

multiply revised and that many of the accretions were the byproduct of its use in teaching at Bologna. For introductory remarks, see Helmholz, *Spirit of Canon Law*, 1–32; for more detailed discussions, see, for example, Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) and Hartmann and Pennington, *History of Canon Law*.

22. Although it is not the central theme of his exposition, Baldwin exhaustively demonstrates the importance of consent in the social thought of Peter the Chanter and his circle as expressed in their exegetical and penitential writings: see John W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970). Brian Tierney places these thinkers in a wider scope in his marvelous *Religion, Law, and the Growth of Constitutional Thought, 1150–1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). Philippe Buc focuses on biblical exegesis, but considers as well how later writers developed ideas about correction of the prince by the people in other genres: see especially chap. 6 of *L'Ambiguité du Livre: Prince, Pouvoir et Peuple dans les Commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1994), 312–398. Peter D. Clarke's work on consent and collective guilt has greatly advanced my own owing to the breadth and depth of his archival knowledge and understanding of the workings of papal government: see especially Clarke, *Interdict*.

23. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants*, suggests that Innocent III had been influenced by Peter the Chanter and his circle (see esp. 1:342–343); Peter D. Clarke develops the suggestion in “Peter the Chanter, Innocent III and Theological Views on Collective Guilt and Punishment,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52, no. 1 (2001): 1–20. As his argument reveals, however, what is truly startling is the number of learned thinkers who passed through or taught in Paris or Bologna and who deployed consent theory in a wide array of genres, beginning with its widespread use in legal and theological commentaries in the late twelfth century. The line of influence between Peter the Chanter and Innocent III need not have been direct.

24. Buc is speaking specifically about the correction of superiors by inferiors: see *L'Ambiguité du Livre*, 395–398.

25. Takashi Shogimen too addresses thinking on fraternal correction, demonstrating that Ockham's position is strikingly innovative: “From Disobedience to Toleration: William of Ockham and the Medieval Discourse on Fraternal Correction,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52 (2001): 599–622. For the online edition of Ockham's *Dialogus* by John Kilcullen, George Knysh, Volker Leppin, John Scott, and Jan Ballweg, see www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/ockdial.html. On fraternal correction more broadly, see Edwin D. Craun, *Ethics and Power in Medieval English Reformist Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); see also Daniel Wakelin, *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft: English Manuscripts 1375–1510* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 19.