

## SEBTS NT Conference, April 13-14, 2007

### The Last Twelve Verses of Mark: Original or Not?

Transcripts of handwritten notes taken by R. Decker, with some later “in flight” assessments on the way home, and a few blog links etc added later. The outlines included below were taken from the handouts where they were available.

Conference speakers (in order of presentations, with abbreviations used below):

Dan Wallace [DW]  
Maurice Robinson [MR]  
J. K. (Keith) Elliott [E]  
David Alan Black [DAB]  
Darrell Bock [DB] ✕

---

#### Session 1: Dan Wallace

#### “From the End Spring New Beginnings: Mark 16:8 as the Conclusion of the Second Gospel”

##### Introduction

###### Presuppositions

(DW assumes: Markan priority and that John was not dependent on the Synoptics (may not even have known them as written documents?))

###### 1. Source criticism

Source criticism plays a large role in the decision. If one accepts the Greisbach Hypothesis (Matthean priority), it is difficult to accept the long ending. If Matthew was written first, why would Mark omit Matthew’s ending? E.g., Farmer *must* argue for vv. 9-20 due to his prior commitment to the Griesbach Hypothesis. Farmer’s source critical assumptions drive his textual criticism.

###### 2. Textual criticism

Your view of textual criticism will likely drive your conclusion regarding the ending of Mark. {Implied: if you’re a majority text advocate, then you *must* accept 9-20; your theory makes it impossible to even consider any other option.}

###### 3. Bibliology

If one argues for preservation, then one can’t consider the possibility of a lost ending. E.g., Pickering (and Burgeon long before him) argues that God failed if the long ending is not original.

DW does not hold to preservation and as a result he can consider all options.  
 DW's own experience/testimony: raised and trained on Sturtz's "equal weight" approach (which is a functional majority text position), but after 17 years, during which time he taught at both DTS and Grace, during his doctoral studies at DTS he was asked to teach the doctoral seminar on NT text crit (no qualified faculty available at the time). In preparing to do so, he read 10K pages on the subject and was forced to reconsider his approach and he concluded that reasoned eclecticism was the only approach that could adequately handle the data/questions. The same method that causes a Sturtzian text critic to adopt reasoned eclecticism also forces someone holding Matthean priority (Griesbach Hypothesis) to adopt Markan priority.

## I. External evidence

### A. The long ending

95% of the external evidence *has* the long ending (maybe a higher percentage). Which is more likely, to omit 9-20 if it already existed? Or add them? Farmer's arguments for why they were omitted don't stand up: the supposed problems with the content of 9-20 are only in the 2d half of the passage (14-20: time of resurrection and snakes), yet this portion is cited in early writings *more often* than the first half (9-13). Why would an ending like 9-20 be added? Seems obvious: no record of any resurrection appearances by Jesus otherwise—even though Mark contains three prophecies of the resurrection. May have seemed incomplete.

#### 1. Manuscripts

The MS support for the long ending is broad geographically and includes both patristic and versional materials.

#### 2. Patristic citations

### B. The short ending (i.e., end at 16:8)

#### 1. Greek Manuscripts

Ⲙ and B are the oldest MSS the contain Mark 16. The "roots" of these two MSS must go very early. They are not directly related, though probably had a common ancestor several generations earlier.

The "Gap" in B: Mark 16:8 comes in the middle of col 2 and all of col 3 is blank. Farmer says that B knew of the ending but omitted it: "a wholly singular phenomenon."

Lane argues that the scribe may have know the short ending.

In B there are a series of umlauts (two dots) in the margins adjacent to lines in which the scribe is aware of a textual problem—but there are no umlauts at 16:8! This suggests that the scribe knew only a text which ended with 16:8.

There are other large gaps in B, esp. in the OT sections; see end of Tobit, 2 Esdras, and Daniel. {May be others; I think Elliott later referred to some additional examples, though implying that there are reasons for some of them: e.g., before MS shifts to a 2 col format for Psalms. There are certainly many blank cols in **Ⲙ**.}

### 2. Ancient versions

{Bock will later comment that this is the key to external evidence and is far more significant than **Ⲙ** and B due to the nature of the variant.}

- Siniatic Syriac, the oldest Syriac material, ends at 16:8.
- Armenian, over 100 MSS (5th C), based on Greek MSS from Constantinople.
- Georgian, the two oldest MSS, 5th C. omit 9-20.
- Sahidic, oldest of Coptic translations, omits.

### 3. Patristic citations

Clement and Origen are both silent regarding the ending, but since neither quote from this section, we cannot verify that they knew it to end this way.

Eusebius, 4th C. explicitly mentions *both* options, saying that “the most accurate copies end here in almost all manuscripts.” Nor do the Eusebian canon numbers make any provision for 9-20.

Jerome, 5th C., is aware of *three* endings for Mark. He says that 9-20 are found “in scarcely any” MSS of the gospel. He references Eusebius’ statement and adds that these are *Greek* MSS. {I assume this implies that E’s statement included both Greek and Latin? Or that it *could* have been taken thus.} Jerome was also aware of what we today call the Freer Logion and was our only authority for such an ending until MS W was discovered.

Why did Jerome include 9-20 in the Vulgate if he considered it inauthentic? Probably for the same reason that it is included in most English translations today!

Remember that there was a riot (a real, physical mob scene!) when it became known that Jerome translated Jonah to say that it was *ivy* rather than a *gourd*! Riots tend to make one cautious!

What in the later MS tradition came to be the majority reading was at one time the *minority* reading (i.e., at the time of Jerome and Eusebius).

### 4. The intermediate ending

{The intermediate ending is external evidence supporting the short ending.}

Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (Latin) is the only MS that ends with the intermediate ending only.

(The intermediate ending is usually found with the long ending.) The obvious secondary ending of the intermediate ending is evidence for a MS tradition that ended with 16:8.

*Other witnesses*

*Three Implications*

- a. MSS with the intermediate and long ending imply MS ancestors that had only the short ending (i.e., ended at 16:8).
- b. Once a reading makes it into the text, it is very hard to dislodge it.
- c. The presence of the intermediate ending means that readers were not satisfied with the ending at 16:8. Which is more likely? An original which ended at 16:8 with 9-20 added later to “finish” it? Or that 9-20 was original and was replaced by the intermediate ending (or had the intermediate ending added to 9-20)?

*5. MSS that indicate doubt about the long ending*

Codex 22 writes “the end” at 16:8! Another dozen MSS add some such note. Another 5 MSS add critical marks to indicate the problem.

C. Summary of external evidence (and scribal motivation)

Scribal policy: “If in doubt, *don’t* throw it out.”

Why does Mark, and only Mark, have such textual problems at the end?

## II. Internal Evidence

*Key issue:* Is it likely that Mark wrote 9-20 or not? This is never argued on reasoned linguistic principles. Two recent studies have raised the bar in this area. {WHO? DW didn’t identify. Need to find out.}

A. Cumulative argument

It is possible to find each stylistic feature paralleled in other parts of Mark, but there is *no* passage that has all these features (vocab and style) together. Farmer looked at only truncated evidence and did not consider the cumulative evidence, nor did he consider source criticism. Why are Matt and Luke so different in the resurrection accounts? Ans: they had lost their “template”—Mark had no such section.

B. Markanisms in the long ending

Morton Smith’s hoax {i.e., Secret Gospel of Mark} is more Markan than 9-20!

C. *Markanisms in the other endings*

### III. Irony in the end

A. (Response to) arguments against Mark intentionally ending the gospel at 16:8

1. *Open-ended conclusion a modern literary technique*

Argued, e.g., by W. L. Knox. But L. Magness, *Sensing Absence*, provides evidence in Greco-Roman literature, in the OT, and in the NT for “open endedness”; this is not a modern literary technique.

2. *Final leaf lost*

This argument assumes codex form, but the codex dates from the end of the first century; the scroll form was used earlier. {Evidence??? From my reading, this is certainly not a given—cf Gamble.} If Mark is early, then it was written on a scroll and the first generations copies would likewise have been written on a scroll. In a scroll, the ending is the most protected part of the document, so very unlikely that it would be lost (contra the codex whose last page is in the most precarious position).

3. *Books don't end with γάρ*

If a sentence can end with γάρ, so can a book. In 1972 a book was discovered ending with γάρ. {Need ident. and details!} P. Vanderhorst article. C. Croy: what of sentences end with γάρ? It is less common in narrative genre. K. Iverson's critique of Croy in *CBQ*: γάρ-ended sentences are rare in all literature, but if Mark intended to “shock” his readers, why not?

Mark's ending (at 16:8) is due to the nature of Jesus. Mark leaves it to the reader to answer the question, who is this Jesus? Therefore the abrupt ending is very appropriate and effective. See ch. 9: “they were afraid to ask him”—and no answer/resolution is given. The reader is left hanging—with ἐφοβοῦντο! The same verb form as 16:8! The ending is “omitted” to draw the reader into the story and force them to ask (and answer) the question, who is Jesus?

B. Creation of a new literary genre

### IV. Conclusion

---

## Session Two: Maurice Robinson

{No paper or outline handed out; one single page illustration only: see attached.}  
MR does not hold Griesback Hypothesis. {Comment probably intended to deflect DW's comment re. the association of this with accepting 9-20.}

There has been no new evidence of significance since the late 19th century. Westcott & Hort, Scrivener, and Burgeon all knew as much as we do today (for the most part).

2d century patristic evidence:

Justin Martyr, “going forth, they preached everywhere”—this is the same Greek phrase as the long ending of Mark (though the word order is different). {Implied that J.M. must have known the long ending—though I’d want to examine that more closely to see if such an assertion really holds up.} J.M. weaves together 16:15 and 16:20.

Irenaeus, specific citation of the end of Mark.

{Much of MR’s paper was based on analogy with various modern studies (e.g., a library bar code label that was truncated, and a modern poet’s successive revisions of her own work). Other areas were hypothetical (perhaps...), pleading a cumulative case probability. Perhaps I was too weary during this paper, but I found it very difficult to follow without an outline. It was hard to follow his logic, at least orally. There were numerous subjective constructs, literary parallels (verbal and thematic, etc.), but these are only relevant if the ending is original—they cannot prove it or even create a preference for it. Some seemed pretty far fetched to me. MR’s argument sounded to me like: “I need to use every possible argument, however tenuous.” [A lot like his paper on Byz priority at the last NT conf. at SEBTS a few years ago.] RD}

MR’s conclusion: Ecclesiastical tradition is unbroken (except for a few 4th C anomalies), so we should follow the church.

{I’m not very impressed by ecclesiological arguments whether they be for the KJV, for Latin, or for the long ending of Mark!}

### **Session Three: J. K. Elliott**

#### **Introductory remarks**

E. argues that 16:8 is not the original ending of Mark’s gospel, but neither is 9-20; the original ending has been lost.

Matthew, Luke, and John have elaborate introductions and satisfactory endings. Mark seems “blunted” on both ends. 16:8 is a bizarre ending; 9-20 doesn’t fit onto 16:8.

The whole textual situation looks very unstable. Ancient books were especially vulnerable at the beginning and the end, whether scroll or codex.

#### **A. [Relevant evidence {no heading given in handout}]**

1. External witnesses in favour of Mark ending at 16:8

{smry statement made since earlier speakers have included it.}

## 2. Internal evidence against Markan authorship of 16:9-20

### a. *Language and style*

See p. 3 of handout; most important items listed are ἐκεῖνος used as pronoun; πομπρευομαι as simple verb; ὅστερον; ἐπιθησουσιν + acc; use of ὁ κυριος as Christological title; and the extended genitive absolute construction in 16:20.

Notice how many items on this list (= p. 3) have multiple occurrences together in 9-20; these are not isolated examples but a *pattern* of difference. {Bock will comment on the significance of this later.}

### b. *Theology and contents*

Vv 9-20 do not continue the narrative of vv 1-8. Seems more like a summary of Luke/Acts and John, not a continuation of the story in Mark.

## 3. Eusebian canon numbers

Eusebius did not include any provision for 9-20, but some later MSS attempt to adopt his system to work for 9-20, but this is found in only a few MSS.

## **B. Investigations into theories claiming that Mark included the Longer Ending in his gospel**

### Literary borrowing?

Is 9-20 a “literary borrowing”? No, especially since it is in narrative. 9-20 is very “gray” in style, does not match Mark’s earlier style. When material is “borrowed” it is always rewritten to fit the style of the user (e.g., Matthew and Luke’s use of Mark!) {E’s statements here imply that this is a known phenomenon in ancient literature, but he did not elaborate; would be interesting to see the examples!} E. thinks 9-20 was a written by a second C writer.

### Western order of the gospels

Mark is the fourth gospel in the western order. This provides a good reason to add a conclusion if Mark didn’t have one! I.e., it would be a very odd way to end a combined edition of four gospels. Thus 9-20 becomes the conclusion of Matthew-Luke-John-Mark. Possible that 9-20 originated when the gospels were first collected and published as a single volume {this would have to assume that the first such collection was in the western order; what is the evidence in this regard?}, and once added, was kept even after the gospels were put into a different order (i.e., non-western order).

## **C. Did Mark intend his gospel to end at 16:8?**

See the books by Morna Hooker on the beginnings and endings of the gospels.

E. says that Mark did *not* intend to end at 16:8. To do so would have been bizarre, odd. There would be no fulfillment of prophecy {i.e. of the resurrection}, which is always included in earlier such prophecies.

{I wonder if this is over-stated? MR made similar comments, but can we say that there is no resurrection in Mark? I think not since there is clearly an empty tomb, and in the context of Mark this can only be understood as a resurrection. It *is* true that there are no post resurrection *appearances* of Jesus, but that is only one evidence of a resurrection! RD}

#### **D. Shortening the original form of Mark's gospel**

##### i. Deliberate suppression of an ending composed by Mark but now lost

Why is there no historical narrative recording Jesus' post resurrection appearance to *Peter*? There are references to this event (Luke, 1 Cor 15), but no actual account. Perhaps this was in Mark's original ending (now lost) which has been suppressed? This is odd given Peter's prominence. There was a reluctance to ascribe such an appearance to Peter—i.e., the oblique references in Luke and 1 Cor without any actual description or narrative of it. {Not sure here if E. is arguing this or, more likely (?), considering a theoretical possibility that some have proposed.}

##### ii. Accidental omission of 9-20

This seems to be E's preferred explanation.

#### **E. The opening of Mark's gospel**

[see p. 4 of handouts]

E. suggests that 1:1-3 is a later addition to the text. For details, see his article: "Mark 1:1-3—A Later Addition to the Gospel?" *NTS* 46 (2000): 584-48.

#### **F. The freestanding existence of 16:9-20**

See the work of James Kelhoffer.

#### **G. Canonical Mark. Concluding remarks.**

The form accepted as canonical was the edition possessed by a particular church or monastery; i.e., the Fathers designated the *books*, but not the specific form of those books. The Bible may be viewed as a collection of inspired books, *or* an inspired collection of books. {E. implies that the second formulation is to be preferred.}

#### **Further work needed:**

- The occurrence of *τελος* in early MSS. The use of the longer ending in Greek, Georgian, and Armenian lectionaries.
- Listing of MSS with Eusebian canon numbers after Mark 16:8

- List of MSS that have the Gospels in the Western order
- Trials to fit the longer ending into Codex Sinaiticus in the style of scribe 'D'.

{Misc. notes that fit somewhere in the above outline, but I don't remember where (jotted at bottom of handout in what seemed at the time to be an excursus).}

There are additions in both **Ⲙ** and B. Check the handwriting size, replacement leaves, etc. **Ⲙ** has a replacement quire at the end of Mark, suggesting that there were known problems here. E. assumes that **Ⲙ** and B are closely related, perhaps even coming from the same scriptorium {note this is contrary to Wallace—and, I think, most other contemporary text critics}, thus they may not be independent witnesses to the omission of 9-20 after all.

The impft of  $\varphi\beta\epsilon\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  when used elsewhere in Mark always has an object. {i.e., implying that the absolute use is a sign that Mark originally wrote something else which has been lost.}

## Session Four: David Alan Black

### “Mark 16:9-20: Mark’s Conclusion to Peter’s Discourses”

See the 6-page (small print) summary paper distributed. DAB added some sections in his reading, but the bulk of it is there.

DAB referenced a 3-vol work by “Masos”(?) on the importance of Matthew in the early church. Need to find out what this work is; Bock was familiar with it

{A few of my comments I jotted during the session:

{ Probably too-formal a view of “publication” in the ancient world.

{If Peter endorsed Luke, why is there no indication of this? (Other than a theoretical postulate?)

{Essentially suggests that Mark arranged for professional transcriptions of Peter’s five lectures (i.e., by other people) which he then put together as a single work, but this is all *very* hypothetical. DAB pictures this as a formal lecture series: “Peter approached the rostrum with scrolls of both Matthew and [the newly written, but not yet published] Luke in hand and referred to them sequentially as he lectured.” This lecture series was for influential Christians in Rome, some of “Caesar’s knights.”

{This doesn’t correlate with the external evidence that *Mark* wrote the gospel *after* Peter left Rome.

--end of RD’s comments}

---

## Session Five: Response from Darrell Bock

{Bock did not have the papers much in advance (I gather only earlier the day of the conference?), so prepared his comments in outline form of what he would likely say to address the issue, then filled in the specifics as he listened to the formal presentations along with the rest of us. Since the first three were the evening before, he would have had more time to reflect on those, but not a great deal since the sessions ran late that night and began relatively early. (Response was really quite well done given these circumstances. I thought the response was equal with the formal papers—and better than some). Since there was no handout, these notes are rather rough and don't have some of the specifics I'd like to have gotten down. If there are references that are incorrect, I may not have gotten in down right in my hasty scribbles, or perhaps couldn't read them afterwards!}

### Re. Presuppositions

We all agree that:

- Both readings are old (i.e., ending with 16:8 *and* 9-20). They have been contested from the early period.
- For the most part, what is taught in 9-20 is taught elsewhere in Scripture.

What we all want to deal with is hard evidence. The *facts* (i.e., external evidence) are not disputed!

Why/how do we all deal with the same data and yet end up in so many different places?

Because we all connect the dots differently. We all make (subjective) judgments.

Be careful of where the facts stop and the reconstructions start, and be careful in interacting with other reconstructions.

Note that *all four* speakers {at least 3 in my assessment: Wallace, Robinson, & to some degree Black; not sure that Elliott made any comments on this?} *changed* their position over time; they rearranged how they connected the dots (paradigm shifts).

Re. the end of Mark, DB's view is that:

- 16:8 is the end, and that judged on both external and internal evidence.
- The second most likely scenario is that the original ending is missing.
- The third most likely {actually, the most *unlikely!* though DB didn't state it this way} is that 9-20 is original {and therefore presumably written by Mark}.

DB assumes Markan priority and there is "something" like Q out there; may not be {DB implied "probably not"} a written document, more likely a way of referring to the stream of [oral] tradition.

The Synoptic evidence is peculiar. In 9–20 the tone changes in that it is summary in form, whereas in the rest of Mark’s gospel it is usually more detailed.

Beware of “brittle fundamentalism”! I.e., holding positions that, if they break, they shatter {i.e., destroy the entire system}. An either/or exclusive system/solution/explanation (*either* “9–20 is original” *or* “a non-inspired Bible”) is a brittle system. In this regard, see Craig Evans’s *Fabricating Jesus*, first chapter has bios of those who came out of fundamentalist homes/churches, but reacted against brittle, either/or thinking. {i.e, Bart Ehrman, etc.}

(end of long prolegomena!)

### Main points

1. **⌘** and B are *not* the real key in terms of external evidence. The versions and Fathers are the key. They corroborate that there is a problem, and an early problem. This is a different kind of text critical problem; it is not re. individual words and phrases (as most *v.l.* are), but an entire unit. We can thus use the versions and the Fathers in a way that we often cannot at the individual variant level (due to translation and language differences). E.g., the Eusebius quote must be taken seriously, as well as Jerome. Same with the versions, Armenian, etc.
2. External evidence clearly shows that the two endings have been in contention since the very early years.
3. Re. the gap in B, *we don’t know why it is there!* We can all give plausible explanations, but we *don’t know* why the gap is there. Note that there are *no umlauts* at this point in the text!
4. Internal evidence is important because it deals with the *why* of the various endings. External evidence can’t tell us *why*, just *if*—and the external evidence clearly tells us that *is* an issue.
  - a. Why create a 16:8 ending if you did have 9–20? If there was an adequate, satisfactory ending, how do you end up with a 16:8 ending?
  - b. Why did the short ending {i.e., what others called the intermediate ending} persist if we had the long ending?

DB commented on MR’s illustrations (the library label and the modern poet) that they are not parallel and are irrelevant.

If 9–20 were omitted because of a perceived problem, then *why* did we lose the entire unit? Why not just “fix” the problem or omit an individual statement? Why jettison the entire section, 9–20?

MR’s lexical data is invalid because it is related only to individual word or forms. Ctr. E’s use of multiple aspects (vocab, verb forms, style issues, etc.) *that are repeated* in the passage but *not* found together elsewhere. It is a “layered” argument, not just individual word statistics. I.e., MR’s argument is invalid; E has it right. {This is a key point, the impact of which seemed to be lost on some, both at the conference and in some of the blog discussions afterwards. Bock is on target here.}

All of the “unique” parts of 9–20 could have come from other sources in the gospels and/or Acts. I.e., 9–20 is likely later than Matthew, Luke, Acts, but if Mark is early (Markan priority), then 9–20 is not Markan.

DB concludes from internal evidence that 9–20 is more likely non-Markan than Markan.

### “Other issues”

Roll or codex form?

Role of Mark in the early church? Mark is the least popular. The most difficult question for Markan priority is the patristic evidence.

There are numerous problems with DAB’s reconstruction. 3 cited {implied numerous others could be listed also}

1. There was not a distinct Christian community beginning at Pentecost.
2. The “Hebrew style” (of Matthew) is a major problem, especially since Eusebius explicitly said that Matthew wrote in “Hebrews characters.”
3. What actual evidence do we really have for the reconstruction proposed? (Little, if any at all.) Very speculative; too many assumptions.

A major change for me [DB] in recent years: I was sure that the Apostolic Fathers used the written gospels regularly, that they were early on recognized and accepted as Scripture. But I have discovered that the AF *didn’t* use the written gospels very much. It is much more likely that they were still relying on oral tradition. When they do refer to Jesus and the gospels, it is very hard to identify any specific source. You can’t tell if they are citing Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John! {This sounds like a PhD dissertation opportunity!} Compare the 1905 Oxford conference on the AF with the 2005 of the same. Conclusions have changed much. {i.e., they reflect the summary of DB’s position above.} We don’t begin to find citations from the written gospels until Justin Martyr—i.e., the age of the apologists! They are not there in the AF.

Re. E's remarks re. the first resurrection appearances of Jesus: Mary or Peter? In ancient culture, women couldn't be witnesses. Thus it depends on the perspective of the record. If the intent was simply a historical narrative, Mary is cited as the first witness since she was the actual first witness. But if the intent and function of the text was legal, then Peter is referenced since he is the first *male* witness.

### Conclusion

How do we get a 16:8 ending with γάρ and with no resurrection appearance of Jesus?

1. Vanderhorst and Iverson's work on endings (cf DW's paper)
2. The prediction > fulfillment pattern is the norm; why different with ending of Mark? Ans: Mark's ending is subtle, but not postmodern. Mark is saying to his readers in essence, "you have God's Word; that's enough."

Three examples of something similar:

- a. Parable of the prodigal: no ending; what happened to the elder brother?
- b. The ending of Acts: what happened to the Jews? What happened to Paul? (and these are both "no endings" at the end of a *book*.)
- c. Parable of rich man and Lazarus: they have Scripture, that is enough, if they won't believe that, miracles won't change anything.

There is no doubt that the women *did* go on to tell the story. The very existence of Mark's gospel is evidence that there indeed was a resurrection. Mark's readers couldn't wait until Jesus made an appearance to them to decide who he was and whether or not there was a resurrection. The Word is enough. It is the same for us.

Even if 9–20 is not original, does that mean that it is not canonical? Not necessarily. *Theoretically* it is possible that 9–20 was written by someone else and could still be canonical. {DB is not arguing for this.}

"I don't care at all for David Parker's solution. And here I am going to be emphatic [or was it 'dogmatic' that DB used?]." Parker suggests that the ending is a matter of theological interpretation that came later; i.e., the original ending was without a resurrection, the resurrection was a later insertion for theological reasons. But we can't wedge alternative Christianities in here. {i.e., Ehrman, et al}

The reason that this has been a problem and difficult to sort out is that it *is* a problem and difficult to sort out! There are numerous forks in the road (dots to connect); different decisions to make at each fork, and that influences your later choices. Which fork is more likely? That question must be asked at each fork.

Both endings are very old and everything is taught elsewhere. Either way, the content of what the Bible teaches is not materially affected. Don't make this into something more than it is. There are more important things than making this a crucial issue. Go and minister and preach the gospel.

---

There have been many blog posts with comments on the conference. I won't try to list them all, but here are a few (and each have links to others). The first two are both students at SEBTS, so their perspective seems to (understandably) favor their own profs views—and perhaps they have heard more from Dr. Robinson and Black on the subject. Some of their comments do not reflect an understanding of some of the points made by Wallace, Elliott, and Bock. But it will give you a different perspective from mine... ☺ (On all of the <blogger.com> sites listed here, click the Show Original Post link at the top if it does not display that by default.)

<https://www2.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=24486759&postID=6800370057172739110>

<https://www2.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=32820160&postID=5973580101590451957>

Dave Black (one of the presenter) mentions some blog posts on his 4/17/07 post, as well as includes a few comments on 4/16/07 with some perspective on what influences have shaped his thinking. Dave has been an ardent advocate of blogging, so it's not surprising to see many of his students doing just that. <http://daveblackonline.com/blog.htm>

And there is a report on the Exangelical Textual Criticism blog (a high-level discussion blog with good content):

<https://www2.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=17859011&postID=7823952574683446173>