

Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?

## Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-05/msg01173.html>

---

- *From:* "Roger Hamlett" <[rogerspamignored@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rogerspamignored@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 18 May 2005 19:12:21 GMT
- 

"Thierry" <-> wrote in message [news:428b8df9\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:428b8df9$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>

> "Paul Winalski" <[prune@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:prune@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

> [news:60vm81pra5m453849revssuibdt04jk0hg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:60vm81pra5m453849revssuibdt04jk0hg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>> I think he meant that, strictly speaking, the Meade

>> RCX line of telescopes is not a true Ritchey-Cretien

>> design. A true R-C has hyperbolic primary and secondary

>> mirrors. The Meade design has a spherical primary working

>> with a corrector plate to deliver an image to the secondary

>> that is nearly identical to what the hyperbolic primary of

>

> Right sir ;- ) hence my question : is the result better or not (even vs.

> a

> SCT or a MCT)

>

> Thierry

The problem is that nobody really knows, and even if they did on the individual early examples, this would be no proof of what is going to happen on latter production quantities of the scopes...

Basic on some guessing, and ray tracing, my expectation is that the scope will display images similar to those on the centre field of an SCT, with a \_curved\_ field, across a reasonably large area. This means it'll show a little chromatic aberration (with a true RC does not), and the same curved field as an SCT or RC, but like an RC, without the coma that is apparent as you move out across the SCT field. My description was 'SCT-GT', and as such (and given just how good some SCT images can be at the centre field), it'll work well for a lot of imaging. If you refocus for each filter for colour images (which will correct for the CA), results should be approaching those from a normal RC, provided the accuracy of the optics is good.

How well the mechanisms will really work, will unfortunately take a while to find out, with problems only being seen once the scopes exist in quantity, and are put through the wide range of conditions that exist in the real world...

Best Wishes

>> a true R-C would deliver. The Meade design makes the optics

Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?

Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?

>> easier to mass-manufacture, at the expense of another piece  
>> of glass in the light path.  
>>  
>> Meade has a clever design here, but it really shouldn't be  
>> called a Ritchey-Cretien, because it's not.  
>>  
>> -Paul W.  
>>  
>> On 18 May 2005 00:36:32 -0700, "Vader" <aries@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
>> wrote:  
>>  
>> >Hi Chuk,  
>> >  
>> >I didn't understood what you did you realy meant.  
>> >  
>> >Valery

---

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?](#)**  
    ◇ From: Vader
- ◆ **[Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?](#)**  
    ◇ From: CLT
- ◆ **[Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?](#)**  
    ◇ From: Vader
- ◆ **[Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?](#)**  
    ◇ From: Paul Winalski

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Color Balance in M-27](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: New images and your opinions](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Do you reviewed the RCX 400 ?](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**