

MARTINA MECCO

Sapienza University of Rome, Department of European American and Intercultural Studies
Univerzita Karlova of Prague, Faculty of Arts

Language and Stylistic Aspects of Karel Čapek's Journalistic Writing: An Analysis of *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* through the Method of Textual Linguistics

Abstract

The present contribution focuses on Karel Čapek's *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem* to analyse its intrinsic structure by applying František Daneš' model of thematic progressions (TP), ie. the choice and ordering of utterance themes, their mutual concatenation and hierarchy, as well as their relation to the hyperthemes of the superior text unit (such as paragraph, chapter, etc.), to the whole text, and to the situation. Thematic progression might be viewed as the skeleton of the plot. This contribution aims to identify the thematic progression patterns (simple linear, constant, with derived themes), in particular in the third part, focused on Masaryk's thinking. Thanks to the identification of the thematic progressions, it is possible to ascertain the communicative intention of the author and to point out some formal aspects. Differently from the first two parts, in which the style is mainly narrative, in the third one the intention of Čapek is to reproduce the style of the president's speeches. Putting in writing Masaryk's thoughts, Čapek preserves the oral dimension and the stylistic originality of the speaker. Moreover, Masaryk himself contributed to the editing of the *Hovory*.

Keywords: Czechoslovakia, Karel Čapek, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*, textual linguistics, biography

1. Introduction

This article is focused on Karel Čapek's *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem* ("Talks with T. G. Masaryk"), an interesting text from a structural and a communicative point of view. The aim is to develop an analysis of the work based on the methodology elaborated in text linguistics, an approach that searches to identify the intrinsic structure of different kinds of texts (not only literary but also scientific ones). The case of the *Hovory* is particularly interesting because in this work, based on conversations that took place between

the author and Masaryk, the attempt to eliminate that gap between the oral and the written dimension emerges as the chief tendency. The article develops an idea already partially exposed by František Daneš. In his study dedicated to the *Hovory* he concentrates the analysis on its *textuality* (Daneš 1994b), ie. the intrinsic structure. Focusing especially on the third section of the work, examples will be given, in which the analysis of the thematic progressions reveals Čapek's primary communicative intention. First, a definition of the model of thematic progressions developed by Daneš will be explained using examples. Thereafter, Čapek's work *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* will be presented, focusing on what he wrote in the fourth part, in which it is possible to comprehend the genesis of the text and the author's communicative intention. At the end, some clue examples of analysis, also from Daneš' article, will be shown. The final part will be significant to put in evidence how Čapek's intentions are elaborated while writing the text.

2. Methodology

František Daneš (1919-2015) was a scholar of Czech Structuralism, who dealt with syntax, sociolinguistics, and text linguistics. He was the first one who theorized the model of thematic progressions (TP) (Daneš 1974, Daneš 1994b), and employed this approach to analyse the thematic-referential dimension of texts. His most important studies were published on *Slovo a slovesnost*, the periodical of Prague Linguistic School, while a summary consideration of this model can be found in *Věta a text (Sentence and text)*, published in 1985. The main starting point of reference of his theories are the assumptions elaborated by Vilém Mathesius (Mathesius 1947) in his work *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt (Czech language and general linguistics)*. Mathesius individuated two fundamental elements, *východisko* and *jádro*, which correspond to the concepts of *theme* and *rheme*. Also considering Mathesius' concept of *aktuální členění* (the division of the sentence), Daneš noticed the possibility to identify different distributions of thematic progressions (*tématické posloupnosti*) and rhematic ones (*rematické posloupnosti*), which constitute the intrinsic textual structure. The combination of these progressions organizes the thematic-referential level of a text and the links between them allow it to move forward. Daneš had a deep interest in determining the possible combinations of these two elements (Daneš 1968) and identified five types of TP. Knowing the huge number of possible combinations involving theme and rheme, he considered these to be the most frequent ones. Concerning the analysis led in this article, the main interesting are the following ones:

- (1) Simple linear TP, in which the *theme* of the following (T2) sentence corresponds to the *rheme* of the previous one (R1):
Karel Čapek (T1) wrote *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* (R1). It (T2=R1) was included in Masaryk's recollecting works.
- (2) TP with constant T, in which the *theme* of the following sentence is the same of the previous one:
Karel Čapek (T1) wrote *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* (R1). He (T1) was one of the most important writers of his era and (T1) published many books
- (3) TP with derived T, in which different themes derive from an *hypertheme*. This is the case, for example, of a definition or an argumentation about a precise theme. Daneš explains (Daneš 1968) this TP through an example, where "diphtheria" is the main theme (T):

Diphtheria (T) is an infectious disease. It is caused by corynebacterium diphtheriae. It is spread by droplet infection by direct contact with the patient, but more often by a carrier, or indirectly by objects stained with mucus. The incubation period is 2 to 5 days ...

According to Daneš, the third type can also be confused with second one, and sometimes it is even difficult to properly distinguish them. Daneš tries to individuate some differences. In TP with derived themes the *hypertheme* is not expressed in individual statements, while in TP with constant T it is. Moreover, in TP with constant T every statement has his own topic, while in the third one it always corresponds to the *hypertheme*. Finishing this theoretical introduction it urges to observe that the model elaborated by Daneš is just theoretical. In fact, while approaching to an analysis using these linguistic concepts, it is immediately clear that it is not possible to always individuate a “pure” prototypical situation in which a type of TP is not contaminated by another one.

3. Silence in Karel Čapek's *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*

Karel Čapek (1890–1936) was one of the most eclectic and multifaceted intellectuals in the first half of XXth century. Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937) was the first president of Czechoslovakia after World War I (1918–1935). He was among the most prominent Czech personalities in many fields, like in philosophy or in literary criticism. Considering Čapek's literary production, it is possible to observe the enormous amount of genres he employed. As stated by the structuralist Jan Mukařovský in his article *Vývoj Čapkovi prózy (Development of Čapek's prose)*, approaching the production of an author like Čapek implies the necessity to consider a huge variety of subgenres (Mukařovský 1941: 427). In this deep stratification lies the complexity not only of the elaboration of his poetics but also, and above all, of his style. Alongside the literary production, it is essential to recall the importance of his activity in journalism. In fact, his collaboration with various periodicals appears wide and due to his necessity to be constantly informed about the political and social issues of the period. In fact, his literary works always present an observance on reality, even the fantastic element plays a metaphorical function aimed at constructing a critical and social perspective. The author himself admits the importance of journalism in an interview led by Vilém Závada and published on *Rozpravy Aventina* in 1931. To Závada's questions “How do you consider your journalistic profession?” he answers as follows: “I think I'm a journalist. I don't do it as something secondary, I consider it serious as literature”. His journalistic production must therefore not be seen as an appendage of the literary one, but the two appear deeply dependent from each other. This forward is essential to introduce *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem* since it can be collocated in the middle between these two genres. Moreover, this work represents a *unicum* in the author's production. There are no other cases in which he abandons (almost) completely the style elaborated before, well described by the Russian scholar Oleg Malevič (Malevič 1968)¹.

As already mentioned, *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem* is interesting in terms of genre and style. The form in which it is written is hybrid. An attempt to determine its nature was made by Jiří Opelík, one of

1 Oleg Malevič's studies regarding Čapek's production are, together with the ones realized by Jiří Opelík, the basis for a critical approach to the author. For a focus on the style in Čapek's early production see the article *Vývoj stylu raných próz Karla Čapka (Evolution of the style in Karel Čapek's early prose)*, translated to Czech in 1971 and published on the critical periodic *Česká literatura*.

the most important scholars of the author. Before showing Opelík's considerations some more general information are required. The work was written by Čapek between 1928 and 1935. The structure is clearly divided into four sections. The first two parts (*Youth and Life and work*) are dedicated to Masaryk's life. The third (*Thinking and life*) retraces his philosophical and political thinking, while in the fourth (*Silence with T. G. Masaryk*) the author reflects on the genesis and the writing of the work. Moreover, the first three parts are written in first-person, which embodies Masaryk, while the third-person of the fourth one can be explained by Čapek's intention to show his own point of view and to reflect on the writing process with an objective attitude. It is interesting to observe how the *Hovory* can be defined. This is anything but a simple definition, as the traditional concept of biography does not correspond to the true nature of the work. Zdeněk Nejedlý said that this can be considered the most well written "autobiography" of Masaryk (Nejedlý 1930: 39). That is significant, because the volume has also been included in Masaryk's completed writings and not only in Čapek's ones². As will be shown after, the author reproduced the speeches of Masaryk, who also intensely contributed to the final editing. In the fourth part Čapek admits that he directly asked Masaryk for a review before publication (Čapek 1990: 350). Then he also jokes when he recalls himself asking the president if he wanted to be paid for his help: "We should at least split them down the middle. Fifty fifty" (Čapek 1990: 351).

As noticed, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* is divided in four parts, in which different structures occur. The first two, dedicated to Masaryk's life, are mostly written with a narrative style and follow a chronological perspective. Recollecting memories about the president's early life, Čapek also inserts digressions related to them. For example, when the narrator talks about his childhood, the flow of memory is interrupted by some considerations about the Czech children's education. By recalling those experiences, he takes the opportunity to discuss about the problem of education, connected with the creation of democracy, he admits: "The development of democracy is closely tied to the development of education" (Čapek 1990: 16). Furthermore, private events are always contextualized within the historical framework in which they take place. The third part clearly differs from the first two for several reasons. Firstly, it is no longer a chronological recollection of events but, rather, an elaboration of Masaryk's philosophical and political thinking sorted out by themes. Secondly, a difference occurs in the expressive style as a result. Although the first-person singular is still used, the structural organization of the sentences is profoundly different. This stylistic choice corresponds to the necessity of create a meditative dimension. Analysing the *Hovory*, Opelík points out an interesting fact. The elaboration of the philosophical thinking of Masaryk in this third part of the *Hovory* "brought Karel Čapek back to the question of pure philosophy" (Opelík 2016: 25). Philosophical questions, moreover, are by no means irrelevant in the author's production: reflections of an existential nature and, as mentioned at the beginning, ethical often occur. To understand the intrinsic structure of this third part and the communicative intentions of the author, it is particularly useful to observe what is written in the fourth.

Silence with T. G. Masaryk is characterized, differently from the first three parts, by an essayistic style. In this section Čapek explains the genesis of the *Hovory*. First, the author and the subject of this "biography" shared a deep friendship. In fact, Čapek had already met Masaryk for the first time in 1922. Despite this, the idea of writing the *Hovory* had not been premeditated in advance. Indeed, Čapek

2 As for the diffusion of the work, Miloš Pohorský in his afterword traces the editorial history and the (bad) fortune of *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* in the communist era. He points out that this was one of Čapek's most famous and most printed books before Communism (Pohorský 1990: 557).

already had several occasions to hear Masaryk's speeches both in private and in public. During his private meetings with the president, the author had never transcribed or recorded anything. On the contrary, the idea of creating this work came from a decision taken by mutual agreement in a rather casual situation. In a bucolic setting, Topolčany's residence, Čapek proposed to write this biography, a project that was immediately defined by Masaryk himself in terms of "těžký úkol", a difficult task (Čapek 1990: 349). Čapek affirms he had a lot of material, that he put together in two different ways. First, he elaborated his own memories of the conversations he conducted with the president. The author discovers himself able to recall many elements thanks to the fact that his interlocutor was often inclined to talk about his life and to share his thinking. Second, Masaryk himself was actively involved. Čapek decided to question, this time with the clear aim of writing this "biography", the president about facts and events unknown or partially unclear to him. After explaining how the *Hovory* originated, the author illustrates some characteristics of Masaryk's speeches. Čapek clearly knew that to each intellectual or writer corresponds a personal style, some expressive modalities. Note what he said in the article *O dnešním jazyce* (*Today's language*), published in 1932 on the periodical *Lidové noviny*:

Do jisté míry každý člověk má svůj vlastní idiom; každá rodina má svou hantýrku, každá skupina, každý stav svůj slovník, svou kadenci, své vyjadřovací zvláštnosti; a zejména každý básník a spisovatel má svůj vlastní jazyk.³

The author briefly reflects on Masaryk's oratory qualities, writing a proper analysis of his style. Two features are taken into consideration by Čapek: the alternation of sound and silence and, subsequently, the order of the words, *ie.* the way of organizing the individual parts of the sentences. As regards the dimension of silence, a fundamental function is attributed to it. According to the author in Masaryk's speeches the moments of *silence* play a fundamental role. Silence embodies, not only metaphorically, the moment of meditation, of reflection. Moments of this kind are given the same importance attributed to the elaboration of the speeches. Words and their absence cannot exist one without the other. When the author begins writing the *Hovory*, he immediately realizes that a drawback of the written dimension compared to the oral one consists in the impossibility of transposing silence as a counterpoint to speech. This aspect implies the absence of a continue flow in the speech. Differently, it is possible to notice the tendency of use brief and delimited sentences, connected through the thematic tissue. Quoting Čapek: "Bylo mnoho mlčeno, aby vznikly Hovory; jen jejich pisatel⁴ ví, jak jsou neúplné; nejvíc jim chybí ten kontrast mlčení."⁵ (Čapek 1990: 352) The second point of Čapek's reflection is still related to the way in which Masaryk organizes his speeches. As he says "u Masaryka je citelné rozpojení mezi myšlením a slovním projevem"⁶ (Čapek 1990: 353). This proximity between the elaboration of thoughts and the way they are expressed produces precise communicative tendencies, individuated by him as follows:

3 "It is certain that every person has his own idiom; every family has his jargon, every group, every state his vocabulary, his cadence, his expressive peculiarities; and especially every poet and writer have their own language" (unless otherwise indicated, translations are those of the author).

4 Regarding the term *pisatel* (writer) a consideration is needed. In this fourth part the author never uses direct references as "Čapek" or "Masaryk" and never expresses himself in the first person. He prefers to take some distance from the situation and use the terms *pisatel* and *Prezident*.

5 "There was much silence in the creation of the *Hovory*; only their writer knows how incomplete they are: furthermore, the counterpoint of silence is lacking."

6 "In Masaryk there is a considerable connection between thinking and verbal expression."

Řekl bych, jeho veškerá řeč má dvě základní polohy: jednak jeho jistoty, nepochybné principy, pravdy, na kterých se ustálil; ty vyjadřuje rozhodně, v brachylogické zkratce, neobyčejně zhuštěně, dává důraz sevřenou pěstí nebo energickým škrtem vztyčeného prstu. Druhá poloha je meditace, hledání, ustavičná cesta za poznáním, ustavičná kritika i autokritika. A já nevím, co ho z toho dvojího charakterizuje hlouběji: zda ta jasná, pevná, spolehlivá jistota člověka vědoucího a věřícího, nebo to nekonečné hledání a zkoušení pravdy.”⁷ (Čapek 1990: 356)

To these two tendencies, that of expressing certain concepts with confidence and that of meditating on these, other characteristics are added. In particular, the meditative passages relate to the tendency to accumulate concepts directly depending on what the discourse focuses on. Čapek uses the expression “tápavost ve slovním výraze”⁸ (Čapek 1990: 354) to describe this feature in Masaryk’s speeches. Concluding this list of characteristics, there is also the tendency to take up single concepts, almost hesitating while speaking. This hesitation is linked to that function led by the dimension of silence. In other words, the elaboration of thoughts must be always accompanied by moments of meditation, because Čapek’s aim is to reach the truth. To these considerations another important feature is added, namely the author’s (*pisatel*) constant insistence on the necessity for truth. The fourth section opens with the expression “nechtěl jsem lhát...”⁹ (Čapek 1990: 347). This necessity corresponds to the will of reporting facts and thoughts accurately. Furthermore, the dimension of truth is one of the key concepts of the biographical genre. However, this dimension of truth also affects the style and implies other two considerations. First, the fact that by reproducing Masaryk’s style (hence why the author insists on the importance of silence and the way in which Masaryk organizes his sentences) Čapek irremediably contaminates his own. In regard to this, it is interesting to observe how it was affected by external influences. Čapek’s own style was clearly not unfamiliar with external influences. Numerous studies have been devoted to this question, including Malevič’s and Opelík’s ones. In *Zdroje jazyka Karla Čapka (Sources of Karel Čapek’s style)* Opelík reflects on the sources of the author’s style and on the stimuli by which it was influenced. As clearly pointed out in this article, the author was aware of these influences (Opelík 2008: 233). This aspect confirms the possibility that in the *Hovory* there is a properly conscious contamination of Masaryk’s style. Secondly, this necessity of fidelity to the oral dimension represents one of the fundamental features of this work: the author’s attempt to delete the distance between the *flatus vocis* and the words printed on paper. Reducing the distance between the two communicative dimensions is anything but simple and obvious. Čapek’s aim is then to write a “biography” (*životopis*) of Masaryk, faithfully reproducing not only the contents concerning his life and his thinking, but also respecting the structure of his speech. In other words, the communicative intention is identified with the goal of being able to reproduce Masaryk’s oratory style. The main question then becomes how Čapek’s communicative aim concretely influenced the writing of the *Hovory*. To find an answer a useful strategy consists in applying Daneš’ TP model.

7 “I would say, all his speech has two basic positions: first, his certainties, the undoubted principles, the truths on which he settled; he expresses them decisively, in brachylogical summary, extraordinarily condensed, emphasizing with a clenched fist or an energetic cut of his erect finger. The second position is meditation, search, the constant path to knowledge, constant criticism, and self-criticism. And I do not know which of the two characterize him more deeply: whether the clear, firm, reliable security of a man who knows and believes, or the endless search and testing of the truth.”

8 “The grouping in words’ expression.”

9 “I didn’t want to lie...”

4. Examples of analysis

In his study *O koherenci textu Hovorů s T.G. Masarykem* (*Textual coherence in Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*) Daneš demonstrates how deeply Čapek knew the strategies employed by Masaryk in his speeches (Daneš 1994: 11). Moreover, he focuses on three main aspects. First, the structure of the text is not regulated by a logical-argumentative setting, but by a thematic-referential one. Second, he notices that these TP occur not only in the argumentative parts, but sometimes also in narrative ones (mostly from the first two parts). The third section of his analysis is dedicated to the use of parts of speech and specific expressions, such as “a vidíte” (and you see). What also emerges from Daneš’ analysis is the evidence that the sentences are not normally connected explicitly, and the thematic-referential dimension prevails. The most recurring TP are predominantly the three described at the beginning of the article, respectively the one with constant T, the one with linear T and, to a lesser degree the one with derived T. Among the examples reported by the scholar, two are particularly interesting:

- (1) “Demokracie (T1) není jen formou státní, (T1) není jen tím, co je napsáno v ústavách; demokracie (T1) je názor na život, (T1) spočívá na důvěře (R1) v lidi, v lidskost a v lidství, a není důvěry (T2=R1) bez lásky (R2), není lásky (T3=R2) bez důvěry. Řekl jsem jednou, že demokracie (T1) je diskuse (R3). Ale pravá diskuse (T4=R3) je možná jen tam, kde si lidé navzájem důvěřují a poctivě hledají pravdu. Demokracie (T1), to je hovor mezi rovnými, přemýšlení svobodných občanů před celou veřejností [...].”¹⁰ (Čapek 1990: 328)
- (2) “Pokud běží o marxismus: marxismus (T1) je hospodářská teorie (R1) a filozofie (R2), zejména filozofie dějin. Hospodářská teorie (T2=R1) je věc vědeckého zkoumání, revize a zlepšování, tak jako se děje v každé vědě; a také ta filozofie (T3=R2), jako každá jiná filozofie (T3), musí být podrobena kritice a volné úvaze (R3). Proto vznikl revizionismus (R4) a vzniká teď opět. Každá revize (T5=R4) víry a programu bolí (R5); ale bez té bolesti (T6=R5) by nebylo vývoje (R6). Já nemám v kapse hotovou sociální doktrínu; řekl bych to tak – už jsem to kdysi tak pověděl: vždycky jsem pro dělníky a lidi pracující vůbec, často pro socialismus a zřídka pro marxismus (T1).”¹¹ (Čapek 1990: 125)

According to what has been stated, these examples clearly reveal the two main tendencies explained by Čapek and show how well he knew Masaryk’s style and reproduced it. In Example (1) there is a TP with a constant theme that reproduces Masaryk’s tendency to insist on a certain concept with a hesitant rhythm. This TP is a pattern also identifiable in many other paragraphs, see: Example (3):

10 “Democracy is not a form of state, it is not only what it is written in the constitutions; democracy is an opinion about life, it consists in trusting people, in humanity among the humans, there is no trust without love, and no love without trust. Once I said that democracy is discussion. But a true discussion is possible only there, where people trust each other and conscientiously search the truth. Democracy is a talk between equals, the thinking of free citizens in front of the whole public [...].”

11 “As for Marxism, it is an economic theory and philosophy, a philosophy of history in particular. Economic theory, like every science, is a matter for investigation, revision, and improvement, and Marxism, like any philosophy, must be open to criticism and free deliberation. That is why revisionism arose and will continue to do so. Every revision of a creed or program is painful, but without the pain there can be no progress. I have no ready-made social doctrine in my pocket. As I have said elsewhere, I am always for the workman and working people in general, often for socialism, and rarely for Marxism.”

- (3) “Náboženství (T1), jak je konkrétně vidíme, je zpravidla kolektivní, lidové, národní; (T1) je kodifikováno v neosobních dogmatech a organizuje se v církve; (T1) mění se, (T1) uchovává v sobě přežitky z minulosti, často až z dob primitivních, (T1) vyvíjí a (T1) zdokonaluje se s rozvojem myšlení a kultury. Náboženství (T1) je útvar nesmírně složitý, rozrostlý mnoha směry; proto je třeba pozorné analýzy jeho prvků, složek, projevů nebo jak bych to řekl. [...] Jak by náboženství (T1) nebylo složité!”¹² (Čapek 1990: 255)

Example (2) shows the other tendency, namely the one to reflect on a concept employing related ones, which allow to deeper understand its meaning. In agreement with that principle of the search for truth, two types of thought elaboration typical of Masaryk are shown here. Moreover, the two structures can also coexist in the same paragraph. This coexistence becomes even more evident in another passage:

- (4) “Každá organizace (T1), zejména tak ohromná jako církev (T1a), je ipso facto skutečnost politická (R1). Církev (T1a) se vyvinula v pohanském státě (R2), proti němu (R3) a částečně i s ním (R4); jako organizovaná společnost [implied subject = (T1a)] musela nutně upravit svůj poměr k státu (R5), který (T1b=R5) byl tehdy jedinou všeobšáhrou společenskou organizací. [...] Církev (T1a) se nepokoušela pohanský stát odstranit (R6) nebo přetvořit politicky (R7), nýbrž obrátit na křesťanství (R8); když se pokřesťanil [implied subject = (T1b=R8)] a církev zestátnil (R9), utvořila se křesťanská teokracie (R10). Stát (T1b) našel v církvi svůj mravní a náboženský základ (R10); monarchové – notabene absolutističtí (T2 – associated with T1b) – byli “z boží milosti”. (R11) [...] Poměr církve (T1a) a státu (T1b) se ustálil povlovně. [...] Církev (T1a) sama sebou je svou podstatou institucí společenskou (R12); vedle učení a kultu (R13) je strážkyní (R14) a vůdkyní mravnosti a celé správy životní (R15).”¹³ (Čapek 1990: 278–279)

In Example (4) there is a hypertheme, *organizace* (organization), from which two themes are derived, the one represented by *církev* (church) and the one by *stát* (state). The two concepts are analysed through a TP which is both linear and constant. This thematic-referential organization of the speech and the absence of explicit connectors, well observed by Daneš, reveal Čapek's attempt to express in the written dimension the one of silence, which corresponds to hesitation. As result, a reduction of the shift between orality and writing emerges. Daneš' analysis can then be expanded mentioning that the intrinsic

12 “Religion, as we specifically see it, is usually collective, popular, national; it is codified in impersonal dogmas and organized in the church; it changes, preserves the relics of the past, often from primitive times, and develops and improves with the development of thinking and culture. Religion is an extremely complex entity, sprawling in many ways; therefore, a careful analysis of its elements, components, manifestations or, as I would say, is needed. [...] How complicated religion would be!”

13 “Every organization, especially as great as the church, is ipso facto a political reality. The Church developed in the pagan state, against it and partly with it; as an organized society, it necessarily had to adjust its relationship with the state, which was then the only comprehensive social organization. [...] The Church did not try to remove or reshape the pagan state politically, but to convert to Christianity; when he was Christianized and the church was nationalized, a Christian theocracy was formed. The state has found its moral and religious basis in the church; the monarchs – notabene absolutist – were “by the grace of God”. [...] The relationship between church and state has stabilized slowly. [...] The Church itself is, by its very nature, a social institution; in addition to teaching and cult, she is the guardian and leader of morality and the whole administration of life.”

structure of the *Hovory* discloses the principal character of Masaryk's reflection on philosophical and political concepts: it is not based on an argumentative process but on a meditative one.

5. Conclusions

It is clear from these four examples how a linguistic analysis of the *Hovory* reveals the presence of precise stylistic structures. Furthermore, this demonstrates how Čapek did not write a classic biography. In fact, renouncing his own style, he succeeds in creating a work that escapes the ordinary classification of this genre. Then, it is possible to confirm what stated by Mukařovský, ie. the tendency of the author to employ different subgenres. Indeed, Mukařovský's consideration quoted at the beginning of the article could be expanded, highlighting how Čapek is even able to create new subgenres from an intrinsic point of view. The traditional model of biography is problematized by the aspects analysed in this article. First, the elaboration of a structure based, as pointed out by Daneš, on the thematic-referential tissue using specific thematic progressions as reflection of his loyal attitude to Masaryk's style. Second, the renounce of the authorial style, which is largely contaminated by the one of Masaryk. Third, the potential elimination of the gap between the oral and the written dimension in which reporting the element of silence against the continuous flow of the speech is the clue feature. This last one point is a direct and intended consequence of the first two. In conclusion, bending an unconventional form of biography to a personal and new communicative intent Čapek creates a text in which the elaboration of Masaryk's thinking is determined by the intention, at the same time, to reproduce the real style of his speeches within this thinking is conveyed.

References

- Ferrari, Angela (2014) *Linguistica del testo. Principi, fenomeni, strutture*. Roma: Carrocci.
- Čapek, Karel (1986) "O umění a kultuře III." [In:] Karel Čapek *Spisy 19*. Praha: Československý spisovatel; 502–503.
- Čapek, Karel (1990) *Spisy XX. Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*. Praha: Československý spisovatel.
- Daneš, František (1968) "Typy tematických posloupností v textu (na materiále českého textu odborného)." [In:] *Slovo a Slovesnost*. Volume 29; 125–141.
- Daneš, František (1979) "O identifikaci známé (kontextově zapojené) informace v textu." [In:] *Slovo a Slovesnost*. Volume 40; 257–270.
- Daneš, František (1985) "Tematické posloupnosti a jevy příbuzné." [In:] *Věta a text*; 207–218.
- Daneš, František (1994a) "O koherenci textu Hovorů s T.G. Masarykem." [In:] Světa Čmejrková, František Daneš (eds.) *O Čapkových Hovorech s T.G. Masarykem*. Praha: ACADEMIA; 11–26.
- Daneš, František (1994b) "Odstavec jako centrální jednotka tematicko-kompoziční výstavby textu (na materiále textů výkladových)." [In:] *Slovo a Slovesnost*. Volume 55; 1–17.
- Firbas, Jan (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Firbas, Jan (1995) "On the Thematic and Rhematic Layers of a Text." [In:] Brita Wårvik, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen (eds.) *Organization of Discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference*. Turku: University of Turku; 59–72.
- Hrbáček, Josef (1994) *Nárys textové syntaxe spisovné češtiny*. Praha: Trozonia; 51–54.
- Malevič, Oleg (1968) *Karel Čapek: Kritiko-biografičeskij očerk*. Moskva: Chudožestvennaja literatura.
- Malevič, Oleg (1971) "Vývoj stylu raných próz Karla Čapka." [In:] *Česká literatura*. Volume 19/5–6; 409–427.
- Mukařovský, Jan (1941) *Kapitoly z české poetiky. Díl druhý. K vývoji české poesie a prózy*. Praha: Melantrich.
- Mathesius, Vilém (1947) *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt*. Praha: Melantrich.
- Mukařovský, Jan (1931) "Masaryk jako stylist." [In:] Roman Jakobson, Jan Mukařovský *Masaryka a řeč. Zvláštní otisk z pátého svazku. Masarykova sborníku*. Praha: Tiskla Grafia; 5–27.
- Svoboda, Aleš (1981) *Diatheme*. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyne.
- Svoboda, Aleš (1981) "Two Chapters on Scene." [In:] *Brno Studies in English*; 81–92.
- Opelík, Jiří (2008) "Zdroje jazyka Karla Čapka." [In:] Jiří Opelík *Čtrnáctého prací o Karlu Čapkovi a ještě jedna o Josefu Čapkovi jako přivažek*. Praha: Torst; 231–244.
- Opelík, Jiří (2016) "O skryté roli knihy Hovory s T.G. Masarykem." [In:] Jiří Opelík *Uklizený stůl aneb Moje druhá knížka o Karlu Čapkovi a opět s jedním přivažkem o Josefovi*. Praha: Torst; 21–37.
- Pohorský, Miloš (1990) "Karel Čapek a jeho T. G. M. – Masaryk a jeho K. Č." [In:] *Karel Čapek Spisy XX. Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*. Praha: Československý spisovatel; 557–584.