

Along the same lines, the inserted leaves in volume 2 also lay the groundwork for Shirley's eventual decision to subordinate herself to her chosen husband in volume 3. In the late addition to volume 2, Shirley proclaims on [A11?].B299.E15:

"Indisputably, a great, good, handsome man is the first of created things. . . .

"I would scorn to contend for empire with him,—I would scorn it. Shall my left hand dispute for precedence with my right?—shall my heart quarrel with my pulse?—shall my veins be jealous of the blood which fills them?"¹¹⁹

In volume 3—and in yet another late insertion consisting of a leaf of London Superfine wove paper: [A lacking]. [B lacking].C878.E310—the narrator describes Shirley's "lost privilege of liberty" leading up to her marriage:

Louis was himself obliged to direct all arrangements: he was virtually master of Field-head, weeks before he became so nominally: the least presumptuous, the kindest master that ever was; but with his lady absolute. She abdicated without a word or a struggle. . . .

In all this, Miss Keeldar partly yielded to her disposition; but a remark she made a year afterwards proved that she partly also acted on system. "Louis," she said, "would never have learned to rule, if she had not ceased to govern: the incapacity of the sovereign had developed the powers of the premier."¹²⁰

The late insertion in volume 2 helps explain why Shirley, who is usually so very independent, eventually chooses to submit herself to the authority of this man toward the end of volume 3—a development in the plot that could, in other circumstances, seem out of character.

Other instances of excision and expansion offer clear evidence of even more strategic revisions to the novel and its plot across its several volumes. Major revisions to the chapter "Further Communications on Business" entailed two partial-leaf excisions (ff. A321.B321.C323.E39 and [A323]. [B323].C328.E44), the removal of one full leaf (what had been f. A322.B322), and the insertion of four wove leaves (see table 2), likely bearing approximately three pages' worth of new material—an alteration evident again not just in the changes to the paper stock, but also in differences in leaf numbering. Note that the partially excised leaf preceding the wove insertion is numbered A321.B321.C323.E39—reflecting a difference of just two leaves apparent between its brown- and red-ink sequences—and the leaf following the section of wove leaves bears the sequence A324.B324.C329.E45. The latter numbering demarcates a difference of five leaves owing to the new three-leaf expansion. This revision seems to have been made at an intermediate stage between the brown-ink and the later red-ink sequences, as *both* brown-ink and red-ink numbering are present on the wove leaves. Were this section entirely concurrent with the red-ink sequence, why would brown-ink numbering have been necessary at all? In addition, this wove section is corrected in red ink, suggesting that the red-ink numbering was introduced only as part of a later round of revision. The equivalent of one full wove leaf may have entailed some recopying of material that was revised as part of the excisions made to the adjacent leaves ff. A321.B321.C323.E39 and [A323]. [B323].C328.E44 (see figures 2 and 3).¹²¹

119. *Shirley*, Clarendon edition, 245.

120. *Shirley*, Clarendon edition, 730.

121. Also see note 49 above.