

führt, kam dieses ja einzig den Kaisern mit *Augustus*-Titel zu). Das wichtigste Ergebnis dieser Studie ist eine von dem A. vorgeschlagene Anordnung der Kaiserporträts, die sich, trotz der in vielen Fällen problematischen Datierung, als logische Abfolge im Stil verstehen lässt. Er hat zwischen vielen geschlossenen Gruppen unterscheiden können, z.B. die valentinianischen Porträts der Jahre 364 bis 375/378 sind alles andere als das theodosianische Grundschema, das seit dem Jahre 388 nachweisbar ist. Interessant ist auch die Neudatierung des Trierer Kaiserkopfes (Trier, Landesmuseum; Taf. XIII), das man an sich sehr gut mit Stichel als Bildnis des Honorius identifizieren könnte. Darauf basiert aber die nicht ganz überzeugende Behauptung, dass sich am Beginn des 5. Jh. derselbe Porträtstil im westlichen wie im östlichen Teil des Reiches beobachten liesse. Das Material ist noch zu knapp für derartige Schlussfolgerungen.

Im ganzen: eine verdienstvolle Arbeit, die mit einem übersichtlichen Katalog und Register versehen ist. Dem Leser wäre aber auch ein Sachverzeichnis von grossem Nutzen gewesen. Es ist sehr erfreulich, dass der Autor eine Publikation über die spätantiken Privatporträts vorbereitet.

*Mika Kajava*

*Hjalmar Torp: The Integrating System of Proportion in Byzantine Art. An Essay on the Method of the Painters of Holy Images. Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia. Series altera in 8° vol. IV. Institutum Romanum Norvegiae. Giorgio Bretschneider, Roma 1984. XX, 189 p. Lit. 95.000.*

It is regrettable that the title of this study, although completely in keeping with the theme of the research, may not succeed in arousing the interest of larger circles than the students and specialists of Byzantine art. The book indeed has a great deal to offer to scholars of theology and aesthetics, and, in general, to anyone interested in the history of ideas in the Byzantine world.

The aim of the study is to discover and define some basic principles underlying representations of human figure and composite pictures in Byzantine church art. These principles also have a bearing on medieval art in the Latin West. The first Chapter contains an excellent discussion of the concept of art and the artist, as well as of the divine message conveyed in religious paintings. Chapter II is devoted to the literary sources that provide instructions as to the measurements to be used in painting a human figure. Here the author has been able to bring some new evidence in that he presents the first translation of a previously overlooked paragraph in the so-called 'Source A' of the Painter's Manual of Mount Athos entitled 'Explanation of the measurements according to nature'. As regards the literary sources, it would have been profitable to print the Greek texts in full (e.g. in the form of an Appendix). The inclusion of the original texts, which

are generally of difficult access, could certainly have facilitated eventual terminological studies.

Using the above-mentioned passage as his guide, the author then analyses various paintings, starting from the representations of single heads and arriving at the construction of monumental systems of decoration. In this connection a few words could have been added to explain the principle used in the selection of the reference material.

Highly rewarding is the part where the ideological basis for the use of the modules and the geometrical system is studied. To a great extent the answers can be sought in the writings of Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite which are characterized by a strong Neoplatonic flavour. Accordingly, the art is seen as imitation, not only of visible objects but also the ideas behind the objects, the heavenly archetypes, and the artist is under certain circumstances able to approach the unchangeable world of ideas. The proportional regularity of the whole cosmic order, the macrocosm, is repeated in a single painting by the underlying geometrical system.

In the last part of the work the author searches for the origins of the Byzantine system and ends up with the explanation that it derives from Egyptian art. There remains, however, a chronological and, in spite of the introduction of the concept of Hellenism, to some extent also a cultural gap between Egyptian art and the Byzantine period, and, as the author is well aware, much preliminary work should be made in tracing the intermediary stages in Greco-Roman art. At any rate, the symbolism of the method cannot be attributed to an Egyptian basis.

*Jaakko Aronen*