

council of Chalcedon, and I will read you a statement of this 28th council don't try to take it down because it is a little too long to copy it is ~~in~~ on page 279 Schaaf's Vol. 3. I want you to get the gist of it. See this Vol. for statement.

(end of Record)

c12 2s

Now you see what this statement is trying to say, this statement says that in a large area around Constantinople the archbishop in Constantinople is to have the supreme authority in the church. It says the fathers rightfully recognized, they mean the first council in Nicaea in 325, that the church Rome, the great imperial city had a great authority over the churches in its area now the second council in 381, said the church new Rome had similar authority, now of course in 325, new Rome, Constantinople was not yet founded but now in 381 they said that new Rome had similar authority in its area, in 325 they had recognized the authority of the archbishops in Alexandria and of ~~Antioch~~ Antioch, 381 they simply added Constantinople and put it right ~~it~~ after Rome, so at Chalcedon they reaffirmed what had been done in 381, they said that Constantinople is second in honor only to Rome and it is supreme in authority in its area, and a large area there by larger area by which Rome had any affected jurisdiction at this time, although Rome claimed it over the whole western church. Now you see that there are ~~two~~ two things that are bad about this from Leo's view point, one of them is that it gave the Constantinople archbishop just as much power as the archbishop of Rome in a different area, put him absolutely equal with him as far as authority is concerned, but even more important than that it says that the authority of Rome comes because it is the great ancient capitol of the empire, and Constantinople is the new capitol of the empire and therefore it should have a similar authority, well now Leo of course did not ~~his~~ claim that his authority had any thing to do with the ~~council~~ ^{fact} that Rome had been the capitol