

**UNIVERSITY OF TARTU**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES**

**THE SYMBOL OF THE ROSE IN TWO ESTONIAN TRANSLATIONS OF  
W. B. YEATS' *THE SECRET ROSE***  
**BA thesis**

**KARL TOOM**  
**SUPERVISOR: *Lect.* KATILIINA GIELEN, PhD**

**TARTU**  
**2026**

## ABSTRACT

The thesis focuses on how two Estonian translations of William Butler Yeats' *The Secret Rose* interpret the symbol of the rose.

The thesis is divided into two main sections: literature review and analysis. The first section discusses how Yeats has employed the rose himself, and also how other scholars have addressed the question of symbol translation. The second section is subdivided into comparison and discussion: the thesis first highlights the key comparative passages as well as omissions concerning the symbol of the rose and later discusses the findings along the axes of ontology, epistemology and ethics.

The conclusion presents the major findings of the thesis.

Key words: William Butler Yeats, *The Secret Rose*, translation, symbolism

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                        |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>ABSTRACT.....</b>                                                   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>                                          | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>                                               | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1. YEATS AND THE ROSE.....</b>                                      | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>2. TRANSLATING SYMBOLS.....</b>                                     | <b>10</b> |
| <b>3. ANALYSIS.....</b>                                                | <b>15</b> |
| 3.1 Methodology.....                                                   | 15        |
| 3.2 Key comparative passages.....                                      | 18        |
| 3.2.1 The rose as a material object.....                               | 18        |
| 3.2.1 The rose as an invocation.....                                   | 20        |
| 3.2.3 The rose as divine revelation.....                               | 21        |
| 3.2.4 The rose as a paragon of ethics.....                             | 23        |
| <b>4. DISCUSSION: SHIFTS IN ONTOLOGY, EPISTEMOLOGY AND ETHICS.....</b> | <b>25</b> |
| 4.1 Ontology.....                                                      | 25        |
| 4.2 Epistemology.....                                                  | 27        |
| 4.3 Ethics.....                                                        | 30        |
| <b>5. EDITION-LEVEL COMPARISON.....</b>                                | <b>32</b> |
| 5.1 The 1939 edition.....                                              | 32        |
| 5.2 The 2002 edition.....                                              | 33        |
| 5.3 Shared omissions and differences.....                              | 34        |
| <b>6. CONCLUSION.....</b>                                              | <b>35</b> |
| <b>REFERENCES.....</b>                                                 | <b>37</b> |
| <b>RESÜMEE.....</b>                                                    | <b>40</b> |

## INTRODUCTION

*The Secret Rose* is a collection of short stories by the Irish poet, writer, and playwright William Butler Yeats, with deep mystical and mythical undertones. The collection was first published in 1897 with illustrations by John Butler Yeats, the author's father. *The Secret Rose* comprises eight short stories, prefaced by quotes from Villiers de L'Isle Adam and Leonardo da Vinci, as well as a foreword and the poem *To the Secret Rose*, both by the author. The stories are arranged in chronological order, with the first tale, *The Binding of the Hair*, taking place in pagan times and the last one, *Of Costello the Proud, of Oona the Daughter of Dermott and of the Bitter Tongue*, being temporally located in the seventeenth century (Martin 1975: 25).

W. B. Yeats displayed a serious interest in folklore, the mystical, as well as the spiritual, allowing him to effectively reimagine and ascribe new meaning to themes from Irish mythology (Bryan 2015: 69). Yeats was also heavily influenced by symbolist and cabbalistic poetry, which looks beyond the material world to access an essential sphere of true meaning, using abstract symbols to bridge the gap between the two realms (Bate 1983: 1215). In 1886, almost ten years before the publication of *The Secret Rose*, Yeats became a member of the Dublin Theosophical Organisation and, later in 1888, joined the Rosicrucian Order of the Golden Dawn, further steeping himself in the occult (Billigheimer 2002: 277). As such, the rose becomes a key symbol for Yeats, tying all his interests and aspirations into a single emblem that he discusses throughout his early works as a link between the temporal world and the essence of the divine (Billigheimer 2002: 276). In *The Secret Rose*, the symbol of the rose is used throughout the collection as a vision appearing at dire moments for the heroes of the tales, or as a premonition of the proximity of divinity (Martin 1975: 33). Nevertheless, the exact meaning of the rose in Yeats is difficult to

characterise beyond a linking conduit between the temporal and the divine, as Yeats himself has used it to allude to beauty, perfection, love, and incorruptibility (Billigheimer 2002: 276). Although extensive research into the many aspects of *The Secret Rose* would undoubtedly reveal much about the qualities of Yeats as a fiction author (Martin 1975: 37), this thesis focuses on the symbol of the rose in two Estonian translations of the collection – the 1939 edition, translated under the pseudonym of Mart Luht, and the 2002 edition, translated by Krista Kaer.

Texts do not exist in a vacuum; they are always perceived and mutated through the lens of the people experiencing the texts, as well as the conditions surrounding those people (Lotman 1972: 13). The two translations that form the subject of this thesis were produced 63 years apart, with significant societal change taking place in between. It then follows that the two translators have had noticeably different lived experiences in their respective moments of translation. Moreover, not only have the translators had considerably dissimilar lives, but so too have their audiences, meaning that the lens through which the original is meant to be viewed is doubly mutated for these translations. Although Luht's identity is unclear, an educated guess can be made about his background. He was born before Estonia first gained independence in 1918, as his translation of *Julienne's Marriage* was published already in 1930 (Luht 1930), which, for him to have lived his entire life up to that point in independent Estonia, would make him twelve years old at the time of translating. It then follows that Luht spent some of his formative years witnessing the shaping of Estonian national identity and the subsequent creation of an independent country, thereby likening him to Yeats in that regard. He would have had to have been someone quite educated and perhaps even renowned at the time, as he also translated from German and French. *The Secret Rose* appears to have been his final work, as translations from under that pseudonym stop after 1939. Although it is difficult to speculate, 1939 was a

tumultuous year in Estonian and world history, which could have resulted in some sort of personal repercussions for the translator. It could also be that the translator dropped the pseudonym for a multitude of reasons. It would benefit Estonian translation history greatly if Luht's identity could be discovered, but unfortunately, this thesis lacks the space and scope to research this question further.

Krista Kaer, on the other hand, is one of the more recognisable translators in Estonia. Born in Tapa, she studied English Language and Literature at the University of Tartu and has translated more than 80 novels and plays by English, Irish, and American authors, including Doris Lessing, John Banville, Oscar Wilde, and Sebastian Barry (Dublin Literary Award 2013). She is also one of the directors of the Tallinn Literary Festival HeadRead and the editor-in-chief of Varrak Publishers (Dublin Literary Award 2013).

When comparing these two translations, it is crucial to note that the variable of cross-culturalism is very high, Irish mythology and the psyche of the Irish reader of the time do not seamlessly transpose into the corresponding Estonian equivalent, resulting in the subsequent translation being a very intricate work with a significant standard of complexity (van den Broeck 1981: 80). Not only is this true between the two translations themselves, but also within Yeats' original. This is due to Yeats having been an avid folklorist and mystic, who effectively collected folk tales and myths from the western part of Ireland and, through translation from Gaelic, formed these into his poetry as well as prose - most notably *The Secret Rose* and *The Celtic Twilight* (Bryan 2015: 69). Although Yeats had a decent grasp of Gaelic, he did not usually perform these translations himself and often employed the help of friends like Lady Gregory (Bryan 2015: 69). The result of all these translations is a complicated mesh of cultural contexts and drifts in meaning. Although a definite interpretation of any text is near impossible to reach

(Korn-Bursztyn 1997: 20), in broad terms, when faced with a complex symbol or metaphor to translate the translator has a choice of whether to relay the language as closely to the original as possible and hope that the intricacies of the text reemerge, or to make the conscious choice of interpreting the figurative-poetic language in a certain manner.

The aim of this thesis is to compare and analyse the translations of *The Secret Rose* by Mart Luht and Krista Kaer, focusing especially on how the two translators have approached the symbol of the rose. The first part of this thesis gives an overview of the symbol as Yeats used it, the intricacies of symbol or metaphor translation and possibly also something else. The second part of this thesis analyses the two translations, highlights the key differences and attempts to provide insight as to why the respective translators might have made the choices they did.

## 1. YEATS AND THE ROSE

In the 1920's, Yeats expressed his ideas of statehood and shared symbols through suggesting that rhetoric and propaganda can unify a nation briefly, especially in times of crisis, but lasting cohesion requires unifying symbols with the appropriate ideals behind them (Yeats, cited in Foster 2016: 71-72). He describes cultural unity as being both intellectual and semantical, with the symbols representing national ideals giving a people something tangible, yet morally challenging to strive towards (Yeats, cited in Foster 2016: 71-72). However, it is important to note here that Yeats expresses these sentiments in retrospect, recalling his cultural and artistic endeavours of the 1890's, roughly 30 years after the fact. Yeats' later endeavours notwithstanding, his work in the 1890's, including *The Secret Rose*, emerges from within the context of the Celtic Revival, contributing to the creation of a lasting idea of what Irishness is

(Foster 2016: 74). For Yeats, the most evident of these national-moral symbols is the rose, because it transcends the cultural-religious tensions in Ireland, embodying the ideals of love and eternal beauty, without an overreliance on religious mysticism (Regan 2006: 94). Thus, even without Yeats' own retrospective musings on the topic, the rose is, in Yeats' early writing, evidently the quintessential symbol of national unity of being, shaped from the cultural transformation of the Celtic Revival (Foster 2016: 72).

The symbolic power of the rose derives from its ability to function in multiple spheres at once, especially in the context of building a national identity. The rose unites the realms of the mundane and the divine, depicted by Yeats as both participating in suffering with the people, and simultaneously existing as a timeless, immortal ideal (Billigheimer 2002: 278). Combined with Yeats' own interpretation of nations requiring challenging, but ultimately obtainable moral goals, this allows the rose to become an uniquely powerful signifier of Irish identity, as it is located at the intersection of the divine, the mundane, the mythological and the historical, but most importantly, also suffering the same woes as the Irish people, thereby uniting moral aspiration with lived reality (Billigheimer 2002: 278).

These symbols, for Yeats, are not crafted by any single individual, but rather, they are retrieved from the collective subconscious Yeats refers to as the "Great Memory", which preserves and carries signifiers of shared values through time (Weeks 1948: 283). This explains the rose further as not just a poetic device, but something Yeats considers culturally resonant enough to express the collective lived realities of the Irish people, thus fulfilling the unifying role Yeats attributes to symbolic images, as outlined by Foster.

Yeats uses the rose extensively in many of his texts, possibly purposefully due to the rose's duality as a symbol - representing both a divine ideal of love and beauty as well as the

personification of Ireland as a suffering, mystical entity (Regan 2006: 94). This ties in well with his idea of national symbols rising from collective memory, as it allows Yeats to disregard, when necessary, the Catholic-Protestant divide, presenting the rose as something that predates the Irish conversion, thus enforcing its status as a common, unifying symbol of eternal grace (Regan 2006: 94).

As a part of a broader effort to reclaim and partially construct Irish national identity through mythology and mysticism, Yeats' profound interest in folklore transcends mere aesthetics, instead manifesting as a relatively conscious attempt at recovering cultural and moral ideals suppressed by colonisation, drawing on extant tradition to reforge a national consciousness (Bryan 2015: 68-69). Yeats' involvement with mysticism, however, including his belief in the supernatural, receiving divine visions, and the like, places the rose, for Yeats, into a broader context, in which these mystical symbols allow people to access deeper realisations about what it means to be human, or more specifically, Irish, through revelation and introspection (Bryan 2015: 74-75). In this context, the rose reveals itself to be more than an image derived from mythology, but a condensation of authentic experiences of Irishness, deeply rooted in oral tradition and what Yeats referred to as "fairy faith" of rural Gaelic Ireland, which Yeats considered to be in a more truthful connection to the Irish moral-cultural past (Bryan 2015: 69). As such, the rose in Yeats becomes the tentpole of national renewal, allowing Yeats to depict Irish identity as simultaneously spiritual, historically grounded and in many ways directly opposed to English cultural dominance, mobilising folklore to form a coherent national consciousness (Bryan 2015: 68-69), tying together the cultural memories of the Irish Golden Age and the equally relevant aspirations for a politically and culturally independent Ireland.

## 2. TRANSLATING SYMBOLS

Having established an approximation of how Yeats himself employed folklore and the rose, the question of the translatability of these symbols becomes central. Any kind of translation, however insignificant culturally, is not a neutral act; it's a process that in and of itself obscures meaning, despite the fact that a fluent, invisible translation can seem like an original piece of writing (Venuti 1986: 179). This same invisibility, then, is the phenomenon which most intensely obscures the level of transformation a text goes through in translation. A translation is not just a faithful reproduction of the original, but rather a repositioning of the original within an entirely different linguistic and cultural context, which both serve to alter the original's meaning (Venuti 1986: 181). In the light of Yeats' multi-layered symbolism, this means that the rose can not be transferred unaltered across languages, preserving every nuance of its unifying power as a national symbol, because each translation inevitably alters the associations attached to the symbol, as well as its role in the broader mythology that Yeats has constructed around it.

As a process, translation is essentially a series of choices the translator makes in an attempt to interpret the original (Venuti 1986: 182). This means selecting from among a multitude of possible meanings, making each translation decision prioritise some interpretations over others (Venuti 1986: 182). The main source of semantic dilution from the source text in this process is the fact that languages do not correspond to each other perfectly; new connotations and associations will inevitably emerge in the target language (Venuti 1986: 182-183). As a consequence, the translator not only transfers meaning, but actively passes judgement on which facets of the original survive translation, and which do not.

For Yeats' symbolic framework, this is of great importance. Yeats sees these symbols as emerging from the shared "Great Memory", laden with cultural and historical significance (Weeks 1948: 283). Translation inevitably interferes in this process by replacing the substrate of this "Great Memory" with another, thereby altering how the symbol of the rose functions within the target language and, as such, participating in Yeats' identity-shaping process.

This becomes even more apparent when the actual nature of the symbol or metaphor is considered. Although the two terms are closely related, they are not exactly interchangeable. A metaphor usually establishes a straightforward comparison between two dissimilar objects by describing one in terms of the other, while a symbol is typically an object that is used in the stead of some broader, more abstract concept (Anderson 2025). Metaphors thus function through direct comparison and symbols through wider, less concrete associations (Anderson 2025). Nevertheless, the two categories are adjacent, providing a considerable overlap in the discussion of their translation on a theoretical level, because both deal with figurative language and meaning extending beyond the literal level of the words used, while also being highly dependent on the surrounding cultural context. Metaphors vary greatly in terms of how well they are integrated into a given literary canon, as well as their complexity, ranging thus from widespread expressions to almost private poeticisms (van den Broeck 1981: 75-76). Since the more common expressions tend to be relatively simple to translate, due to their field of meaning being somewhat narrow, more imaginative symbols tend to be increasingly resistant to translation, particularly when used in a literary framework, such as Yeats'. This is due to the fact that symbols and metaphors like Yeats' rose are not just aesthetic flourishes, but function as integral components of the text's structure, originating from the cultural bedrock of the source, carrying

within themselves a plethora of cultural, artistic and linguistic information simultaneously (van den Broeck 1981: 79).

Considering both of these theories in tandem, van den Broeck's ideas reinforce Venuti's claim about the transformative nature of translation, exemplifying that complex, culturally embedded symbols like Yeats' rose may be further weakened, reinterpreted or even substituted in translation.

Another aspect of the translation process is also the way in which potential audiences perceive and understand translated symbols in the context of their own cultural backgrounds. Each culture uses language differently to articulate any sort of meaning, especially what Nazarova and Zadornova refer to as relationships of extralingual reality, complicating comprehension further (Nazarova and Zadornova 1989: 210). Especially in artistic writing, comprehension does not depend solely on physical understanding, but on the reader's ability to access shared semiotic structures, requiring the reader to profess a level of sophistication to be capable of recognising the various cultural references in the text (Nazarova and Zadornova 1989: 210). This is further proven through analysing texts as complex semiotic phenomena with several layers. Literature becomes meaningless if a text is examined as a sum of all the meanings of all the words; instead, it should be considered as layers of simultaneously active meanings - religious, societal, moral - that the text carries in its entirety (Lotman 1976: 11-12). The language used in poetic literature is then an integral part of meaning itself, carrying aesthetic and cultural significance in addition to being a vehicle for content (Lotman 1976: 17-20, 33-35). Translation, therefore, has to be understood as carrying much more than content from one language to another, because the vastness of what must be transferred also contains the entire network of relations connecting the text to a particular cultural system.

The question in cross-cultural translation is then, to what degree and under which conditions can meaning be preserved when dealing with complex cultural phenomena such as symbols in literary works (Scheff 1987: 365). In this respect, symbol and metaphor are particularly vulnerable, as they depend heavily on the associations that link them to their cultures of origin - associations that vary between cultures and therefore shape understanding (Richardson 2011: 63). Particularly in religious discourse, symbols and metaphors operate through shared understanding of culture and lived experience, so when those are removed in the process of translation, the symbol loses part of its communicative force and may need to be somehow altered to preserve meaning (Richardson 2011: 68). This is highly relevant in the case of Yeats. Although Ireland and Estonia share some historic and folkloristic features - centuries of foreign occupation, folk tales of all kinds of creatures and characters, the symbolic and religious connections that the rose carries are not entirely transferable. The rose is deeply rooted in Irish collective mythological memory, while also functioning within Irish religious meanings (Weeks 1948: 23). It thus follows that even when a lexical equivalent of the rose exists in Estonian, the broader semiotic superstructures that give it force can not be assumed to survive the journey. The rose may therefore transfer as an image, but not necessarily along with the same quasi-sacred implications it embodies within Yeats' realm of Irish cultural mysticism.

The issue becomes more pronounced when the translational practices of the Estonian target culture are considered as well. Sütiste and Lotman (2016: 22) note that from the late 1920's onwards, the widespread norm was artistic translation, with creative liberties taken by translators mostly being expressed through stylistic or lexical means, with prose translation being generally praised for keeping the form of the original (Sütiste and Lotman 2016: 22-23). In contrast, later practices from the 1950's to the end of 1990's gradually developed towards

preserving the content of the original most closely (Sütiste and Lotman 2016: 29). By the turn of the 21st century, the creative liberty allowed to a translator was regarded as lesser than in previous decades (Sütiste and Lotman: 31). With regard to this thesis, this goes to show that these two translations are not only separated by changes in language, but also in translational norms. The former belongs to a more form-conscious era, while the latter was produced at a time when the translator's role is more confined within the source text.

However liberal the prevalent norms may be, the distortions that translation inevitably introduces to any given text are not necessarily errors. When translators face concepts without direct equivalents in the target culture, they must adapt or generalise them enough so that they would be comprehensible to the target audience, often then leading to diminished specificity, but not necessarily ruining the translation as a whole (Vagelpohl 2010: 174). Importantly, such shifts should not be considered in binary terms of rigid versus free translation, but instead interpreted as possible solutions to various problems of translatability, if elements of one culture can not be faithfully reimagined in the other (Vagelpohl 2010: 182).

This claim finds a specific, relevant, literary illustration when looking at Yves Bonnefoy's translations of Yeats' poetry. Bonnefoy approaches translation as interpretation, and at times as purposeful explication with the aim of preserving what he considers to be the inherent poetic value of the text, rather than the precise appearance of the original (Caws 2002: 53). Yeats uses very vivid imagery, with an immediate material presence through various creatures of the physical world, and as such, Bonnefoy treats them as lived, perceptible realities, that should be transferred with comparable eloquence, rather than equivalence (Caws 2002: 53). This loss of equivalence comes, however, at the cost of loss of ambiguity, as the method he employs revolves around making interpretative choices that inevitably prioritise one meaning available in Yeats'

text over others (Caws 2002: 54). For example, in *Among School Children*, Bonnefoy opts to translate “labour” as “enfantement” (childbirth), selecting one specific meaning and as such transforming the poem in accordance with his own moral and poetic preferences (Caws 2002: 56). A similar pattern can be seen in Hebrew translations of Yeats’ *The Second Coming*, where translators who choose to translate the title as *The Second Revelation* produce a symbolically different meaning than those who opt for *The Coming Of The Messiah* or *The Return Of The Messiah* (Ruppo 2024: 30-31). In both cases, the translation foregoes one meaning at the expense of another, repositioning the text effectively within a new framework.

In summary, all these perspectives support the idea that translation is, in its structural essence, a transformative process. When discussing Yeats and particularly his use of the rose, this theoretical framework suggests that different translations will inevitably forego different aspects of the symbol. However, rather than producing a gradable scale of “right” or “wrong” translations, the outcomes would rather indicate the translators’ choices, their personal cultural backgrounds and poetic preferences, each of which subtly transmute the ways in which the original resonates with the reader.

### 3. ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 Methodology

This thesis uses comparative close reading, supplemented by translation-shift analysis and edition-specific comparison to study the symbol of the rose in W. B. Yeats’ *The Secret Rose*, and its two Estonian translations, published respectively in 1939 and 2002. The aim of this is to

analyse how the differences between these three versions alter the rose as a symbol, as well as how each version shapes the context for interpreting Yeats.

The analysis stems from the core idea that the rose in *The Secret Rose* is more than just a metaphor - it is a symbol with a concrete function. The significance of the rose in Yeats derives from its recurrence, representation, the ways in which it is apprehended and also how the people around it respond to it. The object of the analysis is therefore the mesh of images, related concepts and actions Yeats associates with the rose. These include material phenomena like rubies, fire, illumination, voice, fragrances, but also more spiritual ideas such as sacrifice and divine authority.

The primary method of the thesis is comparative close reading, which places emphasis on language, syntax, imagery and form among other things, rather than storytelling (Showalter 2002: 98). This method places the English-language original side-by-side with the 1939 and 2002 editions, focusing the comparison on passages with the most symbolic weight. These are mostly found in the story *Out Of The Rose*, including, but not limited to, the ruby on the knight's helmet, the vision of the voice from within the rose and the references to the "heart" of the rose. This is supplemented by analysis of other, smaller excerpts from some other stories from *The Secret Rose*, which do not explicitly revolve around the symbol of the rose to a comparative degree, but offer complementary passages that aid in tying the analysis into a cohesive whole. The thesis also includes an analysis of passages that do not directly concern the rose, but serve to connect the rose to broader concepts such as truth, corruption and sacrifice. The thesis does not catalogue every instance of the rose occurring in *The Secret Rose*, instead explicitly focusing on passages that are most significant for interpreting the rose as a symbol, i.e. passages which have

the highest concentration of meaning - substantial sections of text, which are meaningfully impacted by small lexical shifts occurring during the process of translation.

Substantiating these differences analytically, the thesis uses translation-shift analysis. This refers to the process of identifying and interpreting differences between the original and the two translations, i.e. the replacements that have taken place when substituting one language for another (Catford 1965: 22). The ultimate purpose of this analysis is to help differentiate between incidental or accidental variations and changes that are recurrent enough to form a distinct pattern that reshapes the rose as a symbol in a significant way. This allows the thesis to draw conclusions on the basis of repeated patterns regarding passages with a high concentration of meaning, rather than isolated examples.

The thesis interprets these patterns along three main courses of analysis: ontology, epistemology and ethics. In the context of this thesis, ontology refers to how the rose is treated as an object - is it an emblem, a metaphor, a divine presence? Epistemology handles how the rose becomes known to those experiencing it, whether it is seen, smelled, heard, encountered in a vision, received through guidance from a mentor, etc. Finally, ethics considers the kinds of reactions the rose expects or elicits from those in contact with it - whether it demands obedience, moral actions, or deeper comprehension of its nature.

Additionally, in order to construct a complete analysis, the thesis examines the broader edition-specific context of the rose - namely, how the editorial composition of each edition shapes the translation. Specifically, whether the omission or retention of certain passages, poems or related stories shapes the context in which the rose is interpreted. Such omissions are treated as conscious choices that shape the symbolism that remains available to the Estonian audience.

Lastly, the thesis operates on the presumption that literary works produced in drastically different cultural environments are formed on the basis of different literary norms, habits of translators and also expectations of audiences (Sütiste and Lotman 2016: 18). Neither version is thus treated as meaningfully better or worse. The thesis aims to analyse them as temporally situated reconstructions of a source material, each making some interpretations of the rose more readily available, while hindering others - ultimately describing and interpreting the various reconfigurations of the rose across editions.

## 3.2 Key comparative passages

### 3.2.1 The rose as a material object

This section aims to contrast the first appearances of the rose in the English original and in the two Estonian translations. The specific aim of this is to pinpoint the manner in which the rose is presented as a palpable object, as well as a kind of heraldic signifier, before the later, more explicitly symbolic appearances of the rose. In order to fully analyse this, some other, adjacent material qualities surrounding the rose's presentation are also examined, as well as the knight's character, as it is heavily interlinked with how the rose appears to the reader, since the rose only manifests itself through the person of the knight.

**Table 1: The material appearance of the rose**

| Element                         | English original                                                    | 1939 translation                                                  | 2002 translation                                       |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Heraldry on the knight's helmet | "hed had upon his<br>helmet the crest of no<br>neighbouring lord or | "ta kiivril polnud<br>ühegi lähikonna suure<br>isanda või kuninga | "tema kiivri küljes<br>polnud ühegi<br>naaberüliku ega |

|               |                                                                                               |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                               |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|               | king, but a small rose<br>made of rubies”                                                     | vappi, vaid väike,<br>rubiinidest tehtud<br>roos”                                                      | kuninga vapp, vaid<br>hoopis väike roos,<br>tehtud rubiinidest”                                               |
| Luminescence  | “that glimmered<br>every moment to a<br>deeper crimson”                                       | “mis iga hetkega<br>helkis tumedamas<br>punas”                                                         | “millest helkis iga<br>hetk sügavpunast<br>valgust”                                                           |
| Knight’s hair | “His white hair fell in<br>thin curls upon his<br>shoulders”                                  | “Ta valged juuksed<br>langesid harvade<br>kiharatena ta õlule”                                         | “Tema hallid hõredad<br>lokid langesid<br>korratult õlgadele”                                                 |
| Knight’s face | “its disorder added to<br>the melancholy of his<br>face”                                      | “nende korratus<br>süvendas ta näo<br>kurbust”                                                         | “see lisas veelgi<br>kurvameelsust tema<br>näole”                                                             |
| Dreamer/doer  | “the dreamers who<br>must do what they<br>dream, the doers who<br>must dream what they<br>do” | “unistajail, kes<br>peavad teostama oma<br>unistusi, teotsejail,<br>kes peavad unelema<br>oma tegusid” | “kes peab tegema<br>seda, millest ta<br>unistab, tegija nägu,<br>kes peab unistama,<br>sellest, mida ta teeb” |

All three versions present the rose in the same manner; it appears in the stead of other heraldry a knight might wear, and is across all three versions represented by a small ruby rose on the knight’s helmet. This serves to contrast the rose with signifiers of mundane authority, as all

versions emphasise the absence of any other insignia.

The key difference in the appearance of the rose lies in its luminescence. The original describes the light emanating from the crest as growing darker, which the 1939 version retains; however, the 2002 version omits the tonal shift of the colour.

The knight's appearance also varies slightly between versions. The 1939 translation approximates the original, retaining the "thin" quality of the knight's hair, while the 2002 version uses "korratu (dishevelled)". Both still imply that these lonesome, sorrowful dreamer figures rarely appear in the world and, in the case of the knight, are chiefly defined by the visual of the rose.

### 3.2.1 The rose as an invocation

This section examines how the knight addresses the rose in the beginning of the story, as the manner in which the two translations and the English original formulate the knight's prayer ties in with his symbolically heavier monologue later in the story.

**Table 2: The rose as invocation**

| Element | English original                                     | 1939 translation                                | 2002 translation                       |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Address | "O Divine Rose of Intellectual Flame"                | "Oo, mõistusliku kuulsusega jumalik roos"       | "Oo mõistuse Leegi Taevalik Roos"      |
| Prayer  | "let the gates of thy peace be opened to me at last" | "avanegu ometi viimaks mulle sinu rahu väravad" | "avanegu mulle lõpuks sinu rahu värav" |

Both translations here preserve the original structure of the knight's behaviour while praying - he turns westwards with outstretched arms, and addresses the rose directly. Both versions also retain the knight's request for access to the peace of the rose.

The most significant difference lies in the epithet the knight uses to address the rose. Here, it does seem that the 1939 version makes a slight error, as it seems that Luht has misread "flame" as "fame" and has thus translated it as "kuulsus". This shifts the focus of the text away from the connection between fire and intelligence, which is apparent both in the 2002 version and the original.

A minor difference also appears in the nature of the gate. Both the 1939 version and the English original use the plural, while the 2002 translation uses the singular "värav". Regardless, both versions retain the rose as a conduit for accessing final peace.

The rose is not yet explained at this point in the story; however, it is already clearly something that can be addressed directly and also associated with peace, as well as being a sort of final destination for earthly life.

### 3.2.3 The rose as divine revelation

This section addresses the most symbolically relevant content of the entire book, as it discusses the knight's contact with the Palestinian knight and the subsequent descriptions of the rose. The section aims to compare how the three versions present the rose as a messenger of divine truths.

### **Table 3: The rose as divine revelation**

| Element                                               | English original                                                            | 1939 translation                         | 2002 translation                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Name of the Rose                                      | “a great Rose of Fire”                                                      | “suurt Tulest Roosi”                     | “suurt Tuleroosi”                            |
| Voice                                                 | “A Voice out of the Rose”                                                   | “Hääl Roosi seesmusest”                  | “hääl Roosi südamest”                        |
| Light of the heart                                    | “the light of their own hearts” / “the wayward light of the heart”          | “oma südame valgusest” / “südame valgus” | “omaenda südame valgusest” / “südame valgus” |
| Kingdom                                               | “the Kingdom of God, which is in the Heart of the Rose”                     | “Jumala Riiki, mis on Roosi südames”     | “Jumalariiki, mis on tulnud Roosi Südamest”  |
| Vision of the crimson rose                            | “we seemed to see in a vision a crimson Rose spreading itself about him...” | omitted                                  | omitted                                      |
| Fragrance                                             | “the air was filled with fragrance”                                         | “täitus õhk järsku Roosi lõhnaga”        | “täitis õhku Roosi lõhn”                     |
| Rose emblem shining blood-red as the knight confesses | “while he told it, the Rose shone a deep                                    | omitted                                  | omitted                                      |

|  |                                   |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
|  | blood-colour in the<br>firelight” |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|

The central structure of how the knight tells his story is preserved across both translations: the Palestinian knight witnesses a fiery rose, a voice from the rose speaks to him and is in a way connected to truth as well as the Kingdom of God. The broader theological framework is thus retained in both versions.

However, the wording of the passage differs in several key aspects, most significantly regarding the placement of the voice. The 1939 version locates the voice as coming from inside the rose, or from perhaps the inner being of the rose; the 2002 version, however, pinpoints it to the heart of the rose. The connection between the Kingdom of God and the rose also differs. The 1939 version and the original state that the Kingdom of God is within the heart of the rose, whereas the 2002 version describes it as being projected outwards from the heart of the rose.

Both translations omit a considerable amount of imagery. Neither version includes the passage where the group of knights see a crimson rose spreading around the Palestinian knight, and neither also retains the passage where the rose shines a deep red colour in the firelight when the knight tells his story. Even though both versions reduce the visual qualities of the revelation, the element of scent is retained across the two translations.

### 3.2.4 The rose as a paragon of ethics

This section studies the connection of the revelations of the rose to physical actions in the material world, with the main focus on the knight's ideas of service and good causes, with the aim of comparing the demands originating from the rose.

**Table 4: The rose as a paragon of ethics**

| Element                      | English original                                                                                          | 1939 translation                                                                            | 2002 translation                                                                       |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dying in service             | “they must prove their anger against the Powers of Corruption by dying in the service of the Rose of God” | “peavad nad tõestama oma viha Rüvetuse Jõudude vastu, surres Rooside teenistuses”           | “peavad nad Rooside teenistuses surres tõestama oma viha Kõlvatuse Jõudude vastu”      |
| Sending into the world       | “he sent us out in troops into the world to seek good causes, and die in doing battle for them”           | “saatis meid salkadena välja maailma, otsima häid eesmärke, ja surema nende eest võideldes” | “saatis meid oma väena maailma üllaid üritusi otsima ja nende pärast võideldes surema” |
| Why service should be chosen | “We must choose our service for its excellence, and for this alone”                                       | “Me pidavat valima oma teenistuse selle headuse ja ainult headuse pärast”                   | “Me peame valima oma teenistuse selle tubliduse pärast, ja üksnes selle pärast”        |
| Fasting to death judged as   | “this he told us was evil”                                                                                | “see olevat kurjast”                                                                        | “see on paheline”                                                                      |

Both versions preserve the narrative that life in the service of the rose leads to an eventual death in battle for a good cause. Most importantly, in both versions, the rose is not just revealed,

but also directly linked to some sort of action. The Palestinian knight, who initially serves as a kind of prophet for the rose, sends his disciples out into the world with the service of those being measured through the innate goodness of the causes they fight and die for.

The wording of the passages differs in many key areas. The English “good causes” became “häid eesmärke” in the 1939 edition and “üllaid üritusi” in the 2002 edition. The phrase explaining why these causes should be chosen also differs, with the 1939 version using “Kõlvatuse Jõudude” and the 2002 version using “Rüvetuse Jõudude”.

The next section will discuss what these differences suggest about the symbolic role of the rose in either of the versions.

## **4. DISCUSSION: SHIFTS IN ONTOLOGY, EPISTEMOLOGY AND ETHICS**

### **4.1 Ontology**

The close readings indicate that the first major difference between the translations is in the ontological perception of the rose - what kind of object is it presented as. In all three texts, it is more than simple decoration, but the differences lie in how much of an active role it assumes and to what degree it remains a symbolic object.

In the English original, it is introduced as something that has a palpable material presence, but it assuredly is not limited to its physical form. It is a small rose, made of rubies, serving as a crest on the knight’s helmet, but Yeats presents it in a way that immediately signifies that this is not a mere jewel. As noted in the previous sections, the rose “glimmered every moment to a deeper crimson”, which seems to give the rose a certain symbolic agency to react to events taking place around it. Later, Yeats associates the rose with fire and the Kingdom of

Heaven in its heart. Combined, these facets of the rose make it both an emblem and an active presence.

The 1939 translation fixates the rose on the knight's helmet as a central symbol too, but keeps it slightly more of an inert object, rendering its power through the intensity of the crimson, but reducing the rose's agency. The "glimmered to" is contrasted in the 1939 edition by "tumedamas punas (*in* a deeper crimson)" referring to conditions changing around the rose rather than the rose itself, adapting the tone of light emanating from it. Although, as mentioned in the previous section, the following difference is probably accidental, it still carries ontological weight. In the 1939 translation, the "Divine Rose of Intellectual Flame" becomes "mõistusliku kuulsusega (of intellectual *renown*)". Whatever the exact purpose of this phrasing, it reduces the fire imagery associated with the rose, reducing its self-radiant capability. While still significant and clearly sacred, the rose in Luht's 1939 translation, through this, becomes less of an object with an active force within itself. This same phenomenon is visible later, as the 1939 version does not reduce the rose to just physical insignia, retaining the Rose of Fire and the Kingdom of God in its heart, but chooses to omit the most intense visual representation of the rose by leaving out the crimson rose spreading around the Palestinian knight. This means that although the rose is still a central symbol in the 1939 translation, it is not fully realised in its capacity as an apparition with autonomous agency.

The 2002 translation is different in this aspect. Although Kaer also omits the vision of the crimson rose around the Palestinian knight, sharing a reduction of the rose's visual representation with the 1939 version, the 2002 version as a whole retains more of the luminosity and agency of the rose.

This difference becomes more pronounced with the location of the Kingdom of God. The English original places the Kingdom of God inside the “Heart of the Rose”, while the 1939 version attempts to retain this logic, iterating that the Kingdom of God is “roosi südames (in the heart of the rose)”. The 2002 version, however, places the Kingdom of God as being projected outward from the heart of the rose (“roosi südamest”). Thus, the English original and the 1939 version assign the rose a similar ontological value as a kind of inner place, while the 2002 version makes the rose function more as a point of origin.

Taken as a collective, the excerpts from the previous section point to a clear pattern, which allows for ontological distinction. In the English original, the rose serves both as a passive, material emblem around which the knight’s mission revolves, as well as an active luminous presence, strongly associated with fire. The 1939 version maintains the rose’s sanctity, but drifts more towards making it a representation for what it represents, rather than an active apparition. In the 2002 version, the rose retains some of its active luminosity, even though Kaer also omits some strong visual imagery. The main ontological difference between the versions is thus the fact that in the 1939 edition, the rose is morphed more fully into an emblem, while the 2002 version preserves more of the rose’s active role within the story told in *Out Of The Rose*.

## 4.2 Epistemology

This section addresses the question of access to the rose across the two translations. In the English original of *Out Of The Rose*, it is done so through three major senses - seeing, hearing and smelling. Although both Estonian versions preserve this dynamic, they do so with a degree of unevenness. Drawing on the previous section on ontology, it can be said that the original grants more intense visual access to the rose, while both translations narrow that considerably, with the 1939 version doing so to a greater extent.

In the English original, the rose is first and foremost seen. To begin with, this becomes evident to the reader through descriptions of the knight's helmet, with later visions intensifying the visual aspects of the rose in three major ways. Firstly, the vision encountered by the Palestinian knight of a "great Rose of Fire", secondly, those listening to the Palestinian knight encountering a "crimson rose spreading about" the Palestinian knight, and finally, the ruby rose on the helmet of the knight in the story, glowing in a "deep blood-colour" as he speaks to the boy. These aspects of the rose in the original hold great symbolic value because they make the rose immediately tangible to those witnessing it, removing the need to access it through religious doctrine only. Moreover, the English original also grants listeners auditory access to the rose with "a Voice out of the Rose" speaking to the disciples of the Palestinian knight. Lastly, the rose makes itself felt through fragrance, with the air filling with the scent of the rose as the Palestinian knight spoke. In terms of the mythology of the story, this is significant because it makes the revelations offered by the rose universally accessible truths rather than obscure prophecies in a religious text.

The 1939 edition preserves this epistemology partially. As the close reading presented, it retains the auditory and olfactory elements but considerably reduces the visual perceptibility of the rose. This is epistemologically relevant because it changes the ratio between revelation and more traditional understanding. As the supernatural element about the rose is thus lessened, the rose becomes more dependent on the knight's verbal account, rather than on immediately perceptible visuals. This is also reinforced by other differences discussed in the close reading section, as the 1939 version lessens the explicit images of flame and rather chooses to present the rose in more abstract moral terms like "headus (goodness)". This emphasis makes the rose move

further from a sensory manifestation and towards something that is rather accessed through intellectual means.

The 2002 version preserves more of the original epistemology, but not its entirety. As the close reading indicated, the rose is more tightly associated with flame and luminosity; it is shown as emanating light and described as “mõistuse leek (intellectual flame)”. The auditory element also remains represented, as well as the scent. Nevertheless, the 2002 version has the same two major omissions that the 1939 version also has, namely the crimson rose around the Palestinian knight as well as the firelight shine during the knight’s confession. Thus, although the 2002 version keeps more of the original epistemology, it is still narrowed.

A further difference appears in the way that the “voice” is presented. As the close reading indicated, in the 1939 version, the voice originates from within the rose (“roosi seesmusest”), whereas in the 2002 version, it originates from the “heart (süda)” of the rose. In both cases, the rose is something from which truth is derived; for the 1939 version, the exact location remains more obscure.

Therefore, the epistemological difference between the two Estonian versions is not immense - neither keeps the original’s representation entirely intact. However, the 2002 version retains more of the luminescence and fire imagery, likening the rose more to a visually perceptible phenomenon. In this sense, the 1939 version presents the rose more as something that requires intellectual interference for it to be graspable. The two versions offer a different balance between vision and mediation in accessing the truths originating from the rose. Although both remove visual aspects of the rose, more of the luminosity vocabulary survives in the 2002 version, resulting in a less severe reduction in its visibility and decreasing the knight’s role as a divine mediator.

### 4.3 Ethics

In all three versions, the rose is presented as demanding a particular kind of action from its witnesses. The account of the Rose of Fire, delivered by the knight, directly calls to service and death in battle. Ultimately, the ethical distinctions across the versions lie in how this call to action is framed. The action itself, as well as its content, remains without significant alterations across the versions.

The English original places the call to action most clearly in the revelation presented by the rose and the straightforward opposition to corruption entailed in the revelation. The 1939 translation shifts this towards moral intelligibility, and doing “the right thing”. The 2002 version is more similar to the original in this sense, but also shows significant simplification.

Drawing on the close reading, the English original makes the rose’s ethical demand functionally inseparable from the manner in which it reveals itself, through stating that “those who have clearly seen” must not accept the wickedness of the world, but “prove their anger against the Powers of Corruption”. The rose here calls to a very straightforward action in a world that has been described as corrupt and devoid of heart-light. This paints the knight and his former companions as more than questing knights, but servants of a greater good, imposed on them by divine vision.

The 1939 version largely retains this logic, but importantly reformulates it in a more explicitly moralistic manner, shifting the phrasing of the story towards goodness and rightness. Originally, the service of the rose must be chosen for “excellence, and for this alone”, but in the 1939 version, it must be chosen for “goodness and for goodness’ sake alone (headuse ja ainult headuse pārast). This clearly explicates the action as ethical and less open to interpretation than

the original's somewhat open "excellence", also harkening back to the beginning of the story where the knight chooses to fight for the villagers, calling it a "hea tegu (good deed)".

This alters the ethical compass of the rose. In the English original, the rose demands action because it reveals a divine truth about reality. Although the same general structure is apparent in the 1939 version, the wording presented places the burden of decision upon the individual. The knight and his fellows should, in that version, define "good" for themselves, or figure it out through the rose, not blindly receive "excellent" commands.

The 2002 translation positions itself in the middle ground. Kaer preserves the knight's service against the powers of corruption, keeping the passage about the disciples of the rose having to prove themselves in battle. However, where the 1939 version uses "headus", the 2002 edition uses "tublidus (worthy of recognition)". Although still an ethical term, it carries a significantly lighter connotation than "goodness", suggesting different values like valour or worthiness, thus not explicitly moralising the rose to such a broad extent that the 1939 version does.

Similarly, this difference manifests itself in the kinds of deeds the rose calls the knight and his fellows to perform. The original mentions these as "good causes", the 1939 version as "häid eesmärke (good causes)" and the 2002 version as "üllaid üritusi (noble endeavours)". The 1939 wording is here most clearly understandable along the moral axis of good and evil, while the 2002 edition is more chivalric in its tone, making the 1939 edition easier to grasp on the principle of morally justified action, while the 2002 edition leans more towards abstract heroic self-sacrifice.

This allows the pattern emerging from the previous two sections to be fully analysed. Thus, ontologically, the 1939 version makes the rose a clear emblematic symbol,

epistemologically a concept needing divine mediation or mentorship to be fully understood and ethically something that explicitly places a clear moral obligation on its witness to define goodness and act upon it. The 2002 edition, however, preserves more of the original ontology through granting the rose more of a luminescence, retaining its epistemological role as a divine vision and not explicating its moral purpose, explaining it through the language of heroism and symbolic obligation to the rose itself.

## 5. EDITION-LEVEL COMPARISON

This section will discuss primarily the differences found elsewhere in *The Secret Rose*, not just *Out Of The Rose*. None of the other stories in the collection explicitly revolves around the symbol of the rose, but some occasionally rely on it as a storytelling device. Since the rose does not appear in just one story, but is a continued motif in the collection, these other instances of the rose being used have an impact on how the symbol is perceived throughout the book.

### 5.1 The 1939 edition

In addition to omissions within *Out Of The Rose*, the 1939 version has several other notable omissions when compared with the original and the 2002 version. Most significantly, the 1939 translation leaves out the poem *To The Secret Rose* in the preface of the book, while retaining other constituent elements of the preface, such as the quotations. The 1939 edition also omits the story *Where There Is Nothing, There Is God*.

The fact that *Where There Is Nothing, There Is God*, is omitted is very influential from the perspective of interpreting the Rose, because that story contains an explicit visual interpretation of the Rose, which does not dovetail well with the intently less visual and more expressly moral image of the Rose presented in *Out Of The Rose*. As shown in earlier sections of

this thesis, the 1939 edition tends to present the Rose as something that does not have a physical, sacred presence, but rather as a symbolic sanctum, from which meaning and associated obligations emerge through moral and spiritual ponderance. Therefore, its presentation is that of a conduit through which meaning has to be accessed. *Where There Is Nothing, There Is God*, however, presents an image with a theological meaning that has been fully undisclosed. In the English original, a ruby is identified as a symbol of the love of God, its red colour explicitly tied to fire imagery and subsequently, fire is said to “burn up everything”, culminating in the statement “where there is nothing, there is God”. In *Where There Is Nothing, There Is God*, the Rose and the ruby jewel do not have an ethical consequence to their presence; they are explicit theological symbols. The 1939 edition completely excludes this story, removing the ruby/fire/God axis from the translation as a whole, also making the rose available through fewer visual manifestations than the original, thus increasing the more inward, meditative capacity of the symbol.

However, the 1939 edition also excludes the poem *The Secret Rose* from the book’s preface, which significantly removes from the interpretation of the Rose as an intellectual conduit. *The Secret Rose* can be interpreted as conveying the idea that those seeking redemption must suffer to achieve catharsis (Billigheimer 2002: 281), which would have interfaced well with the more ponderous interpretation implied by the other retentions in the 1939 edition.

## 5.2 The 2002 edition

The 2002 edition retains more of the Rose-related material discussed in this thesis. It includes more of the visual imagery used in *Out Of The Rose*, as well as the story *Where There Is Nothing, There Is God*. The latter is particularly significant because it reinforces the image of the

Rose as explained through fire, rubies and divine presence. This gives the reader access to a more explicitly visual, physical interpretation of the theological dimension implied by the Rose.

The 2002 edition also retains the poem *To The Secret Rose* in the preface of the volume. Although the poem is far too complex to analyse here fully, this retention does add to the reader's ability to encounter the Rose in various modes, adding a poetic, if convoluted layer to the interpretation.

### 5.3 Shared omissions and differences

The two Estonian translations share several notable omissions. Most notably - both versions translate the title of the story, *Out Of The Rose*, as “Roosi Südamest (from the heart of the rose)”, moving the symbolic focus of the story to the heart of the rose, not just its interior. As established in previous sections, neither version includes the passage in *Out Of The Rose*, in which the crimson rose spreads surrounding the Palestinian knight. Neither version retains the blood-coloured rose shining in the light of the fire. Lastly, neither version includes the final image in the final story of the entire book, *Of Costello the Proud, of Oona the Daughter of Dermott and of the Bitter Tongue*, where the procession of Sidhe women rises to the skies in the shape of a “great silvery rose”.

These omissions indicate that some material regarding the rose symbol is missing from both translations. In every case, the omitted material is that of a stark visual, making it lose some of its most prevalent visual manifestations.

The shared omissions are especially pertinent because the previous sections have shown that the epistemological and ontological dimensions of the symbol differ across the three versions. Placed alongside the edition-level analysis, it becomes evident that the differences exceed wording in *Out Of The Rose* and concern the broader catalogue of images through which

Yeats narrates the entire collection of *The Secret Rose*. The 1939 version and the 2002 version do not present the same rose as a symbol, and the sections missing from one or the other volume are not limited to incidental wording.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to compare the symbol of the rose in William Butler Yeats' *The Secret Rose* and its two Estonian translations, analysing how differences in wording and deliberate omissions shape the symbolic role of the rose. To achieve this, the thesis used comparative close reading, translation-shift analysis and edition-level comparison. The analysis approached the symbol of the rose along three axes: ontology, epistemology and ethics.

The comparison showed that the three versions do not present the reader with the same rose. In Yeats' original, the rose functions as a presence with many varied characteristics; it's a ruby jewel, a flaming manifestation of divine wrath, a revelation, and the source of eternal truth. In the original, the rose can be perceived through multiple senses, including sight, sound and fragrance. The original rose's ethical prescriptions can be deduced from its physical presence or some sort of interaction with it. The original keeps the rose ambiguous so that it is at the same time material, religious, and ethical.

The 1939 translation explicates the symbol, making it realise its meaning through its power as an ethical conduit, rather than a material object. On the ontological level, the rose is made a stable emblem of accessing divine truths about the world through struggle and less an active participant which bestows these truths upon listeners. Epistemologically, the reduced visual presence of the rose in the 1939 translation, exemplified by the many deliberate omissions

of the more visual aspects of the symbol, gives way to a more mediated access to the revelations offered by the rose. The 1939 edition also omits several more convoluted or more explicitly religion-adjacent passages, making the rose easier to interpret as a conduit towards spiritual truth, rather than a sacred phenomenon in and of itself.

The 2002 translation is generally more similar to the symbolic fabric of the English original, preserving more of the language of fire, light, and force, colouring the rose in less moral terms than the 1939 translation. Nevertheless, the 2002 version does not reproduce the original. Similar to the 1939 version, the 2002 edition also omits some visual passages, especially the ones where the rose appears to be an independent supernatural phenomenon. The 2002 version, in summary, leaves the symbol of the rose more open to interpretation than the 1939 version.

The edition-level comparison reinforces this idea. The two editions present different collections of images and stories to the reader. The 1939 version offers a narrower range of symbolism to interpret the rose from, while the 2002 version opts for a broader interpretation.

In summary, the comparison implies that the 1939 version explicates the rose as a symbol with significant moral and spiritual directive, whereas the 2002 version preserves more of the rose's metaphysical ambiguity; the two versions organise the same symbol in considerably differing ways, one opts to stabilise it for the reader, the other chooses to preserve its instability.

## REFERENCES

### Primary sources

- Yeats, William Butler. 2002. *Saladuslik roos* [The Secret Rose]. Trans. by Krista Kaer. Tallinn: Varrak (Original work published in 1897).
- Yeats, William Butler. 1939. *Punane Hanrahan* [Red Hanrahan]. Trans. by M. Luht. Tartu and Tallinn: Loodus (Original work published in 1897).
- Yeats, William Butler. 1981. *The Secret Rose: Stories by W. B. Yeats. A Variorum Edition*. New York: Cornell University Press (First published in 1897).

### Secondary sources

- Anderson, Mic. 2025. 10 Frequently Confused Literary Terms. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Available at <https://www.britannica.com/list/10-frequently-confused-literary-terms>, accessed May 17, 2026.
- Bate, Andrew Jonathan 1983. Yeats and the symbolist aesthetic. *MLN*, 98: 5, 1214–1233.
- Billigheimer, Rachel V. 2002. The rose of Ireland in the early poems of W. B. Yeats: eternity is in the glitter on the beetle's wing. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 91: 363 (Autumn), 276–283.
- Bryan, Amanda. 2015. Decolonisation and mysticism in William Butler Yeats's The Celtic Twilight and The Secret Rose. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 51: 1, 23–36.
- Catford, John Cunnison. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caws, Mary Ann. 2002. Bonnefoy translates Yeats. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 39: 2, 121–134.

- Dublin Literary Award. 2013. Krista Kaer. Available at <https://dublinliteraryaward.ie/the-library/judges/krista-kaer/>, accessed May 17, 2026.
- Foster, Robert Fitzroy. 2016. Philosophy and passion: W. B. Yeats, Ireland and Europe. In *Yeats Annual*, 20, Essays in Honour of Eamonn Cantwell, 71–96. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Korn-Bursztyn, Carol. 1997. Translating stories across cultures. *Education and Culture*, 14: 1 (Spring), 18–23.
- Lotman, Yuri. 1976. *Analysis of the Poetic Text*. Trans. by D. Barton Johnson. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Martin, Augustine. 1975. Apocalyptic structure in Yeats's *The Secret Rose*. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 64: 253, 24–34.
- Nazarova, Tamara and Velta Zadornova. 1989. On cross-cultural translation. *Current Anthropology*, 30: 2, 209–210.
- Prévost, Marcel. 1930. *Julienne'i abielu* [Julienne's Marriage]. Trans. by M. Luht. Tartu: Loodus (Original work published in 1898).
- Regan, Stephen. 2006. W. B. Yeats: Irish nationalism and post-colonial theory. *Nordic Irish Studies*, 5, 87–99.
- Richardson, Joseph E. 2011. Religious metaphor and cross-cultural communication: transforming national and international identities. *Brigham Young University Studies*, 50: 4, 61–74.
- Scheff, Thomas J. 1987. Is accurate cross-cultural translation possible? *Current Anthropology*, 28: 3, 365.
- Showalter, Elaine. 2003. *Teaching Literature*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Sütiste, Elin and Maria-Kristiina Lotman. 2016. “The Translator Must...”: On the Estonian Translation Poetics of the 20th Century. *Interlitteraria*, 21, 1, 17–34.
- Vagelpohl, Uwe. 2010. Cultural accommodation and the idea of translation. *Oriens*, 38, 165–184.
- Van den Broeck, Raymond. 1981. The limits of translatability are exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics Today*, 2: 4 (Summer–Autumn), 73–87.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1986. The Translator’s Invisibility. *Criticism*, 28, 2, 179–212.
- Weeks, Donald. 1948. Image and idea in Yeats’ “The Second Coming”. *PMLA*, 63: 1, 281–292.

## RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL  
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

**Karl Toom**

**The Symbol of the Rose in Two Estonian Translations of W. B. Yeats' *The Secret Rose***

**Roosi sümbol W. B. Yeatsi „Salajase Roosi” kahes eestikeelses tõlkes**

Bakalaureusetöö

2026

Lehekülgede arv: 42

Annotatsioon:

Käesoleva bakalaureusetöö eesmärgiks on analüüsida, kuidas erinevatel ajastutel erinevate tõlkijate poolt produtseeritud tõlked kujutavad roosi kui sümbolit William Butler Yeatsi lühijuttude kogumikus „Salajane Roos”. Lõputöö jaguneb kaheks peamiseks osaks: kirjanduse ülevaade ning tõlgete võrdlev analüüs.

Sissejuhatus annab lühiülevaate originaalteosest, selle autorist ning kahest tõlkijast Mart Luhast ja Krista Kaerast. Kirjanduse ülevaade pakub taustinformatsiooni Yeatsi seosest roosi kui sümboliga ning käsitleb kujundliku keelekasutuse tõlkimise teoreetilisest poolest. Ülevaates ilmneb esiteks, et Yeatsi nägemuses oli roos väga mitmetähenduslik sümbol, kuid teiseseks see, et kujundliku keelekasutuse tõlkimine on kompleksne protsess, mille käigus nii teadlikult, kui ka paratamatusena kaovad teatud tähendused.

Empiiriline analüüs keskendub suurima tähendusliku koormaga tekstilõikudele, kus käsitletakse roosi sümbolit. Analüüs kulgeb kolme peamist telge pidi: epistemoloogia, ontoloogia ning eetika. Võrdleva analüüsi tulemusena selgub, et 1939. aasta tõlge stabiliseerib roosi sümbolina, omistades sellele konkreetse tähenduse meediumina, mille kaudu on võimalik kogeda imutuslikke tõesid maailma kohta. Seevastu 2002. aasta tõlge jätab roosi tõlgenduse sümbolina lahtisemaks, sarnanedes selles osas originaalile. Säärase valiku põhjuseks võivad olla erinevatel ajastutel domineerinud tõlkepraktikad.

## **Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks**

Mina, Karl Toom  
(*autori nimi*)

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) minu loodud teose

The Symbol of the Rose in Two Estonian Translations of W. B. Yeats'

*The Secret Rose*

---

(*lõputöö pealkiri*)

mille juhendaja(d) on Katiliina Gielen ,  
(*juhendaja nimi*)

reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada Tartu Ülikooli digitaalarhiivi kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni;

2. annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi kaudu Creative Commons'i litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 4.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni;
3. olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile;
4. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Karl Toom  
**19.05.2026**

**Autorsuse kinnitus**

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva bakalaureusetöö ise ning toonud korrektselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride instituudi anglistika osakonna bakalaureusetöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

*/allkirjastatud digitaalselt/*

Karl Toom

Tartus, 19.05.2026

**Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.**

Katiliina Gielen

Tartus, 19.05.2026