Reading 1 Peter with the Scribes: Pronominal Variation, Scribal Alteration, and the *Editio Critica Maior*[1]

Travis B. Williams

1. Introduction

Textual critics frequently encounter variations between first- and second-person plural pronouns in the New Testament manuscript tradition, a phenomenon long noted in the textual record of 1 Peter.[2] A well-known example appears in 1 Pet 2:21, where the NA[29] text reads ὑμῶν and ὑμῖν, though a number of manuscripts attest first-person alternatives (ἡμῶν and ἡμῖν).[3] Most scholars agree that the second-person reading represents the 'initial text' (*Ausgangstext*), as reflected by its "A" rating in UBS[6].[4] Yet while the original form is widely accepted, the cause of the variation has been variously assessed. Some years ago, Bruce M. Metzger identified two possibilities—accidental confusion of *eta* and *upsilon* due to similar pronunciation (itacism) or intentional alteration to broaden the theological scope of Christ's example—without adjudicating between them,[5] an agnostic posture that most Petrine commentators have since maintained. H. A. G. Houghton's more recent discussion, by contrast, settles on the first explanation while leaving the second largely untested.[6]

The present study reopens this question by treating the *Editio Critica Maior* (*ECM*) not merely as a finished product that informs exegesis, translation, or theology, but as a powerful analytical tool. Its extensive documentation of manuscript readings allows variations to be quantified across witnesses, enabling patterns to be detected that would otherwise remain invisible.[7] By integrating quantitative analysis with traditional philological

[1] I am grateful to Paul A. Himes, Peter R. Rodgers, and Nelson Hsieh for reading an earlier draft of this paper and offering many valuable suggestions. I would also like to thank Joel Shelton for his assistance with the statistical analysis performed therein.

[2] See, e.g., Frederick H. A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the Use of Biblical Students*, 4th ed. (London: Bell, 1894), 11; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1934), 195; Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 255–56.

[3] The combination of first-person pronouns (ἡμῶν ἡμῖν), which is found in the *Textus Receptus*, is not very well attested (642, 1243, 2344, 2718, 2805, Cyr). Alternatively, there are different mixtures of the pronouns with varying degrees of support: ὑμῶν ἡμῖν (2492) and ἡμῶν ὑμῖν (049, 0142, 33, 307, 323, 623, 2464, 2541, Byz, co$^{sa(ms)}$, Cyr^{mss}).

[4] This reading is found in a variety of important Greek manuscripts (P^{72}, ℵ, A, B, C, Ψ, 69, 81, 945, 1241, 1739, *al*) as well as a number of other witnesses (vg, co$^{sa(mss)}$, sy^{h}, arm, eth, geo^{A1}, Cyr^{T}, Dam, PsOec).

[5] Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 620.

[6] H. A. G. Houghton, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion to the Sixth Edition of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2025), 342–43. Cf. Klaus Wachtel, *Der byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der Koine des Neuen Testaments*, ANTF 24 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 248–49, who proposes a two-stage account in which the first-person reading originated through itacism but established itself under the influence of formulaic statements about Christ's suffering 'for us.' Wachtel's hybrid framing anticipates, in a limited way, the dual-mechanism account developed below.

[7] Quantification is a necessary prerequisite for understanding scribal activity, though it is often omitted from modern assessments. This omission has been highlighted by L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, who

judgment, this inquiry seeks to determine where pronominal variants are best explained by phonological confusion and where they more likely reflect intentional scribal intervention, and then it asks what those patterns imply for the modern interpretation of 1 Peter.

Such an approach situates the investigation within a broader methodological debate. On one side, scholars emphasize scribal agency, treating variants as interpretive artifacts that illuminate how the text was received in early Christian communities.[8] On the other, many argue for scribal fidelity, insisting that most variation was unintentional and that the primary goal of textual criticism remains the recovery of the earliest attainable text.[9] Although these models are sometimes presented as mutually exclusive, such a dichotomy is unnecessary: the present study assumes that both unintentional and intentional changes occurred and seeks methodological criteria by which each can be demonstrated.[10] Accurate reconstruction of the initial text provides a foundation for understanding how the text was later interpreted; careful attention to scribal tendencies, in turn, refines judgments about that initial text.

What the *ECM* makes possible is precisely this kind of bi-directional analysis. By quantifying pronominal variation across the manuscript tradition and testing it against the diagnostic features predicted by an accidental model, this paper develops replicable criteria for distinguishing accidental from intentional variation, applies them to the manuscript tradition of 1 Peter in light of broader patterns observable across the New Testament, and explores how these patterns should inform the exegesis, translation, and theological

---

note, "scribal errors have never been made the subject of a statistical study, and so it is not possible to establish with any degree of precision the relative frequency of the various types" (*Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 4th ed. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013], 223). In recent years, efforts have been made to remedy this situation (e.g., James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 [Leiden: Brill, 2008]), and this study represents a small contribution toward that end.

[8] E.g., Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, SNTSMS 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966); Wayne Kannaday, *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition: Evidence of the Influence of Apologetic Interests on the Text of the Canonical Gospels*, TCSt 5 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2004); Juan Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2/218 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[9] See, e.g., Alan Taylor Farnes, *Simply Come Copying: Direct Copies as Test Cases in the Quest for Scribal Habits*, WUNT 2/481 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019); Abidan Paul Shah, *Changing the Goalpost of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2020); Alan Mugridge, *Scribes, Motives, and Manuscripts: Evaluating Trends in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2024); idem, *Scribes, Theology, and Apologetics: Assessing Scribal Interference in New Testament Manuscripts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2024).

[10] For instance, those who claim that scribes faithfully reproduced their exemplar also admit that, at times, they made intentional changes that were theologically motivated (e.g., Robert D. Marcello, "Myths about Orthodox Corruption," in *Myths and Mistakes in New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Elijah H. Hixson and Peter J. Gurry [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019], 211). At the same time, those who emphasize scribal variation also caution against attributing too great a role to copyists in the transmission process (e.g., Eldon J. Epp, "How New Testament Textual Variants Embody and Exhibit Prior Textual Traditions," in *Biblical Essays in Honor of Daniel J. Harrington, SJ, and Richard J. Clifford, SJ: Opportunity for No Little Instruction*, ed. Christopher G. Frechette, Christopher R. Matthews, and Thomas D. Stegman [New York, NY: Paulist, 2014], 276).

interpretation of the letter.[11] Pronominal variation, I attempt to show, is not simply a textual problem to be resolved, but a significant window into both the mechanics of transmission and the lived interpretation of scripture in early Christian communities.

2. Pronominal Variation as Accidental Mistake

Many scholars attribute pronominal variation in New Testament manuscripts to accidental error rather than intentional theological revision.[12] The most common explanation appeals to phonological confusion—specifically the similar pronunciation of *eta* and *upsilon* in post-classical Greek, which could lead scribes to interchange first- and second-person plural pronouns. This explanation is well-grounded historically and must be acknowledged as a genuine feature of the transmission process. Yet acknowledging that accidental confusion *could* occur is a different matter from determining when it *did*. The task of this section therefore extends beyond merely establish the possibility of phonological error; it seeks to develop the diagnostic profile by which such mistakes can be recognized in the manuscript record—a profile that will serve as the baseline against which patterned, non-accidental behavior is measured in what follows.

2.1. The Mechanics of Accidental Pronominal Confusion

In Classical Greek, the vowels *eta* and *upsilon* were phonologically distinct: the former represented an open-mid front vowel and the latter a rounded front vowel. During the Hellenistic and Roman periods, however, both gradually shifted toward an /i/-sound, such that by the early centuries of the Common Era their pronunciation overlapped sufficiently that confusion between forms such as ἡμῶν and ὑμῶν would have been entirely possible.[13] This convergence is amply documented in inscriptions and papyri, where interchange between the two vowels appears with notable frequency.[14] The phenomenon is therefore not hypothetical but a well-established feature of post-classical Greek phonology, documented from the early centuries of the Common Era and persisting throughout the period in which New Testament manuscripts were copied.

---

[11] Because criteria for intentional alteration depend on a clear picture of what accidental variation looks like, the study first develops its diagnostic profile (§2) before establishing and applying criteria for patterned scribal intervention (§3–4).

[12] The recent assessment by Robert F. Hull is shared by many scholars: "The New Testament is replete with variations between the first- and second-person pronouns (ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, *hēmeis*, *humeis*) because these sounded alike" (*The Story of the New Testament Text: Movers, Materials, Motives, Methods, and Models*, RBS 58 [Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2010], 19).

[13] See W. Sidney Allen, *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 62–66; cf. also Michel Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*, 2nd ed., Collection de philologie classique 3 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1955), §226; Benjamin Kantor, *The Pronunciation of New Testament Greek: Judeo-Palestinian Greek Phonology and Orthography from Alexander to Islam* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2023), 549–50, 580–81.

[14] Examples of the interchange between *eta* and *upsilon* from the epigraphic record are provided by Leslie Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, vol. 1: *Phonology* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 267. Examples of the interchange between *eta* and *upsilon* from the papyrological record are provided by Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1: *Phonology*, Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55 (Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino - La goliardica 1975), 262–65.

The opportunity for such confusion was not limited to dictation, though dictation certainly provided one obvious avenue.[15] Even when copying proceeded primarily by sight, scribes typically engaged in sub-vocalization, mentally rehearsing words as they transferred them from exemplar to page. Modern cognitive research has shown that reading frequently involves an internal "phonological loop" in which written language is processed in sound-based units retained briefly in working memory.[16] Silent copying thus retained an aural dimension, and the potential for interchange between similarly-pronounced vowels persisted whether the copying process was strictly auditory or primarily visual.

These factors confirm that phonological confusion between first- and second-person plural pronouns must be acknowledged as a genuine mechanism of textual variation. The question is thus whether the distribution and character of the surviving variants conform to what would be expected under a primarily accidental model. To answer that question, we must first specify what accidental variation looks like when it does occur.

2.2. The Diagnostic Profile of Accidental Variation

If phonological confusion is the primary mechanism behind a given pronominal variant, certain features should be observable in the manuscript record. These features, taken together, constitute a diagnostic profile that distinguishes mechanical lapse from patterned alteration. Four characteristics are particularly significant.

First, accidental variants tend to produce *grammatical, syntactical, or contextual incoherence*. Phonological substitution operates without regard to meaning; when a scribe incorrectly writes a pronoun on the basis of sound alone, the resulting reading frequently disrupts sense. In 1 John 2:12, for example, a minority reading substitutes ἡμῖν for ὑμῖν, yielding the awkward statement, "I am writing *to us*." Because the epistolary context clearly presupposes address to the recipients and not to the author and his associates, the reading is best explained as a mechanical lapse. A similar case appears in Mark 1:24, where certain manuscripts replace ἡμᾶς with ὑμᾶς, producing the nonsensical question, "Have you come to destroy *yourselves*?" Such readings disrupt grammar or sense in ways that no scribe would deliberately introduce, aligning with what textual critics commonly describe as "nonsense readings."[17]

Second, accidental variants typically appear as *isolated substitutions* rather than coordinated changes. A scribe altering a pronoun by phonological confusion will not simultaneously adjust surrounding pronouns to maintain consistency, since the alteration was not deliberate to begin with. When a pronoun shift stands in isolation while parallel forms in the immediate context remain unchanged, the resulting inconsistency weakens any

---

[15] Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 21–22.

[16] On this process, see further Alan D. Baddeley and Graham Hitch, "Working Memory," *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 8 (1974): 47–89; cf. also idem, "The Phonological Loop as a Buffer Store: An Update," *Cortex* 112 (2019): 91–106.

[17] See Ernest C. Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 111, who defines a nonsense reading as "words unknown to grammar or lexicon, words that cannot be construed syntactically, or words that do not make sense in the context." Cf. Eldon J. Epp, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant,'" in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 168, who defines a nonsense reading as "a reading that fails to make sense because it cannot be construed grammatically, either in terms of grammatical/lexical form or in terms of grammatical structure, or because in some other way it lacks a recognizable meaning."

argument for intentional revision. Likewise, substitutions that violate grammatical concord or disrupt established rhetorical structure suggest inattentive copying rather than theological reflection.

Third, accidental variants display *limited manuscript distribution*. Because phonological confusion arises sporadically and independently, such errors tend to appear in single witnesses or small clusters and rarely achieve broader manuscript support. A reading that arose through one scribe's auditory slip has no inherent reason to be reproduced across multiple independent streams of transmission. Where a variant is attested only in scattered witnesses without evident genealogical or thematic coherence, the most economical explanation is mechanical error.

Finally, accidental variants exhibit *directional neutrality*. If pronominal variation is driven primarily by phonological confusion between *eta* and *upsilon*, the substitution should operate in both directions with roughly equal frequency. There is no phonological reason for first-to-second person shifts to occur more often than second-to-first, or vice versa. A model based on accidental error therefore predicts approximate symmetry across a sufficiently large corpus.

These four features—incoherence, isolation, limited distribution, and directional neutrality—constitute the diagnostic profile of accidental pronominal variation. They are not arbitrary stipulations but follow directly from the mechanism itself: phonological confusion is contextually blind, sporadic, independent, and undirected. Where variants exhibit these features, accidental explanation is the most parsimonious account, and intentional theological readings of such variants risk building exegetical conclusions on mechanical lapses.

It is essential to acknowledge this category of variation, for two reasons. First, it demonstrates that not all textual difference is ideologically charged; the manuscript tradition does contain readings that arose without interpretive intent, and these must be identified so that they are not mistakenly treated as evidence of scribal engagement. Second, the diagnostic profile of accidental variation provides the baseline against which patterned behavior must be measured. Intentional alteration, if it occurred, would leave traces that *depart* from this profile—readings that preserve coherence, cluster in particular contexts, achieve broader manuscript support, and display directional asymmetry. The following section addresses this question, asking whether the manuscript tradition exhibits features that exceed what the accidental model predicts and, if so, what explanatory framework can account for them.

3. Pronominal Variation as Intentional Alteration

Accidental phonological confusion, as the preceding analysis has shown, accounts for some pronominal variation in the New Testament manuscript tradition—but not all of it. While many such variants are isolated and incoherent, the broader evidence reveals patterns that are directional, clustered, and often concentrated in passages of theological or ecclesial significance. These features invite consideration of intentional alteration alongside mechanical lapse. Without speculating about scribal motives, this section proceeds methodologically: establishing criteria for identifying intentional change within the textual tradition and testing those criteria through quantitative analysis of pronominal variation across multiple New Testament books. The goal is to determine whether certain shifts from "you" to

"we" reflect instances in which scribes repositioned themselves and their communities within the apostolic address.

3.1. Identifying Intentional Scribal Alteration

A number of scholars have observed that certain shifts between second-person and first-person plural pronouns in 1 Peter appear to reflect deliberate scribal intervention. This conclusion was notably advanced by Westcott and Hort. While acknowledging the potential influence of itacism in the transmission of the text, they nevertheless contended that "[t]he prevailing tendency is to introduce ἡμεῖς wrongly, doubtless owing to the natural substitution of a practical for a historical point of view."[18] Their assessment, however, was necessarily impressionistic: the manuscript evidence required to test it on quantitative grounds was not yet available in the form the *ECM* now provides.

Still, the evidentiary gap is not the only obstacle. Attributing intention to ancient copyists raises methodological challenges in its own right, and these difficulties compound one another. Discerning the psychological motives of scribes is inherently challenging, particularly given the limited data available regarding individual manuscripts and the persons responsible for their production.[19] Manuscripts rarely identify their copyists, and even when they do, they offer no explanation for specific alterations, leaving the interpreter to reconstruct intention from the change itself. Compounding this opacity, textual transmission was a multistage process in which a given variant could arise during initial copying, during correction by a later hand, or from the exemplar itself, and it is often impossible to determine at which stage a particular change occurred.[20] In the case of pronominal variation specifically, an accidental explanation remains viable unless strong evidence rules it out, since *eta* and *upsilon* were frequently pronounced similarly and could easily be confused in hearing or sub-vocalization. Each of these limitations would be serious on its own; together they make confident assignment of intention to any single variant especially fraught.

These difficulties help explain why proposals of intentional scribal alteration, though often plausible, can rest on uncertain foundations. In many instances, intentionality is inferred by elimination; that is, if a variant cannot readily be explained as accidental, or if alternative explanations appear unlikely, it is classified as deliberate.[21] But such reasoning

---

[18] Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix* (London: Macmillan, 1882), 310.

[19] On the difficulties associated with psychological diagnosis, see Dirk Jongkind, "Singular Readings in Sinaiticus: The Possible, the Impossible, and the Nature of Copying," in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. David C. Parker, TS 3/6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 35–54; cf. also David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 37.

[20] See further Ulrich Schmid, "Scribes and Variants—Sociology and Typology," in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. David C. Parker, TS 3/6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 1–24; see also idem, "Conceptualizing 'Scribal' Performances: Reader's Notes," in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, ed. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, TCSt 8 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2011), 49–64.

[21] An influential formulation of this elimination-based approach appears in Larry W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*, SD 43 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), 68: "As a basic working principle, we may say that when a variant cannot be attributed to the common scribal mistakes in copying, and especially when the variant can be attributed to a reasonable editorial intention, it is very likely that the variant is an intentional change." See also Jeffrey Kloha, "The Ethics of Sexuality and Textual Alterations in the Pauline Epistles," in *Textual Variation: Theological and*

risks circularity, especially when it relies on selective examples or broad assumptions about early Christian theology and scribal practice. When the criterion for identifying intentional change is itself derived from the variants in question, the argument explains nothing.

A more robust defense of intentional alteration requires a clearer methodological framework grounded in the manuscript evidence itself.[22] Analysis must begin not with conjectures about motive but with demonstrable textual behavior, and intentional alteration must be demonstrated positively rather than inferred by the failure of accidental explanation. In order to argue convincingly that a scribe intentionally altered a pronoun, interpreters must show three things: (1) that the variant carries meaningful rhetorical or theological significance; (2) that it forms part of a broader pattern of change and not an isolated anomaly; and (3) that the pattern exhibits features—directionality, clustering, genre sensitivity—that exceed what a random model would predict.

What such non-random behavior would look like in practice can be specified by inverting the diagnostic profile of accidental variation established above. Where accidental variants produce incoherence, intentional variants would preserve grammatical and contextual sense. Where accidental variants appear in isolation, intentional variants would cluster in passages of theological or ecclesial significance. Where accidental variants achieve only limited distribution, intentional variants would gain traction across identifiable manuscript streams. And where accidental variants exhibit directional neutrality, intentional variants would display predictable asymmetry—most plausibly a consistent movement from "you" to "we" rather than reciprocal fluctuation.[23] A fifth feature, genre sensitivity, may be added to these four: letters, in which the distinction between author and audience is rhetorically central, would be more susceptible to deliberate pronominal adjustment than narrative texts.

Of these inverted features, the directional prediction warrants particular defense, since pronominal alteration is not unidirectional in its rhetorical effects.[24] As J. B. Lightfoot observed long ago in his discussion of the text of the Clementine epistles in MS C (Constantinopolitanus), the substitution of second-person forms for first-person ones can heighten the directness of hortatory discourse, sharpening the force of exhortation by confronting

---

Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, ed. David C. Parker, TS 3/6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 106.

[22] An important terminological clarification is necessary at this point: throughout the study, "intentional" refers to patterned transmissional behavior detectable across manuscripts, not to demonstrable deliberation in the mind of any individual scribe. Manuscript attestations are not fully independent observations in the strict statistical sense, since many witnesses share genealogical relationships. Even where certain clusters derive from a shared exemplar rather than from multiple independent acts of alteration, the resulting pattern would remain incompatible with purely accidental causation at some stage in the transmissional history.

[23] The claim that pronominal variation "clusters" in theologically significant passages requires methodological clarification, lest it appear impressionistic. To avoid circularity, clustering must be measured against an objective baseline: if variation were primarily accidental, its distribution should approximate the distribution of opportunity, such that the proportion of variants within a given thematic unit roughly corresponds to that unit's share of total pronominal occurrences. Substantial deviation from this proportional expectation requires further explanation. Thematic units must, of course, be defined by pre-established criteria—lexical, structural, or rhetorical—rather than identified after variants are observed. Disproportion alone does not prove intentional alteration, but when it converges with directional asymmetry, overdispersion, and genre sensitivity, the cumulative evidence becomes increasingly difficult to reconcile with a purely accidental explanation.

[24] A point brought to my attention by Paul Himes.

the hearer more immediately.[25] If heightened directness were the primary driver of pronominal change, one would expect a roughly symmetrical distribution between the two directions, or even a preference for second-person substitutions.

The manuscript evidence, however, consistently shows the opposite: scribes are significantly more likely to replace second-person forms with first-person ones than the reverse, as the corpus-wide data presented in the next section will show. This asymmetry suggests that first-person forms do more than intensify address; they reposition the scribe and his community within the scope of the text's claims, collapsing historical distance and allowing the copyist to participate rhetorically in the apostolic "we." Communal repositioning thus appears to be the dominant scribal impulse, with rhetorical intensification—where it occurs—operating as a secondary pattern.

The value of this framework lies in what it makes testable. Accidental variation is real but sporadic; intentional variation, if present, must be patterned—and patterning, unlike intention, can be measured. The next section therefore turns to quantitative evidence in order to determine whether such patterning is detectable in the New Testament manuscript tradition.

3.2. Quantifying Pronominal Variation

With its extensive witness apparatus, the *ECM* provides an opportunity to test the question of scribal intentionality on an empirical basis. To determine whether pronominal variation is better explained by accidental or intentional causes, this study examined 155,351 attestations of first- or second-person plural pronouns across selected books of the New Testament: Mark, John, Acts, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, the Catholic Epistles, and Revelation.[26]

Out of these, only 4,213 instances (2.7%) exhibit variation from the NA[29] reading by substituting a pronoun of the opposite person. The data consequently confirm that, taken as a whole, scribes transmitted pronominal forms with a high degree of accuracy. However, the distribution of these variants is not random. Several statistical observations indicate that a substantial portion of the changes do not conform to the diagnostic profile of accidental variation established above. Four tests address its key features in turn: directionality, dispersion, distribution, and genre sensitivity.

The first test concerns *directional neutrality*. If *eta*/*upsilon* confusion were the primary cause, one would expect approximately equal movement from first-person to second-person forms as from second-person to first. Yet the data reveal a clear asymmetry. Across all occurrences, there were 2,531 shifts from second to first person (e.g., ὑμῖν → ἡμῖν), while only 1,682 shifts from first to second (e.g., ἡμῶν → ὑμῶν). To determine whether this

[25] J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part 1: *S. Clement of Rome: A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1890), 128–29.

[26] See Appendix: Pronominal Variation according to the *ECM*. For this study, I have relied on the evidence from each of the currently available volumes of the *ECM*, including the Gospel of Mark, the Acts of the Apostles, James, 1–2 Peter, 1–3 John, Jude, and Revelation. I have also included the data from The International Greek New Testament Project available online. This includes the collation of Greek manuscripts selected for the ECM of certain books, such as the Gospel of John (https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/iohannes/ECMGreek/index.html), Romans (https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/apparatus/romans/index.html), Galatians (https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/apparatus/galatians/index.html), and Ephesians (https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/apparatus/ephesians/index.html).

disparity is statistically significant, a chi-square goodness-of-fit test can be applied using the following formula:[27]

$$x^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

where O is the observed count in each category and E the expected count under the null hypothesis of equal distribution. The resulting value confirms that the imbalance exceeds what would be expected under a neutral phonological substitution model applied to the extant manuscript corpus.[28] Scribes were about 50% more likely to alter "you" (ὑμεῖς) to "we" (ἡμεῖς) than the reverse.[29] Such directional bias suggests a consistent scribal tendency, often toward inclusivity or communal identification, and is difficult to reconcile with a model based primarily on accidental phonological confusion.

The second test concerns the *dispersion of variants* across pronominal positions. If scribal errors were primarily accidental, the number of variants at each pronominal position (i.e., a specific occurrence of a first- or second-person plural pronoun in a particular verse) should approximate a Poisson distribution, in which the mean and variance are approximately equal.[30] Taking each of the 1,232 pronominal positions catalogued in the appendix as a single observation—where the count for each is the number of manuscripts attesting a person-switch at that position—the mean number of variants per position is $\bar{x} \approx 3.42$ and the sample variance is $s^2 \approx 113.00$. Computing the dispersion index using the formula:

$$D = \frac{s^2}{\bar{x}}$$

where $\bar{x}$ is the sample mean and s^2 the sample variance, yields a value of approximately 33.04. A ratio this high (*viz*. over thirty times greater than expected under a random error model) indicates extreme over-dispersion. In statistical terms, the data do not behave as a random scattering of low-probability copying errors. Instead, they show marked clustering: long stretches of text with no variation at all, punctuated by sudden peaks where

---

[27] Robert V. Hogg, Joseph W. McKean, and Allen T. Craig, *Introduction to Mathematical Statistics*, 7th ed. (Boston, MA: Pearson, 2013), 561–65.

[28] Under the null hypothesis (H_0), variation is proportional to opportunity — that is, proportional to the total manuscript attestations of each pronominal category (see George Casella and Roger L. Berger, *Statistical Inference*, 2nd ed. [Pacific Grove, CA: Thomson Learning, 2002], 373–74). The expected variant counts are therefore $E_1 = 4{,}213 \times \frac{53{,}460}{155{,}351} \approx 1449.79$ for first-person originals and $E_2 = 4{,}213 \times \frac{101{,}891}{155{,}351} \approx 2763.21$ for second-person originals. Substituting these into the chi-square goodness-of-fit formula yields a first-person contribution of $\frac{(1{,}682-1449.79)^2}{1449.79} \approx 37.19$ and a second-person contribution of $\frac{(2{,}531-2763.21)^2}{2763.21} \approx 19.51$, for a total of $\chi^2 \approx 56.70$. With one degree of freedom, this corresponds to $p \approx 5.06 \times 10^{-14}$, well below any conventional cutoff.

[29] Crucially, this asymmetry is not an artifact of the base text containing more second-person than first-person pronouns: when expected variant counts are weighted by the actual distribution of pronominal opportunities in the corpus (see n. 29), the observed shift from second to first person still exceeds expectation by a wide margin, while the reverse direction falls below it.

[30] William Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Wiley, 1968), 1:156–59; cf. also Morris H. DeGroot and Mark J. Schervish, *Probability and Statistics*, 4th ed. (Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley, 2012), 287–91.

large numbers of manuscripts diverge from the initial text. This kind of distribution is exactly what one would expect if scribal alteration occurred selectively at passages perceived as theologically or liturgically significant. The same selectivity, as the next test shows, also operates at a broader scale.

The third test concerns *genre sensitivity*. When narrative texts (Mark, John, Acts) are compared with epistolary texts (Pauline and Catholic epistles), the rate of pronominal variation is significantly higher in the latter. To evaluate whether this difference is statistically significant, a two-proportion z-test can be applied using the following formula:[31]

$$z = \frac{p_1 - p_2}{\sqrt{p * (1 - p) * \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

where p_1 and p_2 represent the proportion of variants in narrative and epistolary texts respectively, n_1 and n_2 the total number of manuscripts examined in each group, and p the pooled variant proportion. The resulting value demonstrates that the difference between narrative and epistolary variation rates is not due to random fluctuation.[32] Pronominal variation is instead genre-sensitive—less common in narrative discourse and notably more frequent in letters. This already challenges a purely phonological explanation, since vowel confusion should not produce statistically distinct behavior in different literary forms.

The fourth test concerns the *manuscript distribution* of individual variants. In the gospel of John, for instance, pronominal variation is almost entirely absent—except at 11:50, where over three-quarters of surviving manuscripts change ὑμῖν ("for you") to ἡμῖν ("for us"). If such a reading resulted from random phonological confusion, it would be statistically inconceivable for it to occur in so many independent manuscript streams in one place, while not occurring at all in the surrounding narrative. The binomial probability of

[31] Ronald E. Walpole, Raymond H. Myers, Sharon L. Myers, and Keying Ye, *Probability and Statistics for Engineers and Scientists*, 9th ed. (Boston, MA: Prentice Hall, 2011), 363–64.

[32] For this comparison, narrative books comprise Mark, John, and Acts, while epistolary books comprise Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and the Catholic Epistles (James, 1–2 Peter, 1–3 John, Jude). Revelation has been excluded on generic grounds, since its hybrid character—an epistolary frame enclosing apocalyptic visions and prophetic exhortation—resists straightforward classification within either category. Within the narrative corpus, Acts itself patterns somewhat intermediate, with a variation rate (2.96%) considerably higher than Mark (0.67%) or John (0.75%); this likely reflects the high concentration of embedded speeches in Acts (e.g., the Petrine sermons of chs. 2–3, the speech of Stephen in ch. 7, and the Pauline defenses of chs. 13, 17, 20, 22, 26), whose rhetorical features more closely resemble epistolary discourse. Acts has nevertheless been retained within the narrative category on formal generic grounds, and a sensitivity analysis (Mark + John only versus the Pauline and Catholic Epistles) yields an even sharper contrast, indicating that Acts is not driving the observed effect. Applying the two-proportion z-test with this partition: for narrative books, $\hat{p}_1 = \frac{1{,}285}{82{,}885} \approx 0.0155$, and for epistolary books, $\hat{p}_2 = \frac{2{,}667}{69{,}730} \approx 0.0382$, yielding a difference in proportions of $\hat{p}_2 - \hat{p}_1 \approx 0.0227$. The pooled proportion is $\bar{p} = \frac{1{,}285+2{,}667}{82{,}885+69{,}730} = \frac{3{,}952}{152{,}615} \approx 0.0259$. The standard error is then $\mathrm{SE} = \sqrt{\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})\left(\frac{1}{n_1}+\frac{1}{n_2}\right)} = \sqrt{0.0259 \times 0.9741 \times (1.207 \times 10^{-5} + 1.434 \times 10^{-5})} = \sqrt{0.02525 \times 2.641 \times 10^{-5}} \approx 0.000816$. The resulting test statistic is $Z = \frac{0.0227}{0.000816} \approx 27.87$, with a two-tailed p-value far below 10^{-100}. The corresponding result for the sensitivity analysis (Mark + John versus the Pauline and Catholic Epistles) is sharper still: with the narrative rate falling to roughly 0.72% once Acts is excluded, the difference in proportions rises to ≈ 0.031, yielding $z \approx 34$ and a two-tailed p-value well below 10^{-200}.

observing 91 or more altered manuscripts out of 118, assuming a background error rate reflective of Johannine usage (well below 2%), can be calculated using the formula for the upper-tail cumulative probability of a binomial (n, p) distribution:[33]

$$P(X \geq k) = \sum_{i=k}^{n} \binom{n}{i} p^i (1-p)^{n-1}$$

This formula effectively allows us to ask: If each manuscript has the probability p of showing a pronoun variation by pure accident, what is the probability that at least k manuscripts out of n would show that variation? Even when the baseline rate of pronominal variation (derived from the full corpus) is adjusted upward beyond its observed average,[34] the probability of such concentrated divergence arising by chance remains extremely small.[35] While this binomial calculation assumes independence among manuscripts, even substantial adjustments for genealogical dependence leave the probability of such concentrated convergence by random phonological error effectively indistinguishable from zero.[36] The manuscript tradition therefore reflects a shift from "for you" to "for us" that is inconsistent with a purely accidental model and is instead consistent with the broader inclusivizing tendencies observable elsewhere in the tradition.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that pronominal variation in the New Testament does not behave like a purely accidental phenomenon. It is directionally biased rather than neutral; clustered rather than scattered; genre-sensitive rather than uniform; and concentrated at specific loci to a degree that random error cannot explain. This does not imply systematic doctrinal corruption, nor does it suggest pervasive scribal manipulation. Even so, in certain instances—including, as the next section will show, several passages in 1 Peter—transmissional behavior and interpretive development appear to converge.

---

[33] Hogg, McKean, and Craig, *Mathematical Statistics*, 139–41; see also Feller, *Probability Theory*, 118–22.

[34] The improbability of the observed concentration does not depend upon a single precise background error rate. Even if one assumes a substantially higher baseline rate of pronominal confusion than the corpus average, the likelihood of such a concentration arising by chance remains negligible.

[35] At John 11:50, the evidence is as follows: the total number of manuscripts evaluated is $n = 118$, the number attesting the variant is $k = 91$, and the corpus-wide accidental variation rate is $p_{\text{global}} \approx \frac{4{,}213}{155{,}351} \approx 0.0271$. Restricted to the Fourth Gospel, the background rate is even lower, with $p_{\text{John}} \approx \frac{248}{33{,}218} \approx 0.0075$. Under the corpus-wide rate, the expected number of variant manuscripts at this position is $E[X] = np_{\text{global}} = 118 \times 0.0271 \approx 3.20$, whereas the observed count is $k_{\text{obs}} = 91$ — approximately twenty-eight times the expected value. Applying the upper-tail binomial cumulative probability:

$$P(X \geq 91) = \sum_{i=91}^{118} \binom{118}{i} (0.0271)^i (1-0.0271)^{118-i} \approx 3.84 \times 10^{-117}$$

If instead the Johannine baseline is used, the expected value falls to $np_{\text{John}} = 118 \times 0.0075 \approx 0.89$, and the tail probability drops further:

$$P(X \geq 91) = \sum_{i=91}^{118} \binom{118}{i} (0.0075)^i (1-0.0075)^{118-i} \approx 1.11 \times 10^{-167}$$

In either case, the probability that 77% of manuscripts would independently produce the same pronoun change through random η/υ confusion is, for all practical purposes, zero.

[36] See further n. 23 above.

4. Pronominal Variation in 1 Peter

The textual tradition of 1 Peter contains a small but conspicuous body of pronominal variants whose distribution invites scrutiny. Whether these variants reflect accidental phonological confusion or patterned scribal intervention can be tested against the framework developed above: directional asymmetry, genre sensitivity, overdispersion, and thematic clustering. 1 Peter is a particularly suitable corpus for such a test, since the epistle is addressed to a defined audience while simultaneously employing communal and participatory language—foregrounding the very distinction between "we" and "you" that these criteria are designed to probe. In what follows, we will consider whether pronominal variation within the letter exhibits the measurable features identified above. Only where these features converge will intentional scribal agency be considered a plausible explanatory category.

4.1. Variants Best Explained as Accidental Alterations

Not all pronominal variation in 1 Peter can be attributed to theological reflection or deliberate scribal intervention. A number of instances clearly arise from mechanical lapses, phonological confusion, or minimal scribal competence rather than interpretive intent. These variants are typically isolated, infrequent, and internally incoherent; they do not produce meaningful theological reformulations of the text and therefore fit the profile of accidental change established previously.

One category of accidental alteration consists of readings that generate grammatical or rhetorical incoherence. In such cases, the pronoun shift results in a sentence that is either syntactically incorrect or contextually implausible. For example, on one manuscript (365) at 1 Pet 5:12, the reading ἔγραψα ἡμῖν ("I have written *to us*") appears in place of ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ("I have written *to you*"). This change violates the logic of the epistolary conclusion, in which the author naturally addresses the recipients. The resulting construction is not only stylistically awkward but borders on semantic contradiction. It is therefore best explained as an unintended slip. Though exegetically insignificant, such accidental forms must be distinguished from intentional variants so that exegetical decisions are not built upon readings that emerged through mechanical lapse.

Accidental alteration may also occur when scribes substitute pronouns within fixed confessional formulas or liturgical expressions but do so in a way that is unattested elsewhere. Although this phenomenon is more prominent in other New Testament writings, the same mechanism may underlie certain minor variations in 1 Peter. In 1 Pet 1:12, for instance, certain manuscripts (378, 1881, 2147) replace ὑμᾶς with ἡμᾶς, changing "those who brought *you* the good news" into "those who brought *us* the good news." A similar pattern recurs at 1 Pet 1:25, where minuscule 1729 reads, "the gospel was proclaimed *to us*." These altered forms undermine the logic of Peter's apostolic authority and make little sense contextually unless one also changes other constituents of the sentence. Because such alterations do not align with any known confessional or theological trend and fail to gain traction in the broader tradition, they are most plausibly attributed to unconscious substitution rather than intentional revision.

These instances of pronominal variation in 1 Peter conform to the characteristics of accidental change: they are few in number, lack coherence, appear in isolated manuscripts, and do not shape the rhetorical force or theological trajectory of the epistle. They are

essential to acknowledge, for they demonstrate that not all textual difference is ideologically charged. At the same time, their limited scope and irregular distribution provide a necessary contrast to the more clustered, coherent, and directionally consistent variants that will be examined in the following subsection. It is in those examples that the possibility of intentional scribal alteration must be considered.

4.2. Variants Suggestive of Intentional Alteration

While several pronominal variants in 1 Peter are best explained as accidental, others exhibit features that exceed what would be expected under a neutral phonological model. These variants cluster, in particular, within soteriological passages, and a precise definition of that category is a necessary preliminary to the analysis that follows.

For the purposes of this analysis, "soteriological" passages are defined according to lexical criteria independent of pronominal distribution. A passage is classified as soteriological if it contains explicit reference to Christ's suffering (πάσχω/πάθημα applied to Christ), redemptive terminology (λυτρ-, σωτηρ-, ἀναγεννάω), atonement language (αἷμα, ἁμαρτία in Christological context), or substitutionary constructions (ὑπέρ) referring to Christ's death. On this basis, 22 of the 57 pronominal instances in 1 Peter fall within soteriological contexts.[37] These passages constitute approximately 39% of total pronominal opportunities, yet account for roughly 73% of manuscript-level pronominal variation. This disproportion exceeds expectation by a factor of nearly two and is more consistent with thematic clustering than with random phonological distribution.

Against this background, four diagnostic features mark the subset of variants that resist a purely accidental explanation: grammatical coherence, directional fit with the broader corpus-wide asymmetry, occurrence in soteriological passages, and attestation in manuscripts whose transmissional profile shows the same directional tendency across diverse books. It is the convergence of these indicators that warrants closer investigation.

A clear example of this convergence appears in 1 Pet 2:21, where all four diagnostic features are visibly present. The NA[29] text reads: καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ("Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example"). Several manuscripts attest first-person forms (ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν). Unlike the accidental variants discussed above, this shift produces no grammatical disruption and no contextual incoherence.

---

[37] The classification of pronominal positions as "soteriological" follows the lexical criteria stated above and is applied at the level of the immediate passage rather than the single verse. A position is counted as soteriological when one of the trigger lexemes (πάσχω/πάθημα applied to Christ; λυτρ-, σωτηρ-, ἀναγεννάω; αἷμα or ἁμαρτία in Christological context; ὑπέρ referring to Christ's death) appears within the same syntactic or rhetorical unit as the pronoun. Thus, for example, 1 Pet 1:12 is included on the basis of σωτηρ- in v. 10 and παθήματα Χριστοῦ in v. 11, since vv. 10–12 form a single argumentative unit; 1 Pet 1:20 is included on the basis of λυτρ- and αἷμα in vv. 18–19; 1 Pet 2:25 is included as the concluding clause of the atonement unit in 2:21–25; and 1 Pet 4:12 is included on the basis of παθήμασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 13. By contrast, positions such as 1 Pet 1:4 and 1:21, which sit adjacent to soteriological language but belong to syntactically distinct clauses lacking the trigger lexemes, are excluded. To test the sensitivity of the analysis to this judgment, a stricter classification was also run in which only positions containing a trigger lexeme in the same verse were counted as soteriological. Under that stricter rule, soteriological positions comprise 12 of 57 (≈ 21%) and account for 239 of 491 manuscript-level variants (≈ 49%), yielding a disproportion factor of approximately 2.31×—a sharper, not weaker, concentration than the inclusive count reports. The headline finding is therefore robust across both definitions: under either rule, variation is substantially overrepresented in soteriological contexts relative to opportunity.

The sentence remains syntactically coherent and rhetorically smooth. Consequently, the alteration cannot be dismissed as a nonsense reading or mechanical lapse.

Second, the direction of change at 1 Pet 2:21 is consistent with the broader corpus-wide asymmetry. Across the New Testament tradition, second-to-first shifts outnumber first-to-second by roughly 3:2, a disparity that cannot be reconciled with neutral phonological confusion. At a single locus where the initial text reads second-person, of course, a variant can only move in one direction, so directionality here cannot independently establish intentional alteration. What it can show is that this variant is not anomalous: it accords with the patterned behavior documented at the aggregate level. Whether it belongs to the patterned subset, rather than to the accidental residue that the same population contains, depends on the further criteria considered below.

Third, the variant occurs in a passage central to the letter's soteriological argument, where Christ's suffering is presented as both redemptive and exemplary.[38] This is more than a descriptive observation: as noted above, soteriological passages account for approximately 39% of pronominal opportunities in 1 Peter yet attract roughly 73% of manuscript-level variation, and 2:21 sits squarely within that over-represented subset. The pronoun choice here directly shapes the scope of application—whether the beneficiaries of Christ's example are the original addressees ("you") or a more inclusive community ("us")—and modern commentators have consistently read the shift to first-person forms at this verse as universalizing Christ's example beyond the original audience.[39] Distributional over-representation and attested interpretive impulse together give thematic centrality genuine evidentiary force.

Finally, the variants at 2:21 are not randomly distributed across the manuscript tradition. Minuscules such as 621 (11th century) and 1838 (11th century) attest first-person plural forms at multiple loci within 1 Peter, and the same directional preference recurs in their readings of other New Testament books.[40] While some agreement may reflect genealogical proximity, shared exemplars typically produce clustered agreement within a textual unit rather than a sustained directional tendency across diverse books. More tellingly, the rate of substitution is not uniform across the corpus. Manuscript 621, for instance, attests first-person variants at approximately 13% of opportunities in Acts and 7% in Romans, but at roughly 39% in 1 Peter—a rate three to five times its baseline. Within Acts, moreover, its variants concentrate disproportionately in the Petrine speeches of chapters 2–4, and in

[38] See Travis B. Williams and David G. Horrell, *1 Peter: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ICC (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2023), 1:812–21.

[39] Others have similarly claimed that the change from "you" to "us" at 1 Pet 2:21 reflects an impulse to universalize the scope of Christ's example—shifting the address from the original audience to the church as a whole (e.g., J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, HNTC [New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1969], 119; Peter H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990], 109 n. 11; Reinhard Feldmeier, *Der erste Brief des Petrus*, THKNT 15/1 [Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005], 111; cf. also J. K. Elliott, "The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012], 220).

[40] Within 1 Peter, minuscule 621 attests first-person forms at fourteen loci (1:9, 10, 12*bis*, 20; 2:21*bis*, 25; 3:7, 13, 18; 5:7, 8, 10), and 1838 does so at eight (1:12, 20; 2:9, 21; 3:13, 15, 18; 4:4). Across the Catholic Epistles, 621 attests twenty-one such variants and 1838 attests twenty-five, with 1838's distribution especially even across books (James [8], 1 Peter [8], 2 Peter [4], 1 John [3], Jude [2]). Outside the Catholic Epistles, 621 attests sixteen first-person variants in Acts and six in Romans, while concentrating most heavily in 1 Peter (roughly 39% of opportunities, against ~13% in Acts and ~7% in Romans).

Romans they cluster in soteriologically and parenetically charged passages (chs. 8, 13, 15–16). A purely phonological mechanism cannot account for this distribution, since vowel confusion should be book-neutral and context-neutral. The differential behavior of these witnesses is more consistent with scribal responsiveness to rhetorical and theological content than with mechanical lapse. At 1 Pet 2:21, the variant therefore appears as one expression of a behavior visible across these manuscripts' broader transmissional profile.

The convergence of these four features at 1 Pet 2:21—grammatical coherence, directional fit, distributional over-representation, and differential manuscript behavior—places the variant outside what a purely accidental model can plausibly explain. Such cases remain a minority within the overall tradition of 1 Peter, which is otherwise remarkably stable. Yet their presence indicates that, at specific points, the manuscript tradition reflects adjustments in pronominal address consistent with broader inclusivizing tendencies documented elsewhere in the New Testament transmission history.

The same patterned behavior carries implications beyond 1 Pet 2:21 itself: where this scribal tendency is strong enough to produce broad attestation, it may also have shaped the text at points where modern editions currently print the resulting first-person form as original, a possibility the next section pursues at 1 Pet 2:24.

4.3. The ECM, Exegesis, and the Text of 1 Peter

Results from this study carry significant implications for understanding the textual history of 1 Peter and for how the letter is interpreted and translated. One key implication, extending to the wider field of textual criticism, is that pronominal variation cannot be accounted for by a single explanatory model. The manuscript evidence of 1 Peter reflects the broader New Testament pattern in which pronominal variation arises from both accidental and intentional causes, distinguishable through coherent methodological criteria. The text of the letter is, on the whole, remarkably stable: most first- and second-person plural pronouns are transmitted without alteration across diverse manuscripts. But alongside this fidelity appears a smaller but significant subset of variants that resist purely accidental explanation.

These variants occur in passages central to 1 Peter's theology—Christ's suffering (2:21, 24), the identity of believers (2:9), and the benefits of faith (1:4, 9, 10, 12). At these places, scribes frequently shift pronouns from second to first person, broadening the text's address from a historical audience to a wider community while preserving grammatical coherence. Consequently, the transmission of 1 Peter was not merely a mechanical process but also a hermeneutical one, offering insight into how early Christian communities heard themselves addressed within scripture.

The implications of this study also extend beyond identifying patterns of scribal behavior in 1 Peter, offering insight into which textual readings may reflect the letter's initial form. The cumulative evidence assembled here indicates that ὑμῶν in 1 Pet 2:24 deserves renewed consideration in future editions of the *ECM*.[41] Although the *ECM* currently prints ἡμῶν with substantial external support,[42] the internal evidence and broader tendencies

[41] This idea was initially postulated in Williams and Horrell, *1 Peter*, 1:776 n. h, although based on a much more limited dataset. Another potential reading that could also be revisited is ὑμῶν in 1 Pet 4:17; however, the evidence—both external and internal—is not as strong as that for ὑμῶν in 2:24.

[42] The evidence consists of the majority of manuscripts (P^{81}, א, A, C, K, L, P, Ψ, 33, 1739), ancient versions, and an early citation by Polycarp (*Phil*. 8.1: ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον). On this basis, the first-person plural pronoun is found in all major editions of the Greek New

documented in this study point in a different direction. Among the most salient factors are (1) the empirically documented scribal inclination within 1 Peter to replace second-person plural pronouns with first-person forms; (2) the heightened likelihood of alteration in soteriological passages, which in 1 Peter account for approximately 39% of pronominal opportunities yet attract roughly 73% of manuscript-level variation; and (3) the consistent preference of the Petrine author himself for second-person address throughout the letter.

One observation deserves particular emphasis. Among the witnesses supporting ὑμῶν at 1 Pet 2:24 is minuscule 621, which the preceding section identified as one of the manuscripts most strongly inclined toward first-person forms in 1 Peter (attesting fourteen such variants at roughly 39% of pronominal opportunities, against ~13% in Acts and ~7% in Romans). That a manuscript with this profile preserves ὑμῶν at 2:24—a passage where its general tendency would predict ἡμῶν—is more readily explained if ὑμῶν stood in its exemplar. The witnesses most prone to introduce first-person forms in soteriological contexts are precisely the ones we would expect to read ἡμῶν here if ὑμῶν were not original; their preservation of ὑμῶν against their own scribal pattern therefore constitutes positive evidence that ὑμῶν reflects the earlier reading.[43]

This conclusion gains further support from both intertextual and contextual considerations. The immediate source of 1 Pet 2:24, Isaiah 53:4 (LXX), employs the first-person plural pronoun (οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει), a feature that could readily have prompted a scribe to assimilate 1 Peter's wording to the familiar Isaianic form.[44] Likewise, early Christian writers almost invariably used first-person pronouns when speaking of Christ's atoning death—"for *our* sins" (1 Cor 15:3; Gal 1:4; 1 John 2:2; 4:10; Rev 1:5)—which may have exerted additional influence toward the reading ἡμῶν. Crucially, in 1 Pet 2:24 the subsequent purpose clause contains the first-person plural verb ζήσωμεν ("that *we* might live"), so that ἡμῶν yields a smoother, harmonized construction;[45] by contrast, ὑμῶν stands as the *lectio difficilior*,[46] resisting that natural harmonization. On standard transcriptional canons, this asymmetry explains why a scribe would be more likely to change ὑμῶν to ἡμῶν than the reverse.

These considerations—textual, contextual, and intertextual—render ὑμῶν the more plausible initial text. If accepted, this conclusion would identify 1 Pet 2:24 as a rare instance in which a refined analysis of scribal intentionality, thematic context, and transmission

---

Testament: Lachmann, Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, von Soden, Hodges-Farstad, Robinson-Pierpont, SBLGNT, THGNT, NA[29].

[43] Although the manuscript evidence in favor of ὑμῶν is not as numerous as ἡμῶν, it is early and strong. The witnesses include P^{72}, C-S, B, 621^{*}, 1595, 1729.

[44] Some have postulated that the first-person pronoun derives from an earlier hymn or creed (e.g., Gottfried Schille, *Frühchristliche Hymnen* [Berlin: Evangelische Verlagssanstalt, 1962], 45–46; Reinhard Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zur Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*, SUNT 5 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967], 140–43; Klaus Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, SUNT 7 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974], 83–86). But this hypothesis is an unnecessary in light of the Petrine author's use of Isaiah 53.

[45] As acknowledged by J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1988), 134 n. i and Jacques Schlosser, *La première épître de Pierre*, CBNT 21 (Paris: Cerf, 2011), 164 n. g.

[46] Various commentators—even those who do not adopt the reading—acknowledge that ὑμῶν is the *lectio difficilior* in 1 Pet 2:24 (e.g., Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996], 190 n. 13; Greg W. Forbes, *1 Peter*, EGGNT [Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2014], 92).

patterns justifies reconsideration of an established *ECM* reading. Selecting between ὑμῶν and ἡμῶν, therefore, becomes not only a matter of reconstructing the earliest form of the text, but also a decision with exegetical and translational consequences, shaping how Christ's salvific work is articulated for contemporary readers. The *ECM*'s presentation of both readings thus enables interpreters to reflect explicitly on how the scope of Christ's atoning work is understood and communicated within the letter.

5. Conclusions

Whether New Testament scribes merely preserved their exemplars or, at times, reshaped them remains a central question in textual criticism. Pronominal variation offers a focused test case, since such changes directly affect the relationship between author and audience. This study has approached that question in 1 Peter by employing a methodological framework grounded in linguistic analysis and quantitative evidence derived from the *ECM*.

Accidental explanation does not account for all the data. A distinct group of variants is directionally consistent, thematically concentrated, and often distributed across identifiable manuscript streams. These shifts—most frequently from second-person to first-person forms—cluster in passages articulating Christ's suffering, communal identity, and the benefits of salvation, with soteriological passages in 1 Peter attracting roughly 73% of manuscript-level variation while accounting for only 39% of pronominal opportunities. Patterns of this kind exceed what would be predicted under a random phonological model and are more coherently explained as instances of patterned, non-accidental transmissional behavior.

The cumulative force of this analysis converges on a specific textual judgment. At 1 Pet 2:24, the *ECM* currently prints ἡμῶν. The convergence of patterns documented throughout this study—directional asymmetry, soteriological concentration, and the differential behavior of manuscripts such as 621—together with intertextual and contextual considerations, suggests that ὑμῶν has a stronger claim to representing the initial text than its external support alone might indicate. If the analysis offered here holds, ὑμῶν warrants serious consideration as the printed text in future editions of the *ECM*.

This single textual decision illustrates the broader payoff of the method. Distinguishing accidental from patterned variation is not an end in itself but a tool: it equips interpreters to determine when a variant bears exegetical weight, when it reflects the interpretive dynamics of early Christian reception, and when it may compel reconsideration of the initial text itself. The *ECM* is therefore not only a record of *what* was transmitted but a means of recovering *how* it was transmitted. Textual criticism and exegesis, on this view, are mutually informing disciplines, each strengthened by attentive engagement with the scribal history of the text—and each capable, when the manuscript evidence is examined with both philological care and quantitative rigor, of refining the other.

Appendix:
Pronominal Variation according to the *ECM*

Reference	*NA[29] reading*	*Variants*	*# Greek MSS*
Mark 1:8	ὑμᾶς	None	187
Mark 1:8	ὑμᾶς	863[C]	188
Mark 1:17	ὑμᾶς	427, 1515	190
Mark 1:24	ἡμῖν	None / ἡμῶν (037, 042r)	189
Mark 1:24	ἡμᾶς	792, 1546	190
Mark 2:8	ὑμῶν	None / ἑαυτοῖς (1574)	192
Mark 3:28	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 4:11	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 4:24	ὑμῖν	2106	194
Mark 4:24	ὑμῖν	None	193
Mark 5:12	ἡμᾶς	None	198
Mark 6:3	ἡμᾶς	792, 1047, 1515, 2766	190
Mark 6:11	ὑμᾶς	None	191
Mark 6:11	ὑμῶν	None / ὑμᾶς (472, 863, 2738r)	190
Mark 6:11	ὑμῶν	None	198
Mark 6:31	ὑμεῖς	1128, 1253*, 1528, 2206	190
Mark 6:37	ὑμεῖς	None	188
Mark 7:6	ὑμῶν	None	189
Mark 7:9	ὑμῶν	None	192
Mark 7:11	ὑμεῖς	None	198
Mark 7:13	ὑμῶν	None	198
Mark 7:18	ὑμεῖς	None	192
Mark 8:12	ὑμῖν	None	193
Mark 8:17	ὑμῶν	None	192
Mark 8:29	ὑμεῖς	None	198
Mark 9:1	ὑμῖν	None	192
Mark 9:5	ἡμᾶς	61, 152, 222*, 555, 716, 792, 1546	189
Mark 9:13	ὑμῖν	None	188
Mark 9:19	ὑμᾶς	None	192
Mark 9:19	ὑμῶν	None / πρὸς ὑμᾶς (349)	190
Mark 9:22	ἡμῖν	None	198
Mark 9:22	ἡμᾶς	None / ἡμῖν (733), ἡμῶν (154*)	190
Mark 9:28	ἡμεῖς	None	190
Mark 9:38	ἡμῖν	None / μεθ’ ἡμῶν (05, 019r, 043, 1342)	189
Mark 9:40	ἡμῶν	05, 019, 124, 184, 700, 872*, 1424, 1645, 2193[C], 2738	189
Mark 9:40	ἡμῶν	05, 055*, 118, 124, 191[C], 569, 700, 728r, 752, 873, 1009, 1047, 1273, 1326, 1424, 1446*V, 1528, 1579, 2193[C], 2206*	189
Mark 9:41	ὑμᾶς	None	198
Mark 9:41	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 10:3	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 10:5	ὑμῶν	None	198
Mark 10:5	ὑμῖν	None	192
Mark 10:15	ὑμῖν	None	193
Mark 10:28	ἡμεῖς	None	196
Mark 10:29	ὑμῖν	None / σοι (2517)	195

Mark 10:35	ἡμῖν	None	194
Mark 10:36	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 10:37	ἡμῖν	None	193
Mark 10:43	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 10:43	ὑμῖν	None	193
Mark 10:43	ὑμῶν	None	193
Mark 10:44	ὑμῖν	None / ὑμῶν (04^{C3r}, 05, 032, 042, 1, 13, 69, 79, 118, 124, 205, 209, 346, 543, 565, 732, 788, 826, 828, 872, 949r, 983, 1071, 1337, 1506, 1542^{S}, 1582, 1654, 1689, 2148, 2193, 2542, 2886), ἡμῶν (427)	193
Mark 11:2	ὑμῶν	349, 695, 872*, 1253, 1396	192
Mark 11:3	ὑμῖν	None	191
Mark 11:10	ἡμῶν	None	198
Mark 11:17	ὑμεῖς	None	194
Mark 11:23	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 11:24	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 11:24	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 11:25	ὑμῶν	79, 179, 273, 346, 544, 569, 579, 590*, 719^{C}, 728*, 803, 949, 979, 1253, 1302, 1326, 1337, 1654, 2148, 2206, 2607, 2738 / μου (2411*)	193
Mark 11:25	ὑμῖν	None	195
Mark 11:25	ὑμῶν	None	195
Mark 11:29	ὑμᾶς	None	194
Mark 11:29	ὑμῖν	None	195
Mark 11:33	ὑμῖν	None	195
Mark 12:7	ἡμῶν	None	192
Mark 12:11	ἡμῶν	26, 61, 152, 427, 513, 555, 695, 732, 740, 792, 863, 954, 983, 1071, 1093, 1128, 1342^{C}, 1396, 1515, 1546, 1689, 2106, 2148, 2607, 2738	192
Mark 12:19	ἡμῖν	None	194
Mark 12:29	ἡμῶν	18, 35, 205*^{V}, 238, 349, 377, 517, 766, 807, 829, 872^{C}, 954, 1082, 1093, 1160, 1546, 1675, 2726 / σου (044, 79, 304, 427, 695, 732, 827, 1084, 1396, 1424, 1457, 1495, 2106, 2738r)	192
Mark 12:43	ὑμῖν	None	192
Mark 13:4	ἡμῖν	None	190
Mark 13:5	ὑμᾶς	None	190
Mark 13:9	ὑμεῖς	None	191
Mark 13:9	ὑμᾶς	None	191
Mark 13:11	ὑμᾶς	None	198
Mark 13:11	ὑμῖν	None	189
Mark 13:11	ὑμεῖς	None	188
Mark 13:21	ὑμῖν	None / ὑμῶν (2542)	193
Mark 13:23	ὑμεῖς	None	196
Mark 13:23	ὑμῖν	None	192
Mark 13:29	ὑμεῖς	None	198
Mark 13:30	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 13:36	ὑμᾶς	None	198
Mark 13:37	ὑμῖν	None	193
Mark 14:9	ὑμῖν	None	182
Mark 14:13	ὑμῖν	None	184
Mark 14:15	ὑμῖν	None	182
Mark 14:15	ἡμῖν	None	198

Mark 14:18	ὑμῖν	None	198
Mark 14:18	ὑμῶν	273	183
Mark 14:25	ὑμῖν	None	182
Mark 14:28	ὑμᾶς	None	198
Mark 14:49	ὑμᾶς	None / μεθ’ ὑμῶν (26, 595)	186
Mark 14:58	ἡμεῖς	None	178
Mark 14:64	ὑμῖν	579, 949, 1253*	187
Mark 15:9	ὑμῖν	1128	193
Mark 16:3	ἡμῖν	None	190
Mark 16:7	ὑμᾶς	None	189
Mark 16:7	ὑμῖν	None	193
John 1:14	ἡμῖν	None	112
John 1:16	ἡμεῖς	None	112
John 1:22	ἡμᾶς	None	116
John 1:26	ὑμῶν	1093, 1253, 1344	118
John 1:26	ὑμεῖς	None	119
John 1:51	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 2:5	ὑμῖν	None	112
John 2:18	ἡμῖν	None	115
John 3:7	ὑμᾶς	33, 69, 118, 209, 333, 565, 792, 1029, 2106, 2192, 2585, 2786, 2886	116
John 3:11	ἡμῶν	None	115
John 3:12	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 3:12	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 3:28	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 4:12	ἡμῶν	None	119
John 4:12	ἡμῖν	None	119
John 4:20	ἡμῶν	None	114
John 4:20	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 4:22	ὑμεῖς	None	113
John 4:22	ἡμεῖς	None	113
John 4:25	ἡμῖν	173, 792, 1128, 1546, 2718	114
John 4:32	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 4:35	ὑμεῖς	None	115
John 4:35	ὑμῖν	None	115
John 4:35	ὑμῶν	None	116
John 4:38	ὑμᾶς	None	115
John 4:38	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 4:38	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 5:19	ὑμῖν	None	112
John 5:20	ὑμεῖς	None	112
John 5:24	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 5:25	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 5:33	ὑμεῖς	None	112
John 5:34	ὑμεῖς	None	112
John 5:35	ὑμεῖς	None	112
John 5:38	ὑμῖν	None	112
John 5:38	ὑμεῖς	None	111
John 5:39	ὑμεῖς	None	112
John 5:42	ὑμᾶς	None	110
John 5:44	ὑμεῖς	None	113
John 5:45	ὑμῶν	None	112
John 5:45	ὑμῶν	None	112

John 5:45	ὑμεῖς	None	112
John 6:26	ὑμῖν	None	111
John 6:27	ὑμῖν	None	111
John 6:31	ἡμῶν	173, 544, 732, 983r, 1029, 1071, 1546, 1689, 2106, 2680	111
John 6:32	ὑμῖν	None	111
John 6:32	ὑμῖν	124, 430, 792, 841, 1128	111
John 6:32	ὑμῖν	841, 1128	110
John 6:34	ἡμῖν	None	112
John 6:36	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 6:42	ἡμεῖς	None	119
John 6:47	ὑμῖν	None	118
John 6:49	ὑμῶν	69, 295, 430, 579, 792, 799, 1009, 1319, 1424	116
John 6:52	ἡμῖν	None	114
John 6:53	ὑμῖν	None	113
John 6:61	ὑμᾶς	None	115
John 6:63	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 6:64	ὑμῶν	None	114
John 6:65	ὑμῖν	None	114
John 6:67	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 6:69	ἡμεῖς	None	113
John 6:70	ὑμᾶς	None	113
John 6:70	ὑμῶν	None	113
John 7:7	ὑμᾶς	None	115
John 7:8	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 7:19	ὑμῖν	69, 1344, 2718	114
John 7:19	ὑμῶν	None	114
John 7:22	ὑμῖν	168, 1253r	114
John 7:28	ὑμεῖς	None	114
John 7:33	ὑμῶν	None	113
John 7:34	ὑμεῖς	None	113
John 7:35	ἡμεῖς	None	114
John 7:36	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 7:47	ὑμεῖς	None	118
John 7:51	ἡμῶν	173, 382, 579, 1253, 1424, 1546, 1797, 2585	119
John 8:5	ἡμῖν	None	121
John 8:7	ὑμῶν	None	118
John 8:14	ὑμεῖς	None	118
John 8:15	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 8:21	ὑμῶν	None	117
John 8:21	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 8:22	ὑμεῖς	None	115
John 8:23	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 8:23	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 8:24	ὑμῖν	None	117
John 8:24	ὑμῶν	None	117
John 8:24	ὑμῶν	None	116
John 8:25	ὑμῖν	None	116
John 8:26	ὑμῶν	None	116
John 8:31	ὑμεῖς	None	116
John 8:32	ὑμᾶς	None	115
John 8:34	ὑμῖν	None	115
John 8:36	ὑμᾶς	295, 579, 799*, 1009, 1463	117
John 8:37	ὑμῖν	None	117

John 8:38	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 8:39	ἡμῶν	None	117
John 8:40	ὑμῖν	None	119
John 8:41	ὑμεῖς	None	119
John 8:41	ὑμῶν	173, 579, 865	119
John 8:41	ἡμεῖς	None	119
John 8:42	ὑμῶν	01, 011, 168*, 173, 579, 1010, 1128, 1319, 2615, 2766	119
John 8:44	ὑμεῖς	None	119
John 8:44	ὑμῶν	None	119
John 8:46	ὑμῶν	None	118
John 8:46	ὑμεῖς	None	118
John 8:47	ὑμεῖς	None	118
John 8:48	ἡμεῖς	None	118
John 8:49	ὑμεῖς	None	118
John 8:51	ὑμῖν	None	119
John 8:53	ἡμῶν	None	120
John 8:54	ὑμεῖς	None	119
John 8:54	ἡμῶν	P^{66*}, 01, 03*, 04, 05, 033, 044, 0233, 109, 168, 213, 226, 249, 295, 333, 346, 377, 397, 732, 792, 799, 807, 821, 841, 865, 869, 992, 1009, 1010, 1029, 1071, 1079, 1093, 1230, 1242, 1253, 1293, 1321, 1424, 1463, 1546, 1561*, 1571S, 1654, 1788, 1797, 2106, 2192*, 2223, 2411, 2561, 2575, 2615, 2680, 2713, 2768, 2786	119
John 8:55	ὑμῖν	None	119
John 8:56	ὑμῶν	579, 1253, 1546, 1689, 1797, 2766	119
John 8:58	ὑμῖν	None	119
John 9:4	ἡμᾶς	None	120
John 9:19	ὑμῶν	None	119
John 9:19	ὑμεῖς	None	119
John 9:20	ἡμῶν	None	119
John 9:21	ἡμεῖς	None	119
John 9:24	ἡμεῖς	None	118
John 9:27	ὑμῖν	None	118
John 9:27	ὑμεῖς	None	118
John 9:28	ἡμεῖς	None	118
John 9:29	ἡμεῖς	None	118
John 9:30	ὑμεῖς	579r, 1128 (*these MSS change the verb to fit)	118
John 9:34	ἡμᾶς	None	117
John 9:40	ἡμεῖς	None	115
John 9:41	ὑμῶν	None	115
John 10:1	ὑμῖν	None	116
John 10:7	ὑμῖν	None	118
John 10:24	ἡμῶν	None	117
John 10:24	ἡμῖν	None	117
John 10:25	ὑμῖν	None	117
John 10:26	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 10:32	ὑμῖν	None	118
John 10:34	ὑμῶν	None	117
John 10:36	ὑμεῖς	None	117
John 11:11	ἡμῶν	382, 892^{S}, 1546, 2192	117
John 11:15	ὑμᾶς	None	117
John 11:16	ἡμεῖς	None	116

John 11:48	ἡμῶν	None	115
John 11:49	ὑμεῖς	None	116
John 11:50	ὑμῖν	02, 07, 011, 017, 028, 032, 037, 038, 041, 044, 045, 065, 0141, 0233, 1, 13, 18, 22, 33, 35, 69, 109, 118, 124, 138, 157, 168, 209, 226, 249, 265, 295, 317, 333, 357, 377, 382, 397, 543, 544, 565, 579r, 597, 788, 799^{C}, 807, 821, 826, 828, 841, 869, 884, 892^{S}, 994, 1009, 1014, 1029^{C}, 1071, 1079, 1093, 1192, 1210, 1219, 1230, 1278, 1319, 1320, 1321, 1344, 1463, 1546, 1561, 1571^{S}, 1582, 1654, 1689, 1788, 1797, 2192, 2193, 2223, 2372, 2411, 2575, 2585, 2615, 2680, 2713, 2718, 2768, 2886	118
John 11:56	ὑμῖν	2585r	115
John 12:24	ὑμῖν	None	111
John 12:30	ὑμᾶς	None	112
John 12:34	ἡμεῖς	None	112
John 12:35	ὑμῖν	None	113
John 12:35	ὑμᾶς	None	113
John 12:38	ἡμῶν	None	111
John 13:10	ὑμεῖς	None	109
John 13:12	ὑμῖν	None	107
John 13:13	ὑμεῖς	None	107
John 13:14	ὑμῶν	None	107
John 13:14	ὑμεῖς	None	106
John 13:15	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 13:15	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 13:15	ὑμεῖς	None	106
John 13:16	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 13:18	ὑμῶν	None	106
John 13:19	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 13:20	ὑμῖν	None	107
John 13:21	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 13:21	ὑμῶν	None	105
John 13:33	ὑμῶν	None	105
John 13:33	ὑμεῖς	None	105
John 13:33	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 13:34	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 13:34	ὑμᾶς	None	105
John 13:34	ὑμεῖς	None	105
John 14:1	ὑμῶν	None	105
John 14:2	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 14:2	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 14:3	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 14:3	ὑμᾶς	None	106
John 14:3	ὑμεῖς	None	106
John 14:8	ἡμῖν	None	104
John 14:8	ἡμῖν	None	105
John 14:9	ὑμῶν	None	106
John 14:9	ἡμῖν	None	106
John 14:10	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 14:12	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 14:16	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 14:16	ὑμῶν	None	106

John 14:17	ὑμεῖς	None	105
John 14:17	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 14:17	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 14:18	ὑμᾶς	None	105
John 14:18	ὑμᾶς	None	105
John 14:19	ὑμεῖς	None	106
John 14:19	ὑμεῖς	None	105
John 14:20	ὑμεῖς	None	106
John 14:20	ὑμεῖς	None	106
John 14:20	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 14:22	ἡμῖν	None	104
John 14:25	ὑμῖν	None	103
John 14:25	ὑμῖν	None	103
John 14:26	ὑμᾶς	None	101
John 14:26	ὑμᾶς	None	101
John 14:26	ὑμῖν	None	102
John 14:27	ὑμῖν	None	101
John 14:27	ὑμῖν	None	101
John 14:27	ὑμῖν	None	101
John 14:27	ὑμῶν	None	101
John 14:28	ὑμῖν	None	101
John 14:28	ὑμᾶς	None	101
John 14:29	ὑμῖν	None	101
John 14:30	ὑμῶν	None	101
John 15:3	ὑμεῖς	None	101
John 15:3	ὑμῖν	None	101
John 15:4	ὑμῖν	None	100
John 15:4	ὑμεῖς	None	100
John 15:5	ὑμεῖς	None	100
John 15:7	ὑμῖν	None	98
John 15:7	ὑμῖν	None	98
John 15:9	ὑμᾶς	None	97
John 15:11	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 15:11	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 15:11	ὑμῶν	346	96
John 15:12	ὑμᾶς	None	97
John 15:14	ὑμεῖς	None	98
John 15:14	ὑμῖν	None	98
John 15:15	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:15	ὑμᾶς	None	99
John 15:15	ὑμῖν	None	99
John 15:16	ὑμεῖς	None	97
John 15:16	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:16	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:16	ὑμεῖς	None	98
John 15:16	ὑμῶν	None	98
John 15:16	ὑμῖν	None	98
John 15:17	ὑμῖν	None	97
John 15:18	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:18	ὑμῶν	None	98
John 15:19	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:19	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:20	ὑμῖν	None	98

John 15:20	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:21	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 15:26	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 15:27	ὑμεῖς	None	96
John 16:1	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 16:2	ὑμᾶς	None	95
John 16:2	ὑμᾶς	None	94
John 16:4	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 16:4	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 16:4	ὑμῖν	None	96
John 16:4	ὑμῶν	None	96
John 16:5	ὑμῶν	None	97
John 16:6	ὑμῖν	None	97
John 16:6	ὑμῶν	None	97
John 16:7	ὑμῖν	None	93
John 16:7	ὑμῖν	None	93
John 16:7	ὑμᾶς	None	93
John 16:7	ὑμᾶς	None	96
John 16:12	ὑμῖν	None	98
John 16:13	ὑμᾶς	None	98
John 16:13	ὑμῖν	None	98
John 16:14	ὑμῖν	None	100
John 16:15	ὑμῖν	None	103
John 16:17	ἡμῖν	None	102
John 16:20	ὑμῖν	None	100
John 16:20	ὑμεῖς	None	99
John 16:20	ὑμεῖς	None	100
John 16:20	ὑμῶν	None	100
John 16:22	ὑμεῖς	None	102
John 16:22	ὑμᾶς	None	102
John 16:22	ὑμῶν	None	102
John 16:22	ὑμῶν	None	102
John 16:22	ὑμῶν	None	102
John 16:23	ὑμῖν	None	103
John 16:23	ὑμῖν	None	103
John 16:24	ὑμῶν	None	104
John 16:25	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 16:25	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 16:25	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 16:26	ὑμῖν	None	105
John 16:26	ὑμῶν	None	106
John 16:27	ὑμᾶς	None	108
John 16:27	ὑμεῖς	None	108
John 16:33	ὑμῖν	None	107
John 17:11	ἡμεῖς	None	110
John 17:21	ἡμῖν	None	107
John 17:22	ἡμεῖς	None	107
John 18:8	ὑμῖν	None	109
John 18:31	ὑμεῖς	None	113
John 18:31	ὑμῶν	None	110
John 18:31	ἡμῖν	None	112
John 18:39	ὑμῖν	0109*, 18, 35, 168, 841, 1242, 2561^{C1}, 2718	110
John 18:39	ὑμῖν	None	110

John 18:39	ὑμῖν	None	110
John 19:4	ὑμῖν	None	106
John 19:6	ὑμεῖς	None	107
John 19:7	ἡμεῖς	None	108
John 19:14	ὑμῶν	None	107
John 19:15	ὑμῶν	None	108
John 19:35	ὑμεῖς	None	105
John 20:17	ὑμῶν	None	106
John 20:17	ὑμῶν	None	105
John 20:19	ὑμῖν	None	104
John 20:21	ὑμῖν	None	103
John 20:21	ὑμᾶς	None	103
John 20:26	ὑμῖν	None	104
John 21:3	ἡμεῖς	None	104
Acts 1:5	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 1:7	ὑμῶν	378, 1884	123
Acts 1:8	ὑμᾶς	None	126
Acts 1:11	ὑμῶν	None	121
Acts 1:17	ἡμῖν	1838^{C}	123
Acts 1:21	ἡμῖν	None / ἡμῶν (321)	121
Acts 1:21	ἡμᾶς	None	121
Acts 1:22	ἡμῶν	None	122
Acts 1:22	ἡμῖν	None	121
Acts 2:8	ἡμεῖς	None	122
Acts 2:8	ἡμῶν	None	120
Acts 2:14	ὑμῖν	None	124
Acts 2:15	ὑμεῖς	None	126
Acts 2:17	ὑμῶν	None / αὐτῶν (05)	124
Acts 2:17	ὑμῶν	None / αὐτῶν (05)	123
Acts 2:17	ὑμῶν	None	122
Acts 2:17	ὑμῶν	None	120
Acts 2:22	ὑμᾶς	05*, 6, 61^{C*}, 103, 621, 876, 1241, 1831^{S}, 1890^{S1}, 2718, 2774	122
Acts 2:22	ὑμῶν	61*, 61^{C1}, 103, 1642, 2774	123
Acts 2:29	ὑμᾶς	None	120
Acts 2:29	ἡμῖν	61, 326, 467, 617, 808, 886, 1751, 1837, 1842, 1884, 2495	120
Acts 2:32	ἡμεῖς	None	119
Acts 2:33	ὑμεῖς	None	119
Acts 2:36	ὑμεῖς	None	123
Acts 2:38	ὑμῶν	None	120
Acts 2:38	ὑμῶν	None	65
Acts 2:39	ὑμῖν	05 / ὑμῶν (2243^{C})	119
Acts 2:39	ὑμῶν	05	119
Acts 2:39	ἡμῶν	43	119
Acts 3:4	ἡμᾶς	None	122
Acts 3:12	ἡμῖν	None	124
Acts 3:13	ἡμῶν	522^{C}, 1884, 220	122
Acts 3:13	ὑμεῖς	None	122
Acts 3:14	ὑμεῖς	None	119
Acts 3:14	ὑμῖν	None	119
Acts 3:15	ἡμεῖς	None	122
Acts 3:16	ὑμῶν	621	123

Acts 3:17	ὑμῶν	None	121
Acts 3:19	ὑμῶν	None	122
Acts 3:20	ὑμῖν	330*, 665, 1831^{S}, 1842, 2243^{C}, 2718	122
Acts 3:22	ὑμῖν	254, 621, 2243^{C}, 2412	120
Acts 3:22	ὑμῶν	01*, 04, 08, 025, 044, 5, 18, 33, 35, 88, 94, 103, 180, 206^{S}, 254^{C}, 319, 326, 383, 424, 431, 436, 468, 522, 614, 617, 621, 629, 630, 636, 876, 915, 1241, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1409, 1501, 1509, 1595, 1611, 1642, 1704, 1718, 1751, 1827^{S}, 1837, 1884, 1890, 2138, 2243, 2344, 2374, 2412, 2495, 2652, 2774, 2805	114
Acts 3:22	ὑμῶν	05, 206^{S}, 254, 1642	120
Acts 3:22	ὑμᾶς	None	123
Acts 3:25	ὑμεῖς	None	125
Acts 3:25 <>	ὑμῶν	01*, 04, 05, 044, 0165, 94, 181, 307, 429, 431, 436, 610, 614, 621^{*V}, 636, 1162, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1409, 1595, 1611, 1678, 1751, 1875, 1890, 1891, 2138, 2412, 2805, 2818	124
Acts 3:26	ὑμῖν	61*, 621, 1842	125
Acts 3:26	ὑμᾶς	43, 61*, 621, 636, 1162	123
Acts 3:26	ὑμῶν	43, 61*, 254, 621 / αὐτῶν (04*, 33, 424^{C}), αὐτοῦ (5, 88, 103, 228, 323, 429, 522, 630, 915, 945, 1251, 1490, 1501, 1704, 1739, 1751, 1827^{S}, 1831^{S}, 1891, 2200, 2298, 2652)	124
Acts 4:7	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 4:9	ἡμεῖς	None	124
Acts 4:10	ὑμῖν	1642, 1874* / ὑμῶν (1831^{*S})	124
Acts 4:10	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 4:10	ὑμῶν	1678 / ὑμῖν (43)	124
Acts 4:11	ὑμῶν	05, 93*, 181, 321, 614, 619, 621, 636, 1162, 1718, 1874*, 1884, 2412	123
Acts 4:12	ἡμᾶς	03, 436, 996, 1509, 1595, 1704, 2243	123
Acts 4:19	ὑμῶν	None	124
Acts 4:20	ἡμεῖς	None	122
Acts 4:25	ἡμῶν	None	122
Acts 5:9	ὑμῖν	None	123
Acts 5:28	ὑμῖν	None	124
Acts 5:28	ὑμῶν	None	124
Acts 5:28	ἡμᾶς	None	124
Acts 5:30	ἡμῶν	None	119
Acts 5:30	ὑμεῖς	None	119
Acts 5:32	ἡμεῖς	None	120
Acts 5:38	ὑμῖν	None	122
Acts 6:2	ἡμᾶς	94 / ἡμῖν (04, 05, 621*, 1127, 1838^{C}, 1842), ὑμῖν (1838*)	125
Acts 6:3	ὑμῶν	1842, 2147, 2243^{C}	124
Acts 6:4	ἡμεῖς	None	125
Acts 6:14	ἡμῖν	049, 88, 180, 228, 319, 522, 915, 945, 1243, 1509, 1563, 1704, 1739, 1874, 2147, 2200	131
Acts 7:2	ἡμῶν	61, 1838, 2652	125
Acts 7:4	ὑμεῖς	None	123
Acts 7:11	ἡμῶν	61*, 1838	126
Acts 7:12	ἡμῶν	61*, 1838	124
Acts 7:15	ἡμῶν	044, 61*, 1838	123

Acts 7:19	ἡμῶν	61*, 1409, 1838*	124
Acts 7:19	[ἡμῶν]	61*	113
Acts 7:27	ἡμῶν <>	None / ἡμᾶς (05, 08, 61, 88, 181, 429, 431, 436, 522, 614, 621, 629, 630, 636, 915, 945, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1595, 1611, 1642, 1704, 1729, 1739, 1751, 1831^{S}, 1842, 1875, 1884, 1890, 1891, 2138, 2147, 2200, 2298, 2344, 2412, 2495, 2652)	122
Acts 7:37	ὑμῖν	365, 383	125
Acts 7:37	ὑμῶν	621, 1642, 1874	123
Acts 7:38	ἡμῶν	01, 61*, 468, 1501, 1678, 1838	125
Acts 7:38	ἡμῖν	P^{74}, 01, 03, 61*, 307, 453, 468, 610, 886, 1251, 1409, 1501, 1642, 1678, 1729, 1838, 1875, 1890, 2138, 2243, 2495, 2818	125
Acts 7:39	ἡμῶν	044, 61*, 81, 94, 307, 330, 436, 453, 467, 468, 610, 1409, 1501, 1678, 1838, 1884, 1890, 2818	125
Acts 7:40	ἡμῖν	None	126
Acts 7:40	ἡμῶν	None	125
Acts 7:40	ἡμᾶς	None	126
Acts 7:43	ὑμῶν	None	116
Acts 7:43	ὑμᾶς	None	129
Acts 7:44	ἡμῶν	02, 049, 436, 467, 468, 636, 1501, 1563, 1842, 1890, 2298, 2718	111
Acts 7:45	ἡμῶν	61*, 468, 522, 636, 1501, 1842, 1875	124
Acts 7:45	ἡμῶν	05, 468, 636, 886^{K}, 1501, 1729, 1842, 1875	124
Acts 7:51	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 7:51	ὑμῶν	1642^{C}, 1838*, 2147, 2652	124
Acts 7:51	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 7:52	ὑμῶν	049*, 1642*	125
Acts 7:52	ὑμεῖς	None	125
Acts 8:24	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 9:38	ἡμῶν	None / αὐτῶν (P^{45}, 04*, 04^{C3}, 044, 5f2, 33, 61, 88, 94, 180, 307, 429, 431, 436, 441, 453, 467, 522, 610, 614, 619, 621, 623, 629, 630, 915, 945, 996, 1162, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1409, 1448, 1501, 1505, 1595, 1611, 1642, 1678, 1704, 1729, 1735, 1739, 1751, 1827, 1831, 1838, 1842, 1890, 1891, 2138, 2147, 2200, 2298, 2412, 2495, 2652, 2718, 2818)	128
Acts 10:28	ὑμεῖς	None	124
Acts 10:33	ἡμεῖς	None	124
Acts 10:37	ὑμεῖς	None	123
Acts 10:39	ἡμεῖς	None	123
Acts 10:41	ἡμῖν	None / ἡμῶν (0142, 1832, 2495)	125
Acts 10:42	ἡμῖν	None	124
Acts 10:47	ἡμεῖς	321, 1359, 1509, 1718, 1729	120
Acts 11:13	ἡμῖν	None	128
Acts 11:15	ἡμᾶς	None	127
Acts 11:16	ὑμεῖς	None	126
Acts 11:17	ἡμῖν	1729, 1831^{S}, 1875	125
Acts 13:15	ὑμῖν	None	123
Acts 13:17	ἡμῶν	1595, 1842	122
Acts 13:26	ὑμῖν	02, 05, 81, 1595	125

Acts 13:26	ἡμῖν <>	P^{45}, 04, 08, 5, 61, 88, 94, 180, 181, 206, 307, 429, 431, 436, 441, 453, 467, 522, 610, 619, 621, 623, 629, 630, 636, 915, 945, 996, 1162, 1175, 1270, 1297, 1409, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1595, 1642, 1678, 1704, 1729, 1739, 1751, 1827, 1831^{S}, 1838, 1842, 1875, 1884, 1891, 2147, 2200, 2298, 2495, 2652, 2718, 2805, 2818	125
Acts 13:32	ἡμεῖς	None	124
Acts 13:32	ὑμᾶς	None	124
Acts 13:33	ἡμῖν	254, 1251 / ἡμῶν (P^{74}, 01, 02, 03, 04*, 05, 1409), ὑμῶν (044), αὐτῶν (629, 1175, 2147)	124
Acts 13:34	ὑμῖν	None / αὐτῷ (2774)	124
Acts 13:38	ὑμῖν	None	123
Acts 13:38	ὑμῖν	441, 1718, 1842	123
Acts 13:41	ὑμῶν	None	125
Acts 13:41	ὑμῖν	None / ὑμῶν (1831^{S}, 2344)	125
Acts 13:46	ὑμῖν	None	127
Acts 13:47	ἡμῖν	None / ἡμῶν (915^{C})	123
Acts 14:11	ἡμᾶς	2344	124
Acts 14:15	ἡμεῖς	None	125
Acts 14:15	ὑμῖν	None	112
Acts 14:15	ὑμᾶς	None	123
Acts 14:17	ὑμῖν	0142, 61^{C*}, 88, 206, 228, 365, 383, 398, 429, 441, 522, 614, 621, 630, 636, 808, 915, 1127, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1448, 1490, 1501, 1595, 1611, 1642, 1718^{C}, 1729, 1827, 1831, 1832^{C}, 1842, 2147, 2243, 2412, 2652	126
Acts 14:17	ὑμῶν	P^{74}, 01^{C2}, 02, 014, 020, 025, 044, 049, 0142, 6, 18, 35, 43, 61^{C}, 69, 88, 93, 103, 104, 206, 218, 228, 321, 323, 326, 330, 365, 378, 383, 398, 429, 441, 522, 617, 621, 629, 630, 636, 665, 808, 876, 915, 945, 996, 1127, 1241, 1243, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1359, 1409, 1448, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1509, 1563, 1595, 1642, 1704, 1718, 1729, 1739, 1751, 1831, 1832, 1837, 1838, 1842, 1852, 1874, 1891, 2147, 2200, 2243, 2298, 2344, 2495, 2652, 2805	125
Acts 14:22	ἡμᾶς	103, 326, 1505, 1837, 2298*, 2495, 2718	126
Acts 15:7	ὑμεῖς	None	129
Acts 15:7	ὑμῖν	05^{C1}, 08, 014, 020, 025, 044, 049, 0142, 1, 6, 43, 61, 88*, 93, 103, 104, 206, 218, 254, 319, 321, 323, 326, 330, 365, 378, 383, 398, 424, 459, 467, 468, 522, 607*, 617, 621, 629, 642, 876, 915, 1127, 1241, 1243, 1251, 1292, 1359, 1448, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1609, 1611, 1718, 1827, 1831, 1832, 1837, 1838, 1852, 1874, 1884, 1890, 2138, 2147, 2243, 2344, 2495, 2652^{V}	126
Acts 15:8	ἡμῖν	6^{C}, 1729, 1842, 2243	125
Acts 15:9	ἡμῶν	None	127
Acts 15:10	ἡμῶν	1729*	127
Acts 15:10	ἡμεῖς	254	127
Acts 15:24	ἡμῶν	01*, 5, 69*, 228*, 383, 623, 636, 915, 1409, 1501, 1838, 2147*, 2243, 2774	124
Acts 15:24	ὑμᾶς	None	128
Acts 15:24	ὑμῶν	None	125

Acts 15:25	ἡμῖν	1729, 1739	126
Acts 15:25	ὑμᾶς	None	126
Acts 15:25	ἡμῶν	05, 436, 945, 1359, 1563, 1827, 1842, 2774	124
Acts 15:26	ἡμῶν	None	127
Acts 15:28	ἡμῖν	None	125
Acts 15:28	ὑμῖν	05*, 383, 876	126
Acts 16:9	ἡμῖν	None	126
Acts 16:10	ἡμᾶς	None	125
Acts 16:15	ἡμᾶς	None	128
Acts 16:16	ἡμῶν	None	126
Acts 16:16	ἡμῖν	None	130
Acts 16:17	ἡμῖν	None	112
Acts 16:17	ὑμῖν	P^{127}, 02, 04, 044, 33, 61^{C}, 81, 88, 94, 180, 181, 431, 436, 441, 522, 614, 619, 621, 623, 636, 915, 945, 996^{V}, 1162, 1270, 1297, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1595^{V}, 1642, 1678^{V}, 1704, 1827, 1831, 1838, 1842, 1875, 1890, 2147, 2344, 2412, 2495, 2652, 2718, 2805	128
Acts 16:20	ἡμῶν	02*	129
Acts 16:21	ἡμῖν	None	129
Acts 16:37	ἡμᾶς	None	131
Acts 16:37	ἡμᾶς	None	131
Acts 16:37	ἡμᾶς	None	131
Acts 17:3	ὑμῖν	None	129
Acts 17:20	ἡμῶν	None	125
Acts 17:22	ὑμᾶς	None	123
Acts 17:23	ὑμῶν	None	124
Acts 17:23	ὑμῖν	180	124
Acts 17:27	ἡμῶν	02^{*V}, 020, 044, 69, 431, 619, 1162, 1297, 1505, 1751, 1838, 2344, 2718	121
Acts 17:28	ὑμᾶς	P^{74}, 03, 049, 61, 326, 614, 617, 1595, 1642, 1729, 1837, 2344, 2412, 2718	123
Acts 18:6	ὑμῶν	None	125
Acts 18:6	ὑμῶν	None	125
Acts 18:14	ὑμῶν	None	128
Acts 18:15	ὑμᾶς	None	127
Acts 18:21	ὑμᾶς	None	126
Acts 19:13	ὑμᾶς	None	129
Acts 19:15	ὑμεῖς	None	129
Acts 19:25	ἡμῖν	206, 429, 522, 1127, 1490, 1751 / ὑμῶν (619, 1162)	124
Acts 19:27	ἡμῖν	522	124
Acts 19:36	ὑμᾶς	43, 61, 330, 441, 636, 1490, 1718*, 1729, 1838*	124
Acts 19:37	ἡμῶν	08*, 014, 020, 025, 049, 0142, 1, 5, 6, 18, 35, 43, 61, 69, 88, 93, 103, 104, 206, 218, 323, 326, 378, 383, 398, 429, 436, 441, 459, 467, 468, 607, 614, 617, 619, 621, 623, 629, 630, 915, 996, 1127, 1162, 1241, 1243, 1251, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1359, 1409, 1448, 1501, 1505, 1509, 1563, 1595, 1609, 1611, 1642, 1718, 1729, 1735, 1751, 1827, 1831, 1832, 1837, 1838, 1842, 1852, 1874, 1890, 2138, 2147, 2200, 2243, 2298, 2344, 2374, 2412, 2464, 2495, 2652, 2805	123

Acts 20:5	ἡμᾶς	None	124
Acts 20:6	ἡμεῖς	None	126
Acts 20:7	ἡμῶν	None	125
Acts 20:13	ἡμεῖς	None	128
Acts 20:14	ἡμῖν	None	123
Acts 20:18	ὑμεῖς	None	125
Acts 20:18	ὑμῶν	None	126
Acts 20:20	ὑμῖν	None	125
Acts 20:20	ὑμᾶς	None	120
Acts 20:21	ἡμῶν	None	123
Acts 20:25	ὑμεῖς	None	126
Acts 20:26	ὑμῖν	None	127
Acts 20:27	ὑμῖν	None	123
Acts 20:28	ὑμᾶς	None	128
Acts 20:29	ὑμᾶς	None	128
Acts 20:30	ὑμῶν	43, 181	129
Acts 20:32	ὑμᾶς	1729	127
Acts 20:35	ὑμῖν	None	129
Acts 21:1	ἡμᾶς	None	128
Acts 21:5	ἡμᾶς	None	123
Acts 21:5	ἡμᾶς	None	127
Acts 21:7	ἡμεῖς	None	125
Acts 21:11	ἡμᾶς	None	125
Acts 21:12	ἡμεῖς	None	127
Acts 21:16	ἡμῖν	None	127
Acts 21:17	ἡμῶν	None	125
Acts 21:17	ἡμᾶς	None	126
Acts 21:18	ἡμῖν	None	126
Acts 21:23	ἡμῖν	None	126
Acts 21:25	ἡμεῖς	None	127
Acts 22:1	ὑμᾶς	None	126
Acts 22:3	ὑμεῖς	522	125
Acts 22:14	ἡμῶν	None	125
Acts 22:25	ὑμῖν	None	126
Acts 23:15	ὑμεῖς	None	129
Acts 23:15	ὑμᾶς	P^{48V}, 044, 88, 180, 330, 378, 441, 522, 621, 623, 636, 876, 915, 1243, 1448, 1490, 1595, 1642, 1729, 1735, 1827, 1831, 1832, 1838*, 1842, 1875, 2243, 2298, 2464	129
Acts 23:15	ἡμεῖς	None	129
Acts 24:4	ἡμῶν	None	125
Acts 24:8	ἡμεῖς	None	125
Acts 24:21	ὑμῶν	None	125
Acts 24:22	ὑμᾶς	1729	129
Acts 25:5	ὑμῖν	None	127
Acts 25:24	ἡμῖν	None	126
Acts 25:26	ὑμῶν	None	127
Acts 26:6	ἡμῶν	None	77
Acts 26:7	ἡμῶν	None	129
Acts 26:8	ὑμῖν	None	128
Acts 26:14	ἡμῶν	None	122
Acts 27:1	ἡμᾶς	None	116
Acts 27:2	ἡμῖν	None	126
Acts 27:6	ἡμᾶς	None	125

Acts 27:7	ἡμᾶς	None	124
Acts 27:10	ἡμῶν	01^{C2}, 020, 93, 468, 665	124
Acts 27:18	ἡμῶν	None	126
Acts 27:20	ἡμᾶς	None	122
Acts 27:22	ὑμᾶς	1729, 1751	126
Acts 27:22	ὑμῶν	441, 808, 1490, 1501, 2147, 2243^{C}, 2495	125
Acts 27:26	ἡμᾶς	522*, 2718*	124
Acts 27:27	ἡμῶν	None	122
Acts 27:31	ὑμεῖς	467*, 1642, 1838, 2718	125
Acts 27:34	ὑμᾶς	1729, 2652	125
Acts 27:34	ὑμῶν	636, 1162	123
Acts 28:2	ἡμῖν	None	122
Acts 28:2	ἡμᾶς	None	121
Acts 28:7	ἡμᾶς	None	120
Acts 28:10	ἡμᾶς	None	125
Acts 28:15	ἡμῶν	None	123
Acts 28:15	ἡμῖν <>	None	119
Acts 28:20	ὑμᾶς	None	122
Acts 28:21	ἡμεῖς	None	125
Acts 28:22	ἡμῖν	None	123
Acts 28:25	ὑμῶν	014^{S}, 020, 025, 1, 5, 18, 35, 43, 69, 88, 93, 94, 103, 180, 218, 228, 254, 307, 319, 321, 330, 365, 383^{C}, 429, 431, 436, 441, 453, 467, 522, 607, 610, 614, 617, 621^{C}, 623, 629, 636, 642, 665, 808, 876, 915, 1067, 1127, 1241, 1243, 1292, 1359, 1448, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1509, 1563, 1609, 1611, 1642, 1678, 1704, 1718, 1729, 1751, 1832, 1852, 1890, 1891, 2138, 2200, 2243*, 2374, 2412, 2495, 2774, 2805, 2818	124
Acts 28:28	ὑμῖν	None	122
Rom 1:4	ἡμῶν	None	103
Rom 1:6	ὑμεῖς	None	104
Rom 1:7	ὑμῖν	P^{10}	106
Rom 1:7	ἡμῶν	None	105
Rom 1:8	ὑμῶν	6V, 455^{K*V}, 606, 1506^{K}, 1611, 1991^{S2K}, 2516, 2576^{K}	105
Rom 1:8	ὑμῶν	467^{*V}, 1506^{K}, 1838, 1846, 1950^{K}, 1987^{KC}, 1991^{SK}	104
Rom 1:9	ὑμῶν	None	105
Rom 1:10	ὑμᾶς	None	104
Rom 1:11	ὑμᾶς	None	103
Rom 1:11	ὑμῖν	None	104
Rom 1:11	ὑμᾶς	38, 455^{K*}, 629*, 1950^{KV}, 2102^{K*V}	102
Rom 1:12	ὑμῖν	None	103
Rom 1:12	ὑμῶν	None	102
Rom 1:13	ὑμᾶς	None	102
Rom 1:13	ὑμᾶς	None	102
Rom 1:13	ὑμῖν	None	102
Rom 1:15	ὑμῖν	None	102
Rom 2:24	ὑμᾶς	1505, 1950^{K*}, 1987^{K*}, 2127*, 2495	99
Rom 3:5	ἡμῶν	1834, 2105^{K*}, 2464	103
Rom 3:8	ἡμᾶς	1319	103

Rom 4:1	ἡμῶν	None	106
Rom 4:12	ἡμῶν	None	107
Rom 4:16	ἡμῶν	None	108
Rom 4:24	ἡμᾶς	326, 1837	109
Rom 4:24	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 4:25	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 4:25	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 5:1	ἡμῶν	None	110
Rom 5:5	ἡμῶν	01*, 33, 81*, 1115, 2464	108
Rom 5:5	ἡμῖν	623^{K}, 2464	108
Rom 5:6	ἡμῶν	None	108
Rom 5:8	ἡμᾶς	None	107
Rom 5:8	ἡμῶν	None	108
Rom 5:8	ἡμῶν	None	108
Rom 5:11	ἡμῶν	None	108
Rom 5:21	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 6:4	ἡμεῖς	None	107
Rom 6:6	ἡμῶν	None	108
Rom 6:6	ἡμᾶς	365	107
Rom 6:11	ὑμεῖς	88, 915, 1115, 1319, 1838-2, 1846, 1961, 1973, 1987^{S}, 1991^{C}, 1995, 2012, 2102	109
Rom 6:12	ὑμῶν	61, 88, 263, 455^{K*}, 467, 915, 1115, 1506^{K}, 1838, 1877*, 1950^{K}, 1973^{K}, 1991^{K}, 2127, 2495, 2523, 2544*, 2853	107
Rom 6:13	ὑμῶν	None	107
Rom 6:13	ὑμῶν	None	108
Rom 6:14	ὑμῶν	1973^{KC}, 2102^{KC}	108
Rom 6:19	ὑμῶν	5, 1798^{K}, 1846*, 1973^{K*}, 1987^{SK}, 1995^{K}, 2197^{K}, 2576^{K*V}	107
Rom 6:19	ὑμῶν	None	107
Rom 6:19	ὑμῶν	None	107
Rom 6:22	ὑμῶν	None	108
Rom 6:23	ἡμῶν	69	107
Rom 7:4	ὑμεῖς	None	107
Rom 7:4	ὑμᾶς	1962^{K}, 2102^{K*}, 2197^{K}	107
Rom 7:5	ἡμῶν	330, 451, 1108, 1505, 1611, 1798^{K}, 1991^{K}, 1995^{K}, 2495, 2523, 2576^{K*V}	108
Rom 7:6	ἡμᾶς	1505, 2495	107
Rom 7:25	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 8:4	ἡμῖν	6, 1886, 1961^{K}, 2127, 2576^{K}	108
Rom 8:9	ὑμεῖς	None	110
Rom 8:9	ὑμῖν	608^{K}, 621^{K*V}, 2110^{K}, 2523	109
Rom 8:10	ὑμῖν	455^{K*}, 608^{K}, 1950^{K}, 1973^{K}, 2523, 2576^{K}	110
Rom 8:11	ὑμῖν	61*, 441^{K}, 608^{K}, 621^{K*V}, 2197^{K}, 2936^{K}	110
Rom 8:11	ὑμῶν	38, 61*, 441^{K}, 455^{K*}, 608^{K}, 1837, 1886, 1942^{K*}, 2544	109
Rom 8:11	ὑμῖν	61*, 441^{K}, 608K, 1886, 2523	109
Rom 8:16	ἡμῶν	1834*, 1877	110
Rom 8:18	ἡμᾶς	1241, 1838, 2495, 2853	111
Rom 8:23	ἡμεῖς	None	110
Rom 8:23	ἡμῶν	None	110
Rom 8:26	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 8:31	ἡμῶν	None	110
Rom 8:31	ἡμῶν	None	110

Rom 8:32	ἡμῶν	None	110
Rom 8:32	ἡμῖν	049, 629	112
Rom 8:34	ἡμῶν	None	111
Rom 8:35	ἡμᾶς	None	111
Rom 8:37	ἡμᾶς	None	111
Rom 8:39	ἡμᾶς	None	112
Rom 8:39	ἡμῶν	None	112
Rom 9:10	ἡμῶν	None	109
Rom 9:24	ἡμᾶς	None	108
Rom 9:26	ὑμεῖς	None	109
Rom 9:29	ἡμῖν	None	107
Rom 10:16	ἡμῶν	None	110
Rom 10:19	ὑμᾶς	None	110
Rom 10:19	ὑμᾶς	None	107
Rom 11:13	ὑμῖν	None	109
Rom 11:25	ὑμᾶς	None	108
Rom 11:28	ὑμᾶς	61, 103^{K}, 330, 400^{V}, 451, 1506^{K}, 1611, 1751, 1834*, 1838, 1877*, 2105^{K}, 2110^{K}, 2344^{*V}, 2400, 2464, 2495*, 2516	108
Rom 11:30	ὑμεῖς	None	107
Rom 12:1	ὑμᾶς	None	106
Rom 12:1	ὑμῶν	None	106
Rom 12:1	ὑμῶν	365, 441^{K}, 451, 1950^{K}, 2400	107
Rom 12:2	ὑμᾶς	455^{K*}, 1798^{K}	107
Rom 12:3	ὑμῖν	81, 1834, 1950^{K}, 1987^{K}	107
Rom 12:6	ἡμῖν	88, 441^{K}, 606^{K}, 886^{K}, 915, 1069, 1505, 1524^{K}, 1751, 1877, 1950^{K}, 1987^{K}, 1995^{K*}, 2012^{K}, 2127, 2352*, 2495, 2516	108
Rom 12:14	ὑμᾶς	None	107
Rom 12:18	ὑμῶν	None	107
Rom 13:11	ὑμᾶς	P^{46V}, 01^{C2}, 06, 012, 020, 044, 049, 0150^{K}, 1, 5, 6, 33, 35, 38, 43, 61*, 88, 103^{K}, 104, 218, 256, 263, 398, 400, 424^{K}, 436, 441^{K}, 455^{K}, 459, 467, 606^{K}, 621^{K}, 629, 630, 886^{K}, 915, 1069, 1108, 1115, 1175, 1241, 1243, 1359, 1505, 1506^{K}, 1573, 1611, 1617, 1718, 1739, 1834, 1875, 1877, 1886, 1893, 1908^{K}, 1909^{K}, 1912, 1942^{K}, 1950^{K}*, 1961^{K}, 1963^{K}, 1995^{K}, 1996^{K}, 1999^{K}, 2000^{K}, 2012^{K}, 2110^{K}, 2200, 2344, 2352, 2495, 2516, 2523, 2544, 2576^{K}, 2659^{K}, 2685	110
Rom 13:11	ἡμῶν	025, 218, 1881	111
Rom 14:7	ἡμῶν	2127	107
Rom 14:12	ἡμῶν	04, 43, 81*, 1115, 1838, 1886, 1912, 1962^{K}, 2344	110
Rom 14:16	ὑμῶν	P^{46V}, 06, 012, 044, 0150^{K}, 1506^{K}, 1852, 1950^{K}, 1973^{K*}, 2110^{K}	111
Rom 15:1	ἡμεῖς	38, 326, 365, 1837	111
Rom 15:2	ἡμῶν	06^{C1}, 012, 025, 048, 0150^{K}, 61, 69, 103^{K}, 104, 326, 330, 365, 424^{K}, 451, 455^{K}, 467, 608^{K}, 630, 886^{K}, 1069, 1108, 1241, 1505, 1506^{K}, 1611, 1718, 1798^{K}, 1834, 1837, 1838, 1852, 1881, 1886, 1942^{K}, 1961^{K}, 1962^{K}, 1963^{K}, 1973^{K}*, 1985^{K}, 1991^{K}, 1995^{K}, 1996^{K}, 1999^{K}, 2000^{K}, 2102^{K}, 2105^{K}, 2110^{K}, 2127, 2197^{K}, 2200, 2352,	109

		2400, 2495, 2516, 2544, 2576$^{K C}$, 2659^{K}, 2853, 2936^{K}	
Rom 15:5	ὑμῖν	P$^{46 V}$, 61*, 104$^{* V}$, 455^{K}, 1319, 1961^{K}, 1962^{K}, 1985^{K}, 1991^{K}, 1995^{K}, 2102^{K}, 2576^{K}	111
Rom 15:6	ἡμῶν	None	107
Rom 15:7	ὑμᾶς	03, 06*, 025, 048, 0150^{K}, 35, 104, 424$^{K * V}$, 441^{K}, 455^{K}, 459, 467, 608^{K}, 621^{K}, 629, 886^{K}, 1115*, 1506^{K}, 1524^{K}, 1617, 1798^{K}, 1852, 1875, 1877, 1908^{K}, 1909^{K}, 1950^{K}, 1961^{K}, 1973^{K}, 1985^{K}, 1987^{K}, 1991^{K}, 1995^{K}, 2000^{K}, 2102^{K}, 2105^{K}, 2110^{K}, 2127^{C}, 2197^{K}, 2352, 2576^{K}, 2659^{K}, 2936^{K}	109
Rom 15:13	ὑμᾶς	1, 38, 455^{K}, 608$^{K *}$, 621^{K}, 1319, 1573, 1875, 1881, 1950^{K}, 1991$^{K *}$, 2102$^{K *}$, 2127, 2516, 2576^{K}, 2853	109
Rom 15:13	ὑμᾶς	1, 1506^{K}, 1963$^{K *}$, 1985$^{K *}$, 2576^{K}	108
Rom 15:14	ὑμῶν	None	109
Rom 15:15	ὑμῖν	None	109
Rom 15:15	ὑμᾶς	None	109
Rom 15:22	ὑμᾶς	None	110
Rom 15:23	ὑμᾶς	None	108
Rom 15:24	ὑμᾶς	None	110
Rom 15:24	ὑμῶν	38, 43, 104, 256, 263, 606, 1108, 1243, 1359, 1506, 1611, 1617, 1881*, 1942, 1962, 1963, 2000$^{* V}$, 2516, 2576$^{* V}$	109
Rom 15:24	ὑμῶν	None	110
Rom 15:28	ὑμῶν	None	110
Rom 15:29	ὑμᾶς	None	108
Rom 15:30	ὑμᾶς	None	110
Rom 15:30	ἡμῶν	None	111
Rom 15:32	ὑμᾶς	None	111
Rom 15:32	ὑμῖν	None	112
Rom 15:33	ὑμῶν	38, 1506^{K}	112
Rom 16:1	ὑμῖν	None	109
Rom 16:1	ἡμῶν	P^{46}, 02, 012, 025, 33*, 43, 441^{K}, 455^{K}, 915, 1912, 1961^{K}, 1991^{K}*, 2576^{K}	110
Rom 16:2	ὑμῶν	None	108
Rom 16:6	ὑμᾶς	04$^{C 2}$, 020, 049, 1, 5, 33, 38, 69, 88, 103^{K}, 104, 218, 263^{C}, 398, 400, 436, 441^{K}, 455^{K}, 459, 467, 608^{K}, 621^{K}, 623^{K}, 630, 886^{K}, 915, 1069, 1115, 1175, 1241, 1359, 1617, 1751, 1834, 1838, 1846, 1875, 1877, 1893, 1912, 1947^{K}, 1961^{K}, 1962^{K}, 1963^{K}, 1985^{K}, 1995^{K}, 1996^{K}, 1999^{K}, 2000^{K}, 2012^{K}, 2102$^{K C}$, 2200^{V}, 2344, 2352, 2516, 2523, 2544, 2576^{K}, 2659^{K}	112
Rom 16:9	ἡμῶν	025, 81, 88, 1505, 1798^{K}, 1852, 2197^{K}, 2495, 2936^{K}	111
Rom 16:16	ὑμᾶς	38, 886^{K}	112
Rom 16:17	ὑμᾶς	None	111
Rom 16:17	ὑμᾶς	None	111
Rom 16:18	ἡμῶν	None	111
Rom 16:19	ὑμῶν	38, 1115, 1751, 2344	111
Rom 16:19	ὑμῖν	None	110
Rom 16:19	ὑμᾶς	None	111

Rom 16:20	ὑμῶν	02, 1963^{K}, 2516^{C}	111
Rom 16:20	ἡμῶν	1963^{K*}, 1995^{K*}	112
Rom 16:20	ὑμῶν	326, 1837, 1838, 1846	112
Rom 16:21	ὑμᾶς	None	111
Rom 16:22	ὑμᾶς	None	111
Rom 16:23	ὑμᾶς	None	112
Rom 16:23	ὑμᾶς	None	111
Rom 16:25	ὑμᾶς	None	114
Gal 1:3	ὑμῖν	1241, 1319, 2102^{K}	163
Gal 1:3	ἡμῶν	81*	164
Gal 1:4	ἡμῶν	None	166
Gal 1:4	ἡμᾶς	254^{K}, 629, 915, 1523^{K}, 1918, 2344, 2492	165
Gal 1:4	ἡμῶν	2344	166
Gal 1:6	ὑμᾶς	P^{46*}, 015, 33, 43, 104, 442^{K}, 459, 891^{K}, 935, 1127, 1241, 1398, 1751, 1798^{K}, 1841*, 1913^{K}, 1978^{K}, 1992^{K}, 2102^{K}, 2248^{K}, 2482^{K}, 2674, 2805	163
Gal 1:7	ὑμᾶς	1241, 1980^{K*}	165
Gal 1:8	ἡμεῖς	None	165
Gal 1:8	ὑμῖν	1241, 1836*, 1918, 1962^{K}, 2004	165
Gal 1:8	ὑμῖν	38	165
Gal 1:9	ὑμᾶς	None	164
Gal 1:11	ὑμῖν	None	165
Gal 1:20	ὑμῖν	None	164
Gal 1:23	ἡμᾶς	336*, 365, 620, 642^{S}, 1175r, 1841, 1918r, 2544	165
Gal 2:4	ἡμῶν	642^{S}	165
Gal 2:4	ἡμᾶς	1108, 1505, 1611, 1950^{K}, 2005, 2495	164
Gal 2:5	ὑμᾶς	43, 61, 69, 81, 327^{K}, 336*, 455^{K}, 462, 582, 606, 608^{K}, 620, 720^{K}*, 1251, 1319, 1834, 1918, 1978^{K}, 1995^{K}, 2110^{K}*, 2344, 2544, 2576^{K},	165
Gal 2:9	ἡμεῖς	None	166
Gal 2:15	ἡμεῖς	394, 891^{K}, 1115, 2105^{K}	166
Gal 2:16	ἡμεῖς	None	166
Gal 3:1	ὑμᾶς	104, 891, 1241, 1398, 1524, 1918, 2492	163
Gal 3:2	ὑμῶν	None	164
Gal 3:5	ὑμῖν	1, 33, 455^{K}, 935, 1241, 2576^{K*}	165
Gal 3:5	ὑμῖν	33, 2002^{K}	164
Gal 3:13	ἡμᾶς	None	163
Gal 3:13	ἡμῶν	None	163
Gal 3:24	ἡμῶν	38, 1918	162
Gal 3:28	ὑμεῖς	51, 1241, 1405, 1798, 2102, 2197, 2248, 2936	163
Gal 3:29	ὑμεῖς	455, 642^{S*V}, 1241, 1929*	160
Gal 4:3	ἡμεῖς	025, 38, 81, 455^{K}, 1834, 1836*, 1881, 1995^{K}, 2482^{K}, 2511, 2576^{K}	164
Gal 4:6	ἡμῶν	06^{C2}, 020, 044, 049, 075^{K}, 0150^{K}, 1, 5, 6, 33, 35, 51, 61, 69, 81, 88, 122, 177, 203^{K}, 206, 218, 256, 263S, 326, 327^{K}, 330, 336, 337, 365, 378, 394, 398, 424^{K}, 429, 436, 451, 455^{K}, 506, 582, 606, 620, 623^{K}, 629, 630, 639, 642^{S}, 891^{K}, 915, 935, 1069, 1105, 1108, 1127, 1251, 1267^{K}, 1319, 1367, 1398, 1405, 1505, 1563, 1573, 1611, 1617, 1730, 1741, 1750, 1751, 1753, 1837, 1838, 1841, 1863, 1899, 1908^{K}, 1913^{K}, 1929^{K}, 1942^{K}, 1947^{K}, 1950^{K}, 1961^{K}, 1978^{K},	164

		1980[K], 1984[K], 1987[K], 1991[K], 1992[K], 1995[K], 2002[K], 2004, 2005, 2110[K], 2127, 2138, 2200, 2248[K], 2279, 2352, 2356, 2400, 2464, 2482[K], 2492, 2494, 2495, 2511, 2516, 2523, 2544, 2576[K], 2659[K], 2674, 2733[KV], 2805, 2815, 2865, 2899[K]	
Gal 4:11	ὑμᾶς	None	164
Gal 4:11	ὑμᾶς	None	164
Gal 4:12	ὑμεῖς	None	164
Gal 4:12	ὑμῶν	None	163
Gal 4:13	ὑμῖν	None	161
Gal 4:14	ὑμῶν	None	163
Gal 4:15	ὑμῶν	1241	163
Gal 4:15	ὑμῖν	None	163
Gal 4:15	ὑμῶν	1918, 2004, 2464	164
Gal 4:16	ὑμῶν	None	164
Gal 4:16	ὑμῖν	None	163
Gal 4:17	ὑμᾶς	38*f, 38[C], 720[K], 1241, 1918, 2344, 2936[K]	164
Gal 4:17	ὑμᾶς	044, 38, 1241, 1245	164
Gal 4:18	ὑμᾶς	None	162
Gal 4:19	ὑμῖν	69*	163
Gal 4:20	ὑμᾶς	None	164
Gal 4:20	ὑμῖν	None	165
Gal 4:26	ἡμῶν	1798[K]	165
Gal 4:28	ἡμεῖς	None	166
Gal 5:1	ἡμᾶς	103[K], 177, 337, 608[K], 630[C*], 935, 1105, 1115, 1251, 1267[K], 1736, 1741, 1841, 1929[K], 1947[K], 1961[K], 1978[K], 1992[K], 1995[K], 2000[K], 2544[C]	165
Gal 5:2	ὑμῖν	None	165
Gal 5:2	ὑμᾶς	38, 69[C], 886[KV], 2110[K], 2464	166
Gal 5:5	ἡμεῖς	None	166
Gal 5:7	ὑμᾶς	None	166
Gal 5:8	ὑμᾶς	1962[K]	166
Gal 5:10	ὑμᾶς	None	166
Gal 5:10	ὑμᾶς	38, 891[K]	166
Gal 5:12	ὑμᾶς	2138*, 2344, 2516,	165
Gal 5:13	ὑμεῖς	None	166
Gal 5:21	ὑμῖν	None	164
Gal 6:1	ὑμεῖς	None	162
Gal 6:11	ὑμῖν	None	162
Gal 6:12	ὑμᾶς	103[K], 177, 206, 429, 1241, 1838*, 1947S[K]	162
Gal 6:13	ὑμᾶς	38, 103[K], 206, 1241, 1947S[K], 2482[K]	163
Gal 6:14	ἡμῶν	None	163
Gal 6:18	ἡμῶν	None	162
Gal 6:18	ὑμῶν	336, 720[K], 1108[C], 1127, 1241, 1617, 1918, 1985[K], 2004, 2102[K]	163
Eph 1:2	ὑμῖν	None	102
Eph 1:2	ἡμῶν	025	102
Eph 1:3	ἡμῶν	None	102
Eph 1:3	ἡμᾶς	664, 1831	102
Eph 1:4	ἡμᾶς	38	102
Eph 1:4	ἡμᾶς	1918	102
Eph 1:5	ἡμᾶς	61, 2344	101

Eph 1:6	ἡμᾶς	None	101
Eph 1:8	ἡμᾶς	None	102
Eph 1:9	ἡμῖν	None	101
Eph 1:12	ἡμᾶς	None	100
Eph 1:13	ὑμεῖς	01^{C2ar}, 02, 020, 044, 1, 35, 38, 61*, 93, 181*, 326, 330, 383, 398, 451, 459*^{V}, 629, 636*, 665, 1069, 1241, 1319, 1398, 1617, 1751, 1834, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1877, 1893, 1913, 1918, 2004, 2138, 2180, 2243*, 2352, 2400, 2464, 2492, 2516, 2523, 2576, 2865^{S}	101
Eph 1:13	ὑμῶν	044, 1, 38, 263, 330, 451, 1108, 1398, 1505, 1611, 1831^{C}, 1918, 2005, 2012*, 2400, 2464, 2492, 2495, 2516, 2544, 2576, 2805	100
Eph 1:14	ἡμῶν	025, 33, 365, 442, 1319, 1573, 1881, 1910-1, 2127, 2523	101
Eph 1:15	ὑμᾶς	38, 61*, 88, 330, 1398, 1918, 2180, 2400, 2492, 2516, 2865^{S*}	101
Eph 1:16	ὑμῶν	0150r, 38, 915, 1913, 1918, 1962, 2127, 2516	101
Eph 1:17	ἡμῶν	None	102
Eph 1:17	ὑμῖν	39, 1918	102
Eph 1:18	ὑμῶν	1, 467*, 1918	102
Eph 1:18	ὑμᾶς	P^{46*}, 1175, 1910-2, 1939, 1963, 1991^{V}, 1996, 1999, 2012, 2516, 2576	102
Eph 1:19	ἡμᾶς	06*, 012, 025, 075^{S}, 33, 61^{C}, 69, 104, 436, 459, 462, 467, 629, 636, 1175, 1831, 1908, 2004, 2180, 2344, 2523, 2805, 2853	102
Eph 2:1	ὑμᾶς	6, 38, 1881, 2243*, 2464	102
Eph 2:1	ὑμῶν	629, 1838*	102
Eph 2:3	ἡμεῖς	1985	102
Eph 2:3	ἡμῶν	0150, 181, 326, 1837, 1985, 2005	102
Eph 2:4	ἡμᾶς	None	102
Eph 2:5	ἡμᾶς	1918	102
Eph 2:7	ἡμᾶς	1505, 2495, 2516	102
Eph 2:8	ὑμῶν	06*, 012, 81, 181, 442, 606, 636, 1834, 1836, 1877, 1913, 1918, 1939, 1963, 1987, 1991, 1996, 1999, 2012, 2180, 2243, 2516, 2576, 2805	101
Eph 2:11	ὑμεῖς	1985	102
Eph 2:13	ὑμεῖς	1987	102
Eph 2:14	ἡμῶν	104, 181*, 263, 459, 1918, 2492, 2516	102
Eph 2:17	ὑμῖν	1, 35, 104, 606, 664, 1241, 1617, 1751, 1831^{*V}, 1831^{Cf}, 1877, 1913, 1987, 2243, 2344, 2352, 2544, 2576	102
Eph 2:22	ὑμεῖς	None	101
Eph 3:1	ὑμῶν	None	101
Eph 3:2	ὑμᾶς	None	101
Eph 3:11	ἡμῶν	None	101
Eph 3:13	ὑμῶν	P^{46}, 6, 81*, 88, 436, 915, 1241, 1881, 1918, 1985, 2180	103
Eph 3:13	ὑμῶν	P^{46}, 04, 0278^{C}, 33, 69^{C}, 81, 104, 436, 459, 462, 467, 1573, 1739, 1838, 1912, 1985, 2127, 2853, 2865	102
Eph 3:16	ὑμῖν	38, 365, 1241, 1751, 1838^{C}, 1918, 2516	102
Eph 3:17	ὑμῶν	636, 1918	102

Eph 3:20	ἡμῖν	02, 326, 1069, 1108, 1127, 1241, 1505, 1739*, 1837, 1918r, 2004, 2495	102
Eph 4:1	ὑμᾶς	None	103
Eph 4:4	ὑμῶν	1175*, 1877^{C}, 1918, 2523*	103
Eph 4:7	ἡμῶν	03, 33, 38, 629, 1241, 1836, 1881, 1939, 1963, 1985, 1991*, 1996, 1999, 2012, 2516	103
Eph 4:17	ὑμᾶς	1836	104
Eph 4:20	ὑμεῖς	None	101
Eph 4:22	ὑμᾶς	None	102
Eph 4:23	ὑμῶν	None	103
Eph 4:26	ὑμῶν	1241^{C}, 2243	102
Eph 4:29	ὑμῶν	1241, 1918	103
Eph 4:31	ὑμῶν	1241, 1319, 1918, 2243^{*V}, 2516	103
Eph 4:32	ὑμῖν	P^{49V}, 03, 06*r, 06^{C2}, 020, 044, 049, 075, 0278, 1, 33, 88, 93, 94, 104, 181, 398*, 424, 436, 459, 467, 606, 665, 915, 1069, 1108, 1115, 1175, 1241, 1505, 1611, 1739, 1831, 1836, 1838, 1877, 1881, 1893, 1908, 1910, 1912, 1918r, 1939, 1962, 1963, 1985, 1987, 1996, 1999, 2004, 2005, 2011, 2012, 2138, 2180, 2243, 2464, 2495, 2523, 2544, 2805, 2865	102
Eph 5:2	ἡμᾶς	01*, 01^{C2b}, 02^{V}, 03, 025, 0159, 61, 69, 81, 218, 326, 442, 462, 1175, 1241, 1834, 1837, 1912, 1918, 1939, 1963, 1996, 1999, 2012, 2344*, 2400*, 2576, 2853	104
Eph 5:2	ἡμῶν	03, 0278^{C}, 61^{C}, 69, 218, 442, 462, 1175, 2344	104
Eph 5:3	ὑμῖν	1987, 2576	103
Eph 5:6	ὑμᾶς	33, 1241	102
Eph 5:19	ὑμῶν	None	102
Eph 5:20	ἡμῶν	None	102
Eph 5:33	ὑμεῖς	104, 636, 915*, 1241, 1617	103
Eph 6:1	ὑμῶν	365, 1241, 1939*, 2138, 2344	102
Eph 6:4	ὑμῶν	467, 2516	102
Eph 6:5	ὑμῶν	None	101
Eph 6:9	ὑμῶν	1241, 1918, 2180, 2464, 2576	102
Eph 6:11	ὑμᾶς	None	105
Eph 6:12	ἡμῖν	P^{46r}, 03, 06*, 012, 044, 81, 636, 1175, 1831, 1834, 2180	105
Eph 6:14	ὑμῶν	None	103
Eph 6:21	ὑμεῖς	None	103
Eph 6:21	ὑμῖν	None	103
Eph 6:22	ὑμᾶς	None	103
Eph 6:22	ἡμῶν	38, 451, 467*, 1241, 1398, 1910-1, 1985, 1987, 1991, 2180, 2243^{C}, 2464, 2516, 2576, 2853	103
Eph 6:22	ὑμῶν	P^{46*}, 38, 365*, 1241, 1918, 1987^{V}, 2516	102
Eph 6:24	ἡμῶν	None	101
Jas 1:3	ὑμῶν	254, 808^{C}, 1524, 1678, 1729, 1850, 2180, 2344*, 2464	138
Jas 1:5	ὑμῶν	456*, 1729	138
Jas 1:18	ἡμᾶς	1241, 2718^{S}	140
Jas 1:18	ἡμᾶς	1241	139
Jas 1:21	ὑμῶν	020, 049, 056, 0142, 1, 6, 38, 43, 88, 180, 252, 254, 307, 321, 326, 365, 378, 398, 400, 442,	139

		453, 522, 607, 621, 623, 642, 808, 876, 999, 1241, 1270, 1297, 1409, 1509, 1595, 1609, 1661^{C}, 1729, 1751, 1799, 1827*, 1837, 1838, 1840, 1848^{Z}, 1850, 1875, 2180, 2186, 2197, 2242, 2344, 2464, 2492^{C}, 2718, 2774,	
Jas 2:1	ἡμῶν	None	138
Jas 2:2	ὑμῶν	254, 322, 522*, 1067, 1838, 2243, 2344	138
Jas 2:6	ὑμεῖς	None	138
Jas 2:6	ὑμῶν	38, 2243^{Z}	138
Jas 2:6	ὑμᾶς	38, 181^{T}, 1729, 1838, 2243^{Z}, 2652, 2674	138
Jas 2:7	ὑμᾶς	38, 631, 1838, 1890, 2243^{T}, 2674, 2774	138
Jas 2:16	ὑμῶν	206, 307, 429, 522, 614, 720^{CV}, 1067^{C}, 1678, 1799, 2197, 2200, 2344, 2412	139
Jas 2:21	ἡμῶν	018^{*V}, 61, 400, 1241, 1270, 1297, 1595, 1598, 1611, 1661, 1718, 1729	139
Jas 3:3	ἡμῖν	None	140
Jas 3:6	ἡμῶν	365, 436, 2242	139
Jas 3:13	ὑμῖν	38, 2197^{V}, 2242, 2523	139
Jas 3:14	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 4:1	ὑμῖν	1838, 2147, 2242, 2523	139
Jas 4:1	ὑμῶν	69^{T}, 180, 522, 720^{C}, 1838, 2147, 2523, 2674	139
Jas 4:1	ὑμῶν	2147, 2344, 2523*, 2718*	139
Jas 4:2	ὑμᾶς	38	139
Jas 4:3	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 4:5	ἡμῖν	1, 5, 6, 252, 365, 378, 614, 676*, 996, 1241, 1251, 1292, 1409, 1505, 1595, 1611, 1729, 1842, 1890, 2138, 2147, 2243, 2412, 2492*, 2495, 2523, 2652, 2774	138
Jas 4:7	ὑμῶν	38^{C}, 629, 631, 1838, 1840, 2523*, 2718	138
Jas 4:8	ὑμῖν	None	137
Jas 4:9	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 4:10	ὑμᾶς	643, 1359, 1729	139
Jas 4:14	ὑμῶν	18, 33, 35, 88, 180^{C}, 206, 254, 321, 429, 630, 915, 999, 1490, 1524, 1678^{T}, 1729, 1831, 1838, 2200, 2243^{Z}, 2344^{C}, 2674, 2774	139
Jas 4:15	ὑμᾶς	326^{T}, 915, 1409, 1729, 1874^{*V}, 2200, 2242, 2243, 2652	140
Jas 4:16	ὑμῶν	None	140
Jas 5:1	ὑμῶν	None	140
Jas 5:2	ὑμῶν	629	139
Jas 5:2	ὑμῶν	436, 1243	139
Jas 5:3	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 5:3	ὑμῖν	None	139
Jas 5:3	ὑμῶν	180	139
Jas 5:4	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 5:4	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 5:5	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 5:6	ὑμῖν	None	139
Jas 5:8	ὑμεῖς	None	139
Jas 5:8	ὑμῶν	None	139
Jas 5:12	ὑμῶν	43, 330, 623, 1729, 1751, 2242	139
Jas 5:13	ὑμῖν	1840^{T}	139
Jas 5:14	ὑμῖν	None	139
Jas 5:17	ἡμῖν	61, 1067, 1241, 2523*	139

Jas 5:19	ὑμῖν	665^{C}	139
1 Pet 1:2	ὑμῖν	None	139
1 Pet 1:3	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 Pet 1:3	ἡμᾶς	378, 876^{*V}, 1241, 1890*	138
1 Pet 1:4	ὑμᾶς	P^{72}, 5, 43, 61^{T}, 94, 254, 330, 398, 876, 1524, 1661, 1799, 1832, 1842, 1890^{C}, 2243, 2492*	138
1 Pet 1:7	ὑμῶν	88, 915, 1848	139
1 Pet 1:9	ὑμῶν	218, 431, 621, 629, 1505, 1729	138
1 Pet 1:10	ὑμᾶς	018, 0142, 33, 61, 180, 206, 218^{*Vf}, 378, 621, 629, 996, 1490, 1501, 1661, 1729, 1799, 1831, 2186, 2243, 2344, 2544	138
1 Pet 1:12	ὑμῖν	61, 94, 104, 218, 319, 326, 378, 424^{C}, 621, 642, 808, 876, 915, 945, 996, 1127, 1241, 1359, 1490, 1524, 1563, 1609, 1661, 1718, 1799, 1831, 1832, 1837, 1838, 1881, 2186, 2243, 2374, 2774	138
1 Pet 1:12	ὑμῖν	61^{T}, 621	138
1 Pet 1:12	ὑμᾶς	378, 1881, 2147	138
1 Pet 1:13	ὑμῶν	None	138
1 Pet 1:13	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 Pet 1:14	ὑμῶν	180	137
1 Pet 1:15	ὑμᾶς	43, 1881^{*V}	137
1 Pet 1:17	ὑμῶν	None	137
1 Pet 1:18	ὑμῶν	None	137
1 Pet 1:20	ὑμᾶς	02, 5, 61^{T}, 321^{Z}, 431*, 621, 623, 630, 1067, 1501, 1609, 1735, 1838, 1842^{T}, 2243^{Z}, 2374, 2423, 2544	138
1 Pet 1:21	ὑμῶν	522*, 996, 2243^{Z}	137
1 Pet 1:22	ὑμῶν	049, 321, 614, 665, 1175^{Z}, 1409, 2344^{V}, 2412, 2544	137
1 Pet 1:25	ὑμᾶς	1729	139
1 Pet 2:7	ὑμῖν	01*, 61^{T}	139
1 Pet 2:9	ὑμεῖς	69, 2243^{Z}	138
1 Pet 2:9	ὑμᾶς	431, 1501, 1838, 1881, 2243^{Z}	138
1 Pet 2:12	ὑμῶν	None	139
1 Pet 2:12	ὑμῶν	None	138
1 Pet 2:21	ὑμῶν	6, 33, 94, 104, 180, 206, 218, 254, 307, 323, 330, 365, 378, 398, 429, 436, 453, 459,468^{Z}, 614, 621, 623, 629, 630, 642, 720, 808, 876, 918, 1067, 1127, 1243, 1359, 1409, 1490, 1501, 1505^{C}, 1524, 1563, 1661*, 1678, 1718, 1751, 1799, 1831, 1832, 1838, 1842, 1874, 1881, 2147, 2186, 2200, 2243, 2298, 2344, 2374, 2412, 2464, 2541, 2652, 2718, 2774, 2805, 2818	138
1 Pet 2:21	ὑμῖν	6, 94, 180, 218, 398^{C}, 453, 614, 621, 629, 642, 720, 808, 918, 1243, 1359, 1505, 1563, 1718, 1751, 1842, 2344, 2374, 2412, 2492, 2652, 2718, 2774, 2805, 2818	138
1 Pet 2:24	ἡμῶν	P^{72}, 03, 621*, 1595, 1729	140
1 Pet 2:25	ὑμῶν	020, 049, 0142, 18, 35, 43, 69^{T}, 180, 319, 323, 326, 365, 378, 617, 621, 642*, 665, 808, 918, 1067, 1243, 1359, 1563, 1595, 1609, 1718, 1729, 1751, 1832, 1837, 1842*, 1852*, 1890,	139

		2138, 2186, 2243, 2344*, 2423*, 2464, 2492, 2652, 2718, 2805	
1 Pet 3:2	ὑμῶν	None	138
1 Pet 3:7	ὑμῶν	621, 1067^{*V}, 1729	139
1 Pet 3:13	ὑμᾶς	218, 621*, 1563, 1718, 1729, 1735*, 1838	137
1 Pet 3:15	ὑμῶν	None	137
1 Pet 3:15	ὑμᾶς	None	137
1 Pet 3:15	ὑμῖν	0142, 1838, 1890, 2243^{Z}	137
1 Pet 3:16	ὑμῶν	1729	138
1 Pet 3:18	ὑμᾶς	01^{C2}, 02, 04, 018, 020, 0142, 5, 18, 33, 35, 61, 81, 88, 94, 104, 180, 218, 252, 254, 307, 319, 321, 323, 378, 400, 431, 436, 442, 453, 459, 467, 468, 614, 621, 623, 629, 630, 642, 720, 808, 876, 915, 918, 945, 1067, 1127, 1270, 1297, 1359, 1409, 1524, 1563, 1595, 1678, 1718, 1729, 1735, 1739, 1751, 1832, 1838, 1842, 1848, 1881, 1890, 2147, 2186, 2243, 2298, 2344, 2374, 2412, 2464, 2541, 2544, 2652, 2774, 2805, 2818	138
1 Pet 3:21	ὑμᾶς	04, 020, 43, 323, 378, 398, 429, 436, 442, 522, 614, 630, 1067, 1241^{C}, 1292, 1409, 1448, 1490, 1505, 1611, 1831, 1881, 1890^{C}, 2138, 2147, 2200, 2412, 2541, 2652	138
1 Pet 4:1	ὑμεῖς	None	138
1 Pet 4:4	ὑμῶν	61^{T}, 400, 442, 1270, 1297, 1595, 1729, 1838, 1845, 1881^{C}, 1890, 2243^{Z}, 2492	137
1 Pet 4:12	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 Pet 4:12	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 Pet 4:12	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 Pet 4:14	ὑμᾶς	1241, 1729	137
1 Pet 4:15	ὑμῶν	43, 1751	137
1 Pet 4:17	ἡμῶν	01*, 02^{C}, 5, 61^{T}, 69, 94, 254, 378, 436, 623, 665, 918, 1067, 1241, 1490, 1501, 1524, 1661, 1718, 1751, 1827, 1831, 1842^{T}, 1848, 1890, 2298, 2374, 2464, 2541, 2544, 2805	137
1 Pet 5:1	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 Pet 5:2	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 Pet 5:6	ὑμᾶς	049, 69*	138
1 Pet 5:7	ὑμῶν	None	138
1 Pet 5:7	ὑμῶν	01*, 1, 33, 43, 431^{C}, 436, 442, 453, 621, 665^{*V}, 1067, 1409, 1751, 2541, 2652	138
1 Pet 5:8	ὑμῶν	621, 642, 1490, 1831^{C}, 1890	138
1 Pet 5:9	ὑμῶν	93, 665	138
1 Pet 5:10	ὑμᾶς	0206, 61^{A}, 330, 398, 431^{C}, 442, 607, 621, 665, 1729, 1735*, 1799, 1881, 1890, 2243^{Z}, 2423^{C}, 2492, 2774, 2805	138
1 Pet 5:12	ὑμῖν	365	138
1 Pet 5:13	ὑμᾶς	None	139
1 Pet 5:14	ὑμῖν	None	138
2 Pet 1:1	ἡμῖν	None	139
2 Pet 1:1	ἡμῶν	None	138
2 Pet 1:2	ὑμῖν	None	138
2 Pet 1:2	ἡμῶν	None	138

2 Pet 1:3	ἡμῖν	400, 1127, 1241, 1729, 2243, 2464	138
2 Pet 1:3	ἡμᾶς	436, 996, 1067, 1241, 1409, 1505, 1661, 2541	138
2 Pet 1:4	ἡμῖν	02, 88, 442, 915, 996, 1661, 1729, 1735, 2186, 2774^{V}	138
2 Pet 1:5	ὑμῶν	None	139
2 Pet 1:8	ὑμῖν	307, 453, 629, 918, 2186, 2818	139
2 Pet 1:8	ἡμῶν	None	139
2 Pet 1:10	ὑμῶν	None	138
2 Pet 1:11	ὑμῖν	None	138
2 Pet 1:11	ἡμῶν	None	138
2 Pet 1:12	ὑμᾶς	None	138
2 Pet 1:13	ὑμᾶς	None	138
2 Pet 1:14	ἡμῶν	None	139
2 Pet 1:15	ὑμᾶς	None	139
2 Pet 1:16	ὑμῖν	None	139
2 Pet 1:16	ἡμῶν	None	139
2 Pet 1:18	ἡμεῖς	None	138
2 Pet 1:19	ὑμῶν	181, 442, 522, 1729, 1874, 2243^{Z}	138
2 Pet 2:1	ὑμῖν	None	139
2 Pet 2:3	ὑμᾶς	None	138
2 Pet 2:13	ὑμῖν	None	139
2 Pet 3:1	ὑμῖν	None	139
2 Pet 3:1	ὑμῶν	None	139
2 Pet 3:2	ὑμῶν	044, 0142, 5, 61, 88, 180, 206, 326, 330, 398, 400, 429, 468, 522, 607, 614, 623, 630, 720, 808, 876, 915, 1067, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1448, 1490, 1501, 1505, 1595, 1611, 1678, 1735^{C}, 1751, 1799, 1827, 1831, 1832, 1837, 1838^{Z}, 1852, 2138, 2147, 2200, 2243, 2298, 2374, 2412, 2464, 2544, 2718, 2774, 2805	140
2 Pet 3:8	ὑμᾶς	04, 1838	140
2 Pet 3:9	ὑμᾶς	94, 104, 206, 218, 307, 321, 378, 429, 442, 453, 459, 467, 522, 621, 629, 630^{*V}, 720, 808, 876, 918, 1127, 1359, 1490, 1501, 1678, 1751, 1799, 1831, 1832, 1838, 1842, 1848, 2147, 2243, 2652, 2818	140
2 Pet 3:11	ὑμᾶς	01*, 5, 104, 459, 621, 630, 1270, 1297, 1595^{Z}, 1729, 1838, 1842, 1874, 1875, 1890, 2147, 2243, 2464, 2544, 2774	140
2 Pet 3:15	ἡμῶν	5, 629, 1241	139
2 Pet 3:15	ἡμῶν	None	139
2 Pet 3:15	ὑμῖν	025, 6, 88, 621, 1297, 1595, 1718*, 1729, 1799, 2200, 2492	139
2 Pet 3:17	ὑμεῖς	None	138
2 Pet 3:18	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 1:1	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 1:1	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 1:2	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 1:2	ἡμῖν	1409, 1501, 1661	137
1 John 1:3	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 1:3	ὑμεῖς	None	137
1 John 1:3	ἡμῶν	None	137
1 John 1:4	ἡμεῖς	None	137

1 John 1:4	ἡμῶν <>	02, 04, 018, 025, 0142, 5, 6, 33, 61, 81, 88, 93, 94, 104, 206, 218, 254, 307, 330, 365, 378, 400^{T}, 424, 429, 431, 442, 453, 459, 467, 468, 614, 621, 623, 629, 630, 642, 665, 720, 808, 876, 915, 918, 945, 996, 1127, 1243, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1359, 1448, 1490, 1505, 1523, 1524, 1563, 1595, 1611, 1661, 1678, 1718, 1735, 1739, 1751, 1799, 1831, 1832, 1842, 1844, 1852, 1881, 1890, 2138, 2147, 2186, 2200, 2243, 2298, 2344, 2374, 2412, 2464, 2544, 2652, 2805, 2818	137
1 John 1:5	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 1:7	ἡμᾶς	None	137
1 John 1:8	ἡμῖν	None	137
1 John 1:9	ἡμῶν	None	137
1 John 1:9	ἡμῖν	None	137
1 John 1:9	ἡμᾶς	None	137
1 John 1:10	ἡμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:1	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:2	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 2:7	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:8	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:8	ὑμῖν	02, 049, 61, 69, 81^{V}, 180, 323, 398, 436, 621, 945, 1739, 1827, 1845, 1881, 1890, 2243^{T}, 2298, 2541, 2805	137
1 John 2:12	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:12	ὑμῖν	1842	137
1 John 2:13	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:13	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:14	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:14	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:14	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:14	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:19	ἡμῶν	621*, 1729	138
1 John 2:19	ἡμῶν	614, 621*, 1241, 2412*	138
1 John 2:19	ἡμῶν	621*, 1241, 1729	138
1 John 2:19	ἡμῶν	1241, 1729	138
1 John 2:19	ἡμῶν	044, 1241, 1729	138
1 John 2:20	ὑμεῖς	None	137
1 John 2:21	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:24	ὑμεῖς	None	137
1 John 2:24	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:24	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:24	ὑμεῖς	None	137
1 John 2:25	ἡμῖν	03, 1241, 1292*, 1661, 1729, 1881	138
1 John 2:26	ὑμῖν	None	138
1 John 2:26	ὑμᾶς	88, 1729	138
1 John 2:27	ὑμεῖς	None	137
1 John 2:27	ὑμῖν	None	137
1 John 2:27	ὑμᾶς	None	137
1 John 2:27	ὑμᾶς	326^{T}, 442, 1729, 1838	137
1 John 2:27	ὑμᾶς	181^{T}, 378, 1729, 1838, 1890^{C}	137

1 John 3:1	ἡμῖν	03, 018^{T}, 049, 81, 252, 365, 400, 467^{C}, 522*, 623, 1270, 1297, 1505, 1595, 1661, 1729, 2147, 2492	138
1 John 3:1	ἡμᾶς	01*, 04, 018, 020, 025, 049, 0142, 1, 43, 69, 81, 93, 180, 181, 252, 254, 319, 326, 330, 400, 424, 436, 442, 459, 607, 617, 621*, 629, 665, 996, 1067, 1175, 1241, 1270*, 1297, 1409, 1501, 1523, 1524, 1595, 1609, 1661, 1729, 1827, 1832, 1837, 1844, 1845^{*V}, 1874, 1875, 1881, 2186, 2344, 2423, 2464, 2492, 2544, 2774, 2805	138
1 John 3:7	ὑμᾶς	1729	137
1 John 3:13	ὑμᾶς	5, 321, 621^{C}, 808*, 1501, 1729	137
1 John 3:14	ἡμεῖς	None	138
1 John 3:16	ἡμῶν	None	137
1 John 3:16	ἡμεῖς	None	137
1 John 3:19	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 3:20	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 3:20	ἡμῶν	None	138
1 John 3:21	ἡμῶν	1241, 1505*, 1595^{T}	137
1 John 3:23	ἡμῖν	None	138
1 John 3:24	ἡμῖν	252^{T}, 1241, 1501, 1844	138
1 John 3:24	ἡμῖν	1729	138
1 John 4:4	ὑμεῖς	None	138
1 John 4:4	ὑμῖν	1067, 1751, 1838	138
1 John 4:6	ἡμεῖς	None	140
1 John 4:6	ἡμῶν	None	140
1 John 4:6	ἡμῶν	None	140
1 John 4:9	ἡμῖν	049^{*V}, 330, 629, 915^{T}, 1241, 1505, 1729, 1852, 2374, 2544*	138
1 John 4:10	ἡμεῖς	None	138
1 John 4:10	ἡμᾶς	1241	138
1 John 4:10	ἡμῶν	1241	138
1 John 4:11	ἡμᾶς	467*, 1241, 2344	139
1 John 4:11	ἡμεῖς	None	139
1 John 4:12	ἡμῖν	1241, 1729	140
1 John 4:12	ἡμῖν	629, 1127, 1729	140
1 John 4:13	ἡμῖν	None	138
1 John 4:13	ἡμῖν	None	138
1 John 4:14	ἡμεῖς	None	139
1 John 4:16	ἡμεῖς	None	140
1 John 4:16	ἡμῖν	1241, 1729	140
1 John 4:17	ἡμῶν	None	140
1 John 4:17	ἡμεῖς	None	140
1 John 4:19	ἡμεῖς	None	138
1 John 4:19	ἡμᾶς	None	138
1 John 5:4	ἡμῶν	018^{C}, 020, 048, 049, 0142, 81, 88, 104, 319, 321, 365, 398, 400, 424*, 459, 467, 607, 617, 876, 915, 996, 1175, 1241, 1270*, 1595, 1609, 1729, 1735, 1827, 1832, 1838, 1874, 1881, 2186, 2423, 2774	140
1 John 5:11	ἡμῖν	1241	139
1 John 5:13	ὑμῖν	None	139
1 John 5:14	ἡμῶν	None	137
1 John 5:15	ἡμῶν	None	137

1 John 5:20	ἡμῖν	None	137
2 John 2	ἡμῖν	025, 81, 400, 442, 808, 996, 1127, 1270, 1297, 1501, 1595, 1661, 1678*, 1729, 1827, 1831, 1875, 1890^{C}	142
2 John 2	ἡμῶν	81, 206^{S}, 400, 808, 996, 1127, 1270, 1297, 1501, 1595, 1609, 1661, 1678*, 1729, 1831, 1890^{C}, 2805*	142
2 John 3	ἡμῶν	5, 18, 35, 43, 61, 81, 94, 180^{V}, 206^{S}, 326, 365, 400, 468, 607, 623, 808, 945, 996, 1127, 1270, 1292, 1297, 1490, 1501, 1524, 1595, 1609, 1729, 1735^{C}, 1831, 1836, 1845^{C}, 1874^{Z}, 1890, 2423	142
2 John 10	ὑμᾶς	522^{*V}, 621*, 1729	141
2 John 12	ὑμῖν	None	141
2 John 12	ὑμᾶς	None	141
2 John 12	ἡμῶν <>	02, 03, 0142, 5, 33, 61, 81^{V}, 93, 94, 218, 254, 323, 365, 424^{Z}, 429, 431, 436, 442, 623, 665, 996, 1067^{T}, 1127, 1243, 1409, 1490, 1501, 1524, 1661, 1739, 1799, 1831, 1845, 1881, 1890, 2298, 2344*, 2464, 2492, 2541, 2544, 2718	141
3 John 8	ἡμεῖς	None	140
3 John 9	ἡμᾶς	5, 326, 436, 522*, 1067^{C}, 1241^{V}, 1661^{*V}, 1837, 1881, 2541	140
3 John 10	ἡμᾶς	0142, 81, 378, 1241, 1505*, 1661, 1735, 1881	140
3 John 12	ἡμεῖς	None	142
3 John 12	ἡμῶν	None	142
Jude 2	ὑμῖν	522, 614, 1751, 1799, 1846	138
Jude 3	ὑμῖν	None	140
Jude 3	ἡμῶν	6, 69, 104, 254, 459, 1505, 1523*, 1838, 1842, 1844, 1881, 2298, 2805	140
Jude 3	ὑμῖν	None	140
Jude 4	ἡμῶν	1241, 1678, 1729	140
Jude 4	ἡμῶν	1241	140
Jude 5	ὑμᾶς	206^{S}, 629, 1729, 1846*	140
Jude 5	ὑμᾶς	1729, 1838^{T}, 1838^{Z}, 2298	140
Jude 12	ὑμῶν	330, 1243, 1838, 2147	139
Jude 17	ὑμεῖς	None	138
Jude 17	ἡμῶν	None	138
Jude 18	ὑμῖν	018, 180*	140
Jude 20	ὑμεῖς	04, 1844, 1852	139
Jude 20	ὑμῶν	04, 323, 431, 1409, 1739, 1852, 2147, 2243, 2298, 2412, 2652	139
Jude 21	ἡμῶν	None	139
Jude 24	ὑμᾶς	02, 431, 1595, 1729	140
Jude 25	ἡμῶν	1241	139
Jude 25	ἡμῶν	1241	139
Rev 1:4	ὑμῖν	2256, 2432, 2847	95
Rev 1:5	ἡμᾶς	None	95
Rev 1:5	ἡμᾶς	None	95

Rev 1:5	ἡμῶν	None	95
Rev 1:6	ἡμᾶς	None	92
Rev 1:9	ὑμῶν	None	92
Rev 2:10	ὑμῶν	2056*	91
Rev 2:13	ὑμῖν	None	90
Rev 2:23	ὑμῖν	None	90
Rev 2:23	ὑμῶν	2019, 2432, 2847	90
Rev 2:24	ὑμῖν	None	90
Rev 2:24	ὑμᾶς	522, 2037*	90
Rev 4:11	ἡμῶν	None	94
Rev 5:10	ἡμῶν	None	90
Rev 6:10	ἡμῶν	None	90
Rev 6:16	ἡμᾶς	None	90
Rev 6:16	ἡμᾶς	None	90
Rev 7:3	ἡμῶν	None	90
Rev 7:10	ἡμῶν	None	90
Rev 7:12	ἡμῶν	None	89
Rev 11:15	ἡμῶν	None	94
Rev 12:10	ἡμῶν	None	93
Rev 12:10	ἡμῶν	None	93
Rev 12:10	ἡμῶν	None	93
Rev 12:12	ὑμᾶς	141, 792, 2019, 2081*, 2256, 2429, 2672, 2845, 2847	93
Rev 18:20	ὑμῶν	2077, 2495, 2672, 2845, 2847	91
Rev 19:1	ἡμῶν	None	89
Rev 19:5	ἡμῶν	None	90
Rev 19:6	ἡμῶν	None	89
Rev 22:16	ὑμῖν	None	83