

Pré-rapport du mémoire de M2 Pre-report of the Master's thesis

Édition/Edition (2019—2021)

Étudiant(e)/Student :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : ***Ekaterina Mazur***
Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis : ***Catholic Cathedrals in Europe and Representation of Heritage via Mobile Application***

Mobilité / Mobility :

Veillez souligner les établissements !/ Please, underline the institutions !

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest (ELTE)

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales de Paris (EHESS)

Università degli Studi di Catania (UNICT)

Univerzita Karlova, Prague (CUNI)

Université Laval, Québec (UL)

Directeurs de recherche / Supervisors¹ :

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : ***dr. Judit Klement***
Titre /Title : ***associate professor***
Université/University : ***ELTE***

Évaluation/Evaluation:

Veillez consulter le tableau de conversion ci-dessous !/ Please, consult the grade conversation chart below !

Note dans l'établissement / Grade at the institution:	A
Note dans le 2eme établissement (ELTE) / Grade at the 2 nd institution (ELTE): (Note dans le 3eme établissement / Evaluation – grade at the 3rd institution:)	5
Note TEMA+ / TEMA+ grade:	Excellent

Pré-rapport / Pre-report :

max. 4500 caractères espaces inclus/max. 4500 characters including spaces

¹ Le pré-rapport est écrit par le 2eme directeur (ou par le 2eme et 3eme directeurs) qui ne participe pas à la soutenance et inclut des questions à aborder lors de la soutenance./The pre-report is written by the 2nd supervisor (and in case the 3rd supervisor too), who does not personally take part in the defense and it includes questions to be addressed to the student during the thesis defense.

The thesis of Ekaterina Mazur fully meets the expectations of a master thesis. She has a relevant scientific question, which leads her narrative throughout the text. She also gives an impressive overview of the theoretical approaches of her theme and found a convincing methodological model for her analysis, which she consistently used in the analytical part. Additionally, the thesis has all necessary formal elements, the footnotes and bibliography are correct, and the understanding of the author's message is supported by figures. (Only two remarks on formal elements: the footnote numbers are mostly after the punctuation, but not always. And on page 53 a sentence has three footnote numbers, but only one footnote should be linked to a sentence.)

The thesis consists of three main parts, additionally introduction and conclusion. The introduction clearly outlines the aim of the thesis and describes its structure. The first thematic section deals with the issue of religion and heritage. The second chapter focuses on the digital platforms in the world of museums. The third part contains the author's own study: the analysis of the mobile application of four Roman Catholic cathedrals in Europe.

The theoretical background of the thesis presented in Chapter I (*Religion and Heritage in Europe*) is impressive: the manifestation of culture, UNESCO's approach to religious heritage, Authorised Heritage Discourse, changing identities of cultural institutions, religious heritage as a specific phenomenon, recent challenges of religion etc. However, there is an important issue, which is detailed discussed in chapter I but not represented in any subtitle: the museification of religious heritage. This topic is now part of subchapter 1.2. and it is separated from Chapter II (*Museums and the Use of Digital Technologies*), which is dedicated to the topic of the museum and its digital platforms. I would suggest integrating the topic of museification of religious heritage into Chapter II. With this change, the topic of the museum will not be cut, and the length of the chapters will be more balanced. (Now, the length of Chapter I is 44 pages, in contrast with Chapter II's 13 pages.)

The analysis is detailed in Chapter III (*Mobile Applications of Cathedrals*). The author convinced me with her methodological approaches, and I fully appreciate the way how she translated Luc Pawels' method into her own analysis. This is an exceptional elaboration of a research question using the method of another scholar. Moreover, the author consistently applies the developed methodology throughout the analysis. Although I liked the analysis very much, I need to pass on two comments on it. First on the selection of the cases. The criteria of selection are mentioned in the thesis, but the reader doesn't know how many other cathedrals with the mobile application could meet the selection criteria, and why these four should be analysed deeply. Secondly, I missed in the analysis the link between the mobile presentation of the cathedral and its city/urban society/society. I accept, that the focus of the analysis is on the mobile application. But I would be interested whether there is any national/urban specificity in mobile presentation, or it doesn't matter where the analysed cathedrals are.

Questions:

- 1) Please describe the main characteristics of an imagined good working mobile application from the point of view of religious heritage.
- 2) Do you see national or urban specificities in the analysed mobile applications?

Budapest, 18 June 2021



Signature (digital)

TEMA+ Grade conversion table

ELTE (Hungarian)	EHESS (French)	UNICT (Italian)	CUNI (Czech)	UL (Canadian)	Notes TEMA+
5	16-20 (pas de 19 et 20)	30 (A, Excellent)	A	95-100 (A+, 4,33) 90-94 (A, 4,00) 85-89 (A-, 3,67)	Très bien/Excellent
4	14-15	27-29 (B, Very Good)	B	80-84 (B+, 3,33) 75-79 (B, 3,00) 70-74 (B-, 2,67)	Bien/Good
3	12-13	23-26 (C, Good)	C	66-69 (C+, 2,33) 63-65 (C, 2,00) 60-62 (C-, 1,67)	Assez bien/ Amply sufficient
2	10-11	21-22 (D, Satisfactory) 18-20 (E, Sufficient)	D, E	55-59 (D+, 1,33) 50-54 (D, 1,00)	Passable/ Satisfactory/ Almost sufficient
1	0-9	1-17 (F, FX)	F	49 et moins (E, 0,00)	Insuffisant/ Insuficient