

TEXTUAL CRITICISM, THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS, AND ADONIRAM JUDSON'S BURMESE NEW TESTAMENTS

John de Jong
Laidlaw College

Tim Meadowcroft was one of my doctoral supervisors, forming a great team with Allan Bell. For the entire duration of my doctoral candidacy I was living in Yangon, Myanmar, visiting New Zealand once a year for supervision meetings. In one of these early meetings, Tim said to me, “I finally understand you! You just love beaver away at this technical work.” With a nod in that direction it is a privilege to offer this article in honour of Tim on his retirement. It is serendipitous that this collection of articles for Tim is in a Baptist publication, for mine concerns that most celebrated of Baptists, Adoniram Judson, the pioneering missionary to Myanmar (Burma). Judson’s translation of the entire Bible into Burmese, completed in 1840, remains the most widely used version in modern day Myanmar, a veritable “textus receptus.” This article will look at Judson’s translation of the NT into Burmese and consider its relationship with *the* Textus Receptus.

When Adoniram Judson had finished his translation of the entire Bible into Burmese, a project which had taken from 1816 to 1840, he sent some copies to the USA with a covering letter that included these words:

In my first attempts at translating portions of the New Testament, above twenty years ago, I followed Griesbach, as all the world then did; and though, from year to year, I have found reason to distrust his authority, still not wishing to be ever changing, I deviated but little from his text, in subsequent editions, until the last; in preparing which I have followed the text of Knapp, (though not implicitly,) as upon the whole the safest and best extant; in consequence of which, the present Burmese version of the New Testament accords more nearly with the received English.¹

In his analysis of the Judson Bible, James W. Khong independently concluded that Judson’s NT variant choices “go together with (the) KJV.”² My previous research on the Judson Bible focused on his OT translation and textual criticism, demonstrating that Judson exploited the best international scholarship of his time to produce a sophisticated version of the OT in Burmese. His reading of Ps 92.10b, “you (God) have poured over me fresh oil” (NRSV), for example, only entered English versions with the RSV

¹ Adoniram Judson. “Letter, Dec. 28, 1840,” *The Baptist Missionary Magazine* 21, no. 6 (1841): 186.

² James W. Khong, “Presenting the Gospel Message to the Modern Burmans: Through Scriptural Translations” (MA Miss. Dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary School of World Mission, 1992), 87. Khong’s thesis is a valuable analysis of three Burmese Bible translations by a native Myanmar speaker with reference to modern translation theory.

in 1952.³ Yet, by his own testimony, Judson moved away from the best available scholarship for his final NT translation. This article will pursue three questions in relation to the issues raised above:

1. What are the differences between the final and earlier editions of Judson's Burmese NT?
2. How do Judson's earlier and final NT editions compare with modern English versions as opposed to the KJV ("the received English" in the letter above)?
3. Finally, and most difficult to answer, why was Judson suspicious of Griesbach's critical editions of the Greek NT?

To answer these questions, I have compared Judson's 1832 NT edition with his final 1840 NT edition.⁴ The 1840 NT translation is still the most commonly used Burmese version to this day, although spelling was standardised in subsequent editions. For this research I have used an 1866 publication.⁵ Griesbach's critical Greek NT is available on BibleWorks 10.⁶ Unfortunately I have not had access to "Knapp's text" in order to see to what extent the changes in the 1840 edition, from the 1832 edition, were based on Knapp, but this does not hinder my analysis.

METHODOLOGY

To get a comprehensive answer to the differences between the 1832 and 1840 Burmese NT editions would require line by line analysis of both texts. But this demands too much effort and time, certainly more than my present questions require. Instead, I have made use of the NRSV's text critical notes, which are more generous than most modern English versions. I have gone through the NRSV NT and compared the variant readings it highlights with the KJV, the Judson 1832 and 1840 editions, all the time keeping an eye on Griesbach's critical Greek NT. This methodology cannot claim to give a comprehensive analysis of the two Judson NT editions and there are almost certainly other differences between the two versions, based on text critical decisions, beyond those I have identified. Nevertheless, my methodology is sufficient to answer the questions, and has also shed light upon why Judson was suspicious of Griesbach's critical NT texts.

Any hope I might have had that the earlier version of Judson's NT might resemble our modern versions was quickly dashed. The 1832 edition is more similar to the KJV than to modern NT versions. This is because Griesbach's critical Greek NT was still largely similar to the Textus Receptus. The breakthroughs in NT textual criticism that produced our modern NT versions were to come in the late 19th century, and Griesbach was yet a child of the late 18th century. Nevertheless, he was a seminal figure and those later breakthroughs built upon his thorough ground-breaking work.

³ See John Hans de Jong, "A 19th Century New England Exegete Abroad: Adoniram Judson and the Burmese Bible" *HTR* (forthcoming, 2019).

⁴ *The New Testament, in Burmese*. (Maulmein, 1832).

https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=UylKAAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

⁵ *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; Translated into the Burmese from the Original Greek*. (Rangoon: American Baptist Mission Press, 1866.) <https://books.google.com.mm/books?id=y2lpAAAACAAJ>

⁶ Johann Jakob Griesbach. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Manual Edition*. 1805. On BibleWorks – Version 10.0.8.498.

THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS AND GRIESBACH'S GREEK NT

In 1516, Desiderus Erasmus of Rotterdam published the first edition of his Greek NT.⁷ After the invention of the printing press, Erasmus' Greek NT was not the first to be printed, an honour which went to the Complutensian Polyglot (1514).⁸ The Complutensian Polyglot was a better critical Greek NT than that of Erasmus but it was Erasmus' text that became the standard Greek NT for Reformation and Protestant scholarship, the "Textus Receptus." Bruce Metzger paints Erasmus' NT in the worst possible terms. It was hurriedly put together, was based upon inferior Greek texts, and constitutes a "debased form of the Greek Testament."⁹ While not disputing the substandard character of Erasmus' NT, Robert Hull gives some mitigating factors,

Had he (Erasmus) been given more time and expended more effort to gather manuscripts, he could have produced a better text (by today's standards) than what he did produce – but only marginally so, for the science of textual criticism was not far enough advanced to prepare him to make the judgments needed, even if he had been able to acquire many more ancient manuscripts."¹⁰

Erasmus' NT was reproduced in influential editions in the sixteenth century by Robert Estienne, known as Stephanus (1546, 1549, 1550, 1551), and Théodore de Bèze (Beza), Calvin's successor at Geneva, who reproduced Erasmus' NT in ten editions from 1565-1611 (one posthumous). Both of these scholars engaged in textual analysis, but they only made annotations to Erasmus' text rather than producing their own, in this way bolstering the authority of Erasmus' NT.¹¹ Its authoritative status as the "received text", Textus Receptus, came from the preface to the second edition published by the Elzevir brothers in Leiden (1633), claiming that "[the reader has] the text which is now received by all, in which we give nothing changed or corrupted."¹² This marketing strategy has had far reaching effects, with the status of Erasmus' NT as the Textus Receptus evoking powerful religious convictions, even to the present era.¹³

⁷ The following account draws heavily on Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005): Chapter 3, "The Pre-critical Period: The Origin and Dominance of the Textus Receptus", 137–164; and Chapter 4, "The Modern Period: From Griesbach to the Present," 165–194. I will, however, refer to Metzger in the body of the essay as these historical sections have been largely reproduced from Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.)

⁸ The Complutensian Polyglot was not published, however, until 1522, after it received the papal imprimatur in 1520, "by which time it had been 'scooped' by the edition of Erasmus." Robert F. Hull, Jr. *The Story of the New Testament Text: Movers, Materials, Motives, Methods, and Models* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 36.

⁹ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 149.

¹⁰ Hull, *New Testament Text*, 37–38.

¹¹ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 149–152.

¹² *Ibid.*, 152.

¹³ See, e.g., the YouTube video entitled, "The NIV is a fake Bible" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dS-tlgZ0PvI> accessed 11/09/18. Similarly <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lr-onxCHaLE> "NIV (do you use the New International Version NIV?)" accessed 11/09/18. These video presentations condemn the NIV because it departs from the Textus Receptus.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, scholars made great progress in collecting variant readings from the NT manuscripts, but these efforts were routinely condemned as attacks on the sacred text. John Mill's collection of 30,000 variant readings, for example, was attacked by Daniel Whitby as undermining the authority of scripture and "tantamount to tampering with the text."¹⁴ A new stage in NT textual criticism began with Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687–1752), who established that the reliability of manuscripts lies not in how many there are, but in the quality of the manuscript. He assessed the reliability of NT manuscripts by distinguishing two groups of texts: Asiatic, from Constantinople and its environs, and African – divided into two, represented by codex Alexandrinus and the Old Latin. Bengel also formulated the idea that the difficult reading is preferred to the easy reading. For his pioneering work he was attacked as an enemy of the faith.¹⁵ Johann Salomo Semler (1725–91) further refined Bengel's methodology, classifying NT manuscripts into three major groups.¹⁶

Johann Griesbach (1745–1812) built upon this work, and Metzger credits him with having "laid foundations for all subsequent work on the Greek text of the New Testament."¹⁷ Griesbach further refined both the groups of texts – Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine – and text-critical theory with his fifteen canons of textual criticism.¹⁸ In addition to Griesbach's contribution to the development of NT textual criticism, he was the first to change the text itself, rather than making annotations to the Textus Receptus, as previous textual critics had done.¹⁹ His Greek NT editions were published at Halle 1775–77, Halle and London 1796–1806; Leipzig 1803–07, and editions were also published in England, Scotland and America.²⁰

The first Greek NT to be printed in the USA was the Textus Receptus, in Massachusetts in 1800.²¹ Griesbach's critical Greek NT, however, was not far behind, being introduced to a burgeoning American biblical scholarship by the forerunner of the New England biblical studies movement, Joseph Stevens Buckminster. Amongst a library of 3000 volumes that he brought back from Europe were Griesbach's works on New Testament textual criticism. Buckminster had Griesbach's 1794 "manual" edition of the Greek NT printed in New England, under the auspices of Harvard University, in 1809.²² Such was their commitment to rigorous scholarship that Griesbach's text was accepted above the Textus Receptus by the New England scholars, who formed the heart of the nineteenth century American biblical studies movement. It was Griesbach's NT text that Adoniram Judson pored over for many years as he translated

¹⁴ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 152–158. Quotation, 155. Consider also the title of Leonard Twell's response to Daniel Mace's NT which had extensive text-critical annotations: *A Critical Examination of the last New Testament and Version of the New Testament: wherein the Editor's Corrupt Text, False Version, and fallacious Notes are Detected and Censur'd* (London, 1731–32). Cited in Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 158.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 158–160.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 161–162.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 165.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 165–167. See further, Hull, *New Testament Text*, 72–75.

¹⁹ Hull, *New Testament Text*, 74.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 167.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 164.

²² Jerry Wayne Brown, *The Rise of Biblical Criticism in America, 1800–1870: The New England Scholars* (Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969), 23–24. The "manual" edition was Griesbach's Greek NT with abridged text-critical notes.

the NT into Burmese. But, as his letter reveals, Judson harboured suspicions over Griesbach's text and eventually abandoned it in favour of George Christian Knapp's critical Greek NT.

COMPARING JUDSON'S 1832, 1840 AND MODERN NEW TESTAMENTS

Analysis of Judson's 1832 and 1840 editions is presented in four categories. It must be noted, however, that compared with the 36 instances discussed below, I observed a further 227 times in which both the 1832 and 1840 editions agree with the KJV, over and against the NRSV. This shows how similar Griesbach's NT is to the Textus Receptus.

1. Variants Followed in the 1832 Edition But Not the 1840 Edition, Based on Griesbach's Text, Adopted in Most Modern New Testaments

This first section identifies passages in the 1832 edition where Judson followed Griesbach over and against the Textus Receptus, decisions which have stood the test of time and are followed by most modern versions. Judson then rejected these variant readings and followed the readings found in the Textus Receptus for his final 1840 edition.

Matthew 6:13 "For the kingdom and the power and the glory are yours forever. Amen." Like the NRSV and most modern English versions, the concluding doxology to the Lord's Prayer is omitted from the 1832 edition, but reappears in the 1840 edition.

Matthew 6:18 "...your Father who sees you in secret will reward you (openly)." Most modern NTs omit "openly", as does the 1832 edition, but it reappears in the 1840 edition.

Matthew 20:22 "But Jesus answered and said, 'Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?' They say unto him, 'We are able'" (KJV). The underlined section is omitted from most modern versions, and from the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition.

Matthew 24:13 "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh" (KJV). The underlined section is omitted from most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition.

Mark 9:38 "And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbid him, because he followeth not us" (KJV)." The underlined phrase, "who does not follow us" is omitted from most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition.

Luke 9:56 "For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village" (Lk. 9:56 KJV). Most modern versions and the 1832 edition omit the underlined sentence, but it reappears in the 1840 edition.

Luke 11:2 "And he said unto them, 'When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth'" (KJV). "Our" is omitted

from most modern versions, and from the 1832 edition, as is the clause, “Your will be done, on earth as in heaven.” Both return in the 1840 edition.

Luke 11:4 “And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil (KJV).” The underlined clause is omitted from most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition.

Luke 17:36 “There will be two women grinding meal together; one will be taken and the other left” (NRSV). This entire verse is omitted in most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition.

Acts 8:37 “And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God” (KJV). This verse is omitted from most modern versions and from the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition.

Acts 15:18 “Known to God from eternity are all His works” (NKJV). The underlined words are omitted from most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but included in the 1840 edition. The omitted words constitute what is judged an addition (underlined): *gnōsta ap aiōnos estin tō theō panta ta erga autou*. Thus, NRSV, “Known from long ago.”

Colossians 1:14 “In whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins” (KJV). “Through his blood” is omitted in most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but reappears in the 1840 edition.

Hebrews 2:7 “Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands” (KJV). The underlined clause is omitted in most modern versions and the 1832 edition, but reappears in the 1840 edition.

These thirteen instances show Judson’s 1832 Burmese NT, like many parts of his OT translation, utilized the cutting edge of biblical scholarship, enabling him to make text-critical decisions which are accepted today. Unlike his OT translation, Judson subsequently rejected these decisions and reverted to the traditional readings of the Textus Receptus for his final edition of the Burmese NT.

2. Places Where Both the 1832 and 1840 Editions Agree, Against the Textus Receptus

This second section analyses eleven places where Judson’s 1832 and 1840 editions of the NT both disagree with the Textus Receptus and follow textual variants which have been accepted by most modern NT versions. Without access to Knapp’s text it is not possible to see whether Knapp also followed these variants, although it seems likely that he would have, or at least could have, as his was also a critical Greek NT, although inferior to Griesbach’s.²³ There may also have been places where Judson has continued to follow Griesbach against Knapp.

²³ See the contemporary comparative review, Gray and Bowen, “The New Testament in the Common Version, Conformed to Griesbach’s Standard Greek Text,” *The North American Review* 31 (1830): 267–275.

Matthew 16:20 “Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ” (KJV). Most modern versions omit “Jesus” from this verse, as does both the 1832 and the 1840 editions.

Matthew 27:35 “And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots” (KJV). The underlined section, not included in most modern versions, is omitted from both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

Matthew 28:20; Mark 16:20; Luke 24:53 The concluding “Amen” to the gospel is omitted from both the 1832 and 1840 editions, as it is in most modern versions.

John 3:25 “Then there arose a question between *some* of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying” (KJV). Most modern versions and both the 1832 and 1840 editions have “a Jew.”

Acts 17:27 “That they should seek the Lord...” (KJV). Most modern versions have “God” instead of “The Lord”, as do both the 1832 and the 1840 editions.

1 Thessalonians 2:15 “Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men:” (KJV). Most modern versions have “the prophets”, as also in both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

2 Thessalonians 2:8 “And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming” (KJV). Most modern versions and both the 1832 and 1840 editions have “the Lord Jesus.”

1 Timothy 2:7 “Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not;) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity” (KJV). “In Christ” is omitted in most modern versions and both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

1 John 5:21 The final “Amen” is omitted in most modern versions and both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

This section shows that Judson did not reject the discipline of textual criticism for the NT, nor did he have an unconditional commitment to the Textus Receptus.

3. Variants which are different from both the Textus Receptus and modern versions, based on Griesbach

The third section of analysis shows two cases where the 1832 edition followed Griesbach’s text critical decisions, which have not stood the test of time.

John 6:69 The 1832 edition, following Griesbach, has “The Christ, the Son of God”, omitting the “living” from the KJV and the 1840 edition, “The Christ, the Son of the living God.” Both are quite different from most modern versions, “The Holy One of God” (NRSV). This modern reading was followed by the New England scholar George Noyes, a contemporary of Judson, who translated Tischendorf’s Greek NT in 1869.²⁴

²⁴ See BibleWorks—Version 10.0.8.498. For Lobegott Friedrich Constantin von Tischendorf (1815–1874), see Hull, *Story of the New Testament Text*, 78–79.

Romans 16:25-27 In the 1832 edition, the conclusion to Romans, 16:25–27, is transposed to immediately after Rom 14:23, becoming Rom 14.24-27. The 1840 edition repositioned it back to 16:25–27. History has proven that in this case Judson made the right decision in following the Textus Receptus in the final 1840 edition.

4. Places Where the 1832 Edition Follows the Textus Receptus Against Griesbach

The following ten cases show Judson rejecting Griesbach's decisions and following the Textus Receptus in the 1832 edition, decisions which were retained in the 1840 edition.

Romans 15:29 “And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ” (KJV). The underlined phrase is different than most modern versions which omit “of the gospel”, e.g., “and I know that when I come to you, I will come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ” (NRSV). Griesbach also omits this phrase (*tou euangelion*.) Judson, however, included it in both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

Galatians 4:6 “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father” (KJV). In most modern versions and Griesbach, the underlined “your” is “our.” In both the 1832 and 1840 NTs Judson follows the Textus Receptus.

Ephesians 4:9 “Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?” (KJV). Although “first” is omitted in most modern versions and Griesbach, Judson includes it in both the 1832 and 1840 NTs.

Ephesians 6:24; 1 Timothy 6:21; Titus 3:15; Philemon 25 Judson includes the final “Amen” in both editions of his NT, although most modern versions and Griesbach omit it.

Colossians 2:2 “That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ;” (KJV). In place of the underlined text, the NRSV has, “God's mystery, that is, Christ himself” (*tou mystēriou tou theou, Christon*), which (in Greek) is close to Griesbach: “God's mystery” (*tou mystēriou tou theou*). Judson, however, follows the Textus Receptus in both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

1 Timothy 3:16 “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory” (KJV). Most modern versions and Griesbach read “he” or “who” instead of “God”, e.g., “He (Greek *hos* “who”) was revealed in the flesh” (NRSV).²⁵ Judson follows the Textus Receptus in both the 1832 and 1840 editions.

1 John 5:7-8 “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. ⁸ And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one” (KJV). The underlined section is omitted in most modern versions and Griesbach, but included in both the 1832 and 1840 editions. This variant, the so-called

²⁵ See *Ibid.*, 63, for how (*hos*) became (*theos* “God”).

Comma Johanneum, is so weakly attested that even Erasmus omitted it at first, not inserting until the third edition of his Greek NT in 1522.²⁶

This fourth section gives insight into why Judson was suspicious of Griesbach. Judson was, on the one hand, a meticulous scholar, but on the other he was an orthodox Calvinistic evangelist and church planter. He may have been uncomfortable removing “of the gospel” in Rom 15:29, but more tellingly Col 2:2, 1 Tim 3:16 and 1 John 5:7–8 all have christological and Trinitarian elements that Judson has retained. It must also be remembered that in Judson’s base, New England, orthodox Calvinists were locked into an intractable battle with the Unitarian movement.²⁷ It is evident that Judson was unwilling to follow Griesbach in these cases on theological grounds.

CONCLUSION: WHY JUDSON WAS SUSPICIOUS OF GRIESBACH

If Judson was suspicious of Griesbach’s critical NT text, why did he use his text for so many years before abandoning it? The answer is clear. Griesbach’s critical NT text was considered the gold standard within the New England biblical studies movement, the movement which produced Judson.²⁸ As the committed biblical scholar that Judson was, there was probably never any question about whether he would use Griesbach’s Greek NT as the basis of his translation. Yet he was suspicious of Griesbach’s text, and eventually abandoned it in favour of George Christian Knapp’s Greek NT. What led to this decision?

Judging from a review article in *The North American Review*, a Boston publication, Griesbach’s reputation had not diminished in New England by 1830.²⁹ Gray and Bowen (first names unknown) compared Griesbach’s Greek NT with Knapp’s. They were unequivocal that Griesbach’s NT was a ground-breaking new recension whereas Knapp’s was a much inferior work. Of Knapp’s NT, Gray and Bowen wrote,

The language of the preface throughout leads the reader to anticipate a sort of halting compromise between critical accuracy, which had made some of its claims heard, and a lingering popular attachment to some vitiated passages, which have now, with a remarkable unanimity of sects, been condemned, as not entitled to a place in scripture.³⁰

This resonates with the changes that Judson made in his final 1840 edition of the NT. The analysis of Judson’s 1832 and 1840 editions above shows that significant textual decisions in the 1832 edition, which have carried the day in modern versions, were rejected in the 1840 edition, where he turned back to the Textus Receptus. It seems that the power of the Textus Receptus had a hold on Judson. This becomes

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 37; Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 146–148.

²⁷ See Brown, *The Rise of Biblical Criticism*, especially 10–26; 125–139.

²⁸ About this movement see Brown, *The Rise of Biblical Criticism*; John H. Giltner, *Moses Stuart: The Father of Biblical Science in America* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1988); Jay G. Williams, *The Times and Life of Edward Robinson: Connecticut Yankee in King Solomon’s Court* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1999). For Judson as a product of this movement, see John Hans de Jong, “New England Exegete Abroad.”

²⁹ Gray and Bowen, “Griesbach’s Standard Greek Text”, 267–275.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 271.

evident in the fourth section of the textual analysis where even in the 1832 edition Judson did not follow Griesbach, particularly 1 Tim 3:16 and 1 John 5:7–8. These passages explicitly confirm Christ's divinity and the doctrine of the Trinity, respectively. Although Judson was, apparently grudgingly, committed to following Griesbach's text, he would not follow him there. Here two different sides of Judson appear. On the one hand he was an accomplished and meticulous scholar, but on the other he was a committed believer and a church planting evangelist. It seems these two sides were in some tension when it came to translating the NT. In the final analysis, tension between scholarship and faith played a role in Judson's translation of the NT into Burmese.