

**THE COMMEMORATION OF THE BURNT FATHERS IN THE NEW IADGARI: LITURGY
AND TRADITION OF THE MARTYRED MONKS OF ST. SABAS¹**

Tamaz Davidze

Doctor of Philology of Akaki Tsereteli State University
Kutaisi, 59 Tamar Mepe St. 4600,
Georgia, +995558148401, tazodevidze@gmail.com,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4029-6171>

Abstract. This article examines the liturgical service for the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers – the monks of the Great Lavra of St. Sabas martyred by fire and smoke around 796–798 – as preserved in the New Iadgari and its later Athonite redaction. Through comparative textual and structural analysis of the principal Georgian witnesses (primarily Sin. Geo 1 and Jer. 100) and the early Greek source Sin. Gr. 607, the study traces the evolution of the service’s liturgical rank and hymnographic composition.

In the New Iadgari tradition, the commemoration on 19 March occupies a prominent structural position within the Great Lent cycle, nearly equivalent to the Annunciation, featuring stichera at the Praises and an eight-ode kanon attributed to Stephen the Sabaite. In contrast, both the Athonite redaction (Jer. 100) and the ancient Greek witness (Sin. Gr. 607) display a clear reduction in liturgical rank, evident in the omission of stichera at the Praises and the redistribution or simplification of other elements.

While the hymnographic core demonstrates notable stability across the traditions, the outer liturgical framework underwent progressive simplification. This process reflects the broader impact of Byzantinization and the increasing dominance of the penitential character of Great Lent. The study argues that the New Iadgari preserves an earlier Palestinian-Sabaite form of the service that was gradually marginalized in both Greek and later Georgian usage, highlighting the conservative role of Georgian monastic scriptoria in transmitting archaic features of the Jerusalem liturgy.

Keywords: New Iadgari, Burnt Fathers, St. Sabas Lavra, Sabaite liturgy, Byzantinization, Georgian hymnography, Jerusalem rite

Introduction. The New Iadgari represents one of the most important witnesses to the early medieval liturgy of Jerusalem and its Palestinian monastic traditions. As a comprehensive hymnographic and calendrical collection, it preserves a stage of the Hagiopolitan rite prior to the full impact of Constantinopolitan standardization. Among its distinctive features is the inclusion of three immovable feasts within the cycle of Great Lent: the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste (9 March), the Annunciation (25 March), and the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers – the monks of the Great Lavra of St. Sabas martyred around 796–798 (19 March in the New Iadgari).

In contemporary liturgical practice, only the Forty Martyrs and the Annunciation retain full festal expression during Great Lent. The Burnt Fathers’ commemoration has been significantly marginalized, surviving in a reduced form on 20 March. This shift reflects the broader historical process of liturgical Byzantinization – the gradual alignment of local Palestinian and monastic traditions with the standardized rite of Constantinople, particularly from the ninth to the twelfth centuries.

The historical event itself is recorded in a near-contemporary account attributed to Stephen the Sabaite (ca. 725–807), nephew of St. John of Damascus, who is also traditionally regarded as the author of the kanon for this feast. The prominent place assigned to the service in the New Iadgari – structurally nearly equivalent to that of the Annunciation – suggests that the martyrdom held considerable significance in the early Sabaite tradition.

¹ კვლევა №YS-24-1215 განხორციელდა შოთა რუსთაველის საქართველოს ეროვნული სამეცნიერო ფონდის მხარდაჭერით.

This research № YS-24-1215 has been supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG)

Recent scholarship provides a valuable framework for understanding this transitional period. Daniel Galadza's *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (2018) offers a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of the Hagiopolitan rite under Byzantine influence, while Stig Frøyshov's studies on the Iadgari tradition have underscored the importance of Georgian witnesses for reconstructing the early Jerusalem Tropologion and its Sabaite adaptations.

Against this background, the present study focuses on the liturgical service for the Burnt Fathers as preserved in the New Iadgari (primarily Sin. Geo 1, with parallels in Sin. Geo 14, 26, 59, and 64–65) and its later Athonite redaction by St. George the Hagiorite (Jer. 100). By comparing these Georgian witnesses with the ancient Greek source Sin. Gr. 607, the article seeks to determine how the liturgical rank and structure of the service evolved, to what extent the New Iadgari preserves an earlier Palestinian-Sabaite form, and what this reveals about the selective impact of Byzantinization on Georgian liturgical tradition.

Methods. This study employs a comparative textual and structural analysis to trace the transmission, redactional development, and changing liturgical rank of the service for the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers. The methodological approach combines close philological reading of the hymnographic texts with systematic structural comparison of their liturgical components and rank indicators.

The base text is drawn from Sin. Geo 1 (ff. 93v–95v), one of the most complete and earliest witnesses of the New Iadgari. This version is systematically compared with other New Iadgari manuscripts (Sin. Geo 14, Sin. Geo 26, Sin. Geo 59, and Sin. Geo 64–65) and with the later Athonite redaction by St. George the Hagiorite preserved in Jer. 100. Additional Georgian sources – the Polykephalon of Parkhali and manuscript A 188 (11th century, ff. 233v–247v) – are consulted for hagiographical and historical context.

For the Greek tradition, the manuscript Sin. Gr. 607 (ff. 71v–77v) serves as the primary witness. Parallel readings focus on three key elements: (1) the Vespers stichera at “Lord, I have cried,” (2) the eight-ode kanon attributed to Stephen the Sabaite, and (3) the presence or absence of stichera at the Praises. Special attention is paid to the migration and redistribution of troparia between sections, as well as variations in the number, length, and internal coherence of individual odes (particularly the fourth and seventh).

Liturgical rank is assessed according to established criteria in Eastern Christian liturgical studies: the presence and number of stichera at “Lord, I have cried,” and at the Praises, the elaboration of Vespers and Matins, the distribution of troparia within the kanon, and the inclusion of additional elements such as the pre-canon sticheron (tsardgomay). These indicators are interpreted within the framework of liturgical Byzantinization as developed by Daniel Galadza (2018), who analyses the progressive alignment of Hagiopolitan and Palestinian monastic usages with Constantinopolitan norms. The study also draws on Stig Frøyshov's methodological approach to the Iadgari tradition, which emphasizes the value of Georgian sources for reconstructing earlier layers of Jerusalem hymnography and distinguishing between archaic and later redactional elements.

All comparisons were conducted using high-resolution digital facsimiles of the manuscripts. Textual variants, additions, omissions, and rearrangements were documented through parallel tables and line-by-line collations. Where relevant, English translations of key troparia are provided to facilitate analysis. The study acknowledges the inherent limitations of working with medieval liturgical manuscripts, including possible scribal interventions, fragmentary preservation, and the difficulty of reconstructing the precise performance context of early medieval services.

Results and Discussion. The authorship of the liturgical chants for the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers is closely associated with the Sabaite monastic milieu. These chants are traditionally attributed to Stephen the Sabaite (ca. 725–807), nephew of St. John of Damascus. Beyond his well-known work as a hagiographer, Stephen was also a prolific hymnographer who collaborated closely with his uncle in composing several Lenten hymns. Sophronios Eustratiadis highlights this early collaboration:

“While still young, he collaborated with his teacher in the composition of hymns, as is attested by the heirmos for the martyr Sabbatios, of which seven odes – according to the testimony of the Paris Coislin Codex 220, f. 956, namely the first, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, and ninth – were composed by John, while the remaining three – the first, sixth, and seventh – were composed by Stephen” (Εὐστρατιάδης 1933, p. 595).

Stephen's hymns were subsequently translated into Georgian and incorporated into both the New Iadgari manuscripts and the later Athonite redaction by St. George the Hagiorite. His authorship is confirmed in Sin. Geo 5 (f. 28v), where he is listed among the principal composers of Lenten hymns alongside Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Theodore the Studite:

“The hymns for the holy fasts of the weeks were composed by Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem; others were composed by the holy monk Stephen the Sabaite, nephew of John of Damascus; others by our holy father Theodore the Studite. Another set for 'Lord, I have cried,' and the Praises was composed by the blessed Minchkhi the Georgian” (Sin. Geo 5, f. 28v).

The prominent liturgical rank accorded to the service for the Burnt Fathers in the New Iadgari indicates that their martyrdom was regarded as a particularly significant event within Jerusalem tradition. This is further supported by the inclusion of the full Georgian translation of the martyrdom narrative, preserved in the Polykephalon of Parkhali and in manuscript A 188 (11th century, ff. 233v–247v). As Korneli Kekelidze noted, both the account of the Burnt Fathers and the Martyrdom of Romanos the New Martyr were translated into Georgian from Arabic (Kekelidze 1957, pp. 111–112).

A structural comparison with the other two immovable feasts incorporated into Great Lent clearly illustrates the elevated status of the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers.

Table 1. Structure of major festal services during Great Lent in Sin. Geo 1

Feast	Lord, I have cried	Matins kanon	Praises	Aposticha
Forty Martyrs of Sebaste	3 stichera	+	-	-
Burnt Fathers	3 stichera	+	4 stichera	-
Annunciation	3 stichera	+	3 stichera	+

As Table 1 demonstrates, in terms of overall composition the service for the Burnt Fathers is almost equal in weight to that of the Annunciation, the only notable difference being the absence of stichera at the Aposticha. Such structural richness – especially the presence of four stichera at the Praises and a substantial kanon – is exceptional within the penitential context of Great Lent and clearly reflects the high esteem in which the martyred monks of St. Sabas were held in the early Jerusalem rite.

In the New Iadgari tradition, the commemoration is fixed on 19 March. This date is not accidental; it reflects the early Palestinian (Hagiopolitan) liturgical practice, which Georgian sources often preserve in a more archaic form than later Byzantine witnesses. As Frøyshov notes, “the Georgian witness is by far the most important [for the Jerusalem liturgy], since while the Armenian witness is more or less limited to an archaic version of the Lectionary, the Georgian one appears to cover all the liturgical books of Jerusalem” (Frøyshov, 2012, p. 228). However, the service does not appear uniformly in all New Iadgari manuscripts. While it is fully preserved in Sin. Geo 1, Sin. Geo 14, and Sin. Geo 64–65, it is absent in others such as Sin. Geo 34 and Sin. Geo 59. This variation already signals the selective transmission and gradual marginalization of certain Palestinian commemorations within the Georgian liturgical corpus.

Where the service is included, its overall structure remains remarkably consistent across most New Iadgari manuscripts. It consists of three principal components: stichera at “Lord, I have cried,” (Vespers), the full Matins kanon (eight odes, without the second ode), and stichera at the Praises. The Vespers stichera comprise three troparia, followed by a Theotokion. The Matins kanon is an eight-ode composition. The distribution of troparia across the odes of the Matins kanon (excluding the Theotokia) reveals a markedly uneven pattern, as shown in Table 2. While most odes contain three or four troparia, the fourth ode stands out with six troparia in all three traditions – Sin. Geo 1, Jer. 100, and Sin. Gr. 607 alike.

An exception occurs in Sin. Geo 26, where the service is limited only to the stichera at “Lord, I have cried,” and the Praises, with no Matins kanon present (ff. 23r–23v). This abbreviated form further illustrates the selective transmission of the commemoration within the New Iadgari corpus.

Table 2. Number of troparia in the Matins kanon (excluding Theotokia)

Ode	Sin Gr. 607	Sin Geo 1	Jer. 100
I Ode	4	4	4
III Ode	3	3	3
IV Ode	6	6	6
V Ode	3	3	3
VI Ode	3	3	3
VII Ode	5	3	5
VIII Ode	4	4	4
IX Ode	4	4	4

A particularly noteworthy feature is the disproportionate length of the fourth ode, which contains six troparia — significantly more than any other ode. These troparia form a coherent thematic unit centered on the adversary's envy, the stirring up of the barbarians, the monks' steadfast resistance in the desert, and their ultimate victory through Christ. Their internal cohesion and substantial length strongly suggest that this section constitutes an original compositional block rather than a later compilation. This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that the fourth ode remains the longest not only in the New Iadgari (Sin. Geo 1), but also in the later Athonite redaction (Jer. 100) and the ancient Greek witness (Sin. Gr. 607). Such consistency across different linguistic and redactional layers indicates that the distinctive length and thematic unity of the fourth ode belong to the kanon's early tradition.

The textual comparison across the three witnesses reveals two distinct patterns. While the fourth ode exhibits remarkable stability, the seventh ode shows clear quantitative variation. Here Sin. Geo 1 contains only three troparia, whereas both Jer. 100 and Sin. Gr. 607 preserve five. The two additional troparia present in the latter two traditions are essentially identical in content. For illustration:

Sin Gr. 607

[75v] Ὁλην πρὸς σὲ μεταθέντες,
ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν Χριστέ,
τον θυμὸν δὲ
κατὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας
μόνης ἀνθοπλίσαντες, σοὶ εὐηρέστησαν
πανσόφῳ χρώμενοι λογισμῷ,
οἱ θεράποντές σου Κύριε.

*Having transferred all desire
from the world to You, O Christ,
and having armed the anger
only against sin,
they pleased You
using most wise reasoning,
Your servants, O Lord.*

Jer. 100

[180r] სურვილი და წადილი
ყოველი შენდა მომართ მოეცავალა საწუთროდსაგან,
უფალო,
ხოლო გულისწყრომა ადულო ცოდვისა მიმართ,
ამისთვის სათნოეყვნეს
ახოვანნი
და უშიშნი
მონანი შენნი და მორჩილნი ბრძანებათა შენთანი.

*All desire and longing
have they turned toward You
from the world, O Lord,
but their wrath they have raised
only against sin.
Therefore, they have pleased You –
the venerable and fearless
servants of Yours, obedient to Your commandments.*

Νόμον θεόγραφον ἔνδον,
ταῖς πλαξί τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν,
θεόθεν Μάρτυρες δεδεγμένοι,
ἕνα ἐν Τριάδι Θεὸν ἐκηρύξατε·
Εὐλογητὸς εἶ καὶ αἰνετός,
ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τῶν Πατέρων ἡμῶν.

შჯული დაწერილი
შინაგან ფიცართა გულისათა თქუენისათა
შეგეწყნარა,
[180v]მარტვლნო,
და ერთსა ღმერთსა სამებით ჰქადაგებდით,
სანატრელნო,
და მისსა მიმართ ჰკმობდით
და იტყოდეთ: კურთხეულხარ

*The God-inscribed law within,
on the tablets of your hearts,
having received it from God, O Martyrs,
you proclaimed one God in Trinity.
Blessed are You and worthy of praise,
O God of our fathers.*

*The law inscribed by God
within the tablets of your hearts have you received,
O Martyrs,
and the one God in Trinity you proclaimed, O venerable
ones,
and toward Him you cried out
and said: Blessed are You.*

This close correspondence between the Athonite redaction (Jer. 100) and the ancient Greek witness (Sin. Gr. 607) in the seventh ode, where the New Iadgari (Sin. Geo 1) offers a noticeably shorter version, illustrates that the differences between the traditions are mainly quantitative rather than qualitative.

More importantly, this textual alignment reveals that the Athonite redaction takes into account a later, slightly modified Greek version of the service.

The service for the Burnt Fathers as preserved in Jer. 100, the Athonite redaction by St. George the Hagiorite, differs noticeably from the earlier New Iadgari version. The most important change is the complete omission of the stichera at the Praises. Since their presence was a characteristic marker of a higher-ranking feast in the Hagiopolitan system, this omission clearly indicates a deliberate lowering of the liturgical rank of the commemoration. A similar simplification is already attested in the ancient Greek witness Sin. Gr. 607, suggesting that the Athonite redaction drew upon an evolving Greek tradition rather than simply abbreviating the New Iadgari.

At the same time, Vespers is expanded with multiple sets of stichera (Mkhneoni, Gikharodeni, and Qoveli sasobay), some of which incorporate material originally belonging to the Praises in the New Iadgari, while a new pre-canon sticheron (tsardgomay) is introduced at Matins. These modifications point to a complex redactional process in which certain archaic Palestinian elements were retained even as the service was adapted to the penitential demands of Great Lent and aligned more closely with Constantinopolitan norms (cf. Galadza 2018).

These modifications are presented in detail in Table 3.

Table 3. Liturgical structure of the Burnt Fathers' service in Jer. 100 (Athonite redaction by St. George the Hagiorite)

Section	Element	Number	Remarks
Vespers	Mkhneoni	3	Stichera at "Lord, I have cried"
	Gikharodeni	3	Includes material from the Praises of Sin. Geo 1
	Qoveli sasobay	1	Additional
Matins	Pre-canon sticheron	2	New element
	Ode I	4 + Theotokion	–
	Ode III	3 + Theotokion	–
	Ode IV	6 + Theotokion	Remains the longest
	Ode V	3 + Theotokion	–
	Ode VI	3 + Theotokion	–

	Ode VII	5 + Theotokion	Expanded compared to New Iadgari
	Ode VIII	4 + Trinitarian	–
	Ode IX	4 + Theotokion	–
	Stichera at the Praises	0	Omitted – significant reduction in liturgical rank

This contrast highlights that the Georgian New Iadgari witnesses preserve an earlier and more elaborate stage of the service than that reflected in the surviving Greek sources and the later Athonite redaction.

The early Greek witness Sin. Gr. 607 (ff. 71v–77v) already displays a structurally simpler form of the service. This structure is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Liturgical structure of the Burnt Fathers' service in Sin. Gr. 607

Section	Element	Number	Remarks
Vespers	Stichera at “Lord, I have cried”	3	
Matins	Pre-canon sticheron	–	absent
	Ode I	4 + Theotokion	–
	Ode III	3 + Theotokion	–
	Ode IV	6 + Theotokion	Remains the longest
	Ode V	3 + Theotokion	–
	Ode VI	3 + Theotokion	–
	Ode VII	5 + Theotokion	–
	Ode VIII	4 + Theotokion	–
	Ode IX	4 + Theotokion	–
Stichera at the Praises	-	Omitted – significant reduction in liturgical rank	

Between these two poles stands the Athonite redaction preserved in Jer. 100. It can be regarded as a transitional stage: while it shares the reduced rank with Sin. Gr. 607 (omission of the Praises stichera), it nevertheless retains certain archaic Palestinian features, most notably the introduction of a pre-canon sticheron (tsardgomay) at Matins — an element often associated with higher-ranking feasts in the Hagiopolitan tradition. At the same time, the expansion of Vespers with multiple sets of stichera, some of which recycle material from the Praises of the New Iadgari, reveals an attempt to compensate for the loss of stichera at praises. Thus, Jer. 100 reflects a complex compromise between the preservation of older Sabaitic elements and the increasing pressure toward simplification during Great Lent.

The absence of stichera at the Praises marks a significant departure from the more solemn form preserved in the New Iadgari.

Sin Gr. 607

Ἀγρίως τὰ κύκλω
περιλαβὼν ὡς ἐπόρθησεν,
φυγαδεῦσαι δὲ τοὺτους οὐκ
ἴσχυσε
τοὺς ἀντιτύπους,

Sin. Geo 1

მჯდომი რად ვერ
შემძლებელ იქმნა
ოტებად წმიდათა
უდაბნოვსა მათისაგან

Jer. 100

მძუნვარედ
აღძრნა შემოგარენი, ვითარცა
სუროდა,
ხოლო ოტებად ამათ

μάρτυρας ἐξ ὅρουσ ὁ δολίως
νίκης θείας ἀοράτως,
ὀφθαλμοφανῶς ἐπεστράτευσεν
[74r].

*Fiercely encircling them round
about
as though to sack them,
he could not put these steadfast
ones to flight –
these opponents,
the martyrs from the mountain
whom the deceiver
with a victory invisible to the
eye,
openly waged war against.*

სანატრელთა,
ივლტოდა იგი და
განჰზადნა საკუთარნი
მსახურნი აღჭურვილნი,
რადთა მათ მიერ მოსრნეს
უწყალოდ [94r].

*The fierce one who had
encircled them on every side
as if to plunder them,
could not drive them away –
these steadfast ones.
Yet he himself was invisibly
vanquished by victory
and visibly launched an
attack
against the desert-dwellers.*

უძლეველთა ვერ უძლო
წინააღმდეგომმან წმიდათამან,
რამეთუ იძლია
უხილავად, ამისთვის
ცხადად და საჩინოდ ბრძოლა
უყო [180r]

*Fiercely, he stirred up those
around them
as if to plunder them,
but he was unable to put these
steadfast ones to flight.
Yet he himself was invisibly
vanquished,
and for this reason he openly and
visibly launched an attack
against them.*

Unlike the variations observed in the seventh ode, the Matins kanon maintains a high degree of textual stability across all three sources. The comparison of selected troparia from the fourth ode demonstrates that the Georgian versions closely follow the Greek original both in meaning and rhetorical structure, with only minor stylistic adaptations. This high degree of fidelity reflects the development of Georgian hymnographic translation art, which gradually moved from more literal and prosaic renderings toward increasingly refined poetic versions that adhered closely to the Greek models while achieving natural rhythm and elegance in Georgian.

In this respect, the comparison of the Georgian versions with the ancient Greek source not only reveals the redactional diversity inherent in the history of this hymnographic text but also illustrates the path along which the art of translation evolved in Georgian literary culture. The close semantic proximity of the texts indicates that they represent different recensions of the same original composition. At the same time, the structural similarity between Jer. 100 and Sin. Gr. 607 suggests that the New Iadgari version derives from an earlier Greek textual tradition, distinct from the one that later influenced the Athonite redaction.

It is also worth noting that in Jer. 100, the seventh ode is not followed by a Theotokion, unlike most other odes.

Overall, the evidence highlights a persistent and coherent hymnographic core. While the outer liturgical framework underwent simplification and adaptation, the kanon – especially its fourth ode – remained remarkably stable across all three traditions. This stability indicates that the New Iadgari transmits an earlier and more elaborate form of the service, preserving important features of the Palestinian-Sabaite tradition that are only partially reflected in the surviving Greek sources. In this respect, Georgian monastic scriptoria played a distinctly conservative role in the transmission of Jerusalem liturgy, even as the broader Byzantine rite moved toward greater uniformity.

Conclusion. The comparative analysis of the liturgical service for the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers demonstrates that the New Iadgari preserves an early stage of this Sabaite tradition. In Sin. Geo 1, the commemoration on 19 March occupies a structurally prominent position within the Great Lent cycle, nearly equal in elaboration to that of the Annunciation. The presence of stichera at the Praises and the overall integration of the feast into the penitential season all attest to the high liturgical esteem in which the martyred monks of St. Sabas were held in the medieval period.

When compared with the later Athonite redaction in Jer. 100 and the ancient Greek witness in Sin. Gr. 607, a clear process of simplification and liturgical rank reduction becomes evident. In both later

traditions, the stichera at the Praises are omitted, and in Jer. 100 Vespers is expanded with additional sets of stichera, and a new pre-canon sticheron (tsardgomay) is introduced at Matins. These modifications reflect not only practical adaptation to the penitential character of Great Lent, but also the broader impact of Byzantinization, through which many local Palestinian commemorations were gradually aligned with the norms of the Constantinopolitan Typikon.

At the same time, the hymnographic core of the service – particularly the eight-ode canon – exhibits remarkable textual and thematic stability across all three traditions. The fourth ode remains the longest and most thematically coherent section in every version, consistently preserving central motifs such as ascetic struggle, brotherly love, the barbarian attack, martyrdom by fire and smoke, and the double crown of monasticism and martyrdom.

The service for the Commemoration of the Burnt Fathers in the New Iadgari offers a vivid illustration of the dynamic interplay between the preservation of ancient Sabaite and Jerusalemite liturgical traditions and the advancing process of Byzantinization. The gradual marginalization of this feast during Great Lent – visible above all in the omission of the stichera at the Praises and the reduction of its overall liturgical rank – reflects broader transformations in the Eastern Christian liturgical calendar. Ultimately, the Georgian witnesses, and especially the New Iadgari, remain among the most valuable testimonies to an earlier and more elaborate form of this commemoration, preserving important features of the Palestinian monastic tradition that were progressively simplified in later Byzantine usage.

REFERENCES

Calendar of the Georgian Apostolic Church. (2011). Tbilisi: Patriarchate of Georgia.

Eustratiades, S. (1933). Στεφάνος ὁ Σαβαΐτης ὁ ὑμνογράφος [Stephanos the Sabaite the hymnographer]. *Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, 10, 595–600.

Frøyshov, S. S. R. (2012). The Georgian witness to the Jerusalem liturgy: New sources and studies. In B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeple, & S. Alexopoulos (Eds.), *Inquiries into Eastern Christian worship* (Eastern Christian Studies 12, pp. 227–267). Peeters.

Galadza, D. (2018). *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*. Oxford University Press.

Kekelidze, K. (1957). *ძველი ქართული ლიტურჯიკის ისტორია* (ტ. II) [History of Old Georgian Literature (Vol. II)]. თბილისი: საქართველოს მეცნიერებათა აკადემია.

Renoux, Ch. (Ed.). (1969–1971). *Le Grand Lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem (Ve–VIIIe siècle)* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 188–189, 204–205). Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO.

Acknowledgements. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Alexandra Nikiforova (Institute of World Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow; Department of Greek and Roman Literature; Faculty Member at St. Tikhon's Orthodox University, Research Center for the History of Theology and Theological Education; and Humboldt Foundation Fellow at the University of Regensburg, Faculty of Catholic Theology) for her invaluable guidance, insightful suggestions, and continuous support throughout this research. Her expertise in Byzantine hymnography and Jerusalem liturgical traditions has been instrumental at every stage of the project. As the consultant of the research project YS-24-1215, her thoughtful advice and meticulous feedback have greatly enriched this study.