

---

Subject: Terry, could not really understand most of your post...maybe you can clarify?

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2004 03:05:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Terry, Thank for joining in on this interesting discussion. I could not understand most of your post, so i will simply pose a few clarification questions & hope you can elaborate. -----Questions below----

TC WROTE: "Notice in NP's design, ANY of his designs he never uses a passive element in the final output circuit (in series). The whole reason for his current source amp is to eliminate the negative electrical effects of these (passive) devices on the sound. Even his 4-way spkr uses 4 amps to deliver direct amp loop circuits with the voice coil, never to be damaged by extraneous compensation. He can hear the detrimental effects these have. "MY RESPONSE TO ABOVE: Not sure what you are trying to say. Are you saying active crossovers before the amp are better than passive crossovers after the amp? In some cases that is a well known and well accepted concept. Many people biamp or even triamp. I fail to see what is new here. TC WROTE: "You cannot push clarity through a resistor, although you can push a flat signal. "MY RESPONSE TO ABOVE: Could you please elaborate what aspect of the signal is harmed by the resistor, in terms of signal properties. For example, is it the phase? TC WROTE: "That's also why he builds one of the worlds most elaborate and expensive active crossovers, because you cannot mess with an output circuit of a conventional amp and maintain ultimate clarity. "MY RESPONSE TO ABOVE: Is the active crossover that he builds expensive in sense of the retail price he charges or in the cost price to him? Could you please elaborate how you know it is one of the world's most expensive? How does it compare to, say, Marchand crossovers? What parts does he use? What kind of circuit is it? TC WROTE: "In his circuits the compensation affects the output yes, but only in the frequency current domain entirely without affecting back electromotive force (emf) into the amp circuit as do other circuits. And without any kind of the signal clouding effects of the ceramic resistor media needed to balance a hi Q driver as in example #3 which NP and myself agree would be detrimental to clarity "MY RESPONSE TO ABOVE: "What do you mean only in the current domain? As opposed to what? Voltage? What voltage and current are we talking about here, since we have active crossovers...the source or the amplifier? Finally, what back EMF force are you talking about? The speaker, to the best of my knowledge because of conservation of energy, CANNOT generate any back EMF force on the amplifier. Maybe I am wrong. Please elaborate. TC WROTE: "Once an output signal sees the ceramic matrix, it is split into smithereens never to be assembled correctly again. Far far better to adjust the circuit ANYWHERE but the final output circuit like before the amp (actively). "MY RESPONSE TO ABOVE: "What matrix are you talking about? Is this the same concept that the "resistor" hurts the signal? Splitting into smithereens along what aspect of the signal? Frequency? Phase? Please elaborate. TC WROTE: "So yes it's the same game of adding RLC to tailor response. Only he has changed the rules to maintain absolute clarity. Something passive circuits with conventional amps both tube and SS cannot do. "MY RESPONSE TO ABOVE: Can you please define clarity, and why you think an after amplifier network will hurt it more than a before amplifier one? Again, please keep in mind, many people have been using biamping & triamping for decades. I cannot see anything new in here, but maybe i am missing it, and would really appreciate your elaboration. thanx-akhilesh

---