In 1942, Gertrude Chandler Warner’s *The Boxcar Children* was published. Featuring the now-iconic black-and-white illustrations by L. Kate Deal, the narrative tells the story of four orphaned youngsters who flee the machinations of a heartless baker, take refuge in an abandoned railway car in the woods, and are eventually reunited with their long-lost grandfather. Both for its portrayal of an interesting story with engaging characters and for its promotion of independent reading, *The Boxcar Children* became an immediate commercial and critical success. Although Warner’s text pre-dates the official advent of the Early Reader, it is commonly considered a classic of the genre. In 2007, in fact, the National Education Association named *The Boxcar Children* to its list of “Teachers’ Top 100 Books for Children” (n.p.). Meanwhile, in 2012, the book appeared on a compendium of the “Top 100 Chapter Books” from the *School Library Journal*. In light of these accolades, Joy Fleishhacker rightly characterized Warner’s text as “a staple in library, classroom and home collections” (par. 1).

While the 1942 edition of *The Boxcar Children* is beloved by generations of young readers, it is not the initial version of the book. Nearly two decades before, in 1924, Warner released her story for the first time. Called *The Box-Car Children*, the text contains differences that extend far beyond the hyphen that appears in its title: the book is four chapters longer, its main characters hail from the Cordyce family rather than one named Alden, and the plot includes several scenes that are not present in the later edition. In spite of both the classic status of Warner’s story and the significant changes between the 1924 and 1942 editions, *The Box-Car Children* is routinely eclipsed by its more recent and far more popular abridgement. The 1924 edition has long been out of print and is not widely read nor, in some cases, even known. According to WorldCat, a global catalog of book collections, the narrative is held by only a handful of libraries in the United States. Moreover, many discussions of *The Boxcar Children* in scholarly books, journal articles, and educational materials list 1942 as the book’s only and thus seemingly original date of publication. A review of a graphic novel adaptation of Warner’s story that appeared in the highly respected and
The Boxcar Children and The Box-Car Children widely circulated publication Booklist, for example, commences by stating that “[The] Boxcar Children was published in 1942” (Zvirin 61). Another article that ran in the equally authoritative School Library Journal opened its discussion in an analogous way, asserting that the now-popular series “began in 1942” (Anduri 187). Such remarks have been especially pervasive when the modern version of Warner’s novel has celebrated its fiftieth, sixtieth, and seventieth anniversaries. An array of newspaper articles, press releases, and book reviews mark these publishing milestones. But in so doing they omit the fact that The Boxcar Children had actually been released much earlier, although this original version differed markedly from its successor.2

Recouping the publication history of Warner’s narrative has significance that extends far beyond merely correcting a chronology, however. The modifications to The Box-Car Children also yield compelling new insights into the creation of the Early Reader. Although this category of children’s literature is commonly seen as a product of the late 1950s, the publication history of Warner’s narrative demonstrates that its roots extend back at least a decade earlier. The alterations that the author made to her original 1924 book helped to establish the scope, style, and parameters of this genre. In everything from the large-scale thematic changes to the smaller sentence-level edits, the process by which The Box-Car Children became The Boxcar Children can be seen as offering a map—and, in many ways, even a manual—for the construction of a text designed to promote independent reading.

In what has become an oft-recounted episode in the history of American children’s publishing, Shannon Maughan explains: “The birth of the early/beginning reader genre can be traced back to the advent of the Harper Collins [then Harper and Bros.] I Can Read! line, which launched in 1957 under editor Ursula Nordstrom” (par. 4). I contend that remembering and retracing the process by which The Box-Car Children became The Boxcar Children calls this history into question. Fifteen years before the date commonly recognized as the beginning of the Early Reader category, Gertrude Chandler Warner was participating in it. Although the role that she played in both the creation and the popularization of this literary format has been long overlooked, she was a pioneer. Indeed, I would argue that she was one of its originators.

* * *

The original 1924 version of Gertrude Chandler Warner’s The Box-Car Children is not only overlooked today, it was also neglected upon its initial release. As was noted by Joe Boyd, the former owner of Albert Whitman Company, who publishes the current edition of Warner’s book, the 1924 edition “never did well” (qtd. in Goddard, “Celebrate” 22). Although the narrative was issued by an established press with good distribution networks, The Box-Car Children simply didn’t connect with audiences. The book did not sell enough copies to merit a second printing and—as the WorldCat records mentioned above indicate—few copies of the first edition found their way
into library collections. Despite its unpopularity, Warner did not give up on the narrative. Although the full-time elementary teacher and part-time author published eight more books and dozens of individual essays, articles, and stories between 1924 and 1942, she kept returning to her tale about Henry, Jessie, Violet, and Benny. From the beginning, Warner’s interest in the story was strongly connected with her work as first-grade teacher. An article that appeared in a local Putnam newspaper asserted about *The Boxcar Children* that the story “is a familiar tale to many of Putnam’s school children who have had it told to them since 1924” (“New Book” par. 1).

Through these experiences, Warner knew that her original book was not unpopular because children didn’t like the plot of her story. On the contrary, they consistently marveled at the independence, industriousness, and self-sufficiency the protagonists displayed, and they especially delighted in the adventure, excitement, and drama of Henry, Jessie, Violet, and Benny’s experiences (Warner, “Letter” 288). While the process of sharing *The Boxcar Children* with her students confirmed the appeal of her plot, it called into question the style of her writing. As biographer Mary Ellen Ellsworth has documented, over the years of reading the original tale aloud to her classes and having them read segments of the narrative to her, “[Warner] had begun to think about it some more, too. She wanted all children to enjoy—even those who might be poor readers, and those who might be learning the English language” (Ellsworth, *Gertrude Chandler 4 5*). *The Box-Car Children* was written in a manner that was too difficult for her students who were just learning to read independently. Her narrative had too many complex words and grammatically convoluted sentences for most children to be able to understand it let alone enjoy the experience of reading it. As Hollie Gilmore has discussed, the original 1924 novel used an array of terms—such as “piazzas,” “quizzically,” and “delicatessen”—that were commonly found in “the higher grade levels” (par. 5). The text was a challenge for even the strongest and most advanced of Warner’s pupils. Even if these boys and girls “were able to sound out these words, they typically did not know the definitions, [and] thus [they could not] comprehend the story in its full context” (Gilmore par. 6). Meanwhile, for Warner’s pupils who struggled with literacy, *The Box-Car Children* was wholly beyond their abilities.

This compositional flaw in Warner’s book was not atypical. As the teacher-author would quickly discover, there were few stories released during the 1920s, 1930s, or early 1940s that had captivating plots but that were also written in a style that was accessible for Early Reader or older children who were struggling with literacy because English was not their first language. As an article that appeared in the local newspaper discussed, “Since Miss Warner has taught First Grade in local schools since 1918, she has become much interested in the lack of easy reading material for older children who have difficulty in reading” (“Brief Biographies” par. 3). The *Dick and Jane* books, which made their debut in 1927 (Keeshan 7), became widely used basal readers during the 1930s. But, akin to their more famous counterparts
in the 1950s, the students in Warner’s classes found them dull. Lines from the opening vignette in *Fun with Dick and Jane* (1940) provide a representative example: “‘Look, look,’ said Dick. ‘See Sally. See funny Sally and Father.’ ‘See, see,’ said Sally. ‘Sally is up, up, up. This is fun for Sally’” (9).

Warner was interested in books that fostered independent reading but that also had compelling plots and well-crafted characters. According to biographer Mary Ellen Ellsworth, during a summer in the mid-1930s, the teacher-author even combed bookstores in Chicago looking for such narratives and was dismayed at her inability to find any (Interview). On the contrary, as a newspaper article from the era on this subject affirmed, “The material now on the market is easy enough for these overgrown pupils, but the subject matter is below their level of interest” (“Brief Biographies” par. 3). Gertrude Chandler Warner set out to fill this combined pedagogical need and publishing gap by rewriting *The Box-Car Children*. Working steadily on this revision for nearly two decades and refining it via trial and error by sharing passages with her students, she transformed her original 1924 novel into the version that is known and loved today. This new rendering of *The Boxcar Children* is designed specifically for Early Reader. Meeting the needs of this new audience involved far more than mere editorial tinkering; it constituted a complete overhaul of the text. Warner scaled back the original book’s vocabulary, streamlined its plot, and simplified its sentences, all while retaining the excitement and adventure of the story.

The significant stylistic differences between the 1924 and 1942 versions of the Boxcar story begin with the very first sentence of the new edition. The original novel commences in the following way: “About seven o’clock one hot summer evening a strange family moved into the little village of Middlesex” (9). By contrast, in the rewrite, Warner simplifies this remark, trimming and tightening it to read: “One warm night four children stood in front of a bakery” (7). This type of alteration applies to nearly every sentence in the 1942 text. The passage “‘Mustn’t we surely run away?’ whispered Jess in Henry’s ear” (11) in the original version becomes the more modern-sounding and less grammatically awkward “‘Oh, Henry!’ whispered Jessie. ‘Let’s run away from here!’” in the new version (13). Similarly, in the 1924 edition, Warner described the children’s flight from the baker’s shop in the following way: “They walked until two o’clock in the morning, stopping often this time to rest and to drink from the horses’ watering troughs. And then they came upon a fork in the road with a white signpost shining in the moonlight” (23). In the 1942 rewrite, this passage now reads: “They walked until two o’clock in the morning, and then they came to some signs by the side of the road” (22–23).

Together with crafting shorter and grammatically clearer sentences, Warner also reduced the exposition of the 1942 version of the book, eliminating long prosy descriptions as well as events that were not central to the plot. The seventeen chapters of the 1924 book are condensed into thirteen, allowing the events to unfold more quickly. For instance, the following
paragraph appears in the first chapter of the original text: “Jess pulled wisps of hay over the opening so that it was absolutely invisible, and then proceeded to dig out a similar burrow for herself” (16). Its counterpart in the revised edition makes it both easier to read and propels the action forward much faster: “Jessie began to make a nest in the haystack for Benny, and when they put him into it, he went to sleep again. The other children also made nests” (19). The final sentence eliminates the need for several detailed and difficult-to-read passages, such as “Then [Henry] wiggled himself backward into the haycock without stopping to hollow it out, pulled a handful of hay over his head, and laid his head on his arm” (16). An even more dramatic condensation takes place a few pages later. Three simple sentences in the 1942 revision—“They slept all day, and it was night again when they woke up. Benny said at once, ‘Oh Jessie, I’m hungry. I want something to eat’” (19)—take the place of nearly two full pages, or more than 290 words, of long and largely prosy description relaying these same occurrences in the 1924 original.

In addition to making many of the scenes in the book move more quickly, Warner eliminated other entire narrative events. Accounts of the detailed chart that Henry keeps on the wall of the Boxcar, where they track their finances (54–55); the scene where Violet and Jess cut their hair (78); and the scene where Benny receives the pony from his Grandfather at the end of the book (142–43)—to name just a few examples—are all excised. While most of these edits constitute the loss of just a few paragraphs, others, such as the episode where Jess, Violet, and Benny gather and then sell ginseng root to earn extra money so that Benny can have a new pair of much-needed stockings, involve the deletion of nearly a full chapter. In The Boxcar Children, Benny still receives a replacement for his old, tattered stockings, but the money comes from Henry’s earnings. Furthermore, in the 1924 edition, the teddy bear that Violet makes for Benny out of his old stockings is named “Ginseng” after the origin of the money that made the creation of this toy possible. In the 1942 edition, the bear’s name is changed; he is known by the matter-of-fact and already familiar term, “Stockings” (119).

The alterations to other character names in The Boxcar Children are also a product of its new focus on an audience of Early Reader. In the 1924 edition, the protagonists’ surname is Cordyce; in the 1942 rewrite it has become Alden. This substitution could be regarded as puzzling—given that it appears without any real plot motive or clear thematic message—until it is viewed through the lens of creating a text to promote independent reading. The word “Cordyce” is difficult to decipher for children who are encountering it for the first time, raising linguistic conundrums such as the following: Where do the syllables break and which one is emphasized? Does the “rd” combination function as a consonant cluster? How does the letter “y” operate: is it a vowel or a consonant? Is the second “c” a hard or soft sound? For instance, could the word be correctly pronounced “Cordy-KEH” or
“COR-dyke”? By contrast, the two-syllable replacement “Alden” is easy to sound out independently: “All-DEN.”

Warner, as a longtime teacher of the first grade, was aware of the phonics approach to reading instruction, along with its efficacy. In 1921, in fact, she had written an article with her sister on the subject, “The Return of A, B, C.” The essay chronicles the struggle that a boy named Tony had while learning to read. The teacher at his school had been following “the modern phrase-and-sentence method” (Warner and Warner 144), which has students recognize entire words rather than learn the pronunciation of each letter and then use these elements to sound out increasingly more difficult vocabulary. As Warner relays, “A modern word-fiend tried to explain to me here, that, after having learned ‘gingerbreadboy,’ a child comes naturally by three words (or even four if they allowed ‘gin’ in the school curriculum)—namely, ‘ginger,’ ‘bread’ and ‘boy’” (Warner and Warner 137).

Unfortunately, as Warner soon discovered, “Tony didn’t. I tried him. He looked upon ‘ginger’ as an entire stranger, interesting in form, but still foreign” (Warner and Warner 137). While Tony and his classmates had been taught the alphabet, they learned only the names of each letter. So, for example, the letter “W” was known only as “Double-You,” not by the “wuhw” sound that it brings to a word. Warner repeatedly asserts that Tony’s unfamiliarity with phonics forms the root of his inability to detect or decipher new terminology.

This situation was not limited to the reading experiences of this one isolated child. As Warner goes on to explain in “The Return of A, B, C,” it was replicated with her own students. Taking over a first-grade class after the original teacher died in the 1918 influenza pandemic, “I found … that many of the children were recognizing ‘good-day to you’ wholly by the quaint little dash in the middle of ‘good-day.’ They shouted heartily ‘good-day to you’ whenever I showed them any word containing a hyphen” (Warner and Warner 143). This realization prompted Warner to shift her approach to literacy. Contrary to her school’s prescribed pedagogical methods—and in defiance of the viewpoints of numerous experts at the time about the best approach to reading instruction—Warner returned to what she called a “decried method” (Warner and Warner 138): “To remedy this difficulty [with word recognition], I abstracted Phonics bodily from my afternoon session, and inserted it directly before the reading period in the morning” (Warner and Warner 143). She wrote “The Return of A, B, C” both to defend this decision and to encourage other teachers and parents to follow suit: “Certainly ‘W’ is a more helpful tool to a child when he has been taught to pucker up his lips like the howling wind when he sees this letter coming, than when he has been taught to get set for a ‘d’ sound [for the letter’s name ‘Double-You’] which is not there” (Warner and Warner 142). As Warner asserts, “Why confuse a child’s mind at first with what a letter is arbitrarily called by someone else? Surely it is more sensible to show him what noise to make when he sees it” (Warner and Warner 142).
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Warner’s belief in a phonics approach to fostering independent reading is evident throughout her revisions to *The Boxcar Children*. Together with the substitution of the linguistically complicated appellation “Cordyce” for the easy-to-sound-out surname “Alden,” all of the other name changes can be viewed through the same lens: Dr. McAllister in the 1924 edition becomes Dr. Moore in the 1942 rendering. Meanwhile, the town of Intervale which hosts the Field Day race is renamed Silver City. Finally, the locale known as Townsend in the 1924 versions becomes Greenfield in the new edition.

While many of the modifications that appear in the 1942 version of *The Boxcar Children* resulted from Warner making cuts to her original narrative, she expanded on her existing text in some instances. The titles that Warner gave to each of her chapters form a telling example: Chapter 1: “The Flight” becomes “The Four Hungry Children”; Chapter 2: “The Second Night” becomes “Night is Turned into Day”; and Chapter 4 “A New Home” becomes “A New Home in the Woods.” While these elaborations might seem to work at cross-purposes with her attempt to make the text simpler and easier to read, they do not. Warner’s expanded titles are more descriptive and provide readers with a preview of the events that will unfold in the pages that follow. In this way, they both ignite curiosity about the plot and provide narrative clues that may help beginning readers to decipher a challenging passage.

This same philosophy applies to the illustrations that appear in the book. Whereas the 1924 edition of *The Box-Car Children* contained only four lithographs, the 1942 edition boasts 40 images. The illustrations, drawn by L. Kate Deal, are black-and-white and range from small pictures of isolated objects to a full-page portrayal of a multifaceted narrative event. Whatever their size and subject, the pictures depict a person, place, or thing that is being discussed on that page, usually in a passage that is in very close proximity. For example, an image of the wooden shelf holding all of the cups, dishes, and pots that Jessie, Violet, and Benny found at the dump and brought back to the boxcar does not simply appear in the chapter where these event stake place, it is embedded within the specific sentence that describes these exact items. Warner begins: “When they were on the shelf, Violet picked some white and yellow flowers and put them …” (53). When readers turn the page, however, they do not initially see the continuation of this sentence. Instead, they see L. Kate Deal’s black-and-white drawing of the wooden shelf with these items on it. The image helps the book’s audience navigate the closing part of the sentence by visually showing what the words describe: “in a cup full of water in the middle of the shelf” (Warner 54).

Meanwhile, the illustration that prefaces Chapter 8 operates in a slightly different but equally instructional manner. The drawing depicts the finished swimming pond that the children construct near the boxcar. The bulk of the chapter that follows discusses the long and rather elaborate process of stacking logs and positioning rocks to dam off the water and create the pond. The image, therefore, allows young readers to see the finished product.
and therefore helps them to understand the detailed and sometimes confusing account of this project that follows. As even these few examples demonstrate, L. Kate Deal’s illustrations function in a manner that is similar to Warner’s expanded chapter titles: piquing the reader’s interest, while providing helpful, visual cues about the action that is taking place on that page.

Warner’s goal of reissuing *The Boxcar Children* in “simplified form for school use” (“Brief Biographies” par. 3) is reflected in the publication history of the modern version of the narrative. While Albert Whitman Company is now commonly regarded as the publisher of this text, they were not the press that initially released the new version of the book. In 1942, *The Boxcar Children* was issued by Scott Foresman Company, an educational textbook publisher located in Chicago. This event was anything but mere coincidence. Not only did Foresman publish the *Dick and Jane* series, but Warner had worked for the press for three consecutive summers beginning in 1936 as an editorial consultant (McClure Interview). A practice that Wendy McClure asserts was not uncommon among schoolteachers, especially unmarried female ones like Warner (Interview), these positions typically involved a wide variety of endeavors, from identifying promising submissions and determining appropriate grade levels for new reading material to working with current authors on manuscript revisions and generally providing the press with first-hand, from-the-trenches opinions about children’s reading tastes and habits. Warner’s work at Foresman quickly focused a unique task that was the direct result of her classroom work with *The Box-Car Children*. As Warner’s biographer notes, “She was trying to find ways to write books for children that were both exciting and easy to read” (Ellsworth, *Gertrude Chandler Warner* 44).

A newspaper profile marking the release of the 1942 edition of *The Boxcar Children* dubs it a “triumph after a long campaign” (“Brief Biographies” par. 3). None of the biographers, museum directors, editors, or rare book collectors that I spoke with knew whether Warner had approached Foresman with her revised manuscript—either while she was working there or after the fact—or whether the company, who perhaps had also recognized a gap in the existing children’s book market, had approached her. Although the exact process by which Warner placed her book with Foresman is unclear, what happened next is not. From the moment of its release in 1942, *The Boxcar Children* was an immediate success. Young people loved the adventurous story and memorable characters. Meanwhile, teachers loved the way that it was “composed of easy words and short sentences” to promote independent reading (“She Leaves” par. 1). Even during a time of strict paper rationing precipitated by the Second World War, *The Boxcar Children* enjoyed steady sales and Foresman soon needed to issue a second edition. Moreover, by the end of the 1940s, “so many kids were reading *The Boxcar Children* in school as third-graders, and they wanted to have [a copy of] it at home” as well (McClure Email par. 7). Unfortunately, Foresman sold to schools only; the company did not offer materials to commercial bookstores or private individuals. So, in 1950, Albert Whitman was selected to produce an edition
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for the commercial market. As Joe Boyd, the company’s former owner, revealed, the press eventually became the sole publisher of *The Boxcar Children*: “Albert Whitman was able to sell the books very well, and eventually we were getting the bulk of the sales. So it seemed only natural that Albert Whitman take over as publisher” (McClure Email par. 7).

Warner’s book was issued by both Scholastic and Albert Whitman in both hardback and paperback form. However, all versions featured the editorial methodology that Warner adopted for re-crafting her 1924 novel into the edition that is known and loved today, which anticipated features that are now commonly identified as signatures of the Early Reader category. A review of *The Boxcar Children* that appeared upon the 1942 publication of Warner’s text summarized the “subtle techniques which make the book enjoyable”:

The peaked excitement of the plot, written to appeal to the eager interests of middle-grade readers, the appeal of [L.] Kate Deal’s illustrations that step into the story at the beginning of each chapter and practically beckon the child to come along, the easy-to-read type and short, fast lines, the use of plenty of conversation, is that every [sic] page has the look of something happening on it, and the psychology of making the characters real boys and girls, so that the book will appeal to boys and girls alike. (“New Book” par. 4)

To this list, Hollie Gilman appended one additional element: “The 1942 edition followed a strict and controlled vocabulary of only 600 words in order to target the lower grade levels” (par. 8).

These features map exactly onto contemporaneous discussions about the hallmarks of successful Early Readers. Allison McDonald, for example, opened her 2013 article on the subject with the assertion: “Writing a good early reader is an art. The words need to be simple, repetitive, and easy to decode, yet the story still has to grab the reader. I think that is why you see so many character-driven books and series for Early Reader” (par. 1). Meanwhile, Robin Smith, in a discussion that appeared in *The Horn Book* in 2011 about what distinguishes Early Readers from picture books added the following defining traits: “The vocabulary is generally limited to words that are sight words or can be decoded easily using the rules of phonics” (Smith par. 3). Citing a final key distinction—and one that echoes the artwork of L. Kate Deal—Smith asserts: “The illustrations are critical … and need to directly reflect the text, helping give clues about harder words and tell the story” (par. 3).

In 1949, following the critical and commercial success of *The Boxcar Children*, Warner wrote a sequel, *Surprise Island*. The text was not only released by the education textbook publisher Scott Foresman Company, but it also followed the same Early Reader formula as its predecessor: a restricted vocabulary, exciting plot, and simple sentence structure (McClure Interview). That same year, Warner retired from teaching “so that she could have more time to write” (Ellsworth, *Gertrude Chandler Warner* 47).
remark was accurate, for she spent much of this period penning seventeen additional tales about Henry, Jessie, Violet, and Benny, a process that transformed the original text into a popular and prolific mystery series. After her death in 1979, Albert Whitman Company “carried on Warner’s vision,” hiring a bevy of writers to create new stories about Henry, Jessie, Violet, and Benny. “Today, the Boxcar Children series has more than 100 books” (“About the Creator” par. 4). Taken collectively, the books enjoy “combined sales of 170,000 copies” per year (Goddard, “Celebrate” 22).

The Boxcar Children and its numerous sequels were not the only narratives that Warner wrote in this style. In 1954, she published 1001 Nights, another text that adapted an already existing narrative into what we would now call the Early Reader format. A reviewer at the time strongly recommended the text “because of the careful selection of no more than 900 different words in the entire book and yet with no impairment of the glittering pageantry which is so characteristic of the Arabian Nights” (“Miss Gertrude” par. 2). Akin to the history of The Boxcar Children, 1001 Nights was “marketed by two publishers, Scott, Foresman and Co. for the supplementary schoolbook field, and Albert Whitman Co. for the trade” (“Miss Gertrude” par. 6). When Gertrude Chandler Warner died in 1979, a regional newspaper in Connecticut observed: “We continue to feel Gertrude’s presence among us and to profit by it” (qtd. in Ellsworth, Gertrude Chandler Warner 59). Though readers, publishers, and critics of Early Readers may not have realized it, they do so as well. This literary format owes a great debt to Gertrude Chandler Warner; it is time that we recognize it.

Notes
1. They are: the University of Virginia, the University of Florida, the University of Chicago, the New York Public Library, and the Hennepin County Library in Minnetonka, MN.
2. In fact, of the dozens of these types of pieces that appeared over the decades, I found only one that mentioned the original 1924 release of Warner’s text: Connie Goddard’s “Boxcar Children Celebrate Golden Anniversary,” in the January 27, 1992, issue of Publishers Weekly. About midway through her article, Goddard remarks, “The Boxcar Children actually dates back more than 50 years ... It was originally a longer book, published by Rand McNally in 1924” (22). That said, this disclosure is the exception, not the rule. Overwhelmingly, reviewers and critics do not mention—and, in some cases, I would hazard to guess may even be unaware—that Warner’s book first debuted in 1924.
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