

Re: Review of TMB Super Monos with Valery on board

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2004-06/4695.html>

From: Edward (*reply_at_thegropup.thx*)

Date: 06/28/04

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 2004 03:41:43 GMT

"MrGrytt" <mrgrytt@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message

>

> *How is anything I said a "stretch"?*

The monocentrics, when proper executed, are certainly fine planetary eyepieces. However, some of the exuberance about them is more akin to team sport than optical science. There is no such consensus on the optimal design and much less agreement on the real world implementation. I admire TMB and his work, I just cringe when people are compelled to declare superiority without sufficient basis, whether it is AP, TMB or ETC.

Roland Christen posted the following on AP-UG, which I will repeat here, simply to muddy the waters a bit and perhaps allow once again for some diversity of thought.

" While talking with Thomas Baader several years ago about eyepiece designs, we discussed the original Zeiss monocentric vs. the newer Abbe Orthoscopic designed by Dr. Pudenz of Zeiss Jena. It was quite clear from the spot diagrams provided by Pudenz that the Abbe Ortho was quite superior in off-axis corrections (Zeiss has all the original data for all their old designs, as well as samples for testing). In fact, when Zeiss originally designed the APQ line of triplet refractors, much thought was given to a suitable planetary eyepiece set for these refractors. According to Baader, the designers at Zeiss did look at a modern version of the monocentric, but even with the highest index and most modern glasses, they were not able to achieve equal performance to the Abbe Orthos. The only way to do it was to use an aspheric surface on one of the elements, something that could be practical at 20mm or longer, but would be prohibitive at shorter focal ratios." [R. Christen]

Regards,

Ed T.