Jurnal Penelitian Nusantara
Volume 1 ; Nomor 6 ; Juni 2025 ; Page 816-823
Doi : https://doi.org/10.59435/menulis.v1i6.446
Website : https://padangjurnal.web.id/index.php/menulis
E-ISSN : 3088-988X

A Diachronic Lexical Analysis of *Little Women*: Comparing The 1869 and 1970 Editions

Zahira Sufyan[1*], Otong Setiawan Djuharie[2]

[2]Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung
[1]zahistudy@gmail.com, [2]otongsetiawandjuharie@uinsgd.ac.id

Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive comparative textual analysis of Chapter 1 of Louisa May Alcott's seminal novel, *Little Women*. The primary focus is a diachronic examination of lexical and orthographic variations between the original 1869 Roberts Brothers first edition and the 1970 Everyman's Library paperback edition, spanning a century of publication history. The central research problem addresses the process and implications of textual alteration in classic literature reprints. This study aims to identify, categorise, and analyse these changes to illuminate the editorial decisions, whether conscious or unconscious, that shape the evolution of a literary text for subsequent generations of readers. The methodology employed is a meticulous side-by-side comparative reading of the chapter, documenting discrepancies in vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, grammar, and capitalisation. The results indicate a consistent pattern of modernisation in the 1970 edition. Key findings include the substitution of colloquial or archaic vocabulary, the updating of orthography (e.g., 'dont' to 'don't'), and the modification of punctuation to align with contemporary conventions. These alterations, while enhancing immediate readability, subtly modify the original linguistic flavor, narrative rhythm, and historical context of Alcott's work. The preservation of certain authorial idiosyncrasies, such as character-specific misspellings, is also noted, suggesting a nuanced editorial framework. The study concludes that such textual evolution has a tangible impact on character voice and overall tone, underscoring the importance of edition selection in both academic and leisure reading.

Keywords: *Little Women, Louisa May Alcott, Textual Analysis, Diachronic Linguistics, Editorial Practices.*

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background: The Enduring Legacy and Textual Instability of a Classic

Since its initial publication in two parts in 1868 and 1869, Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women* has transcended its origins as a mere children's story to become a foundational text in American literature and a global cultural phenomenon. Its immediate and overwhelming success cemented its place in the literary canon. Still, its endurance for over a century and a half speaks to a power that goes beyond simple narrative charm. The novel has functioned as a formative cultural artifact, profoundly shaping conceptions of American girlhood, family life, and female ambition (Stern, 2021). For generations, the March sisters Meg, Jo, Beth, and Amy have served as archetypes, providing models of behavior, aspiration, and morality that have been both embraced and contested by readers. The novel's portrayal of domesticity in Civil War-era New England, with its universal themes of love, loss, duty, and sacrifice, has allowed it to be continuously reinterpreted, ensuring its relevance far beyond its immediate historical context.

The initial publication of *Little Women* by Roberts Brothers of Boston occurred at a pivotal moment in American history. The nation was emerging from the trauma of the Civil War, and this post-bellum period was marked by intense social, industrial, and cultural transformation. A key aspect of this transformation was the rapid development of a national publishing industry and a push toward greater literacy and educational standardization. This movement fostered a standardizing impulse in the English language itself, seeking to establish a more uniform "correct" American English. However, this existed in tension with the rich and varied linguistic landscape of the time, which was replete with regional dialects, vernacular slang, and colloquialisms that reflected the diverse realities of American life. Alcott's prose brilliantly captures this linguistic duality. Her narrative voice often adopts a more formal, almost Johnsonian cadence, reflecting the literary conventions of her era. Yet, her dialogue is alive with the sounds of authentic speech, capturing the unique voices of her characters with their distinctive idioms and grammatical quirks. Jo's slang, Amy's malapropisms, and Hannah's dialect are not mere window dressing; they are integral to the novel's realism and its construction of character.

It is precisely this rich, historically specific linguistic texture that becomes a central issue in the novel's long publication history. As a perennial bestseller, *Little Women* has been reprinted numerous times by various publishers in a wide range of formats, from lavish, illustrated gift editions to affordable mass-market paperbacks. Each new edition represents an act of cultural transmission, presenting the text to a new generation of readers. This act, however, is never neutral. It necessitates a series of editorial decisions that raise a critical question for literary and linguistic scholarship: how does a text, and by extension its cultural meaning, evolve over a century of republication? Does the *Little Women* read by a child in 1970 offer the

same linguistic and aesthetic experience as the one read in 1869? This study argues that it does not, and that the subtle history of textual alteration is a subject worthy of close critical examination.

1.2 Problem Statement: Fidelity, Accessibility, and the Editorial Hand

The core problem this research addresses is the inherent and complex tension between textual fidelity and reader accessibility that arises when republishing classic literature. An editor or publisher of a historical text is faced with a fundamental choice: should the text be preserved with absolute fidelity to the author's first-edition text, complete with its period-specific linguistic features, orthographic inconsistencies, and potentially unfamiliar punctuation? Or should it be modernized to remove potential barriers for a contemporary audience, ensuring a smoother, more accessible reading experience? This dilemma places the editor in the role of a mediator between the author's original creative act and the expectations of a modern reader.

This study proceeds from the hypothesis that modern editions, particularly mass-market paperbacks like the 1970 Everyman's Library edition under examination, will inevitably favor accessibility. The commercial and pedagogical impetus is to produce a version of the text that feels immediate and un-intimidating. However, this process of intralingual translation—adapting a text for a new audience within the same language—is not a neutral or purely technical act. It is an act of interpretation that risks altering not just the surface features of the text, but its deeper meanings. By "correcting" perceived archaisms or non-standard grammar, an editor may inadvertently flatten the nuances of character, dilute the historical flavor of the narrative, and erase the very linguistic markers that Alcott used to build her world (Putri & Haryadi, 2023).

Therefore, this research aims to move beyond a simple cataloging of differences to a more interpretive analysis of their impact. The primary objectives are as follows:

1. **To meticulously document and categorize** the full range of lexical, orthographic, syntactic, and punctuation-related shifts between the 1869 Roberts Brothers first edition and the 1970 Everyman's Library edition, focusing on a representative sample of the text.
2. **To identify systematic patterns of editorial intervention**, thereby inferring the implicit editorial philosophy or "house style" that guided the modernization of the 1970 text.
3. **To analyze the cumulative effect of these changes** on key literary elements, including character voice (particularly the rebellious vernacular of Jo March), narrative rhythm, and the overall historical tone of the novel.
4. **To argue for the critical importance of edition selection** in both scholarly analysis and general readership, demonstrating that the choice of text fundamentally shapes the reader's aesthetic and historical engagement with the work. Through this granular analysis, the study seeks to highlight the "invisible" work of the editor and make a case for a more conscious and critical approach to the reading of classic texts.

1.3 Literature Review and Guiding Theoretical Framework

This study is situated at the intersection of Alcott scholarship, textual criticism, and historical linguistics. While the body of work on Louisa May Alcott is vast, it has historically focused on thematic, biographical, and feminist interpretations. Scholars like Johnson (2022) have expertly traced the novel's critical reception and its adaptation across different media, while others like Handayani (2021) have analyzed its enduring feminist values. These works provide an essential context for understanding the novel's cultural importance. However, they do not typically engage in the kind of micro-level textual analysis that is the focus of this paper.

The fields of historical linguistics and digital humanities have provided new tools for understanding language change over time. Miller's (2021) work on the evolution of American colloquialisms provides a backdrop for understanding why certain words used by Alcott might be targeted for modernization, while the computational stylistics employed by Jones (2023) opens up possibilities for large-scale analysis of textual variance. Despite these advances, a significant gap in the literature persists: a direct, qualitative, and interpretive comparative analysis between the foundational 1869 edition of *Little Women* and a standard, influential 20th-century mass-market edition. Studies, such as Nugraha's (2024), on the general trends in reprinting classics touch upon the phenomenon, but they often lack a specific, evidence-based focus on a single, culturally significant work. Similarly, stylistic analyses of Alcott's dialogue, like that of Williams (2022), often rely on a modernized or composite text, thereby inadvertently overlooking the very textual variations that are the subject of this paper. This study aims to fill this specific scholarly gap.

The theoretical framework guiding this research combines principles from textual criticism and diachronic linguistics. Textual criticism, as theorized by scholars from W. W. Greg to Jerome McGann, provides the vocabulary and methodology for analyzing the production, transmission, and alteration of texts. It raises crucial questions about authorial intention, the stability of the literary work, and the role of the editor and publisher in shaping the text the public receives (Chapman, 2022). This study employs its comparative method to treat each edition not as a flawed copy of an ideal original but as a distinct historical artefact with its own integrity. Diachronic linguistics provides the scientific basis for analyzing the language changes themselves. It explains the processes by which words, spellings, and grammatical structures become archaic or obsolete, providing a rationale for why a 20th-century editor might, for instance, systematically replace a semicolon with a period or "correct" a vernacular form like "ain't." By integrating these two fields, this paper asserts that the choice of an edition is a critical act. Every version of *Little Women* tells a story, and this paper is dedicated to uncovering the story told by the subtle differences between the 1869 and that of 1970.

1.3. Diachronic Linguistics and American English

Diachronic linguistics, the study of language change over time, provides the scientific basis for analyzing the specific alterations in the text. American English underwent significant evolution between 1869 and 1970. Miller (2021) charts the broad changes in American English during this period, noting trends toward orthographic regularization (e.g., the standardization of contractions and hyphenation) and the obsolescence of certain colloquialisms. The language of Alcott's time-

retained certain features of British English and had a different set of conventions regarding punctuation, particularly the use of the semicolon and comma, than what became standard in the 20th century (Thompson, 2019). This linguistic context is crucial for understanding *why* an editor in 1970 might make specific changes. The alterations are not random; they reflect a century of linguistic drift.

By integrating these three fields, this study addresses a clear gap in the literature. While Alcott's novel has been thoroughly analyzed for its themes, and while textual criticism and diachronic linguistics provide the tools for analysis, there has been no sustained, micro-level comparative study of the textual evolution of *Little Women* itself. This paper undertakes that specific task.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach for this study is a qualitative, comparative textual analysis designed to systematically identify, categorize, and interpret variations between two specific editions of *Little Women*. This method was chosen to facilitate a deep, granular reading rather than a broad, computational overview.

2. Primary Sources

The two texts selected for this analysis represent a temporal span of 101 years, offering a clear window into the evolution of the text:

- **The 1869 Edition (Baseline Text):** Alcott, L. M. (1869). *Little Women, or, Meg, Jo, Beth and Amy. Part First*. Boston: Roberts Brothers. This edition serves as the foundational text. It represents the novel as it was first presented to the public and reflects the linguistic and orthographic conventions of Alcott's time and her original publishers. It is the closest available source to the author's final intention for the first part of her work.
- **The 1970 Edition (Comparative Text):** Alcott, L. M. (1970). *Little Women*. London & New York: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd (Everyman's Library) & E. P. Dutton & Co. This edition was chosen as a representative of a popular, accessible, and widely distributed 20th-century paperback. The Everyman's Library series is historically significant for its mission of making literary classics available to a broad, general audience, making its editorial choices particularly relevant to the question of modernization for readability.

2.2. Research Stages

The research was executed through a structured, multi-stage process to ensure rigor and comprehensiveness.

1. **Data Collation and Alignment:** The full text of Chapter 1, “Playing Pilgrims,” from both the 1869 and 1970 editions was isolated. The 1869 text spans pages 7-22, while the 1970 text covers pages 1-10. The texts were digitised and aligned sentence by sentence in a parallel-column document to facilitate direct, unambiguous comparison.
2. **Comparative Analysis and Annotation:** A manual, line-by-line reading of the aligned texts was performed. Every identified variance, regardless of its seeming insignificance, was highlighted and annotated directly within the working document. This included changes in single characters, words, punctuation marks, and capitalisation.
3. **Data Categorization:** Following the annotation phase, each identified variance was systematically categorized to structure the analysis. The categories were developed from both the data itself and established frameworks in textual studies (Davis, 2020). The primary categories are:
   - **Lexical Substitution:** The replacement of a word or phrase with a synonym or a more modern equivalent (e.g., *grub* vs. *work*). This category also includes changes to vernacular or dialect forms (e.g., *ain't* vs. *I'm not*).
   - **Orthographic Modernization:** Changes in spelling and hyphenation to conform to 20th-century standards (e.g., *dont* vs. *don't*; *niminy piminy* vs. *niminy-piminy*).
   - **Punctuation and Syntax:** Modifications in the use of commas, semicolons, periods, dashes, and exclamation points that alter sentence structure, rhythm, or rhetorical emphasis.
   - **Capitalization:** Differences in the capitalization of common and proper nouns (e.g., *china-aster* vs. *China-aster*).
4. **Qualitative Interpretation:** The categorized data was then analyzed to identify overarching patterns and discuss their potential effect on the reading experience. This stage involved interpreting the *function* of the changes—for instance, asking why an editor might change a semicolon to an exclamation point or substitute one adjective for another—and linking these micro-level changes to macro-level effects on characterization, tone, and historical authenticity.

2.3. Scope and Limitations

This study is intentionally limited to a deep analysis of selected representative chapters. While this provides a rich dataset for a granular research, the findings are not intended to be generalisable to the entire novel without further, more extensive research. The analysis is primarily qualitative and does not employ computational or statistical methods to measure the frequency or significance of textual variance; such an approach, while valuable, falls outside the scope of the current project but presents a clear avenue for future work. Furthermore, this study focuses exclusively on the textual evidence within the two chosen editions. It does not engage with archival research concerning the publishers' internal documents, correspondence, or house style guides, which might provide direct evidence of editorial intent. Therefore, any discussion of "editorial philosophy" is necessarily inferential, based on the patterns of change observed in the texts themselves. Finally, while the 1970 Everyman's Library edition is chosen as a representative example of a 20th-century mass-market paperback, it is by no means the only one. A comprehensive study of all 20th-century editions is beyond the scope of this paper, which aims to illustrate a process rather than provide an exhaustive history of the novel's publication. The focus remains strictly on the linguistic and stylistic impact of the observed changes between two key historical points.

3. Results and Discussion

The comparative analysis of Chapter 1, “Playing Pilgrims,” reveals a consistent and deliberate editorial philosophy in the 1970 Everyman's edition: one of conservative modernisation. The editors appear to have systematically prioritised accessibility for a contemporary audience while, for the most part, attempting to preserve the novel's essential spirit. The changes, though not overwhelming in number, are systematic and fall into distinct categories that merit individual discussion. These alterations, when viewed collectively, subtly yet definitively shift the linguistic texture, character voice, and historical feel of Alcott’s original prose, demonstrating how editorial intervention shapes the reader's experience of a classic text across time.

3.1. Lexical Substitution: The Standardization of Character Voice

The most significant modifications are lexical substitutions, where words from the 1869 text are replaced. These changes, while small, have a discernible impact on characterization, particularly that of Jo March, whose voice is defined by its colloquial and rebellious energy.

Table 1. Analysis of Lexical Substitutions in Chapter 1

1869 Edition (Source)	**1970 Edition (Source)**	**Analysis**
“...I'm sure we **grub** hard enough to earn it.”	“...I'm sure we **work** hard enough to earn it.”	The verb *to grub* carries strong connotations of laborious, dull, and often physical toil, akin to digging. It paints a picture of weary, unglamorous effort. Replacing it with the generic 'work' neutralizes this evocative imagery, slightly diminishing the hardship Jo is describing and making her speech more standard and less vivid.
“I **ain't**!”	“I**'m not**!”	This is a direct correction of a vernacular form to a grammatically standard one. *Ain't* in the 1869 text is a powerful marker of Jo's defiance against being the prim "young lady" Meg wants her to be. The correction to 'I'm not' enforces a grammatical propriety that Jo is actively resisting, thereby flattening the linguistic conflict that Alcott originally wrote into the scene.
“...teaching those **dreadful** children...”	“...teaching those **tiresome** children...”	This substitution significantly alters the tone of Meg’s complaint. *Dreadful* suggests the children are a source of dread or deep frustration, a genuine trial. *Tiresome*, by contrast, is a much milder adjective, implying simple weariness or annoyance. The 1970 edition softens Meg's emotional state, making her complaint seem less severe and more conventionally feminine.
“...and other girls nothing **at all”**	“...and other girls nothing **at all”**	**No change.** This phrase is retained, showing that some common expressions were considered timeless.
“We’ve got father and mother, and each other, **anyhow**,”	“We've got father and mother and each other,”	The removal of “anyhow” slightly alters Beth's tone. The 1869 version implies a faintly defensive contentment, as if challenging her sisters' complaints. The 1970 version is more straightforward.
“when our men are suffering so **in the army**.”	“when our men are suffering so **in the army**.”	**No change.** This specific historical reference is maintained, preserving the story's context.
“...when your nose isn’t **nice**.”	“...when your nose isn’t **nice**.”	No change. The simple and somewhat ambiguous adjective “nice” is retained, showing that not all common words were deemed in need of modernization

“Don’t **peck at one another**, children.”	| “Don’t **peck at one another**, children.”	No change. This distinctive domestic metaphor (“pecking at one another”) is preserved, keeping the original flavor of the prose. This shows an editor's respect for the author's unique stylistic choices.

The shift from 'ain't' to “I'm not” is particularly telling. In the 1869 text, Jo's use of 'ain't' is a defiant linguistic marker of her rejection of the “young lady” persona. By “correcting” it, the 1970 edition grammatically polishes her speech at the expense of its character-driven subtext. These changes, although seemingly minor, accumulate to subtly realign the characters' expressions with those of later 20th-century sensibilities, making them slightly less rugged and more palatable.

Analysis extended to later chapters reveals a similar pattern. In Chapter 3, “The Laurence Boy,” Jo's description of Laurie as a “**jolly**” boy in the 1869 edition is changed to “**nice**” in the 1970 edition. *Jolly* has a cheerful, old-fashioned 19th-century feel, while *nice* is a much more generic and less specific descriptor. This change again slightly dulls the historical distinctiveness of Jo's voice.

3.2. Orthographic and Punctuation Modernization: Shaping Rhythm and Tone

The majority of alterations fall into the category of updating spelling and punctuation to modern standards. These changes are less about meaning and more about conforming to evolving orthographic conventions, yet punctuation changes can significantly alter the rhythm and emotional delivery of a sentence.

Table 2. Examples of Orthographic and Punctuation Variations

Category	**1869 Edition (Source)**	**1970 Edition (Source)**	**Detailed Analysis**
Spelling	“...I am afraid I **dont**;”	“...I am afraid I **don't**;”	A standard orthographic modernization, reflecting the universal adoption of the apostrophe in the contraction. This change has a minimal impact on meaning but aids instantaneous readability for a modern eye.
Punctuation (emphasis)	“...it's bad enough to be a girl, anyway, when I like boys' games and work and manners, and I can only stay at home and knit **like a poky old woman.”**	“...it's bad enough to be a girl, anyway, when I like boys' games and work and manners, and I can only stay at home and knit, like a poky old woman!”	The 1869 version uses a period, delivering Jo's final complaint with a sense of flat, resigned finality. The 1970 edition adds a comma and an exclamation point, transforming the phrase into a more dramatic, exclamatory outburst. This alters the emotional texture from one of weary complaint to one of active, vocal frustration.
Hyphenation	“...niminy **piminy** chits.”	“...niminy-piminy chits.”	Reflects the modern convention of hyphenating compound adjectival phrases before a noun. A minor change made for formal clarity and grammatical correctness according to 20th-century standards.
Capitalization	“...as prim as a **china-aster**.”	“...as prim as a **China-aster**.”	The 1970 edition correctly capitalizes the proper noun 'China' within the compound word, adhering to modern capitalization rules.
Punctuation (Dialogue)	“I detest rude, unlady-like girls.” “I hate affected, **niminy piminy** chits.	“I detest rude, unlady-like girls!” “I hate affected, **niminy-piminy** chits.”	In the 1869 text, the back-and-forth between Jo and Amy ends with a period, suggesting a sharp but conclusive statement. The 1970 edition changes this to an exclamation point, heightening the drama of their spat and adding an emotional intensity that is more explicit.
Punctuation (Clause)	“Dear me, how happy and	“Dear me, how happy and good we'd be, if we	The 1869 version uses a comma before the closing quotation mark, a typical 19th-century

	good we'd be, if we had no worries,"	had no worries!"	practice. The 1970 edition changes this to an exclamation mark to better reflect the emotional tone of Meg's wishful sigh, prioritising expressed emotion over older grammatical conventions.

The change in punctuation in Jo's speech about knitting is a significant stylistic shift. The 1869 version's period suggests the thought trails off in disappointment. The 1970 version's exclamation point makes the final phrase a more forceful, standalone outburst. While the core meaning remains the same, the emotional nuance differs. The 1970 version is arguably more theatrical, whereas the 1869 version feels more introspective and melancholic. This demonstrates how punctuation is not merely grammatical but also rhetorical, shaping the rhythm and tone of the prose.

Changes in punctuation often have a more profound stylistic impact than mere correction. In Chapter 19, "Aunt March Settles the Question," a long sentence in the 1869 edition explaining Jo's dilemma uses several semicolons to link interconnected clauses, creating a complex, flowing train of thought. In the 1970 edition, this sentence is often broken into several shorter sentences, each ending with a period. While grammatically correct, this alters the narrative pace. The original text feels more ruminative and internal. At the same time, the modern version is more direct and staccato, which may be deemed more accessible to contemporary readers but loses some of Alcott's prose rhythm.

3.3. The Anomaly of Preservation: "Vocabilary"

Amidst these patterns of modernization, the preservation of Amy's malapropism, "I am proper to use good words, and improve your **vocabilary**," is a significant finding. The misspelling is faithfully reproduced in the 1970 text, even as other, less significant aspects of the text are updated.

This act of preservation suggests a sophisticated editorial framework. The editors of the 1970 edition appear to differentiate between what they consider authorial oversights or outdated conventions (like *dont*) and deliberate, character-defining linguistic traits. Amy's struggle with long words is a central, humorous, and endearing part of her character arc in the early chapters. To "correct" her speech would be to fundamentally misunderstand and diminish Alcott's method of characterisation through dialogue. This decision demonstrates respect for authorial intent where it is most artistically salient, creating a hybrid text that is modernised for accessibility but curated to preserve key literary features.

4. Discussion of Cumulative Impact

Collectively, these changes illustrate the delicate tightrope walk of modern reprint publishing, an act that can be understood as a form of intralingual translation adapting a text for a new audience within the same language. On one hand, the publisher aims to make the text accessible and fluid for readers unfamiliar with 19th-century linguistic conventions. The Everyman's Library series, in particular, was founded on the democratic principle of making classics widely available, which inherently prioritizes readability. On the other hand, there is a curatorial responsibility to maintain the integrity of the original work. The 1970 edition favors the former, employing a strategy of conservative modernisation. The lexical substitutions and updated orthography remove potential stumbling blocks, creating a smoother, more immediate reading experience for a 20th-century reader.

However, this smoothness comes at a significant, if subtle, cost. The texture of Alcott's original prose its occasional roughness, its specific colloquialisms, its period-specific grammar is a vital part of its historical and literary identity. The standardization of Jo's dialect by changing "ain't" to "I'm not" or "grub" to "work" does more than correct the grammar; it sanitizes her voice, lessening the very quality of rebellious authenticity that makes her so revolutionary for her time. These changes flatten the linguistic landscape of the novel, subtly eroding the social and class distinctions embedded in the characters' speech. The original roughness is not a flaw to be polished away, but a feature to be understood —an integral part of the novel's charm and historical value. The cumulative effect is a text that feels slightly less *of its time* a version of the 19th century curated for the 20th. Therefore, while the 1970 edition faithfully reproduces the novel's plot and themes, it presents a slightly different linguistic world than the one Alcott crafted, subtly altering the reader's imaginative and historical engagement with the text.

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis of the first chapter of *Little Women* has successfully illuminated the subtle yet significant process of textual evolution in classic literature. The research confirms the initial hypothesis that the 1970 Everyman's Library edition was systematically modernized, while also revealing a more nuanced editorial approach than a simple "correction" model would suggest. The study's findings can be summarized in three key points.

First, the most common alterations are orthographic and punctuational, designed to align the 1869 text with 20th-century conventions for the benefit of reader accessibility. These changes, while numerous in type, are relatively infrequent and have a minimal impact on the core meaning, but can subtly alter narrative rhythm.

Second, a more impactful category of change involves lexical substitution, where colloquial or emotionally charged words are replaced with more standard, neutral terms. These substitutions, as seen in the modification of Jo March's dialogue (e.g., 'grub' to 'work', 'ain't' to 'I'm not'), subtly temper the distinctive voices of the characters and soften the vernacular texture of the original prose.

Third, the deliberate preservation of character-defining errors, such as Amy's “vocabilary,” demonstrates a sophisticated editorial practice that distinguishes between perceived textual flaws and intentional authorial devices for characterization. This suggests editors act not just as correctors but as interpreters of authorial intent.

The implications of this study are twofold. For literary scholars, it highlights the critical importance of selecting an edition. An analysis of Alcott's style or characterisation that relies solely on a modernised text may miss the very linguistic nuances that were central to her original craft. For educators and general readers, this study reveals that the classic texts we read are often not static artefacts but evolving documents, shaped by generations of editors. While the 1970 edition of *Little Women* provides a faithful and accessible rendering of the beloved story, it is, in effect, a slightly different linguistic experience from the one its original audience had in 1869.

Directions for Future Research

This study, focused on a single chapter, provides a foundation for several broader avenues of inquiry:

1. **Full-Text Computational Analysis**: A digital, full-text comparison of both editions could quantify the frequency of these changes and identify patterns across the entire narrative. Tools from the digital humanities could measure shifts in sentence complexity, lexical diversity, and sentiment.
2. **Cross-Publisher Comparison**: A comparative study of multiple 20th-century editions of *Little Women* from different publishers (e.g., Puffin, Penguin, Signet) could reveal varying editorial philosophies and house styles.
3. **Translation Analysis**: Examining translations of *Little Women* into other languages could provide insight into how different cultures handle the modernization and cultural translation of Alcott’s specific brand of 19th-century American domesticity.
4. **Authorial Manuscript Comparison**: Where available, comparing Alcott's original manuscripts to the first edition would provide a deeper understanding of the initial editorial process she experienced with Roberts Brothers, adding another layer to the book’s textual history.

Ultimately, this research affirms that each edition of a literary work tells its own story not only the one within its pages, but also the story of its journey through time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise and gratitude are extended to God Almighty, for His infinite grace and guidance are the sole reasons this research could be conceptualized, undertaken, and completed. Without His blessings, no part of this journey would have been possible.

First and foremost, the author wishes to express her most profound and sincerest gratitude to her beloved mother, whose unwavering moral support, constant prayers, and generous financial assistance were instrumental in the completion of this research journal. Her belief in this project was a continuous source of motivation and strength.

Special thanks are extended to Drs. Otong Setiawan Djuharie, M.Pd., lecturer for the Academic Writing course, whose invaluable guidance, constructive criticism, and profound knowledge patiently steered this research from its inception to its final form. His mentorship was essential to the scholarly quality and intellectual rigor of this work.

The author is also profoundly grateful to her colleagues and friends in the English Litearature Department, Class F. Their spirited discussions, shared resources, and collective enthusiasm created a stimulating academic environment that was both challenging and supportive. A special thank you for the camaraderie, the late-night study sessions, and for sharing crucial information regarding the standards and conventions of writing scientific articles. Their friendship and encouragement are deeply appreciated.

REFERENCES

Alcott, L. M. (1869). *Little Women, or, Meg, Jo, Beth and Amy. Part First*. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

Alcott, L. M. (1970). *Little Women*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Chapman, M. (2022). *Making a Classic: The Editorial History of 19th-Century American Fiction*. Yale University Press.

Davis, P. (2020). *The Complete Guide to Editorial Practices*. Oxford University Press.

Fitria, T. N. (2022). Analisis Resepsi Sastra pada Novel Little Women Karya Louisa May Alcott. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 8(1), 169-179.

Handayani, S. (2021). The Interpretation of Feminism Values in "Little Women" (2019) Movie. *Journal of English Language and Literature (JELL)*, 6(2), 89-95.

Johnson, C. (2022). *Reading Alcott in the 21st Century: Reception and Adaptation*. Modern Literature Association.

Jones, M. (2023). Computational Stylistics and 19th-Century Novels. *Journal of Digital Humanities*, 12(1), 45-62.

Miller, A. (2021). The Diachronic Evolution of Colloquialisms in American English: 1870-1970. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 9(2), 112-130.

Nugraha, B. (2024). Reprinting the Classics: A Study in Modern Editorial Intervention. *Indonesian Journal of Literary Studies*, 7(1), 22-38.

Putri, E., & Haryadi, R. (2023). The Adaptation of Classic Children's Literature for Modern Audiences. *Child-Lit Quarterly*, 4(2), 55-70.

Rahmawati, D. (2020). Representasi Peran Perempuan dalam Film Little Women. *Jurnal Ilmiah LISKI (Lingkar Studi Komunikasi)*, 6(2), 101-112.

Smith, J. (2021). Vocabularic Shifts in Serialized Victorian Fiction. *Journal of Textual Scholarship*, 15(3), 204-225.

Stern, M. B. (2021). *The History of a Bestseller: The Making of Little Women*. Harvard University Press.

Thompson, G. R. (2019). *Publishing the American Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press.

Williams, T. (2022). The Voice of the March Sisters: Stylistic Analysis of Alcott's Dialogue. *American Literary History*, 34(4), 780-801