

## Abstract

In my thesis I apply Walter Benjamin's thought as interpretative framework to Karel Teige's texts and I focus on notions of aura and autonomy. In the first chapter I initiate my exposition with reading Benjamin's notion of aura as spatiotemporal continuity of an artwork, its uniqueness if it is valued by society. I refuse that Benjamin rejects the autonomy of an artwork as opposite to its tendentiousness and political commitment. Benjamin's proclamation of the politicization of art from the conclusion of *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility* is supposed to be read as the literarization of the conditions of living from his text *Autor as Producer*. In conclusion is admitted that this demand can be read as a rejection of autonomy of art as it is conceived in Peter Bürger's Theory of the Avant-Garde.

In the second chapter I handle Teige's examination of phenomena which can be described by Benjamin's terminology as liquidation of aura. It is claim that Teige as well as Benjamin rejects to award an original with a special status. Attention is payed to Teige's emphasis on democratization of artwork reception and to his practical artistic activity in nonauratic media: to image poems and typography.

In the third chapter is discussed what was Teige's attitude to autonomy of artwork. Three possible readings of that notion (which are indicated already in the first chapter) are distinguished: strongly lartpourlartistic, weakly lartpourlartistic (adornian) and bürgerian. I show that Teige definitely rejects strongly lartpourlartistically read autonomy (the art is always *fait social* for him, it is never torn from society completely) as well as bürgerian read autonomy (he demands unification of art and life practice – radical democratisation of its reception and even its production). On the other hand, it can not be simply ascribed to him the redemption of faintly lartpourlartisticly read autonomy as is often the case. While in his early texts Teige still defends the political tendency of artwork, during the 1920s he gradually leaves this position and on the contrary explicitly calls for untentious, unpolitical and unfunctional art. This conception of Karel Teige, in which art is functional if and only if it is unfunctional, is compared to the position of Theodor Adorno, according to which the work of art is social if and only if it is withdrawn from society.