

Performance Studies Network International Conference
AHRC Centre for Musical Performance as Creative Practice (CMPCP)
Cambridge – July 14th–17th, 2011

From Stage to Studio (...and back again)

Dr. Amy Blier-Carruthers

Royal College of Music – amy.blier-carruthers@rcm.ac.uk

Intro:

The advent of recording is arguably the biggest change musicians have ever had to deal with; I would say that it has been much more influential than the changes to their instruments or to concert hall design during the nineteenth century. Almost overnight, they were expected to cope with a completely new mode of performing, and it must have been frightening. Let's take for example a film called *The Legend of 1900*. It's about a boy, an orphan, who was born and raised on an early transatlantic ship (like the Titanic). When he grows up he becomes an amazingly virtuosic pianist and joins the ship's band. He lives happily like this for years. A producer from a gramophone company hears of his prodigious talent and comes on board to make a recording of him. As the pianist stares at the recording horn and attached equipment, he looks worried, and as he turns to the keyboard he reluctantly says: 'This is gonna hurt, isn't it?' His performance is, as usual, magical, but as soon as he hears the master played back and the producer starts to tell him that he is going to be world-famous and sell huge numbers of records he panics and grabs the master, muttering through clenched teeth: 'My music isn't going anywhere without me.' He eventually breaks it, the only copy, into pieces.¹ I think that this scene is illustrative of how many musicians may have felt upon their first encounter with recording; eventually some people got used to it, and some people did not. The same issues are still visible to a certain extent today – distrust of the machinery, doubts about whether you like what is captured, the thought of your performance going somewhere where you are no longer in control of it, the thought of a disembodied performance existing at all.

But this sense that things were never going to be the same again... well, it was right. Things haven't been. Musicians' lives haven't been the same. Because now there was a split, there was a difference. There were concerts and there were recordings, and they are certainly not the same.

I have been working on this problem by studying the live performances and studio recordings conducted by Sir Charles Mackerras, aiming in this way to explain how these two performing

¹ *The Legend of 1900* (Medusa Produzione, 1999), Giuseppe Tornatore (dir.).

situations can be understood. In order to do this I've been looking at details of performances, and observing concerts, rehearsals, and recording sessions. Having found that many performance traits *did* vary relatively consistently depending on whether the occasion was a concert or a recording session, I asked Sir Charles, the performers, and production team members he was working with why this might be: how might they describe their approaches to and feelings about various different types of performance situation? Does their creative practice vary across different performing conditions? What kinds of factors do they have to consider when making the transition from stage to studio?

And what does it sound like? Tonight you are actually going to hear some of these differences. Not many people have heard these, so you're in for a pretty exclusive treat!

Live and Recorded are Different:

The difference between a live and studio situation may be intuitively obvious, but so far nobody has really looked at the sometimes uneasy tension between these two performance modes.

Philosophers have discussed the issue, but often come up with value-laden arguments, nearly always prioritizing the live performance. Where I differ is that I'm not interested in putting one above the other, and I'm happy for people to make various arguments on the subject: It all depends on what you're looking for, and it can work out in a number of different ways depending on how define your field of enquiry and your terms.

There *is* a problem here, however: why do people still compare and judge recordings in relation to live performances? Eric Clarke writes that '...in an age when far more music is heard via recorded and broadcast media than in live performance, we have still not arrived at a stable conception of what a recording is – “captured” performance or studio construct.'²

If we compare this situation to film and theatre, for instance, it might help us question our own attitudes a little. Film and theatre seem to have carved out separate niches for themselves - people hardly bother comparing them anymore – but in the case of classical music this emancipation of studio from stage has not so far been achieved.

One reason for this, recently suggested by one of my students,³ is that in the world of drama, film and theatre actors are usually different groups of people. This is not a luxury afforded to classical musicians; they are expected to be both, and to hop from one mode to the other at the switch of a

² Eric Clarke, 'Listening to Performance' in John Rink, *Musical Performance a Guide to Understanding* (CUP, 2002), 194.

³ I am grateful to Lindsay Wright, an undergraduate student on my course *Music in Performance* (King's College London), for suggesting this idea.

red light. And people's reaction to editing, for instance, is much more accepting in film than in music. If a classical musician admits to a splice every few bars (or even every few notes!), many would be up in arms saying that this was 'cheating'. In film, however, as the producer Andrew Keener tells Robert Philip:

'Nobody berates Meryl Streep for wanting to do twenty takes of a single twenty-second shot. Each time she will bring another nuance, another eyebrow raise, another eyelid flash, to a different part of the take.'⁴

Perhaps by looking at the differences in classical performance situations, we might start to find a way to see them independently of each other, and appreciate them for their respective merits.

Dual Methodologies:

I have chosen dual approaches, a combination of analysis and ethnography. I have found this approach useful as it allows me to find out not only *what* is going on, but perhaps also *why*. Jonathan Stock writes that 'music is process as well as product, an arena for both social action and personal reflection; it is [quoting ethnomusicologist Anthony Seeger] "emotion and value as well as structure and form"'. This dual approach is really useful in that it can reveal the crunchy bits – it can show that occasionally our original assumptions are wrong, and it can sometimes show a disconnect between theory and practice (what people say they do/want is not always necessarily what they do/want)

Today I'm going to focus on analyzing the sounds, and with only 30 mins you'll have to forgive me if it doesn't look like a perfect fusion of analysis and ethnography.

What I'll outline:

I'll quickly illustrate how concerts and recordings compare in the opinions of the people I interviewed, to give you a bit of context, and then I will outline some of the traits of performance which vary depending on performance situation (supported by some examples). It would seem that over time, people's expectations have shifted and they often expect live performances to be as polished and perfect as recorded ones, so to conclude I will consider if recording *has* influenced or subsumed live concerts, and I will offer some ways in which the balance might be redressed.

When talking about the views of my interviewees, I'll simply call them 'the violinist' or 'the engineer'. I've done my best to present the views of my sources fairly, but I by no means claim that the story I'm telling here is true of everyone everywhere.

⁴ Philip, Robert, *Performing Music in the Age of Recording* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 54.

Concerts and Recordings compared:

So, what *is* a recording, compared to a concert, for these musicians? It would seem that the main thing to remember about a recording is that it is not simply a captured live performance – it is a completely different thing.

Mackerras feels that a concert always engenders a different feeling to a recording studio: he says ‘there’s a sense of occasion at a concert, always, that must inevitably be lacking at recordings [...] It *definitely is* a different feeling.’⁵

The production team’s main concern is, of course, the making of the recording, but in order to do this they must consider how to manage the transition from the live concert to the studio. They call this a process of ‘transformation.’

The producer Michael Haas writes: ‘A studio is not a concert hall and a recording is not a concert’⁶ [...] ‘As with “live” theatre and film, the differences (in both means and ends) between recordings and concerts are so vast, that they are hardly the same art form, but we *can* enjoy both without needing to set one above the other.’ The engineer says that ‘a recording has to make up for the fact that you can’t see the performance.’⁷

As for performers, when asked to comment on their experience of live concerts and studio recordings, they all answered that the two situations were completely different: when asked if a recording should approximate a performance in a concert hall, one replied ‘It just doesn’t!’ [AM]; in another musician’s opinion, the two are so completely different that it’s ‘almost pointless comparing them!’ [LB]; one feels that different performing situations affect you differently, be it a concert or recording or radio broadcast, and you have to take different things into consideration [JC]; and another says that when doing a recording, ‘you’re in a completely different place (mode) mentally’ than when performing live [AM]. In general, where live concerts are ‘an event’, studio recordings are ‘plastic music’ and ‘sound the same every time’ [JC]; where concerts are about ‘expression’, recordings are about ‘balance and accuracy’, you have to ‘tense up, focus, and get it accurate’ [AM]; where concerts are ‘thrilling’ and ‘each night is different’, recordings are a ‘manufactured product’ [LB]; one says that concerts are ‘fabulous, but then you go into the studio and it’s not so much fun’ [LB].

⁵ Personal Communication: Interview with Sir Charles Mackerras, conductor, Thursday, December 14th, 2006.

⁶ Michael Haas, Studio Conducting, in Bowen, José Antonio (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Conducting*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 28.

⁷ Personal Communication: Interview with Andrew Hallifax, independent recording engineer, Tuesday, August 21st, 2007.

It is the event, the venue, the audience (or lack thereof), the method of working, the technical expectations, and the final result, that make the two performing modes different from each other – in fact, it would seem that the only thing that remains constant is the fact that the same musicians are playing the same music, but with every other factor being different, it is no surprise that the results might also differ.

Variable Performance Traits:

I will now look at the performance traits which vary depending on the performance situation, and play you some of the results of my analysis.

I'd like to take a second to thank the British Library for allowing me to do this research, but also to the Music Preserved Archive at the Borthwick Institute at York University – and Roger Beardsley in particular, who will be greatly missed – for magically having some of my case study recordings and allowing me play them for you.

(I'm going to be using examples from Beethoven's *Fidelio* and Mozart's Piano Concerti in D minor and C minor)

Performance traits where I have found differences between the live performance and the recording include: timbre, declamation and characterization, dramatic timing, vibrato, phrasing and articulation, dynamics, tempo, and perfection and editing.

[Intro to sound examples:]

When heard in direct comparison to each other, even for just a few seconds, and considering how many factors they have in common (piece, performers, date, and often venue), the live and studio recordings sound strikingly different.

- 1 - Example 85: [CD 2 Tr 1] *Fidelio*/Overture – Opening bars 1-12 STUDIO 0:28
- 2 - Example 86: [CD 2 Tr 2] *Fidelio*/Overture – Opening bars 1-12 LIVE 0:30
- 3 - Example 3: [CD 1 Tr 3] Piano Concerto K466/I – Ex. 3 Soloist's entry bar 77 STUDIO 0:21
- 4 - Example 4: [CD 1 Tr 4] Piano Concerto K466/I – Ex. 3 Soloist's entry bar 77LIVE 0:21

So the first thing we can consider is timbre.

Timbre:

Dan Levitin (in his book *This is Your Brain on Music*) tells us that we are very sensitive to timbre – even to the extent of randomly recognizing a pop song from a snippet of a tenth of a second (the

duration of a finger snap). It is therefore not surprising that we are so sensitive to the difference in sound when comparing two types of recording.

Firstly, the **acoustics** of a hall change when an audience is present – they are deadening the resonance of the hall with their bodies, and so performers have to adapt to this change.

5 - Example 19: [CD 1 Tr 19] *Piano Concerto K491/I* – Ex. 3 Opening LIVE 0:39

6 - Example 20: [CD 1 Tr 20] *Piano Concerto K491/I* – Ex. 3 Opening STUDIO 0:37

Balance and microphone placement:

Secondly, a live concert recorded as such for BBC Radio 3 and a studio recording picked up by more numerous carefully placed microphones will without doubt sound different.

The relative balance of sections of the orchestra, and of orchestra and soloists, is completely different on a recording to in a concert. The soloists are sonically placed at the front of a recording, potentially as an aural equivalent to their place at the front of the platform, but to necessarily in keeping with what one usually hears in the concert hall. Here we have only the piano, but we can tell he's in a different place in the texture.

7 - Example 37: [CD 1 Tr 37] *Piano Concerto K466/III* – Ex. 16 piano entry after tutti LIVE 0:15

8 - Example 38: [CD 1 Tr 38] *Piano Concerto K466/III* – Ex. 16 piano entry after tutti STUDIO 0:15

Declamation and Characterisation:

Declamatory style and characterization includes the concepts of theatricality, acting and staging, and occasion. This has to do with how the performer puts his message across to the audience or listener. In a live situation, the musicians must project their performance over a significant distance to the audience. In a studio they have the closeness of the microphone and the lack of an audience to contend with. In the case of opera the microphone is directly in front of the singer, each singer is miked-up separately, and as we know the microphone is undiscerning and unforgiving. If one exactly replicated one's stage performance under these circumstances (especially considering that the listener at home would also be lacking the visual stimulus and distractions of a live performance), it would risk sounding far too potent and possibly over-done.

Generally, the result is that the performances in the studio recording often come across as much more restrained, that the necessity for precision has required a reining in of exuberance in the performance style. Upon closer examination it seems that this difference in characterisation is a result of several factors occurring at any one time, including tempo, vibrato, dynamics (or range of dynamics), pronunciation, and articulation.

The character in this next example is much tamer in the studio recording; the whole feeling of the two performances is completely different. The live performance is a bit faster and the soloists are singing more loudly to fill the hall.

[use 30 and 30 seconds]

9 - Example 117: [CD 2 Tr 33] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – End *Un poco piu Allegro* STUDIO 0:36

10 - Example 118: [CD 2 Tr 34] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – End *Un poco piu Allegro* LIVE 0:40

The lead-in to the recapitulation of the first movement of this piano concerto is executed with much more *rubato* in the live performance, both in the flute cadence and the following 1st violin lead-in.

11 - Example 47: [CD 1 Tr 47] *Piano Concerto K491/III* – Ex. 7 Recap lead-in STUDIO 0:22

12 - Example 48: [CD 1 Tr 48] *Piano Concerto K491/III* – Ex. 7 Recap lead-in LIVE 0:21

Dramatic Timing:

The dramatic timing is how I describe the order in which you perform the work.

Making a recording is a split-up process (built up from bits which are put together at the end, and producers work hard to achieve what they call a convincing ‘span’ for the recording), whereas a live performance is continuous, a progression from the beginning to the end of the work. This has an impact on the whole performance. In opera especially, the progression of numbers and arias is a lot less predictable and tidy than a carefully organized CD with separate tracks.

[‘This is just one live example.’]

13 - Example 176: [CD 2 Tr 92] *Fidelio*/ No. 8 Duet – Applause at end and straight into recit LIVE 0:15

Vibrato:

There are some discernible differences in vibrato between live and studio performances. Generally, in the operatic examples, vibrato often seems to be more intense in a live performance, perhaps to fill the acoustic space or express emotion, or to bridge the physical gap between the performer and audience.

In the *Fidelio* performances I examined, it appears that in studio recordings vibrato is often slower and wider, and in concerts the vibrato is quicker and narrower. I at first hypothesized that live performances seemed more overtly expressive because the singers were employing a wider vibrato, but this has turned out not to be the case. It seems that in these case studies live performances have a more active or exciting quality to them due to a vibrato which is not wider, but quicker (and narrower) – this creates a sense of heightened activity.

In his first line, Rocco/Siegfried Vogel sings with a wider and slower vibrato on the studio recording.

14 - Example 186: [CD 3 Tr 3] *Fidelio* 'Ach, Vater, Vater, eilt!' – 'Des Königs...' Rocco entry STUDIO 0:07

15 - Example 187: [CD 3 Tr 4] *Fidelio* 'Ach, Vater, Vater, eilt!' – 'Des Königs...' Rocco entry LIVE 0:10 (stop at 0:07)

['Let's hear those again']

This holds true for the female singers as well. The opening bars of Marzelline's first Aria (No. 2) find Ildikó Raimondi singing with approximately the same speed of vibrato, but with a narrower one in the live performance.

16 - Example 196: [CD 3 Tr 13] *Fidelio*/No. 2 Aria – Opening bars 1-10 LIVE 0:30

17 - Example 197: [CD 3 Tr 14] *Fidelio*/No. 2 Aria – Opening bars 1-10 STUDIO 0:29

Phrasing and Articulation:

Phrasing and articulation differ quite frequently between live and recorded performances. The notes often seem fuller and more sustained in the recordings, whereas they are shorter and more separated in the live performance

18 - Example 65: [CD 1 Tr 65] *Piano Concerto K466*/I – Ex. 1 Opening LIVE 0:30

19 - Example 66: [CD 1 Tr 66] *Piano Concerto K466*/I – Ex. 1 Opening STUDIO 0:30

Dynamics:

Dynamics cannot be discussed with any certainty, as the loudness of the recordings are dependent on the levels set when they were transferred. The musicians *do* have some interesting opinions on this, but I don't have time to go into those here.

Tempo:

Live and studio performances often seem to have similar tempi, which is quite striking in itself, but when they *are* different, the live performance nearly always seems to be quicker.⁸ This might have something to do with the heightened excitement of the players and conductor. Apart from the purely physical effects of tense or adrenaline-producing situations, it is not possible in the moment to view one's actions from an objective distance, and it is often difficult to consciously slow down or take time.

20 - Example 254: [CD 3 Tr 71] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – Beginning STUDIO 0:20

21 - Example 255: [CD 3 Tr 72] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – Beginning LIVE 0:25

I will now mention one **Impact that recording has had on playing styles:**

⁸ One of Dorottya Fabian's interviewees says: "I take more risks with a live audience – faster tempos etc" in Fabian (2008), 244.

Perfection and editing:

The main long-term impact of recording that musicians working today identify is the expectation of perfection

The issue of perfection, and by inference mistakes, comes up repeatedly in discussions of studio recording in the academic literature, but I wonder if they are really as much of an issue in modern recordings as they used to be, or as they are made out to have been by modern commentators.

Today, the standard of professional singing and playing is so high that even in live performances audible mistakes are rare, and from the evidence of this research, much less common even than we might expect. This is not to say that players don't struggle to get things right – they do, every day of their lives – but they do such a good job that an audience member won't hear very many major mistakes in any given live performance.⁹

However, despite this, perfection is still a major worry for performers, in two main ways. Firstly, even if the audience won't notice the mistake, their peers will – it's a matter of who's listening. Secondly, it almost seems that there's a myth of perfection, like an invisible bar that's been set by recordings, and that critics will hold you to in the effort to find something to say – 'pity about that frog in bar 263'.

All the musicians said that recording has influenced the public's expectations to such an extent that perfection of execution is now seen as not just the ideal but the norm. But any concert-goer knows that even the most exciting, masterfully-played concert by one of the best orchestras is not going to be completely flawless. But it seems, though, that bit by bit we may have come to expect more and more perfect performances, unthinkingly, *even* in the concert hall.

Musicians don't like having to prioritize perfection, they don't want to be 'slaves to wrong notes',¹⁰ and would like things to be different. However, this preference for sacrificing perfection for the energy of a live event does not extend so far as a willingness to release completely unedited lifelike recordings. The trumpeter admits that although he loves the expression of the live concert best, he 'couldn't live with releasing a recording with mistakes' (for instance an unedited live performance). Although the approach is a more honest one, it just wouldn't sound good enough, because 'the

⁹ According to two relatively new members of Manchester's *Hallé* orchestra, the main thing they practise for and worry about is to play as well as possible, with as few mistakes – *none*, if possible. Of course the musicality is important, but your colleagues (or your conductor or audience) will hear your mistakes more than they will hear the levels of more or less musical expression.

¹⁰ Emanuel Ax in Sachs, Harvey, 'Six Famous Ears: Emanuel Ax, Alfred Brendel and Andras Schiff Tell How They Listen', interviews gathered for the Orpheus Instituut, Ghent, Belgium, and presented as a paper at the conference 'The Musician as Listener', May 22-23, 2008.

market has been cultivated and we've been trained to want something that's physically impossible live.'

What musicians really want, it would seem, is the time and money and support necessary to give them the opportunity to get something they're happy with down on record (and the measure of that might not only be perfection).

Some ways balance being redressed:

["this is the 'and back again...' bit of my title"]

'Live' Recordings:

The classical recording industry is suffering financially and studio time is becoming increasingly limited, which means that the likelihood of making a recording you're happy with is diminishing, not improving. But orchestras are now finding new ways of making money, one of which is by making and releasing so-called 'live' recordings. This entails recording the live concert, but there is still some editing involved, as any mistakes are patched-in by using parts of the rehearsal or if necessary being re-taken in a patching session.

With the decline of traditional commercial recording, these are now a financial necessity – they are much cheaper to produce - but they *are* also artistically preferable for some of the orchestra-members, because they are more like the real thing, they're closer to a concert.

However, some like them, and some don't.

This mixed attitude is probably not surprising, considering the mixed nature of this mode of performance/recording. The engineer posits that whilst 'live' recording could be seen as offering the best of both worlds, it equally 'could be seen as possibly the *worst* of both worlds, because the musicians aren't comfortable with the hybrid performance situation, the clash of two mutually exclusive performance modes.'¹¹

This is because the musicians are trying to do more than one thing at once – they're stuck between being prepared for the excitement of a live concert and trying to attain the perfection of a recording.

So with this new situation, recordings are now influencing performance in the sense that the existence of recording is invading the concert hall. Musicians can no longer be as uninhibited – again, perfection is creeping in. So we can see that this genre is mostly welcomed as an alternative to a straight recording session, but *it also* has its problems.

We seem to be somewhat stuck in a vicious circle.

¹¹ Personal Communication: Interview with Andrew Hallifax, independent recording engineer, Tuesday, August 21st, 2007.

Let a Recording be a Recording:

However, I would like to suggest that a way out of this is to stop comparing one against the other – that we allow performances and recordings to be emancipated from each other, that we enjoy live performances that might not be perfect, and that we let a recording be a recording.

There are ways in which a recording can be more successful than a live performance, where a recording can help us hear (and experience) things which we often can't in a live context; they render audible passages which would normally be obscured in live performance, such as inner lines, quiet accompanied solo passages or complex solo passagework. In this example the soloist's right-hand line cannot be heard very well in the live recording, but both hands are very clear in the studio recording.

22 - Example 39: [CD 1 Tr 39] *Piano Concerto K466/I* – Ex. 9 bars 153-58 LIVE 0:12

23 - Example 40: [CD 1 Tr 40] *Piano Concerto K466/I* – Ex. 9 bars 153-58 STUDIO 0:13

When it is the case of a singing part, this can make a huge difference to how the plot of the opera is understood, as it is easier to miss entire lines of text in a live performance (although the more recent advent of surtitles helps with this).

In the Quartett (No. 3) in *Fidelio*, Jacquino is shocked and hurt to find that the woman he loves and has just asked to marry him is in love with someone else, to whom her father is in the process of betrothing her.

24 - Example 93: [CD 2 Tr 9] *Fidelio*/No. 3 Quartett – Jacquino bars 40-48 LIVE 0:35

25 - Example 94: [CD 2 Tr 10] *Fidelio*/No. 3 Quartett – Jacquino bars 40-48 STUDIO 0:30

In conclusion:

So, having found that live performances and studio recordings do differ, but that they are often unhelpfully compared to each other, what's the solution to this situation which some feel is unsatisfactory? I have neither the time here nor the expertise to really offer a magic cure, but I'm sure it has something to do with ontology – allowing each medium to be what it is – but it also has to do with money, time, and control or empowerment. It will also have something to do with what we all think a performance really should be – perfect, or expressive?

This is something that I think needs to be opened for debate, for classical music to be really successful; something that will need to be grappled with by the players, singers, conductors, orchestras, managers, producers, record companies, critics, and even the listeners, the consumers... and... scholars. In fact, everyone here!

Thank you

CMPCP – CD examples

- 1 Example 85: [CD 2 Tr 1] *Fidelio*/Overture – Opening bars 1-12 STUDIO
- 2 Example 86: [CD 2 Tr 2] *Fidelio*/Overture – Opening bars 1-12 LIVE

- 3 Example 3: [CD 1 Tr 3] Piano Concerto K466/I – Ex. 3 Soloist's entry bar 77 STUDIO
- 4 Example 4: [CD 1 Tr 4] Piano Concerto K466/I – Ex. 3 Soloist's entry bar 77LIVE

- 5 Example 19: [CD 1 Tr 19] *Piano Concerto K491/I* – Ex. 3 Opening LIVE
- 6 Example 20: [CD 1 Tr 20] *Piano Concerto K491/I* – Ex. 3 Opening STUDIO

- 7 Example 37: [CD 1 Tr 37] *Piano Concerto K466/III* – Ex. 16 piano entry after tutti LIVE
- 8 Example38: [CD 1 Tr 38] *Piano Concerto K466/III* – Ex. 16 piano entry after tutti STUDIO

- 9 Example117: [CD 2 Tr 33] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – End *Un poco piu Allegro* STUDIO
- 10 Example 118: [CD 2 Tr 34] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – End *Un poco piu Allegro* LIVE

- 11 Example 47: [CD 1 Tr 47] *Piano Concerto K491/III* – Ex. 7 Recap lead-in STUDIO
- 12 Example48: [CD 1 Tr 48] *Piano Concerto K491/III* – Ex. 7 Recap lead-in LIVE

- 13 Example 176: [CD 2 Tr 92] *Fidelio*/ No. 8 Duet – Applause at end and straight into recit LIVE

- 14 Example 186: 102[CD 3 Tr 3] *Fidelio*' 'Ach, Vater, Vater, eilt!' – 'Des Königs...' Rocco entry STUDIO
- 15 Example 187: 103 [CD 3 Tr 4] *Fidelio*' 'Ach, Vater, Vater, eilt!' – 'Des Königs...' Rocco entry LIVE

- 16 Example 196: 112[CD 3 Tr 13] *Fidelio*/No. 2 Aria – Opening bars 1-10 LIVE
- 17 Example 197: 113 [CD 3 Tr 14] *Fidelio*/No. 2 Aria – Opening bars 1-10 STUDIO

- 18 Example 65: [CD 1 Tr 65] *Piano Concerto K466/I* – Ex. 1 Opening LIVE
- 19 Example66: [CD 1 Tr 66] *Piano Concerto K466/I* – Ex. 1 Opening STUDIO

- 20 Example 254: 170[CD 3 Tr 71] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – Beginning STUDIO
- 21 Example 255: 171 [CD 3 Tr 72] *Fidelio*/No. 1 Duet – Beginning LIVE

- 22 Example 39: [CD 1 Tr 39] *Piano Concerto K466/I* – Ex. 9 bars 153-58 LIVE
- 23 Example 40: [CD 1 Tr 40] *Piano Concerto K466/I* – Ex. 9 bars 153-58 STUDIO

- 24 Example 93: [CD 2 Tr 9] *Fidelio*/No. 3 Quartett – Jacquino bars 40-48 LIVE
- 25 Example 94: [CD 2 Tr 10] *Fidelio*/No. 3 Quartett – Jacquino bars 40-48 STUDIO