

INTRODUCTION



Beginning in May–June 1915, when the plan for the Armenian genocide was put into practice under the Ottoman authorities’ supervision, the region of Bilad al-Sham saw an influx of tens of thousands of Armenian deportees. There is no precise information as to how many people there were in this mass of deportees, and I do not intend to enter into the debate about numbers here. What is certain is that those who arrived in this area represented a sizable proportion of the Armenian population of Cilicia and the towns and villages to the east of it. The new arrivals in the area also included human wrecks from Central and Western Anatolia as well as the Armenian High Plateau. Bilad al-Sham was an extensive region, roughly encompassing what is today western Syria, Lebanon, Israel, the Palestinian territories, and Jordan. It was in this vast region of the Ottoman Empire that, for more than three years, the Armenian deportees would wage a struggle to survive.

With the end of World War I in autumn 1918, it rapidly became apparent to an international public that Bilad al-Sham was the region harboring the largest concentration of Armenian genocide survivors. All had witnessed a human catastrophe. Death, disease, and misery had reigned uncontested over their environment. An entire social system was in shambles there. The deportees had found themselves needing to adapt to extreme conditions and comply with the pitiless laws of survival.

The present work sets out to reconstruct these historical times, in a sense. It proposes to examine a form of human existence bound up with the period in question, reconstruct the deportees' social environment, with its many-sided internal relations, and study the human reactions flowing directly from the spirit of the times and the singular conditions then created. It therefore stands to reason that the main axis of this study should be the Armenian deportees' day-to-day existence or, more precisely, the day-to-day concerns imposed by their struggle for survival. In that sense, the deportees are also the main protagonists of the present work, and the subject examined here is their peculiar world, in which prevailing conditions were harsh and survival had become a special art. For the same reasons, the focus here is not on the policies implemented by the chief architects of those extreme conditions—the Ottoman authorities and in particular the *Ittihat ve terakki* or Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), the party that held absolute power in the empire. Doubtless, we need to know the ruling party's political and ideological line, the Unionists' attitude toward the Ottoman Armenians, the way the genocidal project was carried out, and the various stages of its unfolding in order to arrive at an exact understanding of the overall situation of the Armenian deportees concentrated in Bilad al-Sham and the conditions of existence that flowed from it. Nevertheless, in no way do these factors, taken alone, open a window on the deportees' singular world. They do not allow us to observe and study the traumatized Armenians' daily lives and comprehend their inner state of mind under the extreme conditions, or the means they mobilized to cope with the catastrophe, or the unequal battle they waged against epidemics and dire poverty. None of these realities can appear straightforwardly or authentically in Ottoman state communications or reports, other Ottoman official documents, state laws, or even the Unionist leaders' secret correspondence.

For a minute examination at the level envisaged here, it is the deportees' personal testimony, their self-narration, that is of the greatest significance. In this perspective, diarists will not only be one of the present work's main themes but will even, as individuals giving an account of their own inner world, become our most important primary source. Under catastrophic conditions, diarists portray a collectivity whose mode of life and daily existence are, to say the very least, caught up in a process of radical change. In this sense, Andrea Löw notes that one of the most pertinent questions is the progressive disintegration of such a collectivity's frame of reference, which had been, under normal conditions, a factor promoting these people's security.¹ Such disintegration is

a hellish process that leads toward death. The best witness to it and its best interpreter is, I submit, the diarist.

In the case of the Armenian genocide, eyewitness testimony can take the form of retrospective narration, in which a survivor attempts to reconstitute his or her lived experience and transform it into common knowledge, whether in the guise of memoirs, correspondence, interviews, or art. When that happens, the narrative—apart from already being personal testimony with its own inherent value—simultaneously becomes subject to the influence of its present, that is, post-catastrophic times, and displays the traces of historical reconstruction. The language it uses is that of the personal testimony of its day; by the same token, the way questions are framed and the dominant conceptual approach correspond to the spirit of the times.² In addition to eyewitness accounts of this type, we also have texts written in the days of the catastrophe itself—diaries, letters, minutes of the meetings of public institutions or their account books—by writers who, facing an uncertain future, were incapable of prophesying their fate. What preoccupied them was their daily round, which survivors' memoirs do not, as a rule, emphasize to the same extent. Such quotidian events are especially observable in diaries, which contain texts and narrations whose ends and logical conclusions are very often unknown to their authors. According to Philippe Lejeune, the diarists here consent to work hand in hand with an unpredictable, uncontrollable future.³ They offer us scraps of real life, which, while undoubtedly subject to authorial self-censorship at the moment of their transformation into text, nevertheless manifestly bear the stamp of the authenticity of the moment. To be sure, what we see is not a live-action video, yet it *is* a life process in which we can very well observe a gradual transformation of the prevailing conditions, internal shifts, and manifold influences in their wake to which diarists and their associates were subject.

The present work does not reduce diaries to the role of mere ancillary documents that can provide confirmation of a historical event. On the contrary, it treats diaries as fundamental primary sources or “monuments,” to use Marc Nichanian’s expression; as such, these works of self-narration shed their status as purely factual, archival documents and are invested with new and enduring value.⁴ Throughout the present investigation, diaries will serve as our basic travel companions and guides. It is by way of diaries that we will be able to penetrate to the level of day-to-day life and expose the most minute yet simultaneously essential details. Diary entries will show us a family’s struggle to obtain its daily bread, the gradual impoverishment that deprived it of basic

nourishment, the mutual assistance family members gave each other and its limitations, the deaths of loved ones, and the conversions or other moral compromises made for the sake of survival. In their daily jottings, in a word, the diarists studied here depict a process—the gradual deterioration of day-to-day existence—whose culmination is unknown to them, although they know they are living through a human catastrophe, that death is pitilessly mowing down their loved ones, and that they themselves are helpless in the face of it all.

The diary regarded as a primary source acquires its full value when it proves possible to situate it in its true social and temporal context. Then we can comprehend personal testimony, illuminate its various and sometimes obscure facets, bring out its contradictions, underscore the novelties it transmits, and transform seemingly insignificant details into keys for deciphering events and situations. Carlo Ginzburg might never have succeeded in recreating Menocchio's sixteenth-century microcosm,⁵ had he not also had expert knowledge of the sects flourishing in the Friuli region in the medieval period. In other words, Ginzburg was closely acquainted with both the times of the miller who is his book's main protagonist and the social context he lived in. This allowed him to put Menocchio back in his native habitat, illuminate the hidden recesses of his personality, and penetrate to the heart of the thoughts he expressed.

From the standpoint of microhistory, I have also tried to respect this principle throughout the present work. That is, I have focused on individuals whose experiences and testimony shed light on a particular historical period. Our Menochios are two diarists, Father Der Nerses Tavukjian and Krikor Bogharian. In the years of the deportation they lived in the same places, Hama and Salamiyya, today neighbouring towns in Syria. By focusing on just one small area in Bilad al-Sham, their self-narration throws a spotlight on the day-to-day life of those deported there and, more generally, on the environment in which their struggle for survival took place. Nevertheless, as the other sources used in the present study show, my investigation of the situation of the Armenian deportees then living in Bilad al-Sham and the two localities just mentioned is part of a wider-ranging research project. This made it possible to place the Hama-Salamiyya microcosm in a broader social, economic, and political framework and to examine it in that perspective.

There is, of course, good reason for turning to this kind of description in two voices, based on a pair of diaries. Not only did Der Nerses and Bogharian find themselves in the same geographical areas, but their diaries are complementary. While Der Nerses's penetrating observations and psychological-intellectual analyses create scenes of moral dereliction and catastrophe *sui generis*, we gain intimate knowledge, thanks

to Bogharian, of the economically unusual state of local markets, the process of Islamization, and other fundamental matters of the kind that the priest from Ayntab rarely stops to consider. Here and there, moreover, the two diaries are interlinked, for the Tavukjian and Bogharian families had been on very close terms in Ayntab. Information about the Tavukjians appears in Bogharian's diary, and vice; I even found correspondence between the two families from the war years. All this explains why I have opted for the variant of a description in two voices: it is the most appropriate way to present a faithful picture of the deportees' everyday lives.

The two diarists at the center of the present study show us a tripolar social field that emerged under extreme conditions. These two deportees waged their own struggle for existence within the boundaries of that field. The first pole is the diarist himself, with his personal preoccupations, memories of the past, uncertainty about the future, constantly fluctuating moods, and moments of happiness and despondency. The second pole is his family, that immediate nucleus in which, on various levels, a spirit of cooperation prevails. That same nucleus is where the everyday trials and tribulations of the catastrophic environment come emphatically to the fore to be depicted in their true colors: epidemics, lack of food, consequences of dire poverty, deaths of loved ones. The third pole is the diarist's wider circle, which in the present case comprises the other deportees in Hama-Salamiyya, who in some sense constitute a prolongation of the life of his community of origin, as well as indigenous inhabitants, the local economy, prices of basic foodstuffs, and the town itself. Here the diarist is most likely to record impressions of his environment, portraying his compatriots' mode of life and efforts to adapt to local conditions and engage in remunerative economic activity; and describing the pervasive poverty, the unburied bodies, and the many different facets of the deportees' degradation and decline. In sum, the diaries allow me to chart the evolution of this tripolar microcosm, following an individual and familial experience while also observing the deterioration of environmental conditions, gradual disintegration of a social system, and especially, the dire impact that the extreme situation had on the deportees' way of life.

Without a doubt, Der Nerses's and Krikor Bogharian's diaries pertain chiefly to what these men saw and experienced in the three years and more of their deportation: the events that took place in their field of vision. The interpretations they offer surely also depend on their personal worldviews and their mood on the day a given diary entry was made. Phenomena of this sort, however, are not peculiar to diaries or the genre of self-narration in general. Rather, as I see it a subjective

factor is at work in all forms of textual expression, whether a letter, memoir, or state official's political report. Consequently, what is essential is not the primary source itself, but the methodology of the scholar utilizing it, that is, the extent of his or her familiarity with the subject under investigation and skill at locating it in a broader context. When the second desideratum is lacking, the scholarly work seems to lose its authenticity and fail in its attempt to reconstitute an accurate picture of the past. In this perspective, moreover, there is no difference between the intellectual productions of a scholar who consults thousands of documents in a state archive and another who bases his entire work on an eyewitness account by a single individual.⁶ In the case at hand, making diarists into main protagonists is an essential requirement flowing from the need to make the narrative as authentic as possible. On a topic of this kind, a deportee's insider's perspective is likewise indispensable, as it enables us to study and understand the influences at work in a given social structure, the individual strategies deployed in it, and many other details of the rapid transformation of a human life environment.

Throughout this study, it will be crucially important to set micro-historical observation in its wider context.⁷ Properly understood, the Armenians' environment in Hama-Salamiyya was never an isolated world. Its history was intimately bound up with the situation of Armenian deportees in other towns and villages of the Bilad al-Sham region. Of course, disparities between the peculiarities and distinct social systems of the various localities made for varying conditions in the villages and towns of Bilad al-Sham and their indigenous populations, and highlighted the differences between the groups of Armenian deportees that settled in them. For example, a majority of those deported to the agricultural district of Salamiyya were urban Armenians from Ayntab (present-day Gaziantep), whereas the big commercial city of Damascus was settled by substantial numbers of deportees from rural Western Anatolia, although it, too, saw the arrival of large numbers of urban deportees from Cilicia. Under these circumstances, local characteristics combined with the Armenian deportees' origin and character to create singular situations that heightened the disparities between the various places of deportation in Bilad al-Sham.

Naturally, this diversity contributed to shaping the deportees' strategies of survival. Armenians in Damascus could sometimes practice a trade or open a small business to earn a living. In contrast, large numbers of Armenians from Ayntab were forced to leave Salamiyya, which was basically an overgrown village, for the nearby town of Hama, where they expected to find job openings in their trade, weaving. All these phenomena underscore the importance of the local history of every one

of the Armenians' deportation destinations. Thus there is no gainsaying the significance of microhistorical study of the population centers in which the Armenian deportees found themselves, including Damascus, Amman, Homs, Jarash, Rayak, Salt, Aleppo, Hauran, and many others. Such study will surely shed new light on the extreme conditions generally encountered by the Armenians in this region. Yet, major disparities of this kind notwithstanding, it seems likely that the deportees faced the same basic problems no matter where they found themselves in Bilad al-Sham: epidemics, a steadily worsening economic crisis, the fear that they would be displaced again, steadily increasing food prices, the draft. These problems formed a whole. They appeared simultaneously throughout Bilad al-Sham with virtually the same intensity and evolved along the same lines. This points to a certain homogeneity in the environments in Bilad al-Sham in which Armenian deportees were struggling to survive, so that the essential difference resided in the means adopted to overcome the dangers that all faced.

Both Krikor Bogharian's and Der Nerses's diaries were published, and both were released in Beirut: Bogharian's in 1973, Der Nerses's in 1991. Bogharian's published diary comprises a chapter in a general work entitled Յեղասպան թուրքը, վկայություններ քաղուած՝ հրաշքով փրկուածներու գրոյցներէն (The genocidal Turk: Eyewitness accounts culled from the accounts of people who were miraculously saved). This chapter is eighty-one pages long (the pages measure 5.5 by 9.4 inches, or 14 by 21.3 centimeters). Der Nerses's diary, edited by Toros Toranian, begins in 1909 and continues, with interruptions, up to 1933. In all, the diary contains 393 pages (6.3 by 9.3 inches, or 16 by 23.5 centimeters). Entries for the three years from deportation to liberation take up 95 pages. Efforts to obtain the manuscript of Bogharian's diary were unsuccessful, but I had better luck in Der Nerses's case. Thus the diarist is known to have settled in Aleppo in the early 1920s and continued to live there until he was murdered in 1934. After his death, one of the priest's sons, Kevork Nersoyan, undertook to have the diary recopied, with the obvious intention of publishing it. This task was accomplished by Father Kalusd Ekmekjian, who prepared a manuscript, that is, a typed copy of as much of the diary as was contained in the notebooks put at his disposal. Missing from Ekmekjian's typescript are the entries covering the period from October 1911 to May 1915. It might be supposed that the priest from Ayntab did not keep a diary in this period. However, the periodical Հայ Անթէպ [Armenian Anteb] contains information that tends to invalidate this assumption: the single issue published in 1965 reproduces a diary entry for 14 November 1913 under the title "Extracts from Father Der Nerses' Tavukjian's Diary." This entry

merely provides supplementary biographical information about Bishop Papken Gyuleserian (the future Catholicos of Antelias Papken I).⁸ But the very fact that it exists suggests that Der Nerses most probably kept his diary without interruption and that the entries for the nearly three-year period encompassing the pre-war and early war years are simply missing from the typed variant of the text. It is highly likely that the notebooks containing these entries had been entrusted to compatriots of Der Nerses's from Ayntab who later prepared various publications about the town, to which the information in the priest's diaries would have represented a very valuable contribution. It would follow that it is by no means simple happenstance that the 1913 entry turns up in Հայ Անթաթ, a journal published in Beirut: Krikor Bogharian was the editor of the journal, which contains only material about Armenians in Ayntab. The rest of the notebooks containing the diary may well have met a very typical end, going from hand to hand, never becoming available to Kalusd Ekmekjian, and eventually being lost without a trace.

What remains at a scholar's disposal, besides the published text, is thus the typescript of Der Nerses's diary, comprising a total of eight hundred pages measuring 8.3 by 11.7 inches (21 by 29.7 cm). Entries for the period running from the deportation to liberation comprise eighty-four pages. It is most fortunate that this variant was available, for there are major discrepancies between the typed and the published versions of the text. The editor of the published book evidently cut many entries about the illnesses and, especially, epidemic diseases that befell Der Nerses's family, as well as scenes in which the sick received care. Also occasionally excised are evocations of the degradation the deportees underwent under the extreme conditions they faced. This is unfortunate, because information of this kind sometimes holds the key to understanding Der Nerses's day-to-day life, the conditions of his and his family's existence, and their struggle for survival.

It should be pointed out here that while conducting research for the present study I was able to consult, besides Der Nerses's and Bogharian's diaries, other writings by the two men that shed further light on the deportees' environment in the Salamiyya-Hama area. These are personal testimonials, such as letters written during the years of the deportation or thereafter, autobiographical notes written thereafter, and essays and books that, in aggregate, lead to a better understanding of our two diarists, their personalities, and their times. In Bogharian's case, it proved possible to obtain (in addition to his many published articles and books) some of his personal papers, housed in the archives of Beirut's Haigazian University. As for Der Nerses, the portion of his legacy that may be characterized as personal testimonial consists instead in the

countless letters he wrote, many of which it proved possible to find in the seat of the Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia in Antelias (near Beirut) or in the central archive of the Armenian General Benevolent Union in Cairo. Other important material was available in the archives of the Armenian Prelacy of Aleppo, which house Armenian community institutions' minutes and account books from the period of the deportation. Although they rarely directly concern the Hama-Salamiyya area, these documents nevertheless proved to be precious primary sources for understanding the fundamental problems facing deported Armenians in Bilad al-Sham and for retracing the complicated operations required to provide assistance to the traumatized people there. In the final analysis, all these documents served the same ultimate purpose: they are a means to understand the strategies of survival developed by the deportees in the Hama-Salamiyya area, the many obstacles in their path, and their daily battle to obtain food and stay alive.

At the same time, research done for the present study showed that the genre of the diary has been badly neglected in studies of the Armenian Genocide. Deportees who kept diaries are far from rare; Der Nerses and Bogharian were but two of many. In particular, these diarists include priests (I have no special explanation for this), along with well-read young people like Bogharian and still others who had only an elementary school education. In a word, keeping a diary during the genocide appears to have been a widespread practice among Armenians from nearly every social stratum. The essential question, however, is how these diaries were ultimately utilized. Many who found it inappropriate to publish their survival experiences in diary form; instead reworked their diaries, transforming them into autobiography. As a result, to borrow Philippe Lejeune's and Catherine Bogaert's expression, their writing "lost its essential feature, namely, the authenticity of the moment."⁹ Hayg Aramian's book is a text of this kind: clearly the author based this work on his diary, but thoroughly revised the day-to-day entries decades after the events took place, introduced new analyses, and published the whole in the form of a memoir.¹⁰ Although Vahram Dadrian did not go to the same extreme, he too later revised his diary, which he began to keep at the age of fifteen. Thus, entries dated between 1919 and 1922 and consisting of succinct notes were expanded, and narratives by other eyewitnesses were grafted onto them, and thereby the "authenticity of the moment" was, in short, dealt a heavy blow.¹¹ As we shall see in Chapter 1, Bogharian's diary likewise holds traces of later editing. The field of Armenian Genocide studies includes many other texts of personal testimony that were later edited and prepared for publication, not by their authors, but by others. Editors have often seen fit,

in Krikor Beledian's phrase, to "make these texts acceptable," that is, to "upgrade" them by rewriting them, given that their authors were not writers, historians, or college graduates.¹² The publicist Vahram Mavian, son of a priest from Zeytun (present-day Süleymanlı) named Der Hagop Mavian, opted to publish only selected entries from the notebooks containing his deported father's diaries; what is more, he included them in a work in which his own memoirs and his father's diaries are paired off and interwoven.¹³

All this, of course, testifies to a lack of awareness of the inherent value of diaries. However, I am convinced that, in some circumstances, this underestimation of diaries also stems from what might be defined as an extreme sense of shame or self-accusation. For instance, an attentive reading of Der Nerses's or Krikor Bogharian's diaries justifies the supposition that the two of them recorded episodes (personal or not) or moral compromises made for the sake of survival that would be regarded as unacceptable and blameworthy, both from the standpoint of the reconstructed Armenian historiography of the postwar period and, more generally, when measured against the social norms prevailing in their community. These are diaries whose authors, together with some members of their immediate families, were genocide survivors. The fact that they had to give accounts to postwar Armenian society very probably weighed quite heavily on these individuals and their descendants. They would consequently have felt a pressing need to revise their or their relative's work, insert explanations, bring the text into line with the spirit of the times, publish only excerpts or, going still further, simply leave them unpublished, with the result that entire diaries have been lost with the passage of time.

Meanwhile, another factor that also has to do with the domestic Armenian climate in the postwar period is the genocide's transformation into a tale of martyrs and heroes. It is evident that the countless victims led off to slaughter were the martyrs, while the heroes were those who leveled rifles at their executioners, fought with arms in hand, and fell on the field of unequal battle. However, as Yehuda Bauer rightly notes about the Jewish Holocaust, "there is no justification for turning Holocaust history into a hagiography of the victims."¹⁴ Bauer continues: "It is wrong to demand, in retrospect, that these tortured individuals and communities should have behaved as mythical heroes."¹⁵ In an atmosphere of this kind, the survivors' self-narration of their day-to-day struggles, the concessions they made for the sake of staying alive, and their departures from their own moral standards may, at first glance, seem to have nothing heroic about them and to be far removed from scenes of massacre and armed resistance. Sadly,

this fact has helped shape decisions about whether diaries and, more generally, personal testimonials are made available to the public. The economic factor has also had an impact: many authors who would like to see their self-narrative texts published have lacked the funds needed to realize this wish. The result is that, to the present day, family attics and institutional archives are bulging with countless works that are still waiting to see the light.

This book is divided into five chapters. The first introduces the two diarists, Der Nerses and Krikor Bogharian. It also provides a description of the surroundings in which these two deportees lived and information regarding their families. The focus here tends to be on the first phase of deportation, in which families and relatives were still mostly together. Many Ayntab residents lived together in exile. Family savings were not yet depleted. But how long could family and community mutual support—a primary means of survival—last in such extreme conditions?

The second chapter examines the general situation in Bilad al-Sham. The Armenians deported to this region were not subjected to mass slaughter. How, then, should we describe this environment, in which the deportees often ran a pitiless race against time at a murderous pace? The chapter focuses on the nationalist-colonialist policies of Ahmed Jemal Pasha, commander of the Ottoman Fourth Army, whose field of operations was Bilad al-Sham. It is primarily based on testimony by our two diarists. This chapter also examines the presence in Salamiyya of Ayntab residents and deportees from other regions. The narrator here is mainly Bogharian, who describes the surroundings and the local populace. Early on, local conditions were relatively encouraging. But the life of an Armenian deportee depended mostly on outside factors. Deportees and their families were far removed from the minimum conditions necessary to create a stable life and to ensure ways of surviving. Thus Salamiyya, while initially promising some modicum of protection, would soon become an unbearable place for many.

The third chapter examines each of the three links in a “money-food-connections” chain that defined the context in which these Armenians carried out their struggle for survival. Demonstrably, all three links represented means of survival. Each was closely bound to the others, and elimination of any one of them could bring the whole process of adaptation and survival to a halt, with fatal consequences for the deportees. Under the conditions that prevailed in the Hama-Salamiyya region, exemplified by the experiences of Der Nerses’s and Krikor Bogharian’s own families, all three links were progressively weakened as time went on, making the effort required for survival more onerous. This situation harbored the obvious threat of an irreversible decline that hung over

the heads of every last deportee in the region, Der Nerses and Krikor Bogharian included.

In the fourth chapter I follow the diarists' path, introducing failed attempts to survive as the specter of death loomed ever larger within Hama-Salamiyya. Der Nerses in particular writes of the period beyond this stage—more precisely, the period that began in 1917—and thus becomes a witness to moral decline. Hunger and epidemic diseases pushed the death rate to merciless levels, and the deportees attempting to cope with this state of affairs had become, generally speaking, weak, spent creatures. Der Nerses often says of the deportees at this stage that they had “become animals,” meaning that their whole social structure had collapsed, obliterating the normal human relations on which it was founded.

The fifth and final chapter highlights how the deportees were now ready to make all sorts of compromises for the sake of surviving, engaging in behavior they would have abhorred under normal conditions. Here I describe the forced collective Islamization of Armenians in Hama-Salamiyya—which, however, was not salvation, but just one of several steps taken in order to survive. Deportees' struggles to survive in such extreme conditions continued, many times proving fatal. In Krikor Bogharian's family, a fortunate transformation due to initiative taken by his mother, Santukhd, would ensure the family's survival. At the same time, however, Der Nerses's family, like the majority of deportee families, experienced a period of mortal agony. This is how things continued until the end of World War I.

Notes

1. Andrea Löw, *Juden im Getto Litzmannstadt. Lebensbedingungen, Selbstwahrnehmung, Verhalten* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006), p. 45.
2. Annette Wieviorka, *L'ère du témoin* (Paris: Hachette littératures, 1998), p. 13.
3. Philippe Lejeune, *On Diary*, ed. Jeremy Popkin and Julie Rak (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), p. 20.
4. Marc Nichanian, *The Historiographic Perversion*, trans. Gil Anidjar (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), pp. 93–94.
5. Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, trans. John and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).
6. See Elke Hartmann and Gabriele Jancke, “Roupens ‘Erinnerungen eines armenischen Revolutionärs’ (1921/51) im transepochnalen Dialog – Konzepte und Kategorien der Selbstzeugnis-Forschung zwischen Universalität und Partikularität,” in Claudia Ulbrich, Angelika Schaser, and Hans Medick, eds., *Selbstzeugnis und Person – Transkulturelle Perspektiven* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2012), pp. 31–71; “Rupeni

- ‘Hay heghapokhagani me hishadagnere,’ inknavgayutyan arargay yev badmakragan aghpyur” [Rupen’s “Memoirs of an Armenian Revolutionary” as self-presentation and historical source], in National Archives of Armenia, ed., *Rupen Der Minasian: Pasdatghteri yev nyuteri zhoghovadzu* [Rupen Der Minasian: Documents and materials] (Yerevan: National Archives of Armenia, 2011), pp. 39–48.
7. See Carlo Ginzburg, “Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about It,” *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 1 (Autumn 1993): 21–24.
 8. “Hadvadzner Der Nerses Kahana Tavukjiani orakiren” [Selections from Father Nerses Tavukjian’s diary] *Hay Anteb* 6, no. 3 (1965): 66–67.
 9. Philippe Lejeune and Catherine Bogaert, *Le journal intime. Histoire et anthologie* (Paris: Textuel, 2006), pp. 23–24.
 10. Hayg A. Aramian, *Hayots Danteagan: Medz yegherni badkam. Kavaran yev hrashali Harutyun* [The Armenian Purgatorio: The message of the great tragedy; Purgatory and miraculous resurrection] (Beirut: Donigian, 1970).
 11. Vahram Dadrian, *To the Desert: Pages from My Diary*, trans. Agop Hacikyan (London: Gomidas Institute, 2006).
 12. Krikor Beledian, “Traduire un témoignage écrit dans la langue des autres,” in Vahram and Janine Altounian, eds., *Mémoires du génocide arménien. Héritage traumatique et travail analytique* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2009), p. 98.
 13. Vahram Mavian, *Ampoghchagan yerger* [Complete works] (Antelias: Catholicosate of Cilicia, 1993), pp. 235–242.
 14. Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 149.
 15. Ibid.

Selected Bibliography

Published Material

- Altounian, Vahram and Janine, eds., *Mémoires du génocide arménien. Héritage traumatique et travail analytique*. Paris, 2009.
- Aramian, Hayg A. Հայոց Տանթական. Մեծ եղեռնի պատգամ. Քաւարան եւ հրաշալի Յարութիւն [Hayots Danteagan: Medz yegherni badkam. Kavaran yev hrashali Harutyun] [The Armenian Purgatorio: The message of the great tragedy; Purgatory and miraculous resurrection]. Beirut, 1970.
- Bauer, Yehuda. *Rethinking the Holocaust*. New Haven and London, 2002.
- Dadrian, Vahram. *To the Desert: Pages from My Diary*, trans. Agop Hacikyan. London, 2006.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, trans. John and Anne Tedeschi. Baltimore, 1992.
- “Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about It,” *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 1 (Autumn 1993): 10–35.
- Lejeune, Philippe and Bogaert, Catherine. *Le journal intime. Histoire et anthologie*. Paris, 2006.
- Löw, Andrea. *Juden im Getto Litzmannstadt. Lebensbedingungen, Selbstwahrnehmung, Verhalten*. Wallstein, 2006.
- Mavian, Vahram. Ամբողջական Երկեր [Ampoghchagan yerger] [Complete works]. Antelias, 1993.
- Nichanian, Marc. *The Historiographic Perversion*, trans. Gil Anidjar. New York, 2009.

Popkin, Jeremy and Rak, Julie, eds. *On Diary*. Honolulu, 2009.

Ulbrich, Claudia, Schaser, Angelika and Medick, Hans, eds. *Selbstzeugnis und Person – Transkulturelle Perspektiven*. Vienna, 2012.

Wieviorka, Annette. *L'ère du témoin*. Paris, 1998.

Ռուբեն Տեր Մինասյան. փաստաթղթերի և նյութերի ժողովածու [Rupen Der Minasian: Pasdatghteri yev nyuteri zhoghovadzu] [Rupen Der Minasian: Documents and materials]. Yerevan, 2011.

“Հատուածներ Տեր Ներսէս Քհնյ. Թավուզճեանի օրագիրէն” [Hadvadzner Der Nerses Kahana Tavukjiani orakiren] [Selections from Father Nerses Tavukjian’s diary] *Hay Anteb* 6, no. 3 (1965): 66–67.