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Dear Dr. Michael Tavel Clarke,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise my article, “Postcolonial Palimpsests: Entwined Colonialisms and the Conflicted Representation of Charles Bon in William Faulkner’s *Absalom, Absalom!*”. I found the readers’ reports to be very helpful, and I have addressed the suggestions of the readers in my revised draft. The most significant changes I have made are as follows:

1. I have streamlined and cut a number of the footnotes from the beginning of the article, and I would be happy to cut more if the readers think that is necessary.
2. I have worked to foreground my authorial voice in opening pages. For instance, I have added a more direct discussion of my argument to the end of the introduction both to help my own voice come across and also to more clearly show the relationship I envision between Bon's fluidity and the narrators’ colonial commitments.
3. I have developed my understanding of certain key terms: I have shifted from “deep colonialisms” to “entwined colonialisms,” which I think more exactly represents how I envision the overlapping temporal periods and various colonialisms interacting in the novel, as exemplified through Bon's story.  In paragraph 2, I flesh this concept out more fully, and in footnote 6, I explain how the periods are distinct but enmeshed due to the lingering power structures of colonialism (as opposed to conflated, which would result in non-identifiable temporal settings). I have also included a more detailed explanation of how I view Faulkner as “challenging” a linear model of progressive time in paragraph 2.
4. I have added a couple of sentences reiterating my argument to end of the theory heavy paragraph on page 8.
5. I have deepened my understanding of the interaction between Bon’s fluid race and sexuality and the entwined colonialisms and, as a result, I have reworked my use of the term “queer.” This more nuanced reading comes across most strongly through the added paragraph on page 11. I have also emphasized what I see as the pay-off to framing Bon’s sexuality as queer: such a reading privileges the subversive nature of his sexual fluidity and its potential to challenge plantation hierarchies.
6. I have included more references throughout to Bon’s existence as a narrative construction, and I acknowledge that even his fluidity is tied to the narrators’ portrayals of him (for instance on pages 4 and 7). However, I do not feel that his fluidity is tied exclusively to Mr. Compson’s version, as the second reader’s report implies, but that as a result of the various narrative constructions, he is necessarily multiple and mutable, which I assert on pages 4 and 7. Further, I argue that Bon’s fluidity is central to Quentin and Shreve’s conception of him as a biracial Haitian immigrant and his shifting racial positioning due to different cultural conceptions of race in Haiti and the US South.
7. I have reworked the sections that imply that there is an essential Bon that the narrators misrepresent. For example, I state that the narrators’ versions reveal more about themselves and their time periods than the social and political situation in Bon’s antebellum South (as opposed to Bon himself) on pages 5, 6, and 18.

Thank you again for the feedback and for taking the time to consider my revised essay. I am very open to making more changes as the readers see fit. I look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully yours,