

KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY FF UP V OLOMOUCI
Hodnocení bakalářské práce

Autor: Hana Svoboda

Název práce: David Zeisberger, the Missionary of the Moravian Church: The Scope and Limits of His Cultural Relativism

Vedoucí práce: prof. PhDr. Michal Peprník, Dr.

Oponent: PhDr. Matthew Sweney, Ph.D.

| | Hodnocení A,B,C a F (nevyhovující) | Poznámky |
|---|--|--|
| 1/ Cíl - záměr: vymezení | A | Highly interesting topic, related both to the Americas and the author's faith |
| splnění | C | Some basic problems (see below) |
| 2/ Argumentace (schopnost formulovat východiska a závěry, logická koherence, schopnost generalizace a konkretizace) | B | |
| 3/ Znalost primární literatury | A/F? | See "Primary Sources" below |
| 4/ Znalost sekundární literatury (rozsah, adekvátnost) | D | See "Secondary Sources" below |
| 5/ Samostatnost (schopnost odborné polemiky, kritický úsudek), originalita | | |
| 6/ Formální úroveň (dodržování zvolené bibliografické normy) | E | Footnotes are not done according to norms—the first cited source should be described in full Bibliography not standardly indented |
| 7/ Jazyková a stylistická úroveň práce | C | Mostly well-written, but with some odd, unforgiveable errors—see Question 1, below |
| 8/ Jazyková a stylistická úroveň resumé | | |
| 9/ Typografické provedení, úprava | | No problems |
| 10/ Poznámka k práci | | See below |

Připomínky a otázky k obhajobě:

The thesis attempts to detail the missionary work of David Zeisberger, a Moravian Brother, with Native peoples in the Ohio River area of what is now the USA, in relation to cultural

relativism. This is an original, worthy topic, and thus I was very interested in reading the thesis.

However, there are a couple of major flaws right from the start:

- 1) The personage of David Zeisberger is not properly introduced. The reader would appreciate a biography of the subject of the thesis, however brief. We do not get that here.
- 2) The concept of “cultural relativism” is not properly defined, so we really do not know what it is. (I will discuss this further under the heading of “Sources”.)
- 3) The author herself states that Zeisberger’s diaries contain straightforward facts and not impressions, therefore it is difficult to establish any sense of the “scope and limits of cultural relativism” in his writings or work.

Perhaps this is one of those cases when the title was chosen before the actual research was done and the conclusions made.

Primary Sources

I am sure that the author has read Zeisberger’s *Diaries* and his *History of Northern American Indians*. But as a reader, I want to read what he has to say, too. (There are only 1 brief quotation from the *Diaries*, on p. 21.) Why are they not quoted more often in the thesis?

Secondary Sources

The author herself states that she had problems finding a good definition of “cultural relativism”. That is obvious; perhaps she should have looked a bit further, and in a library. The result is that her main source is an article entitled “Cultural Relativism” by Mark Glazer, found on the Internet. Unfortunately, this internet source is corrupted, and her quotes from it do not make any sense.

For example (this is the author quoting Glazer quoting Franz Boas): “1. It is unattainable to resolve similarity in all the sorts of culture by professing that they are so because of the unity of the human mind. (...) 4. The observation that cultural dissimilarities are of unimportant is unauthenticated.” (8)

This is total nonsense. I cannot accept this as a reliable source, and thus the author’s methodology is highly dubious. Why not quote Boas directly to get the quote right? In all of Chapter 1 of this thesis, the only source used is Glazer’s two-page “essay”. This is very poor scholarship.

Questions:

1. There are some odd turns of phrases which make the text difficult to understand in places:
 - a) “Kroeber (...) composed countless ethnography.” (9) Countless ethnographic studies? If that is what is meant, it is still wrong: surely they could be counted. I do not understand this phrase.
 - b) “(...) Robert Lowie whose statements are most consequential.” (10) Does this mean that his statements (which?) had some consequences (which?) in the field of cultural anthropology (how?)??? Why mention Lowie at all if this odd statement has nothing to do with your thesis? Or if it does have something to do with your thesis, why is it not developed?
 - c) “The Moravian Brothers were a radical Christian group which combined their evangelizing activities with pain-focused worship.”(11) Cože?
2. Could you give us a (brief) biography of Zeisberger? And provide us with some critical commentary on him by historians and/or church elders? This is sorely lacking in the thesis.
3. On page 14, you have the immensely interesting detail about how persons seeking to enter the Bethlehem community were chosen: “Moravians let Jesus Christ make the decision of

who would live there by casting dice.” Do you know Einstein’s famous quote on dice? What would Al have said about this???

4. On page 15 you state that Moravian missionaries would “teach Native Americans crafts”. What crafts? Weren’t they capable of providing for themselves?


5. The phrase “first fruits” is not explained. On p. 15 there is a quote from the editor of Zeisberger’s *Diaries*: “The first fruits are those who have been set aside for salvation from the foundation of the world,” but I have no idea what this sentence means outside of context. Please explain.

Závěr:

Práce je - ~~není~~ doporučena k obhajobě.

Navržený klasifikační stupeň:

V Olomouci dne 26.05.2017


UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO
FILOSOFICKÁ FAKULTA
katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
771 80 OLOMOUČ

~~Vedoucí~~ – oponent bakalářské práce

KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY FF UP V OLOMOUCI
Hodnocení bakalářské práce

Autor: Hana Svoboda

Název práce: David Zeisberger, the Missionary of the Moravian Church: The Scope and Limits of His Cultural Relativism

Vedoucí práce: prof. PhDr. Michal Peprník, Dr.

Oponent: PhDr. Matthew Sweney, Ph.D.

| | Hodnocení A,B,C a F (nevyhovující) | Poznámky |
|---|--|--|
| 1/ Cíl - záměr: vymezení | A | Highly interesting topic, related both to the Americas and the author's faith |
| splnění | C | Some basic problems (see below) |
| 2/ Argumentace (schopnost formulovat východiska a závěry, logická koherence, schopnost generalizace a konkretizace) | B | |
| 3/ Znalost primární literatury | A/F? | See "Primary Sources" below |
| 4/ Znalost sekundární literatury (rozsah, adekvátnost) | D | See "Secondary Sources" below |
| 5/ Samostatnost (schopnost odborné polemiky, kritický úsudek), originalita | | |
| 6/ Formální úroveň (dodržování zvolené bibliografické normy) | E | Footnotes are not done according to norms—the first cited source should be described in full Bibliography not standardly indented |
| 7/ Jazyková a stylistická úroveň práce | C | Mostly well-written, but with some odd, unforgiveable errors—see Question 1, below |
| 8/ Jazyková a stylistická úroveň resumé | | |
| 9/ Typografické provedení, úprava | | No problems |
| 10/ Poznámka k práci | | See below |

Připomínky a otázky k obhajobě:

The thesis attempts to detail the missionary work of David Zeisberger, a Moravian Brother, with Native peoples in the Ohio River area of what is now the USA, in relation to cultural

relativism. This is an original, worthy topic, and thus I was very interested in reading the thesis.

However, there are a couple of major flaws right from the start:

- 1) The personage of David Zeisberger is not properly introduced. The reader would appreciate a biography of the subject of the thesis, however brief. We do not get that here.
- 2) The concept of “cultural relativism” is not properly defined, so we really do not know what it is. (I will discuss this further under the heading of “Sources”.)
- 3) The author herself states that Zeisberger’s diaries contain straightforward facts and not impressions, therefore it is difficult to establish any sense of the “scope and limits of cultural relativism” in his writings or work.

Perhaps this is one of those cases when the title was chosen before the actual research was done and the conclusions made.

Primary Sources

I am sure that the author has read Zeisberger’s *Diaries* and his *History of Northern American Indians*. But as a reader, I want to read what he has to say, too. (There are only 1 brief quotation from the *Diaries*, on p. 21.) Why are they not quoted more often in the thesis?

Secondary Sources

The author herself states that she had problems finding a good definition of “cultural relativism”. That is obvious; perhaps she should have looked a bit further, and in a library. The result is that her main source is an article entitled “Cultural Relativism” by Mark Glazer, found on the Internet. Unfortunately, this internet source is corrupted, and her quotes from it do not make any sense.

For example (this is the author quoting Glazer quoting Franz Boas): “1. It is unattainable to resolve similarity in all the sorts of culture by professing that they are so because of the unity of the human mind. (...) 4. The observation that cultural dissimilarities are of unimportant is unauthenticated.” (8)

This is total nonsense. I cannot accept this as a reliable source, and thus the author’s methodology is highly dubious. Why not quote Boas directly to get the quote right? In all of Chapter 1 of this thesis, the only source used is Glazer’s two-page “essay”. This is very poor scholarship.

Questions:

1. There are some odd turns of phrases which make the text difficult to understand in places:
 - a) “Kroeber (...) composed countless ethnography.” (9) Countless ethnographic studies? If that is what is meant, it is still wrong: surely they could be counted. I do not understand this phrase.
 - b) “(...) Robert Lowie whose statements are most consequential.” (10) Does this mean that his statements (which?) had some consequences (which?) in the field of cultural anthropology (how?)??? Why mention Lowie at all if this odd statement has nothing to do with your thesis? Or if it does have something to do with your thesis, why is it not developed?
 - c) “The Moravian Brothers were a radical Christian group which combined their evangelizing activities with pain-focused worship.”(11) Cože?
2. Could you give us a (brief) biography of Zeisberger? And provide us with some critical commentary on him by historians and/or church elders? This is sorely lacking in the thesis.
3. On page 14, you have the immensely interesting detail about how persons seeking to enter the Bethlehem community were chosen: “Moravians let Jesus Christ make the decision of

who would live there by casting dice.” Do you know Einstein’s famous quote on dice? What would Al have said about this???

4. On page 15 you state that Moravian missionaries would “teach Native Americans crafts”. What crafts? Weren’t they capable of providing for themselves?


5. The phrase “first fruits” is not explained. On p. 15 there is a quote from the editor of Zeisberger’s *Diaries*: “The first fruits are those who have been set aside for salvation from the foundation of the world,” but I have no idea what this sentence means outside of context. Please explain.

Závěr:

Práce je - ~~není~~ doporučena k obhajobě.

Navržený klasifikační stupeň:

V Olomouci dne 26.05.2017


UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO
FILOSOFICKÁ FAKULTA
katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
771 80 OLOMOUČ

~~Vedoucí~~ – oponent bakalářské práce

KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY FF UP V OLOMOUCI
Hodnocení bakalářské práce

Autor: Hana Svoboda

Název práce: David Zeisberger, the Missionary of the Moravian Church: The Scope and Limits of His Cultural Relativism

Vedoucí práce: prof. PhDr. Michal Peprník, Dr.

Oponent: PhDr. Matthew Sweney, Ph.D.

| | Hodnocení A,B,C a F (nevyhovující) | Poznámky |
|---|--|--|
| 1/ Cíl - záměr: vymezení | A | Highly interesting topic, related both to the Americas and the author's faith |
| splnění | C | Some basic problems (see below) |
| 2/ Argumentace (schopnost formulovat východiska a závěry, logická koherence, schopnost generalizace a konkretizace) | B | |
| 3/ Znalost primární literatury | A/F? | See "Primary Sources" below |
| 4/ Znalost sekundární literatury (rozsah, adekvátnost) | D | See "Secondary Sources" below |
| 5/ Samostatnost (schopnost odborné polemiky, kritický úsudek), originalita | | |
| 6/ Formální úroveň (dodržování zvolené bibliografické normy) | E | Footnotes are not done according to norms—the first cited source should be described in full Bibliography not standardly indented |
| 7/ Jazyková a stylistická úroveň práce | C | Mostly well-written, but with some odd, unforgiveable errors—see Question 1, below |
| 8/ Jazyková a stylistická úroveň resumé | | |
| 9/ Typografické provedení, úprava | | No problems |
| 10/ Poznámka k práci | | See below |

Připomínky a otázky k obhajobě:

The thesis attempts to detail the missionary work of David Zeisberger, a Moravian Brother, with Native peoples in the Ohio River area of what is now the USA, in relation to cultural

relativism. This is an original, worthy topic, and thus I was very interested in reading the thesis.

However, there are a couple of major flaws right from the start:

- 1) The personage of David Zeisberger is not properly introduced. The reader would appreciate a biography of the subject of the thesis, however brief. We do not get that here.
- 2) The concept of “cultural relativism” is not properly defined, so we really do not know what it is. (I will discuss this further under the heading of “Sources”.)
- 3) The author herself states that Zeisberger’s diaries contain straightforward facts and not impressions, therefore it is difficult to establish any sense of the “scope and limits of cultural relativism” in his writings or work.

Perhaps this is one of those cases when the title was chosen before the actual research was done and the conclusions made.

Primary Sources

I am sure that the author has read Zeisberger’s *Diaries* and his *History of Northern American Indians*. But as a reader, I want to read what he has to say, too. (There are only 1 brief quotation from the *Diaries*, on p. 21.) Why are they not quoted more often in the thesis?

Secondary Sources

The author herself states that she had problems finding a good definition of “cultural relativism”. That is obvious; perhaps she should have looked a bit further, and in a library. The result is that her main source is an article entitled “Cultural Relativism” by Mark Glazer, found on the Internet. Unfortunately, this internet source is corrupted, and her quotes from it do not make any sense.

For example (this is the author quoting Glazer quoting Franz Boas): “1. It is unattainable to resolve similarity in all the sorts of culture by professing that they are so because of the unity of the human mind. (...) 4. The observation that cultural dissimilarities are of unimportant is unauthenticated.” (8)

This is total nonsense. I cannot accept this as a reliable source, and thus the author’s methodology is highly dubious. Why not quote Boas directly to get the quote right? In all of Chapter 1 of this thesis, the only source used is Glazer’s two-page “essay”. This is very poor scholarship.

Questions:

1. There are some odd turns of phrases which make the text difficult to understand in places:
 - a) “Kroeber (...) composed countless ethnography.” (9) Countless ethnographic studies? If that is what is meant, it is still wrong: surely they could be counted. I do not understand this phrase.
 - b) “(...) Robert Lowie whose statements are most consequential.” (10) Does this mean that his statements (which?) had some consequences (which?) in the field of cultural anthropology (how?)??? Why mention Lowie at all if this odd statement has nothing to do with your thesis? Or if it does have something to do with your thesis, why is it not developed?
 - c) “The Moravian Brothers were a radical Christian group which combined their evangelizing activities with pain-focused worship.”(11) Cože?
2. Could you give us a (brief) biography of Zeisberger? And provide us with some critical commentary on him by historians and/or church elders? This is sorely lacking in the thesis.
3. On page 14, you have the immensely interesting detail about how persons seeking to enter the Bethlehem community were chosen: “Moravians let Jesus Christ make the decision of

who would live there by casting dice.” Do you know Einstein’s famous quote on dice? What would Al have said about this???

4. On page 15 you state that Moravian missionaries would “teach Native Americans crafts”. What crafts? Weren’t they capable of providing for themselves?


5. The phrase “first fruits” is not explained. On p. 15 there is a quote from the editor of Zeisberger’s *Diaries*: “The first fruits are those who have been set aside for salvation from the foundation of the world,” but I have no idea what this sentence means outside of context. Please explain.

Závěr:

Práce je - ~~není~~ doporučena k obhajobě.

Navržený klasifikační stupeň:

V Olomouci dne 26.05.2017


UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO
FILOSOFICKÁ FAKULTA
katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
771 80 OLOMOUČ

~~Vedoucí~~ – oponent bakalářské práce