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Figure 1: Damaged rubric artifacts in a medieval manuscript were captured by (a) an RGB camera and (b) our characterized imaging system. Our characterized system not only yields more discriminated visual reproduction but measures physically-meaningful radiance at a high accuracy.

Abstract

Digital imaging of cultural heritage artifacts has become a standard practice. Typically, standard commercial cameras, often commodity rather than scientific grade cameras, are used for this purpose. Commercial cameras are optimized for plausible visual reproduction of a physical scene with respect to trichromatic human vision. However, visual reproduction is just one application of digital images in heritage. In this paper, we discuss the selection and characterization of an alternative imaging system that can be used for the physical analysis of artifacts as well as visually reproducing their appearance. The hardware and method we describe offers a middle ground between the low cost and ease of commodity cameras and the high cost and complexity of hyperspectral imaging systems. We describe the selection of a system, a protocol for characterizing the system and provide a case study using the system in the physical analysis of a medieval manuscript.

Categories and Subject Descriptors (according to ACM CCS): I.3.3 [Computer Graphics]: Picture/Image Generation—Digitizing and scanning

1. Introduction

Digital imaging has been highly successful in giving scholars access to the visual appearance of physical artifacts that they cannot access in person. Colorimetrically accurate images allow scholars to perform comparative studies of objects that are scattered around the world. Further, high quality images allow the general public to have access to the world’s cultural treasures. However, imaging is capable of doing more than just visual reproduction. Digital imaging systems can be designed as measurement systems. Measurement systems can collect data that allow scholars to answer additional questions about artifacts that cannot be answered by means of simple visual inspection. These questions include, “What materials were used to form the artifact?” and “What sequence of changes were made in the artifact?”. Measurement with digital imaging is appealing because it does not require the physical removal of material from the artifact. To use an imaging system for measurement, however, different choices for the optical components in the system are needed, as well as a different characterization of the performance of the system in terms of physical, rather than visual properties.

The efficiency of commercial cameras for visual reproduction is based on the trichromatic theory of human vision.
On a very simplified level, the human visual system (HVS) works by producing three signals resulting from visible light falling on three types of cone receptors in the retina. Camera sensors and filters are designed to approximate these three signals. A camera is characterized by a transformation (generally a three-by-three matrix) that converts the values produced by the sensor to a device independent coordinate system, such as CIE XYZ [Joh02]. Devices for visual production, such as computer displays, are similarly characterized, so that displayed images give a viewer the same visual impression as the original scene.

To use an imaging system as a measurement device for analysis, different sensors and filters are needed, as is a different characterization. Rather than just sensing visible light, it is useful to sense both ultraviolet and infrared radiation as well. Filters that are optimized for visual reproduction are poor for identifying the spectral wavelength distribution of light, so they need to be replaced with filters with well-defined spectral ranges. Rather than finding a transformation that converts the imaging output to an HVS-oriented standard color space [MJ02], we need a radiometric characterization that converts the output into the average radiancy within well-defined spectral ranges.

Recently, a number of multispectral and hyperspectral imaging systems have been developed for measurement and documentation of artifacts [FK06]. These high-end systems have the disadvantages of high cost and/or long acquisition times. In this work, we show how measurements can be performed without such a high-end system based on the nature of the spectral properties of the artifacts in question. In particular, we consider the imaging of a medieval manuscript and identifying the pigments used. We show that a physically characterized system that captures data in five broad bands in the range of near-ultraviolet to near-infrared radiation can successfully identify pigments.

In the following sections we begin by briefly reviewing previous work in imaging artifacts. We then examine the key issues in the selection of components for an imaging system for measurement. We describe a method for both colorimetrically and radiometrically characterizing an imaging system. Finally, we present a case study in which a five-band, radiometrically characterized, imaging system is used for pigment identification in a medieval manuscript.

2. Background and Previous Work

This section describes the background and presents a brief discussion of previous techniques.

2.1. Spectral Imaging

Electromagnetic radiation can be captured physically by an optical mechanism. The electromagnetic radiations are commonly described in terms of the photon wavelengths. The spectral ranges can be classified into three big categories — near-ultraviolet (NUV): 300–400nm; visible (VIS): 400–700nm; near-infrared (NIR): 700nm–3.0µm [ISO07]. Trichromatic and multispectral imaging deals with VIS; hyperspectral imaging refers to NUV or NIR sensing, including VIS. In particular, many VIS/NIR imaging applications have been popular for painting pigment identifications in the conservation and cultural heritage contexts [FK06].

In practice, high-end hyperspectral imagers with narrow (e.g. 10nm) bands can cost in excess of €100,000, in contrast with high quality commodity cameras that are available for less than €2,000–4,000. In our work, we use a device in the middle ground—an imaging device designed for applications in astronomy, costing about €4,000. The device allows us to improve performance over a commodity camera by extending the detectable wavelength range that is sensed and allowing the use of filters with sharp wavelength cut-offs.

Spectral imaging can be categorized into two different designs. First, when a full-spectrum light source illuminates an object’s surface, the reflected light is captured by a narrow bandpass filtered device [WCC∗00, ACC∗03, RB05]. The narrow bandpass filters on a motorized wheel or liquid crystal tunable filter (LCTF) are employed to discriminate the incident spectrum. Alternatively, a spectral dispersion unit can be used instead of bandpass filters. Spectral images are reconstructed through inverse solving, but it yields computational artifacts and a smaller spatial resolution than filter-banded imagers [KCBW10]. Second, a monochromatic sensor captures an object’s surface, illuminated by a set of narrow-banded illuminations [EKB∗10, FCBTR10, KZD∗10]. This method does not illuminate a subject with a full spectrum light source such as a Xenon light source; hence, it can minimize the ionization damage. Thanks to the evolution of LED technology, the configuration of narrow-handed LED lights would be more cost-efficient than the full spectrum light source; however, fluorescence (the emission of light by a substance that has absorbed light of a different wavelength such as NUV) are baked in the reflected light, interfering reflectance measurements of each wavelength.

2.2. Radiometry, Colorimetry, and Characterization

Radiometry refers to the measurement of optical radiation, which is an electromagnetic radiation within the frequency range of 3 × 10¹⁵ to 3 × 10¹⁷ Hz [CIE86]. In contrast, photometry is the measurement of light, which is defined as electromagnetic radiation detectable by the human eye within the wavelength range from 380nm to 780nm [CIE86]. Colorimetry is the measurement of human color perception, interpreting radiometric spectra to trichromatic human color perception. The Commission Internationale de l’Eclairage (CIE) defined the standard colorimetric observation, so-called color matching functions (CMFs) [CIE86] which defines psychophysically driven trichromatic cone responses within visible spectral range. The responsivity of modern trichromatic camera filters approximates that of these CMFs.
CIEXYZ coordinates could be derived by taking the product of a light source $L(\lambda)$, a subject’s reflectance $\rho(\lambda)$, and CMFs $\bar{x}(\lambda)$, $\bar{y}(\lambda)$, and $\bar{z}(\lambda)$:

$$
X = K_m \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) \bar{x}(\lambda) \Delta\lambda
$$

$$
Y = K_m \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) \bar{y}(\lambda) \Delta\lambda
$$

$$
Z = K_m \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) \bar{z}(\lambda) \Delta\lambda,
$$

where $K_m$ is the maximum photographic luminous efficacy 633lm/W. This $Y$ value corresponds to luminance (unit: cd/m²) [Hun98].

The trichromatic structure of colorimetry has been smoothly integrated into the trichromatic imaging system. Three different color filters (red/green/blue or cyan/magenta/yellow) are engraved on the semiconductor to mimic the CMF responsivity.

$$
R = \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) D_r(\lambda) \Delta\lambda
$$

$$
G = \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) D_g(\lambda) \Delta\lambda
$$

$$
B = \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) \rho(\lambda) D_b(\lambda) \Delta\lambda,
$$

where $D_r(\lambda)$, $D_g(\lambda)$, and $D_b(\lambda)$ are spectral sensitivity of the three channels and $R/G/B$ are the trichromatic response values of a pixel on the sensor.

Assuming Grassmann’s Additivity Law (any color can be matched by certain amounts of multiple primaries) [Hun98] and the linear response of the semiconductor to given electrons, we could drive a linear transform from $D_{r/g/b}(\lambda)$ to CMFs, since we have a sample population of pairs of XYZ and RGB in Eqs. (1) and (2). For instance, known reflectance measurements under certain illumination conditions (CIE D50 illuminant) [MJ02, Joh02, ISO06] or a transmittance target with illumination [KK08] are employed; or a monochromatic light source is used to derive full spectral sensitivity of the camera system [MVP00, MVP03, ISO06, NFG07].

Sugiura et al. [HTN∗00] introduced a direct reconstruction method of reflectance by using a multispectral camera. Zhao and Berns [ZBT07] proposed an approach for approximating reflectance from multispectral imaging, based on Wyszecki’s metameric hypothesis. Zhao et al. [ZBTC08] demonstrated a pigment mapping application of multispectral imaging. Note that the development and validation of these methods were implemented assuming human color perception. In contrast, our application focuses on radiometric accuracy—exploiting NUV/VIS/NIR—as an extension of [HTN∗00]. See Fig. 5(a) for an example of measured spectral sensitivity of a trichromatic camera. Our characterization takes a mixed approach by using radiance measurements of reflective samples with a full spectrum light source of NUV/VIS/NIR.

### 2.3. Application – Manuscript Analysis

We demonstrate the use of a characterized imaging system in the analysis of a medieval manuscript written by the English scholar John Gower in the 15th century. The manuscript was written in old English and French for main texts, and Latin for rubric summaries. The text of the manuscript is the third recension of the Confessio Amantis. Also contained are some Latin and French poems. This manuscript had been in a family’s possession for a century (see Fig. 6(d) for the mildew damage). While their house was almost destroyed by a fire in the 18th century, the manuscript became damp and damaged by mildew.

Paleographic study on this manuscript suggests that red lead, brazillwood, cochineal, dragon’s blood, azurite, and iron gall ink might have been used for lettering. Identifying the original pigments is challenging and a number of scientific techniques have been tried [Cla01]. The spectral reflectance of the candidate pigments is shown in Fig. 11. The smooth variation of reflectance with wavelength allows us to use a relatively small number of wavelength bands to differentiate between the pigments.

### 3. Optics – Selection and Characterization

In this section, we discuss the selection of the optics that allow imaging from NUV to NIR. We also describe the characterization of the system that allows us to transform the output from the imaging system into average radiance values in well-defined wavelength bands.

#### 3.1. Solid-State Sensor

Our goal in this hardware configuration is to build a compact and mobile spectral imaging system, which covers NUV/VIS/NIR spectra. We chose an astronomical imaging system equipped with a Kodak KAF-8300 sensor (with
micro-lens) with a built-in motorized filter wheel (QSI 583). See Fig. 2 for the structure of our employed imager and the quantum efficiency of the semiconductor [Kod08]. Its quantum efficiency covers a spectrum from 320 and 1100nm. It is enough for sensing our target range of NUV through NIR for our application.

Temperature Like the other astronomical imagers, this imager includes thermal-electric (TE) cooling, so-called Peltier cooling. While a camera is operated, thermally produced electrons accumulate in the pixels, which interfere with the cooling. While a camera is operated, thermally produced electrons (converted from the captured photons) that make up the image. For instance, when the shutter is opened for 30 seconds to take a NUV shot, the sensor temperature increased in 1–2°C. This accumulation of the thermal electrons is called dark current noise. This lowers the dynamic range of the sensor and accordingly reduces the signal-to-noise ratio. We keep the temperature of the image below a particular target spectral range. Our filter configuration with ordinary glass optics. Fig. 2(c) compares measured RMS noise at different temperatures.

3.2. Lens

Our objective of this design is to cover the continuous spectral range from NUV to NIR. We first characterized the spectral transmittance of two different types of lenses: (a) glass-based Nikon (24mm F2.8) and (b) quartz-based Jeoptik CoastalOpt (60mm F4). Fig. 3 compares the differences of transmittances of these two lenses—in particular transmittance of NUV and NIR—measured by a calibrated spectrometer (Ocean Optics USB2000). The NUV transmittance of the Nikon lens drops down rapidly from 430nm and NIR transmittance starts to decrease from 770nm. This lens provides even spectral transmittance from 430nm to 770nm. In contrast, the Jeoptik lens shows steady transmittance from 400nm to 850nm. This quartz-base lens appears relatively more efficient in transmitting NUV than the glass-based optics.

Fig. 5 shows complete spectral sensitivities with two different optics. The quartz-based lens appears optimal for NUV/VIS/NIR; the glass-based lens could be a better choice for VIS/NIR. The respective lens should be selected for a particular target spectral range. Our filter configuration with the Nikon lens can capture isolated NUV (370–400nm) and NIR (660–900nm) with Peltier cooling. We chose this optics for our manuscript imaging, considering the focal length of the optics and cost efficiency.

3.3. Imager Characterization

We employed five bandpass filters: Astrodon UV and Baader Blue/Green/Red/IR filters. Their hyperspectral transmittances were measured with an oxygen-free Xenon light source (5495 K). Fig. 4 presents the transmittance measurements.

In Eq. (2), the spectral sensitivity of the camera $D(\lambda)$ is the product of quantum efficiency of the semiconductor $Q(\lambda)$ and filter transmittance $T_{1,2,...,n}(\lambda)$. Assuming we have $n$ filters, the raw camera responses $C_{1,2,...,n}(\lambda)$ of each channel are:

$$C_1 = \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) q(\lambda) T_1(\lambda) \Delta\lambda,$$

$$C_2 = \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) q(\lambda) T_2(\lambda) \Delta\lambda,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$C_n = \sum_{\lambda} L(\lambda) q(\lambda) T_n(\lambda) \Delta\lambda.$$

(3)

By averaging the radiances measurements $L(\lambda) q(\lambda)$ of $n$ filter bandwidths, we can compute multi-band radiance measurements $\Psi_{1,2,...,n}$.

$$\Psi_1 = \frac{1}{|\lambda_1|} \sum_{\lambda_1} L(\lambda_1) r(\lambda_1) \Delta\lambda_1,$$

$$\Psi_2 = \frac{1}{|\lambda_2|} \sum_{\lambda_2} L(\lambda_2) r(\lambda_2) \Delta\lambda_2,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\Psi_n = \frac{1}{|\lambda_n|} \sum_{\lambda_n} L(\lambda_n) r(\lambda_n) \Delta\lambda_n,$$

(4)

where $|\lambda_{1,2,...,n}|$ is the cardinality of $\lambda_{1,2,...,n}$. Once we have two data sets—the full spectral camera signals $C$ and the radiances $\Psi$ from a number of training samples (see Fig. 7(a))—we derive a linear affine transform $M$ by solving: $M = (C^T C)^{-1} C^T \Psi$. Ordinary camera characterization models (with respect to human color vision) map camera signals in Eq. (2) into CIEXYZs in Eq. (1); however, they introduce a metameric limitation in identifying reflectance. In contrast, our characterization model transforms the $n$-channel camera signals $C_{1,2,...,n}$ in Eq. (3) directly into the multi-band radiance measurements $\Psi_{1,2,...,n}$ in Eq. (4). This method provides more discrimination power than CIEXYZs.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength [nm]</th>
<th>Absolute quantum efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>6.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.7E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.3E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>5.0E-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 300            | 0.0E+00                     |
| 400            | 1.2E-03                     |
| 500            | 2.4E-03                     |
| 600            | 3.6E-03                     |
| 700            | 1.2E-03                     |
| 800            | 4.0E-04                     |
| 900            | 8.0E-04                     |

Camera measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength [nm]</th>
<th>Spectral Responsivity (Jenoptik)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>6.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.7E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.3E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>5.0E-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camera measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength [nm]</th>
<th>Spectral Responsivity (Nikon D70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.2E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.4E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>3.6E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.2E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.0E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>8.0E-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength [nm]</th>
<th>Spectral Responsivity (Baader)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.5E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5.1E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>7.6E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.2E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.0E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>8.0E-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camera measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength [nm]</th>
<th>Spectral Responsivity (Astrodon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>6.0E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.7E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.3E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>5.0E-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
based characterization. The characterization process yields $M$ from the training data; we then estimate the radiances by computing: $\hat{\Psi} = CM$.

Fig. 7 shows the color targets under the full-spectrum light source. (a) is for training, and (b) is for testing. (c) compares gamut distributions of the two targets. (d) shows the measured spectral power distribution of the employed Xenon light source. Note that this light source covers the spectral range from 300 to 900 nm.

**Testing Variation** We evaluated the qualitative difference by finding the coefficient of variation (CV). Suppose there are two different data sets $x$ and $y$. The calculation of CV is:

$$CV = \frac{100}{\bar{y}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum (x_i - y_i)^2},$$

where $\bar{y}$ is the mean of the data set $y$ and $N$ is the number of $y$ elements. The deviation in this CV is calculated from the difference between two elements $(x_i - y_i)$, similar to RMS error, which is then normalized by the mean in a percentage scale.

**4. Results**

We characterized our imaging system both colorimetrically and radiometrically, and compared the characterization to results using commodity cameras. Fig. 8(a) shows the results of a classical colorimetric characterization that relates camera output to CIEXYZ values [ISO06]. We employed RAW outputs of the commodity cameras by interpolating bayer-pattern signals into three channels. Three-by-three linear transforms for each camera were derived from the training color samples and were then evaluated using a new test scene under a different illumination. Our imaging system performs in the same range as the commodity cameras with respect to color accuracy.

Fig. 8(b) shows the results of radiometrically characterizing the systems. The plots show the accuracy of the average radiance value given by each system, for the wavelength bands in which each channel has non-zero sensitivity.

Note that the commodity cameras have much larger bands (200–300 nm) than our imager (100–150 nm). See Fig. 5. The results in Fig. 8(b) show that the commodity cameras have much higher error in estimating average radiance over less localized wavelength bands. This effect is further diagrammed in Fig. 9. An ideal system would be in the lower left-hand corner of this figure – it would give results with no error over wavelength bands of vanishingly small width. Because our imager has a small number of bands, the bandwidth is larger than the ideal. However, the wavelength range is better defined for the results of our imaging system than for the commodity cameras, and the estimated average radiances are more accurate.

Fig. 6 presents visual production of the manuscript, captured with our method by converting CIEXYZ coordinates into sRGB display signals. Compared with an ordinary trichromatic camera capture (b), our capture (c) not only pro-

---

**Figure 7:** (a) and (b) show the employed training (140 colors) and test (24) color samples. (c) compares the gamut differences of the targets. (d) is the spectral measurements of our Xenon light source.

**Figure 8:** Average accuracy of characterization. Our NUV/VIS/NIR imager is compared with Canon 350D and Nikon D100. The training presents the predicted color accuracy with the training data (140 patches under the Xenon lamp). The test shows the accuracy with a different test data set (24 patches under a halogen lamp with an NIR-blocking filter). A side of the error bar represents the standard deviation of bands or XYZ channels.

**Figure 9:** Bandwidth vs. radiometric accuracy.
Figure 10: (a) and (b) show the reflectance of the target pigments, measured by our method and a spectrophotometer. (c) and (d) present the result of pigment identification, determined by testing CV errors between the measured reflectance with candidate reflectances. Both instruments identify the English flourishing as Dragon’s blood and the washed-out rubrics as Red lead. $R^2$ of the two instruments is 0.9240.

Figure 11: Measured reflectance of red candidate pigments.

provides sharper color discrimination, but also captures NUV (aver. 380nm in a range of 370-390nm) and NIR (aver. 800nm in a range of 660-900nm). See Images (c)–(i). Plots (j)–(n) show accuracy of the predicted radiance in each bandwidth under the same light source, corresponding to (e)–(i).

5. Pigment Identification

The objective of our radiometric characterization is to use our imaging system as a measuring tool rather than merely for making a visual production. We used our imager to assist textual pigment identification in the medieval manuscript. In particular, we were interested in two red pigments: one for flourishing, and the other one for rubricating in 6 recto (see Fig. 1 for measured points).

Prior to our imaging analysis, we built a reflectance gallery of seven candidate pigments on a parchment (same as the manuscript—but modern), which are particularly red and were popular for rubrication in the 15th century [Cla01], by measuring reflectances with a spectrophotometer (GretagMecbeth EyeOne): Red lead (lead tetroxide, Pb$_3$O$_4$), Brazilwood (Redwood—brazilin, red colorant in wood, C$_{16}$H$_{14}$O$_3$) with water, Brazilwood with vinegar, Brazilwood with vinegar and chalk, Cochineal (cochenille—carminic acid, C$_{22}$H$_{30}$O$_{13}$) with water, Cochineal with vinegar, and Dragon’s blood ink.

Our characterized imager measures the incident radiance $R_{1,2,...,5}$ with 5 bandwidths. Defining $L(\lambda_1), L(\lambda_2),...,L(\lambda_5)$ and $\rho(\lambda_1), \rho(\lambda_2),...,\rho(\lambda_5)$ in Eq. (4) as $L_{1,2,...,5}$ and $\rho_{1,2,...,5}$, in order to derive the reflectance of the captured pigment $\rho_{1,2,...,5}$ from $R_{1,2,...,5}$, we need the irradiance measurements of the light source $L_{1,2,...,5}$. To do that, we employed a material with known and even spectral reflectance such as the ColorChecker patch A4 or Spectralon. Then, the captured reflectances $\rho_{1,2,...,5}$ are driven by: $\rho_1 = R_1/L_1$, $\rho_2 = R_2/L_2$, ..., $\rho_5 = R_5/L_5$. See Fig. 10(a) and (b) for our camera measurements of the flourishing and the rubric samples.

We test the coefficient of variation of our characterized camera measurements with a dense number of spectral samples measured on the manuscript with a spectrophotometer. The values given at the center of the wavelength bands for our characterized system match well with the spectrophotometer results. The advantage of our imaging system is that we can gather data on a full manuscript page rather than at the isolated points that we can measure with the spectroradiometer.

6. Discussion

Currently, we configured our system with a minimal number of filter bands. The radiances of each band were calculated
by averaging radiances within each bandwidth. As shown in Section 5, the low-frequency reflectance properties of the textual pigments could be well identified with high accuracy. As future work, we intend to investigate higher frequency reflectances with narrower bandpass filters such as LCTF, in order to reduce metameric errors.

One optical issue in focusing was noticed when the Nikon lens was used for NUV and NIR imaging. This lens’ focal length is designed for VIS, and the spectral dispersion of NUR/NIR requires adjustments of the focal length. An small image size differences of NUV and NIR were manually adjusted to register them with other VIS channels.

Our pigment identification is based on the maximum likeliness of the measured reflectance on the same parchment substrate. Our current analysis does not include the Kabelka-Munk theory [Mac97]. Testing our system performance with different pigments and substrates, compared with costly x-ray reflectographic measurements as ground truth, would be an interesting future direction.

6.1. Conclusions

In this paper, we discuss the practical selection and radiometric characterization for a bandpass-filter imaging system. Our appropriately selected optics and characterization approach allow us to measure NUV, VIS, and NIR radiance as a function of wavelength. We demonstrate that our system can be used for pigment identification in a manuscript. The results validate the accuracy in identifying the pigments, rivaling the performance of a spectrophotometer.
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