

Editorial

THE WARM WELCOME accorded the first issue of *Ad Parnassum* has undoubtedly served as a strong encouragement to pursue the initiative. Indeed, while this second issue now appears, both the third and even part of the fourth are already well into their preparatory stages. This, surely, is a clear and comforting sign of great vitality. For this I would like to thank the scholars who sent their contributions and, at the same time, invite them to continue their collaboration with the journal. I also take this opportunity to remind everyone of the importance of the subscriptions (of both institutions and individuals) for the survival of *Ad Parnassum*: the journal cannot at present avail itself of public support (direct or indirect) and is forced to live on the generosity and commitment of Ut Orpheus Edizioni, which regrettably has no fairy godmothers to turn to and needs all possible solidarity (formal and material) from the academic community. In addition – this time, however, merely for cathartic purposes – I would like to share with the patient reader the astonishment displayed by certain sincere admirers of the journal for its miraculous Italian origin, given that this distinguished country boasts a singular relationship between the cultural splendour of its past and the embarrassing abstinence of the present. To say nothing of the future.

On a more specifically musicological note, we begin to register in the pages of *Ad Parnassum* a close debate on the theme of ‘musical classicism’, with contributions on its very definition, its utility or, even more bluntly, the possible mythopoeic nature of the phenomenon. Which is after all a good thing, for historically the surplus-value squeezed out of dogmas is the exclusive privilege of those who have the means to produce them. For everyone else, dogmas are an unaffordable luxury.

Allow me, now, a final consideration; or rather, a modest proposal. Given that *Ad Parnassum* is the delegated arena for investigating the history of instrumental music of the 18th and 19th centuries, it would be a good thing if some willing scholars should begin to assert here a particular ineludible problem: the relationship between the Industrial Revolution (also involving, for instance, the massive influx of pianos and harps and scores for the wider markets) and its peculiar ideological and political values and social needs, on the one hand, and the aesthetic-musical sphere, on the other. To give just one example, an awareness of its existence (or otherwise) and an analysis of this relationship in specific cases could greatly assist the stylistic and comparative scrutiny of composers like Haydn, Boccherini and Clementi, and perhaps might even generate some agreeable de-mystifying repercussions concerning the legitimacy of certain primacies of dubious acquisition. I say this because for some time I have had the impression that Adam Smith and David Ricardo – and maybe even William Thackeray – are knocking vigorously at our doors. If that is the case, is it not time to let them in?

Roberto De Caro