

living.”⁷ Hovhannes Mughrditchian’s son and publisher knew that his father’s memoirs had to be translated into English: “For our children and grandchildren, we knew we had to have an English-language version.”⁸

The memory of the Genocide reverberated in Diaspora Armenian literature as a source of identity, a leitmotiv, or a hidden theme. Successive generations of Diasporan writers tried to confront the Catastrophe (*Aghet*), comprehend it, and deal with it.⁹ These responses—narrative prose or poetry, eyewitness accounts, memoirs, or texts only remotely echoing the theme of the Genocide—cover a very broad spectrum and are immensely variegated. In general terms, they are crafted at a distance of time and space without direct experience of the Genocide, with the impetus of a transmitted pain or a suddenly discovered past, bearing the influence of different cultural, religious, environmental, and sociopolitical factors, and within different levels of skill and understanding of the poetics of genocide. These literary works are created with a variety of thrust and motivation.

By creating these works, the authors may seek catharsis in order to relieve the transgenerational pain. Leonardo Alishan, a third-generation Iranian-Armenian-American writer, was

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. x.

⁸ Mughrditchian, *To Armenians with Love* (1996), citation from the preface by Paul Martin, pp. xvii-xviii.

⁹ See Perroomian, *Literary Responses to Catastrophe* (1993), in which the literary responses to historical catastrophes culminating in the Genocide of 1915 are analyzed. See also *idem*, “New Directions in Literary Responses” (2003), in which the responses of second- and third-generation writers are examined.