

---

Subject: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 14:56:05 GMT

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

---

nstudio.com> wrote:

>

>Yeah, I wont really need to lock to Paris especially if I track a click

to

>the tape machine then use the same click in Paris I can visually line up  
the

>tracks to the click later. But in your method, if I undertand things correctly,

>you would not have gotten "tape compression" as you were just getting the

>electronic through put? Seems like you;d actually have to record. to get

>the tape "sound" or am I wrong?

>

>

>

>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>>I used to do this with a TEAC 80-8. I wish I still had it. Latency isn't

>an

>>issue. The signal path through

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 15:32:40 GMT

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

---

the components of the tape machine is faster

>>than your A/D and D/A conversion so in all likelihood, you will have around

>>1.2ms latency (the AD/DA latency in Paris).

>>

>>The way I did it was to patch the preamps directly to the deck, then send

>>the returns to 8 paris inputs and record them. Sounded great. I also striped

>>a smpte track to tape and sync'ed Paris to the deck using my old Opcode

>>Studio 64XTC. If you've got a box with this capability, you'd be goodto

>go

>>if you just wanted to lock Paris to the deck. I just didn't like losing

>a

>>track to the stripe and actually it worked better, IMO, just to track the

>>tape returns because I wasn't losing a generation every time I played back

>>the tape afterwards.

>>;o)

>>

>>"cujjo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:43526a05\$1@linux...

>>>

>>>

>>> My old 1" 16 keeps staring at me from the corner of my control room.

>>>

>>> I keep wonderiing if I should be tracking drums and bass on it then  
>>bouncing  
>>> in to Paris..  
>>>  
>>> Is anyone else doing that here?  
>>>  
>>> My problem is my old board is gone. I would need to use Paris as a monitor  
>>> portion of a console. I think I'd need to send my pre amps in to tape,  
>>open  
>>> a Paris project and send the outs of the tape machine there, and send  
>that  
>>> to the musicians as a monitor, I wonder if there will be too much latency  
>>> and it would screw with perfomances. It seems like this should work  
>>though.  
>>>  
>>> Then right after the take, roll it back, hit record on paris, and

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 16:09:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

play  
>the  
>>> tape into paris.  
>>>  
>>> Rewind and record over that take for the next song.  
>>>  
>>> Does this sound like it's worth the effort?  
>>  
>>  
>Sorry, a bit of a cloudy head today,  
>Can you clarify this?  
>Thanks

"Dave Parkin" <dave@blackbirdstudio.com.au> wrote:

>  
>  
>  
>Howdy,  
>  
> If you use the repro heads, the sound will go straight on-off tape with  
>very little time delay. You can use one tape for an entire album this way.  
>The repro heads stripe to tape, and send back to monitor post tape.  
>  
>Cheers

>  
>  
>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>Yeah, I wont really need to lock to Paris especially if I track a click  
>to  
>>the tape machine then use the same click in Paris I can visually line up  
>the  
>>tracks to the click later. But in your method, if I undertand things correctly,  
>>you would not have gotten "tape compression" as you were just getting the  
>>electronic through put? Seems like you;d actually have to record. to get  
>>the tape "sound" or am I wrong?  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>>I used to do this with a TEAC 80-8. I wish I still had it. Latency isn't  
>>an  
>>>issue. The signal path through the components of the tape machine is faster  
>>>than your A/D and D/A conversion so in all likelihood, you will have around  
>>>1.2ms latency (the AD/DA latency in Paris).  
>>>  
>>>The way I did it was to patch the preamps directly to the deck, then send  
>>>the returns to 8 paris inputs and record them. Sounded great. I also striped  
>>>a smpte track to tape and sync'ed Paris to the deck using my old Opcode  
>>>Studio 64XTC. If you've got a box with this capability, you'd be goodto  
>>go  
>>>if you just wanted to lock Paris to the deck. I just didn't like losing  
>>a  
>>>track to the stripe and actually it worked better, IMO, just to track  
the  
>>>tape returns because I wasn't losing a generation every time I played  
back  
>>>the tape afterwards.  
>>>;o)  
>>>  
>>>"cujo" <

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 16:15:31 GMT

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

---

udio.com" target="\_blank">chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message  
news:43526a05\$1@linux...

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> My old 1" 16 keeps staring at me from the corner of my control room.

>>>>  
>>>> I keep wondering if I should be tracking drums and bass on it then  
>>>>bouncing  
>>>> in to Paris..  
>>>>  
>>>> Is anyone else doing that here?  
>>>>  
>>>> My problem is my old board is gone. I would need to use Paris as a monitor  
>>>> portion of a console. I think I'd need to send my pre amps in to tape,  
>>>>open  
>>>> a Paris project and send the outs of the tape machine there, and send  
>>that  
>>>> to the musicians as a monitor, I wonder if there will be too much latency  
>>>> and it would screw with performances. It seems like this should work  
>>>though.  
>>>>  
>>>> Then right after the take, roll it back, hit record on paris, and play  
>>the  
>>>> tape into paris.  
>>>>  
>>>> Rewind and record over that take for the next song.  
>>>>  
>>>> Does this sound like it's worth the effort?  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback head) will produce different results. If you try to record to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance between heads. During record, the electronics pass the input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal being output at that point has not been anywhere near the tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also much better as it is optimised for playback, where the Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the material would have to be transferred off the tape in less than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording. Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from the recording.

David.

Dave Parkin wrote:

> Howdy,

>  
> If you use the repro heads, the sound will go straight on-off tape with  
> very little time delay. You can use one tape for an entire album this way.  
> The repro heads stripe to tape, and send back to monitor post tape.  
>  
> Cheers  
>  
>  
> "cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:  
>  
>>Yeah, I wont really need to lock to Paris especially if I track a click  
>  
> to  
>  
>>the tape machine then use the same click in Paris I can visually line up  
>  
> the  
>  
>>tracks to the click later. But in your method, if I undertand things correctly,  
>>you would not have gotten "tape compression" as you were just getting the  
>>electronic through put? Seems like you;d actually have to record. to get  
>>the tape "sound" or am I wrong?  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>  
>>>I used to do this with a TEAC 80-8. I wish I still had it. Latency isn't  
>>  
>>an  
>>  
>>>issue. The signal path through the components of the tape machine is faster  
>>>

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [dave Parkin](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 16:21:18 GMT

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

---

than your A/D and D/A conversion so in all likelihood, you will have around  
>>>1.2ms latency (the AD/DA latency in Paris).

>>>

>>>The way I did it was to patch the preamps directly to the deck, then send  
>>>the returns to 8 paris inputs and record them. Sounded great. I also striped  
>>>a smpte track to tape and sync'ed Paris to the deck using my old Opcode  
>>>Studio 64XTC. If you've got a box with this capability, you'd be goodto

>>

>>go

>>  
>>> if you just wanted to lock Paris to the deck. I just didn't like losing  
>>  
>>a  
>>  
>>> track to the stripe and actually it worked better, IMO, just to track the  
>>> tape returns because I wasn't losing a generation every time I played back  
>>> the tape afterwards.  
>>>;o)  
>>>  
>>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:43526a05\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> My old 1" 16 keeps staring at me from the corner of my control room.  
>>>>  
>>>> I keep wonderiing if I should be tracking drums and bass on it then  
>>>  
>>>bouncing  
>>>  
>>>> in to Paris..  
>>>>  
>>>> Is anyone else doing that here?  
>>>>  
>>>> My problem is my old board is gone. I would need to use Paris as a monitor  
>>>> portion of a console. I think I'd need to send my pre amps in to tape,  
>>>  
>>>open  
>>>  
>>>>a Paris project and send the outs of the tape machine there, and send  
>>  
>>that  
>>  
>>>>to the musicians as a monitor, I wonder if there will be too much latency  
>>>>and it would screw with perfomances. It seems like this should work  
>>>  
>>>though.  
>>>  
>>>>Then right after the take, roll it back, hit record on paris, and play  
>>  
>>the  
>>  
>>>>tape into paris.  
>>>>  
>>>>Rewind and record over that take for the next song.  
>>>>  
>>>>Does this sound like it's worth the effort?  
>>>  
>>>

>Yeah, what I was thinking of doing is actually record on tape, so this should be the sync head no?, monitoring from the sync head in to paris, then after the take switch to repro, rewind the tape, hit record in paris, play the tape, then line the tape tracks up to the click that is in the Paris project. then move on to the next song.

Will it work?

ALso I wonder if people like bass guitar from tape or digital better. It may not be worth the effort I dunno.

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:  
>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>a

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 18:43:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>material would have to be transfered off the tape in less  
>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from  
>the recording.

>

>David.

>

>Dave Parkin wrote:

>> Howdy,

>>

>> If you use the repro heads, the sound will go straight on-off tape with

>> very little time delay. You can use one tape for an entire album this way.

>> The repro heads stripe to tape, and send back to monitor post tape.

>>

>> Cheers  
>>  
>>  
>> "cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Yeah, I wont really need to lock to Paris especially if I track a click  
>>  
>> to  
>>  
>>> the tape machine then use the same click in Paris I can visually line up  
>>  
>> the  
>>  
>>> tracks to the click later. But in your method, if I undertand things  
correctly,  
>>> you would not have gotten "tape compression" as you were just getting  
the  
>>> electronic through put? Seems like you;d actually have to record. to  
get  
>>> the tape "sound" or am I wrong?  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> I used to do this with a TEAC 80-8. I wish I still had it. Latency isn't  
>>>  
>>> an  
>>>  
>>>> issue. The signal path through the components of the tape machine is  
faster  
>>>> than your A/D and D/A conversion so in all likelihood, you will have  
around  
>>>> 1.2ms latency (the AD/DA latency in Paris).  
>>>>  
>>>> The way I did it was to patch the preamps directly to the deck, then  
send  
>>>> the returns to 8 paris inputs and record them. Sounded great. I also  
striped  
>>>> a smpte track to tape and sync'ed Paris to the deck using my old Opcode  
>>>> Studio 64XTC. If you've got a box with this capability, you'd be goodto  
>>>  
>>> go  
>>>  
>>>> if you just wanted to lock Paris to the deck. I just didn't like losing  
>>>  
>>> a  
>>>



>>>>track to the stripe and actually it worked better, IMO, just to track  
the  
>>>>tape returns because I wasn't losing a generation every time I played  
back  
>>>>the tape afterwards.  
>>>>;o)  
>>>>  
>>>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:43526a05\$1@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>My old 1" 16 keeps staring at me from the corner of my control room.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>I keep wonderiing if I should be tracking drums and bass on it then  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [audioguy\\_nospam\\_](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 19:57:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>>bouncing  
>>>>  
>>>>>in to Paris..  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Is anyone else doing that here?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>My problem is my old board is gone. I would need to use Paris as a monitor  
>>>>>portion of a console. I think I'd need to send my pre amps in to tape,  
>>>>>  
>>>>>open  
>>>>>  
>>>>>a Paris project and send the outs of the tape machine there, and send  
>>>  
>>>that  
>>>  
>>>>>to the musicians as a monitor, I wonder if there will be too much latency  
>>>>>and it would screw with performances. It seems like this should work  
>>>>>  
>>>>>though.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Then right after the take, roll it back, hit record on paris, and play  
>>>>>  
>>>>>the  
>>>>>  
>>>>>tape into paris.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Rewind and record over that take for the next song.

>>>>

>>>>>Does this sound like it's worth the effort?

>>>>

>>>>

>>Yes, that will work just fine. Personally, I would hit record in Paris at the same time. When you are done, transfer the tape tracks to the same Paris project later in the timeline. This will allow you to compare easily as to which tracks you like better. With some slight nudging here and there, you should also be able to swap tracks back and forth between the direct Paris recording and the tape transfer.

David.

cujo wrote:

> Yeah, what I was thinking of doing is actually record on tape, so this should  
> be the sync head no?, monitoring from the sync head in to paris, then after  
> the take switch to repro, rewind the tape, hit record in paris, play the  
> tape, then line the tape tracks up to the click that is in the Paris project.  
> then move on to the next song.

> Will it work?

> Also I wonder if people like bass guitar from tape or digital better.

> It may not be worth the effort I dunno.

>

>

>

> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:

>

>>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>>a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>>material would have to be transferred off the tape in less  
>>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from  
>>the recording.

>>

>>David.

>>  
>> Dave Parkin wrote:  
>>  
>>> Howdy,  
>>>  
>>> If you use the repro heads, the sound will go straight on-off tape  
>  
> with  
>  
>>> very little time delay. You can use one tape for an entire album this  
>  
> way.  
>  
>>> The repro heads stripe to tape, and send back to monitor post tape.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> Yeah, I won't really need to lock to Paris especially if I track a click  
>>>  
>>> to  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> the tape machine then use the same click in Paris I can visually line up  
>>>  
>>> the  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> tracks to the click later. But in your method, if I understand things  
>  
> correctly,  
>  
>>>> you would not have gotten "tape compression" as you were just getting  
>  
> the  
>  
>>>> electronic through put? Seems like you;d actually have to record. to  
>  
> get  
>  
>>>> the tape "sound" or

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

am I wrong?

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>I used to do this with a TEAC 80-8. I wish I still had it. Latency isn't

>>>>

>>>>an

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>issue. The signal path through the components of the tape machine is

>

> faster

>

>>>>>than your A/D and D/A conversion so in all likelihood, you will have

>

> around

>

>>>>>1.2ms latency (the AD/DA latency in Paris).

>>>>>

>>>>>The way I did it was to patch the preamps directly to the deck, then

>

> send

>

>>>>>the returns to 8 paris inputs and record them. Sounded great. I also

>

> striped

>

>>>>>a smpte track to tape and sync'ed Paris to the deck using my old Opcode

>>>>>Studio 64XTC. If you've got a box with this capability, you'd be goodto

>>>>

>>>>go

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>if you just wanted to lock Paris to the deck. I just didn't like losing

>>>>

>>>>a

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>track to the stripe and actually it worked better, IMO, just to track

>

> the

>

>>>>>tape returns because I wasn't losing a generation every time I played

>  
> back  
>  
>>>>the tape afterwards.  
>>>>;o)  
>>>>  
>>>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:43526a05\$1@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>>My old 1" 16 keeps staring at me from the corner of my control room.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>I keep wonderiing if I should be tracking drums and bass on it then  
>>>>>  
>>>>>bouncing  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>in to Paris..  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Is anyone else doing that here?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>My problem is my old board is gone. I would need to use Paris as a monitor  
>>>>>portion of a console. I think I'd need to send my pre amps in to tape,  
>>>>>  
>>>>>open  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>a Paris project and send the outs of the tape machine there, and send  
>>>>>  
>>>>>that  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>to the musicians as a monitor, I wonder if there will be too much latency  
>>>>>>and it would screw with perfomances. It seems like this should work  
>>>>>  
>>>>>though.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>Then right after the take, roll it back, hit record on paris, and play  
>>>>>  
>>>>>the  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>tape into paris.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>Rewind and record over that take for the next song.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>Does this sound like it's worth the effort?  
>>>>>>

>>>>

sound and that this will cause tape delay.

You would NOT be using the sync head in this environment. You record using the record head and play back using the play head, so your comments about the frequency response of the sync mode are not germane.

As to your comment:

This is correctly based on some truisms about tape. Tape will start to loose its top end after hundreds of plays or after long periods on the shelf, but your comment ignores the thousands of good sounding records made using analog recorders during the last 40 or so years. Most of those records were not recorded and mixed in 8 hours. 8 months is more typical.

Dark Side of the Moon took many months to record and mix and has more real

It should be obvious that I am a fan of analog tape, and in the absence of all-analog recordings, I like to do analog/digital hybrid recordings. I have often used my Ampex and Rexox 2 tracks just this way.

I have also had good luck going the opposite way from the common method.

I have produced several projects that started digital, that I moved to analog 48 just prior to mixing. Actually I worked that way exclusively for several

Respectfully,  
Gene

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:

>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>being output at th

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [audioguy\\_nospam\\_](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 20:43:40 GMT

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

---

at point has not been anywhere near the  
>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the

>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>material would have to be transferred off the tape in less  
>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from  
>the recording.  
>  
>David.  
>Hi Gene,

A few comments back at ya...

gene lennon wrote:

> sound and that this will cause tape delay.  
> You would NOT be using the sync head in this environment. You record using  
> the record head and play back using the play head, so your comments about  
> the frequency response of the sync mode are not germane.

I was replying to Dave Parkins comment of this:

"Howdy,

If you use the repro heads, the sound will go straight  
on-off tape with very little time delay. You can use one  
tape for an entire album this way. The repro heads stripe to  
tape, and send back to monitor post tape.

Cheers"

Which was incorrect in its terminology of the tape heads...  
hence the description I gave.

> As to your comment:

> This is correctly based on some truisms about tape. Tape will start to loose  
> its top end after hundreds of plays or after long periods on the shelf, but  
> your comment ignores the thousands of good sounding records made using analog  
> recorders during the last 40 or so years. Most of those records were not  
> recorded and mixed in 8 hours. 8 months is more typical.  
> Dark Side of the Moon took many months to record and mix and has more real

I understand and appreciate this point. The high frequency

content starts to degrade right away... perhaps not perceptibly. I agree that there are many wonderful recordings that have taken years to produce on analog tape, and still sound amazing. I was simply stressing the need to transfer sooner during a project, rather than later. If you have the take you want, why not transfer right away?

>  
> It should be obvious that I am a fan of analog tape, and in the absence of  
> all-analog recordings, I like to do analog/digital hybrid recordings. I have  
> often used my Ampex and Rexox 2 tracks just this way.  
> I have also had good luck going the opposite way from the common method.  
> I have produced several projects that started digital, that I moved to analog  
> 48 just prior to mixing. Actually I worked that way exclusively for several

> Respectfully,  
> Gene

I wish I actually had budgets to work with. Sadly, recording in our city has gone to the basement... both literally and figuratively. It has been ages since I had a really good project to work on. I trust you consider yourself fortunate to be able to work on projects that you would even consider do this on.

I miss tape... the smell, the sound, and the limitations that made musicians work so much harder to get \*the take\*. In the cut and paste world we live in, much of our art is disappearing.

Respect back at ya!

David.

>  
> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:  
>  
>>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>>a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with



>>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>>material would have to be transferred off the tape in less  
>>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from  
>>the recording.

>>  
>>David.  
>>

>  
> Gene, you may be the man to answer this question,  
I really want to do it this way, and see no worries with the extra little  
effort.

However, my machine is certainly no sludger it is a 1" Tascam MS16 running  
at 30 ips with DBX! DO you think there is still an advantage to me using  
thy hybrid approach?

Also, do you like the sound of bass hitting tape?

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:  
>

>sound and that this will cause tape delay.  
>You would NOT be using the sync head in this environment. You record using  
>the record head and play back using the play head, so your comments about  
>the frequency response of the sync mode are not germane.  
>As to your comment:

>This is correctly based on some truisms about tape. Tape will start to loose  
>its top end after hundreds of plays or after long periods on the shelf,  
but  
>your comment ignores the thousands of good sounding records made using analog  
>recorders during the last 40 or so years. Most of those records were not  
>recorded and mixed in 8 hours. 8 months is more typical.  
>Dark Side of the Moon took many months to record and mix and has more real

>  
>It should be obvious that I am a fan of analog tape, and in the absence  
of  
>all-analog recordings, I like to do analog/digital hybrid recordings. I  
have  
>often used my Ampex and Rexox 2 tracks just this way.  
>I have also had good luck going the opposite way from the common method.

>I have produced several projects that started digital, that I moved to analog  
>48 just prior to mixing. Actually I worked that way exclusively for several

>Respectfully,  
>Gene  
>  
>"Dave(EK Sound)" <

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 20:52:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

udioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca" target="\_blank">audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:

>>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>>a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>>material would have to be transferred off the tape in less  
>>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from  
>>the recording.

>>  
>>David.

>>  
>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>  
>  
>Gene, you may be the man to answer this question,  
>I really want to do it this way, and see no worries wiht the extra little  
>effort.  
>However, my machine is cerainly no studer it is a 1" Tascam MS16 running  
>at 30 ips with DBX! DO you think there is still an advantage to me using  
>thy hybrid approach?  
>Also, do you like the sound of bass hitting tape?

of analog tape.  
That is when you intentionally push tape past it normal limits to get a particular

sound.

That is what I use my 2 tracks for. I will intentionally drive drums or bass deep into tape at +3 or more to get the saturation and compression sound that you can only seem to get from real tape. (I have not tried the new Portico yet.)

This is using the analog recorder just as you would any effect. You try it and listen back and make adjustments.

Paris can get close, but I like real tape, particularly on drums and bass when I am looking for a more aggressive sound.

to break up from the lack of headroom in the electronics before the tape effect kicks in. If I had one I would give it a try and see if I liked it.

Obviously anyone who has dealt with plugin latency issues in Paris can easily deal with the tape delay.

Let us know how it turns out if you try it.

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [audioguy\\_nospam\\_](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 21:12:28 GMT

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

---

GeneP.S. Can the MS16 do DBX encode and decode at the same time? If not, I would

GeneYou mean just turn it off?

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>

>P.S. Can the MS16 do DBX encode and decode at the same time? If not, I would

>Gene

>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>

> You mean just turn it off?

>

if the DBX worked I/O simultaneously, or if you could just switch it off.

As I recall the MS16 was about \$8000 when it first came out. I guess I should

Gene"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>

>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>>

>> You mean just turn it off?

>>

>if the DBX worked I/O simultaneously, or if you could just switch it off.  
>As I recall the MS16 was about \$8000 when it first came out. I guess I should

>Gene

Just to be clear. The issue of simultaneous DBX I/O is only a concern if you are running the deck in real time as an effect. If you cut tracks directly to tape and later transfer the tracks to Paris this is a non-issue. GeneHehehehe!!!!!!! I had a running joke going with an old buddy of mine in Austin. It had to do with gear looking \*cool\* as opposed to what it actually did. He liked Paris because all of the componentry was black. He actually preferred certain Earthworks mics over others because they were black. Recently he floated the floor and bought some tube traps for his home studio. I ruined his day when i asked him if they were black. They weren't and he actually called them up to see if they could be returned for black ones. I think he actually may try to change their color.

;o)

"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@kc.rr.com> wrote in message news:4346dc77\$1@linux...

>

> This is a Cubase SX3 only comp, so no ME. He also REALLY wants a totally black

> computer. To the point of when we were discussing CD/DVD writers, his only  
> concern was that it was BLACK. 80P''''

> "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

> >

> >

> >Rod,

> >I have removable SATAs in my comp. I wanted beige and got them.

> >The second pair I purposely bought black to differentiate them.

> >Sometimes it's a good thing. XP black, ME beige.?.

> >Tom

> > "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote in message =

> >news:4346ab89\$1@linux...

> >

> > Yeah, I don't think that would fly anyway. I think I'll just put the =

> >system

> > drive in an internal bay and hook it up directly to the mobo...no =

> >mobile

> > rack. He'll never be changing it anyway.

> > I was trying to give him the option to have an extra system drive to =

> >pop

> > in, in case of failure...since he's not a tech guy at all.

> > Or I may paint it.

> > Rod

> > "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

> > >  
> > >  
> > > Yes but it STILL has to be black...  
> > > Tom  
> > > "Aaron Allen" <nospam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message =3D  
> > > news:4346957e@linux...  
> > > USB 2.0 External drive bay could be your answer.... they're cheap =  
> > too  
> > =3D  
> > > now.  
> > > AA  
> > >  
> > >

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 21:27:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

r />  
> > > "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@kc.rr.com> wrote in message =3D  
> > > news:43455e37\$1@linux...  
> > > >  
> > > > Yeah, I'm using a short rounder cable, I've tried several, all =  
> > with  
> > =3D  
> > > the=3D20  
> > > > same  
> > > > results. I've tried CS. The results are still the same. The guy =  
> > is =3D  
> > > REALLY  
> > > > stuck on wanting the WHOLE computer black, or, I would just use =  
> > the  
> > =3D  
> > > beige  
> > > > drive that works.  
> > > > I may just put the sys drive in an internal bracket and slap the  
> > =  
> > =3D  
> > > cover=3D20  
> > > > over  
> > > > the hole and call it good, but this kind of bugs me, and I'd like  
> > =  
> > > to  
> > =3D  
> > >  
> > > > figure  
> > > > it out. I appreciate the suggestions. Keep those cards and =

> >letters =3D  
> > >coming.  
>> > >  
>> > > Rod  
>> > >  
>> > > EK Sound <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote:  
>> > >>Are you using a nice "short" high density IDE cable? Try CS mode  
> =  
> >on  
>> > >>the drive to see if this helps also.  
>> > >>  
>> > >>David.  
>> > >>  
>> > >>Rod Lincoln wrote:  
>> > >>  
>> > >>> they say 66/100/133  
>> > >>> Rod  
>> > >>> EK Sound <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote:  
>> > >>>  
>> > >>>>Are these rated for 133?? I had a similar problem with 66 trays  
> =  
> >in  
>> >=3D  
>> >XP.  
>> > >>>>  
>> > >>>>David.  
>> > >>>>  
>> > >>>>Rod Lincoln wrote:  
>> > >>>>  
>> > >>>>>I'm building a computer for a friend to run cubase on. Got =3D  
>> >everything  
>> > >>>  
>> > >>> going  
>> > >>>  
>> > >>>>>fine, EXCEPT the mobile rack tray (IDE) for the system drive.  
>> > >>>>>Here's the history. I bought 2 of these on line (he wanted =  
> >black,  
>> >=3D  
>> >so  
>> > > I  
>> > >>>  
>> > >>> had  
>> > >>>  
>> > >>>>>to go with a different brand than I normally use) neither one  
> =  
> >of  
>> >=3D  
>> >them

> > > >>>  
> > > >>> worked  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>>>I got "ERROR in READING DRIVE)  
> > > >>>>on boot (this is the system drive). It is on ide bus 1 by =

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 21:50:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> >itself  
> > =3D  
> > >and  
> > > > is  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> set  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>>>properly with the jumper for single master.  
> > > >>>>I already tried different ide cables...no worky, BUT, when I =  
> >=3D  
> > >switched  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> to  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>>>a mobile rack that I use, it worked fine. So I figured it was  
> =  
> >=3D  
> > >just=3D20  
> > > >>>>crappy  
> > > >>>>racks. (mines beige and this guy wants black).  
> > > >>>>I went to comp usa and bought one of their "brand" black =  
> >mobile =3D  
> > >drives  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> on  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>>>a recomendation from a friend and get the same dang error =  
> >again.  
> > =3D  
> > >Now,  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> it  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>>>could be that this drive from CRAP USA is also bad, but I'm =  
> >=3D  
> > >starting

> > > > to  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> wonder  
> > > &gt;

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 22:01:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

;:>>  
> > > >>>>> if something else is going on that I'm missing. I'll do some =  
> > more  
> > =3D

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 22:05:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>  
> > >  
> > > >>>>> troubleshooting  
> > > >>>>> as I get the time, but I would welcome any suggestions as to =  
> > what  
> > =3D  
> > > may  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> be  
> > > >>>  
> > >

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 22:12:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>>>>> another reason fkor the problem.  
> > > >>>>> I have a hard time believing that this mobo just doesn't like  
> > =  
> > =3D  
> > > "black"  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>> rack  
> > > >>>  
> > > >>>>> drives.  
> > > >>>>> Rod

---



> > > >>>

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 22:45:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> > > >>>  
> > > >=3D20  
> > >  
> > >  
> > >  
> > ><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">  
> > ><HTML><HEAD>  
> > ><META http-equiv=3D3DContent-Type content=3D3D"text/html; =3D  
> > > charset=3D3Diso-8859-1">  
> > ><META content=3D3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3D3DGENERATOR>  
> > ><STYLE></STYLE>  
> > ></HEAD>  
> > ><BODY bgColor=3D3D#ffffff>  
> > ><DIV><FONT face=3D3DArial size=3D3D2>Yes but it STILL has to be =3D  
> > >black...</FONT></DIV>  
> > ><DIV><FONT face=3D3DArial size=3D3D2>Tom</FONT></DIV>

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 23:01:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

e thousands of good sounding records made using  
> analog  
> recorders during the last 40 or so years. Most of those records were not  
> recorded and mixed in 8 hours. 8 months is more typical.  
> Dark Side of the Moon took many months to record and mix and has more real

I understand and appreciate this point. The high frequency content starts to degrade right away... perhaps not perceptibly. I agree that there are many wonderful recordings that have taken years to produce on analog tape, and still sound amazing. I was simply stressing the need to transfer sooner during a project, rather than later. If you have the take you want, why not transfe

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 23:15:56 GMT

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

---

r right away?

>  
> It should be obvious that I am a fan of analog tape, and in the absence of  
> all-analog recordings, I like to do analog/digital hybrid recordings. I  
> have  
> often used my Ampex and Rexox 2 tracks just this way.  
> I have also had good luck going the opposite way from the common method.  
> I have produced several projects that started digital, that I moved to  
> analog  
> 48 just prior to mixing. Actually I worked that way exclusively for  
> several

> Respectfully,  
> Gene

I wish I actually had budgets to work with. Sadly, recording in our city has gone to the basement... both literally and figuratively. It has been ages since I had a really good project to work on. I trust you consider yourself fortunate to be able to work on projects that you would even consider do this on.

I miss tape... the smell, the sound, and the limitations that made musicians work so much harder to get \*the take\*. In the cut and paste world we live in, much of our art is disappearing.

Respect back at ya!

David.

>  
> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:  
>  
>>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the Sel/Sync head  
>>(record head) and the Repro head (playback head) will produce different  
>>results. If you try to record to tape then play back with the Repro head,  
>>you \*will\* have a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the  
>>distance between heads. During record, the electronics pass the input  
>>signal back to the output stage directly. The signal being output at that  
>>point has not been anywhere near the tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode  
>>will do this (with delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is

>>also much better as it is optimised for playback, where the Sel/Sync head  
>>is optimised for recording. Also, the material would have to be  
>>transferred off the tape in less than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the  
>>analog recording. Past that point the smallest domains self align as a  
>>result of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from the  
>>recording.

>>  
>>David.

>>  
>  
>I could have sworn that I saw somewhere that only 3 x HDSP PCI cards were possible.. I'm currently running 2 x HDSP 9652 PCI's and a Multiface/PCI. I wouldn't mind adding another Multiface/PCI (yeah, I know.....get a Madi.....I have my reasons not to).....soooo.....I was wondering if, by any chance, I'm having a senior moment and 4 x HDSP PCI cards can be utilized.In town for a bit and would love to chat with fellow Parisites.

Rob\_AYes, I'm in Dallas right now. My Paris rig is living with my bandmate in Illinois, though :)

Where are you staying? If you'd like, you could check out the studio I'm helping my mom get started. We're in Oak Cliff.

Graham

"Rob Arsenault" <info@studiomanitou.com> wrote:

>In town for a bit and would love to chat with fellow Parisites.

>  
>Rob\_A  
>

>I've read numerous times that tape holds it's broadest freq and dynamics for about 5 seconds and that after 30 seconds, given a means of audible comparison, there is a noticeable difference. I have never had the opportunity to run a test but always assumed, based on the profile of the writers who espouse this notion, that this aspect of tape was accurately represented. Given a chance, I would lunge, not walk, at an opportunity to test this.

Dubya

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message news:4352bd9d\$1@linux...

>  
> Hi Dave. a few comments.  
> I think it is understood that you would use "Repro" mode to get the tape  
> sound and that this will cause tape delay.  
> You would NOT be using the sync head in this environment. You record using  
> the record head and play back using the play head, so your comments about

> the frequency response of the sync mode are not germane.  
> As to your comment:  
> "Also, the material would have to be transferred off the tape in less than  
> 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording."  
> This is correctly based on some truisms about tape. Tape will start to  
> loose  
> its top end after hundreds of plays or after long periods on the shelf,  
> but  
> your comment ignores the thousands of good sounding records made using  
> analog  
> recorders during the last 40 or so years. Most of those records were not  
> recorded and mixed in 8 hours. 8 months is more typical.  
> Dark Side of the Moon took many months to record and mix and has more real  
> "sheen" than any digital pop-rock record I've ever heard. I am not talking  
> about pumped up "Air", but true high frequency information.  
>  
> It should be obvious that I am a fan of analog tape, and in the absence of  
> all-analog recordings, I like to do analog/digital hybrid recordings. I  
> have  
> often used my Ampex and Rexox 2 tracks just this way.  
> I have also had good luck going the opposite way from the common method.  
> I have produced several projects that started digital, that I moved to  
> analog  
> 48 just prior to mixing. Actually I worked that way exclusively for  
> several  
> years. Next budget that allows. I will go that route again.  
> Respectfully,  
> Gene  
>  
> "Dave(EK

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 16 Oct 2005 23:31:10 GMT

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

---

the distance

>>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>>material would have to be transferred off the tape in less  
>>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from

>>the recording.

>>

>>David.

>>

>But you can't do that in Paris.

It only sees dual mono, (split tracks).

--

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4352e197\$1@linux...

>

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

>>Off the top of my head, I would say yes.

>>You're processing 2 files, (dual mono), 2 plugins, as opposed to one

>>stereo

>

>>file and one plugin.

>

> OK, I'll try re-doing some L/R tracks into stereo interleaved

> tracks & report back if I notice a difference in CPU usage.

>

> Neil"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>But you can't do that in Paris.

>It only sees dual mono, (split tracks).

Yes, yes, yes, but there are so many people here now using other DAW's... so just in case it might help anyone:

On the original version of one particular song I had, tracked & being mixed in CubaseSX, as follows:

33 total tracks, @ 24-bit / 88.2k.

47 instances of various plugins.

And about a dozen instances of the SX EQ.

CPU usage was hovering between 88% & 90%.

After re-tracking 14 stereo L/R keyboard tracks into regular stereo interleaved files/tracks, copying & pasting the exact channel settings (plugins & all) from one of the L/R dual mono channels it was replacing (except that I changed the pan settings, of course) and deleting the original L/R tracks each time, the CPU usage dropped down to about 80%. This is on an AthlonXP 2800, BTW.

So, apparently it DOES make a difference, albeit not a huge one... though enough to be able to insert another CPU-hungry

plugin, at least! lol

Neil

>--

>Martin Harrington

>www.lendanear-sound.com

>

>"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4352e197\$1@linux...

>>

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

>>>Off the top of my head, I would say yes.

>>>You're processing 2 files, (dual mono), 2 plugins, as opposed to one

>>>stereo

>>

>>>file and one plugin.

>>

>> OK, I'll try re-doing some L/R tracks into stereo interleaved

>> tracks & report back if I notice a difference in CPU usage.

>>

>> Neil

>

>"W. Mark Wilson" <wmarkwilson@verizon.net> wrote:

>I've read numerous times that tape holds it's broadest freq and dynamics for

>about 5 seconds and that after 30 seconds, given a means of audible

>comparison, there is a noticeable difference. I have never had the

>opportunity to run a test but always assumed, based on the profile of the

>writers who espouse this notion, that this aspect of tape was accurately

>represented. Given a chance, I would lunge, not walk, at an opportunity to

>test this.

>

>Dubya

>

I think this may be true to an almost immeasurable degree, but it is also true that analog alignment tapes were rated to hold plus or minus one tenth of one db accuracy for 5 years or 1000 plays over the full audio spectrum, and most Ampex alignment tapes were recorded on standard Ampex 206 tape.

Generally I would start hearing 256 (my normal first choice) become dull only after hundreds of passes. There is no arguing that this is one area where digital is vastly superior.

GeneTest tapes were recorded at low levels (185-200nWB) on low print tape for this exact reason... to maintain frequency response over time. Taking a roll of 250 or 456 to the edge of its retentivity will produce significant print in just 1 day. The finer domains will easily realign to this higher level changing the frequency response of the recorded material... hence my suggestion to get it transferred as soon as possible.

Regarding the Portico... I still don't see how having a tape head circuit in the audio path would emulate the tape transfer characteristics of "actual tape". I would love to sit down with Rupert and discuss how he gets it to do this! :-)

David.

gene lennon wrote:

> "W. Mark Wilson" <wmarkwilson@verizon.net> wrote:

>

>>I've re

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [wmarkwilson](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 01:42:44 GMT

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

---

corded on standard Ampex 206 tape.

>

> Generally I would start hearing 256 (my normal first choice) become dull

> only after hundreds of passes. There is no arguing that this is one area

> where digital is vastly superior.

> Gene

>Ahh, yes, but you didn't mention "other" DAWS

--

Martin Harrington

[www.lendaneer-sound.com](http://www.lendaneer-sound.com)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:43530c7c\$1@linux...

>

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

>>But you can't do that in Paris.

>>It only sees dual mono, (split tracks).

>

> Yes, yes, yes, but there are so many people here now using other

> DAW's... so just in case it might help anyone:  
>  
> On the original version of one particular song I had, tracked &  
> being mixed in CubaseSX, as follows:  
>  
> 33 total tracks, @ 24-bit / 88.2k.  
> 47 instances of various plugins.  
> And about a dozen instances of the SX EQ.  
>  
> CPU usage was hovering between 88% & 90%.  
>  
> After re-tracking 14 stereo L/R keyboard tracks into regular  
> stereo interleaved files/tracks, copying & pasting the exact  
> channel settings (plugins & all) from one of the L/R dual mono  
> channels it was replacing (except that I changed the pan  
> settings, of course) and deleting the original L/R tracks each  
> time, the CPU usage dropped down to about 80%. This is on an  
> AthlonXP 2800, BTW.  
>  
> So, apparently it DOES make a difference, albeit not a huge  
> one... though enough to be able to insert another CPU-hungry  
> plugin, at least! lol  
>  
> Neil  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>>--  
>>Martin Harrington  
>>www.lendaneer-sound.com  
>>  
>>"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4352e197\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:  
>>>>Off the top of my head, I would say yes.  
>>>>You're processing 2 files, (dual mono), 2 plugins, as opposed to one  
>  
>>>>stereo  
>>>  
>>>>file and one plugin.  
>>>  
>>> OK, I'll try re-doing some L/R tracks into stereo interleaved  
>>> tracks & report back if I notice a difference in CPU usage.  
>>>  
>>> Neil



>>

>>

>.....me too. I will be going down to Austin in the near future. I called Neve in Wimberley and talked to the manager (not Rupert) about a month ago. He told me I could come out there and see the place. I'm going to ask some questions. It's about an hour south of Austin.

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote in message news:43533a80\$1@linux...

> Test tapes were recorded at low levels (185-200nWB) on low  
> print tape for this exact reason... to maintain frequency  
> response over time. Taking a roll of 250 or 456 to the edge  
> of its retentivity will produce significant print in just 1  
> day. The finer domains will easily realign to this higher  
> level changing the frequency response of the recorded  
> material... hence my suggesti

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 03:16:43 GMT

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

h of an issue it is and over what period of time.

them to digital. Most were 15 years old or older. The tapes that were well

see any obvious flaking. Ironically, most of my old DAT tapes are useless. I hope CDR and DVD longevity is better.

The Portico is interesting. If it works as promised, it implies that much

to saturating the tape. That would stand everything I was ever told on its

Genel track on an MCI 2inch 24 track. I track on Paris the same time in case the tape plays up also if I have the killer take on tape and band want to try another I do taht on Paris as I can do as many takes as possbile. It gets costly on tape.

I then transfer the basic band tracks to Paris and do all my overdubs and mixing from Paris.Hank

>Yes, that will work just fine. Personally, I would hit

>record in Paris at the same t

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [audioguy\\_nospam\\_](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 05:41:42 GMT

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

---

ime. When you are done,  
>transfer the tape tracks to the same Paris project later in  
>the timeline. This will allow you to compare easily as to  
>which tracks you like better. With some slight nudging here  
>and there, you should also be able to swap tracks back and  
>forth between the direct Paris recording and the tape transfer.

>  
>David.

>  
>cujo wrote:

>  
>> Yeah, what I was thinking of doing is actually record on tape, so this  
should  
>> be the sync head no?, monitoring from the sync head in to paris, then  
after  
>> the take switch to repro, rewind the tape, hit record in paris, play the  
>> tape, then line the tape tracks up to the click that is in the Paris project.  
>> then move on to the next song.  
>> Will it work?  
>> ALso I wonder if people like bass guitar from tape or digital better.  
>> It may not be worth the effort I dunno.

>>  
>>  
>>  
>> "Dave(EK Sound)" <[audioguy\\_nospam\\_@shaw.ca](mailto:audioguy_nospam_@shaw.ca)> wrote:

>>  
>>>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>>>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>>>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>>>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>>>a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>>>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>>>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>>>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>>>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>>>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>>>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>>>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>>>material would have to be transfered off the tape in less  
>>>than 8 hou

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 06:12:14 GMT

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

---

gt;>1.2ms latency (the AD/DA latency in Paris).  
>>>>>  
>>>>>The way I did it was to patch the preamps directly to the deck, then  
>>  
>> send  
>>  
>>>>>the returns to 8 paris inputs and record them. Sounded great. I also  
>>  
>> striped  
>>  
>>>>>a smpte track to tape and sync'ed Paris to the deck using my old Opcode  
>>>>>Studio 64XTC. If you've got a box with this capability, you'd be goodto  
>>>>>  
>>>>>go  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>if you just wanted to lock Paris to the deck. I just didn't like losing  
>>>>>  
>>>>>a  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>track to the stripe and actually it worked better, IMO, just to track  
>>  
>> the  
>>  
>>>>>tape returns because I wasn't losing a generation every time I played  
>>  
>> back  
>>  
>>>>>the tape afterwards.  
>>>>>;o)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:43526a05\$1@linux...  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>My old 1" 16 keeps staring at me from the corner of my control room.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>I keep wonderiing if I should be tracking drums and bass on it then  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>bouncing  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>in to Paris..  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>Is anyone else doing that here?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>My problem is my old board is gone. I would need to use Paris as a  
monitor

>>>>>>portion of a console. I think I'd need to send my pre amps in to tape,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>open  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>a Paris project and send the outs of the tape machine there, and send  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>that  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>to the musicians as a monitor, I wonder if there will be too much  
latency  
>>>>>>and it would screw with performances. It seems like this should work  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>though.  
>>>>>>  
>&

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 07:11:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

gt;>>>>  
>>>>>>>Then right after the take, roll it back, hit record on paris, and  
play  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>the  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>tape into paris.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>Rewind and record over that take for the next song.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>Does this sound like it's worth the effort?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>ok... so I will admit it. I have never been able to get my head around the  
way paris runs automation, so I usually try and work without it....

but, well, now... I need it.

here are a few questions...

why is it that I can input automation by making moves with the mouse, but  
not with the c16 ? I hit the "auto/marker" button....and armed the tracks....  
but it didnt take from the fader moves on the c16.....

also... why are my "pencil" buttons greyed out in the automation window?  
if I could figure out how to access them, I might just draw it in....

if someone could help.. I would be mucho mucho grateful...

I didnt seem to find the answers to either of these in the FAQ's.....

scott h  
fresnelmusic@comcast.netDJ,

What I want to hear are the reasons not to get a MADI...:)

Chris

DJ wrote:

> I could have sworn that I saw somewhere that only 3 x HDSP PCI cards were  
> possible.. I'm currently running 2 x HDSP 9652 PCI's and a Multiface/PCI. I

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [hank](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 08:47:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> wouldn't mind adding another Multiface/PCI (yeah, I know.....get a  
> Madi.....I have my reasons not to).....soooo.....I was wondering if,  
> by any chance, I'm having a senior moment and 4 x HDSP PCI cards can be  
> utilized.

>  
>  
>  
>

--

Chris Ludwig  
ADK  
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>  
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>  
(859) 635-5762Okay, it doesn't look like any Mac guys are using Waves 3.6!

How 'bout you PC guys? What is the version of Waves that works?

Gantt

Gantt Kushner wrote:

> Do any Mac people have experience w/ Waves 3.6 and Paris? I've  
> been using Waves 3.2 w/ no significant problems, but I tried V.3.2  
> and Paris crashed, so I've been sticking w/ 3.2. I'm curious about  
> V.3.6, which is the last OS 9 compatible update...

>

> Thanks!

>

> GanttGantt Kushner <gizmo@his.com> wrote:

>Okay, it doesn't look like any Mac guys are using Waves 3.6!

>

>How 'bout you PC guys? What is the version of Waves that works?

>

>Gantt

>

>Gantt Kushner wrote:

>

>> Do any Mac people have experience w/ Waves 3.6 and Paris? I've  
>> been using Waves 3.2 w/ no significant problems, but I tried V.3.2  
>> and Paris crashed, so I've been sticking w/ 3.2. I'm curious about  
>> V.3.6, which is the last OS 9 compatible update...

>>

>> Thanks!

>>

>> Gantt

>

I use 4.05  
with no problems.

Regards,

DimitriosJohn <no@no.com> wrote:

>Does it work in paris and what directx do i need?

Hi,

I use waves 4.05 with DirectX 9c on XP.

I guess 5 will work too but it updated mostly for mac I think...

Regards,

DimitriosI usually do a small move with the mouse then draw the rest in.

COuld it be that you need to select the volume in the automation editor.

"scott h " <fresnelmusic@comcast.net> wrote:

>

>ok... so I will admit it. I have never been able to get my head around the  
>way paris runs automation, so I usually try and work without it....

>  
>but, well, now... I need it.  
>  
>here are a few questions...  
>  
>  
>why is it that I can input automation by making moves with the mouse, but  
>not with the c16 ? I hit the "auto/marker" button....and armed the tracks....  
>but it didnt take from the fader moves on the c16.....  
>  
>also... why are my "pencil" buttons greyed out in the automation window?  
>if I could figure out how to access them, I might just draw it in....  
>  
>  
>if someone could help.. I would be mucho mucho grateful...  
>  
>I didnt seem to find the answers to either of these in the FAQ's.....  
>  
>  
>scott h  
>fresnelmusic@comcast.netNice!  
Do you and the band monitor via Paris?

"hank" <hkovac@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>  
>I track on an MCI 2inch 24 track. I track on Paris the same time in case  
the  
>tape plays up also if I have the killer take on tape and band want to try  
>another I do taht on Paris as I can do as many takes as possbile. It gets  
>costly on tape.  
>I then transfer the basic band tracks to Paris and do all my overdubs and  
>mixing from Paris.Hank  
>>Yes, that will work just fine. Personally, I would hit  
>>record in Paris at the same time. When you are done,  
>>transfer the tape tracks to the same Paris project later in  
>>the timeline. This will allow you to compare easily as to  
>>which tracks you like better. With some slight nudging here  
>>and there, you should also be able to swap tracks back and  
>>forth between the direct Paris recording and the tape transfer.  
>>  
>>David.  
>>  
>>cujo wrote:  
>>  
>>> Yeah, what I was thinking of doing is actually record on tape, so this  
>should  
>>> be the sync head no?, monitoring from the sync head in to paris, then

>after  
>>> the take switch to repro, rewind the tape, hit record in paris, play  
the  
>>> tape, then line the tape tracks up to the click that is in the Paris  
project.  
>>> then move on to the next song.  
>>> Will it work?  
>>> ALso I wonder if people like bass guitar from tape or digital better.  
>>> It may not be worth the effort I dunno.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>>This is actually incorrect. On a 3 head R-R machine, the  
>>>>Sel/Sync head (record head) and the Repro head (playback  
>>>>head) will produce different results. If you try to record  
>>>>to tape then play back with the Repro head, you \*will\* have  
>>>>a very noticeable delay based on tape speed and the distance  
>>>>between heads. During record, the electronics pass the  
>>>>input signal back to the output stage directly. The signal  
>>>>being output at that point has not been anywhere near the  
>>>>tape. Only recording in "Repro" mode will do this (with  
>>>>delay). The frequency response of the Repro head is also  
>>>>much better as it is optimised for playback, where the  
>>>>Sel/Sync head is optimised for recording. Also, the  
>>>>material would have to be transfered off the tape in less  
>>>>than 8 hours to keep the "sheen" of the analog recording.  
>>>>Past that point the smallest domains self align as a result  
>>>>of print-through, eliminating the highest frequencies from  
>>>>the recording.  
>>>>  
>>>>David.  
>>>>  
>>>>Dave Parkin wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>>Howdy,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> If you use the repro heads, the sound will go straight on-off tape  
>>>>>  
>>>> with  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>very little time delay. You can use one tape for an entire album this  
>>>>>>  
>>>> way.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>The repro heads stripe to tape, and send back to monitor post tape.  
>>>>>>



>>>>>Cheers  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>Yeah, I wont really need to lock to Paris especially if I track a click  
>>>>>  
>>>>>to  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>the tape machine then use the same click in Paris I can visually line  
>up  
>>>>>  
>>>>>the  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>tracks to the click later. But in your method, if I undertand things  
>>>  
>>> correctly,  
>>>  
>>>>>>you would not have gotten "tape compression" as you were just getting  
>>>  
>>> the  
>>>  
>>>>>>electronic through put? Seems like you;d actually have to record.  
to  
>>>  
>>> get  
>>>  
>>>>>>the tape "sound" or am I wrong?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>"DJ" <

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 14:56:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ot; <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:  
>  
>"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:  
>>Test tapes were recorded at low levels (185-200nWB) on low  
>>print tape for this exact reason... to maintain frequency  
>>response over time. Taking a roll of 250 or 456 to the edge  
>>of its retentivity will produce significant print in just 1

>>day. The finer domains will easily realign to this higher  
>>level changing the frequency response of the recorded  
>>material... hence my suggestion to get it transferred as soon  
>>as possible.

>>  
>>Regarding the Portico... I still don't see how having a tape  
>>head circuit in the audio path would emulate the tape  
>>transfer characteristics of "actual tape". I would love to  
>>sit down with Rupert and discuss how he gets it to do this! :-)

>>  
>>David.

>>  
>  
>Well, we both agree about what happens to tape. We just disagree about how  
>much of an issue it is and over what period of time.

>them to digital. Most were 15 years old or older. The tapes that were well

>see any obvious flaking. Ironically, most of my old DAT tapes are useless.  
>I hope CDR and DVD longevity is better.

>  
>The Portico is interesting. If it works as promised, it implies that much

opposed

>to saturating the tape. That would stand everything I was ever told on its

>Gene  
>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>  
>  
>this is getting interesting.  
>If this is true, you could make a 2 buss unit that was just sort of a stereo  
>record head.  
>Insert it at mixdown and hit it hard.

>  
><http://www.rupertneve.com/portico5042.html>  
I am theorizing about the effect. I have not heard anyone claim what I suspect.  
GeneOh, sorry, I thought it was included in the mic pre.  
Didn't know it was a separate unit.  
Gene,you can talk him into sending you one I'd bet.

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>  
>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>>  
>>  
>>this is getting interesting.

>>If this is true, you could make a 2 buss unit that was just sort of a stereo  
>>record head.  
>>Insert it at mixdown and hit it hard.  
>>  
><http://www.rupertneve.com/portico5042.html>  
>I am theorizing about the effect. I have not heard anyone claim what I suspect.  
>Gene  
>I could not help but note that ID takes longer and longer to actually get  
back to purchasers requesting unlock codes with the passing of time - which  
is expected and a natural progression of events.  
This could be a way to push the inevitable end of product support into something  
more kind for end users.

-----  
Something you need cracked? Tell the Copyright Office  
8 October 2005 18:50 by Dela

The U.S. Copyright Office is conducting a periodic review of anti-cracking provisions set in the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), and is seeking feedback from the public on what you would like to see cracked and why. If there is a genuine reason why you think something should be allowed to be cracked, the office might just allow it. Congress mandated that the register of Copyrights revisit the anti-circumvention section every three years to ensure that consumers have proper access to things they have purchased.

Last time around, the office allowed the bypassing of copy protection on computer games available only in obsolete formats, cracking ebooks copy protection so that blind people can use software to read it out, cracking of web filtering software to view the list of blocked sites and cracking computer programs protected by a "dongle" that is malfunctioning. The office will take written submissions through December 1st and will accept rebuttals until February 2nd 2006.

After this time has passed, beginning in April the office will hold two sets of hearings. Basically, if the copyright office can be convinced that something copy protected prevents fair use of the work, then it might allow the copy protection to be circumvented legally. "I suspect that we will hear shortly from people who feel they have not been able to use copyrighted materials because of the DMCA," said Ralph Oman, an intellectual property attorney and former register of copyrights.

Source:  
Wired

<http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,69115,00.html?tw=r ss.TOP:->) well at least we are keeping our disagreement civil!

I invite you to a test... record a live performance directly to tape, then transfer it immediately to a digital format. Store the tape

properly for a month and repeat the transfer. Compare the two files to see if there is a difference. I would be interested in your observations myself.

DAT absolutely sucks... I am so glad it is finally going away. It really makes you wonder what really is the best archival format.

I am of the opinion that the whole "tape sound" does have \*something\* to do with the heads and electronics as you have mentioned... how much remains to be seen. It will be interesting to see what DJ learns in his visit to Portico.

Regards,

David.

gene lennon wrote:

> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy\_nospam\_@shaw.ca> wrote:

>

>>Test tapes were recorded at low levels (185-200nWB) on low

>>print tape for this exact reason... to maintain frequency

>>response over time. Taking a roll of 250 or 456 to the edge

>>of its retentivity will produce significant print in just 1

>>day. The finer domains will easily realign to this higher

>>level changing the frequency response of the recorded

>>material... hence my suggestion to get it transfered as soon

>>as possible.

>>

>>Regarding the Portico... I still don't see how having a tape

>>head circuit in the audio path would emulate the tape

>>transfer characteristics of "actual tape". I would love to

>>sit down with Rupert and discuss how he gets it to do this! :-)

>>

>>David.

>>

>

>

> Well, we both agree about what happens to tape. We just disagree about how

> much of an issue it is and over what period of time.

> them to digital. Most were 15 years old or older. The tapes that were well

> see any obvious flaking. Ironically, most of my old DAT tapes are useless.

> I hope CDR and DVD longevity is better.

>

> The Portico is interesting. If it works as promised, it implies that much

> to saturating the tape. That would stand everything I was ever told on its

> Gene

>Awesome. I'm on board. I am afraid that ID has been behaving VERY poorly the last few years.

I would testify at the hearing, on general principle alone.

Jimmy

"Fred Bloggs" <ParisUsers@defender.com> wrote in message  
news:4353c206\$1@linux...

>

> I could not help but note that ID takes longer and longer to actually get  
> back to purchasers requesting unlock codes with the passing of time -  
which

> is expected and a natural progression of events.

> This could be a way to push the inevitable end of product support into  
something

> more kind for end users.

> -----

> Something you need cracked? Tell the Copyright Office

> 8 October 2005 18:50 by Dela

>

> The U.S. Copyright Office is conducting a periodic review of anti-cracking  
> provisions set in the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), and is  
seeking

> feedback from the public on what you would like to see cracked and why. If

> there is a genuine reason why you think something should be allowed to be

> cracked, the office might just allow it. Congress mandated that the  
register

> of Copyrights revisit the anti-circumvention secti

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 15:16:30 GMT

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

---

on every three years to

> ensure that consumers have proper access to things they have purchased.

>

> Last time around, the office allowed the bypassing of copy protection on

> computer games available only in obsolete formats, cracking ebooks copy  
protection

> so that blind people can use software to read it out, cracking of web  
filtering

> software to view the list of blocked sites and cracking computer programs

> protected by a "dongle" that is malfunctioning. The office will take

written

> submissions through December 1st and will accept rebuttals until February  
> 2nd 2006.

>

> After this time has passed, beginning in April the office will hold two  
> sets

> of hearings. Basically, if the copyright office can be convinced that  
> something

> copy protected prevents fair use of the work, then it might allow the copy

> protection to be circumvented legally. "I suspect that we will hear  
> shortly

> from people who feel they have not been able to use copyrighted materials

> because of the DMCA," said Ralph Oman, an intellectual property attorney

> and former register of copyrights.

>

> Source:

> Wired

>

> [http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,69115,00.html?tw=r ss.TOP"cujo"](http://www.wired.com/news/politics/0,1283,69115,00.html?tw=r ss.TOP)  
<chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>

>I'm spending a dreary Saturday afternoon doing some studio chores and cranking

>some lovely lovely music from a band that some of you may not know much  
>about: Big Star

>

>Big Star's main man was Alex CHilton who is more famous perhaps as the 17

>year old singer of "The Letter" and"Cray Like A Baby" a member of The Box

>Tops

>

>Although recorded at Aredent in '72 and some a bit later, the engineerign

>is still almost unmatched, I had met Jim Dickinson a few years back (Jim  
>engineered

>Big Star's Third) he told me that Engineer John Fry put everything he had

>&gt;

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 15:20:03 GMT

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

---

;into the making of these records and pretty much gave up after them.

>

>The songs, the playing and the sound are marvelous.

>

>My good friend Phil Aiken will bakc me up on this, check em out if you have  
>not.

>Start whith #1 Record and Radio City as "third" is a bit dreary.

>

> [http://www.rykodisc.com/Catalog/CatalogArtist\\_01.asp?Action= Get&Artist\\_ID=21](http://www.rykodisc.com/Catalog/CatalogArtist_01.asp?Action= Get&Artist_ID=21)

Hi,

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 15:21:33 GMT

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

---

nd that after 30 seconds, given a means of audible  
>>>>comparison, there is a noticeable difference. I have never had the  
>>>>opportunity to run a test but always assumed, based on the profile of  
>  
> the  
>  
>>>  
>>>>writers who espouse this notion, that this aspect of tape was accurately  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>represented. Given a chance, I would lunge, not walk, at an opportunity  
>>>  
>>>to  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>test this.  
>>>>  
>>>>Dubya  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>I think this may be true to an almost immeasurable degree, but it is  
>  
> also  
>  
>>>true that analog alignment tapes were rated to hold plus or minus one  
>  
> tenth  
>  
>>>of one db accuracy for 5 years or 1000 plays over the full audio  
>  
> spectrum,  
>  
>>>and most Ampex alignment tapes were recorded on standard Ampex 206 tape.  
>>>  
>>>Generally I would start hearing 256 (my normal first choice) become dull  
>>>only after hundreds of passes. There is no arguing that this is one area  
>>>where digital is vastly superior.  
>>>Gene

>>>

>

>

>Ummm, I'm not at ALL trying to be smart here, but my ignorance is a black hole.

What else would they be used for?

Right now we're trying to get the SPDIF connectors on his MEC to translate to the AES/EBU connectors on his KSP8, which I suspect is the problem...

I was hoping the ADAT card would make our lives simpler.

Jimmy

"EK Sound" <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote in message news:4353d2c8\$1@linux...

> For audio transfer via lightpipe they work just fine.

>

> David.

>

> uptown jimmy wrote:

>

> > Howdy!

> >

> > I've never paid much attention to this, but do the ADAT cards work well?

Any

> > known issues?

> >

> > Swen has ADAT ins and outs on his Kurzweil KSP8....

> >

> > Jimmy

> >

> >

> >It's not an issue in practical terms for a lot of people here.

But it is certainly an issue.

Jimmy

"benjamin" <none@a.a> wrote in message news:4353d2e0\$

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 15:22:56 GMT

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

---



maybe one other original "Star" (?); the other members (from what I've read up Chilton et al.

I called and Borders has it in stock, if anyone's interested.

Cheers,  
Larry HoganHowdy!

I've never paid much attention to this, but do the ADAT cards work well? Any known issues?

Swen has ADAT ins and outs on his Kurzweil KSP8....

JimmyFor audio transfer via lightpipe they work just fine.

David.

uptown jimmy wrote:

> Howdy!  
>  
> I've never paid much attention to this, but do the ADAT cards work well? Any  
> known issues?  
>  
> Swen has ADAT ins and outs on his Kurzweil KSP8....  
&

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 16:37:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

t; hole.  
>  
> What else would they be used for?  
>  
> Right now we're trying to get the SPDIF connectors on his MEC to translate  
> to the AES/EBU connectors on his KSP8, which I suspect is the problem...  
>  
> I was hoping the ADAT card would make our lives simpler.  
>  
> Jimmy  
>  
> "EK Sound" <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote in message  
> news:4353d2c8\$1@linux...

>> For audio transfer via lightpipe they work just fine.  
>>  
>> David.  
>>  
>> uptown jimmy wrote:  
>>  
>> > Howdy!  
>> >  
>> > I've never paid much attention to this, but do the ADAT cards work  
>> > well?  
> Any  
>> > known issues?  
>> >  
>> > Swen has ADAT ins and outs on his Kurzweil KSP8....  
>> >  
>> > Jimmy  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>  
>So one ADAT card can't send and receive? Just one or the other?

And wouldn't it be 24 bit, not 20 bit?

Hmmm....

Jimmy

"John Macy" <spamlessjohn@johnmacy.com> wrote in message  
news:4353d669\$1@linux...

>  
> I have my KSP8 setup with analogue ins X4 (malted together from the cards)  
> with the 4 stereo returns coming back in on an ADAT card. Works like a  
charm  
> :)  
>  
>  
> "uptown jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:  
> >Howdy!  
> >  
> >I've never paid much attention to this, but do the ADAT cards work well?  
> Any  
> >known issues?  
> >  
> >Swen has ADAT ins and outs on his Kurzweil KSP8....  
> >  
> >Jimmy

> >  
> >  
> >

>No,1 ADAT card can send and receive.John probably has his set up like that to overcome the seperate submix/card issue.

20 bit is the limit of the ADAT card;welcome to PARIS huh):  
Its fine;I use my KSP-8 ADAT with PARIS no problems.

Pete

"uptown jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>So one ADAT card can't send and receive? Just one or the other?

>

>And wouldn't it be 24 bit, not 20 bit?

>

>Hmmm....

>

>Jimmy

>

>

>"John Macy" <spamlessjohn@johnmacy.com> wrote in message

>news:4353d669\$1@linux...

>>

>> I have my KSP8 setup with analogue ins X4 (muled together from the cards)

>> with the 4 stereo returns coming back in on an ADAT card. Works like

a

>charm

>> :)

>>

>>

>> "uptown jimmy" <

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 21:48:06 GMT

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

---

spam@not\_here.dude" target="\_blank">nospam@not\_here.dude> wrote:

>>>>>need more info..

>>>>>what operating system and what version of Paris are you on?

>>>>>

>>>>>What it sounds like is that you are on WinXP and haven't correctly

>>>>>installed

>>>>>

>>>>>the effects subsystem.. but I'd need to confirm the info on your setup.

>>>>>

>>>>>AA

>>>>>

>>>>>  
>>>>>"Keith" <klee311@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
>>>>>news:43386af9\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Just instal

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 22:42:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>  
> ADAT transfer, which works fine if you know how to avoid the bugs...

My Q2 makes strange noises sometimes, however. I don't think it likes  
44.1K sample rate too much.

Gantt

uptown jimmy wrote:

> Howdy!  
>  
> I've never paid much attention to this, but do the ADAT cards work well? Any  
> known issues?  
>  
> Swen has ADAT ins and outs on his Kurzweil KSP8....  
>  
> JimmySwen is trying to send and return Paris digital info via the SPDIF jacks to  
the Kurzweil AES/EBU jacks. He's using XLR (AES/EBU) to SPDIF cables  
specified by Kurzweil and endorsed by several online bigshots. No go.

The cables are 6 feet long, which is supposedly the outside edge for this  
sort of thing. Maybe the cables should be shorter? Four feet?

He's clocking the KSP8 and Paris to a Lucid clock via BNC with no problems.  
Just no signal transfer on the digital buss.

I, however, am enjoying perfect signal transfer between my Paris rig and my  
Kurzweil Rumour and Mangler, via SPDIF, through my new Digipatch, which is  
an excellent piece of kit. Awesome setup. Zero latency, perfect clarity,  
infinite patchability of several FX boxes across three MEC/submixes. Thanks,  
Deej!

Next I'll try to chain multiple FX boxes in the Digipatch. That's where the  
sweet stuff is, IMO, when you have chained FX pulsing and percolating in  
series. Groovy, baby.

Awesome for me, headache for Swen. If anyone knows about that cabling thing (versus a dedicated digital translation device), let me know...

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
news:43542d25@linux...

> The adat card can send and receive digital info. It can only send sync. It  
> cannot slave to ADAT sync from another device. It's a control freak.

>

> ;o)

>

> "uptown jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message

> news:4353d772\$1@linux...

> > So one ADAT card can't send and receive? Just one or the other?

> >

> > And wouldn't it be 24 bit, not 20 bit?

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?

Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 23:03:21 GMT

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

---

am enjoying perfect signal transfer between my Paris rig and  
my

> Kurzweil Rumour and Mangler, via SPDIF, through my new Digipatch, which is  
> an excellent piece of kit. Awesome setup. Zero latency, perfect clarity,  
> infinite patchability of several FX boxes across three MEC/submixes.

Thanks,

> Deej!

>

> Next I'll try to chain multiple FX boxes in the Digipatch. That's where  
the

> sweet stuff is, IMO, when you have chained FX pulsing and percolating in  
> series. Groovy, baby.

>

> Awesome for me, headache for Swen. If anyone knows about that cabling  
thing

> (versus a dedicated digital translation device), let me know...

>

> Jimmy

>

>

> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:43542d25@linux...

> > The adat card can send and receive digital info. It can only send sync.

It



Paris and Digipatch, or FX to Digipatch?

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
news:4354526f@linux...

---

---

Subject: Re: is anyone tracking on tape here?  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Tue, 18 Oct 2005 15:03:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ge  
>>>>>> news:43544510\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>> Swen is trying to send and return Paris digital info via the  
>> SPDIF  
>>>>> jacks  
>>>>>>> to  
>>>>>>> the Kurzweil AES/EBU jacks. He's using XLR (AES/EBU) to  
SPDIF  
>> &gt;

---