

The representation of perceived angular size in human primary visual cortex

Scott O Murray¹, Huseyin Boyaci² & Daniel Kersten²

Two objects that project the same visual angle on the retina can appear to occupy very different proportions of the visual field if they are perceived to be at different distances. What happens to the retinotopic map in primary visual cortex (V1) during the perception of these size illusions? Here we show, using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), that the retinotopic representation of an object changes in accordance with its perceived angular size. A distant object that appears to occupy a larger portion of the visual field activates a larger area in V1 than an object of equal angular size that is perceived to be closer and smaller. These results demonstrate that the retinal size of an object and the depth information in a scene are combined early in the human visual system.

Differences in perceived distance can have a marked effect on estimations of object size^{1–4}. Many well-known size illusions are based on this effect and they are often very compelling. For example, the moon illusion—the fact that the moon looks considerably larger on the horizon than it does at its zenith—is no less apparent despite knowing that its size remains constant through the sky^{5–8}. Though size illusions can often be explained by principled size-depth relationships^{1,2,6,9–12}, they raise an important question regarding the organization of the human visual system. One of the most fundamental properties of human primary visual cortex (V1) is the precise mapping of visual angle subtense onto the cortex. What happens to this retinotopic map when our perceptions of angular size are dramatically changed owing to differences in perceived depth? While holding an object's physical angular size constant, we show that the spatial extent of activation in V1 changes according to the object's perceived angular size.

RESULTS

Behavioral measurements of the size illusion

We used a rendered three-dimensional (3D) scene of a hallway and walls to present objects (spheres) at either a close ('front') or far ('back') apparent depth (**Fig. 1a**). Behavioral measurements showed that subjects perceived the angular size (diameter) of the back sphere to be at least 17% larger (s.e.m. = 1.9%) than that of a front sphere of identical angular size ('angular size illusion'), a finding consistent with other studies showing that for a given angular size, distant objects appear to occupy more of the visual field than closer objects^{2,3,10,11}. This effect was very robust and reliable over several measurement techniques (see **Supplementary Methods** online). Specifically, although the precise magnitude varied with different measurement techniques, the direction of the perceptual effect did not depend on whether the spheres were presented successively, simultaneously, briefly,

for long durations or with added dynamic textures. For the perceptual estimates reported here, we used a method-of-adjustment technique (see **Methods**) that consistently estimated the smallest effect-size across subjects, giving us a lower bound on the estimated illusion size.

fMRI measurements of the size illusion

To localize differences in brain activity corresponding to the changes in perceived angular size, we performed an fMRI experiment using stimulus conditions similar to those in the behavioral experiment. The 3D background (hallway and walls) was always present and the spheres always had the same angular size (6.5° visual angle). To ensure a large fMRI signal, the spheres were rendered with a checkerboard texture that counterphase-flickered at 8 Hz. The front and back spheres were presented in successive 10-s blocks and separated by 10-s fixation periods with a fixation mark at the center of each sphere's future presentation position (**Fig. 1b**). Fixation was maintained at the centers of the spheres. During scanning, all subjects reported having a strong size illusion: the back sphere appeared to occupy a larger portion of the visual field than the front sphere. Regions of interest (ROIs) in V1 corresponding to five different eccentricities along the radius of, and extending beyond, the spheres were identified using standard retinotopic mapping procedures (refs. 13,14; **Fig. 2a–c**). Event-related signal averages for each subject were calculated with each location's (front versus back) own fixation periods serving as baseline (**Fig. 3**, middle column). The average response 6–10 s after presentation of a sphere served as a peak measurement for each ROI.

The fMRI response to the back (perceptually larger) sphere extended in eccentricity beyond the response to the front (perceptually smaller) sphere (**Fig. 3**, top row), despite the fact that both spheres occupied identical visual angles. In particular, the peak response for the third and fourth ROIs, which occupied the approximate boundary of the spheres,

¹Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Box 351525, Seattle, Washington 98195, USA. ²Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 75 East River Road, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA. Correspondence should be addressed to S.O.M. (somurray@u.washington.edu).

Received 1 November 2005; accepted 13 January 2006; published online 5 February 2006; doi:10.1038/nn1641




Figure 1 Stimulus for the behavioral and fMRI experiments. **(a)** In the behavioral experiment, subjects were asked to adjust the front sphere to match the angular size of the back sphere so that the two images of the spheres would overlap perfectly if they were moved to the same location on the screen. A larger-scale demonstration of the stimulus and size illusion is available at <http://faculty.washington.edu/somurray/sizedemo.html>. **(b)** A schematic of the experimental design used in the fMRI experiment. Subjects maintained fixation on a small green dot. The spheres were rendered with counterphase-flickering checkerboard patterns. Each condition was presented in succession for 10 s and then repeated five times in each scan.


was significantly higher for the back sphere than for the front sphere. To estimate the size of the fMRI effect, we calculated the average difference (see Methods) between the front and back peak response curves. The curve in response to the back sphere extended in eccentricity beyond that in response to the front sphere by an average eccentricity of 20% (maximum difference = 23%), which was approximately equivalent to the measured perceptual effect.

To compare the result obtained with a perceived difference in angular size to that obtained with an actual difference in angular size, two separate two-dimensional (2D) measurements were also performed where the 3D context (hallway and walls) was replaced with a uniform gray screen (Fig. 3, middle and bottom rows). The screen locations of checkerboard stimuli ('disks') were matched to the locations of the spheres in the 3D scene and, to approximately match the percept in the 3D scene, the top disk had a larger angular size than the bottom disk. The peak fMRI response in the same five ROIs depended on the angular size of the disk: activity in response to the larger disk extended in eccentricity beyond that in response to the smaller disk. The differences in response curves were similar for the 6.5° and 8.125° comparison (maximum difference = 25%, mean = 20%) and the 4.875° and 6.5° comparison (maximum difference = 25%, mean = 15%). Overall, the distribution of activity using the 2D disks with an actual difference in angular size closely resembled the response difference to the spheres in the 3D scene, which had only a perceptual difference in size.

Figure 2 ROIs. fMRI data were analyzed in V1 in five adjacent ROIs of equal size extending along the eccentricity dimension. **(a–c)** In **a**, the area shown in greater detail in **b** and **c**. Counterphase-flickering annuli **(b, left)** were used at varying eccentricities to define the ROIs. The cortical area **(b, right)** activated by three such annuli that correspond to positions 1, 3 and 5 in **c**. The blue/green colormap represents responses to the inner annulus (leftward activation on the inflated cortical representation) and outer annulus (rightward activation on the inflated cortical representation). The red/yellow colormap represents responses to the middle annulus. **(c)** The five ROI positions and their approximate mapping onto the stimulus.

Control experiments

Although there were small differences in background features surrounding the front and back spheres in the 3D scene, it is unlikely



An alternative way to characterize the fMRI effect in the 3D experiment is to estimate the absolute 2D eccentricities activated by the 3D stimuli. Specifically, we wanted to determine how many degrees of 2D visual angle in cortex were activated by the near and far 3D stimuli. To do this, we required a criterion for deciding at what point activation 'ends' in the cortex. We did this by determining a criterion in the 2D experiments (middle and bottom panels in Fig. 3) that matched the actual retinal size and then applying this criterion to the 3D data. We found that for the 6.5° conditions in the 2D experiments, the response curves matched the retinal size when the curves were at 22% of their maximum value. Applying this criterion to the 3D data revealed that the front and back spheres activated an area corresponding to 2.9° and 3.5° of cortex, respectively. Keeping in mind that the radius of the spheres was 3.25°, the front sphere activated a smaller absolute cortical area and the back sphere activated a larger absolute cortical area than did a 2D stimulus of equivalent size. We return to this point in the following control experiments.




Figure 3 Imaging results. For each stimulus condition, event-related averages in V1 were calculated for each of five subjects (example subject, middle column), where time = 0 is the start of a checkerboard presentation. Peak measurements were averaged across hemispheres and subjects (right column). For both a perceptual difference in angular size (top row) and an actual difference in angular size (middle and bottom rows), activity for the larger stimulus extended in eccentricity beyond that for the smaller stimulus. The shaded region between the peak response curves (right column) shows the range over which differences in the curves were calculated (see main text and Methods). * $P < 0.05$. Error bars represent s.e.m.

that they contributed to the measured differences. The signals in response to the front and back spheres were measured with respect to fixation at each of those locations. Thus, for both the front and back spheres, the signal measured was with respect only to the addition of a sphere to the local background features (which were static and present during the fixation periods). However, there could have been differences caused by the relationship between the spheres and the local features in the scene. In particular, lighting differences in the renderings caused the contrast between the back sphere and its surround to be higher than that between the front sphere and its surround. To examine the effects of local contrast, we included a 2D condition that matched the mean luminance of the spheres and background in the 3D scene. We observed no differences in peak activity in response to the top (higher contrast) and bottom (lower contrast) disks (Fig. 4a).

An additional feature of the peak response curves for the 2D disks (Fig. 4a) is that they were at the midpoint between the front and back peak response curves measured with the 3D scene (dashed lines, Fig. 4a). That is, the response to the back sphere in the 3D scene extended beyond the response to an equivalently sized 2D disk, and the response to the front sphere was restricted to a smaller area than the response to an equivalently sized 2D disk. We drew the same conclusion from the estimates of the absolute 2D eccentricities activated by the 3D stimuli, as discussed in the previous section. We tested

whether perception follows a similar symmetric pattern: does the back sphere appear to be larger and the front sphere appear to be smaller than an equivalent 2D disk? We used a matching paradigm where subjects adjusted a 2D disk located outside the 3D scene to match the size of the front and back spheres. We found that subjects reliably judged the angular size of a 2D disk to be intermediate between that of the front and back spheres (Fig. 4b). This symmetry in perception is consistent with the symmetry observed in the fMRI data.

Next, we used these behavioral measures to estimate the cortical area activated by the 3D stimuli. The front sphere appeared to be 0.91 times smaller than an equivalently sized 2D disk. Applying this behaviorally derived scale factor ($3.25^\circ \times 0.91$) gave an estimate (2.95°) of the 2D cortical area activated in response to the front sphere. Recall that in the previous section, based on the fMRI curves, our estimate of absolute 2D eccentricity activated by the front sphere was 2.90° . Thus, there was a high degree of correspondence between the behaviorally derived and fMRI-derived estimates. The behaviorally derived scale factor applied to the back sphere ($3.25^\circ \times 1.04 = 3.38^\circ$) was, again, close to our previous fMRI-derived estimate of 3.50° . Though the fMRI estimates were slightly larger, there was notable agreement between what was predicted from the direction and magnitude of the behavioral effect and what was measured with fMRI.

We performed a final control experiment that had two primary objectives. First, we wanted to minimize any differences of local

stimulus features surrounding the front and back spheres; we achieved this by using a greatly simplified 3D scene (similar to the classic Ponzo illusion). The only depth cues were two lines with linear perspective and a small luminance gradient on an otherwise gray screen (Fig. 4c). Second, we wanted to investigate whether reducing the perceptual effect also reduced the fMRI effect. There was some evidence to suggest that there was a correlation between the strength of the perceptual effect across subjects and the size of the fMRI effect in the original experiment (see **Supplementary Data** online), but a different way to address this question is to use a stimulus configuration that is known to reduce the strength of the perceptual effect. As expected, the perceptual effect with the reduced depth cues was at least 16% smaller than that measured in the original 3D scene, a finding consistent with previous research showing that reducing depth cues significantly reduces the magnitude of size illusions¹¹. (Note that the 16% reduction was measured under the same behavioral conditions as the original, brick hallway stimulus. During the fMRI conditions, which included a dynamic contrast-reversing stimulus and which required subjects to maintain fixation, most observers felt that the size illusion with the minimal depth cues was even weaker.) Consistent with the reduced perceptual effect, there was a reduced, though significant, fMRI difference (maximum response-curve distance = 15%, mean = 9%) with the back sphere activating a larger area in V1 than the front sphere (Fig. 4c).




Figure 4 Control experiments. **(a)** A similar brick background pattern and luminance contrast, but no size illusion, was used. There was no difference in the measured signal as a function of eccentricity for the top (high contrast) versus bottom (low contrast) checkerboard locations. The dashed lines are the 3D data plotted from **Figure 3**. Note that the 2D response curves fall between the responses to the front and back spheres. **(b)** To directly compare 2D and 3D size judgments, a 2D disk located outside the 3D scene was adjusted to match the front and back spheres. The front and back spheres in the 3D scene were judged to be smaller and larger, respectively, than an equivalent 2D disk. **(c)** A 3D scene with minimal depth cues was used, resulting in a smaller perceptual effect than the original 3D scene. Consistent with the reduced perceptual effect, the fMRI effect was smaller, but still significant, with activity in response to the perceptually larger (back) sphere extending in eccentricity beyond that in response to the perceptually smaller (front) sphere. $*P < 0.05$. Error bars represent s.e.m.

DISCUSSION

We have demonstrated a relationship between the spatial extent of activation in human primary visual cortex and an object's perceived angular size. Previously it was assumed that retinotopic maps are fixed and solely reflect a feedforward mapping between the retina and cortex, such that when two images occupy the same portion of the visual field, they will activate the same cortical area. When the information to be represented is 2D (as in almost all previous retinotopic mapping studies), this characterization seems to be valid. But adding a third dimension to the information (such as exists in almost all naturally occurring stimuli) complicates this characterization. The ultimate goal of the visual system is clearly not to precisely measure the size of an image projected onto the retina. A more behaviorally critical property of an object is its size relative to the environment, which helps determine its identity and how one should interact with the object. Estimating an object's behaviorally relevant size requires that its retinal projection be scaled by its distance from the observer or from other objects in the environment. The results presented here indicate that the scaling process affects the retinotopic representation in V1, one of the earliest stages of the human visual system. On the basis of the current results, we suggest that the topographic representation in V1 should be thought of as dynamic and dependent on the 3D content in the scene. It remains to be seen, in future studies, what the limits of this rescaling process are as they relate to topographical changes in V1. For example, if a stimulus could be created that resulted in a doubling of perceived angular size, to what extent would this be reflected in topographic changes in V1? Presumably, feedforward inputs to V1 limit the degree of rescaling.

The source of the effect could arise from a number of different mechanisms. In our stimulus configuration, feedback from higher visual areas would seem to make an important contribution to the effect that we observed. Extracting depth information from the texture and perspective cues in our stimuli requires that the information be integrated over a large area and probably necessitates the large receptive

fields found in higher-order visual areas. This depth information, once extracted, could then be used to rescale retinotopic representations in other visual areas. In addition, visual attention processes, which are known to be retinotopically specific^{15–17}, may make an important feedback contribution to the spatial extent of the response. However, it should be emphasized that an attention mechanism would require a redistribution of spatial attention in 2D (screen) coordinates based on 3D cues and not simply an attentional gain mechanism. Finally, as with any fMRI experiment, signal differences may not reflect differences in spiking in V1 neurons but could reflect differences in synaptic input. Overall, understanding the possible role of feedback and other mechanisms will require further experiments.

From our findings that perceptually larger stimuli result in an increased area of activation in V1, we can make a number of behavioral predictions. For example, previous detection and discrimination tasks that have depended on physical stimulus size (such as spatial summation; refs. 18,19) should have altered thresholds depending on perceived angular size. Previous psychophysical results are consistent with this prediction²⁰. Similarly, an important question is whether there are resolution differences as a function of perceived size—a larger cortical representation may translate into improved spatial discrimination thresholds. Finally, visual aftereffects induced by adaptation may extend over a larger area in retinal space for stimuli perceived to be far away than for stimuli perceived to be close by.

Presumably, the visual system progressively transforms information from a retinal to an object-centered reference frame whereby retinal size is progressively removed from the representation. Thus, another important issue to address in future studies is the extent to which other retinotopic areas manifest a pattern of results similar to what we observed in V1. To make the necessary measurements in intermediate retinotopic areas (V2, V3, V4 and so on), however, will require the use of an imaging protocol with greater spatial resolution. Extrastriate retinotopic areas become progressively smaller and, even with our current imaging parameters, we could not differentiate ROIs in V2 with sufficient resolution to perform a similar analysis.

Our results are not consistent with a previous neuroimaging experiment that used a spatial position illusion²¹. In that study, stationary patterns containing inward and outward moving elements created the perception of an inward and outward position shift of the elements. Thus, the stimulus with the outward moving elements appeared to occupy a larger portion of the visual field than the stimulus with inward moving elements. Paradoxically, the study found a relative increase in the fMRI signal in eccentric V1 for the inward (smaller) moving patterns and a relative increase in foveal V1 for outward (larger) moving patterns. Additional stimulus conditions in the original study as well as replication studies performed by another laboratory

(J. Liu, D. Ress, S. Nakadomari & B.A. Wandell, *Soc. Neurosci. Abstr.* 18.11, 2004) indicate that changes in perceived position are irrelevant to the effect. Instead, the source of the fMRI differences seems to be a large motion signal associated with the trailing edge of the stimuli, changes in motion direction or both. Given that the changes in activity distribution we observed were relatively small, it is likely that if present in this earlier study²¹, they were dominated by the large motion signal and were thus not measurable with fMRI.

Our results are consistent with earlier work suggesting that neural responses in early visual cortex may change as a function of depth to allow for object scaling^{20,22–25}, pointing to a variety of ways in which neural processing could be modified in V1. Some of this previous work has identified changes in firing rate as a function of distance ('distance tuning', ref. 25) whereas other research has suggested that receptive fields may change size as a function of distance to the object^{20,22,23}. Computational models have also identified strategies for dynamic control of information between arrays of neurons at different levels of the visual pathway, which allow for shifts in the relative alignment of inputs and outputs²⁶. Although the specific mechanisms underlying the effects that we measured remain unidentified, our results demonstrate a previously unknown correspondence between perceived size and retinotopic maps in human primary visual cortex.

METHODS

Participants. Five volunteers with normal or corrected-to-normal vision participated in 1–3 fMRI imaging sessions each. All subjects who participated in the fMRI experiments also participated in the behavioral sessions. Informed consent was obtained according to procedures approved by the University of Minnesota Internal Review Board.

Visual stimuli. All stimuli (except the disks used in Experiment 1) were rendered using the Radiance software package²⁷ and were viewed binocularly (see **Supplementary Note** online for a discussion of binocular viewing and vergence eye movements and their relationship to our results). The scene was illuminated by a mixture of diffuse and single distant punctate light-source, both of which were neutral in chromaticity. We wrote the software for the behavioral experiments using the Java programming platform (<http://java.sun.com>). In the fMRI experiment, identical background images were used for the counterphase stimulus presentations to ensure that there were no slight pixel modulations in the background caused by differences in rendering between the two counterphase spheres. The entire scene occupied 18° of visual angle. Stimuli were projected using an LCD projector (Sharp) onto a rear-projection screen located in the magnet bore and were viewed with an angled mirror. During scanning, we used Presentation software (<http://www.neurobehavioral.com>) to display the stimuli, which were synchronized with MRI data acquisition. Subjects were instructed to maintain fixation on a small point that moved between presentation locations throughout the experiment.

Behavioral experiment. Two behavioral measurements were made while subjects were positioned in the MRI scanner. (Subjects performed additional trials, with different measurement techniques, outside the scanner. We obtained the same pattern of results, some of which are described in the **Supplementary Methods**.) The experiments were designed to establish the lower bound of the magnitude of the size illusion. Subjects were given unlimited time to inspect the scene and were free to move their eyes and scan the stimuli during inspection. For the first experiment, subjects were presented with the 3D scene and both spheres and were asked to adjust the size of the front sphere until its angular size matched that of the back sphere. The concept of 'angular size' was carefully explained and subjects were told to adjust the size so that the two images of the spheres would perfectly overlap if moved to the same location on the screen. (Because head position was fixed with respect to the stimulus, the number of pixels an object occupies on the screen, the 'image size', was also used to describe the task.) The behavioral effect was quantified by computing the ratio of the size of the front sphere to the size of the back sphere. The second experiment was similar to the first, except that a single sphere was presented and

subjects adjusted a 2D gray disk located outside the scene until it matched the sphere in angular size. The behavioral effect was quantified by dividing the size of the 2D disk adjusted to match the back sphere by the size of the back sphere and by dividing the size of the 2D disk adjusted to match the front sphere by the size of the front sphere. For both experiments, each measurement consisted of five trials. Behavioral data were also collected with either a static or a counterphase-flickering checkerboard texture added to the spheres. Overall, these measurements did not differ from those obtained using static, gray spheres. However, in preliminary testing, one subject was able to use a matching strategy based purely on the apparent size of the checks in the checkerboard textures. We used gray spheres for all subjects to eliminate the possible use of this strategy.

fMRI procedure. MRI data were collected on a 3-T scanner (Siemens Trio) outfitted with an eight-channel phase-array coil. Echoplanar data were acquired using standard parameters (24 3-mm-thick axial slices; field of view, 220 mm; matrix, 64 × 64; repetition time (TR), 2.0 s; echo time (TE), 30 ms; flip angle, 70°). We acquired 8–12 functional runs, each consisting of 104 images, for every subject. The first four volumes were discarded to allow for magnetization equilibration. A T1-weighted anatomical volume (3D MPRAGE; 1 × 1 × 1 mm³ resolution) was acquired for localization and visualization of the functional data.

After motion correction (SPM99, <http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>), the functional data were coregistered with the anatomical scan. Data were analyzed in equally sized, predefined ROIs in V1, averaging four functional voxels per ROI. Maps of the horizontal and vertical meridian (10-s block design alternating between horizontal and vertical meridian stimuli) identified the border of V1 and V2. A series of counterphase-flickering annuli (10-s block design alternating between annuli of different radii) were used to define regions within V1 corresponding to five eccentricities along the radius of the spheres (3D experiment) and disks (2D experiment). The ROIs were defined using BrainVoyager and visualized on inflated cortices for each subject. Time courses from each ROI were then extracted and imported into Matlab for further analyses. This included an event-related averaging of each stimulus condition (with the average of the last two time points of each fixation condition serving as a baseline for each stimulus block) and extraction of peak responses by averaging time points 6–10 s after the start of a presentation block for each stimulus condition. Statistical paired *t*-tests were used to evaluate differences in the peak response for each of the ROIs.

We estimated the difference in the peak response curves using two different methods. The first estimated the 'effect size'. We wanted to estimate how much further one curve extended beyond another in eccentricity and to express this difference as a percentage. This was done to compare the fMRI data to behavioral measures of the perceptual effect size (also expressed as percentages). We estimated the percentage difference between peak response curves by first performing a bicubic interpolation to obtain a denser sampling of the curves. Next, we calculated the percentage difference in eccentricity between the curves at 20 equally spaced intervals between the half-maximum and half-minimum point of the response curves. This range was found to consistently capture the maximum differences in the curves.

The second method for characterizing the peak response curves estimated the absolute 2D eccentricities activated by the 3D (sphere) stimuli. We wanted to estimate how many degrees of 2D visual angle in cortex were activated by the near and far 3D stimuli. This involved establishing a criterion for deciding where in the cortex activation ends. To do this, we considered the 6.5° curves in both of the 2D experiments (**Fig. 3**, middle and bottom rows), as the spheres in the 3D room were also 6.5°. This also allowed us a replication opportunity, as the 2D 6.5° curves were measured twice. We found that when the curves reached the 3.25° eccentricity point (that is, the radius of the 6.5° disk), the curves were at 23% (**Fig. 3**, middle row) and 21% (**Fig. 3**, bottom row) of their maximum value. To estimate the absolute 2D eccentricities activated by the 3D stimuli, we obtained the eccentricity value that corresponded to the 3D stimulus curves when they reached 22% of their maximum value.

Note: Supplementary information is available on the Nature Neuroscience website.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank S. He, F. Fang and P. Sinha for their comments and suggestions related to this manuscript. This work was supported by the US National Institutes of

Health (F32 EY015342 to S.O.M. and RO1 EY-015261 to D.K.) and the National Geo-Spatial Intelligence Agency (HM1582-05-C-0003 to S.O.M.).

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Published online at <http://www.nature.com/natureneuroscience/>
Reprints and permissions information is available online at <http://npg.nature.com/reprintsandpermissions/>

1. Holway, A.H. & Boring, E.G. Determinants of apparent visual size with distance variant. *Am. J. Psychol.* **54**, 21–37 (1941).
2. Joynton, R.B. The problem of size and distance. *Q. J. Exp. Psychol.* **1**, 119–135 (1949).
3. Gilinsky, A.S. The effect of attitude upon the perception of size. *Am. J. Psychol.* **68**, 173–192 (1955).
4. Ono, H. Distal and proximal size under reduced and non-reduced viewing conditions. *Am. J. Psychol.* **79**, 234–241 (1966).
5. Kaufman, L. & Rock, I. The moon illusion, I. *Science* **136**, 953–961 (1962).
6. King, W.L. & Gruber, H.E. Moon illusion & Emmert's law. *Science* **135**, 1125–1126 (1962).
7. Rock, I. & Kaufman, L. The moon illusion, II. *Science* **136**, 1023–1031 (1962).
8. Kaufman, L. & Kaufman, J.H. Explaining the moon illusion. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **97**, 500–505 (2000).
9. Foley, J.M. The size-distance relation and intrinsic geometry of visual space: implications for processing. *Vision Res.* **12**, 323–332 (1972).
10. Jenkin, N. & Hyman, R. Attitude and distance-estimation as variables in size-matching. *Am. J. Psychol.* **72**, 68–76 (1959).
11. Leibowitz, H., Brislin, R., Perlmutter, L. & Hennessy, R. Ponzo perspective illusion as a manifestation of space perception. *Science* **166**, 1174–1176 (1969).
12. McCready, D. On size, distance, and visual angle perception. *Percept. Psychophys.* **37**, 323–334 (1985).
13. Engel, S.A., Glover, G.H. & Wandell, B.A. Retinotopic organization in human visual cortex and the spatial precision of functional MRI. *Cereb. Cortex* **7**, 181–192 (1997).
14. Sereno, M.I. *et al.* Borders of multiple visual areas in humans revealed by functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Science* **268**, 889–893 (1995).
15. Tootell, R.B. *et al.* The retinotopy of visual spatial attention. *Neuron* **21**, 1409–1422 (1998).
16. Somers, D.C., Dale, A.M., Seiffert, A.E. & Tootell, R.B. Functional MRI reveals spatially specific attentional modulation in human primary visual cortex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **96**, 1663–1668 (1999).
17. Ress, D., Backus, B.T. & Heeger, D.J. Activity in primary visual cortex predicts performance in a visual detection task. *Nat. Neurosci.* **3**, 940–945 (2000).
18. Barlow, H. Temporal and spatial summation in human vision at different background intensities. *J. Physiol. (Lond.)* **141**, 337–350 (1958).
19. Kersten, D. Spatial summation in visual noise. *Vision Res.* **24**, 1977–1990 (1984).
20. Richards, W. Apparent modifiability of receptive fields during accommodation and convergence and a model for size constancy. *Neuropsychologia* **5**, 63–72 (1967).
21. Whitney, D. *et al.* Flexible retinotopy: motion-dependent position coding in the visual cortex. *Science* **302**, 878–881 (2003).
22. Richards, W. Spatial remapping in the primate visual system. *Kybernetik* **4**, 146–156 (1968).
23. Marg, E. & Adams, J.E. Evidence for a neurological zoom system in vision from angular changes in some receptive fields of single neurons with changes in fixation distance in the human visual cortex. *Experientia* **26**, 270–271 (1970).
24. Trotter, Y., Celebrini, S., Stricanne, B., Thorpe, S. & Imbert, M. Modulation of neural stereoscopic processing in primate area V1 by the viewing distance. *Science* **257**, 1279–1281 (1992).
25. Dobbins, A.C., Jeo, R.M., Fiser, J. & Allman, J.M. Distance modulation of neural activity in the visual cortex. *Science* **281**, 552–555 (1998).
26. Anderson, C.H. & Van Essen, D.C. Shifter circuits: a computational strategy for dynamic aspects of visual processing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **84**, 6297–6301 (1987).
27. Larson, G.W. & Shakespeare, R. *Rendering with Radiance: the Art and Science of Lighting and Visualization* (Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, 1996).