

Abstract:

This doctoral thesis is concerned with autobiographical forms, their general characteristics as well as with three examples of Czech works of art that prove how difficult it is to make that general characteristics and show various kinds of autobiographical narrative. It aims to show the often heterogeneous character of the so-called autobiographical genres, and present some approaches in their study.

In the opening chapter, we define the term autobiography or autobiographical form in regard to literary history and theory, and special attention to Czech research in this field. We concentrate on the genre specifics of autobiographical forms, the opposition of „literary“ and „authentic“ diary, the term „autobiographical pact“ coined by Philippe Lejeune and several patterns of autobiographical memory introduced by James Olney. The key aspect of our study is the nature of autobiographical form derived from the subject's style and illocutionary acts, i. e. stylization as defined by John Searle followed by Jean Starobinski or Paul de Man. Out of the wide spectrum of issues connected with autobiography we focus on the description of the subject's narrative structure, mainly on its language, style, frequent motifs, its memory and relationship to other characters in its text.

The complexity of the very nature of autobiographical forms is demonstrated on three works, all of which bear some autobiographical traits: *Přestupný rok* by Jiří Kolář, *Disiecta membra* by Jan Zábřana and *Let* by Bohumila Grögerová and Josef Hiršal. They are interrelated by the presence of an autobiographical subject and a socio-historical bond. The autobiographical I of all three works comments explicitly or implicitly on the political circumstances of his/her timespace. Based on the narrative and motif analysis we study the image of the autobiographical I, the imagery used for its characterization and way of narration, what language is being used and who is the implied addressee of the text. The autobiographical subjects of the present works differ substantially, yet the texts share several important topics. These are especially the language and work of art as such and collective as well as individual memory. In this chapter, we make use of the previously introduced theoretical concepts in order to interpret the texts, but moreover, to show the often transgressive nature of autobiographical works, their semantic ambiguity and intentional use of uncertainty during the construction of the subject.

In the final chapter, we compare the three texts regarding to the points discussed in the opening theoretical part and attempt to show that the definitions of autobiographical

forms and autobiographical forms per se do not always have to match, and yet these forms can still bear their essential characteristics, i. e. tell a story of oneself.

Key words:

Autobiography, diary, memoir, epistolary novel, stylization, illocutionary act, authenticity, autobiographical I, literary diary, fictive diary, autobiographical pact, memory, weaving, rummaging, *Přestupný rok*, *Disiecta membra*, *Let let*