

Abstract

The thesis investigates the hypothetical literary notebooks of Karel Hynek Mácha reconstructed from manuscripts that are regarded as fragments of a larger whole, as well as fragmentary descriptions by other authors, references found in Mácha's own manuscripts, and other testimonies. In four relatively independent chapters, the author assesses the validity of the hypothesis about the existence of the notebooks, with the aim of clarifying the immediate context of Mácha's *Notebook* and its place in the collection of sources by the author. The first chapter deals with a manuscript previously referred to as the *Sketch of May*, considered today to be a fragment of the *Small Notebook*, to which Mácha refers in the *Notebook*. The second chapter takes a different perspective on a related problem, examining the *Villani Notebook*, a manuscript by Mácha allegedly destroyed around 1945. The next two chapters turn to the subject of transcriptions of writings by Mácha supposed to have originally appeared in notebooks since lost. One of these segments is known as *Sabina's Quotations 'of Mácha's Notes'*, and is contained primarily in three manuscripts comprising the *Appendices* to Sabine's *Introduction to a Temperament* [Úvod povahopisný]. The second is part of a transcription with the title *Extract from Various Excerpts and Notes of the Poet K. H. Mácha*, made by Mácha's friend Eduard Hindl.

In conclusion, the author of the thesis argues against the existence of the *Villani Notebook*, challenges the idea that *Sketch of May* is a fragment of a larger physical whole, and questions the characterisation of the *Small Notebook* as a literary notebook. The author also rejects Sabina's authorship of the *Appendices* to the *Introduction to a Temperament*, thereby undermining the conventional view that *Sabina's Quotations 'of Mácha's Notes'* deal with works by Mácha. It is similar in the case of Hindl's *Extract from Various Excerpts and Notes of the Poet K. H. Mácha*, which, according to the author of the thesis, does not actually reproduce excerpts from Mácha's manuscripts. These partial findings then lead to a reorientation of *Notebook* within the larger context: one can no longer postulate, contrary to the conventional view, a literary notebook by Mácha created parallel to the *Notebook*. The impact of these conclusions further extend to publishing practices, significantly redefining the structure of that aspect of Mácha's writings that is traditionally referred to as his *Literary Notebooks*.