

When Someone in the Church Has Hurt Them

Standalone Practicum Module · Matthew 18:6-7; Matthew 23:1-7, 23-28; John 21:15-19; 2 Corinthians 4:7

SESSION OVERVIEW

Discovery Aim

Discover that the harshest language in the Gospels is aimed at religious leaders who damage the people in their care, that Christ said it before any critic did, and that the truth of a message is not voided by the unworthiness of the messenger. Then learn to tell the difference between an objection and a wound, and to answer each one differently.

Catholic Touchstone

The Church is at once holy and always in need of purification. That is true, and it is not an answer to somebody's pain, and this module exists to keep your people from using it as one.

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

Read all of this before you run it, and do not run it defensively

The single most common failure in this conversation is answering a wound with an argument. The second most common is defending an institution when the person in front of you was not attacking an institution, they were describing something that happened to them or to someone they love.

The module has one governing rule, and it is in the practicum: **the first sentence may not be a defense.** Everything else follows from that.

Somebody in your own group may have been hurt themselves. Assume it. Do not go around the room, do not ask anyone to share, and be available afterward.

You will not out-condemn Christ on this

Matthew 18:6-7: "whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a great millstone fastened round his neck and to be drowned in the depth of the sea."

Read that beside the fiercest thing a critic has ever said about the Church and notice which is harsher. The Lord got there first, in his own words, and the Catechism quotes precisely this verse when it treats the gravity of scandal (CCC 2285).

This is the opening move of the whole module. Not "the Church is holy," which is true and is not what the moment needs. The opening move is that Christ said it worse, and he said it about people who harm the vulnerable in his name.

Where the Lord's anger actually falls

Matthew 23 is tonight's live discovery, so hold the detail. What your group needs to see is the pattern: some of Jesus's severest rebukes fall on religious leaders whose hypocrisy harms others. He eats with tax collectors and calls the scribes whitewashed tombs.

And in the middle of that chapter sits the sentence that does the doctrinal work of this module. Matthew 23:2-3: "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat; so practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do; for they preach, but do not practice."

The authority of the office is not voided by the unworthiness of the holder. Jesus says so about men he is in the middle of denouncing. That is not a dodge invented later to protect an institution; it is his own instruction, given in the same breath as the condemnation.

The Church's own teaching, stated precisely

CCC 1584 puts it as sharply as it can be put: the unworthiness of the minister does not prevent Christ from acting, and the Catechism quotes St. Augustine there, that the spiritual power of the sacrament is like light, which passes through defiled beings without itself being defiled.

And CCC 1550 immediately blocks the misuse: the fact that grace is not impeded by the minister's unworthiness does not mean the minister is thereby without sin. The Church teaches both, in complementary passages, and your people need both.

2 Corinthians 4:7 is an analogous reminder in St. Paul's words: "we have this treasure in earthen vessels, to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us." The vessel was never advertised as the treasure.

What John 21 is doing here, and what it is not doing

Peter denied Christ three times. In John 21:15-19 Jesus asks him three times whether he loves him, and gives him the job back.

Notice what Jesus does not do. He does not pretend it did not happen; the threefold structure makes the denial unmistakable. And he does not make Peter grovel or perform. He asks, and he restores, and he tells him plainly that it will cost him his life.

And notice what this passage is not. It is not a template for quietly restoring a man to ministry after he has harmed someone. Christ restoring Peter after cowardice is not a precedent for a diocese moving a priest after abuse, and if anyone in your group reaches for it that way, stop them. The failure your friend is describing was very often exactly that confusion.

Two different conversations

Before your group can respond well, they have to know which conversation they are in, and there are at least three.

A wound. Something was done to this person or to someone they love. An argument is not the response, and reaching for one is experienced as a second injury. The response is to receive it seriously, say so, and stop talking. Receiving a disclosure seriously is not the same as ruling on every disputed fact in it, and it is not your job to.

An institutional failure. They are describing a documented pattern of cover-up and reassignment. Here the correct response is agreement, because the claim is true, followed eventually by the distinction between the Church's claims and her ministers' conduct.

An objection. They are using the record as a reason the whole thing must be false. This one is actually an argument and can be answered as one, and it is the least common of the three.

Most people mistake the first for the third, and answer a bleeding person with a syllogism.

OLD TESTAMENT ROOTS AND FULFILLMENT

Shepherds who fed themselves

Ezekiel 34:1-10, which this study has now met three times. Woe to the shepherds of Israel who have been feeding themselves; the weak they have not strengthened, the sick they have not healed, the crippled they have not bound up, the strayed they have not brought back. And God says: I am against the shepherds. The indictment of bad religious leadership is a standing theme of the prophets, not a modern grievance.

The sons of Eli

1 Samuel 2:12-17 and 2:22-25. The priests' sons were treating the offerings with contempt and engaging in grave sexual misconduct with the women who served at the entrance to the tent of meeting, and the text says the sin of the young men was very great in the sight of the Lord. Scripture records clerical abuse in the sanctuary itself, and does not soften it.

Malachi on priests

Malachi 2:7-9: the lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and men should seek instruction from his mouth. And then: but you have turned aside from the way, you have caused many to stumble by your instruction. The standard and the failure, in consecutive verses.

VOICES OF THE CHURCH

VOICES OF THE CHURCH | St. Augustine on light passing through what is defiled

The spiritual power of a sacrament, St. Augustine wrote, is like light: those to be enlightened receive it in its purity, and if it passes through defiled beings it is not itself defiled.

The Catechism quotes him in exactly those terms when it teaches that the unworthiness of the minister does not prevent Christ from acting. This matters to anyone asking whether their own baptism or marriage or absolution still counts. The comforting part is true: a minister's unworthiness does not by itself invalidate a sacrament. Point a specific worry to a priest rather than settling it yourself, since validity turns on more than the minister.

St. Augustine, quoted at CCC 1584.

VOICES OF THE CHURCH | Pope Benedict XVI, writing to a country that had been failed

In his 2010 pastoral letter to the Catholics of Ireland, Pope Benedict XVI addressed victims of abuse directly, acknowledged that they had suffered grievously, said that he was truly sorry, recognized that their trust had been betrayed and their dignity violated, and acknowledged that in many cases church authorities had failed to act as they should have.

Do not paraphrase this into something softer. A pope writing to an entire nation of Catholics said that the authorities of the Church failed. The Church, including Benedict XVI writing to Ireland, has publicly acknowledged grave abuse and serious failures by church authorities.

Pope Benedict XVI, Pastoral Letter to the Catholics of Ireland (2010). Document-level citation.

VOICES OF THE CHURCH | St. Catherine of Siena, who did not leave

St. Catherine of Siena wrote to popes and cardinals in blunt and unsparing terms about corruption among churchmen, urging reform, calling the pope to act courageously rather than fearfully, and refusing to be deferential about what she thought was rotten.

And she never left. She is the model this module is aiming at: love for the Church that is fierce enough to say the true thing out loud from inside her, rather than defending what should not be defended. Her fidelity is worth commending, and it is not a judgment on people who have needed distance, boundaries or time in order to be safe.

St. Catherine of Siena, summarized from her Letters. A faithful summary of her posture and arguments, not a quotation.

CATECHISM CONNECTION

The Church has said all of this herself, in her own catechism, and your group should hear it from her rather than from you.

- **CCC 2284-2286.** Scandal, and its particular gravity when caused by those whose office obliges them to teach and form others. CCC 2285 quotes Matthew 18:6 directly.
- **CCC 1584.** The unworthiness of the minister does not prevent Christ from acting in the sacraments.
- **CCC 1550.** And that does not mean the minister is without sin. Both paragraphs, together, or neither.
- **CCC 827.** The Church, holding sinners close, is at once holy and always in need of purification, and follows constantly the path of penance and renewal.
- **CCC 1428.** The call to conversion is addressed to the whole Church, which is at once holy and in need of purification, and this is a work of ongoing repentance rather than a settled state.
- The comparison between a criminal doctor and the practice of medicine, if you use it, is our illustration and not the Church's teaching. Say so when you use it.

LEADER NOTES

THREAD WATCH | leader only

Standalone module. It carries none of the core study's threads.

The governing rule of the whole module is in the practicum: the first sentence may not be a defense. If your group leaves with only that, the module has worked.

Do not let this become a session about the Church's critics. It is a session about how to sit with a friend. The moment the room starts talking about the media, you have lost it. Redirect once, firmly.

Assume someone in the room was hurt. Do not draw anyone out, do not ask for stories, and stay afterward. Know your parish's contact for reporting and for victim assistance before you walk in, and know that in most dioceses there is a specific office for it.

Do not overclaim reform. If someone asks what has changed since 2002, say what you actually know and admit what you do not. Overclaiming here destroys your credibility with exactly the person you are trying to reach.

SESSION GOALS

1. Establish from Matthew 18:6 that Christ's language on this is harsher than any critic's.
2. Have the group discover for themselves where the Lord's anger falls in the Gospels.
3. Land Matthew 23:2-3 as the Lord's own instruction rather than a later institutional defense.
4. Have the group name the three different conversations, and practice telling them apart.
5. Use John 21 correctly and block its misuse.
6. Work the objection at full strength without flinching and without defending what should not be defended.
7. Have every person in the room say a first sentence out loud that is not a defense.

TIMED PLAN

Minutes	Movement
0:00-0:05	Opening prayer, and the note that nobody will be asked to share anything personal tonight.
0:05-0:12	Win questions.
0:12-0:22	Build 1, Matthew 18:6-7. Read it aloud twice.
0:22-0:34	Live discovery: where does the Lord's anger fall?
0:34-0:44	Build 2, Matthew 23:2-3, and the Church's own teaching in CCC 1584 and 1550.
0:44-0:52	Build 3, John 21, including what it is not.
0:52-1:02	Build 4, the three conversations.
1:02-1:16	Build 5, the build-then-press. Give it the full time and do not rush the concessions.
1:16-1:28	Practicum: the first sentence.
1:28-1:30	Take-homes and closing prayer.

If you only have 75 minutes, cut these first

- Drop Build 3 (John 21), keeping only the spoken warning about its misuse. Saves eight minutes.
- Run the Matthew 23 discovery as a straight reading of verses 1 to 7 with one question. Saves six minutes.
- Shorten Build 4 by giving the three conversations yourself rather than drawing them out. Saves five minutes.
- **Do not cut Build 5 or the practicum.** The practicum is the only thing in this module that changes anybody's behavior.

IF IT GOES SIDEWAYS

IF IT GOES SIDEWAYS | leader only

If someone in the room discloses that they were hurt, stop the module. Do not process it in the group, do not let anyone else respond, and thank them. Move on gently within a minute, for their protection rather than

the room's comfort, and find them afterward.

Safeguarding, and this part is not optional. Where a disclosure concerns a minor or a vulnerable adult, or where there is any sign of present danger, follow civil law and your diocesan safeguarding policy, including mandatory reporting where it applies. Do not promise confidentiality you cannot keep. Do not investigate, do not test the account, and do not adjudicate disputed detail; receiving a disclosure seriously is not the same as ruling on every fact in it. Where there is immediate risk, act now rather than in the week. Know your diocesan safeguarding and victim assistance contacts before you lead this session.

If the room turns to the media, to anti-Catholic bias, or to what other institutions have done, redirect once and firmly: none of that is a sentence you can say to a hurting friend, and this module is about what you can say.

If someone deploys "the Church is holy, her members are sinners" as a conversation ender, agree that it is true and then ask them to imagine saying it to a survivor. That question does the work better than any correction from you.

If someone asks what has actually changed since the scandals broke, answer with what you know and admit what you do not. Do not improvise a reform record.

If the room gets angry at the Church, let it. Anger at grave injustice can be entirely right and should not be managed away, though like all anger it still needs charitable direction.

Discussion Guide

When Someone in the Church Has Hurt Them

Matthew 18:6-7; Matthew 23:1-7, 23-28; John 21:15-19; 2 Corinthians 4:7

OPENING PRAYER

Lord Jesus, some of your severest words fell on religious men who hurt the people in their care, and you meant every one of them. Give us the honesty not to defend what you condemned, the humility to agree when someone tells us the truth about your Church, and the restraint to stop talking when talking is not what is needed. Amen.

WIN

- ▶ When has someone apologized to you properly? What made it land?
- ▶ Think of a time someone gave you an explanation when you needed something else. What did you actually need?

BUILD

Nobody will be asked to share anything personal tonight. Read Matthew 18:6-7 aloud, twice, slowly.

1. Matthew 18:6-7. Who is Jesus talking about, and how does the severity of his language compare with the harshest thing you have heard anyone say about the Church?

ANSWER | share after the discussion

He is talking about anyone who causes one of these little ones who believe in him to sin, and he says it would be better for that person to be drowned in the depth of the sea with a millstone around his neck.

Now put it beside the angriest thing your friend has ever said about the Catholic Church, or the angriest headline you have read. Christ speaks at least as severely, and about causing his little ones to sin. Applying it to abuse is an application, and it is a sound one.

This is the opening move of the whole module, and it is not "the Church is holy." It is that you cannot out-condemn Christ on this, so you do not have to try, and you certainly do not have to argue against the condemnation.

The Catechism quotes this exact verse when it treats the gravity of scandal, at CCC 2285, and notes that scandal is graver by reason of the authority of the one who causes it.

LIVE DISCOVERY | let the group find it

Send them looking. The answer surprises people who have not noticed the pattern.

Have someone read Matthew 23:1-7 aloud, and a second person read Matthew 23:23-28.

Then ask one question: across the Gospels, who receives some of his severest rebukes?

What they should find: some of his severest rebukes fall on religious leaders. He eats with tax collectors and calls the scribes and Pharisees whitewashed tombs. He is gentle with the woman caught in adultery and scorching with men who bind heavy burdens and will not lift a finger to move them, and who shut the kingdom of heaven in people's faces.

Then ask them to find the one instruction inside the denunciation, at Matthew 23:2-3, and read it aloud.

Which is: the scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat, so practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do. Let the group sit with the fact that this sentence is in the middle of the fiercest chapter in the Gospel.

2. Matthew 23:2-3. What is Jesus telling the crowd to do, and what does that establish?

ANSWER | share after the discussion

To do what these men say and not what they do. A hypocrite's teaching is not thereby false, and Jesus says so while denouncing them. Do not slide straight from there to sacramental efficacy: that rests on CCC 1584 and is a distinct principle. And note what this text never licenses, obedience to an immoral command or silence about abuse.

That matters enormously in this conversation, because the principle is not a later institutional defense invented to protect anybody. It is the Lord's own instruction, given in the same breath as the condemnation.

The Church states it in the same two-sided way. CCC 1584 says the unworthiness of the minister does not prevent Christ from acting in the sacraments, quoting St. Augustine that light passing through defiled things is not itself defiled. And CCC 1550 immediately blocks the misuse: that does not mean the minister is thereby without sin.

One practical use worth naming. People who were baptized, married, or absolved by someone later disgraced sometimes quietly wonder whether it counted. The answer to the fear as they are asking it is yes: a minister's personal sin or later disgrace does not by itself invalidate an otherwise valid sacrament. Say that, and add the honest caveat, that validity also depends on matter, form, intention and, where required, orders and faculties, so a specific worry about a specific sacrament belongs with a priest or a tribunal. Note too that in the Latin Church the spouses themselves are the ordinary ministers of Matrimony.

And 2 Corinthians 4:7 is an analogous reminder rather than a proof of sacramental validity: the treasure is in earthen vessels, so that the power belongs to God and not to us. The vessel was never advertised as the treasure.

3. John 21:15-19. What does Jesus do with Peter, and what does he not do? Then say what this passage is not.

ANSWER | share after the discussion

He asks three times whether Peter loves him, matching the three denials, and gives him the job back. He does not pretend the denial did not happen, and he does not require Peter to perform contrition or grovel. And he tells him plainly that it will end in his death.

So restoration is real, it is possible, and it does not involve pretending.

And now say what this passage is not, out loud, because someone will reach for it. Christ restoring Peter after cowardice is not a precedent for an institution quietly returning a man to ministry after he has harmed someone. Peter's failure was cowardice about himself, and it differs in kind from the exploitation of another person. Do not call it victimless: he publicly disowned Christ. Confusing those two is very close to the actual failure your friend is describing.

4. Before you can respond well, you have to know which conversation you are in. Working from your own experience, how many different conversations are hiding under "the Church hurt me"?

ANSWER | share after the discussion

At least three, and they need different responses.

A wound. Something was done to this person, or to someone they love. An argument is not the response here, and reaching for one is felt as a second injury. The response is to receive it seriously, to say so, and then to be quiet. That is different from adjudicating every detail, which is not yours to do.

An institutional failure. They are describing a documented pattern of concealment and reassignment. The correct response is agreement, because the claim is true. The distinction between the Church's claims and her ministers' conduct comes later, if ever, and never in the first ten minutes.

An objection. They are using the record as an argument that the whole thing must be false. This one really is an argument and can be treated as one. It is also the least common of the three.

The failure mode is mistaking the first for the third. Most of us answer a bleeding person with a syllogism, and then wonder why the friendship cooled.

5. Someone says: the Church covered up the abuse of children for decades. There is no answer to that, and anyone who defends the institution is complicit. Are they right?

ANSWER | share after the discussion

Work the build-then-press below carefully. Notice before you start that the press does not begin by disputing anything.

DIG DEEPER

Ezekiel 34:1-10. Woe to the shepherds of Israel who feed themselves. The weak not strengthened, the sick not healed, the strayed not brought back. And then: I am against the shepherds. This study has now met this chapter three times, and this is the sharpest use of it.

1 Samuel 2:12-17 and 22-25. The sons of Eli treating the offerings with contempt, and lying with the women who served at the entrance to the tent of meeting. Scripture records abuse in the sanctuary and does not soften it.

Malachi 2:7-9. The lips of a priest should guard knowledge; and you have caused many to stumble by your instruction. The standard and the failure in consecutive verses.

BUILD THEN PRESS

Build the objection at full strength:

Build it at full strength and do not soften a word of it. Softening it in this room is practice for softening it in front of a friend.

The factual claim is true and documented. Priests abused children. Bishops knew. Men were moved to other parishes where they offended again. Victims who came forward were disbelieved, pressured, and sometimes treated as the problem. This continued after it was known, in multiple countries, for decades.

And it was not a failure of the Church's teaching. Everyone involved knew exactly what the Church taught.

And now the harder version, which the study owes you. The objection is not only about individual sinners. The concealment was institutional: decisions taken by men in office, repeated across dioceses and countries, with the instinct to protect the institution winning over the protection of children. That looks like a failure of the Church's governance rather than a failure of a few of her members, and it appears to sit badly with what the Church says about herself. Put it that way, because that is the form your friend will put it in. The failure was in the men entrusted with applying it, and the instinct that took over was to protect the institution's reputation over its children.

The objector can also point out, fairly, that the "holy Church, sinful members" distinction arrives most often precisely when Catholics are uncomfortable, which makes it look like a technique rather than a doctrine.

And the hardest form: for the person in front of you, the Church is not an abstraction. It is a particular building, a particular man, and a particular year. Nothing about the Church's universal claims touches what happened in that room.

Then press, from the text:

Now press, and notice where the pressing starts.

First, agree. The factual claim is true. Say so, without qualification and without a "but" in the same sentence. Any Catholic who disputes the record has lost the conversation and deserves to have lost it. This is not a concession made for effect; it is the truth, and it is the first thing to say.

Second, name the distinctions the institutional objection actually needs, without using them to minimise anything. The Church claims holiness in her origin, her Founder and her sacraments, and indefectibility in her endurance and her teaching. She has never claimed that her officeholders are impeccable or that her governance is well run, and the record here is a real and grave failure of governance for which the Church has apologised. Those distinctions are not a dodge, and they are also not a defence of what was done. Third, take them to Matthew 18:6. Not defensively. Show them that the strongest condemnation of what happened is not in a report or a headline; it is in the Gospel, in Christ's own mouth, about people who harm the little ones who believe in him. You are not on opposite sides of this. You are quoting the person you are asking them to consider.

Fourth, the actual distinction, once it can be heard. Matthew 23:2-3 is Jesus telling a crowd to obey the teaching of men whose conduct he had just eviscerated. The claim of Christianity is that a particular man rose from the dead. That claim is either true or false, and nothing done by a bishop in 1987 makes it more or less true. Those are separable questions, and the first is the one nothing here touches. Be honest that other real questions remain: whether Christ founded and still guides this Church, whether her doctrinal claims are true, and whether a particular parish is presently safe. Misconduct does not make the Resurrection false; it does not answer those questions either.

Fifth, and mark this one as ours rather than the Church's: if a doctor abused a patient, nobody would conclude that medicine is false. They would conclude that the doctor was a criminal and the hospital

covered it up, and both of those would demand justice. The illustration is ours. Say so when you use it, and know that it will not land on someone who is bleeding.

Now the concessions, and give them fully. Do not overclaim reform; say what you actually know and admit what you do not. Do not use the holy Church distinction as a shield, because it is true and it is not an answer to pain. And accept that for many people this is not an argument at all. It is a wound, and the correct response to a wound is not a syllogism. Sometimes the right move is to say "I am so sorry that happened to you," and then to say nothing else at all for a long time.

SEND

- ▶ Who in your life has stopped going because of something that was done? Do you actually know the story, or only that they stopped?
- ▶ What is your instinct in this conversation, and is it the right one?

PRACTICUM

PRACTICUM | the first sentence

PRACTICUM: the first sentence. Twelve minutes, in pairs.

The rule for the whole exercise: your first sentence may not be a defense. Not a "but," not a "well actually," not a statistic, not "every institution has this problem," and not "the Church is holy even when her members are not."

Round one. In pairs. One person says, in their own words, something they have actually heard from a real person: what was done to them, or to someone they love, or why they stopped going. The other person responds with **three sentences and no more**, and the first one cannot be a defense.

Then swap. Then do it once more, with a different opening.

Round two, the harder one. Same pairs. This time the speaker states it as an argument rather than a wound: this proves the whole thing is false. The responder again gets three sentences, and the first still cannot be a defense.

Notice how different the two rounds feel, and notice how strong the pull is to give the same answer to both.

Debrief, five minutes, whole group. Two questions only. What was the hardest thing about not defending? And did anyone find a first sentence they would actually use?

Leader guidance. For most people the true first sentence is some version of "I am so sorry that happened to you," or "thank you for telling me," or "I want to understand." Keep "you are right" for what you actually know, since agreement to facts you have not heard is not compassion. Many will never have said any of it out loud. That is the entire point of the exercise. Do not let anyone rehearse a clever response, and do not let the pairs drift into discussing the Church. If somebody's three sentences are all silence, that is a passing answer and you should say so.

LIVE IT THIS WEEK

LIVE IT THIS WEEK

This week. One conversation you have been avoiding, and one sentence you have never said.

- Think of one person you know who left, or pulled back, over something that was done. Not a category of person. One person.
- Ask them what happened, if you have never asked and if they are willing. Then respond with the first sentence you practised, and little else. If what you hear involves a minor, a vulnerable adult, or anyone presently at risk, that is no longer a conversation to hold on your own: contact your diocesan safeguarding office, and civil authorities where the law requires it.
- If you are not able to have that conversation, write the first sentence down anyway and keep it.
- Find out this week who handles reporting and victim assistance in your diocese, and write the contact down. Leaders should know these contacts, so they can respond responsibly and promptly.
- And pray for the person by name, without praying that they come back. Pray for them.

CLOSING PRAYER

Lord Jesus, you said it would be better for a man to be drowned than to harm one of your little ones, and you were not exaggerating. We are sorry for what has been done in your name, and for every time we have hurried past it to defend something. Give us the courage to agree, the patience to stay quiet, and mercy for the people who cannot come back yet. Amen.

SCRIPTURE MEMORY

"But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us."

2 Corinthians 4:7

MODULE 3 | PART THREE

Leader Reference Card

When Someone in the Church Has Hurt Them

Every passage used in this session, in the order it appears.

Passage	Where and why
Matthew 18:6-7	Primary text, read aloud twice. The millstone.
Matthew 23:1-7	Live discovery. Burdens bound and not lifted; the seat of Moses.
Matthew 23:23-28	Live discovery. Whitewashed tombs.
Matthew 23:2-3	Build 2. Do what they say, not what they do.
John 21:15-19	Build 3. Peter restored, and what the passage is not.
2 Corinthians 4:7	Build 2 and memory verse. Treasure in earthen vessels.
Ezekiel 34:1-10	Old Testament Roots and Dig Deeper. I am against the shepherds.
1 Samuel 2:12-17, 22-25	Old Testament Roots and Dig Deeper. The sons of Eli.
Malachi 2:7-9	Old Testament Roots. The priest who caused many to stumble.