been going on since Paul’s departure.” Conybeare and Howson, edn. 2, ii. p. 10.

**28.  
mightily convinced**] The original word is a  
very forcible one,—he **argued down**, as we  
say,—‘*proved in their teeth:*’ and then it has  
also the sense of *continuity*,—that this was  
not done once or twice, but continuously.

**CHAP. XIX. 1–40.**] ARRIVAL, RESIDENCE, AND ACTS OF PAUL AT EPHESUS.

**1. the upper tracts**] By this name  
were known, the eastern parts of Asia  
Minor, beyond the river Halys, or in comparison with Ephesus, in the direction of  
that river.

**certain disciples**] These  
seem to have been in the same situation as  
Apollos, see on ch. xviii. 25. They cannot  
have been mere disciples of John, on account of **when ye believed**, which can bear  
no meaning but that of believing *on the  
Lord Jesus:* but they had received only  
John’s baptism, and had had no proof of  
the descent of the Holy Spirit, nor knowledge of His gifts.

**2.**] The indefinite  
past tense in the original should be faithfully rendered: not as A. V. ‘*Have ye  
received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?*’  
but **Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when  
ye became believers?** i.e. ‘*on your becoming believers, had ye the gifts of the  
Spirit conferred on you?*’—as in ch. viii.  
16, 17. This is both grammatically neccssary, and absolutely demanded by the sense;  
the enquiry being, not as to any reception  
of the Holy Ghost during the period since  
their baptism, but as to one simultaneous  
with their first reception into the church:  
and their *not* having *then* received Him is  
accounted for by the *deficiency of their  
baptism*.

**We did not so much as  
hear**] Literally, **on the contrary, not  
even...** Here again, not, ‘we *have  
not* heard,’ which would involve an absurdity: “for they could not be followers  
of Moses or of John the Baptist, without  
hearing of the Holy Ghost” (Bengel);—but **we did not hear**, at the time of our  
conversion:—Our reception into the faith  
was unaccompanied by any preaching of  
the office or the gifts of the Spirit,—our  
baptism was not followed by any imparting  
of His gifts: **we did not so much as hear  
Him mentioned**. The stress of the sentence  
is on *hearing*: so far from *receiving* the  
Holy Ghost, they did not even *hear* of His  
existence.

**3.**] St. Paul’s question  
establishes the above rendering:—**To what  
then** (if ye did not so much as hear of the  
Holy Ghost at your first believing) **were  
ye baptized?** If the question and answer  
in ver. 2 regarded, as in A. V., the *whole  
interval* since their conversion, this enquiry  
would have been more naturally expressed  
in the perfect tense.

**Unto what**]  
**unto** (with a view to, as introductory to)  
**what profession?** They answer, **Unto** (that  
indicated by) **the baptism of John**, viz.:  
*repentance*, and *the believing on Jesus,*  
*then to come*, but *now* (see ch. xviii. 25,  
note) *the object of our faith*.

**5.**] Two  
singular perversions of this verse have  
occurred: (1) the Anabaptists use it to  
authorize the repetition of Christian baptism, whereas it is not *Christian baptism*  
which was repeated, seeing that John’s baptism was *not such*, but only the baptism  
which they now for the first time received;  
and (2) some of the orthodox, wishing to  
wrest this weapon out of the hands of the  
Anabaptists, oddly enough suppose this  
verse to belong still to Paul’s discourse, and