
Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 03:46:21 GMT

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

Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB mix. You don't know how much. ;o)

I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion though the analog streaming still seems to have revealed the *Parisness* of the mix.

Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears haven't been playing tricks on me recently. I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar card. I think you're going to have something closer to a cross between mix B & C.

Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something similar and post it up.

;O)

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557f156\$1@linux...

>

> Here's what I think:

>

> - "A" is OK, but not as good as either "B" or "C"... here's why:

> 1.) It's not as clear overall... it's got a bit of an edge or rasp to it.

> 2.) It's not as well-defined across the entire frequency spectrum... for example listen to the delay on the lead vocals; it comes across MUCH clearer in "B".

> 3.) In it's defense, it DOES seem to be a little bit more phase-coherent than "B", though. Something about it is a little tighter.

>

> - "B" is pretty good because:

> 1.) It definitely comes across as a bit "bigger" than "A"; the soundfield isn't necessarily wider, but it's more well-defined.

> 2.) It's VERY clean... listen to the high mids & highs...

> subtle things like the delay on the vocals I mentioned, and also the air on the background vox overall come across much better. Better so than in version "C", also.

> 3.) The low end is better than "A", as well - listen to the

> break section after the BG vox are done - like starting right
> at 1:00 minute into the clip... you can feel the low notes
> better there than in "A".
>
> - "C" is also pretty good, but for completely different reasons
> than "B":
> 1.) There's nothing harsh about it, it's very smooth. Nothing
> objectionable about it.
> 2.) It's pretty clean and doesn't sound clipped in any way.
> 3.) Low end feels great... lotsa "glue" to the lows & lo-mids.
> 4.) Highs & subtle things are subdued, though - listen to the
> cymbals, the delay on the lead vox, and also the overall tone
> of BG vox... less definition & "air" than "B".
>
> My wish? If I could have something that were a combination of
> the 500 HZ & below portion of Mix "C", and everything from that
> point upwards from mix "B".
>
> And the answers are:
>
> Mix "A" is the straight-ahead Native 2-Buss version.
>
> Mix "B" is the Native Stems version.
>
> Mix "C" is the Summed-in-Paris version.
>
>
> Neil
>
>
>
> "alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
> >I listened through my computer speakers .
> >A sounded like you spread the stereo field a little making the echo
repeats
>
> >and keyboard drone seem wider.A is my best out of the 3 if i had to pick.
> >C was a little narrower with less mids.
> >B was about the same width , more mids.
> >Im with DJ on after the 3rd time through the line blurred.
> >
> >"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> >> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> >> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> >> just mentioned):
> >>

> >>
http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3
> >>
> >>
http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3
> >>
> >>
http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3
> >>
> >>
> >> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> >> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> >> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
> >>
> >> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> >> you like better?
> >>
> >> Neil
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 04:28:09 GMT

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

You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumulated when you've got 12 mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a pair of mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rhythm guitar, a stereo piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal with 3-4 part harmony vocals added.

A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle it better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream 40 tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I want to continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have been extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking just patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes. It's all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my UAD-1 cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot. Very high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same mojo that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have 1073's, I will die.

;o)

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)

>

> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
> project, then" lol

>

> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion

>

> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?

>

> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.

>

> No prob!

>

> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
> >cross between mix B & C.

>

> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
> the definiton & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
> KILL. And I'd love it.

>

>

> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
> >similar and post it up.

>
> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>
> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 04:53:40 GMT

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

I'm going to try this as soon as my 3rd card gets here and another component that I've been waiting on. I've been summing a few mixes in Pulsar when doing the fader levels and pans in Cubase and I'm liking it a lot. I haven't done a *large* mix yet where I'm simply streaming mono tracks from Cubase through the Pulsar mixer and adjusting fader levels and pans in Pulsar. I like to automate my faders and I'm going to have to figure out a way to do this in Pulsar. There is a lot of midi functionality in the Scope mixer. I haven't explored it yet. All indications are that fader and panning adjustments in the Scope mixer are the way to go. The Cubase mixer is just so **** efficient and convenient, I want to stay there.

;o)

<OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4558018e\$1@linux...

>
> So you're not summing in Pulsar? I thought that's what you were
> going to do, so you could keep everything ITB, yet still have
> DSP summing?
>
> Neil
>
>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
> >You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumulated when you've got 12
> >mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a pair
> of
> >mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythm guitar, a stereo
> >piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal
> with
> >3-4 part harmony vocals added.
> >
> >A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle it

> >better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream 40
> >tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I want
> to
> >continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have been
> >extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
> >streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking
just
> >patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes.
It's
> >all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my
UAD-1
> >cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot.
Very
> >high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same
mojo
> >that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have
> >1073's, I will die.
> >
> >;o)
> >
> >
> >
> >"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
> >> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
> >> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
> >> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
> >> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
> >>
> >> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
> >> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
> >> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
> >> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
> >> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
> >> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
> >> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
> >> project, then" lol
> >>
> >> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
> >> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
> >> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
> >>
> >> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
> >> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
> >> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?
> >>
> >> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears

> >> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
> >>
> >> No prob!
> >>
> >> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
> >> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
> >> >cross between mix B & C.
> >>
> >> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
> >> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
> >> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
> >> the definititon & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
> >> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
> >> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
> >> KILL. And I'd love it.
> >>
> >>
> >> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
> >> >similar and post it up.
> >>
> >> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
> >> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
> >> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
> >>
> >> Neil
> >>
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 15:14:39 GMT

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

KISS???.....not sure what this means but if it refers to simplifying things/using fewer of any particular device(s).....I wouldn't have a clue.

;))

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message news:45580ce0\$1@linux...

> Deej, I guess you don't subscribe to the KISS principal, huh?

> --

> Martin Harrington

> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45580005\$1@linux...
>> You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumulated when you've got
12
>> mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a
pair
>> of
>> mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythym guitar, a stereo
>> piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal
with
>> 3-4 part harmony vocals added.
>>
>> A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle it
>> better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream
40
>> tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I want
>> to
>> continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have
been
>> extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
>> streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking
just
>> patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes.
>> It's
>> all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my
>> UAD-1
>> cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot.
>> Very
>> hig quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same
mojo
>> that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have
>> 1073's, I will die.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>>> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>>> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>>> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
>>>
>>> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
>>> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
>>> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff

> >> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
> >> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
> >> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
> >> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
> >> project, then" lol
> >>
> >> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
> >> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
> >> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
> >>
> >> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
> >> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
> >> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?
> >>
> >> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
> >> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
> >>
> >> No prob!
> >>
> >> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
> >> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
> >> >cross between mix B & C.
> >>
> >> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
> >> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
> >> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
> >> the definiton & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
> >> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
> >> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
> >> KILL. And I'd love it.
> >>
> >>
> >> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
> >> >similar and post it up.
> >>
> >> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
> >> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
> >> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
> >>
> >> Neil
> >>
> >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 15:17:13 GMT

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

>Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?<

But that's the next test Neil. Track the whole project all over again at 44.1 *exactly* as was previously done at 88.2. ;o)

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)

>

> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
> project, then" lol

>

> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion

>

> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?

>

> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.

>

> No prob!

>

> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
> >cross between mix B & C.

>

> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-

> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
> the definiton & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
> KILL. And I'd love it.
>
>
> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
> >similar and post it up.
>
> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>
> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [DJ](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 02:26:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I just listened to them on my Studio monitors. A sounded a bit harsh. B sounded pretty well balanced and I liked it. There was something about C overall that I preferred..a sense of space around the vocal track I think. It was a big difference when I first heard the track. After listening to them all a few more times, the differences began to blur. Something about it just jumped out at me about C.

Tell me this was the native mix ITB so I can stop the madness.

;o)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557cf79\$1@linux...

>
> Style isn't the issue here, it's a matter of: "can you do a big
> mix with a lotta tracks in Native vs. summming in some other
> way"? lol
>
> Keep the comments coming guys! It's interesting so far -
> different people are liking different versions! Will any one
> version win out?
>
> Neil
>
>

> "Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >Not really my cup-of-tea stylistically, but "B" is the one you want. It's
> >pretty different from the other two - to me, as if I yanked the cotton
out
> >of my ears after listening to "A" and "C".
> >
> >-Carl
> >
> >"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> >> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> >> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> >> just mentioned):
> >>
> >>
> >> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
> >>
> >>
> >> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
> >>
> >>
> >> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
> >>
> >>
> >> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> >> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> >> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
> >>
> >> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> >> you like better?
> >>
> >> Neil
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Dubya Mark Wilson](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 01:05:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not listening on refs but my laptop speakers tell me A is best, B is second but slightly scoopy, C is last, narrow and less detailed. Lower mids in A really treat the guitars nicely without trouncing the keys and seems just all around more suitable for the piece. B wouldn't be bad if it were Contemp Jazz or such. C... don't know what's up with that one but it just don't do it for me. I'll be interested to hear which is PARIS, etc, and

what your routing, hdwr and procedures are/were.

Dubya

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...

>
> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> you like better?
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 01:22:48 GMT

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

Hmm, that's very interesting..

I preferred "C", except for that fact that it sounded a little smaller to me than the others, it was cleaner somehow.

"B" was next and the "A" which I didn't like...too mushy

--

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"Dubya Mark Wilson" <mark.xspam@avidrecording.com> wrote in message news:4557c2bb@linux...

> I'm not listening on refs but my laptop speakers tell me A is best, B is
> second but slightly scoopy, C is last, narrow and less detailed. Lower
> mids in A really treat the guitars nicely without trouncing the keys and
> seems just all around more suitable for the piece. B wouldn't be bad if
> it were Contemp Jazz or such. C... don't know what's up with that one but
> it just don't do it for me. I'll be interested to hear which is PARIS,

> etc, and what your routing, hdwr and procedures are/were.
>
> Dubya
>
> "Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
>>
>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>> just mentioned):
>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>>
>>
>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>>
>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>> you like better?
>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 01:24:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not really my cup-of-tea stylistically, but "B" is the one you want. It's pretty different from the other two - to me, as if I yanked the cotton out of my ears after listening to "A" and "C".

-Carl

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
>
> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> you like better?
>
> Neil

Subject: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 01:30:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris' mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I just mentioned):

<http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

<http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

<http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do you like better?

Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Nappy](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 01:55:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nappy

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>
>Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
>They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
>Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>you like better?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 02:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dubya... I'll wait 'til I get a few more responses before I say which is which, but here's what the procedures were:

-For the straight-ahead 2-bus Native Mix, it was basically just as I've been saying in recent threads with regard to managing levels, nothing special. Dithered down to a 16-bit wav file @ 44.1k in SX using the UV22HR dither plugin. Done.

-For the Native Stems mix, it was the exact same mix as above, but I just ran out the following stereo stems:

- 1.) Drums
- 2.) Low end stuff (bass, keyboard bass)
- 3.) Keys
- 4.) Guitars
- 5.) Vocals

I put all the tracks in various folders so I can just mute the whole folder for the tracks that I'm not sending out to the stems. This does not affect the sound in any way (placing them

in folders), it's just a convenient way of grouping them without really "grouping" them audio-wise. Also in this manner, all the group send/return effects that have anything to do with each track are included in the particular stem, as well. Now in this case I don't dither down at this stage, what I do is to export each stem at 88.2k/32-bit float, then open a new (empty) project, and import those stem files I just created... if I'm getting any overs on the master, I just bring down each stereo stem channel by the same amount, and it keeps everything in the same balance - easy. At THAT point, I dither down to 16-bit/44.1k for the final stereo mix file.

-For the "Mixed in Native/Summed in Paris" mix, I of course kept the mix identical, but sent four groups out of one of my Multiface's 8 balanced analog outs to the 8-in MEC module. Those groups were similar, but not identical to the stems I used for the stems mix version (I didn't want to send a fifth group out, because then I would've had to use the lower-resolution MEC Master inputs); those groups were:

- 1.) Drums
- 2.) Low End stuff & Rhythm Guitars
- 3.) Keys & solo guitars
- 4.) Vocals

Now, I did place a transparent brickwall limiter set at -0.3 and no gain maximization across each output, so that I wouldn't clip either the 8-in module or the individual channels in Paris. This also replicated the stems mix in that regard, because I limit everything going out into stems to -0.3. I know some of you guys love the clip factor in Paris, but I wanted to make it fair in all respects.... if I'm avoiding clipping in SX, I should also be avoiding it in Paree. In this regard, neither the 8-in module's inputs or any of the individual channels in Paris were clipping with the channel levels set at 0db - all those channels were left untouched because the mix & balances were, of course, coming from the SX mix. I did have to bring the Master down to -2.4db to avoid clips there, which should tell you that Paris was indeed getting good solid levels into the channels. I set Paris for "Live Mix" mode & bounced to disk at 16-bit/44.1k. This actually - it could be argued - gave Paris an advantage in a way, since no dither was needed to convert to that bitrate.

To convert the .wav files to hi-rez mp3 (the reason I didn't mix down directly to mp3 in the Cubase 2-bus or stems version is that I wanted to make sure it was fair since I couldn't do that in Paris (i.e: bounce directly to disk into mp3 format) - IOW, all versions had to undergo the step to convert from .wav to mp3... anyway, to convert from .wav to mp3, I simply

imported all three versions into a new project in Cubase, made sure they played back at as close to the same relative power levels (both peak & RMS) as I could, and exported straight to hi-rez mp3.

And that's what you're hearing.

Neil

"Dubya Mark Wilson" <mark.xspam@avidrecording.com> wrote:

>I'm not listening on refs but my laptop speakers tell me A is best, B is

>second but slightly scoopy, C is last, narrow and less detailed. Lower mids

>in A really treat the guitars nicely without trouncing the keys and seems

>just all around more suitable for the piece. B wouldn't be bad if it were

>Contemp Jazz or such. C... don't know what's up with that one but it just

>don't do it for me. I'll be interested to hear which is PARIS, etc, and

>what your routing, hdwr and procedures are/were.

>

>Dubya

>

>"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...

>>

>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'

>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another

>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I

>> just mentioned):

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

>>

>>

>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of

>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then

>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

>>

>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do

>> you like better?

>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 02:50:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Style isn't the issue here, it's a matter of: "can you do a big mix with a lotta tracks in Native vs. summing in some other way"? lol

Keep the comments coming guys! It's interesting so far - different people are liking different versions! Will any one version win out?

Neil

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotNOSPAMmail.com> wrote:

>Not really my cup-of-tea stylistically, but "B" is the one you want. It's
>pretty different from the other two - to me, as if I yanked the cotton out
>of my ears after listening to "A" and "C".

>
>-Carl

>
>"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...

>>
>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>> just mentioned):

>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

>>
>>
>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

>>
>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>> you like better?

>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Rob Arsenault](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 02:51:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A was kinda dull sounding to me, B might have been a bit brittle on the top but still my fav followed very closely by C.

Rob_A

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
>
> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> you like better?
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Dubya Mark Wilson](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 02:58:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Prolly not that interesting, Martin, considering my laptop speakers are maybe the size of a nickel.

W.

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
news:4557c6ad\$1@linux...

> Hmm, that's very interesting..

> I preferred "C", except for that fact that it sounded a little smaller to
> me than the others, it was cleaner somehow.

> "B" was next and the "A" which I didn't like...too mushy

> --

> Martin Harrington

> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>

> "Dubya Mark Wilson" <mark.xspam@avidrecording.com> wrote in message

> news:4557c2bb@linux...

>> I'm not listening on refs but my laptop speakers tell me A is best, B is

>> second but slightly scoopy, C is last, narrow and less detailed. Lower

>> mids in A really treat the guitars nicely without trouncing the keys and

>> seems just all around more suitable for the piece. B wouldn't be bad if

>> it were Contemp Jazz or such. C... don't know what's up with that one

>> but it just don't do it for me. I'll be interested to hear which is

>> PARIS, etc, and what your routing, hdwr and procedures are/were.

>>

>> Dubya

>>

>> "Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'

>>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another

>>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I

>>> just mentioned):

>>>

>>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>>>

>>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

>>>

>>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

>>>

>>>

>>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of

>>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then

>>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

>>>

>>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do

>>> you like better?

>>>

>>> Neil

>>

>>

>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 03:18:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>I just listened to them on my Studio monitors. A sounded a bit harsh. B
>sounded pretty well balanced and I liked it. There was something about C
>overall that I preferred..a sense of space around the vocal track I think.
>It was a big difference when I first heard the track. After listening to
>them all a few more times, the differences began to blur. Something about
it
>just jumped out at me about C.
>
>Tell me this was the native mix ITB so I can stop the madness.
>
>;o)

I'll tell you which one each version was... soon! :D

Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [AlexPlasko](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 03:30:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I listened through my computer speakers .
A sounded like you spread the stereo field a little making the echo repeats
and keyboard drone seem wider.A is my best out of the 3 if i had to pick.
C was a little narrower with less mids.
B was about the same width , more mids.
Im with DJ on after the 3rd time through the line blurred.

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
>
> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>

> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> you like better?
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 03:31:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mix B seemed to work for me..But I prefer C overall. I Like mix A as well,
but needs some "glue"..

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>
>Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
>They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
>Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>you like better?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 03:36:26 GMT

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

Hi Neil,

Yes styles of music is the case. I still say that it's very difficult to mix Hip and R & B styles of music (Hot aggressive) bangin beats, that are in your face..

I use Nuendo, Pro- Tools & Paris. I know each strenghts and weaknesses. Nuendo/SX , has a nice wide-open, warm charater mix summing sound..While Pro Tools has a very nice top-end that pretty much mixes itself. Paris, warm, not a wide(summing), but can take very aggressive styles of muic with ease..

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>Style isn't the issue here, it's a matter of: "can you do a big
>mix with a lotta tracks in Native vs. summing in some other
>way"? lol

>

>Keep the comments coming guys! It's interesting so far -
>different people are liking different versions! Will any one
>version win out?

>

>Neil

>

>

>"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>Not really my cup-of-tea stylistically, but "B" is the one you want. It's
>>pretty different from the other two - to me, as if I yanked the cotton
out

>>of my ears after listening to "A" and "C".

>>

>>-Carl

>>

>>"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'

>>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another

>>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I

>>> just mentioned):

>>>

>>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>>>

>>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

>>>

>>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

>>>

>>>

>>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of

>>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>>>
>>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>>> you like better?
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Nappy](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 03:41:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I meant b.

respect
Nappy

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>
>Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
>They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
>Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>you like better?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 04:09:47 GMT

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

Listening on small PC speakers:

B best. Detailed and in your face. I guess SX stems.

A a little dark, but it works, I guess Paris.

C don't like this one. Grainy. I guess SX 2-buss.

BR

"Kim" <hiddenounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:4557e240\$1@linux...

>

>

> I can only listen a low volume on a cheap system at the moment as I'm at

> work, but from what I heard, I thought B was Paris, but almost preferred

> mix C for the material in question.

>

> I'll have another listen when I get home on my proper monitors.

>

> Cheers,

> Kim.

>

> "Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>>

>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'

>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another

>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I

>> just mentioned):

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

>>

>>

>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of

>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then

>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

>>

>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do

>> you like better?

>>

>> Neil

>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 04:10:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can only listen a low volume on a cheap system at the moment as I'm at work, but from what I heard, I thought B was Paris, but almost preferred mix C for the material in question.

I'll have another listen when I get home on my proper monitors.

Cheers,
Kim.

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>
>Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
>They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
>Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>you like better?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 04:21:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If it's possible, it would be interesting to hear a test with the SX-stem-files imported and summed in Paris.

BR.

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:4557ed5b@linux...
> Listening on small PC speakers:

> B best. Detailed and in your face. I guess SX stems.
> A a little dark, but it works, I guess Paris.
> C don't like this one. Grainy. I guess SX 2-buss.
>
> BR
>
>
> "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:4557e240\$1@linux...
>>
>>
>> I can only listen a low volume on a cheap system at the moment as I'm at
>> work, but from what I heard, I thought B was Paris, but almost preferred
>> mix C for the material in question.
>>
>> I'll have another listen when I get home on my proper monitors.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Kim.
>>
>> "Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>>> just mentioned):
>>>
>>
>>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>>>
>>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>>>
>>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>>>
>>>
>>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>>>
>>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>>> you like better?
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 04:21:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

FWIW, C is the softest starting out, A is the loudest and B is in the middle (according to my DB meter).

That said, C also seems to be somewhat muffled compared to the other two. A feels like it's the most open.

Keeping in mind that I just got back from the opera and I still have sopranos ringing in my ears (Magic Flute)...

So lessee, how about:

A - Stems
B - SX
C - Paris

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Neil wrote:

> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> you like better?
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by Nil on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 05:15:18 GMT

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

Here's what I think:

- "A" is OK, but not as good as either "B" or "C"... here's why:

- 1.) It's not as clear overall... it's got a bit of an edge or rasp to it.
- 2.) It's not as well-defined across the entire frequency spectrum... for example listen to the delay on the lead vocals; it comes across MUCH clearer in "B".
- 3.) In it's defense, it DOES seem to be a little bit more phase-coherent than "B", though. Something about it is a little tighter.

- "B" is pretty good because:

- 1.) It definitely comes across as a bit "bigger" than "A"; the soundfield isn't necessarily wider, but it's more well-defined.
- 2.) It's VERY clean... listen to the high mids & highs... subtle things like the delay on the vocals I mentioned, and also the air on the background vox overall come across much better. Better so than in version "C", also.
- 3.) The low end is better than "A", as well - listen to the break section after the BG vox are done - like starting right at 1:00 minute into the clip... you can feel the low notes better there than in "A".

- "C" is also pretty good, but for completely different reasons than "B":

- 1.) There's nothing harsh about it, it's very smooth. Nothing objectionable about it.
- 2.) It's pretty clean and doesn't sound clipped in any way.
- 3.) Low end feels great... lotsa "glue" to the lows & lo-mids.
- 4.) Highs & subtle things are subdued, though - listen to the cymbals, the delay on the lead vox, and also the overall tone of BG vox... less definition & "air" than "B".

My wish? If I could have something that were a combination of the 500 HZ & below portion of Mix "C", and everything from that point upwards from mix "B".

And the answers are:

Mix "A" is the straight-ahead Native 2-Buss version.

Mix "B" is the Native Stems version.

Mix "C" is the Summed-in-Paris version.

Neil

"alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:

>I listened through my computer speakers .

>A sounded like you spread the stereo field a little making the echo repeats

>and keyboard drone seem wider.A is my best out of the 3 if i had to pick.

>C was a little narrower with less mids.

>B was about the same width , more mids.

>Im with DJ on after the 3rd time through the line blurred.

>

>"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...

>>

>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'

>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another

>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I

>> just mentioned):

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>

>>

>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>

>>

>>

>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of

>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then

>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

>>

>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do

>> you like better?

>>

>> Neil

>

>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!

Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 05:34:45 GMT

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

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

>If it's possible, it would be interesting to hear a test with

>the SX-stem-files imported and summed in Paris.

BR, it's possible, but I'm not sure what the best way to go about it would be... I could do either one of the following:

1.) Take the existing stems (which are at 88.2k/32-bit float) and straight-on samplerate/bitrate-convert them to 44.1/16-bit using something super-accurate like Voxengo's r8Brain, then import them into Paris.

2.) Make new identical stems, yet dithering each one down to 44.1k/16-bit in SX, then importing them into Paris.

Not sure which method would be best... what do you guys think?

Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Nei](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 05:57:54 GMT

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

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>mix. You don't know how much. ;o)

I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes? Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one project, then" lol

>I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
>soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
>into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion

Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?

>Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears

>haven't been playing tricks on me recently.

No prob!

>I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
>card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
>cross between mix B & C.

That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining the definiton & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B" guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would KILL. And I'd love it.

>Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
>similar and post it up.

Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol

Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 06:18:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I only listened on my comp speakers as well, doesn't do the comparison justice, although it's real world,

--

Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"Dubya Mark Wilson" <mark.xspam@avidrecording.com> wrote in message news:4557dd36\$1@linux...

> Prolly not that interesting, Martin, considering my laptop speakers are
> maybe the size of a nickel.

>

> W.

>

> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> news:4557c6ad\$1@linux...

>> Hmm, that's very interesting..

>> I preferred "C", except for that fact that it sounded a little smaller to

>> me than the others, it was cleaner somehow.
>> "B" was next and the "A" which I didn't like...too mushy
>> --
>> Martin Harrington
>> www.lendaneer-sound.com
>>
>> "Dubya Mark Wilson" <mark.xspam@avidrecording.com> wrote in message
>> news:4557c2bb@linux...
>>> I'm not listening on refs but my laptop speakers tell me A is best, B is
>>> second but slightly scoopy, C is last, narrow and less detailed. Lower
>>> mids in A really treat the guitars nicely without trouncing the keys and
>>> seems just all around more suitable for the piece. B wouldn't be bad if
>>> it were Contemp Jazz or such. C... don't know what's up with that one
>>> but it just don't do it for me. I'll be interested to hear which is
>>> PARIS, etc, and what your routing, hdwr and procedures are/were.
>>>
>>> Dubya
>>>
>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>>>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>>>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>>>> just mentioned):
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipA.mp3](http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen%20ClipA.mp3)
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipB.mp3](http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen%20ClipB.mp3)
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipC.mp3](http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen%20ClipC.mp3)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>>>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>>>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>>>>
>>>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>>>> you like better?
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 06:20:04 GMT

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

So was I..

--

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message [news:4557f635\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:4557f635$1@linux...)

> Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was the native
> mix.

> The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead giveaway but I was soooooo
> hoping that C was the native ITB mix. You don't know how much. ;o)

>

> I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the soundstage on
> mix

> C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT into Paris rather than the
> AD/DA conversion though the analog streaming still seems to have revealed
> the *Parisness* of the mix.

>

> Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears haven't
> been

> playing tricks on me recently. I think you may have a nice surprise when
> you

> get the Pulsar card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
> cross between mix B & C.

>

> Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something similar and
> post it up.

>

> ;O)

>

>

>

> "Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message [news:4557f156\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:4557f156$1@linux...)

>>

>> Here's what I think:

>>

>> - "A" is OK, but not as good as either "B" or "C"... here's why:

>> 1.) It's not as clear overall... it's got a bit of an edge or
>> rasp to it.

>> 2.) It's not as well-defined across the entire frequency
>> spectrum... for example listen to the delay on the lead vocals;
>> it comes across MUCH clearer in "B".

>> 3.) In it's defense, it DOES seem to be a little bit more phase-
>> coherent than "B", though. Something about it is a little

>> tighter.

>>
>> - "B" is pretty good because:
>> 1.) It definitely comes across as a bit "bigger" than "A"; the
>> soundfield isn't necessarily wider, but it's more well-defined.
>> 2.) It's VERY clean... listen to the high mids & highs...
>> subtle things like the delay on the vocals I mentioned, and
>> also the air on the background vox overall come across much
>> better. Better so than in version "C", also.
>> 3.) The low end is better than "A", as well - listen to the
>> break section after the BG vox are done - like starting right
>> at 1:00 minute into the clip... you can feel the low notes
>> better there than in "A".
>>
>> - "C" is also pretty good, but for completely different reasons
>> than "B":
>> 1.) There's nothing harsh about it, it's very smooth. Nothing
>> objectionable about it.
>> 2.) It's pretty clean and doesn't sound clipped in any way.
>> 3.) Low end feels great... lotsa "glue" to the lows & lo-mids.
>> 4.) Highs & subtle things are subdued, though - listen to the
>> cymbals, the delay on the lead vox, and also the overall tone
>> of BG vox... less definition & "air" than "B".
>>
>> My wish? If I could have something that were a combination of
>> the 500 HZ & below portion of Mix "C", and everything from that
>> point upwards from mix "B".
>>
>> And the answers are:
>>
>> Mix "A" is the straight-ahead Native 2-Buss version.
>>
>> Mix "B" is the Native Stems version.
>>
>> Mix "C" is the Summed-in-Paris version.
>>
>>
>> Neil
>>
>>
>>
>> "alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>> >I listened through my computer speakers .
>> >A sounded like you spread the stereo field a little making the echo
>> >repeats
>>
>> >and keyboard drone seem wider.A is my best out of the 3 if i had to
>> >pick.
>> >C was a little narrower with less mids.

>> >B was about the same width , more mids.
>> >Im with DJ on after the 3rd time through the line blurred.
>> >
>> >"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote in message news:4557bcc2\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>> >> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>> >> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>> >> just mentioned):
>> >>
>> >>
> http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3
>> >>
>> >>
> http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3
>> >>
>> >>
> http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>> >> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>> >> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>> >>
>> >> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>> >> you like better?
>> >>
>> >> Neil
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 06:22:19 GMT

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

Deej, I guess you don't subscribe to the KISS principal, huh?

--

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45580005\$1@linux...

> You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumulated when you've got 12

> mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a pair

> of
> mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythm guitar, a stereo
> piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal with
> 3-4 part harmony vocals added.
>
> A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle it
> better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream 40
> tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I want
> to
> continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have been
> extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
> streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking just
> patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes.
> It's
> all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my
> UAD-1
> cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot.
> Very
> hig quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same mojo
> that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have
> 1073's, I will die.
>
> ;o)
>
>
>
>
> "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
>>
>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
>>
>> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
>> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
>> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
>> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
>> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
>> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
>> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
>> project, then" lol
>>
>> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
>> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
>> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
>>
>> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I

>> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
>> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?
>>
>> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
>> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
>>
>> No prob!
>>
>> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
>> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
>> >cross between mix B & C.
>>
>> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
>> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
>> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
>> the definiton & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
>> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
>> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
>> KILL. And I'd love it.
>>
>>
>> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
>> >similar and post it up.
>>
>> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
>> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
>> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>>
>> Neil
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 06:24:30 GMT

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

So you're not summing in Pulsar? I thought that's what you were going to do, so you could keep everything ITB, yet still have DSP summing?

Neil

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accummulated when you've got 12

>mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a pair of
>mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythm guitar, a stereo
>piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal with
>3-4 part harmony vocals added.
>
>A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle it
>better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream 40
>tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I want
to
>continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have been
>extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
>streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking just
>patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes. It's
>all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my UAD-1
>cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot. Very
>high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same mojo
>that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have
>1073's, I will die.
>
>;o)
>
>
>
>"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
>>
>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
>>
>> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
>> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
>> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
>> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
>> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
>> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
>> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
>> project, then" lol
>>
>> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
>> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
>> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
>>
>> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
>> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
>> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?

>>
>> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
>> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
>>
>> No prob!
>>
>> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
>> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
>> >cross between mix B & C.
>>
>> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
>> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
>> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
>> the definititon & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
>> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
>> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
>> KILL. And I'd love it.
>>
>>
>> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
>> >similar and post it up.
>>
>> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
>> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
>> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>>
>> Neil
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 06:26:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lucky boy...
My wife works for Opera Australia, so I get to see all the operas on tech
night or opening night, which is pretty cool.

--
Martin Harrington
www.lendanear-sound.com

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4557f074\$1@linux...

>
> FWIW, C is the softest starting out, A is the loudest and B is in the
> middle (according to my DB meter).
>

> That said, C also seems to be somewhat muffled compared to the other two.
> A feels like it's the most open.
>
> Keeping in mind that I just got back from the opera and I still have
> sopranos ringing in my ears (Magic Flute)...
>
> So lessee, how about:
>
> A - Stems
> B - SX
> C - Paris
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
> Neil wrote:
>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>> just mentioned):
>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>>
>> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>>
>>
>> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>>
>> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>> you like better?
>>
>> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 13:20:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am posting before reading the results after listening to A then B then C then A again on these cheap comp speakers I definately think A sounds different then both

B & C.

I dont know if better is the word.

However, A seems more upfront and rocking.

--

Thanks,

Brandon

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
news:45580de2@linux...

> Lucky boy...

> My wife works for Opera Australia, so I get to see all the operas on tech
> night or opening night, which is pretty cool.

> --

> Martin Harrington

> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4557f074\$1@linux...

>>

>> FWIW, C is the softest starting out, A is the loudest and B is in the
>> middle (according to my DB meter).

>>

>> That said, C also seems to be somewhat muffled compared to the other
two.

>> A feels like it's the most open.

>>

>> Keeping in mind that I just got back from the opera and I still have
>> sopranos ringing in my ears (Magic Flute)...

>>

>> So lessee, how about:

>>

>> A - Stems

>> B - SX

>> C - Paris

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>

>>

>>

>> Neil wrote:

>>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'

>>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another

> >> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> >> just mentioned):
> >>
> >>
http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipA.mp3
> >>
> >>
http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipB.mp3
> >>
> >>
http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipC.mp3
> >>
> >>
> >> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> >> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> >> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
> >>
> >> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> >> you like better?
> >>
> >> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 13:27:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I would like to listen to them on refs.
I definately heard that A was not as detailed
as the other two, but I liked it cause it suits the music
in my opinion. Someone said "raspy" earlier.
I think that is pretty accurate.
The other two seemed to have a blanket on top of them.
Interesting results.

--
Thanks,

Brandon

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:45586ee4@linux...
> I am posting before reading the results after listening
> to A then B then C then A again on these cheap

> comp speakers I definately think A sounds different then both
> B & C.
> I dont know if better is the word.
> However, A seems more upfront and rocking.
>
> --
> Thanks,
>
> Brandon
>
>
>
>
> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> news:45580de2@linux...
> > Lucky boy...
> > My wife works for Opera Australia, so I get to see all the operas on
> tech
> > night or opening night, which is pretty cool.
> > --
> > Martin Harrington
> > www.lendaneer-sound.com
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:4557f074\$1@linux...
> > >
> > > FWIW, C is the softest starting out, A is the loudest and B is in the
> > > middle (according to my DB meter).
> > >
> > > That said, C also seems to be somewhat muffled compared to the other
> > two.
> > > A feels like it's the most open.
> > >
> > > Keeping in mind that I just got back from the opera and I still have
> > > sopranos ringing in my ears (Magic Flute)...
> > >
> > > So lessee, how about:
> > >
> > > A - Stems
> > > B - SX
> > > C - Paris
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > -Jamie
> > > www.JamieKruz.com
> > >
> > >
> > >

> > > Neil wrote:
> > >> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
> > >> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
> > >> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
> > >> just mentioned):
> > >>
> > >>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
> > >>
> > >>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
> > >>
> > >>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
> > >> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
> > >> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
> > >>
> > >> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
> > >> you like better?
> > >>
> > >> Neil
> >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 14:51:54 GMT

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

DJ-

On the Pulsar web site, they make a big deal of their mixers being a significant upgrade on any of the other native DAW mixers...

"two of probably the most capable software mixers ever: the STM 48 S Surround Mixer and the 96-channel STM 4896 Recording Mixer."

FWIW

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>I'm going to try this as soon as my 3rd card gets here and another component
>that I've been waiting on. I've been summing a few mixes in Pulsar when
>doing the fader levels and pans in Cubase and I'm liking it a lot. I haven't
>done a *large* mix yet where I'm simply streaming mono tracks from Cubase
>through the Pulsar mixer and adjusting fader levels and pans in Pulsar.

|

>like to automate my faders and I'm going to have to figure out a way to
do

>this in Pulsar. There is a lot of midi functionality in the Scope mixer.

|

>haven't explored it yet. All indications are that fader and panning
>adjustments in the Scope mixer are the way to go. The Cubase mixer is just
>so **** efficient and convenient, I want to stay there.

>

>;o)

>

>

>

><OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4558018e\$1@linux...

>>

>> So you're not summing in Pulsar? I thought that's what you were
>> going to do, so you could keep everything ITB, yet still have
>> DSP summing?

>>

>> Neil

>>

>>

>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>> >You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumululated when you've got
12

>> >mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a
pair

>> of

>> >mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythym guitar, a stereo

>> >piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal

>> >with

>> >3-4 part harmony vocals added.

>> >

>> >A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle
it

>> >better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream
40

>> >tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I want

>> to

>> >continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have
been

>> >extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when

>> >streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking

>just
>> >patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes.
>It's
>> >all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my
>UAD-1
>> >cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot.
>Very
>> >high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same
>mojo
>> >that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have
>> >1073's, I will die.
>> >
>> >;o)
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>> >> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>> >> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>> >> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>> >> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
>> >>
>> >> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
>> >> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
>> >> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
>> >> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
>> >> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
>> >> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
>> >> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
>> >> project, then" lol
>> >>
>> >> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
>> >> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
>> >> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
>> >>
>> >> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
>> >> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
>> >> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?
>> >>
>> >> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
>> >> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
>> >>
>> >> No prob!
>> >>
>> >> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
>> >> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a

>> >> >cross between mix B & C.
>> >>
>> >> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
>> >> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
>> >> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
>> >> the definititon & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
>> >> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
>> >> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
>> >> KILL. And I'd love it.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
>> >> >similar and post it up.
>> >>
>> >> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
>> >> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
>> >> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>> >>
>> >> Neil
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 15:05:41 GMT

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

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>Mw wish...
>the 500 HZ & below portion of Mix "C", and everything from that
>point upwards from mix "B".
>
>And the answers are:
>
>Mix "A" is the straight-ahead Native 2-Buss version.
>
>Mix "B" is the Native Stems version.
>
>Mix "C" is the Summed-in-Paris version.
>
>
>Neil

>

Neil-

Thanks so much for posting this, it's really helpful.
One of the things I've heard repeated often over the years here is the need to mix Paris projects differently (like any piece of gear, play to its strengths). Specifically the highs need more presence.

Naive question but adding a few dbs and a stereo spreader in the treble would go a certain way towards granting your wish of combining the lows of C with the highs of B, wouldn't it?
Mixing stems in Paris might be a good way to attack this...

Ted

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Nil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 15:37:14 GMT

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

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>

>"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>>Mw wish...

>>the 500 HZ & below portion of Mix "C", and everything from that

>>point upwards from mix "B".

>>

>>And the answers are:

>>

>>Mix "A" is the straight-ahead Native 2-Buss version.

>>

>>Mix "B" is the Native Stems version.

>>

>>Mix "C" is the Summed-in-Paris version.

>>

>>

>>Neil

>>

>

>Neil-

>

>Thanks so much for posting this, it's really helpful.

>One of the things I've heard repeated often over the years here is the

>need to mix Paris projects differently (like any piece of gear, play to its

>

>strengths). Specifically the highs need more presence.
>
>Naive question but adding a few dbs and a stereo spreader
>in the treble would go a certain way towards granting your wish of
>combiningg the lows of C with the highs of B, wouldn't it?
>Mixing stems in Paris might be a good way to attack this...

Ted, it could be (the way to deal with it), but I wanted to try & make this comparison as much about summing as possible, in a fair manner - although Paris did have an advantage in that I didn't have to dither down to the 44.1/16 2-buss wav file therein. I did this both for my own curiosity - as I'm looking for the best solution, too - as well as doing it for you guys so that I could demonstrate that:

1.) The whole "collapsed soundfield" thing in Native is not necessarily a given... none of the three clips have a major difference between them in either the stereo spread or imaging. There are some slight differences, yes - as one would expect... I think we'd all be shocked as hell if there WEREN'T some differences; and 2.) as I also have mentioned in past threads, running several stems out, then reimporting into a new project reinforces the imaging & soundstage, and also preserves more subtleties.

If had EQ'ed the Paris stuff any differently, it wouldn't have been as accurate of a comparison for the purposes of this test. Having said that, maybe that'll be the next step! Like I said, I'm looking for the "right stuff" for my own benefit as well... it's not as if I just went out & repurchased some Paris gear just in order to get you guys to drink my Native Kool-aid. :)

So maybe the next step should be:

1.) A clip of the Paris-Summing, but with some EQ applied (in Paris at the time of creating the 2-channel mix itself); trying to match as closely as possible the upper mids & highs of clip "B" (the Native Stems mix).

2.) A clip of the Native Stems themselves imported into Paris (like someone asked about); but since the stems are at 88.1k I'm not sure if I should samplerate convert them using dither or do it with no dither.

Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 15:55:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>
>Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>
>
>They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
>Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>you like better?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 16:00:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I thought C was best, then B..A was kind of irritating ...harsh.
I listened on Mackie 824's through wavelab.

Rod

"Neil" <IOU@OIUOI.com> wrote:

>
>Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>just mentioned):
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipA.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipB.mp3>
>
> <http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experiment%20ClipC.mp3>
>

>
>They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of
>instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then
>background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.
>
>Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do
>you like better?
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments&
also the answers

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 17:21:14 GMT

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

And for those who preferred the sound of C but mix in Cubase, perhaps rolling off some of the high end on the output with a phase coherent mastering EQ could approach a similar sound.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Ted Gerber wrote:

> "Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>
>> Mw wish...
>> the 500 HZ & below portion of Mix "C", and everything from that
>> point upwards from mix "B".

>>
>> And the answers are:
>>
>> Mix "A" is the straight-ahead Native 2-Buss version.

>>
>> Mix "B" is the Native Stems version.

>>
>> Mix "C" is the Summed-in-Paris version.

>>
>>
>> Neil

>>
>
> Neil-
>
> Thanks so much for posting this, it's really helpful.
> One of the things I've heard repeated often over the years here is the

> need to mix Paris projects differently (like any piece of gear, play to its
> strengths). Specifically the highs need more presence.
>
> Naive question but adding a few dbs and a stereo spreader
> in the treble would go a certain way towards granting your wish of
> combiningg the lows of C with the highs of B, wouldn't it?
> Mixing stems in Paris might be a good way to attack this...
>
> Ted

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [rick](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 19:51:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

john was also a fussy eater as a boy so it's best not to mollycoddle
him too much.

On 14 Nov 2006 06:20:33 +1000, "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>
>Sure, I could do wav's for those short clips, I suppose.
>
>I'm using 320k mp3's for these though, not 128's... that's
>pretty high-resolution.
>
>Neil
>
>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>Can't you all post short wav files instead of mp3's? When I see mp3 I don't
>>even want to listen. Seriously? Is there some lossless mp3 format that
>>you all are using?

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 20:14:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Can't you all post short wav files instead of mp3's? When I see mp3 I don't
even want to listen. Seriously? Is there some lossless mp3 format that
you all are using?

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 20:20:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sure, I could do wav's for those short clips, I suppose.

I'm using 320k mp3's for these though, not 128's... that's pretty high-resolution.

Neil

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Can't you all post short wav files instead of mp3's? When I see mp3 I don't
>even want to listen. Seriously? Is there some lossless mp3 format that
>you all are using?

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 21:25:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Keep It Simple Stupid.....

;>)

--

Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45589786@linux...

> KISS???.....not sure what this means but if it refers to simplifying
> things/using fewer of any particular device(s).....I wouldn't have a clue.

>

> ;)

>

>

> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> news:45580ce0\$1@linux...

>> Deej, I guess you don't subscribe to the KISS principal, huh?

>> --

>> Martin Harrington
>> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>>

>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45580005\$1@linux...

>> > You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumulated when you've got
> 12

>> > mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a

> pair
>> > of
>> > mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythm guitar, a stereo
>> > piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal
> with
>> > 3-4 part harmony vocals added.
>> >
>> > A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle it
>> > better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to stream
> 40
>> > tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I
>> > want
>> > to
>> > continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have
> been
>> > extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
>> > streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking
> just
>> > patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different submixes.
>> > It's
>> > all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my
>> > UAD-1
>> > cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a lot.
>> > Very
>> > high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same
> mojo
>> > that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't have
>> > 1073's, I will die.
>> >
>> > ;o)
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>> >> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>> >> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>> >> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>> >> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
>> >>
>> >> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
>> >> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
>> >> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
>> >> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
>> >> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
>> >> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
>> >> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one

>> >> project, then" lol
>> >>
>> >> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
>> >> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
>> >> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
>> >>
>> >> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
>> >> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
>> >> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?
>> >>
>> >> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
>> >> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
>> >>
>> >> No prob!
>> >>
>> >> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
>> >> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
>> >> >cross between mix B & C.
>> >>
>> >> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
>> >> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
>> >> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
>> >> the definititon & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
>> >> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
>> >> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
>> >> KILL. And I'd love it.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
>> >> >similar and post it up.
>> >>
>> >> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
>> >> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
>> >> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>> >>
>> >> Neil
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 22:45:13 GMT

Nice! Sounds like you're pretty lucky yourself, Martin.

My wife is a classically trained singing teacher. She also teaches speaking voice and dialects so we see a lot of theater performances. I'm not complaining. :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Martin Harrington wrote:

> Lucky boy...
> My wife works for Opera Australia, so I get to see all the operas on tech
> night or opening night, which is pretty cool.

<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4557f074\$1@linux...

>>
>> FWIW, C is the softest starting out, A is the loudest and B is in the
>> middle (according to my DB meter).

>>
>> That said, C also seems to be somewhat muffled compared to the
other two.

>> A feels like it's the most open.

>>
>> Keeping in mind that I just got back from the opera and I still have
>> sopranos ringing in my ears (Magic Flute)...

>>
>> So lessee, how about:

>>
>> A - Stems

>> B - SX

>> C - Paris

>>
>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> www.JamieKrutz.com

>>

>>

>>

>> Neil wrote:

>>> Three files total... one's a 'Mixed in SX, Summed in Paris'
>>> mix, another is a straight-ahead SX 2-Buss Mix, and another
>>> is an SX Stems Mix (note: NOT necessarily in the order I
>>> just mentioned):

>>>>

>>>>

[http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipA.mp3](http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen%20ClipA.mp3)

>> >>

>> >>

[http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipB.mp3](http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen%20ClipB.mp3)

>> >>

>> >>

[http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen t%20ClipC.mp3](http://www.saqqararecords.com/Music/Neil/Summing%20Experimen%20ClipC.mp3)

>> >>

>> >>

>> >> They're fairly short... 1:14 each, just enough to get a touch of

>> >> instrumentation by itself, a portion with lead vox, then

>> >> background vox. They're Hi-Rez mp3's.

>> >>

>> >> Any guesses as to which is which? Or better yet, which one do

>> >> you like better?

>> >>

>> >> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 23:48:03 GMT

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

I just had a pastrami and swiss with horseradish and then some chocolate ice cream and have apple cider for my beverage. Is that odd? hehe

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:

>john was also a fussy eater as a boy so it's best not to mollycoddle

>him too much.

>

>

>

>On 14 Nov 2006 06:20:33 +1000, "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>>

>>Sure, I could do wav's for those short clips, I suppose.

>>

>>I'm using 320k mp3's for these though, not 128's... that's

>>pretty high-resolution.

>>

>>Neil

>>

>>

>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>Can't you all post short wav files instead of mp3's? When I see mp3 I don't

>>>even want to listen. Seriously? Is there some lossless mp3 format that

>>>you all are using?

>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [DJ](#) on Mon, 13 Nov 2006 23:57:43 GMT

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

I tried.....it's impossible.

;o)

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message

news:4558e077\$1@linux...

> Keep It Simple Stupid.....

> ;>)

> --

> Martin Harrington

> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>

> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45589786@linux...

> > KISS???.....not sure what this means but if it refers to simplifying

> > things/using fewer of any particular device(s).....I wouldn't have a clue.

> >

> > ;)

> >

> >

> > "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message

> > news:45580ce0\$1@linux...

> >> Deej, I guess you don't subscribe to the KISS principal, huh?

> >> --

> >> Martin Harrington

> >> www.lendaneer-sound.com

> >>

> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45580005\$1@linux...

> >> > You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accumulated when you've got

> > > 12

> >> > mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one, a

> > pair

> >> > of

> >> > mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythm guitar, a stereo

> >> > piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal

> > with

> >> > 3-4 part harmony vocals added.
> >> >
> >> > A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle
it
> >> > better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to
stream
> > > 40
> >> > tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route I
> >> > want
> >> > to
> >> > continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have
> > > been
> >> > extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
> >> > streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking
> > > just
> >> > patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different
submixes.
> >> > It's
> >> > all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using my
> >> > UAD-1
> >> > cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a
lot.
> >> > Very
> >> > high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the same
> > > mojo
> >> > that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't
have
> >> > 1073's, I will die.
> >> >
> >> > ;o)
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
> >> >>
> >> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
> >> >> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
> >> >> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
> >> >> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
> >> >> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
> >> >>
> >> >> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
> >> >> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
> >> >> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
> >> >> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
> >> >> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
> >> >> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
> >> >> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 01:33:33 GMT

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

Yes-

I agree. The test you did was an excellent one to answer a specific question. My comment was moving towards next step considerations. I too have been wrestling with the Q of Native in addition to or instead of Paris, although I think I like the character of Logic better than Nuendo (? hate to take a stand on this).

I know that if I take tracking/mixing drums out of the equation (I seem to suck at this) I can achieve good results with Paris.

I have a good friend North of Toronto whose been recording for 30 years. He went to Pro Tools when he went digital, but 2 years ago outfitted his studio with a CuB-SX rig. He (by his own admission) has not been able to get the sound out of that rig that I have been able to get out of Paris.

3 years ago I was playing with a Presonus MP 20. I tested it by plugging in a Taylor 312-ce _direct_ and then did some soloing with an American standard Strat, also plugged _directly_ in and added a little verb from an M3000. The next week I was at another friends studio who had just installed a big Neve purchased from Ocean Way. I played what I had tracked in Paris, and one of the main engineers walked in during it and immediately began to crow about their new Neve and "doesn't it sound great and when did we track this and who is this anyway?"

So any switch I make will be driven by MIDI needs and a desire to use some plugs -thinking of Duende- that I can't use with Paris. In the end, I suspect I'll put up with the workaround hassles and use both Paris and Native to get what I want.

Thanks again for your shared expertise and enthusiasm.

Peace,

Ted

>If had EQ'ed the Paris stuff any differently, it wouldn't have
>been as accurate of a comparison for the purposes of this test.
>Having said that, maybe that'll be the next step! Like I said,
>I'm looking for the "right stuff" for my own benefit as
>well... it's not as if I just went out & repurchased some
>Paris gear just in order to get you guys to drink my Native
>Kool-aid. :)
>
>So maybe the next step should be:
>
>1.) A clip of the Paris-Summing, but with some EQ applied (in
>Paris at the time of creating the 2-channel mix itself); trying
>to match as closely as possible the upper mids & highs of
>clip "B" (the Native Stems mix).
>
>2.) A clip of the Native Stems themselves imported into Paris
>(like someone asked about); but since the stems are at 88.1k
>I'm not sure if I should samplerate convert them using dither
>or do it with no dither.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [neil\[1\]](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 04:23:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
>I just had a pastrami and swiss with horseradish and then some chocolate
ice
>cream and have apple cider for my beverage. Is that odd? hehe

Just the apple cider part.

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 10:23:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i'm bettin' hard cider.

On 14 Nov 2006 14:23:27 +1000, "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>I just had a pastrami and swiss with horseradish and then some chocolate
>ice
>>cream and have apple cider for my beverage. Is that odd? hehe
>
>Just the apple cider part.

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 16:28:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I wish !

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>i'm bettin' hard cider.
>
>
>
>On 14 Nov 2006 14:23:27 +1000, "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I just had a pastrami and swiss with horseradish and then some chocolate
>>ice
>>>cream and have apple cider for my beverage. Is that odd? hehe
>>
>>Just the apple cider part.
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments &
also the answers
Posted by [DJ](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 16:38:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yesssss!!!!!!

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4559e54b\$1@linux...
>
> Yes, instead of "KISS" DeeJ subscribes to the "KICC" formula
> (Keep It Convolutd & Complicated)
>

> :)
>
>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
> >I tried.....it's impossible.
> >
> >;o)
> >
> >"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> >news:4558e077\$1@linux...
> >> Keep It Simple Stupid.....
> >> ;>
> >> --
> >> Martin Harrington
> >> www.lendaneer-sound.com
> >>
> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45589786@linux...
> >>> > KISS???.....not sure what this means but if it refers to
> >> >simplifying
> >>> > things/using fewer of any particular device(s).....I wouldn't have a
> >>> >clue.
> >>> >
> >>> > ;)
> >>> >
> >>> >
> >>> > "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> >>> > news:45580ce0\$1@linux...
> >>>> > DeeJ, I guess you don't subscribe to the KISS principal, huh?
> >>>> > --
> >>>> > Martin Harrington
> >>>> > www.lendaneer-sound.com
> >>>> >
> >>>> > "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45580005\$1@linux...
> >>>>> > You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accummulated when you've
> >>>>> >got
> >>>>> > 12
> >>>>>> > mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one,
> > > a
> >>>>> > pair
> >>>>>> > of
> >>>>>> > mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythym guitar, a
> > >stereo
> >>>>>> > piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead
> >>>>>> >vocal
> >>>>> >with
> >>>>>> > 3-4 part harmony vocals added.
> >>>>>>> >
> >>>>>>> > A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to

handle
> >it
> >> >> > better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to
> >stream
> >> > 40
> >> >> > tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route
> I
> >> >> > want
> >> >> > to
> >> >> > continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards
have
> >> > been
> >> >> > extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability
when
> >> >> > streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also
liking
> >> > just
> >> >> > patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different
> >submixes.
> >> >> > It's
> >> >> > all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using
> my
> >> >> > UAD-1
> >> >> > cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a
> >lot.
> >> >> > Very
> >> >> > high quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the
> >same
> >> > mojo
> >> >> > that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't
> >have
> >> >> > 1073's, I will die.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > ;o)
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
> >> >> >> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
> >> >> >> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
> >> >> >> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
> >> >> >> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
> >> >> >> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
> >> >> >> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff

> >>
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted! - OK, here's my assessments & also the answers

Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 16:48:27 GMT

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

Yes, instead of "KISS" DeeJ subscribes to the "KICC" formula
(Keep It Convolutd & Complicated)

:)

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>I tried.....it's impossible.

>

>;o)

>

>"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message

>news:4558e077\$1@linux...

>> Keep It Simple Stupid.....

>> ;>)

>> --

>> Martin Harrington

>> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>>

>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45589786@linux...

>> > KISS???.....not sure what this means but if it refers to

>> simplifying

>> > things/using fewer of any particular device(s).....I wouldn't have a

>> clue.

>> >

>> > ;)

>> >

>> >

>> > "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message

>> > news:45580ce0\$1@linux...

>> >> DeeJ, I guess you don't subscribe to the KISS principal, huh?

>> >> --

>> >> Martin Harrington

>> >> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>> >>

>> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:45580005\$1@linux...

>> >> > You'd be surprised how many tracks can be accummulated when you've

>got
>> > 12
>> >> > mics on a drum kit, three fiddles with a pair of mics on each one,
a
>> > pair
>> >> > of
>> >> > mics on a bass amp and a DI, a pair of mics on rythym guitar, a
>stereo
>> >> > piano, a mono mic on lead guitar, dobro and mandolin and a lead vocal
>> > with
>> >> > 3-4 part harmony vocals added.
>> >> >
>> >> > A mix like this can get pretty busy and muddy. Paris seems to handle
>it
>> >> > better than Cubase ITB. the three cards are so I can be able to
>stream
>> > 40
>> >> > tracks via ADAT from Cubase to Paris if I decide that's the route
I
>> >> > want
>> >> > to
>> >> > continue to take once the dust clears. So far, the Pulsar cards have
>> > been
>> >> > extremely stable. I'm hoping to continue that kind of stability when
>> >> > streaming 40 tracks from Cubase to Paris for summing. I'm also liking
>> > just
>> >> > patching Creamware processors into Paris tracks on different
>submixes.
>> >> > It's
>> >> > all DSP based/zero audible latency at that point but I'm not using
my
>> >> > UAD-1
>> >> > cards. Still, the Creamware DSP based hardware is impressing me a
>lot.
>> >> > Very
>> >> > hig quality. If I can find some Pulsar EQ's that can give me the
same
>> > mojo
>> >> > that the UAD 1073 does, I'm going to be a happy camper. If I don't
>have
>> >> > 1073's, I will die.
>> >> >
>> >> > ;o)
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4557fb52\$1@linux...
>> >> >>

>> >> >> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>> >> >> >Well ****!!! Man.....I was *really* hoping that Mix C was
>> >> >> >the native mix. The way the vocal sat in the mix was a dead
>> >> >> >giveaway but I was soooooo hoping that C was the native ITB
>> >> >> >mix. You don't know how much. ;o)
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I know, the whole "two-computer" thing is a clusterfuck, no
>> >> >> matter what... just this somewhat simple experiment took me
>> >> >> quite awhile to set up, and then youre dealing with stuff
>> >> >> like: "OK, so I have to monitor through Paris for the analog
>> >> >> summing part, but then what do I do with the other mixes?
>> >> >> Repatch my monitors? Re-route through my VST outputs? OK, so
>> >> >> I guess I'll just save three different versions of this one
>> >> >> project, then" lol
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >I think you would have a bit more detail and depth to the
>> >> >> >soundstage on mix C if you were streaming the tracks over ADAT
>> >> >> >into Paris rather than the AD/DA conversion
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Can't do it... Even if I had a couple of Paris ADAT cards, I
>> >> >> couldn't do it... how would I get from my 88.2k samplerate
>> >> >> coming out of my ADAT outs, to the 44.1k Paris ADAT protocol?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Thanks for taking the time to do this test Neil. Guess my ears
>> >> >> >haven't been playing tricks on me recently.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> No prob!
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >I think you may have a nice surprise when you get the Pulsar
>> >> >> >card. I think you're going to have something closer to a
>> >> >> >cross between mix B & C.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> That would RAWK - seriously! To be able to have the phase-
>> >> >> coherence of staying 2-track ITB all the way through, yet
>> >> >> getting better summing out of the whole deal, while retaining
>> >> >> the definititon & clarity up top (again, listen to mix "B"
>> >> >> guys... that's just an MP3 file and even at that resolution
>> >> >> you can STILL hear what 88.2k can do for you!) - that would
>> >> >> KILL. And I'd love it.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Once my 3rd card comes in, I'll get around to doing something
>> >> >> >similar and post it up.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Why do you need three cards? What the hell are you doing with
>> >> >> that bluegrass stuff you've been recording... turning it into
>> >> >> a damn 60-track symphony? POST SOME CLIPS NOW! lol
>> >> >>

>> >> >> Neil
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 19:14:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the sugarplum chic is on her way for the sc>hc conversion.

On 15 Nov 2006 02:28:44 +1000, "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
>I wish !
>
>rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>i'm bettin' hard cider.
>>
>>
>>
>>On 14 Nov 2006 14:23:27 +1000, "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I just had a pastrami and swiss with horseradish and then some chocolate
>>>>ice
>>>>cream and have apple cider for my beverage. Is that odd? hehe
>>>
>>>Just the apple cider part.
>>

Subject: Re: Summing Comparison Files Posted!
Posted by [DJ](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2006 19:21:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>news:v95kl21i9pdeqtsad1hb26sk8fck0mvoes@4ax.com...
>> the sugarplum chic is on her way for the sc>hc conversion.
>>
>> On 15 Nov 2006 02:28:44 +1000, "John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >I wish !
>> >
>> >rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>> >>i'm bettin' hard cider.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>On 14 Nov 2006 14:23:27 +1000, "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>
>> >>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>> >>>>
>> >>>>I just had a pastrami and swiss with horseradish and then some
>> >>>>chocolate
>> >>>>ice
>> >>>>cream and have apple cider for my beverage. Is that odd? hehe
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Just the apple cider part.
>> >>
>>
>
