
Subject: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 14:39:49 GMT

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

Hi,

i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch and clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these effects on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??

It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?

regards,

Dimitrios

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 14:56:18 GMT

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

I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar). Mine has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode, or something more colored.

Deej

"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

>

> Hi,

>

>

> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch

> and

> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

> effects

> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??

> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?

> regards,

> Dimitrios

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:08:44 GMT

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

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek

>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar). Mine

>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might

>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode, or

>something more colored.

>

>Deej

>

>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message

>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hi,

>>

>>

>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch

>> and

>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

>> effects

>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??

>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?

>> regards,

>> Dimitrios

>

>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:08:45 GMT

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

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek

>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar). Mine

>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might

>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode, or

>something more colored.

>

>Deej
>
>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>
>> Hi,
>>
>>
>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch

>> and
>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

>> effects
>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>> regards,
>> Dimitrios
>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:13:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SORRY for double empty posts !

DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money will be enough !!
What I really want to know is the following.
I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary DA.
After [putting the mytek immediately there was a tremendous change in sound, sparkle lack of high frequency distortion defined low end and wider stereo field.
He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I said hmmm not quite.
So after a long debate there I thought that these changes could get RECORDED !
Isn't that so ?
If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't the soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
That's a serious one here !
Cheers,
Dimitrios

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:

>
>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek
>
>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar). Mine
>
>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might
>
>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
or
>
>>something more colored.
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Hi,
>>>
>>>
>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch
>
>>> and
>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these
>
>>> effects
>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>> regards,
>>> Dimitrios
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:42:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has one of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from a system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious. Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night and day.

Deej

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
>
> SORRY for double empty posts !
>
> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
> will
> be enough !!
> What I really want to know is the following.
> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
> DA.
> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
> sound,
> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
> field.
> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
> RECORDED
> !
> Isn't that so ?
> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't the
> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
> Thats a serious one here !
> Cheers,
> Dimitrios
>
> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>
>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek
>>
>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar). Mine
>>
>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might
>>
>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
> or
>>
>>>something more colored.
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Hi,
>>>>
>>>>

>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch
>>
>>>> and
>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these
>>
>>>> effects
>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>> regards,
>>>> Dimitrios
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:44:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thad,

I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks anything it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful lil' thang.

;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:467bee5d\$1@linux...

>
> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The
> sounds
> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe, no
> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're just
> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they go
> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what
> you're
> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The AD
> turns
> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly you
> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your
> fancy
> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured by
> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
> conditions.
>
>
> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did

> through
> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
>
> TCB
>
> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
>>
>>SORRY for double empty posts !
>>
>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
> will
>>be enough !!
>>What I really want to know is the following.
>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
>>DA.
>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
>>sound,
>>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
>>field.
>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
>>RECORDED
>>!
>>Isn't that so ?
>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't the
>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>>Thats a serious one here !
>>Cheers,
>>Dimitrios
>>
>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>>
>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
>>>>Mytek
>>>>
>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
>>>>Mine
>>>>
>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might
>>>>
>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
>>or
>>>>
>>>>something more colored.
>>>>
>>>>Deej

>>>>
>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds
>>>>> punch
>>>>
>>>>> and
>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these
>>>>
>>>>> effects
>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>> regards,
>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:44:29 GMT

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

OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The sounds start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe, no opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're just a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they go to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what you're suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The AD turns the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly you will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your fancy DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured by the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these conditions.

So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did through the RME when you play it back through the RME again.

TCB

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:

>

>SORRY for double empty posts !

>

>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money will

>be enough !!

>What I really want to know is the following.

>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary

>DA.

>After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in sound,

>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo

>field.

>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.

>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get RECORDED

>!

>Isn't that so ?

>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif

>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't the

>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??

>Thats a serious one here !

>Cheers,

>Dimitrios

>

>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:

>>

>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek

>>

>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar). Mine

>>

>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might

>>

>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,

>or

>>

>>>something more colored.

>>>

>>>Deej

>>>

>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message

>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

>>>>

>>>> Hi,

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stero field adds punch

>>

>>>> and

>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

>>
>>>> effects
>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>> regards,
>>>> Dimitrios
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 15:56:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But you know you can't record clock. If you did what Dimitrios is talking about and then attached a crap DA and played back the file you looped through the Benchmark it would still sound like crap.

TCB

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Thad,

>

>I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks anything

>it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful

lil'

>thang.

>

>;o)

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message [news:467bee5d\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:467bee5d$1@linux...)

>>

>> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The

>> sounds

>> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe,
no

>> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're just

>> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they
go

>> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what

>> you're

>> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The AD

>> turns

>> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly

you
 >> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your

>> fancy
 >> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured
 by
 >> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
 >> conditions.
 >>
 >>
 >> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did

>> through
 >> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
 >>
 >> TCB
 >>
 >> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
 >>>
 >>>SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>
 >>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
 >> will
 >>>be enouph !!
 >>>What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
 >>>DA.
 >>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was \tremendous change in

>>>sound,
 >>>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
 >>>field.
 >>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
 >>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
 >>>RECORDED
 >>>!
 >>>Isn't that so ?
 >>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
 >>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 the
 >>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>Thats a serious one here !
 >>>Cheers,
 >>>Dimitrios
 >>>
 >>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>
 >>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to

>>>>>Mytek

>>>>

>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).

>>>>>Mine

>>>>

>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might

>>>>

>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,

>>>or

>>>>

>>>>>something more colored.

>>>>>

>>>>>Deej

>>>>>

>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message

>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Hi,

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds

>>>>> punch

>>>>

>>>>> and

>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

➤➤➤➤

>>>>> effects

>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??

>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?

>>>>> regards,

>>>>> Dimitrios

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

 ∇ $\vee$

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:00:18 GMT

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

But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-free clock, as well.

IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like when you play it back on another system, for example. This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record the 2-mix to.

Neil

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has one

>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from a

>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.

>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night and

>day.

>

>Deej

>

>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message [news:467be722\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:467be722$1@linux...)

>>

>> SORRY for double empty posts !

>>

>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money

>> will

>> be enough !!

>> What I really want to know is the following.

>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary

>> DA.

>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was rltremendous change in

>> sound,

>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo

>> field.

>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.

>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get

>> RECORDED

>> !

>> Isn't that so ?
>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
the
>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>> Thats a serious one here !
>> Cheers,
>> Dimitrios
>>
>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>>
>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek
>>>>
>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
Mine
>>>>
>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might
>>>>
>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
>> or
>>>>
>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>
>>>>>Deej
>>>>>
>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stero field adds punch
>>>>
>>>>> and
>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these
>>>>
>>>>> effects
>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>> regards,
>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:02:59 GMT

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

Dear TCB,

Back to the future thing...

The Mytek DA is doing something great to the sound that COMES out from the analog outputs , right ?

Thats why we can hear this on any analog medium like my powered monitors.

So lets say we record these Mytek's analog outs to another medium that might be an analog tape machine or another digital device with great AD converters like say Mytek, ok ?

NOW lets record RME's outputs playing the same file which sound small and distorted compared to the other and record this on same medium .

Isn't obvious that these two files will be totally different and the first

"myteked file will have at least 90% of what we were hearing from mytek's out while "RME" file will be like rme was in the first place ?

I am very very curious if we get something here !!!

Regards,

Dimitrios

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The sounds

>start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe, no

>opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're just

>a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they go

>to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what you're

>suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The AD

turns

>the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly you

>will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your fancy

>DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured by

>the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these conditions.

>

>

>So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did through

>the RME when you play it back through the RME again.

>

>TCB

>

>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:

>>

>>SORRY for double empty posts !

>>

>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money

>will

>>be enough !!

>>What I really want to know is the following.

>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary

>>DA.

>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in sound,

>>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo

>>field.

>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hhmm not quite.

>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get RECORDED

>>!

>>Isn't that so ?

>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif

>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't the

>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??

>>Thats a serious one here !

>>Cheers,

>>Dimitrios

>>

>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:

>>>

>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to Mytek

>>>>

>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).

Mine

>>>>

>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might

>>>>

>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,

>>or

>>>>

>>>>something more colored.

>>>>

>>>>Deej

>>>>

>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message

>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

>>>>>

>>>>> Hi,

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stero field adds punch

>>>>>

>>>>> and

>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

>>>>>

>>>>> effects

>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??

>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>> regards,
>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:07:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Neil (TCB and DJ and others)
I am not just rendering the file !!
I Am RECORDING the analog outputs of the DA which we were hearing !!
Regards,
Dimitrios

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

>
>But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down
>stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file
>is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-
>free clock, as well.
>
>IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not
>making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like
>when you play it back on another system, for example.
>This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out
>of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record
>the 2-mix to.

>
>Neil

>
>

>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has
one
>
>>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from
a
>
>>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.
>
>>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night
>and

>>day.
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>
>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
>
>>> will
>>> be enough !!
>>> What I really want to know is the following.
>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
>>> DA.
>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
>
>>> sound,
>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
>>> field.
>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get

>>> RECORDED
>>> !
>>> Isn't that so ?
>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
>the
>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>>> Thats a serious one here !
>>> Cheers,
>>> Dimitrios
>>>
>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
Mytek
>>>>
>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
>Mine
>>>>
>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You might
>>>>
>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
>>> or
>>>>

>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>
>>>>>Deej
>>>>>
>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds
punch
>>>>
>>>>> and
>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these
>>>>
>>>>> effects
>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>> regards,
>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:14:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Correct...you would have to be recording through the D/A to something like a
Masterlink, but dimitrios' converter has a BNC clock out (it's an AD/DA and
so he should be able to clock the whole system with this.

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf212\$1@linux...
>
> But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down
> stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file
> is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-
> free clock, as well.
>
> IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not
> making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like

> when you play it back on another system, for example.
> This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out
> of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record
> the 2-mix to.
>
> Neil
>
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has one
>
>>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from a
>
>>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.
>
>>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night
> and
>>day.
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message [news:467be722\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:467be722$1@linux...)
>>>
>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>
>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
>
>>> will
>>> be enough !!
>>> What I really want to know is the following.
>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
>>> primary
>>> DA.
>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
>
>>> sound,
>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
>>> field.
>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
>>> RECORDED
>>> !
>>> Isn't that so ?
>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
> the
>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>>> Thats a serious one here !

```
>>> Cheers,  
>>> Dimitrios  
>>>  
>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:  
>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to  
>>>>>Mytek  
>>>>  
>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).  
> Mine  
>>>>  
>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You  
>>>>>might  
>>>>  
>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,  
>>> or  
>>>>  
>>>>>something more colored.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Deej  
>>>>>  
>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message  
>>>>>news:467bdf35$1@linux...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Hi,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds  
>>>>>> punch  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> and  
>>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE  
>>>>>> these  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> effects  
>>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??  
>>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?  
>>>>>> regards,  
>>>>>> Dimitrios  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>
```

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:16:33 GMT

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

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message news:467bf2b3\$1@linux...

>

> Dear TCB,

> Back to the future thing...

> The Mytek DA is doing something great to the sound that COMES out from the

> analog outputs , right ?

Yes.

> That's why we can hear this on any analog medium like my powered monitors.

> So let's say we record these Mytek's analog outputs to another medium that

> might

> be an analog tape machine or another digital device with great AD

> converters

> like say Mytek, ok ?

Yes.

> NOW let's record RME's outputs playing the same file which sound small and

> distorted compared to the other and record this on same medium .

> Isn't obvious that these two files will be totally different and the first

> "myteked" file will have at least 90% of what we were hearing from Mytek's

> output while "RME" file will be like RME was in the first place ?

> I am very very curious if we get something here !!!

> Regards,

> Dimitrios

You are correct.

>

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The

>>sounds

>>start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe, no

>>opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're just

>>a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they go

>>to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what

>>you're

>>suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The AD

> turns

>>the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly you

>>will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your

> fancy

>>DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured

> by
 >>the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
 >>conditions.
 >>
 >>
 >>So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did
 >>through
 >>the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
 >>
 >>TCB
 >>
 >>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
 >>>
 >>>SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>
 >>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
 >>will
 >>>be enough !!
 >>>What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
 >>>DA.
 >>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was a tremendous change in
 >>>sound,
 >>>sparkle lack of high frequency distortion defined low end and wider stereo
 >>>field.
 >>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I said hmmm not quite.
 >>>So after a long debate there I thought that these changes could get
 >>>RECORDED
 >>>!
 >>>Isn't that so ?
 >>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
 >>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't the
 >>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>That's a serious one here !
 >>>Cheers,
 >>>Dimitrios
 >>>
 >>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>
 >>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
 >>>>>Mytek
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 > Mine
 >>>>
 >>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
 >>>>>might

>>>>
>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
>>>or
>>>>
>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>
>>>>>Deej
>>>>>
>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds
>>>>>> punch
>>>>>
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE
>>>>>> these
>>>>>
>>>>>> effects
>>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>>> regards,
>>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:18:15 GMT

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

Dear TCB,

If I record this to an analog two tape machine using the Mytek's DA and connect then tape's out to the same monitors won't I hear the "better" mix ?

Regards,

Dimitrios

"TCB " <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>But you know you can't record clock. If you did what Dimitrios is talking

>about and then attached a crap DA and played back the file you looped through

>the Benchmark it would still sound like crap.
>
>TCB
>
>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>Thad,
>>
>>I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks anything
>
>>it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful
>lil'
>>thang.
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:467bee5d\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The

>>> sounds
>>> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe,
>no
>>> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're
just
>>> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they
>go
>>> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what

>>> you're
>>> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The
AD
>
>>> turns
>>> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly
>you
>>> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your
>
>>> fancy
>>> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured
>by
>>> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
>>> conditions.
>>>
>>>
>>> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did
>
>>> through
>>> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.

>>>
 >>> TCB
 >>>
 >>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
 >>>>
 >>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>>
 >>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
 >>> will
 >>>> be enough !!
 >>>> What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
 >>>> DA.
 >>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
 >
 >>>> sound,
 >>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
 >>>> field.
 >>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
 >>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get

 >>>> RECORDED
 >>>> !
 >>>> Isn't that so ?
 >>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
 >>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >the
 >>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>> Thats a serious one here !
 >>>> Cheers,
 >>>> Dimitrios
 >>>>
 >>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>> I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
 >
 >>>>>> Mytek
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 >
 >>>>>> Mine
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
 might
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
 >>>>>> or

>>>>>
>>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Deej
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds
>
>>>>>>> punch
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE
these
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> effects
>>>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>>>> regards,
>>>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:23:48 GMT

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

Right.

;o)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf844\$1@linux...

>

> Then yes, based on your post & his last one before it, he would

> indeed be recording the "better (jitter-free) mix to the 2-track

> tape. IOW, in this connection/routing scenario, it would be the

> same mix as he would be hearing over the speakers.

>
> Neil
>
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>Correct...you would have to be recording through the D/A to somethihnglike
> a
>>Masterlink, but dimitrios' converter has a BNC clock out (it's an AD/DA
> and
>>so he should be able to clock the whole system with this.
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf212\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down
>>> stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file
>>> is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-
>>> free clock, as well.
>>>
>>> IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not
>>> making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like
>>> when you play it back on another system, for example.
>>> This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out
>>> of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record
>>> the 2-mix to.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has
> one
>>>
>>>>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from
> a
>>>
>>>>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.
>>>
>>>>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night
>>> and
>>>>day.
>>>>
>>>>Deej
>>>>
>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>>>

>>>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when
 >>>>> money
 >>>>>
 >>>>> will
 >>>>> be enough !!
 >>>>> What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
 >>>>> primary
 >>>>> DA.
 >>>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
 >>>>>
 >>>>> sound,
 >>>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider
 >>>>> stereo
 >>>>> field.
 >>>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hhmm not
 >>>>> quite.
 >>>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
 >>>>> RECORDED
 >>>>> !
 >>>>> Isn't that so ?
 >>>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
 >>>>> spdif
 >>>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >>>>> the
 >>>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>>> Thats a serious one here !
 >>>>> Cheers,
 >>>>> Dimitrios
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>Mytek
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 >>>>>>> Mine
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>might
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice"
 >>>>>>>mode,
 >>>>>>> or
 >>>>>>>

```
>>>>>>something more colored.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>Deej  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message  
>>>>>>news:467bdf35$1@linux...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Hi,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds  
>  
>>>>>>>punch  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>and  
>>>>>>>clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE  
>  
>>>>>>>these  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>effects  
>>>>>>>on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??  
>>>>>>>It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?  
>>>>>>>regards,  
>>>>>>>Dimitrios  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>
```

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:26:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then yes, based on your post & his last one before it, he would indeed be recording the "better (jitter-free) mix to the 2-track tape. IOW, in this connection/routing scenario, it would be the same mix as he would be hearing over the speakers.

Neil

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >Correct...you would have to be recording through the D/A to somethihnglike
 a
 >Masterlink, but dimitrios' converter has a BNC clock out (it's an AD/DA
 and
 >so he should be able to clock the whole system with this.
 >
 >
 >"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf212\$1@linux...
 >>
 >> But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down
 >> stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file
 >> is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-
 >> free clock, as well.
 >>
 >> IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not
 >> making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like
 >> when you play it back on another system, for example.
 >> This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out
 >> of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record
 >> the 2-mix to.
 >>
 >> Neil
 >>
 >>
 >> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has
 one
 >>
 >>>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from
 a
 >>
 >>>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.
 >>
 >>>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night
 >> and
 >>>day.
 >>>
 >>>Deej
 >>>
 >>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
 >>>>
 >>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>>
 >>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
 >>
 >>>> will
 >>>> be enouph !!

>>>> What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
 >>>> primary
 >>>> DA.
 >>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
 >>
 >>>> sound,
 >>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
 >>>> field.
 >>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
 >>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
 >>>> RECORDED
 >>>> !
 >>>> Isn't that so ?
 >>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
 >>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >> the
 >>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>> Thats a serious one here !
 >>>> Cheers,
 >>>> Dimitrios
 >>>>
 >>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>>
 >>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to

 >>>>>>Mytek
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 >> Mine
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You

 >>>>>>might
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
 >>>> or
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>something more colored.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Deej
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
 >>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Hi,
 >>>>>>>

>>>>>>
>>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds

>>>>>> punch
>>>>>
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE

>>>>>> these
>>>>>
>>>>>> effects
>>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>>> regards,
>>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:34:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok then,
The analog tape would show the difference, what about a recording using AD
again with SAME clock (mytek's own), wouldn't that be also a "better mix
" ?
If all the above have some truthness then the mastering houses might using
the Gold Lavy's to embeddend the "better sound coming out of them !
Regards,
Dimitrios

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

>Then yes, based on your post & his last one before it, he would
>indeed be recording the "better (jitter-free) mix to the 2-track
>tape. IOW, in this connection/routing scenario, it would be the
>same mix as he would be hearing over the speakers.

>
>Neil
>
>
>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>Correct...you would have to be recording through the D/A to somethihnglike
>a
>>Masterlink, but dimitrios' converter has a BNC clock out (it's an AD/DA
>and
>>so he should be able to clock the whole system with this.
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf212\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down
>>> stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file
>>> is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-
>>> free clock, as well.
>>>
>>> IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not
>>> making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like
>>> when you play it back on another system, for example.
>>> This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out
>>> of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record
>>> the 2-mix to.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has
>one
>>>
>>>>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from
>a
>>>
>>>>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.
>>>
>>>>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night
>>> and
>>>>day.
>>>>
>>>>Deej
>>>>
>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>>>

>>>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
 >>>
 >>>>> will
 >>>>> be enough !!
 >>>>> What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
 >>>>> primary
 >>>>> DA.
 >>>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change
 in
 >>>
 >>>>> sound,
 >>>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
 >>>>> field.
 >>>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
 >>>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
 >>>>> RECORDED
 >>>>> !
 >>>>> Isn't that so ?
 >>>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
 spdif
 >>>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >>> the
 >>>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>>> Thats a serious one here !
 >>>>> Cheers,
 >>>>> Dimitrios
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
 >
 >>>>>>>Mytek
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 >>> Mine
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
 >
 >>>>>>>>might
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
 >>>>> or
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>something more colored.
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>Deej

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 16:37:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unless there's a De-jitterizer plugin that I'm not aware of :)

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

>

>Then yes, based on your post & his last one before it, he would

>indeed be recording the "better (jitter-free) mix to the 2-track

>tape. IOW, in this connection/routing scenario, it would be the

>same mix as he would be hearing over the speakers.

>

>Neil

>

>

>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>Correct...you would have to be recording through the D/A to somethihnglike

>a

>>Masterlink, but dimitrios' converter has a BNC clock out (it's an AD/DA

>and

>>so he should be able to clock the whole system with this.

>>

>>

>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf212\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down

>>> stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file

>>> is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-

>>> free clock, as well.

>>>

>>> IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not

>>> making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like

>>> when you play it back on another system, for example.

>>> This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out

>>> of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record

>>> the 2-mix to.

>>>

>>> Neil

>>>

>>>

>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>>This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has

>one

>>>

>>>>of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from

>a

>>>

>>>>system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.

>>>

>>>>Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night

>>> and

>>>>day.

>>>>

>>>>Deej

>>>>
>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>>>
>>>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
>>>
>>>>> will
>>>>> be enough !!
>>>>> What I really want to know is the following.
>>>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
>>>>> primary
>>>>> DA.
>>>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change
in
>>>
>>>>> sound,
>>>>> sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
>>>>> field.
>>>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
>>>>> So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
>>>>> RECORDED
>>>>> !
>>>>> Isn't that so ?
>>>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
spdif
>>>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
>>> the
>>>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>>>>> Thats a serious one here !
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten.....> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
>
>>>>>>>>Mytek
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
>>> Mine
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
>
>>>>>>>>might
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,

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

>

>To clarify - you can get jitter in two places - going
>in/recording and going out/playback. The worst, is of course,
>going in - because you're stuck with that... once it's there,
>you can't get rid of it.

>

>Unless there's a De-jitterizer plugin that I'm not aware of :)

>

>Neil

>

>

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

>>

>>Then yes, based on your post & his last one before it, he would
>>indeed be recording the "better (jitter-free) mix to the 2-track
>>tape. IOW, in this connection/routing scenario, it would be the
>>same mix as he would be hearing over the speakers.

>>

>>Neil

>>

>>

>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>Correct...you would have to be recording through the D/A to somethihnglike
>>a

>>>Masterlink, but dimitrios' converter has a BNC clock out (it's an AD/DA
>>and

>>>so he should be able to clock the whole system with this.

>>>

>>>

>>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:467bf212\$1@linux...

>>>>

>>>> But, that difference isn't translated into the bounced-down
>>>> stereo mix (as far as I know, anyway) the rendered stereo file
>>>> is what it is... unless you're clocking from the cleaner/jitter-
>>>> free clock, as well.

>>>>

>>>> IOW, you're just hearing it better over the monitors - not
>>>> making a difference as to what the 2-mix will sound like
>>>> when you play it back on another system, for example.
>>>> This assumes that you're rendering to digital, ITB; not going out
>>>> of your DAW into another box or Masterlink or whatever to record
>>>> the 2-mix to.

>>>>

>>>> Neil

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>> This is because the Mytek is probably reclocking the signal. Mytek has
 >>one
 >>>>
 >>>>> of the best clocks made.. You may not think you're hearing jitter from
 >>a
 >>>>
 >>>>> system, until you use a high quality DA. Then the difference is obvious.
 >>>>
 >>>>> Much more depth, imaging and clarity. It's the difference between night
 >>>> and
 >>>>> day.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> DeeJ
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote in message news:467be722\$1@linux...
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when
 money
 >>>>
 >>>>>> will
 >>>>>> be enough !!
 >>>>>> What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his

 >>>>>> primary
 >>>>>> DA.
 >>>>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was a tremendous change
 >in
 >>>>
 >>>>>> sound,
 >>>>>> sparkle lack of high frequency distortion defined low end and wider
 stereo
 >>>>>> field.
 >>>>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I said hmmm not quite.
 >>>>>> So after a long debate there I thought that these changes could get
 >>>>>> RECORDED
 >>>>>> !
 >>>>>> Isn't that so ?
 >>>>>> If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
 >spdif
 >>>>>> out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >>>> the
 >>>>>> soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>>>> That's a serious one here !
 >>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached
to
>>
>>>>>>>Mytek
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
>>>> Mine
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
>>
>>>>>>>might
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice"
mode,
>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Deej
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds
>>
>>>>>>>> punch
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE
>>
>>>>>>>> these
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> effects
>>>>>>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad
??
>>>>>>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>>>>>>> regards,
>>>>>>>> Dimitrios
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 17:28:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then it will sound different because of tape.

My point is if the DA and AD do their jobs correctly the files will be literally _identical_. Down to the last bit. If it doesn't then your converter is being used as an effect, which I think is insane. You could just as easily render the file, burn it to a CD and listen through your Mytek.

It's your stuff, do what you want. I still go by the dinosaur, mid-90's thought that once it's 1s and 0s the smart thing to do is avoid DA/AD conversions, SRC, multiple dithering, and such like.

TCB

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:

>

>Dear TCB,

>If I record this to an analog two tape machine using the Mytek's DA and connect

>then tape's out to the same monitors won't I hear the "better" mix ?

>Regards,

>Dimitrios

>

>"TCB " <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>But you know you can't record clock. If you did what Dimitrios is talking

>>about and then attached a crap DA and played back the file you looped through

>>the Benchmark it would still sound like crap.

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>Thad,

>>>

>>>I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks anything
>>
>>>it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful
>>lil'
>>>thang.
>>>
>>>;o)
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:467bee5d\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The
>
>>>> sounds
>>>> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe,
>>no
>>>> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're
>just
>>>> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they
>>go
>>>> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what
>
>>>> you're
>>>> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The
>AD
>>
>>>> turns
>>>> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly
>>you
>>>> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then your
>>
>>>> fancy
>>>> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured
>>by
>>>> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
>>>> conditions.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it did
>>
>>>> through
>>>> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>>>

>>>>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
 >>>> will
 >>>>>be enough !!
 >>>>>What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
 >>>>>DA.
 >>>>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change in
 >>
 >>>>>sound,
 >>>>>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
 >>>>>field.
 >>>>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
 >>>>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
 >
 >>>>>RECORDED
 >>>>>!
 >>>>>Isn't that so ?
 >>>>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the spdif
 >>>>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >>the
 >>>>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>>>Thats a serious one here !
 >>>>>Cheers,
 >>>>>Dimitrios
 >>>>>
 >>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached to
 >>
 >>>>>>>Mytek
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 >>
 >>>>>>>>Mine
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
 >might
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice" mode,
 >>>>>>>>or
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>something more colored.
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>Deej
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
 >>>>>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

Neil

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>Then it will sound different because of tape.

>

>My point is if the DA and AD do their jobs correctly the files will be literally

>_identical_. Down to the last bit. If it doesn't then your converter is
being

>used as an effect, which I think is insane. You could just as easily render

>the file, burn it to a CD and listen through your Mytek.

>

>It's your stuff, do what you want. I still go by the dinosaur, mid-90's
thought

>that once it's 1s and 0s the smart thing to do is avoid DA/AD conversions,

>SRC, multiple dithering, and such like.

>

>TCB

>

>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:

>>

>>Dear TCB,

>>If I record this to an analog two tape machine using the Mytek's DA and
>connect

>>then tape's out to the same monitors won't I hear the "better" mix ?

>>Regards,

>>Dimitrios

>>

>>"TCB " <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>But you know you can't record clock. If you did what Dimitrios is talking
>>>about and then attached a crap DA and played back the file you looped
through

>>>the Benchmark it would still sound like crap.

>>>

>>>TCB

>>>

>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:

>>>>Thad,

>>>>

>>>>I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks anything

>>>>

>>>>it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful

>>>>lil'

>>>>thang.

>>>>

>>>>;o)
>>>>
>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:467bee5d\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>>> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The
>>
>>>>> sounds
>>>>> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe,
>>>>no
>>>>> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're
>>just
>>>>> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they
>>>go
>>>>> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what
>>
>>>>> you're
>>>>> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The
>>AD
>>>
>>>>> turns
>>>>> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly
>>>you
>>>>> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then
your
>>>
>>>>> fancy
>>>>> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured
>>>by
>>>>> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
>>>>> conditions.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it
did
>>>
>>>>> through
>>>>> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>SORRY for double empty posts !
>>>>>>
>>>>>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when money
>>>>> will
>>>>>>be enough !!
>>>>>>What I really want to know is the following.

>>>>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his primary
>>>>>DA.
>>>>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was rltremendous change
in
>>>
>>>>>sound,
>>>>>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider stereo
>>>>>field.
>>>>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.
>>>>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
>>
>>>>>RECORDED
>>>>>!
>>>>>Isn't that so ?
>>>>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
spdif
>>>>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
>>>the
>>>>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>>>>>Thats a serious one here !
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>Dimitrios
>>>>>
>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached
to
>>>
>>>>>>>Mytek
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
>>>
>>>>>>>>Mine
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
>>might
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice"
mode,
>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Deej
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 18:56:38 GMT

Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful, will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?

I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly it would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way on other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row? Will we get incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth' with each pass?

And the theme for the day is that there are diminishing returns when it comes to audio precision, and they show up way, way before most people in this racket seem to realize. Which is why I think Brian T didn't just track at 16 bit I think he truncated individual tracks and then dithered the stereo mixdown. Smart guy, that Brian.

TCB

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

>
>Thad, it's not about using the convertors as an effect (Unless
>you're talking about what some of the mastering guys are doing
>with the apparently undistortable Lavry Gold's & Prim's); it's
>about samplerate stability/jitter & how that affects the quality
>of the sound.
>
>Interestingly enough, Dan Lavry's White Paper on jitter mentions
>that as bitrate increases, jitter effects become more
>noticeable... perhaps that's why Brian T. always insisted that
>Paris sounded better at 16 bits than at 24!

>
>Here's a link to that piece, BTW:
>
>http://www.lavryengineering.com/white_papers/jitter.pdf

>
>
>Neil

>
>
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>
>>Then it will sound different because of tape.
>>
>>My point is if the DA and AD do their jobs correctly the files will be
literally
>>_identical_. Down to the last bit. If it doesn't then your converter is
>being
>>used as an effect, which I think is insane. You could just as easily render
>>the file, burn it to a CD and listen through your Mytek.
>>

>>It's your stuff, do what you want. I still go by the dinosaur, mid-90's
>thought
>>that once it's 1s and 0s the smart thing to do is avoid DA/AD conversions,
>>SRC, multiple dithering, and such like.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:
>>>
>>>Dear TCB,
>>>If I record this to an analog two tape machine using the Mytek's DA and
>>connect
>>>then tape's out to the same monitors won't I hear the "better" mix ?
>>>Regards,
>>>Dimitrios
>>>
>>>"TCB " <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>But you know you can't record clock. If you did what Dimitrios is talking
>>>>about and then attached a crap DA and played back the file you looped
>through
>>>>the Benchmark it would still sound like crap.
>>>>
>>>>TCB
>>>>
>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>Thad,
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks
anything
>>>>>
>>>>>it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful
>>>>>lil'
>>>>>thang.
>>>>>
>>>>>;o)
>>>>>
>>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:467bee5d\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger. The
>>>
>>>>> sounds
>>>>> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no vibe,
>>>>no
>>>>> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're
>>>just
>>>>> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then they
>>>>go

>>>>> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what
 >>>
 >>>>> you're
 >>>>> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter. The
 >>>AD
 >>>>
 >>>>> turns
 >>>>> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly
 >>>>you
 >>>>> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then
 >your
 >>>>
 >>>>> fancy
 >>>>> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured
 >>>>by
 >>>>> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these

 >>>>> conditions.
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it
 >did
 >>>>
 >>>>> through
 >>>>> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> TCB
 >>>>>
 >>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when
 money
 >>>>>> will
 >>>>>> be enough !!
 >>>>>> What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>>>> I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
 primary
 >>>>>> DA.
 >>>>>> After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change
 >in
 >>>>>
 >>>>>> sound,
 >>>>>> sparkle lack of high frequency ditortion defined low end and wider
 stereo
 >>>>>> field.
 >>>>>> He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not quite.

>>>>>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could get
>>>
>>>>>>RECORDED
>>>>>>!
>>>>>>Isn't that so ?
>>>>>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
>spdif
>>>>>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
>>>>the
>>>>>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
>>>>>>Thats a serious one here !
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>Dimitrios
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached
>to
>>>>
>>>>>>>>Mytek
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
>>>>
>>>>>>>>Mine
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA. You
>>>might
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>want to try that with a clean comp line and RNC in "Really nice"
>mode,
>>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>something more colored.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Deej
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgioNOSPAM@otenet.gr> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>news:467bdf35\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Hi,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stero field adds
>>>>
>>>>>>>> punch
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> and

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 19:48:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>But you can't _record_ that. Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of
of
>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy
>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the worst)
>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark. So

>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop, with
>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact same
>file as the original. So why do it? Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter
>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter, it can't any
>more than tape can have a head misaligned.
>
>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,
>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better
>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?
>
>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly it
>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because
>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way on
>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row? Will we get
>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth'
with
>each pass?
>
>And the theme for the day is that there are diminishing returns when it
comes
>to audio precision, and they show up way, way before most people in this
>racket seem to realize. Which is why I think Brian T didn't just track at
>16 bit I think he truncated individual tracks and then dithered the stereo
>mixdown. Smart guy, that Brian.
>
>TCB
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>Thad, it's not about using the convertors as an effect (Unless
>>you're talking about what some of the mastering guys are doing
>>with the apparently undistortable Lavry Gold's & Prim's); it's
>>about samplerate stability/jitter & how that affects the quality
>>of the sound.
>>
>>Interestingly enough, Dan Lavry's White Paper on jitter mentions
>>that as bitrate increases, jitter effects become more
>>noticeable... perhaps that's why Brian T. always insisted that
>>Paris sounded better at 16 bits than at 24!
>>
>>Here's a link to that piece, BTW:
>>
>>http://www.lavryengineering.com/white_papers/jitter.pdf
>>
>>
>>Neil
>>
>>

>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Then it will sound different because of tape.
>>>
>>>My point is if the DA and AD do their jobs correctly the files will be
>literally
>>>_identical_. Down to the last bit. If it doesn't then your converter is
>>being
>>>used as an effect, which I think is insane. You could just as easily render
>>>the file, burn it to a CD and listen through your Mytek.
>>>
>>>It's your stuff, do what you want. I still go by the dinosaur, mid-90's
>>thought
>>>that once it's 1s and 0s the smart thing to do is avoid DA/AD conversions,
>>>SRC, multiple dithering, and such like.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Dear TCB,
>>>>If I record this to an analog two tape machine using the Mytek's DA and
>>>connect
>>>>then tape's out to the same monitors won't I hear the "better" mix ?
>>>>Regards,
>>>>Dimitrios
>>>>
>>>>"TCB " <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>But you know you can't record clock. If you did what Dimitrios is talking
>>>>>about and then attached a crap DA and played back the file you looped
>>through
>>>>>the Benchmark it would still sound like crap.
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>Thad,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm using aBenchmark DAC-1 for my final D/A conversion. It reclocks
>anything
>>>>>>
>>>>>>it's handed to 96k before it exdcretes it out the D/A. It's a wunnerful
>>>>>>lil'
>>>>>>thang.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>;o)

>>>>>
 >>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:467bee5d\$1@linux...
 >>>>>
 >>>>>> OK, I want to poke my eyeballs out with a sharpened coat hanger.
 The
 >>>>
 >>>>>> sounds
 >>>>>> start out as 1s and 0s. Nothing more, nothing less. They have no
 vibe,
 >>>>>no
 >>>>>> opinion, no mojo, no plans, no depth, no clarity no nothing. They're
 >>>>just
 >>>>>> a bunch of effin 1s and 0s, a whole flipping bunch of them. Then
 they
 >>>>>go
 >>>>>> to your DA converter and are turned into electricity. If you do what
 >>>>
 >>>>>> you're
 >>>>>> suggesting, then that electricity goes back to the AD converter.
 The
 >>>>AD
 >>>>
 >>>>>> turns
 >>>>>> the electricity back into 1s and 0s. Now, if it does its job perfectly
 >>>>>you
 >>>>>> will have EXACTLY THE SAME STRING OF 1s AND 0s! If you don't, then
 >>your
 >>>>
 >>>>>> fancy
 >>>>>> DA converter is not doing its job, and DA converters should be measured
 >>>>>by
 >>>>>> the degree to which they can exactly replicate a file under these
 >
 >>>>>> conditions.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> So, if your mytek does its job your mix will sound EXACTLY like it
 >>did
 >>>>
 >>>>>> through
 >>>>>> the RME when you play it back through the RME again.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> TCB
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@.....> wrote:
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>SORRY for double empty posts !
 >>>>>>>

>>>>>>>DJ I know your praises about portico which is on my wishlist when
 >money
 >>>>>>> will
 >>>>>>>be enouph !!
 >>>>>>>What I really want to know is the following.
 >>>>>>>I went to a friend's studio and he used rme fireface (yak) as his
 >primary
 >>>>>>>DA.
 >>>>>>>After [putting the mytek immediately there was r\tremendous change
 >>in
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>sound,
 >>>>>>>sparkle lack of high frquency ditortion defined low end and wider
 >stereo
 >>>>>>>field.
 >>>>>>>He asked OK now my mixes will sound like this and I sai hmmm not
 quite.
 >>>>>>>So after a long debate there I thought that thiese changes could
 get
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>RECORDED
 >>>>>>>!
 >>>>>>>Isn't that so ?
 >>>>>>>If you record the da of mytek back to myte's ad and then route the
 >>spdif
 >>>>>>>out to get recorded as digital file on any medium ,pc or dat... isn't
 >>>>>the
 >>>>>>>soundmix becoming "myteked" ??
 >>>>>>>Thats a serious one here !
 >>>>>>>Cheers,
 >>>>>>>Dimitrios
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@oten....> wrote:
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>>>I use a good AD and DA in my master bus insert which is attached
 >>to
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>>Mytek
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>Stereo A/D converters (hmmmm..seems you may have something similar).
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>Mine
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>has a device (a Portico 5042) in the chain between that AD/DA.
 You
 >>>>might
 >>>>>>>>>

>

>But you can't _record_ that.

You can if you go out of the Mytek (or whatever's) analog outs to tape or another digital machine's analog in's... if that 2nd machine is clocked to the Mytek (or whatever's) clock, then it could preceiveably result in a higher-quality 2-track file.

>Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of

>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy

>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the worst)

Oh, I'm not running down the RME stuff... I LOVE my Multifaces (Multifascia?). Are there better convertors? Apparently... though I don't know if a Mytek or Benchmark are among those.

>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark. So

>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop, with

>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact same

>file as the original. So why do it?

To improve upon a convertor that may have a more jittery clock?

I guess if he's going out of an RME's analog outs to 2-track tape, and he's hearing a difference with the Mytek's output, then that difference would be translated to tape.

>Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter

>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter,

>it can't any more than tape can have a head misaligned.

What I said was that you can get jitter upon recording... that jitter you're stuck with - you can't get rid of it; and then you can also get additional jitter at playback.... if you're finding that using a different clock or set of convertors on playback improves things - that could be the reason it's doing so... you're eliminating or lessening the amount of playback jitter.

>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,

>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better

>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?

I have no idea - frankly I'm surprised that someone's finding a better convertor set than RME stuff at any price point south of the super-ultra top-end gear. I'm just giving Dimi the benefit of the doubt for the sake of the current discussion.

>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly it

>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because

>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way on
>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row?

The idea isn't that it's an "effect" that can be enhanced with cascading several of a given convertors, the idea is that it's (again, theoretically, assuming there IS an improvement that's being heard) kind of a sonic Windex that can remove grime in the form of artifacts created by jitter... using Windex (the non-sonic kind LOL) can only get a glass so clean, right? I mean if there's something embedded in the glass, Windex can't get that out, so if there's record-end jitter embedded in the source, you can't remove it, but playback-end jitter can be minimized or possibly even eliminated.

>Will we get
>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth' with
>each pass?

Nope, you can only get the glass so clean... if there are newly-embedded jitter artifacts on a rendered file and you pass it through another stage, you can't get it any cleaner.
We're not talking about rendering it more than once, we're talking about the one & only rendering of the final mix to a two-track file prior to mastering.

Unless I'm misunderstanding something here.

Neil

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 21:22:51 GMT

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

Neil thats nice post...

So regarding mytek versus RME there is a big big difference.

RME is good until you hear something better.

My Lavry DA sounds fantastic !

So the most importantly conclusion if some other agree here is that a very good da and ad clocked by the same jitter minimal clock can produce a BETTER sounding stereofile than just the rendered Paris or Cubase file.

Do we agree here ?

Cheers,

Dimitrios

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

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>But you can't _record_ that.

>

>You can if you go out of the Mytek (or whatever's) analog outs

>to tape or another digital machine's analog in's... if that 2nd

>machine is clocked to the Mytek (or whatever's) clock, then it

>could preceiveably result in a higher-quality 2-track file.

>

>>Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of

>>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy

>>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the worst)

>

>Oh, I'm not running down the RME stuff... I LOVE my Multifaces

>(Multifascia?). Are there better convertors? Apparently...

>though I don't know if a Mytek or Benchmark are among those.

>

>>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark.

So

>>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop, with

>>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact same

>>file as the original. So why do it?

>

>To improve upon a convertor that may have a more jittery clock?

>I guess if he's going out of an RME's analog outs to 2-track

>tape, and he's hearing a difference with the Mytek's output,

>then that difference would be translated to tape.

>

>>Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter

>>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter,

>>it can't any more than tape can have a head misaligned.

>

>What I said was that you can get jitter upon recording... that

>jitter you're stuck with - you can't get rid of it; and then you

>can also get additional jitter at playback.... if you're finding

>that using a different clock or set of convertors on playback

>improves things - that could be the reason it's doing so...

>you're eliminating or lessening the amount of playback jitter.

>

>>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,

>>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better

>>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?

>

>I have no idea - frankly I'm surprised that someone's finding a

>better convertor set than RME stuff at any price point south of

>the super-ultra top-end gear. I'm just giving Dimi the benefit

>of the doubt for the sake of the current discussion.
>
>>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly it
>>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because
>>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way on
>>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row?
>
>The idea isn't that it's an "effect" that can be enhanced with
>cascading several of a given convertors, the idea is that it's
>(again, theoretically, assuming there IS an improvement that's
>being heard) kind of a sonic Windex that can remove grime in the
>form of artifacts created by jitter... using Windex (the non-
>sonic kind LOL) can only get a glass so clean, right? I mean if
>there's something embedded in the glass, Windex can't get that
>out, so if there's record-end jitter embedded in the source, you
>can't remove it, but playback-end jitter can be minimized or
>possibly even eliminated.
>
>
>>Will we get
>>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth'
>with
>>each pass?
>
>Nope, you can only get the glass so clean... if there are newly-
>embedded jitter artifacts on a rendered file and you pass it
>through another stage, you can't get it any cleaner.
>We're not talking about rendering it more than once, we're
>talking about the one & only rendering of the final mix to a two-
>track file prior to mastering.
>
>Unless I'm misunderstanding something here.
>
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2007 21:38:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll agree with you if by saying: "a BETTER sounding stereofile
than just the rendered Paris or Cubase file" you mean the actual
final mix two-buss rendering or out-routed file AS IT'S BEING
CREATED. IOW, you're in an active mixdown, going from your
Multitrack files, through your 2-buss & either rendering it to
disk, or routing the L&R out through your convertors into
another device (tape, in your case) that will record the 2-track

mixdown.

If you're talking about an ALREADY-EXISTING 2-track mixdown that already has jitter embedded in it, then no, you're not going to be able to get rid of that. You could, in theory (by using a good or well-clocked convertor to play that back as opposed to a poorly-clocked convertor) eliminate any MORE jitter from entering the picture, but that's about it.

Neil

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@ote.....> wrote:

>

>Neil thats nice post...

>So regarding mytek versus RME there is a big big difference.

>RME is good until you hear something better.

>My Lavry DA sounds fantastic !

>So the most importantly conclusion if some other agree here is that a very

>good da and ad clocked by the same jitter minimal clock can produce a BETTER

>sounding stereofile than just the rendered Paris or Cubase file.

>Do we agree here ?

>Cheers,

>Dimitrios

>

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

>>

>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>But you can't _record_ that.

>>

>>You can if you go out of the Mytek (or whatever's) analog outs

>>to tape or another digital machine's analog in's... if that 2nd

>>machine is clocked to the Mytek (or whatever's) clock, then it

>>could preceiveably result in a higher-quality 2-track file.

>>

>>>Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of

>>>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy

>>>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the worst)

>>

>>Oh, I'm not running down the RME stuff... I LOVE my Multifaces

>>(Multifascia?). Are there better convertors? Apparently...

>>though I don't know if a Mytek or Benchmark are among those.

>>

>>>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark.

>So

>>>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop, with

>>>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact same

>>>file as the original. So why do it?

>>

>>To improve upon a convertor that may have a more jittery clock?

>>I guess if he's going out of an RME's analog outs to 2-track

>>tape, and he's hearing a difference with the Mytek's output,

>>then that difference would be translated to tape.

>>

>>>Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter

>>>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter,

>>>it can't any more than tape can have a head misaligned.

>>

>>What I said was that you can get jitter upon recording... that

>>jitter you're stuck with - you can't get rid of it; and then you

>>can also get additional jitter at playback.... if you're finding

>>that using a different clock or set of convertors on playback

>>improves things - that could be the reason it's doing so...

>>you're eliminating or lessening the amount of playback jitter.

>>

>>>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,

>>>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better

>>>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?

>>

>>I have no idea - frankly I'm surprised that someone's finding a

>>better convertor set than RME stuff at any price point south of

>>the super-ultra top-end gear. I'm just giving Dimi the benefit

>>of the doubt for the sake of the current discussion.

>>

>>>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly

it

>>>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because

>>>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way

on

>>>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row?

>>

>>The idea isn't that it's an "effect" that can be enhanced with

>>cascading several of a given convertors, the idea is that it's

>>(again, theoretically, assuming there IS an improvement that's

>>being heard) kind of a sonic Windex that can remove grime in the

>>form of artifacts created by jitter... using Windex (the non-

>>sonic kind LOL) can only get a glass so clean, right? I mean if

>>there's something embedded in the glass, Windex can't get that

>>out, so if there's record-end jitter embedded in the source, you

>>can't remove it, but playback-end jitter can be minimized or

>>possibly even eliminated.

>>

>>
>>>Will we get
>>>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth'
>>with
>>>each pass?
>>
>>Nope, you can only get the glass so clean... if there are newly-
>>embedded jitter artifacts on a rendered file and you pass it
>>through another stage, you can't get it any cleaner.
>>We're not talking about rendering it more than once, we're
>>talking about the one & only rendering of the final mix to a two-
>>track file prior to mastering.
>>
>>Unless I'm misunderstanding something here.
>>
>>
>>Neil
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sat, 23 Jun 2007 15:23:07 GMT

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

I have not finished reading this thread because it seems moot, but in case anyone else has not mentioned this obvious point, Dimitrios, the only way to get a better in the box mix with converters is to use better A-D.

Dimitrios wrote:

> Hi,
>
>
> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch and
> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these effects
> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
> regards,
> Dimitrios

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 23 Jun 2007 16:11:12 GMT

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

Bill,

The bottom line of all this is to reduce jitter as much as possible at all stages of the recording process. Jitter creates a lot of the *digital harshness* and midrange/low end flabbiness/wierdness that everyone complains about. To that end, as far as Paris is concerned, an external clock source makes quite an improvement. I tried to use the Paris D/A's to mix and was going crazy trying to nail the mid frequencies. I finally took my mix down to Catcusfire's studio in Taos (remember Andy?) and played it back through a Cranesong HEDD and discovered that there was nothing wrong with the mids, it was the D/A converters I was using (Paris on Paris clock). Not long afterwards, MikeClaytor came to Durango and brought a Benchmark DAC-1 and we patched it into a mix and the difference was very obvious. Not long after that I got a Lucid GenX 6 and clocked my entire system to it. The A/D and D/A conversion (D/A's that I was using for processors on inserts) improved as well and the system, overall, exhibited more clarity, depth /better imaging. I would strongly recommend an external clock for any Paris user.

As far as Cubase goes, I'm clocking my RME hardware to the BNC output of a Mytek Stereo A/D. I think the RME hardware reclocks everything it sees to it's own internal clock, but I'm not sure exactly how they do this. At any rate, I am happy with what I'm getting from the 24 RME AD/DA's I've got here whether they are being clocked by the Mytek or whether the Mytek clock is being reclocked to the RME clock. I am still monitoring everything from the Benchmark DAC-1 and if I was recording to tape or something like a Masterlink, I'd be using the DAC-1 outputs to send the 2bus to the recorder and monitoring off the playback heads if it was an analog deck and making final mix decisions based on what the tape was telling me. As far as digital goes, I would not be making final tweak decisions by monitoring off the D/A's of the mix deck because I could be certain that whatever the DAC-1 was feeding the digital recorder would be what I'd (supposedly) end up with as the final product and the digital deck's D/A's probably wouldn't be up to the level of the DAC-1's D/A converters.

Deej

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:467d3c4b@linux...
>I have not finished reading this thread because it seems moot, but in case
>anyone else has not mentioned this obvious point, Dimitrios, the only way
>to get a better in the box mix with converters is to use better A-D.
>
> Dimitrios wrote:
>> Hi,
>>
>>
>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch
>> and
>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these
>> effects
>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??

>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>> regards,
>> Dimitrios

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 23 Jun 2007 16:30:23 GMT

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

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>As far as Cubase goes, I'm clocking my RME hardware to the BNC output of
a

>Mytek Stereo A/D. I think the RME hardware reclocks everything it sees to

>it's own internal clock, but I'm not sure exactly how they do this.

It will if you let it, but you don't have to let it do so... in
your RME setup/options screen, make sure to select "Auto-Sync"
(or is it "auto-detect"? I forget which... you'll see it)
instead of "Master", and set your preferred sync source to
"Word Clock". If you do this, and the word clock input/sync
shows "lock" as opposed to "sync", then you know you've got it.

Neil

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 23 Jun 2007 17:15:48 GMT

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

Neil, you are right. Superior clocking means everything. At the commercial
studio at our church, we tested the Digi Clock, Apoge Big ben and the Lcid
GN-x192..The Lucid won out..

The test was done by our senior engineer to show us (Producers) how much
of a difference there was btw clocking units.

What still amazes me is when he would dis-engage a unit(no clocking) btw
he 3 HD 192's...Just liek what Neil stated...Flubby mids and lows..Truth
is, that reminded me immediatly of how my Paris rig sounded...So, I was use
to mixing to that flub..ADN..get this....This scenario had nothing to do
with summing... As the HD system mentioned above was linked to an SSL G series
console...Still, with no clock, flub...Lucid..Tight round botom and mids...

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Bill,
>
>The bottom line of all this is to reduce jitter as much as possible at all

>stages of the recording process. Jitter creates a lot of the *digital
>harshness* and midrange/low end flabbiness/wierdness that everyone complains

>about. To that end, as far as Paris is concerned, an external clock source

>makes quite an improvement. I tried to use the Paris D/A's to mix and was

>going crazy trying to nail the mid frequencies. I finally took my mix down

>to Catcuse's studio in Taos (remember Andy?) and played it back through
a
>Cranesong HEDD and discovered that there was nothing wrong with the mids,
it
>was the D/A converters I was using (Paris on Paris clock). Not long
>afterwards, MikeClaytor came to Durango and brought a Benchmark DAC-1 and
we
>patched it into a mix and the difference was very obvious. Not long after

>that I got a Lucid GenX 6 and clocked my entire system to it. The A/D and

>D/A conversion (D/A's that I was using for processors on inserts) improved

>as well and the system, overall, exhibited more clarity, depth /better
>imaging. I would strongly recommend an external clock for any Paris user.
>
>As far as Cubase goes, I'm clocking my RME hardware to the BNC output of
a
>Mytek Stereo A/D. I think the RME hardware reclocks everything it sees to

>it's own internal clock, but I'm not sure exactly how they do this. At any

>rate, I am happy with what I'm getting from the 24 RME AD/DA's I've got

>here whether they are being clocked by the Mytek or whether the Mytek clock

>is being reclocked to the RME clock. I am still monitoring everything from

>the Benchmark DAC-1 and if I was recording to tape or something like a
>Masterlink, I'd be using the DAC-1 outputs to send the 2bus to the recorder

>and monitoring off the playback heads if it was an analog deck and making

>final mix decisions based on what the tape was telling me. As far as
>digital goes, I would not be making final tweak decisions by monitoring

off
>the D/A's of the mix deck because I could be certain that whatever the DAC-1

>was feeding the digital recorder would be what I'd (supposedly) end up
with
>as the final product and the digital deck's D/A's probably wouldn't be up
to
>the level of the DAC-1's D/A converters.
>
>Deej
>
>"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:467d3c4b@linux...
>>I have not finished reading this thread because it seems moot, but in case

>>anyone else has not mentioned this obvious point, Dimitrios, the only way

>>to get a better in the box mix with converters is to use better A-D.
>>
>> Dimitrios wrote:
>>> Hi,
>>>
>>>
>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch

>>> and
>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

>>> effects
>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>> regards,
>>> Dimitrios
>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 23 Jun 2007 17:39:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> and monitoring off the playback heads if it was an analog deck and making
> final mix decisions based on what the tape was telling me.

Arrrggghhhh!!!!.....I meant the "repro head".

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:467d47ad@linux...
> Bill,
>

> The bottom line of all this is to reduce jitter as much as possible at all
> stages of the recording process. Jitter creates a lot of the *digital
> harshness* and midrange/low end flabbiness/wierdness that everyone
> complains about. To that end, as far as Paris is concerned, an external
> clock source makes quite an improvement. I tried to use the Paris D/A's to
> mix and was going crazy trying to nail the mid frequencies. I finally took
> my mix down to Catcusfire's studio in Taos (remember Andy?) and played it
> back through a Cranesong HEDD and discovered that there was nothing wrong
> with the mids, it was the D/A converters I was using (Paris on Paris
> clock). Not long afterwards, MikeClaytor came to Durango and brought a
> Benchmark DAC-1 and we patched it into a mix and the difference was very
> obvious. Not long after that I got a Lucid GenX 6 and clocked my entire
> system to it. The A/D and D/A conversion (D/A's that I was using for
> processors on inserts) improved as well and the system, overall, exhibited
> more clarity, depth /better imaging. I would strongly recommend an
> external clock for any Paris user.

>

> As far as Cubase goes, I'm clocking my RME hardware to the BNC output of a
> Mytek Stereo A/D. I think the RME hardware reclocks everything it sees to
> it's own internal clock, but I'm not sure exactly how they do this. At any
> rate, I am happy with what I'm getting from the 24 RME AD/DA's I've got
> here whether they are being clocked by the Mytek or whether the Mytek
> clock is being reclocked to the RME clock. I am still monitoring
> everything from the Benchmark DAC-1 and if I was recording to tape or
> something like a Masterlink, I'd be using the DAC-1 outputs to send the
> 2bus to the recorder and monitoring off the playback heads if it was an
> analog deck and making final mix decisions based on what the tape was
> telling me. As far as digital goes, I would not be making final tweak
> decisions by monitoring off the D/A's of the mix deck because I could be
> certain that whatever the DAC-1 was feeding the digital recorder would be
> what I'd (supposedly) end up with as the final product and the digital
> deck's D/A's probably wouldn't be up to the level of the DAC-1's D/A
> converters.

>

> Deej

>

> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:467d3c4b@linux...

>>I have not finished reading this thread because it seems moot, but in case
>>anyone else has not mentioned this obvious point, Dimitrios, the only way
>>to get a better in the box mix with converters is to use better A-D.

>>

>> Dimitrios wrote:

>>> Hi,

>>>

>>>

>>> i was wondering if a great DA which opens up the stereo field adds punch

>>> and

>>> clarity to sound reproduction etc can be recorded and so CAPTURE these

>>> effects
>>> on a stereo file, by recording the da's output using a good ad ??
>>> It sounds as it can be done but do I miss something here ?
>>> regards,
>>> Dimitrios
>
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 25 Jun 2007 00:01:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry I didn't respond to this earlier. I've been _very_ busy chasing girls and playing golf.

I think we agree more than we don't here. But what we're talking about then is recoding from source A to destination B and using the Mytek as an effect. Which I think is insane but, yes, it's possible. Passing the sound out the Mytek and then tracking it back via the Mytek seems more insane. But we're talking about using a converter as an effect, and I guess its come to this.

TCB

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

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>But you can't _record_ that.

>

>You can if you go out of the Mytek (or whatever's) analog outs
>to tape or another digital machine's analog in's... if that 2nd
>machine is clocked to the Mytek (or whatever's) clock, then it
>could preceiveably result in a higher-quality 2-track file.

>

>>Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of
>>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy
>>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the worst)

>

>Oh, I'm not running down the RME stuff... I LOVE my Multifaces
>(Multifascia?). Are there better convertors? Apparently...
>though I don't know if a Mytek or Benchmark are among those.

>

>>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark.
So

>>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop, with
>>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact same

>>file as the original. So why do it?
>
>To improve upon a convertor that may have a more jittery clock?
>I guess if he's going out of an RME's analog outs to 2-track
>tape, and he's hearing a difference with the Mytek's output,
>then that difference would be translated to tape.
>
>>Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter
>>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter,
>>it can't any more than tape can have a head misaligned.
>
>What I said was that you can get jitter upon recording... that
>jitter you're stuck with - you can't get rid of it; and then you
>can also get additional jitter at playback.... if you're finding
>that using a different clock or set of convertors on playback
>improves things - that could be the reason it's doing so...
>you're eliminating or lessening the amount of playback jitter.
>
>>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,
>>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better
>>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?
>
>I have no idea - frankly I'm surprised that someone's finding a
>better convertor set than RME stuff at any price point south of
>the super-ultra top-end gear. I'm just giving Dimi the benefit
>of the doubt for the sake of the current discussion.
>
>>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly it
>>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because
>>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way on
>>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row?
>
>The idea isn't that it's an "effect" that can be enhanced with
>cascading several of a given convertors, the idea is that it's
>(again, theoretically, assuming there IS an improvement that's
>being heard) kind of a sonic Windex that can remove grime in the
>form of artifacts created by jitter... using Windex (the non-
>sonic kind LOL) can only get a glass so clean, right? I mean if
>there's something embedded in the glass, Windex can't get that
>out, so if there's record-end jitter embedded in the source, you
>can't remove it, but playback-end jitter can be minimized or
>possibly even eliminated.
>
>
>>Will we get
>>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth'
>with
>>each pass?

>
>Nope, you can only get the glass so clean... if there are newly-
>embedded jitter artifacts on a rendered file and you pass it
>through another stage, you can't get it any cleaner.
>We're not talking about rendering it more than once, we're
>talking about the one & only rendering of the final mix to a two-
>track file prior to mastering.
>
>Unless I'm misunderstanding something here.
>
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [Rich\[3\]](#) on Mon, 25 Jun 2007 14:32:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry I didn't respond to this earlier. I've been _very_ busy chasing girls
>and playing golf.

Man I wish I was this busy...

I guess I'm surprised that the converters would make that much of a difference
that they would be used as an "effect"...

Do you say that they open things up enough to use them this way?

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>Sorry I didn't respond to this earlier. I've been _very_ busy chasing girls
>and playing golf.
>
>I think we agree more than we don't here. But what we're talking about then
>is recoding from source A to destination B and using the Mytek as an effect.
>Which I think is insane but, yes, it's possible. Passing the sound out the
>Mytek and then tracking it back via the Mytek seems more insane. But we're
>talking about using a converter as an effect, and I guess it comes to this.
>
>
>TCB
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>But you can't _record_ that.

>>

>>>You can if you go out of the Mytek (or whatever's) analog outs
>>to tape or another digital machine's analog in's... if that 2nd
>>machine is clocked to the Mytek (or whatever's) clock, then it
>>could preceiveably result in a higher-quality 2-track file.

>>

>>>Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of
>>>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy
>>>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the worst)

>>

>>>Oh, I'm not running down the RME stuff... I LOVE my Multifaces
>>(Multifascia?). Are there better convertors? Apparently...
>>though I don't know if a Mytek or Benchmark are among those.

>>

>>>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark.

>So

>>>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop, with
>>>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact same
>>>file as the original. So why do it?

>>

>>>To improve upon a convertor that may have a more jittery clock?

>>I guess if he's going out of an RME's analog outs to 2-track
>>tape, and he's hearing a difference with the Mytek's output,
>>then that difference would be translated to tape.

>>

>>>Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter
>>>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter,
>>>it can't any more than tape can have a head misaligned.

>>

>>>What I said was that you can get jitter upon recording... that
>>jitter you're stuck with - you can't get rid of it; and then you
>>can also get additional jitter at playback.... if you're finding
>>that using a different clock or set of convertors on playback
>>improves things - that could be the reason it's doing so...
>>you're eliminating or lessening the amount of playback jitter.

>>

>>>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,
>>>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better
>>>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?

>>

>>>I have no idea - frankly I'm surprised that someone's finding a
>>better convertor set than RME stuff at any price point south of
>>the super-ultra top-end gear. I'm just giving Dimi the benefit
>>of the doubt for the sake of the current discussion.

>>

>>>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly
it

>>>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because
>>>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way
on
>>>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row?
>>
>>The idea isn't that it's an "effect" that can be enhanced with
>>cascading several of a given convertors, the idea is that it's
>>(again, theoretically, assuming there IS an improvement that's
>>being heard) kind of a sonic Windex that can remove grime in the
>>form of artifacts created by jitter... using Windex (the non-
>>sonic kind LOL) can only get a glass so clean, right? I mean if
>>there's something embedded in the glass, Windex can't get that
>>out, so if there's record-end jitter embedded in the source, you
>>can't remove it, but playback-end jitter can be minimized or
>>possibly even eliminated.
>>
>>
>>>Will we get
>>>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth'
>>with
>>>each pass?
>>
>>Nope, you can only get the glass so clean... if there are newly-
>>embedded jitter artifacts on a rendered file and you pass it
>>through another stage, you can't get it any cleaner.
>>We're not talking about rendering it more than once, we're
>>talking about the one & only rendering of the final mix to a two-
>>track file prior to mastering.
>>
>>Unless I'm misunderstanding something here.
>>
>>
>>Neil
>

Subject: Re: Can a DA change the sound of a mix if recorded ??
Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 25 Jun 2007 14:49:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Rich,

If you track back up the thread you'll see me saying I think this is a crazy idea, but yes, that's what Dimitrios is thinking about doing. Taking the output from a high end D/A converter and recording that output to a second source. Originally the idea was to loop it back through the same box and the the A/D conversion but I pointed out that if the box is doing its job then the net result should be a bit for bit copy of the original.

Personally I think this is an example of false precision, and I'm essentially positive it would fail a test for diminishing returns. But hell, I'm deaf anyway, and audiophiles pay over \$1k for six feet of speaker cable and this appears homespun farmer's almanac sensible compared to that.

TCB

"Rich" <studiodog_99@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>Sorry I didn't respond to this earlier. I've been _very_ busy chasing girls
>>and playing golf.
>
>Man I wish I was this busy...
>
>I guess I'm surprised that the converters would make that much of a difference
>that they would be used as an "effect"...
>
>D your saying that they open things up enough to use them this way?

>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>

>>Sorry I didn't respond to this earlier. I've been _very_ busy chasing girls
>>and playing golf.
>>
>>I think we agree more than we don't here. But what we're talking about
then
>>is recoding from source A to destination B and using the Mytek as an effect.
>>Which I think is insane but, yes, it's possible. Passing the sound out
the
>>Mytek and then tracking it back via the Mytek seems more insane. But we're
>>talking about using a converter as an effect, and I guess its come to this.

>>
>>
>>TCB

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

>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>

>>>>But you can't _record_ that.
>>>

>>>>You can if you go out of the Mytek (or whatever's) analog outs
>>>>to tape or another digital machine's analog in's... if that 2nd
>>>>machine is clocked to the Mytek (or whatever's) clock, then it
>>>>could preceiveably result in a higher-quality 2-track file.
>>>

>>>>Put another way, if Dimitrios fed the SPDIF of
>>>>an RME Mutliface (BTW - running down RME gear on sonics is pretty ballsy
>>>>in my opinion. Maybe not the best in the world, but certainly not the
>worst)
>>>
>>>>Oh, I'm not running down the RME stuff... I LOVE my Multifaces
>>>>(Multifascia?). Are there better convertors? Apparently...
>>>>though I don't know if a Mytek or Benchmark are among those.
>>>>
>>>>and ran it through DeeJ's Benchmark it would sound like the Benchmark.
>>>>So
>>>>what Dimitrios is hearing is the converter. A perfect DA -> AD loop,
with
>>>>infinite sample rate and word length, would create exactly the exact
same
>>>>file as the original. So why do it?
>>>>
>>>>To improve upon a convertor that may have a more jittery clock?
>>>>I guess if he's going out of an RME's analog outs to 2-track
>>>>tape, and he's hearing a difference with the Mytek's output,
>>>>then that difference would be translated to tape.
>>>>
>>>>Clock jitter? You said yourself jitter
>>>>is a record/playback issue. The file doesn't have any jitter,
>>>>it can't any more than tape can have a head misaligned.
>>>>
>>>>What I said was that you can get jitter upon recording... that
>>>>jitter you're stuck with - you can't get rid of it; and then you
>>>>can also get additional jitter at playback.... if you're finding
>>>>that using a different clock or set of convertors on playback
>>>>improves things - that could be the reason it's doing so...
>>>>you're eliminating or lessening the amount of playback jitter.
>>>>
>>>>Even if the Mytek is used as an effect, if the RME converter is so awful,
>>>>will the Mytek'd file played through it sound better? And how much better
>>>>will the final playback devices be sonically than the RME?
>>>>
>>>>I have no idea - frankly I'm surprised that someone's finding a
>>>>better convertor set than RME stuff at any price point south of
>>>>the super-ultra top-end gear. I'm just giving Dimi the benefit
>>>>of the doubt for the sake of the current discussion.
>>>>
>>>>>I'm saying this is a bad idea theoretically in that if done perfectly
>it
>>>>>would just create a copy of the file, and a bad idea practically because
>>>>>even if it's a good 'effect' it won't be audible in a significant way
>on
>>>>>other equipment. I mean, why not Mytek it 10 times in a row?

>>>
>>>The idea isn't that it's an "effect" that can be enhanced with
>>>cascading several of a given convertors, the idea is that it's
>>>(again, theoretically, assuming there IS an improvement that's
>>>being heard) kind of a sonic Windex that can remove grime in the
>>>form of artifacts created by jitter... using Windex (the non-
>>>sonic kind LOL) can only get a glass so clean, right? I mean if
>>>there's something embedded in the glass, Windex can't get that
>>>out, so if there's record-end jitter embedded in the source, you
>>>can't remove it, but playback-end jitter can be minimized or
>>>possibly even eliminated.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Will we get
>>>>incremental (or maybe even compound) increases in 'clarity' and 'depth'
>>>with
>>>>each pass?
>>>
>>>Nope, you can only get the glass so clean... if there are newly-
>>>embedded jitter artifacts on a rendered file and you pass it
>>>through another stage, you can't get it any cleaner.
>>>We're not talking about rendering it more than once, we're
>>>talking about the one & only rendering of the final mix to a two-
>>>track file prior to mastering.
>>>
>>>Unless I'm misunderstanding something here.
>>>
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>
