

**THE MIDDLE EAST LIBRARIANS' ASSOCIATION**

**OCCASIONAL PAPERS  
IN  
MIDDLE EASTERN LIBRARIANSHIP**

**NUMBER 1**

**EDITED BY  
DAVID H. PARTINGTON**

Copyright 1981 MELA

MELA, the Middle East Librarians' Association, is a private, non-profit, non-political organization of librarians and others interested in those aspects of librarianship which support the study of or dissemination of information about the Middle East.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Middle East Librarians' Association gratefully acknowledges a generous contribution toward the publishing costs of this first issue of Occasional Papers made by the Harvard University Middle East Center through Professor Dennis Skiotis.

## INTRODUCTION

The Middle East Librarians' Association was established in 1972 to meet a need felt by a number of individuals involved with Middle Eastern collections in American libraries for an organization that would focus attention upon a range of problems -- from the practical and technical to the intellectual and speculative -- with the expectation that the sharing of professional concerns would lead to improved library service for the promotion of scholarship. Toward that end, MELA holds annual meetings and publishes MELA Notes, which conveys items of current interest to the membership.

The annual meetings have occasionally brought forth papers worthy of preservation in a durable format. Now, with this first issue of Occasional Papers, MELA initiates a continuing series to convey studies produced by its members to wider reaches of the library world.

Issue no. 1 of Occasional Papers contains all the papers presented at the annual meeting in November, 1979, held at Salt Lake City. Missing is a technical presentation on the impact of AACR II, delivered by Ms. Frances Morton of the Library of Congress, and a briefing paper on the Near East Union Catalog by Dr. George Atiyeh, also of the Library of Congress. Future issues of the Occasional Papers may or may not reflect MELA's annual program.

The Salt Lake City program was designed so that papers were presented on the three perennial areas of professional library concern: technical services; collection building or acquisition; and reference. In addition, Dr. Veronica Pantelides submitted a paper that addressed the issue of library school education and its applicability to Middle Eastern librarianship, and Mr. James Pollock, the first and now retired editor of MELA Notes, provided insights into the nature of our professional calling.

David H. Partington  
Cambridge, Mass.  
October 22, 1980

## CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	iii
What is a Middle East Librarian? James W. Pollock . . . . .	1
The Computer as Romanizer, Chris Filstrup . . . . .	7
Problems in Armenian Collection Development And Technical Processing in U.S. Libraries, Gia Aivasian . . . . .	16
Persian Publishing and Persian Collections In U.S. Research Libraries, With a Partial Supplement to Iraj Afshar's Bibliography of Bibliographies for Persian Studies, 'Abbas Sepehri . . . . .	35
Current Problems in the Acquisition of Library Materials from Turkey, Robert F. Zeidner . . . . .	58
Problems of the Middle East Specialist In Small Libraries, Brenda Bickett . . . . .	64
Bibliographic Instruction for Students of the Middle East, Francine McNulty . . . . .	67
Toward Bibliographic Control of the Arabic Literature of the New World, Fawzi Abdulrazak . . . . .	74
The Role of the Library School in the Career of the Middle Eastern Librarian, Veronica S. Pantelidis . . . . .	79
Non-Print Resources for Study of the Middle East, Marsha McClintock . . . . .	86



## CONTRIBUTORS

Fawzi Abdulrazak is the Arabic Language Specialist in the Middle Eastern Department, Harvard College Library. Mr. Abdulrazak is the author of Arabic Historical Writing (1974- ).

Gia Aivasian is the Head of the Armenian Collection in the Research Library, University of California at Los Angeles.

Brenda Bickett is the Arabic Specialist in the University Library, Georgetown University, Washington.

Chris Filstrup is Head of the Oriental Division, New York Public Library.

Marsha McClintock is the Middle Eastern Librarian, Ohio State University

Francine McNulty is the Middle Eastern Cataloger, Middle Eastern Department, Harvard College Library.

Veronica Pantelidis is professor of library science, East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C., and is the author of two major bibliographies: Arab Education, 1956-1978; and The Arab World, Libraries and Librarianship, 1960-1976.

James W. Pollock is Head of the Near East Collection, Indiana University Library.

'Abbas Sepehri is Head of the Middle East Collection, University of Texas, Austin.

Robert F. Zeidner (Col.) is a member of the Middle East Center, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

## What Is A Middle East Librarian ?

The word "caboose" is intriguing to me. I first met it as the name of one of the cars on a real or model railroad. As a motorist I know it is the second most important part of the train to watch for. As a young Arabist I noted the smiling grimace that an older Egyptian friend made when I used the word in his shop. Then there is the venerable old personal name entry we have, spelled with a "Q" in romanization. Lately, I looked in an Arabic dictionary to see why my friend had once put his hand over his face. A nightmare--that is the meaning!

Now these concluding words from your poverty-stricken servant, the possessor of a nightmare-- 'Abdak al-Faqir al-Shaykh Abū al-Kābūs. And our topic is a question to which I give answer.

Question: What is a Middle East Librarian, or Who are We?; answer: The Film and The Curtain.

After this great day of review I am proud of my job in Middle East Librarianship. The mental parade of your many research questions and your technical and public interests has recruited my thoughts. You notice that I have joined up and am capering along out of step behind the orderly lines you have drawn. Other people's thinking, you see, always turns my head, to see where the action was. That is why this librarian wants to come to MESA, and why I was so glad to heat up the water when young MELA took her first bath in public, watched by other approving area librarians from all our four coasts. MELA is still very young as the calendar flips. But is it not true comrades, watch dogs and work dogs that we are, one year with us is like seven with anyone else, and we are therefore riper and wiser than we seem? Ay na'am!

Next week you may find on your desk a letter from the University of Chihuahua asking your help in finding a good Middle East librarian. What will you look for in the position description? To use the knife-thrower's jargon, is the description "on target" as a precise outline? Or, is the teaching and book program and librarian's salary founded and funded on quicksand money from the Gulf of Ben Adam located



somewhere East of Suez? Why, you will think, must the librarian be able to speak conversational Berberese in order to help patrons who otherwise do not comprehend? Few of us would try to fit ourselves into that profile, on the reasonable suspicion that someone else was being vaguely described, and also because we do know what Middle East librarianship is about.

Today we have mentally grasped many of the control handles by which our jobs are operated. All areas of the total vocation have been freshly scrubbed. As we reflect on the situation, (here there is a change of metaphor) I'm sure we all feel that we have uncovered a number of tender but glowing-with-health-and-growing edges to our job perspective. By your leave I would like to continue using and changing metaphors to sketch my impression of Middle East librarianship--of who we are. The theme is posed as a question, and my reply only creates more questions and problems I dare say. My answer to the question "What is a Middle East Librarian?" is that we are--The Film and The Curtain. Briefly translated, we are the personification of our library's records, and we are the interpreter standing between civilizations.

The African Studies Archivists and Librarians have just finished their meeting in Los Angeles. Their great continent has individual societies nearly beyond number that are developing gradually from oral to written cultures. I think a living vestige of oral tradition, one that is kept in use among us by verbatim legal records and journalistic interviews, is in the question and answer or dialogue formats we find in religious literary writings. Middle East librarians have the books of answers or opinions on religious law along with the questions that called them forth. Theology and philosophy stimulate the writing of commentaries in the "He said"/"I say" format, or in the pattern of "They may argue"/"But we reply" polemics and apologetics. And literary production in poetry and prose is full of dialogue with real or symbolic characters. Our libraries are the repositories of these records of conversation or monologue. Carefully composed statements in free sentences of prose or measured and rhyming poetry are first of all for reciting by the mouth of a speaker to the ears of those who hear. After that the statements are written down and preserved in more or less rare and precious books. What I say now is for you; and what you have said today is for me. We have today's record on paper, a thin sheet of mixed plant fibers. More importantly and to the point, we have the proceedings permanently stored in the electronic film pathways of our brains. Conscious replay of these

films is of course slow and faulty, because by habit we rely so much on written records; but the storage function is active and orderly. With practice, and with our attention expanded and focussed by interest in our work, our librarian's role as the film can become more useful and satisfying.

By this I don't mean that we should become walking microfilms or encyclopedias. No, my friends, not even a walking card catalog! But we do know the access points to our reference sources and catalogs. We should also know how to interview a patron needing help, and be able to locate in his mind just what he wants to say. I have found, to my surprise, that some patrons go away happy with a minimum of factual gain but a maximum of healthy mental exercise in the question and answer interview. Access is improved to their own stored information, so that their power of analysis and evaluation is freed up for action. No longer does the student's mind seem like an automobile motor embedded in grease hardened by a cold winter's night.

Let us pursue the metaphor of our role as the film personification a bit further. Will one of you here please carry this recording tape-end to the entrance of this meeting room? (Rest of tape on reel is held by speaker.) Thank you. There in representation you see the first parent of our race, going back long before written or grammatical speech developed, an actual person to whom I myself am related at this moment. And for each of you there is a direct line to our first parent also, but individually different from my direct line. On each line there is recorded the experiences, judgments and feelings of the past. My record is actively, electrically and wonderfully influenced by your records, as each of us can say. And I do not stop there, but I believe there is much more that is available, and credible to be said. Limits to perception and understanding I think are often self-imposed. In our conversation with patrons, with each other, and with the writers and voices of the past, the only limits to perception and communication of meaning are the proved wisdom that protects society's general welfare, and the swift movement of the film on its reel of time. (Thank you for holding the tape. You may release it now. (And it is rewound.)) It is possible to do so, and I think we all should rightfully think of our memories and minds as being part of a well-functioning data base more useful and valuable than any that shall be invented.

Now we will change the scene and the metaphor. Before us is a curtain, the curtain, which is our role as the interpreter standing between civiliza-

tions. In this role we must become a "see through", opening curtain, instead of a firmly closing and opaque ornamental wall.

Some time ago a friend working in Beirut was in the States lecturing. He stopped with us for a meal and visit and while in our home he opened a curtain for us that had veiled a piece of our antique furniture in mystery. It's a wooden folding chair made in Palestine perhaps eighty years ago. The back and front foot-support is one undulating frame of five strips of one-by-two-inch-thick wood. The seat and back foot-support of four strips fold up in scissors fashion or fold down to make a flat solid wood seat. It was once fully decorated with mother-of-pearl, and it has an incised wavy leaf design down each strip of wood. Straight across the back, at shoulder-blade height under the curved top line there is this solemn Arabic phrase: "Salāmat al-insān" (the well-being of a person): and no more is written. I was curious about its reference, thinking that perhaps there was once a set of the chairs that would together form a line of poetry or Scripture. Here is where my mind was like the cold auto motor slumbering in frigid grease, unable to turn over. This was until my friend visited and said, "Do you know the other half of the proverb?" "No." "Here it is: 'Salāmat al-insān fī hifz al-lisān' (the well-being of a person is in guarding the tongue)."

In its original setting we can imagine that a guest might be offered that chair, and on recognizing the script as half of the familiar proverb, would then be discreet in speech according to circumstances. (As a side note, the Biblical usage in Proverbs 21:23 is close to this, but I think has a more inclusive reference: "He who keeps his mouth and his tongue keeps himself out of trouble.") We were introduced to a bit of Arabic folklore in this proverb, and it reflects a nice way of subtle communication, an opened curtain on a real scene.

As a would-be poet of mean stature, I have nailed together two other rhyming phrases that could be worse, perhaps. Understanding the first phrase "Salāmat al-insān" as the usual friendly exclamation of sympathy or concern for a person's well-being in a minor illness or injury (you remember the chair's scissors-like design), we suggest the completion as: ... "al-jālis fī hādhā al-makān" (Sorry, old chap, whoever sits in this place). And here is a more specific warning: "Salāmat al-insān, al-wāḍi' hunā al-ḡuhrān" (To him we hope no woe betides, who sets down here his own backsides)! As you have already observed, these latter musings can neither clarify the proverb's meaning, nor would they dignify the circumstances of a friendly home visit. But maybe I can

still sell them to a cafe owner in Midaq Alley!

This little excursion into Proverbia, as the Latin puts it, and an attempt to locate another saying in these Arabic collections (the one above is listed clearly in Anis Furayha's collection) made me wish for a full study and indexing of this body of compact wisdom. What an aid to understanding of the Arabic civilization it would be, a library reference tool of first importance.

The Qur'an and the Hadith literature are basic to Islamic civilization, and quotations from these permeate its written and spoken communications. Both of these monumental collections are analyzed in concordances now. The final index volume of the Hadith concordance set must be nearing completion.

On cards in a vast file in the former School of Oriental Studies of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem there exists a far advanced Concordance to Classical Arabic Poetry from the Pre-Islamic Period onwards up to the Close of the Umayyad Dynasty (750 AD). This project was begun by Professor Joseph Horowitz who was the School's first director from 1926 to his death in 1931. (See Muslim World 36 (1946) p. 85, as abstracted from an earlier article in New Palestine by Walter Fischel.) The Concordance is apparently still growing. And it would be a most worthy project for publication by the joint efforts of UNESCO, the International Union of Academies, and other interested sponsors. Would it not make for peaceful collaboration in the hate-ravaged Near East? A great curtain opening of understanding between peoples should come of this project when the time is right. Publicity and pressure for it I believe are necessary factors in bringing the time closer.

We have indexes to Arabic, Hebrew and Persian periodical files being published and added to our collections. Prior to 1974 our English counterparts were working on an Index Arabicus that indexed 50 Arabic periodical titles. J.D. Pearson reported to us at our first workshop on cooperation at Cambridge (Mass) that it had gone to a Beirut printer. We must inquire as to its status. Pearson's good suggestions need our Association's formal attention, I think. The Arabic Script Union List at Michigan and the Near East National Union List project at the Library of Congress deserve our support and aid. The preparation and use of these and other new bibliographical aids will make our role as the curtain easier.

The film has to do with our everyday memory and thinking apparatus. It is a self-contained unit with many as yet undiscovered capacities. We do know that the film has the capacity to interface with other

film units of different language patterns. And it has the capacity to activate and manipulate the tools collected on our library shelves. At this point we become the curtain. Ours is a service to patrons that opens up for them a clearer comprehension of their own field, and makes it possible for them to advance in both research and theory.

Now I give you these pictures in oral tradition. They are an impression of what our task is and who we are doing it.

James W. Pollock

# The Computer As Romanizer

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

As an instrument of standardization and centralization, the computer is reshaping the library landscape. Microfiche COM sets replace card catalogs; CRTs make obsolete long shelves of bound indexes; programmers displace filers and searchers; magnetic tapes disemploy catalogers; and everywhere command strategies, delimiters, and fields spring from the teeth of the digital dragon.<sup>1</sup> Library literature is replete with scenarios of an increasingly paperless information network and with warnings that unless librarians embrace the new technology their jobs will be put to pasture by an aggressive, for-profit information industry. Whatever the limits of quantified information storage and retrieval, electronic technology is pushing the library world into unfamiliar territory.

The New York Public Library (NYPL) was one of the first large research libraries to close its card catalogs and to open a computerized book catalog. The link of the library's catalog records to its authority file is a good example of the rigor a computer can bring to bear on standardizing catalog information. To appear in the book catalog, an access point must first be established on the authority file. Personal and corporate names, topical subjects, series and other access words are searched in the authority file to make a match. If the computer cannot find a match, the finding element is barred from the catalog. For example, if the Library of Congress (LC) adds a death date to a personal name, a MARC record including that name will not be accepted until the authority file is changed. A correction of the authority file automatically corrects the personal name form every time it appears in the book catalog as an access point. This linkage affords centralized control of a large and complex file.

By using the same tags as MARC, NYPL's automated system makes optimum use of the cataloging done centrally at LC. The library's computer takes a MARC

record, reformats it to fit local catalog requirements, and produces a print-out to which a cataloger adds a classmark and other tagged information, such as Festschrift, to which MARC is indifferent. The computer searches all access points in the authority file and establishes those it cannot match. At present a cataloger must add cross references and other authority work to the established form, but as LC's authority file becomes available on magnetic tape even that work can flow computer-to-computer. For MARC records the computer has not totally eliminated human intermediaries, but it does utilize the product of a central cataloging staff (LC's) to reduce drastically local duplication of staff time. And of course, the computer has eliminated a large corps of filers. Managing a large file is child's play for an IBM 370.

For all its efficiency and manipulability, NYPL's automated bibliographic system, when instituted in 1972, lacked the capability to manage non-Roman script languages except in transliterated form. Since then, NYPL has saved Hebrew and Cyrillic script languages from romanized display, but all other non-Roman script languages must still accept total transliteration in order to see the light of public access. In replacing the card catalog, the automated file rendered obsolete the three by five card, a far more flexible format of which Oriental Division catalogers had made skillful use in the past. As long as main entry and other access points were romanized for filing in the union catalog, de rigueur at NYPL, a cataloger could write or type the body of the bibliographic record in any script. In this way Oriental language catalogers achieved a balance between the standards of the centralized union catalog and the highly pluralistic reality of Asian language materials.

For example, for many years it was Oriental Division practice, for Chinese books, to transliterate main entry and title (using Wade-Giles), often to translate the title and imprint, and to hand write the author-title ( and sometimes imprint) description in Chinese characters in columns running from the right side of the card to the left. Arabic cataloging was done in the same way, with the author-title statement handwritten under the typed transliteration and/or translation. In addition, the Oriental Division maintained a title card file completely in Arabic script and filed by Arabic alphabetization.

By its very nature, the three by five card served decentralized interests. It was Melvil Dewey's contribution to the Gutenberg application of the myth of Cadmus. As long as it was properly coded for filing, the fifteen square inches of surface was enough for displaying all manner of scripts. In closing the card NYPL threw out the Oriental baby with the bath water.

By disregarding all graphic systems other than the expanded ALA Roman character set, the new system upset the balance between centralized control of a union catalog and precise description of diverse materials. At best, full transliteration offers only indirect replication of the title page. Without an exact replication as a backup to the romanized access points, a bibliographic record requires a user to master the system of phonetic transformation and to trust wholly in the judgment of the cataloger/transliterator. The catalog becomes a veil, sometimes diaphanous, sometimes opaque, between the searcher and the searched. The Italian traduttore-traditore, translator as traitor, may be justly altered to trascrivente-traditore, transliterator as traitor.

#### EAST ASIA

Computerization and its concomitant evil, transliteration, affect the languages of the Far East, South Asia, and the Middle East differently. Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, all based on the non-alphabetic Chinese character, can be changed into Roman characters only at the cost of dense ambiguity. A phonetic value such as /chu/ has many possible referents: pearl, tree trunk, spider, vermilion, bamboo, to help, to live, to fuse.... A string of three or more phonetic equivalents is necessary to reduce ambiguity. The problem stems from the Roman alphabet's grossly inadequate rendering of Chinese phonemes. To maintain a Far Eastern catalog, a library must preserve the original characters somewhere. At NYPL this record has been pushed out of the public catalog to the shelf list where Far Eastern script information is added by hand.

If we liken Far Eastern scripts to an endangered species, the public catalog is the area of intense development where all elements incompatible with the new, strictly enforced standards are eliminated. The computerizers act as agents of a central government determined to streamline the filing system. The Oriental Division shelf list then becomes a refuge to which the endangered species retreats from the path of the electronic juggernaut. This situation is a library instance of the settler-aborigine dynamic. As life at the center becomes more civilized, older styles of existence move to a periphery where they persist at a simpler level.

Because the consequences of total romanization are dire, LC has kept materials in East Asian languages out of MARC. According to John Haeger of the Research Libraries Group (RLG), LC will soon contract with RLG to develop MARC-compatible hardware and software for Far Eastern materials. The package will



include input, display, and search capabilities in the vernacular scripts. It is interesting that the language group facing the greatest obstacles to entering a machine-readable system has been the object of the most experimentation and is nearest to being accommodated by the new technology.

Programming ideographic languages so that they can be controlled by a manageable keyboard is a herculean task. The National Diet Library of Japan and various other organizations of Japan and Taiwan are working on three basic strategies to bring Chinese, Korean, and Japanese under computer control. The first uses a large keyboard of approximately 2700 keys. About 2000 keys have a one-to-one correspondence with the 2000 most common characters. The additional keys trigger radicals that can be aggregated to compose the ideographic characters not included in the first set of 2000 as well as kana and Roman alphabetical elements. The second approach follows a two step phonetic-graphic selection program. A request is made by a phoneme, in Roman or kana characters, to which there are a number of Chinese character equivalents. The keyboard operator then selects the correct character for input. The third approach follows the traditional Chinese method of organizing characters by radicals or strokes. Using visual analysis, a programmer assigns a two digit code to three corners of the character. Each ideograph receives a unique six digit number by which it can be input, stored, and retrieved.

Although the software is still imperfect, the hardware is ready on a commercial basis. RLG's East Asia Committee is confident that software problems will be solved in the next three years and that MARC-compatibility will follow soon after. This effort is being financed by grants of 1.2 million dollars from the Ford, Mellon, and Hewlett Foundations and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Originally the Ford Foundation intended to use the Committee of East Asian Librarians (CEAL) as a channel for this money, but the group was too dispersed and underorganized to sponsor such a large endeavor. When Mr. Haeger joined RLG in 1979, foundation money followed, enabling RLG to finance a full scale program to computerize Far Eastern script languages.

#### SOUTH ASIA

The status of South Asian languages offers a sharp contrast to the work being done on East Asian languages. In late 1978, LC announced that it would totally romanize all South Asian language records for inclusion in MARC. This decision included Dravidian, Devanagari, and Arabic script languages. Although LC solicited reactions from the South Asian library

community to an earlier pilot project, it was apparent that LC had made up its mind to scuttle South Asian scripts in the attempt to make South Asian materials available on MARC as soon as possible.

Even though a number of South Asian librarians in charge of large collections spoke out against the decision and persuaded LC to hold thorough discussions in January, 1979, the college of South Asian librarians was unable to muster a solid and united front against the total romanization decision. Important reasons for this lie in India's own diversity. The Indian subcontinent is a jungle not only of languages but of scripts. Through the Special Foreign Currency program, American libraries collect over two dozen languages in a dozen scripts. The sheer number of scripts is daunting to computerizers, for a solution requires a separate terminal for each script or a number of multi-script terminals. English is certainly one of the most important legacies of the British Empire to the subcontinent. In terms of market value, English language material is the largest category received though the Indian Special Foreign Currency program. It is six times as costly as Hindi, 17 times Bengali, 24 times Tamil. English survives, indeed thrives, as the lingua franca for the Indian establishment. LC's decision to romanize fully all South Asian languages in effect extends the tradition, now 150 years old, of English as lingua franca to the script of the English language as the catalog's lettere franche. Considering the diversity of Indian language and culture, romanization achieves an astonishing degree of order. All those languages, ranging from hoary Sanskrit to relative newcomers such as Malayalam and Urdu, in one computerized file stand as a monument to computer logic. In effect, LC's decision says that for library catalogs Indian printed materials that remain non-English will at least have to accept a Western script. The cost of this monolithic arrangement is the total abstraction in the library catalog of language from its graphic form. Such a file is at best a finding guide with little research value.

#### MIDDLE EAST

LC's announcement that it was also seriously considering total romanization for Arabic and Hebrew script languages elicited a much more united effort by Middle East and Judaica librarians than the South Asian specialists could achieve. From the South Asian experience, librarians in charge of Middle East collections learned the importance of recruiting the support of library directors and other administrative officers. A whirlwind of memoranda and a long session

at LC persuaded LC to disregard its inclination to shuck the graphic shell from the linguistic kernel. Arguments raised in favor of keeping the mixed format of the LC printed card included: (1) transliteration adds vowels to the graphic display of languages that leave them unwritten; (2) transliteration of Arabic and Hebrew script languages entails interpretation of meaning beyond the traditional responsibility of cataloging; (3) totally romanizing bibliographic records seriously compromises the catalog as a research tool.

Arguments in favor of total romanization included: (1) computerization of non-Roman script languages would cost LC a million dollars; (2) access points are already in romanized form; (3) readers are accustomed to romanization schemes and would not find the loss of information caused by the absence of the vernacular script significant; (4) inclusion of Arabic and Hebrew script materials in MARC would greatly reduce the cost of cataloging at individual libraries. I think the decision not to move to total transliteration rested on LC's judgment that economic savings could not justify the intellectual denigration of the catalog that is implicit in total romanization and that computerization of these languages is not as awesome a task as first glance had it.

LC's decision to rescue Arabic and Hebrew script languages from the MARC-spewing maw of the computer leaves Middle East and Judaica librarians on the tenterhooks of LC's willingness to sustain card production for titles in these languages after its card catalog is officially closed. This means that on the advent of AACR 2, LC will have to close the old catalog, open a new card catalog using cards in the same mixed format until these languages are computerized, then close that intermediate catalog and open a third, computer-produced file. LC faces this three step entry into computerized cataloging for both Far East and Middle East languages. By romanizing South Asian languages before the advent of AACR 2, LC avoids such an awkward approach. For libraries such as NYPL that have closed their card catalogs already, the continuation of LC cards in Far Eastern and Middle Eastern languages has little practical consequence. The theoretical stakes in the romanization controversy were high, but for a library displaying its holdings in a photo-composed book catalog the payoff is small. Even libraries that will continue card catalogs must realize that pressure to draw a wider range of materials into the MARC fold will increase and that card catalogs will become relatively less and less economical.

Because NYPL has lived with an automated file since 1972, it has taken steps to produce non-Roman

script display in the new catalog. It has developed the hardware and software to convert Hebrew and Cyrillic romanized records into Hebrew and Cyrillic script in the photo-composed book catalog. By devising one-to-one correspondence between Roman and Hebrew or Cyrillic characters, NYPL is able to input a record completely in Roman characters on a standard keyboard, and, by prefacing the input with an escape mode command for the appropriate language, to display the bibliographic record in the original script. In addition to bibliographic records that resemble the mixed format of the LC printed card, this system also produces a Hebrew title file at the end of the book catalog and running right to left. The data are stored according to the binary string of the Roman keyboard character but the display program activates photo-composition grids of Hebrew or Cyrillic characters. Though incapable of on-line vernacular script input and retrieval, NYPL's system eliminates the worst aspect of total transliteration. The final, public product reinstates the original script to its proper place in the catalog record.

NYPL's cataloging system in no way is paperless. Old-fashioned worksheets and more contemporary print-outs flow back and forth between catalogers and the computer center like a biblical swarm of locusts. For all Oriental languages and even for Hebrew and Cyrillic, the person who inputs the record knows only the expanded Roman character keyboard. Hebrew and Cyrillic cataloging differs from other non-Roman script language cataloging only in the use of escape mode commands and final display. Beehive Corporation actually made a dual script, Hebrew/Roman character terminal for NYPL, but it has not been linked to the bibliographic system. For the near future at least, all processes prior to catalog display will remain in a transliterated mode.

In the two or three years after LC closes its catalog, it is vital that librarians presiding over Asian language materials organize sufficiently to keep control over the quality of centralized cataloging of their materials. Over the next decade few libraries will be content to finance large Asian language cataloging staffs whose output is largely duplicated elsewhere. Asian language catalogs must enter the main stream of centralized, machine-readable cataloging without the degradation of cataloging standards that will inflict South Asian materials for the near and even long-term future.

Faced with the greatest technological problems, Far East specialists have made the greatest progress in developing machine-readability. Softened by a strong tradition of anglicization, South Asian librarians have presided, however reluctantly, over the full extension of Roman script to the catalog display

of non-English South Asian languages. These librarians will have to summon up powerful arguments to prevent their libraries from accepting MARC transliterated copy.

Middle East librarians face less formidable problems than East Asian specialists, but they lack funding to mount a concerted effort to develop hardware and software tailored to library needs. Ongoing work on computerizing information in Arabic script is, typically, decentralized. Harvard and the University of Texas, Austin, use CRTs to teach Arabic. Both systems use an Arabic keyboard and have message subprograms that select the correct form of letter according to content. The Arab League and Moroccan Ministry of Education are working on computerization as are a number of private firms in England and the United States.

At the Middle East Librarians' Association (MELA) meeting in Utah (1979), Pierre MacKay reported on his work of adapting a Hewlett-Packard 2645 terminal to display Arabic script languages for editing purposes.<sup>2</sup> The beauty of MacKay's program, *Katib*, is that the terminal alone is programmed for Arabic script input and editorial display. MacKay uses a standard Roman character keyboard following the ISO standard for Latin-letter alphabets to link the terminal to the main frame. The "number cruncher" (as he affectionately calls the main frame) processes information coming from the terminal as binary strings associated with a standard keyboard. The main frame remains insouciant of the peculiarly Arabic script activity occurring on the periphery. By accommodating the complexities of Arabic script display to a 7-bit code, MacKay has engineered an Arabic script terminal compatible with any main frame programmed according to ANSI, ISO, and Federal Information Processing standards. *Katib*'s CRT script display is rudimentary but readable and includes Persian and Ottoman Turkish variations. The CRT provides copy for editing, not hard copy printing. A more refined display could be accomplished with an additional VideoComp program that would have to be loaded into the main frame.

MacKay's terminal resembles the display programs of NYPL for Hebrew and Cyrillic in that it does not encumber the main frame with programs peculiar to the Arabic script. The language specialist does not have to recruit the services of a programmer to integrate the Arabic script program into the high level language of the main frame. Both MacKay and NYPL accept the Roman character keyboard as the intermediate language necessary to enter the main frame. In NYPL's case, this means a great deal of paper work. MacKay's program is inextricably wedded to a particular piece of hardware, the Hewlett-Packard terminal, which is

designed to fit any main frame using a standard code. Form and content are inseparable.

Following the lead of the East Asian librarians, the Middle East specialists' first task is to gather information, both from on-site inspection and from literature, on computerization of Arabic taking place in commercial, academic, and governmental arenas. I don't think this can be done without freed time and funding. It may be that MELA can persuade RLG, OCLC, or some other utility to fund this study. Upon gathering information about software and hardware already available, a task force would have to analyze these products for their library usability. I am fairly certain that the expertise if not the full blown product is present. It is simply a matter of focusing technological know-how on the particular problems of bibliothecal storage and retrieval. What we are really awaiting is institutional initiative that will press for tangible results. It will be interesting to see whether MELA can play a central role in this gearing up and whether large research libraries care enough about the non-Roman languages of the world to invest in this endeavor.

Chris Filstrup

1. Marshall McLuhan. Understanding Media. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964, p. 82 ff.
2. See also MacKay's "Setting Arabic with a Computer," Scholarly Publishing, January 1977, p. 142-150; and his "Computer Processing for Arabic Script Materials" in Les arabes par leurs archives (Colloques internationaux du CNRS, no. 555), p. 197-211.

## Problems In Armenian Collection Development And Technical Processing In U. S. Libraries.

In the course of the past ten years or so, many of the problems in Armenian collection development and technical processing in U.S. libraries have been resolved, some are continually present, and new ones are forthcoming with such novel phenomena as automated shared cataloging which will show Armenian records in romanized form.

The single most important factor that lies at the root of Armenian collection development, processing, and even reference service problems, is the esoteric nature of the Armenian language. Dealing with Armenian materials is a thorn in the side of library management because these materials cannot be streamlined into processing routines as can roman alphabet materials. To the Armenian specialist, Armenian materials are both a delight and a nightmare: a delight because one ends up being a selection officer, a gifts and exchange librarian, a cataloger (both for monographs and serials) and a reference librarian, thus exercising complete control of the collection and feeling one has an exciting, multifaceted job; a nightmare because one finds that one is in charge of a library within a library and is therefore obliged to deal with numerous clerical and housekeeping tasks side by side with the most intellectual and diversified responsibilities called for by the job, and ends up feeling terribly fragmented and subject to moments of fear for one's sanity. Armenian materials are a problem to the library patron with a knowledge of the Armenian language, when in the library's catalog/s names and titles are presented in romanized form. Is he a Western Armenian speaker? Is he an Eastern Armenian speaker? Does he know that romanization is based on Eastern Armenian phonetic values? Does it occur to him to check at the reference desk of the library for the table of tomanization? A variety of cross-references try to cover various approaches to an author's name, but titles have a single entry. Let us now go into

specific problems in the areas of Armenian collection development and processing.

#### COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

When a university's curriculum includes an Armenian studies program, such a program usually attracts students that are interested in Classical and Modern Armenian language, in literature, and in history. Furthermore, students in other disciplines may be interested in such areas as Armenian linguistics, art and architecture, music, folklore and so forth. The university library must be able to support all these needs. Its Armenian collection -- and by this term I mean Armenian language materials as well as non-Armenian language materials on Armenian subjects -- must include early, not so early and current printed monographs, periodicals and newspapers. Also, a nice collection of manuscripts -- preferably originals, if not, on microfilm or microfiche -- would enhance the library's prestige and attract scholars.

Armenian studies programs in universities are a recent phenomenon in the U.S. -- they have a life history of no more than 15-20 years (at the moment there are four universities with Armenian programs: Harvard, UCLA, Columbia, and Pennsylvania). The program at UCLA, for example, had its beginnings in the early 1960's but the regular program of offering M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in language, literature and history dates from 1969. Consequently, a systematic Armenian collection development and control in American university libraries, to my knowledge, do not go much further back than the early 1960's. There may be one or two exceptions.

What is the volume of Armenian publication? Armenian printing history dates from 1512. Anything published between that date and 1800 is considered an incunabulum. In this period approximately 1000 titles were printed<sup>1</sup> (in a limited number of copies). How many copies of these are now extant in the world is not known at the present. From 1801 to 1850, some 1700 titles were printed.<sup>2</sup> I have been unable to learn the volume of production between 1851 and 1921, but since the Sovietization of Armenia, i.e., 1921 until 1977, some 50,000 titles were printed in Soviet Armenia alone.<sup>3</sup> Currently, the annual publication rate in Soviet Armenia is 1000 titles in Armenian, Russian and several other languages in 10-12 million copies.<sup>4</sup> If we assume that something between 5-10,000 Armenian titles were printed between 1851 and 1921 in the Caucasus, the Ottoman Empire and in the rest of the Armenian Diaspora (we have to remember that this includes the period of modern Armenian cultural renaissance when writing, translating, newspaper and



periodical publishing activities boomed), and that approximately 2-3,000 were printed in non-Armenian languages, we are talking about roughly 60-65,000 monographic titles.

With regard to serials, Armenians are noted as periodical and newspaper publishers. They say that when three Armenians come together, very soon you see as many newspapers being published. Hovannes Petrosian, in his three-volume index to Armenian periodicals (Hay parberakan mamuli bibliografia. Yerevan, 1954-57), shows that from 1794 to 1900 some 256 newspapers and periodicals made their appearance; 1900-1956, 1164 Armenian and 45 non-Armenian language periodical titles, excluding Soviet Armenian; and on the present territory of Soviet Armenia, from 1902 to 1954, 196 periodicals and 209 newspapers in Armenian and Russian "saw the light" as is said in Armenian. In 1971 there were 119 newspapers and 296 periodical titles current in the world.<sup>5</sup> I am sure that the number today is much higher. In Los Angeles alone, 4-5 newspapers and periodicals have made their appearance in the past several years.

As for manuscripts, approximately 25,000 are extant in the world; over 15,000 of them are preserved in the Manuscript Library of Yerevan, which is better known as the Matenadaran.

What percentage of this vast amount of material would sufficiently cover the needs of a library whose university offers a respectable Armenian studies program, remembering, of course, that the main interest lies in the humanities? How could a library secure current and retrospective publications, not to mention manuscripts or their microfilm copies?

In my opinion, today if a library outside the Armenian homeland were to have a collection of some 30,000 titles (excluding manuscripts), such a library could easily claim to have a magnificent collection. Building up such a collection requires in-depth knowledge of the intellectual production in the area, of the history of Armenian book printing, access to bibliographic sources, numerous contacts with institutions in Armenia and with publishers and bookdealers throughout the world, and finally, widespread reputation in order to attract gifts or sales of private collections large and small. In many U.S. libraries, it is the Near Eastern bibliographer who has the task of developing the Armenian collection and who generally does not know Armenian -- a situation that leaves much to be desired. Even if qualified staff were at hand, because of the scarcity of retrospective publications -- especially of early printed books--I doubt that a library starting its Armenian collection development in the 1970's could secure enough of these publications to create a truly firm base to build upon.

It follows that libraries have to share the information on their resources and rely on each other's collections. To this end, I have been working, during the past twelve years, towards creating a single information source which will pool together on the pages of a book catalog the resources of libraries with major Armenian holdings. This work will be entitled Union catalog of Armenian materials in U.S. libraries and, by the time it is ready for publication, it will include more than 15,000 titles.<sup>6</sup>

What are some of the ways of securing retrospective and current Armenian publications?

#### Materials in Non-Armenian Languages

In the realm of retrospective publications in non-Armenian languages, other than the occasional catalogs of the printing houses of the Venice and Vienna Mekhitarist Fathers (they have published books in Armenian and the European languages), a bibliographer has to wade through a sea of entries of general Near Eastern catalogs of various European and American bookdealers to find Armenological works. Certain specialized bookdealers, such as Librarie Orientale of Paris, rarely publish catalogs, and the bibliographer must appeal to them when searching for specific titles which often means futile loss of time and effort. It might be easier and even more economical to buy paper or film copies of such books from other libraries. There is the occasional small local Armenian bookstore as well that will carry, alongside the Armenian books, some out-of-print Western language books purchased from private sources.

As for current books in Western languages, announcements somehow manage to find the bibliographer. Again, there are the general Near Eastern catalogs to consult. Furthermore, the Armenian press has a way of learning about them and publicizing them. Also, current and some retrospective English language books are purchased in bulk by the National Association for Armenian Studies and Research of Cambridge, Mass., and offered for sale through regular book lists. Similarly with the bookstore of the Diocese of the Armenian Church in New York. Both offer some titles in Armenian as well.

#### Materials in Armenian

Securing Armenian language retrospective publications is a very special problem. The history of the Armenians has been such that until the establishment of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia in 1921, very little publishing had taken place on Armenian soil (notably at the Geworgian Seminary of Eĵmiatsin).

From 1512 to the present, Armenian books have been published in Venice, Amsterdam, Constantinople, Vienna, Calcutta, Madras, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Rostow on the Don, Astrakhan, Shusha (in Karabagh, now part of Azerbaijan), Tiflis, Baku, Eĵmiatsin, New Julfa (Iran), Yerevan (here most heavily in the 20th century), and various other Near Eastern, European and American cities where appreciable Armenian communities or centers of Armenian learning were or are located. But communities rise and decline -- a fact that can be applied to those in the Central and Eastern European countries (such as Poland, Romania, Italy, Hungary, etc., where Armenian communities had been established as far back as the 11th century), in India, Astrakhan, Tiflis and others. Gone are the printing houses, the book dealers, the families that had private libraries. Where are the books? Of course, many of them have found their way to libraries in Soviet Armenia; others are in local state libraries; some occasionally appear on the shelves of bookdealers, and still others are in the possession of private collectors, while many are lost forever.

The best way to secure such books is to find private collectors who are willing to sell or donate their libraries to institutions where there is a guarantee that the books will be preserved as well as used. Active search and publicity on the part of the seeking library is a must. UCLA has been fortunate in this respect in that it has succeeded in securing through bulk purchase several small collections as well as the impressive Dr. Garo O. Minasian collection from Isfahan, Iran (which included Armenian incunabula, rare India and New Julfa imprints as well as other out-of-print books published in Europe). It has also received as gifts Dr. K.M. Khantamour's private collection of some 1000 finely bound rare books, and many books from second or third generation Armenian Americans who cannot read Armenian. Recently, we also received part of Mr. Harry Kurdian's library (Wichita, Kansas) comprising some 650 books and approximately 1500 periodical pieces.

A certain number of retrospective Armenian publications may be acquired on exchange -- mainly through the Myasnikian State Library of Yerevan or the Fundamental Library of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia. They are interested in all kinds of Western publications, including Armenological studies in Western languages. Pre-1940's publications, however, may be extremely difficult to secure in print form. Retrospective Armenian publications of the Mekhitarist Congregations of Venice and Vienna may, of course, be directly purchased from them. However, many of their titles are now out-of-print. For the rest, one has to be on a constant lookout, keeping in touch with

various Armenian bookdealers -- the best way being personal visits.

Recently, a solution has been offered to this general problem by the Inter Documentation Company of Zug, Switzerland (Editor: J.J.S. Weitenberg of the University of Leiden) which has begun to print on microfiche Armenian out-of-print books and periodicals, having as a starting base the Armenian collection at the University Library of Helsinki. This material is available on an annual subscription basis (\$fr. 1000 annually).

The bulk -- approximately 90% -- of current Armenian language publications are Soviet Armenian imprints. No purchases of current books may be conducted directly with the sources in Armenia. Blanket orders may be placed with certain officially recognized European and American outlets of Soviet publications such as Four Continent in New York, Livres Étrangers in Paris, or Kubon u. Sagner in Munich. Or, orders may be placed with any of these outlets for titles selected from the annual catalog of to-be-published books called Hayeren grk'er/Knigi na armiânskom iâzyke. It must be said, however, that there is no absolute guarantee that all books ordered in this manner will reach the shelves of your library. Until you receive the catalog, make your selections, place your order, which in turn is sent on by your dealer, much time passes by and there is the chance that some of the most desirable books are unavailable. It isn't that books are necessarily published in limited numbers of copies. In America, an important poet's new publication may not sell more than 3000 copies, whereas in Armenia -- a country with a population of only three million -- a favorite poet's book may enjoy a printing of 30-50,000 copies. Armenians are avid readers and, very often, especially in the areas of literature, history and the arts, titles are sold out within weeks of publication.

To cover this gap, the bibliographer has to resort to other means, such as blanket order arrangements with the above-mentioned book dealers or exchange arrangements with libraries in Armenia. Furthermore, the Committee for Cultural Relations with Armenians Abroad of Yerevan is generous to libraries that indicate a desire to receive books on specified subject areas as gifts. However, the number of books received this way is understandably limited.

Current Armenian books in the rest of the world are secured in a rather helter skelter way, again, by being on the alert for announcements in the Armenian press and by keeping in touch with book dealers, particularly in Lebanon and in the U.S.

## Periodicals

Current newspapers and periodicals of the diaspora are fairly easy to secure on a subscription basis. Titles from Soviet Armenia are secured, at least at UCLA, through exchange arrangements. Often, securing replacements for lost issues proves to be difficult. As for retrospective issues of periodicals, I personally have found it close to impossible to find Soviet Armenian periodicals older than ten years. Space problems have forced many institutes to discard back issues of the periodicals they publish.

For retrospective issues of Western Armenian periodicals, the best collection is said to be that of the library of the Vienna Mekhitarists. There exists a catalog of this library's newspaper collection.<sup>7</sup> The only way, therefore, of possessing copies of any of these periodicals is by ordering Xerox or microfilm copies. A practical way for all U.S. libraries interested in developing an Armenian periodicals collection on microfilm would be through a joint order by sharing the expenses of preparing the negative copies. Or, perhaps, this idea could be suggested to the Inter Documentation Company of Switzerland from whom, eventually, libraries could order microfiche sets.

## Manuscripts

An occasional Armenian manuscript finds its way to a library. It is most welcome when it is a gift, but when it is offered for sale, very often it becomes impossible to acquire in these days of limited book budgets. Of late years, the chances of securing Armenian manuscripts on microfilm have been improving. It is possible, for example, to request occasional manuscript microfilms from the Matenadaran in Yerevan. Similarly with the Hill Monastic Microfilm Library of St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, with special permission from the library owning the original manuscript. The HMML is developing a microfilm collection of manuscript collections in Europe. Its Austrian project includes 1,181 Armenian manuscripts located at the library of the Mekhitarist Congregation of Vienna. Unfortunately, the Vienna Mekhitarists are not very forthcoming with permission to release copies of manuscript microfilms. The same may be true of the Venice Mekhitarists, but the situation could change in time. It is hoped that American libraries will have better luck in securing some microfilms of manuscripts located in Munich.

Paris, Helsinki, London, etc., when HMML completes its European project.

The identification of manuscripts in the Western world for microfilm ordering and their eventual cataloging will be facilitated by the existence of numerous catalogs of Armenian manuscript collections at various institutions. For example, the Matenadaran of Yerevan has published a two-volume catalog of its manuscripts<sup>8</sup> and is in the process of preparing for publication a series of catalogs which will describe the manuscripts in greater detail. As far as manuscripts in public institutions in the U.S. are concerned, there is A.K. Sanjian's Catalogue of Armenian medieval manuscripts in the U.S. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1976) which covers all holdings (a total of 174 items) except those at UCLA. The later, which number more than 100, will be dealt with in a separate catalog by Professor Sanjian in the near future.

As can be seen from the foregoing, many are the problems faced by the bibliographer in trying to build up a respectable and viable Armenian collection in a U.S. library.

#### Technical Processing

We all know that it is not enough just to have a rich collection. Since the idea is to have these materials used as widely as possible, their in-depth subject analysis, proper classification, and the easy accessibility of names and titles is of fundamental importance. In discussing processing problems, I shall be speaking strictly of libraries making use of Library of Congress classification and subject headings.

Processing is the area where most libraries with appreciable Armenian collections have difficulties. There are many libraries -- research and public -- that have the books but no language specialists. They have several options. One is to place the books on low priority for deferred cataloging. For all practical purposes, they might as well not have the books. Another option is to make use of Library of Congress cataloging. Here they face the problem of matching a book in hand with the Library of Congress card copy. If no one has familiarity with the idiosyncracies of the transliteration table or an idea regarding the forms of Armenian names (particularly forenames, compound forenames, and genitive forms of surnames that do appear on title pages occasionally), the matching process could become a near impossibility. Only in the instance of Soviet Armenian publications where there is an added title page in Russian -- which information is supplied on Library of Con-

gress records -- could these libraries have some measure of success.<sup>9</sup> And even here they will run into problems because of differences in romanization from the Armenian and from the Russian. Furthermore, it does not help matters at all, when we note that a large percentage of Soviet Armenian publications give the Russian added title information on the verso of the title page or in colophon position. This information is not shown on Library of Congress records and libraries are unable to make use of Library of Congress copy. At UCLA we supply this added information for the benefit of libraries that seek our assistance in cataloging their Armenian books. A third option could be to use Library of Congress copy where found and in all other cases to simply romanize the title page information and show only author and title records in the catalog. Of course, the latter method has its traps: it does not provide subject analysis which is a major disservice to the library user and it can play havoc with main entries. Even if the person working with these books possessed some degree of Armenian but was not a subject specialist and worse, not a professional catalog librarian familiar with the Library of Congress' history of Armenian bibliographic control procedures, he/she could produce a less than useful bibliographic record.

Here it would be helpful to record the development of bibliographic control procedures (classification, subject headings, romanization) for Armenian materials in the U.S. Somewhere between 45 to 65 years ago (between 1915 and 1935) the Library of Congress developed its classification schemes and subject headings for Armenian subject areas based on a group of predominantly non-Armenian language books at hand. Until 1971, these classification numbers and subject headings were unquestioningly used by Library of Congress personnel and other libraries using the LC system. In the meantime, the Turkish massacres of Armenians had occurred, the Armenian Republic had come and gone, and Soviet Armenia was established -- all offering the need for new subject headings and/or revised classification numbers. Generally, the classification schemes were well thought-out, except in the area of the Eastern Armenian language -- the language used in Soviet Armenia today -- about numerous aspects of which many publications have appeared and continue to appear. If you had looked at the Library of Congress classification schedule for Armenian language (PK8001-8454) as late as 1970, you would have seen that 100 numbers were assigned to "General and Classical Armenian," 100 numbers to "Modern Armenian" (meaning Modern West Armenian), 50 numbers to "Middle Armenian" -- a dead language about which very few publications exist, and 4 numbers for "Modern

East Armenian." What made it even more ridiculous was the fact that in the Library of Congress transliteration table, the phonetic values of Modern East Armenian were used (and are now being used), yet in the classification scheme this currently dominant language was allotted only four numbers!

However, the Library of Congress was most inadequate in the area of Armenian subject headings. As late as 1966, the 7th edition of the Library of Congress Subject Headings showed two headings for Armenian language, namely "Armenian Language" which mixed together Classical, Middle and Modern West Armenian (even though the classification schedule made clear distinctions among them) and "East Armenian language" which relegated all records representing this subject to the "E" section of the public catalog like poor second cousins.

In the literature area, as late as 1970, no distinction was made between pre-modern and 19th and 20th century Armenian literature, even though items in this category were cataloged by the Library of Congress. Similarly with drama, fiction, prose and poetry.

The worst area, however, was that of history. In the 7th edition of the Library of Congress Subject Headings there were only two history-related subject headings, namely "Armenia - History" and "Armenian question." Somewhere between 1966 and 1970 the Library of Congress added "Armenian massacres, 1915-1923" -- an important and overdue addition. As one can see, there did not exist a period breakdown for the history of a country as ancient as Armenia.

In 1968 UCLA had approximately 8,000 Armenian books. All the above-cited inadequacies were apparent in the face of such a large collection. For the in-depth and systematic cataloging of these materials it was necessary to grow away from the Library of Congress' almost obsolete and, at the very best, limited subject heading and improve its classification schemes for Armenian subjects. In early 1968, I expanded classification schemes -- the most important being the release of 46 unused numbers to the existing 4 assigned to Modern East Armenian, and devised new language and literature subject headings as well as a history period breakdown for use at UCLA. The language divisions were:

- Armenian language (general & all-inclusive)
- Armenian language, Classical
- Armenian language, Middle
- Armenian language, Modern
- Armenian language, Modern - East Armenian
- Armenian language, Modern - West Armenian



Thus all the divisions of the language were arranged in an organic relationship to each other.

Our new history period subdivisions numbered 14 as against the original "Armenia - History", as:

- Armenia - History - To 428
  - Artaxiad (Artashesian) dynasty, 189 B.C. - 1 A.D.
  - Arsacid (Arshakuni) dynasty, 66-428
  - 428-1522
  - Persian and Greek rule, 429-640
  - Arab period, 640-885
  - Bagratuni dynasty, 885-1045
  - Turkic-Mongol domination, 1045-1522
  - 1522-1800
  - 1801-1900 (10)
  - 1901-
  - Armenian Republic, 1918-1920
  - 1921-

In addition, the Cilician Kingdom received the subject heading "Cilician Kingdom, 1080-1375." 11

Circa 1969, the Library of Congress began systematic buying of Armenian language books and producing cataloging records without introducing any changes in the critical areas mentioned above. This was a perfect time to create uniformity in the modernized bibliographic control of Armenian materials on the national level. A written proposal in 1970 submitting the above changes drew positive response from the Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress. The result was that new subject headings and history period breakdowns appeared in the 8th edition of Library of Congress Subject Headings (1975), and classification changes appeared in the July-September 1970 Library of Congress Classification Additions and Changes list 159 (DS 161-199) and PK 8451-8499 ranges); the history period breakdown appeared in the Library of Congress' Period Subdivision Under Names of Places (1975). Thus, UCLA practice became national standard.

In view of these changes, Library of Congress and National Union Catalog records up to 1971 cannot be used blindly by libraries adding such records for the first time to their catalogs. Thus, this is another problem area in the processing of Armenian materials. This is a major reason why the work on the Armenian Union Catalog is progressing so slowly. Classification numbers are not touched unless cataloged by UCLA after 1968, but many subject headings, where the discrepancies are identifiable, are being

changed.

Another problem area -- this one current as late as 1978 and even persisting to this date -- is the question of romanization. When I first began using the Library of Congress Armenian romanization table, I realized that it was not acceptable as it stood. The table, which prefers the Eastern Armenian phonetic values and makes provision for cross-references from the Western Armenian phonetic values, was acceptable in principle but was defective in certain areas due to the orthographic differences between East and West Armenian. Two items were of major consequence, especially when applied to the romanization of names.

The first was the matter of the composite vowel or digraph ու. In the standard table of transliteration the two characters of the vowel were treated as individual characters and the vowel romanized into ow, i.e., a diphthong -- a distortion of the sound which makes words containing the vowel completely unrecognizable in romanized form. It is worth noting here that in SSR Armenia, ու is considered a character and has been absorbed in the alphabet table itself. In addition, there is the fact that in the case of Soviet Armenian publications (which make up about 90% of Armenian publications in the world), libraries tend to make use of the Russian added title page information where the Armenian ու becomes the Russian у which romanizes to a u. Furthermore, many Soviet Armenians publish in Russian and when their names are romanized the original Armenian vowel always converts to u, again, via the Russian у. For practical reasons, as well as for the fact that u is much more representative of the vowel sound than ow, it was necessary that ու be romanized into u.

The second item needing reconsideration was the question of the Armenian patronymic suffix - յան generally used by Soviet Armenians. The Western Armenian patronymic suffix is - եան. Regular romanization required the latter to convert to -ean but an exception rule allowed it to romanize to -ian -- a form preferred by Armenians living in the Western world and spelling their names in Western languages.

On the other hand, Soviet Armenian names received regular romanization and the յան converted to -yan. Such a distinction poses problems to the cataloger and is a trap for the unwary. First, it becomes the responsibility of the cataloger to determine whether an author published in Soviet Armenia is actually a Soviet Armenian author or a Western author whose work is being published there. The cataloger will either have to waste a lot of time investigating the author's place of origin, or will simply work from the title-page, thus rendering the exception rule for Western Armenian authors meaningless.

Secondly, on the Russian added title-page in Soviet Armenian publications, the suffix յան transliterates to the Russian ан which becomes the romanized -ian. And again, names of Soviet Armenian authors writing in Russian are always shown in catalog records with the -ian ending. Consequently, libraries end up representing Soviet Armenian authors both with -yan and -ian endings. Furthermore, if an author has published both in Armenian and in Russian, much time would be wasted in changing already established names from the Russian -ian ending to the romanization from the vernacular, i.e., -yan. Again, for all these practical reasons, it was necessary to establish one general rule: romanize all Armenian names ending in եան or յան to -ian.

These recommendations were accepted by the Library of Congress in 1976 and with a few additional changes the new table was submitted to and approved by the Descriptive Cataloging Committee of the American Library Association. The new table appears as the revised standard table of Armenian romanization in the Library of Congress' Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 121 (Spring, 1977), and was put into practice by the Library of Congress in 1978. But this is not the end of the story. Library of Congress will apply this table to all new names and titles being established. So far as this writer has been able to determine to date, old entries will not be revised, and already established names based on the old table will continue in the old form as new titles or new editions of these authors' works are cataloged. This means that in cataloging a book, a librarian must look up Library of Congress entries under both possible forms and must have both tables of romanization at hand. Otherwise, with blind acceptance of Library of Congress records, libraries will be in danger of duplicating the application of two romanization standards in their records, and thus confuse the patrons.

Very recently, the processing of Armenian language books has taken a new direction. Most major U.S. libraries are now participants in the pooling of catalog records in on-line (machine readable) systems such as the Ohio College Library Center (better known as OCLC) to which both the Library of Congress and UCLA are contributors. At this time, no software exists that would make Armenian characters machine-readable. Consequently, the Library of Congress has resorted to supplying its Armenian catalog records entirely in romanized form. This practice, for one, means murdering the language. Patrons familiar with the language will be confused and frustrated as they will have difficulties in reconstructing the vernacular version from the romanized form: is the original in Classical Armenian, in modern West Armenian, or in

modern East Armenian? The problem will be compounded for scholars familiar with other romanization schemes: it is one thing to try to grapple with a romanized main entry (as in the case of the traditional system where the main entry only is romanized for filing purposes and the body of the information is in the vernacular) but to wrestle with an entirely romanized record will be hard to bear. For libraries wanting to make use of these records, the basic problems mentioned in this paper will continue to hold true, and there will be the additional loss of the capability of working with the added Russian title-page information note that was available on the traditional Library of Congress depository cards (see footnote #9). The only advantage<sup>12</sup> will lie in the fact that the names of the libraries making use of these records will be recorded in the system, and this will be of help to interlibrary loan departments and thus lighten the load on those libraries best known for Armenian holdings. It is hoped that the necessary software is created in the near future so that the body of the machine-readable record will be presented in Armenian characters.

\* \* \*

As can be seen from the foregoing, much has been achieved in modernizing the bibliographic control of Armenian publications. The table of romanization has been standardized; the Library of Congress has cataloged a large number of books which in turn has generated numerous new Armenian subject headings; and libraries have been able to profit from all this activity. Yet, there are persistent problems. The librarian cataloging these materials must know Armenian, but unfortunately such specialist librarians are not readily available. Some libraries, aware of the existing problems, apply to me for assistance in cataloging their Armenian holdings. They send Xeroxed copies of the title-pages of their books and if Library of Congress or UCLA catalog copy exists for a title, I send them a copy of the record. In this manner their books get cataloged and I receive information as to library holdings of Armenian materials for the forthcoming Union Catalog of Armenian Materials in U.S. Libraries. This project, begun in 1968, is more than half way completed. It has been progressing slowly because of the detailed search that has to be conducted through the National Union Catalog and OCLC records to find the items; because not all records appear in the National Union Catalog (original cataloging of Armenian language materials is not recorded here), or OCLC (not all libraries are participants in this system) and libraries must be visited to secure

fuller information; because of the numerous changes that have to be made on old records (main entries, subject headings) and the cross-references that will have to be generated through these changes; and because other libraries will have to be helped in cataloging their books before their holdings can go on record in the union catalog. Once complete, this dictionary catalog which will offer access to publications in Armenian and in non-Armenian languages through author, title and subject, will have many advantages:

1. It will provide a single centralized source of information of books and periodical and newspaper titles on Armenological subjects in major U.S. libraries.
2. It will provide numerous subject bibliographies.
3. It will assist libraries to verify the existence of Armenological sources in U.S. libraries and, therefore, facilitate interlibrary loan.
4. It will provide bibliographic information for retrospective collection development and consequently collections will grow and Armenian book business will expand.
5. It will assist libraries in cataloging materials they have in hand since many libraries do not have Armenian specialists even though they have Armenian books.

The picture of Armenian collection development and processing in the U.S. is much brighter today than it was some ten years ago, in spite of the problems presented in this paper. Knowing what the problems are and where help is forthcoming is a giant step towards resolving them. The Armenian community in the U.S. is growing, Armenian programs in universities are flourishing, and it is essential that libraries whether serving their local communities or supporting university programs keep step with this growth both in the size of their collections and in the quality of their bibliographic records.

Gia Aivazian

[Footnotes follow on next page]

## Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Haykakan sovetakan hanragitaran, v. 3 (Yerevan, 1977), p. 89.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>4</sup> The Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (Yerevan, 1977), p. 17.
- <sup>5</sup> Armenian press directory, edited by Edward Gulbekian. 2nd ed. (London, HARQ Publications, 1971).
- <sup>6</sup> More on this project will be said in the second segment of this paper.
- <sup>7</sup> Karapetian, Rap'ayēl. Liakatar ts'uts'ak hayerēn lragirneru oronk' kē gtnuin Mkhit'arian Matendarani mēj i Vienna, 1794-1921. (Vienna, 1924).
- <sup>8</sup> Ts'uts'ak dzeḡagrats' Mashtots'i anvan Matenadarani, compiled by O. Eganian, A. Zeyt'unian, and P'. Ant'abian. (Yerevan, 1965-70).
- <sup>9</sup> This capability applies only in the instance of Library of Congress printed cards. Armenian language cards could be separated from the rest of the depository cards received from the Library of Congress and the Russian title page information of the book could be compared with the notes on the printed cards concerning this information, until the matching card is found. This capability also is now lost to libraries that join the OCLC on-line system. In 1979, the Library of Congress announced that records of certain non-roman alphabet languages, including Armenian, would be represented in completely romanized form. This means that libraries must have staff that can deal with Armenian romanization, and more. The Library of Congress will no longer show the Russian added title page information, but merely state in note position: "Added t.p. in Russian." In this matter, libraries made a mistake when they kept silent or indicated approval of the Library of Congress' decision. It was only UCLA that raised its voice on their behalf, but it was only one voice. The Library of Congress could have been persuaded to continue sending depository cards until such time as the

software necessary to deal with Armenian characters became available..

- 10 Later, when the Library of Congress considered these period breakdowns for adoption, it revised this heading to read "Armenia - History - 1917-1921" with an explanatory note saying that the heading includes the Armenian Republic, 1918-1920.
- 11 The Library of Congress changed this to read "Cilicia - History - Armenian Kingdom, 1080-1375"
- 12 In the traditional system, when libraries reported their holdings to the National Union Catalog, the records supplied, if other than Library of Congress printed card copy, were not reproduced in the National Union Catalog because this system could not deal with non-roman alphabet records, except if they were Library of Congress printed cards.

ARMENIAN TRANSLITERATION

Ա	ա	Ա	ա	մ
Բ	բ	Բ	բ	յ՝
Գ	գ	Ն	ն	ն
Դ	դ	Շ	շ	sh
Ե	ե	Ո	ո	o
Զ	զ	Չ	չ	ch՛
Է	է	Պ	պ	բ(բ)
Ը	ը	Ջ	ճ	յ(չ)
Թ	թ	Ռ	ր	rh
Ժ	ժ	Ս	ս	s
Ի	ի	Վ	վ	v
Լ	լ	Տ	տ	տ(դ)
Խ	խ	Ր	ր	r
Ս	ս	Ծ	ց	ts՛
Կ	կ	Ի	ւ	w
Հ	հ	Փ	փ	p՛
Ձ	ձ	Ք	ք	k՛
Ղ	ղ	Օ	օ	ō
Ճ	ճ	Ֆ	ֆ	f
	ա			
	բ(բ)			
	գ(գ)			
	դ(դ)			
	ե՛			
	զ			
	է			
	տ՛			
	շh			
	ի			
	լ			
	kh			
	տ(դ)			
	կ(գ)			
	h			
	զ(տ)			
	gh			
	ch(յ)			

SOURCE: The Library of Congress, Processing Department,  
Cataloging Service Bulletin, no. 47 (September, 1958)

"The transliteration table printed herewith has been approved by the American Library Association and the Library of Congress. It is based on the phonetic values of Classical and East Armenian. The variant phonetic values of West Armenian are included in brackets but are intended solely for use in preparing references from West Armenian forms of names when this may be desirable."



ARMENIAN

This table is based on the phonetic values of Classical and East Armenian.<sup>1</sup>

Ա	ա	A	a		Ն	ն	
Բ	բ	B	b	[P p] <sup>1</sup>	Շ	շ	Sh sh <sup>4</sup>
Գ	գ	G	g	[K k] <sup>1</sup>	Ո	ո	O o
Դ	դ	D	d	[T t] <sup>1</sup>	Չ	չ	Ch' ch'
Ե	ե <sup>2</sup>	}	E	e	Պ	պ	P p [B b] <sup>1</sup>
			Y	y <sup>3</sup>	Ջ	ջ	J j [Ch ch] <sup>1</sup>
Զ	զ	Z	z		Ք	ք	Ķ ķ
Է	է	Ē	ē		Ս	ս	S s
Ը	ը	Ĕ	ĕ		Վ	վ	V v
Թ	թ	T'	t'		Տ	տ	[D d] <sup>1</sup>
Ճ	ճ	Zh	zh <sup>4</sup>		Ր	ր	R r
Ի	ի	I	i		Ծ	ց	Ts' ts'
Լ	լ	L	l		Խ	խ	W w
Խ	խ	Kh	kh <sup>4</sup>		Ու	ու	U u
Մ	մ	Ts	ts <sup>4</sup>	[Dz dz] <sup>1, 4</sup>	Փ	փ	P' p'
Կ	կ	K	k	[G g] <sup>1</sup>	Զ	զ	K' k'
Հ	հ	H	h		Եւ	ew	ew in Classical orthography
Ջ	ճ	Dz	dz <sup>4</sup>	[Ts ts] <sup>1, 4</sup>	Եվ	ev	ev in Reformed orthography
Ղ	ղ	Gh	gh <sup>4</sup>		Օ	օ	Ö ö
Ճ	ճ	Ch	ch	[J j] <sup>1</sup>	Ֆ	ֆ	F f
Մ	մ	M	m				
Ծ	ժ <sup>2</sup>	}	Y	y			
			H	h <sup>5</sup>			

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The variant phonetic values of West Armenian are included in brackets but are intended solely for use in preparing references from West Armenian forms of names when this may be desirable.

<sup>2</sup> Armenian words ending in *-աւն* (in Classical orthography) or *-յաւն* (in Reformed orthography) are romanized *-ian*.

<sup>3</sup> This value is used only when the letter is in initial position of a name and followed by a vowel, in Classical orthography.

<sup>4</sup> The acute accent is placed between the two letters representing two different sounds when the combination might otherwise be read as a diagraph (e. g. *Դձնուի* D'znuhi).

<sup>5</sup> This value is used only when the letter is in initial position of a word or of a stem in a compound, in Classical orthography.

## Persian Publishing & Persian Collections In U.S. Libraries

### Historical Perspective

Most of the private publishers in Iran are booksellers. In old Tehran booksellers were located at Bāzār-i Bayn al-Ḥaramayn and Tīmchah-'i Kitābfurūshihā. About fifty years ago the publishers moved to Nāṣir Khusraw Street; from there to Khiyābān-i Shāhābād, and recently they have clustered on Inqilāb Avenue (formerly Shahreza Avenue).

Publishers and booksellers first established a trade union in 1946 which subsequently joined the High Council of Trade Unions in 1958. Among the oldest firms were Khayyām, Ganj-i Dānish, Bārānī, Markazī and Kulālah-i Khāvar.

Important modern private publishers and booksellers are Amīr Kabīr, Andīshah, Nīl, Tūs, Ibn-i Sīnā, Gūtanburg, Ṣafī 'Alī Shāh, Zavvār, Ṭahūrī, Payām, Numūnah, and Chihr. In the provinces, important publishers are Ṣaqafī and Ta'yīd in Iṣfahān; Ma'rifat in Shīrāz; Surūsh in Tabrīz; and Zavvār in Mashhad. Among government publishers Vizārat-i Farhang va Hunar, Āmūzish va Parvarish, Iqtiṣād, 'Ulūm va Āmūzish-i 'Ālī, Ta'āvun va Rūstāhā, and Sāzmān-i Barnāmah have been more active than others. Semi-official publishers include Bungah-i Tarjumah va Nashr-i Kitāb, Bunyād-i Farhang-i Irān, Anjuman-i Āṣār-i Millī, and Sāzmān-i Jughrāfiyā'ī-i Kishvar.

Due to the rising cost of printing since 1972, smaller print runs and a limited market for scholarly books, essential works and classical texts have been

issued more by government and semi-offical bodies than the private sector. The increase in the amount of scholarly publication in the public sector in recent years is linked also with the pre-revolution reforms which allocated large sums of money to revamp education, encourage scholarship, expand libraries, and to develop educational standards.

Iranian governments have always tried to regulate and control private publishing. After the establishment of the National Book Depository Law in 1968, the National Library, affiliated with the Ministry of Culture and Arts, performed the role of a censoring agent for the government. Publishers were required to submit one "printed" copy of each manuscript before publication, and two copies of their printed books to the National Library after approval for publishing was secured from the Library. While this control was effective for the most part, small businesses were at times able to break the law and publish works critical of the existing social conditions. In 1977 the government was charged with trying to impose strict control over publishing by denying tax exemption and financial aid to small publishers, so that, burdened by steep rises in the cost of labor and price of paper, they would be forced out of business. This control would, presumably, be then effected by providing Amīr Kabīr, one of the largest private publishers, with sufficient money to attract intellectuals and writers, thereby assuring that all important manuscripts would flow through its hands, thus turning Amīr Kabīr into Iran's largest private publishing screening enterprise.<sup>1</sup>

These allegations have yet to be proved, but patterns in the private publishing scene have changed. For instance, a number of small publishers either closed down or merged with publishers having sounder financial footing. Thus, Amīr Kabīr purchased Ibn-i Sīnā and Kitābhā-yi Jībī, and merged with Kharazmie Publishing House. Also, the registration of books was charged to Idārah-i Nigārish within the Ministry of Culture and Arts, which had a special censorship section.

Conversely, the later part of 1978 and the first quarter of 1979 were the most active periods for Iranian private publishing in many years. During a book-buying trip to Iran in mid-October, 1979, this writer was amazed at the number of customers entering or leaving bookstores. The license for publishing, along with a relaxation on censorship, had their roots in Amir Abbas Hoveyda's premiership when a special committee was formed to look into declining book statistics. A "black list" of nearly 1,200 books was presented to Hoveyda. Due to increasing

pre-revolutionary pressure, his office reduced the list almost daily. In late October, 1978, just after the fall of Sharif Emami's government, the "black list" disappeared. At that time, the most controversial books were more readily found than ever before in the market. Literary and socio-historical works of Āl Aḥmad, Buzurg 'Alavī, Bihrangī and Sharī'atī were abundantly available. With the success of revolution and the establishment of an Islamic government there was a shift in subject matter emphasis. Hundreds of religious titles appeared either in original or in reprints. Because more than twenty different political and religious parties organized or reorganized, newspapers and periodicals of various ideologies abounded. Less fortunate, however, have been the scholarly government or semi-official publications which had been totally or partially funded by the Shah administration. Many of the sponsors of these publications were included in the post-revolutionary purges. Until a reorganization in the government ministries takes hold, the fate of a large group of scholarly publications remains uncertain. Barrasihā-yi Tārikhī, Nāmah-i Anjuman-i Āṣār-i Millī, Hunar va Mardum, Jāvīdān Khirad, Mardumshināsī va Farhang-i 'Āmmah, and monographic series published by Bunyad-i Farhang-i Īrān and Anjuman-i Āṣār-i Millī are included in this group. Recently the Islamic government reestablished censorship by closing down some forty periodicals and newspapers and has threatened to close more if they do not follow "the revolutionary path" set by the new leaders.

### Publishing Output

The publishing industry, never very prosperous in Iran compared to other developing countries, faced a bigger recession in 1973 when the price of paper and the cost of printing rose rapidly. The Iranian Statistical Center, conducting interviews with publishers, booksellers, authors, translators and readers, summarized the situation as follows:<sup>2</sup>

1. The rising cost of paper and printing resulted in highly priced books.
2. Censorship and difficulty in obtaining publishing permits discouraged publishers from investing money in certain books.
3. Publishers did not readily accept manuscripts dealing with social problems because of censorship and government repression.
4. There was a lack of interest in reading by the general public.

5. Schools and educational institutions failed to create the necessary interest in reading.
6. Iran lacked a system of book export which would enable booksellers to sell to the outside market.
7. Private publishers had no protection from the government or credit institutions such as banks.
8. Book distribution was poor throughout the country.
9. The Iranian press and media had no active role in introducing books.
10. Authorship was not a secure profession.

Because of these problems, a typical press-run in Iran varied between 500 to 2,000 copies, occasionally reaching 5,000 or more, except for paperbacks and textbooks. The average number of copies printed for the years 1967 and 1971 was 2,094. Books with more than 5,000 copies formed only 10% of all the titles published.

Statistics provided by various agencies for different periods on the publishing output in Iran are divided and conflicting. The Iranian National Bibliography lists books received for registration by the National Library under the Book Depository Law of 1968. However, publications of government agencies, scientific research organizations, and some educational institutions are either excluded from listing or are only partially represented. Incomplete though they may be, the National Library statistics have been compiled and used since 1963. Prior to that the ten-year bibliography compiled by Īraj Afshār and Ḥusayn Banī Adam (1968) provides statistics for the period 1954-1963. According to this bibliography some 5,602 titles were published in these years of which 333 were children's books. Table 1 shows the distribution of books published for 1954-1963 by subject.

(Table #1)

		general	philos.	religion	soc. sci.	language	pure sci.	appl. sci.	art	liter.	hist. & geog.
T = total	5602	92	350	567	612	275	331	453	92	2160	670
A = adult	5269	92	350	567	612	275	269	441	89	1968	606
J = juv.	333	---	---	---	---	---	62	12	3	192	64

Source: I. Afshār. Kitābshināsī-i dahsālah-'i Īrān. Teheran: Book Society, 1968.

A comparison of the average annual book production in the decade 1954-1963 with the trend for 1963 and later shows some increase in the number of titles published in the later years. In fact, the number for 1971 is about four times that of 1963. However, looking at some factors, the level of book production in 1971 was still low. For instance, the Ministry of Education reported that in the same decade (1954-1963) the rate of literacy increased from 22% to 36%. The number of graduates from higher institutions of learning increased from 4,302 to 17,949, and that of high schools from 21,000 to 55,000; whereas the number of books produced in ten years increased by only 1,439 titles.

A study of books in the years 1963-1971 also shows some change in the ratio of titles published by subject as compared to the preceding years. Literary titles (still the highest percentage) show some decline in 1971. Philosophy titles also decrease after a relative increase in the preceding years. Books of general reference, applied sciences, social sciences and especially religion grew notably. (See the attached tables, 2a and 2b.)

(Table #2a)

Distribution of number of titles published,  
1963-1971, by subject and year

	Total	General	Philos.	Religion	Soc. Sci.	Lang.	Pure sci.	Ap. Sci.	Art	Liter.	Hist. & Geog.
1963	522	11	24	45	65	24	33	30	12	217	61
1964	984	37	53	96	106	41	53	68	15	421	94
1965	1,104	46	51	181	97	56	71	62	18	418	104
1966	1,242	42	65	126	123	53	69	99	17	537	111
1967	1,341	18	59	177	132	92	60	112	14	535	142
1968	-----	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	--	---	---
1969	1,231	42	64	125	113	52	67	104	17	536	111
1970	1,586	67	62	295	162	89	76	100	37	587	111
1971	1,961	81	60	335	300	104	124	155	35	577	190

Source: Iranian National Bibliography, 1963-1971

In a separate study by the Center for Cultural Studies and Coordination, Ministry of Culture and Arts, the number of titles published in 1971 has been placed at over 3,474.

The 1975 partial statistics put out by the National Library indicated a big decline in book production. According to the Library some 1,916 titles were published in each of the years 1973 and 1974, but the number for the period April-October, 1975 was only 700 titles. This was the year when, following the Arab Oil Embargo and the subsequent tripling of oil prices, inflation was rampant in Iran, and some small publishers were forced to either merge with others or go out of business. To offset the high cost of typesetting, less original publishing took place. Instead, off-set editions of the previously published titles (mostly in religion) were reproduced. Subjects other than religion stood in this order: poetry and literature, history and geography, social sciences, basic sciences, applied sciences, language and culture, and general reference. Most of the titles published were translations from English, and

(Table #2b)

Percentage of books published from 1963 to 1971, by subject

Year		General	Philosophy	Religion	Soc. Science	Language	Pure Sci.	Appl. Sci.	Art	Literature	History & Geography
1963	100	2.1	4.6	8.6	12.5	4.6	6.3	5.7	2.3	41.6	11.7
1964	"	3.7	5.4	9.7	10.8	4.2	5.4	6.9	1.5	42.8	9.6
1965	"	4.2	4.6	16.4	8.8	5.1	6.4	5.6	1.6	37.9	9.4
1966	"	3.4	5.2	10.1	9.9	4.3	5.6	8.0	1.4	43.2	8.9
1967	"	1.3	4.4	13.2	9.8	6.9	4.5	8.4	1.0	39.9	10.1
1968	"	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
1969	"	3.4	5.2	10.2	9.2	4.2	5.4	8.4	1.4	43.6	9.0
1970	"	4.2	3.9	18.6	10.2	5.6	4.8	6.3	2.3	37.1	7.0
1971	"	4.1	3.1	17.1	15.3	5.3	6.3	7.9	1.8	29.4	9.7

Source: Iranian National Bibliography, 1963-1971.

some from French, German and Arabic. The private publishers' translations were mostly history and social sciences; those issued in the public sector were in basic and applied sciences.

Statistics on pre-1954 book production in Iran are scarce. Therefore, it is hard to estimate how many titles have been published since the introduction of Arabic and Persian printing in the 19th century. A report on Iran's cultural activities issued by the Center for Cultural Studies and Coordination, Ministry of Culture and Arts, puts the number of Iranian publications for the 30 years preceding 1975 at 34,578. By putting together available statistics from various sources, one sees that a total of 50,000 books may have been issued in Iran since the introduction of printing.

As for serials, a study of the Iranian press for the period from 1964 to 1974 reveals that a total of 212 titles of daily newspapers, weeklies, monthly and quarterly journals and annuals in Persian, Assyrian (Syriac), Armenian, German, English, French and Arabic formed the Iranian press for that decade. From this number 138 were published in Tehran and the remainder in the provinces.<sup>3</sup>

After the Revolution, hundreds of new periodicals and newspapers appeared; some of them continue to be published. Featured among these literary, historical, religious and political newspapers and periodicals were those of minority ethnic groups, including Azeri Turks, Arabs, and Kurds.<sup>4</sup>

Table #3  
Iranian serial publications for 1964-1974

Type	Tehran	Other Cities	Total
Newspaper	21	7	28
Weekly	53	64	117
Monthly	55	2	57
Quarterly	1	1	2
Annual	5	-	5
Bulletins	3	-	3

Source: Barzīn, Mas'ūd. The Iranian Press. Tehran: Kitābkhānah-i Bahjat, 1976.



Table #4

Iranian serial publications for 1971, by language

	Total	Persian	English	French	Arabic	German	Armenian	Assyrian
Newspaper	34	27	5	1	-	-	1	-
Weekly newsletters & Bulletins	71	70	-	-	-	1	-	-
Weekly journals	30	29	1	-	-	-	-	-
Monthly journals	50	48	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	185	174	6	1	1	1	1	1

Source: Ministry of Information

IRANIAN NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS THAT WERE  
PUBLISHED IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE  
1979 REVOLUTION

Persian Newspapers

- |                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. 'Adālat             | 13. Awliyā'               |
| 2. Akhbār-i imrūz      | 14. Āyandah-i Āzarbāyijān |
| 3. 'Alī Bābā           | 15. Āzādī (Tihran)        |
| 4. Andīshah            | 16. Āzādī (Ahwaz)         |
| 5. Andīshah-i āzād     | 17. Āzarābadagān          |
| 6. Ārash               | 18. Āzarakhsh             |
| 7. Ārmān               | 19. Āzarbāyijān           |
| 8. Ārmān-i mustaḡ'afīn | 20. Bahār                 |
| 9. Asar                | 21. Bahār-i Īrān          |
| 10. Ashūr              | 22. Bāmdād                |
| 11. 'Aṣr               | 23. Barābarī              |
| 12. 'Aṣr-i nuvīn       | 24. Bārān                 |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 25. Barnāmah-i Ḥukūmat-i Jumhūrī-i Islāmī | 76. Kārtūn   |
| 26. Barrasī                               | 77. Khadang  |
| 27. Bāzār                                 | 78. Khalq  |
| 28. Bīdārī                                | 79. Khalq-i Musalmān                                 |
| 29. Bīdārī-i zān                          | 80. Khurāsān   |
| 30. Būrs                                  | 81. Khurūs-i Jangī                                   |
| 31. Chāp                                  | 82. Lālah  |
| 32. Dāmūn                                 | 83. Mahnāmah-i put                                   |
| 33. Dānishāmūz-i mubāriz                  | 84. Mard-i imrūz                                     |
| 34. Dānistānīhā                           | 85. Mardum   |
| 35. Dar khidmat-i inqilāb                 | 86. Mardum-i Īrān                                    |
| 36. Dawrahgard                            | 87. Mardum-i Īrān (Ittiḥād-i dimūkrātīk)             |
| 37. Dīplumāt                              | 88. Mash Ḥasan                                       |
| 38. Dirafsh-i āzādī                       | 89. Mihr-i Īrān                                      |
| 39. Dunyā                                 | 90. Mu'allim   |
| 40. Dunyā-i jadīd                         | 91. Mubāriz (Organ of Iranian Workers' Organization) |
| 41. Fajr-i umīd                           | 92. Nabard-i mā                                      |
| 42. Farmān                                | 93. Nabard-i millat                                  |
| 43. Faryād-i Gīlān                        | 94. Nahīb-i āzādī                                    |
| 44. Gawd                                  | 95. Nahīb-i gharb                                    |
| 45. Guzārishhā-yi ḥuqūqī                  | 96. Nahāt-i zanān-i Musalmān                         |
| 46. Ḥājī Bābā                             | 97. Nāmah-i āhangar                                  |
| 47. Hamsayāh'hā                           | 98. Nāshir   |
| 48. Hamshahrī                             | 99. Nashriyah-i kārgarān-i Musalmān                  |
| 49. Ḥaqīqat                               | 100. Nāshir  |
| 50. Hifdah-i Shahrīvar                    | 101. Navīd   |
| 51. Iftikhārāt-i millī                    | 102. Nidā-yi āzādī                                   |
| 52. Imām                                  | 103. Nidā-yi miḥan                                   |
| 53. Inqilāb-i Islāmī                      | 104. Nidā-yi mustag'af                               |
| 54. Īsār                                  | 105. Nidā-yi nāsyūnālīst                             |
| 55. 'Ishqī                                | 106. Nidā-yi Zāhidān                                 |
| 56. I'tirāf                               | 107. Nūr-i Khurāsān                                  |
| 57. Ittiḥād                               | 108. Pānizdah-i Khurdād                              |
| 58. Ittiḥād-i chāp                        | 109. Parkhāsh  |
| 59. Ittiḥād-i dimūkrāsī                   | 110. Pāsdārān  |
| 60. Ittiḥād-i mardum                      | 111. Payām   |
| 61. Jihād-i mu'allim                      | 112. Payām-i janāb                                   |
| 62. Jangal                                | 113. Payām-i khalq                                   |
| 63. Jaras barā-yi dihqān                  | 114. Payghām-i imrūz                                 |
| 64. Javānān-i inqilāb                     | 115. Paykār  |
| 65. Jawshan                               | 116. Paykār-i khalq                                  |
| 66. Jibhah-i āzādī                        | 117. Payk-i junūb                                    |
| 67. Jibhah-i millī-i Īrān                 | 118. Pūyā  |
| 68. Jibhah-i sīmā-yi inqilāb              | 119. Qiyām-i Īrān                                    |
| 69. Jīgh va dād                           | 120. Rahāyī-i zan                                    |
| 70. Jum'ah                                | 121. Rahnamā   |
| 71. Jumhūrī-i Islāmī                      | 122. Ranjbar   |
| 72. Jumhūrī-i Khalq-i Musalmān-i Īrān.    | 123. Rūydād  |
| 73. Junbush                               | 124. Ṣadā-yi Būshihir                                |
| 74. Kār                                   | 125. Ṣadā-yi dānishjū                                |
| 75. Kārgar                                |  |