This appears to be a well-researched MA thesis that combines historical overview with some theory and literary analysis. The scope, especially of the second chapter, is ambitious but it is handled well. I propose the grade "very good" (2) for the following reasons:

The objective of the thesis—"to identify and define the strategies of abolitionist discourse and the rhetorical practices which it employed especially in shaping the image of Africans and [to illustrate] how the hegemonic discourse of sentimentalism influenced their writing" (Abstract)—is clear. Less clear is the choice of poetry and travel writing as exemplary. Although it is stated that "polemical writings such as sermons, articles and pamphlets written by the most prominent abolitionists" (Abstract) would have been more representative, the relationship between these genres and those analyzed in the thesis is not explored in depth. This is not to question the focus on what were, in the context of abolitionism, relatively marginal genres but to ask Ms. Bartová to think further about the relationship of poetry and travel narratives to genres that were employed by abolitionists more frequently. Would she see any differences related to the different conventions of the various genres used by abolitionists?

My second question concerns the conclusion that abolitionist discourse paradoxically "often may have discouraged the British public in perceiving the black Africans as capable, independent and equal" (9) and that "even though writers and poets meant their works to elevate the black slaves into an equal position, their usage of sentimental discourse often led to reaffirmation of the hierarchy from which they approached the issue of slavery" (80). In Ms. Bartová's view, could this paradox have been overcome in abolitionist discourse and how?

A similar query pertains to the argument that "the only way for the black Africans to become part of English society was to employ the discourse of the English language and essentially write their presence into being by becoming part of the sentimental discourse" (9). In Ms. Bartová's view, could slaves have avoided writing themselves into the "oppressor's language"? And what does she think about Henry Louis Gates's theory of signifyin(g), which is not mentioned in the thesis at all?

Finally, a question (or rather a critical remark) concerning the end, namely the extract from Ayn Rand's *Anthem*. Rand's book is one of the bluntest proclamations of egotism published in the 1930s and the quote is torn out of this context. In the original, the following sentences come before those cited in the thesis: "To be free, a man must be free of his brothers. That is freedom. This and nothing else." The trope of the brother, central in Ms. Bartová's thesis, is central in Rand's book as well, but it is used with negative connotations that derive from Rand's ideology of ruthless self-interest. Why is that supposed to be a fitting end of the thesis?
Regarding the form, there are some problems as well. Although the prose is fluent, it is not flawless. There are errors/typos such as, “he purposefully depict the blacks” (27); “he offers no resolution to the situation, as shows the following analysis” (35); “an undeniable part of the abolitionist cannon” (36); “Britain prying itself of being a pioneer of democracy and freedom” (38); “punishment acted out to the slaves” (44), etc. Also, Stedman's conviction that “if the English emancipated their slaves, they would inevitably end up under crueler masters, serving other nations” (49) is clearly not an “ethical conclusion” (49) but a conclusion he may have wrongly viewed as ethical, so the wording is inaccurate. I also wonder why only chapters four and five are broken into numbered subchapters.
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