
Subject: Does this seem right?

Posted by [TC](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 04:05:40 GMT

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

>above, and the RME Multiface... all those units have various &
>>sundry of the features I mentioned for around HALF that price
>>(Multiface has 8 analog i/o's, plus other digital options, &
>>word clock, but no onboard DSP... Emu & TC units have half-ass
>>versions of less i/o's and one has no word clock, but both DO
>>have DSP EFX) how hard would it be to incorporate all of these
>>features I mentioned for twice to slightly more than twice the
>>price?

>>

>>I think the 16-minimum channels of straight-up analog i/o is the
>>biggest feature set that's mi

Subject: Re: Does this seem right?

Posted by [animix](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 04:15:00 GMT

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

ssing from a lot of the half-

>>rack half-asses out there... you can do a full rock/pop/country
>>band with 16 in's - not a big huge major-label-type session
>>with top & bottom snare mics; front, back & outfront kick mics,
>>plus ambient room mics & a PZM taped to the wall or the
>>drummer's T-Shirt, plus five channels of bass & 19 channels of
>>guitar amp mics, but then the people who are doing those are
>>MOSTLY (not all, but) MOSTLY on PT systems anyway, or if
>>something like what I'm discussing were available, they could
>>just buy TWO of these units. My point is, if something like
>>this were available, with ONE unit, and no fucking around
>>trying to lightpipe & wordclock all kinds of digicrap together,
>>you could do basic tracks that looked like:

>>

>>1.) Kick

>>2.) Snare Top

>>3.) Snare Bottom

>>4.) HiHat

>>5.) OH-Right

>>6.) OH-Left

>>7.) Drum Room/Ambient Right

>>8.) Drum Room/Ambient Left

>>9.) Bass D.

Subject: Re: Does this seem right?

I.

>>10.) Bass mic'ed

>>11.) Guitar 1a

>>12.) Guitar 1b

>>13.) Guitar 2a (or Piano Lo/Keys Right)

>>14.) Guitar 2b (or Piano Hi/Keys Left)

>>15.) Scratch Vox

>>16.) Cowbell

>>

>>Want to spot-mic your toms, too? OK, maybe only use 1 guitar

>>for the basic trax & drop the cowbell if you need to & you

>>can't stereo submix your toms into to two channels, but you

>>get the idea, right? With 16 pure analog i/o you don't have to

>>lightpipe or SPDIF anything in, you can use all your "BOOTEK"

>>mic pres like your Massenbergs & your Chandlers & your Great

>>Rivers, etc - none of which come with digital i/o's - and still

>>have a GREAT setup for a full-on basic tracking session!

>>

>>Then after you track all your basics, you've got your DSP-no-

>>latency 'verb for the vocalist to hear as he's doing his real

>>takes, and DSP summing for mixdown time, just like Gay Paree

>>without the fucking mimes & the cats & the 17-day wait to

>>reauthorize like the poor couple of sonsofbitches who we've

>>seen posting the last few days; and just like PTHD, but without

>>being trapped into the endless cycle of "spend more than I

>>muthafuckin' have, spend more than I muthafucking have again

>>two years later"...

>>

>>... so why hasn't somebody done this? THIS is the market we're

>>all in, right? Those features at that price point? Wouldn't we

>>all pay it? Tomorrow, first thing in the morning? Wouldn't

>>about at least a quarter million other people that we don't

>>even know about do the same? And it can be done (obviously,

>>look at the half-assed feature sets at half the price that if

>>combined, could add up to this type of unit at that price

>>point!).

>>

>>So why? WHY hasn't anyone done this?

>>

>><Rant off>

>>Yeah.....if full spec DVD (as in 96k/24bit) was my destination format, I'd

not be using Paris for mixing anyway.

;o)

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message

news:45497267\$1@linux...

> What you do is sound, (thinking), but to go back to full spec DVD, that
> doesn't make much sense to me.

> --

> Martin Harrington

> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>

> "DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote in message news:4548e372@linux...

> > I do it often (as in almost always) for CD's. Dithering at the final
stage

> > seems to cover any quantization noise created by the truncation....but

> > this

> > is for CD's. I'm not doing DVD's here, but I would definitely apply some

> > sort of dither or noise shaping (as in using Waves IDR) to the audio,
even

> > if not going to 16 bit.

> >

> > Deej

> >

> > "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message

> > news:4542db33\$1@linux...

> >> Hmmmm

> >> So you're happy to truncate 24 bit files to 20 bit and then convert
back

> > to

> >> 24 bit for the DVD master....how does it sound?

> >> --

> >> Martin Harrington

> >> www.lendaneer-sound.com

> >>

> >> "espresso" <audio@espressodigital.com> wrote in message

> >> news:453dc969\$1@linux...

> >> > I posted this a while ago.. I now use Nuendo with a Layla 3G to
output

> >> > 8

> > > x

> >> > analog channels and 8 x ADAT stems to Paris ie. Paris is now my
mixer,

> > > its

> >> > in the same computer, its easy....hardly any overhead as all Paris is

> >> > doing

> >> > is sitting in 'live' mode. I've been doing a bunch of live concert
DVDs

> >> > with

> >> > 50 odd channels - 2 hour files - no chance I'd be wanting to convert

> >> > all

> >> > those puppies to .pafs... or even the stems for that matter. The
proof

> > is
> >> > in
> >> > the sound - the files played through Paris are alive and have depth.
> > Same
> >> > mix in Nuendo...urrrgghh. I know that I'm getting a double belt of
> >> > DA-AD
> >> > plus losing 4 bits of info through the Paris ADAT, but honestly the
end
> >> > justifies the means. All i'm trying to add to the discussion is - if
> >> > you
> >> > want the functionality of the native program plus the Paris sound its
> >> > readily achievable without having to jump through the '2nd computer
as
> > FX
> >> > buss' hoops.
> >> >
> >> > Cheers,
> >> >
> >> > David.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > "Kim" <

Subject: Re: Does this seem right?
Posted by [TC](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 05:12:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_00B7_01C6FEAC.099D6DA0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

<HTML><HEAD>

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

<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>I looked at the Steinberg website but =
didn't see=20

anything yet on this.</DIV>

<DIV>They don't list XP Pro 64 as =
the OS to use so=20
I'm a little nervous about it.</DIV>
<DIV>I probably should stay away from it=20
huh.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Anyone know?</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DAria
