
Subject: Verrry Interesting full-range
Posted by [Bill Epstein](#) on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 10:50:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anybody know this Galaxy line?
150 to 18K; 95dB

Subject: Re: Verrry Interesting full-range
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 15:51:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kinda looks like the old JBL 2105 and LE5 midrange drivers. If you pick one up, let us know how it sounds.

Subject: Re: Verrry Interesting full-range
Posted by [Bill Fitzmaurice](#) on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 20:44:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's probably not all that great, certainly not Lowther or Fostex smooth. They use those in "Hot Spot" vocal monitors for small lounge acts, where fidelity is not a particular concern. But I guess you never know 'til you try it.

Subject: Detailed maybe, but...
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 21:37:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where have you heard a smooth Lowther?

Subject: Re: Verrry Interesting full-range
Posted by [footstony](#) on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 21:56:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks Bill, I agree it's verrry interesting (does anyone remember the tv show laugh-in) Qes a bit

high but i'd still like to see it backloaded with a mid bass horn.make a cheap pa!Philip

Subject: Re: Detailed maybe, but...

Posted by [Bob Brines](#) on Thu, 17 Mar 2005 01:12:24 GMT

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

In my living room!

Subject: Re: Detailed maybe, but...

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 17 Mar 2005 01:39:51 GMT

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

All kidding aside, you and Martin use response shaping components, which are an absolute necessity with Lowthers, in my opinion. You can use a Fostex driver in a minimalist system with no passive components and it sounds alright. But you can't do that with a Lowther. It's kind of like listening to a compression driver without some form of EQ. Unbearable.

Subject: Re: Detailed maybe, but...

Posted by [Bob Brines](#) on Thu, 17 Mar 2005 02:57:25 GMT

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

Mine may be a minority opinion, but I cannot tolerate a tonally unbalanced speaker. IMO, almost any single driver full range speakers, even my FT-1600 with the Fostex FE167E requires a contour filter. An unfiltered full-ranger is shouty and forward with thin bass. I just can't do the politically correct no passive components think. IMO --YMMVBob

Subject: Re: Detailed maybe, but...

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 17 Mar 2005 03:34:31 GMT

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

I agree completely. If I were going to implement a single driver solution, I'd probably do it the same way and for the same reasons. My solutions are not so different philosophically. I tend to like having a single driver carry the majority of information, and to cover the entire vocal range. In

my smaller systems, the main driver covers bass and vocals, and the tweeter only covers the frequencies well above the vocal overtones. It's like a single driver with a supertweeter. In my larger systems, the midrange is run without an electrical crossover. It's like the main driver in my smaller systems but there is a sub added below them. The woofer is sent only information below that which the midrange is capable of reproducing. Likewise, the tweeter is crossed over where the midrange is out of gas, and both response and directivity are matched. So this is like a single driver with a built-in sub and a supertweeter and where the directivity of all subsystems is matched.

Subject: Re: Verry Interesting full-range
Posted by [footstony](#) on Thu, 31 Mar 2005 03:26:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks for the tip Bill. I've just ordered one. I'm in Australia so I have to wait till it comes. I'll let you know how it sounds. Regards Philip
