

Horn loudspeaker design

Three articles summarizing the development of design theories and concluded with two systems for construction

by J. Dinsdale, M.A., M.Sc.
Cranfield Unit for Precision Engineering

Reprinted from WIRELESS WORLD, March 1974

After a period in the infancy of the gramophone when it was universally employed, the horn loudspeaker has fallen from popularity, due probably to its relatively large size, complexity of manufacture and hence high cost. Although full-range horn systems are used today only by a small number of enthusiasts, most experts are unanimous in acclaiming their virtues as loudspeaker enclosures, especially their high degree of realism and "presence". These articles examine briefly the history of the exponential horn loudspeaker and discuss the theory of horn-loading and the technical requirements of a good design. Comprehensive data are included for a wide range of horns, together with outline designs for a large and a small horn, suitable for domestic use.

The ideal exponential horn consists of a straight circular tube whose cross-sectional area increases logarithmically along its length from a small throat (at which is mounted the loudspeaker) to a large mouth. Extreme bass notes demand a mouth of very large area (20 to 30 sq. ft) and a horn at least 20ft in length, whereas extreme treble notes require a horn with dimensions of only a few inches. For this reason most wide-range horn systems will incorporate a number of separate loudspeakers, each with its individual horn of appropriate length and mouth area. To accommodate these horn combinations within a cabinet of reasonable size, the bass and middle horns are generally of square cross-section and are "folded" into a complicated pattern. Unfortunately, the inevitable restrictions and compromises introduced by these departures from a straight axis and circular section can cause serious variations in the frequency response, and much of the art of horn design is concerned with achieving a product of reasonable overall size and cost, without sacrificing any of the astonishing realism which is obtainable from the ideal horn.

The efficiency of a horn system will be typically between 30 and 50%, a figure to be compared with 2 or 3% for a bass-reflex enclosure and less than 1% for a totally enclosed box.

The principal reasons for the evident lack of popularity of the horn probably lie in its dimensions and cost. The overall size of a bass horn, even when folded into a cabinet of reasonable shape, will be larger than a bass-reflex or infinite baffle enclosure of

comparable specification. But although one reads occasionally of straight horns up to 20ft long, excellent results may be obtained from horns of more moderate dimensions; for example a complete horn system may be folded into an attractive cabinet of volume only 6 cu. ft, a not unreasonable size for domestic listening. The cost of horn enclosures is often considered to be prohibitive, and it is true that there is considerably more work in constructing a folded horn than in other enclosures; furthermore, this is work best performed by craftsmen and not easily adapted to "production-line" methods. Nevertheless, the building of a folded horn is by no means outside the capability of a competent do-it-yourself enthusiast, and it is to these individuals that the practical designs will be directed.

Although the early acoustical gramophones or phonographs employed horns of one type or another to couple the diaphragm to the listening room, and the early electrical reproducers of the 1920s and '30s also used horns, thereafter the horn suffered a setback from which it has never recovered. Certainly, a few companies market horn loudspeaker enclosures, and the occasional articles in the technical press^{1,2} stir up a passing interest, but unless one resorts to the masterly academic treatises by Olson³ or Beranek,⁴ or reverts to pre-1940 publications, there is very little information available for the enthusiast who wishes to both design and construct a horn. Recent experience gained by Telfer and others^{5,6} has reinforced the author's opinion that there are many audio enthusiasts who would be interested in constructing a horn enclosure.

After a brief historical survey, these articles examine the theory behind the horn-loaded loudspeaker enclosure and explain the basic points to consider when designing horns. The various compromises adopted by different workers are discussed, especially in the area of folding techniques, and the effects of these compromises on audio quality are studied. Finally, outline designs for two domestic horns are given: a "no-compromise" horn to suit the most fastidious (and enthusiastic) listener, and a "mini-horn" which provides a more limited performance for those with smaller living rooms (and bank balances), and which, while no more obtrusive than most commercial loudspeaker cabinets, will provide extremely clear and natural reproduction.

Background

It has been known for many thousands of years that when sound is passed through a tube with a small throat and a large mouth, it experiences an apparent amplification, and from Biblical times man has used rams' and similar naturally occurring horns both as musical instruments and as megaphones. Thomas Edison attached a tin horn to his primitive phonograph in 1877 to couple the minute vibrations of the diaphragm to the air load in the listening area, and to the majority, the term "gramophone horn" conjures up an image of the early gramophones or phonographs designed between about 1890 and 1912, all of which utilised an external horn.

A variety of expansion contours were employed for these early horns, mainly straight conical horns in the earliest machines, but the later gramophones of this period employed large flaring horns with either straight or curved axes depending on the overall length of the horn and the general design of the complete equipment. An analysis of these early horns, carried out in the light of modern acoustic knowledge, reveals a lack of understanding at that time of the operation of the horn as an acoustic transformer. This is surprising since Lord Rayleigh had analysed the "transmission of acoustic waves in pipes of varying cross-section" in Articles 265 and 280 of his classic treatise "Theory of Sound", published in 1878.⁷

Lord Rayleigh gave the analysis in Art. 281 for the passage of sound through a conical pipe, and he also made the interesting statement that "when the section of a pipe is variable, the problem of the vibrations of air within it cannot be generally solved". For some years after publication, Lord Rayleigh's results were purely of academic interest, but more general interest was aroused about the turn of the century by the early gramophones, most of which used external conical horns, as in the early HMV "dog" models.

After 1912, a number of manufacturers introduced internal horns with a degree of folding to enable cabinets of reasonable size to be used, and these models held the consumer market during the following 12 years, on account of their compactness and suitability as pieces of furniture. (Even in those early days, the enthusiast must have had

problems in persuading his wife to provide house-room for a large unfolded external horn.)

In the early 1920s a number of designers carried out theoretical analyses based initially on the work of Lord Rayleigh, but extending the work to be more applicable to the full audio range at domestic listening levels. Among these early analyses must be mentioned the work in America by A. G. Webster⁸ in 1920, by C. R. Hanna and J. Slepian⁹ in 1924 and by P. B. Flanders¹⁰ in 1927. In Britain independent analyses were carried out by P. Wilson in 1926 writing in *The Gramophone* magazine and later with A. G. Webb in "Modern Gramophones and Electrical Reproducers", and also by P. G. A. H. Voigt¹² in 1927.

All of these analyses, except the last, were based on an exponential contour, and were derived from a statement in Art.265 of Rayleigh's treatise. Webster had worked out an approximate theory for other types of horn and had deduced that the exponential was the optimum contour. All these analyses made the assumptions that (a) the cross-section is circular, (b) the axis is straight, and (c) all wavefronts are plane.

However, while it may be reasonable to assume plane wavefronts at the throat of the horn, it is clear that the wavefront at the mouth will be curved (as if a balloon were emerging from the horn, being inflated at the same time). Wilson, who had independently derived the analysis of the exponential horn in 1926 working from Rayleigh's treatise, later published a modified form on the assumption that the wavefront would assume a spherical shape always cutting the

contour of the horn and its axis at right angles.

This assumption, that the curvature of the wavefront would gradually increase from zero (the initial flat wavefront at the throat), satisfies also the condition specified by Hanna and Slepian and later by I. B. Crandall¹³ that the wavefront as it emerges from the open end will be equivalent to that provided by a spherical surface, as opposed to that produced by a flat piston. Voigt, however, had commenced his analysis on the assumption that wavefronts within the horn will be spherical and of the same radius throughout their progression through the horn. This assumption leads to a tractrix curve for the horn contour, and both theoretical considerations and very careful listening tests by the author and others tend to support the claims of the tractrix as the optimum horn contour. The mathematical basis of the exponential and tractrix curves is discussed in a later section of this article.

During the 1920s, 30s and 40s a large number of experimenters investigated methods of folding horns into small enclosures for domestic gramophone reproducers, and the records of the Patents Office bear witness to the ingenuity of man at overcoming conflicting conditions in the search for perfect sound reproduction. These designs for folded horns enjoyed a greater or lesser degree of success according to a number of factors including the performance of the loudspeaker motor. Nevertheless, it must be repeated that they were almost invariably of square or rectangular cross-section, and the axis was no longer straight and thus any resemblance between their actual perform-

ance and theoretical considerations was to some extent coincidental.

The advent of the moving coil loudspeaker in 1927 and electrical amplification stimulated further advances in the design of horns, which, because they now no longer had to be connected to the acoustical tone-arm, were freed of many of the earlier constraints. Many loudspeaker motor units were designed specifically for horn loading, and it was not until World War II that interest in the horn lapsed in favour of the bass reflex, infinite baffle and other types of loading systems which, although they had the peripheral advantages of smaller physical size, greater ease of design and manufacture and hence lower cost, were decidedly inferior in terms of musical realism.

During this time the designs of Voigt in Britain and of Klipsch¹⁴⁻¹⁸ in America continued to attract considerable support, especially the ingenious method evolved by the latter in adapting a doubly-bifurcated bass horn design to utilize the acoustic advantages inherent in corner positioning, a design which has now become a classic. Others at this time were experimenting with horn-loaded loudspeakers, notably J. Enoch and N. Mordaunt (whose design was subsequently incorporated in the Tannoy "Autograph" and "GRF" enclosures). Lowther (using a modern version of Voigt's high-flux motor unit) and J. Rogers (whose horn-loaded mid-frequency ribbon is still regarded by many as the ultimate in sound reproduction in this range) and one must not overlook the contributions of H. J. Crabbe¹⁹ and R. Baldock²⁰ in more recent times.

However, it must be emphasised that the multiple reflections, absorptions, resonances and changes of direction inherent in folded horns, together with the uncertainty of function of non-circular sections must inevitably alter the performance of such horns from that of the straight, circular-section horn on which the design may have been based.

Recent years have seen a minor resurgence in the popularity of the horn, caused perhaps by the search for "perfect sound reproduction", and there are many who hope that this trend will continue.

A very readable account of the early history of the horn loudspeaker has been given recently by P. and G. L. Wilson.²¹

General theoretical principles

The following section deals principally with the exponential contour, which is the basic expansion curve used in most high quality horn loudspeakers, and the tractrix, which has a more complicated formula, but with a dominant exponential component—indeed the two curves are virtually identical from the throat to about midway down the horn.

Determination of flare contour

The theory of the conical horn was originally worked out by Lord Rayleigh, but the first serious attempts to establish a practical working formula for the exponential horn were not made until 1919 and the years following. The basic formulae for the transmission of sound waves through horns have been given in modern terms by V. Salmon²²




Fig. 1. Acoustical resistance and reactance against frequency at the throats of a series of infinite horns of different contour.

and others. Beranek⁴ has plotted the acoustical resistance and reactance against frequency at the throats of a series of infinite horns of different contour with identical cross-sectional areas at the throat and at a given point along the axis of the horn, and the resulting curves are shown in Fig. 1. For optimum loading of the loudspeaker motor, it may be shown that the impedance presented by the throat of the horn should be entirely resistive and of constant value throughout the working frequency range, i.e. the sound transmission should be of unity "power factor". Examination of the curves in Fig. 1 shows that the exponential and hyperbolic contours satisfy this condition most closely.

However, a further condition to be satisfied is that of minimum distortion at the throat of the horn, caused by "air overload". When a sound wave is propagated in air, a series of harmonics will be produced, thereby distorting the waveform. This occurs because if equal positive and negative changes in pressure are impressed upon a mass of air, the resulting changes in volume will not be equal; the volume change due to an increase in pressure is less than that due to an equal decrease in pressure. The rapid expansion and compression of air caused by the propagation of sound waves takes place adiabatically, i.e. there is no net transfer of heat, and the pressure and volume are related by the formula $pV^\gamma = \text{constant}$, where

- p = pressure
- V = volume
- γ = adiabatic gas constant (approx. 1.4 for air under normal room conditions)

This curve has been plotted in Fig. 2, together with a superimposed large sinusoidal change in pressure to illustrate the corresponding distorted change in volume.

If the horn were a long cylindrical pipe, distortion would increase the further the wave progressed towards the mouth. However, in the case of a flaring horn, the amplitude of the pressure wave decreases as the wave travels away from the throat, so for minimum distortion the horn should flare out rapidly to reduce the pressure amplitude as early as possible after the sound wave has left the throat. From this viewpoint it is apparent that the parabolic and conical contours will generate the least distortion due to air overload, and that distortion will be highest for the hyperbolic horn, because the sound wave must travel a further distance before the pressure reduces significantly.

Further inspection of Fig. 1 shows that the acoustical resistance of the hyperbolic horn lies within 10% of its limiting value over a larger part of its working frequency range than that of the exponential horn, and for that reason the hyperbolic horn provides rather better loading conditions to the loudspeaker motor. However, in view of the considerably higher air-overload distortion of the hyperbolic horn, the exponential or one of its derivatives is generally chosen as a satisfactory compromise between the hyperbolic and conical contours.

In cases where the advantages of a long




Fig. 2. Adiabatic pressure/volume relationship for air.

slow flare rate are required without the attendant high air-overload distortion, Olson³ has shown that a horn can be made up of a series of manifold exponential sections, commencing with a very short stub of high flare rate at the throat (to minimize distortion) which leads into a longer section of lower flare rate and thence to the main horn of very low flare rate. Klipsch has referred to this technique as the "rubber throat" in his paper on corner horn design.¹⁴ The mouth acoustical impedance of each exponential section is designed to match the throat impedance of the preceding section, right along the chain. Practically any acoustical impedance relationship with frequency may be obtained by this technique, but the procedure is complicated, and the additional effort cannot generally be justified for domestic horns.

Determination of mouth area

The acoustical resistance and reactance of the exponential horn have been plotted on a normalized scale in Fig. 3, which shows that

the acoustic impedance is entirely reactive below a frequency given by

$$f_c = \frac{mc}{4\pi}$$

where c = speed of sound; m = flare constant which appears in the basic exponential horn formula

$$S_x = S_T e^{mx}$$

where S_x is the area at distance x from throat; S_T is the area at the throat.

The frequency f_c , known as the cut-off frequency, is the lowest frequency at which the horn will transmit acoustical power, and thus the flare constant defines the lower frequency of transmission by a given horn. The flare constant may be calculated for any given cut-off frequency, and the horn profile may then be constructed. The above statement refers strictly only to horns of infinite length. In horns, as in cylindrical tubes, wavefronts of sounds whose wavelength is large compared with the mouth diameter tend to be reflected back into the horn where they interfere with successive wavefronts. Just as the loading of the loudspeaker motor by the throat of the horn must be largely resistive over the working frequency range for the smooth efficient transfer of acoustical energy, so must be the loading presented to the mouth of the horn by the surrounding air. Beranek has shown⁴ that for the radiation impedance of the mouth to be mainly resistive, the relationship $C/\lambda > 1$ must hold, where C is the circumference of the mouth of the horn and λ is the wavelength of the lowest note to be transmitted. If the mouth of the horn is not circular, it will behave in a similar way for equal mouth areas, i.e. if $C = 2\pi r_m > \lambda_c$ is the limiting condition

$$\text{and } S_m = \pi r_m^2 > \frac{\lambda_c^2 c}{4\pi} r_m > \frac{\lambda_c}{2\pi}$$

where λ_c = cut-off wavelength; r_m = mouth radius; S_m = mouth area.

Thus a horn of square section may be employed provided the mouth area exceeds $\frac{\lambda_c^2}{4\pi}$. Hanna and Slepian had examined from




Fig. 3. Acoustical resistance and reactance of an exponential horn.

a different standpoint the behaviour of wavefronts at the mouth of the horn, and deduced that reflection was a minimum when the slope of the profile was 45° (i.e. included angle of 90°). This will be so where the mouth circumference equals the cut-off wavelength of the horn. It also illustrates the importance of distinguishing between the values of flare constant used for calculating exponential increase in area, and in plotting the profile of the actual horn. Fig. 4 (after Olson) illustrates the effect of foreshortening the horn to a length less than




Fig. 4. Performance of foreshortened horns. Reflections at the mouth cause peaks and troughs in the frequency response near to cut-off.

the ideal. When the mouth circumference becomes less than the cut-off wavelength, reflections at the mouth cause objectionable peaks and troughs in the frequency response at frequencies near to cut-off, and if, in a given design, the mouth dimensions are restricted, it is generally preferable to increase the cut-off frequency to a value which allows the correct mouth area to be adopted, rather than to accept the uneven bass response illustrated in Fig. 4.

Plane and curved wavefronts

Hitherto, the assumption has been made that successive wavefronts remain plane throughout their propagation through the horn. However, along a straight circular section horn the wavefront must be normal to the axis, and also normal to the walls. (If the wavefront were either approaching or receding from the walls, energy would be either absorbed or supplied; alternatively, the composite wavefront resulting from the original wavefront and its reflection will itself be normal to the walls.) Thus wavefronts transmitted along a cylindrical tube will be plane, while wavefronts transmitted down a conical horn will be spherical. It is therefore clear that the wavefront emerging from an exponential horn will possess a degree of curvature, and that the conventional calculations made on the assumption of the exponential increase of plane wavefronts will be in error (in practice, the actual cut-off frequency will be somewhat altered from that derived theoretically, and the profile errors of the horn are not excessive).

The correct approach to the design of a horn in which the areas of successive wavefronts expand according to a true exponential law is not certain, since any horn profile chosen will *per se* determine the contour of the wavefronts within it, and in general this contour will be different to that originally assumed. Wilson¹¹ decided to assume spherical wavefronts of increasing curvature from zero (plane wavefronts) at the throat of the horn, and on this basis he cal-

culated a modified contour which lies just inside and very close to the true exponential. Fortunately, if a papier mâché horn is made on a solid former designed to a true exponential contour, the shrinkage of the papier mâché when drying converts the horn very closely to Wilson's modified form. Nevertheless, the prime assumption has been made that wavefronts are spherical and of changing curvature, and it is by no means certain that this is the case.

The tractrix contour

Voigt, in his 1927 patent, had proceeded on the more elementary assumption that the wavefronts within the horn must be spherical and of the same radius throughout their propagation through the horn. He based this assumption on the reasoning that if the curvature increases from plane waves (zero curvature) at the throat to a certain curvature at the mouth, then a point on the axis must travel at a faster rate than a point at the wall. Since the entire wavefront must travel at the speed of sound (assumed to be constant throughout the horn) the wavefront has no alternative but to be spherical and of constant radius. This requires that the horn contour should be the tractrix.

The tractrix is the involute of the catenary (the curve adopted by a uniform heavy chain suspended between two points at the same level) and is the curve traced out by a load being dragged along by a man moving in a straight line not passing through the load. It is not the "pure pursuit" curve traced by a missile which always travels towards an escaping target, as is often mistakenly supposed. The length of a tractrix horn of mouth circumference λ_c , may be expressed as the cut-off wavelength

$$x = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \log_e \frac{\frac{\lambda}{2\pi} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^2 - y^2}}{y} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\right)^2 - y^2}$$

where y is the radius

cf. the equivalent exponential,

$$x = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \log_e \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\pi y} \right)$$

Both these curves are shown in Fig. 5.

It will be seen that the tractrix has a dominant exponential term which becomes less significant towards the mouth; in fact for the first 50% of their length the exponential and tractrix contours for a given cut-off frequency and throat area are virtually identical, but thereafter the tractrix flares at an increasingly greater rate until it attains its fully developed mouth at 180° included angle. In view of the complex nature of the formula, the best way to construct a tractrix is by graphical means, as shown in Fig. 6. The curve thus derived may be used to provide ordinates for the tractrix horn, after some smoothing of the slight discontinuities inherent in the graphical construction.

Whereas the tractrix terminates when the angle between the horn and the axis is 90° (180° included angle), the true exponential goes on to infinity in both directions. The




Fig. 5. Comparison of the exponential and tractrix contours.

tractrix horn for given throat and mouth dimensions is thus shorter than the equivalent exponential. It has been suggested that with the full tractrix terminating in a mouth of 180° included angle, the sound appears to originate from a point just inside the mouth, where the included angle is only 90°. There is thus some evidence that the tractrix may be terminated prematurely at this point, and if this is done, the mouth perimeter will be 90% of the wavelength at cut-off, as shown in Fig. 5, which compares the true and modified exponentials and the tractrix contours.

Efficiency

The efficiency of an exponential horn loudspeaker is determined by a large number of parameters, and a comprehensive treatment has been provided by Olson.³ Typical efficiencies of bass horns can be as high as 50%, while mid-frequency and treble horns can have efficiencies of over 10%, and these figures compare very favourably with bass-reflex enclosures (efficiency 2 to 5%) and infinite baffles (efficiency generally less than 1%). The extremely high efficiency of the horn is not necessarily of value in enabling amplifiers of lower output power to be used. Indeed, some class B output stages may produce a higher distortion level in horns because they need only be operated within the first 10% of their capability, at which low levels the effects of crossover distortion are more pronounced.


The principal advantage conferred by the horn's high efficiency is that for a given loudness the amplitude of movement of the loudspeaker motor is appreciably less than with other enclosures. The effects of nonlinearities in the magnetic field and suspension are therefore greatly reduced, and there is less tendency for "break-up" of the cone to occur. Thus the relatively high distortion products normally produced by the loudspeaker motor will be minimized, and, provided the horn itself does not introduce distortion, extremely high quality sound can be radiated.

A further advantage resulting from this reduction in amplitude of movement of the cone is that a form of inter-modulation distortion, caused by variation of the volume of the cavity between the loudspeaker cone and the throat of the horn, may be reduced to negligible proportions.

Tuning the throat cavity

The cavity, which must inevitably exist between the loudspeaker diaphragm and the throat of the horn, plays an important function in the design of horn systems, since it can be used to limit the maximum frequency to be transmitted. Although the lower frequency limit may be set with some precision by the flare rate of the horn, in conjunction with the mouth area, the upper frequency limit is ill-defined, being determined by a combination of (a) unequal path lengths between different parts of the diaphragm and the throat of the horn, (b) internal cross reflections and diffraction effects within the horn, especially when the horn is folded, (c) the high frequency characteristics of the motor unit itself, and (d) the effective low-pass filter characteristic presented by the cavity between diaphragm and throat.

Fig. 6. Graphical construction of the tractrix.



Using a straight edge of length equal to the final mouth radius, the tractrix curve is constructed of a series of tangents, length not greater than $\frac{1}{10}$ the mouth radius, starting at the throat.

It may be shown that a cavity of fixed volume behaves as an acoustic reactance of value

$$\frac{S_D^2 \rho c^2}{2\pi f V}$$

where S_D = area of diaphragm, V = volume of cavity, ρ = density of air, c = speed of sound, f = frequency.

When the cavity is placed between the diaphragm and throat, it behaves as a "shunt capacitance" across the throat itself, and thus by choosing the correct parameters, the cavity/throat combination acts as a low-pass filter at a frequency which may be set by making the cavity impedance equal to the throat impedance at the desired frequency,

$$\text{i.e. } \frac{S_D^2 \rho c^2}{2\pi f V} = \frac{\rho c S_T^2}{S_T}$$

where S_T = throat area, f = desired upper frequency limit, whence

$$V = \frac{c S_T}{2\pi f}$$

The volume of the cavity may therefore be calculated to provide high-frequency roll-off at a point before the poorly-defined effects (a) to (c) stated above become significant (Fig. 7).

A further benefit resulting from the use of a cavity tuned to prevent mid and high frequencies from entering a bass horn at the rear of a loudspeaker is that the efficiency of transmission of these frequencies by the opposite side of the loudspeaker is greatly increased, thus improving the performance of a mid/high frequency horn mounted at the front of the loudspeaker.

The considerations affecting the practical determination of the upper and lower frequency limits of a particular horn will be considered in more detail.

Loading the rear of the loudspeaker motor

Mention has already been made of distortion resulting from the non-linear expansion/compression characteristics of air. This effect is accentuated when a loudspeaker is horn-loaded on one side only, because the





Fig. 7. Effect of the throat cavity in limiting high frequency performance.

constant resistance characteristic of the throat acts only against excursions of the cone in the forward direction; when the cone moves back it is against a far lower load and hence the excursion will be larger. The ideal way of eliminating this distortion is to load both sides of the loudspeaker by equal horns, or to employ a bass horn for loading the rear of the cone and a middle/top frequency horn to load the front. The design of the mini-horn, to be described, utilizes this feature.

An alternative solution favoured by many designers is to load the rear of the loudspeaker by a sealed compression chamber, the effect of which is to provide a loading similar to the horn. The compression chamber thus reduces the effects of non-linearity due to uneven loading on each side of the loudspeaker diaphragm, and also presents a better resistive load to the diaphragm because a closed chamber on the opposite side of the diaphragm to the horn itself acts as an "inductive" reactance which tends to balance the "capacitive" reactance presented by the mass reactance of the throat impedance at low frequencies.

Klipsch states¹⁴ that the volume of this cavity is given by the throat area multiplied

by the speed of sound divided by 2π times the cut-off frequency. This is readily shown as follows:

The air chamber reactance is given by

$$\frac{S_D^2 \rho c^2}{2\pi f_c V}$$

where S_D = diaphragm area, V = volume of air chamber.

The throat reactance at cut-off is

$$\frac{\rho c S_T^2}{S_T}$$

where S_T = throat area.

Equating these,

$$V = \frac{c S_T}{2\pi f_c}$$

However, some observers claim that the use of a compression chamber detracts from the realism of the reproduced sound, and advocate either double horn-loading or a combination of horn-loading with direct-radiation from the other side of the diaphragm; in other words, the most realistic reproduction occurs when both sides of the diaphragm are allowed to radiate.

Summary

In summarizing this section, it is clear that there is no universal formula applicable to any aspect of horn design. The reason for mentioning the alternative approaches and for providing a comprehensive list of references is to stimulate others to experiment in those areas where to a large extent results must be evaluated subjectively by very careful comparative listening tests *a posteriori*.

To quote Wilson:²¹ "It cannot legitimately be assumed that a horn incorporated in a cabinet has the precise characteristics of any particular type of straight horn, whether exponential, hyperbolic, catenary or tractrix, even though their dimensions have been used as guides in its construction. The multiple changes of direction, coupled with reflections and absorptions and internal resonances, are always such as to destroy any legitimate comparison. Every internal (horn) enclosure construction must be judged on its merits as revealed by measurement and by listening tests."

(To be continued)

REFERENCES

1. Crabbe, H. J., "A Concrete Horn Loudspeaker System, Mk. 2". *Hi-Fi News*, Oct.-Nov. 1967.
2. "Toneburst", "Low-cost Horn Loudspeaker System", *Wireless World*, May 1970 and Jan. 1972.
3. Olson, H. F., "Acoustical Engineering", van Nostrand, 1957.
4. Beranek, L. L., "Acoustics", McGraw-Hill, 1954.
5. Cohen, A. B., "Hi-Fi Loudspeakers & Enclosures" 1st Edition Rider, 1961.
6. Telfer, G., Private communication, Nov. 1972.
7. Strutt, J. W., Lord Rayleigh, "Theory of Sound" Pt. 2, Macmillan, 1878.
8. Webster, A. G., *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* Vol. 6 (1920).
9. Hanna, C. R. & Slepian, J., "The Function and Design of Horns for Loudspeakers", *J.A.I.E.E.* Vol. 23, Feb. 1924.
10. Flanders, P. B., British Patent No. 245,415, 24th March 1927.
11. Wilson, P. & Webb, A. G., "Modern Gramophones and Electrical Reproducers", Cassell 1929.
12. Voigt, P. G. A. H., British Patents Nos. 278,098 (1927), 351,209 (1930), 404,037 (1934), 435,042 (1935).
13. Crandall, I. B., "Vibrating Systems and Sound", van Nostrand, 1926.
14. Klipsch, P. W., "A Low-frequency Horn of Small Dimensions", *J. Acous. Soc. Am.* Vol. 13 No. 2, Oct. 1941.
15. Klipsch, P. W., "Improved Low-frequency Horn", *J. Acous. Soc. Am.* Vol. 14 No. 3, Jan. 1943.
16. Klipsch, P. W., "A High-Quality Loudspeaker of Small Dimensions", *J. Acous. Soc. Am.* Vol. 17 No. 2, Jan. 1946.
17. Klipsch, P. W., "A New High-frequency Horn", *I.E.E.E. Trans. Audio*, Nov.-Dec. 1963.
18. Klipsch, P. W., "Loudspeaker Developments", *I.R.E. Trans. P.G.A.*, May-June 1953.
19. Crabbe, H. J., "Design for a Folded Corner Horn", *Wireless World*, Feb. 1958.
20. Baldock, R., *Hi-Fi News*, Vol. 11, April 1967.
21. Wilson, P. & G. L., "Horn Theory and the Phonograph", presented to 83rd meeting of Acoust. Soc. Am., April 1972.
22. Salmon V., "Generalized Plane Wave Horn Theory", *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* Vol. 17 No. 3, Jan. 1946.
23. Klipsch, P. W., "Loudspeaker Performance", *Wireless World*, Feb. 1970.
24. Harwood, H. D., "Speakers in Corners", *Wireless World*, April 1970.
25. Klipsch, P. W., "A Note on Acoustic Horns", *Proc. I.R.E.*, July 1945.
26. Wood, A., "The Physics of Music", Methuen 1944.
27. Moir, J., "High Quality Sound Reproduction" 2nd Edition, Chapman & Hall, 1961.