

---

Subject: Re: Struggling with understanding TONALITY in speakers

Posted by [DMoore](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2010 02:04:39 GMT

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

---

I think "tonality" and other terms used to describe certain aspects of a speaker's response (or lack thereof) is generally indicative that there is very likely something wrong with the speaker. What does the term "tonality" actually have to do with a frequency spectrum in any meaningful sense?

Logically, a set of terms used to describe various aspects of performance is, by its very nature, naturally limiting (i.e., to some ill-defined component(s) of the frequency spectrum) and if easily recognised (or accepted by the listener) the speaker would have a set of sonic detriments easily extracted from the whole response spectrum which is never a good thing for speakers to provide. Shouldn't an excellent speaker provide a response that is hard to define - that is, if the definition is brader than just "real"? Therefore anything less than the term "realistic" or even "real" is a negative attribute, is it not?

I've also heard of other terms such as "presence" and "timing" (?) being used to describe speaker output. But seems to me that "realism" (the convincing of the listener (eyes closed) that they are hearing, the sounds as recorded. This is absolutely convincing when it happens, and no other words will adequately describe it. A lack of terms other than "real" is a good thing.

If speakers can be broken down into terms describing a lack of something such as "tonality", "presence", and/or "timing" issues recognisable by a given listener, then it ain't "realistic"!

If it has a word to describe it (other than the term "real" or a derivative thereof) - it is not a good thing for a speaker to have...

DM

---