
Subject: Moth Audio

Posted by [Frank Echols](#) on Fri, 09 Jul 2004 22:05:47 GMT

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

What are inside of Moth Audio speakers? How do they compare?

Subject: Re: Moth Audio

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Sat, 10 Jul 2004 04:26:47 GMT

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

Hi Frank, I think they have a chinese replica of a lowther. Supposed to sound decent. Never heard one though. If you want to stick to fostex, I have heard a fostex fe206E at a friend's, in 1.3 cubic feet BR boxes (Sold by classic audio). they were decent for simple instrument arrangements, jazz, etc. Alternately, you could buy a fostex and do one of the pans for them on the web, including their website. I believe madisound sell a kit that includes the drivers and precut wood. Many any options. However, the moth audio cicada may sound good, i have just never heard one. -akhilesh

Subject: Re: Moth Audio

Posted by [roncla](#) on Sat, 10 Jul 2004 13:16:26 GMT

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

The 206e is an outstanding performer for the price. But BHL is a requirement for this low Qts driver. A much more simple and good performer is Martins MLTL but will require a correction curve circuit and added series resistance. <http://ihost.it-mate.co.uk/users/roncla/files/composit.jpgron>

Subject: Re: Moth Audio

Posted by [roncla](#) on Sat, 10 Jul 2004 13:20:24 GMT

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

Someday i will learn to proof read. BLH= back loaded horn. Dont know what a BHL is. ron

Subject: I thought it was Back Horn Loaded <nt>

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 10 Jul 2004 22:41:40 GMT

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

.

Subject: Re: I thought it was Back Horn Loaded <nt>
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 11 Jul 2004 05:11:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's exactly what I thought too. But I guess it could have been Big-ol' Heavy Loudspeaker.

Subject: Re: Moth Audio
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Sun, 11 Jul 2004 15:08:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree roncla. I've never heard it in a BLH, but it seems like it would sound pretty darn good in one. Even in a BR, it sounds OK. Martin's MLTL with circuit should sound pretty good too, just i have never heard one that was fully developed. -akhilesh

Subject: Re: Moth Audio
Posted by [robertG](#) on Thu, 15 Jul 2004 18:34:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

From the outside, they look like Lowthers. But the other side is not as good looking: magnet is tiny and they certainly are not meant for BLH, I do not have the Qts values, but looking at the way they are built, must be pretty high (as compare to a Lowther)

Subject: Re: Moth Audio
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2004 21:03:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I Robert,YOU wrote:magnet is tiny and they certainly are not meant for BLH----I was wondering if you could expand on this a bit. DO we need a large magnet for a BLH?thanx!-akhilesh

Subject: Re: Moth Audio

Posted by [robertG](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2004 23:14:12 GMT

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

For proper BLH operation, you will choose a very low Qts driver (lower than .3). Qts represent the ability of a motor structure to control the moving mass, especially at resonance frequency. The higher the number, the lesser the control. High Qts drivers (sometimes as high as 1) are very at ease on open baffle. Medium Qts driver (from .3 to .6) can be use in a variety of designs (closed, reflex, etc.), while very low Qts won't have enough bass output at resonance to be effective in either closed or reflex enclosure or open baffle. There is no clear cut line between design applications and I do not want to imply that one is better than the other. Personally, I like very low Qts in BLH because of the great speed and impact of the design. A very strong motor is generally characterised as a driver with a very big magnet, therefore, it is easy to associate big magnets to low Qts (although it's not always so, because the weight of the moving mass has to be taken in account - it's a weight power ratio). Moth driver is made by Tai-sonic (see link), and the size of it's motor indicate a highish Qts value (as compared with Lowther or Fostex). Even more so, Moth use the driver in what look like a reflex design.

<http://www.tai-sonic.com/products-body.htm>

Subject: Re: Moth Audio

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Sat, 17 Jul 2004 04:16:33 GMT

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

Thanx Robert! Very instructive! -akhilesh

Subject: Re: Moth Audio

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sat, 17 Jul 2004 08:13:12 GMT

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

Great link Robert, Thanks. I never knew much about Moth Audio, so that is good information. I assumed they used Fostex drivers.
