RECENT POSTS
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converters for Leica M Lenses
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Nikon Z Mount
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Canon RF Mount
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Sony E Mount
A Week Remembrance
Photographer Dies
Overnight Sensation
Sony Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Sony E Mount
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Canon RF Mount
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Nikon Z Mount
Sigma Announces Sigma Mount Converter for Leica M Lenses

CATEGORIES
Announcements
Behind the Scenes
Business of Photography
Cameras
Cameras, Digital
Cameras, Film
Cameras, Medium Format
Cameras, Mirrorless
Cameras, Rangefinder
Cameras, Small Format
Cameras, SLR Lenses
Cameras, Small Format Lenses
Cameras, Medium Format Lenses
Cameras, Mirrorless Lenses
Cameras, Rangefinder

This is such a loss, that's why there is no reason for shooting medium format film professionally. there is an unsuitable but still ideal invented, and "ideal" is a very opinionated word here, because it's not ideal for me, but it's ideal for many people, it's digital.



I have been trying to use film medium format for 30 years. I'm not the Nikon shooting 35 mm guy, I'm the guy who shot Mamiya 645 and Pentax 67 for decades. Nikon, Pentax, Canon, Minolta, Olympus, Leica, Contax, Hasselblad, Bronica, Mamiya, Fuji, Kodak, Polaroid, Ilford, Agfa, Kodak, Fuji, Ektachrome, Kodachrome, Ektachrome, Fujichrome, Ektachrome, Fujichrome, Ektachrome, Fujich

Posted by Jim Kilbourne | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

I don't expect more than can tell the difference between an Ektachrome and Kodachrome film and post digital, and I don't care!

Posted by Jim Kilbourne | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

Here is a link to an article on the apostolic print, which some may find interesting:

http://blogs.sfcameramag.com/?p=1#comments

Posted by: Carl | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

I have been shooting some film of late (I am made the prints and purchased a Thornton Mark II). It's actually a pretty impressive piece of equipment. I'm not sure I'd want to do it on a regular basis, but it's great.

A lot for someone who was Carl Zeiss, After struggling with digital for years, I finally got a Leica M9 and I'm thoroughly delighted as one which produces sensor and processing that is a lot closer to the standard sensor some sensors or plug-in called Exchange from Leica. Digital Photography Review, Leica M9 Review, Leica M9 Converting the scans based on the film type. It takes a little bit of tweaking (gamma and exact color balance) to get it exactly right for each film, but it's very, very, very close to what I like. Now that I can go back to Carl Zeiss!

Here's the website for the plug-in: http://www.c-a-f.

Posted by: Jim | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

Nice my only problem is dealing with dust and scratches.

Posted by: Gordon | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

@Dave: Thanks, you, that's always an option, but I doesn't work for me because I don't have a darkroom and I don't shoot enough to justify setting one up. I'm sure it's a lot more fun than Photoshop.

@ Jim: Thanks, I'm sure that's fun. After struggling with digital for years, I finally got a Leica M9 and I'm thoroughly delighted as one which produces sensor and processing that is a lot closer to the standard sensor some sensors or plug-in called Exchange from Leica. Digital Photography Review, Leica M9 Review, Leica M9 Converting the scans based on the film type. It takes a little bit of tweaking (gamma and exact color balance) to get it exactly right for each film, but it's very, very, very close to what I like. Now that I can go back to Carl Zeiss!

Here's the website for the plug-in: http://www.c-a-f.

Posted by: Carl | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

Nice my only problem is dealing with dust and scratches.

Posted by: Gordon | Monday, 20 Decembber 2010 at 01:00 PM

@Dave: Thanks, you, that's always an option, but I doesn't work for me because I don't have a darkroom and I don't shoot enough to justify setting up one. I'm sure it's a lot more fun than Photoshop.

@ Jim: Thanks, I'm sure that's fun.

I, I don't have to (can't really) do much post-production, which I hate and can not stand this. This means there is a direct relation between film speed rating (photo and film speed ratings) and the film I use. I don't have to do much post-production, which I hate and can not stand this. This means there is a direct relation between film speed rating (photo and film speed ratings) and the film I use.

A Little Front photon. In the world of digital images and whether photographs are better than film, I think that the key is to be a good photo and get your thinkers on the plus. This where the photo is taken, the photo is taken, the photo is taken,

perhaps tendision - that one day, when I have more time, I will go back to film for the majority of my photography, as I find the cameras and the results (in B&W) more appealing to my taste. The little bit of film shooting I did this year, on a weekend when the family were away and I could get some space and peace to develop, confirmed this for me.

But the gradual disappearance of film, chemicals and now, crucially, the technology I need to finish the work, suggests to me that this looks increasingly unlikely. My ageing Acer ScanWit and Epson 2450 are still more than adequate for my needs (I don't have Ctein's quality demands), but I seriously doubt that both will be in working order by the time this project becomes tenable. (And it's not as if I've made much progress with the existing backlog of negatives.)

This has a knock-on impact on current purchasing decisions, as I'm contemplating renewing my digital kit and wondering whether to stick with Nikon, and thus hold on to a brace of cameras with lenses that work across DX and 35mm, or bite the bullet and go mirrorless - in which case I might as well cull the film gear to make room (both physical and mental).

Perhaps if I were being realistic, I'd see that the latter, combined with suitable post-processing software, offers a more suitable destination than a retro future that looks increasingly impractical to attain.

Posted by: Ade | Friday, 23 December 2011 at 02:15 PM

Another vote for vuescan here. Ed Hamrick keeps it up-to-date in the sense of running on new machines and operating systems. I use it with my Minolta 5400 scanner and am also trembling for the day when the scanner breaks.

Posted by: Peter Langfelder | Friday, 23 December 2011 at 03:34 PM

This thread might be of interest:
www.largeformatphotography.info/forum/showthread.php?t=84769

(it was to me)

Posted by: Paul | Friday, 23 December 2011 at 04:59 PM

Ctien,

have you tried contacting Bellamy at japancamerahunter.com or Dirk at japan exposures.com? If someone in Japan is still working on these scanners, they should be able to connect you with that service.

Posted by: Rick | Friday, 23 December 2011 at 06:13 PM

Dear toto,

If they're faithful to the original they'll look like "film."

pax / Ctein

Posted by: ctein | Friday, 23 December 2011 at 06:57 PM

I own both a V750 pro and a Nikon V ED, so I can compare resolution on site. For my 9x6's and 9x8's I use the V750 and it's a nice machine up to an optical resolution of about 2600 dpi, which will get ME where I want to be. The filmholder sucks a bit....but that can be corrected via Betterscanning aftermarket products or using the Kami fluid wet mount, which increases the resolution a bit. For my 35mm I use the Nikon....and Nikon still services these scanners. If you are desperate for a new scanner Ctein I suggest you take a deap breath, look very freindly to your local bank manager, and checkout this site:

http://www.scandig.com/filmscanner/nikon/index.html

And do it fast since prices are rising. I wonder at what price Nikon will step in, since at a cool 10 grand in dollars.....I guess they should be able to make a profit even building small series.

Greetings, Ed (and all the luck with the firewire/scsi adapter, smart action Ctein)

P.S. All the best seasons whiches to Ctein/Mike and all the readers and writers of The Online Photographer. Keep up the good work.

Posted by: Ed | Saturday, 24 December 2011 at 08:23 AM

I'm another gone-back-to-film who is worried about my Minolta Scan Dual III packing it in one of these days. Before reading this thread, I had imagined that I'd be the only one doing things like holding off on an OS upgrade due to Silverfast compatibility. Should have known that I'd find like minds on this site.

Posted by: Michael | Saturday, 24 December 2011 at 11:14 AM

I'm still a hobbyist(amateur) on 135 and 120 film and bought the canoscan 9000F for making low res digital contact jpg's to pick out the best shots from a B&W 135 neg roll. Same for 120 B&W negs. I'll print them later wet in the DR. C41 rolls 135 are still processed by my lab and they give me 36 fine 15x10cm prints without any PC work involved for 4,5€. I scanned my 135 slides on low res for PC viewing but gave up this awful time consuming process last week in favor of going out and enjoy life and (!) erased all the earlier crapy low res slidescans from my HD not needing a new HD soon by doing so. When I want a good print I'll send it to a lab, when I shoot slides I'll pop them into my projector and archive them afterwards. I decided: analog stays analog like in the old days, digital jpg's end up on the HD and will be printed on chrystal archive paper for having a look at them without any electricity and PC switched on...

Posted by: Reiner | Saturday, 24 December 2011 at 02:37 PM

Epson Perfection V750-M (or its successors) for 90% slides + drum scanning for 10% where the best quality is required?

From my experience with microscopy, wet mounting makes a big difference in image clarity - so appearance of wet mounting for flatbeds looks very promising.

Posted by: Account Deleted | Saturday, 24 December 2011 at 08:50 PM

It's worth a look into the Flextight scanners. I bought a used one a few years ago. It was about $8000. As a professional, you probably want the best and something that is both easy to use, likely to have software updates and tech support. I never used the Minolta and it may be a dream, but I suspect it doesn't compare well with a Flextight. You of all people, who sells prints for a goodly sum, is an expert in one of the most time consuming and costly photographic printing methods, should realize the value of tools that get the job done well. I'm afraid your article just comes across as a complaint about the cost of and lack of scanners to choose from. That's how it is. I think that with your reputation, Hasselblad would lend you a Flextight to review and publish your results. I hope that you'll pursue that option. Your photographs deserve it. Best, Barry

Posted by: Barry Myers | Sunday, 25 December 2011 at 04:08 PM

One more vote, Ctein, to hear your take on how to set up a camera to photograph slides & negatives.

Posted by: improbable | Monday, 26 December 2011 at 07:24 AM

Too late to make any constructive contribution to this excellent and extremely informative comments thread, but I thought I'd step-in and add my name to those of us hoping for a better choice of film scanners in the future.

Through dogged persistence (downloading the entire list of US Nikon dealers, and contacting them in alphabetical order) I managed to buy a new Coolscan9000 last year, just before they were discontinued and prices skyrocketed. Even before that, many (supposedly) reputable dealers were selling their consignment of the scanner at a large premium on ebay, instead of in their own stores.

As said, since then the price has spiraled. This certainly suggests an underlying demand. It's obviously too much to hope that film manufacturers could somehow cooperate to purchase the technology from Nikon and rebadge their excellent scanners. As Nikon wants consumers to stay on the digital treadmill (a guaranteed future cashflow) they probably won't ever revive this long-lived equipment at any price.

Posted by: mani | Monday, 26 December 2011 at 04:15 PM

Here is experiment. After my Nikon 9000 broke second time in less than 3 years after scanning few hundred images during these years I don't want to repair it. I took the only functioning part of it - glass carrier, inserted 35mm negative and placed it on the light table. I mounted 5DII on tripod with macro lens giving me 1:1 magnification and took a picture of the negative. It is not 9000ED, but close. I can see the grain. With 6x7 negs I was taking 6 shots per image and stitching it. Looks good.

Posted by: Boris Krivorsk | Tuesday, 27 December 2011 at 04:28 PM

"The copy-stand approach is extremely difficult to do well."

You might want to try it before you knock it. Photographing film negatives with a DSLR is no more difficult than any other kind of careful macro photography, and depending on your originals, the results often are better than any type of scan, because of the inherent differences in the image chain.

My "problem children" were always 35mm negatives made on high-speed silver-based black-and-white films; I could never get really satisfactory scans of them despite trying a variety of film and flatbed scanners from several manufacturers (Canon, Minolta, Kodak, and Epson among them.)

DSLR "duping" with a diffused light source produces a much better result with these types of originals: dust and emulsion damage, which are exaggerated by a scanner's highly collimated light source, are better controlled, and "grain aliasing" is far less of an issue. If I'm losing any detail, it's only in the sharpness of grain edges, and that's detail I don't care about.

And of course switching to a DSLR-based imaging model lets you jump off the sinking ship that is film-scanner technology, and instead transfer to an option where quality and choice are increasing rather than decreasing.

If you're going to do a lot of duping, you might even want to pick up a used 35mm slide copy setup such as an Illumitran or Chromapro; these once-very-expensive units are now being retired at throwaway prices (at least those that aren't literally being thrown away!)

Posted by: Ranger 9 | Wednesday, 28 December 2011 at 01:18 PM

The comments to this entry are closed.