

Editor's Note

Correction to Blair Kuntz, "Arabic Transliteration Scheme: ISO or LC?" *MELA Notes* 78 (2005) 56:

The only serious competitor to the LC scheme, however, is the ISO scheme (first edition published in 1984) which has been adopted by the United Kingdoms branch of the Middle East Libraries Committee and by other European library committees.

Corrected text supplied by the author (02/10/2006):

The ILO standard has been adopted as the official British standard for romanization of Arabic (BS4280) (although MELCOM UK has agreed on the adoption of LC romanization tables), and outside the English-speaking world the national standards for romanization of Arabic in many European countries are also based on ISO (Vernon, p. 11).

We are grateful to Paul Auchterlone for having noticed the error and bringing it to our attention in an email:

From: Paul Auchterlonie

To:

Date: Thu, 12 Jan 2006 12:59:20 +0000 (GMT Standard Time)

Dear Mr. Rodgers,

At our MELCOM (UK) meeting yesterday, it was pointed out by Geoffrey Roper that in the latest number of *MELA Notes* (no. 78) there is a statement that "the ISO scheme...has been adopted by the United Kingdom's branch of the Middle East Libraries Committee and by other European library committees" (p. 56).

I cannot speak for other countries, but no UK university or national library uses ISO transliteration for Arabic or Persian, or has done so for twenty years. I was present at the MELCOM meeting in Oxford in the mid-1980s when the Committee discussed the issue of recommending a transliteration scheme to all its member libraries. As it was felt that the future lay in shared cataloguing and that North American libraries would be supplying the bulk of new records for Middle Eastern languages, the Committee decided to recommend LC transliteration and this has been our policy ever since, to which all member libraries of university or national

status have adhered. All libraries contributing to COPAC (the online union catalogue of members of the UK Consortium of Research Libraries, plus the British Library and the National Libraries of Scotland and Wales) have submitted their records for material in Arabic and Persian in LC transliteration since COPAC began in the 1990s, and there is no reason to believe that any library is contemplating changing.

MELCOM (UK) feels that readers of MELA Notes should not be misled by a factual error of such fundamental importance. I would be grateful if, as editor of the journal, you could incorporate a correction to Blair Kuntz's statement in the next issue of MELA Notes.

With best wishes,
Paul Auchterlonie.

Paul Auchterlonie
Chair MELCOM (UK)
University of Exeter
Old Library
Prince of Wales Road
Exeter EX4 4SB
U.K.