

Film and TV School of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague
Department of Photography

Assessment of the Bachelor's Thesis

Author of thesis: Karol Sekta

Title of thesis: Sally Mann and David Hamilton

Assessment of the primary advisor

Assessment of the opponent

Author of the assessment (first name, last name, workplace): Pavel Vančát

Evaluation of the content and final form of the thesis (A/excellent – B/very good – C/good – D/good with objections – E/satisfactory – F/unsatisfactory – not recommended for defence)

Suitability of the selected objective and work approach.....B
Relative completeness of the literature used for the selected topic.....B
Ability to critically evaluate and use professional literature.....D
Logicity of the thesis structure, connection of its chapters.....D
Language and stylistic level of the thesis.....C
Compliance with citation norms (should the text repeatedly contain adopted passages without citing the source, the work cannot be recommended for defence).....B
Sufficient extent of image attachments, justifiability and suitability of attachments, graphic layout.....C
Originality of the thesis, contribution to the development of the field of study.....D
Overall evaluation of the thesis.....C

Verbal evaluation of the thesis including questions that the diplomate must address in his/her thesis defence:

The thesis proposes a comparison between the works of Sally Mann and David Hamilton, one based not only on the analysis of their particular photographic projects but also on their literary, movie, and artistic sources and contexts. The author wants to anchor his analysis in the archetype of nymphet – he, however, does not present any solid understanding of the notion thus leaving the reader to take it for its commonplace meaning. Herein lies one of the main problems of the thesis – can one reasonably talk about Sally Mann's daughters as about nymphets or lolitas, that is sexually precocious girls?

Although the thesis is mostly descriptive, dependent on secondary sources (some of which are used erroneously, for example the description quoted on p. 12 refers to a different image that the author actually shows and discusses) and could use some proofreading and editing, the author managed to capture the ambivalent nature of these works and theory reception. I recommend the evaluation C.

Date:

Signature:.....