

Language and linguistics

Morphosyntactic Parallelism as a Cohesion Strategy in the
Hymns of the New Iadgari

Tamaz Devidze

tamaz.devidze@atsu.edu.ge

Akaki Tsereteli State University

Kutaisi, Georgia

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.52340/atsu.2026.1.27.04>

The New Iadgari, a major monument of medieval Georgian hymnography, preserves a rich repertoire of the ancient Jerusalem liturgical tradition. Due to fundamental prosodic differences between Greek syllabic-tonal meter and Georgian prosody, direct transfer of melodic-rhythmic structures proved impossible. This study attempts to show that cohesion in the Georgian translations is achieved primarily through internal morphosyntactic parallelism. Drawing on Jakobson's principle of equivalence (1987) and Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory (1976), the analysis of selected Lenten hymns demonstrates that systematic grammatical repetitions create syntactic isocolons and "grammatical rhyme." Treating Georgian versions as autonomous linguistic realities, the study underscores morphosyntactic parallelism as a fundamental compensatory mechanism that ensures textual unity in the liturgical context.

Keywords: *New Iadgari, morphosyntactic parallelism, cohesion, syntactic isocolon, grammatical rhyme, hymnography, Lenten cycle*

The New Iadgari represents one of the most significant monuments of Georgian hymnographic heritage, preserving key elements of the ancient Jerusalem liturgical tradition (Tropologion) from the 5th to 9th centuries, with its formation continuing well into the 10th century (Metreveli et al. 1980). While the Old Iadgari reflects early Jerusalem practice, the New (or Great) Iadgari incorporates later redactions and original Georgian compositions, reflecting both translation activity and creative adaptation to local musical and linguistic realities.

Georgian hymnographic translations from Greek cannot be regarded as mere calques. Due to fundamental prosodic differences — Greek reliance on syllabic count and tonal accent versus the stress-based and agglutinative flexibility of Georgian — the direct transfer of melodic-rhythmic structures proved

impossible (Sulava 2006). In response, morphosyntactic parallelism emerges as a prominent cohesion strategy in the Georgian hymnographic translations. Rather than being merely incidental, this feature appears to function as a systematic compensatory mechanism that addresses the absence of classical Greek metrical structures, thereby contributing to textual stability, rhythmic resonance, and liturgical performability.

This study treats the Georgian versions as autonomous linguistic realities, in which structural unity is achieved through systematic grammatical repetitions — including case suffixes, aorist verbal templates, and preverbs — rather than through mechanical reproduction of the source text. Drawing on Jakobson’s principle of equivalence in poetic language (1987) and Halliday and Hasan’s theory of textual cohesion (1976), the analysis focuses on syntactic isocolons — clauses of equal length and parallel grammatical structure — as key devices. These isocolons may reflect the rhythmic and melodic segmentation of the *Heirmos*, although precise correspondence requires further musicological verification. Morphological glossing according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules is employed to visualize recurring grammatical markers and their distributional patterns.

Ultimately, the research seeks to demonstrate how Georgian hymnography transformed foreign models into a culturally resonant liturgical discourse, emphasizing internal “grammatical rhyme” (*homoeoteleuton*) and verbal symmetry as essential compensatory mechanisms that allowed the tradition to maintain both theological depth and performative vitality within its own linguistic framework.

This study represents an attempt to demonstrate that the cohesion strategies observed in the hymns of the New Iadgari may reflect the creative potential and internal resources of the Georgian language itself. Confronted with the impossibility of directly transferring the syllabic and tonal structures characteristic of Greek hymnography, the Georgian redactors appear to have drawn upon the morphological and syntactic possibilities of their native language to create an autonomous poetic discourse. In this sense, morphosyntactic parallelism can be seen as a compensatory mechanism that effectively substitutes for the classical Greek metrical system, generating rhythmic resonance and structural unity through purely internal linguistic means.

The present study draws on two complementary theoretical frameworks to analyze cohesion in the hymns of the New Iadgari: Roman Jakobson’s concept of poetic parallelism and M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan’s theory of textual cohesion.

Jakobson (1987 [1960]) defines the poetic function of language as the

projection of the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection onto the axis of combination. In poetic texts, equivalence operates not only at the phonological or lexical levels but also at morphological and syntactic ones, creating pervasive patterns of recurrence and contrast. In liturgical hymnography, where the text must align with musical periods and serve performative and mnemonic purposes, such parallelism acquires particular importance. It transforms grammatical categories into autonomous carriers of rhythm and structure, compensating for the absence of quantitative meter typical of classical Greek poetry. In the Georgian context, this manifests as systematic repetition of verbal templates, case markers, preverbs, and inflectional suffixes, producing what can be termed “grammatical rhyme” or homoeoteleuton.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) provide a functional model of cohesion, identifying grammatical devices—reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion—that create texture in discourse. In the hymns under study, grammatical cohesion predominates through the systematic repetition of specific morphological markers. These include the dative suffix *-s* accompanied by an emphatic final vowel *-a* (resulting in the surface form *-sa*), the aorist suffix *-a*, etc. Such repetitions function as cohesive ties that bind individual clauses into larger symmetrical units, ensuring structural predictability and unity.

While certain fusional elements exist – such as the third-person plural subject suffixes (*-n*, *-en*, *-es*), which simultaneously encode person and number – the language is overwhelmingly characterized by affix-rich morphology in which individual affixes tend to express discrete grammatical functions. This agglutinative profile, with its wealth of prefixes (version markers, person indices) and suffixes (thematic markers, screeve indicators, plural markers), provides exceptional flexibility for constructing symmetrical and rhythmic patterns. In hymnographic redactions, the ability to concatenate and rearrange affixes without significant fusion or allomorphy allows translators to achieve precise syntactic isocolons and recurring grammatical rhymes, aligning textual structure with the requirements of the Heirmos melody while preserving semantic clarity.

The methodological core of the analysis is interlinear morphological glossing following the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie, Haspelmath & Bickel 2015). These conventions require:

- Word-by-word vertical alignment between the original text and glosses,
- Morpheme-by-morpheme segmentation with hyphens,
- Consistent category abbreviations (e.g., AOR for aorist, PASS for passive, PV for preverb, 3SG for third-person singular),

თ. დევოძე

- Left alignment and precise correspondence between segments.

This method allows clear visualization of recurring grammatical elements and their distribution across clauses, revealing patterns that might remain hidden in plain text. For Old Georgian verbs, glosses distinguish preverbs (PV), root, screeve markers, person/number, and voice. Examples in the analysis will follow the standard three-line format:

ო	-ქმ	-გ	-ო	-თ
i	-kmn	-en	-i	-t
PASS-	become	AOR.PASS	EPENTH	2PL

Where Greek parallels exist, they are presented alongside for contrast, highlighting divergences in cohesive strategies.

The research focuses on identifying syntactic isocolons – clauses of approximately equal length and parallel grammatical structure. In Old Georgian, flexible word order facilitates such symmetry without semantic loss, enabling the redactors to rearrange constituents to fit rhythmic requirements.

The corpus primarily draws on digitized Sinai manuscripts (Sin. Geo. 1, Sin. Geo. 14, and Sin. Geo. 26), which represent important 10th-century witnesses of the New Iadgari. Given the editorial heterogeneity of medieval hymnographic traditions and the frequent difficulty of identifying exact Greek Vorlagen, the Georgian texts are treated as autonomous linguistic systems rather than mere derivative translations.

This combined approach – Jakobsonian equivalence + Hallidayan cohesion + Leipzig glossing – enables a rigorous description of how morphosyntactic parallelism functions as the dominant cohesion strategy in Georgian hymnography, transforming imported models into a culturally and linguistically self-sufficient liturgical discourse.

This section examines four representative examples from the Lenten cycle hymns of the New Iadgari, drawn from the digitized Sinai manuscripts (Sin. Geo. 1, Sin. Geo. 14, and Sin. Geo. 26). The selection focuses on fragments that exemplify morphosyntactic parallelism as a cohesion strategy, including morphological repetition (e.g., aorist suffixes, preverbs), syntactic isocolons (balanced clauses), and root consistency. Each example includes the Old Georgian text, interlinear glossing per Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie et al. 2015), English translation (revised for clarity and liturgical tone), and, where identifiable, Greek parallels for contrast. Analysis highlights cohesive devices and their compensatory role

in Georgian prosody versus Greek syllabism and tonality. Due to the editorial heterogeneity of medieval hymnography, exact Greek Vorlagen are often elusive (Nikiforova 2025; Sulava 2006), so the Georgian text is treated as autonomous when necessary.

The analysis of four representative hymns from the Lenten cycle reveals that morphosyntactic parallelism operates as the dominant mechanism of textual cohesion in the New Iadgari. Rather than relying on syllable count or tonal accentuation characteristic of Greek hymnography, Georgian redactors consistently employed grammatical repetition — including aorist verbal templates, preverb series, and case suffixes — to construct syntactic isocolons and “grammatical rhyme.”

A central finding is the compensatory nature of this strategy. While Greek *irmos* models exhibit relatively balanced syllabic structure, the Georgian troparia show considerable variation. This unevenness, clearly visible when comparing manuscript lineation with the underlying melodic model, highlights the prosodic challenge faced by translators. Instead of forcing syllabic equivalence, which would have distorted natural Georgian syntax and semantics, the redactors shifted the burden of rhythmic organization onto the morphological and syntactic levels. The recurring aorist suffix *-a*, combined with root consistency and preverb repetition, created internal rhythmic anchors that aligned the text with the melodic phrases of the *Heirmos* more effectively than syllable count alone could have done.

This approach reflects a fundamental difference in cohesive strategies. Greek hymnography frequently depends on lexical chaining, polyptoton, and conjunctive particles for textual linkage. In contrast, Georgian hymnography prioritizes agglutinative symmetry and grammatical equivalence, allowing greater flexibility in word order while maintaining structural predictability. Such autonomy confirms that the Georgian versions function not as secondary translations but as independent linguistic realities shaped by local musical and performative requirements.

Theoretically, these observations strongly support Jakobson’s notion of poetic equivalence projected onto the axis of combination (1987) and Halliday and Hasan’s concept of grammatical cohesion (1976). In the liturgical context, the resulting “textual glue” ensures not only memorability but also the seamless integration of text and polyphonic chant, transforming potential prosodic fragmentation into a unified sacred order.

While the present study is limited to four examples from the Lenten cycle, the consistency of the observed patterns suggests that morphosyntactic

parallelism represents a broader adaptive principle in Georgian hymnography. Future research combining detailed musicological reconstruction with broader corpus analysis could further clarify the interplay between linguistic form and melodic realization across different liturgical cycles.

Example 1: Tripartite Aorist Sequence in Divine Acts (from the First Ode, Meatfare Sunday)

This troparion illustrates “verbal rhyme” through the repetition of similar aorist verbal templates and root consistency, creating rhythmic anchors that compensate for the absence of Greek metrical structures.

აღმოდინებელი ყოველთა ცხორებისა, საკურველთმოქმედი,
საფლავსა დაიდვა, ვითარცა მკუდარი
განჯრწნადი და სიკუდილი დაჰსნა და პირველ შექმნილი მტერთაგან
იქსნა.

The rhythmic division presented above follows the line breaks found in the Sin. Geo. 1 manuscript. However, this division appears to be imperfect or incomplete, as it does not fully reflect the expected melodic periods of the Heirmos. Such discrepancies between manuscript lineation and underlying rhythmic structure are not uncommon in medieval hymnographic transmission and further highlight the role of morphosyntactic parallelism as a compensatory mechanism that ensures textual and musical coherence despite variations in scribal practice.

(1) აღმო-მადინებ-ელ-ი	ყოველ-თ-ა	ცხორებ-ის-ა,
agmo-madineb-el-i	q'ovel-t-a	cxoreb-is-a
PV-flow-PTCP-NOM	all-PL-GEN	life-PL-DAT,
საკურველთ-მოქმედ-ი,	საფლავ-ს-ა	და-ი-დვ-ა,
akurvelt-mokmed-i	saplav-s-a	da-i-dv-a
miracle-do-PTCP-NOM,	tomb-DAT- EMPH	P V - P A S S - l a y -
ვითარცა	მკუდარ-ი	AOR.3SG
vitarcā	mkudar-i	განჯრწნად-ი
as	dead-NOM	ganxrcnad-i
და	სიკუდილ-ი	corrupt-NOM
da	sikudil-i	და-ჰ-ქსნ-ა
and	death-NOM	da-h-xsn-a
და	პირველშექმნილ-ი	PV-OBJ.3-abolish-
da	pirvel shekmnul-i	AOR.3SG
and	first create-PTCP-NOM	მტერ-თ-ა-გან
		mter-t-a-gan
		enemy-PL- EMPH
		-ABL

იქსნ-ა.

i-xsn-a

PV-deliver-AOR.3SG.

The Fountain of all life, the Worker of wonders, was laid in the tomb as one dead, as though subject to corruption; and He abolished death and delivered the first-created from the enemies.

This manuscript division, however, appears imperfect and does not fully correspond to the expected melodic periods of the Heirmos. The first line is significantly longer (approximately 18–20 syllables), while the subsequent lines are shorter and more balanced (14–16 and 12–14 syllables respectively). Such discrepancies between scribal lineation and underlying musical-rhythmic structure are not uncommon in medieval hymnographic manuscripts.

It can be argued that the Georgian hymnographic translations exhibit a systematic use of morphosyntactic parallelism as their primary cohesion strategy. This parallelism, which does not appear to be accidental, functions as a compensatory mechanism that addresses the impossibility of directly replicating the syllabic and tonal structures of Greek hymnography, thereby ensuring textual stability, rhythmic resonance, and suitability for liturgical performance. The three main clauses are structured around parallel aorist verbal templates ending in the recurring suffix -a (და-ი-ღვ-ა, და-ჰ-ქსნ-ა, იქსნ-ა), reinforced by root consistency in the verbs ქსნ/ხსნ. This grammatical rhyme, combined with flexible word order, creates strong rhythmic anchors that align the text with the musical phrases of the Heirmos, even when the syllable count varies.

Thus, the apparent imperfection of the manuscript division highlights the compensatory role of morphosyntactic parallelism: it ensures textual and performative unity by prioritizing grammatical symmetry over strict syllabic equivalence.

The primary challenge addressed by these strategies is prosodic: Greek hymnography relies on syllabic-tonal balance (typically 8–12 syllables per verse in heirmoi), whereas Georgian, with its stress-based and agglutinative prosody, cannot mechanically replicate this structure without distorting natural word order or semantic clarity. As shown in the rhythmic comparisons (e.g., irmos №3 and №17 from Metreveli 1971), Georgian troparia exhibit greater syllable variation (12–20 per verse) than their Greek models. These counts are approximate, based on vowel nuclei and consonant clusters typical in Old Georgian prosody (cf. Sulava 2006). This disparity renders direct syllabic calquing impossible and necessitates an internal compensatory mechanism.

In contrast to Greek, where cohesion often relies on lexical chaining, polyptoton, or conjunctive particles (καὶ... καὶ), Georgian prioritizes morphological repetition and agglutinative symmetry. This shift reflects the autonomous linguistic reality of the Georgian redaction: translators were not bound to literal or mechanical reproduction but creatively adapted the text to fit local prosody and polyphonic chanting traditions. The result is a self-sufficient liturgical discourse that preserves theological depth while achieving rhythmic resonance through internal means.

At the current stage of research, no exact Greek Vorlage for this troparion has been identified in the extant editions of the Lenten Triodion or related Byzantine hymnographic sources. The Georgian redaction appears to function as an autonomous linguistic reality, shaped by internal morphosyntactic adaptations rather than a direct calque of a preserved Greek version.

Cohesion here relies on morphological repetition and root consistency as primary devices (Halliday & Hasan 1976). The sequence და-ი-ღვ-ა (da-i-dv-a), და-ჰ-ჰსნ-ა (da-h-xsn-a), იჰსნ-ა (i-xsn-a) creates a “grammatical rhyme” through the recurrent -a suffix (aorist 3SG), functioning as textual glue (Jakobson 1987). The roots ჰსნ/ბსნ (abolish/deliver) in the last two verbs add lexical cohesion via polyptoton, binding divine acts into a unified narrative of salvation. Syntactically, the clauses form isocolons of similar length (7–9 syllables each). This symmetry compensates for Greek prosodic constraints, where cohesion might depend on lexical chaining (e.g., ζωή/νεκρός) rather than suffixal recurrence. In the autonomous Georgian system, flexible word order allows rearrangement for acoustic resonance without semantic loss, ensuring structural stability.

The troparion “აღმომადინებელი ყოველთა ცხორებისა...” is composed on the model of the irmos from Metreveli (1971, №3), Greek version: Σοὺ ἡ τροπαιοῦχος δεξιὰ... (Thy right hand, invincible...). The Greek irmos is structured in 3–4 verses with relatively balanced syllable counts (8–12 per verse), reflecting Byzantine tonal-syllabic prosody.

In contrast, the Georgian troparion exhibits uneven syllable distribution (approximately 18–20 in the first verse, 14–16 in the second, and 12–14 in the third). This variation highlights the prosodic challenge: Georgian’s stress-based and agglutinative system cannot replicate the stricter syllabic balance of Greek without compromising naturalness or meaning.

Compensation is achieved through syntactic isocolons and morphosyntactic parallelism. The troparion’s verses are organized into clauses of comparable grammatical structure, often ending in aorist verbs with the recurring -a suffix (და-ი-ღვ-ა, და-ჰ-ჰსნ-ა, იჰსნ-ა), creating a strong “grammatical rhyme” and

rhythmic anchors. Root consistency in *ჰსნ/ხსნ* (abolish/deliver) further binds the clauses lexically, while preverb repetition (*da-*, *i-*) adds formal cohesion.

This symmetry aligns the text with the melodic periods of the heirmos, ensuring performative unity in polyphonic chanting despite the absence of strict metrical equivalence.

Example 2: Escalating Divine Interventions with Preverb Repetition (from the Fourth Ode. Meatfare Sunday)

This fragment demonstrates tripartite symmetry in predicates, emphasizing cumulative power through parallel structures.

შემუსრა საწერტელი მაცთურისა ქრისტემან
 ღმრთაებით უვნებელმან და ჯორციელად ვნებულმან,
 ჯოჯოხეთი დათრგუნა ძრიელებით
 მტერისა საბრჯჳ განაქარვა და სიკუდილისა ჯელმწიფებაჲ დაჰჰსნა.
 Interlinear Glossing (focus on key sequence):

(2) ჯოჯოხეთ-ი	და-თრგუნ-ა	ძრიელ-ებ-ით
jojoxet-i	da-trgun-a	zriel-eb-it
hades-NOM	PV-subdue-AOR.3SG	might-PL-INS
მტერ-ის-ა	საბრჯჳ	გან-ა-ქარვ-ა
mter-is-a	Sabrx-e-y	gan-a-karv-a
enemy-GEN- EMPH	snare-NOM	PV-VERS-scatter-AOR.3SG
და	სი-კუდილ-ის-ა	ჯელმწიფება-ჲ
da	kudil-is-a	Xelmcipeba-y
and	death-GEN-EMPH	dominion-NOM
და-ჰ-ჰსნ-ა		
da-h-xsn-a.		
PV-OBJ.3-abolish-AOR.3SG.		

Christ destroyed the deceiver’s claw, impassible in Godhead yet passible in flesh; He subdued hades, scattered the enemy’s snare by His might, and abolished death’s dominion.

Approximate match in Lenten Triodion (e.g., from the Service for Meatfare Sunday): “Κατέλυσεν ὁ Χριστός... καὶ τὴν τοῦ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν κατήργησεν” (Christ destroyed hades... and abolished the power of death). Exact Vorlage uncertain due to redactional differences.

The cohesion is multifaceted, with predicative duplication forming syntactic isocolons: each clause ([Object + Verb]) is structurally balanced, creating a

rhythmic escalation of divine victory (Jakobson 1987). Morphological repetition in the aorist -a suffix (და-თრგუნ-ა, გან-ა-ქარვ-ა, და-ჰ-ჰსნ-ა) acts as a cohesive tie, guiding the listener through micro-periods. Preverb consistency (da- in two verbs, gan- in one) enhances “textual glue,” while root variety (თრგუნ, ქარვ, ჰსნ) adds semantic progression without disrupting symmetry. Compared to Greek, where cohesion often uses syntactic agreement (e.g., κατέλυσεν... κατήργησεν, verb repetition), Georgian employs agglutinative flexibility for internal rhythm, compensating for prosodic divergences. This “sacred order” transforms the text into a performative unity, essential for polyphonic chanting.

The troparion “შემუსრა საწერტელი მაცთურისა...” follows the irmos from Metreveli (1971, №17), divided into 3–4 verses with varying syllable counts (20, 16, 12), contrasting the Greek version (8–12 syllables per verse). This disparity illustrates the prosodic challenge: Georgian’s stress-based system cannot replicate Greek tonal-syllabic meter, making direct transfer impossible.

These isocolons create “sacred order” through grammatical rhyme (-a suffix) and flexible word order, ensuring rhythmic resonance without metrical rigidity (Jakobson 1987). This adaptation underscores the autonomous nature of Georgian hymnography, where morphosyntactic symmetry replaces syllabic uniformity for liturgical stability.

To compensate, the Georgian redaction employs syntactic isocolons – clauses of equal grammatical structure and length that may correspond to melodic periods. For instance:

- Verse 1-2: Introductory clause with contrastive participles (უვნებელმან და ჯორციელად ვნებულმან) – syntactic parallelism in attributes.
- Verse 3-4: Action sequence with preverb repetition (და-თრგუნა, განაქარვა) – balanced object-verb patterns.
- Verse 4: Culmination with finite verb (დაჰჰსნა) – root consistency with prior acts.

Example 3: Passive Aorist Forms in Martyr Troparia (from Forty Martyrs of Sebaste)

This example highlights contrastive parallelism in passive constructions, emphasizing collective endurance.

კუერთობითა გუემულ იქმნენით და ქვითა განიტუნენით
და ტანჯვითა მრავლითა განიკაფენით,
ხოლო ერთობაჲ თქუენი არა დაჰჰსენით, მოწამენო,
სიყუარულითა შეკრულნო
და მოწლებითა მძებრითა

ერთბამად მოჰკუედიოთ,
 ღუაწლით შემოსილნო,
 და ტაბლასა საღმრთოსა შეიწირენით,
 ვითარცა მსხუეპრლნი უბიწონი.

For the purposes of this study, a specific passage from this troparion is of particular interest. Namely:

(3) კუერთხ-ით-ა	გუემულ იქმნ-ენ-ი-თ	და
kuertx-it-a	guemul ikmn-en-it	da
staff-INS-EMPH	beaten become-AOR.PASS- EPENTH-2PL	and
ქვ-ით-ა	გან-ი-ტუნ-ენ-ი-თ	და
kv-it-a	gan-i-tun-en-i-t	da
stone-INS- EMPH	PV-PASS-stone-AOR.PASS- EPENTH -2PL	and
ტანჯვ-ით-ა	მრავლ-ით-ა	გან-ი-კაფ-ენ-ი-თ.
tanjv-it-a	mravl-it-a	gan-i-kap-en-it.
torment-INS- EMPH	many-INS- EMPH	PV-PASS-finish-AOR.PASS- EPENTH -2PL

With staves were ye beaten, with stones were ye stoned, and with many torments did ye finish your course.

Similar phrasing in hymns for the Forty Martyrs (Lenten Triodion, March 9): “Ράβδοις ἐτυπανίσθητε, λίθοις ἐλιθοβολήθητε, βασανοις πολλαῖς ἐτελειώσατε” (Ye were beaten with rods, stoned with stones, perfected by many tortures). The Georgian simplifies and symmetrizes the structure.

Cohesion is driven by morphological repetition of the passive aorist pattern, creating a “grammatical rhyme” that binds the martyrs’ sufferings into a collective unit (Halliday & Hasan 1976). The syntactic template [Instrument + Passive Verb] forms isocolons of equal length. While word order flexibility in Old Georgian positions verbs clause-finally for rhyme emphasis. In Greek, cohesion relies on polyptoton (e.g., ἐτυπανίσθητε/ἐλιθοβολήθητε) and predicative variety, but Georgian’s agglutinative system enables denser repetition, serving as a compensatory mechanism for metrical absence. This reinforces theological tension between suffering and triumph, transforming the narrative into a stable liturgical discourse.

Example 4: Multi-Layered Preverb and Suffix Repetition in Martyr Endurance (from Forty Martyrs of Sebaste)

This passage showcases preverb da- series and mixed finite/masdar forms for layered cohesion.

ოთხმან ათეულმან წმიდათამან ოთხი ძლევისა ღვაწლი აჩუენა
და სიმც'ნით' [93v] ღმერთშემოსილთაგან პირველად ტკივილი
კორცთად

რომელი მყინვარისაგან
დაითმინეს მათ, წყლულებაჲ, ქრისტესთჳს
დათხევაჲ სისხლთაჲ და დამუსრვაჲ წუჳთა მათთაჲ წალთებითა
და უკუანადსკნელ ყოვლისა ამის კორცნი მათნი მისცნეს ცეცხლსა

დასაწუჳელად,

რომლითა იქმნეს ყოველნივე შესაწირავად
მსხუერპლად ცხოვლად ღმრთისა
და ევედრებიან მას
მარადის მონიჭებად ღზინებაჲ
და მოტეებაჲ სულთა ჩუენთათჳს.

ჩუენთვის საინტერესოა ამ საგალობლის კონკრეტული მონაკვეთი.
კერძოდ:

(4) მყინვარ-ის-ა-გან	და-ი-თმინ-ეს	მათ,
mqinvar-is-a-gan	da-i-tmin-es	mat,
frost-GEN-EMPH-ABL	PV-VERS-endure-AOR.3PL	they.DAT
წყლულება-ი...	დათხევა-ი	სისხლ-თ-ა-ი
cqluleba-y...	datxev-a-y	sisxl-t-a-y
wounding-NOM...	shed-MASD	blood-PL-EMPH-NOM
და	დამუსრვა-ი	წუჳ-თ-ა
da	damusrva-y	cuv-t-a
and	Shatter-NOM	shin-PL-GEN-EMPH
მათ-თ-ა-ი...	და	უკუანადსკნელ
mat-t-a-y...	da	ukuanaysknel
they-GEN-EMPH-NOM	and	finally
ყოვლ-ის-ა	ამის	კორც-ნი-ი
q'ovl-is-a	amis	xorc-n-i
all-GEN-EMPH	this.GEN	body-PL-NOM
მათ-ნი-ი	მი-ს-ც-ნი-ეს	ცეცხლ-ს-ა.
mat-n-i	mi-s-c-n-es	cecxl-sa.
they-PL	PV-OBJ.3-give-PL.OBJ-AOR.3PL	fire-DAT-EMPH

They endured suffering from the frost, the wounding... the shedding of blood and the shattering of their shins... and finally, after all this, they gave their bodies unto the fire.

From the Canon for the Forty Martyrs (Lenten Triodion, Ode 1): “Πάγον ὑπέμειναν... τραύματα... αἵμασιν ἐρραντίσθησαν... καὶ τὸ τέλος ἐν πυρὶ παρέδωκαν τὰ σώματα” (They endured the frost... wounds... were sprinkled with blood... and at last delivered their bodies to the fire). The Georgian version consolidates for symmetry.

Analysis: Cohesion emerges from preverb *da-* repetition across verbs and masdars (და-ითმინ-ეს, და-თხევ-აჲ, და-მუსრ-ვ-აჲ), creating a high density of formal ties that unify the sequence of torments (Jakobson 1987). The third-person plural aorist *-ეს* (-es) in და-ითმინ-ეს and მი-ს-ც-ნ-ეს bookends the passage, while masdar *-აჲ* (-a-y) adds nominal cohesion. Syntactically, the clauses build isocolons through enumeration, corresponding to melodic periods. Compared to Greek, where cohesion uses conjunctive chaining (καὶ... καὶ).

The four examples analyzed from the Lenten cycle of the New Iadgari demonstrate that morphosyntactic parallelism serves as a primary and highly effective cohesion strategy in Georgian hymnographic translations. Across diverse syntactic contexts – divine acts (Example 1), escalating victories (Example 2), passive martyrdom sequences (Example 3), and layered endurance narratives (Example 4) – recurrent grammatical patterns emerge: aorist tamplate repetition (-a, -en-it, -es), preverb series (da-, gan-, i), root consistency, and instrument/masdar parallelism. These devices create syntactic isocolons and “grammatical rhyme” (homoeoteleuton), binding clauses into symmetrical units that ensure textual unity and performative rhythm.

Morphosyntactic parallelism fulfills this role by projecting equivalence onto the syntactic axis (Jakobson 1987). Rather than depending on syllable count, cohesion is achieved through grammatical recurrence: the aorist *-a* suffix in Example 1 creates rhythmic anchors across divine predicates; the passive plural *-en-i-t* in Example 3 binds collective suffering into a unified sequence; preverb *da-* repetition in Example 4 unifies a chain of torments. These patterns transform grammatical categories into carriers of rhythm and structure, compensating for the absence of quantitative meter. Flexible word order in Old Georgian further enables clause-final verb placement, maximizing acoustic symmetry without semantic compromise.

Theoretically, these findings align with Jakobson’s principle of equivalence (1987) and Halliday & Hasan’s cohesion model (1976). Grammatical ties – particularly repetition and conjunction – function as “textual glue,” while pervasive

თ. დევოძე

parallelism elevates morphological markers to autonomous poetic value. In a liturgical context, this ensures mnemonic stability and collective performability, transforming imported models into culturally resonant expressions of Georgian sacred order.

Limitations of the study include the restricted corpus (four examples from the Lenten cycle) and the ongoing difficulty of identifying exact Greek Vorlagen due to medieval redactional heterogeneity. Future research could expand to other cycles (e.g., Easter or saints' feasts), incorporate musicological analysis of heirmos melodies, or quantitatively map cohesive device frequency across manuscripts. Nevertheless, the present analysis confirms that morphosyntactic parallelism is not merely a stylistic feature but a fundamental adaptive that enabled Georgian hymnography to thrive as an independent tradition.

Table 1: Syllable Variation, Main Cohesive Devices, Isocolon Types, and Compensatory Effects Across the Examples

Example	Syllable variation (vs irmos)	Main cohesive device	Type of isocolon	Compensatory effect
Example 1 Tripartite Aorist Sequence (აღმომადინებელი... იქსნა)	Georgian: 18–20 / 14–16 / 12–14 Greek model: 8–12 per verse (№3)	Aorist suffix -a repetition + root consistency (ქსნ/ხსნ)	Syntactic (verb-final clauses of similar length)	Replaces strict syllabic balance with grammatical rhyme and rhythmic anchors for melodic alignment
Example 2 Escalating Divine Victories (შემუსრა... დაჰქსნა)	Georgian: ~20 / ~16 / ~12 Greek model: 8–12 per verse (№17)	Preverb da-/gan-series + aorist -a suffix	Syntactic (predicate + complement parallelism)	Creates escalation through morphological repetition, compensating for uneven syllables with verbal symmetry

Example 3 Passive Martyrdom Sequence (კუერთხითა... განიკაფუნით)	Georgian: ~14–16 per clause (3 parallel units) Greek model: 10–12 (Forty Martyrs canon)	Passive plural suffix -en-it repetition	Morphological + syntactic (Instrument + Passive Verb template)	Denser repetition in agglutinative system binds collective suffering, replacing Greek polyptoton for metrical absence
Example 4 Layered Martyr Endurance (მყინვა-რისაგან... ცეცხლსა)	Georgian: 12–18 across enumeration Greek model: 10–14 (Canon, Ode 1)	Preverb da- series + mixed finite/masdar forms (-ეს, -აო)	Syntactic (enumerative clauses + bookend aorist)	High-density formal ties unify torment sequence, compensating for prosodic variation with agglutinative cohesion

Georgian’s agglutinative inventory allows intricate patterns without phonetic variety, compensating for prosodic differences and ensuring memorability in liturgical performance. This “textual glue” reinforces the martyrs’ collective “sacred order.”

In summary, these examples demonstrate how morphosyntactic parallelism serves as a compensatory cohesion strategy in the New Iadgari’s Lenten hymns, adapting Greek models to Georgian linguistic realities for structural and rhythmic unity.

The present study has shown that morphosyntactic parallelism functions as the primary cohesion strategy in the Lenten hymns of the New Iadgari. There is good reason to believe that, within the Georgian translation tradition, a distinct principle was developed to address the challenges of rendering Greek hymnography.

These devices created “grammatical rhyme” and rhythmic anchors that compensated for the lack of classical metrical structures, ensuring textual stability, performative coherence, and liturgical effectiveness.

Three principal conclusions can be drawn. First, the Georgian versions of these hymns cannot be regarded as derivative translations but constitute autonomous linguistic realities shaped by creative adaptation. Second, the systematic use of morphological and syntactic parallelism transformed potential prosodic fragmentation into a unified “sacred order,” where grammatical equivalence replaced syllabic equivalence. Third, this adaptive strategy not only

preserved theological content but also enabled the hymns to integrate seamlessly with Georgian polyphonic chanting traditions, demonstrating a remarkable synthesis of linguistic creativity and liturgical functionality.

By prioritizing agglutinative symmetry and grammatical recurrence over literal reproduction, Georgian hymnographers succeeded in producing a self-sufficient poetic discourse capable of sustaining spiritual resonance across centuries. The findings confirm that morphosyntactic parallelism was not a mere stylistic ornament but a fundamental compensatory mechanism that allowed the Jerusalem liturgical heritage to flourish in its Georgian form.

Future research should extend this analysis to other liturgical cycles, incorporate detailed musicological reconstruction of heirmos melodies, and conduct quantitative corpus studies across a wider range of manuscripts.

References

- Comrie, B., Haspelmath, M., & Bickel, B. 2015. *Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Jakobson, R. 1987. *Linguistics and poetics*. In K. Pomorska & S. Rudy (Eds.), *Language in literature* (pp. 62–94). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1960).
- Metreveli, E., Chankievi, Ts., & Khevsuriani, L. 1980. *Udzvelesi iadgari* [The Ancient Iadgari]. Metsniereba.
- Mother Mary, & Ware, K. (Trans.). 1978. *The Lenten Triodion*. Faber and Faber. (Original Greek text: *The Service Books of the Orthodox Church*).
- Nikiforova, A. 2025. *The Panegyri of Archangel Michael in Sinai and Egypt: A reconstruction attempt of the 9th-century Greek Melkite rite*. *Theologia Christiana Academica*, 61–82.
- Sulava, N. (2006). *Kartuli himnografia: traditsia da poetik'a* [Georgian hymnography: Tradition and poetics]. Tbilisi.

ენა და ენათმეცნიერება

მორფოსინტაქსური პარალელიზმი, როგორც კოჰეზიის სტრატეგია
ახალი იადგარის საგალობლებში

თამაზ დევიძე

tamaz.devidze@atsu.edu.ge

აკაკი წერეთლის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

ქუთაისი, საქართველო

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52340/atsu.2026.1.27.04>

ახალი იადგარი შუა საუკუნეების ქართული ჰიმნოგრაფიის მნიშვნელოვანი კრებულია, რომელშიც შემონახულია ძველი იერუსალიმური ლიტურგიული ტრადიციის მდიდარი რეპერტუარი. ბერძნულ სილაბურ-ტონალურ მეტრსა და ქართულ პროსოდიას შორის არსებული ფუნდამენტური განსხვავებების გამო, მელოდიურ-რიტმული სტრუქტურების ზუსტი ანალოგის შექმნა შეუძლებელი აღმოჩნდა. ეს კვლევა ცდილობს აჩვენოს, რომ ქართულ თარგმანებში კოჰეზია, უპირველეს ყოვლისა, მიიღწევა შინაგანი მორფოსინტაქსური პარალელიზმის გზით. იაკობსონის ეკვივალენტობის პრინციპზე (1987) და ჰალიდე-ჰასანის კოჰეზიის თეორიაზე (1976) დაყრდნობით, დიდმარხვის ციკლის საგალობლების ანალიზი აჩვენებს, რომ ამგვარი პარალელიზმით იქმნება სინტაქსური იზოკოლონები და „გრამატიკული რითმა“. ქართული ვერსიების ავტონომიურ ენობრივ რეალობად განხილვით, ნაშრომი ხაზს უსვამს მორფოსინტაქსურ პარალელიზმს, როგორც ძირითად კომპენსატორულ მექანიზმს, რომელიც უზრუნველყოფს ტექსტის მთლიანობას ლიტურგიკულ კონტექსტში.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: ახალი იადგარი, მორფოსინტაქსური პარალელიზმი, კოჰეზია, სინტაქსური იზოკოლონი, გრამატიკული რითმი, ჰიმნოგრაფია, დიდმარხვის ციკლი

ახალი იადგარი ქართული ჰიმნოგრაფიული მემკვიდრეობის ერთ-ერთ უმნიშვნელოვანესი წყაროა, რომელიც ასახავს იერუსალიმის ლიტურგიული ტრადიციის (ტროპოლოგიონის) მდიდარ რეპერტუარს. კრებულის ჩამოყალიბება გრძელდებოდა X საუკუნემდე (Metreveli et al., 1980). ახალი კრებული შეიცავს როგორც ნათარგმნ, ისე ორიგინალურ ქართულ ჰიმნოგრაფიულ ნიმუშებს.

ბერძნულ და ქართულ პროსოდიებს შორის არსებული ფუნდამენტური განსხვავებები – ბერძნული სილაბურ-ტონალური

თ. დევიძე

მეტრი და ქართული ხაზგასმითი აგლუტინაციური პროსოდია – გამორიცხავდა მელოდიურ-რიტმული სტრუქტურების პირდაპირ და მექანიკურ გადატანას (Sulava, 2006). პარალელურად ამისა, ქართულ თარგმანებში დასტურდება შინაგანი მორფოსინტაქსური პარალელიზმი, რაც, ვფიქრობთ, არ არის შემთხვევითი მოვლენა, არამედ წარმოადგენს ქართული ენის შემოქმედებითი პოტენციალის გამოვლინებას, რომელიც ერთგვარად ანაზღაურებს ძველბერძნული სილაბურ-ტონალური მეტრის არარსებობას და ქმნის ავტონომიურ, შინაგანად ორგანიზებულ ლიტურგიულ დისკურსს.

კვლევა ეყრდნობა ორ ძირითად თეორიულ ჩარჩოს: რ. იაკობსონის პოეტური ეკვივალენტობის პრინციპს (1987) და მ. ჰალიდეისა და რ. ჰასანის ტექსტური კოჰეზიის თეორიას (1976). იაკობსონის მიხედვით, პოეტურ ტექსტში მსგავსებები ვლინდება არა მხოლოდ ფონოლოგიურ ან ლექსიკურ, არამედ მორფოლოგიურ და სინტაქსურ დონეებზეც, რაც ქმნის განმეორებადობისა და კონტრასტის სისტემას. ჰიმნოგრაფიაში, სადაც ტექსტი უნდა ემთხვეოდეს მუსიკალურ პერიოდებს და ემსახურებოდეს შესრულებით მიზნებს, ასეთი პარალელიზმი განსაკუთრებულ მნიშვნელობას იძენს.

ჰალიდეი და ჰასანი (1976) გვთავაზობენ კოჰეზიის ფუნქციურ მოდელს, რომელიც გრამატიკული და ლექსიკური საშუალებების (რეფერენცია, სუბსტიტუცია, ელიფსისი, კავშირი და ლექსიკური კოჰეზია) გამოყენებით ქმნის ტექსტის ერთიან სტრუქტურას – ე.წ. „ქსოვილს“.

მეთოდოლოგიურად კვლევა ეფუძნება ხაზთაშორის მორფოლოგიურ გლოსირებას ლაიფციგის წესების მიხედვით (Comrie, Haspelmath & Bickel, 2015). ემპირიული მასალა აღებულია სინის ციფრულ ხელნაწერებზე (Sin. Geo. 1, Sin. Geo. 14, Sin. Geo. 26), რომლებიც ახალი იადგარის X საუკუნის მნიშვნელოვან წყაროებს წარმოადგენენ. ანალიზი ფოკუსირებულია დიდმარხვის ციკლის საგალობლებზე, სადაც განსაკუთრებით მდიდარია განმეორებადი მორფოლოგიური ნიმუშები.

კვლევაში განხილულია ოთხი მაგალითი. პირველ მაგალითში („აღმომადინებელი ყოველთა ცხორებისა...“) ნაჩვენებია წყვეტილის ყალიბის განმეორება, როგორც შინაგანი რიტმის შექმნის ხერხი. მეორე მაგალითში („შემუსრა საწერტელი მაცთურისა...“) რიტმული ექსპრესია იქმნება ზმნისწინების საშუალებით. მესამე მაგალითში („კუერთხითა გუემულ იქმნენით...“) ნაჩვენებია სინტაქსური იზოკლონების როლი კოჰეზიის შექმნაში. მეოთხე მაგალითში კი („მყინვარისაგან დაითმინეს...“) შინაგანი რიტმის საფუძვლია ერთი და იმავე ზმნისწინის პერიოდული გამოყენება და სახელზმნური ფორმების თანმიმდევრობა.

შედეგები აჩვენებს, რომ მორფოსინტაქსური პარალელიზმი

ქმნის „გრამატიკულ რითმას“ და სინტაქსურ იზოკლონებს, რომლებიც ანაზღაურებენ სილაბური თანაბრობის არარსებობას და უზრუნველყოფენ ტექსტის რიტმულ და სტრუქტურულ მთლიანობას. ეს მექანიზმები არა მხოლოდ შემთხვევითი არ არის, არამედ წარმოადგენს ქართული ენის შინაგანი რესურსების შემოქმედებით გამოვლინებას, რომელიც ერთგვარად ანაზღაურებს ძველბერძნული სილაბური სისტემის შეზღუდვებს.

თეორიული თვალსაზრისით, კვლევის შედეგები კარგად ერგება იაკობსონის პოეტური ეკვივალენტობის პრინციპსა და ჰალიდე-ჰასანის კოჰეზიის თეორიას. პრაქტიკულად კი ისინი ადასტურებენ, რომ ქართულმა ჰიმნოგრაფიამ არა მხოლოდ შეინარჩუნა იერუსალიმური ღვთისმსახურების ტრადიცია, არამედ შემოქმედებითად გარდაქმნა იგი საკუთარ ენობრივ და მუსიკალურ კონტექსტში, რითაც შეიქმნა ავტონომიური, თვითკმარი ლიტურგიული დისკურსი.