

THE MYTHICAL TIME IN THE VISION OF SOLOMON MARCUS

Victoria FONARI¹

¹Associate professor, PhD, State University of Moldova, Chişinău, Republic of Moldova
Corresponding author: Victoria Fonari; e-mail:victoria_fonarii@yahoo.com

Abstract

Time is the phenomenon that is researched from a multidimensional point of view. The competences of Acad. Solomon Marcus in mathematical, linguistic and semiotic sciences imply a distinction between the physical and the artistic time. Taking into account the possibilities of destiny, he was also interested in the studies of Mircea Eliade. Our paper distinguishes the time phenomenon out of many categories accessed by Solomon Marcus, the term mythical time being our priority. The time phenomenon is related, sine qua non, to space, however, in the chronotopedichotomy the researcher dissociates time studies its antinomian facet - timelessness, but he places it in front of the mirror - the person. Awareness of time is inherent to man. Time seen as part of a triptych receives these connotations that it estimates from the perspective of myth - the cyclical, uniqueness, continuous present, timelessness. They are all determined by the existential mode of being, both of actual actions, which can be counted in real time, and also those that are lived, which capitalize on the inward time, a time of emotions, the one that confronts eternity in a moment.

Keywords: *mythical time, timelessness, mythical thinking, chaos, order, interdisciplinary.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Academician Solomon Marcus has set out to open new frontiers in research. His studies show a connection to find the contiguous elements between the real science and the humanities, making inroads into the history of science in order to dissolve complicated theories related to mathematics and linguistics. Our scientific concern is the myth. The connection between the myth and the speeches of the scientist, known worldwide, I realized for the first time in the study "Philosophical and Poetic Visions on the Inward Time", which was published in the book "Artistic and Stylistic Directions in Contemporary Literature". This dialogue with the book was made complete with a live one in 2008 at the Congress organized by the Romanian Association of Semiotic Studies "AROSS" organizationally

coordinated by university. Professor Doina Cmeciu, at that time having the position of Dean of the Faculty of Letters of "Vasile Alecsandri" University.

Our last meeting was on the 31st of August 2013, at the Book Hall, organized by the National Library, in Chisinau. It was at the presentation of my book of poems, "The Shadow of the Flake". A small book in size, but consistent with the poems selected by Prof. George Lateş, who was responsible for the CartEsenţe collection, in Galati: the Lower Danube. I was glad to see the master, I did not know he had come to the Romanian Language Day because the next day he had to deliver a speech at the Academy of Sciences of Moldova. Later he wrote an appreciation of my book, which I cherish very much: "Only after returning to Bucharest, one morning when I found my freshness, I could enjoy your tiny book - tiny in shape, but very comprehensive in feelings. If it were only to meditate on the title "The Shadow of the Flake", it seems, that it is here the poetic definition of poetry itself. The flake (I think of that of snow) is the personified poetry. You see it floating freely and happily in the air (apparently there are not two identical flakes), you want to identify with it, to be its purity, but when he gets close and you want to catch it, it is no longer. Did it die, did it disappear, or it was it not? Or was it an illusion, a dream? And when Victoria invents the "shadow of the dream," this is the illusion of the square root, the illusion of illusion, the dream of another dream. The shadow is a second existence, it is someone's; but if this 'someone' is just a delusion, its shadow is the deception of deception. And so the phrase on the cover of the little jewelry that Victoria Fonari gives us suggests the essence of poetry, its inherently self-referential nature. Thank you for the happy chance of

having got in my way at the Book Fair in Chisinau at the end of August 2013 "(Oct 3, 2013 at 12:09 PM) (FONARI, 2003).

2. THINKING WAYS AND MYTHICAL THINKING

Acad. Solomon Marcus treated complicated notions through an empirical game that achieved a way from the history of the emergence of the notion or the frame of discovery through reasoning to the emotional comprehension, a kind of update of the phenomenon approached in everyday life.

I am initially referring to his study "Ways of Thinking," where among the methodological differences my attention was drawn by "the thinking through metaphors," "the triadic thinking in semiotics" and "the transformative thinking." Thinking through metaphors refers to chemistry, making an analogy between the notion of valence and social equivalence. The metaphor is perceived as a model. In literary theory, the metaphor exploits the individual thinking of the writer, from the point of view of the structure it can co-opt certain models (I refer to the condition of the name or the verb, depending on which it is the reference image). Because I do not come from an exact science framework, I wondered why the metaphor is seen as a model and has reference precisely in chemistry? Not in Mathematics or Physics? My answer comes from an analogy that I have drawn from my cultural and imaginative empiricism. The crystallography is a science that investigates the appearance, construction, and evolution stages of a crystal. It is a science closest to inorganic chemistry, obviously with all the tendency to have as small a size as possible, crystalline research has intensified its expansion in other disciplines too - physics, engineering, etc. But the crystal is a rebellious structure with properties as though fixed, but at the same time unrepeatable. Perhaps this construction too, made up of words that assemble differently in the mastership of the poet, decomposing and metamorphosing from inside, receives new connotations.

At the cultural level or from the optics of transfusion from individual to general, I would

specify this path between the myth and the metaphor / symbol. From the optics of spirituality, it seems that energetic-entropic thinking should also be omitted, referring to it, Solomon Marcus calls it a "beautiful obsession" (MARCUS, 1987a). The transforming thinking is the one that directly targets the mythical perspectives of cooping us into the thinking of our time, thus the roots remain present, but not intact. Among the reference names, I chose the following observation: "But there is another way the man of science can follow: to notice, on the basis of his personal experience and culture, the sources of radical transformation through which his discipline has passed" (MARCUS, 1987b). The fragment denotes the transfer of how the concept works in person, but the scientist too has the force to modify it according to his own parameters.

This consideration can also be overlapped with the transformation of the myth of Mircea Eliade's mythical thinking on the relationship: myth - sacredness - ritual: "any rite, any myth, any belief or divine figure reflects the experience of the sacred, and therefore implies the notions being, meaning and truth" (ELIADE, 1992).

In Mircea Eliade's vision, the mythical thinking, also appears as a comparative expression that needs to be elucidated from the most diverse aspects. But what connects these two scholars is not only the biographical moment Solomon Marcus tells about in "Around the temporality of myths": "I keep in my house two books signed with dedication from Mircea Eliade from the early 80's. Being in Paris, in the house of some mathematicians who knew Mircea Eliade, he sent me these two books, one of them being just *Le Mythe de l'éternel retour*. He had been warned that I would come to Paris and meet those mathematicians. I can understand that he did not want to put me in a very difficult situation because he knew that when I was traveling abroad I was being watched by the Securitate. A personal meeting with him might have caused me problems from this point of view. I was in a very tight time crisis, I had a doled program for a few days" (MARCUS, 2014). The myth requires comparative methods in research, in the projection used by Solomon Marcus to draw a formula I could say that the similarity of these outstanding personalities

makes up the perspective of wonder, of getting closer to everything by personal discovery and by stipulating the individual capabilities to research, to reveal and to synthesize.

On the wave of transformations in the relationship from the myth towards the symbol, the philosopher Alexandru Boboc also reveals the inverse assertion from the metaphor to the myth, which he argues with the views of the universal culture: "It is the phenomenon of the transformation of some metaphors into myths, described by Vico, then by the romantics and by Cassirer. There is thus a concealed collaboration between the ability of the language to set up itself and the action of "mythical thinking" (in the "form of metaphorical thinking") in the context of a "story", of an account in the specific language ("mythical") of what not only "happened" sometime, but was also founded" (BOBOC, 2015).

Solomon Marcus takes over the idea of opposition between science and art that insists through the objective-subjective, reason-sensibility ratio, the relationship that he constrains up to *incompatibility*, but this desiderate, through Pythagoras' thread of demonstrations, is overthrown in order to conclude: "Beyond the apparently unaffected appearance of science there is a warm heart, a huge generosity, but in order to seize them, an intellectual and moral effort is required, an attitude of adherence, involvement, trust, to remove the spontaneous suspicion generated by the misunderstood things" (MARCUS, 1990). The connecting arguments are placed in several papers, such as the "Mathematical Shock", which, at first glance, has no connection whatsoever with literature, but the author does with such refinement by organizing his reasoning according to the comparative rules, and which refers to science from an ontological perspective: "The world of mathematics is, the same as the world of literature, dominated by fiction. There is as much convention in Euclid as it is in Aeschylus" (MARCUS, 1987a). From the amalgam of personalities, the author selects the one that capitalizes ontological perspective, the antiquity also having a syncretism feature. Generally, we perceive in his studies one of Friedrich Schleiermacher's rules that determines the individuality of the

researcher, being consistent with the texts he interprets.

Solomon Marcus does not have a definition of the mythical thinking. However, in many of his writings we meet with a homage paid to the myth: "The fact that we work with metaphors helps us understand the connection between myths and culture. Two main forms of culture, literature and science are daughters of myths and take from myths (...) primarily the symbolic function. It is essential in both literature and mathematics. Those who lived the mythical period of history were not aware of everything I am telling you now. These are contemporary readings of distant times. The same as the myths, and literature and science are placed in a fiction universe. But Euclid's geometry is still in a universe of fiction too. The point, the right line, the circle, the sphere are fictional objects. They do not exist as such in this tangible, sensorial accessible reality. The holographic principle without which neither poetry nor mathematics could be conceived, nor science in general, without the ability of people to discover the local that can account for the global and the momentum that would account for eternity, there would be neither literature, nor science" (MARCUS, 2014). If we selected the keywords that determine the myth in a connection with the notion of culture, we would draw a graph with the following coordinates: essence, symbol, fiction, the holographic principle that pulsates between the local and the global.

The empiricism, typical of the XXI century research, appears in a form of generalization, comes from the experience of mathematical formulas that must be attributed as a regularity: "Any myth, no matter how different it may be, relies on a certain connection between the anthropos and the cosmos. I can draw a very long list of ways in which science and literature have taken from myths what their essential is. The paradox took over from myths too. Eliade always emphasizes that the sacred is essentially of a contradictory nature. It is something that embraces you and something that challenges you" (MARCUS, 2014). The myth does not accept axioms, but the axioms are proper to the exact sciences. But there are certain structures: which are within the allowed and unacceptable

boundaries, we could exemplify through the cardinal points of being Hero (in the case of Ulysses) or Nobody (the first name for Polyphemus), the Most Beautiful Helen (the dignity that must be won by returning to Sparta) and the sacrifice of Euphigenia, which emphasizes the superficiality of Menelaus' wife, the eagle the symbol of power (the sign of Zeus), but also the symbol of dogma (in the case of Prometheus punishment). However, in the perception of the myth as a sacred essence, which he selects from Mircea Eliade's vision, it is an attitude in which it is emphasized that any relation to the notion passes through a preference or rejection experience. In the case of Solomon Marcus, science is attributed to the mythical roots that the Hellene stipulated through the nine muses.

The sacredness comes as an attitude of touching a syncretism proper to the cell, the letter, the point. The myth becomes a cultural big bang that subsequently explodes and expands culturally into the most widespread forms, preserving the entity of the beginning, even when it may symbolize the opposite.

3. CATEGORIES OF TIME AFTER SOLOMON MARCUS IN A PROJECTION OF THE ANCIENT MYTH

Time research is scientifically dominated by physics, yet in a mathematical, linguistic and philosophical prerogative we only select what would contribute to a literary study. Our attention refers to the "three ways: the representation of the moment, the representation of the flow of time and the timelessness. If during the cycle the "eternal return", draws the attention, in the representation of the moment the emphasis falls on the singular, the unified, on what never comes back again" (MARCUS, 1989). From the perspective of mythical thinking, both are acceptable. The cycle is based on some representations such as Persephone, the myth of the seed (the return to spring in the daylight) or the order determined by *parce / moire* by spinning, the making of the ball of thread and the cutting of the thread. The unique moment retains the punishments that emphasize the act of breaking the order or of competing with the

gods. This sanction does not allow the recovery of the previous time. But the punishment itself can be cyclical. For example, the myth of Prometheus insists on dividing the destiny of the titan to the stealing of the fire from Olympus and beyond. The time up to can not be recovered, it is the uniqueness of the moment - offering the sacred fire to mankind, but the punishment - the pecking of the liver is associated with the cyclic character. It is the cyclical character of Sisyphus' punishment (the continuous lifting of the stone and its fall) represents a foundation of A. Camus' existentialist vision. To persevere in our vision, we specify that the perspective of the moment is related to the rebellion of the king of Corinth not to accept death as a common experience of man. The line of arguments in this respect could also continue with the myth of Arachne, Daphne, etc.

The correspondence between time and the river belongs to the philosophical vision of Heraclitus *pantarhei*, which served as the source of inspiration for many writers, we exemplify through the lyrics of Arcadie Suceveanu: "I do not want to know of any kind / of fundamental principles, I was crying, leave me alone with this stupid pantarhei, "and I was running through the water in which I had once mirrored / but the water was another / always and always another, another." (Heraclitus' Fight).

From this individualization in the confrontation of time, it is appropriate to explain the subjective aspect of time, which Solomon Marcus was also concerned about. The subjective time relates to the relationship between the conscious and the unconscious, which the scholar analyzed in the "Atemporalitate" (Timelessness) section. In the segments of the text, where he approaches this category, we notice his demotivating predilection to use various creations, either art objects or artistic literature. Regardless of which concrete object he would select for his argumentation, it has the ability to be *read*. Reading, in this sense, is the interpretation of images, the dialogue that occurs in the interaction between the one who is in front of an art object and the object. "Timelessness has been identified in several ways. It is known, first of all, that the temporal dimension is excluded from the unconscious life, so the delirious is timeless" (MARCUS, 1989).

The notion of timelessness approaches his notion of naught that he specifies in the volume "Universal Paradigms". In this context, the timelessness intensifies the researcher's desire to look into the eyes of the myth of what it was until the appearance of the world. A problem that has generated many philosophical discussions, it is obvious that in this context the scholar manifests all his skills, in the notional river respectively there appears the desire to distinguish between the relation chaos and order. The timelessness comes to imprint techniques of letting itself holographed in the research of the writers who have cherished the word nevermore (nevermore - A.Ed.Poe) or never, nowhere - Victor Teleuca. The triad that the scholar gives in the interpretation of a dynamic subject: time-space-person, can be savored used for the interpretation of the negative pronoun *Nobody* which passes like a red thread from Homer up to Borges, with poetic ramifications in Romanian literature, such as the anonymity in Blaga's philosophy, or "the thought without a voice" in Arghezi.

The phenomenon of time is *sine qua non* connected to space, but still in the dichotomy of the chronotope, the author dissociates time, studies its antinomic face - timelessness, but places it in front of the mirror - of the person. The awareness of time is inherent to man. Time, seen as a component of a triad, receives these connotations that he estimates from the perspective of myth - cyclicity, uniqueness, continual present, timelessness. All of them are determined by the existential way of the being, both by actual actions that can be counted in real time, but also by those lived, which capitalize on the interiorized time, a time of emotions, the one that shapes eternity in the moment.

4. THE REFERENCES TO M. ELIADE IN THE TEXTS OF SOLOMON MARCUS

Similar to Renaissance works, in Solomon Marcus's research, we find references from many areas. These references also interact with the mythical perspective. Although the scholar denies the subjectivity in myths, their reception will divide time into an objective one (the reading

time) and another subjective (the time of reflections that can not be exactly segmented).

The references to Mircea Eliade appear in approaching time and the perspective of the sacred center: "There is no subjective time in myths. I think there is another cultural context that we need to relate in order to understanding the myth of the eternal return. From the ancient Greeks there is an extraordinary idea. With Eliade this axiom is predominant, that there was a lost paradise (John Milton's *Paradise Lost*). But there is another version of a similar idea, that is, there was a time of perfect knowledge. Some claim that this perfect knowledge produced the Euclidean geometry. And that we lost it. With Plato there is this world of pure ideas, which is his only reality, the same as for Eliade the only reality is that of the sacred" (MARCUS, 2014). Solomon Marcus's desideratum was to come closer to this knowledge. But, the syncretic character, the depth, the thinking in a form where science conjugates itself into metaphors, determined him to include also the category of mythical time. But the ancients had the ability to determine the concrete but also the abstract. The myth is the concrete explanation of abstract phenomena. The passage of time is also concretely explained - Cronos eats his children - it is the condition that the Hellenes have observed, what appears must also disappear.

Respectively, Solomon Marcus observes that the mythical thinking has similarities to the one of every man's paradise age - the childhood, when time is not perceived segmentally - between yesterday - today - tomorrow, the child, up to a certain age has a continuous present: "The same attenuation, the same tendency towards timelessness, or if you want a *continuous present* appears, we now know, in another three areas that at first sight have nothing to do with myths. The very young child lives in a continuous present, it seems that when only he is about six years old he begins to understand what yesterday-today-tomorrow is all about. Then there is the attenuation of this distinction in the quantum world. Where there are no trajectories, there are no motion equations, again we have a continuous present. Suddenly this extraordinary show appears. Three worlds, seemingly the most disparate possible, the world of myths, the quantum universe and the universe of life of the

very young child all stand under the sign of this timelessness" (MARCUS, 2014). In this synchronization, the connection that the scientist notices is interesting. The worlds he highlights and identifies as distinct worlds that he differentiates from the universe: "There must be made a distinction here the same as in Eliade. The world is something different from the universe. The universe is the world from the moment when it acquired a structure, an order. When it comes to the initial moment, the initial explosion, of creation it refers to this orderly universe, not simply to the world, which is "from eternity." We, therefore, meet the infinite potential that is at hand even for the young child, who finds that after any day there comes another day" (MARCUS, 2014). This primordial moment is tangential to the investigations the scholar makes about chaos vs. order.

5. THE MYTHICAL TIME

In the time and space correlation, the mythical time is investigated between the parameters: chaos and order. That vision of the creation of the universe is met in many peoples. However, as the word "chaos" is of Greek origin, it is natural to be a feature of mythology that has most influenced the European culture. In this dichotomy, one can also see the connection between two ancient visions that were continuous in a connection: the Greek civilization and the Roman civilization. The chaos has its synonymous equivalence in nothingness, in timelessness, the order is generated as a time structure.

Mircea Eliade places the chaos not only as a hypostasis that was at the beginning of the world, the exegete of religions does not exclude it, another optic of chaos is offered, being in antinomy with the sacred consciousness: "The consciousness of a real and significant world is closely related to the discovery of the sacred. Through the experience of the sacred, the human spirit has perceived the difference between what is revealed to be real, powerful, rich, and meaningful, and what is lacking in these qualities, that is, the chaotic and dangerous flow of things, their forcible and void of meaning appearances and disappearances" (ELIADE, 1992).

If Mircea Eliade implies the notion of sacred in perceiving the order, the chaos respectively denotes the lack of sacred consciousness, then Solomon Marcus exploits chaos through another coordinate that belongs to the physical matter.

The explanation of this dichotomy, researcher Solomon Marcus achieves through a syncretic parallelism, stipulating: "major meanings of order and chaos: 1. The order as structure and the chaos as amorphous state; 2. The order as the presence of a rule and the chaos as absence of any rule; 3. The order as information and chaos as entropy; 4. The order as predictability and the chaos as a random phenomenon; 5. The order as simplicity (reduced complexity) and high complexity as chaos; 6. The order harmony (symmetry) and the chaos as deceptive antisymmetric; 7. The order as stability and the chaos as instability, the so-called deterministic chaos; this last aspect is the one that is considered of what is now called the science of chaos, which is actually the science of the order that the seeming chaos conceals; 8. The order as absence and the chaos as naught; 9. Ordered-Chaotic vs Clear-Confused" (MARCUS, 2005). These nine precepts in the chain of argumentation change their connotations as though they would assimilate their peculiarities until they incorporate their opposite. As if it were a monad which, the same as a clepsydra: the level of sand passes from one side to another in a similar form, the content fills as in the opposite pole decreases. Arguments are the words that determine the order at first as "structure" that by the end becomes "absence", and the chaos is attributed the "amorphous state" that becomes rationally "asymmetric misleading". The notional braiding is in precept 7. The study of chaos, or, as it appears in the quote in the chain of contextual synonyms, of confusion determines one of the hermeneutical rules to clarify what is opaque. If we were to paraphrase the version of this research, the chaos would be transfigured in order or the incomprehensible to become meaningful. From the point of view of the mythical thinking, generally the advocating is for order, yet in the defiance of order there is a heroic admiration, such as the stealing fire or defying death by Orpheus, Sisyphus, Hercules, the empirical knowledge of Odysseus of what is

forbidden. In the myth respectively, the order appears as a supreme force, but at the same time it also has a totalitarian character. Cyclicity or reciprocal substitution denotes the passage through certain stages from chaos to order and from order to chaos.

This close correlation is explained through the mythical perspectives: "The identification of chaos with the vacuum refers, in some myths, to the period preceding the Creation. Nothingness, naught (from Latin: *ne-nu, ens-entis-* being) refers to what does not exist, so it would be somewhat symmetrical to the void. But by its poetic and philosophical connotations, by its association with the existentialist philosophy, nothingness seems closer to chaos than void" (MARCUS, 2005). The ontological vision passed through the horizons of etymology holds the vector of modern sciences.

The track is governed by the notions imposed by the vocabulary of the respective domains, where we see how the dichotomy works in a monad. What the scientist reveals is the passage to another stage of research, the one which approaches the syncretic character of the sciences from antiquity, but being on another information / knowledge loop: "From the same entity we can also approach from the direction of the order, of the structure too; let us remember the importance of the zero sign in structural linguistics, of the absence as a pair of the presence in the Boolean logic, in the code theory, and in informatics, of void multitude in the theory of multitude and the neutral element in algebra, of silence in literature, and in philosophy. The naught in everyday communication cumulates both the aspect of structure and that of chaos. We are in the face of one of the most delicate hypotheses of order and chaos, in which the two opposing terms can hardly be separated. We would be tempted to say, the same as in structural linguistics, that the opposition of the two terms is neutralized. But the identity is also a form of opposition" (MARCUS, 2005).

There appears a trade between intuition and order, respectively, between the reasoning and the subjectivity. And all these are gathered in an algorithm that is not meant to distinguish the boundaries between chaos and order, but to make them work together, to operate, to contact

the crystalline form with the amorphous form. It is a reversal of mentality in which the antinomy is not perceived for differentiation, but to stipulate unity links. In these links of unity the creative timelessness does not eliminate the conventional time of data.

6. THE MULTITUDE PERCEIVED AS AN INVESTIGATIVE PECULIARITY

The specifics of generalizing is proper to this analysis. Acad. Solomon Marcus distinguishes common features in the diversification of art on the scale of time, which he approaches in a meta-interpretation way, capitalizing on "the status of literary critique": "The values that a certain historical epoch imposes is the axiomatic basis of the literary research; and the literary research, as it can easily be noticed by just revising the specialized magazines, is not really concerned with the establishment of values, being rather interested in the structure of the works, in the personality and vision of the authors, in the evolution of genres, in so many categorical or historical aspects of literature. As a consequence of these researches, the initial axiological basis is reconsidered. The literary value is indirectly involved and targeted through explicable structures" (MARCUS, 1989). In this study, the fundamental reference remains the artistic creation: "Literature is approached from different directions; from linguistics, history, philosophy, folklore, sociology, mathematics, aesthetics, semiotics, psychology, psychoanalysis, hermeneutics, computer science and so on" (MARCUS, 1989). The perspectives are not just listed, in all his works Solomon Marcus experienced the joy of demonstrating his concepts through the most different notions. The interdisciplinary study is a possibility to find global visions of modern science, seen from a correlation from particular to the general, sometimes the way also indicates the course from the universal to the local. On the firmament of mythology perceived at the humanitarian level, it is also written about the importance of knowing the mythology of each culture. The general character of his research has always been applied to the particular.

References

- BOBOC, A. (2015) *Metaphor and myth in the genesis of cultural forms* [in Romanian]. Available from: <https://tribuna-magazine.com/metafora-si-mit-in-geneza-formelor-culturii/> [10 January 2019].
- ELIADE, M. (1992) *The History of Religious Beliefs and Ideas*, vol. 1 [in Romanian]. Chişinău: Universitas Publishing House.
- FONARI, V. (2003) *Philosophical and poetic vision on internalized time*. In: Dolgan M., editor. *Artistic and stylistic orientations in contemporary literature, Vol I* [in Romanian]. Chişinău: CE USM Publishing House.
- MARCUS, S. (1987a) *The Shock of Mathematics* [in Romanian]. Bucureşti: Albatros Publishing House.
- MARCUS, S. (1987b) *Thinking modes* [in Romanian]. Bucureşti: Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House.
- MARCUS, S. (1989) *Invention and discovery* [in Romanian]. Bucureşti: Cartea românească Publishing House.
- MARCUS, S. (1990) *Controversy in science and engineering* [in Romanian]. Bucureşti: Tehnical Publishing House.
- MARCUS, S. (2005) *Universal Paradigms* [in Romanian]. Piteşti: Paralela 45 Publishing House.
- MARCUS, S. (2014) *Open wounds 5 (II)*. Fire and Mirror [in Romanian]. Bucureşti: Spandugino Publishing House.