

---

Subject: Reference Line 2000 vs. 3000 Passive Preamp?

Posted by [Vinylyly](#) on Sat, 07 Oct 2006 14:37:30 GMT

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

---

I presently own a Reference Line 2000 passive preamp, however I found a Reference Line 3000 at a local shop. Other than the 3000 having a fancier front plate than the 2000, I'm wondering what the internal differences are. The heart and soul of a passive preamp is the attenuator, the 2000 has the British Penny/Giles and the wiring is solid silver 'Kimber' wire. Does anyone know what the attenuator of the 3000 is, or what the difference is between the two preamps that would make it a step up if I made a trade. I dearly love my Reference Line passive preamp and the only time I would get rid of it would be for a step up.

---

---

Subject: Re: Reference Line 2000 vs. 3000 Passive Preamp?

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 08 Oct 2006 16:21:30 GMT

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

---

Is the Reference Line 2000 that you have basically just a switch and attenuator? Seems to me that's perfect for some systems with plenty of drive and no need for an additional input gain stage.

---

---

Subject: Re: Reference Line 2000 and 2000

Posted by [Vinylyly](#) on Mon, 09 Oct 2006 14:19:07 GMT

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

---

Both are just switches with an attenuator. All solid silver wiring by Kimber. I use 18" of Kimber solid silver leads. They work wonderfully if you have a good robust tube amp., the very best with my old VTL Compact monoblock 100's with EL 34 tubes. (not so good on 'weany' amps.)

---

---

Subject: Re: Reference Line 2000 and 2000

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 09 Oct 2006 18:58:37 GMT

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

---

Very good. I agree with you, that approach seems to work well on tube amps. With sources that have enough drive, an extra gain stage isn't needed.

---