
Subject: A little A/B

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 03:24:11 GMT

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

Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?

File Attachments

1) [Good News neve or not.mp3](#), downloaded 49 times

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 04:46:10 GMT

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

LOL!!! Well, you're right. It is interesting how the reverb is more obvious in the straight-out digi clip. The 5042 sorta folds it into the mix whereas it's more separately defined in the digi only track. Good call.

;o)

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45d9292b@linux...

>

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

>>Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?

>

> IT'S UNFAIR!!! How can I know which one I like better unless
> you tell me???

>

> OK, seriously... first one sounds a little warmer, a little
> more veiled - it's definitely easy on the ears; second one is
> cleaner, crisper, more defined, a bit harder edge to it... and
> is there a tiny little bit of ambience on the voice that I just
> can't hear in the first one?

>

> Can't tell which one I like best, though - not enough time on
> each clip for it to really settle in, but if I had to guess
> (and I do), I'd say the first one is the Neve tape sim & the
> 2nd portion is straight-out digi.

>

> Neil

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [Nil](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 05:35:55 GMT

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

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?

IT'S UNFAIR!!! How can I know which one I like better unless you tell me???

OK, seriously... first one sounds a little warmer, a little more veiled - it's definitely easy on the ears; second one is cleaner, crisper, more defined, a bit harder edge to it... and is there a tiny little bit of ambience on the voice that I just can't hear in the first one?

Can't tell which one I like best, though - not enough time on each clip for it to really settle in, but if I had to guess (and I do), I'd say the first one is the Neve tape sim & the 2nd portion is straight-out digi.

Neil

Subject: Re: A little A/B
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 10:41:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The first one sounds louder, "fatter", "thicker"? and stuff like that. I'd probably like that one best in the midst of a mix, though the other one sounds nice and clear. Do I win?

S

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45d91867@linux...
> Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?
>
>

Subject: Re: A little A/B
Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 13:05:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I picked it out too on my crappy comp speakers. It wasn't that obvious but I was able to distinguish between the two. The 1st was a little warmer. It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st take.

I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.

--

Thanks,

Brandon

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:45d99f6b\$1@linux...

> First sample sounds warmer, phatter, fuller than the second which sounds,

> well, thinner, cooler. Interestingly, I'm registering those differences

> through tiny little computer speakers. Not because my ears are

> particularly

> good, but, I think, because the "effects" of each output setup are

> sonically

> meaningful.

> MR

>

> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45d91867@linux...

>> Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?

>>

>>

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 13:31:02 GMT

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

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

>Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?

>

>

>

I would say the first is the Neve Portico thingy.

Ted

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 13:58:49 GMT

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

If that is the case, then I percieved the processing in the 1st take as more

pleasing

and a better performance. I think I am focusing on the vibrato of the voice and perceived timing and feel of the performance.

I guess the harshness of the 2nd take really affects how I perceive the performance. I feel the 2nd take is not really vibing with the feel of the song. Weird.

--

Thanks,

Brandon

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote in message news:45d9a791\$1@linux...

>

> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:

>>It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st >>take.

>>I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.

>

>

> I believe the performance is the same - it's the same take bounced twice.

> If

> that's correct, it's interesting that the technology affected your sense

> of the

> the artist's performance.

>

> Ted

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 14:19:28 GMT

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

or maybe my ears just suck. hmmm.....

--

Thanks,

Brandon

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:45d9ada5@linux...

> If that is the case, then I perceived the processing in the 1st take as
> more pleasing
> and a better performance. I think I am focusing on the vibrato of the
> voice
> and perceived timing and feel of the performance.
> I guess the harshness of the 2nd take really affects how I perceive
> the performance. I feel the 2nd take is not really vibing with the feel
> of the song. Weird.

>

> --

> Thanks,

>

> Brandon

>

>

>

>

> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote in message

> news:45d9a791\$1@linux...

>>

>> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:

>>> It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st

>>> take.

>>> I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.

>>

>>

>> I believe the performance is the same - it's the same take bounced twice.

>> If

>> that's correct, it's interesting that the technology affected your sense

>> of the

>> the artist's performance.

>>

>> Ted

>

>

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 14:35:13 GMT

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

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:

> It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st take.

> I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.

I believe the performance is the same - it's the same take bounced twice.

If

that's correct, it's interesting that the technology affected your sense of the artist's performance.

Ted

Subject: Re: A little A/B
Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 14:47:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So it seems I have progressed "to a whole nuba lebel" .:-)
Cool thanks Ted.
For real though in this case to my ears at least in this particular performance the processing really helps convey emotion and feel in a positive way that actually helps the track.

--
Thanks,

Brandon

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote in message
news:45d9b78a\$1@linux...

>
> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:
>>or maybe my ears just suck. hmmm.....
>>
> Not at all-
>
> The point is that good technology in audio conveys emotion. The word
> "trouble"
> in the take seems to move forward. Often, differences in audio playback
> are
> described in terms of EQ, or width, or volume, but to me (broken record
> here)
> the 3-D nature is what's significant.
>
> Ted
>
>
>
>>Thanks,
>>
>>Brandon

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:45d9ada5@linux...
>>> If that is the case, then I percieved the processing in the 1st take as
>
>>> more pleasing
>>> and a better performance. I think I am focusing on the vibrato of the
>
>>> voice
>>> and percived timing and feel of the performance.
>>> I guess the harshness of the 2nd take really effects how I percieve
>>> the performance. I feel the 2nd take is not really vibing with the feel
>>> of the song. Weird.
>>>
>>> --
>>> Thanks,
>>>
>>> Brandon
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote in message
>>> news:45d9a791\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:
>>>>>It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st
>
>>>>>take.
>>>>>I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> I believe the performance is the same - it's the same take bounced
>>>> twice.
>>>> If
>>>> that's correct, it's interesting that the technology affected your
>>>> sense
>>>> of the
>>>> the artist's performance.
>>>>
>>>> Ted
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 15:29:47 GMT

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

1st one definiatly. 2nd one sucks ASS!!!! just kidding.
very subtle difference, but I say the 1st one is the Neve.
Warmer, and more up front. Don't know if I'd miss it if it were back to back
though.

Rod

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

>Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?

>

>

>

Subject: Re: A little A/B

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 15:43:22 GMT

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

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:

>or maybe my ears just suck. hmmm.....

>

Not at all-

The point is that good technology in audio conveys emotion. The word "trouble"
in the take seems to move forward. Often, differences in audio playback are
described in terms of EQ, or width, or volume, but to me (broken record here)
the 3-D nature is what's significant.

Ted

>Thanks,

>

>Brandon

>

>

>

>

>"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:45d9ada5@linux...

>> If that is the case, then I percieved the processing in the 1st take as

>> more pleasing

>> and a better performance. I think I am focusing on the vibrato of the

>> voice

>> and percived timing and feel of the performance.
>> I guess the harshness of the 2nd take really effects how I percieve
>> the performance. I feel the 2nd take is not really vibing with the feel
>> of the song. Weird.
>>
>> --
>> Thanks,
>>
>> Brandon
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote in message
>> news:45d9a791\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:
>>>>It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st

>>>>take.
>>>>I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.
>>>
>>>
>>> I believe the performance is the same - it's the same take bounced twice.
>>> If
>>> that's correct, it's interesting that the technology affected your sense
>>> of the
>>> the artist's performance.
>>>
>>> Ted
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: A little A/B
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 16:01:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

First sample sounds warmer, phatter, fuller than the second which sounds, well, thinner, cooler. Interestingly, I'm registering those differences through tiny little computer speakers. Not because my ears are particularly good, but, I think, because the "effects" of each output setup are sonically meaningful.
MR

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45d91867@linux...

> Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?
>
>
>

Subject: Re: A little A/B
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 16:04:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brandon,

the performance was the same.....but if this thing could automatically polish turds.....oh man, I'd pay anything.

;o)

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:45d9a12c@linux...

>I picked it out too on my crappy comp speakers.
> It wasnt that obvious but I was able to distinguish
> between the two.
> The 1 st was a little warmer.
> It was torn at first since I think I prefer the performance in the 1st
> take.
> I thought maybe that was biasing my decision.

>
> --
> Thanks,
>
> Brandon

>
>
>
> "Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:45d99f6b\$1@linux...
>> First sample sounds warmer, phatter, fuller than the second which sounds,
>> well, thinner, cooler. Interestingly, I'm registering those differences
>> through tiny little computer speakers. Not because my ears are
>> particularly
>> good, but, I think, because the "effects" of each output setup are
>> sonically
>> meaningful.
>> MR
>>
>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45d91867@linux...
>>> Do you hear a difference? Which do you like?
>>>

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