

---

Subject: OT Anyone using UAD 4.2 software yet with Paris?

Posted by [Tom Bruhl](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 02:08:54 GMT

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

---

br />

>>

>I thought the VLZ pro pres were "OK" if you wen't out the insert. Something in the rest of the board was making the low end sound bigger and adding what sounded like an upper mid bump. My belief (I have no proof!) is that this was being done vis phase tricks to make the board sound "bigger" and "clearer" in music stores without showing up in their spec sheet. The borad was "flat" - but it shure didn't sound flat. I imagine a mic with a lot of mids - like a 57 - would suffer from this more than most mics.

As for the C1. I don't know if I got a bad one or not. On mine, when I recorded an acoustic guitar, you could hear that the low mids were \*much\* boomier that if I used my 4050 or my slightly moded c3000s. I found myself using multiband compressors and scooping out the mids to try to deal with the "splash" of low mid that woul pop out constantly.

What really bothers me about this is that most people will hear a bright high end much more easily than a boomy mid range. So, if you aren't used to listening for the mids, the mic sounds great - until you comapre it to a mic with solid mids (or a recording done with one).

I'm glad yours is working out for you, though. It is certainly possible that mine just sucked. There was a rumour that the first run of mics sounded better than the later ones.

Cheers!

Mike

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not\_here.dude> wrote:

>I'm glad to hear I am not the only one that feels that way about the VLZ's.

>I have had experience with (and still own two of the versions) original 1604

>pres/XLR10 unit, VLZ, pre VLZ micros and the VLZ pro models. I have to say

>at this date

---