
Subject: Kleinhorn

Posted by [inktomi](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 17:19:28 GMT

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

These speaks look awesome but they have me scratching my head. Why make such a large cabinet for such a small driver? Granted, it should improve bass but what can you do with such a small cone? Why not use a bigger woofer for the bass portion, and have the front facing box be a dedicated mid?

Subject: Re: Kleinhorn

Posted by [Bill Fitzmaurice](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 20:42:40 GMT

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

The idea is to use a single high SPL low Qts wide range driver, and one way to get good bass out of it is with the large horn. I agree with you that it's too large, unattractive, and there are better ways to go about it. If Nelson had asked me to come up with a design for him it wouldn't look like this, but he didn't.

Subject: The emperor has no cloths

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 00:58:07 GMT

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

Thank goodnees some finally asked this question. I have wondered this as well. Yeah, they look cool, but.....

<http://www.passdiy.com/speakers.htm>

Subject: Perhaps because...

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 13:19:50 GMT

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

after a long career in audio, in a world filled with rectangular boxes, it was fun.

Subject: Because...

Posted by [Mike.e](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 03:22:23 GMT

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

According to some, Simplicity is better than Complexity! Xovers, Drivers, Everything causes distortion so why not use 1 driver with no xover! seems like an ideal plan to some! -but not to me ;-)
Even a 2way would be much more practical and easier to build!

Subject: However...

Posted by [GarMan](#) on Wed, 13 Oct 2004 00:35:20 GMT

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

while it may lack practicality on most home use, it does have its merit as an academic exercise.

Subject: Re: Perhaps because...

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Fri, 15 Oct 2004 21:15:25 GMT

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

Damn, I forgot about the fun factor.....Colin

Subject: J-Lo Re: Kleinhorn

Posted by [lon](#) on Mon, 18 Oct 2004 06:06:23 GMT

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

The J-Lo (which you are no doubt familiar with) would be easier to build but still pretty unwieldy. What do you think of that one?

Subject: Re: J-Lo Re: Kleinhorn

Posted by [Bill Fitzmaurice](#) on Mon, 18 Oct 2004 11:58:21 GMT

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

Actually I'm not familiar with it.

Subject: OK- now I know the one
Posted by [Bill Fitzmaurice](#) on Tue, 19 Oct 2004 11:19:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't know the name of it but came across it in AudioXpress. I don't think that box works all that well, for a variety of reasons, the main one being that it isn't size effective. You can get a lot better extension and SPL from a far smaller package. In the case of both of these horns from Pass Labs they're using horn geometries and theories that were well attuned to 1940s vintage large drivers with modern small wide range drivers and I don't think that it works all that well.

Subject: Re: J-Lo Re: Kleinhorn
Posted by [lon](#) on Wed, 20 Oct 2004 17:15:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I spelt it wrong. It's the J-Low and a pdf is available that shows the design drawings from the piece in audioXpress. But the link below does not pick up the drawing. From there you can get the pdf.

J-Low by Nelson Pass

Subject: I agree but
Posted by [Mike.e](#) on Thu, 21 Oct 2004 10:47:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

if it just had a higher cutoff-i bet 2x as many people could fit one!
