

JCR MANUSCRIPT REVIEW HISTORY 002-3 (REVISION NOTES FROM AUTHORS)

First, we extend our appreciation for this conditional acceptance revision opportunity. We have tried our best to fulfill the editor's challenge to transform the paper from a solid to a strong contribution. This very constructive set of reviews greatly helped us to hone our analysis and points of theoretical contribution.

Our major editorial directives were to 1) revamp the introduction so that the paper's aims and major nomological constructs are revealed more quickly and clearly; 2) clarify and highlight our theoretical contributions vis a vis Peñaloza (2000); 3) resolve the terminological slippage that occurred in various passages throughout the paper; and 4) better foreshadow the concluding discussion, which as Reviewer C pointed out, was not sufficiently connected to the preceding analysis. Our strategies for implementing these directives are outlined below.

Per directive 1, we have completely rewritten the introduction (pages 4-9). In the previous introduction, we struggled to forge an effective balance between the substantive and theoretical aspects of the study. In hindsight, this dilemma reflected that we had not fully crystallized our analytic objectives and theoretical framework. In this version, we have resolved that shortcoming. We feel that our higher order theoretical aims and contributions are now clearly delineated and explained. Given this sharper theoretical positioning and take-away, we can also be more upfront (in the literal and figurative sense) about our context of investigation and its relationship to the higher order theoretical goals and contributions. Overall, we believe this new balance of the substantive and theoretical makes for a better read and it eliminates the rambling and convoluted transition from theory to context that the reviewers identified.

In terms of the theoretical positioning, the AE's recommendation that we consult the work of Halbwachs and related research proved exceedingly helpful. Drawing from this literature, we have significantly refined our conceptualization, most particularly in terms of the distinction between collective and popular memories (a clarification which is now reflected in our revised title).

This improvement has also eliminated much of the terminological slippage that plagued the prior version (i.e., directive #3). However, there were some other semantic confusions posed by our muddled references to the Celtic myth, thesis, and stereotype. A similar inconsistency arose in our various designations of the Moonlight and Magnolias myth. In this version, we consistently use Celtic myth throughout. We now also refer to the Moonlight and Magnolias myth as a complement to the Lost Cause myth, rather than as a narrative variant of the latter. This formulation is conceptually cleaner and more accurate from a historical standpoint.

In the parsimonious spirit of solving two problems in one rhetorical stroke (i.e., directives 2 and 4), our introduction foreshadows theoretical connections to Peñaloza

(2000, 2001) and better sets the stage for our subsequent theoretical take-away points. Our concluding discussion (pages 45-49) now presents an extended discussion of our key contributions and theoretical extensions to Peñaloza (2000, 2001). This discussion also provides the much needed segue to our broader theoretical reconfiguration of the meaning transfer model that we abstracted from the analysis of New South mythmaking.

AE concerns:

1. More thoroughly discuss the South's Bible Belt legacy and the distinctive characteristics of Southern religiosity.

We beg for the mercy of the court. We can't begin to tackle this very involved and socio-culturally complex topic without expanding the paper's length beyond all reason. As a compromise, we have added a footnote (footnote # 3, page 16) that outlines some of the key historical conditions that have shaped the institutional and cultural contours of Southern religion in the postbellum era. In this same footnote, we also direct readers to Stowell's (1998) widely heralded and quite comprehensive history of the effects that the Civil War and Congressional reconstruction had on denominational organizations and religious practices in the former Confederate states and their corresponding manifestations in the religious lives of Southerners. We hope that this compromise will suffice.

2. Miscommunication regarding the Southern Gothic tradition

Regarding the AE's concerns about our reference to the Southern gothic literary tradition, Please see footnote 4, page 20 where we clarify that, in agreement with your comment, the Southern gothic literary tradition took a critical stance toward the lost cause myth. We have added a sentence to reinforce that this narrative motif does not constitute the totality of the genre.

In closing, the *JCR* review process has been truly instrumental to the theoretical evolution and enrichment of this paper. We fully understand and appreciate the time and effort that has been invested by the editors and reviewers in our work. We hope that this version provides a worthwhile pay-off for these investments. We look forward to your evaluations.