This document, prepared by Alex Ross with considerable input from Joshua Rifkin, isolates the Josquin attributions in Bologna R 142 and attempts to sort out in a provisional way some differences and anomalies. The identification of the various scribes follows Brett Kostrzewski’s notes. Double attributions (“Jo. Mo.,” “Jo. Mouton”) are omitted.

2v, 4v. Scribe I.

8v. Scribe I, but the heading might be in a different hand: it appears to be in a different ink (color?), and Josquin is spelled differently. Resembles the style of Scribe II (see 17v etc).

9r. Back to Scribe I’s usual manner, although “a 4” might be in another hand (Scribe II?).
17v. Scribe II. His rendition of the name is quite different from Scribe I’s (compare 8v above).

30r. Scribe II. The name doesn’t quite match versions above and below, but probably Scribe II.

31v. Scribe II, but the name is spelled differently, in the style of Scribe I. Notice that “A” in “A sei” is capitalized. If “Josqn a sei” had been written all at one go, we wouldn’t expect a capital letter (see 8v, 17v, 32r, 33r, etc). Also, “A sei” is centered on the page, with Josqn looking a bit squeezed in. I suspect strongly that Scribe II initially wrote “A sei” and that “Josqn” was added later. Did Scribe I make the addition? It differs in several ways from 2v, 4v, 9r. The J is almost a straight line; the s is different; the n is tighter. In general, it’s not unlike the Scribe II hand in the ensuing text. For now let’s label the writer of “Josqn” Scribe X.
32r. Scribe II. Likely the same situation as 31v above; the name looks squeezed in.

32r, 33r. Scribe II. Here the name and main text are unmistakably in the same hand.

39v. Scribe I resumes, with his customary spelling. Although the “s” is different from the examples in 2v, 4v, and 9r above, the J and n are the same.
50v. Scribe I. The name certainly looks as though it is in the same hand as the remainder of the text, but there are minute divergences from Scribe I’s other renderings. The “s” is not the same as in 39v, 45v, 47r, 49r above; the J is almost a single straight line, lacking clear hooks on both ends; and there is no period. Could the name be by “Scribe X”? Counterarguments: in 2v, 4v, 9r, there is no period after the name and the s is the same as here. It’s probably still Scribe I, but the copy might not have been made at the same time as 39v, 45v, 47r, 49r. Not Scribe I’s finest hour.

52v. Scribe II. The name is, however, not in the usual Scribe II manner, and it looks to be in a different ink. Very similar to Scribe X in 31v. Prof. Rifkin points out that the “n,” angular and hooked, looks much like Scribe II’s “n” elsewhere. My first impulse was to think that this might be Scribe I at a later date, but Prof. Rifkin makes the much better argument that Scribe X is Scribe II in reviewing / compiling mode, adopting Scribe I’s chic styling of Josquin’s name.

54v. Scribe II, but “Josqna sei” seems to be in a different ink. Scribe II in review mode?
55r. Scribe II. “Josq a sei” looks to be another later addition, inserted with the intention of referring to Benedicta es, which begins on the second staff.

56v, 57r, 57v. Scribe II, now rendering the name in his usual style.
Provisional conclusions:

**Scribe I attributions**: 2v (Adjuro vos o filiae Sion = Plus nulz regretz), 4v (Memor esto), 9r (Missus est), 39v (Nymphes nappés), 45v (Preter rerum), 47r (Veni sancte spiritus), 49r (O Maria = Se congîe prrens), 50v (O virgo virginum).

Five from Group 1, one from Group 2 (O virgo), one from Group 4 (Veni sancte).

**Scribe II attributions**: 17v (Ecce tu pulchra es), 30r (Inter natos mulierum), 32r (Vidi speciosam = Tenez moy en vos bras), 32v (Petite camusette), 33v (Ave Maria gratia plena = Adieu mes amours), 56v (Missa Hercules Agnus Dei), 57r (Salva nos), 57v (Fors seulement).

Two from Group 1, two from Group 2, four from Group 4.

**“Scribe X”**: 8v (Iniquos odio habui), 31v (In illo tempore stetit Jesus), 52v (Huc me sydereo, with added sixth voice), 54v (Ave nobilissima creatura), 55r (Benedicta es). Our best guess is that these attributions come from Scribe II as he goes through the partbook at a later date, in reviewing / compiling mode.

Two from Group 1 (asterisk for “Huc”), one from Group 3, two from Group 4.

Our sense is that Scribe II displays a particular urge to affix Josquin’s name to pieces that had previously lacked an attribution. In total, more than half of his attributions fall into Jesse Rodin’s dubious categories (3 and 4). The attribution for “O virgo virginum” apparently comes from Scribe I, who has a much better track record with regard to pieces that belong to the Josquin core group. However, his attribution of “Veni sancte spiritus,” which is now generally ascribed to Mathurin Forestier, suggests that he is not infallible.