The problem of the barbarous excess of human suffering is becoming the main question of global Christianity. This has been highlighted by Pope Francis—the first pontiff from the Global South—due to his sensitivity to the experiences of the women, men, and the ecological context that are “sinned-against.” With this in mind, an important question arises: in an intercultural, globalizing world, how does the global sensus fidei assist in envisioning the wounds of sin and God’s saving work of healing, liberation, and redemption? My argument will address this question by engaging with the Korean anthropology of han (ruptured heart/frustrated hope/black hole in the soul). I will argue that han is an anthropology with a constellation of signifiers “thick” enough to account for one aspect of the global sensus fidei: the shared experiences of unwarranted human suffering and ecological degradation that seek God’s salvation, albeit fragmentary, in this world. I will proceed in four steps. First, I will discuss the method that makes this undertaking possible: intercultural hermeneutics and the semiotics of culture. Second, I will discuss the constellation of some meanings associated with the Korean anthropology of han. Third, I will discuss the terms sensus fidei and consensus fidelium as clarified by the recent document from the International Theological Commission. Finally, I will suggest that han anthropology can be considered a global “flow” within the sensus fidei that can lead to a consensus fidelium: assessing and interpreting doctrine, faith, and practice based upon the experiences of the sinned-against.

Intercultural Hermeneutics and the Semiotics of Culture

Intercultural encounters have become commonplace and unavoidable in a world that is characterized by ever greater technological and economic intertwining. The work of intercultural communication has become indispensable but the practice is complex. This is because approaching a cultural boundary in order to engage with someone else’s culture is precarious. Therefore, an undergirding theory of intercultural hermeneutics is necessary to make intercultural communication possible.


3 One example of this is orientalism as a hermeneutical problem. For the classic treatment of this problem, see Edward Said, Orientalism (NY: Pantheon, 1978).
Intercultural hermeneutics is a relatively new field, and one that has a very short history in its dialogue with and appropriation by the discipline of theology. For the purposes of this essay, I will discuss three of its tools that are most relevant for the work of unlocking some of the meanings carried by han: a presupposition of the “relative incommensurability” of cultures, a semiotic understanding of culture, and a four-position communication paradigm through which intercultural dialogue can occur.

First, a presupposition of “relative incommensurability of cultures” provides an adequate starting point. This foundation respects the deep-seated differences as one approaches a cultural boundary, particularly within an asymmetry of power, even as it recognizes that communication between cultures is possible. In other words, it accounts for the reality of “violent and unequal” encounters among cultures while demonstrating that communication remains possible. “Relative incommensurability” offers the possibility of authentic intercultural communication by highlighting difference while searching for common ground. It can be understood as prioritizing the greater dissimilarities among cultures while searching for the points of contact and lesser similarities through which communication is possible. This presupposition can account for the power differential as my own cultural location intersects with that from which han is envisioned and articulated.

Second, a semiotic approach to culture provides an adequate understanding. The possibility for intercultural communication is rooted in one’s understanding of culture, and a semiotic approach is of great value. As Robert Schreiter points out, a semiotic approach views culture as a network of communication in which verbal and nonverbal messages circulate along complicated, expansive, interrelated pathways that, as a holistic entity, create a system of meaning. Phrased differently, a semiotic approach to culture is “a method by which culture is studied as a communication structure and process.” Signs are the building blocks of meaning, codes are the pathways in which these signs are variously organized, and the confluence of these signs and codes creates a message that is a larger contour within the culture.

One of the primary strengths of such a semiotic approach is its ability to envision a culture as a “text.” As Clifford Geertz writes in describing the utility of a semiotic approach, “culture” is: “As interworked systems of construable signs culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviors, and institutions, or processes can be causally attributed; it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly—that is, thickly—described.”

In other words, for Geertz, a “culture” is a network of interconnected signs and symbols that, in a sense, can be “read” and “interpreted” as a text to greater and lesser degrees of relative adequacy. A text can be on the micro-level—discrete gestures, phrases, daily practices—or a text can be an amalgamation of these smaller units into a
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4 For the sources and development of this emerging discipline, see Robert Schreiter, The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1997), 30-32.
5 Schreiter, The New Catholicity, 45.
7 There are roughly three different understandings of culture used in today’s religious and theological discourse: classicist, modern, and globalized. See Gerald Arbuckle, Culture, Inculturation, and Theologians: A Postmodern Critique (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010), Kathryn Tanner, Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1997), Schreiter, The New Catholicity, Schreiter, “Christian Witness in a New Modernity.” I follow Schreiter in naming the third understanding “globalized” as opposed to “postmodern.”
8 Robert Schreiter, Constructing Local Theologies (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985), 49.
9 Schreiter, The New Catholicity, 30. See also Alejandro Garcia-Rivera, St. Martin de Porres: The Little Stories and the Semiotics of Culture (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995), 31-35.
11 David Tracy writes: “For relative adequacy is just that: relative, not absolute, adequacy. If one demands certainty, one is assured of failure. We can never possess absolute certainty. But we can achieve a good—that is, relatively adequate—interpretation: relative to the power of disclosure and concealment of the text, relative to the skills and attentiveness of the interpreter, relative to the kind of conversation possible for the interpreter in a particular culture at a particular time.” See Tracy, Blessed Rage for Order (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975/1996), 22-23.
large canvass—rituals, celebrations, myths, narratives, ethos. On the macro-level, a system of interrelated texts can be seen as a semiotic domain. That is, an entire complex system that has a bewildering network of signs, codes, and messages that creates a larger meaning structure.\textsuperscript{12} A semiotic approach shows that han anthropology and its cultural context can be interpreted as a kind of “text” to assist in intercultural communication. It also suggests that han carries an excess of meaning that cannot be fully apprehended because it and its constellation of signifiers are a kind of semiotic domain.

Third, a four-position communication paradigm illustrates how communication can occur among cultures that are relatively incommensurable and that are understood through a semiotic approach. This communication paradigm allows for four possible forms of interaction, depending upon the location of the interlocutors. The paradigm distinguishes a cultural insider from a cultural outsider, and asks whether one is a speaker or hearer of the message. In what follows here, this fourfold distinction—insider or outsider, speaker or hearer—allows me to define my own location in interpreting han as an “outsider-hearer” (the one who stands outside the culture and who is attempting to receive, interpret, translate the message) and the articulators of han as the “insider-speakers” (the ones who initiate, create, and send the message). This paradigm attempts to minimize distortion of the message as it migrates from one culture to another.

To summarize this section, Robert Schreiter encapsulates the work of intercultural hermeneutics. He writes that this approach

Focuses on signs (Greek: \textit{semeion}) that carry messages along the pathways (codes) of culture. The purpose of the circulation of those messages within culture is to create identity, which involves building group solidarity and incorporating new information as it comes into the culture. The intercultural hermeneutics challenge would be stated thus semiotically: how does the same message get communicated via different codes, using a mixture of signs from two different cultures?\textsuperscript{13}

An intercultural engagement with something like han is precarious because it can lead to distortion of communication between inner-speaker and outer-hearer. In light of this challenge, an intercultural hermeneutic becomes necessary in order to engage and interpret han to some degree of relative adequacy.

Han: A “Thick” Description

Currently, there is no fully adequate treatment or “thick description” of han in the English language. Han is untranslatable and requires an in-depth study of Korean linguistics, history, politics, gender and class dynamics, religion, artwork, poetry, and theology in order to apprehend some of its meanings. I cannot provide an extensive treatment of han in the space provided; however, I will give an overview of six facets of han anthropology that make it more accessible.

First, han should be received by an “outsider-hearer” as an anthropology and neither as an abstract concept nor a philosophical category in the Western, Kantian, sense. Han anthropology refers to the deep wounds carried by oppressed and violated individuals, groups, and peoples. Philosopher Chang-Hee Son provides a linguistic analysis
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of han (based on the philosophy of hanism of Kim Sang-Yil,\textsuperscript{14}) and notes a difference between three separate hans that are written and pronounced identically in the Korean language but are based upon differing and unequivocal Chinese characters. Son makes a distinction between what he calls the han (韓) of han philosophy, the haan (恨) of minjung theology, and the Southern Han (漢) people of China. Regarding the haan with which this essay is concerned, an anthropology, Son describes the fullness of the character (恨) as a tree with roots stretching very deeply into the earth. As Son writes,

\textit{[Han] is used to describe the heart of a person or people who has/have endured or is/are enduring an affliction but the pains, wounds, and scars are not always apparent and visible because they are the kind that occur deep within the essence, core being, or heart of a person . . . [han] connotes a mind's or a heart's affliction and struggle with a deep emotional or spiritual pain which either poisons the entire being or even ends up nourishing the person.\textsuperscript{15}}

Phrased more viscerally, Wang-Sang Han explains: “Han is a sense of unresolved resentment against injustices suffered, a sense of helplessness because of overwhelming odds against one's feeling of total abandonment, a feeling of acute pain and sorrow in one's guts and bowels.”\textsuperscript{16}

Second, han possesses a psychological component, albeit one in which mind, body, and spirit are intrinsically connected. Philosopher Jae-Hoon Lee has provided a nuanced psychological understanding of the nature of han through a dialogue between Korean culture and the psychological work of Carl Jung and Melanie Klein. He highlights three, interconnected manifestations: won-han, jeong-han, and hu-han. To simplify each variant, won-han is based in aggression and has the energy to lash out; hu-han is the nihilistic woundedness that is a full collapsing in on oneself, is empty, and destructive; jeong-han has two variations: immature and mature. Immature jeong-han is a resigned, depressive state that could lead to mental illness, despair, and disengagement. Mature jeong-han, however, is a healing manifestation of han that Lee analogizes to agape. It is the negative and destructive energy of pain and woundedness transformed into a positive and constructive energy expressed in love for self and others.\textsuperscript{17}

Third, han carries a deep religious constellation of meanings. The deepest of these is found in the traditional religion of Shamanism. This religion is the oldest within the Korean peninsula and is the source for the term han-pu-ri (resolution of han) that has meaning and rituals adopted to some extent by some Christian theologians and ministers. For the purposes of this essay, however, it is more helpful to focus upon recent Christian articulations of han. Theologian Andrew Sung Park is the foremost interpreter of han in the English speaking world and variously describes han as a multifaceted “abyss of pain,” a “wounded heart,” and “frustrated hope” that is the residue of violence unleashed upon the innocent. Park describes han as a “black hole” and a festering wound whose energy must be channeled and resolved either to give life or to give death to one's self and others.\textsuperscript{18} He connects the resolution of han to Protestant understandings of incarnation, atonement, trinity, resurrection, and the life of Jesus in order to envision what han-pu-ri means.\textsuperscript{19} For example, Park writes, “Jesus commiserated with the marginalized by car-
ryng their han. His death is vicarious in the sense that he lived, died, and rose to liberate them from oppression and injustice. . . . Jesus shed his blood to bear our han.”

Fourth, han anthropology is best expressed through art and to this end Korean poet and activist Kim Chi-Ha has offered some of the most striking descriptions of han anthropology. Generally, Kim thinks han is the experiences of oppression and woundedness that also carry the energy for social transformation. Kim writes, “accumulated han is inherited and transmitted, boiling in the blood of the people” and it possesses “the emotional core of anti-regime action.” He also emphasizes the intense negativity of han for, as Wonhee Anne Joh points out, han is never innocent. Its deep negativity cannot be underestimated and one of Kim’s sharpest descriptions of han is “a people eating monster.” For him, han is a “ghastly creature” that “appears as a concrete substance with enormous ugly and evil energy.”

Fifth, han’s roots tap into the depths of suffering in the particularities of Korean history. In crystallizing this painful history, Ham Sok-Hon has described Korea as the “Queen of Suffering.” As Ham writes, “This land, this people, events big and small, its politics and religion, its art and thought—all that is Korean bespeaks suffering. It is a fact, however shameful and painful.” Not only was the Korean peninsula subject to centuries of invasions and pillaging by regional powers, but also there were internal causes of han that possess a socio-political “fourfold dimension.” This includes: colonization and invasion by regional powers such as China, Japan, and Mongolia that threatened the very existence of the Korean nation and people; the tyrannical rulers who inflicted great suffering upon the Korean people; neo-Confucianism’s strict subordination and oppression of women, so that “the existence of women was han itself”; and the overwhelming number of Korean peasants who were officially registered as hereditary slaves and thus treated as government property throughout Korean history.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, han has a privileged connection to the experiences of women. Historically, the suffering of women during the long history of the Korean peninsula has been severe. Particularly after the Yi Dynasty’s adoption of neo-Confucianism, Korean women became fully subordinated in three obediences: to their father, to their husband, and to the eldest son. In addition to this internal structure that caused much han for women, there were external factors as well. For example, in the twentieth century the Japanese pressed tens of thousands of Korean women into sex slavery to be “comfort women” to Japanese soldiers. As Chung Hyun-Kyung has pointed out, the experience of Korean women became the very embodiment of han. She calls them the “han of the han,” and the “minjung within the minjung.” Chung has pointed out that the han of women is most severe and mostly overlooked. The han of women is so pervasive that some have argued that han should be applied almost
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exclusively to the woundedness of women. Although I cannot expand upon this point here, the experiences of women’s han should be placed at the center of han anthropology. Without fully attending to women’s voices and incorporating them into an understanding of han, an “outsider-hearer’s” interpretation cannot achieve any degree of relative adequacy.

A Global Flow within the Sensus Fidei: The Experiences of the Sinned-Against as Consensus Fidelium

Han is a particular anthropology from a particular culture; however, it also can be interpreted as a faith instinct and global “flow”—a sensus fidei—in which a myriad of local cultures participate to greater or lesser degrees. This is because han possesses a constellation of meanings and signifiers “thick” enough to provide insight into one aspect of the global sensus fidei: the cries of the sinned-against that demand some measure of salvation, albeit fragmentary, in this world.

This claim needs clarification, and the International Theological Commission (ITC) recently discussed the term sensus fidei in its document “The Sensus Fidei in the Life of the Church” (2014). The document clarifies this concept and explains the relationship among the “faith intuition” of the individual believer, that of the ecclesial body, and the essential connection between the two. The Commission states that an individual believer possesses a “personal aptitude . . . to make an accurate discernment in matters of faith” and describes this with the term sensus fidei fidelis. The Commission intertwines the individual believer’s “personal aptitude” with “the Church’s own instinct of faith”, and the latter it connects to the term sensus fidei fidelium. To illustrate:

As a theological concept, the sensus fidei refers to two realities which are distinct though closely connected. . . . On the one hand, the sensus fidei refers to the personal capacity of the believer, within the communion of the Church, to discern the truth of faith. On the other hand, the sensus fidei refers to a communal and ecclesial reality: the instinct of faith of the Church herself, by which she recognises her Lord and proclaims his word.32

The Commission then provides a term to indicate the interwoven totality of these instincts: the consensus fidelium.33 The two manifestations of the sensus fidei, ideally, should converge and coalesce to bring about a consensus fidelium. The document goes on:

The sensus fidei in this sense is reflected in the convergence of the baptised in a lived adhesion to a doctrine of faith or to an element of Christian praxis. This convergence (consensus) plays a vital role in the Church: the consensus fidelium is a sure criterion for determining whether a particular doctrine or practice belongs to the apostolic faith.34

30 As the International Theological Commission document indicates, “Unlike theology, which can be described as scientia fidei, the sensus fidei fidelis is not a reflective knowledge of the mysteries of faith which deploys concepts and uses rational procedures to reach its conclusions. As its name (sensus) indicates, it is akin rather to a natural, immediate and spontaneous reaction, and comparable to a vital instinct or a sort of ‘flair’ by which the believer clings spontaneously to what conforms to the truth of faith and shuns what is contrary to it.” See “Sensus Fidei in the Life of the Church,” no. 54.
31 Schreiter points out that the term ‘flow’ arose from the fields of anthropology, sociology, and communication studies. A flow denotes “cultural and ritual movements, a circulation of information that is patently visible yet hard to define. Flows move across geographic and other cultural boundaries, and, like a river, define a route, change the landscape, and leave behind sediment and silt that enrich the local ecology.” See The New Catholicity, 15.
32 International Theological Commission, “Sensus Fidei in the Life of the Church,” no. 3.
33 International Theological Commission, “Sensus Fidei in the Life of the Church,” no. 3.
34 International Theological Commission, “Sensus Fidei in the Life of the Church,” no. 3. The paragraph continues, “In the present document, we use the term, sensus fidei fidelis, to refer to the personal aptitude of the believer to make an accurate discernment in matters of faith, and sensus fidei fidelium to refer to the Church’s own instinct of faith. According to the context, sensus fidei refers to either the former or the latter, and in the latter case the term, sensus fidelium, is also used.”
As a global flow, *han* anthropology shows such a convergence and can be interpreted as an aspect of the *consensus fidei*. It can direct the faith of the church to discern how a doctrine or practice should be interpreted and whether or not a particular doctrine or practice even belongs to the apostolic faith. *Han* anthropology can function in this capacity because, among other reasons, it is part and parcel of the “signs of the times.” The ITC connects the signs of the times to the *sensus fidei* of the Church. They write:

> The Church and her members are constantly confronted with new circumstances, with the progress of knowledge and culture, and with the challenges of human history, and they have to read the signs of the times, ‘to interpret them in the light of the divine Word’, and to discern how they may enable revealed truth itself to be ‘more deeply penetrated, better understood and more deeply presented’. . . . The *sensus fidei* gives an intuition as to the right way forward amid the uncertainties and ambiguities of history, and a capacity to listen discerningly to what human culture and the progress of the sciences are saying. It animates the life of faith and guides authentic Christian action.  

As a *consensus fidelium*, the global flow of *han* anthropology re-centers faith and doctrine upon innocent suffering and emphasizes the cries of the sinned-against for healing and liberation more so than the tears of sinners for forgiveness and redemption. This is because “the *consensus fidelium* is a sure criterion for determining whether a particular doctrine or practice belongs to the apostolic faith.”

For example, articulating a *consensus fidelium* rooted in *han* anthropology sheds greater light upon interpreting basic aspects of Catholic doctrine, such as the Christian anthropology. A primary example of this comes from *Gaudium et spes*. This document is important because, as Walter Kasper has observed, “Prior to Vatican II no council had produced a ‘general outline’ of Christian anthropology. The Pastoral Constitution was the first to attempt to do so.” 36 This document shows that the basic Roman Catholic anthropology emphasizes sinning rather than being sinned-against (*han*). Its Christian anthropology rightfully focuses upon the sinning creature’s alienation from the sinned-against Creator, as well as the modern questions of meaning, existence, and atheism to which this is connected. But, the *consensus fidelium* discussed above suggests that its Christian anthropology needs to emphasize the *han* of the sinned-against and the work of the Living God of Jesus Christ in healing the victims’ wounds and secondarily calling the violators to repent. In other words, the Pastoral Constitution offers a vision of Christian salvation that primarily focuses upon the sinner (with reference to the problems of meaning and atheism) while failing also to focus sufficiently upon the sinned-against (with reference to the problems of innocent suffering and non-persons). 37

A *consensus fidelium* rooted in the *han* of the sinned-against questions this focus and suggests that its vision be broadened. Although the problem of sinning and forgiveness of sins is essential to the faith, this *consensus fidelium* centered on *han* anthropology suggests that redemption of sinners be secondary to the problem of attending to the barbarous excess of innocent suffering of the sinned-against. This means that *han*, and not sin, moves to the center of faith, doctrine, and practice. 38
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36 Full quote: "*Gaudium et spes* signals the first time a council has consciously endeavored to set forth a systematic account of Christian anthropology in an independent thematic context. There are, of course, statements concerning anthropology in earlier conciliar texts. Nevertheless, such statements are always made in connection with the treatment of individual questions relative to Christology, the theology of creation, or grace. Prior to Vatican II no council had produced a ‘general outline’ of Christian anthropology. The Pastoral Constitution was the first to attempt to do so.” Walter Kasper, “The Theological Anthropology of *Gaudium et spes*,” *Communio*, 23 (Spring 1996): 129.
37 See, for example, GS, nos. 3, 9-22, 27. This is a large claim that needs much greater substantiation. I expand upon the anthropology of *Gaudium et spes* in greater detail in chapter one of Kevin P. Considine, *Salvation for the Sinned-Against: 'Han' and Schillebeeckx in Intercultural Dialogue* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015)
38 This insight of prioritizing *han* before sin—while holding both as essential to Christian practice and doctrine—comes from the thought of Suh Nam-Dong, Kim Chi-Ha, and Andrew Sung Park, among many others.
This claim needs further clarification. To place primary importance on han and secondary importance on sin neither eliminates the importance of forgiveness of sin nor minimizes the breadth and depth of human sinfulness. This re-prioritizing is a corrective to the tradition that has emphasized sin, almost exclusively, in an attempt to bring the experiences of han and sin into doctrinal balance. It is important to point out, as Andrew Sung Park explains, that all human beings always exist simultaneously as sinners and sinned-against. Nevertheless, it is helpful to make a distinction between the two positions in order to account for the particular wounds that have been inflicted upon an individual, community, or people group by another individual, community, or people group. Within this world there are clear situations in which there is violator and victim, oppressed and oppressor. All human beings are an amalgamation of both, but one facet often manifests within a specific situation.39

All of this suggests that han anthropology, as a sensus fidei of the sinned-against, can express the shared experiences of unwarranted human suffering and woundedness within a context of ecological degradation and seeks God’s salvation in this world. There are at least seven characteristics that can offer insight into the kinds of wounds signified by han anthropology in the twenty-first century. First, these wounds are sexed and gendered. Due to the overwhelming suffering of women on a global scale,40 women’s experiences must have a privileged connection to a han-informed sensus fidei. For example, women’s bodies are sexualized, objectified, and often made into commodities, their life possibilities frequently stunted, and their identities often defined by their male attachments. Second, these wounds are political and economic. Regarding the former, the ways in which nation-states are functioning and failing directly affect the human dignity of their inhabitants. Regarding the latter, as Pope Francis has argued, “Just as the commandment ‘Thou shalt not kill’ sets a clear limit in order to safeguard the value of human life, today we also have to say ‘thou shalt not’ to an economy of exclusion and inequality. Such an economy kills.”41 Third, these wounds are racialized and inculturated. The problems of race and racialization have been exported globally and constitute a local and global social problem. As J. Kameron Carter points out, race is a human discourse that has functioned to impose identity for the purpose of dehumanizing, controlling, and exploiting black and brown bodies. It is a “power/knowledge nexus” created by Western Europeans that functioned to carry out the colonial project of white domination, enrichment, and superiority.42 Regarding the latter, and as shown above, the “violent and unequal” encounters among cultures have left centuries of turmoil among many peoples as they fight to reclaim the positive value in their ways of life. Fourth, these wounds are queered. The suffering within communities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people long has been ignored or denigrated by Christian faith and practice and their wounds have been left to fester. No longer can the denigration of their unwarranted suffering be tolerated.43 Fifth, these wounds are ecclesial. The ongoing trauma of clerical sexual abuse of minors, and more insidiously its institutional cover-up, has inflicted great harm upon the most vulnerable and innocent of the faithful. Moreover, this evil has sown great suspicion and anger toward the clergy that will continue to fester within the Body of Christ. Sixth, these wounds are sexualized beyond gender. The suffering of children who are victims of sexual assault and sex trafficking, not to mention the men who also are victims of rape and sexual violence, must neither be minimized nor ignored. Finally, these wounds are ecological. There is an overwhelming consensus among climate scientists that human activity continues to accelerate the destruction of the ecological system in which we are interwoven and upon which our survival and flourishing is dependent.44 All of these experiences of being sinned-against testify to the prevalence of han as a “sign of the times.” Han anthropology can

39 Park, The Wounded Heart of God, 70.
41 Pope Francis, Evangelii Gaudium, no. 53.
43 See, for example, Copeland, Enfleshing Freedom, chap. 3.
44 See, for example, Grace Ji-Sun Kim, Colonialism, ‘Han’, and the Transformative Spirit (NY: Palgrave Pivot, 2013).
provide one constellation of signifiers “thick” enough to account for the enormity and diversity of these wounds, articulate them as a global flow within the *sensus fidei*, and suggest that they comprise one aspect of a *consensus fidelium* against which faith, doctrine, and practice must be tested. These voices demand salvation, albeit fragmentary, in this world and call the Church to respond accordingly.

Conclusion

The global Church no longer is a European or North Atlantic church. As many have documented, the vast majority of professing and practicing Christians live in the Global South and are concerned with the problem of suffering rather than the problem of meaning. As this tectonic shift continues, the “faith intuition” of the sinned-against—salvation from *han*—is becoming central, both individually and ecclesially. This demographic shift also suggests that Western philosophies and anthropologies are no longer fully adequate to express the *sensus fidei* of the global Church. The “flow” of *han* anthropology, then, can be understood as part of the global *consensus fidelium* now and in the foreseeable future to assist in assessing and interpreting Catholic doctrine, faith, and practice.