Women Members of the Bucharest Sociological School as Researchers and Authors: a Synthetic Outlook

Ioana-Ruxandra FRUNTELATĂ

Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Litere
University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters
Personal e-mail: ioana.fruntelata@litere.unibuc.ro

Women Members of the Bucharest Sociological School as Researchers and Authors: a Synthetic Outlook

In the anthology "These second-class characters". Publications by women members of the Bucharest Sociological School, Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu initiates the exploration of the history of Romanian sociology by considering the gender issue. Her introductory study provides convincing arguments that, with a few exceptions, women scientists who were members of the Bucharest Sociological School (BSS) have been marginalized both by the leaders of the School and by posterity. Nevertheless, the following article does not employ a gender perspective, suggesting instead to reconsider women's contributions as part of the valuable scientific heritage of BSS on one side and in a larger frame of feminine epistemology on the other side.

To this respect, the article reviews the intellectual identity of the BSS in the light of recent critical contributions which underline the uniqueness of Gusti's scientific and institutional enterprise in a particular historical context dominated by the effort to consolidate Romania's national construction after the unification in 1918. Further, the scientific contributions of women members of the BSS are examined by taking into consideration their adherence to feminist ideology and to the "research and action" ideology of Gusti's School and also the intrinsic quality of the content and form of a few articles signed by few representative authors, such as Ştefania Cristescu, Dochia Ioanovici or Paula Herseni. In the last section of the article, the idea of difference between feminine and masculine cognitive modes is explored, identifying samples of a possible feminine epistemology in the varied materials included in the anthology edited by Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu.

Keywords: Bucharest Sociological School, sociological monograph, qualitative research, women sociologists, feminine epistemology

Argument

In her recent anthology – *"These second-class characters". Publications by women members of the Bucharest Sociological School* – Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu opens a new chapter in the history of the Bucharest Sociological School, retrieving contributions of women authors published between 1920 and 1943 in two of the academic journals coordinated by the prominent Romanian sociologist Dimitrie Gusti: „Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială" (The Archive for Social Science and Reform) and „Sociologie românească" (Romanian Sociology).[1]

The materials included in more than 600 pages are important not only for historical and sociological reasons. They are equally interesting for Cultural Anthropology, Ethnology and Gender Studies and provide data for a larger debate on the role of gender in producing knowledge.

Although in the following paper I do not position myself as a feminist, I consider that by using the gender criterion in grouping the articles in the anthology, Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu makes her point: indeed, although their articles published in the two journals mentioned above are quite numerous (46) and approach most interesting subjects (such as the relationship between labor conditions for women and the development/ dissolution of family or the fine interconnections between folk life and folk crafts or rituals), women authors – with a few exceptions - are rarely included in exegeses of the Bucharest Sociological School. The title of the book quotes critically the label 'second-class characters,' used by sociologist Henri H. Stahl in an interview with Zoltán Rostás, when referring to women members of the Bucharest Sociological School.[2] The ample introductory study employs a feminist perspective to present examples of gender discrimination, showing that men researchers would use field information collected by women without mentioning their names and sometimes they would even take credit for field 'discoveries' made by women.

For example, Ştefania Cristescu resented the fact that her colleagues Ernest Bernea and Ion I. Ionică would use her field materials on folk magic practices in the village Drăguş without acknowledging her contribution[3] and Lena Constante recalled that her major identification of a painter of icons on glass in the same area of Drăguş was unscrupulously exploited by Henri H. Stahl and Constantin Brăiloiu, who probably didn't even realize that they were committing injustice because working with students and making the best of 'collective' results were common practices on the field researches of the BSS: "It was an atrocious grief for me, because that was my discovery" confessed Constante in an interview with Zoltán Rostás.[4] Henri H. Stahl (in the same interview mentioned above) suggests that women were "less creative" and they had rather a gift for teaching than for research. Nevertheless, according to the principle of "collaboration" widely applied in the BSS field researches, a lot of contributions of women (who would collect material, write and classify information, translate references when necessary and so on) are 'hidden' in the 'collective' texts. An illustrative example is that of Paula Herseni, who worked as a kind of personal assistant of her husband, Traian Herseni, one of the leading members of Gusti's school, although she was really gifted as a researcher, as appears from her paper on the research of domestic industry.[5]

Of course, we should take into account the general epistemological paradigm of the interwar epoch in Romania[6] and consider the fact that – marginal as it may seem now – the role assigned to women in Gusti's scientific and social project enabled them to leave their mark in the making of the twentieth century national intellectual community.

A reconsideration of the history of sociology in the interwar Europe in the light of women's contributions might provide new material for a comparison between different national sociological traditions. While American women sociologists and/ or cultural anthropologists are visible in the interwar international history of sociology,[7] references to the situation in Europe are rather scarce.[8]

Leaving aside the feminist perspective, the anthology provides 'first-class' material to reconsider the legacy of the Bucharest Sociological School by taking into account women's contributions. Alongside topics and content, we have the enriching opportunity to examine the scientific discourse of women authors within (and without) a frame of a feminine epistemology.

The legacy of the Bucharest Sociological School

The foundational role of the Bucharest Sociological School in the history of Romanian sociology has been widely acknowledged in recent years: "The evolution of this school, however, was an essential cornerstone in the institutionalization of Romanian sociology. The characteristics which distinguished the Bucharest School of Sociology from Western schools of sociology were not individual ideas or goals, but its context. Its founder and director, Dimitrie Gusti, possessed unique abilities: he was simultaneously an academic, an organizer, and a public-relations man, and it is above all this combination of academia and politics which gave the school its strength."[9] Especially *Cooperativa G* (*Cooperative G*, an Internet platform initiated by Professor Zoltán Rostás and dedicated to the restitution of the work of Gusti and his disciples) has explored in detail the activity of the BSS and proposed new angles to approach it by using the method of oral history to interview surviving members of the school in the 1980s.

The Bucharest Sociological School developed around the seminars of sociology organized by Dimitrie Gusti (1880-1955) at the University of Iaşi in a first stage, before the First World War and at the University of Bucharest in the interwar period. Inspired by the ideal of modernizing society with help of scientists and by examples of practical sociology that he had encountered while studying in Germany, Gusti set up his "research and action" association at a time when the Romanian kingdom, after the 1918 unification of its territories, needed all its intellectual elites to engage into a great nation-building project.[10]

In a country with a predominantly rural landscape, research of village and folklife became a main topic of Gusti's School. The "monographic" campaigns organized between 1925 and 1939 in villages all over Romania engaged large interdisciplinary teams of professors, students and volunteers and produced "dozens of volumes on monographic theory, research techniques, and social intervention, and a number of either analytic or descriptive discussion papers."[11] Nevertheless, "Gusti conceived the complete knowing of the nation through research as an ascendant process, starting from small units, like the villages and cities, up to the medium ones, like regional units, and up to the understanding of the national level, which cumulated all the other units."[12] Although much fewer than those regarding rural issues, the papers on urban life published by authors of the Bucharest Sociological School are significant for the School's approach of society as a complex and stratified referential.

Dimitrie Gusti's successful political career in the interwar period provided a fortunate context for turning an academic scientific and social assistance project into a leading national institution which set up a model of "militant sociology" (*sociologia militans*) (using research for social intervention in a manner that could be referred – leaving aside the colonial agenda - to the activity of the Rhodes Livingstone Institute).[13]

Gusti's vision and charisma, to which he added the ability to raise funds and to surround himself by bright and reliable "leutenants" explain the unique amplitude of his academic and social project and the long-lasting results that his School obtained. Among other accomplishments, the first Romanian Encyclopedia (four volumes of the six envisaged were published between 1938 and 1943) and the Sociological Museum of National Village opened in Bucharest in 1936 (today, the "Dimitrie Gusti" National Village Museum) speak for the team capacity of the BSS as both scientific group and cultural actor.

At the same time, the BSS was part of an international circuit of sociological ideas not only because many of its members had studied for their University degrees with eminent professors in Germany, France or the US,[14] but also because the social impact of Gusti's School had become a research topic in itself for foreign scholars such as Philip E. Mosely and Joseph S. Roucek.[15] The contribution of the BSS to the choir of world sociology was meant to be reinforced on the occasion of the organization of the fourteenth International Congress of Sociology in Bucharest in 1939. Unfortunately, the event did not take place because of the outbreak of the Second World War.

The intellectual identity of the Bucharest Sociological School is indirectly demonstrated by the fact that it created dissident moves: "For instance, Anton Golopenţia, one of the most talented and cherished of Gusti's students, came to reject the method of preparing an exhaustive monograph on a particular social entity, and instead promoted the more flexible method of the summary monograph, which was oriented more towards the study of particular social problems,"[16] and can also be proved by the "borrowing" of its results and even methods in sciences like Folkloristics, Ethnology and (Social) Anthropology. Mihai Pop, a leading Romanian philologist who took part in some of the BSS monographic campaigns, combined the sociological and philological traditions of folklife studies in Romania to set up - in the second half of the twentieth century - what several researchers in the national arena consider to be a Bucharest School of Ethnology.[17]

According to Sanda Golopenţia, "In the evolution of the Sociological School of Bucharest we can distinguish between ***a.*** an ascending trajectory (1918–1939) including a moment of culmination between 1936 and 1939; ***b.*** a stage of coping with the pressure of WWII and, after 1945, with the sovietization of the country (1940–1947); and ***c.*** its suppression by the communist regime in 1948. The School was 'rehabilitated' by the communist regime at the end of the sixties. Since 1989, publications of oral history and archival study are exploring both its activity (part of which is still to be discovered, because many of its members died without publishing all their work) and its successive redefinitions (during and after the communist regime)."[18]

Contributions of women-members of the Bucharest Sociological School

The consistency of women's contributions in the BSS publications is partially explained by the importance assigned to social assistance in Gusti's sociological project. As responsible Romanian citizens, middle class women were encouraged to study (especially the field of Humanities) and pursue a teaching career. At the same time, their participation in the sociological monographic campaigns helped them acquire competence in ethnographic field research. They had a double training: their academic education (sometimes completed abroad) and their integration in the Gustian "research and

action" project. Fieldwork in itself was another school for them: they took part in the monographic campaigns beginning with Nerej – 1927 and some of the women authors had a real gift for noticing the 'imponderables' of the informal culture. Also, the "women issues" (the status and problems of women in rural communities) became a research topic beginning with the 1928 campaign in Fundu Moldovei.[19]

Not the least important, women were aware of the feminist ideology, they adhered to the international feminist movement and were part of feminine associations (the Group of Romanian Women, the Association "Solidarity", the National Council of Romanian Women).[20]

Although she was not a member of the BSS, Calypso Botez, one of the authors included in the anthology and president of the National Council of Romanian Women in 1922, signs three studies in "The Archive for Social Science and Reform", discussing the consequences of the "feminist movement" upon social life in Romania after the First World War. Botez argues that women should involve actively in public affairs, live up to "the world of ideas" and acquire a "citizen conscience."[21] At the same time, she notices the fact that there is no solidarity between the women in upper and middle classes who fight for emancipation and the ones in working classes who share a "patriarchal" view on their gender role: "Their lack of good judgement makes women from unions to stay apart from middle-class women, even if the latter are also working women, especially intellectual workers who have sensed before others the particular needs of their gender and have engaged in the feminist claiming of their rights."[22] Calypso Botez is not just an activist who plainly inventories feminist issues in order to plead for her cause. In-between thorough documentation and political bias, she appears also as a remarkable observer of the social stage. I consider that her 'dramatic' question: "What happens to the family deserted by wife and mother [in favour of a professional career]?"[23] is still worth exploring especially in connection with labour migration in contemporary Romanian/ Eastern European societies.

Indeed, there was a constant concern in the epoch for studying the condition of women as part of the project of social assistance developed by Gusti and his disciples. Calypso Botez quotes another author included in the anthology, Veturia Manuilă, the director of the Superior School of Social Assistance (Şcoala Superioară de Asistenţă Socială), who had coordinated a research documenting working women's discrimination at national level. Derisory payment, much less than necessary for a decent life, 16-18 working hours per day with no benefits and prospective dismissal if they were getting pregnant were among the working conditions of Romanian women in the period 1930-1936 collected by Veturia Manuilă and her team from the State Central Institute of Statistics[24].

The assignment of "feminine topics" to women members of the Bucharest Sociological School is another issue that Theodora Eliza Vacarescu approaches in her introductory study, quoting Henri H. Stahl who asserted in an interview taken by Zoltán Rostás that the gender criterion was operational on the research field. For example, Xenia Costa-Foru would study family and kinship because, as Stahl puts it, "In my opinion, this [family] is a much more appropriate topic for a woman sociologist to study rather than for a man sociologist."[25] Văcărescu remarks that: "Maybe one of the most important dimensions of women's involvement in [sociological] field researches points exactly to the mechanism of their academic marginalization: they introduced as scientific topics a few zones of the social life – family, household, daily lives and occupations of women, raising of children - that had been so far considered 'natural' and therefore not interesting for scholarly exploration."[26]

Ştefania Cristescu, one of the few women authors succesfully placed among the most reputed BSS scholars for her innovative and thorough studies on folk magic practices is present with eight studies in the anthology. Her papers include detailed descriptions of the field material (bringing forth a rich folk magic terminology abounding in rare words and phrases with pronounciations marked by their oral circulation) but also concepts and methodological aspects connected to qualitative research which she practised in the manner of an ethnologist or a cultural anthropologist. "One shouldn't forget that we are in the domain of spiritual life facts which the most conscientious statistics will never capture in totality," remarks Cristescu in a 1936 study upon "The Magic Agent in the Village Cornova (Bessarabia)." Her intensive field research approach helps Cristescu notice that performers of rural magic charms are not only tradition bearers but also innovative creators of new poetic forms influenced by literacy. She also explains the ambiguous status of good ("favourite") magic performers in their community: they are revered for their healing powers but also feared because people think that a person who can cure a disease can also cast one upon a potential enemy.[27]

The examples presented above illustrate Ştefania Cristescu's interest in the learning and transmission of magic practices, in the exploration of the status of magic performers in relation with kinship (families of folk healers or 'witches'/ 'wizards') and space (village/ zonal variations of magic repertories according to the German method of „cultural geography" which she was well aware of). Regarding technique of field research, she recommends working strategies for coping with the difficult (esoteric, blamed by society and Church) topic of folk magic: a "good researcher" should "take advantage" of the animosity between informants "in order to collect

more or less directly the material regarding magic practices."[28]

Also, Ştefania Cristescu investigates the issue of women by including in her proposed "research plan of domestic beliefs and rites" questions regarding the "spiritual communion of women", the belief of people in folk communities in the superiority of men in comparison to women or their different opinions when a boy/ a girl would be born in a family.[29]

Dochia Ioanovici, whom Cristescu recommends in bibliography[30], is author of a single article in the anthology, entitled "Statistical considerations on witchcraft in Runcu village" (*Considerații statistice asupra vrăjitoriei satului Runcu*) and published in "The Archive for Social Science and Reform" in 1932[31]. She employs a scientific vocabulary ("universal principles of magic", "oral rites" and "manual rites", "efficiency" of a rite, etc.) which demonstrates her ability to make use of updated international bibliography on the national research field. At the same time, although she organizes empirical data according to Gustian "frames" and classifications, she takes distance from ready-made theories and reports accurately her field conclusions regarding the interpenetration of magic practices and Christian religion in the beliefs and daily life of Runcu villagers: "I could not adopt the opinion that there is no penetration of religion into magic practices and that religion is repellent to magic [...] simply because facts speak otherwise."[32]

Ştefania Cristescu Golopenţia and Dochia Ioanovici are only two examples of distinct voices of women ethnologists/ cultural anthropologists (in my opinion) in the BSS, just as Calypso Botez could be considered a gender sociologist of her time, although formally, she was not a member of Gusti's School. Some other remarkable authors included in the anthology – Alexandrina Gr. Cantacuzino, Natalia Popovici, and Veturia Manuilă – approach "feminine" topics in the domain of social assistance, such as exploitation of children on the labour market or the situation of families "deserted" by working women and confronting urban poverty. In her 1943 article on the influence of women's employment upon their family life, Natalia Popovici sets premises for a case study in an industrializing urban neighborhood (Tei district in Bucharest), arguing that if women (especially mothers) are employed and spend a lot of time away from home, their families face lack of organization and even dissolution. For young women workers who often have been raised themselves in disorganized families, employment encourages individualism and determines a significant change of mentality disregarding "patriarchal" family.[33]

Xenia Costa-Foru, Lucia Chirulescu, and Nataşa Popovici-Raiski are concerned with rural sociology and write about family life, researching especially domestic aspects such as the role of children in household economies. Xenia Costa-Foru is an author whose name has been consecrated among the important members of the BSS and in the history of Romanian sociology due to her substantial contributions to the sociology of family life. Defining her approach as "the study of social groups in which children are born, educated and introduced to society,"[34] Costa-Foru notices that in the village Drăguş,[35] a research of family life has to take into account the interdependence of people and land. Her approach starts from recording data on the onomastic system of the villagers in Drăguş and she concludes that people use their civil names only in relation with the State (administration, school, military service). In informal contexts within their community, first names of people are associated to names of their family ascendants. Another manner of naming people is to use the name of the land they are on or the one of the owner of the household they live in (in cases of a man who settles in his wife's house after marriage). Naming a person by using his or her individual nickname is the third and more rare practice. Xenia Costa-Foru insists upon the close connection between family life and property in Drăguş by paying attention to the places people occupy in church, to the disposition of their lots in the cemetery or to 'spiritual' kinship governed by godparents. She concludes that "such forms of organizing kinship cannot subsist unless there is a natural economy in villages, which makes possible for a group of people who are related to attach indissolubly to a certain portion of land."[36]

The article of Nataşa Popovici-Raiski on "Family and children in a village in Neamţ county"[37] presents in 1939 the same topic ("disorganized families") which she would approach in an urban environment (under the signature Natalia Popovici) a few years later. The editor Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu explains in a note that the article was presented as the collective work of a school in the village Broşteni, Neamţ county and Nataşa Popovici-Raiski, the director of the school, did not want to sign as an author a paper based on the materials collected by her students, although men researchers in the monographic campaigns would use materials obtained by other persons.[38] Nevertheless, we recognize the style of Popovici-Raiski in the interpretive paragraphs, in which she focuses upon the condition of women and children in "disorganized" rural families. Popovici relates demographic data to field transcriptions and produces a sociological and psychological interpretation of the hopeless condition of women who are imprisoned in their rural households,

working their fingers to the bone to raise another generation of children in a family environment affected by poverty and violence.

Domnica I. Păun, Magdalena Livezeanu, and Cornelia M. Ionescu explore the status of different village groups, some of them marginal, such as the Rroma in the village Cornova (Bessarabia), whom Păun studies as 'different' part of the peasant community in an attempt to find the most appropriate answer to the problem of their integration.[39]

By contouring portraits of village personalities (a craftswoman making fur sheepskin coats, an old man remembering the First World War), Lena Constante and Ecaterina Botez write about representative informants in an ethnological manner. E. Botez published in 1937 (in the section of "Documents" of the "Sociological review") a textualization of a detailed oral life story narrated by an exceptional informant from the western part of Romania (Banat county), old Pelea, born in 1873[40]. Besides the informative value of a document that enables a 'close regard' at the First World War witnessed from the camp of the Central Powers (because Banat was in the Austrian Hungarian empire before the Great War), the philological accuracy of the transcription made by E. Botez (preserving phonetic particularities of the old man's speech) adds to its importance.

The research of the so-called "feminine" topics makes available to present day scholars an important empirical material which could help them understand the social reality in an interwar Romania with "the highest infant mortality in Europe (400,000 children deaths annually)"[41].

Considering the "feminine" topics as part of the heritage of the Bucharest Sociological School, in relation with the generally acknowledged "centralist vision" of Gusti's school,[42] we notice that the scientific treatment of these topics appears to contradict the top-down approach usually assigned to the BSS. Although women authors were intellectuals and could never be perceived by their peasant informants as 'one of them', they worked with a particularly feminine empathy which often helped them build a bridge between academics and illiterate people.

At the same time, the contribution of women authors to "mainstream" topics (in the categories of ethnography and field research methodology) is also important. As Sanda Golopenția notices, "far from being 'single-author volumes' by Stahl, Conea, Herseni, Gusti-Herseni or Golopenţia respectively, the monographs *Nerej*, *Clopotiva*, *Drăguş*, the volume *Îndrumări pentru monografiile sociologice* and the series *60 de sate româneşti* were regrouping, as co-authors, at least 81 *monografişti*, *echipieri* and specialists in social sciences (22 for *Nerej*, 13 for *Clopotiva*, 29 for *Îndrumări*, and 17 for *60 de sate*)"[43]. Among "co-authors" of the 1940 volume *Îndrumări pentru monografiile sociologice* (Guidelines for Sociological Monographs, coordinated by D. Gusti and T. Herseni), Paula Herseni publishes a "Plan for the Research of Domestic Industry" [Plan de cercetare a industriei casnice],[44] which illustrates eloquently her academic excellence. She observes, explains and pays attention to the relationship between part and whole and the recording of variations of data on the field and 'translates' her ideas in Gusti's concepts: "In order to elaborate a complete study on this activity [domestic industry], we have to ask whether its existence, proceeding and development are determined by the other activities of the social (economic, spiritual, ethical and customary, administrative) unit and by the frames (cosmic, biological, historical, psychological) in which that activity lasts."[45]

As an experienced researcher, Paula Herseni recommends to "provoke" domestic activities in order to be able to follow their complete development. Although her references include ethnographic papers published by the Romanian Academy, German contemporary studies and a treaty of peasant economy, she places herself in a sociological angle, considering that the opinion of villagers about domestic industry (expressed in informal talks) could anticipate its local evolution: "Is there any precise gender divison of domestic activities? What is the opinion of village people about disregarding that division (*e.g.* if men help women to collect and process hemp)?"[46]

Eliza Retezeanu has also an interesting methodological contribution, a "Plan for the research of social relations"[47] which, according to the author's note, was drawn up and used in the research in Drăguş, following the instructions of Traian Herseni. In this "plan," we notice the interest in the function of gender in the dynamics of family life, reflected in a question such as "Do domination or equality prevail in the relationships between husband and wife?" But she includes also questions about the manifestations and causes of the relationships between "masters and servants," between neighbours, between locals and newcomers in the village and between people living in different parts of the village Drăguş (upper village or lower village, for example).

Towards another (feminine) epistemology?

According to Elizabeth Anderson, "Feminist

epistemology and philosophy of science studies the ways in which gender does and ought to influence our conceptions of knowledge, the knowing subject, and practices of inquiry and justification."[48] At the same time, by asserting that gender difference is relevant for producing knowledge and consequently for constructing a scientific discourse, feminist scholars imply that the "feminine" cognitive styles and modes of knowledge are "denigrated" in male dominated academic milieus.

Outside feminist or misogynist labels, we are more interested in the idea of difference between feminine and masculine cognitive modes. The mere existence of such a difference would lead to the advancement of knowledge, providing complementary epistemological paths to the mainstream "masculine avenues" of scientific inquiry. The contributions of the BSS women authors support the assumption that although it is no entirely different from that of the men authors (because they are educated in a "masculine" academic system), feminine knowledge production is a highly interesting alternative to it: not only do they approach "feminine" new topics such as the ones presented above, but they also proceed in a feminine way, using "intuitive, synthetic, holistic, contextual and qualitative cognitive styles." An illustrative example in this respect is the article of Lena Constante about a sheepskin coat craftswoman in a western Romanian village.[49] Apparently loose and lacking scientific rigour but displaying an attractive narrative style that captures immediately the attention of readers, the article demonstrates, in my opinion, an ideal manner of writing the ethnographic fieldwork: by observing a woman (Varvara) in the flow of her community's life, by watching her working or listening to her speaking about her craft, the author (Lena Constante) brings together detailed field observations about a piece of folk costume that enable her to understand the centripetal and centrifugal tendencies in the evolution of the researched community. An artist herself, Lena Constante combines her academic training with intuition and empathy and succeeds to create an almost perfectly emic text in which field informants, drawings and pictures appear to speak for themselves while actually the discreet but most relevant critical background facilitates the understanding of their 'native'/'naïve' discourse: "The sheepskin waistcoat (*pieptar,* pronounced *tseptar*) is a basic piece of clothing for the villagers in Şanţ (Bistriţa county), be they men, women or children. [...] Mădălina Nistor, a 70-year-old woman, still wears such a sheepskin coat when she goes to church on holidays. Men would wear shorter sheepskin coats with as many embroideries as the women. Only two or three old men wore such coats last summer when they attended a wedding at church and on that occasion even a few young men borrowed the coats from their parents [...] [Such sheepskin coats] were very expensive, says Mădălina Nistor. 'Only a great householder would wear one'."[50]

A further exploration of the contributions in the anthology from the point of view of the cognitive styles of women authors would set into light 'another side' of the Bucharest Sociological School as an academic and intellectual milieu sheltering not only gender bias but also diverse and 'different' knowledge production.

Note:

1. Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu (ed.), *„Personajele acestea de a doua mână". Din publicaţiile membrelor Şcolii Sociologice de la Bucureşti*. Preface by Zoltán Rostás (Bucharest: Eikon, 2018), 57.
2. In a 2001 interview with Zoltán Rostás, Marcela Focşa (1997-2002), a participant in the BSS monographic campaigns since 1928, also refers to the superior intellect of "the boys" such as Henri H. Stahl: "It was useful for us to observe different villages with these older boys, with Stahl, as they were two or three years older than us and they were more clever than the girls, more oriented." Rostás, *Sala luminoasă*, 110.
3. Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 57.
4. Ibid., 60-61.
5. Ibid., 63-64.
6. See Antonio Momoc, "Engineering a Good Society. The Sociological School of Bucharest National Project for Building Romania," In *European Journal of Science and Theology*, Vol.9, Supplement 2 (2013): 95-104.
7. See Linda Grant, Marybeth Stalp, and Kathryn B. Ward, "Women's sociological research and writing in the AJS in the pre-World War II era," in *The American Sociologist*, no.33 (September 2002).
8. The Polish Maria Ossowska and the British Beatrix Webb seem to be among the few European women sociologists which are mentioned in international reviews of sociology including the interwar period. See Janusz Mucha, "Institutionalization of Sociology," in *Polish Sociological Review*, no. 123 (1998): 235-46.

9. Zoltán Rostás, "The Bucharest School of Sociology," in *East Central Europe*, Vol. 27, no. 2, (2000).
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Momoc, "Engineering".
13. "The Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI) in Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) [...] was the institutional focus for a large group of anthropologists who accomplished path-breaking work after World War II [...]. After World War II, this institute became part of the British government's postwar colonial development effort and was lavishly funded by the Colonial Social Science Research Council (CSSRC) [...]. As a group the RLI anthropologists developed new methods of fieldwork and analysis, including the case method, situational analysis, and network theory, to name but a few. They produced studies that addressed problems of contemporary African life rather than producing retrospective descriptions of precolonial social systems." Lynette Schumaker, "A Tent with a View: Colonial Officers, Anthropologists, and the Making of the Field in Northern Rhodesia, 1937-1960," in *Osiris*, 2nd Series, Vol. 11: *Science in the Field* (1996): 237-258. Quotation from 238-239.
14. A graduate of Philosophy and Modern Philology with a Ph. D degree obtained at the University of Bucharest, Ştefania Cristescu won a scholarship to study Linguistics, Ethnography and Sociology at the Sorbonne Institute of Ethnology with professors J. Vendryes and Marcel Mauss among others. Another member of the BSS, Christina Galitzi obtained a Ph D degree in Sociology in the United States with a thesis which she defended in a commission presided by Franklin Henry Giddings and published at Columbia University Press, New York, under the title *A Study of Assimilation Among the Romanians of the United States.* See Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 55, 39, 452.
15. Vasile Puşcaş, "Philip E. Mosely şi Şcoala sociologică a lui Dimitrie Gusti," in *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu din Cluj-Napoca* [Yearbook of the Institute of History George Barițiu of Cluj-Napoca], Volume LIII (2014): 97-198.
16. Rostás, "The Bucharest School".
17. Ioana Fruntelată, "Etnologia românească actuală: tradiții, teme, practici disciplinare," in *Romanian Studies Today*, edited by Mircea Vasilescu and Magda Răduță (Bucharest: University of Bucharest Press, 2017), 16-29. Quotation from 20-21. See also the analysis of the influence of the BSS upon Romanian folklore studies, ethnography and ethnology in Mihaela Pena, Emil Țîrcomnicu, Laura Jiga-Iliescu, and Teodoreanu, Nicolae, "Şcoala sociologică," in *Etnologie românească. I. Folcloristică şi etnomuzicologie*, eds. Sabina Ispas and Nicoleta Coatu (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Press, 2006), 262-300.
18. Sanda Golopenţia, "The Sociological School of Bucharest between its Heyday and Suppression," in *Revista română de sociologie*, no. 5–6 (2014): 379–404. Quotation from 379.
19. Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 24-25.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid., 147.
22. Ibid., 153.
23. Ibid., 109.
24. Ibid., 312-318.
25. Ibid., 26-27.
26. Ibid., 49.
27. Ibid., 241-264.
28. Ibid., 262.
29. Ibid., 629-630.
30. Ibid., 638.
31. Ibid., 156-169.
32. Ibid., 169.
33. Natalia Popovici, "Influenţa muncii femeii asupra vieţii de familie" [The Influence of Women's Work on Family Life], in Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 318-328.
34. Xenia Costa-Foru, "Câteva aspecte ale vieţii de familie din România" [Some Aspects of Family Life in Romania] (first published in 1936), in Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 234-240.
35. The monographic research of the village Drăguş, Făgăraş district, was conducted in the period 13 July – 1 August, 1929 and 86 researchers took part in the campaign. According to Marin Diaconu (2000: 189), the research in Drăguş was "the climax of the monographic researches of Gusti's Sociological School".
36. In Văcărescu, Personajele: 237.
37. Natașa Popovici-Raiski, "Familia şi copilul într-un sat din Neamţ (Holda)" [Family and Children in Holda Village from Neamţ District], in Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 524-582.
38. Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 524.
39. Domnica I. Păun, "Ţiganii în viaţa satului Cornova" [Gypsies in the Life of the Cornova Village], in Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 223-233.
40. Ecaterina Botez, "Viaţa unui ţăran din Banat. Povestea lui Moş Pelea din Fibiş" [The Life of a Gipsy from Banat. The Story of

Oldman Pelea from Fiviș], in Văcărescu, *Personajele*, 415-429.
41. Bogdan Bucur, "The Bucharest School of Sociology and the Failure of the Interwar Community Development Project," *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov*, Vol. 6 (56) No. 2 (2013): 93-102. Quotation from 99.
42. Bucur, "The Bucharest School," 97.
43. Golopenţia, "The Sociological School," 390.
44. In Văcărescu, Personajele: 610-624.
45. In Văcărescu, Personajele: 613.
46. In Văcărescu, Personajele: 624.
47. Eliza Retezeanu, Plan pentru cercetarea relaţiilor sociale [Plan for the research of social relations]. In Văcărescu, Personajele: 652-656.
48. Elizabeth Anderson, "Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Online at https://plato.stanford.edu.
49. Lena Constante, Varvara Guşe, Suşiţa din Şanţ [Varvara Guşe, the sheepskin coat maker from the village Şanţ]. In Văcărescu, Personajele: 331-338.
50.Lena Constante, Varvara: 331.

Bibliography:

Anderson, Elizabeth. "Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science." *In Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2001.
Retrieved on 01.03.2019 at https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-epistemology/.

Bucur, Bogdan. "The Bucharest School of Sociology and the Failure of the Interwar Community Development Project." In *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov*, Series VII: Social Sciences, Law. Vol. 6 (56), No. 2 (2013): 93-102.

Diaconu, Marin. *Şcoala sociologică a lui Dimitrie Gusti. Documentar sociologic. Vol. I (1880-1933)* [The Sociological School of Dimitrie Gusti. Sociological Documents]. Bucharest: Eminescu, 2000.

Fruntelată, Ioana. "Etnologia românească actuală: tradiţii, teme, practici disciplinare" [Contemporary Romanian Ethnology: Traditions, Themes, Professional Practices]. In *Romanian Studies Today*, edited by Mircea Vasilescu and Magda Răduţă, 16-29. Bucharest: University of Bucharest Press, 2017.

Golopenţia, Sanda. "The Sociological School of Bucharest between its Heyday and Suppression." In *Revista română de sociologie*, no. 5–6 (2014): 379–404.

Grant, Linda, Marybeth Stalp, and Kathryn B. Ward. "Women's Sociological Research and Writing in the AJS in the pre-World War II Era." *The American Sociologist*, no. 33 (September 2002).
DOI: 10.1007/s12108-002-1012-4.

Momoc, Antonio. "Engineering a Good Society. The Sociological School of Bucharest National Project for Building Romania." *European Journal of Science and Theology*, Vol.9, Supplement 2 (June 2013): 95-104.
Retrieved on 19.12.2018 at http://www.cooperativag.ro/engineering-good-society-sociological-school-bucharest-national-project-building-romania/

Mucha, Janusz. "Institutionalization of Sociology." *Polish Sociological Review*, no. 123 (1998): 235-46.
Retrieved on 04.06.2019 at http://www.jstor.org/stable/41274681.

Pena, Mihaela, Emil Ţîrcomnicu, Laura Jiga-Iliescu, and Nicolae Teodoreanu. "Şcoala sociologică" [The Sociological School]. In *Etnologie românească. I. Folcloristică şi etnomuzicologie* [Romanian Ethnology. Folkloristics and Ethnomusicology], Edited by Sabina Ispas and Nicoleta Coatu, 262-300. Bucharest: Romanian Academy Press, 2006.

Puşcaş, Vasile. "Philip E. Mosely şi Şcoala sociologică a lui Dimitrie Gusti" [Philip E. Mosely and the Sociological School of Dimitrie Gusti]. In *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu din Cluj-Napoca* [Yearbook of the Institute of History George Barițiu of Cluj-Napoca], volume LIII (2014): 97-198.

Rostás, Zoltán. The Bucharest School of Sociology. *East Central Europe*, Vol. 27, no. 2, (2000).
Retrieved on 19.12.2018 at http://www.cooperativag.ro/the-bucharest-school-of-sociology/.

Rostás, Zoltán. *Sala luminoasă. Primii monografişti ai Şcolii gustiene* [The Bright Hall. First monographists of Gusti's School]. Bucharest: Paideia, 2003.

Schumaker, Lynette. "A Tent with a View: Colonial Officers, Anthropologists, and the Making of the Field in Northern Rhodesia, 1937-1960." *Osiris*, 2nd Series, Vol. 11, *Science in the Field* (1996) 237-258.
Retrieved on 28.03.2011 at http://www.jstor.org/stable/301934.

Văcărescu, Theodora-Eliza (ed.). *„Personajele acestea de a doua mână" – Din publicaţiile membrelor Şcolii Sociologice de la Bucureşti* ["These Second-Class Characters." Publications by Women Members of the Bucharest Sociological School]. Preface by Zoltán Rostás. Bucharest: Eikon, 2018.































































































