

Who Is That Man?

What's In A Name Series

Acts 18:7

Once again we find ourselves asking the question “What’s In A Name?” We are continuing our study of some of the absurd readings that are found either in Codex Sinaiticus (N), Codex Vaticanus (B), the Nestle-Aland Greek text (N-A), the United Bible Society Greek text (UBS) or any number of the modern versions of today. We will be looking today at Acts 18:7 which reads, *“And he departed thence, and entered into a certain man's house, named Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue.”*

In the verse before us today we read in our AV of a fine man named Justus. Now Justus was a man "that worshipped God" and whose house "joined hard to the synagogue." It was this man that lodged Paul while in Corinth. And no doubt due to his generosity the Holy Ghost assigned him his place in Scripture. It was there he remained enjoying his position until two apostate 'scholars' [sic] schemed to remove him from his place and put a total stranger in his position.

That's right, until the fabrication of the RV of 1881 Justus enjoyed his recognition of one that worshipped God and of one that was a companion of Paul. Prior to 1881 those two apostate 'scholars', Westcott and Hort, created a fictional character when they expunged Justus from Acts 18:7 and introduced the ‘friendless stranger’ “Titius Justus”. What is so astounding about their unmatched compassion for this stranger is that no other Greek text prior to theirs (save Tischendorf's 8th edition) gives him any place. Every other Greek text rightfully recognizes the man as "Justus". And well they should for this is no doubt what Luke wrote when guided by the Holy Ghost.

"Justus" is also the reading of EVERY Greek MS. with the exception of approximately nine (9) manuscripts. When we examine the actual manuscript evidence we encounter an even stranger occurrence. You see, Sinaiticus (N) and E along with a few other MSS. read “Titou Ioustou” or “Titus Justus” (notice the absence of the second “I”). As I pointed out earlier EVERY OTHER MS. simply reads “Ioustou” or “Justus”. This is the Traditional, as well as Majority, reading. In addition, as far as I know the only Early Church Father to quote the place was Chrysostom and he certainly quoted ‘Justus’.

So, as it stands, the ONLY manuscript to read “Titius Justus” is Codex Vaticanus (B). And even it is certainly not conclusive evidence; for it has been corrected to read according to the Traditional reading (i.e. Justus). So, in some respects we could say that the reading “Titius Justus” has NO MANUSCRIPT SUPPORT AT ALL. Isn't that amazing? Despite these FACTS W-H, N-A and the UBS Greek texts all read “Titius Justus”. Does anyone see how absurd their so-called ‘scholarship’ really is????

Keeping in line with the modern mayhem we discover that the ASV reads:

“And he departed thence, and went into the house of a certain man named TITUS Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue.”

However, this has been altered in the NASV to read

“Then he left there and went to the house of a man named TITIUS Justus, a worshiper of God, whose house was next to the synagogue.”

It should be noted that nearly every other modern version reads “Titius Justus”. If practically every Greek manuscript reads ‘Justus’ then how has the reading ‘Titius Justus’ come about? It is really quite simple when you consider that the uncials were written in all capital letters without spacing. When we look at Acts 18:7 we find that it reads, “ONOMATIHOYΣTOY”. This is how it would appear in an uncial copy. This would literally read, “named Justus”. It is somewhat easy to see how a tired scribe could make the mistake of writing “ONOMATI (named)” then allow his tired eyes to combine the last two letters of ‘named’ (i.e. TI) and the first three letters of ‘Justus’ (i.e. IOY); thus, producing THOY. All that would be necessary at this point to produce a new word altogether is a horizontal stroke, or even the imagination that one existed, over the second ‘I’. Were this stroke imagined or mistaken by the scribe he would’ve formed the name TITIOY or Titus. In codex B we find that a ‘T’ has been plunged into the text; therefore, giving us ‘Titius’. Fortunately for us this gross corruption of the text has only survived in a few copies.

In closing, “Titius” is the reading of ONE solitary manuscript, which in all fairness has been CORRECTED to read as does our Authorized Version. Yet, we find our modern ‘scholars’ insisting that this is the genuine reading. It is amazing to watch the modern version proponents question certain readings in our AV, which are based on far greater evidence, then at the same time adopt a reading such as “Titius Justus” based on the support of one corrupt manuscript. This again shows to what extreme these ‘scholars’ have gone in order to change our Authorized Version and just how much they idolize the corrupt codex Vaticanus.