Another Look at Joseph Smith's First Vision

Stan Larson

The First Vision, that seminal event which has inspired and intrigued all of us for nearly two centuries, came into sharp focus again in 2012 when another volume of the prestigious *Joseph Smith Papers* was published. Highlighting the volume is the earliest known description of what transpired during the "boy's first uttered prayer"[1] near his home in Palmyra in 1820. The narrative was written by Joseph Smith with his own pen in a ledger book in 1832. It is printed in the *Papers* volume under the title "History, Circa Summer 1832" and is especially interesting because the account was suppressed for about three decades. In the following transcription of the 1832 account, Joseph Smith's words, spelling, and punctuation are retained and the entire block quote of the 1832 account is printed in **bold** (following the lead of the *Joseph Smith Papers* printing):

> **At about the the age of twelve years my mind become seriously imprest with regard to the all importent concerns of for the wellfare of my immortal Soul which led me to searching the scriptures believeing as I was taught, that they contained the word of God thus applying myself to them and my intimate acquaintance with those of differant denominations led me to marvel excedingly for I discovered that <they did not adorn> instead of adorning their profession by a holy walk and Godly conversation agreeable to what I found contained in that sacred depository this was a grief to my Soul thus from the age of twelve years to fifteen I pondered many things in my heart concerning the sittuation of the world**

of mankind the contentions and divi[si]ons the wicke[d] ness and abominations and the darkness which pervaded the of the minds of mankind my mind become exceedingly distressed for I become convicted of my sins and by searching the scriptures I found that mand <mankind> did not come unto the Lord but that they had apostatised from the true and liveing faith and there was no society or denomination that built upon the gospel of Jesus Christ as recorded in the new testament and I felt to mourn for my own sins and for the sins of the world for I learned in the scriptures that God was the same yesterday to day and forever that he was no respecter to persons for he was God for I looked upon the sun the glorious luminary of the earth and also the moon rolling in their magesty through the heavens and also the stars shining in their courses and the earth also upon which I stood and the beast of the field and the fowls of heaven and the fish of the waters and also man walking forth upon the face of the earth in magesty and in the strength of beauty whose power and intiligence in governing the things which are so exceding great and marvilous even in the likeness of him who created him <them> and when I considered upon these things my heart exclaimed well hath the wise man said the <it is a> fool <that> saith in his heart there is no God my heart exclaimed all all these bear testimony and bespeak an omnipotent and omnipreasant power a being who makith Laws and decreeeth and bindeth all things in their bounds who filleth Eternity who was and is and will be from all Eternity to Eternity and when <I> considered all these things and that <that> being seeketh such to worshep him as worship him in spirit and in truth therefore I cried unto the Lord for mercy for there was none else to whom I could go and to obtain mercy and the Lord heard my cry in the wilderness and while in <the> attitude of calling upon the Lord <in the 16th year of my age>[2] **a piller of fire light above the brightness of the sun at noon day come down from above and rested**

> **upon me and I was filled with the spirit of god and the <Lord> opened the heavens upon me and I saw the Lord and he spake unto me saying Joseph <my son> thy sins are forgiven thee. go thy <way> walk in my statutes and keep my commandments behold I am the Lord of glory I was crucifyed for the world that all those who believe on my name may have Eternal life <behold> the world lieth in sin and at this time and none doeth good no not one they have turned asside from the gospel and keep not <my> commandments they draw near to me with their lips while their hearts are far from me and mine anger is kindling against the inhabitants of the earth to visit them acording to thir ungodliness and to bring to pass that which <hath> been spoken by the mouth of the prophets and Ap[o]stles behold and lo I come quickly as it [is] written of me in the cloud <clothed> in the glory of my Father and my soul was filled with love and for many days I could rejoice with great Joy and the Lord was with me but could find none that would believe the hevnly vision nevertheless I pondered these things in my heart.**[3]

Immediately of interest to even the casual reader is the fact that Joseph never mentions seeing God the Father in his extraordinary vision. He says he "saw the Lord" and further affirms that this is Jesus Christ, since the personage tells him "I was crucifyed for the world." While Joseph says he "was filled with the spirit of God," he does not claim to have seen God as a separate personage introducing his Son. Additionally, there is no description here of Satan trying to bind him in darkness and prevent the prayer. Joseph makes no reference to his mission of restoration. His sins are forgiven, and the Lord announces that his anger is kindled against a wicked world, but there is no indication that Joseph can expect a prophetic calling.

This text of the Prophet's narration in the *Papers* volume is prefaced with a carefully detailed "Source Note," which explains why this excerpt is so unfamiliar to the general members of the Church. The note provides the following information. The 1832 history was written on both sides of the first three leaves of a

new ledger book. The fourth leaf began with a new numbering system and the ledger book became a copybook for Joseph Smith's outgoing letters, as well as copies of Oliver Cowdery's 1829 letters. This volume was listed in an inventory made in Nauvoo, came across the plains to Utah, and ended up in the LDS Church archives—with impeccable "continuous institutional custody." However, this six-page history was at some point excised from the letterbook. Fortuitously, one can actually date the time period when these leaves were removed, because the tearing of the last of the three leaves was done with such little care that a small triangular fragment (containing four words of the text) was initially left in the gutter of the letterbook and then removed and taped back onto the last leaf. The clear cellophane tape that was used for this repair was not invented until 1930, which supplies a *terminus a quo*. Furthermore, "the cut and tear marks, as well as the inscriptions in the gutters of the three excised leaves, match those of the remaining leaf stubs, confirming their original location" in the Joseph Smith letterbook. By 1965 these three leaves of the 1832 account were again "archived together with the letterbook."[4] Thus, the period when these three leaves were separated was approximately 1930 to 1965—or allowing a five-year period for the cellophane tape to come into common usage in America, the three decades from 1935 to 1965.

While the explanatory note adequately traces the physical journey of the three-leaf 1832 history, the four editors of this volume of the *Joseph Smith Papers*—Karen Lynn Davidson, David J. Whittaker, Mark Ashurst-McGee, and Richard L. Jensen—leave the content of this significant 1832 narrative largely unaddressed. They use generic terms in their "Historical Introduction," purposely and carefully referring to it as a "vision of Diety" and a "theophany."[5] This allows them to legitimately refer to a vision of God, a vision of Jesus, or a vision of both the Father and the Son, without drawing attention to the fact that the 1832 account mentions only a vision of Jesus. Later, in the reproduction of the actual text of the 1832 account of the First Vision, at the point where Joseph Smith states: "I saw the Lord," the editors add a footnote: "JS later recounted that he saw two 'personages,' that one appeared after the other, and that 'they did in reality speak unto

me, or one of them did.'"[6] However, what is completely omitted from both the "Source Note" and the "Historical Introduction" is any discussion as to *why* the three leaves were cut out and *who* it was that cut this history out of the letterbook.

Although the editors of the Histories volume of the *Joseph Smith Papers* do not discuss why the 1832 history was excised, we can speculate about who might have removed the leaves, and why. Because we know that the missing pages were kept in the office safe of Joseph Fielding Smith, it is unlikely that the leaves were removed simply in accordance with the archival practice of separating collections based on content. We can also surmise that one of the senior members of the Church Historian's Office would have been responsible for the decision to keep the pages separate; it was probably Joseph Fielding Smith himself, but could possibly have been Earl E. Olson or A. William Lund.[7] There are no available records of the reasoning behind the decision to keep the 1832 account from becoming widely known, but the history of denying researchers access to the account suggests some uneasiness about its contents.

Some time during the 1940s or early 1950s, Joseph Fielding Smith[8] showed Levi Edgar Young (who was then the senior president of the First Council of the Seventy) this 1832 account of the First Vision. LaMar Petersen, an organist and music teacher by profession but an amateur Mormon historian by avocation, had a meeting with Young on February 3, 1953, and took the following notes:

> A list of 5 questions was presented. Bro. Young indicated some surprise at the nature of the questions but said he heartily approved of them being asked. Sa[i]d they were important, fundamental, were being asked more by members of the Church, and should be asked. Said the Church should have a committee available where answers to such questions could be obtained. He has quit going down with his own questions to Brother Joseph Fielding (Smith) because he was laughed at and put off.
>
> His curiosity was excited when reading in Roberts' Doc. History reference to "documents from which these writings were compiled." Asked to see them. TOLD TO GET HIGHER PERMISSION. Obtained that permission. Examined documents. Written, he thought, about 1837 or 1838. Was told NOT TO COPY OR TELL

> WHAT THEY CONTAINED. Said it was a "STRANGE" account of the First Vision. Was put back in vault. REMAINS UNUSED, UNKNOWN.[9]

Thirty-four years later, Petersen wrote his memories of this same episode:

> The most noteworthy [meetings with LDS General Authorities] were six sessions in which my wife and I spent with Levi Edgar Young in 1952. He was forthright in discussing Mormon problems in history and theology, but always in loyal church terms. He told us that he had been defended before the First Presidency by his "buffers"—Apostles [Joseph F.] Merrill, [Charles A.] Callis, and [John A.] Widtsoe. He told us of a "strange account" (Young's own term) of the First Vision, which he thought was written in Joseph's own hand and which had been concealed for 120 years in a locked vault. He declined to tell us details, but stated that it did not agree entirely with the official version. Jesus was the center of the vision, but God was not mentioned. I respected Young's wish that the information be withheld until after his death.[10]

Even though Levi Edgar Young told LaMar Petersen that he had read the "strange account" of the First Vision, he had been instructed "not to copy or tell what they contained," and accordingly did not divulge the contents to anyone. However, while not providing any detailed information about this "strange account" of the First Vision, Young did disclose that it described a vision of only Jesus, without any mention of God. Petersen kept this information confidential until Young's death in December 1963. In early 1964, Petersen told Jerald and Sandra Tanner about this "strange account" of the First Vision. They wrote to Joseph Fielding Smith, asking for an opportunity to see this early account. Joseph Fielding Smith did not know exactly what Levi Edgar Young had told LaMar Petersen, and he refused to let the Tanners see the 1832 history. However, about this same time Joseph Fielding Smith relinquished the three leaves of the excised 1832 history from his private custody within his office safe and transferred it back to the regular Church Historian's collection. Then he authorized Earl E. Olson, his Assistant Church Historian, to show the newly available leaves to Paul R. Cheesman, a BYU

graduate student working on his thesis. Cheesman explained that Olson demonstrated how the pages "matched with [the] edge of the journal to prove location" in the Joseph Smith letterbook.[11] As the result of this assistance, Cheesman prepared a typescript in his 1965 BYU master's thesis on Joseph Smith's visions.[12] Later that same year Jerald Tanner and Sandra Tanner were the first to publish the text of the 1832 account, using Cheesman's imperfect transcript. Four years later Dean C. Jessee published his important article in *Brigham Young University Studies*, with an accurate transcript of the text.[13]

There are currently known to be ten contemporary accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision, written and/or published from 1832 to 1844, given in chronological order: (1) the 1832 account, which is the only one written by Joseph Smith himself; (2) the 1835 account to Robert Matthias, which describes the appearance of one personage and then soon afterward another personage, who gives an awkward third-person testimony "that Jesus Christ is the son of God"; (3) the 1835 account to Erastus Holmes, which is not really an account but just a reference to "the first visitation of Angels"; (4) the 1838–39 account, which is now accepted as LDS scripture in the Pearl of Great Price; (5) the 1842 account to John Wentworth, which included at the end the Articles of Faith; (6) the Orson Pratt report in his 1840 pamphlet *A[n] Interesting Account of Several Remarkable Visions*, which adds the detail that when Joseph saw the light descending, "he expected to have seen the leaves and boughs of the trees consumed, as soon as the light came in contact with them"; (7) the Orson Hyde report in his 1842 German pamphlet *Ein Ruf aus der Wüste* (A Cry from the Wilderness), which closely follows Pratt's pamphlet; (8) the Levi Richards report in 1843, which states that the Lord told Joseph "that the Everlasting covenant was broken"; (9) the David Nye White report in 1843, which adds the detail that he "went out into the woods where my father had a clearing, and went to the stump where I had stuck my axe when I had quit work," and then knelt down and prayed; and (10) the Alexander Neibaur report in 1844, which adds the detail that God had "blue eyes."[14]

Marvin S. Hill, a BYU history professor, states the following about the best way to analyze accounts of the First Vision: "It seems to me that everybody has approached the issue from the

wrong end, by starting with the 1838 official version, when the account they should be considering is that of 1832. Merely on the face of it, the 1832 version stands a better chance of being more accurate and unembellished than the 1838 account which was intended as a public statement, streamlined for publication."[15] Accordingly, we will here focus this examination of the First Vision on those two accounts.

I. The 1832 history is the earliest known account of the First Vision. It is unique in that it is the *only* account that was written by Joseph Smith himself. This 1832 account was put down on paper a little more than two years after the organization of the Church. The presence of the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams at the very beginning and at the end of this account dates the text to after July 20, 1832.[16] Notice that in this 1832 account, Joseph Smith makes clear that the Lord answered his prayer: "I cried unto the Lord for mercy . . . and the Lord heard my cry . . . and while in <the> attitude of calling upon the Lord . . . and the <Lord> opened the heavens upon me and I saw the Lord," though he also acknowledges that the Spirit of God filled him. Also, in the 1832 account Joseph's concern is not what church he should join, because he had already reached the conclusion that none was correct, saying "by searching the scriptures I found that mand <mankind> did not come unto the Lord but that they had apostatised from the true and liveing faith and there was no society or denomination that built upon the gospel of Jesus Christ as recorded in the new testament." There is also no mention of an evil power, as there is in several of the other accounts. This earliest account is similar to others in Methodist evangelism during the early nineteenth century, in which the individuals often had "Heavenly visions at the time of conviction and conversion."[17] The 1832 account ends with a promise of Jesus' imminent Second Coming: "lo I come quickly as it [is] written of me in the cloud <clothed> in the glory of my Father."

Concerning the 1832 account, Dan Vogel states that "the experience emerges as a personal epiphany in which Jesus appeared, forgave Joseph's sins, and declared that the sinful world would soon be destroyed."[18] In a similar way, D. Michael Quinn, after quoting from the 1832 account, says the following:

> This divine conferral of forgiveness was an immensely personal experience for young Smith, as were similar theophanies of other young seekers during the revivals in early America. . . .
>
> Joseph Jr.'s conversion experience distanced him even farther from organized clergy, yet his vision of Deity did not propel him into a religious ministry of any kind. This theophany contained no command to preach repentance or tell anyone of the experience. As a young man, he confided the experience to a few, but Smith's first vision implied no divine calling, no church, no community of believers, and certainly no ecclesiastical hierarchy. He asked forgiveness of his youthful sins in 1820, which God granted in vision.[19]

Quinn's use of the generic phrase "vision of Deity"—once in his quotation and once in the unquoted ellipsis—is permissible since in the context it refers clearly to a vision of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God. However, we must take exception to Quinn's statement that Joseph "asked forgiveness . . . which God granted in vision," since he would have been more accurate to say one of the following: "which Jesus / Jesus Christ / the Lord / the Lord Jesus Christ granted in vision."

II. The "official" account was first written in 1838 and then re-copied into the history of Joseph Smith in 1839 (hence, often referred to as 1838–39). This official version of the First Vision was published in the *Times and Season* in Nauvoo in 1842. It was later included in the important missionary compilation known as *The Pearl of Great Price*, which was published by Apostle Franklin D. Richards in 1851.[20] At the 1880 suggestion by Joseph F. Smith of the LDS First Presidency, this book was voted upon and accepted in LDS General Conference as scripture.[21] The earlier 1832 account does not appear to have been used to make the 1838–39 account, which follows:

> Just at this moment of great alarm I saw a pillar <of> light exactly over my head, above the brightness of the sun, which descended ~~gracefully~~ gradually untill it fell upon me. It no sooner appeared than I found myself delivered from the enemy which held me bound. When the light rested upon me I saw two personages <whose brightness and glory defy all description>

> standing above me in the air. One of <them> spake unto me calling me by name and said (pointing to the other) "This is my beloved Son, Hear him."[22]
>
> My object in going to inquire of the Lord was to know which of all the sects was right, that I might know which to join. No sooner therefore did I get possession of myself so as to be able to speak, than I asked the personages who stood above me in the light, which of all the sects was right (for at this time it had never entered into my heart that all were wrong)[23] and which I should join. I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong, and the Personage who addressed me said that all their Creeds were an abomination in his sight, that those professors were all corrupt, that "they draw near to me to with their lips but their hearts are far from me, They teach for doctrines the commandments of men, having a form of Godliness but they deny the power thereof." He again forbade me to join with any of them and many other thing[s] did he say unto me which I cannot write at this time.[24]

Clearly, being able to learn more of Jesus' words spoken in the First Vision would be a real boon. First-person quotations of the words of Jesus in the 1832 account amount to 145 words, while in the 1838–39 account there are only thirty-five words. The part of the 1838–39 account that is a direct quotation of Jesus is as follows: "they draw near to me to with their lips but their hearts are far from me, They teach for doctrines the commandments of men, having a form of Godliness but they deny the power thereof." The wording "they draw near to me to with their lips but their hearts are far from me" is a loose quote from Isaiah 29:13, "this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me." The wording "They teach for doctrines the commandments of men" is a quote from Matthew 15:9.[25] The wording "having a form of Godliness but they deny the power thereof" is a quote from 2 Timothy 3:5. Thus, the 1838–39 account has a single first-person quotation consisting of three separate quotes from New Testament passages, which contrasts with the much longer 1832 quote of Jesus' words. The only place where both accounts coincide is the 1838–39 quotation from

Isaiah, "they draw near to me to with their lips but their hearts are far from me," which in the 1832 account is "they draw near to me with their lips while their hearts are far from me." The 1832 account provides four times as many words from Jesus.[26] He tells the young Joseph Smith that his sins are forgiven and that he should keep his commandments; He is the Lord and was crucified for the people of the world, in order that those who believe in him may have everlasting life; the people of the world are in sin; they have turned away from the gospel and do not keep his commandments; the Lord is angry with the people of the world and will punish them for their wickedness; the Lord is coming soon—just as it is written—clothed in his Father's glory.

However, despite the availability of this account, historians have generally elided the problem of how many personages appeared to Joseph.[27] Alexander L. Baugh refers to the 1820 theophany of the Father and the Son, and then adds that in the 1835 account there were also "many angels" during the First Vision, but does not refer to the 1832 account.[28] Richard N. Skousen and W. Cleon Skousen quote from the 1835 account, the 1838–39 account, and Orson Pratt's 1840 report, but do not quote from the 1832 account.[29] Both J. Carr Smith[30] and Davis Bitton[31] quote mostly from the official 1838–39 version, but each includes one quotation from the 1832 account—without mentioning that only Jesus is mentioned in the 1832 version.

In his biography of Joseph Smith, Richard Lloyd Dewey refers to the 1832 account in his preface and even makes one small quotation from the 1832 about "seriously imprest with regard to the all important concerns for the welfare of my immortal soul." However, in the discussion of the First Vision he only quotes from the official account of 1838–39. After the extended quotation Dewey provides the following summary: "Over the years Joseph would write about his experience on six different occasions. All six accounts reflect consistency on the major facts. One truly interesting additional fact in one of his accounts is that he saw many angels in addition to the Father and the Son."[32] However, one of the "major facts" that Dewey omits is that the 1832 account only has a vision of Jesus, while all the other accounts have two personages—the Father and the Son.

Richard E. Bennett, in his book *School of the Prophet*, focuses on the years from 1820 to 1830, through the four parts of the Fourth Article of Faith. All quotations are from the 1838–39 scriptural account and various LDS authors, with the single exception of a quote from the 1832 account in a footnote in the "Repentance" chapter, without giving any indication to the reader that only Jesus is mentioned in the 1832 account.[33]

David Paulsen quotes twice from the official 1838–39 account, including the part in which God introduces Jesus with the words: "This is My Beloved Son. Hear Him." Paulsen continues: "In this revelation, Joseph conversed with God and Jesus Christ face to face as one man converses with another." In the footnote at this point Paulsen cleverly reverses the focus by commenting only on Jesus: "All extent [extant] accounts of the vision (1832, 1835, 1838, 1842, 1840, 1869, 1871, 1874, 1842, 1843, and 1844) corroborate Joseph's claim of both seeing and hearing Jesus Christ. While unified on this issue, the accounts vary in other ways." The reader is given no indication at all as to how "the accounts vary," but certainly a very important difference is that in the 1832 history Jesus is the only one mentioned.[34]

In his article on the First Vision, Larry C. Porter quotes directly from the 1832 account four times: (1) how Joseph Smith felt from the age of twelve to fifteen *before* the First Vision; (2) he "felt to mourn for my own sins and for the sins of the world"; (3) the similar statement that "I become [became] convicted of my sins"; and finally, (4) some of the words actually spoken to him during the vision: "I saw the Lord and he spake unto me saying Joseph <my son> thy sins are forgiven thee. go thy <way> walk in my statutes and keep my commandments behold I am the Lord of glory I was crucifyed for the world that all those who believe on my name may have Eternal life."[35] However, Porter immediately follows this last quotation from the 1832 account with the assertion that "As the manifestation of the Father and the Son closed before him," and thus skirts any discussion of the 1832 account having only a mention of Jesus. Also, Porter states that: "These contemporary accounts were sometimes dictated to scribes, recorded by the press, or preserved in the writings of individuals who heard his recounting of the event,"[36] but omits

from his categories the one account that was actually penned by Joseph Smith himself.

Heidi S. Swinton, in the *American Prophet: Joseph Smith,* published by Deseret Book's imprint Shadow Mountain, quotes from the 1832 account two times, without a mention of the difference between the earliest account and all other accounts of the First Vision concerning how many people appeared to Joseph Smith.[37]

In a similar way, consider how official LDS Church literature handles this earliest account. In the lesson manual for the priesthood and the Relief Society for the 2008–2009 year, which is entitled *Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith*, there are four separate quotations made directly from the 1832 account of the First Vision: in the introductory "Life and Ministry of Joseph Smith" there are two short quotes about his early life *before* the First Vision; in chapter 1, which is entitled "The First Vision: The Father and the Son Appear to Joseph Smith," there is one long quote of two paragraphs describing events immediately *before* the actual First Vision, followed by the summary statement that "in answer to his prayer, Heavenly Father and Jesus Christ appeared to him."[38] In chapter 2, which is entitled "God the Eternal Father," there is another long quote of two paragraphs, providing details leading up to just *before* the First Vision, followed by the assertion that "in the First Vision, Joseph learned for himself that the Father and the Son are individual beings."[39] LDS readers of this manual are given absolutely no indication that the 1832 account only describes a vision of Jesus—not the Father and the Son together.

Discussion of the Number of People Appearing in the First Vision

Since the most serious historical problem with the 1832 account is the mention of only the Lord Jesus and not both the Father and the Son, this last category includes those who acknowledge the problem of the number of people seen in the vision, and sometimes offer an explanation out of the difficulty.

Hartt Wixom admits that a problem in the different accounts of the First Vision is that "only Christ is mentioned in the first account, while both Christ and God are referred to" in the other

accounts. He then offers the explanation that "it is possible Joseph focused in the initial version on the one person who talked to him, Christ, since it was he who told Joseph to 'walk in my statutes' and 'keep my commandments.' Joseph did not say that God didn't appear to him."[40] Wixom is correct that Jesus is "the one person who talked to him" and the 1832 account does not mention God the Father introducing his Son. However, it does not appear to be a very strong point for Wixom to state that "Joseph did not say that God didn't appear to him," since one would not expect Joseph to mention who was *not* seen in the vision.

Matthew B. Brown wrote a 268-page book on the various accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision, but concerning the crucial question of whether Joseph saw one personage (as stated in the 1832 account) or two personages (as stated in the other accounts), Brown makes only the following formal statement: "The Most High God is not described as making an appearance alongside His Son in the theophany portion of the 1832 First Vision account."[41]

Richard L. Bushman begins by simply asserting that in the First Vision Joseph saw "the Father and the Son" and then he quotes the 1832 account nine times concerning its unique information, intermixed with quotations from two other sources (the 1835 and the 1838–39 accounts). Bushman states that Joseph "had two questions on his mind: which church was right, and how to be saved," but actually the 1832 account makes clear that Joseph had already concluded that "there was no society or denomination that built upon the gospel of Jesus Christ," and he was seeking forgiveness for his sins. With respect to the problem of the 1832 account mentioning only Jesus, Bushman says the following:

> In his first narrative, Joseph said only that he saw the Lord in the light and heard His words of forgiveness. In 1835, he said that first one personage appeared and then another. In 1838, he reported that the first pointed to the other and said, "This is my beloved Son, Hear him."[42]

Bushman simply states the differences in the number of personages mentioned in the accounts, and provides no further help out of the difficulty.

Matthew Bowman mentions the three manuscript accounts of 1832, 1835, and 1838, and states that the First Vision "was a personal vision in a visionary age, the experience that confirmed to him that God was offering him salvation." Bowman acknowledges that the earliest account has only one person that appeared to Joseph Smith and the later accounts have two personages. Bowman quotes a short section from the 1832 account: "I was filled with the spirit of god and the Lord opened the heavens . . . and he spake to me saying Joseph my Son thy sins are forgiven thee." Inexplicably, Bowman writes that this is God the Father who appeared to the young Joseph Smith, and that in his later recounting of the vision, Joseph Smith "expanded his account" by introducing "the presence of Christ as well."[43] Bowman's error seems to have been caused either by his not having carefully read further in the 1832 account or the haste with which the book was written, because the Lord continues by saying: "I was crucifyed for the world that all those who believe on my name may have Eternal life," making clear that it is the Lord Jesus Christ who is speaking.

James B. Allen and John W. Welch discuss the problem of why the 1832 account only mentions the Lord Jesus Christ, when they believe that Joseph saw both Jesus Christ and God the Father. They suggest that:

> Because the 1832 account does not say that two beings were present in the vision, some people have wondered, Did Joseph Smith see two personages or one? Did he alter his story as time went on? . . . [the 1832 account] actually suggests that the vision progressed in two stages: first, Joseph "was filled with the spirit of god and the <Lord> opened the heavens upon me," and second he "saw the Lord and he spake unto me." The second stage clearly refers to Jesus Christ, who identifies himself as the one who was crucified. Though not explicitly stated, the initial mention of the Spirit of God and the Lord may have reference to the presence of God the Father and his opening of this vision, since it is clear in all the other accounts that the vision was opened by God who then introduced his Son.[44]

However, there is nothing in the syntax of the statement "the Lord opened the heavens upon me and I saw the Lord" to suggest that two different individuals are being implied. *If* the statement had said "the Almighty opened the heavens upon me and I saw Jesus," or "God opened the heavens upon me and I saw the Savior," then we would have a real mention of the Father and the Son. Furthermore, the word "Lord" does not occur just these two times; there are eight instances of "Lord" in the 1832 account, and they all refer to Jesus Christ. Allen and Welch also state that "if David could use the word 'Lord' in Psalm 110:1, 'The Lord said to my Lord,' to refer first to the Father and then to the Son (see Mark 12:36), so could Joseph."[45] However, when one examines the original Hebrew text of Psalm 110:1, it becomes clear that completely different words are used in the Hebrew text of this passage. Even the English translation of the King James Version for Psalms 110:1 provides a full-caps "LORD" for the first and a lower-case "Lord" for the second, which correctly translates the sacred Hebrew tetragrammaton "YHWH" or "YAHWEH" of the first and the Hebrew "Adonai" of the second. Thus, the Allen and Welch arguments fail on both counts.

Steven C. Harper provides the complete text of all ten of the contemporary accounts of the First Vision and he quotes eighteen times from the 1832 account. Concerning the question of how many people appeared in the First Vision, he makes the following statement, which is similar to the interpretation of Allen and Welch seven years earlier:

> The distinction between the 1832 account's apparent reference to only one being—the Lord—and the 1838's unequivocal assertion of two beings has led some to wonder and others to criticize Joseph for changing his story. But it may be that we just need to listen more carefully to Joseph tell the story. It may be that we have assumed that we understood his meaning before we did.
>
> . . . Moreover, because the 1835 account and two of the secondary statements assert that Joseph saw one being who then revealed the other, we could interpret the 1832 account to mean that Joseph saw one being who then revealed another while referring

> to both beings as "the Lord": "the <Lord> opened the heavens upon me and I saw the Lord." We cannot be sure but it seems plausible that Joseph struggled in 1832 to know just what to call the divine personages.[46]

Harper's effort to interpret the presence of two individuals in the vision of the 1832 account—when the text uses "Lord" twice—fails to convince for the same reasons as stated above concerning Allen and Welch's demonstrable misinterpretation of the 110th Psalm.

The most recent discussion of "First Vision Accounts" appeared on the LDS Church's website lds.org in December 2013, written by unnamed LDS scholars, with oversight from unspecified LDS general authorities. First of all, it must be acknowledged that this is an astonishing and refreshing display of openness and it is most commendable that the LDS Church has allowed this discussion. The LDS website states that "critics have argued that Joseph Smith started out reporting to have seen one being—'the Lord'—and ended up claiming to have seen both the Father and the Son." The website suggests that the 1832 account "can be read to refer to one or two personages." I disagree that it can be understood to refer to either one or two individuals, but let's look at their argument. If it is only one person, then "it would likely be to the personage who forgave his sins." That is correct, but the word "likely" should be strengthened to "certainly"—since the heavenly being described himself as follows: "behold I am the Lord of glory I was crucifyed for the world." This is clearly Jesus Christ. Then, if the 1832 account is read in such a way as to refer to two individuals, the LDS website proposes the following: "Note that the two references to 'Lord' are separated in time; first 'the Lord' opens the heavens; then Joseph Smith sees 'the Lord.'" This is the same interpretation suggested by Allen and Welch in 2005 and continued by Harper in 2012. The anonymous writers on the LDS website rightly dropped the misinterpretation of Psalms 110, but it is still a very strained interpretation to get two personages out of two occurrences of the word "Lord"—and it is rejected by Richard L. Bushman, Mike Quinn, Dan Vogel,

Matthew B. Brown, Hartt Wixom, and Matthew Bowman—all agreeing that the 1832 account has only one divine personage mentioned in the vision.

The Transformation of the First Vision in the Twentieth Century

During the nineteenth century, Joseph Smith's First Vision was not emphasized among either members or missionaries. The extensive diaries of Robert Harris Fife provide insight into an LDS missionary serving in the Southern States Mission during the last decade of the nineteenth century.[47] Certainly the most popular LDS missionary book that Fife lent, or sold, or discussed with people during his mission was Parley P. Pratt's *Voice of Warning*, which he mentions nine times. This was originally published by Parley in 1837. His brother and fellow apostle Orson Pratt was the first to publish in 1840 an account of Joseph Smith's First Vision. However, when Parley quoted from his brother's 1840 book in a later edition of his own *Voice of Warning*, he skipped the First Vision part and started with the angel of God revealing the whereabouts of the Book of Mormon plates in the Hill Cumorah near Palmyra, New York. Consequently, the very popular *Voice of Warning* contains nothing about the First Vision of Joseph Smith.[48] It was certainly read and understood by LDS missionaries in the 1890s, even if it was by modern standards somewhat neglected. Fife was conscientious in listing the actual subjects of the informal conversations in homes, in public sermons, and during missionary conferences, either given by Fife or by his fellow LDS missionaries. He recorded in his diaries some fifty-six topics of discussion, but never specifically the "First Vision."

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the Joseph Smith story (which included the First Vision) began to be used in Sunday School texts, in priesthood manuals, in a separate missionary tract, and in B. H. Roberts's multi-volume *History of the Church*—all while Joseph F. Smith was president of the LDS Church.[49] As an added illustration of how drastically things have changed during the twentieth century, an analysis was made in

the late 1970s of LDS quotations of the four Mormon scriptural books—the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price—and the final list was limited to the 1,000 most popular verses among the Mormons. In this list the First Vision was the fourth-most-quoted passage.[50] During the last four decades of the twentieth century, all missionaries in every mission, in every language, were required to present the official version of Joseph Smith's First Vision, which would have certainly given a huge boost to members' familiarity with that version.

A typical modern testimony about the importance of Joseph Smith's First Vision was given by Gordon B. Hinckley, who was president of the LDS Church for almost thirteen years: "Joseph Smith saw the Father and the Son in the Sacred Grove where we stood yesterday. It happened. It was real. If the First Vision occurred, then everything else in connection with the restoration occurred also."[51] The current president, Thomas S. Monson, has also said: "The Father and the Son, Jesus Christ, had appeared to Joseph Smith. The morning of the dispensation of the fulness of times had come, dispelling the darkness of the long generation of spiritual night."[52]

That the earliest written account of the First Vision of Joseph Smith (and the *only* one in Joseph's own handwriting) records only the visit of the Lord Jesus is gradually entering into Mormons' awareness. Thomas Stuart Ferguson, who previously had been a traditional Mormon literalist, admitted in December 1970 that his faith was devastated when "the strange accounts" of the First Vision were published by Paul R. Cheesman and Dean C. Jessee, for "they had plucked all the feathers out of the bird and shot it, and there it lies 'dead and naked on the ground.'"[53]

A very different reaction is provided by the liberal point of view that makes no distinction between actual fact and symbolic myth. This more optimistic approach was taken by Leonard J. Arrington, who said the following concerning the First Vision:

> Because of my introduction to the concept of symbolism as a means of expressing religious truth, I was never preoccupied with the question of the historicity of the First Vision—though

> the evidence is overwhelming that it did occur—or of the many reported epiphanies in Mormon, Christian, and Hebrew history, I am prepared to accept them as historical or metaphorical, as symbolical or as precisely what happened. That they convey religious truth is the essential issue, and of this I have never had any doubt.[54]

Personal Epilogue

I, personally, like the approach of combining all the details of the various First Vision accounts into an interesting mosaic. However, that approach does not adequately address the question of whether one or two divine personages appeared. When I examined the Joseph Smith Papers Project volume containing the 1832 account, I was impressed by the care and detail of the preparation of the "Historical Introduction," "Source Note," and footnotes, but I was shocked by the absence of discussion of the problems introduced by the account with respect to the number of persons who appeared to Joseph, and the historical efforts to avoid those problems by suppressing the 1832 version. I talked on the phone to each of the editors, but none was willing to comment on *why* the leaves were excised from the 1830s ledger. Consequently, I felt the need to write this article. I was born a Mormon and I will die a Mormon. I was taught and believed—and still believe—that we should not be afraid of the truth, and always keep searching for the truth. Since the 1832 version is not only the earliest, but also the only one actually written by Joseph Smith, I regard it as the most reliable.

Notes

1. George Manwaring, "Joseph Smith's First Prayer," *Hymns of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985), hymn #26.

2. This later addition to the text is in the handwriting of the scribe, Frederick G. Williams.

3. Karen Lynn Davidson, David J. Whittaker, Mark Ashurst-McGee, and Richard L. Jensen, eds., *Joseph Smith Histories, 1832–1844*, first volume of the Histories series of The Joseph Smith Papers, edited by Dean C. Jessee, Ronald K. Esplin, and Richard Lyman Bushman (Salt Lake City: The Church Historian's Press, 2012) (*JSP*, H1), 11–13. The First Vision part of this early historical account (which is quoted here) is in the handwriting of Joseph Smith, but the material before and after this is in the handwriting of his scribe, Frederick G. Williams. As an indication of how valuable this 1832 account really is, a comparison could be made of the record of the visit of the angel who told Joseph Smith about the Book of Mormon plates. Early newspaper sources from 1829 to 1831 merely refer to an "angel," an "angel of light," a "spirit," or a "ghost," without any proper name being attached to the personage. Later LDS sources state either that the angel's name was Nephi (in earlier accounts) or Moroni (in later accounts). Joseph Smith in the 1832 account stated that the angel "revealed unto me that in the Town of Manchester Ontario County N.Y. there was plates of gold upon which there was engravings which was engraven by Maroni & his fathers"—thus "Maroni" is a third-person reference and not the name of the angel who was speaking to Joseph.

4. *JSP*, H1, 3–4.

5. Ibid., 5–6.

6. Ibid., 13.

7. Robin Jensen, lead archivist for The Joseph Smith Papers Project, confirmed in an informal telephone conversation on December 20, 2012, that this is a plausible scenario.

8. When Joseph Fielding Smith became president of the LDS Church in 1970, the personal safe in his office was moved into the First Presidency's walk-in vault. The exact time that the 1832 account was put into the Joseph Fielding Smith office safe and the date that he showed the history to Levi Edgar Young would probably be found in the Joseph Fielding Smith Collection, catalogued as Ms 4250 at the Church History Library Archives. On December 11, 2012 the writer sent to Richard E. Turley a written request for permission to read the diaries (either photocopies or microfilm) of Joseph Fielding Smith from 1930 to 1954, but this request was denied.

9. Jerald Tanner and Sandra Tanner, *Joseph Smith's Strange Account of the First Vision; Also a Critical Study of the First Vision* (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Co., [1965]), 4, with the quotation being based on notes made by Petersen of the interview with Levi Edgar Young. Emphasis is in the original, but that emphasis is probably due to the Tanners, who added the full caps and underlining.

Levi Edgar Young was wrong about the date of the "Strange" account of the First Vision, since we now know that it was written in 1832, not 1837 or 1838.

10. LaMar Petersen, *The Creation of the Book of Mormon: A Historical Inquiry* (Salt Lake City: Freethinker Press, 2000), xii. Petersen gave the year as 1952, instead of February 3, 1953. Since he had six separate sessions with Levi Edgar Young, these meetings could have covered late 1952 as well as early 1953. The other option is that the 1952 date is an error in the memory of the nonagenarian Petersen.

11. Paul R. Cheesman, "An Analysis of the Accounts Relating Joseph Smith's Early Visions" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1965), 126. Cheesman thought that this six-page account was written about 1833. In a telephone conversation with the writer on December 15, 2012, his widow, Millie Foster Cheesman, stated that in contrast to the complete restriction placed on Fawn M. Brodie (a niece of President David O. McKay), Cheesman was given full access, allowing him to transcribe the 1832 account of the First Vision.

12. Two decades later Cheesman published his thesis as a hardback book, *The Keystone of Mormonism: Early Visions of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Provo: Eagle Systems International, 1988).

13. Dean C. Jessee, "The Early Accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision," *Brigham Young University Studies* 9 (Spring 1969): 275–94.

14. Dean C. Jessee, "The Earliest Documented Accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision," in John W. Welch with Erick B. Carlson, eds., *Opening the Heavens: Accounts of Divine Manifestations, 1820–1844* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2005), 1–33. See also James B. Allen, "Eight Contemporary Accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision: What Do We Learn from Them?" *The Improvement Era* 73 (April 1970): 4–13; Allen had a total of eight accounts, because he was not aware of the report in the Levi Richards journal and he correctly ignored the short "account" to Erastus Holmes, which is really a one-sentence reference to the First Vision.

15. Marvin S. Hill, "The First Vision Controversy: A Critique and Reconciliation," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15 (Summer 1982): 39.

16. Milton V. Backman Jr., *Joseph Smith's First Vision: Confirming Evidences and Contemporary Accounts* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1971), stated that the 1832 account was in the handwriting of the scribe—not Joseph Smith. However, Dean C. Jessee, in "How Lovely Was the Morning," review of *Joseph Smith's First Vision* by Milton V. Backman, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 6 (Spring 1971): 86, pointed out Backman's error, since Joseph Smith wrote the main part of this account. In the second edition of his book, *Joseph Smith's First Vision:*

Confirming Evidences and Contemporary Accounts, 2nd ed. rev. and enl. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1980), unnumbered "Corrections" page after 227, Backman acknowledged this oversight.

17. Christopher C. Jones, "The Power and Form of Godliness: Methodist Conversion Narratives and Joseph Smith's First Vision," *Journal of Mormon History* 37, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 90, citing a number of contemporary vision accounts.

18. Dan Vogel, *Joseph Smith: The Making of a Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2004), 30.

19. D. Michael Quinn, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View*, 2nd ed., rev. and enl. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2009), 137.

20. Franklin L. West, *Life of Franklin D. Richards: President of the Council of the Twelve Apostles, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1924), 120.

21. From 1880 to 1902, the Pearl of Great Price also included the poem, "Truth," later entitled "O Say, What Is Truth?" which was written by John Jaques, an English convert who joined the LDS Church in 1845 and served as a young missionary at Stratford-upon-Avon, where he wrote the poem. He immigrated with his family to America in 1856 and crossed the plains with the ill-fated Martin Handcart Company, with his daughter being among those who died. Jaques returned to England as a missionary from 1869 to 1871, and then later worked at the Church Historian's Office. He must have felt proud that his poem "Truth" (which had appeared in the first edition of *The Pearl of Great Price* in 1851) became part of the official LDS scripture in 1880 and continued in that status for the last twenty years of his life. However, H. Donl Peterson, in *The Pearl of Great Price: A History and Commentary* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1987), 23, points out that James E. Talmage "deleted" the poem from Mormon scripture in the 1902 edition of the Pearl of Great Price.

22. The words "This is my beloved Son, hear him" are an exact quotation of Mark 9:7 and Luke 9:35, when God spoke from heaven to Peter, James, and John at the transfiguration of Jesus.

23. Draft 3 of the history has the following parenthetical statement: "(for I supposed that one of them were so.)" See *JSP*, H1, 215.

24. Draft 2 of the same history in *JSP,* H1, 214. There are only minor changes to Joseph Smith—History 1:16–20, in the Pearl of Great Price.

25. Mark 7:7 has the same text.

26. For a modern study of the ancient sources about Jesus, see Robert E. Van Voorst, *Jesus outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000).

27. This ignores the following individuals who in discussing the First Vision *only* quote or refer to the official account in the Pearl of Great Price: Leon R. Hartshorn, *Joseph Smith: Prophet of the Restoration* (Provo: Spring Creek Book Company, 2004), 5; W. Jeffrey Marsh, *Joseph Smith: The Prophet of the Restoration* (Springville, Utah: CFI, 2005), 16, 44; Susan Easton Black, *Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet*, Setting the Record Straight Series (Orem, Utah: Millennial Press, 2007), 21–22; Scot Facer Proctor, *A Day Like No Other: Joseph Smith and the First Vision* (Fairfax Station, Va.: Meridian Publishing, 2009); and Christopher Kimball Bigelow and Jonathan Langford, *The Latter-day Saint Family Encyclopedia* (San Diego: Thunder Bay Press, 2010), 114.

28. Alexander L. Baugh, "Parting the Veil: Joseph Smith's Seventy-six Documented Visionary Experiences," in *Opening the Heavens: Accounts of Divine Manifestations, 1820–1844*, edited by John W. Welch with Erick B. Carlson (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2005), 268, 279.

29. Richard N. Skousen and W. Cleon Skousen, *Brother Joseph: Seer of a New Dispensation* (Orem, Utah: Verity Publishing, 2004), 40–44.

30. J. Carr Smith, *A Grove of My Own: Understanding Your Life's Mission* (Springville, Utah: CFI, 2006), xi–xii, 1–3, 7.

31. Davis Bitton, *Knowing Brother Joseph Again: Perceptions and Perspectives* (Salt Lake City: Kofford Books, 2011), 17–18, 33, and 61.

32. Richard Lloyd Dewey, *Joseph Smith: A Biography* (Arlington, Va.: Stratford Books, 2005), 12–16.

33. Richard E. Bennett, *School of the Prophet: Joseph Smith Learns the First Principles, 1820–1830* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2010), 139*n*4, quoting Jesus' statement "Joseph thy Sins are forgiven thee, go thy way [and] walk in my statutes and keep my commandments."

34. David Paulsen, "Joseph Smith Challenges the Theological World," in *The Worlds of Joseph Smith: A Bicentennial Conference at the Library of Congress*, edited by John W. Welch (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2006), 181, 205*n*18.

35. Larry C. Porter, "The Youth of the Grove and the Prophet of the Restoration," in *Joseph: Exploring the Life and Ministry of the Prophet*, edited by Susan Easton Black and Andrew C. Skinner (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005), 36, 38, and 40.

36. Ibid., 41.

37. Heidi S. Swinton, *American Prophet: The Story of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Shadow Mountain, 1999), 36, footnotes 4 and 8.

38. *Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2007), 2–3, 28. Stephen C. Taysom, in "Approaching the First Vision Saga," *Sunstone* 163 (June 2011): 22, incorrectly states that the chapter of this manual on the First Vision "contains only material from the canonical 1838 version."

39. Ibid., 37–38.

40. Hartt Wixom, *Critiquing the Critics of Joseph Smith* (Springville, Utah: CFI, 2005), 78–79. Wixom, in *Critiquing*, 76, states that Frederick G. Williams is the scribe of the earliest account, instead of Joseph Smith himself.

41. Matthew B. Brown, *A Pillar of Light: The History and Message of the First Vision* (American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, Inc., 2009), 92.

42. Richard Lyman Bushman, with the assistance of Jed Woodworth, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 35–40.

43. Matthew Bowman, *The Mormon People: The Making of an American Faith* (New York: Random House, 2012), 13.

44. James B. Allen and John W. Welch, "The Appearance of the Father and the Son to Joseph Smith in 1820s," in *Opening the Heavens: Accounts of Divine Manifestations, 1820–1844*, edited by John W. Welch with Erick B. Carlson (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2005), 63–64. In the ellipsis Allen and Welch point out that eight of the accounts mention two personages, but it is not a question of counting the different accounts, but rather looking at them in chronological order—especially the earliest and the only one written by Joseph Smith himself.

45. Ibid., 74*n*27.

46. Steven C. Harper, *Joseph Smith's First Vision: A Guide to the Historical Accounts* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2012), 90–91. Later in his book (112), Harper refers again to his strained interpretation that these two occurrences of the word "Lord" in the same sentence might perhaps refer to "two separate heavenly beings."

47. The three original diaries of Robert Harris Fife were lost for over fifty years, but fortunately found and donated to Utah State University in June 2009. See Mss 355, Box 1, Special Collections, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

48. James B. Allen, "The Significance of Joseph Smith's 'First Vision' in Mormon Thought," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 1, no. 3 (Autumn 1966): 33.

49. Kathleen Flake, "Re-Placing Memory: Latter-day Saint Use of Historical Monuments and Narrative in the Early Twentieth Century," in Stephen C. Taysom, ed., *Dimensions of Faith: A Mormon Studies Reader* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2011), 231.

50. Kay Briggs, *Most Quoted Scriptures of the Standard Works of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Orem, Utah: Raymont Publishers, 1980), 371, with the specific verse being Joseph Smith—History 1:17.

51. Gordon B. Hinckley, *Teachings of Gordon B. Hinckley* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1997), 227. President Hinckley also made the following statement in the October 2002 General Conference: "That is the way I feel about it. Our whole strength rests on the validity of that vision. It either occurred or it did not occur. If it did not, then this work is a fraud. If it did, then it is the most important and wonderful work under the heavens," *Ensign* 32 (November 2002).

52. Thomas S. Monson, *A Prophet's Voice: Messages from Thomas S. Monson* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2012), 477.

53. Jerald Tanner, Letter to Dee Jay Nelson, December 18, 1970, quoted in the writer's *Quest for the Gold Plates: Thomas Stuart Ferguson's Archaeological Quest for the Book of Mormon*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Freethinker Press in association with Smith Research Associates, 2004), 142.

54. Leonard J. Arrington, "Why I Am a Believer," in Philip L. Barlow, comp. and ed., *A Thoughtful Faith: Essays on Belief by Mormon Scholars* (Centerville, Utah: Canon Press, 1986), 230.