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**Cataloguing practice of Borys Zdanevych: origins of Ukrainian fragmentology**

Borys Zdanevych's catalogue of incunabula (1974) is a unique source for studying fragments of medieval manuscripts used in bookbinding. Fragmentology as a separate discipline has recently emerged in book studies, but as part of broader research has older foundations. Analysis of the methodology reveals an innovative approach to recording manuscript heritage and developing description protocols that allow researchers to better study this field and draw conclusions.
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The catalogue of incunabula of the Central Scientific Library of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, compiled by Borys Ivanovych Zdanevych and published in 1974, represents a remarkable phenomenon in Ukrainian incunabulistics. Borys Zdanevych (1886-1966) was a distinguished Ukrainian bibliographer who worked for decades on the systematic description of incunabula. His research activities included not only cataloguing but also fundamental study of printing history, which led to a comprehensive approach to describing early printed books.

A turning point in Zdanevych's research came in 1937 when he discovered sixteen leaves of a previously unknown Gutenberg print "Provinciale Romanum" in the binding of an Estienne Bible (1557). This discovery, which expanded the canon of works from Gutenberg's workshop, sparked the researcher's particular interest and attention to manuscript fragments in incunabula bindings. The identification of the unknown print demonstrated how careful analysis of fragments could yield results of international significance.

Fragmentology as a separate discipline has recently emerged in book studies with the appearance of the journal "Fragmentology" in 2018, but as part of broader research has older foundations, dating back to the works of Jean Mabillon (1681). An important aspect is the protocol for describing fragments, which allows researchers to better study this field and make well-founded conclusions about the origin, dating, and context of manuscript materials usage.

The particular significance of Zdanevych's catalogue lies in his innovative approach to recording fragments of medieval manuscripts used in early printed book bindings. Structurally, Zdanevych included information about manuscript fragments in the fifth section of the catalogue entry - "Description of the given copy", treating them as an integral part of the history of a specific incunabula copy.

Analysis of the catalogue reveals three main levels of fragment description detail. The most detailed descriptions were provided for fragments that could be completely identified. For example, in description No. 27 (Angelus de Clavasio. Summa angelica) it is noted: "The inner sides of the boards are lined with two sheets of an ancient ornamented manuscript on parchment of liturgical content, with ancient notes (neumes)". The second level is characterized by partial attribution with cautious formulations, as in No. 280 (Leonhardus de Utino): "The inner sides of the binding are lined with fragments of a parchment manuscript of the 14th-15th centuries in German (excerpt from a document?)". The third level was limited to stating the fact of fragments' presence without detailed attribution.

Functional classification of fragments became an important element of Zdanevych's methodology. He systematically recorded the method of use: endpapers, underlays for binding cords, lining of inner sides of binding, spine reinforcement. Attribution work included linguistic identification (Latin, German, Hebrew, Polish), chronological dating, and content attribution (liturgical texts, medical manuscripts, legal documents, dictionaries).

Particularly noteworthy is the case of No. 477 (Thomas a Kempis), where the author recorded even imprints of lost texts: "Two sheets of an ancient manuscript were used to line the inner sides of the boards, which are now absent, but their text is quite clearly imprinted on the boards in mirror image". This demonstrates an exceptionally careful approach to documenting even indirect evidence of manuscript heritage.

Zdanevych's methodological principles were based on reliability (using question marks for doubtful attributions), completeness (recording all available information), and contextuality (description in connection with a specific copy). Overall, the catalogue identifies over 46 incunabula with manuscript fragments, representing a significant corpus for manuscript tradition research.

Despite the innovative nature of Borys Zdanevych's approach to fragmentology, the incunabula catalogue now requires updating in connection with the development of description systems, international description protocols, and especially new fields of knowledge such as fragment studies. Fragments could constitute a separate catalogue rather than merely remaining in the context of bindings, which corresponds to current trends in fragmentology and would allow fuller realization of this unique collection's potential for the international scholarly community.

Borys Zdanevych's methodological approach to describing manuscript fragments created a unique source base for contemporary research. His methodology combined scholarly precision with practical expediency, laying foundations for further development of cataloguing practice and preservation of information about manuscript heritage within printed publications.
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**Практика каталогізації Бориса Зданевича: витоки української фрагментології**

Каталог інкунабул Бориса Зданевича (1974) є унікальним джерелом для дослідження фрагментів середньовічних рукописів, які використовувалися в інтролігаторському ремеслі. Фрагментологія як окрема дисципліна виокремилась недавно в книжкових студіях, проте як частина ширших досліджень має давніші засади. Аналіз методики опису фрагментів виявляє новаторський підхід каталогізатора до фіксації рукописної спадщини та розробки протоколів опису, що дозволяють дослідникам краще досліджувати цю галузь та робити висновки.
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