Written in the Schoolroom” has not, to date, been documented (so far as I can tell) by any editor or scholar.

49. The Clarendon editors missed the majority of these, although they speculated in two instances that leaves could have been introduced owing to “rewritten or expanded material.” In their introduction, the editors note a repetition in the numbering of ff. 299 and 300 in volume 2 “possibly because new material had been added” (xxv). The Clarendon edition does not track penciled numbering (or lack of) or red numbering, but later notes some additional differences in numbering: “Leaf 43, which contains less text than usual, may be rewritten. Leaves 42 and 43 were originally numbered 324 and 325; no original number is visible on f. 44; ff. 45 and 46 were also numbered 324 and 325: perhaps the error was caused by an insertion of rewritten or expanded material” (see p. 269). In this case, one of these leaves appears to be recopied material (or text of approximately the same length as what was cut), while three new leaves of material were added, increasing the overall numbering of leaves in volume 2. See table 2 below.

50. Rosengarten and Smith note that “the readers at Cornhill were disturbed by Charlotte's satire on the Church” and write that “Charlotte would not withdraw the offending chapter.” *Shirley*, Clarendon edition, xix.

51. This figure does not include the four repairs that Brontë made to leaves. The BM/BL leaf count of 896 leaves includes f. 22 from volume 1—a leaf that they added to the manuscript to replace a leaf that was almost certainly removed by Brontë as part of the revision of chapter 1.