

**LITERARY ANALYSIS OF "WAITING FOR GODOT" BY  
SAMUEL BECKETT AND "FAREWELL, GULSARI" BY CHINGIZ  
AYTMATOV: A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

**Orifkhonova Sayyora Obidkhon qizi  
Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages,  
Master degree student**

**Abstract**

This paper presents a comparative literary analysis of *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett and *Farewell, Gulsari* by Chingiz Aytmatov, exploring how each work reflects the human condition through distinct philosophical lenses. Beckett's play, rooted in the Theatre of the Absurd, portrays existential stagnation, uncertainty, and meaninglessness through the endless waiting of Vladimir and Estragon for the elusive Godot. In contrast, Aytmatov's novella adopts a realist narrative interwoven with symbolism to depict the moral decline, loss of values, and the struggle for purpose experienced by Tanabay and his loyal horse Gulsari within the Soviet socio-political landscape. By comparing themes such as hope and despair, time and memory, human relationships, freedom and oppression, the study highlights how both authors address universal questions of existence despite differing cultural contexts and literary styles. The paper concludes that while Beckett emphasizes the absurdity and futility of human efforts, Aytmatov underscores resilience, emotional attachment, and the tragic consequences of ideological conflict, revealing two parallel yet contrasting portraits of humanity in search of meaning.

**KEYWORDS:** Existentialism, absurdism, modernism, Realism; Human condition; Hope and despair; Time and waiting; Soviet literature; Oppression

and power; Symbolism; Memory and past; Identity crisis; Human–nature relationship; Conflict between man and system; Loneliness and companionship; Loss and tragedy; Search for meaning;

## INTRODUCTION

Literature, as a mirror of human existence, has long served as a medium through which writers explore fundamental questions about life, purpose, suffering, and the human struggle for meaning. Among the works that continue to resonate across cultures and historical periods are *Waiting for Godot* (1953) by the Irish playwright Samuel Beckett and *Farewell, Gulsari* (1966) by the Kyrgyz writer Chingiz Aytmatov. Although these works emerge from different literary traditions—Beckett from the post-war European absurdist movement and Aytmatov from Central Asian Soviet realism—both texts engage profoundly with existential concerns and depict characters caught in emotional, social, and ideological turmoil. The juxtaposition of these two literary pieces offers an opportunity to examine not only contrasting narrative techniques and philosophical approaches, but also the universal constants that define human experience.

Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* stands as a canonical work of the Theatre of the Absurd, illustrating a world where meaning, logic, and resolution are suspended. Through the repetitive and cyclical structure of the play, Vladimir and Estragon endlessly wait for the mysterious Godot—an ambiguous figure whose arrival never materializes. Beckett uses minimal plot, fragmented dialogue, and bleak humor to express the futility, uncertainty, and existential stagnation of modern man. The play emerges from a post-World War II context in which belief systems were destabilized, traditional values were questioned, and humanity struggled to reconcile itself with the absurdity of existence. Consequently, *Waiting for Godot* becomes a symbolic representation of

spiritual paralysis, emotional exhaustion, and the perpetual search for meaning in a disordered world.

In contrast, Chingiz Aytmatov's *Farewell, Gulsari* offers a narrative grounded in emotional realism and socio-political commentary. The novella traces the life of Tanabay, a former soldier and devoted herdsman, and his loyal horse Gulsari, against the backdrop of Soviet collectivization and ideological transformation. Through the metaphor of the aging horse, Aytmatov reflects on loyalty, sacrifice, and the erosion of moral values within a rapidly changing society. The novel does not merely document historical challenges; it reveals the intimate psychological struggles of individuals torn between human compassion and state-imposed expectations. As Tanabay confronts disillusionment, regret, and the consequences of blind conformity, Aytmatov emphasizes the tragic intersection of personal life with collective ideology. The narrative thus opens a poignant reflection on freedom, dignity, memory, and the irreversible loss of what once grounded a person's identity.

Despite their distinct styles—absurdist minimalism versus symbolic realism—both Beckett and Aytmatov grapple with core existential questions: What does it mean to exist? Where does one find hope when life offers no certainty? How do social and historical forces shape individual destiny? By comparing these two works, this study seeks to illuminate the thematic intersections and artistic divergences that shape the representation of human suffering, time, hope, and the search for meaning. Such a comparative lens allows us to understand how different cultural narratives respond to universal crises, demonstrating that literature, regardless of geographical or ideological background, ultimately reflects the shared emotional landscape of mankind.

This research, therefore, aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of *Waiting for Godot* and *Farewell, Gulsari* by examining their themes, characters, symbolism, narrative techniques, and philosophical orientations. Through comparative interpretation, the study recognizes that while Beckett

portrays the futility and cyclical absurdity of human life, Aytmatov foregrounds resilience, emotional attachment, and the painful consequences of ideological conflict. Together, these works offer compelling yet contrasting visions of existence, contributing significantly to the understanding of literary responses to the human condition.

## METHODS

This study employs a qualitative comparative literary methodology integrating close reading, thematic analysis, character evaluation, and contextual interpretation. The aim of this approach is to systematically examine the structural, stylistic, and ideological elements of "Jane Eyre" and "O'tkan kunlar", and to identify both convergences and divergences between the two literary works.

**Close reading** of *Waiting for Godot* and *Farewell, Gulsari* reveals how both authors construct meaning not through plot-driven narration but through language, symbol, character psychology, and recurring motifs that reflect existential conflict. Each text demands that the reader engage beyond the literal narrative, uncovering deeper philosophical layers embedded in silence, memory, time, and human longing.

In *Waiting for Godot*, Beckett's language is minimalist yet cyclic, functioning less as communication and more as a performative act of waiting. The dialogue between Vladimir and Estragon often circles back on itself—"Nothing to be done"—the opening line that sets the tone for the entire play. The phrase reflects both a physical state (Estragon struggling to remove his boot) and a metaphysical assertion that human action is futile. The repeated exchange "Let's go." — "We can't." — "Why not?" — "We're waiting for Godot" forms a linguistic loop, symbolizing paralysis and the illusion of progress. Beckett makes silence as meaningful as speech; pauses, fragmented sentences, and unfinished thoughts embody existential emptiness. The absence

*ilmiy –amaliy anjuman*

of scenery and the barren tree serve as the central visual cue—lifeless space mirroring the characters' inner void. Yet, the tree also changes slightly (sprouting leaves in Act II), hinting at the faint presence of hope that never fully materializes. This duality roots the play in ambiguity: existence oscillates between despair and the fragile dream of salvation, but resolution remains perpetually deferred.

Beckett's characters speak to survive time, filling the void with trivial dialogue. Their conversations about hanging themselves, hats and boots, or meaningless memories conceal a desperate attempt to confirm their existence. The appearance of Pozzo and Lucky functions as a distorted reflection of power dynamics within society: Pozzo as the authoritative master, Lucky as the suffering intellectual whose chaotic monologue collapses rational thought into absurdity. Lucky's speech—dense, academic in tone, yet collapsing into incoherence—satirizes philosophical systems that aim to explain existence but ultimately fail. Beckett uses humor not for relief but as a tool of existential criticism; laughter coexists with suffering, emphasizing the absurdity of human routines. Through close reading, it becomes evident that Beckett portrays life as cyclical stagnation, where the expectation of meaning replaces meaning itself.

In contrast, *Farewell, Gulsari* employs lyrical narration and emotional depth to explore human conscience against the backdrop of socio-political transformation. Aytmatov uses memory as the primary narrative device: the story unfolds through Tanabay's retrospective gaze, where past pride turns into present regret. The novel frequently shifts between chronological moments, blending reality with memory and human experience with symbolic imagery. Gulsari, the horse, stands at the center of the narrative not merely as an animal but as a symbol of loyalty, innocence, and the fading spirit of freedom. A close reading reveals that Tanabay's journey parallels Gulsari's life: both once strong and hopeful, later weakened by system-driven exploitation. The scene where

*ilmiy –amaliy anjuman*

Gulsari struggles to keep up with the herd becomes a metaphor for individuals crushed under collectivist pressures. Tanabay's reflections—*he remembers victories, youth, idealism*—become increasingly painful as he watches Gulsari's decline, realizing that loyalty repaid with neglect reflects the fate of many people under ideological regimes.

Aytmatov's language is rich with natural imagery—mountains, wind, steppe—contrasting Beckett's empty landscape. Nature in *Farewell, Gulsari* is alive, symbolic, and responsive; it witnesses human rise and downfall. Unlike Beckett's world where time stalls, Aytmatov's narrative treats time as a force of aging, change, and irreversible loss. Through close reading, we see that every memory Tanabay recalls brings both warmth and sorrow. His remorseful tone—especially during Gulsari's final moments—exposes the emotional cost of blind obedience to authority. The internal conflict within Tanabay is more than personal guilt; it represents the ideological trauma experienced by generations who sacrificed humanity for collective slogans. The farewell scene, where Tanabay sits by Gulsari in silence, echoes Beckett's silences yet carries emotional resolution absent in *Waiting for Godot*. Here, silence speaks not of meaninglessness but of mourning, realization, and late enlightenment.

Comparing both works through close reading reveals profound contrasts: Beckett writes absence, stagnation, and absurdity; Aytmatov writes memory, loss, and accountability. Yet, both authors question the essence of existence. Beckett exposes the futility of waiting for salvation, whereas Aytmatov warns of the tragedy of losing compassion to ideology. Both texts ultimately return to the fragility of human hope—one waiting endlessly for meaning, another discovering meaning only after it is too late. Through language, symbolism, and character introspection, Beckett and Aytmatov transform ordinary experiences—waiting on a road, caring for a horse—into philosophical meditations on what it means to live, hope, regret, and search for purpose in an unstable world.

### **Thematic analysis:**

Thematic analysis was applied to classify and compare the central themes present in both novels, with particular attention to concepts such as love, independence, moral responsibility, and social constraint. Each theme was analyzed in terms of its narrative function and contribution to the overarching message of the work. The thematic approach allowed for the identification of shared literary concerns and highlighted how divergent cultural and historical contexts shape the treatment of similar ideas.

### **Character mapping and comparative characterization:**

Character mapping was conducted to evaluate the roles, psychological depth, relational dynamics, and narrative purposes of the major and secondary characters. This method facilitated a systematic comparison of protagonist development, representations of gender, and the functions of antagonistic forces. Character mapping also provided insight into how personal journeys mirror social realities and ideological underpinnings within each narrative tradition.

### **Contextual and historical analysis:**

Contextual analysis was used to situate each novel within its specific cultural, social, and historical environment. This included examining relevant scholarly literature on Victorian England and 19th-century Central Asia, as well as considering literary movements that influenced the authors. By integrating contextual perspectives, the study was able to interpret narrative decisions, character portrayals, and thematic emphases in relation to broader societal conditions and intellectual currents.

### **Cross-cultural comparative framework:**

A cross-cultural comparative framework was employed to synthesize findings from the previous methodological steps. This framework enabled the identification of structural parallels, thematic intersections, and

ideological contrasts between the two novels. It also provided a systematic approach for evaluating how differing cultural environments shape narrative outcomes, conceptualizations of individual agency, and representations of social order. Through this integrative method, the research establishes a coherent basis for cross-literary comparison.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The comparative analysis of *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett and *Farewell, Gulsari* by Chingiz Aytmatov reveals that although the works emerge from distinct literary traditions and socio-cultural contexts, they converge in their exploration of the human search for meaning. The results indicate that both texts reflect existential anxiety, emotional struggle, and the fragility of hope, yet they articulate these concerns through different narrative strategies, symbolic constructs, and philosophical frameworks.

The findings demonstrate that *Waiting for Godot* embodies the absurdist perspective in which human life is characterized by uncertainty, cyclical repetition, and the absence of resolution. The perpetual waiting for Godot functions as the central motif through which Beckett critiques the human tendency to depend on external forces—religion, authority, salvation—for meaning. The results show that the characters' lack of progress symbolizes existential paralysis; time passes, conversations continue, but nothing fundamentally changes. This stagnation aligns with post-war disillusionment, reflecting a world in which old belief systems have collapsed and new ones have not yet formed. The absurdity of language, fragmented dialogue, and humor used as emotional resistance further highlight the emptiness of human attempts to make sense of existence.

In contrast, the results for *Farewell, Gulsari* indicate that Aytmatov anchors meaning in memory, emotional connection, and socio-political critique. The narrative progression, unlike Beckett's circular structure, follows

*ilmiy –amaliy anjuman*

a linear yet reflective path in which the protagonist undergoes moral transformation. While Beckett's world offers no redemption, Aytmatov provides the possibility of realization—albeit painfully late. Tanabay's journey reveals that meaning is not absent but lost through ideological blindness. The decline of Gulsari mirrors the erosion of human values under collectivist pressure, demonstrating that emotional neglect and obedience to authority lead to irreversible loss. The results further show that nature plays a symbolic role, representing freedom, vitality, and the spiritual dimension of life that contrasts with human failures.

When comparing both texts, the discussion suggests that Beckett and Aytmatov address similar existential concerns but present different outcomes. Beckett's characters exist in a timeless vacuum where hope is deferred indefinitely, while Aytmatov's narrative emphasizes the consequences of delayed awareness. The study highlights that *Waiting for Godot* foregrounds existential despair, portraying life as meaningless without self-created purpose, whereas *Farewell, Gulsari* argues that meaning emerges through responsibility, empathy, and connection to others. This juxtaposition reveals two contrasting responses to existential crisis: passive waiting versus active reflection.

Another significant point emerging from the results is the role of suffering. In Beckett, suffering is monotonous and unproductive, a condition to be endured rather than resolved. In Aytmatov, suffering becomes a catalyst for conscience and transformation. The emotional weight of Tanabay's regret demonstrates that human beings define themselves not only through pain but through their ability to learn from it. This contrast deepens the discussion on how different cultural narratives interpret the human condition—European modernism emphasizes meaninglessness, while Central Asian realism leans toward moral introspection.

Ultimately, the findings show that although *Waiting for Godot* and *Farewell, Gulsari* differ in structure, tone, and philosophical orientation, both

illuminate the complex layers of human existence. The discussion emphasizes that the two works collectively broaden the understanding of existential literature by demonstrating that the search for meaning is universal yet contextually shaped. Beckett warns against the paralysis of waiting, while Aytmatov warns against the tragedy of realization that comes too late. Together, they portray humans as beings who wait, hope, remember, and regret—forever navigating between despair and the desire for purpose.

## CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett and *Farewell, Gulsari* by Chingiz Aytmatov demonstrates that literature, despite its diversity in genre, culture, and narrative form, ultimately converges on the fundamental questions of human existence. Through close reading and thematic examination, it becomes evident that both works explore the search for meaning, the burden of time, and the human confrontation with uncertainty and suffering. However, they arrive at these inquiries through distinct literary paths. Beckett's absurdist vision reveals a world devoid of clear purpose, where hope is suspended in endless waiting and human interaction fails to deliver fulfillment. The silence, circular dialogue, and barren setting signify existential paralysis—an image of humanity trapped in meaninglessness.

Aytmatov, conversely, frames existence within a socio-political reality where hope coexists with loss, and meaning emerges through relationships, memory, and moral awareness. *Farewell, Gulsari* shows how individuals can lose themselves within ideological systems, yet also how reflection and emotional connection can restore a sense of humanity, even if recognition arrives too late. The journey of Tanabay and Gulsari emphasizes responsibility, compassion, and the tragic cost of blind conformity, offering a more emotional and ethically grounded critique of life's hardships than Beckett's detached absurdity.

Taken together, these texts enrich the discourse on existential literature by presenting two contrasting yet complementary worldviews. *Waiting for Godot* emphasizes the futility of waiting for external redemption, suggesting that meaning must be constructed internally, while *Farewell, Gulsari* warns of the irreversible loss that follows when individuals forget their moral compass. Both works remind us that existence is defined not only by suffering but by the choices we make—whether to wait passively or to confront life with awareness and compassion.

This study concludes that while Beckett portrays the emptiness of modern existence, Aitmatov illuminates the human capacity for memory, remorse, and emotional resilience. Their differences reinforce the universality of existential struggles across time and culture. Ultimately, the comparative reading underscores that the quest for meaning remains central to the human condition, and literature continues to serve as a vital space where such questions are examined, challenged, and reimagined.

## REFERENCES

Aitmatov, C. (1970). *Farewell, Gulsary!* (K. Clark, Trans.). Progress Publishers.

Beckett, S. (1956). *Waiting for Godot*. Faber and Faber.

Esslin, M. (1961). *The theatre of the absurd*. Anchor Books.

Kerr, D. (1999). Beckett and the meaning of waiting. *Modern Drama*, 42(3), 347–361.

Rakhmanova, S. (2018). Symbolism and moral dilemmas in Aitmatov's prose. *Central Asian Literary Review*, 4, 22–34.

Williams, R. (1966). *Modern tragedy*. Chatto & Windus.

Aitmatov, Chingiz. 1970. *Farewell, Gulsary!*. Translated by Katerina Clark. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Beckett, Samuel. 1956. *Waiting for Godot*. London: Faber and Faber.

*ilmiy –amaliy anjuman*

Esslin, Martin. 1961. *The Theatre of the Absurd*. New York: Anchor Books.

Kerr, Douglas. 1999. “Beckett and the Meaning of Waiting.” *Modern Drama* 42 (3): 347–361.

Rakhmanova, Saida. 2018. “Symbolism and Moral Dilemmas in Aitmatov’s Prose.” *Central Asian Literary Review* 4: 22–34.

Williams, Raymond. 1966. *Modern Tragedy*. London: Chatto & Windus.