

**OPEN RESPONSE**  
***to the Letter of Mr. Anthonios Markou***  
***(Translation from the original Greek)***

Dear brother in Christ Anthony,

With much grief I read your letter to brother Theoharis. I was grieved because you said other things when I visited you with Father Pedro, his wife Lucia and Theoharis, and now you write other things in your letter. Do you know about the truth? Of course, you know. Do you know about Orthodoxy? Of course, you know. Do you know about the Holy Fathers? Of course, you know. Do you know about the canonical order of the Church? Of course, you know all these things. But how do you ignore them now?

On the first paragraph of your letter you write:

*“Theoharis, my child, I send you this message in order to express my sadness. I’d ask you if you are ashamed of your behaviour, but shame is a virtue and I don’t think you have it...”*

Brother Anthony, Theoharis is a golden child, and very shy. Whoever knows him very well knows that a pure and God-fearing lad like Theoharis is rare to find in today’s society. Although he grew up as Evangelical (Protestant) and comes from a third-generation Evangelical Greek family, he decided to investigate matters of Faith and was baptized five years ago in the Russian Orthodox Church in Exile. The fact that Theoharis went from being an Evangelical to discovering Genuine Orthodoxy is a small miracle. The fact he remained and lives as a chaste lad, a zealot for things divine, a struggler for Patristic Piety, and with temperance and respect, is the greater miracle. Admiration and high esteem is due. If only there were others like Theoharis in Greece and in the world in general, Orthodoxy would also shine! There wouldn’t be today’s chaos we see among the “GOC” of whichever faction.

The truth must be said. Theoharis is very shy. He has the virtue of shame, and those who know him can verify this truth. And for this reason he couldn’t endure the disgracefulness of Bp. Kirykos Kontogiannis! Those who do not have the virtue of shame are those who accept Bp. Kirykos’ scandals and especially those who give excuses in order for the scandals to continue! So if there is any

lack of shame, it does not concern Theoharis, but rather Bp. Kirykos himself and those profane people, yourself among them, who justify his scandals!

In your letter you continue:

*"...Come on, my child, one year near Bishop Kirykos (he gave you hospitality, as he could, he gave you shelter, and he fed you) and your thanks is your scandalization, **that he sleeps in the same building with sister Valentina?** Did you understand this so long near him? I know him for almost 40 years, as a person he has his faults, but nobody has ever accused him of immorality..."*

First, brother Anthony, I want to thank you because by writing the sentence "...he sleeps in the same building with sister Valentina..." you testify in writing the sad REALITY that was also told to us by the nun Vikentia (Kirykos' sister according to the flesh), which she said with many tears. Now she may deny that she told us these things, but she didn't tell them to just one person. She told them to several people: two from Australia, one from the United States, two from Canada, others from Larissa, others from various parts of Greece and abroad. She didn't tell them with a smile, she told them with tears and pain, because these are indeed very sad things. Now if she is in denial, it is in order for her to escape from her brother. But since *Presbytera* (Matushka) Antonina and five different families in Menidi who are really scandalized by Valentina's case, told us the same thing, and since we saw with our own eyes that Kirykos actually lives and sleeps with Valentina, how can it be possible to act as if all is "milk and honey?"

And what exactly was revealed by Nun Vikentia, *Presbytera* Antonina, the five families, various monks, the former novices of Koropi, and other people who are witnesses and know all these things first-hand? That Bp. Kirykos SLEEPS (as you wrote) in the same building with a woman, Ms. Valentina, who is not blood-related to him, she is not even a nun, but a simple unmarried laywoman, who for 22 years acts as Kirykos' "housemaid," and for several of these years "sleeps" with him, earlier at Kalithea, at Peristeri, at Koropi (until Valentina was expelled by nun Vikentia when the latter entered Koropi Monastery and "found them together," as she said), and now the couple lives and even sleep day and night at the "Hermitage of Our Lady of *Paramythia* (Consolation)" in Menidi, where the walls were built very high, and the doors are always locked, so only God knows what happens inside this "hermitage."

Let us note here that when Ms. Valentina started collecting thousands of euros in order to build the actual building at Menidi, she used the idea that a

NURSING HOME would be built to aid the community. You cannot ignore this truth that the people happily gave their donations because it was for a nursing home! If only these unfortunate souls knew that the the term “nursing home” was only a ploy used by Kirykos and Valentina to raise money! If they told the Pontians of Menidi “We are building a house so Kirykos can sleep there together with his housemaid,” would the Pontians have given their money? Of course not! They would not have given a single cent!

But some old people are naïve and just don’t understand. One old man from Menidi used to smoke. At confession, Kirykos told him “Stop smoking.” The old man came back after a few months and told Kirykos: “I want to thank you for telling me to stop smoking! Now I feel very well! To thank you, I made two chairs: one for you, and one... for your wife!” (!!!). How was the wretched man to know that Valentina is not Bishop Kirykos’ wife, but she simply “sleeps in the same building” with him, as you have just written it?

In any case the poor people were cheated. They gave thousands upon thousands of euros, but when the work was finished and they expected some old people to move into the nursing home... What a strange surprise! Kirykos nestled there himself... with his Valentina! And you cannot deny this fact because the day Valentina started moving her belongings in there, the tears of the other women were heard throughout Menidi! Because their offerings, their money, their hard work, etc., for the “nursing home” was all lost! They realized that there was never a “nursing home,” but only disorder and deceit!

If it were a proper Convent it would be another thing. But Bp. Kirykos tonsured a new nun (Nun Kyranna) in December 2009, but instead of living at the “hermitage” as it should be, this nun continues living in the house of her daughter (Barbara). And who lives at the “hermitage?” Kirykos with his Valentina! He has kept Valentina as a laywoman for 22 years, and she dresses as a *presbytera* (priest’s wife). She dresses as the *presbytera* of Bishop Kirykos!

Even if she were a nun, this “blessed” woman it is not allowed to live alone with the Bishop if there are not other nuns living there. And even if there were other nuns, the bishop must sleep outside, in another place, as is the norm in other Old Calendarist Convents. For example, at the Convent of Our Lady of *Axion Estin* (It is Truly Meet), in Methoni, Pieria, His Grace, Bishop Tarasios, sleeps in a completely different building and far from the nuns. And these nuns are many, and not just one, and they are truly nuns, and not laywomen serving as “housemaids.” This canonical order is neglected in the person of Bishop

Kirykos Kontogiannis, who claims to be an exceptional zealot and a “super” confessor! But his claims are all talk, and he puts nothing into practice.

Brother Anthony, it is not a matter of “shame.” It is a matter of Holy Canons. It is a matter of Ecclesiastical Tradition and Order. It is a matter of Orthopraxia. It is a matter of Orthodoxy. The 1923 “Pan-Orthodox” (rather Pan-heretical) Conference by Meletios Metaxakis did not require only a change of the calendar, but also other even worse cacodoxies, such as the marriage of bishops, etc. If we disavow the change of calendar, how can we accept the marriage of bishops? And indeed, in the Apostolic times, Bishops were married, but legally! They did not have a laywoman residing with them that “sleeps in the same building” (as you wrote) and plays the “housemaid.” And if perchance this disorder was taking place, the bishop would be defrocked immediately! They would not permit the scandal to continue for 22 years!

Even if nothing happens between Bishop Kirykos and Ms. Valentina (God knows!), even if she is simply “the bishop’s housemaid,” the fact that Bishop Kirykos “sleeps in the same building with sister Valentina” (as you expressed it) makes Bishop Kirykos liable not only to deposition but also to excommunication!

We quote the relevant Sacred Canons.

Canon 3 of the First Ecumenical Council writes: *“The great Council has forbidden generally any Bishop or Presbyter or Deacon, and anyone else at all among those in the clergy, the privilege of having a subintroducta [i.e., housemaid]. Unless she is either a mother, or a sister, or an aunt, or a person above suspicion.”* The interpretation of St. Nicodemus: *“Men in holy orders and clergymen ought not to cause the laity any suspicion or scandal. On this account the present Canon ordains that this great Council—the First Ecumenical, that is to say—has entirely forbidden any bishop or presbyter or deacon or any other clergyman to have a strange woman in his house, and to live with her, excepting only a mother, or a sister, or an aunt, or other persons that do not arouse any suspicion.”* (The Rudder in English, O.C.I.S., p. 165)

Do you see, brother Anthony, what the Holy First Ecumenical Council writes? Valentina is neither a nun, nor an aunt, nor any person who does not give suspicion. On the contrary, she is not related at all to Bishop Kirykos. But for 22 years she works as a “housemaid” of the then hieromonk and later bishop. And for some of these years they were living together, alone, earlier at Kallithea, at Peristeri, at Koropi, and now at Menidi. Bishop Kirykos has a real sister according to the flesh, namely, nun Vikentia, who lives at Koropi, at Kirykos’ so-

called "Episcopal House." But Kirykos does not live with his real sister, rather he sleeps and lives with his fake *presbytera* (or rather *episkopissa*) Valentina at Menidi! He goes to Koropi only when a stranger comes, so it may "appear" that he supposedly lives there. Bishop Kirykos argues that he is fighting for the Old Calendar for the preservation of the resolutions of the First Ecumenical Council. If that is the case, how does he ignore the 3rd Canon of the same Council? How does he disregard it, while simultaneously posing to be "super" canonical?

Canon 5 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council writes: *"Let no one on the sacerdotal list acquire a woman or housemaid except persons mentioned in the Canon as being above suspicion, but let him safeguard his reputation in this respect. Let even eunuchs safeguard themselves in this very same situation too, by providing themselves with a blameless character. As for those who transgress this injunction, if they are Clergymen, let them be deposed from office; but if they are laymen let them be excommunicated."* The interpretation of St. Nicodemus: *"What the present Canon decrees is the following. Let none of those in holy orders who are living modestly have a woman staying in their house, or a servant girl, unless she be among those specified in a Canon as being above suspicion—this refers to c. III of the First Ec. C.—such persons being a mother and a sister and an aunt; so as to keep himself from becoming liable to incur blame from either the father or the mother in relation to the laity. Anyone among persons that transgresses this Canon, let him be deposed from office. Likewise eunuchs, too, must keep themselves safe from any accusation against them, and therefore let them not dwell together with suspicious persons. In case they dare to do this, if they are clergymen (as having been involuntarily, that is to say, or by nature made eunuchs), let them be deposed from office; but if they are laymen, let them be excommunicated. Read also c. III of the First Ec. C."* (The Rudder in English, O.C.I.C., p. 298)

Do you see, then, brother Antony, that bishop Kirykos is worthy of deposition? It is not enough that he was deposed by the Synod of the "Five," it is not enough that he was deposed by the Synod of Archbishop Nicholas, but even now Kirykos' own "Pan-Orthodox Synod," if only it really loved and appreciated the Sacred Canons, would also consider Kirykos liable to deposition! Kirykos knows how to open the Rudder (Pedalion) on the heads of other Bishops of various factions. He never opens the Rudder on his own head. And this is because he is not a Christian but a Pharisee, and this Phariseeism drove him to his current condition of delusion and schismatoheresy.

Canon 18 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council writes: *"Be ye unoffending even to outsiders, says the Apostle (1 Cor. 10:32). But for women to be dwelling in bishoprics, or in monasteries, is a cause for everyone's taking offense. If, therefore, anyone*

*be caught in possession of a female slave or of a free woman in a bishopric, or in a monastery, for the performance of any service, or ministration, let him be penanced; and if he persists, let him be deposed from office. If, on the other hand, it should happen that in the suburbs there are women, and a Bishop, or an Abbot, wants to go to there, while the Bishop or Abbot is present, let no woman perform any sort of service whatever for him during that time, but let her keep to herself in a different place until the Bishop takes his departure, to avoid any reproach.”* The interpretation of St. Nicodemus: *“The present Canon prohibits women from being within bishoprics and monasteries in order to act as servants, since such a thing causes great scandal and brings great discredit upon prelates and monks both among secular Christians and among the heathen. In fact, the Apostle orders us not to give any offense to even Jews and Greeks outside the Church. So if any prelate or abbot should be caught doing this, let him be duly canonized. But if he should persist in doing it and be incorrigible, let him be deposed from office. If, on the other hand, in the latifundia of a bishopric or of a monastery there should be any women, and the prelate or the abbot should go there to any part of them, as long as these men are there the women are not to perform any act of service, but are to keep away until they depart, on account of the necessity of avoiding any offense or reproach. See also c. III of the First.”* (Rudder in English, O.C.I.C., pp. 446-447)

Brother Anthony, the Sacred Canons explain very clearly the canonical order of the Church of Christ. Do you believe in the validity of the Sacred Canons? Or perhaps like Bishop Kirykos wrote in his letter to Father Pedro, you also believe that “the Canon is right, but we must interpret it correctly,” by which method he entirely overlooks and overturns the Canon, in order to continue his disorders? Or maybe you believe like some innovators of the “Ecumenical Patriarchate” who call the Holy Rudder (Pedalion) “toilet paper”?!!!

Since, for several years, I have been researching the history and tradition of Aramaic Orthodoxy, *i.e.*, the Orthodox Church of Sassanid Persia, I will provide a Sacred Canon of the Holy Local Council convened in 410 AD under St. Isaac, Archbishop of Seleucia, in the presence of 38 bishops. Canon 3 of the aforementioned Holy Council writes: *“Again, concerning female co-habitants: according to what was established by the Council, we all enact that hereafter any man, whether bishop, presbyter, deacon, sub-deacon, or any other clergyman, who makes his dwelling with women and not chastely and in holiness by himself, as is solely proper for the ministry of the church—men with men alone—the same shall not be received in the ministry of the church.”* (The Synod of Mar Ishaq, 410 AD).

Do you see, brother Anthony, that not only in Churches of the Roman Empire, but in those of the Persian State, relevant Sacred Canons were decreed

from the beginning which prohibit Bishops and laywomen to live in the same house? The Universal Church has decreed its decision regarding this matter. No one, and certainly not Kirykos, can invalidate or silence the Voice of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ!

Canon 88 of St. Basil the Great writes: *“I received your letters with all longsuffering, and I marveled that, though able to defend yourself briefly and readily by means of the facts, you insist upon discussing the accusations and try to remedy the irremediable with small words. We were not the first nor the only ones to lay down the law, O Gregory, prohibiting women from cohabiting with men; but please read the Canon promulgated by our Holy Fathers in the Council of Nicaea, which explicitly prohibits them from being subintroductae (or “housekeepers”). The respectability of celibacy consists in this, that it prevents association with women. So that, if anyone professing it verbally does the things done by those who cohabit with women, it is plain that he is forfeiting the respectability of virginity that resides in the appellation, and is not actually abstaining from improprieties in the matter of sensual pleasure. You ought indeed to have been so much the more ready to yield to our suggestion as you assert outright that you are free from every bodily passion. For I am persuaded that neither a man of seventy years of age would cohabit in a passionate fashion with a woman, nor have we with regard to any supervening act ruled what we have ruled as due to any improper act, but because we have been taught by the Apostle that “no one should put an obstacle or a stumbling-block in his brother’s way” (Rom. 14:13). But we are aware that what has been done by others soundly and sanely, will become to others an occasion for sinning. On this account we ordered you, in pursuance of the injunction of the Holy Fathers, to separate from the hag. Why, then, are you accusing the chorepiscopus and bringing up old enmities! Why are you blaming us for lending ready ears to admission of the calumnies! Cast her out of your house, therefore, and settle her in a monastery. Let her remain with virgins, and find yourself male servants, to prevent the name of God from being blasphemed on your account (Isa. 52; Rom. 2:24). Until you have done these things, the myriads of protests you are writing in letters will avail you naught, but, on the contrary, you will die suspended from duties and will have to give the Lord an account for your own state of suspension and idleness. If, on the other hand, you should dare, instead of correcting yourself, to oppose the Priesthood, you will be anathema to all the laity, and any persons accepting you will become outlawed with respect to every church.”*

The interpretation of St. Nicodemus: *“This man Gregory having been at fault in the matter of morality on account of his keeping a virgin woman and nun in his home to attend him as a servant. St. Basil the Great wrote to him to chase her away. Gregory, however, with many excuses for his misconduct, tried to defend himself. Hence in the present letter the Saint first reproaches him because though able to defend himself readily*

*enough by actual deeds, as by chasing the woman away, he offers countless excuses and pretexts. Secondly the Saint tells him that it was not St. Basil that made it law for clerics and those in holy orders not to have women as cohabitants, but the First Ecumenical Council in its c. III. Afterwards he adds that virgin men and those in holy orders have this claim to respectability, namely, their being excluded from association with womankind. If perchance any one of them should profess to be a virgin, but should nevertheless cohabit with women, he is merely proving that his love of virginity was confined to words, whereas in point of deeds he was not willing to deny himself the pleasures to be enjoyed with women. So, Gregory, you ought, he tells him, as readily obey us and chase the woman away as you are declaring that you are not concerned about her. For a readiness and quickness to expel the woman would serve to confirm your unconcern for her; because not even I would ever believe that you who are a man in his seventies would be passionately and pleasurably cohabiting with the woman. But inasmuch as we have been taught by the Apostle not to give offense to others, and since that which others may do without passion and sin such as that, for example, which you are now doing yourself- may be something which may cause others to become passionate and induce them to sin by setting them an example, for all these reasons we have ordered you to chase the woman away from your home, in conformity with c. III of the Nicene Council; and do not accuse either the chorepiscopus of being your enemy as you allege and of having called my attention to the woman, or me on the theory that I am prone to believe in calumnies; but blame yourself for being unwilling to separate from the woman. So cast her out and put her in a monastery; and let her be like a virgin living with virgin women and nuns, while you, as a man, have men serve you, in order to prevent the name of God from being blasphemed by unbelievers on your account when they see you. If, on the other hand, you refuse to chase the woman away, rest assured that in spite of all the myriads of excuses you may offer, you will have to render an account for your suspension from duty as the cause of it, not I. If, again, you dare to continue performing the priestly offices before having corrected yourself, you will be anathematized by all the laity, and any persons that accept you will be chased out of every church. See also c. III of the 1st.”* (Rudder in English, O.C.I.S., pp. 847-848)

Do you see, brother Anthony, that St. Basil in the above Sacred Canon not only deposes but even ANATHEMATIZES the seventy-year old Bishop Gregory because he had a housemaid? And what can be said of Kirykos, who just turned 60, but had his housemaid for 22 years earlier, *i.e.*, from the time he was only 38 years old? And whether or not there is a question of carnal sin, the very fact that he “sleeps in the same building with Valentina” (as you wrote), makes him liable to deposition and anathematization!

How is Bishop Kirykos afraid of the anathemas of the Pan-Orthodox Council of 1583 regarding the calendar, while he submits himself so slightly to this terrible anathema that we read in the above-mentioned Holy Canon of St. Basil the the Great? Do you know the meaning of “anathema,” brother Anthony? If so, do you see how serious this matter is? Then how can Bishop Kirykos Kontogiannis play the “super zealot” and allege himself to be the “only canonical bishop in Greece” (while from 2005 to 2008 he believed that he was the only real bishop left on earth!) and simultaneously be liable not only to deposition but also anathematization? This hypocrisy also surpasses that of the Saducees and Pharisees! An anathema is an anathema, be it in regards to the calendar, or be it in regards to him living in the same house with a woman!

In your letter you continue:

*“Is this a gentleman’s behaviour? Is this kindness? Is this a Christian ethos?...”*

You tell us, brother Anthony! Is this the right conduct of a bishop, and especially of one claiming to be “super” Orthodox? Is it Christian ethos that leads Kirykos to live in the same house with a strange woman, in scorn of the Holy Canons and causing the ordinary people to be scandalized?

You write:

*“...If you had a problem with the Bishop because of something, you should have told him your problem, thank him for the hospitality that he offered you, and afterwards go where you feel at rest. And of course, leave during the day as a gentleman and not at night like a thief...”*

Many times we tried to discuss this matter as well as the matter of Frequent Holy Communion. But Bishop Kirykos as always, did whatebver he could to ignore us, either he left for Menidi not to stay to listen to our questions or he roared like a lion in order to silence us. When Fr. Pedro asked me to raise the issue of Frequent Holy Communion (because he does not know the Greek language well), I raised the issue immediately in front of several witnesses. And bishop Kirykos’ answer was “What you are saying is scholasticism!” Alas! I showed him the Sacred Canons, I showed him Patristic data and his reply did not change! “Scholasticism,” supposedly! But the wretched one does not even know what scholasticism is! Because if he knew he would understand that the greatest scholasticism does not exist anywhere else but in “Orthodox Breath,” or rather “Unorthodox Smoke” or “Shortness of Breath” or “Bronchitis” as people

throughout Greece call his magazine! And the two heretical letters of Bishop Kirykos to Father Pedro are perfect examples of scholasticism written by an outright Latin-minded person!

Since Bishop Kirykos was scorning me, Theoharis tried to talk to him, but Bishop Kirykos also ignored him. Then the theologian Christos Noukas, who knows the issue much better, tried to talk to him. But when he tried to explain the issue to him, Kirykos yelled at him 7 times in a row "Stop talking!" and hung up. So then, how is it that we did not try to express our queries? And yet when Bishop Kirykos sent his first unorthodox, uncanonical and in all respects heretical letter to Fr. Pedro, again both Fr. Pedro and Theoharis and Mr. Christos Noukas tried to explain to Bishop Kirykos that he is falling into serious heresies, but again he ignored them. Then and only then, with fear, faith and love for the dogmas of the Orthodox Church and traditional reverence, Fr. Pedro denounced Kirykos as a heretic and blasphemer.

A little later, Mr. Christos Noukas and Theoharis spoke with Fr. Amphilochius and Fr. Andrew, and showed them the two heretical letters of Kirykos, which Kirykos tried to hide. Then Fr Amphilochius and Fr. Andrew realized that Bishop Kirykos made many dogmatic errors in his two letters. But unfortunately these two priests stay in communion with the unorthodox and scandalous Kirykos, displaying their indifference to the matters of the Faith. However, the God-fearing Theoharis denounced Kirykos!

My unworthiness, having returned to Australia much earlier and being very far away, heard the news on the topic much later, when Fr. Pedro sent me the two heretical letters written by Bishop Kirykos. But by then Father Pedro had already denounced Bishop Kirykos. After the examination of the documents, and much study of various Patristic texts and Holy Canons, I also denounced Kirykos as a heretic and blasphemer, and joined the Australian Archdiocese of the True Russian Orthodox Church of the Catacombs, where the dogmas of the Church and the sacred canons are maintained and respected without hypocrisy. And especially as an apology of faith, I also offer a website in which I clearly present the issue of Holy Communion as well as some ecclesiological issues which were revealed to me when I photocopied Kirykos' archive (with Kirykos' blessing!), and realized that bishop Kirykos and Mr. Gkoutzidis deceive us all for 30 years by hiding significant documents, some of which are (for the very first time) publicly available on the website: <http://www.genuineorthodoxchurch.net>

In your letter you continue:

*“...Regarding the issue of Holy Communion, I have been studying the topic from 1979 (when a Clergy Congress was convened at Holy Transfiguration Monastery, where I gave an introduction). One thing is frequent or continuous Holy Communion, my child, and another without presupposition, without preparation. No where, my child, does there exist a tradition to eat meat and receive communion the next day. I think the best is expressed by St. Nicodemus of Athos in the Sacred Rudder (Pedalion). ‘Although a fast prior to Holy Communion is not provided by the Canons, a three-day fasting is good.’ There exists some reason for the saint to say so...”*

Brother Anthony, which of the two is greater? The “conference” of 1979 or the Holy Canons of the Holy Apostles? The “conference” of 1979 or the Holy Canons of the Seven Ecumenical Councils? The “conference” of 1979 or the Council of 1819 under Ecumenical Patriarch St. Gregory V the New Martyr? The “conference” of 1979 or the approved Counciliar resolution of the Church of Greece in 1886 in favour of the Orthodox Book “Regarding Continuous Communion” of our holy fathers among the saints, St. Macarius Notaras and St. Nicodemus of Athos?

And tell us, dear brother Anthony, when did either Fr. Pedro or Theoharis or Mr. Christos Noukas, or my unworthiness proclaimed that Christians supposedly must “eat meat and receive communion the next day” as you slanderously expressed it? We never proclaimed and never said such a thing. So show us one document in which we expressed such a theory. It does not exist because we never said and never wrote such thing. Fr. Pedro expressed the issue of Holy Communion for the first time during the Dormition Fast of 2009. For the second time he expressed the issue through my unworthiness during November 2009, at the time of the Nativity Fast. For the third time Fr. Pedro expressed his query through Theoharis and Mr. Christos Noukas during Great Lent of 2010. In all three episodes, an issue of “meat” did not exist since Orthodox Christians do not eat meat during these Fasts. The issue was only about the partaking of wine and oil on Saturdays of the Fasts, as the Holy Canons order and as directed even by the “wall calendar” which Kirykos publishes himself. Since the three episodes happened during the Fasts, how do you slander us without fear of God that we supposedly preached “meat-eating” before Holy Communion?

Since your question is rejected as coming from Bishop Kirykos’ evil slanders, allow us to ask you the following questions. Brother Antony, please ask a person from another religion, whether a Jew or a Muslim, an idolater, a Buddhist or a Hindu: “What day of the week do Christians receive communion?”

What will they reply? If they have general education, they will certainly answer "Sunday!" And if you ask them, "What is the day of communion for the Jews?" You will receive the answer "Saturday!" Brother Anthony, ask a little child, ask an old man, ask anyone you want, and without any doubt, you will receive the same answer. Because, brother Anthony, from the time of Christ until today, it is known to everyone that the day of the week in which Christians receive communion always was, still is, and always will be Sunday! Sunday is the Day of Resurrection and Life. Sunday is the day that the Divine Liturgy is indispensable, and the purpose of the Divine Liturgy is Holy Communion. The Apostles, the Holy Fathers from the day of the life-giving Resurrection until today, all taught us this. It is a truth that not only every Christian knows, but people from other faiths also know it, because it is one of the main traditions of Christianity. Now ask Bishop Kyrkos: "What day of the week should Christians prefer to receive communion?" What answer will you receive from the "super Orthodox" and "super canonical" Kyrkos? His answer is: "Saturday!" Tremble O heaven, and groan O earth! Brother Anthony, is this a Christian tradition? Certainly not! It is the tradition of the deicidal Jews and antichristian Sabbatians! Furthermore, Bishop Kyrkos falls in the heresies of Pelagianism, Manichaeism, etc., as we clearly present on the website.

And as far as the footnote in the Rudder regarding a three-day fast, you know very well this footnote regards PRIESTS more than the laity. Whereas bishop Kyrkos never does these things that he demands for the laity. While he demands all laymen to fast from oil for three days before communion, Kyrkos himself and his clergy eat dairy products, eggs, and fish, some even eat meat, even as late as midnight on Saturday night and receive communion on Sunday morning without feeling unworthy. So if "the three-day fast is good" as you write, why doesn't bishop Kyrkos fulfill this fast himself? Also, you know very well that this footnote of the Rudder is not from St. Nicodemus but is rather from the ill-famed, Sabbatian, Anti-Kollyvadic Monk Theodoret, who wrote many cacodoxies in the text of the Rudder (Pedalion) without the opinion of Saints Nicodemus of Athos and Macarius Notaras, and, for this reason, Theodoret was condemned synodically (see in the foreword of the Rudder the letter of Ecumenical Patriarch Neophytus VI). St. Nicodemus of Athos expressed clearly his opinion in the book "Regarding Continuous Holy Communion" which if you read you will confirm that it is very unlikely that St. Nicodemus wrote the particular footnote concerning the alleged "three-day fast." But by reading the footnote, it is clear that it pertains to clergymen more than laymen!

In your letter you continue:

*“...You are still very young, do not start your life picking up coals (slanders, etc), you will find them in front of you. In my 55 years I have seen many like you, I saw their arrogance, their pride, thinking that they know everything, judging everyone and everything, and they finally ended up as spiritual wrecks...”*

Brother Anthony, hitherto I only knew two “spiritual wrecks” who only know how to “judge everyone and everything” within the society of the so-called GOC of Greece, namely, the layman Mr. Menas Kontogiannis who parades himself as “Bishop Kirykos,” and the so-called “theologian” Mr. Eleutherius Gkoutzidis! This is the bitter truth. I visited the whole of Greece, including the Monasteries of the Matthewites and Florinites, and those of the conservative New Calendarists. I also visited the houses of some Matthewites of Kirykos’ Synod and many former Matthewites who knew Mr. Kontogiannis, Mr. Gkoutzidis, and yourself, brother Anthony, very well. They have known the three of you since at least 1970. Every one of them expressed exactly the same things and with detail. Some of these people are from Athens; others from Crete; other from the Islands; others from the Peloponnese; others from Continental Greece; others from Thessaly; others from Macedonia. Every one of them expressed exactly the same things, and with much detail. It is therefore unlikely that they are all lying. This is common knowledge among those who have known you since 1970. Upon hearing your names, the people are disgusted. Perhaps if the three of you dwell in caves and hide, you may find God’s mercy. But you are definitely unfit to be the leaders of any “Genuine Orthodox Church.”

And among those who do not know you, most of the recipients of “Orthodox Breath” don’t even open the envelope. And this is because they know very well that there are many texts in the archive that you have hidden because they are not to your advantage. Thus, you present the most fake “history” concerning the supposedly “purest confession” and “purest apostolic succession.” Admittedly, even my unworthiness was tricked by the fraud of “Unorthodox Smoke,” which is why until now I used to write in favour of the ill-famed Kirykos. However, when I photographed the whole archive in December 2009 and started reading the texts that Mr. Kontogiannis and Mr. Gkoutzidis had hidden for 30 years, I understood that these two men are the greatest deceivers and that they are responsible for the continuation of the schism of 1937, for the old schisms of 1976 and 1977, and for the recent schisms of 1995 and 2005. Some of these documents now appear on the website. Unfortunately, brother Anthony, since you have joined the ranks of the above two crooks, you exist as the third “spiritual wreck.”

Theoharis does not “judge everyone and everything.” But he is a God-fearing Genuine Orthodox Christian, and has a real love for the Faith and the Fatherland. For this reason, despite growing up as an Evangelical Protestant he embraced Orthodoxy and was baptized in the Russian Orthodox Church in Exile. And despite being born in the United States of America, he went to his ancestral homeland, Greece, and fulfilled his military service. He is a Genuine Greek Orthodox Christian. He is not a hero-worshiper like you are, and he cannot stand blasphemies, heresies, Sabbatanism, Pelagianism, Manichaeism, Latinofrankism, the disrespect to the Holy Canons, and generally, all the scandals and disorders of Kirykos.

If you are really Orthodox, you will also renounce the cacodox and scandalous false-bishop Kirykos, and you will be saved. Otherwise you will be accused of the same anathema. Let us read again what St. Basil the Great writes, (through the direct literal translation into the vernacular by St. Nicodemus):

*“If, on the other hand, you refuse to chase the woman away, rest assured that in spite of all the myriads of excuses you may offer, you will have to render an account for your suspension from duty as the cause of it, not I. If, again, you dare to continue performing the priestly offices before having corrected yourself, you will be anathematized by all the laity, **and any persons that accept you will be chased out of every church...**”*

Brother Anthony, according to St. Basil the Great, those who accept Kirykos and cover and justify his scandals are to be “chased out of every church.” Brother Anthony, this applies to you.

In Christ,

Stavros, a sinner