

Review of: "The "Bird of Paradise": Heller and Márkus"

Ştefan Firică¹

1 University of Bucharest

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper addresses Ágnes Heller's critique of the "culturological" studies of György Márkus, with a focus on his conception of "high culture". Secondly, it provides the author's personal account of Márkus's post-Budapest school and post-Marxist thought, in the years that he spent in Australia, mostly at the University of Sidney. This second aim is all the more relevant since John Grumley edited Márkus's posthumous collection of essays *Culture, Science and Society:*Constitution of Cultural Modernity (2013). The paper puts forward interesting ideas about Márkus's later philosophy of culture, in dialogue with Heller' much more critical approach, though maybe a bit more historical and philosophical context would have helped an unspecialized reader.

However, there are a few things to be taken care of before this article could reach a properly academic standard.

I couldn't find the book review specified in note 2, *The Great Book of György Markus*, for which no reference data are provided. I found, instead, this article: Heller, Á. (2015). György Márkus's concept of high culture: A critical evaluation. Thesis Eleven, 126(1), 88–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513614565057, which engages a critical perspective on Márkus's post-Budapest School thinking.

It is not the only deviation from the academic standards. There are more than a few grammar and punctuation errors, as well as typos and other glitches that can hinder the understanding of the paper's line of argument. See, for instance, the unpleasant repetition of a whole section on page 4.

Finally, one example to showcase why these textual mistakes really matter: the term "musicologist" (here, at page 2) probably refers to the "museologist" that Heller talks about in her 2015 article (at page 89). Heller herself borrowed the concept (i.e., the museologist-philosopher) from one of Márkus's studies, as she confesses. Definitely, a rewriting would make this paper more valuable.

Qeios ID: 36KAOZ · https://doi.org/10.32388/36KAOZ