

Review of Tyler Hendricks' Translation of True Father's words at Inauguration of Women's UN Assembly

Andy Lausberg
November 14, 2017

["No Mother" – The Lord of the 2nd Advent – July 16, 2012](#)



Transcription:

어머니를 내가 길러왔어요. 어머님은 없습니다. 문총재 아내자리도 없어요. 제 멋대로이야! 제 멋대로...

I raised up Mother over the years. (But now) there is no Mother. Even the position of the wife of Pres. Moon is vacant. (She's) just doing as she pleases (according to her own whims). According to her own whims....

Tyler Hendricks' Translation

1:05:22 "I have raised [True] Mother. [If not for me,] there would not have been [Heavenly / True] Mother. There would not have been Rev. Moon's wife. [Unidentified subject] would be doing whatever [he / she / they. wants / want]."

Linguistically, the words, sentences, etc., are ambiguous. There are parts that are ambiguous, and parts that are clear. To correctly interpret the individual sentences, it is necessary to draw on various supportive evidences, namely thematic flow, linguistic elements, and real-world context. The a preponderance of evidence that gives different weights to different possible interpretations.

Sentence 1

어머니를 내가 길러왔어요.

Free translation

I raised up Mother over the years.

Literal translation

"Mother, she was raised by me."

"The mother, she was raised by me."

Review: source of ambiguities:

1. Lexical ambiguity

The word for 'mother' [eo-meo-ni] (woman who has born a child) and 'Mother' [eo-meo-ni] (the (informal) name or title by which Mrs. Moon is traditionally addressed in the Unification Church) are identical (homonyms). The formal variant [eo-meo-nim] is not used here. The formal variant would imply strongly the second meaning (reference to Hak Ja Han), but it is not employed here.

This can be resolved in 2 ways:

Resolution 1. The word is a proper noun: refers to Hak Ja Han as 'Mother' – "Mother (Hak Ja Han) was raised by me."

Resolution 2. The word refers to a regular noun: refers to the person who fulfills the role/position of the mother (in God's ideal/providence, etc.). While factually this still refers to Hak Ja Han, the thematic emphasis is on the role of Mother than the person Hak Ja Han.

"The mother (in God's providence) was raised by me."

Comment: There is some ambiguity here. Is Reverend Moon saying that he raised Mother (Hak Ja Han) the person, or is he saying he raised the person who fulfills the role/position of Mother? On one level (factual) it is unambiguous, because in either case, the relevant person is Hak Ja Han. So in either resolution, this is a clear statement that the current status/ability/capacity of Hak Ja Han is due fundamentally to Rev. Moon's training and education.

On another level (textual), the statement is potentially ambiguous, because of the lexical factor (word ambiguity). Moreover, this opening sentence sets the theme for the whole discourse (4 sentences).

Thus, the theme of the discourse is somewhat ambiguous: Is Rev. Moon talking about the person who fulfills the mother position and role in God's providence, with emphasis on the role, or is he talking about Hak Ja Han the person?

Hence, for the discourse, there are two possible themes:

1. Hak Ja Han, the person (concrete)
2. The person who fulfills the role of mother (in God's ideal, providence etc.) (abstract, conceptual)

The theme in the first sentence generates significant CONTEXT for following sentences to be interpreted. (Korean is a highly contextual language, where theme places a significant role in providing context when subjects, objects or other linguistic content is omitted (ellipsis).) Thus, to some extent, the ambiguity in the first sentence is transferred to later sentences as thematic (contextual) ambiguity.

Conclusion: This opening statement requires greater context in order to be interpreted correctly. Some of that context (evidence) is provided in the following statements. Further context can be drawn from extra-linguistic evidence (time, place, subsequent events in the Unification Church, etc.)

Sentence 2

어머님은 없습니다.

Free translation

(But now) there is no Mother.

Literal translation

"Mother is not."

"(our) Mother does not exist"

Review: Source of ambiguities: logic (extra-linguistic factor) The statement clearly says that 'Mother' does not exist (is not present). How to understand this, considering that Hak Ja Han was alive and well at the time?

Resolution 1. "Presently (2012) there is no person in the position of "Mother (True Mother)" ("There is currently (2012) no mother")

Resolution 2. "In the transcendent realm, beyond time, there is no Mother in the ideal of God" ("There is currently no mother")

Resolution 3. "In the transcendent realm, beyond time, there was no Mother in the ideal of God" ("There was no mother in the past")

Salient points:

1. Honorific form of 'mother' is used. This adds weight to the interpretation that Rev. Moon is thematically referring to Hak Ja Han as opposed to the more abstract conceptual 'role of mother'.

2. Present tense (including absence of explicit past tense)

Comment: This sentence is potentially ambiguous, because of the logical conundrum that if Rev. Moon is referring to Hak Ja Han, the person, well, externally, as a person, she exists, but if he is referring to the more conceptual role of 'mother', why does he use honorific, why does he use present tense, and in what sense is there currently "no mother"?

The use of present tense strongly implies that Rev. Moon is referring to a current state of affairs. There is no linguistic evidence that he is referring to a past situation.

Sentence 3

문총재 아내자리도 없어요.

Free translation

Even the position of the wife of Pres. Moon is vacant.

Literal translation

"The position of Pres. Moon's wife does not exist."

"The position of Pres. Moon's wife is not."

Salient points:

1. Use of the title [Cheong Jae] "Chairman" "President" (Head of a group of organizations)
2. Use of expression [anae jari] (literally "wife position", "wife's position". (as opposed to "wife"))
3. Use of the verb: [opseoyo] – to not be there, to not exist, not be present

Review: Source of ambiguities: 1. Omitted subject. 2. Tense (present). 3. Possible ellipsis of case marker [-eh].

How is it possible for a 'position' to not exist? Linguistically, this can be resolved in a few possible ways:

Resolution 1. the subject is omitted ("Mother"(Hak Ja Han)). The case marker for [wife's position] ("in") is omitted:

(어머님은) 문총재 아내자리(에)도 없어요.

(Mother) is not (in) the position of Pres. Moon's wife.

Resolution 2. Tense is omitted/used unconventionally:

문총재 아내자리도 없(었)어요

The position of Pres. Moon's wife (did) not exist.

Salient points:

1. Rev. Moon uses the expression "President (or Chairman) Moon". This strongly implies that he is referring to the present time and present state of affairs and NOT a role in God's ideal (conceptual). The position or role of Chairman is NOT a key position in God's transcendent ideal, but is a position/role within the context of the current time (2012) in relation to the actual life and reality of Rev. Moon and the Unification Movement.

2. He consistently uses present tense, not just in this sentence, but in all statements in the discourse. There is no linguistic evidence to suggest he is talking about the past. So unless one puts forth the conjecture that he is talking about God's transcendent ideal as it manifested in the past, we can reasonably dismiss the notion that he is referring to a past state.

Commentary:

The statement is ambiguous. Given Rev. Moon's regular referencing to states of being and issues that transcend time (The ideal of God, spiritual status, etc), there is a potential question: is he talking about a state that existed in the past when the position of his bride did NOT exist (He had to create it)? OR Is he talking about Hak Ja Han still, stating that she is not standing in or filling the position/role of Pres. Moon's wife?

The evidence within the statement (sentence) itself is inconclusive. One must go to greater context to obtain more information.

Text Conclusion: Use of current real-world context ("Pres. Moon") strongly implies the theme of the sentence is current and real-world based (not transcendent). This is reinforced by clear use of present tense (and absence of past tense). While absence of an explicit subject does generate some ambiguity, the linguistic and contextual evidence weighs significantly in the favor of a current, real-world subject.

Coupled with the two possible main themes, and given that the preponderance of interpretative weight falls on a real-world, current theme, it is significantly more likely that the subject (Mother (Hak Ja Han)) has been omitted – Resolution 1.

Sentence 4 (a and b)

제 멋대로이야! 제 멋대로...

Free translation

(She's) just doing as she pleases (according to her own whims). According to her own whims!!

Literal translation

As (...) pleases!

According to (...)’s own whims.

Review: Source of ambiguities:

1. Omitted subject.

Note on expression [jae mot-dae-ro]: This expression implies a self-centered willfulness. The actor is doing things according to what he or she wants, willfully choosing to ignore a higher or more proper authority (i.e. God, conscience, subject (Divine Principle), boss, parent, social propriety, social mores and expectations, etc.)

The English expressions "as (he/she/it) pleases" and "according to one's own whims" carries some of the nuance, but are by and large morally neutral. One can do as one pleases either in a selfish or immoral way OR in a moral and self-determinate way. "whims" implies a certain capriciousness, but the nuance is quite weak.

The Korean expression, however, has a definite and clear negative nuance. It is a direct negative statement, and carries a moral judgment with regards to the actor.

The impact of the statement (and moral judgment) is emphasized by repetition "As (he/she/it) pleases! As (he/she/it) pleases!" and by the coarse expletive "[i-ya!]

Salient points:

1. Tense is present. NOT past. [i-ya] (NOT [yeoss-eo!])

Commentary:

Who or what is doing things according to (his/her/it's) own whims, willfully?

Again, omission of the subject makes the sentence potentially ambiguous.

Text Conclusion: Because the tense is present tense, there is direct linguistic evidence that the statement is about someone/something currently active and alive (2012). Given that one of the two possible main themes is Mother (Hak Ja Han), there is strong linguistic and contextual evidence that the statement refers to her.

Discourse Analysis

There is ambiguity in the Topic sentence (Hak Ja Han (concrete) or the person who fills the role of Mother (conceptual). This results in contextual ambiguity for the following sentences in cases where ellipsis is used, etc.

Discourse Conclusions

Thus, the over-arching question is, is Rev. Moon topically referring to a (conceptual) providential situation that existed in the past, a (conceptual) providential situation that exists at presents, or a (concrete) providential situation that exists in the present?

Salient points

Linguistic

The present tense is used consistently throughout the whole discourse.

There is factual and linguistic reference to Hak Ja Han (being raised, educated and cultivated by Rev. Moon).

There is linguistic reference to present world realities (reference to President Moon, as opposed to Rev. Moon or 'True Father').

There is reference to roles (position of Pres. Moon's wife).

Thematic Flow

The discourse is concluded with a sharp, critical statement (use of words conveying direct criticism, expletive expression)

Real-world situation

Contradiction between Rev. Moon's statements and Hak Ja Han's statements

Conclusions

Separately, each of the sentences contains ambiguities. Each requires content outside the sentence to provide additional context. Moreover, because there is some ambiguity in the topic sentence, there is some ambiguity in the overarching linguistic theme.

However, other elements to be considered include the overall thematic flow:

Rev. Moon opens with emphasizing this point: that HE raised Mrs. Moon, that her (2012) capacity, ability and status is and was fundamentally reliant on his training and education of her.

He follows this up by stating, in present tense, that "there is no mother", that even the position of the wife of President Moon "is not". He concludes with a sharp criticism, directly indicating willful, rebellious behavior on the part of (someone).

Thus, the thematic flow provides an interpretive weight that Rev. Moon is talking about Hak Ja Han, currently, and NOT merely about a past conceptual providential reality.

While separately, the linguistic nature of the sentences allows the possibility that he is talking about a past, conceptual reality, the linguistic evidence does not back it up that conclusion.

Rather, the linguistic weight of *the consistent present tense, *the real-world references do back up the idea that he is talking about a current, real-world situation.

The final relevant point is that IF Rev. Moon were referring to a conceptual providential situation in the past, there is no way to explain the sharp criticism and expletive expression at the end. It has NO context, in that case, and we must only rely on conjecture and supposition.

Conclusion

Ambiguity exists both in the sentences and in the topic (theme).

That ambiguity can only be resolved by observing where the weight of evidence lies.

The thematic flow of the discourse, the unambiguous linguistic markers, and the final conclusion (criticisms) mean that the weight falls on Discourse Resolution 1 rather than on Discourse Resolution 2.

Discourse Resolution 1 (Around 85% likelihood)

Re. Moon is referring to Hak Ja Han, that the position of Mother and wife of 2012 rev. Moon is vacant, and that the cause is willful behavior on the part of Hak Ja Han.

In this case, it is very difficult to make an unequivocal statement as to what Rev. Moon is talking about, but there is a preponderance of evidence.

Discourse Resolution 2 (Around 15% likelihood)

Rev. Moon is referring to the conceptual role of mother (the true mother) in God's providence, that he raised the person to fulfill that role, that in the past it was vacant, and that someone or something (unexplained) is behaving willfully.

The final salient factor in interpreting this discourse must draw further on the real world situation. It is a fact that the topic sentence in the discourse emphasizes Rev. Moon's role in educating, training and cultivating Hak Ja Han. It is also a fact that this point is one of the key points under contention in the current Unification Church conflict.

Since Rev. Moon's passing (2013 onwards), Mrs. Hak Ja Han has openly contradicted this point as provided by Rev. Moon. Namely that she was NOT reliant on Rev. Moon's education, training or cultivation for her status, ability or capacity.)

The fact that the topic of the discourse emphasizes this point of contention cannot be reasonably ignored, and furthermore the fact of this contention gives increased weight to Discourse Resolution 1.

Tyler Hendricks' Translation

1:05:22 "I have raised [True] Mother. [If not for me,] there would not have been [Heavenly / True] Mother. There would not have been Rev. Moon's wife. [Unidentified subject] would be doing whatever [he / she / they ... wants / want]."

Brief comments on Hendricks' Translation.

There is no linguistic evidence that Rev. Moon is using Conditional Simple Tense "would (not) have been" either in sentence 2 or sentence 3.

It would have to be assumed that the tense is being ellipsed, but there is no linguistic evidence for that. Moreover, ellipsis of such tenses is uncharacteristic of Korean, whereas ellipsis of [case markers] and [subjects] is not uncharacteristic (see discourse review, sentence 3).

In favor of the interpretation given here is that it is consistent with the theology of Rev. Moon (that he raised Hak Ja Han, that he was responsible for restoring the mother position, that he was responsible for establishing the position of wife of Rev. Moon (wife of the True Father), etc.

Ironically, it is not consistent with the theology of Hak Ja Han, who states that her capacity, ability and status were NOT reliant on rev. Moon, and that the position of Mother pre-existed (was established prior to) Rev. Moon, that she was responsible for establishing the position of the husband of the Only Begotten Daughter, etc.

In addition, if "Hak Ja Han being or not being in the Mother position" is NOT the main topic and theme, the final sentence makes little sense. IF Rev. Moon is in fact referring to some other unidentified people, there is no way to know who or what he is referring to given this interpretation.

Hence, while the interpretation (translation) here is possible, it is necessarily vague and relies heavily on conjecture and subjective interpretation, while discarding or overruling a variety of linguistic and real-world evidence (tense, thematic flow, real world contradiction between Rev. Moon and Hak Ja Han).