
Subject: IRQs, again

Posted by [uptown jimmy](#) on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 19:07:51 GMT

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

!
>
>
> Neil
>
>
> "Tom Bruhl" <arpegio@comcast.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>> Exactly. No allkeys.skf
>>
>> 1/2/07 unless there's an automated way to get them.
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <IOUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:458d4771\$1@linux...
>>
>> I'm sure it's that he can't get the "allkeys" file.
>>
>> Tom, did you e-mail Ali? (info@creamware.com) & give him your
>> card's SN#?
>

Subject: Re: IRQs, again

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 19:19:38 GMT

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

;>
>> Neil
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> > So, do you have it there and you are having problems with it? =3D20
>> >
>> > Deej
>> > "Tom Bruhl" <arpegio@comcast.net> wrote in message =3D
>> > news:458cd310@linux...
>> > I got things really cooking here with my new rig except the
>> > Creamware folks are on vacation from today until 1/2/07. =3D20
>> > I picked a great day to install the Pro card . . .
>> >
>> > Hurry up and wait.

>> >
>> > Now, Cubase 4 ? ? ? Should I wait?
>> >
>> > Naw, well maybe . . .
>> >
>> >
>> > NOT!

Subject: Re: IRQs, again
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 19:51:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>> >
>> >
>> > I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
>> > <http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html> =20
>> >
>> ><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
>> ><HTML><HEAD>
>> ><META http-equiv=3D3DContent-Type content=3D3D"text/html; =3D
>> > charset=3D3Diso-8859-1">
>> ><META content=3D3D"MSHTML 6.00.2900.2180" name=3D3DGENERATOR>
>> ><STYLE></STYLE>
>> ></HEAD>
>> ><BODY bgColor=3D3D#ffffff>
>> ><DIV>So, do you have it there and you
> =
>>are =3D
>> >having=3D20
>> >problems with it? </DIV>
>> ><DIV> </DIV

Subject: Re: IRQs, again
Posted by [Mark McDermott](#) on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 21:38:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>
>> ><DIV>Deej</DIV>
>> ><BLOCKQUOTE dir=3D3Dltr=3D20
>> >style=3D3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
>>=3D
>> >BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
>> > <DIV>"Tom Bruhl" <<A=3D20
>> > href=3D3D"mailto:arpegio@comcast.net">arpegio@comcast.net> =

>>wrote =3D
>> >in message=3D20
>> > news:458cd310@linux...</DIV>
>> > <DIV>I got things really cooking =
>>here with
>> =3D
>> >my new rig=3D20
>> > except the</DIV>
>> > <DIV>Creamware folks are on =
>>vacation =3D
>> >from today=3D20
>> > until 1/2/07. </DIV>
>

Subject: Re: IRQs, again
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 22:52:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t;/FONT> </DIV>
><DIV><FONT =
>>face=3D3DArial=20
>> size=3D3D2>Deej</DIV>
><BLOCKQUOTE=20
>> dir=3D3Dltr=3D20
>style=3D3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: =
>>5px;=20
>> MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =3D
>BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; =
>>MARGIN-RIGHT:=20
>> 0px">
> <DIV>"Tom Bruhl" =
>><<A=3D20
> =20
>> href=3D3D"<A=20
>> =
>>href=3D'mailto:arpegio@comcast.net">arpegio@comcast.net</A'>mailto:arpegi=
>>o@comcast.net">arpegio@comcast.net</A>>=20
>> wrote =3D
>in message=3D20
> <A href=3D3D"<A=20
>> =
>>href=3D'news:458cd310@linux">news:458cd310@linux...</DIV'>news:458cd3=
>>10@linux">

Subject: Re: IRQs, again
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Sat, 18 Nov 2006 07:44:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t;>float natively (not new really, but
>>>>better than sticking to 24-bit) and 56 or so bits in hardware instead
>of
>>>
>>>>going to Motorola DSPs at 24.

>>>>The onboard effects were also a step up from anything out there, so the
>>> demo
>>>>did sound good.
>>>>I don't recall which, but one of the demos, imho, wasn't so good (some
>>>>sloppy production and
>>>>vocals in spots, IIRC), so I only listened to it once. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>Coupled with the gain drop and buss makeup, this all gave it a "headroom"
>>> no
>>>>one else had. With very nice
>>>>onboard effects, Paris jumped ahead of anything else out there easily,
>and
>>>
>>>>still respectably holds its' own today
>>>>in that department.
>>>>
>>>>Most demos I hear (when I listen to them) vary in quality, usually not
>so
>>>
>>>>great in some area. But if a demo does
>>>>sound great, then it at least says that the product is capable of at
>
>>>>least
>>>
>>>>that level of performance, and it can
>>>>only help improve a prospective buyer's impression of it.
>>>>
>>>>Regards,
>>>>Dedric
>>>>
>>>>"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:458c14c0\$1@linux...
>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: IRQs, again
Posted by [uptown jimmy](#) on Sat, 18 Nov 2006 17:42:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

n into account, they
>>> work
>>>>>
>>>>>>exactly the same way).
>>>>>>
>>>>>>So at least when talking about apps with 32-bit float all the way
>>>>>>through,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>it's safe to say (since it has been proven) that summing isn't different

>>>>
>>>>>unless
>>>>>there is an error somewhere, or variation in how the user duplicates
>the
>>>>
>>>>>same mix in two different apps.
>>>>>
>>>>>Imho, that's actually a very good thing - approaching a more consistent
>>>>>
>>>>>basis for recording and mixing from which users can make all
>>>>>of the decisions as to how the final product will sound and not be
>>>>>required
>>>>>
>>>>>to decide when purchasing a pricey console, and have to
>>>>>focus their business on clients who want "that sound". I believe we
>are
>>>>>
>>>>>actually closer to the pure definition of recording now than
>>>>>we once were.
>>>>>
>>>>>Regards,
>>>>>Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I the answer is yes, then,the real task is to discover or rather
>>>>>> un-cover
>>>>>> what's say: Motu's vision of summing, versus Digidesign, versus
>>>>>> Steinberg
>>>>>> and so on..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> What's under the hood. To me and others,when Digi re-coded their

>>>>>> summing
>>>>>> engine, it was obvious that Pro Tools has an obvious top end (8k-10k)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> bump.
>>>>>> Where as Steinberg's summing is very neutral.
>&g

Subject: Re: IRQs, again
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Sun, 19 Nov 2006 03:35:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

r />
>>that it is very difficult to dither in a Floating Point environment.
>>Fact remains that the error shouldn't be bigger than 2 to 3 LSB's.

>>
>>Is this a problem?
>>In real world applications: NO.
>>In scientific -unrealistic- tests (forcing the error): YES.
>>
>>The alternative is having a Fixed point mixer, where you already would be
>>in trouble as soon as you boost one channel over 0dBfs. (or merge two files
>>that are @ 0dB)
>>Also, this problem will be pretty much gone as soon as we switch to the
>64
>>bit engine.
>>
>>
>>For the record, the test where Jake hears "music" as residue must be flawed.
>>You should hear noise/distortion from square waves.
>>
>>HTH
>>
>>Fredo
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:
>>>I can't tell you why you hear ProTools differently than Nuendo using a
>
>>>single file.
>>>There isn't any voodoo in the software, or hidden character enhancing
dsp.
>>
>>>I'll see if
>>>I can round up an M-Powered system to compare with next month.
>>>
>>>For reference, everytime I open Sequoia I think I might hear a broader,
>>
>>>clean,
>>>and almost flat (spectrum, not depth) sound, but I don't - it's the same
>>as
>>>Nuendo, fwiw.
>>>Also I don't think what I was referring to was a theory from Chuck -
I
>>
>>>believe that was what he
>>>discovered in the code.
>>>
>>>Digital mixers all have different preamps and converters. Unless you

are
>>
>>>bypassing every
>>>EQ and converter and going digital in and out to the same converter when
>>
>>>comparing, it would be hard
>>>to say the mix engine itself sounds different than another mixer, but
taken
>>
>>>as a whole, then
>>>certainly they may very well sound different. In addition, hardware digital
>>>mixers may use a variety of different paths between the I/O, channel
>>>processing, and summing,
>>>though most are pretty much software mixers on a single chip or set of
>dsp's
>>
>>>similar to ProTools,
>>>with I/O and a hardware surface attached.
>>>
>>>I know it may be hard to separate

Subject: Re: IRQs, again

Posted by [uptown jimmy](#) on Sun, 19 Nov 2006 18:33:07 GMT

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

ow if
>the
>>>> two
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>files truly cancel even a levels below hearing, or
>>>>>>>outside of a frequency change that we will perceive.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>When they don't cancel, usually there will be way more than 1 bit
>>>>>>>difference - it's usually one or more bits in the words for
>>>>>>>thousands of samples. From a musical standpoint this is usually
>in
>>>> a
>>>>>>>frequency range (low freq, or high freq most often) - that will
>>>>>>>show up as the difference between them, and that usually happens
>due
>>>> to
>>>>>>> some
>>>>>>>form of processing difference between the files,
>>>>>>>such as EQ, compression, frequency dependant gain changes, etc.
That
>>>> is
>>>>>>> what

>>>>>>>I believe you are thinking through, but when
>>>>>>>talking about straight summing with no gain change (or known equal
>>
>>>>>>>gain
>>>>>>>
>>>&
