

Study Guide and Commentary

ACIM® Text, Chapter 27

Healing the Ancient Dream

Section II

Proof of Innocence

Explanation of underlining, italics and footnote formats can be found at the end of the commentary.

Overview of Section II

This is a difficult section. As he has done before, Jesus strongly maintains there is a clear-cut link between forgiveness and physical healing. “Who forgives is healed” (3:7), he says. And, lest we think he is referring to some kind of healing of the mind, he makes it even clearer: “A broken body shows the mind has not been healed” (4:8). He applies this not just to our own healing; he goes on to say that the healing of *our* bodies demonstrates to our brother that *he* is forgiven (5:3–4).

There seems to be no wiggle room here, no way to mitigate or minimize the tie between the mind’s forgiveness and the body’s health. We may question that there is a 1-to-1 correlation between the healing of our minds and of our bodies. Many people feel frustrated because they cannot uncover any unforgiving thoughts and yet are experiencing physical illness. This is something we’ll need to look into in some depth.

Paragraph 1

Is healing frightening? ²To many, yes. ³For accusation is a bar to love, and damaged bodies are accusers.¹ ⁴They stand firmly in the way of trust and peace, proclaiming that the frail can have no trust, and that the damaged have no grounds for peace. ⁵Who has been injured by his brother and could love and trust him still? ⁶He has attacked, and will attack again. ⁷Protect him not, because your damaged body shows that you must be protected from him. ⁸To forgive may be an act of charity, but not his due. ⁹He may be pitied for his guilt, but not exonerated. ¹⁰And if you forgive him his transgressions, you but add to all the guilt that he has really earned.

¹ In other words, healing is frightening to many because they *want* a damaged body that silently accuses their brothers of guilt.

The opening question, “Is healing frightening?”, seems to call for a “no” answer. Healing? Frightening? Of course not! Yet the Course asserts that, “to many” the answer is “yes” (1:1–2). Why on earth would anyone be afraid of being healed?

The reason depends on how the Course views sickness or less than perfect health. To the Course, “damaged bodies *are* accusers” (1:3). If you and I are in relationship in some way and you are sick, then your sick body is accusing me of some sin. The body accuses me of causing your ill health. Of course neither of us is conscious of any connection among these things. The connections are all subterranean, below the level of consciousness.

If that connection between illness and guilt is true, then sickness of either body stands between us as a barrier to love (1:3). Sick bodies make it impossible for us to love one another, to trust one another, and to be at peace with one another (1:4). How could I love you or trust you if I (unconsciously) see you as causing me injury (1:5)? All I am aware of is that I find it difficult to love you or to trust you. My ego believes that you are attacking me and that you will do it again (1:6), and it keeps subtly yet insistently reminding me of the “fact.” To the ego, your damaged body proves I am an attacker, and my damaged body shows I am attacking you (1:7). We need protection from one another; sickness *proves* it.

In the ego’s view, maybe it would be charitable for me to forgive you, or vice versa, but you certainly don’t deserve it (1:8). Nor do I. The guilt and harm are real, to our egos. And because of our egos’ weird beliefs, we both know it. If you forgive me, for instance, I “know” I don’t deserve it, and I end up feeling *more* guilty *because* you gave me a gift I don’t deserve (1:9-10).

When we first read of or hear about this strange connection between sickness in another person as an attack on me, accusing me of sin that has somehow caused their sickness, it seems incomprehensible. It seems to defy logic. Yet the Course is quite insistent on this point. As we continue in this section you will see just *how* insistent it is. If you have trouble fully accepting this point, as I still do at times, my best advice is just to take what you can and let the rest go, trusting that it will make sense some day. When you need to understand, you will. When there is something you can do to change it, you will know what to change, and how.

Paragraph 2

2 The unhealed *cannot* pardon, for they are the witnesses that pardon is unfair. ²They would retain the consequences of the guilt they overlook. ³Yet no one can forgive a sin which he believes is real. ⁴And what has consequences *must* be real, because what it has done is there to see. ⁵Forgiveness is not pity, which but seeks to pardon what it knows to be the truth. ⁶Good cannot *be* returned for evil,² for forgiveness does not first establish sin and then forgive it. ⁷Who can say and mean, “My brother, you have injured me, and yet because I am the better of the two, I pardon you my hurt”? ⁸*His* pardon and *your* hurt cannot exist together. ⁹One denies the other, and must make it false.

Locked in by the subconscious beliefs of our egos, if I am sick it is simply impossible for me to truly and completely forgive (“pardon”) anyone. The seeming reality of my illness *proves* that the “sin” of those around me is equally real, and therefore unworthy of forgiveness (2:1). I am attempting to forgive another person while simultaneously holding on to my sickness (that is, refusing to accept healing), which (in my ego) I believe is the consequence of the “sin” I’m trying to forgive. Under those conditions, I simply cannot forgive (2:2–3). If the sickness that my ego believes is being caused by “sin” in another, that “sin” has consequences that seem real to me. And something that has consequences *must be real* because its consequences are there, plain to see (2:4).

When we try to forgive something that we know, in our heart of hearts, is real, that’s just pity. It may seem like you are being forgiving. It may seem loving to let that “sinner” off the hook, but it’s mere pity. We’re allowing ourselves to feel sorry for the sinner, and trying to feel good about ourselves (2:7) in the process, but the “sin” remains (2:5). Forgiveness does not do that (2:6)!

If am feeling hurt in any way by someone, I cannot truly pardon them. As long as the hurt seems real so does the condemnation (2:8–9).

How can you tell when you are seeing wrong, or someone else is failing to perceive the lesson he should learn? Does pain seem real in the perception? If it does, be sure the lesson is not learned, and there remains an unforgiveness hiding in the mind which sees the pain through eyes the mind directs.

(W-193.9:1–3 (CE))

² This is a reinterpretation of the common idea that we should “return good for evil,” an idea based on Bible verses such as 1 Peter 3:9 (RSV): “Do not return evil for evil or reviling for reviling; but on the contrary bless,” and Romans 12:17, 21 (RSV): “Repay no one evil for evil....Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.” The Course does want us to respond to *apparent* evil with blessing, goodness, and forgiveness. Jesus’ point here, though, is that seeing another’s act as *truly* evil precludes real forgiveness, fostering instead a subtle onepmanship in which your “forgiveness” of his “evil” is proof of your moral superiority.

Those lines from the Workbook explain a lot, at least to me. We have *hidden unforgiveness* in our minds. "Hidden" means hidden from our awareness. We don't know it is there. That hidden unforgiveness controls our perception of people and things around us. We see pain that really is not there.

"Here will you understand there is no pain. Here does the joy of God belong to you. This is the day when it is given you to realize the lesson that contains all of salvation's power. It is this: Pain is illusion; joy, reality. Pain is but sleep; joy is awakening. Pain is deception; joy alone is truth" (W-pI.190.10:1-6).

Our eyes are directed by our clouded minds; we are layering what we see with an interpretation of pain when, in Christ's reality, no pain exists.

Paragraph 3

3 To witness sin and yet forgive it is a paradox which reason cannot see. ²For it³ maintains what has been done to you deserves no pardon, and by giving it, you grant your brother mercy but retain the proof he is not *really* innocent. ³The sick remain accusers. ⁴They cannot forgive their brothers and themselves as well, for no one in whom true forgiveness reigns can suffer. ⁵He holds not the proof of sin before his brother's eyes, and thus he must have overlooked it and removed it from his own.⁴ ⁶Forgiveness cannot be for one and not the other. ⁷Who forgives is healed. ⁸And in his healing lies the proof that he has truly pardoned, and retains no trace of condemnation that he still would hold against himself or any living thing.

It's difficult for us to accept that any experience of pain, physical or psychological, indicates an unforgiveness in my mind. So the argument continues. If I see sin someplace, the Course states, it is simply *not reasonable* to me to forgive it (3:1).

The next sentence begins with "for," in the sense of "because." It explains why sentence 3:1 is true. Why isn't forgiveness reasonable? Why is it "a paradox" to see sin and to forgive it? The second word of 3:2 is "it." It refers to "reason" in the first sentence and says that reason "maintains that what has been done to you *deserves* no pardon" (3:2). You may try to forgive the wrong, but you continue to hold on to the pain or sickness that *proves* "he is not *really* innocent" (3:2). Your words may say "I forgive" but your sickness demonstrates that you continue to accuse him or her (or yourself) (3:3). Forgiving a hurt that seems real to you just isn't reasonable!

³. "It" refers to witnessing sin.

⁴. Matthew 7:3-5 (RSV): "Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye? Or how can you say to your brother, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when there is the log in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother's eye." In the Course's allusion, the log to be removed from your own eye *is* the speck of sin that you see in your brother's eye.

There seems to be a missing link in the logic here: How is my sickness the result of my failure to forgive someone else, or to forgive myself? Is *all* sickness the result of unforgiveness? The argument goes on to provide the Course's answer to these questions. "No one in whom true forgiveness reigns *can* suffer" (3:4). "Who forgives *is* healed" (3:7). "Forgiveness is not real *unless* it brings a healing to your brother *and* yourself" (4:1). "A broken body shows the mind has *not* been healed" (4:8).

In other words, the Course clearly states that forgiveness and sickness cannot co-exist in any one person.

This has implications that seem, to me and probably to you, difficult or even impossible to accept. It would seem to imply that nobody alive has perfectly forgiven. At least, nobody I am aware of, including myself. It raises questions about people we regard as having been very holy who contracted some illness and died, like Treya Wilber, Ramana Maharshi, and many others. Were all of them harboring some hidden unforgiveness?

In the last three years I've had multiple surgeries. I had two knee replacement operations and a hip replacement, and I underwent triple bypass surgery on my heart to repair clogged arteries. All of these conditions, before and after surgery, have involved a lot of pain, more physical pain than I have experienced since a back injury I sustained in college. All this time, I have been unable to identify any particular people in whom I see "sin," and am unwilling to forgive.

At the same time, I admit there have been a number of public figures, particularly in politics, whom I have judged quite harshly. Can I therefore say, in stark terms, that my pain these last three years is due to my unforgiveness of Donald Trump and his cohorts? Do I judge them as guilty of despicable behavior? Yes. Do I think that, if I had not judged them and somehow came to view them with compassion and love, I would not have needed these operations? Honestly, no. I don't think the linkage the Course is talking about is that tight, that specific.

What my unforgiveness of these men demonstrates, without a doubt, is that I have not perfectly forgiven the whole world. In addition, I also judge myself. I think my lack of total self-forgiveness is a much more obvious cause of my bodily deterioration that required surgeries. They come from a lifetime of not forgiving myself.

I'm sure I will return to these thoughts later, but for now let's resume the commentary at 3:5.

If someone has truly forgiven ("one in whom true forgiveness reigns"), they do not manifest sickness ("proof of sin") for their brother to see, which proves that they have removed "sin" from their own awareness (3:5). Forgiveness is always mutual (3:6). By forgiving we offer healing to another, and in doing so we too are healed (3:7). My healing proves I have truly pardoned. I have ceased to condemn myself "or any living thing" (3:8). That latter phrase, "any living thing," points my understanding toward the non-specificity of this sin/sickness linkage. Sickness can result from failure to forgive myself or any living thing. Sickness is not always connected to some specific unforgiveness. It can be coming from generalized judgment of others and the world around us. And I think we are all guilty of that.

Paragraph 4

4 Forgiveness is not real unless it brings a healing to your brother *and* yourself. ²You must attest his sins had no effect on you to demonstrate they were not real. ³How else could he be guiltless? ⁴And how could his innocence be justified unless his sins have no effects to *warrant* guilt? ⁵Sins are beyond forgiveness just because they would entail effects which cannot be undone and overlooked entirely. ⁶In their undoing lies the proof that they were merely errors. ⁷Let yourself be healed that you may be forgiving, offering salvation to your brother and yourself. ⁸A broken body shows the mind has not been healed. ⁹A miracle of healing proves that separation is without effect.

The litany continues: “Forgiveness is not real *unless* “ both you *and* your brother (whom you have forgiven) experience a healing (4:1). As we saw in 3:6, forgiveness is always a mutual experience. Both parties are forgiven, both are healed.

Of course you are healed, Jesus seems to say. You have to demonstrate that your brother’s or sister’s “sins” “had no effect on you to demonstrate they were not real”(4:2). The suffering for which you have been blaming him or her has to be gone. That’s the only way you could attribute guiltlessness to your brother (4:3). If you are still suffering pain as a result of his or her actions, calling him innocent wouldn’t be justified (4:4).

I have to admit, even after years of study, I still find it easier to understand this teaching if it concerns emotional or mental pain; I find it more difficult to know how to apply it to physical pain or malady. I’ve gone through months of pain from a deteriorated hip joint, but now, less than a month after surgery, I’m free of pain. Who was I judging and blaming for my pain? Who did I forgive to banish it? Some particular individual? The selfish politicians? The whole world? Myself? I simply don’t know. I’m not aware of forgiving anyone in particular.

The best I know to do is, any time I get sick or experience pain, to take time to look within and see if there is an unforgiveness lurking in my mind. If so, deal with it. Let it go. The same applies to emotional pain, hurt feelings, anger, and so on. I have to affirm that “I am doing this to myself,” and no one else is guilty of causing me grief.

What makes a sin a sin is that (if it could actually exist) it is something that entails “effects which *cannot* be undone and overlooked entirely” (4:5). The disappearance of the effect is proof that what we thought was a sin was merely an error (4:6). We must allow ourselves to receive healing, washing away our unforgiveness toward anyone, including ourselves (4:7). We can affirm, “I want to be healed.”

The next line (4:8) makes it clear that Jesus has physical sickness and healing in mind, so whether or not we can see the connection or identify the unforgiving thoughts that are behind an illness, we can at least affirm our willingness to forgive as fully as we can, and to allow our minds to be healed. We *do want* that “miracle of healing,” demonstrating the unreality of separation (4:9).

Paragraph 5

5 What you would prove to him you will believe. ²The power of witness comes from your belief, and everything you say or do or think but testifies to what you teach to him. ³Your body can be means to teach that it has never suffered pain because of him. ⁴And in its healing can it offer him mute testimony to his innocence. ⁵It is this testimony that can speak with power greater than a thousand tongues, for here is his forgiveness *proved* to him. ⁶A miracle can offer nothing less to him than it has given unto you. ⁷So does your healing show your mind is healed, and has forgiven what he did *not* do. ⁸And so is he convinced his innocence was never lost, and healed along with you.

If you want to make someone realize how much they have hurt you, *you* will believe you have been hurt that much, and your body will show it (5:1). Your belief in the reality of your injury is what gives power to your message to your brother. Your belief affects “everything you say or do or think,” and your words, actions, and thoughts all communicate your pain to your brother, and thus lay the blame for it all on him (5:2). Thinking back to the opening sentence of this section, this is why healing can seem to be frightening. Giving up your pain means giving up your projection of blame. And if the other person is *not* at fault, who is? The fear is that the answer is “me.” If you cannot blame another person, the blame must rebound to you — or so we fear. We have yet to learn to give up blame *entirely*.

When we are physically healed, our bodies are a testimony to the fact that they have never suffered any pain because of our brothers (5:3). A healthy body is a silent witness to the innocence of our brothers (5:4). The silent testimony of a healthy body speaks more loudly than a thousand tongues ⁵ (5:5). It *proves* he is forgiven. A miracle of healing gives as much to your brother as it does to you; he is healed of his guilt, as you are of your illness (5:6). When your body is healed of sickness it demonstrates that your *mind* has been healed of its unforgiveness; you have forgiven the sin your brother never actually committed (5:7). This proves to your brother that he has never lost his innocence. His guilt is eradicated because there is no longer anything to be guilty *about* (5:8).

⁵ This reminds me of a hymn by Charles Wesley (John's brother, co-founder of Methodism):

“O, for a thousand tongues to sing my great Redeemer's praise!” It goes on to say, “He breaks the power of cancelled sin. He sets the prisoner free.” “Cancelled sin.” Seems as if Charles had some inkling of the power of forgiveness!

Paragraph 6

6 Thus does the miracle undo all things the world attests can never be undone. ²And hopelessness and death must disappear before the ancient clarion call of life. ³This call has power far beyond the weak and miserable cry of death and guilt. ⁴The ancient calling of the Father to His Son, and of the Son unto his own, will yet be the last trumpet that the world will ever hear.⁶ ⁵Brother, there is no death.⁷ ⁶And this you learn when you but wish to show your brother that you had no hurt of him. ⁷He thinks your blood is on his hands, and so he stands condemned. ⁸But it is given you to show him by your healing that his guilt is but the fabric of a senseless dream.

Sin is “undone,” or “cancelled” in Wesley’s words⁸. The very definition of “sin” is something whose effects *cannot* be undone and overlooked entirely (4:5). But a miracle *can* undo it, despite what the world may think (6:1). With their going go also hopelessness and death; “the ancient clarion call of life” without guilt wipes them out (6:2).

When the Course calls something “ancient,” I think it means “eternal” or “before time began.” This call of life is the calling of God the Father to His Son, and the calling of the Son to “his own,” all those who belong to Him (6:4). And that includes all of us! This call is the evolutionary impulse, the drive to wholeness. It is the Will of God. It is love, “the agent of universal synthesis” as Teilhard de Chardin called it. Its power far exceeds “the weak and miserable cry of death and guilt” (6:3). It is irresistible, which is why the Course can confidently affirm that we’ll all make it home in the end. The call of life “will yet be the last trumpet that the world will ever hear” (6:4).

The phrase “last trumpet” is, I’m sure, a deliberate reference to the Bible:

*“What I am saying, brothers and sisters, is this: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Listen, I will tell you a mystery! We will not all die, but we will all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the **last trumpet**. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed. For this perishable body must put on imperishability, and this mortal body must put on immortality. When this perishable body puts on imperishability, and this mortal body puts on immortality, then the saying that is written will be fulfilled: “Death has been swallowed up in victory.”” (1 Corinthians 15:50–54 NRSV)*

⁶ 1 Corinthians 15:51-52 (RSV): “Lo! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed.”

⁷ Proverbs 12:28 (KJV): “In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death.”

⁸ See previous footnote.

Notice: “We will *all* be changed.” Even in the Bible there are strong hints of *universal* “salvation.” That loving call of God to His creations is the last note the world will ever hear. The last trumpet isn’t sounding, “Go to hell”; it is saying joyfully, “Welcome home!”

What forgiveness teaches us is that, “There is no death” (6:5). Not only no sickness; no death. “Death has been swallowed up in victory” (I Cor. 15:54). We can learn it, come to know there is no death, when the only message we want to convey to one another is, “you had no hurt of him” (6:6). People all around us believe, to one degree or another, that they have injured us in some way: “He thinks your blood is on his hands” (6:7). By our healing we can give them clear evidence that their guilt is entirely imagined, “a senseless dream” (6:8).

Paragraph 7

7 How just are miracles! ²For they bestow an equal gift of full deliverance from guilt upon your brother and yourself. ³Your healing saves him pain as well as you, and you are healed because you wished him well. ⁴This is the law the miracle obeys: that healing sees no specialness at all. ⁵It does not come from pity, but from love. ⁶And love would prove all suffering is but a vain imagining, a foolish wish with no effects. ⁷Your health is the result of your desire to see your brother with no blood upon his hands nor guilt upon his heart made heavy with the proof of sin. ⁸And what you wish is given you to see.

This is the true meaning of justice, as we’ve seen earlier in the Text. Both you and your brother are equally delivered from guilt (7:1–2). No punishment, only deliverance.

Notice how the word “wish” occurs both in 7:3 and 7:8. The central point of this paragraph is that our wish, our *desire* to see our brother as innocent (7:7), is what heals. The motivation that heals is not an attempt to appear magnanimous and gracious. It comes from love, not self-aggrandizement (7:5–6). You want your brother to feel better, to feel good about himself. You love him, and wishing your brother well is what heals *you* (7:3). You are not made special because you can forgive; in true healing *nobody* is special (7:4).

Earlier I said consider not the means by which salvation is attained, nor how to reach it. But do consider, and consider well, whether it is your wish that you might see your brother sinless. (T-24.II.4:1–2 (FIP), T-24.IV.5:1 (CE))

As the Course always maintains, what you wish for, you see. If you wish to see your brother sinless, *you will* (7:8).

Paragraph 8

8 The “cost” of your serenity is his. ²This is the “price” the Holy Spirit and the world interpret differently.⁹ ³The world perceives in it a statement of the “fact” that your salvation sacrifices his. ⁴The Holy Spirit knows your healing is the witness *unto* his, and cannot be apart from him at all. ⁵As long as he consents to suffer, *you* will be unhealed. ⁶But you can show to him his suffering is purposeless and wholly without cause. ⁷Show him your healing, and he will consent no more to suffer, for his innocence has been established in your sight *and* his. ⁸And laughter will replace your sighs because God’s Son remembered that he *is* God’s Son.

The problem our egos have with forgiving, with being at peace and setting aside all judgment, is that when we are at peace, *so is our brother* (8:1). And we don’t want him to be at peace! We want him to suffer for what he has done. We want to practice partial forgiveness (As if there were such a thing! The *Song of Prayer* pamphlet calls it “forgiveness to destroy.”). We’ll forego all punishment, but we want him to go on feeling guilty about it. That’s the “cost” of forgiveness.

The Holy Spirit sees it quite differently than we do (8:2). We (“the world”) think that in allowing ourselves to be healed of unforgiveness we are letting him off the hook and allowing him to remain unhealed of his unloving act (8:3). The Holy Spirit absolutely *knows* that your healing and his go together (8:4). When you are healed of your unforgiveness, your brother no longer needs to suffer for his supposed sin. If he continues to suffer for it, *you* are not fully healed. By your forgiveness you show him “his suffering is purposeless and wholly without cause” (8:5–6). When you have shown him his innocence (and not his sin), he can let go of suffering, and you will laugh as you see him remembering “that he *is* God’s Son” (8:7–8).

This might be summed up in a nutshell: Punishment never heals; forgiveness always heals.

⁹ In other words, as the following sentences explain, the world believes that your serenity depends on the sacrifice of your brother’s. In contrast, the Holy Spirit knows that your serenity depends on the *presence* of his.

Paragraph 9

9 Who, then, fears healing? ²Only those to whom their brother's sacrifice and pain is seen to represent their own serenity. ³Their helplessness and weakness represent the grounds on which they justify his pain. ⁴The constant sting of guilt he suffers serves to prove that he is slave and they are free. ⁵The constant pain *they* suffer demonstrates that they are free *because* they hold him bound. ⁶And sickness is desired to prevent a shift of balance in the sacrifice.¹⁰ ⁷How could the Holy Spirit be deterred an instant, even less, to reason with an argument for sickness such as this? ⁸And need *your* healing be delayed because you pause to listen to insanity?

So, who are the “many” who find healing frightening? Those of us who still think that we can be at peace by seeing another person (whom we believe has harmed us in some way) endure sacrifice and pain. The common saying, “Revenge is sweet,” is the perfect expression of this viewpoint (9:1–2). We may not think we are revengeful persons, but the Course says if we are suffering pain, that *must* be what we are. People who believe in the sweetness of revenge believe, consciously or unconsciously, that our helplessness and weakness proves that our brother is guilty and deserves to suffer (9:3). As long as he is pricked by guilt over what he “did to us,” we are free, and he is enslaved to his guilt (9:4). How do we know we are free? Because we suffer constant pain (9:5)! Yes, that’s crazy, but crazy is what we are. We think it is our pain that keeps him buried in guilt, and if our pain were to disappear, he would no longer feel guilty. So we *want* our sickness to continue, to keep him guilty (9:6).

The Holy Spirit cannot be bothered to reason with such insanity, but there is no reason for us to remain sick, unhealed, because the rationale for keeping it is just plain nuts.

The section seems to end without a positive response beyond this assertion that remaining sick is nuts. We want some good advice on what we have to do. That seems to begin in the next section.¹¹

¹⁰. This means they want to keep their sickness because they are happy with the current balance of sacrifice. Their sacrifice—being sick—requires their brother to sacrifice—by feeling guilty. Their sickness costs them, but it seems worth it if they can thereby purchase what they really want: their brother’s guilt. If, however, they are healed, then their brother is off the hook. They have lost what they valued (his guilt), while he has been set free. Now there is no balance at all in the sacrifice; they have sacrificed his guilt and he has sacrificed nothing.

¹¹. In the FIP edition, sections II and III were treated as a single section.

Legend:

Light underscoring indicates emphasis that appears in the Urtext or shorthand notes.

The Text is taken from the Circle of Atonement's Complete and Annotated Edition (which I refer to as the "CE" for "Complete Edition" or "Circle Edition"). Please be aware that, even when the wording is identical to the FIP version, the division into paragraphs is often entirely different in the CE, which restores the paragraph breaks found in the original notes. This results in different reference numbering as well. I will indicate for each paragraph the corresponding sentences in the FIP edition. You should be able to locate specific sentences in that edition if you need to, with a minimum of visual clutter in the commentary. Passages that lie outside the current section will continue to have footnoted references. References to quotations are from the CE unless another version is being quoted, in which case that version is indicated.

Footnotes by the commentary author are shown in this font and size. Other footnotes come from the Complete Edition itself.