

---

Subject: Looking for good 20 watt amp design to drive Jordan TL's?

Posted by [Norris Wilson](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 04:32:05 GMT

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

---

Hi, I am trying to help a friend track down a good 20 watt SET design that will firmly run a pair of Jordan JX92S TL speakers. He used to own a pair of Welborne Apollo MKII's and would consider going back that direction. But we feel that at 20 watts, the VV52's were short lived, not a good investment at \$500 a pair. Is there a better alternative short of using an 845 at 900 Volts plus, or a \$500 a pair of VV52's to obtain the desired 20 watts? If a P-P circuit would get you to that musical 20 watts with plenty of drive, that could be an alternative to the big tube SET's. Any input or suggestions would be greatly appreciated. Thanks Norris Wilson

---

---

Subject: Re: Looking for good 20 watt amp design to drive Jordan TL's?

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 07:26:47 GMT

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

---

The Audio Note kits will get you about halfway there in terms of power. The Kit 1 is 10 watts, the Kit 2 is 12. What did you think of my Kit 2? If you'd like, we can try it on your friend's Jordan's and see if he likes them. SET amps sound good in the midrange and higher frequencies, but the real thing to listen for is bass performance. That's the hard part for a SET amp. Most loudspeakers require electric motor braking (literally) because the main part of damping in the T/S specs is electrical, not mechanical. So the output impedance is very important to bass response. If the bass sounds boomy or tubby, try it with a PP amp and see how you like it.

---

---

Subject: Damping factor - SE vs. PP

Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 11:45:59 GMT

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

---

Just to add - PP amp doesn't have a larger damping factor (or lower output resistance) than SE amp per se, but from the fact that most PP amps have a global negative feedback loop and SE amp mostly do not. If we have a typical 300B SE amp with say  $R_a = 3k$ , we can expect  $DF \sim 3$  without neg. feedback, or  $DF = R_a / (r_p + R_w)$ . We can express DF on the secondary side, like ratio  $DF = R_{sp} / R_{out}$ , where  $R_{out}$  is  $r_p + R_w$  (anode resistance and windings resistances "referred" to the secondary). Then, we can have 300B PP amp, class A, say with  $R_{aa} = 6k$ . Primary reflected impedance is doubled, but we now have two output tubes, and  $DF = R_{aa} / (2r_p + R_w)$ . We can see that in both examples (SE & PP) we have about the same DF. In fact, if we use typical UL PP output stage coupled with somewhat lower  $R_{aa}$  (AB1 amp), then we can expect maybe  $DF \sim 1$  without feedback. Simplified, and there's a more about PP/SE things...

---

---

Subject: Re: Looking for good 20 watt amp design to drive Jordan TL's?

Posted by [Norris Wilson](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 15:02:08 GMT

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

---

Hi Wayne, How is life going in the world of Pi? I want to thank you for the kind offer of hooking up your Audio Note 2 SET to my friends Jordan speakers. My friend Mike, who lives in Seattle and I have discussed the Audio Note 2 SET as an option. But, he feels that the 12 watts is not enough to drive the Jordan transmission line speakers. He feels since the Jordan's bottom frequency response goes down to 45 Hz and is 88db efficient at 8 ohms, that it will not have enough authority since he likes to listen to classical music. Also, since he lives in Seattle, it would be difficult to hook up the amplifier with out a dangerous journey across our land at the hands of the delivery wrecking crew. I for one, am not convinced that 12 watts would not be enough power to drive his speakers well. Obviously, a 5" full range driver is not the best choice to play classical through in the first place, possibly at lower listening levels though. I think that is why he feels 20 watts should be at the lower end of the amplifiers output capability. His thinking is somewhat stuck in the direction of a triode based SET amplifier to obtain the last degree of musical purity. I again, am open to any suggestions that would get us there, triode, pentode, SET, or push pull, I'm open. I have been trying to get my friend to build the 7591A version of Poindexter's Musical Machine with some Sansui 1000A output transformers, but he is not ready to do so at this time. Thanks again and I hope someone can chime in with other DIY amplifier designs and suggestions. Norris

---

Subject: Re: Looking for good 20 watt amp design to drive Jordan TL's?

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 12:14:36 GMT

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

---

Seattle is a bit far to drive. I thought maybe your friend lived here. Everything is going great, thanks for asking. Just busy as bees to tell the truth.

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP

Posted by [Steve](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 18:47:06 GMT

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

---

I have to disagree a little. (assume no global feedback). Viewed near the operating point with minimal signal swing, there isn't much difference. But as the signal swings more and more, the DF varies more and more in an SET than a PP amp as the  $R_a$  is changing more in an SET triode while the PP triode combo is more constant. Theoretically, as one triode's  $R_a$  is rising, the other is lowering, maintaining an approx constant. This  $R_a$  swing occurs in all triodes, with the  $R_a$  varying from several hundred ohms to thousands of ohms and eventually (theoretically) infinite ohms at triode cutoff.

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 20:39:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, I simplified very complex tube(s)/transformer/speaker case. Although it is true that internal anode impedance of our output triode (say 300B) is not a constant resistor, and that our  $Z_{out}$  is not constant, especially on the frequency extremes vs. mid frequencies, and that those changes are probably little larger in SE then PP case - we can't say that  $r_p$  (and  $Z_{out}$ ) of SE amp vary wildly like in your example. Measuring the  $Z_{out}$  of SE amps showed relatively constant value throughout the frequency and power output magnitudes. The change in  $r_p$  is not large, and for most practical purposes we can model our triode like voltage source (generator) with its (constant) internal resistance  $r_p$  in series. Definition of DF like I explained it is correct, it is a ratio of primary (reflected) resistance and tube internal resistance, or ratio of speaker resistance and  $r_p$  referred at the secondary -  $r_p$  divided with OPT impedance ratio. PP amp (class A) has two tubes in series. Then we can add complexity in our model ( $R_w$ ,  $L_p$ ,  $L_{sp}$ ,  $C_w$ ,  $Z_{sp}$ ...)...

<http://usuarios.uninet.com.br/~edelima/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 21:11:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

But, if you thought about graphical load line/anode characteristics/waveform "asymetry" around quiescent point, and subjective "sound" of SE amp vs. PP amp it is a little different thing. As Doug observed, not all points on the load line have the same  $r_p$ ...

<http://audioroundtable.com/Tubes/messages/790.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Steve](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 21:48:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>>"we can't say that  $r_p$  (and  $Z_{out}$ ) of SE amp vary wildly like in your example." It might be partly semantics Damir, so I will say the output  $Z$  and subsequent Damping Factor changes "somewhat". Even with a relatively horizontal loadline, the plate current should be held as high as possible, or keep the power down so the signal doesn't swing near the tube's cutoff. Specs from 300b data sheet (since that is the tube you mention.) At 60ma idle current at 100 volts or above, tube  $R_a$  is approx 600 ohms. At the 30ma point of the loadline, the  $R_a$  is approx 1000 ohms. The DF is no longer 3, but 1.8 at the 30ma point. (This means a peak to peak current swing of 30ma to 90ma. One can figure the output power from there.) At the 20ma point, at 100 volts or above, results in an  $R_a$  of approx 1200 ohms, double the 600 ohm  $R_a$  at 60ma. This means that a DF of 3 now becomes a DF of 1.5 at 20ma. (This means the current swings between 20ma and 100ma, with 60ma as quiescent.) If the plate current is allowed to drop to 10ma during a portion of the cycle,

the  $R_a$  is approx 1450 ohms. DF now becomes 1.25. (peak to peak swing of 10ma to 110ma.) At 5ma, the  $R_a$  increases to approx 2000 ohms, or nearly 3 times that at 60ma. Df becomes approx 1. (peak to peak swing of 5ma to 115ma.) As the tube approaches cutoff, the  $R_a$  rises towards infinity till the tube isn't actually conducting. PP has virtually no drop off of DF, except because of variations in individual tube characteristics. PP therefore does not offer such a compromise in Damping factor as SE operation does.

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Steve](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 21:49:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

See my post just above Damir. You must have posted just as I was.

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2005 04:25:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

We can observe various non-linearities on real-tubes graphs. Amplification factor  $\mu$  changes the least on various "points", and anode resistance  $r_p$  more. But, thought that SE amp varies its  $Z_{out}$  and DF wildly during the work isn't correct. If you measure DF on say, 1W, 3W and 5W and DF on say, 100Hz, 1kHz and 10 kHz you'll get about the same result - about 3 in my example. If your theory is correct, then you'll get very different results.

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Steve](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2005 21:22:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Damir, I am not talking about frequency changes varying  $R_a$ .  $R_a$  varies, from the characteristics chart, vs current at any frequency. This varies more over the half cycle from idle current on down VS from idle current on up, where  $R_a$  tends to be much more constant. So what you might be measuring is the Average DF or output Z. But since  $R_a$  changes over a portion of the cycle, the output Z also changes over that portion of the cycle. When the higher output Z occurs, there is less control of the woofer/midrange/tweeter, not only to dampen, but also for initiation of a signal. Take care. Steve

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 06:11:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

We are talking about dynamic anode resistance. It is increment change of alternating anode voltage "through" increment change of (inphase) anode current. Static anode characteristics are not ideal, and because of curvature, we have "added" second, third and other higher order "terms" to the simple  $i_a = u_a / r_p$ . Contribution of third and other odd-order "terms" to the fundamental expression changes the simple static  $r_p = u_a / i_a$ . My point is that with typical use of SE amp (small power, max. power only on short peaks), we have rel. small  $u_a$ , rel. small contribution of odd-order distortion, and we can say that  $r_p = u_a / i_a$ , or dynamic  $r_p$  is about static  $r_p$ , found graphically at the operating point.

---

---

Subject: Re: Damping factor - SE vs. PP  
Posted by [Steve](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 14:55:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Right, we are talking dynamic  $R_a$ , and keeping the power as low as possible is crucial/fundamental for keeping  $R_a$  relatively constant, although never as good as PP. (I think that is one reason I have been hearing suggestions of using Even higher efficiency speakers.)  $r_p = u / g_m$ , both  $u$  and  $g_m$  constantly change during a cycle. Both changing independently, not in sync, in value and causes  $r_p$  to rise. This can be graphed in a quadrant. The  $R_a$  curve (at different plate voltages) rises gradually at first over the first 5 volts peak or 10 volts p-p; then rises rapidly. Even then, a 10 volt peak, 20v p-p, drive signal can easily cause  $R_a$  to change by 20% or more over a cycle. The slope of the loadline is very important. A more vertical loadline dramatically increases  $R_a$ 's change and effect. A more horizontal loadline helps minimize, or even eliminates  $R_a$  changing. But a horizontal loadline causes the output power to lower, rather dramatically. This applies to any triode run SET mode. Just something to think about when designing an SET amp. RL is important.

---

---

Subject: Re: Looking for good 20 watt amp design to drive Jordan TL's?  
Posted by [PakProtector](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 19:46:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

20W of PP is fairly easy, even for a Class A design. KT88's and conservative operation can get there with excellent sound. There are of course other valves than the KT88, but it is an easy example. Take the Hammond 5k/100W 1650 output TX. A pair of good KT88's, a PS to deliver 350V at 250 mA DC. I suggest a choke input filter, valve rectification and film caps (oil filled AC motor run), and borrow the Merlin amp front end (<http://audioroundtable.com/GroupBuild/Projects/>). As soon as I get off my backside and forward Wayne a copy of the hybrid mods to the front end, you'll see another option useable for Pete's

amp as well. It is a MOSFET/triode cascode and does a brilliant job with the E-Linear circuit. I am a bit biased to suggest PP, but it does well for me. If you must have SE, there is plenty to borrow between the two topologies. cheers, Douglas

group build projects

---