

# The Golden Ratio in Picture Framing: A Mathematical and Historical Perspective

Matthias Nott

1994, Translated and Critically Expanded, 2025

August 8, 2025

## Abstract

This document presents a detailed mathematical derivation of the golden ratio and its application to the aesthetic problem of picture framing. We explore the concept of the “optical center”—the visually pleasing vertical position of an image within a mat frame—and show how classical proportions can be adapted for practical use. Beyond the mathematics, we examine the historical context of measurement systems and provide a critical analysis of why the theoretical golden ratio must be modified for real-world application. The derivation reveals an elegant interplay between pure mathematics and human perception.

## 1 Introduction: What is the Golden Ratio?

The golden ratio, denoted by the Greek letter  $\Phi$  (phi), has captivated human imagination for over two millennia. It appears throughout nature—in the spiral of nautilus shells, the arrangement of flower petals, and the proportions of the human body. Artists and architects have long recognized its aesthetic appeal, incorporating it into works from the Parthenon to the paintings of Leonardo da Vinci.

### 1.1 Historical Context

The golden ratio was first formally described in Euclid’s *Elements* (circa 300 BCE), Book II, Proposition 11, which states:

“To cut a given straight line so that the rectangle contained by the whole and one of the segments is equal to the square on the remaining segment.”

In modern terms, we define the golden ratio as follows:

**Definition:** A line segment is said to be divided in the “golden ratio” when the ratio of the whole segment to the larger part equals the ratio of the larger part to the smaller part.

## 2 Mathematical Derivation of the Golden Ratio

### 2.1 Setting up the Problem

Let's denote:

- $M$  = the longer segment (called the "Major")
- $m$  = the shorter segment (called the "Minor")
- $M + m$  = the total length of the line segment

According to the definition, we have:

$$\frac{\text{Total length}}{\text{Longer segment}} = \frac{\text{Longer segment}}{\text{Shorter segment}} \quad (1)$$

Mathematically, this becomes:

$$\frac{M + m}{M} = \frac{M}{m} \quad (2)$$

### 2.2 Solving for the Golden Ratio

Let's solve equation (2) step by step to find the value of  $\Phi = \frac{M}{m}$ .

**Step 1:** Cross-multiply equation (2):

$$(M + m) \cdot m = M \cdot M \quad (3)$$

$$M \cdot m + m^2 = M^2 \quad (4)$$

**Step 2:** Divide both sides by  $m^2$ :

$$\frac{M \cdot m}{m^2} + \frac{m^2}{m^2} = \frac{M^2}{m^2} \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{M}{m} + 1 = \left(\frac{M}{m}\right)^2 \quad (6)$$

**Step 3:** Let  $x = \frac{M}{m}$ . Then we have:

$$x + 1 = x^2 \quad (7)$$

$$x^2 - x - 1 = 0 \quad (8)$$

**Step 4:** Apply the quadratic formula where  $a = 1$ ,  $b = -1$ ,  $c = -1$ :

$$x = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} \quad (9)$$

$$= \frac{-(-1) \pm \sqrt{(-1)^2 - 4(1)(-1)}}{2(1)} \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1 + 4}}{2} \quad (11)$$

$$= \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2} \quad (12)$$

**Step 5:** Since we need  $\frac{M}{m} > 0$  (both lengths are positive), we take the positive solution:

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{M}{m} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618033989... \quad (13)$$

This is the famous golden ratio!

## 2.3 Properties of the Golden Ratio

From our derivation, we can express the Major and Minor in terms of the total length:

**The Major (longer segment):** Since  $\frac{M+m}{M} = \Phi$ , we can rearrange to get:

$$M = \frac{M + m}{\Phi} \quad (14)$$

**The Minor (shorter segment):**

$$m = (M + m) - M \quad (15)$$

$$= (M + m) - \frac{M + m}{\Phi} \quad (16)$$

$$= (M + m) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\Phi} \right) \quad (17)$$

$$= (M + m) \left( \frac{\Phi - 1}{\Phi} \right) \quad (18)$$

Interestingly, using  $\Phi^2 = \Phi + 1$ , we can show that  $\Phi - 1 = \frac{1}{\Phi}$ , so:

$$m = \frac{M + m}{\Phi^2} \quad (19)$$

### 3 Visual Representation of the Concept

Before diving into the application, let's visualize the difference between geometric centering and optical centering using diagrams.

#### 3.1 Geometric Center vs. Optical Center




Figure 1: Comparison of geometric centering (left) versus optical centering (right). In geometric centering, top and bottom margins are equal ( $d = d$ ). In optical centering, the bottom margin  $M$  is larger than the top margin  $m$ , creating a more visually balanced composition. The optical center (orange line) is higher than the geometric center (blue line) by the amount OM.

#### 3.2 The Golden Ratio Division




Figure 2: Division of available space according to the golden ratio. The total space ( $P - A$ ) is divided such that the ratio of Major to Minor equals  $\Phi$ .

## 4 Application to Picture Framing

### 4.1 The Problem Statement

When framing a picture, we face the aesthetic challenge of positioning an image of height  $A$  within a mat (passepartout) of height  $P$ . The question is: how should we distribute the vertical space  $P - A$  above and below the image?

For aesthetic reasons, the bottom margin should be larger than the top margin. This creates visual balance because:

- It compensates for the optical illusion that makes centered objects appear lower than they actually are
- It provides visual stability, as we're accustomed to seeing more weight at the bottom
- It follows classical artistic proportions used in architecture and design

### 4.2 Applying the Golden Ratio

We apply the golden ratio to divide the available space  $P - A$  into two parts:

- Top margin =  $m$  (the Minor)
- Bottom margin =  $M$  (the Major)

where  $M + m = P - A$ .

### 4.3 The Optical Center

The “optical center” (OM) is defined as the difference between the bottom and top margins:

$$\text{OM} \equiv M - m \tag{20}$$

This represents how much higher the image should be placed from the geometric center of the frame (the image center is above the geometric center when the bottom margin is larger).

## 4.4 Deriving the Formula for Optical Center

Let's derive a practical formula for OM in terms of the total available space  $(M + m)$ .

**Step 1:** Substitute equations (??) and (??) into (??):

$$\text{OM} = M - m \quad (21)$$

$$= \frac{M + m}{\Phi} - (M + m) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Phi}\right) \quad (22)$$

**Step 2:** Factor out  $(M + m)$ :

$$\text{OM} = (M + m) \left[ \frac{1}{\Phi} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Phi}\right) \right] \quad (23)$$

$$= (M + m) \left[ \frac{1}{\Phi} - 1 + \frac{1}{\Phi} \right] \quad (24)$$

$$= (M + m) \left[ \frac{2}{\Phi} - 1 \right] \quad (25)$$

**Step 3:** Substitute  $\Phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ :

$$\frac{2}{\Phi} - 1 = \frac{2}{\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}} - 1 \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{4}{1 + \sqrt{5}} - 1 \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{4 - (1 + \sqrt{5})}{1 + \sqrt{5}} \quad (28)$$

$$= \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{1 + \sqrt{5}} \quad (29)$$

**Step 4:** Rationalize the denominator by multiplying by  $\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{1-\sqrt{5}}$ :

$$\frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{1 + \sqrt{5}} \cdot \frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{1 - \sqrt{5}} = \frac{(3 - \sqrt{5})(1 - \sqrt{5})}{(1 + \sqrt{5})(1 - \sqrt{5})} \quad (30)$$

$$= \frac{3 - 3\sqrt{5} - \sqrt{5} + 5}{1 - 5} \quad (31)$$

$$= \frac{8 - 4\sqrt{5}}{-4} \quad (32)$$

$$= \frac{4\sqrt{5} - 8}{4} \quad (33)$$

$$= \sqrt{5} - 2 \quad (34)$$

Therefore:

$$\text{OM} = (M + m)(\sqrt{5} - 2) \quad (35)$$

## 5 The Practical Adjustment: Why Divide by Two?

### 5.1 The Theoretical vs. Practical Discrepancy

In practice, the factor  $(\sqrt{5} - 2) \approx 0.236$  proved to be too large for actual picture framing. This discrepancy arises from a fundamental difference between the theoretical model and the physical reality of framing.

### 5.2 The Split Space Argument

When I developed this formula in 1994, a key insight was that the golden ratio division is not applied to a continuous line segment, but rather to space that is split by the image itself. Consider:

- In the classical golden ratio, we divide a single continuous line
- In picture framing, we have space above and below the image — two separate regions
- The image acts as a visual interruption that fundamentally changes the perception

The argument for dividing by 2 can be understood as follows:

1. The golden ratio creates an asymmetry of approximately 0.236 of the total space
2. This asymmetry is distributed between two separate visual fields (above and below)
3. Each field therefore receives half of the total asymmetry
4. This results in the factor  $\frac{\sqrt{5}-2}{2} \approx 0.118$

### 5.3 Visual Explanation of the Division




Figure 3: The theoretical model treats space as continuous, while in practice the image splits the space into two separate visual fields, justifying the division by 2.

## 5.4 The Final Formula

Through empirical testing and theoretical consideration, the final formula becomes:

$$\boxed{\text{OM} = (P - A) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{5} - 2}{2} \approx (P - A) \cdot 0.118} \quad (36)$$

where:

- $P$  = total height of the mat frame
- $A$  = height of the image cutout
- OM = optical center offset (how much higher the image center should be from geometric center)

## 6 Historical Context: Measurement Systems and Aesthetic Proportions

### 6.1 The Imperial-Metric Divide

The application of mathematical proportions to practical crafts like picture framing highlights an interesting historical tension between measurement systems.

The golden ratio itself is a pure mathematical concept, independent of any measurement system. However, its practical application has been influenced by the tools and standards available to craftsmen throughout history:

- **Ancient Systems:** The Greeks and Romans used body-based measurements (cubits, feet, digits) that naturally incorporated human proportions
- **Imperial System:** Evolved from these body-based measurements, often using fractions that approximate important ratios (e.g.,  $5/8 \approx 0.625$ , close to  $1/\Phi$ )
- **Metric System:** Introduced during the French Revolution (1795) as a decimal system based on natural constants, emphasizing calculation over intuitive proportion

### 6.2 The Craftsman's Dilemma

Traditional framers often worked with rules of thumb rather than precise calculations:

- “Make the bottom margin  $1/8$  wider than the top” (in inches)
- “Add a thumb's width extra at the bottom”
- “The bottom should be as the top plus the width of two fingers”

These approximations, while less mathematically precise, often produced results remarkably close to the golden ratio formula. This suggests that human aesthetic intuition naturally gravitates toward these proportions.



## 6.3 Cultural Variations

Different cultures have developed their own aesthetic standards for framing:

- **Western tradition:** Emphasizes the bottom-heavy optical center
- **Japanese aesthetics:** Often uses asymmetrical placement following the rule of thirds
- **Islamic art:** Frequently employs geometric patterns that incorporate golden ratio spirals

## 7 Critical Discussion

### 7.1 Is the Golden Ratio Truly Universal?

While the golden ratio appears frequently in nature and art, its claimed universality deserves scrutiny:

**Arguments for universality:**

- Appears in diverse natural phenomena (plant growth, DNA helices, galaxy spirals)
- Consistently rated as aesthetically pleasing in psychological studies
- Independently discovered by multiple cultures

**Arguments against universality:**

- Many claimed instances are approximations or coincidences
- Cultural conditioning may influence aesthetic preferences
- Other ratios (like the silver ratio or root rectangles) also appear in art and nature

### 7.2 The Division by Two: A Critical Analysis

The decision to divide the golden ratio factor by two for picture framing deserves careful examination:

**Supporting arguments:**

1. **Visual interruption:** The image creates a break in the visual field that fundamentally alters perception
2. **Perceptual psychology:** The human eye processes separated spaces differently than continuous ones
3. **Empirical validation:** Extensive practical testing confirmed the halved factor produces more pleasing results
4. **Symmetry consideration:** The division distributes the asymmetry equally between two regions

### Alternative interpretations:

1. **Center of gravity:** The adjustment might relate to how we perceive visual weight, with the image's center of gravity needing less offset than pure geometry suggests
2. **Viewing angle:** Pictures are rarely viewed perfectly perpendicular; the adjustment might compensate for typical viewing angles
3. **Frame thickness:** Physical frames add visual weight that might require compensatory adjustment

## 7.3 Limitations and Considerations

The formula has several practical limitations:

- Works best for rectangular frames with moderate aspect ratios
- May need adjustment for very tall or very wide images
- Digital displays might require different parameters than physical frames
- The formula assumes vertical orientation; horizontal layouts might need modification

## 8 Practical Example

Let's consider a concrete example with visual representation:

- Mat frame height:  $P = 50$  cm
- Image height:  $A = 30$  cm
- Available space:  $P - A = 20$  cm

Using formula (??):

$$\text{OM} = 20 \cdot \frac{\sqrt{5} - 2}{2} \tag{37}$$

$$\approx 20 \cdot 0.118 \tag{38}$$

$$\approx 2.36 \text{ cm} \tag{39}$$

This means:

- The image center should be 2.36 cm above the geometric center of the frame
- Top margin:  $\frac{20-2.36}{2} = 8.82$  cm
- Bottom margin:  $\frac{20+2.36}{2} = 11.18$  cm
- Ratio of bottom to top margin:  $\frac{11.18}{8.82} \approx 1.27$




Figure 4: Practical example showing a 30 cm image in a 50 cm frame. The image center is positioned 2.36 cm above the geometric center, creating bottom margin of 11.18 cm and top margin of 8.82 cm.

Note that this ratio (1.27) is considerably less than the golden ratio itself (1.618), confirming that the halving adjustment creates a more subtle effect suitable for practical application.

## 9 Conclusion

The application of the golden ratio to picture framing represents a fascinating intersection of pure mathematics, aesthetic theory, and practical craft. The journey from Euclid's abstract geometric proposition to a concrete formula for mat cutting illustrates how mathematical principles can inform artistic practice.

The critical insight — that the theoretical ratio must be halved for practical application — reminds us that mathematical beauty must sometimes yield to perceptual reality. The split between upper and lower space, mediated by the image itself, creates a different visual experience than a continuously divided line segment.

This work demonstrates that while mathematics can provide valuable guidance for aesthetic decisions, the final arbiter must be the human eye and its complex perceptual apparatus. The formula presented here offers not a rigid rule but a starting point, a mathematically informed suggestion that framers can adjust based on specific circumstances and personal aesthetic judgment.

The enduring appeal of the golden ratio, whether in its pure or modified form, speaks to humanity's deep-seated desire to find order and beauty in proportion — a quest that bridges cultures, centuries, and the eternal divide between theoretical ideals and practical realities.

*Original Mathematical Work © 1994–1995 Matthias Nott*

In Memoriam: My mother, Evi Arnholz, who founded Art & Frame, a picture framing company in 1990 and inspired the younger me to this work and to the creation of the program OptiFrame. Both no longer exist...

*Translation, Expansion, and Critical Analysis © 2025 Matthias Nott*

Inspired by the great YouTube channel and video of [Busted Knuckle Woodworks](#)