

## **Layer and framework theories of lightness**

SORANZO, Alessandro <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4445-1968>> and  
GILCHRIST, Alan

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/24362/>

---

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

### **Published version**

SORANZO, Alessandro and GILCHRIST, Alan (2019). Layer and framework theories of lightness. Attention, perception, and psychophysics.

---

### **Copyright and re-use policy**

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

# Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics

## Layer and framework theories of lightness

Journal:	<i>Attention, Perception, &amp; Psychophysics</i>
Manuscript ID	PP-TR-18-005.R2
Manuscript Type:	Tutorial Review - Invited
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Soranzo, Alessandro; Sheffield Hallam University, Faculty of Development & Society Gilchrist, Alan; Rutgers University, Psychology; Alan Gilchrist, Alan Gilchrist
Keywords:	Color and Light: Lightness/Brightness, Color and Light: Constancy, Color and Light: Contrast

# Layer and framework theories of lightness

Alessandro Soranzo\* and Alan Gilchrist&

\*Faculty of Development and Society - Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK.

&Department of Psychology, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ 07102, USA.

Corresponding author: Alessandro Soranzo

Faculty of Development and Society

Sheffield Hallam University (UK)

Sheffield S10 2BP

Tel. (+44)(0) 114 225 6532

Fax (+44)(0) 114 225 2430

E-mail: [a.soranzo@shu.ac.uk](mailto:a.soranzo@shu.ac.uk)

1  
2  
3                    **ABSTRACT**  
4

5                    Lightness (the perceived dimension running from black to white) represents a problem  
6 for vision science because the light coming to the eye from an object totally fails to specify the  
7 shade of gray of the object, due to the confounding of surface gray and illumination intensity.  
8 The two leading approaches, decomposition theories and anchoring theories, split the retinal  
9 image into overlapping layers and adjacent frameworks respectively. Because each approach  
10 has important strengths and some weaknesses, an integration of them would mark an  
11 important step forward for lightness theory. But the problem remains how this integration can  
12 actually be realized.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Keywords:** Lightness; Decomposition; Anchoring; Scaling; Transparency; Layers;  
Frameworks; Gamut compression; Articulation

## Introduction: The genesis of the lightness debate

Lightness is the perceived dimension running from black to white. Surface lightness is a basic property of an object, along with size and motion. Yet an understanding of how lightness is computed by the brain is far from complete. The problem is that because the light coming to the eye from an object depends on both the amount of light the surface reflects (reflectance) and the intensity of the illumination, it totally fails to specify the shade of gray of the object. Nevertheless, surface lightness tends to remain constant even when the illumination changes; this is referred to as lightness constancy.

Modern theories of lightness constancy can be dated to the late nineteenth century, when a controversy broke out between, on one hand Hering (1878) who supported a low-level explanation of lightness phenomena based on processes sensitive to contrast and, on the other hand Helmholtz (1925) who favored a high-level explanation based on processes involving unconscious inference. Helmholtz argued that, in addition to sensing the luminance of a target surface, the visual system unconsciously estimates the illumination level and it is the relationship between target luminance and estimated illumination that predicts the lightness percept. Hering (1878) argued that Helmholtz's appeal to cognition is unnecessary and that low-level processes like adaptation, pupil size, and lateral inhibition can explain the approximate lightness constancy that exists.

David Katz (1935) was the first to study lightness constancy and its failures systematically. In his most widely emulated method, subjects were asked to adjust the gray level of a disk in bright illumination to make it appear equal in lightness to another disk in shadow. He found both constancy and systematic deviations from constancy. The matched level of the two disks was closer to a reflectance match (100% constancy) than to a luminance match (0% constancy), although the gray disk in shadow appeared darker than the disk in brighter illumination.

1  
2  
3 During the 1920s and 1930s the Gestalt Theorists turned their attention to lightness  
4 perception, making a series of important contributions. They emphasized the importance of  
5 relative luminance, anticipating Wallach's (1948) later finding that two disks of different  
6 luminance appear equal in lightness when they have the same disk/background luminance  
7 ratio. They rejected both Hering's low-level account and Helmholtz's high-level theory,  
8 arguing that Hering and Helmholtz shared the same two-stage approach featuring a primary  
9 stage of raw sensations followed by a second stage in which those sensations were interpreted  
10 based on experience, and suggesting that such a theory is not falsifiable.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 According to Gelb (1929, excerpted in Ellis, 1938, p. 206): "The essentially problematic  
22 aspect of the phenomenon has invariably been taken to be the discrepancy between the  
23 "stimulus" and "colour" reaction. Assuming that retinal stimuli and colour-vision stood in a  
24 more or less direct correspondence with one another, any departure from this primitive and  
25 self-evident relationship - i.e. any "discrepancy" - was explained on empiristic grounds. Thus,  
26 if the discrepancy would not be rendered comprehensible by reference to "physiological"  
27 (peripheral) factors alone, "psychological" factors would also be invoked. In this way the  
28 phenomena of colour constancy were classified as the product of central processes operating  
29 upon and reorganizing genetically simpler colour-processes."  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The Gestaltists put forward the first mid-level theory. Köhler (1947, p. 103) wrote, "Our  
43 view will be that, instead of reacting to local stimuli by local and mutually independent events,  
44 the organism responds to the pattern of stimuli to which it is exposed; and that this answer is a  
45 unitary process, a functional whole which gives, in experience, a sensory scene rather than a  
46 mosaic of local sensations. Only from this point of view can we explain the fact that, with a  
47 constant local stimulus, local experience is found to vary when the surrounding stimulation is  
48 changed."  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The Gestaltists were well ahead of their time, anticipating concepts that would come to  
4 be seen as important only after the computer revolution. Katona (1929), Gelb (1932), Wolff  
5 (1933), and Kardos (1934) demonstrated the critical role of depth perception in lightness. The  
6 later enthusiasm for explanations based on lateral inhibition at the retina would be possible  
7 only by neglecting this work (Soranzo, 2015).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Koffka (1935) and Kardos (1934) proposed that fields of illumination are treated as  
15 frames of reference for computing lightness, providing more concreteness to Helmholtz's  
16 notion of estimating illumination level. Koffka (1935, p. 245) emphasized the crucial role of  
17 relative luminance at edges (gradients), writing "Our theory of whiteness constancy, will be  
18 based on this characteristic of colours, which we found confirmed in so many passages, that  
19 perceived qualities depend upon stimulus gradients." And Koffka made a distinction between  
20 luminance gradients that represent reflectance borders and that represent illumination borders.  
21 Koffka also spoke of a complementary relationship between lightness and perceived  
22 illumination.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 *Gestalt theory abandoned*

39  
40 At the end of World War II, the center of scientific work shifted from Europe to the  
41 United States, and the Gestalt contributions were pushed aside. A low-level explanation was  
42 particularly in vogue during the 1960's mainly because of the physiological discovery of the  
43 lateral inhibition process in the limulus (horseshoe crab) retina (Hartline, Wagner, & Ratliff,  
44 1956). Later, however, during the so-called cognitive revolution, the low-level approach was  
45 challenged by a series of newfound visual phenomena directly contradicting a retinal  
46 interaction explanation. Experiments showed that a change in perceived depth could shift the  
47 lightness of a target surface virtually from black to white, with no change in the retinal image  
48 (Gilchrist, 1977; 1980; Adelson, 1993), or that a dramatic change in the lightness of a target  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 could be produced merely by causing a (spatially remote) reflectance boundary to appear as an  
4 illumination boundary (Gilchrist et al. 1983).  
5  
6

7  
8 The discovery of these visual phenomena led to the emergence of several inverse-optics,  
9 or decomposition, theories (Land & McCann, 1971; Bergström, 1977; Gilchrist, 1977;1979;  
10 Barrow & Tenenbaum, 1978; Marr, 1982; Gilchrist et al. 1983; Adelson, 1993; Arend, 1994;  
11 Adelson and Pentland, 1996), which sought to decompose the retinal image into components  
12 of perceived surface lightness and illumination that mirror the physical variables of reflectance  
13 and illumination that had combined to produce the retinal image in the first place. These are  
14 informally called layer theories.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Later, as the failure of the decomposition theories to explain lightness illusions (Agostini  
25 & Galmonte, 2002; Agostini & Proffitt, 1993; Economou et al. 2007; Bressan & Actis-Grosso,  
26 2001; Soranzo & Agostini, 2006a,b) and failures of lightness constancy (Gilchrist, 1988)  
27 became clear, some theorists abandoned the inverse optics approach and proposed new, mid-  
28 level, so-called framework theories (Gilchrist et al. 1999; Adelson, 2000) that featured  
29 illumination frames of reference.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Meanwhile low-level approaches based on lateral inhibition became more sophisticated  
39 as they morphed into, for example, the neural/computational models proposed by Grossberg &  
40 Mingolla, 1987; Grossberg & Todorovic, 1988; Pessoa, Mingolla, & Neumann, 1995; or the  
41 spatial filtering models proposed by Blakeslee & McCourt, 2001; Kingdom & Moulden, 1992;  
42 Watt & Morgan, 1985). But these, strictly speaking, are models of brightness (perceived  
43 luminance) not lightness (perceived reflectance). The important problem is how we perceive  
44 the properties of objects (like reflectance), not how we perceive the properties of the light  
45 entering the eye.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




1  
2  
3 Both layer and framework theories attempt to explain surface lightness, and both assume  
4 that the retinal image is parsed into components. But they propose different components. The  
5  
6  
7  
8 debate between these layer and framework theories is the focus of the present paper.  
9

## 10 11 12 **Decomposition Theories**

13  
14  
15  
16 The theories of lightness that arose in the 1970s with the cognitive revolution generally  
17  
18 sought to explain veridicality, not error, using an inverse optics approach to decompose the  
19  
20 image into its reflectance and illuminance layers (Land & McCann, 1971; Bergström, 1977;  
21  
22 Gilchrist, 1977; Barrow & Tenenbaum, 1978; Gilchrist, 1979; Marr, 1982; Gilchrist, et al,  
23  
24 1983; Adelson, 1993; Arend, 1994; Adelson and Pentland, 1996). Unlike the earlier low-level  
25  
26 explanations that took absolute luminance as the input, these theories generally assumed that  
27  
28 only luminance ratios at edges are encoded at the retina. Gilchrist (1979; Gilchrist & Jacobsen,  
29  
30 1983; Gilchrist, et al., 1983) and Arend (1994) suggested that luminance ratios at edges are  
31  
32 extracted from the retinal image and classified as either changes in reflectance or illumination.  
33  
34 All the reflectance edges are then integrated to form a map of surface reflectance across the  
35  
36 visual field and the illumination edges are integrated to form an additional map of the  
37  
38 overlying pattern of illumination on the scene (Gilchrist, 1979; Gilchrist et al, 1983). Barrow  
39  
40 & Tenenbaum (1978) called these layers intrinsic images.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Figure 1a represents how the visual system decomposes luminance in a bipartite field of  
47  
48 illumination according to the decomposition approaches.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



*Figure 1a (left): Layer theories split the retinal image into a layer of perceived illumination projected onto a layer of surface reflectance. Figure 1b (right) Framework theories parse the retinal image into frameworks of illumination bounded by corners, occlusion boundaries, and penumbræ.*

If the layers are parsed successfully, perception is completely veridical and no errors are predicted. But in that case the decomposition approach could not explain either failures of constancy or illusions, such as simultaneous lightness contrast (gray patch on a white background appears darker than identical patch on black background). Seeking to accommodate these so-called errors, several authors (Gilchrist, 1988; Ross & Pessoa, 2000; Soranzo & Agostini, 2004; Soranzo et al. 2009; Soranzo, Lugin & Wilson, 2013; Spehar et al. 2002) proposed the idea of partial classification of luminance edges. Lightness constancy errors are explained by assuming that the illumination edges are not fully excluded from the integration, but partially encoded as reflectance changes. Ironically, these attempts have been only partially successful.

### ***Other decomposition theories***

Other theories have much in common with intrinsic image theories even if they don't speak in terms of overlapping layers. Bergström (1977) proposed that by means of an analysis into common and relative components, the light composing the retinal image is decomposed

1  
2  
3 into changes of reflectance, illumination, and 3D form. Musatti (1953) had earlier proposed a  
4 very similar idea using the now-confusing terms assimilation and contrast. Adelson &  
5  
6 Pentland (1996) offered a vivid metaphor in which a workshop constructs a theatre set using  
7  
8 workers who paint surfaces, configure lighting, and bend metal, mirroring Bergström's three  
9  
10 components. Brainard & Maloney (2011) have proposed an equivalent illumination model,  
11  
12 suggesting that constancy fails when the illumination is misperceived.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Although strictly speaking, these theories are not layer theories, they imply that the  
18  
19 retinal image is experienced as a layer of illumination projected onto a layer of surface  
20  
21 reflectance. More importantly, they share with the intrinsic image theories the crucial idea of  
22  
23 complementarity between perceived illumination and perceived reflectance, whether or not  
24  
25 there is an error in the attribution of the luminance to the different components. When a  
26  
27 paleontologist cracks open a layer of rock to reveal a fossil, the two resulting layers of rock  
28  
29 are exactly complementary to each other, even if the split does not fall exactly along the  
30  
31 surface of the fossil. Likewise, when the visual system splits the luminance, the two resulting  
32  
33 layers of lightness and perceived illumination are complementary to each other, even if the  
34  
35 split does not correspond exactly to the actual proportions of reflectance and illumination.  
36  
37 This implies that when a higher amount of luminance is attributed to lightness a  
38  
39 complementary smaller amount of luminance is attributed to illumination. This idea of  
40  
41 complementarity can be found in Koffka (1935; page 244) who suggested "the possibility that  
42  
43 a combination of whiteness and [perceived illumination], possibly their product, is an  
44  
45 invariant for a given local stimulation under a definite set of total conditions. If two equal  
46  
47 proximal stimulations produce two surfaces of different whiteness, then these surfaces will  
48  
49 also have different [perceived illuminations], the whiter one will be less, the blacker one more  
50  
51 [brightly illuminated]." (For clarity we have substituted the term "perceived illumination" for  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Koffka's term "brightness", which meant perceived illumination then, but currently means  
4  
5 perceived luminance.)  
6  
7

## 8 **Framework approach**

9

10  
11 Attempting to account for both lightness constancy and its failures, several theorists  
12  
13 have moved away from the inverse optics logic of the decomposition approach toward theories  
14  
15 that feature frames of reference but are also more rough and ready. Gilchrist abandoned his  
16  
17 inverse optics approach and proposed a new anchoring theory (Gilchrist et al. 1999; Gilchrist,  
18  
19 2006). Commenting that "the Helmholtzian approach is overkill" Adelson (2000, p. 344) also  
20  
21 shifted towards a frameworks approach. Similarly, Anderson abandoned Metelli's (1974)  
22  
23 inverse optics approach in favor of a mid-level theory of transparency (see, for example,  
24  
25 Anderson & Khang, 2010).  
26  
27  
28

### 29 *Anchoring theory*

30  
31

32  
33 Helmholtz (1925) suggested that in order to compute lightness, the illumination level  
34  
35 must be taken into account. However, according to anchoring theory (Gilchrist, 2006;  
36  
37 Gilchrist et al., 1999) the visual system doesn't need to know the actual level of illumination –  
38  
39 it only needs to know which surfaces are getting the same amount of illumination. This  
40  
41 translates the problem into one of perceptual grouping. Multiple surfaces perceived as equally  
42  
43 illuminated can be called illumination groups, and these are products of both grouping and  
44  
45 segmentation processes. For example, in Gilchrist's work on depth and lightness, these groups  
46  
47 coincide with perceived planes. Coplanar surfaces can be said to be grouped by coplanarity or,  
48  
49 alternatively, segregated by depth boundaries. Such groups of equi-illuminated surfaces  
50  
51 function as frames of reference (Dunker, 1938; Koffka, 1935).  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 The lightness of a given surface is computed relative to its frame of reference, but not  
57  
58 exclusively! Lightness is a weighted average of the lightness computed for a target strictly  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 within its local framework (such as the region within a shadow) and its lightness computed in  
4 relation to the entire (global) visual field (Gilchrist et al., 1999). This scheme is roughly  
5  
6 equivalent to an earlier proposal by Kardos (1934) called co-determination, in which lightness  
7  
8 is seen partly in relation to its relevant framework and partly to the foreign framework. The  
9  
10 weighting of local and global values depends primarily on the number of elements, or  
11  
12 articulation level (Katz, 1935), of the local framework. Within each framework, lightness is  
13  
14 anchored by assigning white to the highest luminance and evaluating every other shade  
15  
16 relative to that, using the formula:  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

$$\text{Perceived reflectance} = \text{target luminance} / \text{highest luminance} \times 90\%.$$

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Bressan (2006) has proposed an alternative version of anchoring theory called double-  
29  
30 anchoring theory that includes a surround-as-white rule of anchoring.  
31  
32

33 Adelson's (2000) newer approach is based on the concepts of atmospheres and adaptive  
34  
35 windows. An atmosphere is a region of the visual field sharing the same illumination or glare  
36  
37 or fog. Each adaptive window has its own atmosphere and lightness estimates are computed  
38  
39 based on the statistics within the window. The window is adaptive because its size changes as  
40  
41 a function of the number of surfaces in a given area of the image. The window needs to be  
42  
43 large enough so that it includes a sufficient number of samples. But if the window is too large  
44  
45 it will include samples from different atmospheres. This theory is similar to anchoring theory  
46  
47 and it gives a great importance to the number samples in each adaptive window: the window  
48  
49 grows when there are too few samples and shrinks when there are more than enough. In  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Gilchrist's theory, a local framework coincides with illumination boundaries while in  
Adelson's theory the adaptive window has a soft boundary that doesn't necessarily coincide  
with illumination boundaries.

## Comparison between the two theories


Layer and framework approaches parse the retinal image in different ways. While layer theories split the retinal into two overlapping layer-images, framework theories parse the image into adjacent regions of differing illumination level. At first glance, these two ways of decomposing the image appear incommensurate, even orthogonal. But each theory seems to offer important insights and this suggests that reconciliation might be possible.

Figure 1b represents how the visual system parses the scene into two fields of illumination according to anchoring theories. As one can see by comparing Figure 1a and 1b, the components into which the image is decomposed are quite different for layer and framework theories. In anchoring theories, the image is segmented into frameworks using illumination boundaries (cast edges, occlusion edges, and corners) to parse the image into "contiguous regions of illumination or shadow, like states on a map" (Gilchrist, 2006; page 331) whereas in the intrinsic image approach, the image is split into complementary overlapping layers, one composed by integrating all the illumination edges, the other composed of all the reflectance edges.

Consider some crucial strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

*The anchoring problem:* Both layer and framework theories emphasize that lightness is associated with relative luminance. But the problem of how relative luminance values in the image are transformed into specific lightness values has been dealt with explicitly only by framework theories. According to empirical work the highest luminance is automatically anchored to white (Li and Gilchrist, 1999). In general, decomposition theories have not offered a satisfying solution to the anchoring problem. In support of a decomposition approach, Kingdom (2011) and Rudd (2013; 2014) proposed that the highest value in the reflectance layer, that is the highest lightness, is anchored to white. Rudd (2014) proposed an

1  
2  
3 alternative anchoring rule, the highest reflectance anchoring specifying that the “highest  
4 reflectance in the scene always appears white, but the highest reflectance may not always be  
5 the same as the highest luminance” (p. 8). The author underlined that it is the largest  
6 reflectance in the neural representation, rather than the largest reflectance in the world, that  
7 appears white. However, Gilchrist et al (1999) reported a test, shown in Figure 2, pitting  
8 highest luminance against highest lightness, with results clearly supporting highest luminance.  
9  
10 Due to the presence of the spotlight, the dark gray target on the left had the highest luminance  
11 in the display and it appeared fully white. The white target, although it had the highest value in  
12 the reflectance layer, appeared only light gray.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42



43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Figure 2. In this display (Gilchrist et al. 1999; p. 828) the dark gray target is the highest luminance in the display, and it appears lighter than the white target, which would be the highest value in the reflectance layer.*


Zavagno et al (2004) has noted that the phenomenon of self-luminosity directly contradicts the claim that the highest luminance appears white. This apparent contradiction has been resolved by evidence that, in addition to relative luminance, lightness is anchored by relative area, with a tendency for the largest area to appear white (Li & Gilchrist, 1999; Bonato & Gilchrist 1999; Gilchrist 2006). Gilchrist (2006) has introduced a distinction between upward and downward induction. When the luminance difference between a target surface and its surround increases, and the higher luminance occupies a much larger area than the lower luminance, the change is expressed as a darkening of the darker region, with little

1  
2  
3 change in the lighter region. When the darker region occupies a much larger area, then an  
4  
5 increase in luminance difference is expressed mainly as a trend towards self-luminosity.  
6  
7

8       2) *The scaling problem.* While the anchoring problem concerns which value of relative  
9  
10 luminance is tied to which point on the lightness dimension, the scaling problem deals with  
11  
12 how distances along the luminance scale are mapped onto distances along the lightness  
13  
14 dimension. Decomposition theories have generally assumed that log luminance differences  
15  
16 map directly onto log lightness differences (i.e.: log matched reflectance differences) in 1:1  
17  
18 fashion. But lightness differences can be either compressed or expanded relative to luminance  
19  
20 differences. Testing a high dynamic range Mondrian, Radonjic et al (2011) found a dramatic  
21  
22 compression of the range; a 2,500:1 luminance range was perceived as spanning only a 30:1  
23  
24 reflectance range. Other work has shown a robust expansion; Ivory et al. (2011) found that a  
25  
26 5:1 luminance range Mondrian was perceived as spanning almost a 30:1 reflectance range.  
27  
28 This is attributed by anchoring theory to scale normalization, a tendency to perceive the  
29  
30 canonical range from white to black (30:1) within a framework. Expansion and compression  
31  
32 of the gamut has not been addressed, and is not easily accommodated, by decomposition  
33  
34 theories.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40       In 1995, Cataliotti & Gilchrist reported a dramatic new illusion dubbed the staircase  
41  
42 Gelb effect. A row of 5 squares ranging from black to white was suspended in mid-air and  
43  
44 illuminated by a bright spotlight. Not only did this arrangement produce a huge failure of  
45  
46 constancy, with the black square appearing light grey, but more importantly, it introduced a  
47  
48 strong compression of perceived reflectances relative to actual (see figure 3). In this case the  
49  
50 compression cannot be attributed to scale normalization because it goes in the opposite  
51  
52 direction.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





*Figure 3. Staircase Gelb illusion. When a series of squares, ranging from black to white, is suspended in mid-air and illuminated by a spotlight, the perceived shades of gray are dramatically compressed relative to their actual shades.*

Gamut compression in the staircase Gelb illusion poses a challenge to layer theories because the lightness of each square is shifted upward by a different amount. An error in decomposition, for example, if a portion of an illumination edge were erroneously classified as a reflectance change or if some portion of the common component were erroneously attributed to surface reflectance, would produce an offset in lightness values, rather than compression. In the spotlight, all reflectances should appear to be lightened by the same amount, but not compressed. Gamut compression is associated with the juxtaposition of two fields with differing levels of illumination, especially when one of the field is smaller in area and/or is surrounded by the other. An analogous sort of gamut compression is found in a shadowed area, except that the compression is downward: high reflectances in shadow deviate from constancy more than low reflectances (Ivory & Gilchrist, 2010).

According to anchoring theory the compression stems from what Kardos (1934) called co-determination; the lightness of a surface is not determined exclusively within its own framework of illumination but is partially anchored relative to the adjacent or surrounding field of illumination. Gilchrist and colleagues (Gilchrist et al, 1999) have argued that, although each of the five shades is computed veridically within the spotlight, they are all computed to

1  
2  
3 be white relative to the surrounding dimmer illumination. The compression is held to result  
4  
5 from the averaging of these equal lightness values together with their veridical values.  
6  
7

8         However, recent data from the Gilchrist lab has contradicted a prediction based on this  
9  
10 account. When spotlight intensity is increased beyond 30 times the room level, no further  
11  
12 compression should occur. With all shades computed as white relative to the global anchor,  
13  
14 the source of compression is maxed out. However, experiments have shown (Gilchrist &  
15  
16 Ivory, 2013) that the compression continues to increase as the spotlight intensity is increased  
17  
18 beyond 30 times the room level, but that the degree of gamut compression is predicted by the  
19  
20 luminance ratio between the highest luminance in the spotlight and the highest luminance in  
21  
22 the surrounding field of illumination. This finding supports the general idea of co-  
23  
24 determination while rejecting the particular mechanism proposed in the original version of  
25  
26 anchoring theory (Gilchrist et al, 1999).  
27  
28  
29

30         It has been argued (Bloj et al., 2004; Allred & Brainard, 2013) that gamut compression  
31  
32 can be accommodated within the decomposition approach by assuming the perception of a  
33  
34 different level of illumination on each patch within the shadow. But this construction defies  
35  
36 the intuitive concept of illumination as dispersed across multiple surfaces.  
37  
38  
39

40         3) *Role of articulation.* One of the most powerful factors in lightness is articulation,  
41  
42 which refers to the number of distinct patches within a field of illumination. In their early  
43  
44 work, Katz (1935) and Burzlaff (1931) found poor constancy when subjects matched a disk in  
45  
46 bright illumination to a disk in an adjacent field in shadow. But they found almost perfect  
47  
48 constancy when each field contained a tableau of 48 patches. Although this fact was forgotten  
49  
50 during much of the prior century, many experiments in recent decades have confirmed it  
51  
52 (Agostini & Galmonte, 1999; Schirillo & Arend, 1995; Arend & Goldstein, 1987; Cataliotti &  
53  
54 Gilchrist, 1995). This is easily accommodated by anchoring theory, with articulation level  
55  
56 determining the weight of each competing framework in the co-determination process. But it  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is difficult to see how the role of articulation can be accommodated by a layer approach. In  
4  
5 Gilchrist's intrinsic image theory, for example, the degree of constancy found between  
6  
7 adjacent fields of illumination should depend simply on how veridically the illumination edge  
8  
9 between them is encoded and classified. The number of distinct patches within each field  
10  
11 should play no role.  
12  
13

14  
15 4) *Area effects*. Katz (1935) also found that the degree of constancy is influenced by the  
16  
17 size of the field of illumination; hence his laws of field size. Such effects make sense within a  
18  
19 framework approach because the area of a field influences the weight of that field in the co-  
20  
21 determination process. But, just as with articulation effects, area effects do not seem  
22  
23 commensurate with layer theories.  
24  
25

26  
27 Layer theories are associated with the idea of inverse optics. So, for example, when a  
28  
29 shadow falling across a scene introduces a luminance step into the image, that step is  
30  
31 classified as a change of illumination, and excluded from the reflectance map. In other words,  
32  
33 the confounding of illumination and reflectance in the formation of the image is inverted by  
34  
35 edge classification. But effects of articulation and area have no counterpart in image  
36  
37 formation. They do not function to invert or disentangle confounded variables. For example, if  
38  
39 surfaces in the real world reflected more light as they become larger in area, then the effect of  
40  
41 area on lightness would be consistent with a decomposition approach. But that is not the way  
42  
43 the world works.  
44  
45

46  
47 5) *Transparency and veiling luminance*. Obviously, perception of opaque surfaces seen  
48  
49 through a transparent layer favors a layer decomposition approach because the scene contains  
50  
51 spatially separated layers. Indeed Metelli's (1975) work on transparency was an early and  
52  
53 explicit inverse optics approach, with perceptual color scission the inverse of color fusion. The  
54  
55 transparent surfaces he studied include both a filter and a veil component. But a veiling  
56  
57 luminance can occur without a filter component, as when looking through a sheet of light  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reflected in a window. Glare also constitutes a veiling luminance in the eye. When a veiling  
4  
5 luminance is superimposed on a scene, both luminance values and luminance ratios are  
6  
7 altered. Nevertheless, empirical results show an impressively high degree of lightness  
8  
9 constancy through a veiling luminance (Gilchrist & Jacobsen, 1983). Both layer and  
10  
11 framework theories work well for the filter component, like the shadow it mimics (Metelli,  
12  
13 1974; 1975), but the veil component is better handled by a layer theory.  
14  
15

16  
17 6) *Black rooms and white rooms.* Gilchrist and Jacobsen (1984) obtained lightness  
18  
19 matches for two miniature rooms filled with abstract 3D objects. One was painted entirely  
20  
21 black, including the contents, and the other was painted entirely white. The white room was  
22  
23 perceived as completely white while the black room was perceived as a middle gray, a result  
24  
25 that is more consistent with a layer theory than a framework theory. Because all of the  
26  
27 luminance edges were either gradual or, when sharp, coincidental with a change of planarity,  
28  
29 they were perceptually attributed to the illumination. Presumably the removal of these edges  
30  
31 from the image leaves only a homogeneous reflectance layer. But the specific lightness value  
32  
33 of that layer is not specified. The same challenge applies to shape-from-shading. Algorithms  
34  
35 exist that transform the luminance variations across the image of a sculpture into a specific  
36  
37 three-dimensional shape with homogeneous lightness (Horn, 1975, 1977; Pentland, 1989). But  
38  
39 they do not specify that lightness value.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Perception in a three-dimensional world of one reflectance poses a challenge for a  
46  
47 framework theory as there are no obvious frameworks. One could treat each plane as a  
48  
49 framework but such a framework would have the minimum articulation level of one.  
50

51  
52 Gilchrist and Jacobsen (1983) showed that the luminance variations across the white  
53  
54 room and the black room were qualitatively the same, but with much greater amplitude (i.e.,  
55  
56 high contrast) in the black room. Recent work by Gilchrist and Ivory (2011) further isolated  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 this factor. They found that reducing the variation amplitude by covering a black room with a  
4 veiling luminance makes it appear as a white room.  
5  
6

7  
8 But why does the black room (without the veil) appear middle gray rather than black?  
9  
10 Could this appearance be the result of a compromise between the highest luminance rule of  
11 anchoring (indicating a white room) and the high-contrast luminance variations (indicating a  
12 black room)? This would be consistent with the spirit of compromise in the anchoring theory,  
13 but without the competing frameworks.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Adelson (2000, p. 346) has observed that X-junctions that emerge where the edge of a  
20 veiling luminance intersects a more distant reflectance edge creates the impression of a haze  
21 or veil. Although Anderson and his co-authors (Anderson, Singh, & Meng, 2006; Anderson &  
22 Winawer, 2005; 2008; Anderson, 1999, 2003) are leading proponents of layer theories, they  
23 have proposed a Transmittance Anchoring Principle (TAP), for discovering what part of a  
24 scene is covered by a veiling luminance. TAP states that the “visual system treats the highest  
25 contrast image regions as regions in plain view and only infers the presence of transparent  
26 surfaces if there are spatial or spatio-temporal perturbations in the contrast magnitude along  
27 contours, surfaces, or textures” (Anderson & Winawer, 2008; page 5).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **What are the possibilities for integrating layer and framework approaches?**

43  
44 Phenomenology offers important guidance but does not seem to resolve our dilemma.  
45  
46 We do seem to perceive a layer of illumination projected onto a layer of surface reflectance.  
47  
48 But we also experience frameworks of illumination. This suggests that an integration of the  
49 two kinds of theory is possible.  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 There is no contradiction between layers and frameworks, but rather between layer  
55 theories and framework theories. It can be said that layer and framework theories parse the  
56 retinal image into different components, i.e., layers and frameworks. But this is a bit  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 misleading. For framework theories, the process begins with segregation of the image into  
4 frameworks. But for layer theories, the reflectance and illuminance layers represent the end of  
5 the process, not the beginning. Layer theories begin with edge encoding and edge  
6 classification (Gilchrist et al, 1983). Of course, edge classification and framework segregation  
7 are very closely related. If you know where the illumination edges are, you know where the  
8 frameworks are.  
9

10  
11 Both layer and framework approaches have a gestalt flavor. Both accept relative  
12 luminance as an input. Neither approach is structure-blind. Both find support in Koffka (1935,  
13 see also Gilchrist, 2006, pp. 371-373). The concept of frames of reference was central to  
14 Koffka's thinking, which is most clearly revealed in his analysis of motion perception. But he  
15 also treated different regions of illumination as frameworks. Like Kardos (1934), Koffka did  
16 not consider the lightness value of a target to be exclusively computed within its own  
17 framework, but recognized that values within one framework are distorted by the presence of  
18 adjacent or surrounding frameworks. This can be seen in his remark that, "a field part x is  
19 determined in its appearance by its "appurtenance" to other field parts. The more x belongs to  
20 the field part y, the more will its whiteness be determined by the gradient xy, and the less it  
21 belongs to the part z, the less will its whiteness depend on the gradient xz" (page 246).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 This graded account of belongingness is consistent with the idea of co-determination  
43 (Kardos Gilchrist), whereas layer theories seem to require more of an all-or-none kind of  
44 belongingness in which a target belongs exclusively to one framework or another. At the same  
45 time, Koffka's lightness/perceived illumination invariance theorem, according to which a  
46 combination of lightness and perceived illumination is invariant for a surface of constant  
47 luminance, seems equivalent to the complementarity implicit in the decomposition approach.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 Empirical results have shown that both lightness (Li & Gilchrist, 1999) and perceived  
56 illumination (Kozaki 1965;1973; Oyama, 1968; Gilchrist & Soranzo, under review) are  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 anchored by highest luminance. Although this work was done primarily in the context of  
4  
5 framework theories, these results imply the complementarity layer theories and Koffka's  
6  
7 theorem. Consider a group of patches, such as a Mondrian array. When a higher maximum  
8  
9 luminance is added to the array, two things happen. First, the lightness of a given patch in the  
10  
11 Mondrian goes down. Second, the perceived illumination on the Mondrian goes up. And as  
12  
13 long as the Mondrian is well articulated, these upward and downward shifts are equal in  
14  
15 magnitude. However, in the staircase Gelb illusion, with its relatively weak articulation, errors  
16  
17 in lightness and perceived illumination are not equal and opposite. Gamut compression  
18  
19 implies that the lightness error is different for each square in the staircase. Thus, any error in  
20  
21 perceived illumination could be equal and opposite to, at most, the lightness error for a single  
22  
23 square.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Conclusions**

32  
33 From what we outlined above, it seems clear that both the decomposition and framework  
34  
35 approaches to lightness perception have their pro and cons.  
36

37  
38 Layer theories do not have an adequate account of the anchoring problem. They cannot  
39  
40 account for scaling effects, such as gamut expansion when viewing a low dynamic range  
41  
42 Mondrian, gamut compression when viewing a high dynamic range Mondrian, or gamut  
43  
44 compression in the staircase Gelb illusion. And they fail to capture lightness changes that  
45  
46 occur due to an increase or decrease in the number of visible patches within a field of  
47  
48 illumination. Framework theories have been quite successful in accounting for these effects.  
49

50  
51 On the other hand, framework theories cannot account for lightness constancy through  
52  
53 a veiling luminance, although intuition suggests that this is a version of the scaling problem.  
54  
55 Layer theories easily accommodate the experience of seeing a veil layer in front of an opaque  
56  
57 surface layer, but they do not specify how the presence of the veil is detected and how the  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 intensity of the veil is computed. Framework theories have so far said very little about  
4  
5 perception of the illumination level, beyond the important finding that perceived illumination  
6  
7 level is signaled by highest luminance (Kozaki 1965;1973; Oyama, 1968). One concept  
8  
9 central to both layer and framework theories is that of illumination edges. In layer theories,  
10  
11 illumination edges are separated from reflectance edges while in framework theories,  
12  
13 illumination edges form the boundaries of frameworks.  
14  
15

16  
17 It seems that a new, more comprehensive theory is needed which is capable of  
18  
19 integrating the two approaches. However, because the units into which the retinal image is  
20  
21 split, layers vs frameworks, are so different, it is difficult to see how the two approaches can  
22  
23 be integrated.  
24  
25

## 26 27 28 **References**

- 29 Adelson, E. H. (1993). Perceptual organization and the judgment of brightness. *Science*,  
30  
31 262(5142), 2042–2044.  
32  
33  
34 Adelson, E. H. (2000). Lightness Perception and Lightness Illusions. *The New Cognitive*  
35  
36 *Neurosciences*, 3, 339–351.  
37  
38  
39 Adelson, E. H., & Pentland, A. P. (1996). The perception of shading and reflectance. (W.  
40  
41 Knill, D & Richards, Ed.) *Perception as Bayesian Inference* (Vol. 1). New York:  
42  
43 Cambridge University Press.  
44  
45  
46 Agostini, T., & Galmonte, A. (1999). Spatial articulation affects lightness. *Perception &*  
47  
48 *psychophysics*, 61(7), 1345-1355.  
49  
50  
51 Agostini, T., & Galmonte, A. (2002). Perceptual organization overcomes the effects of local  
52  
53 surround in determining simultaneous lightness contrast. *Psychological Science*, 13(1),  
54  
55 89–94.  
56  
57  
58 Agostini, T., & Proffitt, D. R. (1993). Perceptual organization evokes simultaneous lightness  
59  
60 contrast. *Perception*, 22(3), 263–272.



- 1  
2  
3 Allred, S. R. & Brainard, D. H. (2013). A Bayesian model of lightness perception that  
4  
5 incorporates spatial variation in the illumination. *Journal of Vision*, 13(7):18.  
6  
7  
8 Anderson, B. & Khang, B. (2010). The role of scission in the perception of color and opacity.  
9  
10 *Journal of Vision*, 10(5), 1-16.  
11  
12 Anderson, B. L. (1999). Stereoscopic surface perception. *Neuron*, 24(4), 919–928.  
13  
14 Anderson, B. L. (2003). The role of occlusion in the perception of depth, lightness, and  
15  
16 opacity. *Psychological Review*, 110(4), 785–801.  
17  
18  
19 Anderson, B. L. & Winawer, J. (2005). Image segmentation and lightness perception. *Nature*,  
20  
21 434(7029), 79–83.  
22  
23  
24 Anderson, B. L., & Winawer, J. (2008). Layered image representations and the computation of  
25  
26 surface lightness. *Journal of Vision*, 8(7), 18.  
27  
28  
29 Anderson, B. L., Singh, M., & Meng, J. (2006). The perceived transmittance of  
30  
31 inhomogeneous surfaces and media. *Vision Research*, 46(12), 1982–1995.  
32  
33  
34 Arend, L. (1994). Surface colors, illumination, and surface geometry: Intrinsic-image models  
35  
36 of human color perception. (A. L. Gilchrist, Ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.  
37  
38 Arend, L. E., & Goldstein, R. (1990). Lightness and brightness over spatial illumination  
39  
40 gradients. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 7, 1929–1936.  
41  
42  
43 Barrow, H. G., & Tenenbaum, J. M. (1978). Recovering intrinsic scene characteristics from  
44  
45 images. *Computer Vision Systems*, 3–26.  
46  
47  
48 Bergström, S. S. (1977). Common and relative components of reflected light as information  
49  
50 about the illumination, colour, and three-dimensional form of objects. *Scandinavian*  
51  
52 *Journal of Psychology*, 18(1), 180–186.  
53  
54  
55 Blakeslee, B., & McCourt, M. E. (2001). A multiscale spatial filtering account of the  
56  
57 Wertheimer--Benary effect and the corrugated Mondrian. *Vision Research*, 41(19), 2487–  
58  
59 2502.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Bloj, M., Ripamonti, C., Mitha, K., Hauck, R., Greenwald, S., & Brainard, D. H. (2004). An  
4  
5 equivalent illuminant model for the effect of surface slant on perceived lightness. *Journal*  
6  
7 *of Vision*, 4, 735-746.  
8  
9
- 10 Bonato, F., & Gilchrist, A. L. (1999). Perceived area and the luminosity threshold. *Perception*  
11  
12 *& Psychophysics*, 61(5), 786-797.  
13  
14
- 15 Brainard, D. H., & Maloney, L. (2011). Surface color perception and equivalent illumination  
16  
17 models. *Journal of Vision*, 11(5), 1–18.  
18
- 19 Bressan, P., & Actis-Grosso, R. (2001). Simultaneous lightness contrast with double  
20  
21 increments. *Perception*, 30(7), 889-897.  
22  
23
- 24 Bressan, P. (2006). The place of white in a world of grays: A double-anchoring theory of  
25  
26 lightness perception. *Psychological Review*, 113(3), 526.  
27  
28
- 29 Burzlaff, W. (1931). Methodologische Beitrage zum Problem der Farbenkonstanz  
30  
31 [Methodological contributions to the problem of color constancy]. *Zeitschriftur*  
32  
33 *Psychologie Und Physiologie Der Sinnesorgane*. Abt, 1, 177–235.  
34  
35
- 36 Cataliotti, J., & Gilchrist, A. L. (1995). Local and global processes in surface lightness  
37  
38 perception. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 57(2), 125–135.  
39
- 40 Duncker, K. (1938). Ein Beitrag zur Theorie optisch wahrgenommener Bewegung. Kegan  
41  
42 Paul, Trench, Trubner & Company. [Original published in 1929].  
43  
44
- 45 Economou, E., Zdravkovic, S., & Gilchrist, A. (2007). Anchoring versus spatial filtering  
46  
47 accounts of simultaneous lightness contrast. *Journal of Vision*, 7(12), 1-15.  
48
- 49 Ellis, W. D. (1938/2013). A source book of Gestalt psychology. Routledge.  
50
- 51 Gelb, A. (1929). Die "Farbenkonstanz" der Sehdinge (The color of seen things). *Handbuch der*  
52  
53 *normalen und pathologischen Physiologie*. W. A. von Bethe. 12: 594-678.  
54  
55
- 56 Gilchrist A & Soranzo A. (2014). Partial integration versus local/global anchoring: A test.  
57  
58 *Perception*, 43, Supplement, 13.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Gilchrist, A. L. & Jacobsen, A. (1983). Lightness constancy through a veiling luminance.  
4  
5 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 9, 936-944.  
6  
7  
8 Gilchrist, A. L. (1977). Perceived lightness depends on perceived spatial arrangement.  
9  
10 *Science*, 195(4274), 185–187.  
11  
12 Gilchrist, A. L. (1979). The perception of Surface Black and Whites. *Scientific American*,  
13  
14 24(3), 88–97.  
15  
16  
17 Gilchrist, A. L. (1980). When does perceived lightness depend on perceived spatial  
18  
19 arrangement? *Perception & Psychophysics*, 28(6), 527–538.  
20  
21  
22 Gilchrist, A. L. (1988). Lightness contrast and failures of constancy: a common explanation.  
23  
24 *Perception & Psychophysics*, 43(5), 415–424.  
25  
26  
27 Gilchrist, A. L. (2006). Seeing Black and White. Seeing Black and White. Oxford: Oxford  
28  
29 University Press.  
30  
31  
32 Gilchrist, A. L. & Ivory, S. (2011). Lightness of a black room seen through a veiling  
33  
34 luminance. *Journal of Vision*, 11 (11), 374-374.  
35  
36  
37 Gilchrist, A. L. & Ivory, S. (2013). Why are lightness values compressed in abnormal  
38  
39 illumination? *Perception*, 42, 1\_Suppl., 87-87.  
40  
41  
42 Gilchrist, A. L., Delman, S., & Jacobsen, A. (1983). The classification and integration of  
43  
44 edges as critical to the perception of reflectance and illumination. *Perception &*  
45  
46 *Psychophysics*, 33(5), 425–436.  
47  
48  
49 Gilchrist, A. L., Kossyfidis, C., Bonato, F., Agostini, T., Cataliotti, J., Li, X., Spehar, B.,  
50  
51 Annan, V. & Economou, E. (1999). An anchoring theory of lightness perception.  
52  
53 *Psychological Review*, 106(4), 795.  
54  
55  
56 Gilchrist A. & Soranzo A. (2014). Partial integration versus local/global anchoring: A test.  
57  
58  
59 *Perception*, 43, Supplement, 13.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Gilchrist A. & Soranzo A. (under review). What is the relationship between lightness and  
4  
5 perceived illumination? *Journal of Experimental psychology: Human Perception and*  
6  
7 *Performance*.  
8  
9
- 10 Grossberg, S., & Mingolla, E. (1987). Neural dynamics of surface perception: Boundary webs,  
11  
12 illuminants, and shape-from-shading. *Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing*,  
13  
14 37(1), 116–165.  
15
- 16 Grossberg, S., & Todorovic, D. (1988). Neural dynamics of 1-D and 2-D brightness  
17  
18 perception: A unified model of classical and recent phenomena. *Perception &*  
19  
20 *Psychophysics*, 43(3), 241–277  
21  
22
- 23 Hartline, H. K., Wagner, H. G., & Ratliff, F. (1956). Inhibition in the eye of Limulus. The  
24  
25 *Journal of General Physiology*, 39(5), 651–673.  
26  
27
- 28 Helmholtz, H. von (1925). Helmholtz's treatise on physiological optics (3rd ed., J. P. C.  
29  
30 Southall, Trans.). New York: Optical Society of America. (Original work published 1866)  
31  
32
- 33 Hering, E. (1878). *Zur Lehre vom Lichtsinn*. Vienna: Gerold. [Outlines of a theory of the light  
34  
35 sense]. Berlin: Springer (Original work published 1878).  
36  
37
- 38 Horn, B.K.P. (1975). Obtaining shape from shading information. In P.H. Winston (Ed.), *The*  
39  
40 *psychology of computer vision* (pp. 115-156). New York: McGraw-Hill.  
41  
42
- 43 Horn, B.K.P. (1977). *Understanding image intensities*. *Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 201-231.  
44
- 45 Ivory, S. & Gilchrist, A. (2010). The staircase Kardos effect: An anchoring role for lowest  
46  
47 luminance? *Journal of Vision*. 10(7):414-414.  
48
- 49 Ivory, S., Radonjic, A., & Gilchrist, A. (2011). Gamut expansion as a function of articulation.  
50  
51 *Journal of Vision*. 11(11):365-365.  
52  
53
- 54 Kardos, L. (1934). Ding und Schatten. Eine experimentelle Untersuchung uber die Grundlagen  
55  
56 des Farbensehens. *Zeitschrift Fur Psychologie Und Physiologie Der Sinnesorgane*. Abt. 1.  
57  
58 *Zeitschrift Fur Psychologie*.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Katona, G. (1929). "Zur Analyse der Helligkeitskonstanz." *Psychologische Forschung* 12: 94-  
4  
5 126.  
6  
7  
8 Katz, D. (1935). *The world of colour* (RB MacLeod & CW Fox, Trans.). London: Kegan Paul,  
9  
10 Trench, Trubner.  
11  
12  
13 Kingdom F. A. A. (2011). Lightness, brightness and transparency: A quarter century  
14  
15  
16 of new ideas, captivating demonstrations and unrelenting controversy. *Vision*  
17  
18  
19 *Research*, 51, 652–673.  
20  
21  
22  
23 Kingdom, F., & Moulden, B. (1992). A multi-channel approach to brightness coding. *Vision*  
24  
25 *Research*, 32(8), 1565–1582.  
26  
27  
28 Koffka, K. (1935). *Gestalt psychology*. NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.  
29  
30 Köhler, (1947) *Gestalt psychology: an introduction to new concepts in modern psychology*.  
31  
32 New York: Liveright. A revised edition of the 1929 book.  
33  
34  
35 Kozaki, A. (1965). The effect of co-existent stimuli other than test stimulus on brightness  
36  
37 constancy. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 7(3), 138–147.  
38  
39  
40 Kozaki, A. (1973). Perception of lightness and brightness of achromatic surface color and  
41  
42 impression of illumination. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 15(4), 194-203.  
43  
44  
45 Land, E. H., & McCann, J. J. (1971). Lightness and retinex theory. *Journal of the Optical*  
46  
47 *Society of America*, 61, 1–11.  
48  
49  
50 Li, X., & Gilchrist, A. L. (1999). Relative area and relative luminance combine to anchor  
51  
52 surface lightness values. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 61(5), 771–785.  
53  
54  
55 Marr, D. (1982). *Vision: A computational investigation into the human representation and*  
56  
57 *processing of visual information*. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.  
58  
59  
60 Metelli, F. (1974). The perception of transparency. *Scientific American*, 230(4), 90–98.

- 1  
2  
3 Metelli, F. (1975). *Shadows without penumbra*. In S. Ertel, L. Kemmler, & M. Stadler (Eds.),  
4  
5 Gestalttheorie in der modernen Psychologie (pp. 200–209). Springer.  
6  
7  
8 Musatti, C. L. (1953). Ricerche sperimentali sopra la percezione cromatica. Luce a colore nei  
9  
10 fenomeni dell' "eguagliamento." [Experimental researches on chromatic perception.  
11  
12 Light and color in phenomena of "simultaneous contrast," "constancy," and "equality"].  
13  
14 Archivio di Psicologia, Neurologia e Psichiatria, 14, 541-577  
15  
16  
17 Oyama, T. (1968). Stimulus determinants of brightness constancy and the perception of  
18  
19 illumination. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 10(3), 146–155.  
20  
21  
22 Pentland, A. (1989). Shape information from shading: A theory about human perception.  
23  
24 *Spatial Vision*, 4 (2-3) 165-182.  
25  
26  
27 Pessoa, L., Mingolla, E., & Neumann, H. (1995). A contrast-and luminance-driven multiscale  
28  
29 network model of brightness perception. *Vision Research*, 35(15), 2201–2223.  
30  
31  
32 Radonjic, A., Allred, S. R., Gilchrist, A. L., & Brainard, D. H. (2011). The dynamic range of  
33  
34 human lightness perception. *Current Biology*, 21(22), 1931–1936.  
35  
36  
37 Ross, W. D., & Pessoa, L. (2000). Lightness from contrast: A selective integration model.  
38  
39 *Perception & Psychophysics*, 62(6), 1160–1181.  
40  
41  
42 Rudd, M. E. (2014). A cortical edge-integration model of object-based lightness computation  
43  
44 that explains effects of spatial context and individual differences. *Frontiers in Human*  
45  
46 *Neuroscience*, 8(640), 1–14.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Rudd, M.E. (2013). Edge integration in achromatic color perception and the lightness-  
52  
53 darkness asymmetry., *Journal of Vision*, December 2013, Vol.13, 18.  
54  
55 doi:10.1167/13.14.18  
56  
57  
58  
59 Schirillo, J. A. & Arend, L. E. (1995). Illumination change at a depth edge can reduce lightness  
60  
constancy. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 57, 225–230.

- 1  
2  
3 Soranzo, A. & Agostini T. (2004). Impossible shadows and lightness constancy. *Perception*,  
4  
5 33 (11), 1359-1368.  
6  
7  
8 Soranzo, A. & Agostini, T. (2006a). Photometric, geometric, and perceptual factors in  
9  
10 illumination-independent lightness constancy. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 68(1), 102–  
11  
12 13.  
13  
14 Soranzo, A. & Agostini, T. (2006b). Does perceptual belongingness affect lightness  
15  
16 constancy? *Perception*, 35, 185–192.  
17  
18  
19 Soranzo, A., Galmonte, A. & Agostini, T. (2009). Lightness constancy: Ratio invariance and  
20  
21 luminance profile. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, 71(3), 481–489.  
22  
23  
24 Soranzo, A., Lugin, J. L. & Wilson, C. J. (2013). The effects of belongingness on the  
25  
26 Simultaneous Lightness Contrast: A virtual reality study. *Vision Research*, 86, 97–106.  
27  
28  
29 Soranzo, A. (2015). Simultaneous Contrast, Simultaneous Brightness Contrast, Simultaneous  
30  
31 Color Contrast. In: Luo R. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Color Science and Technology*.  
32  
33 Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. pp 1149-1152. ISBN 978-1-4419-8071-7.  
34  
35  
36 Spehar, B., Clifford, C. W., & Agostini, T. (2002). Induction in variants of White's effect:  
37  
38 Common or separate mechanisms?. *Perception*, 31(2), 189-196.  
39  
40  
41 Wallach, H. (1948). Brightness constancy and the nature of achromatic colors. *Journal of*  
42  
43 *Experimental Psychology*, 38(3), 310.  
44  
45  
46 Watt, R. J., & Morgan, M. J. (1985). A theory of the primitive spatial code in human vision.  
47  
48 *Vision Research*, 25(11), 1661–1674.  
49  
50  
51 Wolff, W. (1933). Concerning the contrast-causing effect of transformed colors.  
52  
53 *Psychologische Forschung* 18: 90-97.  
54  
55  
56 Zavagno, D., Annan, V., & Caputo, G. (2004). The problem of being white: Testing the  
57  
58 highest luminance rule. *Vision*, 16(3), 149-159.  
59  
60




Figure 1a (left): Layer theories split the retinal image into a layer of perceived illumination projected onto a layer of surface reflectance. Figure 1b (right) Framework theories parse the retinal image into frameworks of illumination bounded by corners, occlusion boundaries, and penumbræ.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 2. In this display (Gilchrist et al. 1999; p. 828) the dark gray target is the highest luminance in the display, and it appears lighter than the white target, which would be the highest value in the reflectance layer.




Figure 3. Staircase Gelb illusion. When a series of squares, ranging from black to white, is suspended in mid-air and illuminated by a spotlight, the perceived shades of gray are dramatically compressed relative to their actual shades.