From a parishioner of St. Peter the Aleut Orthodox Church, sent on November 18, 2025 (NS):

Vladika bless!

I hope you are doing well. Pray for me as I pray for you. I have a couple questions for you if you don't mind me asking. When you left ROCOR for Boston, what were the reasons behind you leaving ROCOR? Did you believe ROCOR was in heresy when Boston left?

If I remember correctly, you also left Boston for the GOC-S (Matthewites). Why did you end up leaving Boston? What were the reasons you left the GOC-S?

Kissing your right hand, [Redacted]

The response from His Eminence, the Most Reverend Archbishop Andrei to the same parishioner, sent on November 18, 2025 (NS):

God bless you, [Redacted]!

I left ROCOR because of Met. Vitaly's Christmas Epistle that he circulated right after the repose of St. Philaret. Met. Vitaly, basically, canceled the anathema against ecumenism of 1983. I immediately felt that this would lead the ROCOR into union with the Vatican, eventually. ROCOR did enter into communion with the Cyprianite Synod in 1994, and with the Soviet church in 2007. The MP has been in communion with the Vatican since 1969. HOCNA was one part of the ROCOR which left the new administration of the main ROCOR group in order to preserve Orthodoxy. Bishop Gregory Grabbe had written an article on the Dubious Orthodoxy of the Synod in Resistance (Cyprianites). ROCOR went into communion with this synod in 1994. Vladyka Gregory wrote in the conclusion of his article that by establishing communion with the Synod in Resistance, the ROCOR had fallen under its own anathema of 1983. So, yes. I did think that they were in heresy.

At the time I joined HOCNA, our bishop was Met. Akakios of Diavleia.

In November of 1987, all the clergy of HOCNA, except for Fr. Anthony Gavalas and myself, left Met. Akakios, without his permission, to join themselves to Archbishop Auxentios. I did not believe that it was the proper thing to do.

A couple of years later, Met. Akakios wrote to Fr. Anthony Gavalas, in whose parish I was serving as second priest, that he could no longer sustain having us under his omophorion, and told us to look for another synod to join. We approached the Matthewite synod and were eventually accepted by them.

I did not leave Boston (HOCNA). They left Met. Akakios, and I stayed with him. It was HOCNA that recommended Met. Akakios to me in the first place. Once he accepted me, I did not think it was correct to leave him without his blessing, like the rest of the clergy in HOCNA did.

I left the Matthewite synod as a result of my wife taking another husband and leaving with my children. She is bipolar. She had slandered me so badly that no one wanted anything more to do with me. After four years of waiting for the leadership of the Matthewites to answer my letters about what to do, and receiving no answer, I decided to go to the monastery of the ROAC in Colorado, in hopes that everyone in the world would forget that I had ever lived.

From the same parishioner of St. Peter the Aleut Orthodox Church, sent on November 20, 2025 (NS). The Most Reverend Archbishop Andrei's responses are in **bold**:

Vladika,

Thank you for your speedy reply. You said that you left ROCOR shortly after Met. Vitaly's Christmas epistle. Did he give you a canonical release or did you just leave on your own volition?

Of course, I asked for a release. And Met. Vitaly acquiesced.

What did that process look like?

I wrote a letter to Met. Vitaly, and he answered me through Bishop Hilarion, who was the secretary of the ROCOR at that time. He informed me of Met. Vitaly's decision by telephone. I confirmed it with Bishop Gregory; also by telephone.

Also, at one point in history do you believe ROCOR fell into heresy?

Yes.

Was it shortly after the release of the Christmas epistle?

It was when Bishop Gregory Grabbe wrote in his article about the Dubious Orthodoxy of Metropolitan Cyprianos of Oropos and Fili that by going into communion with this synod, the ROCOR had fallen under its own anathema against ecumenism of 1983. It was confirmed on May 17, 2007, when Met. Laurus signed "the great act of unification with the MP" in Moscow. For more than 80 years the ROCOR considered the MP to a be false church. Met. Anthony Khrapovitsky considered the MP to be a false church. St. Met. Philaret considered the MP to be a false church. Met. Vitaly considered the MP to be a false church. You can, even now, find YouTube videos (in Russian) where St. Met. Philaret and Met. Vitaly express, in their own words, that the MP sacraments are not valid.

Do you believe that the name of God is a divine energy of God?

What do you mean by "energy"?

I am sorry for all the questions. I'm just trying to understand these matters.

Are you fishing for something to help Fr. Mark find fault with me? That would be very shameful, indeed. To pretend to be looking for truth, only to try to catch me in my words.

The question of "imyaslavie" was last examined by the Synod of Moscow in 1914. The president of the 1914 synod was Met. Makariy Nevsky (later martyred by the Soviets) of Moscow. One of the members of this synod was Bishop Anastasy Gribanovsky, who, years later, became the second chief hierarch of the ROCOR, after Met. Anthony Khrapovitsky. At the 1914 synod meeting, the decision of the 1913 synod was set aside. The matter was referred to the Church's theologians for study and slated for final decision at the Sobor of 1917-1918. However, the revolution cut the work of the Sobor short, and this question was left unresolved. When asked in the early 1960s about impassive, Met. Anastasy replied that nothing has changed since the time when the question was referred for examination at an all-Russian Sobor, which could not then be had because of the prevalent political circumstances. This means that this question is UNRESOLVED. No one has made a determination about imvaslavie, either for it, or against it. No legitimate synod has declared it to be a heresy. No legitimate synod has declared not to be a heresy. Can you understand that?

Kissing yore right hand,

[Redacted]