

## The Evangelists of the *Maiestas domini* in the Parma Gospel Book, Biblioteca Palatina di Parma, MS gr. 5

SAKURAI Yuriko

Waseda University, Tokyo

---

### Introduction

The Parma Gospel Book, Bibl. Palatina, MS gr. 5[1] is a *Tetraevangelion* (the Four Gospels)[2] believed to have been compiled in the latter half of the eleventh century in Constantinople. In Byzantine manuscripts, there is no strict style governing the number or content of miniatures and their positions within the text. Most miniatures are illuminations of initials and botanical or geometric motifs, and do not include human figures. In a *Tetraevangelion*, Evangelist portraits [3] are often inserted at the beginning of each Gospel, but some manuscripts, although few in number, include Christological illustrations (full-page, half-page, column picture, initial, marginal) or texts other than the Gospels and their miniatures [4]. The Parma Gospel Book is a manuscript representing the middle Byzantine era (from the ninth to the thirteenth century), and not only includes a preface with a headpiece (ff.3r, 5r) but also a number of miniatures including a full-page miniature of *The Nativity, Constantine and Helena* (f.13r) [5], narrative Christological illustrations (ff.91v-92v) [6], Evangelist portraits (ff.13v, 93v, 138v, 215v), and headpieces at the beginning of each Gospel (ff.14r, 94r, 139r, 216r) [7] (see the Table). However, research on this manuscript has been scarce, and has not been conducted comprehensively on the manuscript in its entirety. Previous attempts, such as those by Millet, Lazarev, and Bonicatti, have been limited to iconographic and stylistic analyses [8]. In this paper, we will study the *Maiestas domini* (f.5r) of the Parma Gospel Book, which serves as the frontispiece of four Gospels.

The *Maiestas domini* [9] is an iconography representing theophany, and is not a representation of a historical episode. The iconography is based on a number of texts, such as the descriptions of the visions of Ezekiel and Isaiah in the Old Testament and the description of John in the Apocalypse, and is also based on texts such as the Irenaeus preface and the liturgical texts. This image is located in or around the apse in a church, and strongly bears the iconic characteristics. It is a theme common to all the genres of Byzantine art, related to the iconodulistic teachings that support the veneration of religious images which became particularly popular in the wake of iconoclasm [10]. During the middle Byzantine period, new ideas such as the significance of the apocalypse and the Second Coming were further added to this image [11]. Though the motifs and characters may vary according to the given situation and context, the iconography of the *Maiestas domini* is basically constructed around the figure of Christ sitting on a throne with the four living creatures (the zodiac) [12] surrounding Him, the four living creatures in turn surrounded by Seraphim, Cherubim, and the prophets.

**Table: The structure of the Parma Gospel Book.** The shaded area indicates the figural miniatures.

Folia	Content		
f.3r	Prefaces	Eusebius and Carpianus	
ff.3r-4v		Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus	
f.5r		<i>Maiestas domini</i>	
ff.5r-6r		Hypothesis of the Harmony of the Evangelists	
ff.6v-7v	Matthew	the Chapter Lists ( <i>Kephalaia</i> ) of Matthew	
ff.8r-12r		Canon Tables	
f.12v		Eusebius and Carpianus, Ammonius	
f.13r		Nativity, Constantine and Helena Standing on Both Sides of the True Cross	
f.13v		Matthew the Evangelist	
f.14r		Journey to Bethlehem	
ff.14r-89v		<b>the Gospel According to Matthew</b>	
ff.90r-91r		Mark	the Chapter Lists ( <i>Kephalaia</i> ) of Mark
f.91v	the Christological Cycle		Marriage Feast at Cana, Transformation of the Water into Wine Miraculous Draught of Fishes (Calling of the Apostles) Preparation for Washing of the Feet, Washing of the Feet the Last Supper, Preparation for the Last Supper
f.92r			Christ's Prayer at Gethsemane, Betrayal of Judas, Repentance of Peter Crucifixion, Descent from the Cross
f.92v			Entombment, Holy Women at the Sepulcher Ascension, Pentecost
f.93r	Blank		
f.93v	Mark the Evangelist		
f.94r	John Baptizing the People		
ff.94r-135v	<b>the Gospel According to Mark</b>		
ff.136r-137v	Luke		the Chapter Lists ( <i>Kephalaia</i> ) of Luke, Hypothesis
f.138r			Blank
f.138v		Luke the Evangelist	
f.139r		Birth of John the Baptist	
ff.139r-213v		<b>the Gospel According to Luke</b>	
ff.214r-v	John	the Chapter Lists ( <i>Kephalaia</i> ) of John, Hypothesis	
f.215r		Blank	
f.215v		John the Evangelist	
f.216r		Anastasis	
ff.216r-270r		<b>the Gospel According to John</b>	
ff.270v-285v		Synaxarion	

## 1. The *Maiestas domini* (ff.5r-6r)



The *Maiestas domini* (f.5r) in the Parma Gospel Book

I would like to begin by describing this particular miniature and its accompanying text, and organizing the matter in question. In the Parma Gospel Book, prior to the Four Gospels, there are prefacing texts [13] titled ‘The Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus’ and ‘The Hypothesis of the Harmony of the Evangelists’ [14], which are accompanied by a headpiece of *Eusebius and Carpianus* (f.3r) and the *Maiestas domini* (f.5r), respectively. The Hypothesis accompanying the miniature of the *Maiestas domini* begins with the initial letter I. This Hypothesis is followed by an introduction to Matthew’s Gospel (f.5r), an explanation of why there are four Gospels, and a description of the four faces of the Cherubim and the four living creatures (f.5v). Introductions to

the Gospels by Mark, Luke, and John follow. I will describe the miniature upon quoting the entire text of the Hypothesis, which is as follows [15]:

Know that the Gospel according to Matthew, written in the Hebrew language, was published by him in Jerusalem, and translated by John. The Gospel describes the anthropomorphic birth of Christ as a man [16].

One must know that there are no more and no less than four Gospels. Since there are four universal winds, there are also Four Gospels, blowing immortality from all of them and regenerating men. From these Gospels, it is evident that He, who was shown to men sitting among the cherubim, gave us the four-part Gospel, just as David, praying for His advent said, ‘You who sit on the cherubim show yourself.’ These Cherubim have four faces, and their faces are the images of the dispensation of the Son of God.

The one like the lion indicates the efficacious, royal, and authoritative nature. The one like the ox presents the sacerdotal and priestly nature. The manlike form depicts the incarnation, and the one like the eagle represents the visitation of the Holy Spirit [17].

Know that the Gospel according to Mark was dictated by Peter in Rome. It began with the prophetic word of Isaiah, which proceeds from on high, and shows the winged image of the Gospel [18].

Know that the Gospel according to Luke was dictated by Paul in Rome. Since it was of priestly character, it began with Zacharias the priest burning incense.

Know that the Gospel of John was dictated by John in the time of the Emperor Trajan on the island of Patmos. It describes the lordly, real, and glorious generation of Christ from the Father [19].

The miniature in question depicts the abstract and theological concept of ‘the harmony of the Four Gospels’ as stated in the Hypothesis [20]. In the middle circle within the rectangle [21] sits the figure of Christ encircled by a mandorla. Below the two pairs of Seraphim supporting the mandorla are two pairs of Cherubim, between which four wheels of fire are depicted. The four symbols bearing the Gospels are placed within the small circles positioned in the four corners, while the sitting Evangelists are arranged facing the lectern in the external square frame. The four living creatures are referred to in the Apocalypse according to John (4 : 6-8), and their characteristics and symbolic significance are described by theologians in the preface of the Gospels. In the upper left corner sits Mark-man, in the upper right corner, Matthew-ox; in the lower left corner is Luke-lion and in the lower right corner, John-eagle. Standing in the margins on both sides of the rectangular picture are David and Isaiah. David is referred to in the Hypothesis as ‘the One who prophesied the Advent’, whereas Isaiah is described in the phrase, ‘(Mark’s Gospel) began with the prophetic words of Isaiah’. Peter and Paul are shown standing on the left side of the title written in majuscule letters, and John the Evangelist and the Emperor Trajan stand on the right. The three Apostles are dressed in tunics and himations and are holding their Gospels. As John the Evangelist is the only one to appear twice on the page, his standing figure is represented as an old man, with the frontal part of the head shown bald for the sake of variety. The Emperor Trajan is clad in a tunic and himation, is carrying a labarum in his right hand, and has a nimbus attached to his crown. All the four figures (the three Apostles and the Emperor Trajan) are referred to in the introduction to the Gospels in the Hypothesis. The Fountain of Life is painted in the upper part of the square frame, and is depicted under a canopy, along with birds, deer, and vegetation [22].

Significant preceding studies on the miniature in question include works by Galavaris and Nelson [23]. Both researchers deal with the relationships between the preface and the miniatures of the Gospel manuscripts, and refer to this particular miniature as part of the above-mentioned subject. Both also share the standpoint of studying the miniatures by making comprehensive comparisons between iconographies and texts relating to the Parma Gospel Book. Needless to say, an approach that compares a number of similar iconographic examples in search of the greatest common factor is vital in the study of manuscripts. However, in the case where one particular miniature is under examination, it is also critical to focus on the manuscript it belongs to in its entirety, as some results may only be attained through monographic research. This paper aims to study the *Maiestas domini* of the Parma Gospel Book while taking into consideration the manuscript in its entirety.

## 2. The positions of the Evangelists

In the miniature under study, Mark is positioned in the upper left corner, Matthew in the upper right, Luke in the lower left, and John in the lower right corner. On the other hand, in the *Tetraevangelion*, the four gospels appear in the order of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Hypothesis too begins with a description of Matthew's Gospel. It is strange that Mark is placed in the upper left, since this is the position that signifies the beginning, suggesting that it would have been more appropriate to place Matthew here. Doubtlessly, the switch in the positioning of both Matthew and Mark is an intentional manipulation on the part of the painter [24]. This is apparent from the arrangement of the Evangelists in the four corners, since the names of only the two Evangelists in the upper half are included in the illustration.

The *Maiestas domini* in the lectionary of the Athens National Library (cod. 2645, f.1r) has been highlighted by researchers as having structural similarities with the *Maiestas domini* of the Parma Gospel Book, such as the positions of the Evangelists in the four corners and the arrangement of characters in the left and right margins [25]. In the Athens Lectionary, it is John who is positioned in the upper left of the four corners, the part which signifies the beginning. As in the text of the lectionary the manuscripts are stated in the order of John, Matthew, Luke, and Mark's Gospels, the arrangement of the four Evangelists in the Athens Lectionary is in accordance with their order in its text. Through comparison, it should be noted that it is peculiar that Mark should be placed in the upper left corner of the Parma Gospel Book, which is a *Tetraevangelion*.

In addition, the positioning of the Evangelists in the *Maiestas domini* of the Parma Gospel Book, with Mark in the upper left corner and Matthew in the upper right, are at variance in their correspondence to the four living creatures. If Matthew had been positioned in the upper left corner and Mark in the upper right in accordance with the order in the Gospel, the positioning would also have corresponded with the order given by Athanasios, which is in the following order: Matthew-man, Mark-ox, Luke-lion, and John-eagle [26]. However, as a result of having had Mark placed in the upper left corner and Matthew in the upper right, 'man' is positioned next to Mark and 'ox' next to Matthew, which prevents any semblance of order between the Evangelists and the symbols. Galavaris explains the disaccord between the Evangelists and the symbols by stating that though the reason is unclear, the symbols are associated with the Cherubim in the preface and are not described in accordance with any specific Gospel [27]. I do not intend to oppose Galavaris's opinion that the symbols are strongly associated with the Cherubim. However, as each symbol is shown bearing a Gospel, it is inconceivable that the symbols are totally unconnected with the Evangelists. It does not seem natural to position the four Evangelists and the symbols in the four corners without making any associations between the two. In fact, associating the Evangelists and the symbols does not weaken the connection between the symbols and the Cherubim in any way. Above all, Galavaris's interpretation does not directly explain why Mark is positioned in the upper left corner. It is reasonable to suppose that there was some valid reason behind positioning Mark in the upper left corner, the order of the Four Gospels and discrepancy with the symbols

notwithstanding.

### 3. Accompanying figures described in the Hypothesis

When considering the positions of the Evangelists, we must also take into consideration their accompanying figures as mentioned in the Hypothesis [28]. As the Hypothesis states ‘The Gospel according to Matthew was translated by John, the Gospel according to Mark was dictated by Peter, the Gospel according to Luke was dictated by Paul, and the Gospel according to John was dictated in the time of Trajan on the island of Patmos’. Based on this text, Peter, Paul, John the Evangelist and the Emperor Trajan are positioned on both sides of the title, two on each side. The critical difference among the Evangelists lies in whether or not they were members of the Twelve Apostles, who were the original Disciples of Christ. Matthew and John were inspired directly by Christ as they were among his Twelve Apostles, whereas Mark and Luke were not. The fact that the canonical Gospels were written by men who were not direct followers of Christ could prove difficult to accept, so lore was created that the Gospels according to Mark and Luke were dictated by Peter and Paul, who were among the Apostles [29]. In other words, the figures of Peter and Paul were included in the miniature to guarantee the legitimacy of both Mark’s and Luke’s Gospels. Mark and Luke are often depicted along with Peter and Paul [30], whereas Matthew and John are combined with various characters. Matthew may be paired with Christ [31], and there are examples of John being paired with his disciple Prochorus [32], or with Mary [33]. The reason John and Matthew are combined with various characters is probably that they do not need to be associated with any specific authority, since they are the original Disciples of Christ. As a matter of fact, Matthew and John may each be represented independently even when Mark and Luke are combined with a secondary character. Evangelists may be depicted along with accompanying figures as per the requirements of the text, such as the preface, but cases have been confirmed where accompanying figures are represented without any such request from the text; therefore the situation seems to vary according to each manuscript.

One of the reasons why Mark was positioned in the upper left corner and Matthew in the upper right in the Parma Gospel Book may have had to do with their associations with the four accompanying figures. First, Mark and Luke, who were not among the Twelve Apostles, are aligned on the left, and Peter and Paul placed beneath them. Matthew and John, who were direct followers of Christ, are aligned on the right, and John the Evangelist and the Emperor Trajan are placed beneath the two. This shows the ingenious structural attempt to vertically separate the Apostles from the Evangelists who were not direct Disciples of Christ [34], and to position characters described in the Hypothesis beneath the Evangelists they are associated with. However, if the aim had been to separate the Twelve Apostles from the others, it would also have been possible to place Matthew and John on the left and Mark and Luke on the right. With those among the Twelve Apostles on the left side and the others on the right, it would have been possible to include Matthew in the upper left corner in accordance with the order of the Four Gospels. Why, then, did the painter position Mark and not Matthew in the upper left of the illustrations? It is in the sequence of the accompanying figures that a major change

would have been effected with the switching of the Evangelists. With Matthew and John on the left and Mark and Luke on the right, the four figures would be positioned in the order (from the left) of John, the Emperor Trajan, Peter and Paul, and Peter would not be positioned in the beginning as in the existing miniature. Mark is believed to have been placed in the upper left corner so that Peter could be positioned at the head of the four accompanying figures; in other words, it was necessary to have Mark in the upper left corner, even though it would be going against the order in the Four Gospels of having Peter placed first.

The subsidiary characters, including Peter, are based on the introduction to the Four Gospels in the Hypothesis. In general, secondary characters are paired with Evangelist portraits, and it is very rare for them to be incorporated in the *Maiestas domini*, as in this miniature. In addition, the introduction to the Four Gospels is generally placed before the text of each Gospel, and it is extremely rare to have the introduction to the Four Gospels collectively described in the Hypothesis, as is done in the Parma Gospel Book [35]. As Nelson states, it is doubtless that both the miniature and the text are attempting to create 'the harmony of the Four Gospels' as advocated in the Hypothesis. Furthermore, the innovative attempt to incorporate accompanying figures in the *Maiestas domini* may have been made in response to a request to have Peter painted on the frontispiece. In other words, it would not have been possible to have Peter depicted on the frontispiece without incorporating the four characters associated with the Evangelists in the *Maiestas domini*.

The same iconographic manipulations as those seen in this miniature for emphasizing Peter are also used in the narrative cycle of Christ's life (ff.91v-92v) [36]. Each of the three pages of this manuscript dealing with Christ's life is divided into four sections, with one or two scenes arranged within one section. In *The Marriage Feast at Cana*, the portrait of Peter deviates from standard iconography by being positioned opposite Christ, where 'the governor of the feast' (Jn 2 : 8) should be placed. The scene which can be referred to as *The Miraculous Draught of Fish* is described twice in the Gospels, first in *The Calling of the Apostles* (Lk 5 : 1-11) and thereafter in *The Appearance at the Sea of Tiberias* (Jn 21 : 1-8). The former is an episode that occurred in the early ministry of Christ, while the latter is an episode that took place after his Resurrection. The difference between the two lies in the movements of Peter. In *The Calling of the Apostles*, Peter gets on the boat with the disciples, while in *The Appearance at the Sea of Tiberias*, he plunges into the lake alone. The subject positioned next to *The Marriage Feast at Cana* is not an episode after the Resurrection but *The Calling of the Apostles* [37]. However, this miniature borrows the iconography of *The Appearance at the Sea of Tiberias* in which 'Peter plunges alone into the lake', in order to represent *The Calling of the Apostles*. In *The Washing of Feet*, the page is divided into the top and bottom sections, and the disciples are depicted in the former, while Peter is sitting face to face with Christ in the latter. The unprecedented challenge here lies not only in the painting of a subject with Peter as the main character, but also in isolating Peter from the other disciples and representing him alone. *The Repentance of Peter* is an episode that took place between *The Betrayal of Judas* and *The Crucifixion*. It would have been possible to insert *Christ Before Pilate* in this section, but a subject in which Peter is the sole main character was selected instead [38]. In fact, Peter appears in nine out of thirteen scenes, and plays a primary role in all the sections, except for the four scenes concerned with the

Death and Resurrection of Christ. Furthermore, these three pages are positioned between the chapter lists (*Kephalaia*) of Mark, which precede the text of Mark's Gospel, and the portrait of Mark [39]. In my previous paper, I had been unable to explain the reason for this strange arrangement, but further examination for this paper has clarified this point, which is that Christological illustrations placing emphasis on Peter have been placed before the text of Mark's Gospel, which was 'dictated by Peter', as if they form the headpiece of the Gospel. In addition to the portrait of Mark (f.93v) and the headpiece *John baptizing the people* (f.94r) for Mark's Gospel, three pages of Christological illustrations have been inserted in front of the text of Mark's Gospel in order to place an emphasis on the presence of Peter. This, in fact, was the philosophy behind the iconographic program of the Parma Gospel Book.

#### 4. The sequence of the symbols

Unlike the case in Western Europe, there are several corresponding relationships between the Evangelists and the symbols designated by theologians in the Byzantine world, and there is no exclusive order. But if we are to assume that the positions of Mark and Matthew have been switched, it is reasonable to assume that our miniature had originally adopted the order given by Athanasios (Matthew-man, Mark-ox, Luke-lion, John-eagle) [40]. It is believed that under the request to position Mark in the upper left corner with the aim of emphasising Peter, the two Evangelists in the top area were switched from left to right and vice versa, which resulted in the breakdown of the corresponding relationships between the symbols and the Evangelists. Of particular interest is the fact that the symbols were not inter-changed when the two Evangelists were switched. If the symbols of man and ox had been switched, the discord between the Evangelists and the symbols could have been avoided even if Mark was positioned in the upper left corner, with only the change in the sequence of the Four Gospels necessary. However, the painter had chosen to represent the symbols in the correct sequence of the Four Gospels and only switched the two Evangelists on both sides. It is impossible to discern at a glance who is positioned where from the sitting figures of the Evangelists painted in the section. However, if the symbols of man and ox were to be inter-changed, it would be quite obvious that they did not follow the order of the Four Gospels, since they were too obviously different in shape. However much the emphasis that had been placed on Peter, it was probably difficult to disrupt the symbolic order of the Four Gospels. At the cost of sacrificing the corresponding relationship between the Evangelists and the symbols, man, the symbol that stands for Matthew, was placed in the upper left corner, the home position for Matthew.

Needless to say, the Parma Gospel Book is a *Tetraevangelion*. Matthew's Gospel is the first text mentioned in the Four Gospels, and the Hypothesis begins with the introduction to this Gospel, which speaks of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Just as three pages of Christological illustrations preceded Mark's Gospel, the text of Matthew's Gospel is preceded by two pages of miniatures, the headpiece of *Eusebius and Carpianus, Ammonius* (f.12v) and *The Nativity, Constantine and Helena* (f.13r), in addition to the portrait of Matthew and the headpiece of *Journey to Bethlehem* (f.14r). The placement of the miniatures within the entire manuscript is



clearly more inclined towards Mark and Matthew than towards Luke and John. Among the Evangelists in the four corners, only Mark and Matthew bear inscriptions.

As images were deemed to be copies of the celestial world, it was the duty of the Byzantine painters to make truthful reproductions of the model, and they were prohibited from making arbitrary changes [41]. Restrictions stemming from norm are quite strong in Byzantine art. However, when attempting to reflect some sort of intention in artistic works without relying on the use of letters such as inscriptions and colophons, the cliché was sometimes broken. There were numerous methods for doing so, such as the switching of the head of a character with that of the emperor who commissioned the picture [42], or implicating the reason for the donation by selecting a biased subject [43]. Changing the sequence of the Evangelists, as was done in this miniature, was another way of doing so. The challenge faced by the painter lay in how to make the miniatures reflect special meaning into the miniatures while observing tradition. The change in Matthew's home position could not be termed a blatant, easily identifiable transgression. Even after switching the two Evangelists on either side, the symbols followed the order of the Four Gospels. However, the two Evangelists bear inscriptions within the narrow space of 2 cm × 2 cm, describing the figure on the left as Mark and the one on the right as Matthew. Would it be too fanciful to suppose that the painter had been trying to strike a precarious balance between norm and deviation?

## Conclusion

This paper studied the *Maiestas domini* (f.5r) of the Parma Gospel Book, and explored why Mark, as opposed to Matthew, was positioned in the upper left of the illustration, the place usually accorded to the first among the four Evangelists. The paper concludes that Mark was positioned in the upper left corner because he was the author of the Gospel that was 'dictated by Peter'. It also concludes that Mark was positioned in the upper left corner so that Peter could be placed first among the four characters positioned below. Accompanying figures were incorporated in the *Maiestas domini* simply so that Peter could be painted on the frontispiece. The emphasis placed on Peter is a characteristic also noted in the illustrations of Christ's life (ff.91v-92v). These three pages of Christological illustrations have been inserted before of the text of Mark's Gospel, which was 'dictated by Peter'.

Though the positions of Mark and Matthew have been switched from left to right and vice versa, the positioning of the symbols seems to give priority to the order of the Four Gospels rather than to the symbols' associations with the Evangelists, and thus man, the symbol for Matthew, is positioned in the upper left. As a result, the miniature ended up with the combinations of Mark-man and Matthew-ox, which do not comply with any order. With inscriptions describing only Mark and Matthew implying the switching of their positions, it is assumed that the symbols have been left untouched because it was not possible to belittle the presence of Matthew, who is the first Evangelist in the Four Gospels, and it was necessary to avoid the blatant disruption in the order of the Four Gospels. Iconographic manipulations have been made in the *Maiestas domini* of the Parma Gospel Book with the intention of placing an emphasis on Peter without deviating from its function as a frontispiece of the Four Gospels.

I had previously pointed out that the Parma Gospel Book may possibly have been a manuscript donated to a church or monastery associated with Peter, or may have been sponsored by someone by the name of Peter [44]. The fact that there is an emphasis on Peter in this miniature seems to complement the conclusion of my previous article.

## Notes

- [1] Total 283 pages. 30×23.2cm. The Parma Gospel Book had originally been bound together with the folia of a different manuscript (ff.1-2, 286), but the two were later separated in 1973 and the manuscript now starts from f.3r. According to Ficcadori, Michael IV Autoreianos, who was the cartophilakos of Agia Sophia in Constantinople and served as the patriarch of Constantinople in Nicaea, owned this manuscript from the late twelfth century to the early thirteenth century. The Gospel Book was then supposedly relinquished to a certain μ(εγάλη)ν μ(ονήν) ‘Great monastery’. Between this time and the year 1229, it was passed on to the island of Malta, where it is confirmed to have been owned by the S. Salvatore Monastery Library in Messina. It was then purchased by the Buonvisi family in 1824, and held at the library owned by Duke Carlo Ludovico, which later became the Biblioteca Palatina. See below for basic documents on the Parma Gospel Book. G. Ficcadori, cat. no.5, in *I manoscritti greci della Biblioteca Palatina di Parma*, ed. P. Eleuteri, Milano, 1993, pp. 3-13 (with bibliography); *Cum picturis ystoriatum codici devozionali e liturgici della Biblioteca Palatina*, ed. L. Farinelli, Milano, 2001, pp. 268-272; M. B. Foti, “Il Vangelo miniato di Parma e la biblioteca del monastero in lingua phari,” *Koinwonia*, 16 (1992), pp. 75-85; Y. Sakurai, “Iconographic Analysis of the Miniatures in the Parma Gospel Book (Bibl. Palatina, Cod.gr.5),” *Bulletin of the Institute for Mediterranean Studies*, 6 (2008), pp. 99-108 (in Japanese).
- [2] *Tetraevangelia* (pl.) are books that consist of the Four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and are a genre of manuscript most widely produced during the Middle Ages. Though this manuscript maintains the appearance of a Four Gospels, it also has some lectionary (*Evangelistarion* or simply *Evangelion*: Gospel passages which are read aloud during liturgies compiled in accordance with the ecclesiastical calendar) qualities; for example, it includes the *Synaxarion* (immovable feasts from 1 September to 31 August). M. L. Dolezal, *The Middle Byzantine Lectionary: Textual and Pictorial Expression of Liturgical Ritual*, diss. University of Chicago, 1991, p. 269, n. 88.
- [3] On the Evangelist portraits in illumination see A. M. Friend, “The Portraits of the Evangelists in Greek and Latin Manuscripts,” *Art Studies* 5 (1927), pp. 115-147; H. Hunger, K. Wessel, “Evangelisten,” *RBK*, vol. 2, cols. 452-507.
- [4] Currently, there are nineteen surviving examples of *Tetraevangelia* that include more than six scenes of Christological illustrations. In total, there are only about thirty surviving examples, including lectionaries. A. W. Carr, “A Group of Provincial Manuscripts from the Twelfth Century,” *DOP*, vol. 36 (1982), p. 56, n. 102.
- [5] Y. Sakurai, “A Feast Image for Encaenia: Iconography of Constantine and Helena in the Middle Byzantine Period,” *Journal of the Japan Art History Society* (The Japan Art History Society) 163 (2008), pp. 143-158 (in Japanese).
- [6] Y. Sakurai, “The Illustrations of the Life of Christ in the Parma Gospel Book,” *ibid.*, 157 (2004), pp. 82-95 (in Japanese).
- [7] On the Gospel headpieces see C. Meredith, “The Illustration of Codex Ebnerianus,” *JWarb*, 29 (1966), pp. 419-424.
- [8] G. Millet, *Recherches sur l’iconographie de l’Évangile aux XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles*, Paris, 1916 (1960), pp. 13 (n. 8), 116, et al; V. Lazarev, *Storia della pittura bizantina*, Turin, 1967, p. 191; M. Bonicatti, “Per una introduzione alla cultura mediobizantina di Costantinopoli,” *RIASA*, n.s., 9 (1960), pp.

208-265.

- [9] On the iconography of the *Maiestas domini* see Sahoko Tsuji, “The Visions of Ezekiel and Isaiah,” *Bizantine Bijyutu no Hyosyo Sekai*, Tokyo, Iwanami Syoten, 1993 (1970), pp. 49-97 (in Japanese); F. van der Meer, *Majestas Domini. Théophanies de l’Apocalypse dans l’art chrétien*, Rome, 1938; Ch. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei vom vierten Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des achten Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden, 1992; J. Lafontaine-Dosogne, “Théophanies-Visions auxquelles participent les prophètes dans l’art byzantine après la restauration des images,” *Synthronon*, Paris, 1968, pp. 135-143; G. Schiller, *Ikongraphie der christlichen Kunst*, vol. 3, Gütersloh, 1986, pp. 233-249.
- [10] A. Grabar, *L’Iconoclisme byzantin dossier archéologique*, Paris, 1957, pp. 241-257; Sahoko Tsuji, “Bizantine Bijyutu no Hyosyo Sekai” *op.cit.*, pp. 3-39 (in Japanese); R. S. Nelson, *The Iconography of Preface and Miniature in the Byzantine Gospel Book*, New York, 1980, pp. 100ff.
- [11] Following the ninth century, central themes of the *Maiestas domini* were based on passages from texts, such as the Trisagion hymn and the Seraphic hymn, which were adopted in liturgical texts. The miniature in question is no exception. Sahoko Tsuji, *op.cit.*, “The Visions of Ezekiel and Isaiah,” pp. 45ff.; Van der Meer, *op.cit.*, pp. 255-281; Ihm, *op.cit.*, pp. 42-51.
- [12] The four living creatures have been interpreted as the symbols of Evangelists by Irenaeus in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, vol. 3, 11: 8; *PG*, 7, cols. 886A-889B. Cf. Van der Meer, *op.cit.*, p. 288.
- [13] There are several designations for the prefatory texts, such as ‘prologue’ (πρόλογος), ‘hypothesis’ (ὑπόθεσις), their use differs from researcher to researcher. In this paper, the text in the *Maiestas domini* shall be called the Hypothesis in accordance with the title. ὑπόθεσις literally meaning ‘theory’ or ‘theme’.
- [14] Ὑποθεσις τῆς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν συμφωνίας. This title is believed to have originated from the phrase ‘ὑπόθεσις κανόνος (κανόνων) τῆς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν συμφωνίας’ (‘the hypothesis of the canons of the harmony of the evangelists’), which is used in the Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus. The only surviving text – other than the Parma Gospel Book – that bears this title, which is a condensed and organised version of Irenaeus’s text, is Oxford, Bodleian Library, E. D. Clarke 10. It is believed that this text was structured on the lines of either the Parma Gospel Book itself, or a similar manuscript in terms of structure, text, and the subject of the miniature. Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, pp. 56ff.; R. S. Nelson, J. L. Bona, ‘Relative size and comparative value in Byzantine illuminated manuscripts: some quantitative perspectives’, in *Paleografia e codicologia greca: Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino-Wolfenbüttel, 17-21 ottobre 1983)*, eds. D. Harlfinger, G. Prato, 2 vols. (= *Biblioteca di Scrittura e Civiltà*, 3), Alessandria, 1991, Tom. I, pp. 339-353 in rep., *Later Byzantine Painting: Art, Agency and Appreciation*, Aldershot, 2007; I. Hutter, *Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturenhandschriften*, vol. 2, 1977-1982, Stuttgart, pp. 56f., fig. 28.
- [15] See below for text of the Hypothesis. Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, pp. 6, 8-9; *PG*, 7, cols. 885ff; H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments I*, 1. Göttingen, 1911, pp. 303, 311.
- [16] *Ibid.*, p. 311; Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, p. 9.
- [17] *Ibid.*, p. 6; Von Soden, *op.cit.*, p. 303.
- [18] The top 7 cm of f.6r has been cut away, and this part of Mark’s Gospel no longer exists, but it is believed to have been included this text. In Oxford, in the Bodleian Library, E. D. Clarke 10, the biographies of Mark, Luke, and John are placed together. Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, pp. 57f., 119-121. On the Bodleian Library, E. D. Clarke 10 see n. 14 in this paper.
- [19] Von Soden, *op.cit.*, p. 311.
- [20] Shigebumi Tsuji, “The Headpiece Miniatures and Genealogy Pictures in Paris. Gr. 74,” *DOP* 29 (1975), p. 173; H. Belting, “Stilzwang und Stilwahl in einem byzantinischen Evangeliar in Cambridge,” *ZKunst* 38 (1975), p. 228.
- [21] Approximate size: H. 10.5 × W. 13.5cm.

- [22] The iconography of the Fountain of Life is believed to represent the concept of the 'regeneration of man' included in the Hypothesis. P. Underwood, "The Fountain of Life in Manuscripts of the Gospels," *DOP* 5 (1950), pp. 41-138; T. Velmans, "La Fontaine de Vie dans la tradition byzantine à la fin du moyen âge," *Synthronon*, Paris, 1968, pp. 119-134.
- [23] G. Galavaris, *The Illustrations of the Prefaces in Byzantine Gospels*, Wien, 1979, pp. 74ff.; Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, pp. 56ff.; Belting, *op.cit.*, pp. 228ff..
- [24] The process by which manuscripts were produced in Byzantine times is not yet clear. In this paper, the word 'painter' is used to refer to 'someone who determined the program and designed the miniature'. Cf. S. Dufrenne, "Problèmes des ateliers des miniaturistes byzantins", *JÖB* 31/2 (1981), pp. 445-470.
- [25] The miniature of the *Maiestas domini* was used not only as the frontispiece of the lectionary, but also as the headpiece of John's Gospel. A. Marava-Chatzinicolau, C. Toufexi-Paschou, *Catalogue of the Illuminated Byzantine Manuscripts of the National Library of Greece. Manuscripts of the New Testament Texts, 10th-12th Century*, vol.1, Athens, 1978, pp. 139-149, fig. 314; Galavaris, *op.cit.*, pp. 51, 116ff.; Shigebumi Tsuji, *op.cit.*, pp. 173ff.; A. Xyngopoulos, *Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Μελενίκου εἰς τὴν Ἐθνικὴν Βιβλιοθήκην Ἀθηνῶν*, Thessaloniki, 1975.
- [26] In addition to St. Jerome's order of Matthew-man, Mark-lion, Luke-ox, and John-eagle, which became the standard in Western Europe, theologians in Byzantine times attempted various interpretations. As it stands, the combination of Mark-man and Matthew-ox as seen in this miniature does not correspond to any order. See below for the corresponding relationships between Evangelists and symbols. Galavaris, *op.cit.*, pp. 36-49; Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, pp. 15-53; K. Wessel, "Evangelistensymbole," *RBK*, vol. 2, cols. 508-516.
- [27] The Tetramorph (a motif that bears wings and the faces of a man, a lion, an eagle, and an ox) found in the Batopedi Monastery on Mt. Athos, 937 (f.17r), a Tetraevangelion which dates back to the fourteenth century, is inscribed with the four *ekphonesis* inherent to liturgical texts. It was Galavaris's interpretation that the Cherubim and the four symbols represented in the center of the *Maiestas domini* in the Parma Gospel Book was a disassembled Tetramorph, and he stated that the miniature in question is also based on the above-mentioned liturgical texts. This concept also corresponds to the description in the Hypothesis of 'the Cherubim having four faces'. Based on the abovementioned arguments, he states that the four symbols are more closely related to the Cherubim than to the Evangelists. The fact that the large circle in the centre and the circular ring surrounding the four symbols are connected indicates that, as Galavaris points out, they are closely related to each other. Galavaris, *op.cit.*, pp. 80ff.. Cf. L. Nees, *Speculum*, vol.57, no.2 (Apr., 1982), pp. 373-376 (book review).
- [28] On the secondary characters associated with Evangelists see Galavaris, *op.cit.*, pp. 33-35, 50-72; Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, pp. 75-91; H. Hunger, K. Wessel, "Evangelisten," *RBK*, vol. 2, cols. 467-469.
- [29] *PG*, 20, cols. 172, 268.
- [30] Leningrad, Publ. Lib., gr. 101 (ff.50v, 76v). Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, figs. 54, 55. There are also cases where Luke is paired with Theophilus. E.g., Oxford, Christ Church 12 (f.82v). Galavaris, *op.cit.*, fig. 23.
- [31] Tbilisi, Mss Institute Ms No. A 484 (f.14v). Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, fig. 66.
- [32] Napoli, Bibl. Naz. Supple. gr. 6 (f.316v). *Ibid.*, fig. 71.
- [33] Vat. Copt. 9 (f.388v). *Ibid.*, fig. 70.
- [34] In the Leningrad Public Library, gr. 98 (ff.111v, 179v), Matthew and John are shown standing, whereas Mark and Luke are seated, thereby making a distinction between those who were among the Twelve Apostles and those who were not. Nelson, *op.cit.*, *The Iconography of Preface*, figs. 62,63.
- [35] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

- [36] Y. Sakurai, *op.cit.*, “The Illustrations of the Life of Christ in the Parma Gospel Book,” pp. 85ff..
- [37] The inscription of ἡ ἄγρᾱ τῶν ἰχθυῶν (fishing) in the miniature in question is derived from the Greek passage in Luke’s Gospel, *The Calling of the Apostles* (5 : 9). E. Nestle, K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart 27th revised edition, 2006. Cf. K. Wessel, “Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen,” *RBK*, vol. 2, cols. 387f..
- [38] Vat., gr. 1156 (c.1070), a manuscript which dates back to the same period as the Parma Gospel Book, sectioned the full-page into six parts (f.194v), and had *Christ’s Prayer at Gethsemane*, *The Betrayal of Judas*, *Christ Before Pilate*, *The Crucifixion*, *The Entombment*, and *The Anastasis* selected as headpieces for ‘The Twelve Evangelia for Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ’. In the miniature in question, *Christ Before Pilate* was chosen in place of *The Repentance of Peter* as the episode between *The Betrayal of Judas* and *The Crucifixion*. Bonicatti, *op.cit.*, pp. 257-261; Dolezal, *op.cit.*, pp. 147, 260-269.
- [39] Codicological analysis revealed that the book is in its original binding.
- [40] In the text of Irenaeus, the symbols are not clearly connected to any specific Evangelist, but later theologians have interpreted the connections to mean Matthew-man, Mark-eagle, Luke-ox, and John-eagle. The relationships between the Evangelists and the symbols are not necessarily limited to the definitions in the text, but it is not clear why the miniature in question adopted the order of Athanasios. The order of Athanasios was also adopted in the Gospel manuscript that was produced in Constantinople in the late eleventh century. E.g., Athens, Nat. Lib., cod. 57. Marava-Chatzinicolaou, *op.cit.*, pp. 108-117; Galavaris, *op.cit.*, pp. 42ff..
- [41] The Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787), striking out in an unprecedented manner, came to an agreement that clergymen, monks and laymen denying the Gospels, the shape of the cross, iconic expressions, and sacred relics offered to the church would be unfrocked and excommunicated, respectively. Prior to the Council of Nicaea, the deacon Epiphanius from Catania in Sicily stated that ‘The making of the Icons is not an invention of painters, but expresses the approved legislation of the Catholic Church’ at the Council of Hieria (754) hosted by the Iconoclasts (‘the Iconoclast Council’). G. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, vol. 13, Firenze, 1867 (1901), cols. 252, 377-380; D. J. Sahas, *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm*, Toronto, 1986, pp. 84, 178-180; C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453 : Sources and Documents*, Toronto, 1986 (1972), p. 172.
- [42] K. Weitzmann, “The Mandyllion and Constantine Porphyrogenetos,” *Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination*, Chicago, 1971, pp. 224-246.
- [43] T. Masuda, “The Ktetor of the Dionysiou Lectionary,” *The Study of the History of Art* (The Society of the History of Art, Waseda University) 30 (1982), pp. 51-66 (in Japanese).
- [44] Y. Sakurai, *op.cit.*, “The Illustrations of the Life of Christ in the Parma Gospel Book,” p. 92.

The illustration of the *Maiestas domini* was provided by the Biblioteca Palatina di Parma.

I would like to thank the director and librarians of the Biblioteca Palatina di Parma, for making my visit at the Library very productive. I would also like to express my special thanks to Dr. G. Scarola and Dr. S. Scipioni who secured important photographs to facilitate my research.