# Diatextual Exchanges and Appropriation Mechanisms in the Absurdist Tragicomedies of Tom Stoppard and Sanchis Sinisterra

Jorge Arroita* iD

* Dr.

**University of Salamanca**
(Phd Student: Faculty of
Philology / Department of
Spanish Language / Area of
Literary Theory and Comparative
Literature) / **University of
Coimbra** (Professor Assistente
Convidado = Guest Assistant
Professor: Faculty of Letters /
Department of Languages,
Literatures, and Cultures)
jorgegfa@usal.es
Salamanca / SPAIN

**Abstract**

This article will apply the theoretical framework of intertextuality and hypertextuality to study appropriation mechanisms used in two absurdist tragicomedies: *Guildenstern and Rosencrantz are dead* (1966) by Tom Stoppard, and *Ñaque, o de piojos y actores* (1980) by José Sanchis Sinisterra. These two plays, both stylistically and generically influenced by Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, hold the same writing processes and purposes: that is, to take minor characters of their main hypotexts (*Hamlet* and *El viaje entretenido*, respectively) and convert them in main characters of their own, but also transforming them and implementing changes in structure, genre, and style. To break down these textual phenomena and their inter-textual procedures, some concepts will be introduced, restructuring both *intertextuality* and *hypertextuality* according to a new theory named as *diatextuality*. Specifically, this study will deepen in the transformations occurred in between these plays and their hypotexts, and how those transformations may affect, not only in the construction of the new texts, but also in the interpretation of the former.

**Keywords:** Intertextuality, appropriationism, rewriting, parody, metafiction.

## Absürd Trajikomedilerde Diyatextüel Etkileşimler ve Sahiplenme Mekanizmaları: Tom Stoppard ve Sanchis Sinisterra Üzerine Bir İnceleme

**Ö**z

Bu makale, iki absürd trajikomedi olan Tom Stoppard tarafından yazılan *Guildenstern and Rosencrantz are dead* (1966) ve José Sanchis Sinisterra tarafından yazılan *Ñaque, o de piojos y actores* (1980) oyunlarında kullanılan sahiplenme mekanizmalarını incelemek amacıyla, metinlerarasılık ve üstmetinsellik kuramsal çerçevesini uygulamaktadır. Her iki oyun da biçimsel ve türsel olarak Beckett'in *Godot'yu Beklerken* adlı eserinden etkilenmiş olup, benzer yazınsal süreçleri ve amaçları paylaşmaktadır: Ana altmetinlerinde (sırasıyla *Hamlet* ve *El viaje entretenido*) yer alan önemsiz karakterleri merkezî figürlere dönüştürmek, aynı zamanda bu karakterleri yapı, tür ve üslup açısından dönüştürmektir. Bu metinsel olguları ve metinlerarası işlemleri ayrıntılı biçimde çözümlemek adına, *metinlerarasılık* ve *üstmetinsellik* kavramları yeniden yapılandırılarak *çiftmetinsellik* adı verilen yeni bir kuramsal çerçeve sunulacaktır. Bu çalışma, söz konusu oyunlar ile onların altmetinleri arasında gerçekleşen dönüşümlere, bu dönüşümlerin yalnızca yeni metinlerin inşasına değil, aynı zamanda önceki metinlerin yorumlanışına nasıl etki ettiğine de derinlemesine odaklanacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Metinlerarasılık, sahiplenme, yeniden yazım, parodi, üstkurmaca.

**INTRODUCTION: THE EMERGENCE OF INTERTEXTUALITY**

*Intertextuality* is not just a concept, thus created by its author and emerged at a specific historical moment, but a primal procedure with many different forms and applications that are related to adaptation and appropriation. Before Kristeva introduced this concept in her famous article of 1967, in traditional literary theory, there were other concepts, albeit with other implications and connotations, that referred to equivalent relational phenomena in-between-texts: those are the *sources* and *influences*. These classic concepts, already there since the early medieval periods, had different implications than *intertextuality*, but the phenomena they referred to were more or less the same: exchanges and relations between texts or authors. The main difference is that *sources* and *influences* used to point at the author, rather than the texts themselves, having a biographical/historical approach and also encompassing a broader range of relational phenomena that includes convergent evolutions, stylistic influences, and other comparative traits difficult to appraise or prove (in this regard, *intertextuality* may be conceived as narrower in its identification and analysis[1]). Instead, the intertextual twist allowed new methodological approaches focused on the microstructural relations between texts, leaving aside the previous macrostructural outlooks in which texts were overlooked as the main object of analysis: "intertextuality replaces the challenged author-text relationship with one between reader and text, one that situates the locus of textual meaning within the history of discourse itself" (Hutcheon, [1988] 2004, p. 168).

The second point is that *intertextuality* is conceived as an interrelation, a reciprocal connection between texts that connects them both at the same time, releasing this subfield or *research program* (Lakatos, 1978) from the biographical, unilateral, and teleological assumptions of traditional literary theory: "the aim is in part to move us away immediately from any rigid concepts of fidelity or infidelity in the adaptive process and towards more malleable and productive concepts of creativity" (Sanders, 2016, p. 9). Jesús Camarero defines this dialogical property as *interactivity* against the *causality* of *sources/influences* (2008, p. 54). On the other hand, we think of *sources* and *influences* as unilateral relations from one text to another, where the *influence* goes from origin to destiny and the *source* moves backward because "the source is the origin and the influence the end"[2] (Weisstein, 1975, p. 169). In any case, *intertextuality* opened up a whole field of new implications and perspectives, projecting the relationships between texts as an entangled network of textual exchanges and resonations.

> *Intertextuality, the condition of any text whatsoever, cannot, of course, be reduced to a problem of sources or influences; the intertext is a general field of anonymous formulae whose origin can scarcely ever be located; of unconscious or automatic quotations, given without quotation marks* (Barthes, 1981, p. 39).

Despite that, the wideness of Kristeva's concept, followed by other French poststructuralists like Barthes, Riffaterre, or Derrida, produced some new analytical problems that other authors pointed out years later, such as Gustavo Pérez Firmat (1978), the first one to narrow the concept only around quotation and (maybe) allusion. Gérard Genette also restructured the concept under his theory of *transtextuality* (1982), subdividing it into two: *intertextuality*, in a narrow and punctual sense, such as quotation, allusion, and plagiarism; and *hypertextuality*, as structural and (more) implicit relations where the latest text depends on the former one. In his own words:

> *[A]ny relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the hypertext) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the hypotext) upon which it is grafted in a manner that it is not of commentary […] It may yet be of another kind such as text B is not speaking of text A at all but being unable to exist, as such, without A* (1997, p. 5).

---

[1] Although that would not be the case for French poststructuralists.
[2] Own translation.

Aside from the trait of not needing to be punctual or strictly verbal (that is, not needing an explicit and specific surface within the text), like narrow *intertextuality*, the two main characteristics of *hypertextuality* are, per definition, being structural and generating a dependency between the texts. From these traits, we can infer that, usually, hypertextual phenomena are reflected in characters, diegetic spaces, structures, thematic features, or more problematic aspects like genres, styles, and metrical-rhythmical patterns (usually forgotten by Genette, due to his special focus on narratology): all of which are intensive/ontological in some way[3], allowing them to be structural and to produce some dependency. Hence, adaptation and appropriation are usually carried out through *hypertextuality* (at least according to Genette's concept): "citation is different again from adaptation, which constitutes a more sustained and deeper engagement usually with a single text or source, than the more glancing act of allusion or quotation" (Sanders, 2016, p. 6).

The problem with this is that Genette projects *hypertextuality* as only operating between two texts and between them as a whole, like he does with the *Odyssey-Ulysses* or *Odyssey-Aeneid*: and that, in practice, is not true. Hypertextual relations can be developed between more than two texts at the same time (mutually interrelated). Besides, they never happen between whole texts, but between specific intratextual elements/aspects within those texts: in a reticular way and, potentially, with different kinds of relations and transformations. These are the main two aspects of *intertextuality* (in its broader sense), as Tiphaine Samoyault pointed out: "relational (exchanges between texts) and transformational (reciprocal modification of the texts that are in this exchanging relationship)"[4] (2008, p. 67). Despite being multilateral, *hypertextuality* can also be carried in different ways, just like *intertextuality*. Genette poses, under his concept of *transposition*[5], different types of hypertextual relations, but substantiated by narratological concepts or definitions, and sometimes with just surface, formal, or unilateral processes. Good examples are his *simple-complex transformations* (inter alia: *transdiegetization*, *transpragmatization*, *transmetrization*, *transstylization*, *transmodalization*, *condensation*, *simulation*, etc.), which he exemplifies with *Odyssey-Ulysses* and *Odyssey-Aeneid*, respectively[6]: projecting the second one as an integration of *Odyssey*'s structural model into its own new codes (namely, a full-fledged appropriation); and the first as a mere translation of its structure to other storyline, genre, and style.

Another problem is that he categorizes those hypertextual mechanisms between *satiric-serious regime*, including his concepts in one of them. This binomial split puts his main concepts at risk, because the way in which two texts (or rather, intratextual elements/aspects) are related or transformed does not depend on the more or less serious treatment carried out by the author, but on the type of specific purposes and technical processes enforced in-between them. Punctual *intertextuality* is very significant for studying appropriationist phenomena, but *hypertextuality* is even more important in order to analyze such phenomena, due to its traits of potential implicitness, structurality and dependency make its transformative procedures capable of adapt and turn certain textual elements into something equivalent, but also new (and that is one of the main approaches to appropriationism). Here we must differentiate *adaptation* from *appropriation* too, according to *intertextuality/hypertextuality*, but also to the concepts of diegetic reproduction (sequels/prequels) and transmediality or transmodality: "rather than the movements of proximation or cross-generic interpretation that we identified as central to adaptation, here we have [within appropriation] a more wholesale redrafting, or indeed recrafting, of the intertext" (Sanders, 2016, pp. 37-38); and "[b]eyond that, appropriation carries out the same

---

[3] Unlike quotations, which are extensive by nature: that is, they do not have an ontological nature.

[4] Own translation.

[5] Generic concept to display any kind of hypertextual relation within the *serious regime*. It is included within his main category of *transformation*.

[6] And associating Joyce's *Ulysses* to a *simple transformation* is by itself quite a problematic statement.

sustained engagement of adaptation but frequently adopts a posture of critique, overt commentary and even sometimes assault or attack" (p. 6), something that we will associate later with *hypertextual oppositions*.

Hence, we will display here some specific mechanisms to redefine *intertextuality* and *hypertextuality*, distinguishing between different intratextual elements involved and different transformative processes which can be applied onto them. All of the concepts to be presented are specific (even though their terms may collide with other concepts for contextual or linguistic reasons) and included under a literary theory named as *diatextuality* (Arroita, 2024): i.e. 'that which goes across the texts'.

### *Diatextuality:* Redefining Intertextual And Hypertextual Procedures

*Diatextuality* is a literary theory made for four purposes: 1) Trying to concretize transformative procedures and mechanisms (both in *intertextuality* and *hypertextuality*), due to the indeterminacy of these concepts in their contemporary theoretical approach and practical analysis, usually being neutral or generic frames: not focused on the technical procedures executed and their transformative nature, or displaying generic concepts aimed at substantial or sociological features that end up being inoperative in textual practice[7]. 2) Understanding inter-textual relations as multilateral networks, not unilaterally determined or only acting between two texts as a whole, but according to reticular and polygenetic phenomena, both internal and external to the texts involved: that is, being able to sustain at the same time multiple relations/transformations between different aspects of two texts, and between various texts as well (mutually intertwined), within a "web of intertextuality which resists easy linear structures and straightforward one-to-one and one-way readings of 'influence'" (Sanders, 2016, p. 209). 3) Overcoming the distinction made upon *intertextuality-hypertextuality*, which narrows down *intertextuality* only to quotations (and maybe allusions or plagiarism), and *hypertextuality* as any kind of structural and (more or less) implicit relationship. 4) Overcoming Genette's framework based on the distinction between *serious-satiric regime*, according to which the processes developed are determined by those binomial (and non-specific) goals: the greater or lesser seriousness of hypertextual processes does not determine, at least in an operative way, those relations and the transformations applied within them, which are more specific in their procedures, purposes, and outcomes.

In order to establish these goals, specially the third point, the following consideration will be presented. Does not make sense regarding *intertextuality* only as quotational phenomena, because its boundaries are broader than the mere inclusion of previous textual fragments, in a punctual, superficial, and explicit way; but neither does projecting *intertextuality* as any kind of generic or transcendent relation between-texts (i.e. non-specific or untraceable influences), without analyzing their numerous particularities and operational differences. Likewise, does not make sense regarding *hypertextuality* as every structural relation whereby there is a necessity from hypertext to hypotext, because there are different kind of structural relationships, authorial purposes, and modes/degrees of necessity or intensity in those mechanisms. Besides, intertextual relations can have certain structural features (for example, when a verse makes up the title of another book or a motif constantly repeated throughout it), and Genettian *hypertextuality* (as it is defined) may be, in some cases, just punctual relations which do not beget an structural necessity, even without any transformation at all[8] (like the circumstantial appearance of an alien character in one moment, as a reference, a playful connection or a backing up for

---

[7] Some evidence of these problems within those lines of research would be, among others: the *discursive-literary-interartistic intertextuality* of Ryszard Nycz, the *external-internal intertextuality* of Jean Ricardou, the *general-restricted-autarchic intertextuality* of Lucien Dällenbach, the *interior-exterior intertextuality* of Graciela Reyes, the *modern-postmodern intertextuality* of Pavao Pavličić, or the *critical-poetic intertextuality* of Leyla Perrone-Moisés (among others).

[8] Characteristic that Genette associates to every hypertextual phenomenon (1997, p. 5).

another writing goal). According to these hypotheses, here will by posed a readjustment and specification of both concepts within *diatextuality*.

This readjustment is made upon the consideration of *intertextuality* as extensive or punctual relations not only narrowed to quotations, but functioning in a non-structural/intensive way: directed towards the integrity of the new text in a more circumstantial sense, more than towards a structural reinterpretation or reformulation of the previous one. Instead, *hypertextuality* will be projected here as intensive relationships which produce a transformative retro-affectation onto the structural features taken from the hypotext. In this regard, *hypertextuality* would be appropriationist by nature, and *adaptation* intertextual, homodiegetic, and potentially transgeneric or transmedial too, but more related to mechanisms of reproduction/imitation that just expand one text into another work, genre, or medium⁹.

Based on these assumptions, the distinction between *intertextuality-hypertextuality* will not be substantial or phenomenic (encompassing every textual aspect susceptible to inter/dia-textualization) but processual, as will also be the subdivisions within them. Therefore, *intertextuality* will be divided into three categories, depending on their transformative nature: neutral/transferential (*imitations*), explicit (*transductions*), and implicit (*transpositions*). On the other hand, *hypertextuality* will be narrowed into two kind of mechanisms, regarding the nature of the process and the main writing purpose applied onto the structural relationship with the hypotext: a weak/retrospective hypertextuality (*oppositions*), directed to an attack, revision, or deconstruction of the hypotext; and a strong/retroactive hypertextuality (*synthesis*), aimed towards the integrity of the hypertext through an ontological reconstruction (or sophistication/evolution) of the element taken.

These "elements" will be called *interlexias* (picking up Barthes' term "*lexias*"), as textual elements/aspects with some characteristic feature or "the envelope of a semantic [or formal/structural] volume" (Barthes, [1970] 2004, p. 10) that permits their identification and delimitation: adding the prefix, we must understood these elements as intrinsically divided, bearing a twofold/multifold nature. Thus, their inter-textualization splits them up between two (or more) textual containers, entailing an extension or division between the two (or more) versions of the *interlexia*, within which transformative procedures may change superficial or structural properties of the pre-textual/hypotextual element, generating new forms or contents and expanding the intertextual memory of literature throughout time. In this regard, *interlexias* are specific units of meaning (detected by a critical reader) which act as a bridge between two territories, wherein the river beneath the bridge, with its drift, is able to adapt, transform or even evolve, the former dry land that now its current moves on. These *interlexias* can be of eight types: *quotational*, *metrical-rhythmical*, *thematic*, *structural*, *of characters*, *diegetic*, *generic*, and *stylistic*.

An important feature will also be considered here in relation to the mechanisms and purposes carried out by the author with this kind of transformations and their differences. That is, the degree of appropriation of the text regarding the *interlexias* involved, something related to the semantic/axiological *surplus value* produced by the relationship, but specially by the transformation executed in-between the two versions/territorialities of the *interlexia*, according to which difference emerges and overcomes mere resemblance or repetition: "as a process of creation, the act of adaptation [or rather appropriation] always involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation […] palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation" (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 33). As we will see, some inter-textual mechanisms imply a higher degree of

_____

⁹ According to the concept of *remediation* (Bolter & Grusin, 2000), which implies certain identity/continuity of the universe, story, characters, and semiotic/axiological codes.

appropriationism: for example, *hypertextuality* in itself, due to its structural condition, tends to allow a higher degree of appropriation than *intertextuality*. But there are other two main traits. If the writing goal is more deconstructive (driven towards a reinterpretation of the pre-text's *interlexia*, rather than its own integrity) it would usually hold a greater appropriationist procedure. And the same will happen if its mode of transformation is more implicit than explicit, because that implicitness entails a more subtle dissolution of the element taken within the new text, and appropriation is broadly understood as a writing mechanism (or rather a general intention, which then applies different procedures) that tries to make some previous content like your own[10]. Then, relational/transformative explicitness (through the inclusion of textual/verbal markers or the enforcement of superstructural changes upon the *interlexia*: i.e. showing the reference involved or the superficial difference between the two interlexical versions) usually discloses the provenance of the *interlexia* and/or the writing intentions hold within the transformative procedure (in between the two versions); while implicitness leaves up its occurrence, methods, and changes in content/form or interpretation/values to the reader's hermeneutics (thus, having a greater degree of appropriation due to its subtlety).

### Intertextual processes: *imitation, transduction, transposition*

Being punctual, circumstantial, or extensive relationships, the meaning here granted for *intertextuality* stems from its kind of extensive/prospective transformations.

1) *Intertextual imitation*: Unaltered reproduction of the *interlexia* in its meaning or *deep structure* (Plett, 1991), even though some *surface* traits/elements may be changed (only when they are peripherical/circumstantial: that is, when they do not affect its profound meaning). The purpose under this mechanism is to reproduce the element taken without (profound/representative) changes, having a transferential nature, instead of transformative. This process holds the lowest degree of appropriation, as it does not entail any adaptation or transformation of the *interlexia* towards new semiotic codes, functions, meanings, or values. It fits, then, with any kind of intention according to which the author wants to maintain the former meanings, values, features, or formal schemes, usually through an expansion of the previous diegetic universe or story (within narrative genres: a prequel/sequel, for example), a quote with equivalent signifiers and meaning, the mere reproduction of prior generic/stylistic features, and the same with the rest of *interlexias*. An *imitation* just leaves the *interlexia* untouched in its profound meanings/values, functions, purposes, and main characteristics, thus being (almost) equivalent to the original (namely, *intertextual identity*) and maintaining an axiological subordination of the text under the pre-text.

2) *Intertextual transduction*: An explicit transformation of the *interlexia* through changes in its *surface* that impact in its *deep structure*, but only extensively, not holding an intensive retro-affectation in the structure of their pre-textual counterpart: its purpose is merely prospective and aimed towards the creation of a new version of the element. In this regard, *transductions* generate an *intertextual tmesis*, a patent cut or split between the two versions that differentiates them in surface too: then, its degree of appropriationism is reduced by the explicit contrast between them (being the simplest type of transformation: a transformation "in itself", rather than an appropriation). For example, modifying the linguistic signifiers of a quote to change its meaning, transforming a character's identity, personality, or behavior, the progression of a prior narrative structure, the main traits of a diegetic space, literary genre or style, etc.

3) *Intertextual transposition*: An implicit transformation of the *interlexia*, and also the most semiotically complex of intertextual processes. Here the *interlexia* is not transformed in its surface features, but adapted in its profound meaning by its inclusion in the new textual container: accordingly,

---

[10] Whose most extreme outcome will be plagiarism.

the implicit transformation of its *deep structure* is carried out by the semiotic interrelation with the nearby cotext, and its integration into the new semiotic system of the text and its value scales. *Transpositions* produce an *intertextual syllepsis* in which the element taken can be read/interpreted in two (complementary or contradictory) ways, generating more hermeneutical indeterminacy and a higher degree of appropriation as well, by adapting (without superficial changes) the previous version into a new one, that is apparently the same but also implicitly different. The purpose behind this process is not only extensive, but also sometimes deconstructive (retrospective, to a certain extent), because not changing the *interlexias*' surface can enable a re-interpretation of the pre-textual content, exposed by the sylleptic contrast between its proper/pre-textual and improper/intertextual meaning or values. In this regard, *transpositions* are usually made for two different purposes: deconstructing by contrast the former values of the *interlexia*, or adapting it to new co(n)textual purposes, meaning, or values, thus related to new epochal frames/perspectives.

Consequently, we can infer that this implicit feature makes *transposition* closer, without being so yet, to hypertextual processes[11], whose ends are more retrospective-like, but in an intensive/structural way. Some cases of *transposition* would be taking a quote without changing its nuclear signifiers (again, there may be circumstantial surface changes, as it happened with *imitations*: for example, in punctuation, prepositions, etc.), but enforcing them to change their meaning or connotations by means of their interrelation with the new surrounding cotext; adapting some metrical-rhythmical pattern, thematic element, structure or diegetic space to new purposes, functions, meanings or values, without changing their characteristic superficial features; taking alien characters without changing their personality and surface traits (name, description, behavior, etc.), but projecting a new interpretation of them and their actions by including them in new actantial contexts or under new value scales (as we will see with Stoppard's Hamlet); or using some prior (and conventionally stratified) genre/style for another end or function that differs from the previous one, adapting it without representative superficial changes[12], instead of transforming it into a new layout that characteristically diverges from the former, or imitating it with equivalent purposes/functions (like it would happen with a conventional prequel/sequel). In this sense, we must distinguish between the (implicit) adaptation of *transpositions* and the mere reproduction of authority/scholarly quotations, plagiarism, prequels/sequels, or any other kind of "transferential" literary borrowing: "Plagiarisms are not acknowledged appropriations, and sequels and prequels are not really adaptations either, nor is fan fiction" (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 34).

**Hypertextual processes: *opposition* and *synthesis***

These two mechanisms respond to intensive relationships which share a structural retro-affection onto the hypotext's *interlexias*, but not the same specific procedures, purposes, or outcomes.

1) *Hypertextual opposition*: This mechanism develops both explicit and implicit transformations combined, generating an opposition (a transformation at its maximum degree) through a retrospective process. They are explicit in their oppositional *mechanism* and implicit in their *intention*, operating through a pragmatic-axiological retro-affection onto the *interlexia*, the hypotext as a whole, and even other texts related with the same features (generically/discursively), by means of a process of *generalization* aimed towards value scales or discursive behaviors in general. The oppositive transformation makes the reversal explicit (thus having an "oppositive transduction", internal to it and

_____

[11] We should recall here that, aside from considering *structurality* and *necessity* as the main traits of *hypertextuality*, Genette pointed out that being (more or less) implicit is also a characteristic of it. We maintained *implicitness* apart because it is not a capital trait: is gradual and not determining for its nuclear definition, being a subsidiary feature. For example, it is developed as well in adaptative-intertextual processes (like *transpositions*) and even in quotes, which are the most characteristic counterpart of *hypertextuality* in its main features.

[12] This will be the case, for example, with Stoppard's *generic/stylistic transposition* over Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*.

semiotically counterposed), and the implicit aspect enforces the significant opposition to the hypotext's values and/or discursive traits.

This process is related to parody and similar procedures, but is not only narrowed to them, trying to break with Genette's dichotomy between *serious-satiric regime*. For example, there may be oppositional attitudes of a revisionist kind (not just parodical/satirical), or hypertrophic attitudes that can still add value (retrospectively) to the *interlexia* or the hypotext as a whole, as we will see with the texts to be analyzed. Thereby, restructuring the three main characteristics (*hypertrophy, intentionality, interpretation*) stated by María José García-Rodríguez in *Teoría de la parodia* (2021), we must differentiate between explicit *mechanisms* and implicit *intentions* in a more specific way, respectively dividing them into: a) *Hypertrophy*, *subversion/reversal*, *rewriting/remodeling*. b) *Mockery*, *invective*, *revision/reinterpretation*[13]. According to the explicit mechanism, semiotically opposed in its capital traits, the reader must infer and decode the axiological opposition contained within it: "parody [or rather *opposition*] demands that a semiotic competence and the intentionality of an inferred decoder must be presupposed"[14] (Hutcheon, 1985, p. 54).

This procedure is usually made for deconstructive purposes, and owing to its oppositive nature, its degree of appropriation is not that high as with the *synthesis*, but it is algo remarkable, due to its structurality and its potential to retro-affect in the interpretation and rereading of the hypotext. *Oppositions* entail another kind of appropriation mechanism, focused on a "dis-appropriation" of the *interlexia* onto itself and towards its previous textual container (or even other texts of the same literary genre, ideological discourse, etc.), so that the former conceptual models are neglected or deconstructed. The main purpose here is always retrospective: subversive or revisionist, and axiologically opposed to the axis reference in its ideology/idiosyncrasy, value scales, or discursive patterns. The phenomenon produced by this process is a *hypertextual interference*: a retro-affectation in which the main goal is putting in doubt, attacking, deconstructing, or reinterpreting the hypotext through the opposition executed onto the *interlexia*.

2) *Hypertextual synthesis*: With this process we finally have *hypertextuality* at its maximum potential, thus being a strong/retroactive *hypertextuality*, with a structural dependency which works in both ways through a feedback movement. Here we also have an explicit transformation through an extensive process directed towards the construction of the hypertext, that begets an *extensive difference* (therefore, it has an internal *transduction* too, as a compositional part of this emergent and more complex process), but then turned into a structural transformation with an *intensive meta-difference* which allows the previous difference to differentiate itself, and then evolve by means of a feedback/retroactive movement (intensively). Niklas Luhmann, picking up Bateson's ideas, poses his concept of *double difference* as an informational/semiotic emergence, to which we will add the feedback factor: "an initial difference and a difference that emerges during, and as a consequence of the [feedback-like] process […] a difference that sets in motion further information [at a higher order]" (2006, p. 40). This quality turns the *simple identity* of the hypotext's *interlexia* into a *sophisticated identity*, going through an evolutionary phenomenon according to which the previous features are synthetized in the new ones, as a compositional part of it.

This superimposition, so-called *hypertextual entanglement*, forces the hypotextual element to be overshadowed by the hypertextual one. With this double movement, in its retroactive nature, not only the previous element is overshadowed, but an ontological point of consistency is created as well, forcing the *interlexia* to be reread in the terms of its later sophistication, rather than in their own. The main

---

[13] These mechanisms/intentions might be combined.
[14] Own translation, as the following with this book.

difference with *oppositions* is that *syntheses* have an evolutionary feature in which the focus is not only the retro-affectation in the hypotext, but the emergent re-ontologization of the *interlexia* (which is prospective as well) in a more sophisticated version with the potential to contain and even eclipse the previous one. Because of this trait, their degree of appropriation is the highest of them all. Firstly, for being hypertextual transformations, related to a structural and therefore greater "process of appropriation, of taking possession of another's story, and filtering it, in a sense, through one's own sensibility, interests, and talents" (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 43). And secondly, for overshadowing the previous version and replacing it in its understanding and repercussion. In other words, for being a more encompasser, transcendent, and/or sophisticated version (albeit not necessarily better) that leaves its germ behind by an absolute appropriation of its structural features, whose characteristics must be more in line with the new sociocultural context to be functional as such (and as long as that deed is accepted by the academia, critics, and public, depending on receptive variables as well[15]). Understood as "evolution", the settlement of *hypertextual syntheses* depends so much on spatio-temporal conditionings, determining their "survival (persistence in a culture) or reproduction (number of adaptations)[16] […] like genes, they adapt to those new environments by virtue of mutation—in their "offspring" or their adaptations. And the fittest do more than survive; they flourish" (pp. 55-56).

**The Absurdist Tragicomedies Of Stoppard And Sinisterra: A Sample Of Diatextual Appropriationism**

Applying the concepts proposed (that we could synthesize, in the order previously stated, as imitation/reproduction, transformation, adaptation, opposition/subversion, and evolution), two plays will be analyzed here, both of them inscribed in the genre of tragicomedy, subgenre of absurdist theatre, and the cultural-artistic context of postmodernism: *Guildenstern and Rosencrantz are dead* by Tom Stoppard, and *Ñaque, o de piojos y actores*[17] by José Sanchis Sinisterra. The main reason to do so is the similar use of their hypotexts, holding so much resemblances between them that an influence of Stoppard on Sinisterra's text might be inferred. Both texts have four similarities: a) A generic and stylistic influence of *Waiting for Godot*, their second hypotext. b) The main plot, diegesis, and characters are taken from a classic play, their first hypotext, which is rewritten from another perspective, with new purposes and by other scriptural means: in Stoppard's, that is *Hamlet* (1603); in Sinisterra's, *El viaje entretenido* (1611) by Agustín de Rojas Villandrando. c) The aforementioned rewriting is carried out by a *transfocalization* (Genette, 1982) or *decentralization* (Saint-Gelais, 2011) of the narrative standpoint within the plays, that also entails a *reinterpretation* of them in accordance with their new protagonists, who previously were peripherical characters: "telling the same story from a different point of view, for instance, can create a manifestly different interpretation" (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 33). d) Philosophically, they offer an existentialist perspective which is settled by a metafictional device, delving into dilemmas such as determinism and free will, related to the lack of freedom within the fictional frame (albeit extrapolated to the real world as well). These traits make both plays pretty similar in their structure and hypertextual relationships, holding strong appropriationist mechanisms that enable an axiological turnabout of their main hypotexts.

---

[15] For example: Eva's conceptualization in between the biblical tradition and the feminist-postmodernist approach to this figure, going from a representation of sin to an embodiment of freedom; or Joyce's Leopold Bloom in contrast to Ulysses, as the new urban anti-hero of modernity, in which war and epicness do not belong anymore, but the everyday struggles of ordinary life. The same with certain genres and styles (or another *interlexias*) that evolved from previous conventionalized setups.

[16] These synthetic elements/aspects, for the aforementioned reasons, are usually widely spread, at least when appertaining to a *canonized stratum* (Even-Zohar, 1979).

[17] In English, *Ñaque, or of lices and actors*. A 'ñaque' is a Spanish company of traveling actors, usually comedians, compound only of two members.

Regarding *diatextuality*, the capital aspects to analyze and typify are the transformative procedures that intervene between the two hypertexts and their hypotexts, according to the specific *interlexias* operating in those relationships (multilaterally). Therefore, the first step is to define the relations developed, and then the transformations enforced onto them. The hypotext shared by both plays, *Waiting for Godot*, sets up two aspects, a *generic* and *stylistic interlexia*, which operate in the same way for both texts, relationally, but not so with their (re)writing purposes regarding their main hypotexts (that is, with respect to the transformations involved[18]). Before appraising those profound intentions, we should define the content of the plays and how the authors made them up in relation to their first hypotexts. Stoppard took Shakespeare's story and decentralized the point of view to create a new interpretation of it, adding new paraliptical scenes[19] without changing the main storyline or any part of the original plot: in fact, every scene that has been taken from *Hamlet* is just like its original counterpart, and even every dialogue is quoted from Shakespeare's words. Thereby, the new dialogue of that paraliptical scenes is the lever that activates an implicit change in the interpretation of the actions carried out in the main plot.

Sinisterra, instead, forces the only two characters recollected from *El viaje entretenido* to an undetermined place, which is the theatre itself (metafictionally speaking), far from their previous day-to-day reality and too unearthly for a fiction that would like to maintain its suspension of disbelief, making the metafictional device completely explicit[20], whereas in Stoppard's play is a little bit more implicit, hinted in small actions, dialogue, or material inconsistencies, like the coin flipped by Guildenstern going heads all the time. This change in the structure of the play reverberates in a change of the diegetic space as well (not intertextually transformed, just a new one), that is not a "realist" universe but a metafictional one:

> *Ríos.- Where are we?*
>
> *Solano.- In a theatre…*
>
> *Ríos.- Are you sure?*
>
> *Solano.- … or something similar.*
>
> *Ríos.- Again?*
>
> *Solano.- Again.*
>
> *Ríos-. Is this the stage?*
>
> *Solano.- Yes.*
>
> *Ríos.- Is this the public?*
>
> *Solano.- Yes?*
>
> *Ríos.- That?*
>
> *Solano.- Does it seems strange to you?*
>
> *Ríos.- Different…*
>
> *Solano.- Different?*
>
> *Ríos.- … again*[21] (Sinisterra, [1980] 2008, p. 14).

In that estranging environment, the dialogue taken from the hypotext is not within material reality but in the minds of the characters, who feel forced to perform it for the public watching, condemned to a Sisyphean circularity determined by their fictional sentence, their only existence within

---

[18] For this very reason, is important to differentiate the relational aspect from the transformative one.

[19] Scenes added in between the story, unlike prolepsis or analepsis.

[20] The protagonists even talk to the public several times and ask what year is it, adapting the staging to the contingency of space-time or public responses, and maybe even affecting the development of the play.

[21] Own translation, as the following with this text.

words: just like Stoppard's text, but driven to an even greater point of metafictional explicitness (and maybe sophistication).

### Relations and transformations in *Guildenstern and Rosencrantz are dead*

Firstly, we will study the main *interlexias* coming from *Hamlet*, assessing their importance with respect to their appropriationist procedures (hence, leaving aside the *diegetic* and *quotational interlexias*, which are not so interesting for the subject matter). Those are: *of characters*, *structural*, and *generic*.

1) *Characters' interlexias*: First of all, we have some peripheral characters (at least in Stoppard's play) who just uphold an *imitation*, established by their only appearance through *Hamlet*'s quotes and their lack of importance in the hypertext: those are Claudius, Gertrude, Polonius, Ophelia, and Horatio. The other main characters have more productive transformations:

a) Upon Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, a *transduction* that splits them up from hypotext to hypertext is enforced, making the new characters differ characteristically from the previous ones in personality, language, and idiosyncrasy. The original couple are mainly the same character, only representing the past and now forgotten childhood of Hamlet, and functioning as a mere tool for Claudius to extract information and persuade Hamlet to return to his usual behavior. In contrast, the new ones have a distinct personality: Guildenstern is the intellectual, concerned, reflexive, and pessimistic character; and Rosencrantz the pragmatic, relaxed, upbeat, and adaptable one, although he also has some brilliant actions and thoughts coming from his innocence and playfulness, which sometimes are more profound than Guildenstern's (especially for not seeking meaning or free will, a fact that may even suggest his implicit understanding of their fictional framework). Exactly the same thing happens with Ríos-Solano (in *Ñaque*) and Vladimir-Estragon (in *Waiting for Godot*), the two original figures that influence the others through *interfigural combination/contamination*: "Figures from different literary works can be brought together in a new fictional context, or a constellation of characters (configuration) from one or more pre-texts […] Stoppard superimposes on this pair of figures the Vladimir-Estragon relationship from Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*" (Müller, 1991, pp. 114-115). And just like them, as quixotic couples, they occasionally swap places in that binomial axis. In this regard, "[t]he revaluation of a character consists in investing him or her – by way of pragmatic or psychological transformation – with a more significant and/or more 'attractive' role in the value system of the hypertext than was the case in the hypotext" (Genette, 1997, p. 343).

b) Hamlet: With Hamlet, the process applied is a *transposition*, because he does not have paraliptical scenes or another way in which is displayed, leaving his textual representation to Shakespeare's words: he is just the same character, explicitly, but the *decentralization* of the point of view (seen from the eyes of Guildenstern/Rosencrantz and Stoppard's discourse) makes Hamlet's actions and values implicitly different from the original ones, according to the new surrounding cotext, stylistic/generic system, and value scales. He goes, performing the same superficial/explicit actions, from being a sensitive intellectual seeking justice for his father's murder, to a selfish and histrionic character immersed in aristocratic power struggles, not concerned about the common problems of other people and lower classes (represented by Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, who are used by him or Claudius, and unfairly executed by his own orders): "We witness Rosencrantz and Guildenstern in their 'downtime' or offstage moments from Hamlet; that offstage becomes this play's onstage […] This serves to render the play's tragic events and the prince in particular as slightly absurd" (Sanders, 2016, p. 70).

> *Ros: A compulsion towards philosophical introspection is his chief characteristic, if I may put it like*
> *that. It does not mean that he is mad. It does not mean he isn't […]*
> *Guil: His play offended the King –*

> *Ros: – offended the King –*
>
> *Guil: – who orders his arrest –*
>
> *Ros: –orders his arrest –*
>
> *Guil: – so he escapes to England –*
>
> *Ros: On the boat to which he meets –*
>
> *Guil: Guildenstern and Rosencrantz taking Hamlet –*
>
> *Ros: – who also offended the King –*
>
> *Guil: – and killed Polonius –*
>
> *Ros: – offended the King in a variety of ways –*
>
> *Guil: To England. (Pause.) That seems to be it.*
>
> *(Ros jumps up.)*
>
> *Ros: Incidents! All we get is incidents! Dear God, is it too much to expect a little sustained action?!*
>
> (Stoppard, 1968, pp. 108-190).

Here we can observe the appropriationist might of *intertextual transpositions*, wherein the implicit transformation may result in a sylleptic/splitted comprehension of the same explicit figure, entailing a strong deconstructive and appropriationist device that contrasts with the *transduction* applied upon Guildenstern/Rosencrantz, aimed towards constructing a new extensive/prospective version of the character without taking ownership of the former. In other words, we see a different Guil/Ros, but the same Hamlet, just reinterpreted.

c) The Player: Known in *Hamlet* as the First Player, in Stoppard's play he has a more important role and a personality change through a *transduction* (or even a *synthesis*, depending on the interpretation of this transformative procedure). He has the same interventions in the scenes reproduced, but also new scenes interacting with Guildenstern and Rosencrantz (in fact, he is the only other character to do so), in which he exhibits a distinctive set-up in contrast to the hypotext. In Stoppard's play, he is not just the main player who represents *The Murder of Gonzago* for the king, but is also suggested as the implied author of the play, a correlate of Stoppard himself. This is suggested by his knowledge of the future and the protagonists destiny, which he hints to them in certain occasions:

> *We're tragedians, you see. We follow directions – there is no choice involved […] A slaughterhouse –*
> *eight corpses all told*[22] *[…] Yes, we were dead lucky there. If that's the word I'm after […] Climatic*
> *carnage, by poison and steel! Double deaths by duel! Show! […] (The two remaining Tragedians, the*
> *two 'Spies' dressed as Ros and Guil, are stabbed, as before. And the light is fading over the deaths which*
> *take place right upstage)* (1968, pp. 72, 75, 110, 116).

From the slight change on his nominalization and the new dialogue, we can infer that there is an explicit transformation that modifies his *deep structure*, turning him into a different character who has a more significant role, even a diegetic knowledge of the storyline. This transformation relies on the reader's interpretation, being able to be grasped as a mere *intertextual transduction* (as with Guil-Ros), or as a *hypertextual synthesis*, due to the new character is a more sophisticated version than the former. It depends on hermeneutics: notwithstanding that the new Player is more complex and encompasses a wider range of meanings/functions, this new version might not replace and overshadow the hypotext's *interlexia* (i.e. to be interpreted in terms of the hypertext's one through a *hypertextual entanglement*). The writing purpose, in this case, may be understood as only extensive/prospective: not aiming towards the hypotext at all, only towards the own metafictional device of Stoppard's play (i.e. not being structurally retroactive). The main reason is that The Player is constructed upon the new dialogue within the paraliptical scenes added, but the new traits of his personality may only be applied onto the First Player

---

[22] This sentence is quite relevant: it preestablishes the death of Guil and Ros by adding two corpses to the count that were not involved in the representation (two spies with the same clothes as they have when watching).

if we interpret all of Stoppard's new dialogue as happening in between *Hamlet*'s own scenes (retrospectively, as well as prospectively), and thereby as a transcendent representation of a creator-like demiurge, both in Stoppard's play and in Shakespeare's. Hence, we arrive here at the interpretation problem related to hermeneutics, depending on whether we assess a retrospective/intensive influence upon the former version of the *interlexia*, or just a prospective/extensive (albeit more complex) rewriting of it. This is related to the fact that Stoppard's play is what Pedro Javier Pardo calls a *version*[23], since it operates as a homodiegetic rewriting with a paraliptical expansion of the plot (within the same diegetic universe and story): "transwritings that are inscribed before, during, or after [the story], as a *development or expansion* of the diegesis", but that also "tend towards alterity and transformation […] since [a *version*] is based on the identity of diegetic universes, although introducing a transformative discontinuity into [or rather between] them"[24] (Pardo, 2018, p. 59-60). Accordingly, Stoppard's play maintains a diegetic identity with *Hamlet*, but also an interfigural, structural, axiological, stylistic, and generic discontinuity with it. This is reflected in the next image (p. 59), along with the other categories posed by Pardo:



Figure 1: The Tripartite Model of *Transwriting*

Consequently, for being a homodiegetic *version* of *Hamlet*, thus inscribed within its story/universe (unlike *Ñaque*, which has a new diegetic space/universe: metafictional, emergent, and superimposed upon the prior one: namely, a "heterodiegetic rewriting" that contains the former diegesis within it[25], as its "metadiegesis", according to Genette's terms), we have two potential choices, that in addition determine whether we interpret a *synthesis* or a *transduction* for this *interlexia*: understanding Stoppard's play as diegetically occurring in between *Hamlet*'s plot (and restarting again with each reading, metafictionally, as it happens with its filmic adaptation, in fact[26]), or appraising it as an extensive version that explores what would have happen "offstage", without being inscribed within *Hamlet*'s own storyline (all along with Beckett's generic/stylistic influence, which propels the discontinuity with Shakespeare's work). The first perspective, instead, allows us to consider the First Player as interpreted by The Player's hermeneutical codes (*hypertextual entanglement*), thus potentially reaching the higher

---

[23] Within his theory of *transwriting* (2018), based on a mixture of Genette's (1982), Doležel's (1998), and Saint-Gelais' (2011) theses.
[24] Own translation.
[25] Being a more complex procedure regarding the diegetic relationship between hypotext-hypertext.
[26] This virtual/implicit standpoint tallies with the actual/explicit metafictional mechanism in *Ñaque* (showing the differences between both metafictional devices).

degree of appropriationism (alongside the *structural synthesis* in *Ñaque*), according to which the new interlexical version saturates and subsumes the hypotextual one under itself.

2) *Structural interlexia*: Stoppard implements a *transduction* of the Hamletian structure by deleting, adding, or replacing some scenes, according to what Genette calls a *transfocalization* through a *paraliptical continuation*, in which he asks: "But what can these two characters do when they are not in the *Hamlet* scene? This is the question that generated this work" (1997, p. 383), and then replies: "Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern will amuse themselves, when alone, in the same way that the two of Beckett's heroes would amuse themselves in a similar situation" (p. 383). Even so, the general progression above the former structure is mostly the same, but starting with the journey of the new protagonists to court and, specially, adding new scenes befallen in between the plot. This *structural transduction* is what allows the introduction of new dialogue, and thereby the *decentralization* and transformation of the characters (in other words, its end is mainly functional). Nonetheless, all of these relations and transformative processes take part in a wider movement: the *generic opposition* to *Hamlet*.

3) *Generic interlexia*: Maybe the most important one, because it establishes, along with the influence of Beckett's play, one of the main purposes of the text: deconstructing *Hamlet* and traditional tragedies in general. Therefore, the process accomplished is a *hypertextual opposition*: structural and retrospective in its writing intentions, more than punctual and extensive/prospective (like the identity change of Guildenstern/Rosencrantz, for example). Whereas *transductions* or *transpositions* are designed as processual transformations that generate an extensive/prospective version of the *interlexia* (explicit/reconstructive or implicit/deconstructive, though), this *generic opposition* is thoroughly focused on a critical deconstruction of the hypotext (the primary hypertextual goal of the text) that explicitly transforms its generic features as well: holding a mockery but also a revisionist intention through both hypertrophic and rewriting/remodeling mechanisms (combining the revisionist type with parody and irony). While the former is a mean to the deconstructive/revisionist end (along with the reader's entertainment), the latter wants to call in question the discourse of tragedies as a bloody and selfish power struggle between characters only belonging to aristocratic classes, while undermining the real struggles of common people (dilemma that is depicted by the *fatum* of Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, which is directly determined by Hamlet's selfish actions).

> [D]rawn to the idea of seeing from a marginalized or disenfranchised character's point of view to enable fresh and often politicized readings of the original to emerge [...] An ideological purpose to the act of re-vision is almost inevitable in this context and so we observe that many Shakespearean appropriations are motivated by a political commitment (Sanders, 2016, p. 71).

This *opposition* produces a retrospective *generalization* that expands the aforementioned criticism to all classic tragedies as well, and whose meaning is encrypted in that complex discursive/axiological implicature (according to an explicit transformation of the literary genre that contains an implicit conflict with the former outlook), within which the style and genre absorbed from *Waiting for Godot* take part. Thus, a *hypertextual interference* is stated upon them, making a competent reader/spectator of Stoppard's play unable to see *Hamlet* and other tragedies alike with the same eyes. The aforementioned process is what we called before a "dis-appropriation": a hypertrophic and revisionist deconstruction through an explicit transformation enforced onto the previous generic aspect (by means of the influence inherited from Beckett's absurdist theatre), but holding an implicit criticism too, which provokes an axiological opposition between the hypotextual/hypertextual version of the *generic interlexia* (i.e. between the original "tragic" genre, and the "absurdist" display of the same story).

To fully understand the generic relationship with *Hamlet*, we need to grasp the stylistic and generic influence of *Waiting for Godot*, and how these aspects are adapted and projected towards *Hamlet*.

1) *Stylistic interlexia*: Equivalent to the following, Stoppard develops a stylistic adaptation through a *transposition*. He does not reproduce Beckett's absurdist style just towards the integrity of his own text, what it would be creating an absurdist play focused on itself, through an *stylistic imitation* that would just inscribe the text under this subgenre. Instead, the stylistic influence of Beckett's text is adapted to new functions and objectives: specifically aimed towards *Hamlet* as its main goal. In this regard, the *generic* and *stylistic transpositions* coming from *Waiting for Godot*, both correlated, are the means to execute an end: the *generic opposition* to *Hamlet*, which is the main purpose of the play (along with setting up the metafictional device and putting reality or free will into doubt), hence more deconstructive/retrospective than constructive/prospective in its appropriation mechanisms.

2) *Generic interlexia*: Like the previous one, the generic aspect of Beckett's play is used and adapted for another purpose, the *generic opposition* to *Hamlet*, rather than making a case for his own construction and development. This is an usual trait within postmodernist fiction, as Pavao Pavličić (2006) pointed out with his concept of *postmodern intertextuality* (among others theorists with similar perspectives), understanding postmodern parodies "as a form of ironic rupture with the past" whereby "irony does indeed mark the difference from the past, but the intertextual echoing simultaneously works to affirm—textually and hermeneutically—the [critical/revisionist] connection with the past" (Hutcheon, 2004, p. 166). This mechanism contrasts with the two hypertextual relationships in *Ñaque*, in which the main focus is its own construction, not being a deconstructive reinterpretation of *El viaje entretenido*, but an exposure of the fictional condition of its characters. Although the mechanism enforced onto these *interlexias* is not as clear to be understood, specially for being an implicit transformation applied upon formal/structural aspects (i.e. for not having a specific figure/element or textual fragment adapted without explicit modifications, unlike other kind of *transpositions*), these processes are *transpositions* because they are not directed towards the same ends, means, or functions, but implicitly adapted to another purpose, redirected to new semiotic/axiological means. Thus, there is also a *syllepsis* in the treatment of these *interlexias*, within which the generic/stylistic influence of *Waiting for Godot* can be understood in relation to the own construction of the play within absurdist theatre (with dilemmas like existentialism, metafiction, and absurdism), but also according to the deconstructive purpose aimed towards *Hamlet* (and all classic tragedies).

### Relations and transformations in *Ñaque, o de piojos y actores*

The main *interlexias* to be studied here are the same ones stated for Stoppard's play, but not its treatment or transformative procedures.

1) *Characters' interlexias*: What happens with the protagonists, Ríos and Solano (the other characters from the hypotext are just removed), is just the same as with Guildenstern and Rosencrantz: they are explicitly transformed by means of the new absurdist dialogue and characterization; their personalities change through a *transduction*, according to Sinisterra's new words (occupying exactly the same functional position as Guil and Ros). The only difference is that the new scenes in Sinisterra's play are the main plot (and not paraliptical scenes added in between the hypotext's storyline), wherein the scenes performed by the characters are only a reminiscence of their fictional past, partially forgotten every time the curtain is opened again: "Solano.- We have to act! Ríos.- Act? Solano.- Yes, act… Ríos.- Do you call what we do acting? […] Ríos.- Chanting… Solano.- No. Ríos.- Telling… Solano.- No… Mimicking? Ríos.- No… Remembering?" (2008, p. 17). Thereby, the hypotext dialogue cannot be totally represented because they are bewildered by their unnatural and alienated context: separated from their previous fictional past, lost and bounded by their metafictional determination. In contrast to Stoppard's play, this particularity will be determinant in the transformative differences with respect to the *generic*, *stylistic*, and (Especially) *structural interlexia* of them both. Through this explicit transformation in the

personality of the main characters (from playful comedians to tormented prisoners in a Sisyphean existence), the lack of free will and impossibility to perform their role (like owing a debt, never fully paid, to the public watching) are the main purposes of the play, driven towards the exposure of the metafictional device and its philosophical implications.

> SOLANO.- *We walked in this joyful life for more than four weeks, eating a little bit, walking so much, with the herd of the farce on the shoulder, without knowing any bed in all of this time…*[27] *(suddenly interrupts itself. Stays quiet, totally unexpressive. With a fearful voice he whispers) Ríos... (Not getting response, shouts aghast) ¡¡Ríos!!*
>
> RÍOS.- *(Startled) What?... What happens? (SOLANO runs his hand across his forehead, looking panicked) ¡Solano!...¡Solano!*
>
> SOLANO.- *A blank…a gap…*
>
> RÍOS.- *A gap? Where?*
>
> SOLANO.- *(Touches his forehead) Here… Nothing here… I don't remember… anything*[28] (Sinisterra, 2008, p. 46).

2) *Structural interlexia*: The transformative nature of this *interlexia* is radically different from the one within Stoppard's play: it is also the only clear *hypertextual synthesis* studied here and the major feature leading to the self-centered condition of *Ñaque*, contrasting with the outer-directed traits of Stoppard's play regarding *Hamlet*. The structure of *El viaje entretenido* is taken as a referential shadow-figure scattered in the fragmentary reminiscences performed by the protagonists (in relation to their hypotextual past). Instead, the structure of *Ñaque* is circular, metafictional, and overlapped above the former as an encompasser rewriting of it.

Whereas in Stoppard's play we have a *structural transduction*, *Ñaque* has also a *transduction* applied onto the structure taken from *El viaje entretenido*, settled by its superficial fragmentation and the addition of new dialogue interspersed in between their rote representation of the hypotextual scenes (almost) performed. But that *transduction* is contained in a more complex and emergent procedure, a *hypertextual synthesis*, because the new circular-metafictional structure contains the previous one: suspended and fragmented within it, restarted each time a performance is carried out in accordance to *staging recursivity* (Arroita, 2023).

Besides the *extensive difference* between both structures, we also have an *intensive meta-difference* which differentiates them at a higher order: according to the metafictional device (a conscious determination applied onto the ontological condition of its diegetic universe), Villandrando's structure is contained within Sinisterra's one, exposing its fictionality and leading to a more complex and transcendent version (namely, a *sophisticated identity*). This new structure is developed to expose the fictional nature of the hypotext's storyline and diegetic universe (and its own, meta-fictionally). Therefore, it is an evolutionary sophistication that replaces and contains the previous dramatic structure within it, through a *hypertextual entanglement* that makes impossible to reread Villandrando's text *a posteriori* (at least the parts in which Ríos/Solano appear) without breaking, in some way, its suspension of disbelief as a fiction. For this very reason, the former structural disposition is overlapped by the new one, turning it into a compositional part of this encompasser reformulation. This is the higher degree of appropriationism seen so far, owing to the fact that Sinisterra is not just implicitly adapting the *interlexia* for another purposes/means, nor transforming it explicitly and neither making a deconstructive/critical opposition, but diluting the previous structure into his own, and therefore overshadowing it in his

---

[27] Until this word, the dialogue is taken from *El viaje entretenido* (just as Stoppard does with *Hamlet*), like a remembrance of what they need to perform in front of the public watching.

[28] Own translation.

favor. It is an appropriation at its maximum degree, where the previous element is even overruled, integrated, and completely ancillary to the new.

3) *Generic interlexia*: Unlike the structure, here we have just a *transduction*, due to there is no opposition regarding the main hypotext, neither a sophistication, implicit transformation, or mere reproduction of its genre. Sinisterra converts the generic aspect inherited from *El viaje entrenido* into a new one, through an explicit transformation sustained by the generic relationship with *Waiting for Godot*, which provides the new traits added to completely change its literary genre: from a miscellaneous travel novel with a pleasant or comical tone, to a metafictional and existentialist tragicomedy belonging to the theatre of the absurd. This would be what Genette calls a *transgeneric hypertext* (1997, p. 18) or *transgeneric practice* (p. 395), and Julie Sanders a *generic shift* (2016, p. 24).

Lastly, the *interlexias* coming from *Waiting for Godot* are, yet drastically important to its construction, not so complex as with Stoppard's play (at least regarding their transformative procedures), due to its fertile relation with *Hamlet*.

1) *Generic interlexia*: Sinisterra only enforces an *imitation* of Beckett's version of absurdist theatre, inscribing his text under this subgenre despite being a rewriting of *El viaje entretenido*. There is no adaptation or differential purpose applied onto the generic reproduction itself, or a deconstructive-driven goal through the rewriting mechanism towards its main hypotext. Sinisterra only uses the generic influence of Beckett's play (and also of Stoppard's, probably) for the integrity of his own and its metafictional/existentialist dilemmas, in a more prospective and self-referential way that only exposes the fictional nature of the hypotext.

2) *Stylistic interlexia*: The stylistic influence of popular-comedian Spanish style and Villandrando's theoretical deliberations about Spanish theatrical atmosphere at the time, catalyzed through the protagonists' voices, are scattered in the text and mixed up with Sinisterra's style, but also with Beckett's style and even Stoppard's, whose influence is also notable. All of them are plain *imitations* (not changed, nor adapted to another purpose than the reader's immersion in the theatrical context of the epoch, or the metafictional/existentialist condition of the characters), partially diluted and scattered in Sinisterra's dialogue. These stylistic traces can be noticed in certain (although relative/disseminated) superficial traits. From Villandrando, in the low expressions, jokes, and theoretical appreciations of 16-17th century theatre. From Beckett, in the quick-absurdist dialogue with no clear end, not reaching any communicative rule or purpose at all (but with a subtle profound meaning throughout it). And from Stoppard (maybe) in the short, quick and faltering exchanges between the characters (absurdist and with profound existential meanings as well), and the irony contained within the scientific/philosophical insights (pretty similar to Beckett's style, but with some characteristic traits of his own). This mixture is very productive, because Sinisterra blends all of these styles into his own, making an intriguing hybrid which has its reflection in the play's unique style, though with a lot of traces of the prior ones[29].

**CONCLUSION**

As seen in the analysis, the relations and transformations between texts can function in different ways, and appropriation mechanisms involve different processes to be carried out too, generating different degrees, results, and interpretations. In this regard, the theoretical framework of *intertextuality* and *hypertextuality* (maybe restructured from new perspectives to re-understand their modes of operation, as *diatextuality* wants to do) is quite useful for appraising and breaking down this kind of inter-textual phenomena. Moreover, to comprehend how new texts work with previous elements, and

---

[29] We could call this phenomenon, referencing Müller, an "inter-stylistic combination/contamination", instead of an "inter-figural" one.

to analyze in what ways they can transform them or even appropriate them according to their own ends and means. *Diatextuality* tries to typify these mechanisms to study their textual outcomes, understanding them (potentially) as reticular interrelations with different pre-textual aspects/elements involved and different transformative procedures that allow the authors to (re)construct previous texts (extensively/prospectively), but also to retro-affect in their comprehension (intensively/retrospectively) and even evolve them towards new and unexpected ontological states, values, or ideas. *Guildenstern and Rosencrantz Are Dead* and *Ñaque, o de piojos y actores* are two representative examples of how these mechanisms may work in relation to the aspects mentioned above: hypertexts made upon previous textual elements that seek to display a new understanding of them through reticular and complex appropriationist devices, being a prime example of the relational, processual, and evolutionary machinery of literature in itself.

## Article Information

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barthes, R. (1981). Theory of the Text. Robert Young (Ed.), in *Untying The Text* (pp. 31-47). London: Routledge.

Barthes, R. (2004). *S/Z*. Madrid: Siglo XXI Editores.

Camarero, J. (2008). *Intertextualidad. Redes de textos y literaturas transversales en dinámica intercultural*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

García-Rodríguez, M. J. (2021). *Teoría de la parodia*. Madrid: Visor.

Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsestes*. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Hutcheon, L. (1985). *Uma teoria da parodia. Ensinamentos das formas de arte do século XX*. Lisboa: Edições 70.

Hutcheon, L. (2004). *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York & London: Routledge.

Hutcheon, L. (2013). *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge.

Luhmann, N. (2006). System as Difference. *Organization*, *13*(1), pp. 37-57.

Müller, W. (1991). Interfigurality. A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures. Heinrich Plett (Ed.), in *Intertextuality* (pp. 101-121). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Pardo, P. J. (2018). De la transescritura a la transmedialidad: poética de la ficción transmedial. Antonio J. Gil González & Pedro Javier Pardo (Eds.), in *Adaptación 2.0. Estudios comparados sobre intermedialidad* (pp. 41-92). Binges: Éditions Orbis Tertius.

Saint-Gelais, R. (2001). Adaptation et transfictionnalité. A. Mercier y E. Pelletier (Eds.), in *L'adaptation dans tous ses états* (pp. 243-258). Quebec: Nota Bene.

Samoyault, T. (2008). *A intertextualidade*. São Paulo: Aderaldo&Rothschild Editores.

Sanchis Sinisterra, J. (2008). *Ñaque, o de piojos y actores*. Valencia: Ñaque Editora.

Sanders, J. (2016). *Adaptation and Appropriation*. New York: Routledge.

Stoppard, T. (1968). *Guildenstern and Rosencrantz are dead*. New York: Groove Press.

Weisstein, U. (1975). *Introducción a la literatura comparada*. Barcelona: Planeta.