

Tractus Errores Graecorum: Polemics of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople against the Greeks

By Jack Hanrahan-Shirley*

This paper examines the Latin text entitled Tractus Errores Graecorum: De Processione Spiritus Sancti. De Animabus Defunctorum. De Azymis Et Fermentato, De Obedientia Romanae Ecclesiae, most probably written and published in 1252 in Constantinople, attributed to the deacon Pantaleone. Attention will be specifically given to the argumentation utilized by Pantaleone to attack the theological and liturgical positions advocated for and defended by his Byzantine opponents. This paper is the first examination of the text by modern English-language scholarship. The analysis of the Tractus Errores Graecorum put forward in this paper provides crucial insights into the history and development of Latin polemics against the Byzantines during the 13th century in the context of the Latin Empire of Constantinople.

Introduction

The Latin Empire of Constantinople, which lasted from the fall of Constantinople to the forces of the Fourth Crusade in 1204 to the reconquest of Constantinople by the Nicene Empire in 1261, receives limited attention from both Byzantinists and Medievalists occupying a 'No Man's Land' between these two fields of academic scholarship. To my knowledge, little or no recent scholarship examines the polemical nature of the theological/ecclesiastical debates between the Latin and Byzantine Churches that took place in this period. This article does not seek to comment on the debates regarding the origins and outcome of the Fourth Crusade, neither does it seek to comment on the social and political affairs of Greece between 1204–1261. Rather the goal of this paper is to substantially engage with the polemical literature that was produced by ecclesiastics of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople against the theological positions held by their Byzantine contemporaries. The Latin text of the polemical work *Tractus Errores Graecorum: De Processione Spiritus Sancti. De Animabus Defunctorum. De Azymis Et Fermentato, De Obedientia Romanae Ecclesiae* will be closely examined in order to determine and discuss the forms argumentation that were utilised by the author of the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* against his Byzantine interlocuters. Importantly, this paper is the first time that the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* will be examined in modern English-language scholarship.

*PhD Student, Macquarie University/University of Vienna, Australia/Austria.

Literature Review

The Fourth Crusade is an event that excites both Medievalists and Byzantinists alike. This has since resulted in the subsequent development of scholarly narratives in the 19th and 20th centuries including the suggestion that the Fourth Crusade was cunningly co-opted into the political machinations of the Doge of Venice Enrico Dandolo. It is asserted, that Dandolo had been seeking an opportunity to take revenge on the Byzantines since the massacre of Latins at Constantinople in 1182 during the reign of Andronicus I. The arrival of an army of Latin crusaders in Venice who were low on funds presented Dandolo with an irresistible opportunity.¹ This story of the deliberation diversion of the Fourth Crusade to attack Constantinople at the urging of the old scheming Doge has been challenged by academics, most notably Donald E. Queller who advanced a ‘theory of accidents’ in order to explain the events of leading up to the fall of Constantinople to the crusaders.² Queller’s position has become the dominant opinion in modern scholarship. However, there are still those who still advocate for older theories although they are almost entirely limited to the realm of popular histories discussing the Fourth Crusade.³

Whilst this intense debate over the causes and the ultimate outcome of the Fourth Crusade is of interest for the purposes of this paper two other fields of study must be focused upon. These are the ecclesiastical history of the Φραγκοκρατία post 1204, particularly in regard to the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople and the examination of Medieval polemical/heresiological literature. Concerning the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, there exists a body of scholarship from the 20th century that examines the various historical, political and ecclesiastical developments of the Latin Patriarchate during the lifetime of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. In this area a scholar of particular note is the American academic Robert Lee Wolff (1915–1980) whose scholarship discussed various facets of the Latin Patriarchate as an ecclesiastical and political body within the Latin Empire.⁴ However, whilst there has been much scholarly work dealing with various aspects of the society and culture of Medieval Greece from

1. J. Godfrey, *1204: The Unholy Crusade*, pp. 56-66; E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople being the Story of the Fourth Crusade*, pp. 233-244.

2. D. E. Queller, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*, pp. 1-205.

3. T. F. Madden, ‘Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade’, pp. 734-738; A. Maddison, *Contours of the World Economy, Essays in Macro-Economic History*, p. 238; J. Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*, pp. 102-126.

4. R. L. Wolff, ‘Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261’, pp. 225-303; R. L. Wolff, ‘The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans’, pp. 213-237; R. L. Wolff, ‘The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261: Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest’, pp. 33-60; R. L. Wolff, ‘Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople: The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria’, pp. 319-328.

1204–1261 as well as the role played by the Latin Church, to my knowledge following the 1970s there has been little to no scholarship dealing extensively with the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople itself as well as its relations with the Byzantine successor states and their ecclesiastics. A welcome exception to this is the work of Filip Van Tricht published in English in 2011 which discusses the interactions between the Latin Emperor and Patriarchate.⁵ However, broader Medieval scholarship focusing on the ecclesiastical interactions between the Latins and the Greeks, including Bernard Hamilton's *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, focuses almost exclusively on the Latin Church in the context of the Holy Land during the 12th century.⁶ General works produced in the domain of Byzantine studies provide better depth in regards to the topic of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople and its relations with the Greeks. For example, J. M. Hussey directly discusses the ecclesiastical relations between the Latins and the Byzantine successor states following the Latin conquest.⁷

The second field of scholarship that must be mentioned in that of Medieval polemical/heresiological literature. Regrettably this particular genre of literature has been subject to much scholarly neglect by recent scholarship. This has in part been driven by the collapse of the major scholarly narratives from the 20th century and the antipathy that many scholars exhibit towards polemical/heresiological literature as a historical source. Often works that are classified as polemical or heresiological in nature are seen by current scholars as unreliable due to the supposedly untrustworthy nature of this material presented in the text. This 'sceptical' perspective in the wider study of Medieval heresy has produced work such as that of Peter Biller who argues in his work on the Cathar heresy that the 'Cathars' as traditionally understood never existed but were instead local communities resisting the impositions of the Papacy. This point is put forward similarly in the popular sphere by Tom Holland.⁸ However, work such as that of Averil Cameron, who argues for the need to engage seriously with the content polemical/heresiological literature in order to provide a nuanced understanding of the forms typology of polemical and heresiological literature from the Medieval/Byzantine period.⁹ Recently a positive development is seen in the edited volume *Contra Latinos et Adversus Graecos* that was published in 2020. This volume covers a number of polemical texts surrounding the debates on the union of Rome and

5. F. V. Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium: The Empire of Constantinople (1204–1208)*, pp. 61-101.

6. C. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance*, pp. 100–177; B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, pp. 1-40.

7. J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in Byzantium*, pp. 184-192.

8. T. Holland, *Dominion: The Making of the Western Mind*, pp. 240-243.

9. A. Cameron, 'How to read Heresiology', pp. 471-492.

the Greek churches, such as that of Eustratios of Nicaea.¹⁰ Returning to the specific context of the Latin Empire of Constantinople the first major study of the *Tractus* was produced in German by Andrea Riedl in 2020. However, it is apparent that outside the discussion of particular authors and texts, such as Nikolaos of Otranto and his writings, little to no in-depth study has been undertaken on the vast majority of the Latin and Greek polemical literature composed between 1204–1261.¹¹

Latin and Greek Polemics in the 12th and 13th Centuries: An Overview

The 12th and 13th centuries were a period of time that saw escalating conflict between the Latin and Greek churches. This ecclesiastical struggle (brought about by the expansion of Latin influence into the Eastern Mediterranean following the success of the First Crusade) necessitated the production of polemical texts on the part of both Latin and Greek. This was done by ecclesiastics on both sides in order to support their different understandings of various theological and liturgical topics, such as the inclusion of the *Filioque* or the usage leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. An example of 12th-century Byzantine polemics against the Latins in the wake of the First Crusade can be seen in the anti-Latin tract written by John the Oxite (the Greek Patriarch of Antioch from 1089 till 1100).¹² The consternation produced by Greek attacks against Latin theological/liturgical positions during the 12th century can be seen in the exchange of letters between the Latin Patriarch of Antioch Aimery of Limoges (1140–1193) and was one of the foremost Latin anti-Byzantine controversialists of the 12th century Hugh Etherianus (1115–1182). In his reply to Hugh's letter Aimery relates that:

Quanto enim Graecis viciniore sumus, tanto sub vestrae protectionis elimata scientia reddimur securiores. Propterea libros de processione Spiritus sancti, quos tam Graece quam Latine scriptos misistis, cum magnam suscipimus cordis alacritate... Non solum autem vivitis vobis, sed nobis et universali Ecclesiae, proque tota Latinitate vos antemurale fortissimum opposuistis, unde non immerito, sicut diximus, nobis gaudendum est, utpote qui talem habemus mediatorem, cui nec docta Graecia resistere, nec fabricatis sophismatum objectionibus potest obviari.¹³

10. A. Barmin, 'The Refutation of Petrus Grossolanus: The Λόγοι ἀντιρρητικοί by Eustratios of Nicaea' in Bucossi A., and Calia A. eds. (2020), *Contra Latinos Et Adversus Graecos: The Separation Between Rome and Constantinople from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century*, pp. 199-216.

11. J. M. Hoeck and R. J. Loenertz eds., *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II*, pp. 50–70; A. Riedl, *Kirchenbild und Kircheneinheit: Der Dominikanische Tractatus Contra Graecos (1252) in Seinem Theologischen und Historischen Kontext*, pp. 1-238.

12. A. E. Siecienski, *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory: The Other Issues That Divided East and West*, pp. 130-140.

13. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Tomus CCII*, p. 231.

For the more we are brought closer to the Greeks, the more secure we are made under the protection of your perfect knowledge. On that account you dispatched books to us on the procession of the Holy Spirit, which were composed in both Greek and Latin, we received them with a great fervour of the heart... But you do not live for yourself alone, but for us and the Universal Church, and with the entirety of Latin Christendom you opposed their strongest defence, whence not undeservedly, as we have said, we rejoice, since we have so excellent a mediator, whom neither the learned Greeks can withstand, nor can he be met by constructed sophistic objections.

Following this epistolary exchange is the polemical work composed by Hugh Etherianus *De Haeresibus Graecorum* (*On the Heresies of the Greeks*) that is perhaps the Magnum Opus of Latin polemical works composed against the Byzantine church in the 12th century on the topic of the Filioque. At the very least Hugh Etherianus writings (some of which that have not all survived) had a significant impact on later Latin polemicists against the Byzantines. This influence is demonstrated by the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* where Pantaleone writes concerning the topic of rendering obedience to the Roman Pontiff: 'Quae ex dictis magistri Hugonis Ætheriani nuper extracta, huic operi duximus inserenda' (Since we have recently taken extracts from the sayings of Master Hugh Etherianus and inserted them into this work).¹⁴

The 13th century saw an uptake in the amount of polemical material produced in Latin and Greek. The drivers of this polemical interaction were two-fold. Firstly, rather than simply being on the fringes of the Byzantine Empire between the Byzantines and the forces of Islam the Latins had erected a Crusader State in Byzantium's heartland. As such, interactions between the Latin and Greek churches were unavoidable. The second driver was the attempts of the Papacy, culminating in the Second Council of Lyon (1274), to attempt to unify the Byzantine Church with Rome. Much of this polemical material from the 13th century between Greeks and Latins, such as the *Ερωτήματα του Φραρ Φραγκήσκου Προς τον Μέγαν Πήτορα* (*Questions of Brother Francis to the Great Orator*), remain under studied.

Who was Pantaleone the Deacon?

At the conclusion of the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* is added by Pantalenone the Deacon himself:

*Quod ego Pantaleon, cum essem ibi Constantinopoli, ubi hoc actum est, hoc idcirco memorabile feci, quo legentibus pateat sermitatis institutio, et nemo audeat talia praesumere.*¹⁵

14. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 487-488.

15. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 574.

That I Pantaleone, when I was in Constantinople, where this act was done. I made it memorable, for this reason, wherein I made a serene manner clear to the readers and let no one dare to presume otherwise.

This information leads to two possibilities as to the identity of Pantaleone. The first is based upon Jacob Basnagi's assertion in his foreword discussing the *Tractus Errores Graecorum Graecorum* found in volume 140 of *Patrologia Graeca* (PG) that this Pantaleon (Pantaleone) is considered to have been a deacon and chartophylax of the Church of Constantinople.¹⁶ Following the accord reached between the Venetians and non-Venetian Crusaders after the conquest of Constantinople the Venetians became one of the most dominant factions in the ecclesiastical politics within the city and throughout the Latin Empire. An example of the influence wielded by the Venetians in ecclesiastical affairs is seen in their attempts, despite action from Pope Innocent III, to prevent any but Venetian clerics from being elected to the position of Latin Patriarch of Constantinople.¹⁷ Due to the fact that the name Pantaleone is historically popular in the region of Venice where a church dedicated to St. Pantaleone existed at least from 1161 in Venice. Pantaleone can be confidently considered to be a Venetian ecclesiastic present in Constantinople in the last decades of the Latin Empire of Constantinople.¹⁸ Since Pantalone is said to have held the position of deacon and chartophylax within the Church of Constantinople it is reasonable to assume that he was part of the cathedral chapter of Hagia Sophia. Furthermore, if the traditional dating for the composition of the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* (approximately in the year 1252) is accepted alongside the assumption that he served at Hagia Sophia, then Pantaleone would have been active in Constantinople at least during the Patriarchates of Nicholas of Castro Arquato (1234–1251) and Pantaleone Giustinian (1253–1286). There is also the prospect that Pantaleone may have held ecclesiastical office under preceding Latin Patriarchs, such as Simon of Tyre (1227–1234). The interpretation of Pantaleone as being a deacon and chartophylax at Hagia Sophia seems to be confirmed in the titles given by to Pantaleone in the text following the *Tractus*. This text, entitled *Narratio Miraculum Maximi Archangeli Michaelis* (*An Account of the Miracles of the Archangel Michael*), Pantaleone is designated, '*Diaconi et Chartophylacis Magnae Ecclesiae*', "A Deacon and Chartophylax of the Great Church (Hagia Sophia)". In support of this characterisation of Pantaleone, Basnagi cites the Nanianus Codex in the footnotes to the edition of the *Narratio* produced in Migne's PG.¹⁹ Although, the possibility should be considered that rather than

16. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 485-486.

17. F. V. Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium: The Empire of Constantinople (1204–1208)*, pp. 219-222; R. L. Wolff, '*Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261*', pp. 234-244.

18. R. L. Wolff, '*Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261*', pp. 253-282.

19. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 573-574.

being attached directly to the cathedral chapter of Hagia Sophia Pantaleone may have acted as a deacon at one of the other Venetian churches operating in Constantinople prior to 1204, specifically the churches of St. Mark, St. Akindynos, St. Nicholas, and St. Mary.²⁰

However, a second interpretation to be considered is founded upon Pantalone's admission that he wrote his *Tractus*, "when...in Constantinople".²¹ Based on the fact that Latin rite churches operated by Venetian clergy throughout the Byzantine Empire where Venice possessed colonies, such as islands of Crete and Euboea, it could be argued that Pantaleone was not part of the Latin Patriarchate in Constantinople but was instead a deacon of a Venetian church outside of Constantinople who then travelled to the capital and whilst there he then wrote the *Tractus* in 1252. However, it is known that the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople was never able to fully exercise its ecclesiastical authority throughout the entirety of the Latin Empire often being undermined by the Papacy. An example of Papal interference in the ecclesial affairs of the Latin Empire is seen in the feud between the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople Gervais of Heracleia (1215–1219) and the Latin bishop of Thessalonica over Achaia. In this controversy Pope Honorius III supported the bishop of Thessalonica. Although, at other times the Papacy supported the rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople, such as during the Patriarchate of Matthew of Equilio (1221–1226).²² During the period that the Latin Patriarchs were present in Constantinople they were never able to establish supremacy over the Latin rite churches of the Italian colonies in the former Byzantine Empire. An example of this Italian independence from the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople is seen in the Venetian colonies of the *Stato da Màr*, such as Crete. The dioceses of these Venetian possessions were placed under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Grado rather than the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople. This ecclesiastical oversight of Venetian colonies in the Eastern Mediterranean followed the agreement made between the Patriarch of Grado Benedict Falier (1201–1207) and the then newly appointed Latin Patriarch of Constantinople Thomas Morosini (1204–1211) in 1205.²³ Therefore, the question must be asked is why would Pantaleone, as a Venetian cleric supposedly outside of the purview of the Latin Patriarch, travel to Constantinople?

This understanding of Pantalone's concluding remark presenting himself as a Venetian colonial ecclesiastic also poses issues for interpreting the circumstantial and the direct evidence that appears to contradict this position. For example, one may accept, and attempt to argue for the position that Pantaleone was a Venetian deacon coming to Constantinople from some Venetian colony or outpost and perhaps even the city of Venice itself in the year 1252 or possibly earlier 1250/1.

20. R. Janin, 'Les sanctuaires des colonies latines à Constantinople', pp. 163-177.

21. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 574.

22. R. L. Wolff, 'Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261'.

23. R. L. Wolff, 'Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261', pp. 234-236.

What then is one to do with the direct manuscript evidence that can be brought against this position? Additionally, I would argue that this interpretation runs against the natural reading of Pantalone's statement:

*Quod ego Pantaleon, cum essem ibi Constantinopoli, ubi hoc actum est.*²⁴

That I Pantaleone, *when I was in Constantinople*, where this act was done.

Pantaleone's statement that he wrote the *Tractus* in Constantinople combined with his status as a deacon implies that he was part of the Venetian ecclesiastical establishment of Constantinople. Therefore, I believe we can conclude from the available evidence that Pantaleone was a Venetian deacon of the church of Hagia Sophia (or at least one of the Venetian churches in Constantinople). He also served as the chartophylax of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople most likely discharging his duties under the Patriarchs Nicholas of Castro Arquato and Pantaleone Giustinian, although the probability that he served earlier Latin Patriarchs, such as Simon of Tyre, should not be discounted.

The Structure of the *Tractus Errores Graecorum*

Basnagi considers in his foreword that the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* is not a single unified text but rather can be divided into three separate 'sections' differentiated on the basis of the respective author/s of each part.²⁵ The first third of the text Basnagi identifies as being the product of the Dominican editor/s who are credited in the by-line of this edition of the text 'Editus Constantinopoli, in aedibus Fratrum Prædicatorum, anno Domini 1252', "Edited in Constantinople at the House of the Dominicans, in the year of the Lord 1252".²⁶ This authorial division is apparently confirmed by the testimony of the Dominican editor/s themselves within the *Tractus* itself when he/they state that:

*Haec autem scripta sunt anno Domini millesimo, ducentesimo quinquagesimo secundo in civitate Constantinopolis, a fratribus Prædicatoribus, ad ædificationem Ecclesiae, et profectum animarum, ad laudem et gloriam Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. Amen.*²⁷

These things were written in the year of our Lord 1252 in the city of Constantinople, by the Brotherhood of Preachers (Dominicans), for the edification of the Church and the protection of Souls, to the praise and glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.

24. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 574.

25. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 485-486.

26. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 487-488.

27. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 540.

However, it may be possible to interpret the statement made by the Dominican editor/s that “These things were written”, etc not as being an admission that wholly new material to the *Tractus Errores Graecorum* (as proposed by Basnagi) has been added, but rather as a declaration of the role of the editor/s in copying the text of the *Tractus*. The second partition of the *Tractus* is identified by Basnagi as material that is derived by the Dominican editor/s from the works of Hugh Etherianus.²⁸ Again this delineation is demonstrable in the text where the Dominican editor/s state:

*Quod licet jam quantor dictis articulis demonstretur, tamen adhuc in his, quae subjecta sunt ostenditur. Quae ex dictis magistri Hugonis Ætheriani nuper extracta, huic operi duximus inserenda.*²⁹

Although this has been already demonstrated by what has been considerably expressed in the above points, *nevertheless again here, are these subjects clarified. Since we have recently taken extracts from the sayings of Master Hugh Etherianus and inserted them into this work.*

The quotation from the *Tractus* (possibly an editorial note from the manuscript tradition that was then included in the main body of the printed edition?) confirm the presence of the second textual division as mentioned by Basnagi’s foreword. Interestingly, it also casts light onto the editorial history of the *Tactus* in the 13th century. Specifically, this passage indicates that at the time the Dominican editor/s in Constantinople were editing the text during the year of 1252 the exact composition of the *Tractus* was in considerable flux. As shown in the above quotation the Dominicans working on the text saw the need when undertaking the editing process to supplement what had already been written (either by themselves or Pantaleone) with quotations from Hugh Etherianus’ writings in order to further support the previous argumentation against the Greeks. In regard to the exact work of Hugh Etherianus’ that the Dominicans are referring to as the source for their “extracts from the sayings of Master Hugh Etherianus” the most likely candidate from Hugh Etherianus’ surviving works is the *De Haeresibus Graecorum*. The influence of Hugh Etherianus’ writings is confirmed in both direct and indirect citations and allusions included by the Dominican editor/s of the text. An example of the Dominican editor/s drawing upon the *De Haeresibus Graecorum* can be seen the reference made to Hugh Etherianus’ discussion of the First Council of Constantinople (381),

28. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 485-486.

29. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 375.

Table 1. Comparison of *De Haeresibus Graecorum* with *Tractus Errores Graecorum*

<i>De Haeresibus Graecorum</i> (1173)	<i>Tractus Errores Graecorum</i> (1252)
Is enim est, cui oves et agni commissi sunt, et idcirco non solum scripti recitator esse debet, virorum interpres illorum quæ ascripta non sunt: ut caput ovium Dei pastor, <i>quod sancta et universalis secunda synodo, his verbis sancivit: episcopus quidem Constantinopoleos habeto primatum honoris post Romæ episcopatum quod ista sit nova Roma.</i> ³⁰	Vocat autem se οἰκουµενικὸν patriarcham, id est <i>orbicularem patriarcham</i> : et licet in quarta distinctione hujus operis, satis de eo disputatum sit, tamen adhuc, in detestationem et sugillationem hujus super nominis, pauca repetemus. <i>Canon iste de ambitione dictæ sedis editus fuit in secunda synodo, clam summo pontifice, ut magister Hugo Etherianus refert, vir utique sapiens, et peritus in utraque lingua.</i> ³¹
For he is, to whom the sheep and the lambs have been committed, and for that reason he should not only be a reader of the Scriptures, but also an interpreter of those men who are not written about: as the head shepherd of the sheep of God, <i>that the holy and universal second council sanctioned by these words: That the bishop of Constantinople has the first rank of honour after the bishop of Rome since it is the New Rome.</i>	He calls himself an οἰκουµενικὸς Patriarch, that is a Universal Patriarch: and although in the fourth division of this work, enough has been debated about it, yet nevertheless, for the detestation and humiliation of this exalted name we repeat a few things. <i>This canon concerning the ambition of the mentioned See was published at the second council in secret from the Supreme Pontiff, as reports Master Hugh Etherianus, a wise man indeed and proficient in both languages.</i>

The final division advocated by Basnagi is a short section of the text that retells the account of a Eucharistic miracle that is identified within the *Tractus* as taking place during last year of the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus (1042–1055) and in the Patriarchate of Michael Cerularius (1043–1059),

Tempore, quo victoriosissimus imperator Constantinus, cognomento Monomachus, imperii per spicaciter moderabatur, dignitatibus, erat quidam Michael Constantinopolitanae sedis patriarcha...Haec vero gesta sunt anno ab Incarnatione Domini millesimo quinquagesimo quino, indictione octava.³²

During the time that the most victorious Emperor Constantine, surnamed Monomachus, sharply governed the empire through his dignitaries, there was a certain Michael (Cerularius) as Patriarch of the See of Constantinople...These events took place in the year of the Incarnation of the Lord 1055 during the eighth indiction.

30. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Tomus CCII*, p. 375.

31. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 571.

32. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 572-574.

In his analysis Basnagi identifies this section as the only part of the text that may be genuinely considered as being authored by Pantaleone the Deacon rather than being the result of interpolations made by the Dominican editor/s working from the manuscript/s of Pantaleone's *Tractus* that they possessed in 13th-century Constantinople.³³ From his examination of the work Basnagi concludes that the text known as *Tractus Errores Graecorum: De Processione Spiritus Sancti. De Animabus Defunctorum. De Azymis Et Fermentato, De Obedientia Romanae Ecclesiae* is falsely attributed to Pantaleone the Deacon.³⁴

Basnagi's remarks concerning the *Tractus* thus may be summarised as follows: the *Tractus* is in the majority of the text was composed at the latest in 1252 by Dominican editor/s writing their own refutations of Greek theological positions. In order to strengthen their own writings, the Dominicans appealed to the authority of the writings of the theologian Hugh Etherianus, such as *De Haeresibus Graecorum* from the 12th century. These additions (whilst considerably extensive) built upon and heavily modified an already extant core text authored by Pantaleone the Deacon. This text existed in some form in the 13th century and at the very least contained the narrative of a Eucharistic miracle that took place during the reign of Constantine IX Monomachus in 1055. Further discussions of the manuscript tradition and the historical transmission of *Tractus Errores Graecorum* of Pantaleone the Deacon are outside the scope of this paper. However, based upon the preliminary observations made in this article it appears that further investigation of these two areas will produce significant scholarly results.

Polemical Argumentation against the Greeks in the *Tractus Errores Graecorum*

Four major topics of debate are addressed in the *Tractus*. These are: the question of the Filioque, disagreements over the Latin teaching concerning Limbo and Purgatory, the use of either leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist and issue of Greek churches submitting to the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope in Rome. The remainder of this article will examine the different forms of argumentation that are deployed within the *Tractus* in order to defend the theological positions taken by supporters of the Latin rite and to attack their Greek opponents.

33. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 485-486.

34. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 485-486.

De Processione Spiritus Sancti (On the Procession of the Holy Spirit)

The first error of the Greeks that the *Tractus* addresses is the Filioque,

*Quorum primus, quia ab ipsa divina majestate inchoans, ore polluto affirmat contra opinionem, imo fidem catholicam, tertiam personam in Trinitate, id est, Spiritum sanctum "a Filio minime procedere", vel spirari, aut existentiam habere.*³⁵

The first of these, commencing with the divine majesty itself, is that they affirm with unclean mouths contrary to reason, nay the Catholic Faith, that the third person of the Trinity, this is Holy Spirit "does not proceed from the Son", or by Spiration, nor does he have existence from the Son.

Table 2. *Polemics on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*

<p><i>Illos vero qui dicunt: Spiritus sanctus procedit quidem a Patre, sed non a Filio, vel aliter, et plus a Patre, quam a Filio: aut prus a Patre, quam a Filio, et similia, ratione fidei adversantia: et hoc asserendo credunt, prædicant et scribunt, sicut jam dudum defiaitum est a sanctis Patribus, tanquam hæreticos a catholica Ecclesia abjicimus, et vitamus, maledicimus et reprobamus.</i>³⁶</p>	<p>Indeed those who say: Certainly, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, but not from the Son, or in another way, more so from the Father than from the Son: or to a greater extent from the Father, than from the Son, and similar, in opposition to the doctrine of the faith: by asserting this they believe, preach, and write what has long since been rejected by the Holy Fathers. We condemn, shun, revile and renounce them as heretics from the Catholic Church.</p>
<p><i>Et constant similiter, in cunctis Scripturis authenticis, et receptis conciliis, hoc quod prædiximus, scilicet, quod Spiritus sanctus est essentialiter a Filio, et procedit ab eo, manifestius contineri. Quæ scripta ita recepta et approbata sunt per concilia generalia, ut qui eorum aliud contrarium sentit vel prædicat, ipso facto et jure sit excommunicatus.</i>³⁷</p>	<p>They agree likewise, upon all the authentic Scriptures and the received councils, this fact we proclaim clearly, that the Holy Spirit is essentially from the Son, and proceeds from Him, is to be avowedly maintained. These Scriptures were received and approved by the Ecumenical Councils, that whoever expresses or preaches anything contrary to them is to be automatically and rightly excommunicated.</p>

As evident by the above quotations, the Dominican editor/s of the *Tractus* attacked their Greek adversaries on two fronts. Firstly, they appealed to the authority of the Church Fathers. The Dominicans focused not only those Church Fathers highly regarded in the West (such as Augustine and Gregory the Great) but also the Fathers that were particularly respected in the East (including John of Damascus and John Chrysostom). It is worth noting here that in the citations

35. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 487.

36. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 509.

37. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 508.

from Patristic sources provided by the Dominicans of Constantinople significant attention is given to providing a response to the John of Damascus whose work was being used by the Greek opposition of the Dominicans to refute the Latin stance on the Filioque.³⁸ The second source of authority to which the Dominicans appealed to against the Greeks was the authority of ecclesiastical councils. This is seen in how the *Tractus* cites the First Council of Constantinople alongside a quotation from Pope Innocent III from the Fourth Lateran Council.³⁹

De Animabus Defunctorum (Concerning the Souls of the Dead)

The second error that the *Tractus* attributes to the Greeks concerns their rejection of the Latin theological speculations of Limbo and Purgatory,

*Secundus autem, secundum theologos, virtutem numero secundam, id est spem fidelium, virulento conamine interimere studens, asserit, "defunctorum animas nec Paradisi gaudiis perfrui, nec infernorum suppliciis, vel igne purgatorio", citra dem iudicii, aut ante latam sententiam extremam, iudiciis posse subiacere.*⁴⁰

The second, according to theologians, is the second virtue in number, which is the hope of the faithful, that by virulent effort they (the Greeks) aim to destroy. They assert 'the souls of the dead do not rejoice in the delights of Paradise, neither suffer the punishments of Hell, nor the fire in Purgatory', before they receive judgement, or prior to the enduring the Last Judgement, they are able to be subject to punishment.

It is demonstrable in literature from the 12th century, such as the exchange between Hugh Etherianus and Patriarch Aimery of Limoges that the debate concerning the theological reality of Purgatory and Limbo was a point of disagreement between Latin and Greek ecclesiastics.⁴¹ The text of the *Tractus* therefore provides further insights into how Latin ecclesiastics defended their stance regarding Limbo and Purgatory whilst in return attacking their Greek opponents. The Dominican editor/s in their elaborations on the defence of Limbo and Purgatory provided two main points in order to attack the objections of the Greeks.

38. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 506-508.

39. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 550-568.

40. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 487.

41. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Tomus CCII*, pp. 229-230.

Table 3. Polemics Concerning the Souls of the Dead

<p><i>De tertio respondebit Athanasius vice nostra. In prædicto siquidem libro Quæstionem suarum, movetur iterum a quærente quæstio talis: Ubi, quæso, sunt, vel perveniunt pueri defuncti, vel in tormentis, vel in regno?...Et licet huic loco Pater sanctus nomen non imposuerit, sancti tamen Latini, ut Augustinus, Gregorius et cæteri, quippe qui eodem spiritu repleti fuerunt, determinantes de nomine loci, hunc locum sinum Abrahæ, sive limbum nominaverunt, in quem ante adventum Chriti sancti Patres descendebant.⁴²</i></p>	<p>On the third point Athanasius will respond in our place. Accordingly in his aforementioned book <i>Question</i>, he is moved again by such an inquiry from the questioner: <i>Where, I pray, do the dead children arrive, either unto torments or to the kingdom?...Although, on this place the holy father did not impose a name, however Latin saints, including Augustine, Gregory, and others, since they had been filled with the same spirit, determined the name of this place, calling it the 'bosom of Abraham' or Limbo, into which the holy fathers descended before the coming of Christ.</i></p>
<p><i>De quarto loco, id est purgatorio, multa sanctorum Patrum testimonia reperimus. Et primo in Epistola ad Corinthios, ubi loquitur Apostolus... Sancta quoque Macrina, soror beati Basilii, cum esset liberalibus studiis imbuta et Spiritu sancto repleta, inter alia, quæ de sacris eruditionibus divinarum Scripturarum exposuit, de igne purgatorio talia testata est dicent...⁴³</i></p>	<p>Concerning the fourth point, that is Purgatory, we discover many testimonies of the Holy Fathers. Firstly, in the Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians) wherein the Apostle says... Saint Macrina, the sister of the blessed Basil, when she was trained in the liberal studies and filled with the Holy Spirit, among the different things, which she expounded on from the sacred teachings of the divine Scriptures, they say that she testified regarding the fire of Purgatory...</p>
<p><i>Secundo respondemus, quod præpositio verbi hujus, per, sumitur aut causative, aut instrumentaliter. Quocumque istorum modorum sumatur, nusquam adamas salvatur secundum eos per ignem; quia non habet hoc ab igne...⁴⁴</i></p>	<p>Secondly, we respond, that this word, <i>per</i>, placed in front (of igne) should be taken as either causative or instrumental. Whichever of these moods are taken according to them Adam is never saved through fire; because he does not have salvation by fire...</p>

As with the defence of the Filioque the part of the *Tractus* defending the Latin concepts of Limbo and Purgatory are dependent upon the citation and exegesis of Patristic sources. The Dominican editor/s specifically cite Athanasius of Alexandria alongside Augustine and Gregory the Great in defence of the concept that the phrase 'bosom of Abraham' found in the Gospel of Luke 16:22 refers implicitly to Limbo.⁴⁵ This merging of the bosom of Abraham with Limbo accelerated in the literature of the Latin West during the 12th century however; there are indicators

42. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 514.

43. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 514-515.

44. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 517.

45. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 514.

of this process going back to Augustine as acknowledged in the *Tractus* itself.⁴⁶ Following their polemical defence of Limbo, the Dominican editor/s turn to the subject of Purgatory. Regarding Purgatory the *Tractus* quotes the writings of Greek Fathers (including Basil the Great and John of Damascus) and refers to other figures such as Macrina, the sister of Basil the Great in support of Purgatory.⁴⁷ The second tactic taken by the Dominicans does not rely on explicit quotations from the Fathers but is instead an argument based on the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 3:11–15 and particularly the grammatical meaning of the preposition *per* in the Vulgate in 1 Corinthians 3:15. This pro-Purgatory exegesis of 1 Corinthians 3:15 provided by the Dominicans is in line with the Latin exegesis of 1 Corinthians 3:15 in the preceding centuries.⁴⁸

De Azymis et Fermentato (Respecting Unleavened and Leavened Bread)

The third error that the Greeks are chastised for concerns the use of leavened bread in the Eucharist.

*Tertius vero ipsam omnipotentis Dei potentiam fermenti termino volens coarctare, voce praedicat, non nisi in fermentati panis materia perfici posse mysterium sacramenti. His itaque fidei, et charitatis, speique virtutibus, a cordibus fidelium dicto studio et ordine deletis.*⁴⁹

The third indeed is that wishing to constrain the power of the Almighty God to the bounds of the leaven; they preach loudly, that the mystery of the sacrament is only perfected in the form of leavened bread. Therefore, with all faith, charity, hope and virtue I declare that they destroy zeal and order in the hearts of the faithful.

As with the dispute between Latin and Greeks, this polemical issue goes back to the time of the Great Schism between West and East. The Dominican editors utilise three main witnesses to substantiate that it is proper to use unleavened bread in the Eucharist:

46. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, p. 514; A. Goldhammer trans., *The Birth of Purgatory*, pp. 52-96.

47. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus CXL*, pp. 514-516.

48. A. Goldhammer trans., *The Birth of Purgatory*, pp. 133-153.

49. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 487-488.

Table 4. Polemics Respecting Unleavened and Leavened Bread

<p><i>Ad primum igitur objectum respondemus sic: Quod fecit Dominus Pascha tempore et modo debito, aut non. Si dicant, non: contra Joannes Chrysostomus homilia octuagesima quarta super Matthaeum, ita dicit: "Non enim Christus transgreditur Pashcae tempus, sed Judaei, qui omnia praesumunt, Christum conculcant et leges; quia diligenter fervebant furore, et saepe conantes interficere, non valuerunt: tunc accipientes ipsum ex insperato, voluerunt etiam Pascha dimittere, pro homicida sua voluntate implenda. Propter quod congregati sunt omnes, etc."⁵⁰</i></p>	<p>Therefore, to the first objection we respond thus: the Lord appointed at Passover the due time and manner, or not. If they say no: contrary to John Chrysostom who in his eighty-fourth homily on Matthew, says thus: "For Christ did not transgress the time of the Passover, but the Jews, who presume on all things, the despise Christ and the Law; since they conscientiously burned with wrath, and often attempted to slay him, in this they had not prevailed. At that time they unexpectedly accepted him because they wished to dismiss the Passover in order to fulfil their murderous desires. For this reason they were all assembled, etc.</p>
<p><i>Ad secundum objectum de auctoritate de Joannis: Ipsi non introierunt, etc., dicimus, quod Pascha multipliciter accipiatur... Pascha igitur, in praemissa auctoritate, accipitur pro azymis: quo necessariario concessio, cessat adversariorum objectio.⁵¹</i></p>	<p>To the second objection concerning the authority of John: <i>They did not enter, etc.</i>, we say, that the Passover is to be received in many different forms... Therefore the Passover, in the aforementioned authority, should be understood as referring to unleavened bread. Where this necessary concession is made the reproach of adversaries ceases.</p>
<p><i>Ad tertiam, quod dicunt, quod ἄρτος supponitur pro fermentato, dicimus, quod multum discrepant a veritate: quia ἄρτος in sacra Scriptura non solum pro azymo, verum etiam pro quodlibet, pane sumitur, prout in sequentibus apparebit.⁵²</i></p>	<p>On the third point, since they say, that ἄρτος is supposed to be leavened bread, we say, that they are at a great variance from the truth. Since ἄρτος in the sacred Scripture does not refer to unleavened bread alone, but moreover is to be understood as any type of bread, as will become visible in the following.</p>

As discussed previously regarding the Filioque as well as the proofs for the existence of Limbo and Purgatory the Dominican's argumentation fundamentally depends on the use of citations derived from the writings of Latin and Greek Church Fathers as well as to the interpretation of certain Biblical passages and appeals to the grammatical meaning of certain words. Concerning the argumentation for the usage of unleavened bread in the Eucharist the Dominican editor/s cite a number of Biblical verses, such as from the Gospel of John and the Acts of the

50. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 519.

51. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 521-522

52. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 522.

Apostles in order to condone the use of unleavened bread. As demonstrated above, the Patristic homilies of John Chrysostom on the Gospel of Matthew are also quoted alongside a number of other authoritative authors, including Theophylact of Ohrid (1050–1107), in support of the Latin rite's Eucharistic practice.⁵³ Finally, the Dominican editor/s debate the meaning of the word ἄρτος (meaning bread) claiming that ἄρτος refers to not only leavened bread but also unleavened bread.⁵⁴

De Obedientia Romanae Ecclesiae (On Obedience to the Church of Rome)

The last error of the Greeks that the authors of the *Tractus* attack is the refusal of the Byzantine Church to submit to the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope in Rome:

*Ultimo, in totius consummationem nequitiae, quartum eam (ad quam horum et similium errorum spectat correctio), id est, sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam, aggreditur; nec ei obediendum communiter asserendo praedicat, moribus affirmat, et factis dicit.*⁵⁵

Finally, in the full summing-up of wickedness, a fourth error (to which the correction of these and similar errors relate), that is, *they attack the holy Church of Rome, nor alas does they preach the maintaining of a common obedience, they attest to this by their character, and display it by their deeds.*

Regarding Pantaleone's argumentation for the supreme authority of the Pope over the whole of Christendom he puts forward the proposition that,

*Sciendum vero, quod probandam obedientiam et debitam reverentiam Ecclesiae Romanae oportet nos quaerere primo: "A quo habuit Ecclesia istam potestatem? Secundo, quando? tertio, an super omnes universaliter, as particulariter? Quantum ad primum, distingue: Quia aut habuit a Deo, mediante Petro, aut a principibus saecularibus; aut simul ab istis tribus; aut a conciliis generalibus: aut simul ab istis tribus; aut a nullo istorum: sed usurpato sibi honore utitur Ecclesi violenter et indigne.*⁵⁶

However, it is understandable, that in proving obedience to and due reverence for the Church of Rome it is necessary that we ask firstly: 'From where does the Church have this power? secondly, at what time? and thirdly, over all universally, or only a small part?' As to the first point: since the Church of Rome possesses it from God, through Peter, either from secular princes, or from these three together; or from the Ecumenical Councils: or from these three together or none of these. Yet the Pope makes use of the honour usurped by the Church of Rome violently and shamefully.

53. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 517-526.

54. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, pp. 522-524.

55. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 488.

56. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 526.

As evidenced by this above quotation, in order to attack the objections of their Greek interlocutors to the concept of Petrine supremacy the Dominicans appeal to three lines of argument. Specifically, that the supremacy of the Papacy is provable from the Scriptures alongside attestations from secular rulers and the canons and decrees of universally accepted Church councils.

Table 5. *Polemics on Obedience to the Church of Rome*

<p><i>Petrus autem habuit praerogativam dignitatis super apostolos, et plenitudinem potestatis super omnes homines. Quod probatur sic: In Evangelio Joannis, cum Dominus ter requisisset a Petro singulariter et specialiter, an ipsam diligeret, audivit: Pasce oves meas.</i>⁵⁷</p>	<p>Peter himself had the prerogative of rank superior to the other Apostles, and the fullness of authority over all men. This is proved thus: In the Gospel of John, when the Lord had asked of Peter three times singularly and specifically whether he loved him, he (Peter) heard: Feed my sheep.</p>
<p><i>Quem in favorem Ecclesiae ponendum decretum Constantini, quo post receptam gratiam in urbe Romana beato Petro et Papae successoribus condidit, et tam Latinis quam Graecis litteris cunctis fidelibus in aeterna memoria reliquit.</i>⁵⁸</p>	<p>The decree of Constantine which placed him in the favour of the Church, wherein after receiving grace he established in the city of Rome the blessed Peter and the Pope's successors, and he left behind letters in both Latin and Greek unto the eternal memory of all the faithful.</p>
<p><i>Qui legati auctoritatem summi pontificis functi, sic in concilio locuti sunt: 'A beatissimo et apostolico episcopo Romano, qui est caput omnium Ecclesiarum, mandata habemus, ut Dioscorus, patriarcha Alexandriae, in concilio non sedeat. Quod si sedeat expellatur.'</i>⁵⁹</p>	<p>The legates discharging the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, spoke thus unto the council: "From the blessed and apostolic bishop of Rome, who is the head of the Universal Church, we have commanded, that Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, shall not sit in the council. If he is seated, he shall be expelled".</p>

The Dominicans then provide these proofs that they rhetorically demanded in the *Tractus*. As with much of the material discussed above these evidences of the Dominicans fit within the established Medieval Latin traditions that were appealed to in the 11th and 12th centuries in order to buttress the authority of the Pope over the Universal Church. Appeals to the interpretation of Biblical passages such as John 21:15–19 as well as the usage of quotations from the Donation of Constantine and appeals to various Ecumenical Councils, such as Chalcedon, were part of a pre-established polemical repertoire that sought to demonstrate Papal supremacy over the entirety of Christendom.

57. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 527.

58. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 536.

59. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL*, p. 531.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 by the Fourth Crusade and the subsequent rise and fall of the Latin Empire during the 13th century are areas of scholarly interest that do receive academic investigation. However, there is a great imbalance between these fields of research and others such as the study of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople and the heresiological/polemical literature produced in the 13th century. The text of the *Tractus Errores Graecorum: De Processione Spiritus Sancti. De Animabus Defunctorum. De Azymis Et Fermentato, De Obedientia Romanae Ecclesiae* discussed in this article is a demonstration of the polemical literature that was produced within and between Latin and Byzantine theologians and communities during this period. Regarding the argumentation utilised by the Dominican editor/s of the *Tractus* to attack their Greek opposition, little if any of the arguments that it presents can be said to be 'original' in nature. As demonstrated above the text's author/s produced a work that was in line with the common Latin defences of these theological positions in previous centuries. However, further study of this type of literature should be carried out as it will provide historians with a clearer picture of the developments in heresiological/polemical literature between Latins and Greeks in the 13th century.

Concerning the structure of text itself, the above analysis highlights how the Dominican editor/s took great liberty with the form of the *Tractus* by adding their own material alongside extracts from the work of Hugh Etherianus to the 'original' text that they had inherited from Pantaleone the Deacon. These liberties were so extensive that little of Pantaleone's original treatise can be said to have survived the editing process according to the analysis of the text by Jacob Basnagi in the 19th century. The exact extent to which the original text may have survived alongside further textual-critical questions, such as the textual transmission of the *Tractus* are areas requiring further research beyond the scope of this article. The discussion of Pantaleone the Deacon's origins provided in this article are only preliminary observations. In light of these remarks, it seems to me that a careful study of surviving evidence from the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople should be undertaken in order to attempt to further verify and clarify this article's comments regarding Pantaleone the Deacon. A text that may be fruitful in relation to investigating further the figure of Pantaleone the Deacon is the hagiography *Narratio Miraculum Maximi Archangeli Michaelis (An Account of the Miracles of the Archangel Michael)* that as previously mentioned is attributed to Pantaleone.

Bibliography

- Barmin, A. "The Refutation of Petrus Grossolanus: The Λόγοι ἀντιρρητικοί by Eustratios of Nicaea." In *Contra Latinos Et Adversus Graecos: The Separation Between Rome and Constantinople from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century*, edited by A. Bucossi, and A. Calia, 199-216. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, Leuven, 2020.
- Cameron, A. "How to read Heresiology." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 33, no. 3 (2003): 471-492.
- Godfrey, J. *1204: The Unholy Crusade*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Hamilton, B. *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*. Cambridge: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- Hoeck, J. M., and R. J. Loenertz (Eds.) *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II.* (Nikolaos-Nektarios of Otranto, Abbot of Casole: Contributions to the history of East-West relations under Innocent III. and Frederick II.) Ettal: Buch-Kunstverl, 1965.
- Holland, T. *Dominion: The Making of the Western Mind*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2019.
- Hussey, J. M. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Madden, T. F. "Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade." *The International History Review*, 17, no. 4 (1995): 726-743.
- Maddison A. *Contours of the World Economy, Essays in Macro-Economic History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae Latinae Tomus CCII, Imprimerie Catholique*. (Patrologia Latina Volume 202, Catholic Printing Press.) Paris, 1855.
- Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae Graeca Tomus CXL, Imprimerie Catholique*. (Patrologia Graeca Volume 140, Catholic Printing Press.) Paris, 1865.
- Pears, H. *The Fall of Constantinople being the Story of the Fourth Crusade*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1885.
- Phillips, J. *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*. London: Pimlico, Vauxhall Bridge Road, 2005.
- Queller, D. E. *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Riedl, A. *Kirchenbild und Kircheneinheit: Der Dominikanische Tractatus Contra Graecos (1252) in Seinem Theologischen und Historischen Kontext*. (Church image and church unity: The Dominican Tractatus Contra Graecos (1252) in its theological and historical context.) Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020.
- Siecienski, A. E. *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory: The Other Issues That Divided East and West*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023.
- Tricht, F. V. *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium: The Empire of Constantinople (1204-1228)*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Wolff, R. L. "The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans." *Traditio*, 2 (1944): 213-237.
- Wolff, R. L. "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204-1261: Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest." *Traditio*, 6 (1948): 33-60.
- Wolff, R. L. "Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople: The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria." *Taditio*, 6 (1948): 319-328.
- Wolff, R. L. "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204-1261." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8, (1954): 225-303.