

## Editorial

**A**H WELL, WE HAD BETTER confess, since the flesh is weak (and about the spirit, the less said the better). Even *Ad Parnassum* takes drugs. In this case it's a powerful academic narcotic called *anniversine*. No doubt you will have heard of it, if you're not already a slave to it. It's a substance that strikes the central nervous system, often causing irreversible damage to the hermeneutic faculties of historians and philosophers (though slightly less damage, it seems, to musicologists and sociologists, owing to certain immune defences, which we shall refrain from exploring further). Whatever the case, we simply couldn't resist the temptation, and hence broke faith with all our attempts at detoxification. And, what's worse, by engaging John Tyrrell to write his authoritative article *Janaček and Programme Music*, we also involved the unwitting professor in our underhand celebrations of the 150th anniversary of the composer's birth. Indeed, unable to stand the 'cold turkey' any more, we have planned a liberatory orgy for our 4th issue, with articles on both Dvořák (first centenary of his death) and Glinka (second centenary of his birth). For such shameful motivations we apologize to both the authors and our readers. Naturally in the future we promise to do all we can to make a complete recovery (or at least abstain for a decent period of time), while at the same time begging compassionate understanding in the likelihood of unfortunate relapses.

Regarding the rest, allow me just a word or two on the way the themes and chronological limits of the journal's horizon of enquiry have been progressively widening. It is only natural, when dealing with the instrumental music of the 18th and 19th centuries, that one should end up by talking about that of the 17th (and its results) and 20th (and its antecedents). Clearly this is right and proper. And the same can be said for the thematic contexts and features. Therefore I see signs of richness and cultural vitality in the wide *excursus* of the present issue, which ranges from an analysis of the role and repertory of the flute in early-18th-century Italy (Federico Maria Sardelli) to contributions on Brahms and Mahler (Michele Calella and James L. Zychowicz, respectively), and from the above-cited article on Janaček to Elio Matassi's reflections on E. T. A. Hoffmann's review of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony (incidentally a paradigmatic document for music criticism and an inescapable historical-philosophical milestone for a general definition of Romanticism). Moreover, this last-mentioned text fits perfectly into the discussion of the Classical and Romantic categories launched by *Ad Parnassum* in its very first issue: a debate that has already generated contrasting opinions and, hopefully, will continue to be equally absorbing. After all, an independent journal like ours also serves this purpose: to provide space for dispute instead of censoring it. As Antonio Eximeno (who had some knowledge of matter) justly observed, «If authors were not to confute one another, the literary Republic would become a flock of sheep».

Roberto De Caro