

Re: logical paradoxes

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-08/2875.html>

From: Acme Diagnostics (*LFinezapthis_at_partpostmark.net*)

Date: 08/23/04

Date: 23 Aug 2004 03:29:06 -0500

Kenneth Doyle <nobody@notmail.com> wrote:

>"Acme Diagnostics" <LFinezapthis@partpostmark.net> wrote in

>news:41263f26\$0\$90170\$45beb828@newscene.com:

>

>My studio was only an 8 track. In 1982, that was a fairly respectable pre-

>production rig. I did a couple of years' apprenticeship in a 24 track

>studio.

Ok, now you're talking! That's way cool.

>That's where I learned all my esoteric but now redundant

>knowledge. For example, did you know that we always stored our tapes with

>the tail out? That minimises magnetic print-through, from one layer of

>tape to the next. If you store the tape tail out, the print-through makes

>a softer post-echo, which is virtually inaudible. If you store it head

>out, the print-through makes a louder pre-echo.

I remember. Got a few old reels in Mom's basement marked "tails out."

I'm one of those who asked you if you could speed up 4% so everyone

would think I was playing blues in Db.

>>>My theory is that electronic keyboards sounded better as the human

>>>interface improved. Velocity sensitive logic circuitry (along with

>>>nice weighted keys) enabled the electronics to more closely

>>>reproduce what the user was doing.

I don't think I've ever had a keyboard without properly weighted keys.

Wait – an old Lowrey organ. You'd cut your fingers on it. Really, blood.

>> I disagree, I think, sort of. There, you're talking about performance,

>> not programming a sequencer.

>

>Right, but that's my point. In the early days, you had to programme the

>amplitude envelope. Once the envelope is programmed there are no subtle

>changes that normally result from playing an instrument differently.

Ok. I give you that. We're talking pop, etc. and you just want to play

parts, or a written part, or the playing is secondary to the arranging (and I can respect that too). Sure, much easier just to hit the key than program it, especially with the "programming keyboard" (weird buttons, etc.). Giving it more thought, I was off-base with my comments. Sure, you could spend months programming a tune. The "human interface" would be a life-saver.

><snip> *For example, if you crop the first X milliseconds from the start of a note from both a guitar and a piano, you can't tell them apart anymore (where X is the the attack + decay portion of the envelope). I'm probably exaggerating to make my point here.*

Slightly. <g> But agree sometimes you cannot ID the instrument being played on a recording unless you are a long-time prof. player of that instrument. You can't always tell by sound alone. I used to argue against this, thinking I had "The Ear." But my wife gave me a test, and I failed badly. Thought a pan flute was a pipe organ!

<Edit for sheer length>

>> *Larry, not so worried about being off-topic when 90% of posts are*
>
>*I'm sure sci.logic can stand a little off-topic chatter. After all, it's*
>*not like we're just repeating the same things to each other, over and over*
>*again.*

LOL. I'm told that math and music are highly related. Probably as much as the 10th willhalt() variation. I suspect there are many musicians here or at least accomplished appreciators. I think Herman Jurjus is the resident expert on classical piano and probably classical music in general.

Larry