Reply to Tai: On the inability of 10 soloists to tell apart Old Italian and new violins at better than chance levels

Tai writes that our paper (1) “reported the inability of violinists to distinguish Stradivari violins from modern ones with regard to timbre” (2). This is incorrect. We neither stated nor implied that timbre is the sole (or even the main criteria) used by violinists in attempting to guess new or old. Although timbre is no doubt important, so too are playability, articulation, dynamic range, and so forth. Because a comprehensive set of relevant criteria has not yet been established, we make no assumptions about which criteria were or were not used in guessing age. We simply report that our 10 subjects seemed unable to guess age at better than chance levels.

It is not clear how the short-term memory problem raised by Tai applies to our study. In asking players to guess the age of violins, we were testing a widely held belief that, in the words of Langhof (3), “any musician will tell you immediately whether an instrument he is playing on is an antique instrument or a modern one.” According to this belief, the experience of playing a violin is quite sufficient for a player to recognize its oldness or newness, without reference to other instruments. Memory is therefore not the issue.

Now, if Tai is still convinced that “the short-term memory problem” is an obstacle to evaluating instruments, he should consider

that violinists routinely take their instruments to violin makers for tonal adjustments, and yet an adjustment takes much longer than 30 s. Nevertheless, players seem to know when the adjustment is right. True, they are not blindfolded, but nothing about the appearance of a violin changes during the adjustment process. Then there is also the question of how players know to come in for an adjustment in the first place. That said, 30 s is time aplenty for players to compare short phrases on two instruments.

Tai seems to criticize our study on the basis that it contradicts his own. His study, however, is based solely on the analysis of measurements and does not include perceptual validation. There is consequently no way of knowing whether the differences he measures can be distinguished by players or listeners—and if distinguishable, which instruments are actually preferred. Even if his measured differences were shown to be obvious to listeners, they still do not contradict our results. We readily admit that individual violins, new and old, may differ from one another in all kinds of ways. However, we still claim that among our test violins, any general differences between old and new were evidently insufficient for our 10

soloists to identify new and old at better than chance levels.

As for Tai’s suggestion that it would be “more reasonable to record various violins and let subjects perform blind listening tests...” our paper is concerned with judgments formed while playing instruments rather than listening to recordings of them.

**Claudia Fritz^{a,1}, Joseph Curtin^b,
and Jacques Poitevineau^a**

^a*Lutherie-Acoustique-Musique, Institut Jean le Rond d’Alembert, Unité Mixte de Recherche 7190, Sorbonne Universités–UPMC Univ Paris 06/Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 75005 Paris, France; and* ^b*Joseph Curtin Studios, Ann Arbor, MI 48103*

1 Fritz C, et al. (2014) Soloist evaluations of six Old Italian and six new violins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 111(20):7224–7229.

2 Tai H-C (2014) Role of timbre memory in evaluating Stradivari violins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 111:E2778.

3 Langhoff A (1994) Measurement of acoustic violin spectra and their interpretation using a 3D representation. *Acustica* 80(5):505–515.

Author contributions: C.F., J.C., and J.P. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: claudia.fritz@upmc.fr.