Subject: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Neil on Sat, 18 Aug 2007 16:09:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hmmmm... price ain't too bad - wonder how it sounds?

http://www.sweetwater.com/store/detail/Sumo

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 18 Aug 2007 17:56:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Neil, I thought you did'nt belive in analog summing..

Fact: In a summing shoot out..The Mack Onxy mixer beat out a lot of 5k summing boxes..

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote:
>
>Hmmmm... price ain't too bad - wonder how it sounds?
>
>http://www.sweetwater.com/store/detail/Sumo
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Neil on Sat, 18 Aug 2007 19:24:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I never said I didn't believe in it. Where are you getting that from?

IIRC, I said that I felt that the difference was perceiveable, but not enough to warrant the extra hassle of routing & rerouting everything, in my case.

And, FYI, there's almost no way in hell that I would use boutique & high-end front-end stuff & then finish it off with a Mackie mixer.

"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>

>Hey Neil, I thought you did'nt belive in analog summing..
>
>Fact: In a summing shoot out..The Mack Onxy mixer beat out a lot of 5k summing
>boxes..
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hmmmm... price ain't too bad - wonder how it sounds?
>>
>>http://www.sweetwater.com/store/detail/Sumo
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMontt on Sat, 18 Aug 2007 23:29:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

True story. A friend of mine (Justin Yooung) just completed his first smooth jazz CD, that was mixed ny 4 time grammy winner Paul Brown (LA).. Justine stated that Paul uses PT HD then out into(Stems) a Mackie 8 buss mixer..

If you are or not familar with Paul's (Brown) work, just listen to the who's who is that genre (Norman Brown, Boney James,) and many many others..Top notch..

Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece of gear is all that it is..

In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OUI.com> wrote:
>
>I never said I didn't believe in it. Where are you getting that
>from?
>
>IIRC, I said that I felt that the difference was perceiveable,
>but not enough to warrant the extra hassle of routing &
>rerouting everything, in my case.
>
>And, FYI, there's almost no way in hell that I would use
>boutique & high-end front-end stuff & then finish it off with a

>Mackie mixer.
>
>
>
>
>"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hey Neil, I thought you did'nt belive in analog summing..
>>
>>Fact: In a summing shoot out..The Mack Onxy mixer beat out a lot of 5k
summing
>>boxes..
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hmmmm... price ain't too bad - wonder how it sounds?
>>>
>>>http://www.sweetwater.com/store/detail/Sumo
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Dimitrios on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 14:37:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,
Would you know which 8 buss mackie mixer he uses ?
I always liked the sound of my 1202 Mackie mixer !!
Regards,
Dimitrios

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>True story. A friend of mine (Justin Yooung) just completed his first smooth
>jazz CD, that was mixed ny 4 time grammy winner Paul Brown (LA).. Justine
>stated that Paul uses PT HD then out into(Stems) a Mackie 8 buss mixer..
>
>If you are or not familar with Paul's (Brown) work, just listen to the who's
>who is that genre (Norman Brown, Boney James,) and many many others..Top
>notch..
>
>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the day. Over
priced
>old gear and newer versions of an old piece of gear is all that it is..
>

>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any when it comes
>to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound better than ITB.. And ,
a
>Mackie can get the job done.. Just like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done
>for me..
>
>
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OUI.com> wrote:
>>
>>I never said I didn't believe in it. Where are you getting that
>>from?
>>
>>IIRC, I said that I felt that the difference was perceiveable,
>>but not enough to warrant the extra hassle of routing &
>>rerouting everything, in my case.
>>
>>And, FYI, there's almost no way in hell that I would use
>>boutique & high-end front-end stuff & then finish it off with a
>>Mackie mixer.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hey Neil, I thought you did'nt belive in analog summing..
>>>
>>>Fact: In a summing shoot out..The Mack Onxy mixer beat out a lot of 5k
>summing
>>>boxes..
>>>
>>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Hmmmm... price ain't too bad - wonder how it sounds?
>>>>
>>>>http://www.sweetwater.com/store/detail/Sumo
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by DJ on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 17:36:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil,

I'm still "really" happy with the Neve 5042 tape emulator thingie. I mean, REALLY" happy. It's not a summing device, but it definitely adds depth and width to the stereo image.....very noticable but it's best (IMO) to "mix to it", not strap it on later after the mix is pretty well set. It's amazing to switch it in and out of the mix and hear the difference (that you don't really notice until it's gone).

;o)

"Neil" <IOOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46c87fa2$1@linux...
>
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>of gear is all that it is.
>
> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
> while there are others that are great, but you have to
> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
> demand is what drives those prices.
>
>>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>
> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by IOOIU on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 17:36:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>of gear is all that it is.

I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
while there are others that are great, but you have to
wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
demand is what drives those prices.

>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..

See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
c.) There are tradeoffs.

Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMontt on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 17:38:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He's using 24 channel 8 buss..

It's strange how many hit records were mixed on a mackie..I too have 1202

but now use a 1604 @ home to track and monitor with.

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:
>
>Hi,
>Would you know which 8 buss mackie mixer he uses ?
>I always liked the sound of my 1202 Mackie mixer !!
>Regards,
>Dimitrios
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>True story. A friend of mine (Justin Yooung) just completed his first
smooth
>>jazz CD, that was mixed ny 4 time grammy winner Paul Brown (LA).. Justine
>>stated that Paul uses PT HD then out into(Stems) a Mackie 8 buss mixer..
>>
>>If you are or not familar with Paul's (Brown) work, just listen to the
who's
>>who is that genre (Norman Brown, Boney James,) and many many others..Top
>>notch..
>>
>>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the day. Over
>priced
>>old gear and newer versions of an old piece of gear is all that it is..
>>
>>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any when it comes
>>to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound better than ITB.. And ,
>a
>>Mackie can get the job done.. Just like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done
>>for me..
>>
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OUI.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I never said I didn't believe in it. Where are you getting that
>>>from?
>>>
>>>IIRC, I said that I felt that the difference was perceiveable,
>>>but not enough to warrant the extra hassle of routing &
>>>rerouting everything, in my case.
>>>
>>>And, FYI, there's almost no way in hell that I would use
>>>boutique & high-end front-end stuff & then finish it off with a
>>>Mackie mixer.
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Hey Neil, I thought you did'nt belive in analog summing..
>>>>
>>>>Fact: In a summing shoot out..The Mack Onxy mixer beat out a lot of 5k
>>summing
>>>>boxes..
>>>>
>>>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Hmmmm... price ain't too bad - wonder how it sounds?
>>>>>
>>>>>http://www.sweetwater.com/store/detail/Sumo
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMontt on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 17:45:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I totally agree with you.

"Neil" <IOOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>of gear is all that it is.
>
>I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>while there are others that are great, but you have to
>wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &

>see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>demand is what drives those prices.
>
>>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>
>See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>c.) There are tradeoffs.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Bill L on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 18:24:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.

So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
Then post your scores. I double dare you.

Neil wrote:
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>> of gear is all that it is.
>
> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
> while there are others that are great, but you have to
> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.

> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
> demand is what drives those prices.
>
>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>
> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by audioguy_editout_ on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 18:30:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Remember, the ITB mix was altered to make it *sound like*
the SSL sum mix... so it is NOT a realistic comparison.

David.

Bill L wrote:
> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>
> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>
> Neil wrote:
>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>
>>

>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>
>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>
>>
>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>
>> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by DJ on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 18:36:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

.....so the secret to getting an ITB mix to sound like an SSL is to buy an SSL, mix with it, then import the mix into PT and use plugins to duplicate the sound of the SSL mix..

This sounds exactly like something I would dream up.

;o)

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message news:46c88e3c$1@linux...

> Remember, the ITB mix was altered to make it *sound like* the SSL sum
> mix... so it is NOT a realistic comparison.
>
> David.
>
> Bill L wrote:
>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>
>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>
>> Neil wrote:
>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>
>>>
>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>
>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>
>>>
>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure

>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>
>>> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by audioguy_editout_ on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 18:49:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The only way to truly test summing would be to send the PT
stems to a *second* PT system for summing there, then a
second pass summed through the analog mixer. You would of
course have to record the resulting sums onto the same unit
(Masterlink, Tascam'1000 etc.) for a fair comparison. But
this STILL wouldn't take into account the convertors, clock,
etc etc etc.

David.

DJ wrote:

> .....so the secret to getting an ITB mix to sound like an SSL is to buy
> an SSL, mix with it, then import the mix into PT and use plugins to
> duplicate the sound of the SSL mix..
>
> This sounds exactly like something I would dream up.
>
> ;o)
>
>
> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message
> news:46c88e3c$1@linux...
>
>>Remember, the ITB mix was altered to make it *sound like* the SSL sum
>>mix... so it is NOT a realistic comparison.
>>
>>David.
>>
>>Bill L wrote:
>>
>>>Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>>>whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
>>>and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>
>>>So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>>>Then post your scores. I double dare you.

>>>
>>>Neil wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>of gear is all that it is.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>
>>>>Neil
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by neil[1] on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 23:14:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Exactly. In the ITB version you don't have to go out into the
analog domain, therefore it's not an apples-to-apples
comparison.

Neil

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:
>The only way to truly test summing would be to send the PT
>stems to a *second* PT system for summing there, then a
>second pass summed through the analog mixer. You would of
>course have to record the resulting sums onto the same unit
>(Masterlink, Tascam'1000 etc.) for a fair comparison. But
>this STILL wouldn't take into account the convertors, clock,
>etc etc etc.
>
>David.
>
>DJ wrote:
>
>> .....so the secret to getting an ITB mix to sound like an SSL is to
buy
>> an SSL, mix with it, then import the mix into PT and use plugins to
>> duplicate the sound of the SSL mix..
>>
>> This sounds exactly like something I would dream up.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message
>> news:46c88e3c$1@linux...
>>
>>>Remember, the ITB mix was altered to make it *sound like* the SSL sum

>>>mix... so it is NOT a realistic comparison.
>>>
>>>David.
>>>
>>>Bill L wrote:
>>>
>>>>Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test

>>>>whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs

>>>>and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>
>>>>So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.

>>>>Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>
>>>>Neil wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>>point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>>Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>>see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>>when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>

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

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Neil on Sun, 19 Aug 2007 23:17:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No, I haven't taken it - and I really don't need to, because:

a.) It's not a dead-on a/b test because in one example you have
to go out into the analog domain (to mix in the console) and in
the ITB example, you don't.

b.) I have no doubt that someone can build a set of plugins
that model the SSL's sonic characteristics.

c.) I already believe that you can get equally good results ITB
vs a large-format console.

Therefore, that particular test wouldn't prove or disprove
anything to me.

Neil

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs

>and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>
>So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>
>Neil wrote:
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>
>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)

>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>
>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>
>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>
>> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMontt on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 01:42:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series) eqs harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is a noticble difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all of the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios with apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really does what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire mix..

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs

>and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>
>So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>Then post your scores. I double dare you.

>
>Neil wrote:
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>
>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>
>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>
>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>
>> Neil

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Bill L on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 02:20:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that same feeling with most digital EQs.

Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.

lamont wrote:
> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series) eqs
> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is a noticble
> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all of
> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios with
> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really does
> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire mix..
>
>
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
>
>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>
>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>
>> Neil wrote:
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>
>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for

>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>
>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by DJ on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 02:29:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:46c8fc69@linux...
> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital is
> the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of the
> knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that same
> feeling with most digital EQs.
>
> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>
Bill,

I agree with you about analog EQ adding something special. The UAD-1 Neve 1073, 1081 and the Helios EQ's really can provide that extra mojo. I'm just wondering what the point is of taking this test if the ITB mix is being modelled on a mix that was already done on an outboard console. Having said that, when I mix, I usually import a stereo master track of a song that is similar in genre and instrumentation to the one I am mixing and use that as a "go by", soloing an muting it as I go along, which is what this comparison is basically doing as I understand it. From that standpoint, you could definitely learn how to "closely emulate" a mix done on a console, but without that point of reference, it might be a lot harder to dial in that kind of similarity.

Deej

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMont on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 03:16:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes wider.
However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.

Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid made
the mix tighter, more focused.

So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of
>the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get
>that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>
>Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>
>lamont wrote:
>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)
eqs
>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is
a noticble
>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all
of
>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
with
>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
does
>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire mix..
>>
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test

>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
>>
>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>
>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.

>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>
>>> Neil wrote:
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny

>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>
>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMont on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 04:44:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey DJ,
that method can be dangerous, due to the fact that the 2 track reference
mix is finished Master with added eq and compression, stereo width enhancements.

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>
>"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:46c8fc69@linux...
>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
is
>> the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of the

>> knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that
same
>> feeling with most digital EQs.

>>
>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>
>Bill,
>
>I agree with you about analog EQ adding something special. The UAD-1 Neve

>1073, 1081 and the Helios EQ's really can provide that extra mojo. I'm just

>wondering what the point is of taking this test if the ITB mix is being

>modelled on a mix that was already done on an outboard console. Having said

>that, when I mix, I usually import a stereo master track of a song that
is
>similar in genre and instrumentation to the one I am mixing and use that
as
>a "go by", soloing an muting it as I go along, which is what this comparison

>is basically doing as I understand it. From that standpoint, you could
>definitely learn how to "closely emulate" a mix done on a console, but
>without that point of reference, it might be a lot harder to dial in that

>kind of similarity.
>
>Deej
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by DJ on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 13:05:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Understood. Seems like I am doing tall the tracking, mixing and mastering
here anyway. No one I work with has the budget for a mqastering engineer so
I just master as I mix. I know this is audio blasphemy, but I spit in the
face of audio blaqsphemy and go there anyway.

(huff huff, grunt grunt)

;o)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:46c91c42$1@linux...
>
> Hey DJ,
> that method can be dangerous, due to the fact that the 2 track reference
> mix is finished Master with added eq and compression, stereo width

> enhancements.
>
>
>
> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>
>>"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:46c8fc69@linux...
>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
> is
>>> the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of the
>
>>> knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that
> same
>>> feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>
>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>
>>Bill,
>>
>>I agree with you about analog EQ adding something special. The UAD-1 Neve
>
>>1073, 1081 and the Helios EQ's really can provide that extra mojo. I'm
>>just
>
>>wondering what the point is of taking this test if the ITB mix is being
>
>>modelled on a mix that was already done on an outboard console. Having
>>said
>
>>that, when I mix, I usually import a stereo master track of a song that
> is
>>similar in genre and instrumentation to the one I am mixing and use that
> as
>>a "go by", soloing an muting it as I go along, which is what this
>>comparison
>
>>is basically doing as I understand it. From that standpoint, you could
>>definitely learn how to "closely emulate" a mix done on a console, but
>>without that point of reference, it might be a lot harder to dial in that
>
>>kind of similarity.
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by LaMont on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 18:13:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

LoL! :)

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>Understood. Seems like I am doing tall the tracking, mixing and mastering

>here anyway. No one I work with has the budget for a mqastering engineer
so
>I just master as I mix. I know this is audio blasphemy, but I spit in the

>face of audio blaqsphemy and go there anyway.
>
>(huff huff, grunt grunt)
>
>;o)
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:46c91c42$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey DJ,
>> that method can be dangerous, due to the fact that the 2 track reference
>> mix is finished Master with added eq and compression, stereo width
>> enhancements.
>>
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>
>>>"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:46c8fc69@linux...
>>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>> is
>>>> the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of
the
>>
>>>> knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that
>> same
>>>> feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>>
>>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>>
>>>Bill,
>>>
>>>I agree with you about analog EQ adding something special. The UAD-1 Neve
>>
>>>1073, 1081 and the Helios EQ's really can provide that extra mojo. I'm

>>>just

>>
>>>wondering what the point is of taking this test if the ITB mix is being
>>
>>>modelled on a mix that was already done on an outboard console. Having

>>>said
>>
>>>that, when I mix, I usually import a stereo master track of a song that
>> is
>>>similar in genre and instrumentation to the one I am mixing and use that
>> as
>>>a "go by", soloing an muting it as I go along, which is what this
>>>comparison
>>
>>>is basically doing as I understand it. From that standpoint, you could
>>>definitely learn how to "closely emulate" a mix done on a console, but
>>>without that point of reference, it might be a lot harder to dial in that
>>
>>>kind of similarity.
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Bill L on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 23:06:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

DJ, I think it makes total sense to model it after a board mix because
if successful, it proves that you can get indistinguishable results. I
don't follow the logic of those who say it's invalid for that reason. If
you can get the result, then there is no reason to insist on an analog
board, except for preference or convenience or client necessity, etc

DJ wrote:
> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:46c8fc69@linux...
>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital is
>> the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of the
>> knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that same
>> feeling with most digital EQs.
>>
>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>
> Bill,

>
> I agree with you about analog EQ adding something special. The UAD-1 Neve
> 1073, 1081 and the Helios EQ's really can provide that extra mojo. I'm just
> wondering what the point is of taking this test if the ITB mix is being
> modelled on a mix that was already done on an outboard console. Having said
> that, when I mix, I usually import a stereo master track of a song that is
> similar in genre and instrumentation to the one I am mixing and use that as
> a "go by", soloing an muting it as I go along, which is what this comparison
> is basically doing as I understand it. From that standpoint, you could
> definitely learn how to "closely emulate" a mix done on a console, but
> without that point of reference, it might be a lot harder to dial in that
> kind of similarity.
>
> Deej
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Bill L on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 23:12:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on
the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%
of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it
could also be emulated digitally.

LaMont wrote:
> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes wider.
> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.
>
>
> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid made
> the mix tighter, more focused.
>
> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>> is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of
>> the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get
>> that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>
>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>
>> lamont wrote:
>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)

> eqs
>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is
> a noticble
>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all
> of
>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
> with
>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
> does
>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire mix..
>>>
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>
>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL plugs
>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>
>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>
>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>
>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>
>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you

>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by EK Sound on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 23:16:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It could also be a difference in the panning law between the SSL and
Protools.

David.

Bill L wrote:
> "Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on
> the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%
> of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
> to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it
> could also be emulated digitally.
>
> LaMont wrote:
>
>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes
>> wider.
>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound
>> department.
>>
>>
>> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid
>> made
>> the mix tighter, more focused.
>> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>
>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and
>>> digital is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the
>>> response of the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them.
>>> I don't get that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>

>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>
>>> lamont wrote:
>>>
>>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)
>>
>> eqs
>>
>>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is
>>
>> a noticble
>>
>>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all
>>
>> of
>>
>>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
>>
>> with
>>
>>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL
>>>> room...But
>>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
>>
>> does
>>
>>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire
>>>> mix..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>>
>>
>>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL
>>>>> plugs
>>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>>
>>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>>
>>
>>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil
>>
>>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Rod Lincoln on Mon, 20 Aug 2007 23:55:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Deej....I'm with you on this...not that I want to be, but everything I mix
here, just like you, is for people who don't have the budjet for mixing AND
mastering, so I do the same thing.
Rod
"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>Understood. Seems like I am doing tall the tracking, mixing and mastering

>here anyway. No one I work with has the budget for a mqastering engineer
so
>I just master as I mix. I know this is audio blasphemy, but I spit in the

>face of audio blaqsphemy and go there anyway.
>
>(huff huff, grunt grunt)
>
>;o)
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:46c91c42$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey DJ,
>> that method can be dangerous, due to the fact that the 2 track reference
>> mix is finished Master with added eq and compression, stereo width
>> enhancements.
>>
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>
>>>"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:46c8fc69@linux...
>>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>> is
>>>> the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of
the
>>
>>>> knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get that
>> same
>>>> feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>>
>>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>>
>>>Bill,
>>>
>>>I agree with you about analog EQ adding something special. The UAD-1 Neve
>>
>>>1073, 1081 and the Helios EQ's really can provide that extra mojo. I'm

>>>just
>>
>>>wondering what the point is of taking this test if the ITB mix is being
>>
>>>modelled on a mix that was already done on an outboard console. Having

>>>said
>>

>>>that, when I mix, I usually import a stereo master track of a song that
>> is
>>>similar in genre and instrumentation to the one I am mixing and use that
>> as
>>>a "go by", soloing an muting it as I go along, which is what this
>>>comparison
>>
>>>is basically doing as I understand it. From that standpoint, you could
>>>definitely learn how to "closely emulate" a mix done on a console, but
>>>without that point of reference, it might be a lot harder to dial in that
>>
>>>kind of similarity.
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Dedric Terry on Tue, 21 Aug 2007 06:17:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

None sounded wider here through my system, and I can pick that out pretty quickly. I picked the right ones about half the time, but the only difference that stood out to me that made me think I had pinned each one down was dynamics/compression in the bass (the instrument, not the frequency range). Some loops sounded tighter as a result of seemingly a little tighter compression on the bass itself, but when I took the test, the actual answers rejected such a pattern, so I chalked it up to simple compression variations. That can make a mix sound wider (bass fills more of the center and "back" of the field, lessening the perceived relative volume of highs, which are what create or enhance the perception of width).

I agree with Bill - emulating the SSL mix after the fact with the PT mix is perfectly valid - that's exactly how I would do it and have offered to do this with various engineers in the past (I talked with Mixerman about doing this a couple of years ago). In my opinion, it actually proves that a DAW may well be sonically more flexible than a board (an unpopular position I've maintained for a long time).

BTW - I downloaded the mixes, stripped the audio out of the QT movies and played them back in Nuendo. I had the QT movies on the timeline though for the label references.

Dedric

On 8/20/07 5:12 PM, in article 46ca21ad@linux, "Bill L"
<bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

> "Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on
> the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%
> of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
> to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it
> could also be emulated digitally.
>
> LaMont wrote:
>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes wider.
>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by TCB on Tue, 21 Aug 2007 16:02:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In other words you could pick it out 7% more often than a coin flip. Doesn't
sound like much of a difference to me.

TCB

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>"Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on
>the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%

>of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
>to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it
>could also be emulated digitally.
>
>LaMont wrote:
>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes
wider.
>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.
>>
>>
>> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid
made
>> the mix tighter, more focused.
>>
>> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital

>>> is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of

>>> the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get

>>> that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>
>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>
>>> lamont wrote:
>>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)
>> eqs
>>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is
>> a noticble
>>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all
>> of
>>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
>> with
>>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
>>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
>> does
>>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire mix..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>>
>>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL
plugs
>>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>>
>>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>>
>>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.

>>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Bill L on Wed, 22 Aug 2007 12:37:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's what i thought. According to them that is the norm. Try it and
see how you do.

TCB wrote:
> In other words you could pick it out 7% more often than a coin flip. Doesn't
> sound like much of a difference to me.
>
> TCB
>
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> "Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on
>> the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%
>
>> of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
>> to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it
>> could also be emulated digitally.
>>
>> LaMont wrote:
>>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes
> wider.
>>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.
>>>

>>>
>>> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid
> made
>>> the mix tighter, more focused.
>>>
>>> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>
>>>> is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response of
>
>>>> the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get
>
>>>> that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>>
>>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>>
>>>> lamont wrote:
>>>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)
>>> eqs
>>>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There is
>>> a noticble
>>>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because all
>>> of
>>>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
>>> with
>>>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
>>>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
>>> does
>>>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire mix..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and test
>>>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL
> plugs
>>>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the test.
>>>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this

>>>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Ted Gerber on Wed, 22 Aug 2007 13:25:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You know, I really think this test is flawed. Both versions sound superb.
I also agree
with Bill's view that their rationale for modelling the SSL mix with PT &
plugs is
valid in a real world scenario.

The problem with the test is that it involves continuos and repeated A/B
audio comparisons.

Try taking the test this way instead:
Listen to the reference tracks.
Just listen to 2 edits, (someone else will have to trigger them
so you won't know which they are) then stop.

Wait a few hours, (or a day) and do it again. Repeat as many times as needed
to equal the total number of edits as the loop or continous track versions
on
the Digi site (as many as 12 separate edits)
Then see what you score.

I scored 7 out of 12 on the Smooth Jazz loop when trying to do it all at
once,
and 11 out 12 when breaking it up.

Last month, we tried 2 different mics on a female singer. We tracked the
entire
song 3 times on one mic, then switched to the other. All 3 of us heard the
difference
immediately, and agreed on which one we wanted to use. The next day, I was
replaying it for all of us, and switched back and forth throughout the tune.
By the
end of the song (4 minutes plus) even I had trouble telling which one was
which, and I was looking at the screen.

Yet, when we came back on subsequent days, and listened with a "cleansed
pallette"
all of easily identified which mic was which.

I have been invloved in similar tests with pianos. Comparing Steinway, Yamaha,

Baldwin & Bosendorfer recorded at the same studio, with the same signal path.
Repeated back and forth comparisons, even between just 2 of them, let alone
all 4, made it harder and harder to distinguish between them. Listening to
them
with "fresh ears" made it relatively easy.

Ted

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>That's what i thought. According to them that is the norm. Try it and
>see how you do.
>
>TCB wrote:
>> In other words you could pick it out 7% more often than a coin flip. Doesn't
>> sound like much of a difference to me.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> "Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on

>>> the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%

>>
>>> of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design

>>> to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it

>>> could also be emulated digitally.
>>>
>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes
>> wider.
>>>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid
>> made
>>>> the mix tighter, more focused.
>>>>
>>>> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>>
>>>>> is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response
of
>>
>>>>> the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get
>>
>>>>> that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>>>
>>>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>>>
>>>>> lamont wrote:
>>>>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)
>>>> eqs
>>>>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There
is
>>>> a noticble
>>>>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because
all
>>>> of
>>>>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
>>>> with
>>>>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
>>>>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
>>>> does
>>>>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire
mix..
>>>>>>

>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and
test
>>>>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL
>> plugs
>>>>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the
test.
>>>>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Bill L on Wed, 22 Aug 2007 23:09:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Your idea is interesting. I'll try that some time. I have found that comparisons require listening to a short (2-4 seconds) section of the tune and AB it blind. I am sure I would have scored much higher in that mode. BUT even in the mode they used, it convinced me that the difference is not so great.

Ted Gerber wrote:
> You know, I really think this test is flawed. Both versions sound superb.
> I also agree
> with Bill's view that their rationale for modelling the SSL mix with PT &
> plugs is
> valid in a real world scenario.
>
> The problem with the test is that it involves continuos and repeated A/B
> audio comparisons.
>
> Try taking the test this way instead:
> Listen to the reference tracks.
> Just listen to 2 edits, (someone else will have to trigger them
> so you won't know which they are) then stop.
> Wait a few hours, (or a day) and do it again. Repeat as many times as needed
> to equal the total number of edits as the loop or continous track versions
> on
> the Digi site (as many as 12 separate edits)
> Then see what you score.
>
> I scored 7 out of 12 on the Smooth Jazz loop when trying to do it all at
> once,
> and 11 out 12 when breaking it up.
>
> Last month, we tried 2 different mics on a female singer. We tracked the
> entire
> song 3 times on one mic, then switched to the other. All 3 of us heard the
> difference
> immediately, and agreed on which one we wanted to use. The next day, I was
> replaying it for all of us, and switched back and forth throughout the tune.
> By the
> end of the song (4 minutes plus) even I had trouble telling which one was
> which, and I was looking at the screen.
>
> Yet, when we came back on subsequent days, and listened with a "cleansed
> pallette"
> all of easily identified which mic was which.
>
> I have been invloved in similar tests with pianos. Comparing Steinway, Yamaha,

>
> Baldwin & Bosendorfer recorded at the same studio, with the same signal path.
> Repeated back and forth comparisons, even between just 2 of them, let alone
> all 4, made it harder and harder to distinguish between them. Listening to
> them
> with "fresh ears" made it relatively easy.
>
> Ted
>
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> That's what i thought. According to them that is the norm. Try it and
>> see how you do.
>>
>> TCB wrote:
>>> In other words you could pick it out 7% more often than a coin flip. Doesn't
>>> sound like much of a difference to me.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> "Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes on
>
>>>> the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than 57%
>>>> of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
>
>>>> to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think it
>
>>>> could also be emulated digitally.
>>>>
>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes
>>> wider.
>>>>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid
>>> made
>>>>> the mix tighter, more focused.
>>>>>
>>>>> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>>>>>> is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response
> of
>>>>>> the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't get
>>>>>> that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> lamont wrote:
>>>>>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E series)
>>>>> eqs
>>>>>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There
> is
>>>>> a noticble
>>>>>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because
> all
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
>>>>> with
>>>>>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL room...But
>>>>>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss really
>>>>> does
>>>>>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire
> mix..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and
> test
>>>>>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves SSL
>>> plugs
>>>>>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the
> test.
>>>>>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those &
>>>>>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any
>>>>>>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Summing Box w/built-in Comp-limiter
Posted by Ted Gerber on Thu, 23 Aug 2007 03:25:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Fair enough

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>Your idea is interesting. I'll try that some time. I have found that
>comparisons require listening to a short (2-4 seconds) section of the
>tune and AB it blind. I am sure I would have scored much higher in that

>mode. BUT even in the mode they used, it convinced me that the
>difference is not so great.
>
>Ted Gerber wrote:
>> You know, I really think this test is flawed. Both versions sound superb.
>> I also agree
>> with Bill's view that their rationale for modelling the SSL mix with PT
&
>> plugs is
>> valid in a real world scenario.
>>
>> The problem with the test is that it involves continuos and repeated A/B
>> audio comparisons.
>>
>> Try taking the test this way instead:
>> Listen to the reference tracks.
>> Just listen to 2 edits, (someone else will have to trigger them
>> so you won't know which they are) then stop.

>> Wait a few hours, (or a day) and do it again. Repeat as many times as
needed
>> to equal the total number of edits as the loop or continous track versions
>> on
>> the Digi site (as many as 12 separate edits)
>> Then see what you score.
>>
>> I scored 7 out of 12 on the Smooth Jazz loop when trying to do it all
at
>> once,
>> and 11 out 12 when breaking it up.
>>
>> Last month, we tried 2 different mics on a female singer. We tracked the
>> entire
>> song 3 times on one mic, then switched to the other. All 3 of us heard
the
>> difference
>> immediately, and agreed on which one we wanted to use. The next day, I
was
>> replaying it for all of us, and switched back and forth throughout the
tune.
>> By the
>> end of the song (4 minutes plus) even I had trouble telling which one
was
>> which, and I was looking at the screen.
>>
>> Yet, when we came back on subsequent days, and listened with a "cleansed
>> pallette"
>> all of easily identified which mic was which.
>>
>> I have been invloved in similar tests with pianos. Comparing Steinway,
Yamaha,
>>
>> Baldwin & Bosendorfer recorded at the same studio, with the same signal
path.
>> Repeated back and forth comparisons, even between just 2 of them, let
alone
>> all 4, made it harder and harder to distinguish between them. Listening
to
>> them
>> with "fresh ears" made it relatively easy.
>>
>> Ted
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> That's what i thought. According to them that is the norm. Try it and

>>> see how you do.

>>>
>>> TCB wrote:
>>>> In other words you could pick it out 7% more often than a coin flip.
Doesn't
>>>> sound like much of a difference to me.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> "Wider" is the only difference I could hear in the identified mixes
on
>>
>>>>> the website, but once I had to guess, I could not hear it more than
57%
>>>>> of the time. I don't know enough about psychoacoustics or audio design
>>
>>>>> to understand what makes something sound wider, but you would think
it
>>
>>>>> could also be emulated digitally.
>>>>>
>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>> The difference (real life) is that the mix thru the SSL board becomes
>>>> wider.
>>>>>> However, I would say that clocking plays a big role int he sound department.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Again, we choose Lucid over Digis Clock and Apogee Big Ben. The Licid
>>>> made
>>>>>> the mix tighter, more focused.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So, along with OTB, clocking plays a part..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> For me the most important difference between mixing analog and digital
>>>>>>> is the EQ and maybe the biggest part of that is simply the response
>> of
>>>>>>> the knobs and how they alter the sound when I turn them. I don't
get
>>>>>>> that same feeling with most digital EQs.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Take the test. You will be surprised. I triple dare you.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>> Bill, I work @ our church studio wich has a SSL 4000 G series(E
series)
>>>>>> eqs
>>>>>>>> harwired to a PT HD3 using Lucid genX clock.. To the point...There

>> is
>>>>>> a noticble
>>>>>>>> difference bte ITB and thru the SSL. We had a great laugh because
>> all
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> the producers who work there all have PT HdS in there perwonal studios
>>>>>> with
>>>>>>>> apgee AD16X and they take numbers to bring in there mixes to SSL
room...But
>>>>>>>> I will say his..inserting the waves SSL comp on the master buss
really
>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> what the real ssl buss comp does..and that is .it glues the entire
>> mix..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Neil & Lamont: did either of you take the ProTools challenge and
>> test
>>>>>>>>> whether you could hear the difference between in the box Waves
SSL
>>>> plugs
>>>>>>>>> and summing vs. SSL channels and summing? It may surprise you.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> So put your money where your mouth is, so to speak, and take the
>> test.
>>>>>>>>> Then post your scores. I double dare you.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> Boutique is only Boutique because it's the buzz phrase of the
>>>>>>>>>>> day. Over priced old gear and newer versions of an old piece
>>>>>>>>>>> of gear is all that it is.
>>>>>>>>>> I guess I can both agree with you & disagree with you on this
>>>>>>>>>> point, depending on which piece of gear is the subject of
>>>>>>>>>> conversation at the moment - I have a few pieces of high-end
>>>>>>>>>> or "boutique" equipment that I think are worth every penny
>>>>>>>>>> I paid for them (Chandler TG-2, Soundelux E251-C come to mind)
>>>>>>>>>> while there are others that are great, but you have to
>>>>>>>>>> wonder "do they REALLY need to charge that much for that?"
>>>>>>>>>> I think vintage gear is in another category... that's driven
>>>>>>>>>> strictly by availability, as, if you're looking to buy a 1073,
>>>>>>>>>> for example, there are only so many for sale at any given time.
>>>>>>>>>> Try making an offer of a grand to anyone selling one of those
&
>>>>>>>>>> see if anyone takes you up on it. Unlikely; therefore the market
>>>>>>>>>> demand is what drives those prices.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> In the end , the ears have it.. I can truly state that any

>>>>>>>>>>> when it comes to summing, almost all analog mixers will sound
>>>>>>>>>>> better than ITB.. And , a Mackie can get the job done.. Just
>>>>>>>>>>> like my Soundcraft Ghost get's it done for me..
>>>>>>>>>> See, but that's your opinion... just because you make a
>>>>>>>>>> statement like: "I can truly state" or "end of story" (as you
>>>>>>>>>> did in another recent thread) doesn't mean it's the end of the
>>>>>>>>>> story for everyone, it just means it's the end of the story for
>>>>>>>>>> you. I've done enough summing experiments (not too long ago &
>>>>>>>>>> posted several results & examples here, in fact, as I'm sure
>>>>>>>>>> you recall) to where I'm convinced that a.) you can indeed hear
>>>>>>>>>> a difference, b.) the difference is not super-significant, and,
>>>>>>>>>> c.) There are tradeoffs.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Neil
>>