

approach in literary criticism to help me navigate the labyrinth of Armenian Genocide literature.

My field of research and study is, and has always been, artistic or creative literature, because I believe that it is through this literature, and not through facts and figures, that the psyche of a people subjected to an unthinkable and immeasurable collective trauma is revealed. It is by reading deeply in this literature that one can come close to understanding the universal truth that lies at the roots of historical documentations. In other words, it is creative literature that brings inconceivable realities into human perspective and facilitates understanding of the complex concept of genocide. It is impossible to penetrate the world of the Armenian Genocide without reading the literary responses to it. Hendrik Willem van Loon (1882–1944), a Dutch-American historian of the first half of the twentieth century, is quoted as attesting that more than 40 boxes of reports and documents were sent to the League of Nations to help support the Armenian cause but that none of them were able to play the role that Franz Werfel's *Forty Days of Musa Dagh* played. The Nazis were aware of the power of this genre of literature when they launched a book-burning campaign as soon as they came to power. Of course, the Turkish government of the time quickly followed suit, forcing Armenians to denounce Werfel's novel and throw copies of the book, together with images of the author, into a bonfire at a cemetery in Istanbul.

I have relied on the power of this literature, the literature of atrocity, to use Lawrence Langer's term, to understand and to convey to my readers the huge impact of the Armenian Genocide on the generations of survivors. By the analysis,