

DOES MARK 16:9-20 BELONG IN THE NEW TESTAMENT?

Cliff Lyons

THE PROBLEM STATED

There have been and are religious writers, textual critics, and preachers who deny that Mark 16:9-20 is genuine. That is, they deny that John Mark, the companion of Paul and Barnabas, wrote this passage. Constantin Tischendorf, (1815-1874), said, "A healthy piety reclaims against the endeavors of those who are for palming off as Mark's what the Evangelist is so plainly shewn to have known nothing at all about."¹ Theodor Zahn, (1838-1933), also takes a negative position toward the closing verses of Mark. He says,

It may be regarded as one of the certain conclusions, that the words 'ephobouyto gar' 16:8, are the last words in the book which were written by the author himself.²

John W. Burgon quotes Arthur P. Stanley, who wrote,

...the discoveries of later times have shown, almost beyond doubt, that it is NOT A PART OF S. MARK'S GOSPEL, BUT AN ADDITION BY ANOTHER HAND; of which the weakness in the external evidences coincides with the internal evidence in proving its later origin.³

Caspar Rene Gregory wrote as follows,

Another passage that textual criticism has shown to have no right to a place in the text of the New Testament is the close of the Gospel according to Mark as it stands in the common editions. Mark 16:9-20 is neither part nor parcel of that Gospel.⁴

More recently, during the Warren-Ballard Debate, July 23-26, 1952, in which L. S. Ballard denied the essentiality of baptism for salvation, Thomas B. Warren asked him: "Please tell us plainly why you do not believe Mark 16:9-20 to be inspired." Ballard's reply: "...the scholars, that's why." In Warren's next speech (4th negative), he presented a chart clearly demonstrating that there is strong, convincing evidence

to believe Mark 16:9-20 is inspired and belongs at the conclusion of Mark 16. Brother Warren pointed out three main sources of evidence to be considered. They were and are: (1) The Greek manuscripts (copies), (2) The Versions (translations into other languages), (3) The writings of the "Church Fathers" (early religious writers who lived after the apostles). Below is a copy of the chart used by brother Warren.

CHART ON MARK 16:9-20

Century			
I ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS OF NEW TESTAMENT			
II	Manuscripts	Versions	Church "Fathers"
II		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peshitto • Curetonian • Coptic • Sahidic • Tatian's Diatessaron 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irenaeus • Papias • Justin Martyr
III			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hyppolytus • Celsus • Eusebius
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vaticanus • Sinaiticus • Washington 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulgate • Gothic • Aethiopic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aphreates • Cyril of Jerusalem • Ehipanus • Ambrose • Chrystom • Augustine • Calendar of church services
V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexandrian • Ephraemi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerusalem Syr. 	
VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bezae 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philoxenian • Georgian 	
VII			
VIII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basiliensis 		
IX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tischendorfianus • Sangallensis • Monacensis • Cyprius 		
X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vaticanus 354 • Nalianus 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains Mark 16:9-20 or quotes therefrom. • Does not contain Mark 16:9-20. 			

Question: Could it be the case that Ballard and others, (Bogard, Norris), when debating, feel so acutely the power of this passage in teaching the necessity of baptism, that even though the evidence is there for believing Mark 16:9-20 to be

inspired and genuine, they are so prejudiced that they throw up a liberal, modernistic smokescreen, and use an unwarranted excuse for rejecting this great passage?

Robert R. Taylor, Jr. writes,

These last dozen verses of Mark 16 have long been a thorn in the side of those who reject baptism as a stated stipulation for attaining the remission of sins or salvation. With crystal clear simplicity Mark 16:16 teaches that belief and baptism are both essentials or imperatives if one is to achieve the happy estate of salvation. This passage has also been a constant thorn to those who reject miraculous manifestations as set forth in Mark 16:17-18 and which occurred early in the Christian movement to confirm the word (Mark 16:20). But modernists do not believe there were any miracles performed, neither by the apostles nor by those upon whom they laid hands in the first century. Therefore, modernism is ever interested in getting rid of the very promise of these miraculous signs of heavenly confirmation. Hence, by removing this portion of Sacred Scripture, modernistic translators can inflict a deadly blow toward one of the great landmark passages in the Bible dealing with baptism and another deadly blow aimed at the promise of fulfillment of miraculous manifestations of the Spirit in confirmation of God's gospel. This would produce quite a motivation for the ones who disliked baptism as an essential for salvation and who denied the presence of miracles in the first century.⁶

Seemingly, the major argument which is set forth by those opposing the genuineness of Mark 16:9-20 is that the passage is missing from two of the oldest manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus. However, the verses are found in nearly all of the other ancient manuscripts, including the Alexandrian, which stands very close to the two just mentioned and in some ways may be superior.

Another argument which certain critics allege as being against verses 9-20 is that there is a difference in style beginning with verse nine. They claim as many as twenty-seven unusual words and phrases in these verses not elsewhere found in Mark.

The above quotations and comments reveal that some see a problem in regard to the last twelve verses of Mark. Thus, our main goal is to study and present the evidence showing that Mark 16:9-20 was written by Mark as an inspired servant

of God. Burgon cut to the heart of the problem when he asks,

Is it reasonable to suspect that the concluding verses of S. Mark are a spurious accretion and unauthorized supplement to his Gospel, nor not?⁷

Thus, is it the case that verses 9-20 are not genuine, but were later added by someone after the first century? Or, did Mark by inspiration write these verses and later some copyist (say in third century) leave a copy of Mark incomplete? Then later this copy became the source of other incomplete copies, including Aleph and B?⁸

As stated earlier, we are dependent on three main sources of evidence for determining the text of the New Testament: (1) Manuscripts, (2) Versions, (3) "Fathers."

OBJECTIONS TO MARK 16:9-20 CONSIDERED *THE GREEK MANUSCRIPTS*

Have textual critics, translators, commentators, preachers, and others been fair in their treatment of Mark 16:9-20? Are there reasonable explanations as to why it is missing from two of the oldest manuscripts? Is there a reason for Mark using some new words in verses 9-20? Of course, it is important to remember that Mark was guided by the Holy Spirit as he wrote the book (II Tim. 3:16-17; II Pet. 1:21; I Cor. 2:13). The Bible [all 66 books, all chapters, verses, and words] is God's revealed will to man. It is no ordinary book! It is our "road map" to guide us to heaven (Psm. 119:105). We must be careful to have a proper attitude as we study it (Acts 17:11; I Tim. 2:15), and as we study textual problems. Modernistic critics, let us remember, do not have a proper respect for God's Word. Even "religious" people, as well as atheists, have made attacks against the Bible, yet it stands. We still have God's Word. Destructive, modernistic critics have come and gone, more are here, and more will likely continue to come, but God's precious Word can and will withstand the destructive efforts of mere men. However, we must not, as soldiers of Christ, withdraw while Satan continues his war against God, God's Word, and man. Let us be good soldiers, war a good

warfare, “speak the truth in love,” not compromise with the enemy, and one day we can say with Paul, “I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness...” (II Tim. 4:6-8; 2:2-4; I Tim. 6:12).

As indicated above, one of the main objections to the genuineness of Mark 16:9-20 is that the Vatican and the Sinaitic Manuscripts do not have the passage. These two manuscripts are two of the oldest known to be in existence. The Codex Vaticanus, or B, is in the Vatican Library at Rome, and is dated about the middle of the fourth century. It originally contained all of the Greek Bible, but has lost most of Genesis and part of Psalms in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it stops at Hebrews 9:13, leaving out the rest of that book. Also, it leaves out I and II Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Revelation.⁹

The Codex Sinaiticus was brought from Mount Sinai in 1859 by Tischendorf, and is now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. This manuscript is said to be dated toward the end of the fourth century. Robertson says this manuscript contains all of the New Testament, yet it does not contain Mark 16:9-20.¹⁰

The Alexandrian Manuscript, however, does contain the closing verses of Mark. It is usually dated in the first half of the fifth century and lacks only Matthew 1:1-25:6; John 6:50-8:52, and II Corinthians 4:13-12:7.¹¹ It is important to understand that the Alexandrian stands very close to Aleph and B datewise, perhaps as close as fifty years, and no more than one hundred years.

Regarding the Vatican Manuscript, at the end of verse eight, there is a *blank space* large enough for verses 9-20, showing that the scribe was at least aware of the existence of these closing verses. Fredrick Henry Scrivener writes that the Vatican Manuscript,

...betrays consciousness on the scribe's part that something is left

out. inasmuch as after...v. 8, a whole column is left blank (the only blank one in the whole volume)...¹²

A professor Stowe also affirms the position set forth by Scrivener, plus giving further information. He says,

The last chapter of Mark's Gospel, from the eighth verse onward, is omitted in the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts, but is contained in the Alexandrian. It is in all the Syrian, Egyptian, and other translations of the second and third centuries and is quoted as the last part of Mark's Gospel by Irenaeus, the most learned Christian writer of the second century, and the student of Polycarp, who had studied with the apostle John.... This chapter of Mark is also found in more than five hundred Greek Manuscripts and also in the Latin and Gothic.... It is a remarkable fact not to be lightly estimated that a whole column of space is left blank in the Vatican Manuscript as if the copyist had intended, but for some reason had omitted to fill it in with the text.¹³

Please notice in the above quotation that further evidence is given in support of Mark 16:9-20. More discussion on the versions and early religious writers will follow later. However, we here note that many of the versions and the quotation by Irenaeus are of the SECOND CENTURY and would therefore account for the existence of verses 9-20 LONG BEFORE the manuscripts of the fourth century. Thus, the critical theory based upon Aleph and B is greatly weakened already, but let us make the case even stronger.

Burton points out that with the exception of Aleph and B, "there is NOT ONE Codex in existence, uncial or cursive—(and we are acquainted with at least eighteen other uncials, and about six hundred cursive copies of this Gospel)—which leaves out the last twelve verses of S. Mark."¹⁴

Perhaps it would be in order to raise the question, "Is the oldest always the best?" Certainly, in this case, there is abundant evidence for believing otherwise. Burton writes in great detail, showing weaknesses, mistakes, and problems with Aleph and B. He points out, for example, that Codex B omits Luke 22:43-44; 23:34; and other verses. Also, although Codex B leaves out Luke 23:34, Aleph contains it. In addition, Burton gives numerous other such references.¹⁵ He also writes

that, "...it is easier to find two consecutive verses in which the two MSS. differ, the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree."¹⁶ Although the following quotation is lengthy, it is quite helpful in understanding how the blank space in Codex B SPEAKS loud and clear in favor of, not against, Mark 16:9-20. Burgon reasoned,

To say that in the Vatican Codex (B), which is unquestionably the oldest we possess, S. Mark's Gospel ends abruptly at the 8th verse of the 16th chapter, and that the customary supscription (KATA MAPKON) follows,—is true; but it is far from being the whole truth. It requires to be stated in addition that the scribe, whose plan is found to have been to begin every fresh book of the Bible at the top of the next ensuing column to that which contained the concluding words of the preceding book, has at the close of S. Mark's gospel deviated from his else invariable practice. He has left in this place one column entirely vacant. It is the only vacant column in the whole manuscript;—a blank space abundantly sufficient to contain the twelve verses which he nevertheless withheld. Why did he leave that column vacant? What can have induced the scribe on this solitary occasion to depart from his established rule? The phenomenon,—(I believe I was the first to call distinct attention to it.)—is in the highest degree significant, and admits of only one interpretation. The old MS. from which Cod. B was copied must have infallibly contained the twelve verses in dispute. The copyist was instructed to leave them out,—and he obeyed; but he prudently left a blank space in memoriam rei. Never was blank more intelligible! Never was silence more eloquent! By this simple expedient, strange to relate, the Vatican Codex is made to refute itself even while it seems to be bearing testimony against the concluding verses of S. Mark's Gospel, by withholding them: for it forbids the inference which, under ordinary circumstances, must have been drawn from the omission. It does more. By leaving room for the verses it omits, it brings into prominent notice at the end of fifteen centuries and a half, a more ancient witness than itself. The venerable Author of the original codex from which Codex B was copied, is thereby brought to view. And thus, our supposed adversary (Codex B) proves our most useful ally: for it procures us the testimony of an hitherto unsuspected witness. The earlier scribe, I repeat, unmistakably comes forward at this stage of the inquiry, to explain that he at least is prepared to answer for the genuineness of these Twelve concluding Verses with which the later scribe, his copyist, from his omission of them, might unhappily be thought to have been unacquainted.¹⁷

Concerning any so called harmony between Aleph and Codex B against Mark 16:9-20, it is indeed amazingly strange that so

much confidence is given to them by Tischendorf, Westcott, Hort, et. al., when “their evidence” is not really convincing. True, neither includes Mark 16:9-20 in the text, but there is a **BIG DIFFERENCE**, for Aleph knows nothing about these verses, yet Codex B bears witness or strongly implies that it knows Mark 16:9-20 was a part of its parent codex. Wayne Price, with reference to Burgon, points out another important point. He says,

Of the four oldest codices, two (B and Aleph) do not have these twelve verses, but two nearly as old (5th mss.) do have them, and these are A (Alexandrinus) and C (Ephraemi Rescriptus). Question: Are these twelve verses an unauthorized addition to A and C, or are they an unwarranted omission from B and Aleph? Codex B itself by this eloquent blank space, declares plainly that from itself they are an omission!¹⁸

Indeed, the evidence is stacked mountain high for the genuineness of this great passage. Question: Why would anyone hold up Codex B against Mark 16:9ff. so superstitiously, when it itself says, “I KNOW this passage is genuine by my blank space?” Also, other manuscript evidence overwhelmingly favors these verses. Price continues his support for these verses by adding,

Both A and C (above) are within fifty years or so of being as old as Aleph, and they both contain these verses. Codex Bezae (D), a 6th century ms. in both Latin and Greek, has these verses in its text. Other early uncials, all late uncials and cursives, Old Latin mss., one old Syriac, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, plus the plain statement by Irenaeus (some 200 years before B and Aleph) shows the existence of these verses in the 2nd century! Again we ask why the argument from antiquity only seems to apply to Greek manuscripts? It would seem that only evidence of the weightiest sort could dislodge these twelve verses from their rightful place in Mark’s gospel, especially since the evidence from the Versions and from Irenaeus show that these verses were a part of Mark’s account within a century (more or less) from the date of the inspired autograph penned by Mark himself!¹⁹

THE VERSIONS

Next, we shall reason that the versions also give strong evidence supporting the genuineness of Mark 16:9-20. We contend that since all the ancient versions contain these verses, they

thereby testify that it was in the Greek copies from which they were taken.²⁰ In substantiating this point, plus reflect and add to our previous discussion, notice this statement made by Davidson:

It is affirmed that all Greek MSS., except B and Aleph, have the paragraph, for example the codexes A C D E G H K L M S U V X I▲; and all evangelistaria, and all synaxaria. The ancient versions, too, including several copies of the old Italic, the Vulgate, the Peshito, the later Syriac, the Curetonian, and the Jerusalem Syriac have it.²¹

McGarvey also points out that “the Peshito Syriac, the Old Italic, the Sahidic and the Coptic” are also among these versions.²² It should be remembered that some of the versions were in existence EARLIER than Aleph and B. These translations, from Greek into other languages, it is said, “are a much better authority than manuscripts which had no existence till early in the fourth century.”²³ Thus, the versions are extremely valuable sources for evaluating the antiquity and genuineness of Mark’s closing verses. Price reasons that, “Perhaps the most valuable of all as far as antiquity is concerned, are the Latin versions.”²⁴ And, let us note that Jerome’s Vulgate (382-404), with Mark being completed about 384 A.D., contains verses 9-20. Price continues by showing that,

...we need to remember that Jerome himself, a first class linguist, made use of earlier mss., his VULGATE being but a revision of the Old Latin. The Old Latin originated sometime in the 2nd century, is represented by some twenty copies, excluding fragments, and even these copies are as old as the celebrated Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, yet the parent copy from which they come dates back to about 150 A.D.²⁵

In addition to other valuable information regarding the versions, Burgon says,

In the iind century, Irenaeus, the Peshito, and the Italic Version as plainly attest that in Gaul, in Mesopotamia and in the African province, the same verses were unhesitatingly received within a century (more or less) of the date of the inspired autograph of the Evangelist himself.²⁶

Certainly, there is no room for appealing to the versions

in an effort to label the last twelve verses of Mark as spurious; the versions testify, “Mark 16:9-20 is genuine.”

EARLY RELIGIOUS WRITERS

Burgon devotes 34 pages in one chapter to discussing these early uninspired writers. He shows how some of their writings have been misused. The chapter heading reads “The Alleged Hostile Witness of Certain of The Early Fathers Proved To Be An Imagination Of The Critics.” This chapter is outstanding! As he deals with Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Jerome, Victor of Antioch, et. al., he demonstrates how their quotations have been misrepresented, plus other matters. After much discussion, he wrote,

Six Fathers of the Church have been examined who are commonly represented as bearing hostile testimony to the last Twelve Verses of S. Mark's Gospel: and they have been easily reduced to one. Three of Them, (Hesychius, Jerome, Victor) prove to be echoes, not voices. The remaining two, (Gregory of Nyssa and Severus) are neither voices nor echoes, but merely names: GREGORY OF NYSSA having really no more to do with this discussion than Philip of Macedon; and “Severus” and “Hesychius” representing one and the same individual. Only by a Critic seeking to mislead his reader will any one of these five Fathers be in future cited as witnessing against the genuineness of S. Mark 16:9-20. Eusebius is the solitary witness who survives the ordeal of exact inquiry. But, Eusebius (as we have seen) instead of proclaiming his distrust of this portion of the Gospel, enters upon an elaborate proof that its contents are not inconsistent with what is found in the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. John. His testimony is reducible to two innocuous and wholly unconnected propositions: the first—That there existed in his day a vast number of copies in which the last chapter of S. Mark's Gospel ended abruptly at verse 8 (the correlative of which of course would be that there also existed a vast number which were furnished with the present ending); The second—That by putting a comma after the word ‘Avaoras,’ S. Mark 16:9, is capable of being reconciled with S. Matthew 28:1. ... I profess myself unable to understand how it can be pretended that Eusebius would have subscribed to the opinion of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and the rest, that the Gospel of S. Mark was never finished by its inspired Author, or was mutilated before it came abroad; at all events, that the last Twelve Verses are spurious.²⁷

True, some of the so-called “Church Fathers” did not quote Mark 16:9-20 in their writings, but does this mean it is

not genuine? Definitely not! Price has written:

One critic argues that *Clement of Alexandria* never mentioned it! The only reply needed to show the absurdity of this argument is to understand that neither did he make reference to the last chapter of Matthew, nor any of the last chapter of Mark! The same writer argued that *Clement of Rome* never refers to Mark 16:9ff., therefore it must not be genuine. However, the reader needs to be aware of the fact that *Clement of Rome* does not quote from the gospel by Mark at all! If this type of argument be valid, then each of the 31,102 verses in the Bible must be quoted by each church father, and any verse omitted by any one father would be considered as spurious by that particular writer. What kind of methodology is this?²⁸

However, some of the early writers did make reference to Mark 16:9-20 in their writings. Irenaeus (130-200 A.D.) quotes from this passage, giving evidence that it existed in the second century and that Mark was its writer. Jerome (A.D. 331-420) has all twelve verses, as we have noted, in his Vulgate. Also, he quotes in his writings from verses 9 and 14. Augustine quotes from verses 9-20 numerous times and writes that "Mark's account of the resurrection was publicly read in the church of his day."²⁹ Ambrose cites verse 15 four times and verses 16, 17 and 19 three times each and verse 20 once. Chrysostom (A.D. 400) quotes verses 19 and 20, and adds, "This is the end of the gospel. Mark makes no extended mention of the Ascension."³⁰

These men say Mark 16:9-20 BELONGS at the conclusion of Mark's inspired record. Indeed, the evidence for the genuineness of these verses from the manuscripts, versions, and early writers is so great, that we pronounce that Aleph and B are guilty of being FALSE witnesses against the closing verses of Mark.

STYLE

The textual critics say the style and phraseology of Mark 16:9-20 is not that of Mark. Therefore, they say, the passage is not genuine. However, this proves also to be a weak argument. Burgon demonstrates that the style and phraseology of this passage is that of Mark. He compares Mark 16:9-20 to Mark

1:9-20 and shows them to be of the same style. He said, “I profess myself unable to discern any real difference of style.”³¹ Question: Shall we listen to Tischendorf, Davidson, Westcott, Hort, et al. and consider Mark 1:9-20 as spurious also? We must not! Burgon very carefully and laboriously deals with 27 alleged words and phrases listed by the critics. These include a variation of the word Sabbath and the mention of Mary Magdalene, “from whom he had cast seven demons” and other words and phrases. Burgon uses 55 pages dealing with this matter and shows that in fact there are 27 reasons to believe verses 9-20 are genuine, based on style and vocabulary. He wrote,

Something more is certain than that the charges which have been so industriously brought against this portion of the gospel are without foundation. It has been also proved that instead of there being discovered twenty-seven suspicious words and phrases scattered up and down these twelve verses of the Gospel, there actually exist exactly as many words and phrases which attest with more or less certainty that those verses are nothing else but the work of the Evangelist.³²

John A. Broadus used an argument similar to Burgon’s by using the verses preceding Mark 16:9-20. He used Mark 15:44-16:8 for a critical study. He found 17 words not used elsewhere in Mark!³³ Hence, the question, should the twelve verses preceding verse nine be rejected also? Certainly not, for a fact like this in the immediate context simply shows the fragile foundation on which this hypothetical criticism has been built. One wonders—if the critics, who support this theory, had extended their study to the verses preceding verse nine, such a theory might never have arisen.

The study made by Broadus led McGarvey to examine the last twelve verses of Luke. In this study, he found nine words which are not used elsewhere by Luke and four which are not found elsewhere in the New Testament. McGarvey then wrote,

...yet none of our critics have thought it worth while to mention this fact, if they have noticed it, much less have they raised a doubt in regard to the genuineness of this passage. Doubtless many other

examples of this kind could be found in the New Testament; but these are amply sufficient to show that the argument which we are considering is but a shallow sophism.³⁴

Now, we ask how can or why do textual critics, preachers, et al. reject Mark 16:9-20 on the basis of style or some other excuse? Robert R. Taylor, Jr., reasons as follows regarding this matter.

Why is it the case that no modernistic and liberalistic effort has been made to discredit the last twelve verses of Luke's gospel treatise? Could it not well be the case that the last twelve verses of Luke 24 do not say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" It has long been my deep conviction that if there had been no allusion to baptism as a condition to salvation in this passage and no allusion at all to supernatural events and miraculous confirmation of God's gospel in the first century, that Mark 16:9-20 would have escaped both denominational and modernistic criticism of such a totally destructive nature. There would have been no concerted effort to omit it from the Sacred Text as we have witnessed their doing toward this highly inestimable passage of Holy Writ regardless of what the fourth century manuscripts said or did not say!³⁵

CONCLUSION

This writer believes that no objection has been raised against verses 9-20 which cannot be reasonably answered. The evidence is strong indeed for believing Mark 16:9-20 is inspired, genuine, and belongs in the conclusion of this great genuine, and belongs in the conclusion of this great book. McGarvey says, "The passage...is authentic in all its details, and there is no reason to doubt that it was written by the same hand which indicted the preceding parts of this narrative."³⁶

By way of summary, the evidence which we have presented from the manuscripts, the versions, and the so-called "Church Fathers," the style and phraseology all support our conclusion—that Mark 16:9-20 is genuine.

ENDNOTES

¹John W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Erlanger, Kentucky: Faith and Facts Press, Reprint), p. 321.

²Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1953), III, p. 467.

³Burgon, p. 81.

⁴Caspar Rene Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1907), p. 511.

⁵Thomas B. Warren, *Warren-Ballard Debate* (Longview, Washington: Telegraph Book Company, 1953), pp. 83,90,104.

⁶Robert R. Taylor, Jr., *Challenging Dangers of Modern Versions* (Pensacola, Florida: Bellview Preacher Training School, 1980), pp. 57,58.

⁷Burgon, p. 96.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁹A. T. Robertson, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925), p. 82.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 83.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 84.

¹²Frederick Henry Scri 1920), p. 500.

¹⁴Burgon, p. 149.

¹⁵David Otis Fuller, *Counterfeit or Genuine* (Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975), p. 170. (Fuller refers to Burgon in Appendix V in *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*.)

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 156.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 165.

¹⁸Wayne Price, "The Ending of the Book of Mark" *Contending for the Faith*, ed. Ira Y. Rice, Jr. (Birmingham: Alabama; Vol. XII, No. 9, 1981), p. 4.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁰J. W. McGarvey, *The New Testament Commentary Matthew and Mark* (Delight: Gospel Light Publishing Company, no date), p. 379.

²¹Samuel Davidson, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1868), II, pp. 112-113.

²²McGarvey, p. 379.

²³Brents, p. 498.

²⁴Price, p. 3.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁶Burgon, p. 115.

²⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 143-145.

²⁸Price, p. 1.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁰*Ibid.*

³¹Burgon, p. 223.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 253.

³³McGarvey, p. 380.

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵Taylor, p. 63.

³⁶McGarvey, p. 382.