Subject: Re: Interesting Article
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 08 Sep 2005 20:57:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

First allow me to express my thanks for a very thorough and insightfull response. You know the article covered all the bases; I guess I just have a hard time understanding why this concept that there isn't any one capable of listening to a piece of stereo equipment and determining whether it sounds good.Discussing this becomes a chore because it has been beaten to death so many times. I find your example interesting and here's why. In your first paragraph you describe the scene well; wherein you disagree with the opinions of several others during a listening session. I see you do what many of us do; borne out by the last paragraph where you tell of the DAC and your reluctance to define it as sounding good without adressing those standard caveats that have been set in stone by the measurement people. You know; we can't possibly seperate our inherent bias from our perceptions. How people throughout the ages were able to write music; build instruments of unparralled quality based on how they sounded etc etc; without the aid of blind ABX tests is beyond my comprehension.You're an experienced listener with a very solid grasp of what constitutes good musical sound and yet you have to check your capabilities at the door to satisfy a paradigm that exists nowhere except in audio.If we measure something with a measuring device or method all we measure is that measuring device and nothing else.Baffling.I think I understand where you are coming from with the example since I have always maintained that many of the small British Monitors sound as musical as a speaker can sound. In terms of pure musicality the B&W's and Spendors and Rogers still can't be significantly improved upon. All originally designed with minimal technology.