

THE MASTER'S SEMINARY

THE ENDINGS OF MARK

BY  
KEITH FONG

SUN VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
MARCH 2022

## CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
The Other Endings .....	1
External Evidence Against the Shorter and Longer Endings.....	2
Internal Evidence Against the Longer Ending.....	2
The Lost Ending.....	3
The No Resurrection Argument.....	3
The No Closure Argument.....	4
The Strange γάρ Ending Argument .....	5
The Unfulfilled Prophecies Argument.....	6
The Unaccomplished Purpose Argument .....	7
Proposed Hypotheses .....	7
The Original Ending .....	9
Abruptness of the Ending.....	9
Ending with Fear.....	9
The Promise and the Warning.....	11
Conclusion .....	12
Bibliography .....	13

## Introduction

The ending of Mark “presents the gravest textual problem in the NT.”<sup>1</sup> Even the most casual reader of the English NT will notice a footnote, bracket, or other note indicating that Mark 16:9-20 (the so-called “longer ending”) is not contained in “some of the earliest manuscripts” (ESV). Some translations even have *two* endings (i.e. NASB)—both the “longer ending” and the “shorter ending.”<sup>2</sup> What is the Bible-believing Christian to do? If the longer and shorter endings aren’t original, shouldn’t they be rejected? But that raises more questions. Did Mark intend to end his book on 16:8, or did he intend to write more? If more was intended, what happened to it? If 16:1-8 *is* Mark’s intended ending, why is it so unsatisfying? This paper will give a summary of why the longer and shorter endings should be rejected, rebut various arguments for a “lost ending”, and finally show why the “original ending” of Mark 16:1-8 is indeed the original, intended, and thus inerrant, ending to the book of Mark.

## The Other Endings

It is “virtually certain”<sup>3</sup> that both the shorter ending and the longer ending (typically 16:9-20) are not Markan. Instead, they are attempts after Mark to fill in the “perceived gap left by the ‘unfinished’ ending at 16:8.”<sup>4</sup> The following is a summary of the evidence of such.

---

<sup>1</sup> James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 497.

<sup>2</sup> There is an additional *third* ending of Mark in the manuscript tradition, the Freer or Washingtonians ending, but it only has one manuscript and so is safely rejected as unoriginal. Carl B. Bridges, “The Canonical Status of the Longer Ending of Mark,” *Stone-Campbell Journal* 9 (Fall 2006): 232–233.

<sup>3</sup> James A. Brooks, *Mark*, vol. 23, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1991), 273. See also Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 497.

<sup>4</sup> R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 687.

### External Evidence Against the Shorter and Longer Endings

The shorter ending is ancient, dating to the 2nd century, but is only found in six extant manuscripts;<sup>5</sup> most manuscripts have the longer ending instead. If the shorter ending were original, scribes would have had no occasion or compulsion to write a longer ending.<sup>6</sup> After all, they would not write another conclusion to a book that already “feels” complete! Thus, the shorter ending can safely be rejected as not original.

The longer ending is also ancient, clearly dating at least from the earliest years of the 2nd century.<sup>7</sup> It is common in the manuscript tradition, but it is also *missing* from very old, reliable manuscripts and from the works of church fathers; in addition, it is often noted as missing in some scribal notes.<sup>8</sup> These lead many scholars to state that the textual evidence against the longer ending is overwhelming.<sup>9</sup>

### Internal Evidence Against the Longer Ending

There are significant internal issues within the longer ending. First, the narrative: the subject changes from the frightened women (16:8) to the resurrected Jesus (16:9) without any

---

<sup>5</sup> William L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 603.

<sup>6</sup> Walter W. Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, vol. 8, The Expositor’s Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 791. This the converse of Warfield’s argument, quoted by Wessel: “The existence of the shorter conclusion...is a fortiori evidence against the longer one [being Markan].” (B. B. Warfield, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (New York: Whittaker, 1890), 20.)

<sup>7</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 499. See also Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:791–792.

<sup>8</sup> For an extensive discussion of the manuscript data, see Jeffrey T Riddle, “The Ending of Mark as a Canonical Crisis,” *Puritan Reformed Journal* 10, no. 1 (2018): 31–54. Riddle argues, contra this paper, for the longer ending’s canonicity. For a medium-length summary, see France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, 685–686. For a short summary, see Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:791.

<sup>9</sup> Joel F. Williams, “Literary Approaches to the End of Mark’s Gospel,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42, no. 1 (March 1999): 22–24. See also Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, 601; Brooks, *Mark*, 23:272. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 497; Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:791.

explanation.<sup>10</sup> Second, the characters: Mary Magdalene is introduced again (16:9) although she is already part of the narrative (15:40, 47; 16:1).<sup>11</sup> Third, the vocabulary: over one third of the significant words in 16:9-20 (18 new words) are never used in 1:1-16:8.<sup>12</sup> Fourth, the style: the longer ending lacks the “vivid and lifelike details so characteristic of Markan historical narrative.”<sup>13</sup> Fifth, the content: the “prominence given to charismatic signs [(16:17-18)] stands in stark contrast to the reserve in Jesus in Mark with regards to signs and sensation (c.f. 8:11-13).”<sup>14</sup> For all of these reasons, none of the resources consulted argue that the longer ending is Markan. Across such a diverse set of scholars, such agreement is rare, and thus noteworthy.

### **The Lost Ending**

The shorter and longer endings are not Markan. However, supposed deficiencies of Mark 16:1-8 have led others to propose that there is in fact another ending—a lost ending. The arguments are summarized and refuted below.

### **The No Resurrection Argument**

Mark 16:1-8 has no resurrection appearance. Proponents of the lost ending say that ending the gospel without a resurrected Christ is absurd. The other three gospel accounts have clear resurrection accounts, and there seems to be no sensible reason why Mark would deviate

---

<sup>10</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 498.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:792. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 498. For a breakdown of the actual Greek words and their issues, see Ezra Palmer Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, International Critical Commentary (New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1922), 302–303.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Bratcher and Eugene A. Nida, *A Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, UBS, 1961), 520. Quoted by Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:792.

<sup>14</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 498–499.

from the story of the life, death, and *resurrection* of Jesus.<sup>15</sup>

However, upon closer inspection, the gospel accounts have much variation in their conclusions. Luke has four events in his gospel's conclusion: "a resurrection report, resurrection appearances, a [great commission], and a report of Jesus' ascension" but that of these, "Matthew includes only the first three, John only the first two, and Mark only the first one. Apparently *there are lots of different ways to end a Gospel.*"<sup>16</sup> Moderns must be wary of imposing an expectation of a gospel genre upon the gospel writers themselves. After all, if Mark wrote his gospel account first, then he would have been the pioneer of the genre, and thus by definition, couldn't get it wrong!<sup>17</sup> Therefore, even though Mark's gospel has no resurrection appearance, this does not inconclusively show that there must be a lost ending.

#### The No Closure Argument

Mark 16:1-8 ends sharply, leaving many unanswered questions about the resurrected Lord and the frightened woman. The prevalence of the spurious longer and shorter endings, probably supplied by well-meaning scribes, indicates that they did not accept 16:1-8 as Mark's intended ending.<sup>18</sup> Proponents of the lost ending conclude that if the scribes didn't accept 16:1-8 as the ending, neither would Mark.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 501–502.

<sup>16</sup> Tim Geddert, "Beginning Again (Mark 16:1-8)," *Direction* 33, no. 2 (2004): 152. Emphasis added.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Robert H. Stein, "The Ending of Mark," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18, no. 1 (2008): 92–93.

<sup>19</sup> Some who reject a lost ending have argued that Mark intentionally left the book open because he "wanted his readers/hearers to continue the story in their own lives." (Brooks, *Mark*, 23:275.) Or, as Geddert says, "Whether this book has a good or a bad ending depends on you. For you are still writing it!" (Geddert, "Beginning Again (Mark 16:1-8)," 157.) For a particularly overt example of this, see Tucker S. Ferda, "The Ending of Mark and the Faithfulness of God," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 13, no. 1 (2019): 36–52. While such conclusions are devotionally attractive, it is more the product of "modern literary theory, and particularly to reader-response theory" (Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 501) than of careful exegesis. Being a citizen of the 1st century world,

However, it is one thing to discern what the scribes intended and quite another to understand what Mark intended. The story of Jonah, the parable of the prodigal son, and the narrative of Jesus walking on water all have abrupt, open endings.<sup>20</sup> If there were scribal additions to these stories, they would have no bearing on the original author's intent; they would only reveal that *the scribes* thought the stories were incomplete, not that the *authors* thought such! Thus, the abruptness of Mark 16:1-8 does not necessarily mean that there is a lost ending; such abruptness could have been Mark's intention.<sup>21</sup>

### The Strange γάρ Ending Argument

Mark 16:8 ends with the conjunctive γάρ. This word is typically not found at the end of a sentence, let alone a book, and proponents of the lost ending say that this implies Mark 16:8 was cut off mid-sentence.<sup>22</sup>

However, while ending a sentence with γάρ is strange, there is sufficient precedent for Mark to do so. Edwards admits that there are “three known examples of Greek books ending in this way” but passionately rejects this as “a precedent for Mark's ending.”<sup>23</sup> Admittedly, while this construction is extremely rare,<sup>24</sup> only *one* prior instance is needed to set precedence.<sup>25</sup> In

---

and not the postmodern one, it is doubtful whether Mark would have had this intention.

<sup>20</sup> Williams, “Literary Approaches to the End of Mark's Gospel,” 25.

<sup>21</sup> In fact, there is good reason to believe that it is. As Gould writes, “the brevity of this ending is quite parallel to the beginning of the Gospel, the beginning and ending being both alike outside the main purpose of the evangelist. It is not strange therefore, but rather consonant with Mk.'s manner.” (Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, 304.)

<sup>22</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 501.)

<sup>23</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 501n20.

<sup>24</sup> Stein, “The Ending of Mark,” 91.

<sup>25</sup> For examples in Ancient Greek literature, see Williams, “Literary Approaches to the End of Mark's

addition, while Edwards claims that neither Mark nor the other gospels “end sentences with gar”<sup>26</sup> there is one example of such in John 13:13.<sup>27</sup> Additionally, there is one example in the LXX (“ἐφοβήθη γάρ”, Gen 18:15), which is strikingly similar to “ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ” (Mark 16:8).<sup>28</sup> Thus, Mark *could* have ended his book with γάρ, even if it is a rare construction. Authorial intent cannot be determined by probability, but by what is in the text.

### The Unfulfilled Prophecies Argument

Proponents say that ending at 16:8 would leave the prophecies of Mark 14:28 and 16:7 as “the only unfilled prophecies in the Gospel, other than [those] concerning the Parousia.”<sup>29</sup> (Stein, “The Ending of Mark,” 97.) He finds this incompleteness an argument for a lost ending.

However, there are other promises that Mark leaves unfilled besides 14:28 and 16:7 and the Parousia. In 10:39, Jesus prophesies that James and John would die. In 12:9, He prophesies the overthrow of the Jewish leadership. In 14:9, He prophesies that the story of Mary and her perfume would go to all the world. Cadwallader also adds 10:20-29, where disciples will be rewarded for their sacrifice for Christ.<sup>30</sup> None of these things would be accomplished within the timeframe of Mark’s gospel, even if there were a longer or lost ending. Thus, evidently not every prophecy must be fulfilled by the book’s end.

---

Gospel,” 25n19.

<sup>26</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 501.

<sup>27</sup> Brooks, *Mark*, 23:273.

<sup>28</sup> Andrew T. Lincoln, “The Promise and the Failure: Mark 16:7, 8,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 2 (1989): 8.

<sup>29</sup> Stein, “The Ending of Mark,” 97.

<sup>30</sup> Alan H Cadwallader, “The Hermeneutical Potential of the Multiple Endings of Mark’s Gospel,” *Colloquium* 43, no. 2 (2011): 139.



## The Unaccomplished Purpose Argument

Proponents of the lost ending say that Mark 16:1-8 leaves the book unfinished because Mark's purpose has not been accomplished. It does not display Jesus as God's Son nor encourage the original recipients in Rome suffering from Neronian persecution.<sup>31</sup> And leaving such goals unaccomplished, 16:8 cannot be the end. Yet, to determine if Mark fulfilled his purpose, it must first be discerned what his purpose is. This will be furthered examined below.

### Proposed Hypotheses

In light of all these arguments, there are two proposed reconstructions: (1) Mark intended to write an ending beyond 16:8, but was prevented from doing so by death, martyrdom, busyness, sickness, or some other unknown cause<sup>32</sup> or (2) Mark did write an ending past 16:8, but it was lost in transmission,<sup>33</sup> perhaps "due to wear-and-tear on the last leaf of a codex."<sup>34</sup>

However, both hypotheses have significant historical and theological problems. The first hypothesis is "mere speculation"<sup>35</sup> with no historical evidence. While it is probable that Mark died as a martyr during Nero's persecution,<sup>36</sup> it is impossible to tell if he died before completing his book. The second hypothesis is also doubtful because it introduces a catch-22. For the lost ending to have been truly lost (with no surviving manuscripts containing the ending), it must

---

<sup>31</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 502.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 503–504.

<sup>33</sup> Wessel, *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, 8:793.

<sup>34</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 503.

<sup>35</sup> Brooks, *Mark*, 23:274.

<sup>36</sup> Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 503–504.

have been lost “at a very early stage...possibly in the original manuscript of Mark itself.”<sup>37</sup> After all, if it was lost in a later stage, it is expected that many copies of Mark would contain not only 1:1-16:8, but the lost ending. However, if the ending was lost at an early stage, “it seems likely that Mark or a close associate would have been able to restore the ending.”<sup>38</sup> In addition, losing the last page of a codex is not a reasonable explanation, not because such is unattested in history but because Mark most likely wrote on a scroll, not a codex, as codices did not become begin until the late 1<sup>st</sup> century.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, losing the climactic end of Mark’s gospel *permanently* is historically quite unlikely.

Even more significantly, these hypotheses cast doubt on God’s sovereignty over the creation and preservation of His Word. As Geddert insightfully says,

Do [lost ending proponents] assume the last verses of Mark were not as inspired as the rest, so God's Spirit "made them disappear"? Or do they believe that the real ending was as inspired as the rest, but unfortunately God failed to keep it in existence long enough for anyone to know about it? Do they really believe that God chose Mark to write the Gospel, but could not keep him alive long enough to finish the job?<sup>40</sup>

If Mark died before he could complete his gospel, then God failed to keep His inspired servant alive to complete the task He commissioned him with. If Mark wrote an ending beyond 16:8 but it was lost in transmission, then God failed to preserve His Word, and failed to keep His promise to preserve His Word forever (Isa 40:8). Such conclusions are unavoidable for those who propose that the ending of Mark is lost, yet such thoughts contradict the sovereign power of God

---

<sup>37</sup> Brooks, *Mark*, 23:273–274.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Mark L. Strauss, *Mark: Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2016), 723n40.

<sup>40</sup> Geddert, “Beginning Again (Mark 16:1-8),” 151.

(Psalm 115:3). There must be a more faithful conclusion.

### **The Original Ending**

The shorter and longer endings are not Markan, and the lost ending hypothesis is spurious. What then is the intended ending of the book of Mark? It is best to understand Mark 16:1-8 as the intended, *original* ending of the book of Mark. While there are many barriers to seeing this as a fitting end to Mark's gospel, they are not insurmountable.

### **Abruptness of the Ending**

Mark ends abruptly at 16:8, yet this both fits Mark's style<sup>41</sup> and provides an inclusio to the beginning of the gospel.<sup>42</sup> The abruptness is perhaps unduly exaggerated by the chapter divisions. It is better to take Mark 15:40-16:8 as the concluding section of the gospel because (1) the proclamation that the crucified Jesus is "the Son of God" (15:39) creates an inclusio with "Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (1:1), and (2) the women disciples are the main characters of this section (15:40-41, 15:47, 16:1, 16:8). This somewhat abates the abruptness of the ending.

### **Ending with Fear**

However, even if an extended conclusion (15:40-16:8) is granted, it still seems strange to end 16:8 on a note of trembling, astonishment, and fear (16:8). But Mark's purpose has been to reveal Jesus Christ as the "Son of God" (1:1), and ending on a note of fear of this divine Son is concordant with that purpose. The theme of fear is consistently woven throughout the entire book of Mark (1:22, 1:27, 2:12, 4:41, 5:15, 5:33, 5:42, 6:51, 9:15, 9:32, 10:32, 11:18, 12:17,

---

<sup>41</sup> Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, 304.

<sup>42</sup> Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, 591–592.

14:50, 14:52, 15:5-6, 16:8).<sup>43</sup> In each case, the fear is a response to Jesus, particularly to His divine, miraculous power. Thus, “the silence and fear of the women \[is purposefully] an indirect Christological affirmation”<sup>44</sup> and the abrupt ending “leaves the reader confronted by the witness of the empty tomb interpreted by the word of revelation.”<sup>45</sup>

An analysis of ἐφοβοῦντο, the penultimate word in the book of Mark, reveals a precise connection between fear and Christ’s resurrection. The word ἐφοβοῦντο, an imperfect middle/passive indicative verb from φοβέω, indicates *persistent* fear and appears in Mark only in 9:32, 10:32, 11:18, 11:32, and 16:8.<sup>46</sup> Three of these instances describe the disciples: in 9:32, the disciples were afraid to ask Him after His second declaration of His passion and resurrection; in 10:32, the disciples following Jesus were afraid, which then leads to Christ’s third and final declaration of His passion and resurrection; and in 16:8, the end of the *resurrection* narrative, the women were afraid. Thus, using ἐφοβοῦντο, Mark links the disciples’ fear at the *promise* of Christ’s death and resurrection (9:32, 10:32) with the women disciples’ fear at the *accomplishment* of Christ’s resurrection (16:8). There are other forms of φοβέω; this cannot be mere coincidence.

The occasion of the book of Mark, namely the Neronian persecution in Rome, gives a tentative explanation for the link between ἐφοβοῦντο and Christ’s resurrection. In the throes of persecution and martyrdom, the Church always needs bold encouragement to face death and to

---

<sup>43</sup> Brooks, *Mark*, 23:274. For a helpful section tracing the themes of fear and misunderstanding in the book of Mark, see Aída Besançon Spencer, “The Denial of the Good News and the Ending of Mark,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 17, no. 2 (2007): 273–277.

<sup>44</sup> Lane, *The Gospel of Mark*, 590–591.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 591–592.

<sup>46</sup> Two describe Jesus’ earthly *enemies* (11:18 the chief priests and scribes; 11:32 the chief priests, scribes, and elders), and can be excluded from the Mark 16:8 discussion because the ones who fear are the women *disciples*.

persevere unto eternal life (Heb 12:4; 2 Peter 3:13-15). Mark ties together persistent fear and the resurrection for rhetorical effect: “If Christ was betrayed into the hands of the Jews, condemned to death and delivered to the Gentiles, mocked and spit upon, flogged and killed—just as He promised—isn’t it just as certain that after three days He was raised from the dead—just as He promised? And if His resurrection is true, if He has defeated death, *why would you still fear?*” Such an encouragement, to put on the hope of eternal life, to believe that the sufferings of this present time are not worth to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed at His coming (Rom 8:18), is exactly what the persecuted Church needed, and needs, to endure.

#### The Promise and the Warning<sup>47</sup>

Fear and the resurrection are juxtaposed in 16:6-8. The young man gives a multitude of commands and promises to the women: do not be amazed, Jesus has been raised, He is not here, see the place where He lay, go [and] say that He goes to Galilee, there you will find Him. The interweaving of three promises and three commands indicates that believing the promises leads to obeying the commands, but that disbelieving will lead to disobeying. After hearing these promises and commands, the women then flee and “say nothing to anyone, for they were afraid” (16:8); in Mark’s gospel, they did not believe, and thus they did not obey.<sup>48</sup> Yet this event of promise and failure is but the conclusion of a repeated theme. Throughout his book, Mark juxtaposes gospel promise with the disciples’ failure repeatedly, especially in “announcement[s]

---

<sup>47</sup> Williams, “Literary Approaches to the End of Mark’s Gospel,” 34. For an in-depth analysis of the promise and failure in the conclusion of Mark, see Lincoln, “The Promise and the Failure.”

<sup>48</sup> Some have argued that the women’s fleeing is positive. This is highly doubtful and should be rejected. For a refutation of said hypothesis, see Geddert, “Beginning Again (Mark 16:1-8),” 153 and Ferda, “The Ending of Mark and the Faithfulness of God,” 38–39.

of the passion and resurrection of the Son of \[M]an (8:31; 9:31; 10:33, 34).”<sup>49</sup> Mark’s conclusion is therefore both a promise of hope (namely the resurrection that overcomes death) but also a warning that fear will lead to disobedience. The abrupt ending of 16:8 is a call to believe everything in Mark 1:1-16:7 and to cast off fear. Christ indeed “has risen” (16:6) “just as He told you” (16:7); there is no more need for doubt. All that remains is the call of discipleship—to believe and follow Christ (8:34).

### **Conclusion**

Despite the existence of a longer ending, a shorter ending, and the lost-ending hypothesis, Mark finished his gospel account with 16:8. While the other endings are well-meaning attempts of believers to supply what was seen as a failure or shortcoming of Mark 1:1-16:8, their existence proves not the gospel’s deficiency, but a deficient understanding of the book of Mark as it stands. Upon further inspection, the intended, original ending of 15:40-16:8 is a perfect ending to this gospel: it honors the inclusio of 1:1 and 15:39, gives a capstone for the theme of fear at Christ’s passion and resurrection, and completes Mark’s purpose to both encourage and warn the persecuted believers to endure. In its current, preserved, form, God has inspired, preserved, and protected the book the Mark and has given it to the Church as a precious gift that She might walk by faith—not by fear—until the Day the Lord comes to take Her home.

---

<sup>49</sup> Lincoln, “The Promise and the Failure,” 294.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bratcher, Robert, and Eugene A. Nida. *A Handbook on the Gospel of Mark*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, UBS, 1961.
- Bridges, Carl B. “The Canonical Status of the Longer Ending of Mark.” *Stone-Campbell Journal* 9 (Fall 2006): 231–242.
- Brooks, James A. *Mark*. Vol. 23. The New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1991.
- Cadwallader, Alan H. “The Hermeneutical Potential of the Multiple Endings of Mark’s Gospel.” *Colloquium* 43, no. 2 (2011): 129–146.
- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel According to Mark*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Ferda, Tucker S. “The Ending of Mark and the Faithfulness of God.” *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 13, no. 1 (2019): 36–52.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Geddert, Tim. “Beginning Again (Mark 16:1-8).” *Direction* 33, no. 2 (2004): 150–157.
- Gould, Ezra Palmer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. International Critical Commentary. New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1922.
- Lane, William L. *The Gospel of Mark*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. “The Promise and the Failure: Mark 16:7, 8.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 2 (1989): 283–300.
- Riddle, Jeffrey T. “The Ending of Mark as a Canonical Crisis.” *Puritan Reformed Journal* 10, no. 1 (2018): 31–54.
- Spencer, Aída Besançon. “The Denial of the Good News and the Ending of Mark.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 17, no. 2 (2007): 269–283.
- Stein, Robert H. “The Ending of Mark.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18, no. 1 (2008): 79–98.
- Strauss, Mark L. *Mark: Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2016.
- Warfield, B. B. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New York: Whittaker, 1890.

Wessel, Walter W. *Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Vol. 8. The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

Williams, Joel F. "Literary Approaches to the End of Mark's Gospel." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42, no. 1 (March 1999): 21–35.