

Part A: Access Issue

Daniel Pinkwater wrote the preface for this edition of Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Clearly, the main entry would be under Twain, Mark, 1835-1910 (AACR2, 2002, 21.1A2). That uniform heading for the author named in the chief source of information, Samuel Clemens, reflects predominant usage (22.2A1), confirmed by OCLC authority records. The record would contain a name added entry for the translator (21.0D1) with the form de Bary, Robert (*tr.*) (22.5D1). The role of preface author is peripheral to authorship of the work itself, however, and it normally may not be documented in a catalog record. However, a cataloger may include a name added entry for a person having a relationship to the work "if the heading provides an important access point" (21.30F1).

Pinkwater is a notable author in children's and youth literature. He is the sole author of many titles and [coauthor of more](#). His work has been frequently [adapted](#) and included in [collections](#). Pinkwater is also the [subject of cataloged works](#), but that fact would not support creating a name added entry for him in the record under consideration (21.30H1). Still, users in many situations may be expected to benefit from collocation of Pinkwater's works, and his authorship of the preface may well justify inclusion of a heading for him as an important access point under 21.30F1.

Seymour Lubetzky (1969, p. 10) asserts that a catalog's function "must not be limited to telling only 'what books the library possesses,' . . . but go beyond that and call [the user's] attention to related materials which might be pertinent to his interest and thus help him to utilize more fully and adequately the library's resources" (emphasis original). This comment raises questions about how to evaluate pertinence to user interest and effectiveness in fully and adequately using the library's resources. Similarly, the ICCP's Statement of Principles (1961)

calls for at least one entry for each work and more than one if necessary in the interest of the user or because of the nature of work. AACR2 provides no general rule about works of mixed responsibility, and rules about shared responsibility offer no analogous guidance about inclusion of an added entry for Pinkwater. The decision is a question of cataloger taste and judgment.

A cataloger for a library without many works by or related to Pinkwater, or one with only limited French language materials, might well omit the added entry, because collocation of materials de-emphasized in the library's particular collection would contribute little to full, adequate use of its resources. Depending on plans for expanding the collection, however, subsequent acquisitions may fill out those parts of the collection and justify the collocating link. The decision gains urgency, because if the information were not added to the record at the time of its creation, the opportunity may be permanently lost. In an environment of online catalogs displaying records stored in databases, additional data presents only a small consideration in storage capacity, which is both cheap and easy to expand, in contrast to former times when space on cards and capacity for their storage were quite constrained. This condition may incline a cataloger to add information in case of doubt, yet such a practice would risk cluttering records, and therefore potentially users' retrieval displays, with information of questionable value to them. An overly lax policy emphasizing inclusion of peripheral information could actually obstruct users' access to resources by skewing the balance of retrieval sets substantially toward recall at considerable expense to precision.

In deciding whether to include the added entry, a cataloger should consider its effect on sharing of the library's resources as well as its catalog records. The heading could be justified if the library had substantial interlibrary loan relationships with other institutions that emphasized Pinkwater's work, since it might help those patrons discover a work potentially interesting to

them. Similarly, if the current record were original cataloging of the resource, that heading could improve access for users of any other library that might later consume the record. The much more likely case, however, would involve a cataloger considering making a local addition to a record downloaded from a central service, so consideration of the library's own users, including those accessing partner libraries, would probably guide the decision.

Pinkwater's authorship of the preface would not justify addition of a heading in the record for *Les Aventures de Huck Finn* if the library's collection policy and holdings were specifically focused in another direction. For example, if the resource were held by a college writing program emphasizing adult literature or a French studies program for adults, then the added entry would not be justified. The case merits consideration, since *Huck Finn* is a work popular with adults as well as children. However, a cataloger should include the name added entry for Pinkwater if the library's collection makes a significant commitment to youth materials. A school library catalog would certainly call for such a heading, as popular as both Pinkwater's works and *Huck Finn* are in that environment. It would be especially valuable for teachers seeking to expand students' awareness from authors they already know to related materials that would be new to them.

The proper uniform heading would be Pinkwater, Daniel Manus, 1941- which reflects predominant usage (22.2A1), confirmed by OCLC Name Authority.

Part B: Description Issue

Description is complicated by indications that the book may have been published separately in two different locations by two different publishers in two different years. This multiplicity of publishers and the difference between the copyright date and the title page date may suggest that one edition was released by Pierre D. Clement Publishing for the European market and another by that firm jointly with Crane, Russak for the U.S. market. If so, the record must allow users to

distinguish the two editions from one another; even if not, cataloging must resolve the multiplicity of data for fields typically featuring one value each.

Lubetzky (1949, p. 7) would have a cataloger create records that describe resources as fully as necessary to "state the significant features of an item with the purpose of distinguishing it from other items and describing its scope, contents, and bibliographic relation to other items . . . but with economy of data and expression." The goals of full description and economy of data conflict somewhat, so the cataloger must strike a balance. An emphasis on economy of data may suggest listing only the publisher named first on the chief source of information, and such a decision may seem supported by the fact that the French-language edition lists a publisher with offices in Paris. Yet the additional publication information is certainly relevant to the edition, indicated by its placement on the title page rather than in some less prominent location.

The cataloger's work must reflect the high popularity of the public-domain resource of which the current item is a translation. Users must distinguish this edition of *Huck Finn* from quite a number of others, creating a high expectation that additional catalog data could aid in that determination. Even in the absence of specific information about particular other related editions, the cataloger is justified in citing the U.S. publisher to promote clear identification of this one within a crowded field. Further, that information may aid in access as well as description and distinction for someone in the United States, who may more easily deal with the New York publisher than with the one that has offices only in Europe.

The MARC 260 field should list London as the place of publication for Pierre D. Clement Publishing and omit Paris, because only the first location is recorded except when variations in typography or placement suggest that another may be primary (1.4C5). That field should name both Pierre D. Clement Publishing and Crane, Russak as publishers (with New York as the place

of publication for the latter) because one is first-named and the other is located in the home country of the cataloging agency (1.4D4d, 2.4D1). In the absence of information about the role of Crane, Russak in releasing the edition beyond what the chief source of information provides, any move by the cataloger to add [distributor] or other designations (2.4E1) would amount to inappropriate speculation, so no such designation should be added.

The difference of 7 years between the dates on the title page and in the copyright statement may create questions in the mind of a user considering multiple editions of the work. The dates are far enough apart to raise concern that they indicate two editions rather than one. This uncertainty should be resolved by listing both dates. That from the chief source of information, 1981, should appear first followed by a comma and c1974 to indicate the earlier copyright (1.4F5, 2.4F1).

References

Anglo-American cataloging rules, 2nd ed. (AACR2). 2002. Chicago: American Library Association.

Lubetzky, S. 1949. Rules for descriptive cataloging in the Library of Congress. Washington: Library of Congress.

Lubetzky, S. 1969. Principles of cataloging. Los Angeles: Institute of Library Research, Univ. of California.

Statement of principles. 1961. Paris: International Conference on Cataloging Principles.