
Subject: DJ's new reference monitor rig.... 113K attach
Posted by [audioguy_nospam_](#) on Sun, 27 Nov 2005 09:23:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

x G450 PCI

playing nice with the Houston controller and the Cubase USB dongle while interacting with the VIA KT 800 chipset. Anyway, I've got it happening now. Hell'uva dance to get this all happening. I live the power of this thing. I'm operating Cubase Sx at 1.5ms latency without a hiccup so far. Now.....what to do with my old Cubase DAW???.....I'm thinking maybe one of those EMU interfaces running Emulator X maybe???

;o)

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message news:43a66053@linux...

> I thought I was home free, but noooooo.....more problems. I'm beginning

> to think I've got a defective mobo. Too much wierd stuff happening.

>

> I'm restoring a Ghosted clean install right now. I went back to my old > system drive and the Houston controller worked, but I couldn't get the Dual

> CPU's to work on it and there were quite a few other problems as well.

>

> Do you know anyone who services the Houston controller? It might be having > some problems as well. I've seen similar phenomena when the USB connector on

> a device went south.

>

> ;O)

> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message > news:43a6255d@linux...

> > Yah, Rrrrrriiiiiiggggggggghht! ;-)

> >

> > David.

> >

> > DJ wrote:

> > > This weekend has truly been hellacious. I sort of expected it. I've > pretty

> > > much succeeded at most of what I wnted to accomplish, but it was a bitch

> > > getting there.

> > >

> > > I'm never going to build another computer as long as I live.....I

> > > promise.

> > >

> > > ;oP

> > >

> > > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> > > news:43a4dd92@linux...
> > >
> > >>I forgot how.
> > >>
> > >>;o}
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
>
>Don.....it's....."0" Actually I'm not sure about total 0, as I've never tested
it, but it's real world 0 for me, on Paris 3.0
using solo tracks (vocals and the occasional trumpet). You should NOT be
getting any noticeable latency.
Rod
"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>
>
>Funny thing though lately when I've tried to do this method of =
>Autotuning I've been getting a wicked latency I never experienced when I
=
>was on 2.2 (or whatever it was)...does anyone know the latency of =
>Autotune in Paris
>
>Don
> "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message =
>news:43a763d6@linux...
> John,
> You can't render eds effects. Also using short passes of=20
> Autotune is more tolerable and achievable using this method.
> Tom
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43a75c92@linux...
> Ahh, this is what I refer to as the SPDIF render. I have been=20
> experimenting with it and it works for getting Native and EDS =
>effects=20
> but no EDS EQ. So what's the advantage over just doing a render =
>with=20
> native effects?
>
> Thanks,
> John
>
> Don Nafe wrote:
> > Thanks Rod...just had a chance to hunt for it - found it and was =
>just about=20
> > to start typing

> >=20
 > > Don
 > >=20
 > >=20
 > > "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@kc.rr.com> wrote in message =
 >news:43a70a65\$1@linux...
 > >=20
 > >>It's really a trick, just patching to bounce autotune in manual =
 >mode..
 > >>If your track to be tuned is on track 1, put autotune on an =
 >insert. Select
 > >>"external" on the eds insert. Assuming your using mec A spdif, in
 >=
 >the=20
 > >>Paris
 > >>batchbay, patch the "Mixer A insert" output of track 1 (green =
 >arrows=20
 > >>Bottom
 > >>row) to Mec Master digital out L or R. Then Patch the Mec Master =
 >Digital
 > >>In L or R (use same as before)to the insert "in" (brown, top)of =
 >mixer A=20
 > >>insert.
 > >>ALSO patch the Mec Master digital in (brown, same as above)
 > >>to track 2 of Mixer A.
 > >>Mute track 1. record inable track 2. You might want to also change
 >=
 >the=20
 > >>input
 > >>monitor to "Always monitor input' in the Project window, but you =
 >don't=20
 > >>have
 > >>to. you just won't hear anything unless your recording.
 > >>NEXT STEP VERY IMPORTANT:
 > >>you MUST make a physical connection (with a real spdif cable) from
 >=
 >the=20
 > >>spdif
 > >>out to the spdif in on the Mec. Now you can autotune away and =
 >bounce your
 > >>newly tuned track to track 2.
 > >>You can use the adat connections the same way as the spdif. Just =
 >make sure
 > >>to loop the lightpipe cable from the in to the out on the back of
 >=
 >the adat
 > >>card.
 > >>Rod

```

> >>
> >>John <no@no.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>>ok, so what's the trick?
> >>>
> >>>Rod Lincoln wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>Don, 8 is the limit if you have 1 mec and 1 adat card. 16 if you
=
>have
> >>
> >>at least
> >>
> >>>>2 mec's and 4 adat cards. If you have no adat cards, then 2, =
>using=20
> >>>>spdif.
> >>>>
> >>>>Rod
> >>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>Hi All
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Is there a limit to the # of tracks that can be sent via the =
>external
> >>
> >>loop
> >>
> >>>>
> >>>>>(hardwired) tip that Brian used on his Auto tune trick =
>segment...I'm not
> >>>>
> >>>>at
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>my rig and I was just wondering
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Don
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >=20
> >
>
><!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 6.00.2900.2180" name="GENERATOR">
> <STYLE></STYLE>
> </HEAD>
> <BODY bgcolor="#ffffff">
> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">Funny thing though lately when I've =
> tried to do=
>
> never=
> experienced when I was on 2.2 (or whatever it was)...does anyone know =
> the=
> latency of Autotune in Paris</FONT></DIV>
>
> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">Don</FONT></DIV>
> <BLOCKQUOTE dir="ltr"
> style="padding-right: 0px; padding-left: 5px; margin-left: 5px; =
> border-left: 1px solid #000000; margin-right: 0px">
> <DIV>"Tom Bruhl" <A=
> href="mailto:arpeggio@comcast.net">arpeggio@comcast.net</A>> wrote =
> in message=
> <A href="news:43a763d6@linux">news:43a763d6@linux</A>...</DIV>
> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">John,</FONT></DIV>
>
> Also using=
> short passes of </FONT></DIV>
> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">Autotune is more tolerable and =
> achievable using=
> this method.</FONT></DIV>
> <DIV><FONT face="Arial" size="2">Tom</FONT></DIV>
> <BLOCKQUOTE=
> style="padding-right: 0px; padding-left: 5px; margin-left: 5px; =
> border-left: 1px solid #000000; margin-right: 0px">
> <DIV>"John" <A href="mailto:no@no.com">no@no.com</A>> wrote =
> in=
> message <A=
> =
>
> this=
>
> <BR>experimenting=
> with it and it works for getting Native and EDS effects <BR>but no =
> EDS=
>
> <BR>native=
> effects?<BR><BR>Thanks,<BR>John<BR><BR>Don Nafe wrote:<BR>> =
> Thanks=
> Rod...just had a chance to hunt for it - found it and was just about
> =

```

>

>
> to start typing
>
> Don
>
> =

>
> "Rod=20

> Lincoln" <<A =

>href=3D"mailto:rlincoln@kc.rr.com">rlincoln@kc.rr.com>=20

> wrote in message <A=20

> href=3D"news:43a70a65\$1@linux">news:43a70a65\$1@linux...
>=20

>
>>It's really a trick, just patching to bounce autotune in =

>manual=20

> mode..
>>If your track to be tuned is on track 1, put =

>autotune on=20

> an insert. Select
>>"external" on the eds insert. Assuming =

>your=20

> using mec A spdif, in the
>>Paris
>>batchbay, =

>patch the=20

> "Mixer A insert" output of track 1 (green arrows=20

>
>>Bottom
>>row) to Mec Master digital out L or R. =

>Then=20

> Patch the Mec Master Digital
>>In L or R (use same as =

>before)to the=20

> insert "in" (brown, top)of mixer A =

>
>>insert.
>>ALSO patch=20

> the Mec Master digital in (brown, same as above)
>>to track =

>2 of=20

> Mixer A.
>>Mute track 1. record inable track 2. You might =

>want to=20

> also change the
>>input
>>monitor to "Always =

>monitor=20

> input' in the Project window, but you don't =

>
>>have
>>to.=20

> you just won't hear anything unless your recording.
>>NEXT =

>STEP=20

> VERY IMPORTANT:
>>you MUST make a physical connection (with =

>a real=20

> spdif cable) from the
>>spdif
>>out to the spdif =

>in on=20

> the Mec. Now you can autotune away and bounce your
>>newly =

>tuned=20

> track to track 2.
>>You can use the adat connections the =

>same way=20

> as the spdif. Just make sure
>>to loop the lightpipe cable =

>from the=20

> in to the out on the back of the=20

> adat
>>card.
>>Rod
>>
>>John =

><<A=20

> href=3D"mailto:no@no.com">no@no.com>=20

> wrote:
>>
>>>ok, so what's the=20

> trick?
>>
>>>Rod Lincoln=20

> wrote:
>>>
>>>Don, 8 is the limit if you =
>have 1=20
> mec and 1 adat card. 16 if you have
>>
>>at=20
> least
>>
>>>2 mec's and 4 adat cards. If =
>you have=20
> no adat cards, then 2, using=20
> =
>
>>>spdif.
>>>
>>>Rod
=
>>>>"Don=20
> Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca>=20
> =
>wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Hi =
>
> All
>>>>
>>>>Is there a limit =
>to the #=20
> of tracks that can be sent via the=20
> =
>external
>>
>>loop
>>
>>>
&=
>gt;>>>(hardwired)=20
> tip that Brian used on his Auto tune trick segment...I'm=20
> =
>not
>>>
>>>at
>>>
>=
>>>>
>>>>my=20
> rig and I was just=20
> =
>wondering
>>>>
>>>>Don
>>>&=
>gt;>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>>&g=
>t;
>=20
>
></BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>
>

>Autotune won't render in manual mode. This is how you get around it. You do
one phrase at a time. If you're using auto mode, then render(native) away.
That's the only thing I use the spdif bounce thing for. All other plugs get
rendered the native way, if needed. I don't do too much of that these days.
No need.
Unless I'm using several Waves Master's plugs. That's another story. Can
you say HOG? they sound good though.
Rod

John <no@no.com> wrote:

>Ahh, this is what I refer to as the SPDIF render. I have been
>experimenting with it and it works for getting Native and EDS effects
>but no EDS EQ. So what's the advantage over just doing a render with
>native effects?
>
>Thanks,
>John
>

>Don Nafe wrote:
>> Thanks Rod...just had a chance to hunt for it - found it and was just
about
>> to start typing
>>
>> Don
>>
>>
>> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@kc.rr.com> wrote in message news:43a70a65\$1@linux...
>>
>>>It's really a trick, just patching to bounce autotune in manual mode..
>>>If your track to be tuned is on track 1, put autotune on an insert. Select
>>>"external" on the eds insert. Assuming your using mec A spdif, in the

>>>Paris
>>>batchbay, patch the "Mixer A insert" output of track 1 (green arrows
>>>Bottom
>>>row) to Mec Master digital out L or R. Then Patch the Mec Master Digital
>>>In L or R (use same as before)to the insert "in" (brown, top)of mixer
A
>>>insert.
>>>ALSO patch the Mec Master digital in (brown, same as above)
>>>to track 2 of Mixer A.
>>>Mute track 1. record inable track 2. You might want to also change the

>>>input
>>>monitor to "Always monitor input' in the Project window, but you don't

>>>have
>>>to. you just won't hear anything unless your recording.
>>>NEXT STEP VERY IMPORTANT:
>>>you MUST make a physical connection (with a real spdif cable) from the

>>>spdif
>>>out to the spdif in on the Mec. Now you can autotune away and bounce your
>>>newly tuned track to track 2.
>>>You can use the adat connections the same way as the spdif. Just make
sure
>>>to loop the lightpipe cable from the in to the out on the back of the
adat
>>>card.
>>>Rod
>>>
>>>John <no@no.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>ok, so what's the trick?
>>>>
>>>>Rod Lincoln wrote:

>>>>
>>>>>Don, 8 is the limit if you have 1 mec and 1 adat card. 16 if you have
>>>
>>>at least
>>>
>>>>>2 mec's and 4 adat cards. If you have no adat cards, then 2, using
>>>>>spdif.
>>>>>
>>>>>Rod
>>>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hi All
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Is there a limit to the # of tracks that can be sent via the external
>>>
>>>loop
>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>(hardwired) tip that Brian used on his Auto tune trick segment...I'm
not
>>>>>
>>>>>at
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>my rig and I was just wondering
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Don
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>
>>DUde, the X is super cool.
Recommended for sure if you have a box to dedicate to it.
AA

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:43a78c4f@linux...
> OK.....looks like I'm finally on my way. there appears to be some
> major
> quirkiness with the driver set I'm using as relates to the Matrox G450 PCI
> playing nice with the Houston controller and the Cubase USB dongle whil'st
> interacting with the VIA KT 800 chipset. Anyway, I've got it happening
> now.
> Hell'uva dance to get this all happening. I live the power of this thing.
> I'm operating Cubase Sx at 1.5ms latency without a hiccup so far.
> Now.....what to do with my old Cubase DAW???.....I'm thinking maybe one

> of those EMU interfaces running Emulator X maybe???

>

> ;o)

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:43a66053@linux...

>> I thought I was home free, but noooooo.....more problems. I'm

> beginning

>> to think I've got a defective mobo. Too much wierd stuff happening.

>>

>> I'm restoring a Ghosted clean install right now. I went back to my old

>> system drive and the Houston controller worked, but I couldn't get the

> Dual

>> CPU's to work on it and there were quite a few other problems as well.

>>

>> Do you know anyone who services the Houston controller? It might be

>> having

>> some problems as well. I've seen similar phenomena when the USB connector

> on

>> a device went south.

>>

>> ;O)

>> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message

>> news:43a6255d@linux...

>> > Yah, Rrrrrriiiiiiggggggggghht! ;-)

>> >

>> > David.

>> >

>> > DJ wrote:

>> > > This weekend has truly been hellacious. I sort of expected it. I've

>> pretty

>> > > much succeeded at most of what I wnted to accomplish, but it was a

> bitch

>> > > getting there.

>> > >

>> > > I'm never going to build another computer as long as I live.....I

>> > > promise.

>> > >

>> > > ;oP

>> > >

>> > > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

>> > > news:43a4dd92@linux...

>> > >

>> > >> I forgot how.

>> > >>

>> > >> ;o}

>> > >>

>> > >>

>> > >

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

>First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is) when using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card. If you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes with the mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP driver under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as well do a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be a living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install that you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,,didn't you? ;o)

Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system drive/coronary arrest) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then reboot on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other drives and then reboot.

Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's in a Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick is to turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot until you get the system happy again, then shut down, reinstall the Magma host card (or the PCI cards in the mobo) and reboot. The 4 x UAD cards are the issue in mine. It takes a while to get all of their addresses sorted out it seems. Eventually everything stabilized.

Lastly and most annoying for me was getting the Houston controller to work with Cubase SX. I finally figured it out. Cubase SX has to be loaded before the system ever sees the Houston driver. It won't do to uninstall/reinstall the driver if the Houston driver is loaded before SX is loaded. My experience was that SX will *never* see that driver and the controller will not work unless SX is loaded before the controller driver. Took me a whole day to figure this one out.What? So that's it then? You're finished? Just like that? All solved? Done?
Complete? Operational? Finito?

So what am I supposed to do tonight for entertainment then? Just sit here?
I wonder is there's anything on TV... doubt it...

....aha, the cricket. :o) That's ok then...

Cheers,
Kim.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is) when
>using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card.
If

>you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes with
the

>mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP driver
>under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as well
do

>a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the
>uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be a
>living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install
that

>you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,,didn't you? ;o)

>

>Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system
>drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system drive/coronary
>arrest) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other
>drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then reboot
>on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other drives
>and then reboot.

>

>Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's in
a

>Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick is
to

>turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot until
>you get the system happy again, then shut down, reinstall the Magma host
>card (or the PCI cards in the mobo) and reboot. The 4 x UAD cards are the
>issue in mine. It takes a while to get all of their addresses sorted out
it

>seems. Eventually everything stabilized.

>

>Lastly and most annoying for me was getting the Houston controller to work
>with Cubase SX. I finally figured it out. Cubase SX has to be loaded before
>the system ever sees the Houston driver. It won't do to uninstall/reinstall
>the driver if the Houston driver is loaded before SX is loaded. My
>experience was that SX will *never* see that driver and the controller will
>not work unless SX is loaded before the controller driver. Took me a whole
>day to figure this one out.

>

>>So what am I supposed to do tonight for entertainment then? Just sit here?

Well, I could bitch for hours about how hard a time I'm having trying to
get my Ensoniq MR Rack script to translate to Cubase SX. It's friggin' wierd
how they implemented this.

;o(

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43a7b8d4\$1@linux...

>

>

> What? So that's it then? You're finished? Just like that? All solved?
Done?

> Complete? Operational? Finito?

>

> So what am I supposed to do tonight for entertainment then? Just sit here?

> I wonder is there's anything on TV... doubt it...

>

> ...aha, the cricket. :o) That's ok then...

>

> Cheers,

> Kim.

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is) when

> >using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card.

> If

> >you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes with

> the

> >mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP
driver

> >under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as well

> do

> >a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the

> >uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be a

> >living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install

> that

> >you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,,didn't you? ;o)

> >

> >Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system

> >drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system
drive/coronary

> >arrest) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other

> >drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then
reboot

> >on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other
drives

> >and then reboot.

> >

> >Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's in

> a

> >Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick is

> to

> >turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot
until

> >you get the system happy again, then shut down, reinstall the Magma host
 > >card (or the PCI cards in the mobo) and reboot. The 4 x UAD cards are the
 > >issue in mine. It takes a while to get all of their addresses sorted out
 > it
 > >seems. Eventually everything stabilized.
 > >
 > >Lastly and most annoying for me was getting the Houston controller to
 work
 > >with Cubase SX. I finally figured it out. Cubase SX has to be loaded
 before
 > >the system ever sees the Houston driver. It won't do to
 uninstall/reinstall
 > >the driver if the Houston driver is loaded before SX is loaded. My
 > >experience was that SX will *never* see that driver and the controller
 will
 > >not work unless SX is loaded before the controller driver. Took me a
 whole
 > >day to figure this one out.
 > >
 > >
 >.....hmmm....too good to be true... ...there must come something
 more....be sure of that....
it's an AMI bios, nothing to do with Amy....it's the first revision
 board... ...only made for experiments...
I think it's therefor you buyed it... ...just because you love to do
 experiments... ...I know your style, it's therefore you hate Mac's...
they have nothing to experiment with... ...so, statistical, you must be a
 real intelligent person... ...hmm...

erlilo

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
 news:43a7af47\$1@linux...

> First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is) when
 > using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card.
 > If
 > you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes with
 > the
 > mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP driver
 > under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as well
 > do
 > a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the
 > uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be a
 > living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install
 > that
 > you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,,didn't you? ;o)
 >
 > Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system

> drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system drive/corona-
> ry) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other
> drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then reboot
> on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other
> drives
> and then reboot.
>
> Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's in a
> Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick is
> to
> turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot
> until
> you get the system happy again, then shut down, reinstall the Magma host
> card (or the PCI cards in the mobo) and reboot. The 4 x UAD cards are the
> issue in mine. It takes a while to get all of their addresses sorted out
> it
> seems. Eventually everything stabilized.
>
> Lastly and most annoying for me was getting the Houston controller to work
> with Cubase SX. I finally figured it out. Cubase SX has to be loaded
> before
> the system ever sees the Houston driver. It won't do to
> uninstall/reinstall
> the driver if the Houston driver is loaded before SX is loaded. My
> experience was that SX will *never* see that driver and the controller
> will
> not work unless SX is loaded before the controller driver. Took me a whole
> day to figure this one out.
>
> It's like autotune is out of sync...I'll try an experiment today if I can
and report back what happens as I can't remember if it's ahead of lagging/

DO n

"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote in message
news:43a78dfb\$1@linux...

>
> Don.....it's....."0" Actually I'm not sure about total 0, as I've never
> tested
> it, but it's real world 0 for me, on Paris 3.0
> using solo tracks (vocals and the occasional trumpet). You should NOT be
> getting any noticeable latency.
> Rod
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>
>>
>> Funny thing though lately when I've tried to do this method of =

>>Autotuning I've been getting a wicked latency I never experienced when I
> =
>>was on 2.2 (or whatever it was)...does anyone know the latency of =
>>Autotune in Paris
>>
>>Don
>> "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message =
>>news:43a763d6@linux...
>> John,
>> You can't render eds effects. Also using short passes of=20
>> Autotune is more tolerable and achievable using this method.
>> Tom
>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43a75c92@linux...
>> Ahh, this is what I refer to as the SPDIF render. I have been=20
>> experimenting with it and it works for getting Native and EDS =
>>effects=20
>> but no EDS EQ. So what's the advantage over just doing a render =
>>with=20
>> native effects?
>>
>> Thanks,
>> John
>>
>> Don Nafe wrote:
>> > Thanks Rod...just had a chance to hunt for it - found it and was =
>>just about=20
>> > to start typing
>> >=20
>> > Don
>> >=20
>> >=20
>> > "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@kc.rr.com> wrote in message =
>>news:43a70a65\$1@linux...
>> >=20
>> >>It's really a trick, just patching to bounce autotune in manual =
>>mode..
>> >>If your track to be tuned is on track 1, put autotune on an =
>>insert. Select
>> >>"external" on the eds insert. Assuming your using mec A spdif, in
> =
>>the=20
>> >>Paris
>> >>batchbay, patch the "Mixer A insert" output of track 1 (green =
>>arrows=20
>> >>Bottom
>> >>row) to Mec Master digital out L or R. Then Patch the Mec Master =
>>Digital
>> >>In L or R (use same as before)to the insert "in" (brown, top)of =


```

>>mixer A=20
>> >>insert.
>> >>ALSO patch the Mec Master digital in (brown, same as above)
>> >>to track 2 of Mixer A.
>> >>Mute track 1. record inable track 2. You might want to also change
> =
>>the=20
>> >>input
>> >>monitor to "Always monitor input' in the Project window, but you =
>>don't=20
>> >>have
>> >>to. you just won't hear anything unless your recording.
>> >>NEXT STEP VERY IMPORTANT:
>> >>you MUST make a physical connection (with a real spdif cable) from
> =
>>the=20
>> >>spdif
>> >>out to the spdif in on the Mec. Now you can autotune away and =
>>bounce your
>> >>newly tuned track to track 2.
>> >>You can use the adat connections the same way as the spdif. Just =
>>make sure
>> >>to loop the lightpipe cable from the in to the out on the back of
> =
>>the adat
>> >>card.
>> >>Rod
>> >>
>> >>John <no@no.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>ok, so what's the trick?
>> >>>
>> >>>Rod Lincoln wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>>Don, 8 is the limit if you have 1 mec and 1 adat card. 16 if you
> =
>>have
>> >>
>> >>at least
>> >>
>> >>>>2 mec's and 4 adat cards. If you have no adat cards, then 2, =
>>using=20
>> >>>>spdif.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Rod
>> >>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>> >>>>
>> >>>>

```

```

>> >>>>>Hi All
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>Is there a limit to the # of tracks that can be sent via the =
>>external
>> >>
>> >>loop
>> >>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>(hardwired) tip that Brian used on his Auto tune trick =
>>segment...I'm not
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>at
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>my rig and I was just wondering
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>Don
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>
>> >=20
>> >
>>
>><!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 6.00.2900.2180" name=3DGENERATOR>
>><STYLE></STYLE>
>></HEAD>
>><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Funny thing though lately when I've =
>>tried to do=20
>>this method of Autotuning I've been getting a wicked latency I =
>>never=20
>>experienced when I was on 2.2 (or whatever it was)...does anyone know =
>>the=20
>>latency of Autotune in Paris</FONT></DIV>
>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
>><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Don</FONT></DIV>
>><BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr=20
>>style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
>>BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
>> <DIV>"Tom Bruhl" <<A=20
>> href=3D"mailto:arpeggio@comcast.net">arpeggio@comcast.net</A>> wrote =
>>in message=20
>> <A href=3D"news:43a763d6@linux">news:43a763d6@linux</A>...</DIV>

```

```

>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>John,</FONT></DIV>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>You can't render eds effects. =
>>Also using=20
>> short passes of </FONT></DIV>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Autotune is more tolerable and =
>>achievable using=20
>> this method.</FONT></DIV>
>> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Tom</FONT></DIV>
>> <BLOCKQUOTE=20
>> style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
>>BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
>> <DIV>"John" <<A href=3D"mailto:no@no.com">no@no.com</A>> wrote =
>>in=20
>> message <A=20
>> =
>>href=3D"news:43a75c92@linux">news:43a75c92@linux</A>...</DIV>Ahh, =
>>this=20
>> is what I refer to as the SPDIF render. I have been =
>><BR>experimenting=20
>> with it and it works for getting Native and EDS effects <BR>but no =
>>EDS=20
>> EQ. So what's the advantage over just doing a render with =
>><BR>native=20
>> effects?<BR><BR>Thanks,<BR>John<BR><BR>Don Nafe wrote:<BR>> =
>>Thanks=20
>> Rod...just had a chance to hunt for it - found it and was just about
> =
>>
>> <BR>> to start typing<BR>> <BR>> Don<BR>> <BR>> =
>><BR>> "Rod=20
>> Lincoln" <<A =
>>href=3D"mailto:rlincoln@kc.rr.com">rlincoln@kc.rr.com</A>>=20
>> wrote in message <A=20
>> href=3D"news:43a70a65$1@linux">news:43a70a65$1@linux</A>...<BR>>=20
>> <BR>>>It's really a trick, just patching to bounce autotune in =
>>manual=20
>> mode..<BR>>>If your track to be tuned is on track 1, put =
>>autotune on=20
>> an insert. Select<BR>>>"external" on the eds insert. Assuming =
>>your=20
>> using mec A spdif, in the <BR>>>Paris<BR>>>batchbay, =
>>patch the=20
>> "Mixer A insert" output of track 1 (green arrows=20
>> <BR>>>Bottom<BR>>>row) to Mec Master digital out L or R. =
>>Then=20
>> Patch the Mec Master Digital<BR>>>In L or R (use same as =
>>before)to the=20
>> insert "in" (brown, top)of mixer A =

```

>>
>>insert.
>>ALSO patch=20
>> the Mec Master digital in (brown, same as above)
>>to track =
>>2 of=20
>> Mixer A.
>>Mute track 1. record inable track 2. You might =
>>want to=20
>> also change the
>>input
>>monitor to "Always =
>>monitor=20
>> input' in the Project window, but you don't =
>>
>>have
>>to.=20
>> you just won't hear anything unless your recording.
>>NEXT =
>>STEP=20
>> VERY IMPORTANT:
>>you MUST make a physical connection (with =
>>a real=20
>> spdif cable) from the
>>spdif
>>out to the spdif =
>>in on=20
>> the Mec. Now you can autotune away and bounce your
>>newly =
>>tuned=20
>> track to track 2.
>>You can use the adat connections the =
>>same way=20
>> as the spdif. Just make sure
>>to loop the lightpipe cable =
>>from the=20
>> in to the out on the back of the=20
>> adat
>>card.
>>Rod
>>
>>John =
>><<A=20
>> href=3D"mailto:no@no.com">no@no.com=20
>> wrote:
>>
>>>ok, so what's the=20
>> trick?
>>>
>>>Rod Lincoln=20
>> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Don, 8 is the limit if you =
>>have 1=20
>> mec and 1 adat card. 16 if you have
>>
>>at=20
>> least
>>
>>>>2 mec's and 4 adat cards. If =
>>you have=20
>> no adat cards, then 2, using=20
>> =
>>
>>>>spdif.
>>>
>>>>Rod
=
>>>>>"Don=20
>> Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca=20
>> =
>>wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Hi =
>>
>> All
>>>>
>>>>>Is there a limit =
>>to the #=20
>> of tracks that can be sent via the=20
>> =
>>external
>>
>>loop
>>
>>>>
>>&=
>>gt;>>>(hardwired)=20
>> tip that Brian used on his Auto tune trick segment...I'm=20
>> =

>>not
>>>
>>>at
>>>
>=
>>>>
>>>>my=20
>> rig and I was just=20
>> =
>>wondering
>>>>
>>>>Don
>>>&=
>>gt;>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>&g=
>>t;
>=20
>>
></BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>
>>
>>
>nah, usually cell phones and kids improve their driving ability.

On Mon, 19 Dec 2005 07:26:16 -0500, John <no@no.com> wrote:

>they love the taste of alcohol!
>
>rick wrote:
>> usually people in green mini vans...they're the worst.
>>
>> On Sun, 18 Dec 2005 13:07:59 -0500, John <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I seem to be a crash magnet so I'm wondering what crashes you the most
>>>in Paris?
>>>
>>>messing with inserts while recording?
>>>
>>>corrupted ppj project files?
>>>
>>>streaming errors?
>>>
>>>Thanks,
>>>John
>>
>>I think if I was an intelligent person, I'd buy a Mac and spend more time
being productive.....but it would be sooooo boring. I'm one of those
people that just has to be constantly screwing around with something just to
find out wat it will do that it's not meant to do. I guess I'm sort of
perverted.
;o)

"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43a7c406\$1@linux...
>hmmm....too good to be true... ...there must come something
> more....be sure of that....
>it's an AMI bios, nothing to do with Amy....it's the first
revision
> board... ...only made for experiments...
> ...I think it's therefor you bought it... ...just because you love to do

> experiments... ...I know your style, it's therefore you hate Mac's...
 > ...they have nothing to experiment with... ...so, statistical, you must be
 a
 > real intelligent person... ...hmm...
 >
 > erlilo
 >
 > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
 > news:43a7af47\$1@linux...
 > > First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is) when
 > > using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card.
 > > If
 > > you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes with
 > > the
 > > mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP
 driver
 > > under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as well
 > > do
 > > a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the
 > > uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be a
 > > living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install
 > > that
 > > you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,didn't you? ;o)
 > >
 > > Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system
 > > drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system
 drive/coronary
 > > arrest) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other
 > > drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then
 reboot
 > > on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other
 > > drives
 > > and then reboot.
 > >
 > > Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's in
 a
 > > Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick
 is
 > > to
 > > turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot
 > > until
 > > you get the system happy again, then shut down, reinstall the Magma host
 > > card (or the PCI cards in the mobo) and reboot. The 4 x UAD cards are
 the
 > > issue in mine. It takes a while to get all of their addresses sorted out
 > > it
 > > seems. Eventually everything stabilized.
 > >

> > Lastly and most annoying for me was getting the Houston controller to work
> > with Cubase SX. I finally figured it out. Cubase SX has to be loaded
> > before
> > the system ever sees the Houston driver. It won't do to
> > uninstall/reinstall
> > the driver if the Houston driver is loaded before SX is loaded. My
> > experience was that SX will *never* see that driver and the controller
> > will
> > not work unless SX is loaded before the controller driver. Took me a whole
> > day to figure this one out.
> >
> >
>
>It says something about how knowledgeable I'm going to be on the subject for me to say "Strewth! They HAVE templates for gear like that in Cubase???".
;o)

I guess I should have known they'd have all that kind of stuff. Just never really thought about it. I'm surprised they would be able to mess something like that up. Not that I'm familiar with the MR rack, but I would have thought that it wouldn't be that hard to get something like that right. I guess they take a few shortcuts for some of the older more abstract gear like that.

If it makes you feel any better it doesn't look like we're going to win the cricket. ;o) It's been a good match until today. I hate it when there's a draw. It seems such a waste. It's one of the oddities of cricket that two teams can have uneven scores and yet fail to actually produce a result. It sucks when it happens, but the fact that it can does add an extra element to the game.

Good luck with your rack. :o)

Cheers,
Kim.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>>So what am I supposed to do tonight for entertainment then? Just sit here?
>

>Well, I could bitch for hours about how hard a time I'm having trying to
>get my Ensoniq MR Rack script to translate to Cubase SX. It's friggin' wierd
>how they implemented this.

>
>;o(
>

>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43a7b8d4\$1@linux...
>>

>>
>> What? So that's it then? You're finished? Just like that? All solved?
>Done?
>> Complete? Operational? Finito?
>>
>> So what am I supposed to do tonight for entertainment then? Just sit here?
>> I wonder is there's anything on TV... doubt it...
>>
>> ...aha, the cricket. :o) That's ok then...
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Kim.
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is) when
>> >using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card.
>> If
>> >you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes with
>> the
>> >mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP
>driver
>> >under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as well
>> do
>> >a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the
>> >uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be
a
>> >living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install
>> that
>> >you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,,didn't you? ;o)
>> >
>> >Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system
>> >drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system
>drive/coronary
>> >arrest) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other
>> >drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then
>reboot
>> >on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other
>drives
>> >and then reboot.
>> >
>> >Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's
in
>> a
>> >Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick
is
>> to
>> >turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot
>until

>

>Oh, I tried compact and as reported, it did nothing. Oh well.Hehehe.....well, that's perhaps an extreme interpretation of the situation, but I've basically been cobbling together something here out of new and used parts that just don't like to play with each other sometimes but when working, will do what I had envisioned back in 1997 when I bought Paris. It's just taken such a huge amount of time and thinking outside the box to get it all happening the way *I* want it to work. The part that is downright crazy is the insistence on building this whole Frankenstein with Paris at it's core and totally integrated in everything that happens here. I mean, *nothing happens without Paris involved. When I'm tracking, I'm tracking to Paris, but I'm using both Paris/Mytek and RME converters which are routed through Totalmix and Cubase SX and then back into Paris. Then when I'm mixing, Paris is the master timeline/sync source along with panning and aux sends/returns post compression EQ'ing and whatever else. Now that native DAWs have so much processing power, that's just plain wierd, don't you think? I don't know.....but I like the way it sounds and the wierdest thing about it is that I'm comfortable driving this jalopy when things could be so much simpler and elegant. I dunno.....maybe not perverted, but somewhat eccentric perhaps??.....but then again, I'm not the only one. I mean, we're all here, right?

;O)

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43a7cba0\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >...has to be constantly screwing around with something just to

> >find out wat it will do that it's not meant to do. I guess I'm sort of

> >perverted.

> >;o)

>

> EEEewww... that took me by surprise! ;o)Eccentric I'd say definately, but then what's life if you don't go get what you want...

I mean everybody can buy a Subaru WRX, but not everybody can tweak the carby on an old chevy V8 and get it purring just right. Gotta take the pleasures where you find them. :o)

On a side note, and a really cool, or perhaps really smooth one at that, I just went and bought a digital set top box for my TV. I'm not up to date with how digital TV is going over in the U.S. but we were early intoducers of it over here, but its taken time to catch on. It's getting much more economical now though. I just went to my local grocery supermarket and they had a set top box for digital TV for just \$75. So how does it help me?

Well it gives me a couple of extra channels, and the extra channels happen to be for ABC and SBS, and the ABC one shows some really cool stuff I'll want to see, and repeats the docos and current affairs on the main ABC station, which I'll find really handy, but better still...

....I'm now listening to jazz on ABC Dig Jazz radio. It's the only completely jazz dedicated radio station we have here, and I must say, while I wondered briefly whether I could actually spare the \$75 over christmas, I'm mighty glad I bought it. And much as I can tell that the station is clearly compressed digital audio, the sound quality is decidedly better than FM radio. In particular the stereo separation is way better than I'd expect on FM. I'm not sure what compression they're using, but it sounds ok.

And my TV brings up a picture of an open magazine, a cup of coffee, and a saxophone. ;o) Oddly it seems to do this for every radio station regardless of whether it's jazz, but it seems particularly relevant for the jazz station. :o)

Cheers,
Kim.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Hehehe.....well, that's perhaps an extreme interpretation of the situation,
>but I've basically been cobbling together something here out of new and used
>parts that just don't like to play with each other sometimes but when
>working, will do what I had envisioned back in 1997 when I bought Paris.
>It's just taken such a huge amount of time and thinking outside the box
to
>get it all happening the way *I* want it to work. The part that is downright
>crazy is the insistence on building this whole Frankenstein with Paris at
>it's core and totally integrated in everything that happens here. I mean,
>*nothing happens without Paris involved. When I'm tracking, I'm tracking
to
>Paris, but I'm using both Paris/Mytek and RME converters which are routed
>through Totalmix and Cubase SX and then back into Paris. Then when I'm
>mixing, Paris is the master timeline/sync source along with panning and
aux
>sends/returns post compression EQ'ing and whatever else. Now that native
>DAWs have so much processing power, that's just plain wierd, don't you
>think? I don't know.....but I like the way it sounds and the wierdest thing
>about it is that I'm comfortable driving this jalopy when things could be
so
>much simpler and elegant. I dunno.....maybe not perverted, but somewhat
>eccentric perhaps??.....but then again, I'm not the only one. I mean,
>we're all here, right?
>
>;O)

>
>
>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43a7cba0\$1@linux...
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >...has to be constantly screwing around with something just to
>> >find out wat it will do that it's not meant to do. I guess I'm sort of
>> >perverted.
>> >;o)
>>
>> EEEeeewww... that took me by surprise! ;o)
>
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Now.....what to do with my old Cubase DAW???.....I'm thinking maybe one
>of those EMU interfaces running Emulator X maybe???

Yeah, or perhaps a dedicated box running a convolution reverb?

It'd be like having a couple of Lexi 480L's without having
to lay out all that dough.

You could probably run several instances of convo reverb, plus
a number of VSTi's on it before it started to bog down, dontcha
think?

NeilHi all. I need to know what the voltage is on the EDS card. Does anyone know
this? I am going to try a PCI extender because my new case won't allow the
EDS card where the motherboard is located. Anyone? thanks... ~ EdThanks Chuck,I will look
into those suggestions...Merry Christmas, zan
"Chuck" <c@c.com> wrote in message news:43a595c7\$1@linux...

>
> Zan,
>
> I'm not sure what software you are using, but there are a couple of things
> that affect playability of vsynths/samplers..
>
> I've used both midiman and edirol USB keyboards, and apart from having a
> mushy, crappy feel and really bad velocity curves that I could never seem
> to correct (black keys louder than white) they are playable in realtime.
> Now I only use the edirol for organ and synth sounds that don't require
> the finesse required for piano.
>
> In cubase I found do not use 'emulated' midi ports (there are articles on
> the net on how to stop this).
>
> Here are some ideas:
>

> Don't use the keyboard in a usb hub. Power the keyboard with an adapter
 > when using USB (not the USB power). Check the bios for a 'usb
 compatibility
 > mode' and try it both ways. Sure others will tell you that they use a
 hub,
 > usb power, etc.. so these are just some things to try.
 >
 > Use the control panel/sounds and audio devices in windows to not allow
 windows
 > itself to use the MIDI device that you want to use in your audio app.
 >
 > Do the same thing for audio output - don't let Windows output or input
 from
 > your audio interface.
 >
 > Then the next thing you have to tackle is output latency. You need to get
 > that as low as possible for vsynths to work right.
 >
 > Of course if you are on a mac next to none of this applies.
 >
 >
 >
 > Chuck
 >
 > If you are using cubase one of the keys appears to be to avoid the use of
 > midi ports that say "emulated". There are a couple of articles on the net
 > on how to get rid of the emulated ports and use the real port.
 >
 >
 >
 > "tonehouse" <zmcleod@comcast.net> wrote:
 > >Hi Chuk thanks a bunch for your comments..I too have been finally
 learning
 > >MIDI,in order to play "soft synths",and drum samples...Very trying at
 best..
 > >I have been having a huge latency problem from USB/MIDI. interface...Do
 > all
 > >the USB things do this? I am using a shitty old Yamaha keyboard for
 > >controller..I hope I can figure it out...zmcleod
 > >"Chuck" <c@c.com> wrote in message news:43a4318e\$1@linux...
 > >>
 > >> Hey guys,
 > >>
 > >> Just wanted to let those of you in the DC area know that
 > >> Chuck Levins is blowing out Yamaha P-60 digital pianos for
 > >> 699 after 100 rebate. These are consumer 88 key weighted boards with
 > >built
 > >> in speakers and sounds and an included ikea type put together stand and

> >seat.
> >>
> >>
> >> I was headed out to buy a MIDI controller but checked over two dozen
> >boards
> >> and midi controllers and nothing had action that was even close so I
> >bought
> >> it.
> >>
> >> I plugged into my giga box via MIDI, silenced the on board sounds and
> was
> >> up and running within minutes.
> >>
> >> Man what a difference having a playable keyboard makes.
> >>
> >> So then onto the GIGA. I have the latest GIGAstudio and was pretty
> >unhappy
> >> with the Gigapiano II with resonance model so I went digging around on
> the
> >> 5 sample CDs that come with it and found a PMI stage piano that sounds
> >really,
> >> incredibly nice.
> >>
> >> Then onto the preonus. With the new drivers you don't have to have
the
> >> pre-sonus hooked up to your computer at all - you can hook up all your
> >gear
> >> and use it as a mixer. So I hooked in the outoput of my giga box and
> my
> >> KRK V6s for output. I was seriously disappointed by the sound - it was
> >weird
> >> and phasey and had some kind of psychoacoustic thing going on where the
> >piano
> >> sound appeared to hang all bunched up in mid air somewhere between my
> >eyes.
> >>
> >> So I tore the thing apart and re-wired and checked and re-checked and
> same
> >> thing. Then I found the 'MIX' knob on the pre-sonus does very strange
> >things
> >> to the pan positions when used in anything other than the full right
> >position.
> >> The mix knob is supposed to be preonus answer to monitoring live
inputs
> >> with no latency. When all the way left you are monitoring live inputs,
> >when
> >> all the way right you are monitoring the computer mix. It was
> >counter-intuitive

> >> to use this thing all the way right when not even connected to a
> >computer,
> >> but there you go...
> >>
> >> So now I have an incredibly playable, fantastic sounding, great
recording
> >> digital piano and it only took me three years of screwing around with
> >shitty
> >> MIDIMAN and ROLAND USB midi controllers, different versions of GIGA and
> >HALION,
> >> different computers, licensing snafus...
> >>
> >> So I've been playing this rig for about a week and feeling really good
> and
> >> my giga box has started spontaneously rebooting from HEAT ISSUES!!!
> >>
> >> The end
> >>
> >> Chuck
> >
> >

>I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am wondering something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards? There must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable computing is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't put your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo running WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to upgrade, but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer horribly expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and effort to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.

Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS itself, but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't think Matrox pixels look any better.

Just wondering . . .

TCBYou will be pleasantly surprised with the converters and if appropriate, the mic pres too (designed by Ted Fletcher). If you have the budget, I'd go with the 1820M interface for Emulator X. The mic amps in here rival my best pre's. Also, they use (arguably) a new topology called current mode amplification.

<http://www.tfpro.com/products/info/26.php>

The pre's are wonderfully clean, neutral, and detailed. They are especially good for dynamic and ribbon mics. My Shinybox ribbons sound much better through these pre's than any other I've tried. It would also be pretty easy

to pipe them out to your paris rig, either via analog or digital.

BTW, I just got my matched pair of SE3's. More to follow... :-)

-Chris

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>DUde, the X is super cool.

>Recommended for sure if you have a box to dedicate to it.

>AA

>

>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

>news:43a78c4f@linux...

>> OK.....looks like I'm finally on my way. there appears to be some

>> major

>> quirkiness with the driver set I'm using as relates to the Matrox G450

PCI

>> playing nice with the Houston controller and the Cubase USB dongle whilst

>> interacting with the VIA KT 800 chipset. Anyway, I've got it happening

>> now.

>> Hell'uva dance to get this all happening. I live the power of this thing.

>> I'm operating Cubase Sx at 1.5ms latency without a hiccup so far.

>> Now.....what to do with my old Cubase DAW???.....I'm thinking maybe one

>> of those EMU interfaces running Emulator X maybe???

>>

>> ;o)

>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

>> news:43a66053@linux...

>>> I thought I was home free, but noooooo.....more problems. I'm

>> beginning

>>> to think I've got a defective mobo. Too much wierd stuff happening.

>>>

>>> I'm restoring a Ghosted clean install right now. I went back to my old

>>> system drive and the Houston controller worked, but I couldn't get the

>> Dual

>>> CPU's to work on it and there were quite a few other problems as well.

>>>

>>> Do you know anyone who services the Houston controller? It might be

>>> having

>>> some problems as well. I've seen similar phenomena when the USB connector

>> on

>>> a device went south.

>>>

>>> ;O)


```

>>> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote in message
>>> news:43a6255d@linux...
>>> > Yah, Rrrrrriiiiiigggggggghht! ;-)
>>> >
>>> > David.
>>> >
>>> > DJ wrote:
>>> > > This weekend has truly been hellacious. I sort of expected it. I've
>>> pretty
>>> > > much succeeded at most of what I wnted to accomplish, but it was
a
>> bitch
>>> > > getting there.
>>> > >
>>> > > I'm never going to build another computer as long as I live.....I
>>> > > promise.
>>> > >
>>> > > ;oP
>>> > >
>>> > > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>> > > news:43a4dd92@linux...
>>> > >
>>> > >>I forgot how.
>>> > >>
>>> > >>;o}
>>> > >>
>>> > >>
>>> > >
>>> > >
>>> > >
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>As the Rude Frenchman in Monty Python's Holy Grail one said....

```

Now go and boil your bottom, son of a silly person!

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

```

>
>I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am wondering
>something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards? There
>must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable computing
>is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't put

```

>your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo running
>WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to upgrade,
>but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer horribly
>expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and effort
>to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.

>

>Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS itself,
>but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't think
>Matrox pixels look any better.

>

>Just wondering . . .

>

>TCBFirst thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels to
go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change on ppl
sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes in
the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the agp/pci
duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs
without taking more than one IRQ.

On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those old
units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are somewhat
evil with resource hogging.

AA

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...

>

> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
> wondering
> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards? There
> must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable
> computing
> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't put
> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo
> running
> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to
> upgrade,
> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer horribly
> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and effort
> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.

>

> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
> itself,
> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't think
> Matrox pixels look any better.

>

> Just wondering . . .

>

> TCBAActually, I think Aaron hit it on the head... the G-450 is already confirmed

by various systems, motherboards, etc. that it works well with these setups, along with Paris. Since I have built and own quite a few different systems, I can tell you that some of the newer, NVIDIA-type power video cards LOVE to screw with IRQs. Or perhaps the other way around... the newer cards are forced on IRQs that Paris don't like. I am not that technical with all that... but in layman's terms, that is my understanding. I bought the G-450 back in 99 or 2000 when everyone on here said it is the easiest to work with... for compatibility. Stuck with it since and I have had ZERO issues.

I am sure some of the newer ones will work just fine... but that may depend on your motherboard, what other cards are plugged in and sometimes, which card is in which slot. If you have the time, patience, money and virtuoso... good luck in finding compatibility... then again... to eliminate that.. find a cheap G-450! Lastly, as I said I have multiple computers and I am at work and can't remember model numbers, but personally, I don't see that much of a difference in a G-450 -vs- some of the newer ones. I don't use DVI, but I have, and I don't see a big difference there either. Of course, at my age, I am about blind... lol

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>First thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels to
>go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change on ppl
>sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes in
>the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the agp/pci

>duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs

>without taking more than one IRQ.
>On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those old
>units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are somewhat

>evil with resource hogging.
>AA
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...
>>
>> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
>> wondering
>> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards? There
>> must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable
>> computing
>> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't put
>> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo

>> running
>> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to

>> upgrade,
>> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer horribly
>> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and effort
>> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.
>>
>> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS

>> itself,
>> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't think
>> Matrox pixels look any better.
>>
>> Just wondering . . .
>>
>> TCB
>
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>I think if I was an intelligent person, I'd buy a Mac and spend more time
>being productive.....but it would be sooooo boring. I'm one of those
>people that just has to be constantly screwing around with something just
>to
>find out wat it will do that it's not meant to do. I guess I'm sort of
>perverted.
>;o)

Well, we all knew that! DeeJ , your just a glutton for punishment;)

Glad your up and rockin again!

As for your old PC, you could run it as a UAD-1, T.C., or Pulsar farm. Wasn't Amy looking to get a new computer? You could make it mobile unit, or just keep it as a back up. Just some thoughts.

James

>
>"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43a7c406\$1@linux...
>>hmmm....too good to be true... ...there must come something
>> more....be sure of that....
>>it's an AMI bios, nothing to do with Amy....it's the first
>revision
>> board... ...only made for experiments...
>> ...I think it's therefor you bought it... ...just because you love to do
>> experiments... ...I know your style, it's therefore you hate Mac's...
>> ...they have nothing to experiment with... ...so, statistical, you must
be

>a
 >> real intelligent person... ..hmm...
 >>
 >> erlilo
 >>
 >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
 >> news:43a7af47\$1@linux...
 >> > First of all, the ASUS A8V-Deluxe is kinda quirky(at least mine is)
 when
 >> > using an older Matrox G450 PCI graphics card along with a G450 AGP card.
 >> > If
 >> > you intend to try this....DO NOT load the VIA AGP driver that comes
 with
 >> > the
 >> > mobo. It's OK to load the rest of the drivers. If you load this AGP
 >driver
 >> > under these circumstances (ie..using the Matrox cards) you might as
 well
 >> > do
 >> > a clean install and start over. Removing the VIA AGP driver using the
 >> > uninstall feature doesn't clear up the problem and your life will be
 a
 >> > living hell until you surrender and restore your original clean install
 >> > that
 >> > you Ghosted.....you did remember to Ghost,,,,,,didn't you? ;o)
 >> >
 >> > Secondly,. if you're using removable caddies and you remove the system
 >> > drive, you will get a system drive error (as invalid system
 >drive/coronary
 >> > arrest) when you reinsert it into the caddy unless you remove the other
 >> > drives from their caddies first, insert the system drive solo, then
 >reboot
 >> > on the single system drive, then shut down, reinsert all of the other
 >> > drives
 >> > and then reboot.
 >> >
 >> > Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's
 in
 >a
 >> > Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The trick
 >is
 >> > to
 >> > turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots), reboot
 >> > until
 >> > you get the system happy again, then shut down, reinstall the Magma
 host
 >> > card (or the PCI cards in the mobo) and reboot. The 4 x UAD cards are
 >the

>> > issue in mine. It takes a while to get all of their addresses sorted out
 >> > it
 >> > seems. Eventually everything stabilized.
 >> >
 >> > Lastly and most annoying for me was getting the Houston controller to >work
 >> > with Cubase SX. I finally figured it out. Cubase SX has to be loaded
 >> > before
 >> > the system ever sees the Houston driver. It won't do to
 >> > uninstall/reinstall
 >> > the driver if the Houston driver is loaded before SX is loaded. My
 >> > experience was that SX will *never* see that driver and the controller
 >> > will
 >> > not work unless SX is loaded before the controller driver. Took me a
 >whole
 >> > day to figure this one out.
 >> >
 >> >
 >>
 >>
 >
 >Thad,

The Matrox G450's are very stable on Win XP if :

1. You don't load the Matrox drivers (let Win XP use it default driver)
2. You don't load the VIA AGP chipset

The mobo I'm using has two PCI slots that share IRQ with the AGP (#1 & 6)

Since the cards also share the same driver, this results in very little, if any, hit to processor resources and allows quad VGA outputs. I have tried NForce VGA cards and found them to be very unfriendly beasts with my old 21' Dell P1110's. It's cold up here in the mountains and I need 4 x 21' CRT's to keep the house warm.because this house is heated with natural gas and the price of natural gas is so high now that heating with electricity is cheaper.....so now you know.

;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...

>

> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am wondering

> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards? There
 > must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable

computing

> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't put
> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo
running

> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to
upgrade,

> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer horribly

> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and effort

> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.

>

> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
itself,

> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't think

> Matrox pixels look any better.

>

> Just wondering . . .

>

> TCBSO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.

Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?

Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.

Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing

since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.

I also recorded it so I know the material.

Thanks,

PeteBut these two posts, combined with DJ's experience, sort of confirm what I
was saying. The 450's are not in any way problem free or certified or anything.

In fact, if DJ loads the AGP drivers for his mobo (a rather logical thing)

the Matrox won't work. And if he loads the freaking Matrox drivers (an even
more logical thing) it won't work. I'd say that's a long ways from compatibility.

I've done quad setups with nVidia chipset boards and nVidia vido cards (on
AGP, one PCI) and trust me they were a lot easier than what it sounds like
DJ went through.

Of course, they're your computers, your life, and none of my business. But
when I hear someone having setup and IRQ problems with a Matrox 450 it's
sort of like hearing someone having problems with the first SoundBlaster
Live! card. "Hey, My SB Live is making my new Athlon X2 crash." "Wow, you
mean it actually boots? Lucky you!"

TCB

"Ed" <askme@email.com> wrote:

>

>Actually, I think Aaron hit it on the head... the G-450 is already confirmed

>by various systems, motherboards, etc. that it works well with these setups,
>along with Paris. Since I have built and own quite a few different systems,
>I can tell you that some of the newer, NVIDIA-type power video cards LOVE
>to screw with IRQs. Or perhaps the other way around... the newer cards
are
>forced on IRQs that Paris don't like. I am not that technical with all
that...
>but in layman's terms, that is my understanding. I bought the G-450 back
>in 99 or 2000 when everyone on here said it is the easiest to work with...
>for compatibility. Stuck with it since and I have had ZERO issues.
>
>I am sure some of the newer ones will work just fine... but that may depend
>on your motherboard, what other cards are plugged in and sometimes, which
>card is in which slot. If you have the time, patience, money and virtuoso...
>good luck in finding compatibility... then again... to eliminate that..
find
>a cheap G-450! Lastly, as I said I have multiple computers and I am at
work
>and can't remember model numbers, but personally, I don't see that much
of
>a difference in a G-450 -vs- some of the newer ones. I don't use DVI, but
>I have, and I don't see a big difference there either. Of course, at my
>age, I am about blind... lol
>
>"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>First thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels
>to
>>go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change on
>ppl
>>sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes
>in
>>the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the agp/pci
>
>>duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs
>
>>without taking more than one IRQ.
>>On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those
>old
>>units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are somewhat
>
>>evil with resource hogging.
>>AA
>>
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
>>> wondering

>>> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards?
There
>>> must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable

>>> computing
>>> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't
put
>>> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qautro nVidia card on a 1999 mobo
>>> running
>>> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to
>
>>> upgrade,
>>> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer horribly
>>> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and effort
>>> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.
>>>
>>> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
>
>>> itself,
>>> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't
think
>>> Matrox pixels look any better.
>>>
>>> Just wondering . . .
>>>
>>> TCB
>>
>>
>I usually master with three Brazilian go-go dancers, my collection of Magnum
P.I. action figures, a pair of Rutherford B. Hayes biographies, a bottle
of champagne, two meat and potato pies, chopsticks, a quart of Johnny Red,
six cubits of fiber optic cable (for Jenny), and a jar of organic peanut
butter.

Oh wait. That's actually my book club Monday nights. Wavelab.

TCB

"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

>
> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>
>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>
>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.

> I also recorded it so I know the material.
>
>Thanks,
>Pete"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>
> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>master.Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>
>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>
>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
> I also recorded it so I know the material.
>
>Thanks,
>Pete

I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab.I've found Sound Forge 8 new for \$170.00.Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish;thats a pretty big difference.

Is there that much of a difference between the two?

The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing if that has a bearing on what to use.

TIA,
PeteThad,

At some point, these old Matrox cards are going to just die. They are *vintage*-purchased back in 1998. I can't believe they are still working, but then again, I can't beklieve my EDS cards are working either.

In the event I upgrade to something more current, which dual head AGP and PCI Nvidia cards would you recommend for AGP which are compatible (to the best of your knowledge) with VIA chipsets? My experience with the VIA chipset and the Nforce graphics cards has been less than stellar and it seems that the VIA chipsets are most friendly with multicore CPU's and my other PCI cards (RME and UAD-1).

Thanks,

Deej

"tcb" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a84f70\$1@linux...
>
> But these two posts, combined with DJ's experience, sort of confirm what I

> was saying. The 450's are not in any way problem free or certified or anything.

> In fact, if DJ loads the AGP drivers for his mobo (a rather logical thing)

> the Matrox won't work. And if he loads the freaking Matrox drivers (an even

> more logical thing) it won't work. I'd say that's a long ways from compatibility.

> I've done quad setups with nVidia chipset boards and nVidia vido cards (on

> AGP, one PCI) and trust me they were a lot easier than what it sounds like

> DJ went through.

>

> Of course, they're your computers, your life, and none of my business. But

> when I hear someone having setup and IRQ problems with a Matrox 450 it's

> sort of like hearing someone having problems with the first SoundBlaster

> Live! card. "Hey, My SB Live is making my new Athlon X2 crash." "Wow, you

> mean it actually boots? Lucky you!"

>

> TCB

>

> "Ed" <askme@email.com> wrote:

> >

> >Actually, I think Aaron hit it on the head... the G-450 is already confirmed

> >by various systems, motherboards, etc. that it works well with these setups,

> >along with Paris. Since I have built and own quite a few different systems,

> >I can tell you that some of the newer, NVIDIA-type power video cards LOVE

> >to screw with IRQs. Or perhaps the other way around... the newer cards

> are

> >forced on IRQs that Paris don't like. I am not that technical with all

> that...

> >but in layman's terms, that is my understanding. I bought the G-450 back

> >in 99 or 2000 when everyone on here said it is the easiest to work with...

> >for compatibility. Stuck with it since and I have had ZERO issues.

> >

> >I am sure some of the newer ones will work just fine... but that may depend

> >on your motherboard, what other cards are plugged in and sometimes, which

> >card is in which slot. If you have the time, patience, money and virtuoso...

> >good luck in finding compatibility... then again... to elimimate that..

> find

> >a cheap G-450! Lastly, as I said I have multiple computers and I am at

> work

> >and can't remember model numbers, but personally, I don't see that much

> of

> >a difference in a G-450 -vs- some of the newer ones. I don't use DVI,
but
> >I have, and I don't see a big difference there either. Of course, at my
> >age, I am about blind... lol
> >
> >"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
> >>First thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels
> >to
> >>go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change on
> >ppl
> >>sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes
> >in
> >>the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the
agp/pci
> >
> >>duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs
> >
> >>without taking more than one IRQ.
> >>On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those
> >old
> >>units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are
somewhat
> >
> >>evil with resource hogging.
> >>AA
> >>
> >>
> >>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...
> >>>
> >>> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
> >>> wondering
> >>> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards?
> There
> >>> must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable
>
> >>> computing
> >>> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't
> put
> >>> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qautro nVidia card on a 1999 mobo
> >>> running
> >>> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to
> >
> >>> upgrade,
> >>> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer
horribly
> >>> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and
effort
> >>> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.

> >>>
> >>> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
> >
> >>> itself,
> >>> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't
> think
> >>> Matrox pixels look any better.
> >>>
> >>> Just wondering . . .
> >>>
> >>> TCB
> >>
> >>
> >
>Hi Pete-

I personally prefer Wavelab big-time over Sound Forge, though I own an older version of SF, 6.0. Wavelab has superior effects, EQ, and dithering, in my opinion.

However, have you considered mastering in paris? If you have No Limit, just insert it on each of the stereo tracks, and use the Paris EQ. I have had AWESOME results doing that. Record it to disk as a stereo .paf, then open in Wavelab, and dither it using the UV H22R option in wave lab to 16-bit .wav.

I also do not know if sound Forge recognizes .paf files. I know that Wavelab does.

Merry Christmas,

Chris

"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

>
>"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>
>> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>>master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>>
>>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>>
>>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
>> I also recorded it so I know the material.

>>
>>Thanks,
>>Pete
>
>I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab.I've found Sound
>Forge 8 new for \$170.00.Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish;thats a
>pretty big difference.
>
>Is there that much of a difference between the two?
>
>The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing
>if that has a bearing on what to use.
>
>TIA,
>PeteYou have a valid point in that they are a bit tricky and you don't want to
do what you 'should' do on the drivers level. However, they 'are' certified
windows drivers.. and that's the way to go. Use the XP built in certified
drivers and don't load the matrox (and in DJ's case, the AGP via VXD/DLL)
and everything is cool. I've had two die on me already and so I'm down to my
last G450 now. I am very interested in what you think are the best available
dual head AGP/PCI combos to get 4 VGA outputs with these days. VERY
interested because I know the day is coming and I don't want to shell the
\$\$\$\$ for the colorgraphics stuff.
AA

"tcb" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a84f70\$1@linux...
>
> But these two posts, combined with DJ's experience, sort of confirm what I
> was saying. The 450's are not in any way problem free or certified or
> anything.
> In fact, if DJ loads the AGP drivers for his mobo (a rather logical thing)
> the Matrox won't work. And if he loads the freaking Matrox drivers (an
> even
> more logical thing) it won't work. I'd say that's a long ways from
> compatibility.
> I've done quad setups with nVidia chipset boards and nVidia vido cards (on
> AGP, one PCI) and trust me they were a lot easier than what it sounds like
> DJ went through.
>
> Of course, they're your computers, your life, and none of my business. But
> when I hear someone having setup and IRQ problems with a Matrox 450 it's
> sort of like hearing someone having problems with the first SoundBlaster
> Live! card. "Hey, My SB Live is making my new Athlon X2 crash." "Wow, you
> mean it actually boots? Lucky you!"
>
> TCB
>

> "Ed" <askme@email.com> wrote:
>>
>>Actually, I think Aaron hit it on the head... the G-450 is already
>>confirmed
>>by various systems, motherboards, etc. that it works well with these
>>setups,
>>along with Paris. Since I have built and own quite a few different
>>systems,
>>I can tell you that some of the newer, NVIDIA-type power video cards LOVE
>>to screw with IRQs. Or perhaps the other way around... the newer cards
> are
>>forced on IRQs that Paris don't like. I am not that technical with all
> that...
>>but in layman's terms, that is my understanding. I bought the G-450 back
>>in 99 or 2000 when everyone on here said it is the easiest to work with...
>>for compatibility. Stuck with it since and I have had ZERO issues.
>>
>>I am sure some of the newer ones will work just fine... but that may
>>depend
>>on your motherboard, what other cards are plugged in and sometimes, which
>>card is in which slot. If you have the time, patience, money and
>>virtuoso...
>>good luck in finding compatibility... then again... to eliminate that..
> find
>>a cheap G-450! Lastly, as I said I have multiple computers and I am at
> work
>>and can't remember model numbers, but personally, I don't see that much
> of
>>a difference in a G-450 -vs- some of the newer ones. I don't use DVI, but
>>I have, and I don't see a big difference there either. Of course, at my
>>age, I am about blind... lol
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>First thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels
>>to
>>>go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change on
>>ppl
>>>sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes
>>in
>>>the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the
>>>agp/pci
>>
>>>duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs
>>
>>>without taking more than one IRQ.
>>>On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those
>>old
>>>units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are somewhat

>>
>>>evil with resource hogging.
>>>AA
>>>
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
>>>> wondering
>>>> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards?
> There
>>>> must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable
>
>>>> computing
>>>> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't
> put
>>>> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qautro nVidia card on a 1999 mobo
>>>> running
>>>> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA to
>>
>>>> upgrade,
>>>> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer
>>>> horribly
>>>> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and
>>>> effort
>>>> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.
>>>>
>>>> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
>>
>>>> itself,
>>>> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't
> think
>>>> Matrox pixels look any better.
>>>>
>>>> Just wondering . . .
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>
>>>
>>
>Thanks for the info Chris.I have thought about mastering in
Paris.

So if mastering in PARIS your talking about bringing my stereo
mix back into PARIS to master correct?What difference would using
Nolimit on the tracks as opposed to the master bus give me if
any?

So then you assemble and lay out your cd tracks in Wavelab for your final master cd?

Any need to dither if I was already using 16 bit files to begin with?

Thanks Chris,
Pete

"Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:

>
>Hi Pete-
>
>I personally prefer Wavelab big-time over Sound Forge,
>though I own an older version of SF, 6.0. Wavelab has
>superior effects, EQ, and dithering, in my opinion.
>
>However, have you considered mastering in paris? If you
>have No Limit, just insert it on each of the stereo tracks,
>and use the Paris EQ. I have had AWESOME results doing that.
>Record it to disk as a stereo .paf, then open in Wavelab, and
>dither it using the UV H22R option in wave lab to 16-bit .wav.
>
>I also do not know if sound Forge recognizes .paf files. I know
>that Wavelab does.

>
>Merry Christmas,

>
>Chris

>
>
>
>
>"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

>>
>>"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>>>master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>>>
>>>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>>>
>>>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>>>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>>>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
>>> I also recorded it so I know the material.

>>>
>>>Thanks,

>>>Pete
>>
>>I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab.I've found Sound
>>Forge 8 new for \$170.00.Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish;thats a
>>pretty big difference.
>>
>>Is there that much of a difference between the two?
>>
>>The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing
>>if that has a bearing on what to use.
>>
>>TIA,
>>Pete
>You can also print your mix (paf) inside Paris, open a new Paris project (call
it Master) and then insert your UAD plugs in stereo on the the 2 tracks
which you've mixed. With the Precision limiter as the last insert in your
chain, and your 2 tracks set to 0 (no Paris eq at this point) it's quite
accurate, Just set the Precision limiter to -.4 or -.3 or whatever you like.

I just keep a project file named Master with the songs I want to compare
against already loaded.

George Axon

"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

>
>Thanks for the info Chris.I have thought about mastering in
>Paris.
>
>So if mastering in PARIS your talking about bringing my stereo
>mix back into PARIS to master correct?What difference would using
>Nolimit on the tracks as oppossed to the master bus give me if
>any?
>
>So then you assemble and lay out your cd tracks in Wavelab for
>your final master cd?
>
>Any need to dither if I was already using 16 bit files to begin
>with?
>
>Thanks Chris,
>Pete
>
>
>"Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:
>>
>>Hi Pete-
>>

>>I personally prefer Wavelab big-time over Sound Forge,
>>though I own an older version of SF, 6.0. Wavelab has
>>superior effects, EQ, and dithering, in my opinion.
>>
>>However, have you considered mastering in paris? If you
>>have No Limit, just insert it on each of the stereo tracks,
>>and use the Paris EQ. I have had AWESOME results doing that.
>>Record it to disk as a stereo .paf, then open in Wavelab, and
>>dither it using the UV H22R option in wave lab to 16-bit .wav.
>>
>>I also do not know if sound Forge recognizes .paf files. I know
>>that Wavelab does.
>>
>>Merry Christmas,
>>
>>Chris
>>
>>
>>
>>"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>>>>master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>>>>
>>>>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>>>>
>>>>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>>>>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>>>>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
>>>> I also recorded it so I know the material.
>>>>
>>>>Thanks,
>>>>Pete
>>>
>>>I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab. I've found Sound
>>>Forge 8 new for \$170.00. Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish; thats a
>>>pretty big difference.
>>>
>>>Is there that much of a difference between the two?
>>>
>>>The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing
>>>if that has a bearing on what to use.
>>>
>>>TIA,
>>>Pete
>>

>Pete,

Are you saying your tracks are 16 bit, or your mix files? I would definitely mix at 24 bits. This will give you higher resolution to do your processing in before knocking it back down to 16 at the end of the mastering process. I do all my mastering (so far) within Wavelab at 32 bit float (output from the montage used for assembly), then dither down to 16 at the very end.

David.

Pete wrote:

> Thanks for the info Chris.I have thought about mastering in
> Paris.
>
> So if mastering in PARIS your talking about bringing my stereo
> mix back into PARIS to master correct?What difference would using
> Nolimit on the tracks as oppossed to the master bus give me if
> any?
>
> So then you assemble and lay out your cd tracks in Wavelab for
> your final master cd?
>
> Any need to dither if I was already using 16 bit files to begin
> with?
>
> Thanks Chris,
> Pete
>
>
> "Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:
>
>>Hi Pete-
>>
>>I personally prefer Wavelab big-time over Sound Forge,
>>though I own an older version of SF, 6.0. Wavelab has
>>superior effects, EQ, and dithering, in my opinion.
>>
>>However, have you considered mastering in paris? If you
>>have No Limit, just insert it on each of the stereo tracks,
>>and use the Paris EQ. I have had AWESOME results doing that.
>>Record it to disk as a stereo .paf, then open in Wavelab, and
>>dither it usung the UV H22R option in wave lab to 16-bit .wav.
>>
>>I also do not know if sound Forge recognizes .paf files. I know
>>that Wavelab does.
>>
>>Merry Christmas,

>>
>>Chris
>>
>>
>>
>>"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>
>>>"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>>>>master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>>>>
>>>>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>>>>
>>>>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>>>>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>>>>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
>>>> I also recorded it so I know the material.
>>>>
>>>>Thanks,
>>>>Pete
>>>
>>>>I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab. I've found Sound
>>>>Forge 8 new for \$170.00. Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish; thats a
>>>>pretty big difference.
>>>>
>>>>Is there that much of a difference between the two?
>>>>
>>>>The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing
>>>>if that has a bearing on what to use.
>>>>
>>>>TIA,
>>>>Pete
>>
>My tracks are 16 bit, not the mix files. I guess I just assumed
since my tracks were 16 bit then I mix in 16 bit, but I see the
rationale for mixing in 24 bit then dithering back down.

Could I do everything I need to do in the cheaper Wavelab
version (was it Essential)? Would that give me all the tools to
create a master cd for replication (red book and all that stuff I
still haven't gotten into)?

Thanks much for the info David,
Pete

EK Sound <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote:
>Pete,

>

>Are you saying your tracks are 16 bit, or your mix files? I would
>definitely mix at 24 bits. This will give you higher resolution to do
>your processing in before knocking it back down to 16 at the end of
>the mastering process. I do all my mastering (so far) within Wavelab
>at 32 bit float (output from the montage used for assembly), then
>dither down to 16 at the very end.

>

>David.

>

>Pete wrote:

>> Thanks for the info Chris.I have thought about mastering in
>> Paris.

>>

>> So if mastering in PARIS your talking about bringing my stereo
>> mix back into PARIS to master correct?What difference would using
>> Nolimit on the tracks as opposed to the master bus give me if
>> any?

>>

>> So then you assemble and lay out your cd tracks in Wavelab for
>> your final master cd?

>>

>> Any need to dither if I was already using 16 bit files to begin
>> with?

>>

>> Thanks Chris,

>> Pete

>>

>>

>> "Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:

>>

>>>Hi Pete-

>>>

>>>I personally prefer Wavelab big-time over Sound Forge,
>>>though I own an older version of SF, 6.0. Wavelab has
>>>superior effects, EQ, and dithering, in my opinion.

>>>

>>>However, have you considered mastering in paris? If you
>>>have No Limit, just insert it on each of the stereo tracks,
>>>and use the Paris EQ. I have had AWESOME results doing that.
>>>Record it to disk as a stereo .paf, then open in Wavelab, and
>>>dither it usung the UV H22R option in wave lab to 16-bit .wav.

>>>

>>>I also do not know if sound Forge recognizes .paf files. I know
>>>that Wavelab does.

>>>

>>>Merry Christmas,

>>>

>>>Chris
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>>>>>master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>>>>>
>>>>>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>>>>>
>>>>>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>>>>>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>>>>>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
>>>>> I also recorded it so I know the material.
>>>>>
>>>>>Thanks,
>>>>>Pete
>>>>>
>>>>>I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab. I've found Sound
>>>>>Forge 8 new for \$170.00. Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish; thats a
>>>>>pretty big difference.
>>>>>
>>>>>Is there that much of a difference between the two?
>>>>>
>>>>>The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing
>>>>>if that has a bearing on what to use.
>>>>>
>>>>>TIA,
>>>>>Pete
>>>>>
>>Hey Aaron,

I tend to use the GeForce FX 5200 series, though they are getting a little long in the tooth themselves. They have solid 2D performance and horrible 3D performance for a gamer, they're cheap, and they're cool enough some don't even have a cooling fan--just a heat sink. For example

http://www.newegg.com/Product/Product.asp?Item=N82E168141211_86

would be a good idea. If you look around there are also dual DVI/dual VGA cards though one of each tends to be the default.

I tend to use nVidia chipsets with nVidia cards. I usually do NOT use the nView desktop management stuff. I probably could but it seems to add very little for what I do and offer another chance for things to go wrong.

TCB

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>You have a valid point in that they are a bit tricky and you don't want to

>do what you 'should' do on the drivers level. However, they 'are' certified

>windows drivers.. and that's the way to go. Use the XP built in certified

>drivers and don't load the matrox (and in DJ's case, the AGP via VXD/DLL)

>and everything is cool. I've had two die on me already and so I'm down to my

>last G450 now. I am very interested in what you think are the best available

>dual head AGP/PCI combos to get 4 VGA outputs with these days. VERY

>interested because I know the day is coming and I don't want to shell the

>\$\$\$\$ for the colorgraphics stuff.

>AA

>

>

>"tcb" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a84f70\$1@linux...

>>

>> But these two posts, combined with DJ's experience, sort of confirm what I

>> was saying. The 450's are not in any way problem free or certified or

>> anything.

>> In fact, if DJ loads the AGP drivers for his mobo (a rather logical thing)

>> the Matrox won't work. And if he loads the freaking Matrox drivers (an

>> even

>> more logical thing) it won't work. I'd say that's a long ways from

>> compatibility.

>> I've done quad setups with nVidia chipset boards and nVidia vido cards

(on

>> AGP, one PCI) and trust me they were a lot easier than what it sounds like

>> DJ went through.

>>

>> Of course, they're your computers, your life, and none of my business.

But

>> when I hear someone having setup and IRQ problems with a Matrox 450 it's

>> sort of like hearing someone having problems with the first SoundBlaster

>> Live! card. "Hey, My SB Live is making my new Athlon X2 crash." "Wow, you

>> mean it actually boots? Lucky you!"
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "Ed" <askme@email.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Actually, I think Aaron hit it on the head... the G-450 is already
>>>confirmed
>>>by various systems, motherboards, etc. that it works well with these
>>>setups,
>>>along with Paris. Since I have built and own quite a few different
>>>systems,
>>>I can tell you that some of the newer, NVIDIA-type power video cards LOVE
>>>to screw with IRQs. Or perhaps the other way around... the newer cards
>> are
>>>forced on IRQs that Paris don't like. I am not that technical with all
>> that...
>>>but in layman's terms, that is my understanding. I bought the G-450 back
>>>in 99 or 2000 when everyone on here said it is the easiest to work with...
>>>for compatibility. Stuck with it since and I have had ZERO issues.
>>>
>>>I am sure some of the newer ones will work just fine... but that may
>>>depend
>>>on your motherboard, what other cards are plugged in and sometimes, which
>>>card is in which slot. If you have the time, patience, money and
>>>virtuoso...
>>>good luck in finding compatibility... then again... to eliminate that..
>> find
>>>a cheap G-450! Lastly, as I said I have multiple computers and I am at
>> work
>>>and can't remember model numbers, but personally, I don't see that much
>> of
>>>a difference in a G-450 -vs- some of the newer ones. I don't use DVI,
but
>>>I have, and I don't see a big difference there either. Of course, at
my
>>>age, I am about blind... lol
>>>
>>>"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>First thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels
>>>to
>>>>go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change
on
>>>ppl
>>>>sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes
>>>in
>>>>the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the
>>>>agp/pci

>>>
>>>>duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs
>>>
>>>>without taking more than one IRQ.
>>>>On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those
>>>>old
>>>>units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are somewhat
>>>
>>>>evil with resource hogging.
>>>>AA
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
>>>>> wondering
>>>>> something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards?
>> There
>>>>> must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable
>>
>>>>> computing
>>>>> is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't
>> put
>>>>> your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo
>>>>> running
>>>>> WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA
to
>>>
>>>>> upgrade,
>>>>> but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer
>>>>> horribly
>>>>> expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and

>>>>> effort
>>>>> to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.
>>>>>
>>>>> Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
>>>
>>>>> itself,
>>>>> but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't
>> think
>>>>> Matrox pixels look any better.
>>>>>
>>>>> Just wondering . . .
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>

>>

>

>see i'm assuming it does NOT stop. I'm betting that both shortened objects and mutes play stream the entire segment I just am not sure how to test. Hmm, how to test this. Brains anyone ?

rick wrote:

> i guess you could run a cpu usage check and see what happens but i
> would assume that the audio streaming would stop when the file stops
> playing. as far as the mutes go, i would think that it would be
> likened to a midi on/off command in that data is sent only during the
> onset of either command.

>

> On Mon, 19 Dec 2005 20:26:21 -0500, John <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>

>>Does an object that has been trimmed still stream the entire object?

>>Like if I take a 5 minute object and trim it to 5 seconds will it still

>>be streaming from hard drive the whole time?

>>

>>Also, do automated mutes continue streaming from disk? I'm betting

>>they both stream and need to be rendered to fix it.

>>

>>Is there a way to verify this?

>>

>>

>>Oh, I tried compact and as reported, it did nothing. Oh well.

>

>Hey, guys-

The impossible is about to happen. I'm flying back to Boston for Christmas. First Christmas outside Napa in... hmmm...53 years. Bonnie's daughter lives there, so the two of us are flying out.

Silly me. Should have checked before today. The only things I can see available to rent tomorrow (!) are, hmm, a little more expensive than I had anticipated. If I did this sort of thing more often I would have known to check into the car at the same time as the ticket. But...

So, do any of you fine Paris folk, who know darned near everything, know of a source for renting a car for a week, cheap? or anything else I should know of, or see, or do, while in Boston?

Or anyone need a fast mural done in exchange for a car for a week? Ha! It would have to be a fast one...

-steveAFAIK, mutes do not stop the file from being streamed, but edits do.

David.

John wrote:

> see i'm assuming it does NOT stop. I'm betting that both shortened
> objects and mutes play stream the entire segment I just am not sure how
> to test. Hmm, how to test this. Brains anyone ?
>
> rick wrote:
>
>> i guess you could run a cpu usage check and see what happens but i
>> would assume that the audio streaming would stop when the file stops
>> playing. as far as the mutes go, i would think that it would be
>> likened to a midi on/off command in that data is sent only during the
>> onset of either command.
>>
>> On Mon, 19 Dec 2005 20:26:21 -0500, John <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Does an object that has been trimmed still stream the entire object?
>>> Like if I take a 5 minute object and trim it to 5 seconds will it
>>> still be streaming from hard drive the whole time?
>>>
>>> Also, do automated mutes continue streaming from disk? I'm betting
>>> they both stream and need to be rendered to fix it.
>>>
>>> Is there a way to verify this?
>>>
>>>
>>> Oh, I tried compact and as reported, it did nothing. Oh well.
>>
>>
>>Essential has only two montage lanes, which would be fine for simple
crossfades... but not anything more detailed. The CD burning
capabilities are the same though, so you could create a full length
file with all the songs correctly spaced and all fades done, then drop
the indexes and burn. We have done loads of masters this way and the
pressing plants haven't had a problem with one yet.

David.

Pete Ruthenburg wrote:

> My tracks are 16 bit,not the mix files.I guess I just assumed
> since my tracks were 16 bit then I mix in 16 bit,but I see the
> rationale for mixing in 24 bit then dithering back down.
>

> Could I do everything I need to do in the cheaper Wavelab
> version(was it Essential)?Would that give me all the tools to
> create a master cd for replication(red book and all that stuff I
> still haven't gotten into)?
>
> Thanks much for the info David,
> Pete
>
> EK Sound <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote:
>
>>Pete,
>>
>>Are you saying your tracks are 16 bit, or your mix files? I would
>>definitely mix at 24 bits. This will give you higher resolution to do
>>your processing in before knocking it back down to 16 at the end of
>>the mastering process. I do all my mastering (so far) within Wavelab
>>at 32 bit float (output from the montage used for assembly), then
>>dither down to 16 at the very end.
>>
>>David.
>>
>>Pete wrote:
>>
>>>Thanks for the info Chris.I have thought about mastering in
>>>Paris.
>>>
>>>So if mastering in PARIS your talking about bringing my stereo
>>>mix back into PARIS to master correct?What difference would using
>>>Nolimit on the tracks as opposed to the master bus give me if
>>>any?
>>>
>>>So then you assemble and lay out your cd tracks in Wavelab for
>>>your final master cd?
>>>
>>>Any need to dither if I was already using 16 bit files to begin
>>>with?
>>>
>>>Thanks Chris,
>>>Pete
>>>
>>>
>>>"Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Hi Pete-
>>>>
>>>>I personally prefer Wavelab big-time over Sound Forge,
>>>>though I own an older version of SF, 6.0. Wavelab has

>>>>superior effects, EQ, and dithering, in my opinion.
>>>>
>>>>However, have you considered mastering in paris? If you
>>>>have No Limit, just insert it on each of the stereo tracks,
>>>>and use the Paris EQ. I have had AWESOME results doing that.
>>>>Record it to disk as a stereo .paf, then open in Wavelab, and
>>>>dither it using the UV H22R option in wave lab to 16-bit .wav.
>>>>
>>>>I also do not know if sound Forge recognizes .paf files. I know
>>>>that Wavelab does.
>>>>
>>>>Merry Christmas,
>>>>
>>>>Chris
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Pete" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
>>>>>master.Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>>>>>
>>>>>Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>>>>>
>>>>>Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
>>>>>Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
>>>>>since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
>>>>>I also recorded it so I know the material.
>>>>>
>>>>>Thanks,
>>>>>Pete
>>>>
>>>>>I've been checking into Sound Forge and Wavelab.I've found Sound
>>>>>Forge 8 new for \$170.00.Wavelab lloks to be \$550ish;thats a
>>>>>pretty big difference.
>>>>
>>>>>Is there that much of a difference between the two?
>>>>
>>>>>The master cd I do will be sent off of replication and pressing
>>>>>if that has a bearing on what to use.
>>>>
>>>>>TIA,
>>>>>Pete
>>>>

>We have several of the FX5200's and they work great. One in the Paris machine right now actually.

David.

TCB wrote:

> Hey Aaron,

>

> I tend to use the GeForce FX 5200 series, though they are getting a little
> long in the tooth themselves. They have solid 2D performance and horrible
> 3D performance for a gamer, they're cheap, and they're cool enough some don't
> even have a cooling fan--just a heat sink. For example

>

> http://www.newegg.com/Product/Product.asp?Item=N82E168141211_86

>

> would be a good idea. If you look around there are also dual DVI/dual VGA
> cards though one of each tends to be the default.

>

> I tend to use nVidia chipsets with nVidia cards. I usually do NOT use the
> nView desktop management stuff. I probably could but it seems to add very
> little for what I do and offer another chance for things to go wrong.

>

> TCB

>

> "Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>

>>You have a valid point in that they are a bit tricky and you don't want

>

> to

>

>>do what you 'should' do on the drivers level. However, they 'are' certified

>

>

>>windows drivers.. and that's the way to go. Use the XP built in certified

>

>

>>drivers and don't load the matrox (and in DJ's case, the AGP via VXD/DLL)

>

>

>>and everything is cool. I've had two die on me already and so I'm down to

>

> my

>

>>last G450 now. I am very interested in what you think are the best available

>

>

>>dual head AGP/PCI combos to get 4 VGA outputs with these days. VERY

>>interested because I know the day is coming and I don't want to shell the
>
>
>>\$\$\$\$ for the colorgraphics stuff.
>>AA
>>
>>
>>"tcb" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a84f70\$1@linux...
>>
>>>But these two posts, combined with DJ's experience, sort of confirm what
>
> I
>
>>>was saying. The 450's are not in any way problem free or certified or
>
>
>>>anything.
>>>In fact, if DJ loads the AGP drivers for his mobo (a rather logical thing)
>>>the Matrox won't work. And if he loads the freaking Matrox drivers (an
>
>
>>>even
>>>more logical thing) it won't work. I'd say that's a long ways from
>>>compatibility.
>>>I've done quad setups with nVidia chipset boards and nVidia vido cards
>
> (on
>
>>>AGP, one PCI) and trust me they were a lot easier than what it sounds
>
> like
>
>>>DJ went through.
>>>
>>>Of course, they're your computers, your life, and none of my business.
>
> But
>
>>>when I hear someone having setup and IRQ problems with a Matrox 450 it's
>>>sort of like hearing someone having problems with the first SoundBlaster
>>>Live! card. "Hey, My SB Live is making my new Athlon X2 crash." "Wow,
>
> you
>
>>>mean it actually boots? Lucky you!"
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>

>>>"Ed" <askme@email.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Actually, I think Aaron hit it on the head... the G-450 is already
>>>>confirmed
>>>>by various systems, motherboards, etc. that it works well with these
>>>>setups,
>>>>along with Paris. Since I have built and own quite a few different
>>>>systems,
>>>>I can tell you that some of the newer, NVIDIA-type power video cards LOVE
>>>>to screw with IRQs. Or perhaps the other way around... the newer cards
>>>
>>>are
>>>
>>>>forced on IRQs that Paris don't like. I am not that technical with all
>>>
>>>that...
>>>
>>>>but in layman's terms, that is my understanding. I bought the G-450 back
>>>>in 99 or 2000 when everyone on here said it is the easiest to work with...
>>>>for compatibility. Stuck with it since and I have had ZERO issues.
>>>>
>>>>I am sure some of the newer ones will work just fine... but that may
>>>>depend
>>>>on your motherboard, what other cards are plugged in and sometimes, which
>>>>card is in which slot. If you have the time, patience, money and
>>>>virtuoso...
>>>>good luck in finding compatibility... then again... to eliminate that..
>>>
>>>find
>>>
>>>>a cheap G-450! Lastly, as I said I have multiple computers and I am at
>>>
>>>work
>>>
>>>>and can't remember model numbers, but personally, I don't see that much
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>>a difference in a G-450 -vs- some of the newer ones. I don't use DVI,
>
> but
>
>>>>I have, and I don't see a big difference there either. Of course, at
>
> my
>
>>>>age, I am about blind... lol
>>>>

>>>>"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>First thing I think of is that I would have to buy 3 new DVI flat panels
>>>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>>go with 3 DVI outs... not cheap. PCI-E is going to force this change
>
> on
>
>>>>ppl
>>>>
>>>>>sooner or later anyway, but - In DJ's case at least - the problem comes
>>>>
>>>>in
>>>>
>>>>>the amount of usable PCI slots and video heads. By sticking to the
>>>>>agp/pci
>>>>
>>>>>duo of Matrox 450, he loses no usable PCI slots and gets 4 head outputs
>>>>
>>>>>without taking more than one IRQ.
>>>>>On a single or even dual head video system, I couldn't see keeping those
>>>>
>>>>old
>>>>
>>>>>units - especially knowing that with the Matrox drivers they are somewhat
>>>>
>>>>>evil with resource hogging.
>>>>>AA
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a81dae\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>>I've been reading this NG on and off again for a few weeks and am
>>>>>>wondering
>>>>>>something. Why do all of you guys use those clunky old Matrox cards?
>>>
>>>There
>>>
>>>>>>must be some reason or another, but one of the first rules of stable
>>>
>>>>>>computing
>>>>>>is never mix hardware and software from vastly different eras. Don't
>>>
>>>put
>>>
>>>>>>your brand new 8X AGP Super Gamer Qauto nVidia card on a 1999 mobo

>>>>>running
>>>>>WinME. Don't run Netscape 4.2 on Server 2003 SP2. Yes, it's a PITA
>
> to
>
>>>>>upgrade,
>>>>>but dual DVI nVidia cards to run on nVidia chipsets are no longer
>>>>>horribly
>>>>>expensive and it seems people here are giving up a lot of time and
>
>
>>>>>effort
>>>>>to use a (let's admit pretty crappy) old video card.
>>>>>
>>>>>Obviously, this same argument could be used to suggest dropping PARIS
>>>>
>>>>>itself,
>>>>>but at least PARIS adds some distinct value with its sonics. I don't
>>>
>>>think
>>>
>>>>>Matrox pixels look any better.
>>>>>
>>>>>Just wondering . . .
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>
>If you are looking for a good mastering limiter, the UAD Precision Limiter
is the best I have heard.

Bill

"Pete Ruthenburg" <ruthenburg@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:43a84d7b\$1@linux...

>
> SO I've got a piano jazz trio project I'm going to try and
> master. Just want some advice on what is being used to master.
>
> Are some of you doing it in PARIS or do I need to buy Wavelab?
>
> Thinking of trying some of the UAD precision stuff too.
> Probably a good project for me to get into the mastering thing
> since it shouldn't require alot since its a jaaz thing.
> I also recorded it so I know the material.
>
> Thanks,

> PeteU-Save Auto but its in Somerville...
http://www.rentusave.com/fran_detail.aspx?fid=1048&c=Somerville&s=MA

"steve the artguy" <artguy@svnhooahaa.net> wrote in message
news:43a87d3d\$1@linux...

>
> Hey, guys-
>
> The impossible is about to happen. I'm flying back to Boston for
> Christmas.
> First Christmas outside Napa in... hmmm...53 years. Bonnie's daughter
> lives
> there, so the two of us are flying out.
>
> Silly me. Should have checked before today. The only things I can see
> available
> to rent tomorrow (!) are, hmm, a little more expensive than I had
> anticipated.
> If I did this sort of thing more often I would have known to check into
> the
> car at the same time as the ticket. But...
>
> So, do any of you fine Paris folk, who know darned near everything, know
> of a source for renting a car for a week, cheap? or anything else I should
> know of, or see, or do, while in Boston?
>
> Or anyone need a fast mural done in exchange for a car for a week? Ha! It
> would have to be a fast one...
>
> -steveFor an auditory experience go to the Christian Science Monitor building and
tour their inverted globe. It is an approximatley 25' diameter globe that
you can walk into and across on a little bridge, with the countries painted
on backlit glass. When you stand in the very center and talk it sounds like
your voice is in the center of your skull. Pretty cool - at least it seemed
that way when I was 20.

Bill

"steve the artguy" <artguy@svnhooahaa.net> wrote in message
news:43a87d3d\$1@linux...

>
> Hey, guys-
>
> The impossible is about to happen. I'm flying back to Boston for
> Christmas.
> First Christmas outside Napa in... hmmm...53 years. Bonnie's daughter
> lives
> there, so the two of us are flying out.

>
> Silly me. Should have checked before today. The only things I can see
> available
> to rent tomorrow (!) are, hmm, a little more expensive than I had
> anticipated.
> If I did this sort of thing more often I would have known to check into
> the
> car at the same time as the ticket. But...
>
> So, do any of you fine Paris folk, who know darned near everything, know
> of a source for renting a car for a week, cheap? or anything else I should
> know of, or see, or do, while in Boston?
>
> Or anyone need a fast mural done in exchange for a car for a week? Ha! It
> would have to be a fast one...
>
> -steve"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>For an auditory experience go to the Christian Science Monitor building
and
>tour their inverted globe. It is an approxinatley 25' diameter globe that

>you can walk into and across on a little bridge, with the countries painted

>on backlit glass. When you stand in the very center and talk it sounds like

>your voice is in the center of your skull. Pretty cool - at least it seemed

>that way when I was 20.

Yeah, but that's also because you were on 'shrooms at the time.

:)"justcron" <pachinko@hydrorecords.com> wrote:
>U-Save Auto but its in Somerville...
> http://www.rentusave.com/fran_detail.aspx?fid=1048&c=Somerville&s=MA
>
>

Justin-

thanks -- I checked it out -- but found a better deal at, of all places,
Avis...

-steve"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>For an auditory experience go to the Christian Science Monitor building
>and
>>tour their inverted globe. It is an approxinatley 25' diameter globe that

>
>>you can walk into and across on a little bridge, with the countries painted
>
>>on backlit glass. When you stand in the very center and talk it sounds
like
>
>>your voice is in the center of your skull. Pretty cool - at least it seemed
>
>>that way when I was 20.
>
>Yeah, but that's also because you were on 'shrooms at the time.
>
>:)

Hey, Bill, thanks for the tip! I bet there are lots and lots of cool stuff
in the Boston area. Only have a week there -- it should be fun.

Keep them tips comin'!

-steveBut is there any way to test it?
John

EK Sound wrote:

> AFAIK, mutes do not stop the file from being streamed, but edits do.
>
> David.
>
> John wrote:
>
>> see i'm assuming it does NOT stop. I'm betting that both shortened
>> objects and mutes play stream the entire segment I just am not sure
>> how to test. Hmm, how to test this. Brains anyone ?
>>
>> rick wrote:
>>
>>> i guess you could run a cpu usage check and see what happens but i
>>> would assume that the audio streaming would stop when the file stops
>>> playing. as far as the mutes go, i would think that it would be
>>> likened to a midi on/off command in that data is sent only during the
>>> onset of either command.
>>>
>>> On Mon, 19 Dec 2005 20:26:21 -0500, John <no@no.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Does an object that has been trimmed still stream the entire object?
>>>> Like if I take a 5 minute object and trim it to 5 seconds will it
>>>> still be streaming from hard drive the whole time?

>>>>
>>>> Also, do automated mutes continue streaming from disk? I'm betting
>>>> they both stream and need to be rendered to fix it.
>>>>
>>>> Is there a way to verify this?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Oh, I tried compact and as reported, it did nothing. Oh well.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Nope.

David.

John wrote:

> But is there any way to test it?
> John
>
> EK Sound wrote:
>
>> AFAIK, mutes do not stop the file from being streamed, but edits do.
>>
>> David.
>>
>> John wrote:
>>
>>> see i'm assuming it does NOT stop. I'm betting that both shortened
>>> objects and mutes play stream the entire segment I just am not sure
>>> how to test. Hmm, how to test this. Brains anyone ?
>>>
>>> rick wrote:
>>>
>>>> i guess you could run a cpu usage check and see what happens but i
>>>> would assume that the audio streaming would stop when the file stops
>>>> playing. as far as the mutes go, i would think that it would be
>>>> likened to a midi on/off command in that data is sent only during the
>>>> onset of either command.
>>>>
>>>> On Mon, 19 Dec 2005 20:26:21 -0500, John <no@no.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Does an object that has been trimmed still stream the entire
>>>>> obj
