
Subject: Ping Speakerman57...2226H Vs 416-8c??
Posted by [Scholl](#) on Thu, 28 Feb 2008 17:35:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hopefully he comes around here. Anyway, I'm considering the 416-8c for 6 cubic foot BR crossed at 400hz to an Audax PR170MO. I've read you preferred the 2226H crossed at 1600. Have you tried the 416-8c at lower crossovers? How did you like articulation on either? I used the 2226H for a few years in the late 90s early 2000s and although it was smooth I thought it like a bit more power than I could listen to when the family was home. Any thoughts from anybody are welcome!! Scott

Subject: Re: Ping Speakerman57...2226H Vs 416-8c??
Posted by [spkrman57](#) on Thu, 28 Feb 2008 22:08:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Scott! The 416 driver will play lower than the 2226, also requires approx 8 cu ft cab tuned to 40 hz for most applications. Many folks like the midrange of the 416 over the 2226 (Tom B. is one of them). I believe the 2226 is more linear across the bandwidth. I also think the 416's have a "bungee-cord" type bass, but then the 2226 is already down around 60hz, but I get usable down to the upper 30's in my smallish/well damped room (12' x 16'). I tried the 416's with various crossovers, but did not do anything I liked. That's not to say that other folks would not find it worthwhile to use. I find it a personal choice thing! If you need more opinions send me a e-mail w/phone nr. Regards, Ron

Subject: Re: Ping Speakerman57...2226H Vs 416-8c??
Posted by [Scholl](#) on Fri, 29 Feb 2008 13:46:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ron, Thanks for the input write me at schollaudio at hotmail dot com