

in particular—again in artistic literature, as before. This shift, or this modified approach, is reflected in articles that I have published and presentations that I have made in recent years.

The second and more important reason is the fact that I could not rely on Turkish-Armenian literature to explore the Turkish-Armenian literary responses to the Catastrophe. There were none. Surviving Armenian intellectuals gathered in postwar Constantinople made superhuman attempts to overcome the devastating effects of the destruction of the Armenian people and to find the means, that is, literary directions, to transcend the Catastrophe. The short-lived *Bardzravank* literary movement initiated in 1922 by Vahan Tekeyan, Hagop Oshagan, Kostan Zarian, Shahan Berberian, and others was an attempt toward that goal. That movement and the literary output it entailed promised a new revival in the history of Western Armenian literature.⁴ The path to reach that revival necessitated facing the past, comprehending the Catastrophe, confronting and responding to it. Oshagan's *Kayserakan haghtergutiun* (Imperial song of triumph) best exemplifies the new direction.⁵

⁴ A periodical of the same name, *Bartsravank*, was published as the organ of this literary movement in 1922. The movement and its periodical met their end under the threat of the Kemalist advances on Constantinople.

⁵ Oshagan, *Kayserakan haghtergutiun* (1983). In his preface to this collection of five stories from this period, Oshagan gives his interpretation of the events of 1915 and the role of Kaiser Wilhelm as an indifferent bystander to the events. He discusses the German conspiracy in a later work, *Mnatsordats* (1932–33). For a discussion of these works, see the chapter on Oshagan in Perroomian, *Literary Responses to Catastrophe* (1993), pp. 173–215.