RECENT POSTS
Sunset Photo Walk
Lens Focus
Photographed Fishbowl
Lens
Off Film No. 1491
Open Mike Friday and Weekend Reading
Lens Focus
Photographed Fishbowl
Lens
Off Film No. 1490
Open Mike Friday and Weekend Reading
Lens Focus
Photographed Fishbowl
Lens
Off Film No. 1489
Open Mike Friday and Weekend Reading
Lens Focus
Photographed Fishbowl
Lens
Off Film No.

Finally, I've used the Olympus 300mm f/2.8 about three times photographing sandhill cranes, using on a sturdy tripod, and can only get sharp images at 1/1600 sec. shutter speeds. And that's with the anti-shock set on 5 sec. delay. On a windy day - forget it!

Posted by: Mel | Wednesday, 15 August 2012 at 10:28 PM

Did I read somewhere that the m43 cameras are applying corrections to raw files for same-maker lenses?

I don't know what body ctein was using, but if the above is true then certain lenses might have been benefiting from in-camera corrections?

Posted by: T N Args | Thursday, 16 August 2012 at 02:27 AM

Taking dozens of pictures with different lenses and comparing them in detail is a long, interesting, and probably very tedious exercise. I am constantly amazed that people will spend their time and energy to do these things, with the sole purpose of sharing the knowledge with others. Thank you very much.

Posted by: Robert Roaldi | Thursday, 16 August 2012 at 06:58 AM

I did the same type of comparison between the Oly 14-54 Mk II (w adapter) m14-42 IIR, and Panny x 14-42 at 14mm, 25mm and 42mm on the E-M5. Handheld in good light at my usual shooting aperture of 5.6, virtually identical. I took the 14-54 and the x14-42 on a walkaround shooting a variety do shots with each, and again, virtually identical, though CA behavior would let you ID which lens shot which. The gear is just really good these days.

Posted by: Alan Fairley | Thursday, 16 August 2012 at 09:17 AM

Dear Robert,

Oh, I am far less altruistic than you give me credit for. I did this because **I** wanted to know, for my own photography.

pax / self-centered Ctein

Posted by: Ctein | Thursday, 16 August 2012 at 02:47 PM

Dear T N Args,

A good question!

You are correct that with some lenses today, lens designers are doing some correction for certain aberrations (like residual lateral chromatic aberration or distortion) in software rather than in hardware. There are purists who think this is a bad thing; so far as I am concerned, any tool for correcting aberrations that works well is a good one (sometimes it doesn't). Understand that designing a lens is always a trade-off, so leaving some aberration correction to software allows designers to correct other aberrations better in glass.

That said, I'm not looking at JPEGs, I'm looking at corrected RAW images processed by Adobe software. So the camera body doesn't come into play in correcting this stuff. ACR recognizes software lens corrections for all the lenses I own that need them, so far as I can tell.

I don't know if the relative lens rankings would change if I were looking at JPEG's. I don't care, since I don't make JPEG's.

pax \ Ctein
[Please excuse any word-salad. MacSpeech in training!]
==========
-- Ctein's Online Gallery http://ctein.com
-- Digital Restorations http://photo-repair.com
==========

Posted by: ctein | Thursday, 16 August 2012 at 10:01 PM

Morning Ctein,

Not at all suprised to hear that the Rokinon 85 is doing well it's build by the Korean lens manufacturer SamYang. I own a SamYang FE 7.5 and that is a great performer as well, the Micro 4/3 FE du jour, I would say outperforming the Pana by far, especially in sharpness, fringing and chromatic aboration. I use it on a 12 Mp GF1 for shooting VR 360/180 sphere's in HDRi and that gives you a sharpness that is scary at times. You should try it out Ctein (for about 300 dollars you get a really nice FE).

Greets, Ed.

Posted by: Ed | Friday, 17 August 2012 at 06:21 AM

Here in Pentax World, where I live, high quality prime lenses are the standard, almost rising to the level of a fetish for many users. (If you think I'm exaggerating, check out some of the Pentax discussion forums.). The FA Limited series (full frame) are especially excellent. Nevertheless, some of my best photos have come from zoom lenses that are undeniably inferior to the primes, optically speaking. I take this to mean that most modern lenses can deliver IQ that is good enough for all but the most demanding purposes. Now which set of lenses are smaller and more fun to use? The primes, of course.

Posted by: Rob | Friday, 17 August 2012 at 03:13 PM

Dear Don,

You should assume nothing of the kind.

pax / Ctein

Posted by: ctein | Friday, 17 August 2012 at 09:08 PM

Dear friv,

Again, one should not assume. Consider that the 20mm f/1.7 Panasonic Lumix lens is also a much-lauded lens, but it does not perform better than Olympus' kit zoom at the same apertures. Yes, it gets you good performance two stops faster, but that was not the question under investigation.

If, by the 25mm Panasonic prime, you're referring to the Leica DG Summilux 25mm f/1.4, it happens I did do a series of test photos against the Lumix 20mm f/1.7 when I bought my OMD. I could not see any significantly better image quality from the Leica lens.

My test was bit cruder than my usual standards, so I might very well have missed some small improvement, but if I did it was not large enough to justify replacing my 20mm.

pax / Ctein

Posted by: ctein | Saturday, 18 August 2012 at 06:11 PM

This review is very true. I wish we had more like this on the net.

Posted by: leo | Wednesday, 22 August 2012 at 09:06 AM

The comments to this entry are closed.