
Subject: Re: Crossover Question about building line arrays

Posted by [selahaudio](#) on Mon, 21 Sep 2009 14:25:28 GMT

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

AudioFred wrote on Mon, 21 September 2009 08:44: selahaudio wrote on Mon, 21 September 2009 08:21

I advise against a non-DSP crossover because they typically only have symmetrical slopes and little ability to contour the response for baffle step and driver anomalies.

Unfortunately this leaves one with the choice of a DEQX, which is as good as it gets, but costs upward for \$5K new, or a Behringer DCX-2496, which costs only \$300, but is mass market quality and not something I would place between a high end pre and amps driving a good pair of speakers.

What do you think of the Behringer used with a "budget" line array, for example one using sixteen sealed Tang Band W3-1053SC 3" woofers and a tweeter array of Dayton 3/4" neo domes or PT2 planars? It seems to me that entry level electronics would sound no better or worse than the Behringer, and actively crossing this array with the Behringer might sound better than a passive crossover.

<http://www.parts-express.com/pe/showdetl.cfm?Partnumber=248-669>

<http://www.parts-express.com/pe/showdetl.cfm?Partnumber=264-880>

There are some options. DBX has a DSP crossover (DriveRack PA+) for \$500. Built better than the Behringer and also has parametric EQ for baffle step and response contouring. I also have access to a 3-way DSP crossover that includes ICE amps. It's more expensive, but for \$2,000 you have six amp channels and a DSP crossover.

The AuraSound NSW1 is a better choice than the Dayton because it will cross lower; however, it is beyond the budget for many builders. The PT2 also crosses lower than the Dayton and would make a good match with the TB woofer. The Dayton 3/4" has a $F_s=2K$ which means a crossover point of at least 3.5K-4K and that's not going to work well in an array with 3" woofers.