

What is the difference between the Son and the Holy Spirit, considered economically?

The Son and the Holy Spirit, considered economically, both have to do with the explicit aspect of the primal source, in contradistinction from the Father, who has to do with the implicit aspect of the primal source (albeit as seen in terms, or from the standpoint, of the explicit aspect—calling God [=strictly ultimate reality] Father being as dependent on the decisive representation through Jesus as calling Jesus the Son, and so on.). But the Son and the Holy Spirit are also different, in that the Son is the meaning of God (=strictly ultimate reality) for us made explicit with respect to its being the *ontic* component of the primal source, and thus the object of revelation that *entitles* us to understand ourselves in faith, whereas the Holy Spirit is this same meaning of God (=strictly ultimate reality) for us made explicit with respect to the apostles' (and, mediately, our) being the *noetic* component of the primal source, and thus the subject of revelation that as such is *empowered* by the presence and power of God Godself. Thus, although the Son and the Spirit both have to do with revealing the Father's love in its meaning for us as gift and demand, the Son is the gift and demand of the Father's love standing over against us as object and entitling us to understand ourselves in faith, while the Holy Spirit is the same gift and demand of the Father's love working within us as subjects and empowering us so to understand ourselves.