

Table of Contents

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO ACIM’S ORIGINS AND HISTORY.....	II
<i>Volume I: Text.....</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Volume II: Workbook.....</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Volume III: Manual for Teachers.....</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Volume IV: Use of Terms.....</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Volume V: Psychotherapy.....</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Volume VI: Song of Prayer.....</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Volume VI: Gifts of God.....</i>	<i>iii</i>
THE FIVE HISTORICAL VERSIONS.....	V
<i>Version One : The Notes.....</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Version Two: Thetford’s Transcript.....</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>Version Three: Helen’s First Retyping (Urtext).....</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>Version Four: HLC (Helen’s Second Retyping).....</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>Version Five: 1975-1996 FIP Editions.....</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>Nomenclature.....</i>	<i>vii</i>
PREFACE TO THE CORRECTED HUGH LYNN CAYCE VERSION.....	VIII
THE REFERENCE SYSTEM.....	X
GLOBAL STYLE AND CAPITALIZATION ISSUES.....	XI
GLOBAL SPELLING ALTERATIONS.....	XIII
GENERAL CAPITALIZATION UNCERTAINTIES.....	XIII
PUNCTUATION.....	XIII
SPECIFIC CHANGES.....	XIV
<i>Chapter 1: Section A: Par.2: p. 1.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Section A: Miracle Principle 22: p. 3.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Section A: Miracle Principle 25a: p. 4.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Section A: Miracle Principle 36a: p. 7.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Section A: Par. 50a: p. 13.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Section A: Par. 50a: p. 13.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section A: Par. 14: p. 22.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section C: Par. 2: p. 31.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section C: Par. 5: p. 31-32.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section C: Par. 6: p. 32.....</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section D: Par. 5: p. 38.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section D: Par. 6: p. 38.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 2: p. 39.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 2: Section E: Par. 12: p. 42.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 3: Section C: Par. 7: p. 49.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 3: Section I: Par. 5: Page 68.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 4: Section B: Par. 5: p. 72.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 4: Section B: Par. 12: p. 74.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 4: Section C: Par. 3: p. 76.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 4: Section C: Par. 5: p. 77.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 5: Section C: Par. 4: p. 103.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 5: Section C: Par. 7: p. 103.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 5: Section C: Par. 7: p. 103.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 5: Section D: Par. 10: p. 106.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 5: Section H: Par. 3: p. 120.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 5: Section I: Par. 2: p. 124.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 6: Section A: Par. 1: p. 128.....</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 4: p. 134.....</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<i>Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 8: p. 136.....</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<i>Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 9: p. 136.....</i>	<i>xvii</i>

Table of Contents

Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 11: p. 136.....	xvii
Chapter 6: Section F: Par. 8: p. 145.....	xvii
Chapter 6: Section F: Par. 9: p. 145.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section C: Par. 1: p. 156.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section C: Par. 2: p. 156.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section C: Par. 3: p. 156-57.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section D: Par. 3: p. 159.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 4: p. 166.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 12: p. 167.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 13: p. 168.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 13: p. 168.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section G: Par. 2: p. 169.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section G: Par. 10: p. 171.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section I: Par. 2: p. 178.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section J: Par. 8: p. 182.....	xvii
Chapter 7: Section K: Par. 4: p. 184.....	xviii
Chapter 8: Section A: Par. 3: p. 188.....	xviii
Chapter 8: Section C: Par.s 6&7: p. 191.....	xviii
Chapter 8: Section G: Par. 7: p. 204.....	xviii
Chapter 8: Section H: Paras 5 & 6: p. 209.....	xviii
Chapter 8: Section I: Par. 4: p. 212.....	xviii
Chapter 8: Section K: Par. 10: p. 221.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section G: Par. 2: p. 235.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section B: Par. 3: p. 239.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section H: Par. 3: p. 239.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 5: p. 242.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 7: p. 242.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 11: p. 243.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 12: p. 243.....	xviii
Chapter 9: Section J: Par. 8: p. 247.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section B: Par. 1: p. 252.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section B: Par. 1: p. 252.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 11: p. 267.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 15: p. 268.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 18: p. 269.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 19: p. 270.....	xviii
Chapter 10: Section G: Par. 3: p. 271.....	xix
Chapter 11: Section F: Par. 4: p. 293.....	xix
Chapter 11: Section J: Par. 7: p. 308.....	xix
Chapter 12: Section B: Par. 7: p. 314.....	xix
Chapter 12: Section C: Par. 13: p. 318.....	xix
Chapter 12: Section E: Par. 9: p. 324.....	xix
Chapter 12: Section G: Par. 1: p. 330.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section B: Par. 7: Sentence 5: p. 337.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 2: p. 341.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 4 Sentence 5: p. 342.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 5 Sentence 2: Page 342.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 6 Sentence 5: p. 342.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 11: p. 344.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section F: Par. 7: p. 350.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section H: Par. 3: p. 354.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section H: Par. 4: p. 354.....	xix
Chapter 13: Section H: Par. 9: p. 356.....	xix
Chapter 14: Section A: Par. 3: p. 362.....	xix
Chapter 14: Section B: Par. 6: p. 364.....	xx
Chapter 14: Section E: Par. 4: p. 376.....	xx
Chapter 14: Section F: Par. 5: p. 378.....	xx

Table of Contents

Chapter 14: Section G: Par. 7: p. 382.....	xx
Chapter 15: Section A: Par. 2: p. 386.....	xx
Chapter 15: Section D: Par. 11: p. 396.....	xx
Chapter 15: Section H: Par. 4: p. 407.....	xx
Chapter 15: Section I: Par. 2: p. 412.....	xx
Chapter 15: Section I: Par. 13: p. 416.....	xx
Chapter 15: Section J: Par. 9: p. 419.....	xx
Chapter 16: Section A: Par. 1: p. 424.....	xx
Chapter 16: Section A: Par. 2: p. 424.....	xx
Chapter 16: Section C: Par. 9: p. 429.....	xx
Chapter 16: Section D: Par. 4: p. 432.....	xx
Chapter 16: Section E: Par. 7: p. 436.....	xx
Chapter 16: Section E: Par. 11: p. 437.....	xxi
Chapter 16: Section F: Par. 11: p. 442.....	xxi
Chapter 16: Section H: Par. 9: p. 450.....	xxi
Chapter 17: Section B: Par. 4: p. 453.....	xxi
Chapter 17: Section D: Par. 7: p. 459.....	xxi
Chapter 17: Section G: Par. 1: p. 472.....	xxi
Chapter 17: Section H: Par. 8: p. 476.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 3: p. 481.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 6: p. 482.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 8: p. 483.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 10: p. 483.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section C: Par. 3: p. 484.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section C: Par. 6: p. 485.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section C: Par. 7: p. 485-6.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section E: Par. 7: p. 492.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section F: Par. 6: p. 494.....	xxi
Chapter 18: Section F: Par. 7: p. 494.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 1: p. 495.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 8: p. 497.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 8: p. 497.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 9: p. 497.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section H: Par. 4: p. 500.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section H: Par. 5: p. 501.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section J: Par. 7: p. 508.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section J: Par. 8: p. 509.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section J: Par. 11: p. 509.....	xxii
Chapter 18: Section K: Par. 2: p. 510.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section B: Par. 3: p. 513.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section B: Par. 6: p. 514.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section B: Par. 11: p. 515.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section C: Par. 7: p. 518.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section D: Par. 2: p. 520.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section D: Par. 13: p. 523.....	xxii
Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 1: p. 528.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 1: p. 528.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 5: p. 529.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 10: p. 530.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section G: Par. 2: p. 530.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section H: Par. 2: p. 534.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section I: Par. 3: p. 537.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section L: Par. 2: p. 543.....	xxiii
Chapter 19: Section L: Par. 8: p. 544-545.....	xxiii
Chapter 20: Section A: Par. 1: p. 547.....	xxiii
Chapter 20: Section B: Par. 3: p. 547.....	xxiii
Chapter 20: Section B: Par. 3: p. 548.....	xxiii

Table of Contents

Chapter 20: Section C: Par. 3: p. 549.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section C: Par. 6: p. 550.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section D: Par. 1: p. 553.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section D: Par. 11: p. 556.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section E: Par. 2: p. 557.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section F: Par. 2: p. 560.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section f: Par. 5: p. 561.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section G: Par. 9: p. 565.....	xxiv
Chapter 20: Section I: Par. 7: p. 571.....	xxiv
Chapter 21: Section A: Par. 2: p. 574.....	xxiv
Chapter 21: Section B: Par. 6: p. 575-576.....	xxiv
Chapter 21: Section B: Par. 9: p. 576.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section C: Par. 6: p. 579.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section C: Par. 9: p. 580.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section D: Par. 8: p. 585.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section E: Par. 2: p. 587.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section F: Par. 3: p. 590.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section F: Par. 6: p. 591.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section G: Par. 1: p. 594.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section G: Par. 2: p. 594.....	xxv
Chapter 21: Section H: Par. 8: p. 600.....	xxv
Chapter 22: Section A: Par. 4: p. 604.....	xxvi
Chapter 22: Section D: Par. 6: p. 615.....	xxvi
Chapter 22: Section D: Par. 9: p. 616.....	xxvi
Chapter 22 Section G: Par. 7: p. 623.....	xxvi
Chapter 22 Section G: Par. 8: p. 623.....	xxvi
Chapter 22 Section G: Par. 9: p. 623.....	xxvi
Chapter 23 Section B: Par. 12: p. 631.....	xxvi
Chapter 23 Section C: Par. 13: p. 635.....	xxvi
Chapter 23 Section E: Par. 1: p. 641.....	xxvi
Chapter 24: Section C: Par. 5-6: p. 649.....	xxvi
Chapter 24: Section D: Par. 3: p. 653.....	xxvi
Chapter 24: Section D: Par. 8 (last paragraph, 2nd to last sentence): p. 655.....	xxvi
Chapter 24: Section G: Par. 10: p. 663.....	xxvi
Chapter 25: Section A: Par. 2: p. 669.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section B: Par. 1: p. 669.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section B: Par. 7: Sentence 3: p. 671.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section C: Par. 2: p. 672.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section C: Par. 11: p. 675.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section G: Par. 6: p. 684.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section H: Par. 3: p. 686.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section H: Par. 8: p. 688.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section H: Par. 9: p. 688.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section I: Par. 1: p. 691.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section I: Par. 5: p. 692.....	xxvii
Chapter 25: Section I: Par. 14: p. 695.....	xxvii
Chapter 26: Section B: Par. 5: p. 701.....	xxvii
Chapter 26: Section B: Par. 8: p. 702.....	xxvii
Chapter 26: Section C: Par. 1: p. 703.....	xxvii
Chapter 26: Section D: Par. 2: p. 706.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section D: Par. 7: p. 707.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 3: p. 710.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 7: p. 711.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 8: p. 711.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 8: p. 711.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section H: Par. 6: p. 716.....	xxviii
Chapter 26: Section H: Par. 9: p. 717.....	xxviii

Table of Contents

<i>Chapter 26: Section H: Par. 15: p. 719</i>	<i>xxviii</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section B: Par. 3: Sentence 5: p. 730</i>	<i>xxviii</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section C: Par. 10-12: p. 735-736</i>	<i>xxviii</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section C: Par. 15: Sentence 5: p. 736</i>	<i>xxviii</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section D: Par. 6: p. 739</i>	<i>xxviii</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section E: Par. 2: p. 741</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 2: p. 744</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 3: p. 744</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 5: Page 745</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 10: p. 747</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section G: Par. 5: p. 749</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section H: Par. 11: p. 754</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 27: Section H: Par. 12: p. 754</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 28: Section B: Par. 2: p. 762</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 28: Section B: Par. 6: p. 763</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 28: Section B: Par. 12: p. 765</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 28: Section F: Par. 3: p. 776</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 28: Section G: Par. 3: p. 780</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section A: Par. 3: page 784</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section C: Par. 6: page 788</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section C: Par. 9: page 789</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section E: Par. 2: page 792</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section E: Par. 3: page 792</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section F: Par. 1: page 794</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 29: Section J: Par. 1: page 805</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 30: Section B: Many Paragraphs pp 809-812</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 30: Section B: Par. 8: p. 810</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section C: Par. 1: Page 844</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section D: Par. 8: p. 848</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section D: Par. 9: p. 848</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section E: Par. 5: p. 851</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section E: Par. 14: p. 853</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section G: Par. 9: p. 860</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section G: Par. 11: p. 861</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>Chapter 31: Section H: Par. 3: p. 863</i>	<i>xxx</i>

A Brief Introduction to ACIM's Origins and History

The Scribing

By Doug Thompson

In November of 1965, Psychology Professor Helen Schucman heard what she came to call an "inner dictation" speak the words "*You will see miracles through your hands through Me*" which she then recorded in her notebook. This followed days of conversations with a "Voice" she had begun to hear in her head. The next words she recorded were: "*This is a course in miracles, please take notes.*" Thus began *A Course in Miracles*.

For more than a decade Schucman continued taking notes in shorthand, and these form the basis for the book *A Course in Miracles*, or just *ACIM*, which has sold more than a million copies since its first large scale printing in 1976.

Questioning her own sanity when the "Voice" first showed up in 1965, Schucman shared her experiences with her friend, colleague, and supervisor, Dr. William (Bill) Thetford, chairman of the Medical Psychology Department at Columbia University. Over the next several years, he typed up her "dictations" day by day as she read aloud to him from her notebooks. Thetford did not believe Schucman was going crazy, and her professional work was in no way impaired by this "scribing" activity they shared.

The Scribes were later to trace the origins of what the *Notes* calls "Bill's better idea" to a comment Thetford had made to Schucman after a particularly acrimonious academic meeting. Thetford had said "there must be a better way" and Schucman had agreed to *help him* find it. This event, both Scribes later recounted, this agreement to "seek" for a "better way" and to do it *together and collaboratively* was the "invitation" which resulted in the Course. Shortly afterward, the words "this is a Course in Miracles" were penned, a course which "the Voice" frequently later referred to as "Bill's course."

The material Schucman and Thetford recorded is amongst the most extraordinary literature ever penned in the English language. In all there were over 3,000 pages of shorthand notes, much of it in perfect Iambic Pentameter representing the largest single example of Iambic Pentameter that we know of.

The "Voice" Schucman heard identified himself as the historical Jesus of Nazareth, commented on the Bible extensively, even offering a number of corrections, and spoke at great length about several of the Bible's major themes. Anyone who has ever wondered "What did Jesus *really* mean" by such statements as "*seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all else shall be added unto you*" will be thrilled to find, in *ACIM*, extensive discourses elaborating this and many other ideas which are briefly and tantalizingly mentioned in the *New Testament*. Of the three years of his public ministry noted in the *New Testament*, during which Jesus was said to be teaching in public and private extensively, we have remarkably few direct quotes attributed to him and only a few dozen pages of biographical material. It is an astonishing paucity of detail. If the claims made by *ACIM's* author are true, that lack of detail concerning the thought of Jesus has been partly rectified in this book.

As the title of the book suggests, and the opening 53 Principles of Miracles detail, there is a great deal of discussion about what miracles are, how they happen, and how one can grow into becoming a "miracle-minded" person who is then a "miracle worker." And yes, it doesn't stop short of discussing raising the dead.

One of the most remarkable statements on this topic was edited out of the abridged edition published in 1975. In it Jesus explains that it is "hellfire" which should be taken allegorically, and "raising the dead" which should be taken literally. This is found in T 8 I 7, on page 61 of this edition.

Both Schucman and Thetford were persuaded of the authenticity of the material, although at first they did not know they were taking down an extensive lecture series by Jesus addressed to the whole world!

The two Psychology professors continued teaching and conducting research while they scribed *ACIM*. They were very aware that in the intellectual climate of New York in 1965 the material would not be acceptable in "academic" circles and their participation in something so "flaky" could seriously threaten their careers should it become known. Thus they kept this work largely secret until 1975, sharing copies only with a few people.

Volume I: Text

The "Scribing" of *ACIM* came in several distinct stages which have been organized into several volumes. The first, scribed between 1965 and 1968 is the "*Text*." Schucman and Thetford were later to organize the thousand-odd pages of manuscript of this volume into 31 chapters with several sections in each. We don't know exactly how many typed pages the original *Thetford Transcript* is because no copy has yet come to light. The oldest available manuscript, a later re-typing known as the *Urtext*, is 1079 pages. The original may be longer. Each chapter and section was given a title and some of the divisions represent real transition points in the material. Others appear largely arbitrary. So too, the titles of the chapters and sections sometimes appear to the reader to be uninformative and apparently mostly unconnected to the content of the section. While not part of the original dictation, these chapter and section divisions and titles have been retained because they are well known, widely used and useful for referencing specific locations in the text (see below: *Reference System*).

Volume II: Workbook

A few months after the *Text* volume was finished in 1968, a second began to be dictated by the "Voice." Volume II has become known as the "*Workbook*." It consists of 361 "lessons" plus numerous pithy discourses along with six "reviews". The reader is advised to do no more than one lesson per day which would take at least a year. The *Workbook* has two parts, the first aimed at "undoing" the ego's thought system which is inimical to the divine

A Brief Introduction to ACIM's Origins and History

nature and the second aimed at restoring the mind to the Creator's thought system, and thus opening to the divine and the miraculous.

Volume III: Manual for Teachers

The third volume is called the "*Manual for Teachers*." We are all "Teachers" all the time, we are told. We cannot be or do anything without "teaching." Calling on all readers to advance toward becoming "Teachers of God," the third volume offers some practical advice and admonition to readers.

Volume IV: Use of Terms

There is a fourth volume, the *Use of Terms*, which appears in later FIP editions as an appendix to the *Manual* under the name "*Clarification of Terms*." Schucman scribed this material after *ACIM* was first published in the "Xerox Edition" (Criswell) in 1975 in response to questions from readers about the meaning of terms. While some of it appears to be genuinely Jesus, other parts of it are clearly inaccurate, which has led many to doubt whether it should be included in the "canon" of *ACIM* at all. Jesus is referred to in the third person, indicating authorship by someone else. In the same time period, 1975-1976, Schucman recorded a number of "*Special Messages*" which very few regard as "canonical" due to the fact that they involve a number of specific "future predictions" which didn't come to pass, along with other distinct errors. In this period of the *Special Messages* and the *Clarification of Terms*, it appears Schucman's fears about the first publication of the Course and the beginnings of the copyright controversy with her alleged "message from the Voice" directing the material to be copyrighted, were blocking her clear "channel" to Jesus such that the messages were sometimes coming through garbled. This tiny volume appears to reflect much of the same thought as the earlier *ACIM* volumes but includes enough suspect material to make its inclusion in the *ACIM* canon somewhat controversial.

Volume V: Psychotherapy

Three other smaller volumes were also scribed. They are called *Psychotherapy*, *Song of Prayer*, and *Gifts of God*. The reader can instantly recognize the same "Voice" and wisdom in these two.

The *Psychotherapy* volume deals with the spiritual dynamics of the patient-therapist relationship along with many practical considerations, right down to setting prices. Given that Schucman and Thetford were Psychologists, the relevance to their professional work is obvious. Given the emphasis in the Course on healing, the relevance to everyone is equally obvious.

Volume VI: Song of Prayer

This beautiful and poetic little volume addresses directly the issue of communication between man and God, in touching, intense, intimate and beautiful language. It is a rich treasury of practical advice and metaphysical insight.

Volume VI: Gifts of God

Published by FIP in a compendium of Schucman's poetry under the same title, the 16 page *Urtext* manuscript by this name is widely recognized as authentic channelled material. The poetry of the Course reaches a crescendo in this volume and many consider it a fitting epilogue to the entire work.

After each volume was "scribed," Schucman and Thetford, later with the help of Ken Wapnick, and finally without Thetford's active participation at all, undertook to edit Thetford's Transcripts to make the material suitable for print publication. At the time none of the participants appear to have had any idea the material they were working on would come to be viewed by many as "Scripture" nor that scholarly interest would develop concerning the precise original wording and punctuation as scholars sought to analyse every nuance of the message.

The "Voice" did instruct Thetford to remove some of the explicitly personal material directed only to the scribes themselves which shows up alongside the "Course" in the original dictation in the early chapters. The "Voice" specifically assigned this task to Thetford and directed Schucman *not* to do the editing herself, one of several instructions she appears to have been unable to comply with, and which was to be the cause of much difficulty and confusion later.

We know from the few fragments of the original *Notes* which have been made public by Kenneth Wapnick in *Absence from Felicity*, that the Voice also said "*every word is meaningful*" and indicated that future correction of extant errors would occur. While every word may have been important to the "Voice" and any genuine scholars coming to work with the material later, some of the subsequent editors clearly did not share this view. One of them, Dr. Kenneth Wapnick, has publicly criticized the idea of "every word" being important. While most can recognize that an obsession with words, as "form" can be misused to obscure the meaning, or "content," words are also content and when they are changed or removed the meaning often changes. Meddling with "Holy Scripture" to "correct" what it says to suit the preferences of editors and authorities has been a popular pastime throughout religious history. It's the bane of textual scholarship where the goal is to understand 'what was written.' This is not to say that later editor's views of 'what was written' are not of interest or even importance. It is only to say that some would like to know which is which, and whether we are reading the words of the author or those of his editors.

Schucman stated that while Thetford "didn't want to change anything" she wanted to change nearly everything, did so, and then changed it back. Little evidence has surfaced to date that Schucman "undid" more than a handful of the thousands of changes she made, even when it was an obvious inadvertent mistake, except in the case of blatant spelling errors. Once she changed something, we can see from the several versions now available, the changes remained into all subsequent revisions and very rarely were any restored to an earlier form except when they involved obvious spelling and grammar errors. However, we certainly do not have all of Schucman's editing drafts and there may be some which contain alterations she later rejected, restoring the material to a previous form.

The early editing did follow the "Voice's" instructions to the extent that some personal material was removed, and some specific dictated corrections were made. Other dictated corrections were not made and the editors removed a great deal more than just the "specifically personal" material of no general value. Schucman re-

A Brief Introduction to ACIM's Origins and History

wrote the first few chapters at least three¹ and there is evidence to suggest perhaps as many as four or even more times. Portions of those first few chapters may have been re-written even more frequently. In each case we can see from those of her drafts which are available that she re-typed the previous draft with changes and some corrections of typos *and* introduced a few new typos. Inevitably, copy-typing such large documents results in inadvertent omissions of words, phrases, lines, whole paragraphs and in one case an entire page.

Why they never proofread the new drafts against the original I do not know. I suspect they were A) largely unaware of how many errors they had inadvertently introduced and B) simply didn't have the time and resources to do it. Thorough proofreading of large documents requires thousands of hours. However, they didn't proof against the original nor even the immediately preceding version, and thus in each editing pass new errors were introduced inadvertently. There were also apparently intentional changes made by the editors of a highly questionable nature, completely rewriting and often distorting some sections for no apparent reason. Robert Perry, noting some of the surprising introductions of errors this involved, has proposed that Schucman, who often expressed embarrassment about the style of the early chapters, was attempting to make the informal and conversational style of the early chapters resemble the grandeur of the high poetry of the later chapters.

Having worked daily with Schucman's manuscripts for the past three years, proofing what she was unable to proof, and documenting the evolution of the material from version to version as she worked through it, I have gained enormous respect for her and the magnitude and difficulty of the task she undertook without the assistance of computers! In a sense I have been retracing her steps from her notes as one might do those of historic explorers from their journals. It's not the same but you certainly *can* see some of what they saw and appreciate in greater detail the magnitude of the accomplishment. I do not wish my observations of the imperfections in the results to be interpreted as negative criticism of Schucman and Thetford. With the resources and technology and time available to them in the early 70s, when "cut and paste" really did mean "scissors and glue" and where a "text search" was done by eyeballing sheets of printed paper, what they accomplished is nothing short of remarkable. That it failed to achieve total perfection in every regard is hardly surprising! If there is "criticism" warranted anywhere it might be of the "myth" of infallible editing which has grown up since Schucman and Thetford handed their unfinished work on to others. This idea that "Jesus" directed every pencil stroke and ensured a total absence of error is very clearly not an idea with any truth to it.

Indeed, that they managed to get it published at all, and that it was at least *mostly* correct, appears to be a miracle!

The "personal material" which was later, and probably correctly removed from the Course, deals extensively with the difficulties Bill and Helen had with each other as well as with the Course. Bill's tendency to be a "professor who refuses to profess" and withdraw from his assignment is dealt with, as is Helen's reluctance to do as she's asked by the Voice, which is to "help Bill" with "Bill's better idea."

Toward the end of the scribing, Schucman and Thetford had increasing difficulty collaborating, and some sense of the dynamics is offered by Kenneth Wapnick in his book *Absence from Felicity* whose title describes the situation he found when he met them in 1973 and began to help them get the material ready for printing.

Bill Thetford would never be the "professor" of the Course which the dictation clearly calls on him to be, nor would he ever fully exercise the role of "editor" he is assigned. Helen Schucman, whom Ken Wapnick described as a "compulsive" editor, took over the editing role and by her own admission "wanted to change everything" and proceeded to change a great deal. While she also noted that Thetford "wanted to change nothing" she not only failed to "help him" in his role, as she was *repeatedly* asked, but proceeded to actively obstruct him by making changes herself, changes the Voice specifically stated were Thetford's responsibility and not hers.

Schucman's severe difficulties with doing the editing, described in some detail by Wapnick, and obviously resulting from the fact that *it was not her job* but rather Bill's, were partly solved when Ken himself proceeded to edit the material with her. Wapnick describes how he had to initiate the editing, how Helen was enormously resistant to it, and even "invariably fell asleep" when the two were attempting to edit together.² No wonder there were some problems with the result.

What Wapnick almost certainly didn't know in 1973 when he first read this version of ACIM, was how much had *already* been changed, how many inadvertent mistakes had *already* crept in, and that Thetford, not Schucman, had been specifically assigned the editing task. He found Schuman's massive psychological resistance to editing a bit mystifying and did not apparently suspect a very obvious explanation for it. It wasn't *her job!* Nor, apparently, was it his. Why Thetford was assigned the role of editor is obvious. *He* "didn't want to change anything" and had enormous respect for "every word" apparently accepting the Author's statement that "*every word is meaningful.*" This is not a view which was shared by *either* Schucman or Wapnick. Unlike Wapnick, Schucman *knew* she was "out of line" and operating contrary to specific instructions. Wapnick quite correctly recognized the importance of getting the material printed and fully recognized that the Scribes needed help and had effectively ceased to be able to collaborate effectively, but what he might have figured out if he had been privy then to the original dictation, some of which is still secret, is that it was Thetford he should be helping and the help Schucman needed was to understand that she too should be helping Thetford. And perhaps the help Thetford most needed was in accepting that he'd been given the task and needed to follow instructions and accept his role, something he never did!

Astonishingly, with the first publication of the Course in 1975, the claim was made that it had not been extensively edited and it was "virtually unchanged" from the original dictation, save for the removal of "personal material." This is astonishing because A) that is what they Scribes had been *instructed to do* (and what Thetford *wanted* but failed to do) and B) because that is so very far from what was actually done. There are many visible reasons for

¹ Cite quote from Wapnick

² Reference *Absence from Felicity*

A Brief Introduction to ACIM's Origins and History

this, and while a few have been suggested here, it is beyond the scope of this item to inquire further into them.

The single most astonishing thing is that they all knew it wasn't true but they said it was anyway. By this stage in the Course's history, the Scribes' inability to deal with their difficulties in collaboration had been "solved" by a complete denial of the difficulty and the failure of collaboration in the final stages. The denial was so total that they could somehow, in good conscience, simply state that there was no problem even though we can now tell they could not possibly have believed that without rather enormous denial of the facts. They "changed the Course" and they weren't supposed to. They knew they weren't supposed to and resolved the conflict simply by saying they hadn't done so.

Later Wapnick was to publicize the idea that "Jesus" had directed the editing and that he and Helen "felt" it was just the way Jesus wanted it. By the final stage *Jesus* may well have been thinking that any way at all was ok so long as they got it printed! The corrections would have to wait for more open and receptive channels who, even if they were to disobey instructions, wouldn't lie about it to themselves and the world.

This substantial denial and self-deception which was soon to become public deception led to the necessity of a substantial cover-up.

Following the publication of the highly edited version in 1975, the original handwritten notebooks and typescripts were locked up and while some of that material has been discovered and published, some has yet to surface. In place of the "history" of the Course's origins and in place of the actual authentic original dictation itself we have a "mythical" account of the origins and the publication of a substantially abridged and changed version of the Course.

Enough has been made public so far that the "myth" of editing being divinely guided is now as credible as the claims of the Flat Earth Society. But until late 1999, that myth was steadfastly maintained, widely believed, and there was no evidence available by which to challenge it. The evidence was locked up and the early efforts to publish it were instantly met by lawsuits, gag orders and court injunctions initiated by Wapnick.

This secrecy and deception is alarmingly reminiscent of the early history of much of the Bible whose original manuscripts are all lost, and which has suffered greatly from "editing" by presumably well-meaning copyists who only managed to muddy the message, introduce confusion, and undermine the authority of great writings by "correcting" what they imagined were "errors". The good fortune for the Course is that the distortions were discovered early enough, before the original material was all lost, that correction is possible. The publication of this volume which represents the *Text* of ACIM as Thetford and Schucman had edited it *before* Wapnick proceeded to initiate the removal of about a quarter of the first five chapters, is one step toward recovering the "Authentic Original Dictation of ACIM"

In the original dictation the Bible's problems and also those of the work of Edgar Cayce are mentioned directly in the context of "corrections" to ACIM. Jesus assures Schucman that he will ensure that corrections will be made, even if that happens generations later. He also states that he will make "every effort" to correct scribal errors but that she must *ask*. As we can see, not

only did the Scribes decline to ask in the end, they actively denied that there was any need for "correction."

This version is *not* the original dictation and it is missing some important material, but it is one large step toward undoing the mistakes of the past in the present and thus releasing the future. For a few months in the year 2000 after its release and before the appearance of the *Urtext* it was widely supposed and asserted that this was the original, unexpurgated, unedited, wording of the Course. By late in the year 2000, it was clear that the *HLC* was some 50,000 words shorter than the *Urtext*. It is "more original" than the Foundation editions and "less edited and abridged" relative to them but it is in no way identical to the "original" and claims of that nature are misinformed.

There is quite a bit of obvious error in all the ACIM manuscripts and editions to date. While many changes introduced by the editors are indisputably mistakes, and often almost certainly inadvertent ones, they also did sometimes correct previous mistakes. There is usually little doubt as to which change is a "correction" and which is a "corruption," but not always. Every change, then, must be carefully considered. And when "considering" we must be sure to do what the original Scribes found they could not, and that is to *ask!*

This edition is one step toward shedding light on the editing process and revealing its underpinnings and shortcomings such that an advance toward restoring the "authentic" dictation can be made. As such it is a very small step indeed. What is left to be done is much greater in size than what has already been done. Each editing change at every stage must be examined, which is rather difficult as long as some of the primary source material remains hidden. As that is done in a spirit of honest inquiry with the desire only to establish the truth, the "purity and integrity" of ACIM, which has been so severely compromised, will eventually be restored as the Author assured Schucman and Thetford it would be.

The Five Historical Versions

On page 6 is a table listing of all renditions, redactions, recensions, versions and editions of *ACIM* which are known or said to exist.

There are a few things which need to be said by way of introduction to that material.

There are only five clearly recognizable distinct versions of the entire volume 1 as of August 2006. New versions may appear in the future but today, while there are many different "editions", they are all editions of one of these five versions. It is known that there were more than five editing passes made on some of the material, but the intermediate drafts either have not survived or have not been made public. We have then, reliable information as to the existence of these five and we have intact copies of the entirety of three of them, some of a fourth, but none at all of one. The one which no one I know has seen, or is willing to admit to having seen, is the original *Thetford Transcript*. Its existence is well-attested, by Thetford himself, but its whereabouts or precise content is, at the moment, a mystery.

Version One : The Notes

The earliest form of the Course is Helen's first manuscript in her notebooks, and that has not only survived, some of it has been

A Brief Introduction to ACIM's Origins and History

published and much of it is accessible at the United States Copyright Office (USCO). Unfortunately, due to a copyright claim on the material by Wapnick, and his refusal to allow the material to be published, while the USCO material can be inspected, it cannot be copied. While this difficulty is certainly temporary, difficulties of access have limited scholarly review of the original dictation.

Version Two: Thetford's Transcript

Bill and Helen reported that day by day as Helen was taking notes by hand, she would dictate these to Bill who typed them up and then read back what he'd typed to ensure accuracy.

Version Three: Helen's First Retyping (Urtext)

There is an early manuscript of the *Text* which is not, however, Thetford's original Transcript. I should qualify that by saying it is certainly not all Thetford's original as it bears many indications of editing in the early portions and differs markedly from the *Notes* fragments we do have of those early pages. Some of the later parts of that manuscript may be Thetford's original transcript. I personally doubt it because the overall quality and accuracy is higher than Thetford's comments about his own typing lead one to suspect, but aside from that I know of no evidence by which we can rule out the possibility that some of it might be.

This *Urtext* manuscript is probably what Wapnick refers to in *Absence* as "Helen's First Retyping." It not only shows editing abridgements in comparison with the original *Notes*, it includes a significant amount of material not present in the *Notes*, material often flagged with the note "dictated without notes." It would seem that while Helen was re-typing the original, she was editing it, both removing material and adding material which she felt was being dictated as she typed. We know from references in the *Notes* that Helen did not always read the whole of what she'd recorded to Bill in the daily exercise whereby she read from her notebooks while Bill typed it up, and then he read it back to ensure accuracy. And we know from this "first retyping" that material was added later which is not in the *Notes*. In these two ways then we know that the first handwritten version, the second version which was typed by Bill, and the third version which was edited by Helen, all contain differences. The *Notes* has material missing from later versions and the later versions have later "dictation" which is not present in the *Notes* or the Thetford Transcript.

Version Four: HLC (Helen's Second Retyping)

According to Robert Skutch, in *Journey Without Distance*, after the *Text* portion was finished but before the *Workbook* dictation began, Bill initiated the insertion of chapter and section breaks.. The *Hugh Lynn Cayce* manuscript (the document recovered from ARE in 1999) has those chapter and section breaks. When compared with the earlier material, we can see that there are other changes. A great deal of the material in the earlier versions was removed in this stage.

Version Five: 1975-1996 FIP Editions

The final stage of substantive abridgement of ACIM is the best documented, since Wapnick, who personally participated in it, has written at some length about his experiences in his book *Absence from Felicity*. Wapnick's account is problematic in that most of

what can be checked against independent sources in his account turns out to be partly or wholly mistaken. However, much is also partly correct and provides information we'd not otherwise have, although that information is not always as accurate or reliable as we'd like.

Wapnick indicates that the *HLC* was the only version he'd seen when he began to edit it with Helen, three months after first seeing it in May 1973. In *Absence* Wapnick portrays himself as the one who was responsible, with Helen lending a hand reluctantly and 'invariably falling asleep.' In later comments Wapnick states that Helen did the editing and he just served as her "secretary." It's likely the case that both contributed significantly. Many observers can see traces of Helen in the final editing since overall, the pattern of introduction of error, re-writing things that didn't need re-writing, and removing things that didn't need removing is consistent with the differences between previous versions. Wapnick's hand is visible in that certain "miracle-related" material which appears to bother him but not to have bothered Schucman and Thetford, goes missing.

What is known to be different about this editing is not just the presence of Wapnick, but the absence of Thetford. His precise role in earlier editing is not clear. There is little way to tell how much of the editing was his doing and how much was Helen's. Helen's own comments are the best information we have. She says she wanted to change just about everything and Bill did not. She says she changed a great deal and then removed the changes, but while we can see massive evidence of changes, we see almost no evidence of anything being put back to an earlier form after having been changed. There are a very few known cases of this however. The impression left is that most of the changes were Helen's doing which is severely problematic since we have the clear scribed instructions from the Author that this work was to be left to Bill!

Bill certainly did not register any open or public objection to the sum total of the editing that I know of. If he had objections, he appears to have kept them private.

The Foundation for Inner Peace (FIP) has published three distinct editions of the 1975 Abridgement, with some minor modifications and corrections one to the next. The first, in August of 1975, has been called by several different names, the "Criswell Edition," and "the Freeperson Press" edition and "The Xerox Edition."

It consisted of some 300 copies of the "Nun's Version" manuscript which were photocopied at 50%, resulting in a smaller book, but also type that was difficult to read. In June of 1976 FIP came out with its second edition, the three volume "Blue Book" which, although it was the second edition, was called the *First Edition*. It included the fourth volume, "*Use of Terms*" as an appendix to Volume Three. In 1992 further corrections were made along with the addition of a reference system, in FIP's third edition which it called the *Second Edition*.

As mentioned previously, it is known that there were "intermediate drafts" between some of the versions. We have direct evidence of that between the *HLC* and the *FIP Abridgement* because Wapnick says the early part was done twice. We have indirect evidence in the "First Re-typing" (aka *Urtext*) in that there are five different pagination systems and a good deal of visible cut

A Brief Introduction to ACIM's Origins and History

and paste which suggests the likelihood of ‘intermediate drafts’ is high.

Nomenclature

A major source of confusion for new students of ACIM is the huge variety of sometimes highly inaccurate names which are used to denote versions of ACIM and different editions of the 5 versions. I’ve tried to choose the most accurate, descriptive, and unambiguous names for each of the versions, though there are any

number of other names I could have chosen and which are or have been used to refer to various versions.

I’ve finally resorted to numbering them in chronological order, one to five, earliest to most recent, to facilitate precise identification in the future, especially if any new drafts show up, but also for novices who are trying to keep track of other names ... correlate any name with one of those numbers and it will all get much simpler! The single largest problem is the name “*Urtext*” which has been commonly used to refer both to version two and version three, resulting in confusion on an epic scale!

Preface to the Corrected Hugh Lynn Cayce Version

This edition of the *HLC* or *Hugh Lynn Cayce Version* (aka “*JCIM*” or *Jesus’ Course in Miracles*) version is the first part of a much larger project intended to provide accurate, machine-readable transcriptions of all extant *ACIM* primary source materials with concordances.

The ultimate goal of this project is to compare all instances of variant readings between all versions and determine which differences are genuine “corrections” and which are editorial mistakes. The result will be a “new version” which is as authentic to the original dictation of the Author as possible. This edition is not that, it is only the first of several necessary tools without which that undertaking cannot begin. It is an accurate copy of the photocopy discovered at the A.R.E. Library in November of 1999. It contains some additional material, which is fully footnoted, which we believe was inadvertently left out and it contains some corrections of spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors. Except for the most trivial of spelling and punctuation corrections, all changes from the *HLC* manuscript are footnoted.

The first phase of “processing” a manuscript on paper is sometimes called “paper capture.” It can be done by manual copy typing or scanning to optical character recognition (OCR) software. Shortly after this manuscript was discovered, this process was undertaken and a computer text file of the material was made available within weeks, showing up on the Internet on January 6, 2000. However that document was not sufficiently proofread and contained several hundred typos. While most were minor and many were obvious, some were considerably more serious.

When an even earlier version of the *Text* volume, the so-called “*Urtext*” was released on the net in August 2000, it was similarly processed with an output quality suffering similar problems. At this time we have two pre-1975 manuscripts for the *Text*, the *HLC* and what is called the “*Urtext*.” For the *Workbook*, *Manual*, *Use of Terms*, *Psychotherapy*, *Song of Prayer* and *Gifts of God*, we have only the “*Urtext*” manuscripts. Most of these are not widely thought to be the original *Thetford Transcript*. However, it is possible that some portions of these *Urtext* manuscripts may be Thetford’s first transcript. Prior to all there is of course the *Notes*, Helen’s shorthand notebooks. There may also be additional manuscripts representing portions of the *Text* which appears to have been re-worked many times between re-typings of the complete volume.

Eventually it is likely that all these documents will be released. When they become available they too will be “captured” to machine readable form.

Once “captured,” the material must be proof-read because the “capture” process is much less than 100% accurate, especially when our “source” document is third or fourth

generation photocopy of an original made with an ink-ribbon typewriter. Proofreading is not complicated, but it is tedious, time-consuming and exacting work. The traditional process is to have one person read aloud from the copy while another follows along on the original, noting any differences. With the aid of computers, we can use a voice synthesizer to “read” the copy aloud, and in many ways this is preferable because humans often “know” what is supposed to be there and fail to notice subtle mistakes. Computers are too dumb to skip over mistakes like that! This is what we did for the *HLC*.

Even with the help of computers, no single proofreading pass of a large document ever catches 100% of the errors. In fact, if we catch 90% we think we’ve done well. The only way to check is to proof it again, and again, and again until one stops finding mistakes.

After ten passes we were no longer finding mistakes. Some mistakes, such as capitalization, presented a major issue in the *HLC* because capitalization is used for emphasis so often. There were hundreds of capitalization capture errors in the version released in 2000. These can only be caught by eye, however, comparing the two documents side by side. To do this the “copy” was paginated identically to the manuscript and printed out and bound with the manuscript pages, so the two pages can be examined and compared side by side, line by line.

In addition to discrepancies between the *HLC* manuscript and the digital copy, there are errors in the *HLC* itself. Some of these are rather simple and obvious spelling and punctuation errors, but we found other errors as well. In some cases there is bad grammar, and in others obviously inadvertent omissions of a word or a phrase or a sentence or even, in one case, an entire page. To find all of these the *HLC* must be compared line-by-line with its predecessor, the *Urtext*. We have not done this. We have only compared the *HLC* to earlier and later versions when there appeared to our eyes or ears some problem with the *HLC* itself. The “corrections” which are included in this edition arose in that way, and not in a thorough proofing of the *HLC* against any other version. That work is still to be done and there is little doubt that many more errors and omissions will show up when it is.

What we have here then is a highly accurate transcript of the *HLC* manuscript with some errors in the manuscript itself being flagged and/or corrected. Where we were aware of mistakes, it seemed to us irresponsible not to inform the reader of the presence of a possible error, or correct it if it was completely obvious that it was an error.

Except for the most trivial and obvious of typos relating to spelling and punctuation, all changes or corrections we’ve made have been footnoted so that the reader can be sure

Preface to the *Corrected* Hugh Lynn Cayce Version

precisely where this text deviates from the manuscript, and why it does so. Our goal was not to ‘change’ the *HLC* but simply to “accurately transcribe it.”

In dealing with discrepancies between the *HLC* and the *Urtext* we did not change anything which appeared to be an intentional change by the previous editors. Only where there was a powerful case that the discrepancies were inadvertent did we consider a change. Even then we sometimes just footnoted the perceived problem and left the text unchanged. Only where there was no discernible probability of the change being intentional did we actually “correct” the *HLC*, and even there we footnoted all but the most obvious and trivial typos.

The reason for footnoting is quite simple. Our list of “errors to be fixed” was initially much larger than it is currently. As each one was reviewed repeatedly by a number of people, it became apparent that in many cases the ‘error’ was in our understanding of the text, and not in the text itself. As we look at the changes previous editors made, we often believe we’re seeing the same thing, that they made changes based on a misreading of the material at times, just as we did. While we’ve removed all such changes we were aware of, we are not claiming that any supernatural power guided every keystroke in this document, nor that our decisions are in any way infallible. It is likely, in my view, that future scholarship, especially if informed by *Thetford Transcript* and *Notes*, will find that some changes we’ve made need to be ‘unmade’ and that the error, again, wasn’t in the text of the *HLC*, but in our understanding of it. Through such evaluation, any errors we’ve made are likely to come to light and be corrected.

I’m repeating myself here because I wish to be unambiguously and precisely clear about what we did and what we didn’t do and what this edition represents. I’m taking such pains at least in part because other publishers have made substantial alterations which were not documented and in some cases, were even denied.

Because our underlying goal was the production of a Concordance, we needed a reference system suitable for a Concordance and we needed to standardize spelling conventions. Where multiple spellings of a word are used or allowed, we’ve standardized this edition to a single variant of possible spellings. The list of words which we’ve modified appears later.

The need for the “early manuscripts” to be published became obvious within hours of the *HLC* being re-discovered in 1999. The differences between it and the later *FIP First Edition* which was mistakenly advertised as “virtually unchanged” are very great in the early chapters. While some of these are clearly corrections, many, many others are clearly inadvertent errors. Where changes are deliberate, in some cases those changes are exceedingly questionable and the possibility of editorial error cannot be discounted.

It must be remembered that at no point after the original *Thetford Transcript* and prior to 1992 did the “editing” of *ACIM* involve any proofreading or checking the “current version” against any but the immediately preceding one. Thus any errors which weren’t obvious, and several which actually were obvious, were preserved into all later versions. The result is that the more they edited it, the worse it got. More new errors were introduced in each recopying and most of the extant errors went uncorrected.

In order to discover “what *ACIM* really says” we must then, where there are variant readings, correct the editorial mistakes while preserving the editorial corrections. The only way to do this is to track every change the editors made at every stage, “undo” those which are obvious mistakes, preserve those which are corrections, and carefully reconsider those changes which are not obviously either corrections or corruptions. Just finding the differences, never mind evaluating them, is a huge task, and it’s much more difficult in the absence of accurate machine-readable copies. Thus the first step in a “thorough proofing” and correction of *ACIM* is the preparation of precisely accurate copies of each version of *ACIM*. With those in hand, computers can help us greatly in identifying all the changes.

The attempt here is not to “replace” any other version of *ACIM* nor is it to suggest that this one is without mistakes. It is simply to offer to the world, for the first time, an accurate, fully proofed edition of the *HLC* for those who are interested in such along with a Concordance which greatly facilitates textual research.

The *HLC* version has some advantages over later versions of *ACIM* for the student. There is more material, there is less missing, and there are fewer errors than is the case with later versions. This version is closer to the original dictation although it is by no means identical to the original dictation, especially in the first chapters. In contrast with earlier versions which have yet more material, virtually all of the “personal” material had been removed by the time the *HLC* was typed. Also, unlike earlier versions, it has chapter and section divisions which are very useful.

Each version has its distinct advantages and disadvantages, and each would be the version of choice in certain applications, for certain people. “The Best Version” is still the one you study carefully and prayerfully!

At this time we’ve proofed the *Urtext Workbook* twice and the *Manual* once. Work has been started on the *Urtext Text*. When these will be finally available in print is not known. The other volumes are much less problematic than the *Text* and we are hoping to have these ready soon. In the Concordance which is available for this edition, the *Workbook*, *Manual*, *Use of Terms*, *Psychotherapy* and *Song of Prayer* volumes are included in their current “partially proofed” state ... which is still potentially useful for the researcher. The Concordance will, of course, be updated as soon as the proofing is finished.

The Reference System

There are two reference systems used in this edition. The first consisting of bolded numbers in brackets (**999**) refers to the original *HLC* manuscript page number. These bracketed, bolded page numbers are inserted in the text precisely where the page break occurs in the original. With these one can readily locate the manuscript page in the original. We strongly encourage all those who publish editions of the *HLC* (or any other version of *ACIM*) in the future to employ at least this basic reference system which is genuinely “universal” since it derives directly from the manuscript Helen Schucman typed.

The second reference system employed in this edition, which we also encourage others to copy in future editions, will be familiar to readers of the *FIP Second Edition* since it employs a simplified version of the obvious logic of that system. Any passage in the *Text* can be referenced according to its chapter, its section, and its paragraph. This is similar to the “book, chapter, verse” system which is so effectively used in Biblical referencing.

To simplify the system, only these three reference coordinates are used. We do not reference the “introductory section” as “in” as *FIP* sometimes does, but just as section “A”, to avoid confusion and simplify the system. And we do not number individual sentences, although there is nothing to stop people from doing so and including sentence numbers in a reference where resolution finer than one paragraph is required.

A great many possible reference systems were considered before we finalized our selection. Each has its pros and cons. The *FIP* system, for instance, has the advantage of being very precise and perfectly mirroring the internal structure of *ACIM*. This is its greatest disadvantage as well. The internal structure of the *Text* volume is also substantially arbitrary, having been overlaid on an otherwise unstructured oral dictation. There is, therefore, nothing “sacred” about it. The internal structure of *ACIM*, while fairly consistent through the *Text* Volume, is highly inconsistent in the *Workbook* and the *Manual*. The result is a variable number of fields and up to five different kinds of information possible in a given field in the *FIP* reference system. The ensuing complexity makes it exceedingly confusing at times for veterans and quite impossibly complex for novices. Even in the *Text*, the *FIP* system has curious anomalies. The chapter divisions are perfectly logical, but instead of numbering the sections starting with one, the first section is called “In” for Introduction, and the second section is numbered “Section One.” But only in some chapters. In other chapters *FIP* numbers the first section as section one as we do! Well we use letters, A, B, C instead of numbers, 1,2,3. In this edition, the first section is “Section A: Introduction” and the second section is Section B. In every chapter. Simple. This also reflects the *HLC* text itself in which each chapter begins with

a short unlabelled section, which sections we are labelling “Introduction.”

A simple sentence, line, or even word number system would be easy and easily understood but has the disadvantage of breaking down as soon as the sentence, line or word count varies between versions. Even between the *FIP First* and *Second Editions*, there is considerable variation in the number of words and sentences. A system based on absolute sentence count, for instance, breaks down as soon as you add or remove one sentence, or change a sentence break to a comma, or vice-versa, something editors frequently do. Every reference after that would vary between versions.

We took a long look at the extremely successful Biblical reference system which consists of book, chapter, and verse. Introduced in the late Middle Ages, and first printed in the Geneva Bible of 1560, it immediately became popular and soon became universal. This was so despite the fact that its chapter and verse divisions were inconsistent in length and sometimes completely arbitrary. The “arbitrariness” doesn’t seem to hinder their general usefulness for identifying passages easily!

A reference system, like the longitude and latitude lines on a map, can be completely arbitrary and still completely useful. Its purpose is not to describe the text, but to locate it!

The Protestant Bible has 66 Books varying in length from one chapter to over 100 chapters. The length of chapters can vary greatly, but the average is a few pages. “Verses” in the Bible do not precisely correspond to sentences, some consisting of several sentences and some sentences spanning more than one verse. However, since there are rarely more than 100 or so in a chapter, they are conveniently sized.

ACIM’s seven volumes are structurally very different but the 31 Chapters in the *Text* and the 30 sections in the *Manual* and the 361 lessons in the *Workbook* are all in the same order of magnitude as the Bible’s “books.” In the *Text* and parts of the *Manual*, these basic divisions are sub-divided into sections which are the same order of magnitude as the Bible’s chapters. And then it’s all divided into nearly uniform and often rather arbitrary paragraph divisions which are the same order of magnitude as the Bible’s verses.

Applying this simple three tier system to *ACIM* is mostly quite easy, and there are only a few spots where it grows a bit confusing. Using the internal “textual geography” of *ACIM*, the divisions which show up even in editions which have no reference system, such as the chapter and sections divisions in the *Text*, for example, the system becomes “universal” which we felt a reference system for our Concordance had to be. It had to be maximally usable on any edition of any version of *ACIM* whether that edition had our reference values printed in the margins or not.

The Reference System

What we sought was a universal system which was at once simple and intuitive and workable and usable on any edition of any version of *ACIM*. The only “textual landmarks” which are consistent across all versions since 1972 are the chapter and section divisions which are largely unchanged even in the FIP Abridgements. Even the paragraph breaks are mostly the same throughout. Thus a reference to chapter, section and paragraph number can usually be easily used to look up a passage in any edition of any version of *ACIM* in which that paragraph actually appears.

The only place we’ve had to break from the strict three-tier referencing in the *Text* is in chapter one, in the 53 miracle principles. Clearly, each miracle principle should be numbered, one through 53. But several have more than one paragraph, so there is an implicit fourth tier in chapter one, although we do stick to the chapter, section, and paragraph number references. Where there is more than one paragraph in a miracle principle, they are labelled A, B, etc. So we have 23 b for paragraph b of Miracle Principle 23, which is in section A of chapter I.

Unfortunately the single most confusing part of the entire reference system is the first section of the first chapter. Even so it is intuitive and presents little difficulty for the user of another edition of the *HLC* who wishes to pencil in the section and paragraph numbers from this edition. It’s perfectly straightforward.

The Concordance, while based on this edition, is quite usable with any edition of the *HLC*, and remains very useful even with the shorter FIP versions. The FIP versions are so substantially altered and shortened in the first few chapters, along with the fact that they have re-located many passages to new contexts and even different chapters, that *HLC* references will sometimes not be easy to use in the early chapters of FIP. Similarly, and for the same reason, FIP references in those portions are not generally usable in the *HLC* or *Urtext* versions.

The *Workbook* and *Manual* present a few challenges but even there we’ve been able to stick very closely to the three tier system which has worked so well for Biblical scholarship. The details of reference for those volumes will appear in the prefaces to those volumes as they are released.

Global Style and Capitalization issues

I have personally never been more challenged by an editing project, and not just because of the enormous size of the documents. First, I have no “style guide” which is specifically applicable to this material.

There are the respective versions which reflect the efforts of previous editors to establish and apply capitalization and other style conventions, but all of them contain inconsistencies.

There is no hard and fast way to determine what should and shouldn’t be capitalized. I have chosen therefore to use the most common spelling conventions familiar to me. Some might feel there is one exception, that being the capitalization of all names and pronouns referring to one of the three persons of the Holy Trinity. Schucman was in the habit of following the 15th century style convention of capitalizing pronouns referring to a person of the Trinity. The King James Bible of 1611 does this, following the fashion of the time, although most modern translations abandon the practice. Schucman follows the 1611 convention, but with her own novel variations, and with enormous inconsistency.

However this immediately leads us into further difficulties. In the *HLC* we find “Heaven” is capitalized while “earth” is not. That isn’t the pattern of the King James Bible. In normal English usage, place names, including names of planets, are usually capitalized. So we have London, Europe, for instance, but oddly “earth” is generally not capitalized except when it is in the company of other planets. Mars and Venus, are almost always capitalized, so why not Planet Earth? Heaven and Hell can both be considered “places” too, and while only “virtual places,” the

convention is often followed in capitalizing both. Yet the general convention in English usage is to have “earth” with a lower case when “Captain Kirk returned to earth” and with a capital only when the status as celestial body is primary, “between Mars and Venus Captain Kirk flew past Earth.”

English is a pretty strange language!

In English Bibles I’ve consulted, however, we find that *neither* heaven nor earth is capitalized! The Scribes of *ACIM* came up with their own wholly unique system of capitalization, and then applied it with notable INconsistency! Should this be considered an “error” and reconciled with common usage, standardized according to some formula, or just left as is?

This is what I mean by the lack of a ‘Style Guide’ appropriate to this material.

Pronouns referring to God, the Holy Spirit, and Christ as God’s Son are capitalized in this edition, even where they are not capitalized in the original *HLC* manuscript. Changes to capitalization of this sort are not always footnoted.

In the FIP *Second Edition*, in which considerable effort was expended to deal with some of these issues, we find that the Will of God and Thoughts of God are also capitalized along with Mind and even Hand. To some extent this is also done in the *HLC*. While I can understand the case for doing that, in this edition we’ve limited the “divine capitalization” to pronouns referring directly to one of the three persons of the Trinity, and not extended this to their will or thoughts or body parts! But what about the Word of God? Ever since St. John wrote “the Word was God” we’ve had a case, in

Global Style and Capitalization issues

Christianity, for capitalizing the "Word" of God, so then why not the Voice and Thought and Will of God as well?

All versions, including FIP *Second Edition* handle the capitalization of "answer" in the expression "God's Answer" erratically, with no rhyme or reason we can discern. It can be likened to the "Word of God" and thus deserving of capitalization, so that's what we went with.

Once again, we have to essentially write our own style-guide here.

The grammar in *ACIM* appears to be mostly straightforward English prose, but there is a good deal of poetry and frequent use of the archaic, but not incorrect "subjunctive mood." Poetic metre sometimes requires contractions, or the dropping or even adding of prepositions. Since the material is not typed out as poetry, but as prose, and it's often not obvious what is and isn't poetry, sometimes these devices result in what appears to be unusual, idiosyncratic, or simply bad grammar. In addition to the less-than-obvious iambic pentameter, there are patterns of rhyme, alliteration and vowel repetitions in three dimensions in some instances. We came across this material in the effort to sort out which changes were "corrections" and which were "corruptions" where direct evidence was not available.

A number of these, but by no means all, are flagged in footnotes pointing out that what appears to be bad grammar is sometimes just the archaic subjunctive or even, in some cases, "poetic licence."

We are aware that with many choices there are good arguments for an alternative choice and that defining what is 'right' and 'wrong' in English usage is a treacherous pastime. We are not so much saying 'this is correct English usage' as we are saying 'this is what we think is best and if you think we are mistaken, let us know!'

So in addition to our basic rule "Would Schucman and Thetford have changed this if they had noticed it" we add "does this change add to clarity and consistency without detracting anything from clarity and consistency?" We feel

we do owe it to our readers to do the best we can and that Schucman and Thetford would agree that clarity and consistency are indeed desirable! So yes, we do think we could persuade them of the advisability of each change we've made.

Heaven and Hell, and when and whether to capitalize them, led us to a stalemate. We finally decided to just leave the capitalization of Heaven and hell as Schucman and Thetford set it, deferring the resolution of the question to some future date. While it would be nice to resolve it, it's not important enough to delay publication over it.

With most questions about spelling of contractions we're erring on the side of conservative, conventional, historical usage in the name of maximizing clarity for readers. Apostrophes go back into contractions, for instance, even though they are not strictly necessary in all cases in US English usage. (see next section for specifics)

The word "towards" (41 occurrences) vs. "toward" (12 occurrences) was another brain-teaser. Our reference sources indicate the two are interchangeable with "toward" being more common in the USA and "towards" more common in the UK. For the purposes of the Concordance, standardization is of value so we standardized it to the shorter and supposedly more American usage, changing 41 instances of "towards" to "toward."

A number of such issues arose and they are listed below. For the purposes of the Concordance, the reader may wish to know which spelling alternative we are using. This is not in any way to suggest the other alternative is "wrong."

Generally these alterations are not footnoted. Our rule has been to preserve the form Schucman and Thetford used wherever the dictionaries we consulted offer alternatives. Where they used more than one form, such as "**nonexistent**" in one place and "**non-existent**" in another, we chose to standardize according to the most popular usage as indicated by the US dictionaries we consulted.

Global Spelling alterations

- 1) "advisor" becomes "adviser"
- 2) "alotted" becomes "allotted"
- 3) "believableness" becomes "believability"
- 4) "cause and effect" becomes "Cause and Effect" as per T II E 12 (42)
- 5) "God's answer" becomes "God's Answer"
- 6) "hyperalert" becomes "hyper alert"
- 7) "idolator[s]" becomes "idolater[s]"
- 8) "[re]interpretor[s]" becomes "[re]interpreter[s]"
- 9) "letting-go" becomes "letting go"
- 10) "light" when it is a contraction of "alight" becomes "'light."
- 11) "light-hearted" becomes "lighthearted"
- 12) "make believe" becomes "make-believe"
- 13) "non-existent" becomes "nonexistent"
- 14) "no-one" becomes "no one"
- 15) "O" becomes "Oh"
- 16) "open-minded[ness]" becomes "open-minded[ness]"
- 17) "openminded[ness]" becomes "open-minded[ness]"
- 18) "reawaken(s/ing/ed)" becomes "re-awaken"
- 19) "reestablish" becomes "re-establish"
- 20) "re-inforce" becomes "reinforce"
- 21) "re-inforcement" becomes "reinforcement"
- 22) "re-interpretor" becomes "reinterpreter"
- 23) "round" when it is a contraction of "around" becomes "'round."
- 24) "[S]saviour" becomes "[s]savior"
- 25) "self perception" becomes "self-perception"
- 26) "self concept" becomes "self-concept"
- 27) "self-same" becomes "selfsame"
- 28) "superconscious" becomes "super-conscious"
- 29) "till" becomes "'til" when it is a contraction of "until"
- 30) "towards" becomes "toward"
- 31) "unreconcilable" becomes "irreconcilable"
- 32) "wait" when it is a contraction of "await" becomes "'wait"
- 33) "whole-hearted" becomes "wholehearted"
- 34) "whisp" becomes "wisp"
- 35) "worshipper(s)" becomes "worshiper(s)"

General Capitalization Uncertainties

In a small number of cases, missing words or spelling errors in the *HLC* manuscript are corrected with handwritten mark-up. The capitalization of the handwriting is usually not preserved, because it is extremely erratic. On page 665, for instance, we have the word "Given" handwritten in the middle of a sentence.

The word is right, the capitalization is not. On page 673 we have handwritten "THE" where no capitalization appears in order. In other cases words are handwritten in all caps where it seems most inappropriate. In these cases, we used the capitalization derived from the *Urtext*.

Punctuation

Schucman and Thetford were prolific in their use of semi-colons where most people would use a full colon or a comma. We have only changed a very small number of the semi-colons although many more probably should be reconsidered.

Similarly, in many cases a comma is used where FIP later used a colon. We have changed some of these in agreement with FIP but stopped footnoting them after a while.

Specific changes

The following pages list the “errors” we *think* we have found in the *HLC* manuscript. Once we stepped past the straightforward proofing job of making a “replica” of the *Hugh Lynn Cayce* manuscript, and set out to correct obvious spelling and grammar errors, corrections which no one would dispute Schucman and Thetford would have made had they noticed them, we came across many other suspected “errors” which, we are equally sure, Schucman and Thetford would have corrected had they noticed those also. Our rule for change was quite stringent, and in no case was a change made because we thought it looked better or sounded better. We changed nothing without solid evidence that there was a genuine error. The error could be bad spelling, bad grammar, bad punctuation, bad capitalization, or inadvertent omission from earlier material where there was no evidence of intentional omission or deletion.

I wish to repeat that in this edition there was no thorough comparison of the *HLC* against any other version, so our failure to note a difference in no way evaluates that difference. It simply means we didn’t notice or didn’t check it. We only checked other versions when something appeared as a possible error in the *HLC*. We checked over a thousand passages and finally concluded that “likely” error existed in fewer than three hundred of those which are listed here. When a complete comparison is done we have no doubt at all that more will be found! It is almost certain that we have erred in some cases. Our certainty of our own lack of infallibility is one reason for the extensive footnoting and this documentation. We invite all readers to check and double-check these changes we have made (as well as those we have not made) and suggested and let us know if there is any reason to suppose we made an error. We almost certainly did make some and we wish to detect and correct them.

The need for a thorough, line-by-line comparison of all versions is obvious to us. This edition represents only the first phase of that very much larger task which is as yet incomplete. This is, at least, an accurate copy of the *HLC* with some corrections of errors in the *HLC* itself. Work on the *Urtext* volumes has already begun. The *Workbook*, *Manual*, *Use of Terms*, *Psychotherapy* and *Song of Prayer* volumes are nearing completion, the *Ur Text* is just beginning its first proofing pass. We are still attempting to obtain a copy of the *Notes*. When we have accurate copies of all versions, the work of detailed comparison can begin. There are vastly more discrepancies between versions than are noted in this volume. Their complete detection and evaluation must await the availability of accurate copies of all versions. We are releasing this “incomplete” material because others have found it useful and as of this date it is the most accurate and thoroughly proofed edition of *ACIM* extant.

In reviewing all the changes we made, the first of which began three years ago, we were surprised at how often we found that what we had thought was a mistake earlier, no longer seemed to be a mistake. A great many changes we initially thought needed to be made turned out to be errors in our understanding of the material, not in the material itself. It certainly appears that earlier editors had a similar experience, noticing (and “fixing”) “errors” that turned out not to be errors at all. Schucman described how she changed many things, only to change them back again later. One thing that distinguishes this editing pass from the previous ones is that the previous editors apparently didn’t check against earlier versions at all and frequently didn’t even review their own editing changes. By the time of Schucman’s death, the changes she had made and authorized, including the obvious mistakes, had become a kind of sacred cow in the minds of some ... “if Schucman did it, it had to be right” even when it very obviously wasn’t. I am certain that given the opportunity to revisit all the editing changes made before 1975, Schucman herself would wish to reconsider many. Many of the errors we found in her work were clearly inadvertent, errors of which she was almost certainly entirely unaware, errors which only could surface with careful proofreading, a task which she never had the opportunity nor resources to undertake.

We’ve spent three years, working part time, putting several hours a day into this work, on average. Schucman and Wapnick, working part time, did their final “Edit” on this material in less than a year. And that involved no proofreading. And that included the *Workbook* and *Manual*! They can’t possibly have been remotely as thorough as we’ve had the opportunity to be. We had the help of a computer lab and some very sophisticated text analysis software. They were working with typewriters, scissors, and glue. Had they attempted the thoroughness which was our goal in this edition, with the resources available to them in 1973, it might have taken them decades to get anything ready for the printer.

In noting the differences between this and previous editions, it is not our intent to condemn the remarkable and magnificent accomplishments of previous editors, without whose enormous contributions we’d never have been able to attempt this work. It is rather to note that the needs of the moment, objectives, methods, and most especially the availability of resources were very different in each period, differences which are reflected in the differing nature of the results. A thoroughly-proofed, precisely accurate copy of the Course with a Concordance was not possible with the resources available to Schucman at the time nor perhaps, was that as necessary as it was to get something “reasonably good” into print quickly. That Schucman managed to do, and for that the entire Sonship is forever grateful to her.

Specific Changes

Chapter 1: Section A: Par.2: p. 1

It does aim, however, at removing the blocks to the awareness of love's Presence, Which is your natural inheritance.

Capitalization is in question here. *FIP* changes this to all lower case: "love's presence" and also has the following pronoun "which," in lower case. In the *Ur* we find this passage is not present. However, the expression occurs twice, the two occurrences capitalized differently, one being "Love's presence," another being "love's presence". However if either word is to be capitalized, it would seem more suitable to capitalize the former than the latter, or probably both. It seems clear that capitalization was not inadvertent, and that Schucman and Thetford understood this phrase to refer to the deity, in short, a "name of God" since both "Presence" and "Which" are capitalized. An inadvertent capitalization error would likely occur once only in one sentence. We have thus chosen to capitalize "Love" here.

Chapter 1: Section A: Miracle Principle 22: p. 3

(* The term "Spiritual eye" is later replaced by the Holy Spirit and the physical eye becomes the ego. The emphasis on the two ways of seeing, however, remains throughout.)

This footnote appears in the original manuscript but is not strictly correct. "Spiritual Eye" and "Holy Spirit" are clearly not entirely synonymous in all cases. Since later editing propagates this misunderstanding, it would appear that both Schucman and Thetford failed to grasp this aspect.

Chapter 1: Section A: Miracle Principle 25a: p. 4

25. a. Miracles are part of an interlocking chain of forgiveness which, when completed, is the Atonement.

There appears to be a semicolon here in the original manuscript, but clearly a comma is appropriate.

Chapter 1: Section A: Miracle Principle 36a: p. 7

A line is missing from the bottom of page 7 photocopy. In "*Blue Sparkly*" editors have chosen the following:

36. "Christ-controlled miracles are part of the Atonement but Christ-guidance is personal. The impersonal nature of miracles is an essential in-"

While it is impossible to be certain, this is very possibly, from examination of the visible character top fragments of the missing line, what the *HLC* actually contained originally.

The *Ur* reading is:

"Christ-controlled miracles are part of the Atonement but Christ-guidance is personal and leads to PERSONAL salvation. The impersonal nature of miracles is an essential in-"

Given that the *Ur* reading seems better, and contains an important idea missing in the other option, which may well have been inadvertently omitted, the *Ur* reading is preserved in this edition.

In the *FIP Second Edition* Miracle Principle 36 was relocated, in part, to T-1.III.4. and T-1.III.5 in *FIP* with *HLC* miracle principle 37 becoming miracle principle 36 in the *FIP* editions.

Chapter 1: Section A: Par. 50a: p. 13

50 a. The miracle is a learning device which lessens the need for time. In the longitudinal or horizontal plane, the recognition of the true equality of all the members of the Sonship appears to involve almost endless time. But we know that time is only an artifact introduced as a learning aid. However, the sudden shifts from horizontal to vertical perception which the miracle entails introduce an interval from which the doer and the receiver BOTH emerge much farther along in time than they would otherwise have been.

The underlined sentence appears in the Ur and seems to have been omitted inadvertently.

Chapter 1: Section A: Par. 50a: p. 13

However, the sudden shifts from horizontal to vertical perception which the miracle entails introduces an interval from which the doer and the receiver BOTH emerge much farther along in time than they would otherwise have been.

The problem here is agreement in number. It must be either "shift introduces" or "shifts introduce." We've corrected it to the latter since it would seem that the word 'shifts' should remain plural. The *Ur* has the same problem.

Chapter 2: Section A: Par. 14: p. 22

Some miracles may SEEM to be of greater magnitude than others. But remember the first point in this course; that there is NO order of difficulty in miracles.

The last two sentences become one sentence, as the "**others. But**" is changed to simply "**others, but**". There is no need for a sentence break here, in fact it makes for poor grammar inserting a period. *Ur*, *FIP* and *Blue Sparkly* all leave it alone.

Chapter 2: Section C: Par. 2: p. 31

In the third sentence,

"all mistakes must be corrected at the level on which they occur."

Both the *HLC* and *FIP* have it "all mistakes must be corrected at the level on which they occur. We feel that the *Ur* has it right with "**at which they occur**". It appears there was a typo going from the *Ur* to the *HLC* which was not corrected in *FIP*.

Chapter 2: Section C: Par. 5: p. 31-32

5. The body, if properly understood, shares the invulnerability of the Atonement to two-edged application. This is not because the body is a miracle, <O (32)> but because it is not INHERENTLY open to misinterpretation. The body is merely a fact in human experience. Its abilities can be, and frequently are, overevaluated. However, it is almost impossible to deny its existence. Those who do so are engaging in a particularly unworthy form of denial. The term "unworthy" here implies simply that it is not necessary to protect the mind by denying the unmindful. There is little doubt that the mind can miscreate. If one denies this unfortunate aspect of the mind's power, one is also denying the power itself.

There is a line left out between the *Ur* and the *HLC*, (underlined above) which is not replaced in later versions, which makes the last sentence of the paragraph incomprehensible since the antecedent to "this unfortunate aspect of the mind's power" is gone. The reader is left wondering "what unfortunate aspect?"

In the *Ur* we find an extra sentence "**There is little doubt that the mind can miscreate**" preceding the last line: "If one denies this unfortunate aspect of its power, one is also denying the power itself."

"This unfortunate aspect of its [the mind's] power" then is its ability to miscreate.

It very much appears that the omission of this one sentence in the *HLC* was an inadvertent editorial error since, again, there does not appear to be any attempt to change content, as would be expected in the intentional correction of an error and the result is an incomprehensible passage.

This line has been restored to the *HLC* from the *Ur* in this edition .

The omission is uncorrected in either *FIP* or *Blue Sparkly*.

Chapter 2: Section C: Par. 6: p. 32

"It does not follow, however, that the use of such agents for corrective purposes is evil"

is how *FIP* puts it, and this is correct in our view. The *Ur* and the *HLC* have it as "**are evil**." The *Ur* has "**application**" instead of "**use**." The subject of the sentence is "**use**" (or "**application**" in the *Ur*) which is singular, and the verb must be singular "**is**" and not the plural "**are**." Alternatively the subject could be made plural, as in "**uses**" or "**applications**". That results in very clumsy style however!

Specific Changes

Chapter 2: Section D: Par. 5: p. 38

“**This situation arises in two ways:**” has a colon in the *Ur* and *FIP*, a semi-colon in the *HLC*. We’ve agreed with the *Ur* and *FIP* and made it a colon.

Chapter 2: Section D: Par. 6: p. 38

At the start of what we mark as Paragraph 6, starting with the words “**In both cases,**” the original *HLC* has a line break (hard return) not followed by an indentation. Was a paragraph break *intended* and the indentation omitted? Or was the carriage return inadvertent? The *Ur* has a paragraph and a page break here. We think the indentation was omitted in error and that a paragraph break was intended

Chapter 2: p. 39

The photocopy quality for page 39 is very poor. The words on the right hand side of the page are mostly missing. The text has been reconstructed with reference to the *Ur*. There are very few differences between what is legible in the *HLC* and the *Ur* in this material, and those are very minor. So while we cannot be 100% certain there were no wording changes in the missing parts of the *HLC* on this page, there is no evidence to suggest such changes, and there is no other way, at this time, for us to establish what was probably there originally.

Chapter 2: Section E: Par. 12: p. 42

The cause and effect principle here is temporarily a real expediter. Actually, “Cause” is a term properly belonging to God, and “Effect,” which should also be capitalized, is His Son.

Most astonishingly, although explicit instructions to capitalize “Cause” and “Effect” are given in the *HLC* and the *Ur*, the words are NOT capitalized in either nor in the *FIP* version! We’ve fixed that.

Chapter 3: Section C: Par. 7: p. 49

“**Only men’s attempts**” in the *HLC* is “**Only man’s attempts**” in the *Ur*. The general pattern in the *HLC* is to use the word “man” rather than “men” and “man’s” rather than “men’s”. We’ve concluded this is a typo therefore, and restored the material to the *Ur* reading. *FIP* appears to omit this material.

Chapter 3: Section I: Par. 5: Page 68

The words “self concept” are changed to the hyphenated word “self-concept” for consistency and for the Concordance.

Chapter 4: Section B: Par. 5: p. 72

The words “(NOT destruction)” are enclosed in brackets, consistent with the *Ur*, however we’ve gone with the *FIP* rendering which replaces the brackets with commas. *FIP* makes it “not the destruction” but we leave it as “NOT destruction”.

Chapter 4: Section B: Par. 12: p. 74

The word “believableness” occurs in the text, but in no dictionary we’ve consulted. It is thus changed to “believability.” The *Ur* is identical. This can be considered a spelling correction. *FIP* preserves “believableness.”

Chapter 4: Section C: Par. 3: p. 76

"I am using your present state of how the mind CAN work"

is not even a sentence. It appears obvious there is some mistake here.

In the *Ur* the line reads:

"I would therefore like to use your present state as an example of how the mind CAN work"

At the very least the words “as an example” appear to have been inadvertently left out, inadvertent because the statement becomes ungrammatical and wholly meaningless with their removal. The reading from the *Ur* is used here.

This material is so substantially changed in the *FIP Second Edition* that we get no help from that source for this question. *Blue Sparkly* does not correct this.

Chapter 4: Section C: Par. 5: p. 77

“**A scissors**” is changed to “**scissors.**” *FIP* agrees. *Blue Sparkly* and the *Ur* keep it as “**A scissors.**” This may be a question of local usage and, we can add, is hardly very important!

Chapter 5: Section C: Par. 4: p. 103

The paragraph ends with a colon, which should be a period. *FIP* and *Ur* agree.

Chapter 5: Section C: Par. 7: p. 103

The words “**spirit of joy**” are capitalized in the *Ur*, though not in *FIP* or the original *HLC*. Since this is a reference to the deity, capitalization is restored.

Chapter 5: Section C: Par. 7: p. 103

The Holy Spirit was God’s Answer to the separation, the means by which the Atonement could repair until the whole mind returned to creating.

The use of the word “repair” here is most curious. We strongly suspect a copying error, but it’s not from the *Ur*, which is identical. *FIP* re-writes this as: “**the means by which the Atonement heals until the whole mind returns to creating.**” That’s a perfectly reasonable conjecture as to the meaning. We really do need to check the *Notes* on this one.

Chapter 5: Section D: Par. 10: p. 106

My “yolk is easy” is changed to “yoke.” This is a rare example, the only one found so far, where the editors erred by using a homonym. *FIP* and *Blue Sparkly* both correct this also.

Chapter 5: Section H: Par. 3: p. 120

The word “escape” is spelled “**excape.**” This error does not occur in any other edition or version we have consulted, including the “*Urtext.*”

Chapter 5: Section I: Par. 2: p. 124

Freud’s system of thought was extremely ingenious because Freud was extremely ingenuous, and a mind MUST endow its thoughts with its own attributes.

This is a suspected typo. It is not at all clear how Freud’s being “**ingenuous**” could endow his thought with “**ingenious**” attributes. The two words are only one letter apart in spelling and we suspect “**ingenuous**” here should be “**ingenious.**”

In the *Ur*, we do find “**ingenious**” instead of “**ingenuous**”, and so the text was restored to the *Ur*’s reading. *Blue Sparkly* also corrects this error. The material is not present in *FIP*.

Chapter 6: Section A: Par. 1: p. 128

“Anger cannot occur unless you believe that you have been attacked; that your attack was justified; and that YOU are in no way responsible.”

The second clause contained by semicolons makes no sense ... *FIP* changes it to:

“Anger cannot occur unless you believe that you have been attacked, that your attack is justified in return, and that you are in no way responsible for it.”

Ur uses commas instead of the semicolons (correctly in our view, as does *FIP*) but is otherwise the same as the *HLC* manuscript.

The problem of course is that we don’t get angry when we believe we have been attacked AND that the attack on us was justified! We get angry when we feel we have been UNJUSTLY attacked. We could just change “justified” (capitalized in the *Ur*) to “unjustified” and largely solve the problem. *FIP*’s solution, to change this sentence to refer to a counter-attack corrects the obvious ill-logic but at the expense of the probable meaning. The counter-attack is referred to later in the paragraph as the logical consequence of these three premises. It makes no sense at all to have the logical conclusion as a premise. Further, in the original the “responsibility” relates to the attack, and after *FIP*’s modification, the responsibility shifts to the counter-attack.

We agree with *FIP* that there is a problem, but we do not agree with *FIP*’s resolution of it. It seems far more likely that “unjustified” was mistakenly turned to “justified” and what is “unjustified” of course is the “attack” one believes one has been subjected to by one’s “attacker.”!

Specific Changes

Since we don't have access to the original *Notes* to check this, we have made our best guess, and have added a few letters in brackets to clarify what appears to us to be the intended meaning:

Anger cannot occur unless you believe that you have been attacked, that your attack[er] was [un]justified, and that YOU are in no way responsible.

Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 4: p. 134

The ego uses projection ONLY to distort your perception both of yourself AND your brothers. The process begins by excluding something THAT exists

The word "THAT" is pencilled in, and probably should not be capitalized. *FIP* has it lower case. However, the *Ur* has "you think" instead of "that". Because we know that no proofing against the *Ur* was ever done on the *HLC* before, we suspect that the editors recognized an inadvertent omission of the words "you think" which resulted in bad grammar in the *HLC* manuscript and corrected it by pencilling in "THAT." However, while this fixes the grammar it does not restore the original meaning. The statements "that exists in you" and "you think exists in you" do not have the same meaning, as the former suggests a fact and the latter implies illusion. This would appear therefore to be an editing error, beginning with inadvertence, in leaving out two words, and ending with the failure to proof adequately. We have restored the *Ur* reading.

Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 8: p. 136

Page 136 of the original photocopy is in terrible shape, with several words being quite illegible. Comparison with the *Ur* shows negligible differences overall on this page so the missing words were copied directly from the *Ur*. Only a few examples are listed here.

The words "were created" before "neither partially nor in part" are added from the *Ur*. The *HLC* is illegible. We are unable to locate this phrase in *FIP*.

Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 9: p. 136

The words "PARALLEL to God's" were inserted from the *Ur* because the *HLC* is illegible. We are unable to locate this phrase in *FIP*.

Chapter 6: Section C: Par. 11: p. 136

The words "what never happened cannot involve any problem" (the word involve is copied from the *Ur*).

FIP renders this "what never happened cannot be difficult" which largely preserves the original meaning. *Blue Sparkly* goes with the *Ur* as we have.

Chapter 6: Section F: Par. 8: p. 145

Without a range, an order of difficulty IS meaningless, and there must BE no range in what you offer to each other.

The comma is not present in the original, but both *FIP* and *Ur* have it. We agree that it belongs.

Chapter 6: Section F: Par. 9: p. 145

The Holy Spirit, Who leads to God, translates communication into being, just as He ultimately translates perception into knowledge. You DO NOT LOSE WHAT YOU COMMUNICATE. The ego uses the body for attack, for pleasure, and for pride.

Both *FIP*(2) and *Ur* include this sentence, though it is missing in the *HLC* manuscript. We have restored the words and capitalization from the *Ur*.

Chapter 7: Section C: Par. 1: p. 156

"This placed you BOTH within the Kingdom, and restores its wholeness in your minds."

The entire paragraph is present tense except for the second word in this sentence, "placed." In the *Ur* it is "places" thus preserving the present tense. It is corrected to "places" in *FIP* also, though not in "*Blue Sparkly*." We have restored the *Ur* reading.

Chapter 7: Section C: Par. 2: p. 156

"This is because the laws have adapted to the circumstances of this world, in which diametrically opposed outcomes ARE believe in."

Rather obviously a typo, the second last word needs to be in the past tense "believed in" rather than "believe in."

Ur has it in the past tense and emphasized "are BELIEVED in." *Blue Sparkly* corrects it. *FIP* completely re-writes the passage. Instead of "are BELIEVED in" (*Ur*), *FIP* holds "seem possible because you can respond to two conflicting voices."

Chapter 7: Section C: Par. 3: p. 156-57

"But those who are FOR freedom, even if they are misguided in how to defent it,"

Obvious typo, "defent" is corrected to "defend" which is the form appearing in the *Ur*. *Blue Sparkly* also corrects it to "defend." We were unable to locate the passage in *FIP*.

Chapter 7: Section D: Par. 3: p. 159

Yet one thing is certain: abilities are POTENTIALS for learning, and you will apply them to what you WANT to learn.

In the *HLC* manuscript there is a semicolon here. In the *Ur* it is a period which we think is better, so we've restored it to that form. This material cannot be located in *FIP*.

Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 4: p. 166

There is a colon at the end of the paragraph. It is not present in the *Ur* where we find a period. We have restored it. *FIP* doesn't include this material.

Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 12: p. 167

12. That is how God Himself created YOU, in understanding, in appreciation, and in love.

While the *HLC* has a semicolon here, we agree with *FIP* and *Ur* that it should be a comma.

Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 13: p. 168

To forget ME is to forget yourself and Him Who created you.

The *HLC* does not capitalize this, nor does the *Ur*. *FIP* does and we agree with *FIP* here.

Chapter 7: Section F: Par. 13: p. 168

I do not want to share my BODY in communion because that is to share nothing. Would I try to share an illusion with the most holy children of a most Holy Father? Yet I do want to share my MIND with you because we ARE of one Mind, and that MIND IS ours.

This sentence, not present in the *HLC* manuscript, is present in *FIP* 2nd Edition and *Ur*. We agree with the *FIP* "Errata" editors that it was inadvertently left out.

Chapter 7: Section G: Par. 2: p. 169

This loses the awareness of being; induces feelings of unreality; and results in utter confusion.

The *HLC* manuscript has two semicolons; *FIP* has no punctuation here. The *Ur* has commas in both places. We agree with *Ur* on this one.

Chapter 7: Section G: Par. 10: p. 171

If they cannot co-exist in peace, and if you WANT peace, you must give up the idea of conflict ENTIRELY and for ALL TIME. This requires vigilance ONLY as long as YOU DO NOT RECOGNIZE WHAT IS TRUE. While you believe that two totally contradictory thought systems SHARE truth, your need for vigilance is apparent.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which is not present in the *HLC* manuscript. We believe it was left out inadvertently.

Chapter 7: Section I: Par. 2: p. 178

The ego's use of projection must be fully understood before its inevitable association between projection and anger can be finally undone.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* have "the", which we think is preferable, instead of "its". The *Ur* also has "UNmade" in place of "undone" at the end of the sentence.

Chapter 7: Section J: Par. 8: p. 182

The only reason why you could possible want ANY part of it is because you do NOT see the whole of it.

Specific Changes

Typo: the word “possible” should be “possibly” as an adverb is required here.

The *Ur* agrees, and so does *FIP*.

Chapter 7: Section K: Par. 4: p. 184

Unable to follow this guidance WITHOUT fear, he associates fear WITH guidance, and refuses to follow ANY guidance at all. If the result of this decision is confusion, this is hardly surprising. The Holy Spirit is perfectly trustworthy, as YOU are.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which is apparently inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 8: Section A: Par. 3: p. 188

“The ego’s voice is a hallucination” is corrected to “The ego’s voice is an hallucination.” The *Ur* has it correct, so does *FIP*.

Chapter 8: Section C: Par.s 6&7: p. 191

One sentence is moved from the end of paragraph six to the beginning of paragraph seven. Otherwise the paragraph breaks after the colon! *Ur* and *FIP* both have this change also.

Chapter 8: Section G: Par. 7: p. 204

Remember that the Bible says, “The word (or thought) was made flesh.”

The word “Word” is capitalized here, as the quote from *John 1:14* capitalizes it. So does *FIP*, but the *Ur* also has it lower case.

Chapter 8: Section H: Paras 5 & 6: p. 209

The 5th paragraph break in the photocopies ends with a colon, most unsuitable, and so this paragraph break has simply been removed. *FIP* and *Ur* both break paragraphs elsewhere also.

Chapter 8: Section I: Par. 4: p. 212

You can indeed by “drugged by sleep,” but this is always because you have MISUSED it on behalf of sickness.

The line “by “drugged by sleep”” becomes “be “drugged by sleep””. This is an obvious typo.

Chapter 8: Section K: Par. 10: p. 221

To price for GETTING is to lose sight of value, making it inevitable that you will NOT value what you receive.

“To price for getting” is changed to “The price for getting” in *FIP*, but *Ur* agrees with the *HLC*.

Chapter 9: Section G: Par. 2: p. 235

The word “vacillates” is misspelled in the original, and corrected here.

Chapter 9: Section B: Par. 3: p. 239

Yet you CAN see him truly because it is possible for you to see YOUR SELF truly.

The *HLC* manuscript has YOUR and SELF over a line ending and there is no visible hyphen. The photocopy is faded on the right margin however. Both *Ur* and *FIP* have this as a single word, “YOURSELF”, and so we’ve gone with that.

Chapter 9: Section H: Par. 3: p. 239

Believe this, and you WILL realize how much is up to you. When anything threatens your peace of mind, ask yourself:

“Has God changed His Mind about me?”

Then ACCEPT His decision, for it is indeed changeless, and refuse to change your mind about YOURSELF.

The original manuscript has a comma here. We agree with *FIP* that the colon is better.

Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 5: p. 242

ALL attack is self attack. It cannot BE anything else. Arising from your OWN decision NOT to be what you ARE, IT IS AN ATTACK ON YOUR IDENTIFICATION. Attack is thus the way in which your identification is lost, because, when you attack, you MUST have forgotten what you are. And if your reality is God’s, when YOU attack,

you are not remembering HIM. This is not because He is gone, but because you are ACTIVELY WILLING NOT TO REMEMBER HIM.

This entire paragraph, present in the *Ur* and *FIP Second Edition*, is entirely missing from the *HLC*. We consider it an oversight and have replaced it.

Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 7: p. 242

When you think you are attacking your SELE, it is a sure sign that you hate what you THINK you are.

In the *HLC* the word “self” is not capitalized, but it is in the *Ur*. We feel that clarity is lost in removing the emphasis so it has been restored.

Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 11: p. 243

Is THIS the image you would be vigilant to SAVE? Are you REALLY afraid of losing THIS? Look calmly at the logical conclusion of the ego’s thought system, and judge whether its offering is really what you want, for this IS what it offers you.

While both the *Ur* and *FIP Second Edition* have this sentence, the original *HLC* leaves it out. We think that was by mistake

Chapter 9: Section I: Par. 12: p. 243

God’s Son knows no idols, but He DOES know His Father.

Both the *Ur* and *HLC* capitalize “His” here. The *Ur* capitalizes both “He” and “His” while *FIP Second Edition* puts both lower case. We agree with *Ur* because “God’s Son” here refers to a person of the Trinity..

Chapter 9: Section J: Par. 8: p. 247

There are four capitalization issues in this paragraph. We capitalize “Great Rays” and “Rays” in agreement with *FIP* although neither the *Ur* nor the *HLC* original capitalize them. We capitalize “Light” in agreement with the *Ur* although neither the *HLC* nor *FIP* do. And we capitalize “Great Light” in agreement both with *FIP* and the *Ur*.

Chapter 10: Section B: Par. 1: p. 252

Remember the Rays that are there unseen.

Neither the *Ur* nor *HLC* capitalize “Rays” although *FIP* does. We agree with *FIP*. Arguably “light” should be capitalized in this paragraph also but none of the versions consulted does so.

Chapter 10: Section B: Par. 1: p. 252

The closer you come to the foundation of the ego’s thought system, the darker and more obscure becomes the way.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include “the foundation of,” although the *HLC* manuscript does not. It would appear its absence is inadvertent.

Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 11: p. 267

According to the Holy Spirit’s teaching, ONLY God’s purpose is [capable of] accomplishment and it is ALREADY accomplished.

The words “capable of” are not present in any version consulted. *FIP* renders this phrase “only God’s purpose can be accomplished,” which catches the likely meaning. The original “only God’s purpose is accomplishment” just doesn’t make sense. The *Ur* capitalizes the word “IS” for “ONLY God’s Purpose IS accomplishment.” That almost makes sense and is possibly what was originally intended. The *Notes* need to be consulted on this one.

Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 15: p. 268

The ego’s interpretation of the laws of perception are, and would HAVE to be, the exact opposite of the Holy Spirit’s.

The *HLC* has “interpretation” in the singular, although the *Ur* and *FIP* both pluralize it. We think it most likely should be pluralized.

Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 18: p. 269

“... yet where the Son is, the Father MUST be.”

The comma is not present in the *HLC* or *FIP*. The *Ur* has it however, and its presence makes the passage clearer so we restored this to the *Ur* reading.

Chapter 10: Section F: Par. 19: p. 270

You cannot accept false witness of HIM unless you have evoked false witnesses AGAINST him.

Specific Changes

The original and all versions have “evoked” here but what is being discussed seems to be more of an “invocation”. Not changed, but considered. Again, we really need to check the *Notes* on this one.

Chapter 10: Section G: Par. 3: p. 271

Yet different experiences lead to different beliefs, and with them different perceptions. For perceptions are learned WITH beliefs, and experience teaches.

. While both the *Ur* and *FIP Second Edition* have this phrase, the original *HLC* leaves it out. We think that was by mistake

Chapter 11: Section F: Par. 4: p. 293

You cannot learn of perfect love with a split mind because a split mind had MADE itself a poor learner.

The *HLC* manuscript has “had” here. Both *Ur* and *FIP* have “has” as we do. This was likely a typo.

Chapter 11: Section J: Par. 7: p. 308

“Yet consider this:” ends paragraph 6. Ending a paragraph with a colon is bad form. The words “Consider this:” were moved to the beginning of the next paragraph (7). These words do not appear in the “*Ur*” although the rest of the two paragraphs do. In *FIP* this material shows up in Chapter 13, and the paragraph break is changed one sentence sooner. *Blue Sparkly* leaves it as is.

Chapter 12: Section B: Par. 7: p. 314

7. Little children, this is not so. Your “guilty secret” is nothing, and if you will but bring it to the light the Light will dispel it.

The second instance of “light” in this paragraph is capitalized for no apparent reason. The capitalization was removed from this word. The *Ur* capitalizes it and also the word WILL immediately following, but *FIP* drops the capitalization here also.

Chapter 12: Section C: Par. 13: p. 318

He could but answer your insane request with a sane answer which would abide with you in your insanity. AND THIS HE DID. No one who hears His answer but will give up insanity.

These two sentences are not in the *HLC* manuscript, but appear in the *Ur* and in *FIP(2)*. Their absence appears inadvertent

Chapter 12: Section E: Par. 9: p. 324

But this is what denial DOES, for by it you ACCEPT insanity, believing you can make a private world and rule your OWN perceptions. Yet for this, light MUST be excluded.

The *Ur* adds the comma plus emphasis: “But for this, light MUST be excluded.” We feel the comma is necessary and so restored it.

Chapter 12: Section G: Par. 1: p. 330

1. Sit quietly and look upon the world you see, and tell yourself; “The real world is not like this.

This colon was originally a comma. *FIP* changes it to a colon and we agree.

Chapter 13: Section B: Par. 7: Sentence 5: p. 337

YOU are the witnesses to the Fatherhood of God, and He has given you the power to create the witnesses to your fatherhood in Heaven. **Deny a brother here, and you deny the witnesses to your fatherhood in Heaven.** The miracle which God created is perfect, as are the miracles which YOU created in His Name. They need no healing, nor do you, when you know THEM.

This sentence does not appear in the *HLC* manuscript, but is in the *Ur* and in *FIP Second Edition*. Since its omission appears to us to have been inadvertent, it is restored.

Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 2: p. 341

They are used only by the Holy Spirit, and it is that which MAKES them pure. If you displace YOUR guilt upon them, the Holy Spirit cannot use them. For by pre-empting for your OWN ends what you should have given to HIM, he cannot use them unto YOUR release.

This sentence appears in *FIP Second Edition* and *Ur* but not in the *HLC* manuscript. Its omission appears inadvertent and so it has been restored.

Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 4 Sentence 5: p. 342

In the sentence “Can you expect to use your brothers as a means to “solve” the past, and still to see them as they really are?” the problem is with the final infinitive “to see” in a place where the present tense is called for. The final “to” is out of place. The trick here is with implied antecedents. Some might dispute whether the grammar problem is “real” or “imaginary.” To this native English speaker’s ear, there is something terribly audibly wrong with the sentence as it stands, and what’s wrong is that the infinitive is being used where the present tense of the verb “to see” is required.

Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 5 Sentence 2: Page 342

Use no relationship to hold you to the past, but with each one, each day, be born again.

Nether comma is in the *HLC* but both are in the *Ur*. We think they were left out inadvertently.

Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 6 Sentence 5: p. 342

If GUILT were real, ATONEMENT would not be

This comma is not in the *HLC* but is in the *Ur* and *FIP*. We think it was left out inadvertently.

Chapter 13: Section D: Par. 11: p. 344

The indent is prefaced with “To him I say,” which should be “To him I say:” The comma is replaced by a colon.

There are several open questions in Chapter 13 which require more consideration, notably “awaking” which *FIP* changes to “waking” (sometimes) and “whate’er” which *FIP* and *Blue Sparkly* change to “whatever” and “builted” (another anachronism) which they leave intact.

There is an argument that the removal of a syllable and the addition of a syllable in the latter two generate Iambic Pentameter.

Chapter 13: Section F: Par. 7: p. 350

But YOU who cannot undo what you have made, nor escape the heavy burden of it’s dullness that lies upon your minds, cannot see THROUGH it.

The underlined clause is present in the *Ur* and *FIP Second Edition* but is missing from the *HLC* manuscript. We’re viewing it as an inadvertent omission.

Chapter 13: Section H: Par. 3: p. 354

Say, therefore, to yourself, gently, but with the conviction born of the love of God and of His Son,

“What I experience I will make manifest.

The *HLC* has a comma after “His Son”, but *FIP(2)* and the *Ur* have a colon. We agree with *FIP* that the colon is better.

Chapter 13: Section H: Par. 4: p. 354

Each day, each hour and minute, even every second, you are deciding between the crucifixion and the resurrection;

The *HLC* has “every” here. The *Ur* and *FIP(2)* have it as “each.” We agree with *FIP* about restoring the earlier form here. We suspect this is one of those cases where Helen, in the editing of 1973, decided to ‘change back’ something she had previously changed.

Chapter 13: Section H: Par. 9: p. 356

Those who accept the Atonement ARE invulnerable. But those who believe they are guilty WILL respond to guilt, because they think it is salvation, and will not refuse to see it and side with it. They BELIEVE that INCREASING guilt is self-PROTECTION. And they will fail to understand the simple fact that what they do not want MUST hurt them.

Both *Ur* and *FIP Second Edition* include this sentence which is missing from the *HLC*. We agree with *FIP* that the omission was an error.

Chapter 14: Section A: Par. 3: p. 362

The Atonement was established as the means of restoring guiltlessness to the mind which has denied it, and thus denied Heaven to Itself.

Specific Changes

The word “**itself**” begins with a capital in the *HLC*, but not in *any* other version. We chose to go with the *Ur* and *FIP* in removing the capitalization

Chapter 14: Section B: Par. 6: p. 364

Do not withhold this glad acknowledgment, for hope of happiness and release from suffering of every kind lie in it.

The *HLC* manuscript, *FIP* and *BS* all have “lie” (plural) here, the *Ur* has “lies” which is correct. The subject is “hope” and it is this (singular) entity which “lies in it”.

Chapter 14: Section E: Par. 4: p. 376

For God is Life, and they ABIDE in Life. Life is as holy as the Holiness by which it was created.

This sentence appears in the *Ur* and *FIP(2)* but not in the *HLC*. We agree with *FIP* that it should be restored.

Chapter 14: Section F: Par. 5: p. 378

To order is to judge, and to arrange BY judgment. Therefore, it is not your function, but the Holy Spirit’s. It will seem difficult for you to learn that you have no basis AT ALL for ordering your thoughts.

This sentence is not present in the original manuscript. Both *FIP(2)* and *Ur* include it. We agree with *FIP* that the omission was inadvertent.

Chapter 14: Section G: Par. 7: p. 382

When your peace is threatened, or disturbed in any way, say to yourself:

“I do not know what anything, INCLUDING THIS, means.

The original, *Ur* and *BS* have a comma here. *FIP(2)* introduces the colon and we agree that it is better.

Chapter 15: Section A: Par. 2: p. 386

For the Holy Spirit USES time in His Own way, and is not bound by it. Time is His friend in teaching. It does not waste Him, as it does you. And all the waste that time seems to bring with it is due but to your identification with the ego, which uses time to support its belief in destruction.

This line appears in *FIP(2)* and *Ur*, but not in the *HLC* manuscript. We agree with *FIP* that it was omitted inadvertently.

Chapter 15: Section D: Par. 11: p. 396

“The Host of God needs not seek to find anything”

This is how the *HLC* puts it, is an apparent spelling error. The word “Host” is of course plural, referring to many. Yet it is also singular, in that there is one host, as there is for instance, one “crowd” consisting of many people. In this sense whether it is dealt with grammatically as singular or plural is a matter of convention, and such conventions can vary from region to region in the English-speaking world. To our ears, it should be “**need**” rather than “**needs**” (The error is in the photocopy, and it is preserved in the *FIP* edition. However, in the *Ur* the line reads correctly “**The Host of God need not seek to find ANYTHING.**” This reading was used as it appears correct and the emphasis on ANYTHING from the *Ur* is kept because it is more consistent with the rest of the paragraph and the preceding sentence where that word is also emphasized. The removal of the emphasis appears inadvertent here.

It is possible the change was intentional. However it sounds better to the ear when changed back to the original, and rather obviously there is no “content” issue at stake here!

Chapter 15: Section H: Par. 4: p. 407

“We said before that the ego attempt to maintain and increase guilt, but in such a way that you do not recognize what it would do to YOU.”

Grammatical problem, agreement in number. The word “**attempt**” needs to be “**attempts**” as Ego is singular.

Chapter 15: Section I: Par. 2: p. 412

Hear him gladly, and learn of Him that you have need of no special relationships at all.

Both the *Ur* and *FIP(2)* capitalize “Him” here, and that is obviously correct, though the *HLC* doesn’t. Restored as per *Ur*.

Chapter 15: Section I: Par. 13: p. 416

Accepting it as undivided you join Him wholly, in an instant. For you would place NO limits on your union WITH Him. The reality of this relationship becomes the only truth that you could ever WANT.

FIP and *Ur* both have this sentence. It’s omission in the *HLC* appears inadvertent.

Chapter 15: Section J: Par. 9: p. 419

You will not succeed in being partial hostage to the ego, for it keeps no bargains, and would leave you nothing. Nor can you be partial HOST to it. You will have to choose between TOTAL freedom and TOTAL bondage, for there are no alternatives but these.

Both *FIP(2)* and *Ur* have this sentence. It’s omission from the *HLC* appears inadvertent.

Chapter 16: Section A: Par. 1: p. 424

The capacity to empathize is very useful to the Holy Spirit, provided you let Him use it in His way. His way is very different. He does not understand suffering, and would have you teach it is not UNDERSTANDABLE.

This sentence appears in no version available to us except for the *FIP Second Edition*. This line is not in the *Ur*. It is presumably derived from the *Thetford Transcript*, or genuine *Urtext*. Its omission was probably an inadvertent typing error. We cannot be sure, however, that it was not a late editorial interpolation by the *FIP Second Edition* editors. Once again it is essential to check the *Notes*.

Chapter 16: Section A: Par. 2: p. 424

These it selects OUT, and joins WITH. And it never joins except to strengthen ITSELF. Having identified with what it THINKS it understands, it sees ITSELF, and would INCREASE itself by sharing what is LIKE itself. Make no mistake about this maneuver; the ego always empathizes to WEAKEN, and to weaken is ALWAYS to attack.

FIP and *Ur* both have this sentence. It’s omission in the *HLC* appears inadvertent. The capitalization is derived from the *Ur*.

Chapter 16: Section C: Par. 9: p. 429

This year, determine not to deny what has been given you by God. Awake and SHARE it, for that is the only reason He has called to you.

These four words, “Awake and share it,” appear in *FIP(2)* and *Ur*. Their omission from the *HLC* appears inadvertent. The *Ur* contains one more sentence immediately *before* this: “He has Himself reminded you of Him.” It was possibly removed for good reason ... it doesn’t quite make sense. “He has reminded you of IT” might make sense. So too might “He has reminded you of Himself.” There appears to be a copying error between the *Notes* and the *Ur* here, but having no access to the *Notes* at this time, we can’t check. We have therefore not included this sentence at this time. The complete paragraph from the *Ur* (Absolute page 607, marked page 434) is as follows:

This year, determine NOT to deny what has been given you BY God, to use for Him. He has Himself reminded you of Him. Awake and SHARE it, for that is the only reason He has called to you. His Voice has spoken clearly, and yet you have so little faith in what you heard, because you have preferred to place still greater faith in the disaster YOU have made. Today, let us resolve TOGETHER to accept the joyful tidings that disaster is NOT real, and that reality is NOT disaster. Reality is safe and sure and wholly kind to everyone and everything. There is no greater love than to accept this, and be glad. For love asks only that YOU BE HAPPY, and will GIVE you everything that makes for happiness.

Chapter 16: Section D: Par. 4: p. 432

The phrase “**Cause and Effect relationship**” is capitalized as per the Author’s instructions on page 42, Chapter 2:E:12

Chapter 16: Section E: Par. 7: p. 436

Recognize this, for it is true, and truth MUST be recognized if it is to be distinguished from illusion: The special love relationship is an attempt to bring LOVE INTO SEPARATION. And, as such, it is nothing more

Specific Changes

than an attempt to bring love into fear, and make it REAL in fear. In fundamental violation of love's one condition, the special love relationship would accomplish the impossible.

The underlined words are missing from the *HLC* but present in the *Ur* and *FIP(2)*. This is another case of inadvertent line omission.

Chapter 16: Section E: Par. 11: p. 437

Hear not the call of hate, and see no fantasies, for your completion lies in truth, and NOWHERE ELSE. See in the call of hate, and in every fantasy that rises to delay you, but the call for help which rises ceaselessly from you to your Creator.

This clause is missing in the *HLC* but present in both *Ur* and *FIP(2)*. Its omission appears to be inadvertent.

Chapter 16: Section F: Par. 11: p. 442

So fearful has the truth become to you that UNLESS it is weak and little, and unworthy of value, you would not dare to look upon it.

Both *FIP(2)* and *Ur* include the words “unworthy of value” although the *HLC* does not. The omission was probably inadvertent but perhaps not, as this paragraph includes other, probably intentional editing

Chapter 16: Section H: Par. 9: p. 450

“God hold nothing against anyone, for He is incapable of illusions of ANY kind.”

Agreement in number. It should be “God holds” not “God hold.”

Chapter 17: Section B: Par. 4: p. 453

4. Be willing, then, to give all you have held outside the truth to Him Who KNOWS the truth, and in Whom all is brought to truth. Salvation from separation will be COMPLETE, or will not be at all. Be not concerned with anything except your WILLINGNESS to have this be accomplished.

Both *FIP(2)* and *Ur* have this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 17: Section D: Par. 7: p. 459

If ALL but loving thoughts has been forgotten, what remains IS eternal. And the transformed past is made like the PRESENT.

The *HLC* manuscript has the singular “has” here, while both the *Ur* and *FIP* use “have” which we agree, is correct.

Chapter 17: Section G: Par. 1: p. 472

Now He will work with you to make it specific, for application IS specific. There are certain very specific guidelines He provides for any situation, but remember that you do not yet realize their universal application.

Both *FIP Second Edition* and *Ur* have the underlined phrase, which is missing from the *HLC*. We suspect the omission was inadvertent.

Chapter 17: Section H: Par. 8: p. 476

And you will see the means you once employed to lead you to illusions transformed to means for truth. Truth calls for faith, and faith makes room FOR TRUTH. When the Holy Spirit changed the purpose of your relationship by exchanging yours for His,

Both *FIP(2)* and *Ur* include this sentence which is, apparently inadvertently, omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 3: p. 481

Do you really think it strange that a world in which everything is backwards and upside-down arose from this? IT WAS INEVITABLE.

Both *FIP(2)* and *Ur* have this sentence. Its omission from the *HLC* is likely inadvertent.

Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 6: p. 482

Give Him but a little faith in each other, to help him show you that no substitute you made for Heaven can keep you from it.

The *HLC* has “him” here but the *Ur* has “Him” which we feel is correct. *FIP Second Edition* agrees.

Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 8: p. 483

Heaven beholds it, and rejoices that you have let it come to you. And God Himself is glad that your relationship is as it was created. The universe within you stands with you, together.

This sentence appears in both *FIP* and *Ur* and appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section B: Par. 10: p. 483

The holy light that brought you together must extend, as YOU accepted it.

There is a shift in tense, from present to past here. While *FIP* preserves this rendering, the *Ur* has it:

The holy light that brought you together MUST extend, as YOU accept it.

It appears that this shift in tense was inadvertent since it's not only poor style, but it makes no sense in the context of the passage. We've thus changed “accepted” to “accept.”

Chapter 18: Section C: Par. 3: p. 484

No limits on substitution is laid upon you.

This is a grammar error, agreement in number. It must be “limit is” or “limits are.” The latter is used because that is what the *Urtext* uses. *FIP* agrees.

Chapter 18: Section C: Par. 6: p. 485

In your waking dreams, the special relationship has a special place. It is the means by which you try to make your SLEEPING dreams COME TRUE. From this, you do not waken. The special relationship is your determination to keep your hold on unreality, and to prevent yourself from waking.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include the underlined portion, omitted, apparently inadvertently, from the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section C: Par. 7: p. 485-6

He does not destroy it, nor <O (486)> snatch it away from you. But He does use it differently, as a help to make HIS purpose REAL to you. Your special relationship will remain, not as a source of pain and guilt, but as a source of joy and freedom.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence, which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section E: Par. 7: p. 492

6. It is this that makes the holy instant so easy and so natural. You make it difficult, because you insist there must be more than you need do. You find it difficult to ACCEPT the idea that you need give so LITTLE, to receive so much. And it is very hard for you to realize that it is not personally insulting that your contribution and the Holy Spirit's are so extremely disproportionate.

Both *Ur* and *FIP* have this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section F: Par. 6: p. 494

The power of joining and its blessing lie in the fact that it is now impossible for either of you to experience fear alone, or to attempt to deal with it alone.

The subject is singular “power” and the verb must be “lies”, and we changed it to that. *FIP* changes this also but does other, apparently inadvertently, things to the sentence which completely transforms its meaning:

“The power of joining its blessing lies in the fact that it is now impossible for you or your brother to experience fear alone, or to attempt to deal with it alone.”

In *FIP* it's no longer the “power of joining and its blessing” which would be the blessing of joining, but it becomes “the power of joining its blessing.” This is likely a typo in *FIP* since there is no antecedent for the pronoun “it” ... just what noun does “it” refer to or stand for?

The *Ur* has it as “lies” and we went with that.

Specific Changes

Chapter 18: Section F: Par. 7: p. 494

“Which ever is saner” occurs in the *HLC* and the *Ur*. *FIP* changes it to “Whoever”, at least recognizing the spelling error. “Whichever” strikes us as the appropriate spelling correction.

Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 1: p. 495

The *HLC* reads thus:

1. **There is NOTHING outside you. That is what you must ultimately learn, for it is the realization that the Kingdom of Heaven is restored to you.**

The precise problem here is difficult to pin down to a grammatical rule, but it sounds wrong, and sounds like it was meant to say “for it is IN that realization ..” not “it is the realization.” Sure enough, that is the way it stands in the *Ur*. *FIP* doesn’t change this one. This is being called a “typo” and restored to the *Ur*’s reading thus becoming:

“1. **There is NOTHING outside you. That is what you must ultimately learn, for it is in that realization that the Kingdom of Heaven is restored to you.**”

Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 8: p. 497

But the COMMUNICATION is INTERNAL. It is NOT made up of different PARTS, which reach each other. Mind reaches to ITSELF. It does not go OUT.

FIP adds the underlined sentence from the *Ur*. The *HLC* omits it. It is marked with handwritten square brackets in the *Ur* however, indicating that its omission was perhaps not inadvertent, but intentional. We include the line with that caveat.

Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 8: p. 497

Within itself it has no limits, and there is nothing outside it. It encompasses EVERYTHING. It encompasses you entirely; you within it, and it within you.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out.

Chapter 18: Section G: Par. 9: p. 497

9. **The body is outside you, and but SEEMS to surround you, shutting you off from others, and keeping you apart from them, and them from you. It is not there.**

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section H: Par. 4: p. 500

It is extremely difficult to reach Atonement by fighting against sin. Enormous effort is expended in the attempt to make holy what is hated and despised. Nor is a lifetime of contemplation and long periods of meditation aimed at detachment from the body necessary.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section H: Par. 5: p. 501

It would be far more profitable now merely to concentrat on this than to consider what you SHOULD do.

The word “concentrat” should be “concentrate.”

Chapter 18: Section J: Par. 7: p. 508

It is not strong enough to stop a button's fall, nor hold a feather. Nothing can rest upon it, for it is but an ILLUSION of a foundation. Try but to touch it and it disappears; attempt to grasp it and your hands hold nothing.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section J: Par. 8: p. 509

The expression “make believe” is changed to “make-believe”. *FIP* agrees with this change.

Chapter 18: Section J: Par. 11: p. 509

A step beyond this holy place of forgiveness, a step still further inward but the one YOU cannot take, transports you to something completely different.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this phrase which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 18: Section K: Par. 2: p. 510

This is probably where the original for the “Love’s meaning” interpolated introduction section (Chapter 1A) came from originally, and it should probably be put back here. This has not been done in this edition. The likely need for it is simply being noted. We didn’t move it, we’re just flagging it.

Chapter 19: Section B: Par. 3: p. 513

Faithlessness would always limit and attack; faith would remove all limitations and make whole. Faithlessness would destroy and SEPARATE; faith would unite and HEAL. Faithlessness would interpose illusions between the Son of God and his Creator; faith would remove all obstacles that seem to rise between them.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 19: Section B: Par. 6: p. 514

Each is united, a complete thought system, but totally disconnected to each other.

While *FIP* and the *Ur* both retain it, ‘disconnected to each other’ is not proper English usage. It should be “disconnected from each other.” In the *Ur*, it reads “DISconnected to each other” which actually makes more sense as a word play. Thus the capitalization of “DIS” is restored to the *HLC* from the *Ur*.

Chapter 19: Section B: Par. 11: p. 515

“Your faithlessness had driven you apart” should be “has driven” since the whole paragraph is in the simple past, not the past perfect tense. *FIP* agrees with this correction. It will prove interesting to check this against the *Notes* when that becomes possible. This is possibly a typo in the *Ur* which went uncorrected until the *FIP* edition.

Upon further consideration, the *Ur/HLC* rendering in past perfect is restored because there is a meaning shift between “has driven” and “had driven.” The perfect tense makes the action complete, done, over with while the simple past allows the action to be ongoing and not completed. In the context it seems like the faithlessness being referred to was indeed a “past perfected” (finished with) issue, and not an immediate issue since those being addressed ARE indeed “recognizing salvation in each other” so their faithlessness must be over and done with, such as “had driven” suggests.

Due to the fact that there are differences of opinion on this, we’ll simply draw your attention to a possible error here and not actually change the *HLC*.

Chapter 19: Section C: Par. 7: p. 518

This is his past, his present and his future. For he has somehow managed to corrupt his Father, and changed His Mind completely.

The original has the past tense: “changed”. The *Ur* has it as we do, in the present tense: “change”. *FIP* agrees.

Chapter 19: Section D: Par. 2: p. 520

Punishment is always the great preserver of sin; treating it with respect, and honoring its enormity. What must be punished, MUST BE TRUE. And what is true MUST be eternal, and WILL be repeated endlessly. For what you think is real you WANT, and will not let it go.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this phrase which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 19: Section D: Par. 13: p. 523

The extension of the Holy Spirit’s purpose from your relationship to others, to bring them gently in, has already begun. This is the way in which He will bring means and goal in line. The peace He laid, deep within BOTH of you, will quietly extend to every aspect of your lives, surrounding both of you with glowing happiness and the calm awareness of complete protection.

Specific Changes

Two entire lines here are missing from the *HLC*. *FIP* restores part of it, but alters it. We're restoring it all from the *Ur*, deeming its omission to have been inadvertent.

Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 1: p. 528

As love must look past fear, so must fear see love not. For love contains the end of guilt, as surely as fear depends on it. Love is attracted ONLY to love. Overlooking guilt completely, it sees no fear.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 1: p. 528

Fear looks on guilt with just the same devotion that love looks on itself. And each has messengers which they send forth, and which return to them with messages written in the language in which their going forth was asked.

There is a grammatical problem with agreement in number here. It must be either "both have messengers which they send" or "each has messengers which it sends." *FIP* corrects it in the second way, we correct it in the first way, such that it becomes "both have." Otherwise, the word "them" has to be changed to "it" later in the sentence. One inadvertent mistake is far more probable than two, in our view. The *Ur* has the same problem. Reference to the *Notes* is required to clear this one up.

Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 5: p. 529

Ur has "breath of love" spelled "breathe of love." An obvious misspelling corrected.

Chapter 19: Section F: Par. 10: p. 530

The first sentence is not a proper sentence, it reads:

"To think you could be satisfied and happy with so little is to hurt yourself, and to limit the happiness that you would have, calls upon pain to fill your meager store and make your lives complete."

One of those two commas simply has to be a period, or the second comma has to go.

In the *Ur*, we find the problem solved, it reads:

"To think you could be satisfied and happy with so little, IS to hurt yourself. And to LIMIT the happiness that you would have, CALLS upon pain to fill your meager store, and make your lives complete."

Rather clearly we have a scribal copying error here from the *Ur* to the *HLC*. The resolution here is to restore the material to the *Ur* reading. We now have two sentences, both of which are grammatically acceptable, and the restoration of the emphasis removed in the *HLC* clarifies the meaning considerably.

The *FIP* rendition gets rid of the second comma, as follows:

"12 To think you could be satisfied and happy with so little is to hurt yourself, and to limit the happiness that you would have calls upon pain to fill your meager store and make your life complete."

Here we have an interesting example of "correcting" without reference to the original. The *FIP* editors clearly recognized the grammar problem, and by removing the second comma, render the sentence both grammatical and rather close to its original form. Why "lives" was changed to "life" is a mystery since the whole section is about holy relationships and is addressing BOTH partners! Why the emphasis, which adds so much clarity to the passage was removed is also mysterious.

In any case, we prefer the original, which is clearer and presents no grammar issues, so the *HLC* was modified to reflect the earlier rendition.

Chapter 19: Section G: Par. 2: p. 530

The *HLC* reads "**This the value that you think.**" Both the *Ur* and *FIP* agree with us that it should be "**This is the value that you think.**" Another scribal copying error ... Schucman and/or Thetford must have been overtired when typing this page! Changed.

Chapter 19: Section H: Par. 2: p. 534

The body will seem to be whatever is the means for reaching the goal that you assign to it. Only the mind can set a purpose, and only

mind can see the means for its accomplishment, and justify its use. Peace and guilt are both conditions of the mind, to be attained.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 19: Section I: Par. 3: p. 537

"**This is no arrogance**" sounds like it should be "**This is not arrogance.**" In the *Ur* we read "**This is NOT arrogance**" and the stress there convinces us this is indeed a typo in the *HLC*. In fact, because it is clearer, we've restored the emphasis from the *Ur* as well. *FIP* doesn't fix it.

Chapter 19: Section L: Par. 2: p. 543

No one can stand before this obstacle alone, for he could not have reached thus far UNLESS his brother walked beside him.

Ur has "it" rather than "thus far" ... we're not sure if this is an inadvertent copying error or intentional editing. In the oldest (*Ur*) reading, the pronoun "it" refers to the obstacle, so the meaning is "He could not have reached *the obstacle* (it) unless his brother walked beside him. This obstacle is still "**the fear of God.**" In the *HLC*, instead of reaching the obstacle, he is just reaching "**thus far**" which is a completely different meaning, and a completely imprecise one at that. It might mean looking upon the fear of God, accepting the Atonement and learning that illusions are not real, since all these descriptors could be describing what "**thus far**" is. In contrast, the word "it" as used in the *Ur* can only mean "**the fear of God.**"

While "it" seems to us the better and more precise reading, our purpose here is not to "correct" intentional changes to the *HLC* made by its editors.

FIP changes it to "this far."

Chapter 19: Section L: Par. 8: p. 544-545

Let him withhold it not, for by <O (545)> receiving it you offer it to him. For he WILL receive of you what YOU received of him. Redemption has been given you to give each other, and thus receive it.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 20: Section A: Par. 1: p. 547

In the last sentence we read:

"But a RISEN Christ becomes the symbol of the Son of God's forgiveness on himself; the sign he looks upon himself as healed and whole."

The construction "**forgiveness on himself**" is odd, one would expect "**forgiveness of himself.**" *FIP* preserves this reading. The *Ur* has it "**forgiveness upon HIMSELF**" which we prefer, and so the *HLC* copy here has been restored to its earlier form and this is being deemed a typo. Once again, a reference to the original *Notes* is required here, since the style remains curious and there may well be other copying errors in this sentence. For instance, if we place a word such as "bestowing" before the word "forgiveness" above, all the oddities in the construction and word choice vanish.

Chapter 20: Section B: Par. 3: p. 547

Easter is not the celebration of the COST of sin, but of it's END. If you see glimpses of the face of Christ behind the veil, looking between the snow white petals of the lilies you have received and given as your gift, you will behold each other's face and RECOGNIZE it.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 20: Section B: Par. 3: p. 548

"In your forgiveness of this stranger, alien to you and yet your ancient Friend, lie his release and your redemption with him."

Agreement in number. It appears at first glance that it should be "**lies**" and not "**lie.**" *FIP* agrees. *Blue Sparkly* does not. The *Ur* keeps it as "**lie.**"

We almost fixed this "error" but upon further inquiry we noticed that the subject of this sentence is plural "**his release and your redemption**" and the verb is plural "**lie**" and the object of the sentence is "**In your forgiveness**". It's an inverted sentence. So, the *Ur* and the *HLC* are right and *FIP*, in this case, has erred.

Specific Changes

Chapter 20: Section C: Par. 3: p. 549

In the second sentence we read: “*No-one but sees his chosen home an altar to HIMSELF.*” We have a prepositional deficit here. There are at least two simple ways to fix this:

No one but sees in his chosen home an altar to Himself ... or

No one but sees his chosen home as an altar to Himself.

FIP chooses the second. After careful examination of the context, it appears that the “**chosen home**” (which can be the body, and in this example is) is not the altar per se, but that altars reside within homes. Homes are not altars, but they may contain altars. We thus feel that if the grammar is to be corrected, it should be in the manner of example 1, above, “*No one but sees in his chosen home an altar to Himself,*” believing the *FIP* editors erred here.

HOWEVER! There is poetic metre to consider. The original, with prepositional deficit, is better Iambic Pentameter than EITHER correction for grammar.

This raises an issue which recurs, when grammar errors are required to preserve Iambic Pentameter, should they be left uncorrected? At the moment our choice is to leave them uncorrected but flag them with possible corrections. The latter is likely to be especially helpful to readers whose native tongue is not English and who are more likely to be confused by grammar aberrations.

Chapter 20: Section C: Par. 6: p. 550

Listen and hear this carefully, nor think it but a dream; a careless thought to play with, or a toy you would pick up from time to time, and then put by. For if you do, so will it be to you:

In the sentence: “**For if you do, so will it be to you:**” we have a colon where there should be a period. Corrected. In the *Ur* and *FIP* there is also a period rather than a colon here.

Chapter 20: Section D: Par. 1: p. 553

Knowledge requires NO adjustment, and, in fact, is lost if any shift or change is undertaken. For this reduces it at once to mere perception; a way of LOOKING in which certainty is lost, and doubt has entered. To this impaired condition ARE adjustments necessary, because they are not true. Who need adjust to truth, which calls on only what he is, to understand?

The underlined words here are problematic. *FIP* changes this to “**it is**”, deciding the antecedent for the pronoun is “**condition**”. Is it the “**condition**” which is “**not true**” or is it the “**adjustments**?” In the *Ur*, we get little help. We find “**BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT TRUE**” capitalized and standing as a separate sentence between periods. Errors in EMPHASIZED words are extremely rare, no example has so far been found, so we are reluctant to accept *FIP*'s conclusion that there is an agreement in number error. We have not yet come up with anything better and perhaps won't until we can check the *Notes*. It is possible the *FIP* editors did precisely that and that this correction derives from there.

This is unlikely however as the correction was made before the 1985 “proofreading” as it appears in later printings of the *First Edition* as a rather obvious “paste-up” correction on line 2 of page 400 of their *First Edition*. The grammatical problem was likely noticed and thus removed *without checking the original* since there is no evidence that they ever checked the original until 1985.

For now, for lack of an alternative which appears any better, we are going with the *FIP* remedy. “**They are**” becomes “**it is**”.

Chapter 20: Section D: Par. 11: p. 556

“Here all thoughts of any separation between us becomes impossible.”

Grammar problem: agreement in number. “**Thoughts become**” or “**thought becomes**” is ok, but “**thoughts becomes**” is not. This was corrected to read: “**Here all thought of any separation between us becomes impossible**” because that is how the *Ur* reads. *FIP* resolves it the other way, leaving “**thoughts**” plural and changing “**becomes**” to “**become**.”

Chapter 20: Section E: Par. 2: p. 557

It lies in him to overlook all your mistakes, and therein lies his OWN salvation. And so it is with yours. Salvation is a lesson in giving, as the Holy Spirit interprets it. It is the reawakening of the laws of God in minds that have established other laws, and given them power to enforce what God created not.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 20: Section F: Par. 2: p. 560

And in that single heart beat is the unity of love proclaimed and given welcome.

Ur and *FIP* agree with our dictionaries that this should be one word “**heartbeat**”.

Chapter 20: Section f: Par. 5: p. 561

Your brother's body is of as little use to you as it is to him. When it is used only as the Holy Spirit teaches it HAS no function, for minds need not the body to communicate.

There is a preposition deficit in all versions consulted. We should perhaps add the word “of.” When parsed, this becomes obvious. You can't say: “*your body is use.*” It has to be “*your body is of use.*” The addition of the adjective “**little**” and the conjunction “**as**”, which introduce the comparison, obscure the underlying grammatical structure, which is probably why this one escaped the notice of so many editors previously. However, adding a word changes the poetic meter and this is probably an instance of grammar being sacrificed to generate IP.

Chapter 20: Section G: Par. 9: p. 565

In the sentence “**Is the malevolence of the unholy relationship, so seeming powerful and so bitterly misunderstood,**” the adjective “**seeming**” should be the adverb “**seemingly**” modifying the implied verb “**is**” as in “[**is**] so **seemingly** powerful.” Grammatically we need an adverb here, and the adjective form is incorrect. *Ur* and *FIP* maintain the adjective form.

However, the author seems to use adjectives as adverbs quite often, so while flagging this as a potential problem, we aren't changing it.

Chapter 20: Section I: Par. 7: p. 571

In the sentence: “**What if you recognized this world is a hallucination?**” we should have the word “**an**” instead of “**a**”. The *Ur* has it “**a**” while *FIP* corrects it to “**an**” as do we.

Chapter 21: Section A: Par. 2: p. 574

There is no choice that lies between these two decisions. And you WILL see the witness to the choice you made, and learn from this to RECOGNIZE which one you chose. The world you see but shows you how much joy YOU have allowed yourself to see in you, and to accept as YOURS. And, if this IS its meaning, then the power to GIVE it joy MUST lie WITHIN you.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include these sentences which appear to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 21: Section B: Par. 6: p. 575-576

Let's begin this one with the paragraph as it appears in the *HLC*.

6. Listen, -- perhaps you catch a hint of an ancient state not quite forgotten; dim, perhaps, and yet not altogether unfamiliar, like a song whose name is long forgotten, and the circumstances in which you heard completely unremembered. Not the whole song has stayed with you, but just a little wisp of melody, attached not to a person or a place or anything particular. But you remember, from just this little part, how lovely was the song, how wonderful the setting where you heard it, and how you loved those who were there and listened with you.

Now if I were editing anyone else's prose the following changes would be made, minimally:

6. Listen, -- perhaps you catch a hint of an ancient state not quite forgotten; dim, perhaps, and yet not altogether unfamiliar, like a song whose name is long forgotten, and the circumstances in which you heard it completely unremembered. The whole song has not stayed with you, but just a little wisp of melody, attached not to a person or a place or

Specific Changes

anything in particular. But you remember, from just this little part, how lovely was the song, how wonderful the setting where you heard it, and how you loved those who were there and listened with you.

The word “it” underlined in red does not appear in the *HLC* or any other version, but if this is poetry, “it” is implied and if this is prose “it” is necessary. The other suggested modifications above smooth out two rather awkward and clumsy, but not strictly “incorrect” constructions. Only the addition of “it” is really necessary here.

While some of these lines *could be* Iambic Pentameter, in that there are arguably the correct number of beats, the whole paragraph certainly isn't. “Perhaps” to “particular” might be, if we stretch things, but breaks down at “particular” and doesn't resume. So really, this paragraph does *not* appear to be Iambic Pentameter. Let's take a look at trying to render this passage as poetry:

Listen, --
perhaps you catch a hint of an ancient
state not quite forgotten; dim, perhaps, and
yet not altogether unfamiliar,
like a song whose name is long forgotten,
and the circumstances in which you heard (it)
completely unremembered. Not the whole
song has stayed with you, but just a little
wisp of melody, attached not to a
person or a place or anything particular.
But you remember, from just this little
part, how lovely was the song, how wonderful
the setting where you heard it, and how you
loved those who were there and listened with you.

The most that can said for poetry here is that you have several lines in a row where the tenth beat doesn't split a word, and I'd guess that is about average for any English prose!

If it is prose then we can't say that “it” was left out to preserve the poetic metre, and it comes to appear that it was just left out!

This one really needs to be compared against the *Notes*. There are *odd* constructions here and it is very close to IP where it isn't IP. This suggests there is a high probability of a transcription error, but it must be prior to the *Ur* because the material is essentially identical there.

Chapter 21: Section B: Par. 9: p. 576

Nothing will ever be as dear to you as is this ancient hymn of love the Son of God sings to his Father still.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include these two words which appear to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 21: Section C: Par. 6: p. 579

All that the ego is, is an idea that it is possible that things should happen to the Son of God WITHOUT his will; and thus without the Will of his Creator, Whose Will cannot BE separate from his own.

FIP Second Edition changes this to “could”. *FIP* claims this change comes from the *Urtext*. The *Ur* however has it as “should” and so we are leaving it as that until we can check the *Notes*.

Chapter 21: Section C: Par. 9: p. 580

“Then only it is possible” should be “Then only is it possible.” *FIP* preserves the *HLC* reading. But the *Ur* has it correctly. We've restored the *Ur* reading, viewing this as a typo.

Chapter 21: Section D: Par. 8: p. 585

Both the *HLC* and *Ur* have:

They have renounced the means for sin by choosing to let all limitations be removed. Desiring to look upon their brothers in holiness, the power of belief and faith goes far beyond the body, SUPPORTING vision, not obstructing it.

FIP Second Edition, has it slightly different:

They have renounced the means for sin by choosing to let all limitations be removed. As they desire to look upon their brothers in holiness, the power of their belief and faith sees far beyond the body, supporting vision, not obstructing it.

We changed the period before “Desiring” to a comma and the comma after “holiness” to a period which cures the grammar more easily, and without having to change any words. This was also required to keep the IP intact.

It thus becomes:

They have renounced the means for sin by choosing to let all limitations be removed, desiring to look upon their brothers in holiness. The power of belief and faith sees far beyond the body, SUPPORTING vision, not obstructing it.

Our basis for choosing this solution to the grammar problem in the *HLC* which is also in the *Ur*, was mainly that the only *actual* transcription error was punctuation! Simply changing commas to periods and vice versa, when it fixes grammar problems is, we feel, a preferable remedy to changing words.

Chapter 21: Section E: Par. 2: p. 587

The word “light” is used where “alight” is required to make sense. *Ur* and *FIP* both use “light” but light as verb makes no sense in the context “your eyes will light on sin” whereas “your eyes will alight on sin” makes perfect sense. It's the word “on” that cinches it. One cannot use light as a verb to “light on” something, but one's eyes may certainly “alight on” anything.

There may be an argument from Poetic metre that a single syllable is needed, and that “light” here is a contraction of “alight”. Fair enough, but in that case it must be written as “light” and not just “light”.

After writing the above it was drawn to my attention that in US English “light” can mean “alight” and is a contraction commonly written without the apostrophe in that country. So we are just adding the apostrophe to make it less ambiguous.

Chapter 21: Section F: Par. 3: p. 590

And thus It recognizes that miracles do not affect another's mind, only Its Own. They always change YOUR mind. There IS no other.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 21: Section F: Par. 6: p. 591

The word “Self” has been capitalized in the word “self-EXTENDING” such that it becomes “Self-EXTENDING.” This was done to maintain consistency with the use of capitalization on “Self” when it refers to a higher, or divine “Self,” which is clearly the “Self” involved in this passage. *Ur* and *FIP* both capitalize “Self” in this instance. *FIP* drops the emphasis on “EXTENDING” but the *Ur* includes the emphasis.

Chapter 21: Section G: Par. 1: p. 594

The sentence “It does not value them, but their correction” is grammatically problematic and somewhat confusing, meaning it does value their correction, but stating it in a very clumsy way. In the *Ur*, the words “them” and “correction” are emphasized which substantially clarifies the meaning, if not fixing the grammar. Since the contrast between what is and is not valued is clearer in the *Ur*, the emphasis from the *Ur* was put back into the *HLC*, the resultant sentence being: “It does not value THEM, but their CORRECTION.” With the emphasis it is obvious that “it does value” is implied between “but” and “their correction.” Otherwise it is unclear.

Chapter 21: Section G: Par. 2: p. 594

The following sentence:

“And how could thoughts that enter into what but seems like yours alone have no effect at all on what IS yours?”

is rendered in the *Ur* with the word “seems” capitalized for emphasis. This seems much clearer, and so the capitalization was restored from the *Ur*, resulting in:

“And how could thoughts that enter into what but SEEMS like yours alone have no effect at all on what IS yours?”

Chapter 21: Section H: Par. 8: p. 600

“And then it will be clear to you that, as you look on the effects of sin in any form, all you need do is simply ask yourself,

“Is this what I would see? Do I WANT this?”

We change the comma after “yourself” to a colon. So does *FIP*. The *Ur* keeps it as a comma, but we agree with *FIP* on this one.

Specific Changes

Chapter 22: Section A: Par. 4: p. 604

Here is the faith in differences shifted to sameness. And here is sight of differences transformed to VISION. And reason now can lead you to the logical conclusion of your union.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 22: Section D: Par. 6: p. 615

The sentence “Nothing so blinding as perception of form” lacks a verb. The *Urtext* is identical. So is *FIP*. Perhaps it should be “There is nothing so blinding” or “Nothing is so blinding.” All versions have it the same way. Once again, we need to check the *Notes*.

Chapter 22: Section D: Par. 9: p. 616

“Unholy values will produce confusion, and in AWARENESS” in the *HLC* is ungrammatical and incoherent.

In the *FIP* edition the emphasis is removed, but not the incoherence.

FIP: “Unholy values will produce confusion, and in awareness” (T-22.III.9.2)

The problem is resolved with reference to the *Ur*, where it reads:

“Unholy values will produce confusion, and IN AWARENESS”.

Thus we changed “in AWARENESS” in to “UNAWARENESS.”

We find many ‘unconventional’ spelling patterns in the *Ur*, which one might refer to as idiosyncratic spelling or just spelling mistakes. The use of prefixes such as “un” where we’d expect “in” and vice versa is common, as is the creation of totally new words such as “extra-mental” and “intra-mental” as a kind of word game or pun to illustrate or emphasize a point. Therefore it appears to be that “IN AWARENESS” is one such word game which works orally but not so well in print. The basic point of the original is preserved by using the word “UNAWARENESS” however. Arguably it might be better to represent it as UN AWARENESS (preserving the original two words) or even just leave it alone entirely and present it as IN AWARENESS with the emphasis as in the *Ur*.

Robert Perry believes this to be correct as is, and believes it to mean, “Unholy values will produce confusion, and will do so in awareness, rather than merely producing unconscious confusion.”

Either correction makes the sentence grammatical although there is a meaning shift between “confusion in awareness” on the one hand and “confusion and unawareness” on the other. It strikes me as unlikely that a comma would be inadvertently added, along with an entire word, and very much more likely that a space was inadvertently added to a common (in the *Ur*) form of misspelling “unawareness.”

A careful reading of the previous paragraphs suggests rather strongly that it is not a “confusion in awareness” that is the point at issue here, but very much “confusion AND unawareness.”

Chapter 22 Section G: Par. 7: p. 623

God would let nothing interfere with those whose wills are His. And they will RECOGNIZE their wills are His, BECAUSE they serve His Will. And serve it willingly. And COULD remembrance of what they are be long delayed?

The sentence appears inadvertently omitted, as it is present in *Ur* and *FIP*.

Chapter 22 Section G: Par. 8: p. 623

Seek not to change it, nor to substitute another goal. This one was GIVEN you, and ONLY this. Accept this one and serve it willingly, for what the Holy Spirit does with the gifts you give each other, to whom He offers them, and where and when, is up to Him.

The sentence appears inadvertently omitted, as it is present in *Ur* and *FIP*.

Chapter 22 Section G: Par. 9: p. 623

“He will withhold no blessing from it, or limit it in any way” becomes

“He will withhold no blessing from it, nor limit it in any way” In *FIP*. It’s unchanged in the *Ur*. We decided to leave it alone and just flag it.

Chapter 23 Section B: Par. 12: p. 631

In the second to last sentence we read:

So is the memory of God obscured in minds that have become illusions’s battleground.

The proper representation of a plural possessive ending in s is S’ apostrophe, rather than the standard apostrophe s. It should be:

So is the memory of God obscured in minds that have become illusions’ battleground.

FIP corrects it this way. In the *Ur* it is “illusion’s battleground” with the singular rather than the plural:

So is the memory of God obscured in minds that have become illusion’s battleground.

This certainly reads better and is most likely what was originally intended. The extra s, making it a plural was probably a typo and *FIP*’s correction is grammatically ok but not faithful to the original (which the *FIP* editors didn’t check).

Chapter 23 Section C: Par. 13: p. 635

You who believe you walk in sanity, with feet on solid ground, and through a world where meaning can be found, consider this: These ARE the laws on which your “sanity” appears to rest. These ARE the principles which make the ground beneath your feet seem solid.

This sentence appears in both *FIP* and *Ur*. It’s omission from the *HLC* appears inadvertent.

Chapter 23 Section E: Par. 1: p. 641

1. Do not remain in conflict, for there IS no war without attack. The fear of God is fear of LIFE, and not of death.

This sentence appears in both *FIP* and *Ur*. It’s omission from the *HLC* appears inadvertent. *FIP* puts it at the beginning of the next Section ... this section division is rather arbitrary.

Chapter 24: Section C: Par. 5-6: p. 649

6. What would they see instead? [They would see] The shining radiance of the Son of God, so like his Father that the memory of Him springs instantly to mind.

In the original *HLC*, the sentence “What would they see instead?” is the last sentence of the preceding paragraph (5). Both *Ur* and *FIP* move it as we have done. The following sentence, beginning with “The shining radiance ...” is missing a verb so is not a proper sentence as it stands in all versions, without the implied “[They would see]”. The question and the answer need to stand side by side. Breaking the paragraph between the question and answer is clearly inappropriate and thus almost certainly an inadvertent mistake.

Chapter 24: Section D: Par. 3: p. 653

Truth is not frail. Illusions leave it perfectly unmoved and undisturbed. But specialness is NOT the truth in you.

These two words occur in both *FIP* and *Ur* and may have been inadvertently left out of the *HLC*.

Chapter 24: Section D: Par. 8 (last paragraph, 2nd to last sentence): p. 655

“The print of nails are on your hands as well” is what the original reads. The problem is agreement in number. It must be “prints (plural) are” or (print (singular) is).

Ur has the same error, *FIP* has it “print is” but the reference here is to the crucifixion in which there was more than one nail and more than one nail-print so the plural throughout is appropriate. So we simply added an “s” to “print” making it “The prints of nails are on you hands as well.”

Arguably, a few lines up, where it says “Look on the print of nails upon his hands” should also be the plural “prints” but there isn’t the same strong grammatical necessity for a correction.

Chapter 24: Section G: Par. 10: p. 663

And never doubt but that your specialness will disappear before the Will of God, Who loves each part of Him with equal love and care. The Christ in you CAN see your brother truly.

Specific Changes

The words "and care" are missing in the *HLC* but are present in the *Ur* and *FIP*.

Chapter 25: Section A: Par. 2: p. 669

The original manuscript reads:

No one who carries Christ in him can fail to recognize Him everywhere. EXCEPT in bodies.

The period after "everywhere" is probably a mistake, since "EXCEPT in bodies" is not a sentence. The period should probably be a comma instead. *FIP* and *Ur* leave it unchanged.

Chapter 25: Section B: Par. 1: p. 669

This sentence is problematic:

"Here is the meeting of the holy Christ unto Himself; nor [are?] any differences perceived to stand between the aspects of His holiness, which meet and join and raise Him to His Father, whole and pure and worthy of His everlasting Love."

The semicolon, which *FIP* holds unchanged, is replaced by a period in the *Ur*, which is better grammar. A second sentence begins with "Nor." Yet the second sentence, or the clause following the semi-colon, lacks a complete verb! We could have inserted "are" after "Nor" making the sentence grammatically correct without altering the meaning in any way we can notice.

We checked IP on this one also and this may well be a case of poetic licence rather than typographical error, so we left it unchanged. Once again, we need to check the *Notes* on this one.

Chapter 25: Section B: Par. 7: Sentence 3: p. 671

"And so what" is changed to "And so What" because the antecedent is the Holy Spirit. The *Ur* keeps it lower case but *FIP* capitalizes it as we have done.

Chapter 25: Section C: Par. 2: p. 672

The original reads:

How long is needed for you to realize the chance of change in THIS respect is hardly worth delaying change that might result in better outcome?

While *FIP* and *Ur* both retain this reading, it seems obvious to us that the word "outcome" should be plural here. Either that, or a definite article is needed to keep it grammatical, such as "g better outcome." We've opted for the plural form. Since the "sense" of the sentence here suggests plural, that's what we've gone with. Once again, we need to check the *Notes*.

Chapter 25: Section C: Par. 11: p. 675

You are the same, as God Himself is One, and not divided in His Will.

The *HLC* has no comma here, nor does *FIP*. The *Ur* does, however, and we include it for clarity. It appears to have been omitted inadvertently.

Chapter 25: Section G: Par. 6: p. 684

Salvation is no more than a reminder this world is not your home; its laws are not imposed on you, its values are not yours. And nothing that you THINK you see in it is REALLY there at all. And this is seen and understood as each one takes his part in its undoing, as he did in making it.

This sentence occurs in *FIP* and *Ur* and appears to have been omitted inadvertently.

Chapter 25: Section H: Par. 3: p. 686

It must be so that either God is mad, or is this world a place of madness.

We didn't change this in the text but it is a candidate ... In the second sentence we read "or is this world" where it really perhaps should be "or this world is." (not footnoted)

Chapter 25: Section H: Par. 8: p. 688

To this One is given the choice of form most suitable to him; one which will not attack the world he sees, but enter into it in quietness, and SHOW him he is mad.

While *FIP* preserves this error, *Ur* has it is "SHOW him it is mad." If it were left as "he" then the sentence says that the Holy Spirit is mad, since He would be the antecedent to the pronoun in that case. Rather obviously not correct!

Chapter 25: Section H: Par. 9: p. 688

From this position does his sinfulness, and all the sin he sees within the world, offer him less and less. Until he comes to understand it COST him his sanity, and stands between him and whatever hope he has of BEING sane.

In the sentence(s) "... him less and less. Until ..." there is a problem. There should be no sentence break, and no period here. Period removed. The sentence break occurs in the same place in the *Ur* and *FIP* leaves this unchanged also. However it is so obvious to us that a period has been inadvertently put in the middle of a sentence that we've taken it out.

Chapter 25: Section I: Par. 1: p. 691

There are tense problems in the following sentence: "You need not give it to Him wholly willingly, for if you could, you had no need of Him." The last phrase could be changed to the more correct future conditional tense: "you would have no need" instead of the grammatically incorrect simple past tense: "you had no need."

Thus it would read: "You need not give it to Him wholly willingly, for if you could, you would have no need of Him."

Both the *Ur* and *FIP* preserve this unchanged.

This is a case of the subjunctive mood. The subjunctive mood is used quite frequently in *ACIM*. It is mostly an archaic usage which often appears at first glance to be an incorrect tense. While we don't flag all instances of the Subjunctive, we feel mentioning a few is helpful.

Chapter 25: Section I: Par. 5: p. 692

Fairness and vengeance are impossible, for each one contradicts the other and denies that it is real.

HLC and *FIP* don't capitalize "and" but *Ur* does. The sense here is that fairness and vengeance are incompatible, and that it is impossible for them to be together. Neither fairness nor vengeance are "impossible" alone, what is impossible is for both to be present simultaneously. Fairness AND vengeance are impossible. So we restored the emphasis for clarity.

Chapter 25: Section I: Par. 14: p. 695

The sentence beginning with "And so must be be..." is corrected to "And so must he be..." The *Ur* has this correct, it's an obvious typo.

Chapter 26: Section B: Par. 5: p. 701

But judge him not, for you will hear no song of liberation for yourself, nor see what it is given him to witness to, that you may see it and rejoice with him.

The word "it" here is not necessary and potentially confusing. However this peculiar style shows up elsewhere and the editors are not unanimous that it should be removed. All versions preserve it and we leave it as it is with this caveat, that it's clearer and better grammar if removed. Once again, we need to check the *Notes* to see if this is part of the original or not.

Chapter 26: Section B: Par. 8: p. 702

It is your special function to ensure the door be opened, that he may come forth to shine on you, and give you back the gift of freedom by receiving it of you.

And obvious spelling mistake "freedom" should be "freedom". Corrected.

Chapter 26: Section C: Par. 1: p. 703

The sentence beginning: "He has not greater difficulty" has obvious problems.

FIP preserves this unchanged. The *Ur* reads "He has not a greater difficulty" which, while not ideal, is a lot better. However, "no greater" or "not any greater" sound much better. After much consideration, "no greater" was chosen since it sounds better and does not effect poetic metre. There is no question of any "meaning shift" here. Once again, we need to check the *Notes*.

Specific Changes

Chapter 26: Section D: Par. 2: p. 706

The sentence “It is not a place, and when you reach it is apart from time” has some obvious problems. In the *Ur* emphasis is given the word “when” which clarifies the meaning: “It is not a place, and WHEN you reach it is apart from time.” The *Ur*’s emphasis was returned as it clarifies the meaning. The idea here, that the “when” or “moment in time” when you reach it is apart from time is tricky to put into words at all! How can there be a time apart from time? Yet without the emphasis it can appear nonsensical.

Chapter 26: Section D: Par. 7: p. 707

And in the recognition this is so, lies the ability to give up all attempts to choose between them, and to MAKE them different. How simple is the choice between two things so clearly UNalike. There IS no conflict here.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been omitted by mistake.

Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 3: p. 710

And so is all time passed, and everything exactly as it was before the way to nothingness was made.

The manuscript, *Ur* and *Blue Sparkly* all have this as “passed.” *FIP*(1 & 2) changes it to “past” and in the context, we agree this is what was intended, and change it also. The entire section is about “all time” being “past and gone” so we conclude this is a typo, and that “past” and not “passed” was originally intended.

Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 7: p. 711

7. Forgiveness is the great release from time. It is the key to learning that the past is over. Madness speaks no more. There IS no OTHER teacher and no OTHER way. For what has been undone no longer is. And who can stand upon a distant shore, and dream himself across an ocean, to a place and time that have long since gone by? How REAL a hindrance can this dream be to where he really IS? For this is fact, and does NOT change whatever dreams he has. Yet can he still IMAGINE he is elsewhere, and in another time. In the extreme he can delude himself that this is true, and pass from mere imagining into belief and into madness, quite convinced that where he would prefer to be, he IS.

This entire paragraph is missing in the *HLC* and *FIP First Edition*. It is present in *FIP Second Edition*. The *HLC* doesn’t even put a paragraph break in the place where this paragraph originally (and once again) appears.

Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 8: p. 711

And how much can his own delusions about time and place effect a change in where he really is?

While both *Ur* and *HLC* have this as “affect”, we agree with *FIP*(2) that it should be changed to “effect.”

Chapter 26: Section F: Par. 8: p. 711

The unforgiven is a voice that calls from out a past forever more gone by.

While all versions have it as “from out” there is a prepositional deficit as it stands, and needs to be “from out of” or changed to “out from”. Once again, we need to check the *Notes* to see how this is in the original.

Chapter 26: Section H: Par. 6: p. 716

We agree with *FIP* that the correct form of the possessive for “vengeance’ heels” should be “vengeance’s heels”. A case can be made that either is correct.

Chapter 26: Section H: Par. 9: p. 717

“Although it falls far short of giving you your full inheritance, it DOES remove the obstacles which you have placed between the Heaven where you are, and recognition of where and what you are”

This sentence is problematic in the term “the Heaven.” The definite article is inappropriate here, and while *Ur* and *FIP* both have it in place, it seems to us it should be removed. Reference to the *Notes* will be required to clear up whether this superfluous article is there also.

Chapter 26: Section H: Par. 15: p. 719

If loss in any form is possible, then is God’s Son made incomplete and not <O (719)> himself. Nor will he know himself, nor recognize his will. He has forsworn his Father AND himself, and made them both his enemies in hate.

FIP and *Ur* both include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 27: Section B: Par. 3: Sentence 5: p. 730

Now in the hands made gently by His touch, the Holy Spirit lays a picture of a different you.

Ur and *FIP* agree that this should be “gentle.”

Chapter 27: Section C: Par. 10-12: p. 735-736

The following three paragraphs (10, 11 and 12) were omitted entirely from the *HLC* manuscript. They represent the whole of page 767 of the *Ur*. This was the dictation for January 24, 1968. *FIP Second Edition* restores the paragraphs and we agree that they were omitted by mistake.

(end of paragraph 9—for reference)

And sickness is desired to prevent a shift of balance in the sacrifice. How could the Holy Spirit be deterred an instant, even less, to reason with an argument for sickness such as this? And need your healing be delayed because you pause to listen to insanity?

10. Correction is NOT your function. It belongs to One Who knows of fairness, NOT of guilt. If you assume correction’s role, you LOSE the function of forgiveness. No-one can forgive until he learns correction is BUT to forgive, and NEVER to accuse. Alone, you CANNOT see they are the same, and therefore is correction NOT of you. Identity and function are the same, and BY your function do you know yourself. And thus, if you confuse your function with the function of Another, you MUST be confused about yourself and who you are. What is the separation but a wish to take God’s Function from Him and DENY that it is His? Yet if it is NOT His it is not YOURS, for YOU must lose what you would take away.

11. In a split mind, identity MUST seem to be divided. Nor can anyone perceive a function unified which has conflicting purposes and different ends. Correction, to a mind so split, MUST be a way to punish sins you think are YOURS in someone else. And thus does he become your victim, NOT your brother, DIFFERENT from you in that he is MORE GUILTY, thus in need of your correction, as the one MORE INNOCENT than he. This splits HIS function off from yours, and gives you both a DIFFERENT role. And so you CANNOT be perceived as one, and with a single function that would MEAN a shared identity with but ONE end.

12. Correction YOU would do MUST separate, because that is the function given it BY you. When you perceive correction is the SAME as pardon, then you also know the Holy Spirit’s Mind and yours are One. And so your OWN identity is found. Yet must He work with what is GIVEN Him, and you allow Him only HALF your mind. And thus He represents the OTHER half, and seems to have a DIFFERENT purpose from the one you cherish, and you THINK is yours. Thus does your function seem DIVIDED, with a half IN OPPOSITION to a half. And these two halves appear to represent a split within a self perceived as two.

13. Consider how this self-perception must extend, and do not overlook the fact that every thought extends because that is its purpose, being (736) what it really IS.

Chapter 27: Section C: Par. 15: Sentence 5: p. 736

“you were lost indeed.” sounds much better as “you would be lost indeed.” *FIP* and *Ur* and *Blue Sparkly* all leave it as it is. We believe this is one of many instances of the Subjunctive Mood.

Chapter 27: Section D: Par. 6: p. 739

And thus is God left free to take the final step Himself. For this you need NO pictures and NO learning aids. And what will ultimately take the place of every learning aid will merely BE.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Specific Changes

Chapter 27: Section E: Par. 2: p. 741

Here they belong, for here their answer is. And where its answer is, a problem MUST be simple and be easily resolved. It must be pointless to attempt to solve a problem where the answer cannot be.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 2: p. 744

“For if it were, there were no need for healing then.”

This isn’t an “incorrect tense” but rather the “subjunctive mood.” It occurs frequently in *ACIM*, is largely an archaic form, but perfectly correct and very likely used with intent, rather than inadvertence. So, this change was restored. The *Ur* has “anymore” as the last word, rather than “then.”

Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 3: p. 744

The word “abiding-place” is hyphenated in both *Ur* and *HLC*. *FIP* removes the hyphen.

Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 5: Page 745

And what you see the world will witness, and will witness TO.

Ur reads: “And what YOU see the world will witness, and will witness TO.” We restored the emphasis such that the sentence becomes:

And what YOU see, the world will witness, and will witness TO.

The emphasis implies a pause or comma here. Removing the emphasis in the *HLC* removes the pause, so we put it back. We also feel the emphasis greatly clarifies the sentences and that its removal must have been inadvertent.

Chapter 27: Section F: Par. 10: p. 747

“Yet all the witnesses that you behold will be far less that all there really are.”

Clearly a typo, and thus was changed. The second “that” should be “than.” It is so in the *Ur* and is corrected in *FIP* also.

Chapter 27: Section G: Par. 5: p. 749

The One Who brings the miracle perceived them all as one, and called by name of fear.

The *Ur* puts quotes around “fear” and so do we, since it makes the sentence clearer.

Chapter 27: Section H: Par. 11: p. 754

“Here is thw CAUSE of suffering” is an obvious typo, and thus was changed to “Here is the CAUSE of suffering”. *Ur* and *FIP* agree.

Chapter 27: Section H: Par. 12: p. 754

... the Voice that calls with love to waken him. A gentler dream, in which his suffering was healed, and where his brother was his friend. God willed he waken gently, and with joy.

Both *FIP* and *Ur* include this sentence which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the *HLC*.

Chapter 28: Section B: Par. 2: p. 762

“Memory holds the message it receives, and does what it is given it to do.”

The sentence is the same in the *Ur*, *HLC* and *FIP*. Yet obviously we have a problem here, one too many instances of the word “it.” The last phrase could be “what it is given to do” or “what is given it to do” but cannot be “what it is given it to do” without mangling the grammar. So this should perhaps be changed to “what is given it to do.”

The main argument against this change is that the extra “it” makes the line into Iambic Pentameter. Thus it has not been changed but is flagged as a grammar problem. Once again, reference to the *Notes* may help resolve this.

Chapter 28: Section B: Par. 6: p. 763

Its memory does not lie in the past, nor waits the future.

The use of “waits” here, where “await” or “wait upon” or “wait for” or even “wait” appears intended, introduces several grammatical problems. The word “memory” is the subject, the word “waits” the verb. “It [memory] waits for the future” is correct, but “It [memory] does not waits for the

future” is not. This has to be “memory does not wait for.” Once again, reference to the *Notes* may help resolve this question. Our best guess is that “waits” was supposed to be “wait” as a contraction of “await” which means by our Style Guide it is to be spelled “wait”. There is no poetic metre issue here, the problem is strictly grammar, and as it is written in both the *Ur* and *HLC*, it’s bad grammar!

Chapter 28: Section B: Par. 12: p. 765

Have no fear that He will fail in what He wills. Nor that you be excluded from the Will that is for you.

“Nor that you be excluded” should be “Nor that you will be excluded” or even “should be” or “might be” in contemporary English Grammar. This can be considered “poetic licence” and also is a case of the subjunctive mood.

The period between “wills” and “Nor” is not needed. The two sentences should probably be one. Both *Ur* and *FIP* preserve this structure but we see no reason for the period, and so remove it.

Chapter 28: Section F: Par. 3: p. 776

“And you WILL deny your Self, and walk upon an alien ground which your Creator did not make, and where you seem to be a something you are not.”

The problem here is with “a something.” The indefinite article is apparently not needed. In the *Ur* we find quotes around the word “something” which seem necessary here, and inadvertently left out. So we put the quotes back in making the sentence:

“And you WILL deny your Self, and walk upon an alien ground which your Creator did not make, and where you seem to be a “something” you are not.”

FIP leaves the quotes out also.

Chapter 28: Section G: Par. 3: p. 780

You hate it, yet you think it IS your self, and that, without it, would your self be lost.

The word “self” in this sentence, in both instances, should probably be capitalized for consistency, since elsewhere “self” refers to the illusory “self” and “Self” refers to the true “Self.” In this case, we are told that we think the body is the true “Self” or that we are thinking that the “self” is really the “Self.” Lower case would be appropriate only if the meaning of the sentence were that we think the body is an illusion rather than real. While we are told it is an illusion, in this passage, we are being told that we think it is the real “Self.”

Chapter 29: Section A: Par. 3: page 784

But not without a gap between you, lest he turn again into an enemy. Let him come close to you, and you jumped back; as you approached, he instantly withdrew. A cautious friendship, limited in scope and carefully restricted in amount, became the treaty you had made with him.

This line, present in the *Ur*, and in modified form in *FIP*, appears to have been left out inadvertently. *FIP* replaces “he instantly withdrew” with “did he but instantly withdraw.”

Chapter 29: Section C: Par. 6: page 788

6. Such is the promise of the living God; His Son have life and every living thing be part of him, and nothing else have life. What YOU have given “life” is not alive, and symbolizes but your wish to be alive apart from life, alive in death, with death perceived as life, and living, death.

The *HLC* has this as “loving” but both the *Ur* and *FIP* have it as “living” which feel is likely correct.

Chapter 29: Section C: Par. 9: page 789

As something, it can be perceived and thought to feel and act, and hold you in its grasp as prisoner to itself.

Quotes are added around “something” to be consistent with other usage.

Chapter 29: Section E: Par. 2: page 792

The miracle were treacherous indeed if it allowed you still to be afraid because you did not RECOGNIZE the fear.

Specific Changes

This appears to be a misuse of the simple past tense where the present conditional is in order, but it could also be the Subjunctive Mood and be quite correct.

Chapter 29: Section E: Par. 3: page 792

It can be in you or someone else, but where it is perceived, it will be there it is attacked.

The second comma is not in the original but is in the *Ur* and is added since this sentence is a real brain-teaser without it.

Chapter 29: Section F: Par. 1: page 794

There is a place in you where this whole world has been forgotten; where no memory of sin and of illusion linger still.

Agreement in number error. The original has "linger". So does the *Ur*. But "memory [...] lingers" so this was corrected for grammar. *FIP* agrees.

Chapter 29: Section J: Par. 1: page 805

Hear, then, your story in the dream you made, and ask yourself if it be not the truth that you believe that it is NOT a dream: A dream of judgment came into the mind that God created perfect as Himself.

The colon after "dream" is decidedly inappropriate. The *Ur* has a period. *FIP* has a period and starts a new paragraph with "A dream ..." We settled for changing the colon to a period as does the *Ur*. The last part of the sentence is a question, and possibly this sentence should end with a question mark, thus:

Hear, then, your story in the dream you made, and ask yourself if it be not the truth that you believe that it is NOT a dream?

Chapter 30: Section B: Many Paragraphs pp 809-812

Two changes were made to this section. First the word "Seven" was added to the section heading "Rules for Decision" and secondly, the words "First", "Second", "Third", etc. were added in bold where the original has only the numerals 1-7. This was done to retain the visual structural clarity of the seven points which might tend to vanish for readers beneath the paragraph numbering system we've added for reference purposes.

Chapter 30: Section B: Par. 8: p. 810

For you have ALREADY gotten angry, and your fear of being answered in a different way from what your version of the questions asks will gain momentum, until you believe the day you want is one in which you get YOUR answer to YOUR question.

HLC original manuscript and *Blue Sparkly* have "questions asks". Both *Ur* and *FIP* have it as "question asks." We're calling this a typo and reconciling it with *FIP* and *Ur*.

Chapter 31: Section C: Par. 1: Page 844

Whatever form his sins appear to take it but obscures the fact that you believe it to be yours,

We have a problem with agreement in number in the *HLC* and the *Ur*. *FIP* corrects it by changing the last "it" to "them". The pronoun "it" here refers to "sins". An alternative is to change "sins appear" to "sin appears", leaving the pronoun the same. We agree with the *FIP* resolution here.

Chapter 31: Section D: Par. 8: p. 848

How utterly opposed to truth is this, when what the lesson's purpose is to teach that what your brother loses YOU have lost, and what he gains is what is given YOU.

The grammar and clarity is better without this "what". But removing it disrupts poetic meter. *Ur* has it, *FIP* changes "what" to "all". The use of "all" however is not any more correct and suggests other connotations not in the original. We decided to leave this one alone, just flagging the problem.

Chapter 31: Section D: Par. 9: p. 848

No pathway in the world can lead to Him, nor any worldly goal is one with His.

The original *HLC* manuscript and the *Ur* have "is" instead of "be". *FIP* changes it to "be" which sounds better. It would ordinarily be stated "nor is any worldly goal one with His." The odd word order is often used to make Iambic Pentameter work, and we think this is one such case.

Chapter 31: Section E: Par. 5: p. 851

"The lesson teaches this;" in the original is changed to "The lesson teaches this;" due to the fact that a colon is more appropriate than a semi-colon here. This is deemed to be a typographical error in the original.

FIP agrees, changing it to a colon also. (not footnoted)

Chapter 31: Section E: Par. 14: p. 853

And what can think has choice, and CAN be shown that different thoughts have different consequence.

It is possible that the word "consequence" should be plural, but all versions we've consulted keep it singular here. There is a substantial difference in meaning between "thought's consequence" and "thought's consequences" so we left it alone.

Chapter 31: Section G: Par. 9: p. 860

Yet while you hold this sword, you must perceive the body as yourself, for you are bound to separation from the sight of him who holds the mirror to another view of what he is, and thus what YOU must be.

Some think this should be two words, "your self" because it seems that the body is confused for self and the self in question happens to be YOURS here, which is quite a different connotation from "yourself." In the *Ur* it is "YOURSELF."

Chapter 31: Section G: Par. 11: p. 861

This is the Savior's vision; that he see his innocence in all he looks upon, and sees his own salvation everywhere.

The semicolon is inappropriate here, it needs to be a colon or a comma. In the *Ur* it appears to be both a comma and a colon, with a *Manual* correction having been made. We just made it a colon. We haven't corrected all questionable semicolon use, but this one appears to be a typo.

All versions have "he see" which is disagreement in number, and needs to be "he sees" as we have made it. It doesn't qualify as a Subjunctive.

Chapter 31: Section H: Par. 3: p. 863

He would not leave one source of pain unhealed, nor any image left to veil the truth. He would remove all misery from you whom God created alters unto joy. He would not leave you comfortless, alone in dreams of Hell, but would release your minds from everything that hides His face from you.

This sentence occurs in both the *Ur* and *FIP*. Its omission appears to have been inadvertent.

Specific Changes