

DRAMATIC AND EPIC VISIONS OF TRAGIC FATE IN SHAKESPEARE AND NAVOI

Manzura Akhrorova

PhD researcher of Samarkand

State Institute of Foreign Languages.

ahrorova1987@mail.ru

ORCID: 0009-0001-4554-0065

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18288309>

Annotation. This paper explores the dramatic and epic visions of tragic fate in the works of William Shakespeare and Alisher Navoi. Drawing on Shakespeare's Hamlet and Navoi's Farhod and Shirin, the study demonstrates that although both authors address similar existential themes such as suffering, moral choice, and responsibility, they articulate tragedy through fundamentally different aesthetic frameworks. Shakespeare presents tragic fate primarily through dramatic speech, inner monologue, and psychological conflict, where language becomes the main space of action. In contrast, Navoi constructs tragic meaning through epic narration, symbolic action, and ethical generalization, in which suffering is expressed not through introspection but through deeds, endurance, and self-sacrifice. Using a comparative-typological approach combined with close textual analysis, the article argues that language in both traditions is not a neutral medium but an active artistic force that shapes the understanding of human destiny. The analysis reveals two complementary models of tragedy: one rooted in inner conflict and self-reflection, and the other grounded in moral commitment and action.

Key words: tragic fate; language and style; Shakespeare; Alisher Navoi; Hamlet; Farhod and Shirin; dramatic and epic forms; inner conflict; ethical sacrifice; comparative literature

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются драматическое и эпическое видение трагической судьбы в произведениях Уильяма Шекспира и Алишера Навои. На материале трагедии «Гамлет» и поэмы «Фархад и Ширин» показано, что при обращении к сходным экзистенциальным темам — страданию, нравственному выбору и ответственности — оба автора воплощают трагическое в принципиально различных эстетических моделях. У Шекспира трагическая судьба раскрывается прежде всего через драматическую речь, внутренний монолог и психологический конфликт, где язык становится основным пространством действия. У Навои же трагический смысл формируется посредством эпического повествования, символического действия и нравственно-этического обобщения; страдание выражается не через самоанализ, а через поступок, стойкость и самоотверженность. На основе сравнительно-типологического подхода и текстуального анализа в статье доказывается, что язык в обеих традициях является не нейтральным средством, а активной художественной силой, формирующей понимание человеческой судьбы. В результате выявляются две взаимодополняющие модели трагедии: одна, основанная на внутреннем конфликте, и другая — на моральной ответственности и действии.

Ключевые слова: трагическая судьба; язык и стиль; Шекспир; Алишер Навои; Гамлет; Фархад и Ширин; драматическая и эпическая формы; внутренний конфликт; этическая жертва; сравнительное литературоведение

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada Uilyam Shekspir va Alisher Navoiy asarlarida fojiaviy qismatning dramatik va epik talqini tahlil qilinadi. “Hamlet” va “Farhod va Shirin” asarlariga tayangan holda, tadqiqot har ikki ijodkor iztirob, axloqiy tanlov va mas’uliyat kabi o’xhash ekzistensial mavzularni yoritgan bo’lsa-da, fojiaviylikni mutlaqo turli estetik modellar orqali ifodalashini ko’rsatadi. Shekspirda fojiaviy qismat asosan dramatik nutq, ichki monolog va psixologik ziddiyat orqali ochiladi; bunda til voqealar rivojining asosiy maydoniga aylanadi.

Navoiyda esa fojiaviy mazmun epik bayon, ramziy harakat va axloqiy umumlashtirish orqali shakllanadi: iztirob o’z-o’zini tahlil qilish bilan emas, balki amal, matonat va fidoyilik orqali ifodalanadi. Qiyosiy-tipologik yondashuv va matn tahliliga tayangan holda maqola har ikki an’anada til neytral vosita emas, balki inson taqdirini anglashni belgilovchi faol badiiy kuch ekanini asoslaydi. Tahlil natijasida fojiaviylikning ikki o’zaro to’ldiruvchi modeli aniqlanadi: biri ichki ziddiyatga, ikkinchisi esa axloqiy mas’uliyat va harakatga asoslangan.

Kalit so’zlar: fojiaviy qismat; til va uslub; Shekspir; Alisher Navoiy; Hamlet; Farhod va Shirin; dramatik va epik shakllar; ichki ziddiyat; axloqiy fidoyilik; qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslik.

The concept of tragic fate occupies a central place in both Western and Eastern literary traditions. Yet the ways in which tragedy is expressed are deeply shaped by language, genre, and cultural worldview. This paper examines two contrasting but complementary artistic models of tragedy through a comparative reading of William Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* and Alisher Navoi’s *Farhod and Shirin*, focusing on how dramatic and epic forms construct the meaning of human suffering, moral choice, and responsibility. In Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, tragic fate is articulated primarily through dramatic speech. The hero’s inner conflict is not merely implied but constantly verbalized through monologues, dialogues, rhetorical questions, and irony.

Language becomes the principal space in which action takes place. Hamlet’s hesitation, self-criticism, and moral doubt are revealed through words before they are realized in deeds. The famous soliloquies do not simply comment on events; they create the tragic situation itself by exposing a consciousness torn between duty and conscience. Irony and indirect speech further intensify this tension, allowing Shakespeare to present tragedy as an inner psychological process rather than as a sequence of external [2,48]. Navoi’s epic vision in *Farhod and Shirin* follows a fundamentally different aesthetic logic. Here tragic fate is not constructed through introspective speech, but through action, symbolic imagery, and ethical narration. Farhod does not articulate his suffering in long monologues; instead, his inner world is revealed through deeds—above all, through labor, endurance, and self-sacrifice. The act of carving mountains to bring water is not merely a plot device but a symbolic expression of devotion, moral responsibility, and commitment to others [9, 159]. Language in Navoi’s epic does not analyze the hero’s psychology; it evaluates and elevates action, transforming individual pain into a universal ethical experience.

Tragedy thus appears not as paralysis of will, but as a path of moral испытание and spiritual growth. These differences reflect the influence of genre. Shakespeare’s drama, grounded in dialogue and performance, foregrounds inner conflict and psychological tension; Navoi’s epic, shaped by narration and imagery, emphasizes action, symbolism, and ethical generalization [11,86]. Yet both traditions share a fundamental principle: language is not a neutral medium. In Shakespeare, it turns thought into dramatic action; in Navoi, it endows action with moral meaning.

In both cases, tragic fate is created through artistic form rather than simply reported by the plot. The comparative analysis reveals two distinct but complementary models of tragedy. Shakespeare presents tragedy as an inner crisis, where suffering arises from reflection, doubt, and moral choice. Navoi presents tragedy as ethical sacrifice, where suffering is justified through devotion, labor, and responsibility toward others [10,32]. Together, these models demonstrate how different cultural and aesthetic systems articulate the same human concerns—destiny, duty, and suffering—through contrasting yet equally powerful artistic languages. By placing Shakespeare and Navoi in dialogue, this paper argues that the study of tragic fate gains depth when approached across traditions. The dramatic and epic visions examined here show that tragedy is not merely what happens to the hero, but how meaning is shaped through language, form, and moral perspective. Such a comparative approach allows us to see Western and Eastern literary cultures not as oppositional, but as mutually illuminating ways of understanding the human condition.

REFERENCES:

1. Shakespeare W. Hamlet. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. — 384 p.
2. Shakespeare W. The Complete Works. — London: Oxford University Press, 2005. — 1263 p.
3. Навоий Алишер. Фарҳод ва Ширин. — Тошкент: Faфур Ғулом номидаги нашриёт, 2011. — 480 б.
4. Навоий Алишер. Ҳамса. — Тошкент: Фан, 2010. — 5 жилд.
5. Bradley A. C. Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth. — London: Macmillan, 1904. — 544 p.
6. Eagleton T. Literary Theory: An Introduction. — 2nd ed. — Oxford: Blackwell, 1996. — 244 p.
7. Halliday M. A. K. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. — London: Edward Arnold, 1978. — 256 p.
8. Leech G. Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose. — London: Longman, 1981. — 402 p.
9. Комилов Н. Навоий поэтикаси. — Тошкент: Фан, 2010. — 320 б.
10. Маматқурова Х. А. Этномаданий Маъноларнинг Бадиий Матнда Ифодаси //Kresna Social Science and Humanities Research. – 2022. – Т. 4. – С. 30-33.
11. Рустамов А. Алишер Навоий ва бадиий тафаккур масалалари. — Тошкент: Фан, 2006. — 248 б.