I want first of all to express my appreciation to Professor Schweizer for his taking my monograph seriously and for his generous and even-handed treatment of its contents. Moreover, although I would be reluctant to consider ‘Part II (as) the most important contribution’ (perhaps the book’s more lasting contribution will be the commentary on all the Pauline Spirit texts), he has rightly focussed on the theological synthesis, rather than offer rebuttal over endless points of exegesis.

As Professor Schweizer notes several times, we tend to agree far more than otherwise, which also makes a meaningful dialogue somewhat difficult. Also, I do not wish to use the occasion of this response as a platform to go over the same ground that the book covers yet one more time. I will therefore focus on four areas pointed out by Professor Schweizer, where it is clear that the final word on Pauline pneumatology has yet to be written (indeed, very likely by the very nature of the data themselves cannot be written): 1) the question of authenticity, and with that the issue of theological development in Paul; 2) the miraculous as an
ongoing, presupposed reality in the life of Paul and the Pauline churches; 3) the issue of Paul's 'trinitarianism'; 4) the implications of the Spirit as eschatological fulfillment, especially as it impacts Paul's understanding of justification and sanctification.

1. The Issue of Theological Development

This is one of the thorny matters in Pauline theology. At issue are not simply questions of authenticity, but of methodology. How do we detect 'development' in Paul on the basis of such slender, very ad hoc evidence that is neither comprehensive nor systematic? I do not want to take up the issues of authenticity here, since on this matter Professor Schweizer and I will undoubtedly agree to disagree—although it would be of some interest to me to know how he handles the alleged inauthenticity of Colossians in light of his acceptance of Philemon.

More to the issue for me is the dating of Philippians, which apparently he is willing to place in an earlier period (during an unknown Ephesian imprisonment?). I have outlined my position on this question in some detail in my recent commentary on Philippians.¹ Suffice it here to say that the combined evidence of the mention of the Praetorian Guard (1.13) and saints in Caesar's household (4.22) clearly supports the traditional view of a Roman imprisonment,² but does not work at all for an alleged, otherwise unknown Ephesian imprisonment.³ The significance of this piece of datum, of course, is that the Spirit talk in Philippians belongs towards the end of Paul's life, yet, despite its paucity, is of a piece with that found earlier in Romans and Galatians. While this evidence is sometimes brought forward to argue for an earlier date for Philippians, that is simply to argue in a circle, based on a prior scheme of

² In the sense that both of these matters clearly belong together in Rome, but cannot be shown to do so elsewhere in the empire.
³ The point to make here is not only that there is no evidence for an Ephesian imprisonment of any kind, let alone the kind presupposed in this letter (of long duration, with political implications of a kind that could result in Paul's execution), but that Ephesus was the capital of a senatorial, not imperial, province, so that there was no Praetorian Guard ever stationed in the city (the inscription often used as evidence is bogus, since the person involved was a member of the Guard [obviously elsewhere], who had taken up residence in Ephesus).