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Dear Faye Halpern and Michael Clarke,

Many thanks, again, for considering my submission to *ARIEL*. Numerous substantive and structural revisions have been made in accordance with the reader’s suggestions.

The theoretical context in the introduction has been refined for the purposes of concision, and the novel is mentioned much earlier in the introduction. The central thesis, which was originally at the end of the third paragraph, now opens the second paragraph and is prefaced by explicit statements that clarify the essay’s intent and methodology. In addition, the thesis is restated and elaborated at the end of page 3 and beginning of page 4 to emphasize the essay’s methodology, focus, and broader implications:

In effect, by studying Bergen’s novel through the lens of trauma theory and postcolonial politics, this essay reveals the extent to which trauma can reconcile cultural ruptures and address power imbalances: although the traumatic nightmare allows for cultural reconciliation, it does so only to a degree; *The Time in Between* recognizes the need for alternative modes of political awareness, and thereby complicates any absolute or simplistic application of Caruth’s assertion that trauma “may provide the very link between cultures,” particularly in a postcolonial context.

The revised introduction thus indicates that the essay discusses both representations of trauma in the novel, particularly as proof of intercultural reconciliation, and offers a critique of trauma theory from the perspective of postcolonial politics. It also addresses the reader’s concerns with the impression that “the novel has been deliberately constructed to respond to the limitations of trauma theory.” I have tried to indicate that the essay is my interpretation of the novel through the lens of trauma theory and postcolonial politics, and in doing so, hope the argument no longer suggests the novel is a programmatic response to discourses of trauma.

 The structure of the essay has also been revised to address the reader’s concerns with the unequal treatment given to the section entitled “Animal Killings.” Given the reader’s valid reservations about the interpretation of Tomas in this sub-section, I have decided to remove the “Animal Killings” portion of the argument. The essay is now composed of two more equally balanced sections. Parts of the original “Animal Killings” section on the significance of parallelism in the novel have now been incorporated into the second subheading, which reads “Beyond Apolitical Humanism: Parallelism, Self-reflexivity, and Aporia.” In addition, the reader asked that clear distinctions between the various levels of narration be provided, particularly in discussions of parallelism. I have elaborated paragraphs on pages 5-6, 7, 12-13 to enhance these distinctions. In particular, narrative terminology, such as diegesis and metadiegesis, has been introduced to distinguish these levels of narration. The section on the Gothic (pp 9-14) has also been revised to address abrupt transitions and lack of clear signposting. Also, as suggested by the reader, further proof of Charles Boatman’s temporal confusion has been added in a new paragraph on pages 7-8. I have tried to address the reader’s concerns with causal fallacies on p.16 by incorporating Linda Hutcheon’s discussion of humanism. Hopefully, this theoretical context will explain more clearly the logical progression of the argument here. The conclusion has also been set off and elaborated in accordance with the reader’s suggestions. Finally, I have tried to clarify prose and diction for enhanced precision and accuracy.