INTRODUCTION

Carlo Donato Cossoni (1623–1700) was a prolific composer active in Northern Italy (Como, Milan, Bologna, and his native village of Gravedona) between the 1660s and 1690s. Beside the sixteen opus numbers issued in print (two of which are now lost), a large number of compositions, especially sacred works, are preserved in autograph manuscripts. Some of those manuscripts are in the archive of the Duomo in Como, and many more reside in the Benedictine Abbey of Einsiedeln (Switzerland), to which Cossoni bequeathed his personal archive of sacred works, including not only scores but also a remarkable number of parts for more than seventy compositions. Yet only a few compositions are transmitted both in autograph and printed form.

Among these are two solo motets and a canzonetta, preserved in autographs in Como and Vienna, and in printed editions from the composer’s years in Bologna. The double sources for these works present interesting differences, both in overall structure, with entire sections replaced or deleted, and in details, such as alteration of harmony and embellishments. Contrary to what one might expect, the changes from the (presumably) earlier manuscript to the printed versions appear to be not so much motivated by the desire for compositional revision as by the need to comply with the technical limitations and economic constraints of seventeenth-century printing.

The unique aspect of our edition lies in providing both versions of these three compositions. Each is presented twice: first individually, in the usual “portrait” format suitable for performance, and then in a “pocket score” format, on facing pages. With this double presentation, we hope to serve the needs of both the performer and the scholar. The differences between the two versions may encourage singers to add their own variants and embellishments, while scholars will be able to explore Cossoni’s motives for introducing each variation.

Biography

Carlo Donato Cossoni was born in Gravedona on the northwestern shore of Lake Como, and was baptized on 11 November 1623. He studied at the Jesuit College of Como, where he was ordained in October 1646. Four years later he obtained a post as organist at San Fedele in Como, where he remained until 1656. In November 1659, he unsuccessfully competed for the post of organist at the Duomo in Milan. For some years he worked as an organist in several minor Milanese churches, including Santa Maria Segreta and San Giuseppe. During this period he became a member of the Accademia dei Faticosi. On 3 November 1662 he was appointed first organist at San Petronio in Bologna, where he served under maestro di cappella Maurizio Cazzati. He held this post for eight years, a particularly prolific period during which he published eleven volumes of music. In or around 1666, he became one of the first members of the Accademia Filarmonica, founded by Marchese Vincenzo Carrati.

Until 1668, Cossoni published exclusively sacred music, notably solo and two- and three-voice motets, psalms, and lamentations. In 1669, his first secular collection, Il primo libro delle canzonette amorose, op. 7, appeared in print. By November 1671, Cossoni was back in Milan.

---

2 The following biographical summary is based on Timoteo Morresi, “Scheda biografica,” in Claudio Bacciaglaluppi and Luigi Collarile, Carlo Donato Cossoni (1623–1700): catalogo tematico (Bern: Peter Lang, 2009).
From March 1672 until August 1681, he celebrated daily mass in the chapel of the Trivulzio family in the church of Santo Stefano in Brolio. In 1675, on the title page of his op. 12, Cossoni calls himself *maestro di camera* to Prince Antonio Maria Teodoro Trivulzio (1649–1678). During the following decade he published three new collections of music. In July 1681 the bishop of Como gave him a canonry in the collegiate church of his native town Gravedona.

At the end of December 1685, Cossoni was appointed *maestro di cappella* at the Duomo of Milan. This put a stop to a long dispute between Archbishop Federico Visconti, opposed to his appointment, and the Milanese aristocracy and *Fabbrica del Duomo*, the vestry board of the cathedral charged with the management of the chapel, who favored it. During Cossoni’s tenure, the choir consisted of eighteen to nineteen singers. Instruments were banned from the cathedral, and exceptions were rarely granted. Cossoni was paid regularly until August 1692, when he left Milan and moved to Gravedona, to spend the final years of his life. In 1694 he published his last collection, *Quattro Messe, tre piene e brevi e l’altra fugata*, op. 16. He wrote his last compositions between August and November 1699: the motet *Ecce sacerdos magnus* (CC 83) and the psalm *Miserere mei Deus* (CC 72). Despite being in Gravedona, Cossoni remained friendly with the *maestro di cappella* of Como’s Duomo, Francesco Spagnoli Rusca (c. 1634–1704), and dedicated his final *Miserere* to him.

From manuscript to print

As music’s essence is performance, notation provides only an indirect and imperfect representation. However, our access to seventeenth-century music necessarily passes through notated scores. It is therefore important to question the specific limits of the various forms taken by music when it is put down on paper. The examples from Cossoni’s output we wish to present here are preserved in two authoritative formats, autograph scores and music prints, each with its own limitations. Autograph scores may contain traces of different layers of textual elaboration. The rationale behind these elaborations, however, needs to be interpreted. Variants may be due to a compositional choice or to a specific occasion, such as that of adapting a composition to a particular performer’s skills. Much seventeenth-century music is known today only from printed sources. To consider a printed musical text as representative of the composer’s ultimate will is problematic. A printed text may be the result of a complex interaction of several factors and individual agendas. The author may wish to project a certain image of himself and his compositional activity, the publisher will have to consider the technical limitations of his press and the market for his editorial product, and the public itself will set restrictions through its expectations of what to find in a music print.

Two motets by Cossoni are preserved both in a print from 1667 and in autograph scores from the Archivio Musicale del Duomo in Como: *Peccavi, Domine* (CC 225 and 225a), for soprano and continuo, and *Quaerens dilectum* (CC 231 and 231a), for alto (or soprano) and

---

3 The complex political implications were unraveled by Marina Toffetti in “No haria de haverse mezclado el conde: Ancora su Carlo Donato Cossoni nella Milano spagnola,” *Studi musicali*, new series 1 (2010): 187–250.
5 The numbering (with the abbreviation CC) refers to the catalogue by Bacciagaluppi and Collarile, *Carlo Donato Cossoni*.
6 An expanded version in Italian of the following sections can be found in Claudio Bacciagaluppi and Luigi Collarile, “Dal manoscritto alla stampa. In margine ad alcune partiture autografe di Carlo Donato Cossoni (1623–1700),” *La musica e il sacro*, ed. by Alberto Colzani, Andrea Luppi, and Maurizio Padoan (Como: AMIS, forthcoming).
continuo. A third example of double transmission, printed and autograph, is the secular canzonetta *Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa* (CC 264 and 264a) for bass and continuo, preserved in a print from 1669 and in a manuscript miscellany from the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. A brief discussion follows, suggesting but a few of the thoughts that may arise from the systematic comparison of such fortunate cases of double transmission.

**Peccavi, Domine**
The music of *Peccavi, Domine* presents a loose alternation between recitative and arioso sections. Three recitative-style sections are to be found: at the beginning, at the words “Suspiro…” and finally at the words “Ad Mariam ergo curro,” marked Largo (possibly implying a tempo change at “Sub tutela virginali”). An “Alleluia” concludes the piece, a standard feature of solo motets. The musical setting only roughly follows the structure of the underlying text, which starts with a prose section (“Peccavi, Domine”), and continues with a free paraphrase of the Marian antiphon *Salve Regina* (from “Non ad Deum pietatis” to “praeces ad Filium”). Four verses of three lines each (“Ad Mariam ergo curro”) precede the “Alleluia.”

The autograph score is clearly a working copy (Figure 1). The original vocal embellishment in measures 82–84, for example, was re-composed. Cossoni doubled the value of two notes in the bass line in order to accommodate a longer vocal line (see Examples 1 and 2). There are also other instances of changes in the score: variants in pitch for the vocal line (measures 27–29, 121–23) or for the continuo (measure 61), and changes in the text underlay (measures 98–102 and correspondingly 109–12). The corrected version is always found in the print (with very slight differences). This strongly suggests that the manuscript version was created before the publication of the motet in 1667.

---

7 The first motet is No. 6 in the *Primo libro de motetti a voce sola*, opus 2, RISM C 4201, and in the second edition of 1668, RISM C 4202. The shelf mark of the autograph is I-COd AA-43; see Alessandro Picchi, *Archivio musicale del Duomo di Como: Catalogo delle opere a stampa e manoscritte dei secoli XVI-XVIII* (Como-Baradello: Rotary Club, [1990]), 143, not catalogued as an autograph. The second motet is No. 16 in the same prints. The shelf mark of the autograph is I-COd V-27; see Picchi, *Archivio musicale*, 113.

8 The canzonetta is No. 17 in the *Primo libro delle canzonette amorose a voce sola*, opus 7, RISM C 4207, and No. 4 in the manuscript miscellany *A-Wn* Mus. Hs. 17760.

---
The motet underwent additional, extensive revision during the preparation of the printed version. Recitatives became richer in contrast, as seen at the opening of the motet, where note values became more differentiated.\(^9\) An Allegro in \(\frac{4}{4}\) was rewritten as a Presto in \(\frac{3}{2}\).\(^10\) The use of ritornelli was varied: one ritornello was suppressed, and the following expanded.\(^11\) Further, the concluding “Alleluia” section was replaced by a new one.\(^12\) However, the two “Alleluia” sections have certain common elements: the phrases are of comparable length, in both versions the basso continuo includes a “passaggiato” figure in \(\frac{3}{4}\), and the vocal lines of both include remarkable melismatic dotted-rhythm figurations. On the other hand, several changes rendered the printed version less sophisticated than the manuscript one. Some embellishments and complex rhythms were simplified,\(^13\) and some repetitions were eliminated.\(^14\) Five trills were omitted in the print.\(^15\)

---

\(^9\) Ms. and print: measures 2–5.
\(^10\) Ms.: measures 113 and following; print: measures 108 and following.
\(^11\) Ms.: measures 147 and 153; print: measures 163 (without ritornello), 169–70.
\(^12\) Ms.: measures 160–78 (the “Alleluia” is incomplete); print: measures 177–205.
\(^14\) Ms.: measures 69–74; print: measures 69–70.
\(^15\) Ms.: measures 137–40; print: measures 153–55.
and two leaps were replaced by a linear melodic progression.\textsuperscript{16}

How might we explain these revisions? The printed motet is dedicated to a singer, “Al Molto Illustre Molto Reverendo Signor Don Florenio Filiberi. Musico Celeberrimo del’llustrissimo Monsignor [Luca] Torregiani Arcivescovo di Ravenna” (Figure 2). The print may thus reflect a version of the motet that Cossoni tailored for the voice and skills of its dedicatee. The changes in the opening recitative fit perfectly into this scenario. The simplified embellishments and rhythms and the omitted repetitions, however, may have a different origin. They may have been prompted by the technical and economic limitations of printing. Perhaps the printer did not have a sufficient number of thirty-second notes in his character set, and therefore had to rewrite two passages in the manuscript (measures 9, 137–40). Perhaps he wished to save on paper, which was the most influential factor in printing expenses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and for this reason he cut any unnecessary repeats.\textsuperscript{17}

Figure 2: Carlo Donato Cossoni, \textit{Peccavi, Domine}, first page of printed score (second edition, I-Bc Z.10, 90–1). Reproduced with permission Museo internazionale e biblioteca della musica, Bologna.

\textit{Quaerens dilectum}

The text of the motet \textit{Quaerens dilectum} may be described as a series of six-syllable lines, with an ABABCD\textsuperscript{C}D etc. rhyme scheme, albeit with some inconsistencies. Presumably, the anonymous author was thinking in terms of modern Italian rather than classical Latin poetry. A metrical description of the lines as \textit{senari} is therefore justified. The content is split between a narrative voice and a protagonist. A narrator sets the scene at the beginning, describing how the protagonist (the soul) is desperately looking for her beloved (Jesus). The soul then speaks, voicing her longing. The text reaches a feeling of closure by returning to the narrator’s voice at the end. In his musical setting, Cossoni interrupts the soul’s monologue (after “cantate laetantes”) partly to restate the narrator’s introduction, transforming it into a sort of ritornello. The latter part of the motet cannot be described in general terms, because it is transmitted in two quite different versions, as will be shown presently.

The autograph of \textit{Quaerens dilectum} shows no traces of the compositional process, and appears to be a fair copy (Figure 3). Still, this version of the motet differs substantially from the one published in 1667. The concluding section of the manuscript—a sort of hopeful prayer in ternary rhythm, followed by a repetition of the opening phrase—was left out in the print. Rather

\textsuperscript{16} Ms.: measures 127–28; print: 137–38.
\textsuperscript{17} See e.g. Lucien Febvre – Henri-Jean Martin, \textit{L’apparition du livre} ([Paris]: Michel, 1958), 118–25.
than a compositional choice, the omission of the reprise could be an economic choice, as we have seen previously, shortening the piece and sparing paper costs. But this cut has radical consequences for the narrative structure of the motet. The return of the narrator’s voice in the final measures closed a circle around the “scene” of direct speech of the nearly despairing soul. Without this return, the dramatic dimension of the piece is much weakened.

Figure 3: Carlo Donato Cossoni, *Quaerens dilectum*, first page of autograph score (I-COd V-27, fol. [1r]). Reproduced with permission Archivio musicale del Duomo, Como.

A conspicuous difference between the two versions is their differing tonality. The manuscript version, for soprano and continuo, is in A major, but without any sharps in the key signature. The printed version, for alto and continuo, is in D major, with two sharps in the key signature. Which key should be considered the original one? The printed score actually prescribes an optional performance for soprano at the upper fifth, as seen by the double clefs (Figure 4). However, the transposition was not carried out mechanically. A revealing passage is the variant in the opening recitative on the words “ardore consumpta” (Examples 3 and 4). The underlying harmony in the printed version is quite uneventful: A major, D major sixth chord, G major. In the manuscript, E major is followed by an exceptionally “difficult” (for modal theory) C-sharp major, repeated after an intermediate G-sharp major sixth chord. The affective content of the underlying words (“consumed by her fire”) is undoubtedly well rendered.

18 The same applies to the motet *Beatus vir qui inventus est* (CC 184), which precedes *Quaerens dilectum* in the printed edition; see Bacciagaluppi and Collarile, *Carlo Donato Cossoni*, 50–51.
If the printed version were the original, a verbatim transposition would produce a “plain” D major, which Cossoni might later have changed in order to render the passage more expressive. On the other hand, if the manuscript version were the original, the transposition a fifth lower in the print would produce an F-sharp major chord. Cossoni would likely then have changed the passage because F-sharp major, even if it is “less difficult” than C-sharp, was still problematic, considering both modal theory and the prevalence of unequal temperament. We tend to prefer the second hypothesis, because modification at the time of publishing the motet would follow the same pattern seen in *Peccavi, Domine*. In both cases, a substantial number of textual variants is due not to compositional choice, but to the necessity of adapting the music to the publisher’s needs. These can arise from the wish to appeal to the public, simplifying passages that are rhythmically or harmonically too difficult, or from the wish to contain the printing costs, shortening phrases and cutting repeats.
**Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa**

Cossoni’s canzonetta *Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa* is an ironic renunciation of love, with the lady wooed (“Lilla,” possibly an invented name, recurring also in other pieces from Cossoni’s opus 7) having left the poet too long awaiting a reply. The poet exaggerates his distress, using a poetic commonplace (“questo al parer mio / è duol ch’ogn’altro duol avanza,” “this, I think, / is a pain that surpasses all other pains”) which would later also be used by Niccolò Giuvo in the libretto for Handel’s *Aci, Galatea e Polifemo* (HWV 72, “Ahi, questo è duol ch’ogn’altro duolo avanza”). The text of the canzonetta is attributed in the autograph score to an otherwise unknown “Canoni co Grossi.” It has six sections, each closed by a repetition of the opening line, used as a vocal ritornello. The entire first section is restated at the end. The remaining sections differ in their metrical structure, not unlike chamber cantata texts. The two central sections are stanzas in short lines (*senari*), suggesting an arioso musical setting as the most appropriate; the second and the fifth sections have long lines (*settenari* and *endecasillabi*), suggesting a recitative-like setting. Here Cossoni does not disregard the text author’s suggestions, as he did in the two motets. Still, the realization is far from being mechanical, as two examples will show. The composer closely follows the text in the sections in *stile recitativo*, alternating free recitative with short *a tempo* episodes. To avoid an immediate repetition of the words “Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa,” Cossoni overlaps the ritornello of the fifth section with the first line of the last section.

The autograph of the canzonetta is preserved in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna as part of the music collection of Emperor Leopold I (Figure 5). In this case as well, a comparison with the printed version of 1669 (Figure 6) shows numerous variants, starting with the opening ritornello. The “motto” (“Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa,” “Time is needed, and then–God only knows”) is initially stated only once in the printed version, but three times in the manuscript. The running sixteenth notes in the bass line are replaced by eighth notes in the print. Later, changes in the embellishments in the vocal line are somewhat inconsistent. A short section is replaced by one measure of simple recitative. The tessitura is narrowed in one recitative. Short passages are cut out, including a harmonically important half measure leading into the final ritornello.

---

19 The library catalog had attributed the canzonetta to Giovanni Antonio Cossoni, Carlo Donato’s father; see *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum …*, ed. by Josef Mantuani (Vienna: Gerold, 1897, reprint Graz: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 1965), 10: 51.

20 Ms.: measures 1–20; print: measures 1–8.

21 The ms. is more florid in measure 74 (print: measure 42), but less embellished in measures 79–81 (print: measures 53–7).

22 Ms.: measures 55–59; print: measures 34–35.

23 Ms.: measures 116–19; print: measures 84–86.

Although the interventions are similar to those found in the two motets, it is unfortunately not possible to tell precisely when the manuscript was written. Another possibly related question concerns the circumstances of its transfer to Vienna. Our hypothesis is that the manuscript belonged to the singer Lorenzo Gaggiotti (d. 1697), who was at the emperor’s service in 1686–87.25 Both Cossoni and Gaggiotti were members of the San Petronio chapel and the Accademia Filarmonica in Bologna.26 Gaggiotti was furthermore the dedicatee of two compositions by

Cossoni: the motet *O regina Dei mater* (CC 220), printed around 1673 in his op. 12,\(^{27}\) and the canzonetta *Un’empia fortuna* (CC 288) printed in 1669 in op. 7—in fact, the piece immediately following *Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa*. The manuscript version from Vienna, more extended and embellished than the printed version, may have been composed with Gaggiotti’s qualities as a virtuoso bass singer in mind. In this scenario, Cossoni would have then simplified and shortened the musical text for publication, complying with the necessities of the print market. The first version may have remained among the singer’s personal belongings and traveled with him to the Viennese imperial court in early 1686.

**Conclusions**

In the three cases presented here, the passage from autograph to print sometimes introduced substantial changes. In our view, these derive from the specific constraints of the print medium. The changes generally tended to simplify the music, with the aim of satisfying the requirements of a publishing market that itself is open to various influences. While the manuscript version may reflect specific circumstances, or even be expressly conceived for a single performer, the print is directed towards a general audience: the buyers are not the same musicians as the commissioners.

It is difficult to judge how far these observations can be extended to the output of Cossoni’s contemporaries. Still, if we recall how much seventeenth-century repertoire is only transmitted in print, it is easy to imagine how different its appearance may be from how it was first conceived. Unfortunately, a double transmission is seldom found in this time—the works published here provide precious evidence for the process of transfer from autograph to print. While Carlo Donato Cossoni will remain a secondary figure in the general history of music, the extraordinary number of preserved autographs makes him an interesting case study, providing insight into the complex and changing nature of music depending on how it was transmitted.
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\(^{27}\) For the date of op. 12 see Bacciagaluppi and Collarile, *Carlo Donato Cossoni*, 21–26.
EDITORIAL REPORT

Abbreviations
The abbreviation CC followed by a number is a reference to the entries in the thematic catalogue of Cossoni’s works: Claudio Bacciagaluppi and Luigi Collarile, Carlo Donato Cossoni (1623–1700): catalogo tematico (Bern: Peter Lang, 2009).

Libraries are cited with their RISM sigla:
_1-Bc_ = Bologna (Italy), Museo internazionale e biblioteca della musica.
_1-COd_ = Como (Italy), Archivio musicale del Duomo.
_1-Wn_ = Vienna (Austria), Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung.

Reference is made to the following literature:
Picchi, _Archivio musicale_ = Alessandro Picchi, Archivio musicale del Duomo di Como: Catalogo delle opere a stampa e manoscritte dei secoli XVI-XVIII (Como-Baradello: Rotary Club, [1990]).

Sources
_Peccavi Domine_ (manuscript version)
CC 225a.
_1-COd_ AA-43; Picchi, _Archivio musicale_, 143.
Autograph score, 2 fols., oblong quarto, 28 x 22 cm, 12 staves per page.

_Peccavi Domine_ (printed version, 1668)
CC 225.
Carlo Donato Cossoni, _Primo libro de motetti a voce sola_, op. 2 (Bologna: Monti, 1667 — RISM C 4201; 2nd impression Bologna: Monti, 1668 — RISM C 4202).

_Quaerens dilectum_ (manuscript version)
CC 231a.
_1-COd_ V-27; Picchi, _Archivio musicale_, 113.
Autograph score, 2 fols., oblong quarto, 28.5 x 22.5 cm, 8 staves per page.

_Quaerens dilectum_ (printed version, 1668)
CC 231.
Carlo Donato Cossoni, _Primo libro de motetti a voce sola_, op. 2 (Bologna: Monti, 1667 — RISM C 4201; 2nd impression Bologna: Monti, 1668 — RISM C 4202).
The motet is described in the index as: “Per ogni tempo”.

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org), WLSCM No. 24
Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa (manuscript version)
CC 264a.
Autograph score in miscellaneous manuscript, 26.5 x 10 cm, 4 staves per page.

Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa (printed version, 1669)
CC 264.

**Editorial Method**
The present edition provides scholars and performers with access to the music, while enabling the reader to compare in every detail two different sources for each piece. In other words, the edition presents not three works, but six single sources. This particular goal justifies editorial choices that are much closer to the original than those the editors would adopt in case of a single source.

Barlines are reproduced as in the sources. The continuo figures are left as in the source, without additions or changes, including flats that would be written today as naturals. Following typical seventeenth-century practice, accidentals apply only to the note they precede and any immediately following repetitions of the same pitch. Cossoni appears not to be consistent with this practice in his autograph manuscripts. Editors follow the autographs in the use of accidentals. Where accidentals are obviously missing from the source or are in need of clarification, the editorial accidental is added in square brackets. Redundant accidentals are maintained, but shown in smaller print. Beaming is added without notice in transcribing the printed sources, while it is kept as written in transcribing the manuscripts. Passages which are not written out in the sources but replaced by abbreviations (such as “etc.”) are marked by italics in the text, and, in the music, by half-brackets above the corresponding staff or staves (e.g., at the end of Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa). Small half-brackets above single notes indicate blackened notation (in Peccavi, Domine). Any other editorial addition is marked by square brackets.
CRITICAL NOTES

It is remarkable to see that the music in all sources is nearly perfectly correct, according to seventeenth-century notational habits. A few slight misprints or slips of the pen occurred mainly in the underlaid text.

*Peccavi Domine* (manuscript version)
Mm. 95, 106, text: *depraecare*.
M. 120, text: *preces*.

*Peccavi Domine* (printed version, 1668)
M. 16: the measure contains three half-notes instead of the expected two. The editors chose not to indicate this in the score, even if it is not correct from a modern point of view. To introduce a change of time signature (and another one bar later) could have suggested to the performers that a change of meter is taking place, while it is a simple continuation of the surrounding pace.
M. 55, text: *recuro*.
M. 142, text: *preces*.
M. 150: the measure contains three half-notes instead of the expected two. See the note at measure 16.

*Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa* (manuscript version)
M. 32, text: *doppo*.

*Ci vuol tempo e poi Dio sa* (printed version, 1669)
M. 19, text: *doppo*.
M. 52, Bass: ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦.
Mm. 76–7, text: *cantarse*.