
Subject: Two different kinds of Line arrays

Posted by [Marlboro](#) on Wed, 25 Apr 2007 17:12:33 GMT

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

From our recent discussions there appear to be two different kinds of line arrays. Both try to stay true to Jim Griffin's research, but attack it from a different angle.1. This first one is most often done and echo's the Rick Craig model. It consists of a basic 2-way system with 6-8 inch woofer line and a 35 - 60 inch line of ribbon or planar tweeters. Sometimes a sub woofer is added to the picture. Crossovers can be either passive or electronic, and are usually somewhere between 1200 and 1600. Speakers are rather high in price: woofers usually in range of the aurum cantus at about \$70 a piece and tweeters usually planars or ribbons costing \$35 - \$70 a piece. Considering that it is a two way this is essential. Sometimes the ART approach is taken where there is just one dome tweeter in the center. This seems to work even though the tweeter portion is not in the nearfield.2. A second approach is the one that I've taken. While I'm sure that others have also done this, I don't know of anyone who has(speak up!)My approach is a bit different in that it is a 3 ways design. There are separate two woofers, a mid range that only handles from about 150 to 300 and then crosses again at between 2500 and 3500. There is a tweeter line which may be planars or could be dome tweeters. If its domes, then they either have to be already at at .9 c-to-c or they have to have flanges(like the Dayton Neo20A) that can be cut to that c-to-c. Since it is a three way, and the bass is picked up by a quality woofer, the midranges can be something that doesn't have to cover the bass range, and this means 3 inchers can be used. Also, in my design as much of the sensitive human hearing range is without a crossover, the mid needs to be small enough to adequately handle the lower tweeter range starting at about 1800hz. My design does not use passive crossovers; it uses an electronic three way with separate amps for the bass, mid, and tweeter lines. _____ Are there other basic design difference out there? Either of the two designs argue with each other about which is better. The first one which is a two way, argues that one has to use very expensive components to get a decent sound. The second argues that using a three way allows one to lower the individual cost of the components, but that electronic Tri-amping must be used to get the best benefit out of the system. Neither the twain shall meet? Marlboro

Subject: What the experts have to say ?

Posted by [jphaggar](#) on Sat, 28 Apr 2007 19:38:29 GMT

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

Interresting !! what do the experts like Rick Craig or Jim Griffin have to tell us about the difference of these two approaches ? Personally I already own a 2 way plus sub , and I'd be curious to compare it to the 3 way approach but would like to hear some advise before going in to this project .Jp

Subject: Re: What the experts have to say ?

Posted by [Marlboro](#) on Sat, 28 Apr 2007 20:24:57 GMT

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

They haven't responded.....If they disagreed with the choice on my part..... it would be like my eating chocolate, and you telling me that I was really eating brown CR*P that just looked like chocolate.I'd smile and put another piece in my mouth, and offer you one to try. Part of me would like to hear their comments, but the other part is like the Chocolate thought above. Like I've said to you privately JP, while I'm quite excited about my fully active system that I built for under \$1300, that really kicks butt over any passive or active crossed point source that I've ever heard, I can't believe that it could be better than say the RS8 and two Cestine double subwoofer arrays, that Rick Craig builds. I'd like to think so but I'd have to hear it to believe it.I'm sure it blows away those single speaker line arrays that are selling for 18 grand, though.Marlboro
