

The aim of the work is to summarize the Czech literary historians' ideas and opinions of the Gellner's poetry and compare them with the author's own ideas. The work is divided into two parts.

The first part summarizes the main ideas of the Gellner's work. At first, he was criticized by Arne Novák and other reviewers for taboo themes in his poetry. After Gellner's disappearance at the beginning of the First World War, his friends wrote lots of articles not only about his poetry, but also about his characters and qualities. There is a big change in the understanding Gellner's work at the beginning of the 50's, when communistic ideology affected others' opinions. František Buriánek's studies are the most famous ones. He tried to explain Gellner's ideas in the way of communistic propaganda. As far as form and structure are concerned, probably the most important study was written by Miroslav Červenka. After the communistic era there are only a few articles about the problem of the interpretation of the Gellner's poetry (Křivánek, Justl, Pohorský), that is not sufficient.

In the second part of the work, there is an attempt to interpret Gellner's poetry in the author's own way. The author puts stress on problems in the interpretation that she finds the most relevant and important, as a distinguishing between poetry in collections of poems and poetry in magazines, problems with a term "buřič" (rebel, troublemaker), a principle of a stylization and some others.