Barth, challenging the use of the term "person" in trinitarian theology, argues for speaking of "three modes of being" in one personal God who is singular in purpose and action yet threefold in revelation. Similarly Rahner argues that the unity of God is the subjectivity of God the absolute subject. Since a "person" is a subjective, self-reflective, individual center of consciousness, use of the term in a trinitarian context can lead to tritheism. He prefers to speak of "three modes of subsistence"—God's self-communication is of the three relative ways in which God subsists. Moltmann criticizes both approaches as modalistic. He and process theologians attempt to base trinitarian theology on a social and organic view. "Person" is not a separate center of consciousness but is constituted by relationship to others. The unity of God is *perichoretic,* an everlasting and complete communion of persons. If one accepts both views in part one might say that "self-possession" and "relationality" are both essential qualities of personhood. As such they are reminiscent of former usages.

Subsequent discussion looked at the incommunicability of the person. There is the theological commonplace in this regard that we do not know the state of our own soul. There is also a notion of the indestructible in the incommunicable which carries ontological connotations. The necessity of communication for persons on the other hand carries psychological connotations. It is too little to say that the incommunicable grows through communication; one needs to say that the incommunicable is established through communication.

The theological use of the term "person" suggests the co-personal reality of humanity versus a notion of many persons as separated substances. Augustine manifested a kind of schizophrenia in this regard. Even as the divine persons are understood as essentially and internally relational, human persons are understood as accidentally and externally relational. In trying to understand other cultures one discovers not only who one is but who one is not. One of the dangers is that difference can become distance which is a typical distortion of human community. Diversity itself is good, it is human perversity which misuses these distinctions.

EARL C. MULLER, S.J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee