

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

Andrew Nyongesa¹

¹ Murang'a University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an ambitious and well thought out article about Agnes Heller's cross examination of George Markus' work. The problem statement is clearly stated at the end of the abstract: to consider Heller's final critique of Markus' work and assess its strengths and weaknesses. The paper is generally well written particularly the specifications of the problem statement. However, the following improvements should be executed;

i). The Layout

The paper contravenes the format characteristic of an academic paper. The abstract should have four or five keywords. There should be an introduction in which historical background of Heller and Markus are captured. The **Mainbody** with the subheading, "Bird of Paradise: Heller and Markus" and a conclusion to summarise the discussion and share the insights with regards to "Bird paradise."

ii). The Subject

It is convincing for the author to assert that Markus had a passion for high culture hence his propensity to evade Derrida and Foucault. As a postmodernist thinker, Derrida deconstructed modernist dichotomies and hierarchies to the extent that in his perspective there can never be "high culture." However, it is prudent to specify the papers and content that Markus published on these postmodernist thinkers briefly.

Furthermore, the reader would want to know how specifically Heller demonstrated philosophy's role in translating "truths" to sanitize the hard sciences from Markus' relegation. Are there any scientific journals in the hard sciences that have popular reception? Are there any journals that Heller has mentioned?

I strongly agree with Heller's contention that hard sciences are within the modernist bounds of high culture as opposed to Markus' claims that novelty in the area is tantamount to knowledge accumulation. The hard sciences sometimes do make real, and practical innovations as opposed to the humanities. Furthermore, their propensity to elevate right/wrong dualism is the essence of high culture in the modernist world.

iii). Documentation

The reference section is not well done. The intelligent reader finds it difficult to specify the documentation style (APA, MLA, MHRA, etc). Heller's source is poorly written (is this MLA 8th edition?). Markus' source is not well written on the list of references. Foot notes should be separated from list of references.

iv). **Critical Works**

Are there any other studies that have associated Marcus works with “Owl of Minerva?” I have not found any online. But this can help to bolster the gap, and problem statement.

iv). **Grammatical Mistakes and English Dialect**

There are few grammatical errors: i). use of the simple past transgresses academic writing conventions. Ideas of great philosophers such as George Markus and Agnes Heller are universal and should be expressed in present simple tense. There is omission of “they” on phrase “after found it difficult” (para 1). Revise “he is drew” (para 4); “This accounts” (para 4). Revise “foe instance” and “on favour of enlightenment”, spellings of “Afganistan.” There are grammatical mistakes at the acknowledgement “ I would thanks Paulin Johnson...”

Revise the phrase “...metaphor and languages produces” (para 5).

Because of the use of words such as “favourite” and “favour”, the British Dialect has been chosen. Change double quotes in the essay to single quotes. Please be consistent. In the essay there is use of double quotes (for American English), but on the references, George Markus source has single quotes (British dialect).

In academic writing, technical words such as “musicologist” should be explained to the audience.