
Subject: Re: I know what I've read....

Posted by [Earl Geddes](#) on Fri, 06 May 2005 23:57:51 GMT

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

I have some comments. Not all sound recordings are individually miked, but that's beside the point. On playback the image should be where the producer placed it, no matter what kind of music you listen to. He's the artistic director and he has the control - that's his job. Yes, there is a huge amount of disconnect in imaging discussions because people don't all see things the same way and they certainly don't use a consistent set of terminology. In the psychoacoustics world the terminology is well defined so I suggest using that. In psychoacoustics localization is imaging - same thing. And the concept of "presence" came up, which I call by the acoustician term of spaciousness (also well defined both subjectively and mathematically). People definitely like spaciousness which is why we don't like anechoic chambers for listening even though they always have good imaging, and it's one of the biggest factors in concert hall evaluation. I totally disagree that all speakers can image well. That's because the speaker itself has diffraction and diffraction smears the image. A diffraction-less speaker will always image well in an anechoic chamber - this I agree to. So now comes the \$60,000.00 question: How does one get good spaciousness and good imaging at the same time. Well, rather than rewrite a long dissertation I will direct you to the white paper on my web site which explains how this can be done. My rooms have spaciousness because they are live, and they image well if you use my speakers - best of both worlds.
