Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

Sbc.s5@tu.edu.iq

nkhalaf@st.tu.edu.iq

Tikrit University- College of Education for Women- English Department

Abstract

This article traces the development of the figure of the 'Fool' as both a theatrical and a philosophical character, from the medieval fool in service to the court, to the post-modern anti-hero in Tom Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead (1966). Using a deconstructive lens, the article investigates how Stoppard's work subverts conventional hierarchies of meaning, identity and intentionality and refashions fools' laughter from a vehicle of wisdom to an emblem of existential senselessness. Taking its cues from Derrida´s idea of différance, Lyotard's postmodern criticism of metanarrative and Baudrillard´s notion of simulacra, the reading presents Stoppard's figures as inhabiting a domain where meaning perpetually becomes other. The research places the contemporary fool within a lineage that stretches from medieval fools, who had, under their guise of madness, subversive knowledge, to postmodern theatre's shattered consciousness. The comparative perspective emphasises the transition from the "wise fool" in the medieval world to become a "disoriented fool" in postmodernity, symbolic of the degeneration and disappearance of certainty and fixed truth. The analysis finds that in Stoppard's play, the jester is repositioned as an emblem of human dislocation within a de-centred universe where language and self no longer have fixed points.

Keywords: Fool, deconstruction, postmodernism, Stoppard, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, Derrida, Lyotard, absurdity, theatre. medieval jesters.

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

عادة تشكيل شخصية الأحمق: من مهرّجي العصور الوسطى إلى مسرح توم ستوبارد ما بعد الحداثي: قراءة تفكيكية لمسرحية روزنكرانتز وغيلدنسترن ماتا

الملخص

يستكشف هذا البحث تطوّر شخصية "المهرّج" أو "الأحمق الحكيم" بوصفها رمزًا مسرحيًا وفلسفيًا، من شخصية المهرّج في بلاط العصور الوسطى إلى شخصية البطل اللاعب والعبثي في مسرحية توم ستوبارد روزنكرانتز وغيلدنسترن ماتا (1966). ومن خلال عدسة تفكيكية، يحلل البحث الكيفية التي يقوم بها ستوبارد بتفكيك البنى التقليدية للمعنى والهوية والغاية، محوّلًا ضحكة الأحمق من أداة للحكمة إلى علامة على العبث الوجودي. يستند التحليل إلى مفاهيم دريدا في "الاختلاف" (différance)، ونقد ليوتار للسرديات الكبرى، ومفهوم المحاكاة (simulacra) عند بودريار، ليكشف كيف يعيش أبطال ستوبارد في عالمٍ يتأجل فيه المعنى بلا نهاية. يضع البحث الأحمق الحديث ضمن سلسلة تاريخية تمتد من مهرّجي القرون الوسطى الذين أخفوا تحت قناع الجنون بصيرةً نقدية عميقة، إلى وعيٍ ممزقٍ في المسرح ما بعد الحداثي. وتُظهر المقارنة أن "الأحمق الحكيم" في المسرح الوسيط يتحوّل إلى "الأحمق التائه" في المسرح ما بعد الحداثي، تعبيرًا عن انهيار اليقين وتفكك الحقيقة المطلقة. ويخلص البحث إلى أن مسرح ستوبارد يعيد تشكيل الأحمق ليصبح رمزًا للاغتراب الإنساني في عالمٍ فقد مركزه، وتلاشت فيه ثباتات اللغة والهوية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأحمق، التفكيك، ما بعد الحداثة، ستوبارد، روزنكرانتز وغيلدنسترن ماتا، دريدا، ليوتار، العبث، المسرح، مهرّجو العصور الوسطى.

Introduction

The role of the Fool, after all, has been paradoxical in literary and dramatic history, a sound of laughter that cries out on the profoundest level. The court jester in the Middle Ages was to be entertained and at the same time be a critic, holding an unusual position of privilege to criticise and poke fun at kings. He was a sort of tolerated renegade, a moral mirror that

threw back the contradictions of power. As Enid Welsford (1935) writes in her classic work, The Fool: His Social and Literary History, the medieval fool was a "licensed truth-teller," who feigned madness in order to disguise social and ethical observation.

In the context of modernity, when belief was disunified, this figure changed drastically. In contemporary and postmodern drama, the role of the fool changed from wisdom to bewilderment, from social critique to metaphysical disorientation. Today's fool does little to strip the emperor of his delusion but much to ridicule the idiocy of life. In Tom Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead (1966), the conventional fool returns as a postmodern, self-referential entity caught in tautological paradoxes, existential disorientation, and linguistic instability. The two minor characters from Shakespeare's Hamlet are reframed as anti-heroes whose quest for meaning is reduced to repetition and absurdity.

Research Problem

Although the figure of the Fool is a constant throughout eras, critical attention has seldom paid any heed to how the medieval "wise fool" transforms into the postmodern "fragmented fool" whose identity and speech not only do not divulge truth but destabilize it. While there has been extensive examination on how Stoppard draws upon postmodern aesthetics or Shakespearean intertextuality, little study is devoted to the medieval writing tradition, much less its Stoppardian adaptation.PS244But seamlessly juxtaposing writings over a five-hundred-year gap requires somewhat a more strange leap: that of drawing connections between distinct timelines with respect to philosophical and historical continuities from the medieval age of folly to postmodernity's absurdity. Thus, it is this role that URM explores as it is destabilised in postmodernist theatre and which, in turn, uncovers more general shifts in knowledge, identity and meaning.

Research Questions

This thesis posits that in Stoppard's play, the character of the Fool deploys a discursive process of reconfiguration as a fragmented consciousness, thereby becoming an icon of postmodern sensibility. A deconstructive reading informed by Derrida's différance, Lyotard's doubt about grand narratives, and Baudrillard's concept of simulation yields how Stoppard deconstructs the possibility of stable identity or meaningful truth. Contrasting the Medieval Fool, who was wise, satirical and socially sanctioned as a truth-teller, to the Postmodern Fool, whose irony is self-damning and language implodes into paradox, this study follows folly's cultural and philosophical progression from faith to fragmentation. The questions addressed by the paper are:

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf
Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

1. In what ways does Stoppard's play reimagine the traditional characterisation of the Fool postmodernity?
2. What philosophical considerations are at play in the transition from medieval to postmodern folly?
3. How does postmodern and deconstructive theory serve to illuminate the identity crisis motivating the Fool in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead?

The importance of this research is to fill a significant void: plenty has been written about Stoppard's postmodern aesthetics and his Shakespearean intertextuality, but few scholars have systematically addressed the Fool's transition between historical/philosophical contexts. Placing Stoppard in the tradition of medieval fools and the evolutionary history of irony, this paper seeks to provide some insights into how the theatre mirrors changes in perceptions of truth, knowledge and absurdity.

Review of Literature

The scholarly debate around the theatrical and philosophical nature of the Fool has passed through various layers of interpretation, from an anthropological vision to a psychoanalytical and post-modern one. At the same time, foundational studies like E. N. Welsford's *'The Fool: His Social and Literary History'* (1935) continues to shape our understanding of the medieval fool as a socially licensed critic whose foolishness is an incognito form of wisdom. The fool, Welsford argues, is a "paradoxical truth-teller" whose voice of the jester provided this moral reflection in structures of power. Her work is still central to any discussion of the fool's double role as entertainer and intellectual dissident.

Expanding upon this rich tradition, in a study of the symbolic development of the fool in Renaissance and modern plays, Meyer emphasises the figure's role as "negotiator between chaos and order" (1991, P. xx). The fool is a figure of liminal consciousness who is always questioning authority and forcing the audience to confront human frailty with humour, in Meyer's characterisation. The shift from late medieval to early modern theatre thus represents a movement toward the internalisation of folly, from an action in society to a mental state.

In this regard, it is worthy of mention in the realm of modern drama that Hooti and Shooshtarian (2011) also deal with the fool's rebirth in postmodern theatre, which is portrayed through Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead. They contend that Stoppard converts the Shakespearean underlings into existential fools, whose language and logic mock modern reason and ancient tragedy alike. In the groundbreaking study, *Stoppard's Fools: The Growth of a Novelist*, Michael Cordner discovers in Stoppard's Fools themselves creatures born out of the postmodern world of irony and uncertainty, "the means by which comedy has for some time now been transformed into a way of asking about knowledge"(Cordner, 2001, p. 103).

Subsequent critics – for example, Hassan (1987), Lyotard (1984) and Hutcheon (1988 when we extend the parameters of our comparison after we observe postmodern aesthetics as aligned with philosophical scepticism. Hassan's indeterminacy and Lyotard's onset of "incredulity toward metanarratives"(Lyotard, 1984, p.24) both lend a clearer focus on how Stoppard's characters reject closure and significance. So too does Hutcheon's conception of parodic intertextuality demonstrate that Stoppard's rewriting of Hamlet is not homage but playfully deconstructive.

Recent work on medieval fools, Connolly's (2021) research into Tudor disabilities, or Izzo's (2023) work on Safavid and Zand court jesters, for example, helps situate the Fool as a historical construction intrinsically linked to social structures, performance, and political dissent. There are, however, very few points of direct contact between that medieval lineage and the so-called postmodern stage. This article adds to that lacuna. There is still no great comeback of the foolish wise man linked to Medieval and Postmodern Images of the Fool. Although much has been written about postmodern theatre, there remains considerable room for exploration in terms of linking medieval and postmodern forms of the fool. Insufficient attention has been given by critics to the way that this moral wisdom of folly in the medieval period becomes existentialist absurd comedy in postmodern drama. This is what I intend this study to address, as it follows the evolution of the fool's voice from the socially protected jester to linguistically enmeshed anti-hero, ultimately focusing on how changes in philosophical and linguistic perspectives resituate boundaries between humour, truth and madness.

Methodology

This study utilises a qualitative, textual and comparative analysis informed by postmodern and deconstructive theories. Primary text used is Stoppard's "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

Are Dead" (1966). Historical background is the tradition of the medieval fool (Welsford, von Bernuth, Richardson, Connolly). Theoretical framework, thus, is Derrida's différance, being nothing but the unstable and indefinitely postponed meaning, Lyotard's critique of metanarratives, and Baudrillard's simulacra and hyperreality. Finally, the analytical approach used is a close analysis of language, identity work, metatheatrical frames and philosophical resonance.

Theoretical Framework

This research is based on postmodernity and deconstruction, which power the instability of meaning, fragmentation of identity and the self-reflexivity of language. The writings of Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard inform the concept for Tom Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead as a postmodern reworking of the role of the fool in drama.

Derrida's Theory of Supplement and Deferral of Meaning

Derrida's différance challenges structuralism's presumption of the stable meaning of words. However, sense can only come into being through an infinite series of differences and delays (Derrida, 1976). In the play, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are caught in just such a cycle: their dialogues circle around one another; they contradict and echo one another without resolution. The iconic scene of the coin toss acts as an emblematic instantiation of différance in practice, endless slippage between chance and necessity. Their language has the appearance of making sense, and yet undermines it. Here, Stoppard theatricalises the deconstructive theme of language as the source and obstruction of meaning.

Lyotard and the Challenge of Grand Narratives

Lyotard's The Postmodern Condition (1984) famously characterises the postmodern as "incredulity toward metanarratives", or universally applicable grand narratives, kinds of stories that he describes us no longer believing in. This theoretical stance might help account for why Stoppard's characters don't manage to arrive at any coherent sense of purpose. The Player, for one thing, effectuates this in a tone of cool irony, with procrastinated deaths and

illusions of performance jumbling into interchangeable absurdities: "We're actors … we're the opposite of people" (Act I, Stoppard, 1966, p. 39). His statement in itself is Lyotardian, a critique of metanarratives, ideas to Superstore Ideocracy: there is no truth; it has been replaced by performative language games. Stoppard's theatre is thus a meta-commentary on the breakdown of certainty: here, the fool is not a canny outsider but a victim of epistemological dissolution.

Baudrillard and the Simulated Worlds.

Baudrillard's simulacra, copies without originals, also help to illuminate the postmodern condition of Stoppard's fools. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are shadows of Shakespearean figures who've been surgically removed from their play. It is false in reality, not a picture of reality, but a simulation of theatricality. This "meta-reality" confuses the line between life and performance, truth and illusion. Their pathetic efforts to behave naturally are continually thwarted by the knowledge that they are assuming scripted personas. In this sense, Stoppard's fools reside in what Baudrillard (1994) refers to as the "desert of the real," a realm saturated with reality that is purely mediatised.

From Deconstruction to Dramatic Practice

Taken together, these theories uncover how postmodern theatre privileges philosophical abstraction over embodied performativity. Stoppard's play doesn't just depict theoretical concepts; it embodies them. The dislocated identities of its characters, their self-feeding dialogue and existential dread are not symbols of desolation, but enactments of what humans become in a world without stable signification. In the performance of différance, incredulity and simulation, Stoppard converts philosophical critique into theatrical effect, and the Fool is brought to life as a living allegory of postmodernism.

Medieval Court Jesters: Historical Roots of the Fool

The figure of the court jester in medieval Europe occupied a complex symbolic space that combined entertainment, subversion, and social critique. As one scholar notes, the jester defied boundaries, shifting between worlds of power and mockery (von Bernuth 2006). This liminality granted the fool a peculiar license: to speak truth to authority while cloaked in folly (Richardson 2018).

Historical accounts distinguish between two kinds of fools: the "licensed" or artificial fool, whose role was conscious performance, and the "natural" fool, whose difference from norms (often cognitive or bodily) placed him or her in a category of otherness (von Bernuth, 2006).

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

The former wielded satire; the latter was often protected yet marginalised, existing at the boundary of sanity and social order.

The fool's clothing and costume also carried meaning. Motley garments, for instance, symbolised the fool's outsider status and permitted speech otherwise unacceptable in court (Gifford, in Richardson, 2018). Such attire visually signalled the inversion of social hierarchy and the temporary suspension of norms.

Beyond entertainment, jesters could function as informal advisers or moral mirrors to rulers. Their jokes and mockery offered a mode of critique that was socially tolerated yet potent. They held a "privilege" of speech that others lacked, enabling them to expose folly without punishment (Connolly, 2021).

While scholarship on medieval court jesters is long-standing, some recent work continues to deepen our understanding of their roles across cultures and eras. For example, Izzo (2023) examines the fools of the Safavid and Zand courts, demonstrating how the fool's role as confidant, clown, and truth-speaker persisted beyond Europe into the modern period of monarchical power.

By tracing the jester's evolution, from sanctioned trickster to symbolic outsider, this section establishes the historical foundation for understanding how the fool figure transforms in postmodern theatre. It shows the fool's origin as a socially integrated paradox (wise yet insane) and sets up the contrast to the fragmented and absurd fool of contemporary drama.

Disembowelling Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*

Tom Stoppard's play Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead (1966) is one of the most powerful re-envisionings of "the Fool" in contemporary drama. Stoppard turns two minor Shakespearean characters from Hamlet into central figures whom he uses to represent the disjointedness of modern and postmodern existence. They are his descendants, the heirs of the medieval jester robbed of purpose, or any voice or wisdom he might once have possessed. What's left is the form of a meaningless folly, re-filled not with meaning but with irony and doubt.

Cyclic Logic and the Decline of Reason

The game opens with the now legendary coin-flip scene, where Rosencrantz tosses a coin that always comes up heads over and over again. Dozens of times in identical or absolutely similar circumstances… Guildenstern: "Do you ever think of yourself as actually dead, lying in a box…?" (Stoppard, 1966, p. 29)

This scene immediately dramatises the activity of Derrida's différance, meaning always already deferred. The recurrence of heads, though it is inconceivable statistically, no explanation offers itself. The cast keeps trying to make sense of the insanity through conventional thought and odds, which only fuels their torment. As Guildenstern insists ,"A lesser man might be moved to re-examine his faith… at least in the law of probability." (Stoppard, 1966, p. 18) Here, Stoppard is about the collapse of reason itself. The coin stands in as a metaphor for linguistic undecidability: the duality of heads/tails (or truth/falsehood)(Stoppard, 1966, p. 91) is shattered, and all that's left are infinite copies of the same possibility. And like Derrida's signifier, it has no stable reference. Where the medieval fool mocked the king's reason, Stoppard's fools mock reason itself.

The Player's Philosophy and Meta-Theatre

The Player, chief of the Tragedians, is director-in-chief and philosopher-king, a postmodern version of the court fool who utters truth through play. Yet his wisdom is self-parodying. "What is the meaning of performance? "Guildenstern asks him, to which he responds, "We act natural… we're skilled at it!" (Stoppard, 1966, p. 42)

This is the spirit of which Lyotard famously speaks, that is, with postmodern incredulity toward "grand narratives. The Player recognises that life is performance; authenticity is a mirage. In the Ironic Age of the Middle Ages, performance by the fool revealed truth through laughter. In Stoppard's universe, performance obscures the lack of truth. Through the Player, cynicism, which reduces all human experience, love, death, and morality to a theatre repetition. Even death, hardest of all facts, becomes simulation: "It's what we do best. We bleed convincingly".

Here, Baudrillard's simulacra appear as the representation of death, which is no longer distinguishable from death. The Player's words explode the line between illusion and being; they verbalise the Fool's historical license to say what should never be said, but now decoupled from any moral or spiritual basis.

Language, Silence, And the End of Meaning

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are caught up in conversations that endlessly circle without moving forward, as is the rest of this play. Their dialogue imitates philosophy, only to disintegrate: "Words, words. They are our only clues "(Stoppard, 1966, p. 31).

This confession is the poststructuralist thought. Language is the very medium of consciousness. The fools seek to have by speech the name, and then derive meaning from it, but their words show how this task is doomed. Their linguistic acrobatics, questions for which there is no answer, definitions that crumple when set on their feet, illustrate what Derrida calls "the play of difference." Things go missing as soon as meaning is made: You never get there.

When silence cuts into their prattle, it is even more horrible than speech. The traditional fool's laughter is replaced by existential silence, a nothingness where language falters and self crumbles away. His exchange from jesting to silence is the fool's postmodern destiny: he can't critique the world since the world itself has become a hall of echoes of vacuity.

Identity and Erasure

Throughout, one of the great achievements of Stoppard is how he presents identity as an unstable performance. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern often don't remember who they are, even getting mixed up about their names:

""I am Guildenstern, and this is Rosencrantz." (Stoppard, 1966, p. 35)

This infinite shifting performs Derrida's displacement of the subject: there is no stable self, only positions or standpoints. They are what others believe them to be: Hamlet, the court, and even the audience. And when those references go, so do they. The medieval fool had a licence to play hide and seek with identity, but he or she was a recognisable social role. Lost, though we scarcely need it, even that licence; Stoppard's fools are simply a more abandoned name for pure, insecure being.

In the process of the play, they discover that their lives, like their dialogue, are scripted. Their sense of being characters in another author's play (Shakespeare's Hamlet) brings ontological despair. Guildenstern laments, "We act natural… we're skilled at it!" (Stoppard,

1966, p. 42) Their tragedy isn't death, but the loss of authorship, of one's own narrative. They incarnate what Lyotard calls the "dissolution of legitimacy," when individuality vanishes with regard to language and narrative.

Death and the Theatrical End

The circle of philosophy is completed in the final lines of the play. The fools don't die fighting; they just die. Their deaths are offstage, narrated rather than performed, the perfect icon of Baudrillard's hyperreality. There is no catharsis for the audience, only the impression of performance.

In Shakespeare's "Hamlet," their deaths are implements of royal power; in Stoppard, they represent meaning itself being whisked away. And they are dead." The lights go down." The last silence is the laughter of the Fool; they are there when reason reaches its furthest extent.

Stoppard's fools, then, carry the historical arc started in medieval courts to its conclusion: from licensed truth-tellers who expose moral contradiction to existential jesters who expose the pointlessness of truth itself. The medieval Fool questioned power; the postmodern Fool questions the very possibility of meaning.

A consideration of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* in relation to the historical and theoretical context of the Fool leads us to a number of important discoveries about how folly, language, and identity change from medieval to postmodern stage.

The transformation of the fool's function is quite clear. In Stoppard's play, the medieval Fool, an elder one-time licensed truth-teller and moralist, is a figure of epistemological breakdown. Transition from wisdom-in-folly to folly-in-wisdom is indicative of postmodern disbelief in absolute truth and rational order. Language, in its turn, is used as entropy. The Fool's classic weapon, conversation, has lost its truth-telling edge. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's circular reasoning reveals a self-gobbling, slippery language (echoing Derrida's différance). It's a theatre of indecision, and it delays the revelation that never arrives; meaning is, in effect, kept at bay but not disclosed; and speech forms materiality as matter commands speech. Loss of identity and agency is used as well. The Fool's ancient privilege, to criticise power with impunity, falls apart in Stoppard's world. The confusion the principals have about their names and identities even dramatises that postmodern breakdown of the self. Identity no longer operates as essence but as repetition and substitution, in line with Lyotard's theory of disintegrated identity. Death is portrayed as a simulation, not a resolution. The fools' deaths no longer signal moral or tragic closure. In the realm of simulacra that Baudrillard theorises, their deaths are twice representations, stage acts, but

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

without closure or escape. Even death becomes a stage effect, reflecting the degradation of metaphysical significance in postmodern life. Continuity and rupture are between eras. Despite these differences, however, the medieval and postmodern fools wander in the same anti-authoritarian Decentered field of power and truth. Yet whereas the laughter of the medieval fool revealed hypocrisy in order, that of the postmodern fool also brings to light a lack of order itself. Such a shift marks a philosophical break from divine hierarchy to linguistic anarchy, from authorised insurrection to ontological nihilism.

These discoveries reveal that Stoppard's play further extends the fool's historical lineage to serve as a philosophical allegory for postmodern consciousness. The fool's stage has relocated from the royal court to the void, from satire to self-reflexivity, from speaking truth to watching it vanish.

Conclusion: Medieval Wisdom and Postmodern Absurdity

The path of the Fool, from medieval palace entertainers whose humour at least was supposedly involuntary to Tom Stoppard's darkly ironic stage jesters, does more than describe a theatrical change. It sketches what appears as a profound revolution in human consciousness. The medieval fool was the embodiment of licensed wisdom, through derision revealing truth; he achieved moral equilibrium by making mirth his moral and power counterpart. His foolishness was protective, a disguise for wisdom. Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, on the other hand, inherit both the fool's habit and the knowledge of its delusions. Their joke is an empty one; their laughter rings in an emptiness devoid of metaphysical certainty.

The reversal is analogous to a broader intellectual move from a universe world." occasionally to "a fragmented postmodern universe centuries, not only the microsecond or millisecond. I think this inversion mirrors a larger shift phenomenologically, from a theocentric Giant Tsunami: Swamped. Avoiding being swallowed by this very large tsunami may be crucial, as discrete events happen occasionally. The fool's speech of the Middle Ages was truth effectuated; the fool's speech of post-modernity is effectuated nothingness. While one

contradiction is resolved, the other shows up.' With the différance of Derrida, the scepticism on the metanarratives of Lyotard, and Baudrillard's simulacra meaning transcends no longer out of language, it seeps into it. The fool is the reflection of postmodern subjectivity, self-aware, ironic, and unable to change his script.

What the wise fool and fragmented fool have in common highlights a profound cultural irony: The freedom that once enabled court jesters to challenge kings has become an existential dead end. Stoppard's characters reside in a world where every act is preordained, every word recycled, and every gesture scripted. The tragedy of their situation is that it's not that they are ignorant, but overinformed: They know too much to believe yet too little to act.

"Refigured" by reconfiguring the fool in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead, Stoppard enacts photography's suspensions, structures of collapse, and architectures of play. His theatre turns the medieval Comic to a postmodern nothingness in which laughter no longer saves, but ridicules life. The Fool, who was once the custodian of moral truth, ultimately becomes the sigil of a humanity untethered, still acting and still speaking, but with no longer any clear sense of for whom or why.

References

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press.

Connolly, P. (2021). *Disability and the Tudors: All the King's fools*. Pen & Sword History.

Cordner, M. (2001). Stoppard's Players. In P. Holland & M. Cordner (Eds.), *Players of Shakespeare 6* (pp. 95–117). Cambridge University Press.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hassan, I. (1987). *The postmodern turn: Essays in postmodern theory and culture*. Ohio State University Press.

Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A poetics of postmodernism: History, theory, fiction*. Routledge.

Izzo, G. (2023). Playing the fool: Jesters of the Safavid and Zand courts. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X23000460

Refiguring the Fool: From Medieval Court Jesters to Tom Stoppard's Postmodern Stage: A Deconstructive Reading of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead

Noor Abdullah Khalaf

Prof. Dr. Ansam Riyadh Abdullah Almaaroof

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Richardson, E. (2018). 'A motley to the view': The clothing of court fools in Tudor England. *Midlands Historical Review, 2*(30).

Stoppard, T. (1966). *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead*. Faber and Faber.

von Bernuth, R. (2006). Fools: From marvels of nature to asylum inmates. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 26*(2). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v26i2.697