
Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 14:38:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If it's a paris mix, just do it the Brian T way, bounce it directly to 16 bit.

Bjorn R

"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ac6093\$1@linux...

>

>

>

> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

>

> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is messing

> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding

> a haze that is really not there.

Subject: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 15:00:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is messing with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding a haze that is really not there.

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 15:30:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dither does nothing to contribute to "clouding" a mix, in fact, it helps with regard to the opposite of that. If you don't dither down to 16 bits, what you're doing is adding a certain amount of distortion via truncating, which (like adding an exciter across the 2-buss) MIGHT make your mix sound more open or have more definition, but all it's really doing is adding distortion.

There are different types of dither, you know... i don't know what type(s) CEP has, but maybe you'd like another type of dither better than whatever they use. You can easily hear

the difference between a couple types, and there's not so much difference - that I can tell, anyway - between a couple others so you might try to hear some different types of noise-shaping & see if you like one better than the other, or one's more appropriate for whatever style of music you're mixing right now. Izotope's Ozone has four different types to choose from, and the one that comes with Cubase (UV22-HR) is pretty clear and neutral.

Neil

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

>
>
>

>How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

>

>I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is messing
>with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding
>a haze that is really not there.

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 19:54:12 GMT

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

For evaluating mixes. But I do believe Brian T once said "dithering is for sissys". It's a Paris thing I guess, I think it means "use your ears". Paris is...eh... special in many ways :-)

Bjorn R

"DiMITRIOS" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message news:47acb256\$1@linux...

>

> If you mi at 16bit then would you do a mastering on that ?

> Regards,

> Dimitrios

>

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

> >If it's a paris mix, just do it the Brian T way, bounce it directly to 16

> >bit.

> >

> >Bjorn R

> >

> >"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
news:47ac6093\$1@linux...

> >>

> >>
> >>
> >> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?
> >>
> >> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is
> >messing
> >> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just
adding
> >> a haze that is really not there.
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 20:49:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you mi at 16bit then would you do a mastering on that ?
Regards,
Dimitrios

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>If it's a paris mix, just do it the Brian T way, bounce it directly to 16
>bit.
>
>Bjorn R
>
>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ac6093\$1@linux...
>>
>>
>>
>> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?
>>
>> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is
>messing
>> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding
>> a haze that is really not there.
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 21:17:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In a crowded, in-your-face, pop/rock/etc mix in Paris, direct truncation to

16 bit works just fine. To drag the mix into those native apps, make them sound so ...native :-)

Bjorn R

"Neil" <IOUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47acbd50\$1@linux...

>

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

>

> >For evaluating mixes. But I do believe Brian T once >said "dithering is
> for sissys".

>

> Sissys who like their mixes properly represented, without
> distorted truncation artifacts, perhaps.

>

> :)

>

> Neil

>

> Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 21:36:32 GMT

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

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

>For evaluating mixes. But I do believe Brian T once >said "dithering is
for sissys".

Sissys who like their mixes properly represented, without
distorted truncation artifacts, perhaps.

:)

Neil

Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 23:47:31 GMT

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

I'm pretty sure Tank preferred going 16 bit all the way in PARIS. So he wasn't
dithering really. I like to track at 24 bit for the simple and largely unforgivable

reason that I think it lets me be a little bit sloppier with levels. That is, at 16 bit I really want to be getting right up there at 0 dbfs on the converter, where with 24 bit files I think I can go a little easier and add gain later on.

Spent all last night tracking acoustic guitars. Used a borrowed auditorium sized Martin on three tunes. Used the Claytor you sold me, and an SE ribbon. The Claytor went through the Langevin DVC and the ribbon through the Sytek (quiet guitar, the DVC didn't have enough gain with the ribbon unless it was stuck right on top of the sound hole) and then into the linen inputs on a Presonus firewire box. I was astonished at how good everything sounded once we got the mics in the right spots. I really think all of the 16 vs. 24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of the people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres make far more difference. But I'm recording in a closet next to a garage, so obviously I'm going to think like that.

TCB

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

>

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

>

>>For evaluating mixes. But I do believe Brian T once >said "dithering is >for sissys".

>

>Sissys who like their mixes properly represented, without >distorted truncation artifacts, perhaps.

>

>:)

>

>Neil

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 03:09:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

>I really think all of the 16 vs.

>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of the >people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres make

>far more difference.

It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile

now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference... the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates & using plugins that process well, instead of adding undesirable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither, etc, etc, as well.

IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better" at each stage of the process.

Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 05:47:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brian tracked to 16.. but he mixed to 24.
AA

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:47ac6d4b\$1@linux...
> If it's a paris mix, just do it the Brian T way, bounce it directly to 16
> bit.
>
> Bjorn R
>
> "cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
> news:47ac6093\$1@linux...
>>
>>
>>
>> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?
>>
>> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is
> messing
>> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding
>> a haze that is really not there.
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 18:14:30 GMT

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

It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect when played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the mix. In this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe of the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must know the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)

Bjorn R

"Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ade757\$1@linux...

>

>

> I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is listening

> to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.

Playin

> in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD plug

> into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small, stereo

> image not as defined and less "in your face"

>

> Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial CD's

> sound fin through it.

>

> By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of BAE312's

> but that is aall in the listening chain as well.

>

> Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but with

> the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or something

> like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game is a

> battle of inches.

>

>

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

> >

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

> >>I really think all of the 16 vs.

> >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of the

> >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres

> >make
> >>far more difference.
> >
> >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
> >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
> >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
> >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
> >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
> >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
> >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
> >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
> >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
> >etc, etc, as well.
> >
> >IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
> >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
> >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
> >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
> >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
> >at each stage of the process.
> >
> >Neil
>

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 18:33:40 GMT

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

Not that I know the right way, I'm trying to learn :-). Another example, my personal opinion. The song "London Calling" by The Clash, a good song, but too much reverb the wrong way. The song "Radio Nowhere" by Springsteen, too much reverb the right way.

Bjorn R

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:47adf14c\$1@linux...

> It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement
> in
> in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect
> when
> played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it
> doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the
> mix.
> I this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe of
> the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must know
> the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)
>

> Bjorn R
>
>
>
> "Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
news:47ade757\$1@linux...
> >
> >
> > I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is
> listening
> > to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.
> Playin
> > in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD
plug
> > into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small,
> stereo
> > image not as defined and less "in your face"
> >
> > Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial
CD's
> > sound fin through it.
> >
> > By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of
> BAE312's
> > but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
> >
> > Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but
> with
> > the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or
> something
> > like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game is
a
> > battle of inches.
> >
> >
> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
> > >>I really think all of the 16 vs.
> > >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of
the
> > >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and
pres
> > >make
> > >>far more difference.
> > >
> > >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
> > >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...

> > >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
> > >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
> > >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
> > >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
> > >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
> > >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
> > >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
> > >etc, etc, as well.

> > >

> > >IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
> > >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
> > >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
> > >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
> > >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
> > >at each stage of the process.

> > >

> > >Neil

> > >

> > >

> > >

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 18:48:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is listening to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time. Playin in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD plug into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small, stereo image not as defined and less "in your face"

Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial CD's sound fin through it.

By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of BAE312's but that is aall in the listening chain as well.

Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but with the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or something like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game is a battle of inches.

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

>

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

>>I really think all of the 16 vs.

>>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of the
>>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres
>make
>>far more difference.
>
>It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
>& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>etc, etc, as well.
>
>LOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
>at each stage of the process.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 19:40:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yes I agree with all that too..But still not exactly my point.
Hmm..ok, what I mean is we make cd's to evaluate mixes and pass around to
band and manager..but if we are making changes in the mix that may be more
related to
the CD itself than the 24 bit mix the Mastering guys is gonna get...we can
go in circles forever. What I should do is I guess open up a mix listening
project in Paris..bring the 16 bit files in there and listen there..just
to test it..and AB them next to the 24 bit un-ditherd files.

Also not talking about mixes translating outside my room..that would most
likely be bad room acoustics..mixing too loud whatever. I know I have those
issues and so it;s been in every studio with every producer I have ever
worked with. Never 100% satisfied with mix translation.

Also curios if dithering makes no difference..why are the so many noise shaping
choises?

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement
in
>in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect
when
>played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it
>doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the mix.
>I this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe
of
>the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must know
>the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)
>
>Bjorn R
>
>
>
>"Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ade757\$1@linux...
>>
>>
>> I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is
>listening
>> to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.
>Playin
>> in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD
plug
>> into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small,
>stereo
>> image not as defined and less "in your face"
>>
>> Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial
CD's
>> sound fin through it.
>>
>> By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of
>BAE312's
>> but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
>>
>> Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but
>with
>> the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or
>something
>> like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game is
a
>> battle of inches.
>>
>>

>> "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>> >>I really think all of the 16 vs.
>> >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of
>> the
>> >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres
>> >make
>> >>far more difference.
>> >
>> >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>> >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>> >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>> >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>> >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>> >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>> >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
>> >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>> >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>> >etc, etc, as well.
>> >
>> >IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>> >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>> >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>> >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>> >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
>> >at each stage of the process.
>> >
>> >Neil
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 19:45:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What CD burning app are you using? What dither app are you using? It should sound the same. Are your monitor level knobs on the C-16 set to Zero? It COULD be CD player. Maybe commercial CD's sound OK because you don't have the multitrack session of those songs to compare it to. Just a thought.

Rod

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

>
>
>I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is listening
>to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time. Playin

>in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD plug
>into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small,
stereo
>image not as defined and less "in your face"
>
>Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial CD's
>sound fin through it.
>
>By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of BAE312's
>but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
>
>Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but with
>the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or something
>like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game is
a
>battle of inches.
>
>
>"Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>I really think all of the 16 vs.
>>>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of the
>>>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres
>>make
>>>far more difference.
>>
>>It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>>now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>>the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>>incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>>obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>>terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>>trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
>>& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>>undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>>etc, etc, as well.
>>
>>IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>>sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>>dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>>a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>>factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
>>at each stage of the process.
>>
>>Neil
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 19:50:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What about an Alesis Master Link? I can SPDIF directly out of Paris digitally into it at 16 or 24 bit and it does a great job of converting to 16 bit for burning to cd. It's really a time saver for me and real seamless.

Rich

"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ac6093\$1@linux...

>

>

>

> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

>

> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is messing

> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding

> a haze that is really not there.

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 20:26:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, very off topic, sorry bout that. But I just saw a documentary of the british punk scene the other day, and they started with the original London Calling track, and switched to a live recording of the same song. Much less reverb, and it sounded much better (in my opinion).

The Springsteen-track is breaking every rule in use of reverb in modern music. A long, loud reverb-tail that mashes into the background vocals. And it works just fine.

(And I think I'll have to get one of those Masterlink thingies :-)

Bjorn R

"Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ae0732\$1@linux...

>

>

> Oh..Wow..Off topic..but I think London Calling is pretty much flawless in
> almost every way..Way ahead of other stuff from that era.. To me the verb
> adds to the excitement. That stuff is so subjective anyway..

>

> I just want to make sure I am making adjustments to bass and drum levels
> for the right reasons..will do some A/B tests..we are going to try running
> mixes through the 1/4" inputs of my BAE312s and test em against goin into
> the mic inputs via Avedis' line pads..gould be too much transformer color.

> Also the BAE's gain knobs are not stepped so could be that the stereo image
> is off.
> Although..it aint when listening in Paris.
>
> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
> >Not that I know the right way, I'm trying to learn :-) Another example,
> my
> >personal opinion. The song "London Calling" by The Clash, a good song, but
> >too much reverb the wrong way. The song "Radio Nowhere" by Springsteen,
> too
> >much reverb the right way.
> >
> >Bjorn R
> >
> >"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:47adf14c\$1@linux...
> >> It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement
> >in
> >> in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect
> >when
> >> played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it
> >> doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the
> >mix.
> >> I this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe
> of
> >> the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must
> know
> >> the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)
> >>
> >> Bjorn R
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> "Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
> >news:47ade757\$1@linux...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is
> >> listening
> >> > to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.
> >> Playin
> >> > in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD
> >plug
> >> > into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds
small,
> >> stereo

> >> > image not as defined and less "in your face"
> >> >
> >> > Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial
> >CD's
> >> > sound fin through it.
> >> >
> >> > By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of
> >> BAE312's
> >> > but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
> >> >
> >> > Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded
better..but
> >> with
> >> > the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or
> >> something
> >> > like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game
> is
> >a
> >> > battle of inches.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
> >> > >>I really think all of the 16 vs.
> >> > >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent
> of
> >the
> >> > >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and
> >pres
> >> > >make
> >> > >>far more difference.
> >> > >
> >> > >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
> >> > >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
> >> > >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
> >> > >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
> >> > >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
> >> > >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
> >> > >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerrates
> >> > >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
> >> > >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
> >> > >etc, etc, as well.
> >> > >
> >> > >LOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
> >> > >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
> >> > >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
> >> > >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those

> >> > >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
> >> > >at each stage of the process.
> >> > >
> >> > >Neil
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [CUjo\[1\]](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 20:45:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have thought about that...Seems like it may be quickly obsolete though...SPEaking of obsolete:
I was even thinking of hooking my ole Panasonic 3700 up to listen back to a DAT in my room..

"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:
>What about an Alesis Master Link? I can SPDIF directly out of Paris
>digitally into it at 16 or 24 bit and it does a great job of converting
to
>16 bit for burning to cd. It's really a time saver for me and real seamless.
>
>Rich
>
>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message [news:47ac6093\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:47ac6093$1@linux...)
>>
>>
>>
>> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?
>>
>> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is
>messing
>> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding
>> a haze that is really not there.
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 21:04:02 GMT

Oh..Wow..Off topic..but I think London Calling is pretty much flawless in almost every way..Way ahead of other stuff from that era.. To me the verb adds to the excitement. That stuff is so subjective anyway..

I just want to make sure I am making adjustments to bass and drum levels for the right reasons..will do some A/B tests..we are going to try running mixes through the 1/4" inputs of my BAE312s and test em against goin into the mic inputs via Avedis' line pads..gould be too much transformer color. Also the BAE's gain knobs are not stepped so could be that the stereo image is off.

Although..it aint when listening in Paris.

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

>Not that I know the right way, I'm trying to learn :-) Another example,
my

>personal opinion. The song "London Calling" by The Clash, a good song, but
>too much reverb the wrong way. The song "Radio Nowhere" by Springsteen,
too

>much reverb the right way.

>

>Bjorn R

>

>"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:47adf14c\$1@linux...

>> It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement
>in

>> in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect

>when

>> played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it

>> doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the

>mix.

>> I this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe
of

>> the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must
know

>> the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)

>>

>> Bjorn R

>>

>>

>>

>> "Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message

>news:47ade757\$1@linux...

>> >

>> >

>> > I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about is

>> listening

>> > to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.

>> Playin
>> > in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD
>plug
>> > into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small,
>> stereo
>> > image not as defined and less "in your face"
>> >
>> > Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial
>CD's
>> > sound fin through it.
>> >
>> > By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of
>> BAE312's
>> > but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
>> >
>> > Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but
>> with
>> > the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or
>> something
>> > like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game
is
>a
>> > battle of inches.
>> >
>> >
>> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
>> > >
>> > >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>> > >>I really think all of the 16 vs.
>> > >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent
of
>the
>> > >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and
>pres
>> > >make
>> > >>far more difference.
>> > >
>> > >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>> > >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>> > >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>> > >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>> > >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>> > >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>> > >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
>> > >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>> > >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>> > >etc, etc, as well.
>> > >

>> > >IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>> > >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>> > >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>> > >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>> > >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
>> > >at each stage of the process.
>> > >
>> > >Neil
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 00:12:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, did some A/B tests this afternoon...Same mix run 4 ways
1 into my 312 via the mic input at 16 bits truncated in Paris
2 into my 312 via the mic input at 24 Bits dithered cool edit
3 Into 312 by the 1/4" input 24 Bits dithered cool edit
4 Into 312 by the 1/4" input 16 bits truncated in Paris

First off the big difference is that the input transformer seemed to be the culprit on some of the haze..the mixes into the 1/4" input were much bigger more open and 3d! with better stereo separation..The other way did have a cool tape saturation type of thing going on..but too much..I'll speak to Avedis about this. We even asked my wife to come in and listen to the 2 mixes without telling her what was different..she nailed it with the second one has more air to it.

Weird thing about this is that I got the Avedis line pads a few weeks ago and really didn't notice the haze till listening back to a compiled CD. Lesson learned..test out gear first. the Avedis pads may work great on his MA5's though

Secondly the dithering was definitely audible but way more subtle. The truncated mixes seemed a tiny bit louder and the cymbals were more open...less hashy.

I don't know if i could pick that out on its on but with the AB test..both of us working on the mix could tell. So from now on I'll bounce my test mixes at 16 even though it takes longer.

"CUjo" <chis@applemanstudio.com> wrote:

>
>
>I have thought about that...Seems like it may be quickly obsolete though...SPEaking
>of obsolete:

>I was even thinking of hooking my ole Panasonic 3700 up to listen back to
>a DAT in my room..

>
>
>

>"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:

>>What about an Alesis Master Link? I can SPDIF directly out of Paris

>>digitally into it at 16 or 24 bit and it does a great job of converting

>to

>>16 bit for burning to cd. It's really a time saver for me and real seamless.

>>

>>Rich

>>

>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ac6093\$1@linux...

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

>>>

>>> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is

>>messing

>>> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding

>>> a haze that is really not there.

>>

>>

>

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 06:10:49 GMT

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

If you're going to dither, please, do it in private. Nobody needs to see that.

S

"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47ac6093\$1@linux...

>

>

>

> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

>
> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is
> messing
> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding
> a haze that is really not there.

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 08:34:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of thing more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a massive penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes time to mix.

In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate' and we'll all use higher sample rates automatically, just like we now record to 24 bit files because we can and they give us an incremental improvement in sound quality.

Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used both my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold me, both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few inches from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a piano bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for three songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!

TCB

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

>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>I really think all of the 16 vs.
>>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent of the
>>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and pres
>make
>>far more difference.
>
>It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates

>& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>etc, etc, as well.

>

>IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
>at each stage of the process.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Nei](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 08:40:21 GMT

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

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

>Secondly the dithering was definitely audible but way more subtle. The truncated
>mixes seemed a tiny bit louder and the cymbals were more open...less hashy.

Just like an exciter might do, in other words? I'm telling you,
the truncation is adding distortion... try a different dither
algo if you don't like the type of noise-shaping that the one
in Cool Edit offers.

Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Neil](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 09:07:50 GMT

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

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

>

>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of thing
>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a massive
>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software
>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really
>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes
>time to mix.

16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over
16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the
most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of
major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense

in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN
30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!

>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and
will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'

No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)

>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used both
>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
me,
>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
inches
>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a piano
>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for three
>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!

Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
to provide a definite split image.

Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 18:35:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

>

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

>>

>>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of thing
>>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a massive
>>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software
>>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really
>>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes
>>time to mix.

>
>16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over
>16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the
>most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of
>major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense
>in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN
>30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!
>
>
>>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and
>will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'
>
>No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)
>
>
>>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used
both
>>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
>me,
>>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
>inches
>>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a piano
>>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for three
>>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!
>
>Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
>of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
>\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
>we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
>did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
>through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
>paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
>sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
>in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
>very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
>to provide a definite split image.
>
>Neil

I picked up one of the Nady ribbons from Deej. They're really weird mics. My first start with guitar sounds in the 'Steve Albini Pair' approach. One dark mic (the ribbon) and one bright mic (the Claytor you sold me, the Baby Bottle you sold me, or a pencil condenser maybe), both about a foot off the speaker, very close to each other, pointed pretty close to the center of the speaker. I move things around from there. The thing about the Nady mics is that--at least the one I have-- is really dark. I read somewhere that they packed the capsule full of junk to keep them from breaking when some idiot blows in them to see if they're working. Can't confirm or deny this,

but it makes a little sense considering how they sound.

TCB

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 19:07:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I did notice right off the bat that the Nady is a bit dark-ish, but it might work out OK for this, since it's your typical Mesa Triple-Rectumfryer shred tone. The rolloff of the mic takes off some of the "fizz".

Still gotta mess with placement a little more - we didn't have time yesterday to toy with that very much, but the guitarist liked what he heard right away... anyway, we'll see how it ends up working out. I noticed it has pretty good gain for a ribbon, though... didn't have the amp super-cranked, yet I also didn't have to max out the gain on any of the preamps I tried it through - 36-40 db of gain on the pre gives a decent, useable level to record with, without the mic sounding too "driven". More than that & it sounds like you're kind of driving the mic too hard... at least in this particular application.

Neil

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

>

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

>>

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

>>>

>>>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of thing

>>>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a massive

>>>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software

>>>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really

>>>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes

>>>time to mix.

>>

>>16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over

>>16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the

>>most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of

>>major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense

>>in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN

>>30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!
>>
>>
>>>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and
>>will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'
>>
>>No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)
>>
>>
>>>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used
>both
>>>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
>>me,
>>>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
>>inches
>>>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a
piano
>>>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for
three
>>>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!
>>
>>Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
>>of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
>>\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
>>we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
>>did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
>>through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
>>paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
>>sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
>>in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
>>very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
>>to provide a definite split image.
>>
>>Neil
>
>I picked up one of the Nady ribbons from DeeJ. They're really weird mics.
>My first start with guitar sounds in the 'Steve Albini Pair' approach. One
>dark mic (the ribbon) and one bright mic (the Claytor you sold me, the Baby
>Bottle you sold me, or a pencil condenser maybe), both about a foot off
the
>speaker, very close to each other, pointed pretty close to the center of
>the speaker. I move things around from there. The thing about the Nady mics
>is that--at least the one I have-- is really dark. I read somewhere that
>they packed the capsule full of junk to keep them from breaking when some
>idiot blows in them to see if they're working. Can't confirm or deny this,
>but it makes a little sense considering how they sound.
>
>TCB

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 19:58:40 GMT

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

I'm with you Cujo. Of course I almost always am :-)

Radio nowhere, while I enjoy the song, sounds to me like bruce doing the killers doing bruce. Of course my old bandmates disagree with me on that call, they like to refer to it as 8675309 nowhere.

Chuck

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

>

>

>Oh..Wow..Off topic..but I think London Calling is pretty much flawless in
>almost every way..Way ahead of other stuff from that era.. To me the verb
>adds to the excitement. That stuff is so subjective anyway..

>

>I just want to make sure I am making adjustments to bass and drum levels
>for the right reasons..will do some A/B tests..we are going to try running
>mixes through the 1/4" inputs of my BAE312s and test em against goin into
>the mic inputs via Avedis' line pads..gould be too much transformer color.
>Also the BAE's gain knobs are not stepped so could be that the stereo image
>is off.

>Although..it aint when listening in Paris.

>

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

>>Not that I know the right way, I'm trying to learn :-) Another example,

>my

>>personal opinion. The song "London Calling" by The Clash, a good song,
but

>>too much reverb the wrong way. The song "Radio Nowhere" by Springsteen,
>too

>>much reverb the right way.

>>

>>Bjorn R

>>

>>"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message [news:47adf14c\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:47adf14c$1@linux...)

>>> It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement

>>in

>>> in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect

>>when

>>> played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it

>>> doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the

>>mix.

>>> I this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe

>of

>>> the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must

>know

>>> the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)
>>>
>>> Bjorn R
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
>>news:47ade757\$1@linux...
>>> >
>>> >
>>> > I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about
is
>>> listening
>>> > to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.
>>> Playin
>>> > in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered CD
>>plug
>>> > into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small,
>>> stereo
>>> > image not as defined and less "in your face"
>>> >
>>> > Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial
>>CD's
>>> > sound fin through it.
>>> >
>>> > By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of
>>> BAE312's
>>> > but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
>>> >
>>> > Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but
>>> with
>>> > the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d or
>>> something
>>> > like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game
>is
>>a
>>> > battle of inches.
>>> >
>>> >
>>> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
>>> > >
>>> > >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>> > >>I really think all of the 16 vs.
>>> > >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent
>of
>>the
>>> > >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and
>>pres

>>> > >make
>>> > >>far more difference.
>>> > >
>>> > >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>>> > >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>>> > >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>>> > >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>>> > >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>>> > >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>>> > >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
>>> > >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>>> > >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>>> > >etc, etc, as well.
>>> > >
>>> > >LOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>>> > >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>>> > >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>>> > >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>>> > >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"
>>> > >at each stage of the process.
>>> > >
>>> > >Neil
>>> >
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 20:23:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil, that do you think of the ribbon mics?

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

>

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

>>

>>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of thing
>>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a massive
>>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software
>>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really
>>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes
>>time to mix.

>

>16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over

>16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the
>most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of
>major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense
>in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN
>30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!
>
>
>>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and
>will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'
>
>No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)
>
>
>>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used
both
>>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
>me,
>>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
>inches
>>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a piano
>>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for three
>>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!
>
>Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
>of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
>\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
>we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
>did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
>through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
>paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
>sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
>in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
>very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
>to provide a definite split image.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 21:25:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have one of those Shiny Box 23c's (cinemag tranny) which I think is just a mod Nady or close to it. Have not liked it on my Marshall yet but works great on a vintage Champ. where it seems to shine is string things..fiddle sounds great through it.

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

>
>Yeah, I did notice right off the bat that the Nady is a bit
>dark-ish, but it might work out OK for this, since it's your
>typical Mesa Triple-Rectumfryer shred tone. The rolloff of the
>mic takes off some of the "fizz".
>
>Still gotta mess with placement a little more - we didn't have
>time yesterday to toy with that very much, but the guitarist
>liked what he heard right away... anyway, we'll see how it
>ends up working out. I noticed it has pretty good gain for a
>ribbon, though... didn't have the amp super-cranked, yet I
>also didn't have to max out the gain on any of the preamps I
>tried it through - 36-40 db of gain on the pre gives a decent,
>useable level to record with, without the mic sounding
>too "driven". More than that & it sounds like you're kind of
>driving the mic too hard... at least in this particular
>application.
>
>Neil
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of
>thing
>>>>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a
massive
>>>>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software
>>>>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really
>>>>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes
>>>>time to mix.
>>>
>>>16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over
>>>16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the
>>>most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of
>>>major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense
>>>in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN
>>>30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!
>>>
>>>
>>>>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and
>>>will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'
>>>
>>>No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)

>>>
>>>
>>>>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used
>>both
>>>>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
>>>me,
>>>>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
>>>inches
>>>>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a
>piano
>>>>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for
>three
>>>>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!
>>>
>>>Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
>>>of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
>>>\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
>>>we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
>>>did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
>>>through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
>>>paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
>>>sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
>>>in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
>>>very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
>>>to provide a definite split image.
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>>I picked up one of the Nady ribbons from DeeJ. They're really weird mics.
>>My first start with guitar sounds in the 'Steve Albini Pair' approach.
One
>>dark mic (the ribbon) and one bright mic (the Claytor you sold me, the
Baby
>>Bottle you sold me, or a pencil condenser maybe), both about a foot off
>the
>>speaker, very close to each other, pointed pretty close to the center of
>>the speaker. I move things around from there. The thing about the Nady
mics
>>is that--at least the one I have-- is really dark. I read somewhere that
>>they packed the capsule full of junk to keep them from breaking when some
>>idiot blows in them to see if they're working. Can't confirm or deny this,
>>but it makes a little sense considering how they sound.
>>
>>TCB
>

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 23:29:17 GMT

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

I still have one of those DAT's, an old Sony A7 which I bought to archive my Session8 recordings. I even still use it from time to time to bring in some older sessions for production. It still sounds pretty damn good.

Rich

--

'Any 20 year-old who isn't a liberal doesn't have a heart,
and any 40 year-old who isn't a conservative doesn't have a brain.'

- Winston Churchill

"CUjo" <chis@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message [news:47ae02e5\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:47ae02e5$1@linux...)

>

>

> I have thought about that...Seems like it may be quickly obsolete
though...SPeaking

> of obsolete:

> I was even thinking of hooking my ole Panasonic 3700 up to listen back to
> a DAT in my room..

>

>

>

> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:

> >What about an Alesis Master Link? I can SPDIF directly out of Paris

> >digitally into it at 16 or 24 bit and it does a great job of converting

> >to

> >16 bit for burning to cd. It's really a time saver for me and real
seamless.

> >

> >Rich

> >

> >"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
[news:47ac6093\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:47ac6093$1@linux...)

> >>

> >>

> >>

> >> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

> >>

> >> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is

> >messing

> >> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just
adding

> >> a haze that is really not there.

> >

> >
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 23:32:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sarah, just like a nurse :-)

Rich

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:47ae98b4@linux...

> If you're going to dither, please, do it in private. Nobody needs to see
> that.

>

> S

>

> "cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
news:47ac6093\$1@linux...

> >

> >

> >

> > How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

> >

> > I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering is

> > messing

> > with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just adding

> > a haze that is really not there.

>

>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 23:42:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I used a DAT to master from for Introspective, that wasn't too long ago
either. The thing I like about the Master Link is its ability to burn right
to cd easily and quickly. I think just about everyone has a cd player, but
not so for a DAT.

Rich

"Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:47af7efb\$1@linux...

>

>

> Phil Alken and I have a friend here in Boston who mixed Radiohead's The Bends.
> Apparently they chose the Dat safety over the 1/2" to master from.
>
> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:
> >I still have one of those DAT's, an old Sony A7 which I bought to archive
> my
> >Session8 recordings. I even still use it from time to time to bring in
some
> >older sessions for production. It still sounds pretty damn good.
> >
> >Rich
> >
> >--
> >'Any 20 year-old who isn't a liberal doesn't have a heart,
> >and any 40 year-old who isn't a conservative doesn't have a brain.'
> >
> >- Winston Churchill
> >
> >"CUjo" <chis@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
news:47ae02e5\$1@linux...
> >>
> >>
> >> I have thought about that...Seems like it may be quickly obsolete
> >>though...SPEaking
> >> of obsolete:
> >> I was even thinking of hooking my ole Panasonic 3700 up to listen back
> to
> >> a DAT in my room..
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:
> >> >What about an Alesis Master Link? I can SPDIF directly out of Paris
> >> >digitally into it at 16 or 24 bit and it does a great job of
converting
> >> to
> >> >16 bit for burning to cd. It's really a time saver for me and real
> >>seamless.
> >> >
> >> >Rich
> >> >
> >> >"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
> >>news:47ac6093\$1@linux...
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?

> >> >>
> >> >> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering
> is
> >> >messing
> >> >> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just
> >adding
> >> >> a haze that is really not there.
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 23:45:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks Chuck.
I do drive my band mates a bit nutz with The Clash.
Of course they all loved it when we got to work with Mikey Dread (who is
not doing well right now)

Oh another great one from that time is The Jam's All Mod COns

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>
>I'm with you Cujo. Of course I almost always am :-)
>
>Radio nowhere, while I enjoy the song, sounds to me like bruce doing the
>killers doing bruce. Of course my old bandmates disagree with me on that
>call, they like to refer to it as 8675309 nowhere.
>
>Chuck
>"Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>Oh..Wow..Off topic..but I think London Calling is pretty much flawless
in
>>almost every way..Way ahead of other stuff from that era.. To me the verb
>>adds to the excitement. That stuff is so subjective anyway..
>>
>>I just want to make sure I am making adjustments to bass and drum levels
>>for the right reasons..will do some A/B tests..we are going to try running
>>mixes through the 1/4" inputs of my BAE312s and test em against goin into
>>the mic inputs via Avedis' line pads..gould be too much transformer color.

>>Also the BAE's gain knobs are not stepped so could be that the stereo image
>>is off.
>>Although..it aint when listening in Paris.
>>
>>"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>>Not that I know the right way, I'm trying to learn :-) Another example,
>>my
>>>personal opinion. The song "London Calling" by The Clash, a good song,
>>but
>>>too much reverb the wrong way. The song "Radio Nowhere" by Springsteen,
>>too
>>>much reverb the right way.
>>>
>>>Bjorn R
>>>
>>>"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:47adf14c\$1@linux...
>>>> It's all about the music. I'm making this big Halion String arrangement
>>>>in
>>>> in Cubase. I compose a track to underline a solo part. It works perfect
>>>>when
>>>> played back in Cubase, but when rendered and played back in Paris, it
>>>> doesn't work. It sound richer, fuller, more 3d, but doesn't fit in the
>>>>mix.
>>>> I this case I want that plastic, thin, native sound. Sometimes the vibe
>>>of
>>>> the song is more important than doing it right. (But I guess you must
>>know
>>>> the right way, to do it wrong... the right way :-)
>>>>
>>>> Bjorn R
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
>>>news:47ade757\$1@linux...
>>>> >
>>>> >
>>>> > I agree with all of that, but in this case what I am talking about
>>is
>>>> listening
>>>> > to the same mixes in the same room not 10 minutes difference in time.
>>>> Playin
>>>> > in Paris sounds wide open and huge.lush lush...then burn dithered
>>CD
>>>plug
>>>> > into the same Dynaudio speakers..same freakin room and it sounds small,
>>>> stereo
>>>> > image not as defined and less "in your face"

>>>> >
>>>> > Pf course to trouble shoot it could be the CD player...but commercial
>>>>CD's
>>>> > sound fin through it.
>>>> >
>>>> > By the way..I touch my mixes with a Drawmer 1968 merc and a pair of
>>>> BAE312's
>>>> > but that is aall in the listening chain as well.
>>>> >
>>>> > Also to the 16 bit thing..for a while I thought 16 sounded better..but
>>>> with
>>>> > the BM15's you can hear a difference..24 seems richer and more 3d
or
>>>> something
>>>> > like that..and yes it is not that much of a difference..but the game
>>is
>>>a
>>>> > battle of inches.
>>>> >
>>>> >
>>>> > "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
>>>> > >
>>>> > >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>> > >>I really think all of the 16 vs.
>>>> > >>24 bit and higher sample rates is not important for 85-90 percent
>>of
>>>the
>>>> > >>people recording out there. I think better/smarter mic choices and
>>>pres
>>>> > >make
>>>> > >>far more difference.
>>>> > >
>>>> > >It's like I've been saying on & off in other threads for awhile
>>>> > >now - it's not about ONE thing making an amazing difference...
>>>> > >the more I work with digital, the more I realize it's all about
>>>> > >incremental gains at various stages of production. So, you're
>>>> > >obviously right about the mics & pres making a difference in
>>>> > >terms of picking the right combination for the sound you're
>>>> > >trying to get, but it IS also about wordlengths & samplerates
>>>> > >& using plugins that process well, instead of adding
>>>> > >undesireable artifacts, and whether to dither or not to dither,
>>>> > >etc, etc, as well.
>>>> > >
>>>> > >IOW, is a 16-bit, 44.1k truncated mix going to automatically
>>>> > >sound like shit vs a 24-bit 88.2k or 96k recording that was
>>>> > >dithered upon mixdown or mastering? I'm not saying that's
>>>> > >a "gimme" that it will - i'm just saying that each of those
>>>> > >factors contributes to something that's "a little bit better"

>>>> > >at each stage of the process.
>>>> > >
>>>> > >Neil
>>>> >
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 23:47:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Phil Alken and I have a friend here in Boston who mixed Radiohead's The Bends. Apparently they chose the Dat safety over the 1/2" to master from.

"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:

>I still have one of those DAT's, an old Sony A7 which I bought to archive my

>Session8 recordings. I even still use it from time to time to bring in some older sessions for production. It still sounds pretty damn good.

>

>Rich

>

>--

>'Any 20 year-old who isn't a liberal doesn't have a heart,

>and any 40 year-old who isn't a conservative doesn't have a brain.'

>

>- Winston Churchill

>

>"CUjo" <chis@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message [news:47ae02e5\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:47ae02e5$1@linux...)

>>

>>

>> I have thought about that...Seems like it may be quickly obsolete

>though...SPeaking

>> of obsolete:

>> I was even thinking of hooking my ole Panasonic 3700 up to listen back to

>> a DAT in my room..

>>

>>

>>

>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:

>> >What about an Alesis Master Link? I can SPDIF directly out of Paris

>> >digitally into it at 16 or 24 bit and it does a great job of converting

>> to
>> >16 bit for burning to cd. It's really a time saver for me and real
>seamless.
>> >
>> >Rich
>> >
>> >"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
>news:47ac6093\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> How are you guys getting your 24 bits to 16 for evaluating mixes?
>> >>
>> >> I've been using CEP for a long time. And I wonder if the dithering
is
>> >messing
>> >> with the sound too much, clouding the stereo image a tad and just
>adding
>> >> a haze that is really not there.
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Dithering
Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 11 Feb 2008 08:22:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not knocking the Nady at all, it's a very decent mic for the (small) money.
There are some guys in the interweb who have mods for them to remove a bit
of the muffling, but I haven't been that brave yet.

With the SE ribbon the gain has been dependent on the source. With a fairly
loud guitar cab the DVC works great. With acoustic guitar or percussion (tambourines
sound _lovely_ with it) I have to use the Syteks just because they have
a lot more gain. I have to admit, I like the Syteks more and more as I use
them. Simple design, really cheap on a 'per pre' basis, and they do a simple
job very well. They make stuff louder. I might pick up two more so I have
12 channels all the time.

Anywho, good luck with the Nadys, I can see them sounding great on a shredding
Mesa triple + cab setup. Plenty of high end there anyway, so the rolloff
might help.

TCB

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

>

>Yeah, I did notice right off the bat that the Nady is a bit
>dark-ish, but it might work out OK for this, since it's your
>typical Mesa Triple-Rectumfryer shred tone. The rolloff of the
>mic takes off some of the "fizz".

>

>Still gotta mess with placement a little more - we didn't have
>time yesterday to toy with that very much, but the guitarist
>liked what he heard right away... anyway, we'll see how it
>ends up working out. I noticed it has pretty good gain for a
>ribbon, though... didn't have the amp super-cranked, yet I
>also didn't have to max out the gain on any of the preamps I
>tried it through - 36-40 db of gain on the pre gives a decent,
>useable level to record with, without the mic sounding
>too "driven". More than that & it sounds like you're kind of
>driving the mic too hard... at least in this particular
>application.

>

>Neil

>

>

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

>>

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

>>>

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

>>>>

>>>>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of
>thing

>>>>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a
massive

>>>>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software

>>>>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really

>>>>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes

>>>>time to mix.

>>>

>>>16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over

>>>16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the

>>>most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of

>>>major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense

>>>in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN

>>>30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!

>>>

>>>

>>>>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and

>>>>will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'

>>>

>>>No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)
>>>
>>>
>>>>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used
>>both
>>>>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
>>>me,
>>>>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
>>>inches
>>>>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a
>piano
>>>>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for
>three
>>>>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!
>>>
>>>Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
>>>of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
>>>\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
>>>we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
>>>did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
>>>through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
>>>paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
>>>sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
>>>in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
>>>very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
>>>to provide a definite split image.
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>>I picked up one of the Nady ribbons from DeeJ. They're really weird mics.
>>My first start with guitar sounds in the 'Steve Albini Pair' approach.
One
>>dark mic (the ribbon) and one bright mic (the Claytor you sold me, the
Baby
>>Bottle you sold me, or a pencil condenser maybe), both about a foot off
>the
>>speaker, very close to each other, pointed pretty close to the center of
>>the speaker. I move things around from there. The thing about the Nady
mics
>>is that--at least the one I have-- is really dark. I read somewhere that
>>they packed the capsule full of junk to keep them from breaking when some
>>idiot blows in them to see if they're working. Can't confirm or deny this,
>>but it makes a little sense considering how they sound.
>>
>>TCB
>

Subject: Re: Dithering

Posted by [neil\[1\]](#) on Mon, 11 Feb 2008 17:34:33 GMT

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

Too early to really tell, James... so far, so good, though. Like I said, we just slapped one up about a foot away from the cabinet & ran it through one of the the Grace's & it sounded pretty good right off the bat. Tried a couple other pre's, but immediately went back to the Grace without even a debate.

Only tried it on the Mesa-shred tone so far... like I was telling Thad, the rolloff on the mic seems to take off a lot of the "fizz", so it might work out just fine for this application (basic trax on rhythm guitar, coupled with an i5 through the Mucusrite Red8)). I doubt i'll be able to use it for layering - might need something with a bit more edge for that so the whole thing doesn't turn into a murkfest (probably keep the i5 & switch out the nady with a BLUE Ball & a guitar with P90's in it for layering stuff).

Neil
use

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>Neil, that do you think of the ribbon mics?

>

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

>>

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

>>>

>>>Totally agree, Neil, oddly enough I think we agree about this sort of thing

>>>more than we disagree. I 'went native' a long time ago and there's a massive

>>>penalty for me going to higher sample rates because I use a lot of software

>>>synths and native f/x. For me, 24 bit files at 44.1 sound really, really

>>>good and give me a lot of options for real time processing when it comes

>>>time to mix.

>>

>>16-bit audio has 65,536 discrete steps to it... 24-bit has over

>>16 Million... that's a BIG difference in what even the

>>most robust CPU's can handle, so yeah if you're using a lot of

>>major stressors like softsynths/VSTi's, 16-bit makes more sense

>>in a lot of cases.... frankly, I'm amazed that we can even RUN

>>30 or 40 tracks of 24-bit!

>>

>>

>>>In a few years, we'll be using dual eight core processors (or more) and

>>will forget the 'Great 44.1 v. 96k Debate'
>>
>>No, no, no, it's 44.1 vs 88.2... 96k is really unnecessary ;)
>>
>>
>>>Fun day of recording for me today, just loud distorted guitars. I used
>both
>>>my Savage and my Top Hat, no f/x, an SE ribbon and the Claytor you sold
>>me,
>>>both about 12 inches off the speaker pointed straight at the cone a few
>>inches
>>>from center, both mics went into the Langevin DVC. The amps were on a
piano
>>>bench and in the sweetest spot in the room. Got all of the tracks for
three
>>>songs in one day. Now that is a work rate I like!
>>
>>Interesting, because today I tried my first-ever recording
>>of a ribbon mic on guitar... picked up a couple of those Nady
>>\$69 ribbons on special at Guitar Center a few weeks ago & today
>>we started setting up for another batch of songs with a band I
>>did a demo for a few months ago - tried one of the ribbons
>>through a couple of pre's & settled on the Grace 101 - then
>>paired it with an Audix i5 through the Focusrite Red, which
>>sounded enough like the ribbon/Grace combo to perhaps track it
>>in "pseudo-stereo" that way. Those two combinations have some
>>very similar characteristics, but are slightly different enough
>>to provide a definite split image.
>>
>>Neil
>
