

My habilitation thesis summarizes my most important scientific results since 2001, when I obtained my PhD. Additionally, it also briefly touches upon my results achieved since then in education and university administration. According to the internal regulations of the Babeş-Bolyai University (Article 6, paragraph g), I have prepared my habilitation thesis in Hungarian, accompanied by an English abstract. The thesis contains four major chapters, each with two subsections, with the exception of the first chapter, which is the longest, and contains six subsections. Furthermore, the habilitation thesis contains the entire list of my publications since 2001 and the bibliography used for preparing the thesis.

The first chapter presents my scientific results from the perspective of my volumes published since 2001. I have published seven individual volumes during the previous one and a half decade. The first chapter does not present in detail my 2001 book, since this volume mostly contains the chapters of my PhD thesis, rewritten as individual studies, and I have covered the content of my PhD thesis at length at the beginning of the chapter, in the first subsection. For the same reason, this chapter also lacks the presentation of my PhD thesis published as a book in 2008. I also did not include here the presentation of my book published in Romanian, since it is not an individual volume, but a selection of the more important writings from my Hungarian-language books. However, this chapter does contain a short description of the volume I am currently working on, which I am planning to publish in 2018. I have considered it important to outline this project in order to also offer a perspective on my future research activity. Thus, the first chapter presents my PhD thesis and four of my seven books, along with the description of my volume planned for the next year.

I have publicly defended my PhD thesis, discussed in the first subsection of the first chapter, in 2001, at the Babeş-Bolyai University, with *cum laude* honors. My PhD supervisor was university professor dr. Sándor Balázs, and the members of the doctoral committee were professors István Csucsujá, Vasile Muscă, Alexandru Boboc, and Kornél Steiger. The analyses of my dissertation mainly focused on the social philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. The question I was interested in concerned the specific – metaphysical and epistemological – presuppositions of ancient political thinkers, along with the methods and objectives of their political reflections. Ultimately, I have been looking for an answer to the question regarding the extent to which their results and conclusions can still be used today.

The most important findings of my PhD thesis are undoubtedly related to the political philosophy of Aristotle. Even among these findings, the most remarkable is that, contrary to the current Anglo-Saxon political philosophy, which is a branch of analytical philosophy, political philosophy, or more simply, politics is rhetorical in its form for Aristotle. This specifically Aristotelian conception of politics cannot be solely explained from metaphysical and epistemological presuppositions. As Aristotle described the ideal of politics considered by him desirable, he primarily had in mind the specifically Athenian conception of politics, most aptly described by Pericles by saying: “for we alone regard the man who takes no part in public affairs, not as one who minds his own business, but as good for nothing; and we Athenians decide public questions for ourselves, or at least endeavor to arrive at a sound understanding of them, in the belief that it is not debate that is a hindrance to action, but rather not to be instructed by debate before the time comes for action” (Thucydides: *History of the Peloponnesian War*. II. 40.). Thus, in this understanding, politics essentially meant talking with each other, so when Aristotle called man sometimes a political, and sometimes a talking being, he was alluding to this ideal of politics based on persuasion and debate.

Insofar as Aristotle considered rhetoric to be the main form of politics, several conclusions about politics itself followed for him from this conception, both for political practice and for our knowledge regarding it. First, politics is for him, so to speak, a “practical” science, meaning not that it is practical, but that – contrary to the “first philosophy” – its objective is not to accumulate knowledge, but the capacity to exercise influence, the ability of persuasion. Second, all political knowledge can only be “probable knowledge”, and politics needs rhetoric precisely because it deals with future and contingent human action: “as for those things which cannot in the past, present, or future be otherwise, no one deliberates about them, if he supposes that they are such; for nothing would be gained by it” – says Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, 1357a). Third and last, both the actor and the addressed subject of politics is the freely talking citizen. If politics thus conceived would not organize itself around freedom, then we could safely use coercion instead of persuasion. In conclusion, a series of consequences followed from the fact that Aristotle conceived of politics as rhetoric, having to do with the nature, function, goal, and not least, the status of political knowledge: politics as knowledge does not represent some higher form of knowledge, as in the case of Plato’s philosopher king, but a participant in the political debate conducted with rhetorical means, which is politics itself.

In the second subsection of the first chapter of my habilitation thesis, I introduce my following volume, published three years after the first, in 2004, under the title *Írástudók forradalma* (The revolution of intellectuals). It is a collection of essays, thematically more or less related to each other, on the French Revolution, or more exactly, its political and philosophical world of ideas. Although the books written on the French Revolution could fill an entire library, synthetic and systematic works on its world of ideas are few and far between. My own volume contains chapters with less scientific novelty and also some more remarkable ones from a scientific perspective. I would like to call attention among these to the chapters on human rights or on the genesis of nationalism.

As for the first, the question of human rights: I still think that the French Revolution permanently changed the way in which Europeans think about freedom. After the Revolution, the idea that freedom is not an implication of a political regime, but a property of Man (each individual) as such, held as a birthright and on the basis of one's human dignity, has become increasingly widespread in Europe. We are still inclined today to think about the content of our dignity and freedom in terms of inalienable human rights, and thus the whole "doctrine" of human rights has become an unchallengeable element of our political culture. As for the latter, the genesis of nationalism: I continue to hold the view that European nationalism is somehow a product of the French Revolution in its origin, and it is related to the political and ideological changes which have occurred during the Revolution. However paradoxical it is, the revolution initiated in the name of Man's freedom and human rights has rapidly lead to the formation of a new ideal of community. By demolishing the old hierarchy of orders and corporations in France, this revolution threatened for a short time with complete social disintegration and anarchy. The new ideal of community was supposed to remove this actual danger – which it managed to do with astonishing historical success and efficiency. Thus, hardly had Man step forth in history as a being separated from others, who carries his rights and dignity exclusively in himself, he immediately vanished and metamorphosed into the member of a nation. The rhetoric of human rights and nationalist ideas are historically, and perhaps also structurally, interrelated – and I think this should be even today one of the main theoretical lessons learned from the French Revolution.

In the third subsection of the first chapter of my habilitation thesis, I summarize my first volume which is no longer simply a collection of studies and not even a series of more or less related essays, but a coherent whole, or a so-called “monography”. This book was published in 2005 under the title *Republikanizmus, nacionalizmus, nemzeti kisebbségek* (Republicanism, nationalism, national minorities). I will discuss here only its first chapter, in which I have returned to one of the important topics of my previous volume, the development of nationalism, summarizing, further clarifying, and also providing new historical arguments for my position on this matter. This is perhaps my scientifically most original text to this day: it formulates a hypothesis on the genesis of nationalism, which I could not find in any other authors’ work, although I have continued to research nationalism for the following decade.

The position I represent in that book chapter on the genesis of nationalism is a “modernist” one. I hold that the nation state as a specific form of statehood, its co-emergent form of political community, i.e. the nation, and their corresponding form of political loyalty, i.e. nationalism, are historically very recent phenomena, neither of them preceding the French Revolution. This point in itself would not yet render my position as original. It is, in fact, quite widespread in current research on nationalism. Its originality is more due to the way in which I investigate the causes behind the formation of nationalism. One of the common features of recent theories on nationalism is that they explain the genesis of the nation state based on the modelling procedures of sociology. That is to say, researchers attempt to deduce generally valid explanatory models from the formation process of individual nation states. The other common feature is to discover impersonal mechanisms of action behind these processes, such as industrialization and the transition from agrarian to industrial society – to mention here only the best known of these theories, that of Ernest Gellner. One result of such explanations is that the genesis of the nation state is viewed, if not as a historical necessity, then at least – in Gellner’s own words – as a “sociological necessity”. Gellner’s conviction was indeed that European modernity cannot be conceived without the nation state and nationalism: these are the necessary consequences of the industrial revolution.

I, on the other hand, hold an alternative position in this matter. My approach is not sociological, but rather historiographical in character. I do not consider the modelling procedures of sociology fully satisfying for the genesis of nationalism, since they usually ignore certain historical facts.

For instance, what explains the fact that nationalism was also developed within agrarian societies? At the same time, the explanation of historical processes based on impersonal mechanisms of action also ignores the fact that history (just as politics) is made by people who choose one course of action or the other in a given situation. Thus, I have chosen a historically centered explanation in this chapter. My attempt is, so to speak, to travel back in thought to the revolutionary France and to give the possibly most authentic account of the processes (be they political, economic, or theoretical in character) which have led to the development of the modern French idea of the nation and to the revival of nationalism. As Alexis de Tocqueville, the author of the most famous book *The old regime and the revolution*, wrote it in a letter to his friend, Louis de Kergorlay: “You know that it is less the facts that I am looking for in this reading than the traces of the movement of ideas and sentiments. It is that above all that I want to paint; the successive changes that were made in the social state, in the institutions, in the mind and in the mores of the French as the Revolution progressed, that is my subject. For seeing it well, I have up to now found only one way; that is to live, in some manner, each moment of the Revolution with the contemporaries by reading, not what has been said of them or what they said of themselves since, but what they themselves were saying then, and, as much as possible, by discovering what they were really thinking. The minor writings of the time, private correspondence are even more effective in reaching this goal than the debates of the assemblies. By the route I am taking, I am reaching the goal I am setting for myself, which is to place myself successively in the midst of the time.”

I consider it important to point out that, in my view, these processes entailed not only mechanisms of action of an “objective” character (i.e. political, economic, etc.), and we should devote at least as much attention to the “ideological” elements. Thus, it is the position of the great adversary (and university colleague) of Gellner, Elie Kedourie, which I consider more acceptable. In his debate with his younger colleague, Kedourie consistently emphasized that, for him, the nation is no more than a simple historical accident. It is essentially nothing else than an “ideological” construct, and it is such philosophers as Rousseau and Fichte who can be held “responsible” for having developed the idea of the nation, or more exactly, national sovereignty. This is, thus, an explanation more characteristic for the historian of political ideas, identifying essentially ideological reasons for the genesis of the nation and the nation state, and focusing primarily on the political institutionalization process of an ideology. Such explanations will

perhaps always seem alien to sociologists, and I readily acknowledge that the political institutionalization process of an idea is hard to grasp with sociological modelling procedures. Therefore, perhaps it really is an absurdity from a sociological point of view. However, we should add that it was also Alexis de Tocqueville, the very father of modern political sociology, who, in his book on the French Revolution, has drawn out with exemplary empathy the process through which the ponderous Rousseauian idea of national sovereignty trickled down to the people, so that in the end even “the imaginations of women and peasants were inflamed”.

My position is, therefore (without explaining it at length here), that the nation is indeed a modern formation: before modernity, more exactly before the French Revolution, one cannot speak of nation in its current sense. Furthermore, I think, in agreement with Kedourie, that the idea of the nation is an ideological construct, and its spread is in no way a historical or “sociological” necessity, but a mere historical accident. However, my position is also, in some sense, an intermediary one, since I also accept that there are some – objective and primarily political – mechanisms of action which stimulated, but also presupposed in their existence, the emergence and existence of the nation. One of these is republican government. To put it briefly, I am saying the same thing as the great Hungarian political thinker of the 20th century, István Bibó, has always said: “democratism and nationalism are blood brothers”, since they have emerged at the same time and place in history. The emergence of the nation as political community was inspired by the introduction of the republican form of government, and nationalism has close ideological ties to the Rousseauian requirement of popular sovereignty.

All this does certainly even today not mean that the republican government (or as we call it today: democracy) necessarily presupposes the national type of political community and the linguistic homogenization of the population. It rather shows that we have introduced with the French Revolution a form of democratic regime in Europe, which simultaneously presupposes and reproduces the national type of political loyalty and community. It presupposes this because of its usual self-legitimation as a nation state, based the principle of “national sovereignty”, according to the Rousseauian logic, and is compelled to permanently reproduce it because it can only be functional as a powerfully centralized and bureaucratized state apparatus as long as its citizens all speak the official language guaranteeing the smooth functioning of administration, justice, and public education.

In the following, fourth subsection, I discuss my later volume on multiculturalism, published in 2009 with the title *Szabadság, egyenlőség, nemzetiség* (Liberty, equality, nationality). Also in this case, I will only deal here with a single book chapter analyzing the opportunities, prospects, and references of intercultural dialogue. This text is, in fact, a polemic with the position of Bhikhu Parekh, one of the internationally recognized specialists on multiculturalism. In the 9th chapter of his book on multiculturalism, Parekh lists those community traditions which have over time come into conflict with the liberal value system of the Western world and discusses at length the arguments for and against their acceptance. He deals with such topics as female circumcision, polygamy, Muslim and Jewish requirements relating to animal slaughter, child marriages enforced without the consent of the involved parties, marriage among close relatives, the banning of Muslim girls from school sports, the situation of Muslim girls wearing *hijabs* at school, and the attachment of the Sikhs to their traditional turban. Although I do not discuss all relevant arguments of Parekh in my book chapter, I thoroughly deal with the theoretical premises of his analyses. I do this mainly because I find that – as well founded as his arguments may otherwise be – at least one of the theoretical premises of Parekh is debatable.

Although I would be inclined to the opposite belief, Parekh states that the majority cannot appeal in such debates to the basic political values of liberal democracies, i.e. the values offering the ultimate legitimation for Western societies and political regimes. The reason invoked by him is that these values are not generally accepted even within the majority society. It is a mistake to believe that the idea of human rights, equality, or other similar political values or ideas would be coercive and generally accepted in liberal societies. Not all members of a liberal society are liberal, and equality most certainly is not a desirable value for the racists among us. However we may relate to the debated practice (whether banning, condemning, tolerating, or extolling it as an example to follow for the majority), we can never refer to these political values within the debate.

Against this, I argue in my book (and continue to hold) that Parekh's position, however convincingly he presents it, is debatable. It is certainly true that not all members of a liberal society are liberal. However, the acceptance of liberal societies is given, among others, by the fact that it also permits and tolerates non-liberal positions. In other words, a liberal society is liberal precisely because one of its fundamental political values, the principle of tolerance or

patience refers even to illiberal views and opinions. (If only liberals would exist in liberal societies, then that society would not be liberal, but most probably dictatorial.) To put it succinctly, my position is that one of Parekh's premises, if not entirely flawed, needs an addition: there are indeed political values we can invoke in such debates. It is, of course, entirely clear for me that even within Western European democratic regimes there are ideas, principles, and institutions whose legitimacy is debatable – however inclined we may otherwise be to think of them as inextricably entwined with our democracies. However, I am also convinced that not all democratic ideals, principles, or institutions have this character: there are some among these about which we cannot argue and bargain with each other and others. I refer here in particular to those from which our democratic regimes get their ultimate legitimation, and which cannot be put to debate, or at least not without endangering the legitimacy of our political regimes – in other words, without us denying ourselves politically.

One such principle, as I have already mentioned, is the principle of tolerance. The other principle could perhaps be the classic principle of consent, which permeates our democratic culture. For instance, it is self-evident for us here in Europe that law is legitimized by public will and not by religious requirements: law is legitimized through the consent of those who are bound to obey it. Thus, in Europe we have become accustomed to only accept political obligations as binding for ourselves and obey such laws for which we previously had the possibility of open debate and to which we have given our consent. Now, this is something entirely different than to obey a command because it happens to be the word of God. Finally, there is the principle of free and public debate, which, in his famous book on democracy, Giovanni Sartori even considers to be the ultimate legitimizing principle of any democratic regime. The distinguishing mark of democracy (all democracies) and also their source of legitimacy is that anything is up for debate and theoretically anyone can speak in this open debate. Let me add here, thinking also of the Charlie Hebdo terrorist attack, that the principle of open debate also extends to religious convictions in democratic states. I mention this also because today we seem to be forgetful of the original meaning of religious tolerance, which initially did not require us to uncritically accept and approve of others' beliefs. What it required was only to respect others' freedom of conscience, which is far from being the same.

Finally, my last volume published hitherto, which I present in the fifth subsection of the first chapter, is again a collection of studies, published in 2013 under the title *Ethnosz és démosz* (Ethnos and demos). Being a collection of studies, one cannot expect any special coherence of content from it, but it can be useful in presenting the new research areas in which I am increasingly interested in. I wish to highlight here only one of these, the problem of the political community of the European Union, which I discuss in a – rather lengthy – study of this book. I have chosen this particular question since it continues to be relevant, indeed ever more topical because of the current migration crisis and the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the European Union (the so-called Brexit). The main idea of this study, outlined in its introduction, is that the closer political integration of the European Union, the “European constitution” would also require the existence of a European nation, the European “demos”. Since this does not exist, political thinkers, such as Jürgen Habermas, who advocate the idea of a politically more united Europe, analyze this possibility in their work. According to Habermas, the European demos, if there will be such a thing, will be a transnational community called to life and held together by “constitutional patriotism”. The first part of my study discusses this vision of Habermas, primarily in a critical vein, building on the consideration that democracy has historically always depended upon the national frame, being thus inconceivable in a transnational medium.

The second part of the study, also using the above consideration as a starting point, seeks for an answer to the question whether we can imagine a European political community as a national-type community. The chosen method of analysis is a historical analogy, which reviews the creation process of the national-type political community in Europe, focusing especially on the beginnings of this process, i.e. France and the Revolution, and investigating whether any analogy can be thought through between the emergence, or creation, of the national and the European identity. This procedure is not new, since it has already been used by Daniel Weinstock in his analyses dedicated to the issue of transnational citizenship. Although, as opposed to Habermas, Weinstock recognizes that the political institutionalization of the EU would require some kind of common national identity, but given that this has been of an artificial character in all of its historical manifestations (in other words, something which is constructed, usually with powerful state support), he holds that existing national identities can be relatively easily deconstructed and recreated at a higher or more encompassing (European) level. According to Weinstein, in the same way in which national identity was once constructed in France, it could also be constructed

at the transnational level, with the sole difference that today we could probably no more employ the coercive instruments employed everywhere in Europe during the formation process of nations, primarily, of course, in the interest of linguistic homogenization.

The conclusion of this second part of the study is that the European political community cannot be thought of as a “national” community in the same way in which it is also inconceivable as a “transnational” community. The reason is precisely that we could no longer employ those instruments which have made Basques and Bretons into Frenchmen two centuries ago. This process cannot even have as its goal today the elimination of existing national identities and their substitution with a more encompassing identity. (For example, the objective cannot be to substitute our existing national identities with some kind of European identity.) The most we can aspire to is to open up a space for new identities in addition to the existing ones. Therefore, I think that the analogy with the processes of nation-building ceases at this point. Furthermore, I am convinced that Weinstock is also wrong in holding that, before the processes of nation-building, groups living in different countries had only rigidly divergent and distinct identities, and they did not thought of themselves as members of the same nation. Nothing could be further from the truth than the claim that the Bretons and Basques living in France did not know themselves to be Frenchmen. France and the French nation was not created by the Revolution, but as the saying goes, it was “the forty kings who made France”. Indeed, it was even needed that France would be “made”, i.e. the French people to be already determined, for it to begin to govern itself later. Thus, when the radicals of the French Revolution began to urge the dissemination of the French language through various means, this did not happen because the inhabitants of Bretagne or Pays d’Oc did not know themselves to be Frenchmen, but because the new, revolutionary ideas on national sovereignty and political equality seemed only feasible if everyone alike spoke French, considered to be the language of the Republic. This was the process which has led to the creation of the modern French nation of our time.

This leaves us, as I argue in the third and final chapter of my study, with the alternative of thinking in terms of a political community, which is neither transnational, nor “national”. History also provides examples for such political communities. Let us call them here, for the sake of simplicity, republican political communities. Therefore, European political community can indeed be conceived as a republican community. However, for this to be achieved, European

nations would have to transcend the national and cultural differences separating them and think in terms of a common order, or a common “thing” (*res publica*). This is also resembles the view of Habermas, with one important difference: for Habermas, constitutional patriotism means a purely political loyalty. Moreover, according to him, this loyalty is owed not so much to political institutions and to the constitution as to the principles they embody. The difference is far from negligible as soon as the principles – unlike constitutions and institutions – are not individual in their character: the same principles can be discovered within the similar constitutions of other countries. To put it differently, that which is individual is not some grouping of principles found in the constitution, but the interpretation of these principles embedded within the national traditions of the particular country. This interpretation is created by the citizens themselves through their debates carried out in various spaces of the public sphere, and since these debates can never reach a conclusion, it would be more correct to say, according to Habermas, that the distinguished object of loyalty is not so much a well-defined interpretation of the constitution as a set of interpretations available to us, or a “common horizon” of interpretations.

Against this, I argue in the final chapter of my study that patriotism, as known to us from its different historical occurrences, has never been a purely political sentiment, and perhaps it cannot even be thought of as such. Although it can be a viable form of political loyalty, nowhere has it emerged simply through loyalty to a written constitution. According to our historical experience, federal regimes can indeed support the major differences of their internal institutional and jurisdictional systems, and thus the federative idea can carry some hope for the enthusiasts of Europe. Yet, this hope can only become reality if European nations will have “something” in common to hold them together, which can function as the object of their common political loyalty. Therefore, if “us, Europeans” truly want a republic, even a federative one (and other political orders as that of the republic are neither possible nor desirable, if we wish for freedom for ourselves and for others), then we have to think in terms of a regime permitting true political cohesion and creating authentic political community, specifically by efficiently linking together sentiments directed at ourselves and at others. However, as I argue in this chapter, this is possible only where people living in a given political order have something in common, namely this political order itself, the political body, or the republic, which is the “common thing”. In other words, it is only possible where the political order of the republic is thought of and felt by the citizens as being their own.

In the sixth, and last, subsection I discuss my plans for the future. Priority among these is given to publishing a new volume, in 2018 at the latest, under the title *Kortárs politikai filozófia* (Contemporary political philosophy). My aim with this book is to present political philosophical reflection, as it were, “in motion”. My plan is to present the most important political challenges of our times and societies, along with the ways in which political philosophy can reflect upon them with its specific methodology and categorical tools. This book will be simultaneously a university textbook and an introduction also enlightening for the general reader. I think that it could be useful and instructive also for the general reader, because I am planning to reflect with this volume upon some of the political and theoretical challenges of our time, which can stir up or keep awake the interest of the reader for political philosophy. The most important risk factor in writing this book stems from the nature of the subject itself: political philosophy is a broad and vaguely outlined domain, showing an astonishing variety in the 20th century. Anyone who wishes to overview all of it is in danger to lose himself in the details, or to present it one-sidedly. Against this former threat, I have planned a very strict structure for the volume, and I try to reflect on its pages on specific, clearly outlined topics. The second danger threatens all of us and is almost inevitable, because one cannot think about politics politically (i.e. with scientific neutrality): one-sidedness in the discussion of the individual topics can only be avoided if one strictly adheres to the specific methodology of political thought, the requirement of “extended thinking”: we should always try to transpose our existence where we are not and view the world through the eyes of those who look at it from a different angle. However difficult, perhaps this is not impossible after all.

In the second chapter of my habilitation thesis I describe my research activity of the last fifteen years in the light of my other publications besides the books, including volumes I have edited, studies published in journals and collective volumes, essays and talks published in conference volumes. Here, I follow not so much the principle of reviewing their content, but of numerical presentation. As for the numbers: since 2001, I have published 21 studies in scientific journals indexed by major international databases, written in English, Romanian, and Hungarian. Additionally, I have also published 7 studies abroad (in Hungary, Holland, etc.), in Hungarian and English, in journals not indexed by international scientific databases. I have hitherto published 13 lengthier studies in collective volumes, also in Romanian and English.

However, the bulk of my publishing activity since 2001 (20 studies and essays) consists of studies and sometimes essays published in Hungarian-language cultural journals from Romania. This is not necessarily because of any reticence toward scientific journals or an inability to write academic texts, but because it is my conviction that if we wish to prevent the increasing depopulation of the university philosophy departments (signs of which are beginning to show both in Hungary and Transylvania), then we have to convince the larger public of general readers about the meaningfulness of practicing philosophy, of the fact that it is more than a mere intellectual pastime or the philological study of our traditions. That is why I have never rejected requests to publish in cultural journals. Generally, in such cases, I have reflected upon current political topics, using the conceptual tools and specific methodology of political philosophy.

I have left to the end two categories of scientific texts usually treated as “stepchildren” among scientific publications. On the one hand, I did some translation work over time, primarily from English. It is not much, 4 texts in total, but it is due to my work as a translator, for instance, that Charles Taylor’s famous text on negative freedom can be read in Hungarian. On the other hand, I have also written 10 book reviews in the last fifteen years. These are not usual book presentations, but lengthy critical reviews, many of which at the level of individual scientific studies. Although reviews are generally viewed as scientific publications of less value, it is my conviction that they are essential accessories for a healthy professional public sphere, without which no scientific life, in the full meaning of the word, is possible. Thus, I have been motivated in their writing by my commitment to the cause and future of the Transylvanian Hungarian philosophical public sphere.

In the second subsection of chapter two, I outline the professional and public impact of my scientific research activity. It would be easy for me to say here that the numbers speak for themselves: 7 individual volumes, more than 60 essays and studies can be considered a quite remarkable performance for a fifteen-year period. However, the essential question remains whether scientific activity has any impact: how many people read these texts, and more importantly, how many of their readers reference them? – since it is the latter which measures the scientific credibility of our publications. Our texts can be considered reliable from a scientific point of view if others can build upon them in their own researches. At the same time, of course,

there is also the question of the echo of these publications in narrower scientific circles. Were they reviewed, and if so, in what journals, and how was their general reception?

Since the publishing of my first volume (2001), 14 reviews have been published about my books, many of them in prestigious philosophical and other scientific journals, such as *Magyar Tudomány* (Hungarian Science), the official journal of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, or *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* (Hungarian Philosophical Review). My volumes have also been reviewed in English by journals indexed in major international databases. Hitherto I have found 36 independent citations of my books and studies, at least half of them citations (and not merely bibliographical references). It is, of course, my volumes which are most often cited, but not exclusively: some of my studies have generally one, and sometimes several, citations. I would like to mention here only the references to my volumes, without providing any detailed bibliographical data, but simply quantifying the references. I have found 4 independent references to my 2004 book on the French Revolution, 6 to my 2005 volume on national minorities and also 6 to my 2009 work on multiculturalism, along with 3 independent citations of my study collection of 2013, *Ethnosz és démosz* (Ethnos and Demos) – naturally, in this latter case, the time since the book's appearance was also quite short. I would also mention here that, since I am also involved in researches on the history of Hungarian political ideas, my work is referenced by historians and literary scholars too. And since political philosophy has also several points of contact with political science and legal theory, I have also found citations and references to my work among political scientists and jurists.

I also count among the recognitions received for my professional work my involvement in numerous scientific panels, in many of which I have held, or continue to hold, elective offices. Since 1994, I am one of the founding editors of the philosophical journal *Kellék* (Accessory), and since 1997, the founder and president of the Pro Philosophia Foundation from Cluj-Napoca. I have been a member of the Hungarian Philosophical Society since 1999, and a member in the public body of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences since 2004. Between 2007 and 2012, I was also a member in the scientific council of the Hungarian University Institute from Cluj-Napoca, and since 2014, I am also a member of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Research Programs from Cluj-Napoca. Between 2008 and 2014, I have been president, for two cycles, of the Cluj-Napoca Academic Committee's Philosophy Department (of the Hungarian Academy of

Sciences), and between 2009 and 2013, for a single election cycle, I have also been a member in the presidency of the Transylvanian Hungarian Philosophical Society. Since 2012, I am the director of the Babeş-Bolyai University's Department for Philosophy in Hungarian, being currently in my second mandate in this office.

In the third chapter, also divided in two subsections, I outline my scientific work from the perspective of individual and group research projects, in which I have been involved as a member or a leader, and I also present the conferences on which I spoke since 2001. I have won 6 individual research project grants during this period and have lead 2 group researches, one of which with international participation. Furthermore, I have participated in 6 group researches, 2 of which with international financing and membership. In each case, I (or we) have also published my (or our) research results, sometimes in journals, and most often in individual volumes. From the scientific conferences (presented in the second subsection) I have only counted those which have published the talks in individual conference volumes, mainly in order to ensure the verifiability of my participation on the basis of my attached list of publications. One of the disadvantages of this choice is that several conferences have been left out, whose organizers planned or are still planning to publish the talks held at the conferences, but the conference volumes have hitherto appeared due to the longer lead time. From this perspective, the account balance of the one and a half last decade includes participation at 4 larger international conferences and 4 conferences held abroad, with international participation. I have also participated at domestic conferences, organized by universities and other academic institutions, on countless times. The workings of such conferences have been published afterwards on 7 occasions. I would also emphasize that I have participated at all these conferences as a result of specific invitations addressed to me personally.

Finally, in the last chapter of my habilitation thesis, I outline my teaching and administrative activity, also in two subsections, analyzing their past, as well as their future perspectives. Here, without covering in any detail my teaching career, it is worth to be mentioned about my administrative activity that I am the president of Babeş-Bolyai University's Department for Philosophy in Hungarian since 2012, being presently on my second mandate. I would also not dwell now upon my achievements, presented in detail in my habilitation thesis, only mentioning here my short-term projects, and even among these, only one. As a department director, one of

my main objectives is the long-term maintenance of this institution and ensuring the availability of the financial resources necessary for its functioning. For this purpose, I intend to give a stronger profile and firmer contours to the – individual and group – research activity conducted by the institute, in an attempt to gain as much funding as possible for our collective researches, both from the Romanian state budget and from EU funding. I am convinced that the future of university philosophical education in Hungarian, as well as, at least partially, that of Hungarian philosophy in Transylvania in general largely depends upon the material maintenance of our institute.