
Subject: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 06:11:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0039_01C74C9F.A9E6E160
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch of 96k =
material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little different.....but =
not necessarily better.....at least to my ears. SRC'ed and dithered =
down, the difference is negligibile. I'm playing back through a Benchmark =
DAC-1.=20

Well...at least I can record at 96k now.....whoopee
-----=_NextPart_000_0039_01C74C9F.A9E6E160
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.5730.11" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've =
been working=20
with a&nbsp;bunch of 96k material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a =
little=20
different.....but not necessarily better.....at least to my ears. =
SRC'ed and=20
dithered down, the difference is negligibile. I'm playing back through a=20
Benchmark DAC-1. </FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Well...at least I can record at 96k=20
now.....<FONT size=3D1>whoopee</FONT></FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
```

-----=_NextPart_000_0039_01C74C9F.A9E6E160--

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [rick](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 11:39:38 GMT

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

88.2...better math on dither.

On Fri, 9 Feb 2007 23:11:43 -0700, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>

wrote:

>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch of 96k material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little different.....but not necessarily better.....at least to my ears. SRC'ed and dithered down, the difference is negligibile. I'm playing back through a Benchmark DAC-1.

>

>Well...at least I can record at 96k now.....whoopee

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 13:30:11 GMT

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

Hey DJ,

I think the biggest reason to record at 96K is to accomodate current and future high resolution consumer playback devices.

Think about all the stuff recorded digitally through the late 80s and early 90s at 48K. There's no option for later remastering at higher sample rates, except to SRC. Yechh

Chuck

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

>

>

>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch of 96k =
>material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little different.....but

=

>not necessarily better.....at least to my ears. SRC'ed and dithered =
>down, the difference is negligibile. I'm playing back through a Benchmark

=

>DAC-1.=20

>

>Well...at least I can record at 96k now.....whoopee

>

><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

><HTML><HEAD>

><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =

```
> charset="iso-8859-1">
> <META content="MSHTML 6.00.5730.11" name="GENERATOR">
> </STYLE></STYLE>
> </HEAD>
> <BODY>
> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">Well.....poo!!!!..... I've =
> been working=20

> little=20
> different.....but not necessarily better.....at least to my ears. =
> SRC'ed and=20
> dithered down, the difference is negligible. I'm playing back through a=20
> Benchmark DAC-1. </FONT></DIV>

> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">Well...at least I can record at 96k=20
> now.....<FONT size="1">whoopee</FONT></FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>
```

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 15:23:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0080_01C74CEC.B4425F70

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

It's not a large project to be sure. I use outboard 'verbs (or two) and = these will either have to be SRC'ed in real time (I've already concocted = the madness to accomplish this, though I'm not sure I want to do it) or = patched analog.....so I can't imagine a drastic improvement using = these. I'll be 'speramentin' some more soon.....whoopee!!

;o)

"Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cdde72\$1@linux...

>=20

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

>>

>>

>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch

> of 96k =3D material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little

> different.....but =3D >not necessarily better.....
>=20
>=20
> OH COME ON!!!
>=20
> What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
> ("tonight")?
>=20
> Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
> ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
> working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
> difference in quality.
>=20
> Neil

-----=_NextPart_000_0080_01C74CEC.B4425F70

Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html"; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.5730.11" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>It's not a large project to be sure. I =
use outboard=20
'verbs (or two) and these will either have to be SRC'ed in real time =
(I've=20
already concocted the madness to accomplish this, though I'm not sure I =
want to=20
do it) &nbsp;or patched analog.....so I can't imagine a drastic =
improvement=20
using these. I'll be 'speramentin' some more soon.....</FONT><FONT=20
size=3D1>whopee!!</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=3D1></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=3D1>;o</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=3D1></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=3D1></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>"Neil" &lt;</FONT><A=20
href=3D"mailto:IOU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>IOU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT=20
```

face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote in message <A=20
href=3D"news:45cdde72\$1 @linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>news:45cdde72\$1 @linux<FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>...</DIV>>
> "DJ" =
<<A=20
href=3D"http://www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com<FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>>=20
wrote:
>>
>>
>>Well.....poo!!!!.....=
I've=20
been working with a bunch
> of 96k =3D material tonight. Big yawn. =
Yeah, it=20
sounds a little
> different.....but =3D >not necessarily=20
better.....
>
>
> OH COME ON!!!
>
> =
What=20
exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>=20
("tonight")?
>
> Also, do you have enough tracks going to =
make a=20
difference?
> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a =
small
> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & =
voice,=20
for
> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going =
and
>=20
ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
> =
working at=20
those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
> difference =
in=20
quality.
>
> Neil</BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0080_01C74CEC.B4425F70--

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 16:02:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>
>
>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
different.....but = >not necessarily better.....

OH COME ON!!!

What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time

("tonight")?

Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a difference in quality.

Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 18:54:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't use a superior summing device.

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

>

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

>>

>>

>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>different.....but = >not necessarily better.....

>

>

>OH COME ON!!!

>

>What exactly did you record & evaluate in that short time

>("tonight")?

>

>Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
>difference in quality.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 10 Feb 2007 23:06:29 GMT

Correction: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collapse after 40 plus with good lot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have to invest in a decent summing device to get your mix back..

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

>
>the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't use
>a superior summing device.

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

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

>>>

>>>

>>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>different.....but = >not necessarily better.....

>>

>>

>>OH COME ON!!!

>>

>>What exactly did you record & evaluate in that short time
>>("tonight")?

>>

>>Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
>>difference in quality.

>>

>>Neil

>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Neil](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 01:52:39 GMT

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

So is it 40 or 50 tracks?

Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?

Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?

Make up my mind!

Neil

"lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Corrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus with
good
>alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have to
invest
>in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>
>"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't
use
>>a superior summing device.
>>"Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>
>>>
>>>OH COME ON!!!
>>>
>>>What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>("tonight")?
>>>
>>>Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
>>>difference in quality.
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 02:36:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...

>

> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to

> mention,

> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)

>

> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior converters

> and

> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it, SX

> will

> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as much

> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..

>

> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as "Play

> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of digital

> mixing"..Whatever..

> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them ,and

> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user, the

> above statements apply as well..

>

> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front end to

> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..

> YOU can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or Analog)

> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..

>

>

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

>>

>>So is it 40 or 50 tracks?

>>Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?

>>Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?

>>

>>Make up my mind!

>>

>>Neil

>>

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

>>>

>>>Corrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus with

>>good

>>>alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have to

>>invest

>>>in a decent summing device to get your mix back..

>>>

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

>>>>

>>>>the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't

>>use

>>>>a superior summing device.
>>>>"Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>
>>>>>OH COME ON!!!
>>>>>
>>>>>What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>("tonight")?
>>>>>
>>>>>Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>>>handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>>example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>>ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>>working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
>>>>>difference in quality.
>>>>>
>>>>>Neil
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 03:13:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to mention, keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)

Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior converters and decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it, SX will give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as much Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..

In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as "Play it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of digital mixing"..Whatever..

If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them ,and all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user, the

above statements apply as well..

That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front end to Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
YOU can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or Analog) will be superior to your IN the Box summing..

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

>
>So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?

>
>Make up my mind!

>
>Neil

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

>>
>>Correction: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus with
>good
>>alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have to
>invest
>>in a decent summing device to get your mix back..

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

>>>
>>>the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't
>use
>>>a superior summing device.

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

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

>>>>>
>>>>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>different.....but = >not necessarily better.....

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>OH COME ON!!!

>>>>>
>>>>>What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>("tonight")?

>>>>>
>>>>>Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small

>>>>handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a
>>>>difference in quality.

>>>>

>>>>Neil

>>>

>>

>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 07:53:54 GMT

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

hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their entire Portico line..

The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing stage on the outs..Cool..

You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????

P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
?mixer<http://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P> roducts

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

>You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message [news:45ce7bb9\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:45ce7bb9$1@linux...)

>>

>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to

>> mention,

>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)

>>

>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior converters

>> and

>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it, SX

>> will

>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as much

>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..

>>

>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as "Play

>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of digital
>> mixing"..Whatever..
>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
,and
>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user, the
>> above statements apply as well..
>>
>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front end
to
>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>> YOu can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or Analog)
>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>
>>>Make up my mind!
>>>
>>>Neil
>>>
>>>"lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Corrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus with
>>>>good
>>>>alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have
to
>>>>invest
>>>>in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>
>>>>"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't
>>>>>use
>>>>>a superior summing device.
>>>>>"Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>>different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>OH COME ON!!!

>>>>>

>>>>>What exactly did you record & evaluate in that short time

>>>>>("tonight")?

>>>>>

>>>>>Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?

>>>>>I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small

>>>>>handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for

>>>>>example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and

>>>>>ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two

>>>>>working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear a

>>>>>difference in quality.

>>>>>

>>>>>Neil

>>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 14:50:57 GMT

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

Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing - it's just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little saturation, and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.

That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what it's all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)

Regards,
Dedric

On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their entire

> Portico line..

>

> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing

> stage on the outs..Cool..

>

> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing

> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>
> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to
>>> mention,
>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>
>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior converters
>
>>> and
>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it, SX
>
>>> will
>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crispy as PT, Not as much
>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>
>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as "Play
>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of digital
>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
> ,and
>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user, the
>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>
>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front end
> to
>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>> YOu can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or Analog)
>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>
>>>
>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>
>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>
>>>> Neil

```

>>>>
>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Corrrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus with
>>>> good
>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have
> to
>>>> invest
>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMOnT" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you don't
>>>> use
>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>>> of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>>>> different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> OH COME ON!!!
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>>>>> ("tonight")?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>>>>> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>>>>>>> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>>>>>> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>>>>>> ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>>>>>> working at those higher samplrates - you will absolutely hear a
>>>>>>>>> difference in quality.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

```

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 16:43:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

>

>It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to mention,
>keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)

Unity gain? In digital, zero isn't "unity gain", is "maxed out-you'd better not go any higher". So what are you saying, Lamont? Everyone knows that going over the zero line is bad, and now you're saying that bringing a fader below zero is bad, so everything should be exactly at zero?

Nice mix, let's hear one of those.

Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 16:52:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Dedic, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing, but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't ever recall seeing in any other box.

FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope... sounded better with it in!"

Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...

Neil

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing -

it's
>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little saturation,
>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>
>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what it's
>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1 @linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their entire
>> Portico line..
>>
>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>
>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>
>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45ce7bb9\$1 @linux...
>>>>
>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to
>>>> mention,
>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>
>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior converters
>>
>>>> and
>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
SX
>>
>>>> will
>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
much
>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>
>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as

"Play
>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of digital
>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>> ,and
>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
the
>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>
>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
end
>> to
>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>> YOu can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or Analog)
>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>
>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>>>>>
>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Corrcrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
with
>>>>>> good
>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have
>> to
>>>>>> invest
>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you
don't
>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an
> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>=20
> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
> sounded better with it in!"
>=20

This is exactly the situation.

-----=_NextPart_000_0091_01C74DC4.ADFBFD50

Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.5730.11" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>"Neil" &lt;</FONT><A=20
href=3D"mailto:UOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>UOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT=20
face=3DArial size=3D2>&gt; wrote in message </FONT><A=20
href=3D"news:45cf3ba4$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>news:45cf3ba4$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>...</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>&gt; <BR>&gt; Hey Dedic, no it =
certainly has=20
nothing to do with the summing,<BR>&gt; but maybe it more or less =
restores some=20
stuff (dunno what) that<BR>&gt; might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe =
that's what=20
Deej is<BR>&gt; hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or =
maybe=20
it's<BR>&gt; really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or=20
harmonic<BR>&gt; distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has =
an<BR>&gt;=20
actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't<BR>&gt; =
ever=20
recall seeing in any other box.<BR>&gt; <BR>&gt; FWIW, I spoke to Brian =
```

at Sonic=20
Circus (where I got my Portico
> Pre's from) about this box & =
he said=20
he liked it so much he
> bought one for himself. He =
said it's=20
a mysterious little box in
> a way, because sometimes you can't =
tell how=20
it's affecting the
> sound, but when you disengage it you =
instantly say:=20
"Nope...
> sounded better with it in!"
>=20

</DIV>
<DIV>This is exactly the situation.=20
</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0091_01C74DC4.ADFBFD50--

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 17:28:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>

I did indeed look at it.....and the fader control that goes with it. A very cool concept. I just don't know if I want to mix to stems if I don't have to right now. My projects here aren't of the massive track count variety. I've mixed a couple of projects of 60 + tracks in Paris when I was running 4 x MECs & 4 x EDS cards and I guess I'm just not *pro enough* to enjoy this. It really wasn't enjoyable to me for some reason. I'm gonna be working with a guy in this area in the near future named Ed Stasium. He's got a big PT rig and mixes large projects for a bunch of labels on the east coast so maybe after flying under his wing for a while I'll be more comfortable with the larger stuff, but the few projects I've been contacted about for mixing with large track counts, I've referred elsewhere because I felt like someone else could do a better job for the client. 50 tracks would be a huge situation here. 36-40 is on the high side but I can do a od job with this size mix. 24-32 is fairly typical and for bluegrass projects (which is what happens here a lot, 10-15 is pretty common) I've got 16 RME AD/DA's here. To integrate this box would necessitate my adding another 8 x channels so that I could continue to have my analog gear patched in as inserts during mixdown while stemming out 8 x stereo busses for summing through the Neve into yet another computer or a Masterlink.

Maybe later, as my situation evolves, I become more experienced and I have the clientele and larger track count projects to justify something like this.

Thanks for your insight on this.

;o)

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 20:32:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil, your question is as confusing as your so-called daw mixing comparisions..

before you make any other comemnts on DAWs, get run out and get a version of PT-Mpowered. Import your wav files into a session..Push the faders up..And report your sonic findings..

Then, if you have copy of Paris, do the same..if you can...

Dude, I work with Nuendo daily. You cannot approach a mix on SX/NUendo he same way as on Pro Tools(anyversion) Paris Samplitude, Logic.. If you did, the mix would sart collasping. The summing stage get narrower, then have to add in a stereo imager..

My resolution was one that is being employed by many other Neundo studio, and that by adding in a different summing stage. Beit a Digital Mixer, Analog mixer, Portco , Summ boxes..Etc.

Until then, your only reference is SX, and we all know how you have to mix with SX. If not, you're in for a long night...

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

>

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

>>

>>It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to mention,

>>keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)

>

>Unity gain? In digital, zero isn't "unity gain", is "maxed out-

>you'd better not go any higher". So what are you saying,

>Lamont? Everyone knows that going over the zero line is bad, and

>now you're saying that bringing a fader below zero is

>bad, so everything should be exactly at zero?

>

>Nice mix, let's hear one of those.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 20:50:23 GMT

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

Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth out more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end is really where a smearing or smoothing effect can help, imho.

I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I look forward to hearing some A/Bs!

Regards,
Dedric

"Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1@linux...

>

> Hey Dedric, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what Deej is
> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an
> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
> ever recall seeing in any other box.

>

> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
> sounded better with it in!"

>

> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...

>

> Neil

>

>

> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing -
> it's

>>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>saturation,

>>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.

>>

>>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what it's
>>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>>> entire
>>> Portico line..
>>>
>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>
>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>
>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=Products
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to
>>>>> mention,
>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>
>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>> converters
>>>>
>>>>> and
>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
> SX
>>>
>>>>> will
>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
> much
>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>
>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as
> "Play

>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>> digital
>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>>> ,and
>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
> the
>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>
>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
> end
>>> to
>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>> YYou can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or
>>>> Analog)
>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>
>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>>>>>
>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Corrrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
> with
>>>>>> good
>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have
>>> to
>>>>>> invest
>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you
> don't
>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>

product that he wouldn't normally find profitable to carry.

;o)

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message news:45cf81f8@linux...

> Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth

> out

> more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture

> a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect

> of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end is

> really where a smearing

> or smoothing effect can help, imho.

>

> I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I look

> forward to

> hearing some A/Bs!

>

> Regards,

> Dedric

>

> "Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hey Dedric, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,

>> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that

>> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is

>> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's

>> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic

>> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an

>> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't

>> ever recall seeing in any other box.

>>

>> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico

>> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he

>> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in

>> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the

>> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...

>> sounded better with it in!"

>>

>> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...

>>

>> Neil

>>

>>

>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver

>>>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing -

>> it's

>>>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little

>>>saturation,
>>>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>>>
>>>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what
>>>it's
>>>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>>>> entire
>>>> Portico line..
>>>>
>>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog
>>>> summing
>>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>>
>>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for
>>>> summing
>>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>>
>>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to
>>>>>> mention,
>>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>>> converters
>>>>>>
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
>> SX
>>>>
>>>>>> will

>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
>> much
>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>
>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as
>> "Play
>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>> digital
>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>>>> ,and
>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
>> the
>>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>>
>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
>> end
>>>> to
>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>> YOU can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or
>>>>> Analog)
>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Corrrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
>> with
>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you
>>>>>>> have
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you

So-Called? Those weren't confusing for anyone but you - I've been trying to hint around in a nice way that you're full of shit, and seeing if you'll bow out of the argument for which you pose no sensible thoughts, but that doesn't seem to be working - so, now I've said in as plain a way as possible... still confused?

>before you make any other comemnts on DAWs, get run out and get a version of PT-Mpowered. Import your wav files into a session..Push the faders up..And
>report your sonic findings..

Actually I may if you're that certain about it... Guitar Center's still open here... will you refund my money if I don't like it? Or wait, you HAVE all these DAW's, Mister Master of all DAW's individual sonic characteristics... why don't you throw up a mix done in each?

Anyway, are you saying that PT-M-Powered is DSP summing (or PTLE, for that matter)? 'Cause it ain't so.

>Until then, your only reference is SX,

'Fraid not, pally... in addition to Paris & SX, I've used Cakewalk (before it was Sonar), Magix (not Sam, never tried Sam), PTMix, PTLE, and PTHD, as well. My impressions of each, in that order, are: utterly useless, nothing special, sucks the big one, not all that bad, & very nice.

I happen to like SX quite a bit, I could probably live with PTLE if it weren't for the track count & i/o limitations, and I could definitely live with a full-out HD system, but I can't really justify that much of a cash outlay.

>and we all know how you have to mix with SX.

Personally, I'll bet you DIDN'T know how to mix in SX before I mapped it out here... not saying you never mixed with it, but you only had bad things to say about it - now you're an authority on "how to mix in it" - as a result of what? You parroting my own words, no doubt.

>If not, you're in for a long night...

If you use any tool in a manner in which you're not optimizing it, you're often in for a bad night.

You mock me for posting comparisons & examples of various

stuff, which I've done for no other reason than to give people here a chance to hear summing example A vs. B, before they cough up a thousand bucks for a Pulsar card; or to have a chance to hear mic A, B & C through a preamp they don't happen to own. At least I put my mixes where my mouth is... everyone here has heard various stuff that I've done and they can judge for their own self if they like it/hate it/think it's the worst trash they ever heard... you, however, we hear nothing from except something your buddies mixed that you played on... you render an opinion, and just expect everyone to take your word for it, but you've presented nothing to back your word up.

You're coming across more like a giant parrot-headed troll every day.

Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Graham Duncan](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 23:29:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DJ,

I'm jealous -- my favorite band in my teen years was Living Colour, and Ed Stasium was behind their first two records. Awesome stuff. Definitely let us know how your work with him goes.

Just because I'm curious, and since the Grammy Awards are tonight, how many here are in the Producers & Engineers wing of the Recording Academy? AES?

As to 96k: I'm going to be upgrading my monitoring chain this year (Benchmark DAC-1 at least, and maybe some PMC monitors). That is of course if our car can stop being smashed up by car thieves in Texas. Gotta love humanity. I get the sense that my current chain (Audio Upgrades modified HD24XR and JBL LSR28p) are not revealing the benefits of 96k. Actually, I think it's more the speakers, but I'll do my best to find this out, budget willing.

Graham

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2007 23:35:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0047_01C74E91.875CD160

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

This is all very reminiscent of the introduction of the Aphex Aural =
Harmonizer in the 70's.

No one knew how it worked, but we all wanted it, even if you could only =
hire at a charge per 30 second of each song it was used on..

--=20

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45cf4dcb@linux...

"Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1@linux...

>=20

> Hey Dedic, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is
> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an
> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
> ever recall seeing in any other box.

>=20

> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
> sounded better with it in!"

>=20

This is exactly the situation.

-----=_NextPart_000_0047_01C74E91.875CD160

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.5730.11" name=3DGENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV>This is all very reminiscent of the introduction of =
the Aphex=20
Aural Harmonizer in the 70's.</DIV>
<DIV>No one knew how it worked, but we all wanted it, =
even if you=20
could only hire at a charge per 30 second of each song it was used =

on..
--
Martin Harrington
<A=20
href=3D"http://www.lendaneer-sound.com">www.lendaneer-sound.com
</=
DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE dir=ltr=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
<DIV>"DJ" <<A=20
=
href=3D"http://www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com">www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> =
wrote in=20
message <A =
href=3D"news:45cf4dcb@linux">news:45cf4dcb@linux...</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>"Neil" <<A=20
href=3D"mailto:UOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=2>UOIU@OIU.com> wrote =
in message=20
<FONT face=3DArial=20
size=2>news:45cf3ba4\$1 @linux<FONT face=3DArial=20
size=2>...</DIV>
<DIV>>
> Hey Dedric, no it =
certainly has=20
nothing to do with the summing,
> but maybe it more or less =
restores=20
some stuff (dunno what) that
> might get lost in ITB summing? =
Maybe=20
that's what DeeJ is
> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried =
one yet).=20
Or maybe it's
> really a magnetic thing more than tape =
compression or=20
harmonic
> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has=20
an
> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I=20
don't
> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>
> =
FWIW, I=20
spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
> Pre's =
from)=20
about this box & he said he liked it so much he
> bought one =
for=20
himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
> a =

way,=20

because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
> sound, =
but=20

when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
> sounded =
better with=20

it in!"
>
</DIV>

<DIV>This is exactly the situation.=20
</DIV></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0047_01C74E91.875CD160--

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:12:39 GMT

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

It's interesting. Ed is one reason I decided to try to simplify things. We were talking the other day and I was describing the studiomonster in it's (then) current incarnation and how I liked the Neve box. I won't go into the whole thing, but the gist of it was "if you think you can get that close to what you're liking about the giant behemoth you've created by using a little box, then lose the behemoth, buy the box"or something similar. I still had to test it for a few days before I drew a big breath and listed the Paris system for sale.

"Graham Duncan" <graham@grahamduncan.com> wrote in message news:45cfa73e@linux...

> DJ,

>

> I'm jealous -- my favorite band in my teen years was Living Colour, and Ed

> Stasium was behind their first two records. Awesome stuff. Definitely let

> us know how your work with him goes.

>

> Just because I'm curious, and since the Grammy Awards are tonight, how

> many here are in the Producers & Engineers wing of the Recording Academy?

> AES?

>

> As to 96k: I'm going to be upgrading my monitoring chain this year

> (Benchmark DAC-1 at least, and maybe some PMC monitors). That is of

> course if our car can stop being smashed up by car thieves in Texas. Gotta

> love humanity. I get the sense that my current chain (Audio Upgrades

> modified HD24XR and JBL LSR28p) are not revealing the benefits of 96k.

> Actually, I think it's more the speakers, but I'll do my best to find this

> out, budget willing.

>

> Graham

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:15:37 GMT

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

You were not hinting at all.. It was plain to see. Most of the time I chose to ignore your lame ass comments, but not this time.

What arguments!! and your so-called Daw test with "trying to make sound like the other daw buy using a series of un related plugins.. That's a fair test?

It's stupid...!!

Did I make myself clear.. Punk ass

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

>

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

>>

>>Neil, your question is as confusing as your so-called daw

>mixing comparisions..

>

>So-Called? Those weren't confusing for anyone but you - I've

>been trying to hint around in a nice way that you're full of

>shit, and seeing if you'll bow out of the argument for which

>you pose no sensible thoughts, but that doesn't seem to be

>working - so, now I've said in as plain a way as possible...

>still confused?

>

>>before you make any other comemnts on DAWs, get run out and

>get a version of PT-Mpowered. Import your wav files into a

>session..Push the faders up..And

>>report your sonic findings..

>

>Actually I may if you're that certain about it... Guitar

>Center's still open here... will you refund my money if I don't

>like it? Or wait, you HAVE all these DAW's, Mister Master of

>all DAW's individual sonic characteristics... why don't you

>throw up a mix done in each?

>

>Anyway, are you saying that PT-M-Powered is DSP summing (or

>PTLE, for that matter)? 'Cause it ain't so.

>

>>Until then, your only reference is SX,

>

>'Fraid not, pally... in addition to Paris & SX, I've used

>Cakewalk (before it was Sonar), Magix (not Sam, never tried

>Sam), PTMix, PTLE, and PTHD, as well. My impressions of each,

>in that order, are: utterly useless, nothing special, sucks the

>big one, not all that bad, & very nice.

>I happen to like SX quite a bit, I could probably live with
>PTLE if it weren't for the track count & i/o limitations, and I
>could definitely live with a full-out HD system, but I can't
>really justify that much of a cash outlay.
>
>>and we all know how you have to mix with SX.
>
>Personally, I'll bet you DIDN'T know how to mix in SX before
>I mapped it out here... not saying you never mixed with it,
>but you only had bad things to say about it - now you're an
>authority on "how to mix in it" - as a result of what? You
>parroting my own words, no doubt.
>
>>If not, you're in for a long night...
>
>If you use any tool in a manner in which you're not optimizing
>it, you're often in for a bad night.
>
>You mock me for posting comparisons & examples of various
>stuff, which I've done for no other reason than to give people
>here a chance to hear summing example A vs. B, before they
>cough up a thousand bucks for a Pulsar card; or to have a
>chance to hear mic A, B & C through a preamp they don't happen
>to own. At least I put my mixes where my mouth is... everyone
>here has heard various stuff that I've done and they can judge
>for their own self if they like it/hate it/think it's the worst
>trash they ever heard... you, however, we hear nothing from
>except something your buddies mixed that you played on... you
>render an opinion, and just expect everyone to take your word
>for it, but you've presented nothing to back your word up.
>
>You're coming across more like a giant parrot-headed troll
>every day.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:21:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

> Punk ass

That's about the first thing you've spelled correctly in about seven years of posting.

Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:25:25 GMT

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

Hi Dedic,

That's exactly what's going on. I don;t knwo if you guys have had achance to watch the DVD 'Mix It Sound Like a Record"..Highly recomended for ITB mixing.

Engineer Charles Dye uses a tape saturation plugins on the input stage and strap on the output stage.

He goes into great detail about why harmonmic distortion is the missing "Glue" to that Record Sound that we've been raised on..

Check out some excerpts.. <http://www.harddisklife.com> then click on the lower right side "saturation and the digital mix buss" button..

"Dedic Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:

>Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth out
>more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture
>a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect
>of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end is

>really where a smearing
>or smoothing effect can help, imho.

>

>I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I look

>forward to

>hearing some A/Bs!

>

>Regards,

>Dedic

>

>"Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message [news:45cf3ba4\\$1@linux...](news:45cf3ba4$1@linux...)

>>

>> Hey Dedic, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
>> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
>> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is
>> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
>> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
>> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an

>> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
>> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>>
>> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
>> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
>> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
>> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
>> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
>> sounded better with it in!"
>>
>> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...
>>
>> Neil
>>
>>
>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing
-
>> it's
>>>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>>saturation,
>>>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>>>
>>>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what
it's
>>>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedic
>>>
>>>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their

>>>> entire
>>>> Portico line..
>>>>
>>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>>
>>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>>
>>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts

>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not
to
>>>>>> mention,
>>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>>> converters
>>>>>
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
>> SX
>>>>>
>>>>>> will
>>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
>> much
>>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known
as
>> "Play
>>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>>> digital
>>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>>>> ,and
>>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
>> the
>>>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
>> end
>>>> to
>>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>>> YOU can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or

>>>>>> Analog)
>>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>>>>>
>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Corrrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
>> with
>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you
have
>>>> to
>>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you
>> don't
>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>>>>>>>> different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> OH COME ON!!!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>>>>>>>>> ("tonight")?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear
a

>>>>>>>>> difference in quality.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Neil

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:27:06 GMT

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

:)You are right.. I type too fast..

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

>

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

>

>> Punk ass

>

>That's about the first thing you've spelled correctly in about

>seven years of posting.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Neil](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 01:17:05 GMT

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

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

>

>What arguments!! and your so-called Daw test with "trying to make sound like

>the other daw buy using a series of un related plugins.. That's a fair test?

By the way - and I have stated this repeatedly, but you can't seem to get it through your addled mind - that particular test was simply a: "here are two versions, which one do you think

sounds better?" test - it wasn't a trick, it wasn't a scam, it was as if you could drop yourself into two different cars going down the road, without knowing what kind of cars they were & being asked "which one drives better to your liking?"

Everyone seems to have gotten this except for you. The only reason I can guess is that you could in fact NOT tell any difference between the two - in which case it's not me you should be pissed at, it's your ears, or your monitors or whatever.

>It's stupid..!!

Again, you're the only one that thinks this - in that scenario you would must be right, and all the rest of us must be stupid... an unlikely outcome.

Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 04:19:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The thing is - I've never been 100% sold on "the record sound" - some aspects are good, but to me it usually sounds like a creative approximation of what a band sounds like, rather than an uncanny representation. Glue is fine creatively, but it doesn't exist in the real world, which is what recording was original intended to capture.

Imho, because of the stargazing factor among engineers (copy the "hitmakers"), what used to be a limitation in the goal of reproducing a performance (noise, nonlinear phase, crosstalk, saturation, harmonic distortion) has become a vintage fad.

I say use what works creatively, but not because it's "that sound" or someone says you need it, but because "that sound" happens to be the one you personally want to make a specific recording more enjoyable. Let's keep the creativity in art rather than trying to duplicate what xyz famous engineer did. Certainly learn new techniques, but also learn the real reasons behind them - including knowing when these happen by intent, by default, by accident, or simply by limitation (i.e. because there was no other option).

Imho, the best people in any field seek to find the source and very dna of any accepted concepts or rules, and in their quest to improve, expand and even reinvent the bounds of their craft, proceed to break them judiciously, untethered by the chains of desire for fame or fortune.

Regards,
Dedric

On 2/11/07 5:25 PM, in article 45cfa5e5\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> Hi Dedric,
> That's exactly what's going on. I don;t knwo if you guys have had achance
> to watch the DVD 'Mix It Sound Like a Record'..Highly recomended for ITB
> mixing.
>
> Engineer Charles Dye uses a tape saturation plugins on the input stage and
> strap on the output stage.
>
> He goes into great detail about why harmonmic distortion is the missing "Glue"
> to that Record Sound that we've been raised on..
>
> Check out some excerpts.. <http://www.harddisklife.com> then click on the
> lower right side "saturation and the digital mix buss" button..
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:
>> Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth
> out
>> more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture
>> a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect
>> of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end is
>
>> really where a smearing
>> or smoothing effect can help, imho.
>>
>> I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I look
>
>> forward to
>> hearing some A/Bs!
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> "Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Hey Dedric, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
>>> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
>>> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is
>>> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
>>> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
>>> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an

>>> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
>>> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>>>
>>> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
>>> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
>>> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
>>> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
>>> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
>>> sounded better with it in!"
>>>
>>> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...
>>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>>>
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>>> on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing
> -
>>> it's
>>>> just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>>> saturation,
>>>> and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>>>>
>>>> That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what
> it's
>>>> all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>
>>>>> entire
>>>>> Portico line..
>>>>>
>>>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>>>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>>>
>>>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>>>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>>>
>>>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not
> to
>>>>>>>> mention,
>>>>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>>>>>> converters
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
>>> SX
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> will
>>>>>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
>>> much
>>>>>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known
> as
>>> "Play
>>>>>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>>>>>> digital
>>>>>>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>>>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>>>>> ,and
>>>>>>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
>>> end
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>>>>>>>>> YOu can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or
>
>>>>>>>>>>> Analog)
>>>>>>>>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Corrrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
>>> with
>>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you
> have
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you
>>> don't
>>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> OH COME ON!!!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ("tonight")?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> working at those higher samplerrates - you will absolutely hear
> a

All LaMont is saying is what the _audio community at large_ is saying right now.

Why do you think there is such a selection of Summing/Line mixing/Tape emulating products out there???

The assertion that all DAWs sound the same when a file is dropped in with no pan, gain, dynamic or EQ changes is virtually meaningless in a real world setting, since none of us would even use a DAW if we weren't going to manipulate pan, gain, dynamics and EQ (and time).

What does "better" mean? Remember Audio 101? "Stereo" means 3 dimensional. Aside from transient and frequency response, and distortion issues, the ability to present audio material across 3 axes is what makes the difference to me.

I just got a project in here that a guy had recorded to a 4 track Teac 20 years ago. He repeatedly bounced down to VHS to get his overdubs (!) It sounds awesome. (Can't stand the tunes themselves, but...) As my wife says, it just seems to jump out at you.

3 dimensionality cannot currently be quantified. Please don't say that since we can't currently measure it, it must not exist. Yes, yes I know that the audiophiles have a well earned "crack" reputation for the commercially driven audio voodoo they sometimes espouse, but lab based assertions without the admission that we, at this time, don't know it all, are vain. Right now we measure amplitude, Freq and x-y axis I fully expect that we'll be able to quantify 3 dimensionality in the future as well.

To my ears, CuBase/Nuendo, without sending something OTB at some point in the mixing/mastering chain, just does not cut it. It lacks the punch, the glue, the realism, the 3 dimensionality that music needs to communicate at the highest level.

So what if I think this? So what if LaMont does too?

Peace,

Respectfully,

Ted

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

>

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

>>

>>What arguments!! and your so-called Daw test with "trying to make sound
>like

>>the other daw buy using a series of un related plugins.. That's a fair
test?

>

>By the way - and I have stated this repeatedly, but you can't
>seem to get it through your addled mind - that particular test
>was simply a: "here are two versions, which one do you think
>sounds better?" test - it wasn't a trick, it wasn't a scam, it
>was as if you could drop yourself into two different cars going
>down the road, without knowing what kind of cars they were &
>being asked "which one drives better to your liking?"

>

>Everyone seems to have gotten this except for you. The only
>reason I can guess is that you could in fact NOT tell any
>difference between the two - in which case it's not me you
>should be pissed at, it's your ears, or your monitors or
>whatever.

>

>>It's stupid..!!

>

>Again, you're the only one that thinks this - in that scenario
>you would must be right, and all the rest of us must be
>stupid... an unlikely outcome.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 06:49:49 GMT

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

My personal observation is that there have been some rather strong opinions about DAW "sound", quite often with comments along the lines of "we all know you can't mix in Nuendo", "you have to use OTB summing to get a good mix", or "you need to get your ears checked if you can't hear what I do" as if other posters need convincing or converting for some reason.

Making absolute statements isn't really being objective, and that's a basic requirement of any A/B comparison debate - objectivity.

If you are going to make absolute statements, please provide audible proof, otherwise, qualify your comments with "to me, this sounds like...", or "in my opinion...", or "I prefer...", and leave it at that.

Differing opinions are fine, and you don't have to prove your opinion to have a right to it. But, questioning the skills of other posters to back up your opinion isn't a credible response.

There are a wide range of opinions on this debate at all levels, so that's probably the only point we all need to agree on.

Regard,
Dedric

On 2/11/07 11:02 PM, in article 45cff4e0\$1@linux, "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>
> Neil-
>
> Your experience and contributions aside, which I've thanked you for
> repeatedly,
> this is a really inappropriate and offensive response to LaMont's opinions.
>
> Why would you take personally, the comments someone else makes about
> a piece of software written by people half way around the world, who have
> nothing to do with you?
>
> Everyone saw your repeated put downs of LaMont. To his credit, he ignored
> them.
> As far as LaMont being the only one who "didn't get" your tests, I'm pretty
> sure
> there were others who Q'd you on them too.
> As far as commenting on LaMont's spelling - pathetic. It makes you look silly,
> or
> if it was a joke, it was bad. Either way, it sucks.
>
> As far as the whole Native mix/buss thing goes, my experience generally leads
> me to share LaMont's opinions. I've worked with only a few of the DAWS -
> Paris, CuBase/Nuendo, Logic, Sonar and PT (up to Mix). The integrated ones
> have always sounded better to me. I do not like CuBase/Nuendo. I have heard
> many CuBase/Nuendo mixes, both in the studio and on all my usual playback
> systems,
> done by very good engineers, and they are always lacking to my ears (so

> far)
> unless they have been sent OTB at some point.
>
> All LaMont is saying is what the _audio community at large_ is saying right
> now.
> Why do you think there is such a selection of Summing/Line mixing/Tape
> emulating
> products out there???

>
> The assertion that all DAWS sound the same when a file is dropped in with
> no
> pan, gain, dynamic or EQ changes is virtually meaningless in a real world
> setting,
> since none of us would even use a DAW if we weren't going to manipulate pan,
> gain, dynamics and EQ (and time).

>
> What does "better" mean? Remember Audio 101? "Stereo" means 3 dimensional.
> Aside from transient and frequency response, and distortion issues, the
> ability
>
> to present audio material across 3 axes is what makes the difference to me.
>
> I just got a project in here that a guy had recorded to a 4 track Teac 20
> years ago.
> He repeatedly bounced down to VHS to get his overdubs (!) It sounds awesome.
> (Can't stand the tunes themselves, but...) As my wife says, it just seems
> to jump
> out at you.

>
> 3 dimensionality cannot currently be quantified. Please don't say that since
> we can't
> currently measure it, it must not exist. Yes, yes I know that the audiophiles
> have
> a well earned "crack" reputation for the commercially driven audio voodoo
> they
> sometimes espouse, but lab based assertions without the admission that we,
> at this
> time, don't know it all, are vain. Right now we measure amplitude, Freq and
> x-y axis
> I fully expect that we'll be able to quantify 3 dimensionality in the future
> as well.

>
> To my ears, CuBase/Nuendo, without sending something OTB at some point in
> the
> mixing/mastering chain, just does not cut it. It lacks the punch, the glue,
> the
> realism, the 3 dimensionality that music needs to communicate at the highest
> level.

>
> So what if I think this? So what if LaMont does too?
>
> Peace,
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Ted
>
>
>
> "Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> What arguments!! and your so-called Daw test with "trying to make sound
>> like
>>> the other daw buy using a series of un related plugins.. That's a fair
> test?
>>
>> By the way - and I have stated this repeatedly, but you can't
>> seem to get it through your addled mind - that particular test
>> was simply a: "here are two versions, which one do you think
>> sounds better?" test - it wasn't a trick, it wasn't a scam, it
>> was as if you could drop yourself into two different cars going
>> down the road, without knowing what kind of cars they were &
>> being asked "which one drives better to your liking?"
>>
>> Everyone seems to have gotten this except for you. The only
>> reason I can guess is that you could in fact NOT tell any
>> difference between the two - in which case it's not me you
>> should be pissed at, it's your ears, or your monitors or
>> whatever.
>>
>>> It's stupid..!!
>>
>> Again, you're the only one that thinks this - in that scenario
>> you would must be right, and all the rest of us must be
>> stupid... an unlikely outcome.
>>
>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 14:28:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric-

I certainly agree with qualifying any and all opinions. "Opinions" being the operative word. I hope I made it clear that my conclusions are personal.

Having said that, the requirement to provide audible proof necessarily means confining ones conclusions to the realm of what is currently understood mathamatically (in the audio case, at least). As a general rule to promote good conduct in Newsgroups, that's fair: If I can't prove it in Laboratory conditions, I need to relegate it to the realm of taste. What's also fair is the acknowledgement that the Lab only reflects what we know at this time, which is more than we knew last time and perhaps less than we'll know next time.

Peace,

Ted

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>My personal observation is that there have been some rather strong opinions
>about DAW "sound", quite often with comments along the lines of "we all
know

>you can't mix in Nuendo", "you have to use OTB summing to get a good mix",
>or "you need to get your ears checked if you can't hear what I do" as if
>other posters need convincing or converting for some reason.

>
>Making absolute statements isn't really being objective, and that's a basic
>requirement of any A/B comparison debate - objectivity.

>
>If you are going to make absolute statements, please provide audible proof,
>otherwise, qualify your comments with "to me, this sounds like...", or "in
>my opinion...", or "I prefer...", and leave it at that.

>
>Differing opinions are fine, and you don't have to prove your opinion to
>have a right to it. But, questioning the skills of other posters to back
up
>your opinion isn't a credible response.

>
>There are a wide range of opinions on this debate at all levels, so that's
>probably the only point we all need to agree on.

>
>Regard,
>Dedric

>
>On 2/11/07 11:02 PM, in article 45cff4e0\$1@linux, "Ted Gerber"
><tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>
>>
>> Neil-
>>
>> Your experience and contributions aside, which I've thanked you for
>> repeatedly,
>> this is a really inappropriate and offensive response to LaMont's opinions.
>>
>> Why would you take personally, the comments someone else makes about
>> a piece of software written by people half way around the world, who have
>> nothing to do with you?
>>
>> Everyone saw your repeated put downs of LaMont. To his credit, he ignored
>> them.
>> As far as LaMont being the only one who "didn't get" your tests, I'm pretty
>> sure
>> there were others who Q'd you on them too.
>> As far as commenting on LaMont's spelling - pathetic. It makes you look
silly,
>> or
>> if it was a joke, it was bad. Either way, it sucks.
>>
>> As far as the whole Native mix/buss thing goes, my experience generally
leads
>> me to share LaMont's opinions. I've worked with only a few of the DAWS
-
>> Paris, CuBase/Nuendo, Logic, Sonar and PT (up to Mix). The integrated
ones
>> have always sounded better to me. I do not like CuBase/Nuendo. I have
heard
>> many CuBase/Nuendo mixes, both in the studio and on all my usual playback
>> systems,
>> done by very good engineers, and they are always lacking to my ears
(so
>> far)
>> unless they have been sent OTB at some point.
>>
>> All LaMont is saying is what the audio community at large is saying
right
>> now.
>> Why do you think there is such a selection of Summing/Line mixing/Tape
>> emulating
>> products out there???

>>
>> The assertion that all DAWS sound the same when a file is dropped in with
>> no
>> pan, gain, dynamic or EQ changes is virtually meaningless in a real world
>> setting,

>> since none of us would even use a DAW if we weren't going to manipulate pan,
>> gain, dynamics and EQ (and time).
>>
>> What does "better" mean? Remember Audio 101? "Stereo" means 3 dimensional.
>> Aside from transient and frequency response, and distortion issues, the
>> ability
>>
>> to present audio material across 3 axes is what makes the difference to me.
>>
>> I just got a project in here that a guy had recorded to a 4 track Teac
20
>> years ago.
>> He repeatedly bounced down to VHS to get his overdubs (!) It sounds awesome.
>> (Can't stand the tunes themselves, but...) As my wife says, it just seems
>> to jump
>> out at you.
>>
>> 3 dimensionality cannot currently be quantified. Please don't say that
since
>> we can't
>> currently measure it, it must not exist. Yes, yes I know that the audiophiles
>> have
>> a well earned "crack" reputation for the commercially driven audio voodoo
>> they
>> sometimes espouse, but lab based assertions without the admission that
we,
>> at this
>> time, don't know it all, are vain. Right now we measure amplitude, Freq
and
>> x-y axis
>> I fully expect that we'll be able to quantify 3 dimensionality in the
future
>> as well.
>>
>> To my ears, CuBase/Nuendo, without sending something OTB at some point
in
>> the
>> mixing/mastering chain, just does not cut it. It lacks the punch, the
glue,
>> the
>> realism, the 3 dimensionality that music needs to communicate at the highest
>> level.
>>
>> So what if I think this? So what if LaMont does too?
>>
>> Peace,

>>
>> Respectfully,
>>
>> Ted
>>
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> What arguments!! and your so-called Daw test with "trying to make sound
>>> like
>>>> the other daw buy using a series of un related plugins.. That's a fair
>> test?
>>>
>>> By the way - and I have stated this repeatedly, but you can't
>>> seem to get it through your addled mind - that particular test
>>> was simply a: "here are two versions, which one do you think
>>> sounds better?" test - it wasn't a trick, it wasn't a scam, it
>>> was as if you could drop yourself into two different cars going
>>> down the road, without knowing what kind of cars they were &
>>> being asked "which one drives better to your liking?"
>>>
>>> Everyone seems to have gotten this except for you. The only
>>> reason I can guess is that you could in fact NOT tell any
>>> difference between the two - in which case it's not me you
>>> should be pissed at, it's your ears, or your monitors or
>>> whatever.
>>>
>>>> It's stupid..!!
>>>
>>> Again, you're the only one that thinks this - in that scenario
>>> you would must be right, and all the rest of us must be
>>> stupid... an unlikely outcome.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 15:19:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
>
>Neil-

>

>Your experience and contributions aside, which I've thanked you for repeatedly,
>this is a really inappropriate and offensive response to LaMont's opinions.

Bullshit! It's a totally appropriate response. I'm fed up with his constant arrogance & proclamations as if from on high without ANYTHING to back it up, and implications (or outright statements as though they were fact) that if we can't hear what he may (or may not, in fact) hear, then we're all wrong.

And frankly, his accusations that I was rigging some tests (for what? WTF personal gain could I possibly get, or motivation could I possibly have to do that?) have gotten on my last nerve. You know, when Deej & Gene were talking about the Bedini BASE unit, I went & found a CD I had recorded & mixed back in '91 using the BASE process, and I was going to post some clips of what it sounded like - I don't think the guys would mind, I know them pretty well, and the band's long broken up, etc. - but since there was no version available without it, I knew I'd just get more shit from Lamont for posting 'em: "So what's this unit doing? How can you expect us to believe what it's doing if there's nothing to compare it to?" Shit like that. So I just said fuck it, why bother?

>Why would you take personally, the comments someone else makes about
>a piece of software written by people half way around the world, who have
>nothing to do with you?

He's not making a comment about the software... he's making comments about how wrong we are for using a certain piece of software. About our inability to use certain tools, about our inability to hear certain things... gee, I guess we're all a bunch of wankers here that should bow at the Lamont altar. Also, since half the shit he says is based on false premises anyway (like when he said that the reason I thought a certain thing was that my points of reference are only Paris & SX - wrong there too), that gives him even LESS credibility, so why are you even bothering to defend him?

>As far as commenting on LaMont's spelling - pathetic. It makes you look silly,

>or

>if it was a joke, it was bad. Either way, it sucks.

"Punk ass" is OK, but that wasn't? You're certainly choosy about which insults are acceptable & which are not, aren't you?

Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 15:23:22 GMT

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

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote in message
news:45d06b7e\$1@linux...

>
> Dedic-
>
> I certainly agree with qualifying any and all opinions. "Opinions" being
> the operative
> word. I hope I made it clear that my conclusions are personal.
>
> Having said that, the requirement to provide audible proof necessarily
> means
> confining ones conclusions to the realm of what is currently understood
> mathamatically (in the audio case, at least). As a general rule to promote
> good conduct in Newsgroups, that's fair: If I can't prove it in Laboratory
> conditions, I need to relegate it to the realm of taste. What's also fair
> is the
> acknowledgement that the Lab only reflects what we know at this time,
> which
> is more than we knew last time and perhaps less than we'll know next time.
>
> Peace,
>
> Ted
>

Ted,

This is referring to some tests that Neil did using different methods and gear with his Cubase SX rig. It was clear to me at the time that he wasn't trying to do anything other than to **create** differences that we could hear and compare by integrating different gear and plugins into the summing he was using. It was never meant to be an A/B test of anything to my thinking, but rather a **let's try this and see what happens** kind of thing. He went to quite a bit of trouble to take the same song and process it in different ways and I, for one, appreciated it. He knows his platform and I'm in the process of learning it so it was very helpful to me. As far as comparing the sound of native DAWs, I'm sure differences exist once the panning and processing switch into high gear and I know LaMont does good work with many DAWs and knows them well. I think there has been some misinterpretation of Neil's intentions as to his methodology in these mixes. I'm going to leave it at that. Personally, I liked Neil's mixes and I don't find anything

objectionable about Cubase 4 sonically. I have recently been getting a bit of time on a Digi 002 system as well and this sounds good too, but I don't think it sounds any better/worse than Cubase. The secret is in the sauce and my sauce is integrating outboard gear and 4 x UAD-1 cards.

Regards,

Deej

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 16:53:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MAn I would like to pick this instructional up, but \$150 is pretty steep for me.

Thanks,

Brandon

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45cfa5e5\$1@linux...
>
> Hi Dedic,
> That's exactly what's going on. I don;t knwo if you guys have had achance
> to watch the DVD 'Mix It Sound Like a Record"..Highly recomended for ITB
> mixing.
>
> Engineer Charles Dye uses a tape saturation plugins on the input stage and
> strap on the output stage.
>
> He goes into great detail about why harmonmic distortion is the missing
> "Glue"
> to that Record Sound that we've been raised on..
>
> Check out some excerpts.. <http://www.harddisklife.com> then click on the
> lower right side "saturation and the digital mix buss" button..
>
>
> "Dedic Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:

>>Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth
> out
>>more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture
>>a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect
>>of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end is
>
>>really where a smearing
>>or smoothing effect can help, imho.
>>
>>I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I look
>
>>forward to
>>hearing some A/Bs!
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedric
>>
>>"Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Hey Dedric, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
>>> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
>>> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what Deej is
>>> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
>>> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
>>> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an
>>> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
>>> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>>>
>>> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
>>> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
>>> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
>>> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
>>> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
>>> sounded better with it in!"
>>>
>>> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...
>>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>>>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing
> -
>>> it's
>>>>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>>>saturation,
>>>>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.

>>>>
>>>>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what
> it's
>>>>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>>>
>>>>Regards,
>>>>Dedric
>>>>
>>>>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>
>>>>> entire
>>>>> Portico line..
>>>>>
>>>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog
>>>>> summing
>>>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>>>
>>>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for
>>>>> summing
>>>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will
>>>>> sound..????
>>>>>
>>>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>>>> ?mixer<http://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P> roducts
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not
> to
>>>>>>> mention,
>>>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>>>> converters
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
>>> SX
>>>>>

>>>>>> will
>>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
>>> much
>>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known
> as
>>> "Play
>>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>>> digital
>>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use
>>>>>> them
>>>>> ,and
>>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
>>> the
>>>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
>>> end
>>>>> to
>>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>>> YYou can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or
>
>>>>>> Analog)
>>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Correction: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40
>>>>>>>>> plus
>>> with
>>>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you
> have
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> invest


```

>>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if you
>>> don't
>>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>>>>>>>> different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> OH COME ON!!!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ("tonight")?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> working at those higher samplrates - you will absolutely hear
> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> difference in quality.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>

```

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [John Macy](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 16:57:20 GMT

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

I especially like the way 96K translates into the MP3 and Ipod formats--really adds to the resolution...

:)

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>The thing is - I've never been 100% sold on "the record sound" - some
>aspects are good, but to me it usually sounds like a creative approximation
>of what a band sounds like, rather than an uncanny representation. Glue
is

>fine creatively, but it doesn't exist in the real world, which is what
>recording was original intended to capture.

>

>Imho, because of the stargazing factor among engineers (copy the
>"hitmakers"), what used to be a limitation in the goal of reproducing a
>performance (noise, nonlinear phase, crosstalk, saturation, harmonic
>distortion) has become a vintage fad.

>

>I say use what works creatively, but not because it's "that sound" or
>someone says you need it, but because "that sound" happens to be the one
you

>personally want to make a specific recording more enjoyable. Let's keep
the

>creativity in art rather than trying to duplicate what xyz famous engineer
>did. Certainly learn new techniques, but also learn the real reasons behind
>them - including knowing when these happen by intent, by default, by
>accident, or simply by limitation (i.e. because there was no other option).

>

>Imho, the best people in any field seek to find the source and very dna
of

>any accepted concepts or rules, and in their quest to improve, expand and
>even reinvent the bounds of their craft, proceed to break them judiciously,
>untethered by the chains of desire for fame or fortune.

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>

>On 2/11/07 5:25 PM, in article 45cfa5e5\$1@linux, "LaMont"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> Hi Dedric,

>> That's exactly what's going on. I don;t knwo if you guys have had achance

>> to watch the DVD 'Mix It Sound Like a Record'..Highly recommended for ITB
>> mixing.
>>
>> Engineer Charles Dye uses a tape saturation plugins on the input stage
and
>> strap on the output stage.
>>
>> He goes into great detail about why harmonic distortion is the missing
"Glue"
>> to that Record Sound that we've been raised on..
>>
>> Check out some excerpts.. <http://www.harddisklife.com> then click on the
>> lower right side "saturation and the digital mix buss" button..
>>
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:
>>> Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth
>> out
>>> more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture
>>> a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect
>>> of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end
is
>>
>>> really where a smearing
>>> or smoothing effect can help, imho.
>>>
>>> I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I
look
>>
>>> forward to
>>> hearing some A/Bs!
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> "Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Hey Dedric, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
>>>> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
>>>> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is
>>>> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
>>>> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
>>>> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an
>>>> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
>>>> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>>>>
>>>> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
>>>> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he

>>>> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
>>>> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
>>>> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
>>>> sounded better with it in!"
>>>>
>>>> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>>>> on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing
>> -
>>>> it's
>>>>> just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>>>> saturation,
>>>>> and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>>>>>
>>>>> That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what
>> it's
>>>>> all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>>
>>>>>> entire
>>>>>> Portico line..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>>>>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>>>>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>>>>
>>>>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>>>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>>>>

>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not
>> to
>>>>>> mention,
>>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>>> converters
>>>>>>
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out
it,
>>>> SX
>>>>>>
>>>>>> will
>>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not
as
>>>> much
>>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known
>> as
>>>> "Play
>>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>>> digital
>>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use
them
>>>>>> ,and
>>>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
>>>> the
>>>>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
>>>> end
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>>>> YOU can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital
or
>>
>>>>>>>> Analog)
>>>>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Correction: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40
plus
>>>> with
>>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you
>> have
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "LaMOnT" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if
you
>>>> don't
>>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little
>>>>>>>>>>>>> different.....but = >not necessarily better.....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> OH COME ON!!!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What exactly did you record & evalute in that short time
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ("tonight")?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Also, do you have enough tracks going to make a difference?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't know that you hear much of a difference on a small
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> handful of tracks like a single acoustic guitar & voice, for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> example, but when you get even 10 or 12 tracks going and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ESPECIALLY when you start throwing them through a verb or two
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> working at those higher samplerates - you will absolutely hear

>
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing -
> it's
>>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>saturation,
>>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>>
>>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what it's
>>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedic
>>
>>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>>> entire
>>> Portico line..
>>>
>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>
>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>
>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to
>>>>> mention,
>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>
>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>> converters
>>>>
>>>>> and
>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,

> SX
>>>
>>>>> will
>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
> much
>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>
>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known as
> "Play
>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>> digital
>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>>> ,and
>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
> the
>>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>>
>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
> end
>>> to
>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>> YYou can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or
>>>>> Analog)
>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Corrrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
> with
>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have
>>> to
>>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

is so godawful overcompressed these days anyway. I'm going to be mixing a lot of rock'n'roll over the next few months so I'll have a chance to put my money where my mouth is, but I'm very happy with what I'm getting at the very early demo stage doing everything ITB. We'll see if I can get it closer to super by the end.

TCB

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing -
it's

>just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little saturation,
>and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.

>

>That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what it's
>all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>

>On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1 @linux, "LaMont"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their entire
>> Portico line..

>>

>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>> stage on the outs..Cool..

>>

>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>> in SX/Neundo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????

>>

>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing

>> ?mixer<http://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P> roducts

>>

>>

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

>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont

>>>

>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45ce7bb9\$1 @linux...

>>>>

>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not to
>>>> mention,

>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)

>>>>

>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior converters

>>
>>>> and
>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out it,
SX
>>
>>>> will
>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not as
much
>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>
>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprmise on all levels..Better known as
"Play
>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of digital
>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use them
>> ,and
>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
the
>>>> above statements apply as well..
>>>>
>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
end
>> to
>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>> YOu can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital or Analog)
>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>
>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>>>>>
>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Corrcrection: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40 plus
with
>>>>>> good
>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you have
>> to
>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>

I don't really agree with this 100%. Some things just sound better than others I think. for instance, the reason I bounce a lot of my decisions off my wife is because she doesn't have a dog in the fight as far as whether tape/tubes/digital/solid state sounds better. she does have incredibly sensitive hearing though. She could care less why something sounds good and so is not caught up in the hype about what this and that *should* sound like. She liked Paris and she likes some ITB Cubase stuff as well, but she really noticed the difference the 5042 made and considered it as a positive addition to the mix without having a bunch of preconceptions about why.

I, OTOH, grew up listening to vinyl that was recorded to tape and I will admit to my predelection to refer to this as a benchmark, even though the *audible*dynamic range is not what digital is supposed to be providing. somehow, it just sounds better to me, cause I'm and old fart, I guess.

;o)

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 18:08:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, happy birthday fom the other old fart around here.

;o)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:45d0a71f\$1@linux...

>

> Lol!!! Me too(Just had a Birthday) 45

>

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

>>

>>> Dedic, it seems that the music industry is in a spiraling motion of

>

>>> perpetual

>>> back tracking. Classic Rock, 1970 R & B...

>>>

>>

>>

>>I don't really agree with this 100%. Some things just sound better than

>

>>others I think. for instance, the reason I bounce a lot of my decisions

> off

>>my wife is because she doesn't have a dog in the fight as far as whether

>

>>tape/tubes/digital/solid state sounds better. she does have incredibly

>>sensitive hearing though. She could care less why something sounds good
> and
>>so is not caught up in the hype about what this and that *should* sound
>
>>like. She liked Paris and she likes some ITB Cubase stuff as well, but she
>
>>really noticed the difference the 5042 made and considered it as a
>>positive
>
>>addition to the mix without having a bunch of preconceptions about why.
>>
>>I, OTOH, grew up listening to vinyl that was recorded to tape and I will
>
>>admit to my predelection to refer to this as a benchmark, even though the
>
>>*audible*dynamic range is not what digital is supposed to be providing.
>
>>somehow, it just sounds better to me, cause I'm and old fart, I guess.
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 18:21:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>Ted,
>
>This is referring to some tests that Neil did using different methods and

>gear with his Cubase SX rig. It was clear to me at the time that he wasn't

>trying to do anything other than to *create* differences that we could hear

>and compare by integrating different gear and plugins into the summing he

>was using. It was never meant to be an A/B test of anything to my thinking,

>but rather a *let's try this and see what happens* kind of thing. He went
to
>quite a bit of trouble to take the same song and process it in different

>ways and I, for one, appreciated it. He knows his platform and I'm in the

>process of learning it so it was very helpful to me. As far as comparing
the
>sound of native DAWs, I'm sure differences exist once the panning and
>processing switch into high gear and I know LaMont does good work with many

>DAWs and knows them well. I think there has been some misinterpretation
of
>Neil's intentions as to his methodology in these mixes. I'm going to leave

>it at that Personally, I liked Neil's mixes and I don't find anything
>objectionable about Cubase 4 sonically. I have recently been getting a bit

>of time on a Digi 002 system as well and this sounds good too, but I don't

>thing it sounds any better/worse than Cubase. The secret is in the sauce
and
>my sauce is integrating outboard gear and 4 x UAD-1 cards.
>
>Regards,
>
>Deej
>

Thanks Deej-

I too liked Neil's mixes, and very much appreciated his contributions, which
I thanked him for each time I posted a response to them. I find myself, as
I listen
to mixes by anyone, separating out the choices that the engineer has made
-
levels, panning, dynamic and temporal options and EQ - from the sound of
the
platform itself. Maybe I'm deluding myself? Does 30 years of voicing and
tuning
pianos for the likes of Leonard Bernstein, Gonzala Rubalcaba and Chick Corea-
trying to interpret their subjective descriptions and turn them into meaningful
results- develop a different way of listening? I honestly have no idea. All
I know
is that "presence" and "3-dimensionality" are real to me. I also know that
we have
no current way of quantifying same.

>The secret is in the sauce and my sauce is integrating outboard gear and
4 x UAD-1 cards.

I'm in the exact same place. Thanks for taking the time to contribute.

Ted

PS FWIW - I blew the budget doing the "Audiophile thing" years ago
&
I would say Neil's (and your) skill in engineering far surpasses mine
&
Oh - I'm a PK too :)

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 18:27:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with you. Too much emphasis on the 1975 sound. The industry has gotten behind the "old" guard Engineers and their wants.

Me, I like the New sound of digital and all of it's possibilities. However, If I'm hired get a certain sound, i go for it. But, I'm a fan a fan of the new wide open sound..

Dedric, it seems that the music industry is in a spiraling motion of perpetual back tracking. Classic Rock, 1970 R & B...

We are not moving forward...

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>The thing is - I've never been 100% sold on "the record sound" - some
>aspects are good, but to me it usually sounds like a creative approximation
>of what a band sounds like, rather than an uncanny representation. Glue
is
>fine creatively, but it doesn't exist in the real world, which is what
>recording was original intended to capture.

>
>Imho, because of the stargazing factor among engineers (copy the
>"hitmakers"), what used to be a limitation in the goal of reproducing a
>performance (noise, nonlinear phase, crosstalk, saturation, harmonic
>distortion) has become a vintage fad.

>
>I say use what works creatively, but not because it's "that sound" or
>someone says you need it, but because "that sound" happens to be the one
you
>personally want to make a specific recording more enjoyable. Let's keep
the
>creativity in art rather than trying to duplicate what xyz famous engineer
>did. Certainly learn new techniques, but also learn the real reasons behind
>them - including knowing when these happen by intent, by default, by
>accident, or simply by limitation (i.e. because there was no other option).

>
>Imho, the best people in any field seek to find the source and very dna

of
>any accepted concepts or rules, and in their quest to improve, expand and
>even reinvent the bounds of their craft, proceed to break them judiciously,
>untethered by the chains of desire for fame or fortune.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 2/11/07 5:25 PM, in article 45cfa5e5\$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> Hi Dedric,
>> That's exactly what's going on. I don;t knwo if you guys have had achance
>> to watch the DVD 'Mix It Sound Like a Record"..Highly recomended for ITB
>> mixing.
>>
>> Engineer Charles Dye uses a tape saturation plugins on the input stage
and
>> strap on the output stage.
>>
>> He goes into great detail about why harmonmic distortion is the missing
"Glue"
>> to that Record Sound that we've been raised on..
>>
>> Check out some excerpts.. <http://www.harddisklife.com> then click on the
>> lower right side "saturation and the digital mix buss" button..
>>
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:
>>> Neil - I think that's the essence of it - harmonic distortion can smooth
>>> out
>>> more barren and sterile frequency content - it also smears the picture
>>> a bit in terms of accuracy, but we enjoy listening for the pleasing effect
>>> of music rather than the stark accuracy of a recording. The top end
is
>>
>>> really where a smearing
>>> or smoothing effect can help, imho.
>>>
>>> I think the 5042 is a cool idea - thanks for passing it along DJ - I
look
>>
>>> forward to
>>> hearing some A/Bs!
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric

>>>
>>> "Neil" <UOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45cf3ba4\$1 @linux...
>>>>
>>>> Hey Dedric, no it certainly has nothing to do with the summing,
>>>> but maybe it more or less restores some stuff (dunno what) that
>>>> might get lost in ITB summing? Maybe that's what DeeJ is
>>>> hearing (I have no clue - haven't tried one yet). Or maybe it's
>>>> really a magnetic thing more than tape compression or harmonic
>>>> distortion that we liked about analog? This unit has an
>>>> actual tape head circuit inside it, which is something I don't
>>>> ever recall seeing in any other box.
>>>>
>>>> FWIW, I spoke to Brian at Sonic Circus (where I got my Portico
>>>> Pre's from) about this box & he said he liked it so much he
>>>> bought one for himself. He said it's a mysterious little box in
>>>> a way, because sometimes you can't tell how it's affecting the
>>>> sound, but when you disengage it you instantly say: "Nope...
>>>> sounded better with it in!"
>>>>
>>>> Interesting stuff... I may have to get one of these or...
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> Just a minor technicality, but putting a 2 channel line driver
>>>>> on the master bus (2 channel pass through) isn't changing the summing
>> -
>>>> it's
>>>>> just rounding the final mix EQ, compressing a bit with a little
>>>>> saturation,
>>>>> and perhaps adding some phase non-linearities.
>>>>>
>>>>> That said, if you like the sound and you get a great mix, that's what
>> it's
>>>>> all about, regardless of the details of how you got there. :-)
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/11/07 12:53 AM, in article 45cebd82\$1 @linux, "LaMont"
>>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> hey DJ...Looks great.. I've heard some very good things about their
>>
>>>>>>> entire
>>>>>>> Portico line..

>>>>>
>>>>> The 5042 looks like an analog gain stage on a mixer, with analog summing
>>>>> stage on the outs..Cool..
>>>>>
>>>>> You're doing it right DJ..You're adding a nice peice of gear for summing
>>>>> in SX/Nuendo..With out it, well you know what your mix will sound..????
>>>>>
>>>>> P.S..did you ever take a peek at the Neve 8816 summing
>>>>> ?mixerhttp://www.neve.eu/index.php?entry=8816&category=P roducts
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>> You should try a Neve 5042 with Nuendo LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:45ce7bb9\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It's all the above that suck the life out of a Cubase SX mix. Not
>> to
>>>>>>> mention,
>>>>>>> keeping your levels way under unity gain zero..Say -6db?? :)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Great Workflow DAW (SX).. So so sonics (imo).. Need superior
>>>>>>> converters
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> decent summing device to get back the Punch and debt./. With out
it,
>>>> SX
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> will
>>>>>>> give you a nice Wide-open sound that's not as "Crsipy as PT, Not
as
>>>> much
>>>>>>> Balls as Paris, and sonically not as sophisticated as Samplitude..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> In the Box mixing, SX is a comprimise on all levels..Better known
>> as
>>>> "Play
>>>>>>>> it safe" digital mixing. Or as some like to say, "correct way of
>>>>>>>> digital
>>>>>>>> mixing"..Whatever..
>>>>>>>> If I have offend, I'm sorry. But, I call them as I hear and use
them
>>>>>>> ,and
>>>>>>>> all I pretty much use them all..As a Nuendo Owner and everyday user,
>>>> the
>>>>>>>> above statements apply as well..

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> That's why I have integrated a SoundCraft Ghost console/as my front
>>>> end
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Neundo and ProTools, and sum out of it.. World Of Different..
>>>>>>> YOu can use a Mackie (anything), Tascam, Whatever mixer(Digital
or
>>
>>>>>>> Analog)
>>>>>>> will be superior to your IN the Box summing..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Neil" <oiuOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> So is it 40 or 50 tracks?
>>>>>>>> Is it only after a lot of plugins or without regard to plugins?
>>>>>>>> Is it a superior summing device or only a decent summing device?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Make up my mind!
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "Iamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Corrcetion: Then, Cubase's summing starts to collasp after 40
plus
>>>> with
>>>>>>>>> good
>>>>>>>>> alot of plugins.. Now, your mix sounds thin and weak.. Now, you
>> have
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> invest
>>>>>>>>> in a decent summing device to get your mix back..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "LaMOnT" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> the Cuabse start sucking (on sound quality) after 50 plus if
you
>>>> don't
>>>>>>>>> use
>>>>>>>>>> a superior summing device.
>>>>>>>>>> "Neil" <IOU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Well.....poo!!!!..... I've been working with a bunch
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of 96k = material tonight. Big yawn. Yeah, it sounds a little

>I don't really agree with this 100%. Some things just sound better than
>others I think. for instance, the reason I bounce a lot of my decisions
off
>my wife is because she doesn't have a dog in the fight as far as whether

>tape/tubes/digital/solid state sounds better. she does have incredibly
>sensitive hearing though. She could care less why something sounds good
and
>so is not caught up in the hype about what this and that *should* sound

>like. She liked Paris and she likes some ITB Cubase stuff as well, but she

>really noticed the difference the 5042 made and considered it as a positive

>addition to the mix without having a bunch of preconceptions about why.
>
>I, OTOH, grew up listening to vinyl that was recorded to tape and I will

>admit to my predelection to refer to this as a benchmark, even though the

>*audible*dynamic range is not what digital is supposed to be providing.

>somehow, it just sounds better to me, cause I'm and old fart, I guess.
>
> ;o)
>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 18:50:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil get a life..

If you noticed, I prettty much stayed away you tests. To get pass this, I apologize about my comments. I really enjoy yor post and your knowlege on the recording process. You have helped me a lot (with your post) when it comes to Rock mixing..

Let's not continue to dilute our nice forum with an in-family fight.

You are not a PK a!@#.. Sorry..

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

>
>"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
>>
>>Neil-

>>

>>Your experience and contributions aside, which I've thanked you for repeatedly,
>>this is a really inappropriate and offensive response to LaMont's opinions.

>

>Bullshit! It's a totally appropriate response. I'm fed up with
>his constant arrogance & proclamations as if from on high
>without ANYTHING to back it up, and implications (or outright
>statements as though they were fact) that if we can't hear what
>he may (or may not, in fact) hear, then we're all wrong.

>

>And frankly, his accusations that I was rigging some tests (for
>what? WTF personal gain could I possibly get, or motivation
>could I possibly have to do that?) have gotten on my last nerve.
>You know, when DeeJ & Gene were talking about the Bedini BASE
>unit, I went & found a CD I had recorded & mixed back in '91
>using the BASE process, and I was going to post some clips
>of what it sounded like - I don't think the guys would mind,
>I know them pretty well, and the band's long broken up, etc. -
>but since there was no version available without it, I knew I'd
>just get more shit from Lamont for posting 'em: "So what's this
>unit doing? How can you expect us to believe what it's doing if
>there's nothing to compare it to?" Shit like that. So I just
>said fuck it, why bother?

>

>>Why would you take personally, the comments someone else makes about
>>a piece of software written by people half way around the world, who have
>>nothing to do with you?

>

>He's not making a comment about the software... he's making
>comments about how wrong we are for using a certain piece of
>software. About our inability to use certain tools, about our
>inability to hear certain things... gee, I guess we're all a
>bunch of wankers here that should bow at the Lamont altar.
>Also, since half the shit he says is based on false premises
>anyway (like when he said that the reason I thought a certain
>thing was that my points of reference are only Paris & SX -
>wrong there too), that gives him even LESS credibility, so why
>are you even bothering to defend him?

>

>

>>As far as commenting on LaMont's spelling - pathetic. It makes you look
>silly,

>>or

>>if it was a joke, it was bad. Either way, it sucks.

>

>"Punk ass" is OK, but that wasn't? You're certainly choosy
>about which insults are acceptable & which are not, aren't you?

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 21:20:42 GMT

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

Thanks ..

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

>Well, happy birthday fom the other old fart around here.

>

>;o)

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message [news:45d0a71f\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:45d0a71f$1@linux...)

>>

>> Lol!! Me too(Just had a Birthday) 45

>>

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

>>>

>>>> Detric, it seems that the music industry is in a spiraling motion of

>>

>>>> perpetual

>>>> back tracking. Classic Rock, 1970 R & B...

>>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>I don't really agree with this 100%. Some things just sound better than

>>

>>>others I think. for instance, the reason I bounce a lot of my decisions

>> off

>>>my wife is because she doesn't have a dog in the fight as far as whether

>>

>>>tape/tubes/digital/solid state sounds better. she does have incredibly

>>>sensitive hearing though. She could care less why something sounds good

>> and

>>>so is not caught up in the hype about what this and that *should* sound

>>

>>>like. She liked Paris and she likes some ITB Cubase stuff as well, but she

>>

>>>really noticed the difference the 5042 made and considered it as a

>>>positive

>>

>>>addition to the mix without having a bunch of preconceptions about why.

>>>

>>>I, OTOH, grew up listening to vinyl that was recorded to tape and I will

>>

>>>admit to my predelection to refer to this as a benchmark, even though
the
>>
>>>*audible*dynamic range is not what digital is supposed to be providing.
>>
>>>somehow, it just sounds better to me, cause I'm and old fart, I guess.
>>>
>>>;o)
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [excelav](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 21:24:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Happy B-Day LaMont!

James

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

>
>Lol!! Me too(Just had a Birthday) 45
>
>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Dedic, it seems that the music industry is in a spiraling motion of
>
>>> perpetual
>>> back tracking. Classic Rock, 1970 R & B...
>>>
>>
>>
>>I don't really agree with this 100%. Some things just sound better than
>
>>others I think. for instance, the reason I bounce a lot of my decisions
>off
>>my wife is because she doesn't have a dog in the fight as far as whether
>
>>tape/tubes/digital/solid state sounds better. she does have incredibly

>>sensitive hearing though. She could care less why something sounds good
>and
>>so is not caught up in the hype about what this and that *should* sound
>

>>like. She liked Paris and she likes some ITB Cubase stuff as well, but she
>
>>really noticed the difference the 5042 made and considered it as a positive
>
>>addition to the mix without having a bunch of preconceptions about why.
>>
>>I, OTOH, grew up listening to vinyl that was recorded to tape and I will
>
>>admit to my predelection to refer to this as a benchmark, even though the
>
>>*audible*dynamic range is not what digital is supposed to be providing.
>
>>somehow, it just sounds better to me, cause I'm and old fart, I guess.
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: 96k????...harumph!!!
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2007 21:31:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks James!!.
"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>Happy B-Day LaMont!
>
>James
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Lo!! Me too(Just had a Birthday) 45
>>
>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Detric, it seems that the music industry is in a spiraling motion of
>>
>>>> perpetual
>>>> back tracking. Classic Rock, 1970 R & B...
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>I don't really agree with this 100%. Some things just sound better than
>>
>>>others I think. for instance, the reason I bounce a lot of my decisions

>>off
>>>my wife is because she doesn't have a dog in the fight as far as whether
>>
>>>tape/tubes/digital/solid state sounds better. she does have incredibly
>
>>>sensitive hearing though. She could care less why something sounds good
>>and
>>>so is not caught up in the hype about what this and that *should* sound
>>
>>>like. She liked Paris and she likes some ITB Cubase stuff as well, but
>she
>>
>>>really noticed the difference the 5042 made and considered it as a positive
>>
>>>addition to the mix without having a bunch of preconceptions about why.
>>>
>>>I, OTOH, grew up listening to vinyl that was recorded to tape and I will
>>
>>>admit to my predelection to refer to this as a benchmark, even though
the
>>
>>>*audible*dynamic range is not what digital is supposed to be providing.
>>
>>>somehow, it just sounds better to me, cause I'm and old fart, I guess.
>>>
>>>;o)
>>>
>>>
>>
>
