

INEZIL PENNA MARINHO: HISTORIOGRAPHICAL OPERATIONS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION (1940-1958)

INEZIL PENNA MARINHO: OPERAÇÕES HISTORIOGRÁFICAS NA EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA (1940-1958)

INEZIL PENNA MARINHO: OPERACIONES HISTORIOGRÁFICAS EN LA EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA (1940 – 1958)

Antonio Sergio Francisco Oliveira*, Omar Schneider*, Wagner dos Santos*, Amarílio Ferreira Neto*

Keywords:

Inezil Penna
Marinho.
History.
Physical Education.

Abstract: The paper analyzes part of Marinho's work to show his understanding of Physical Education History in Brazil. Covering the 1940-1958 period, it uses articles published in journals and books as its sources. The data showed two distinct historiographical perspectives. The first one is expressed in the work *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil* and in works presented as a result of this publication, linking the author to the principles of the Methodical School; the second one was advocated by him in 1958 and follows a different path by linking History, Science and Art, departing from positivism as an expression of a particular way of doing historical research in Physical Education.

Palavras-chave:

Inezil Penna
Marinho.
História.
Educação Física.

Resumo: O trabalho analisa parte da obra de Marinho com a intenção de dar visibilidade à sua compreensão sobre a História da Educação Física no Brasil. Com periodização entre 1940 e 1958, utiliza como fonte artigos publicados em periódicos e livros. A leitura dos dados mostra duas perspectivas historiográficas: a primeira é expressa na obra *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil* e nos trabalhos apresentados em decorrência dessa publicação, que aproximam o autor dos princípios da Escola Metódica; a segunda, defendida por ele em 1958, segue outro caminho ao realizar uma associação entre História, Ciência e Arte, distanciando-se do positivismo como expressão de uma forma particular de fazer pesquisa histórica na Educação Física.

Palabras clave:

Inezil Penna
Marinho.
Historia.
Educación Física.

Resumen: El trabajo analiza parte de la obra de Marinho con la intención de dar visibilidad a su comprensión sobre la historia de la Educación Física en Brasil. Abarcando un periodo que va de 1940 a 1958 utiliza como fuente artículos publicados en periódicos y libros. La lectura de los datos muestra dos perspectivas historiográficas: la primera se expresa en la obra *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil* y en los trabajos presentados como consecuencia de esa publicación, que aproximan al autor a los principios de la Escuela Metódica; la segunda, defendida por él en 1958, sigue otro camino al realizar una asociación entre Historia, Ciencia y Arte, distanciándose del positivismo como expresión de una forma particular de realizar investigación histórica en la Educación Física.

*Federal University of Espírito Santo.
Vitória, ES, Brazil.
E-mail: omarvix@gmail.com

Recebido em: 04.09. 2014

Aprovado em: 12.09. 2014



1 INTRODUCTION

Scientific production in Education and Physical Education has already acknowledged authors representing the debate that took place between the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century: Rui Barbosa, Fernando de Azevedo and Inezil Penna Marinho.

According to Bloch (2001), History writing is not feasible without understanding man's practices in time. Therefore, the study sees Marinho as a committed intellectual, and even when he says that his studies are neutral, his narratives show his involvement with a social project that seeks to write the History of Physical Education by highlighting episodes, events and documents that make a number of academic contributions to production in the area.

Part of the research on Marinho work is focused on grasping his historiographical operations,¹ which allows us to characterize his conception of History. In those operations, getting to know the author means establishing his contribution to studies about the History of Brazilian Physical Education from the second half of the nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century.

In our analyses, we chose to understand how Marinho organized his production on Physical Education History and to understand his investment in producing that History in Brazil by forging exemplary cases in order to show us the trajectory of Brazilian Physical Education.

The study covers the 1940-1958 period because of his intense production in that period. Therefore, we consider some guiding questions: how has Marinho appropriated the History of Brazilian Physical Education? Which historical perspectives has he used? Which discourses has he produced in view of his appropriations of the historical perspective?

Considering uses made of Marinho's work, we believe that it started to be confused with the very memory of the field and therefore became a *monument* of Physical Education and Sports in Brazil over the decades. "The *monument* is characterized by connecting itself to historical societies' ability for voluntary or involuntary self-perpetuation (it is a legacy to collective memory) and resending testimonies that, only in a small portion, are written testimonies" (LE GOFF, 2003, p. 526).

The alternative we choose to work on the issues allows us to establish other readings rather than those presented by researchers such as Nascimento (1997), Ferreira Neto (1999), Goellner (2005, 2009), and Melo (1998), who underscored Marinho's importance for understanding Brazil's Physical Education scenario.

Cultural History enables us to understand the author's production, especially the one discussing the History of Brazilian Physical Education, and relate it to the context in which it originates (vocational training, working spaces and places, circulation tactics and strategies). Therefore, knowing the work of that intellectual helps us to understand the constitution of representations, which should be seen as "[...] instruments of a mediating knowledge that makes one see an absent object by replacing it with an image capable of reconstituting it into memory and figuring it as it is" (CHARTIER, 1988, p. 20).

¹ History writing is understood here as a historiographical Operation – a term coined by Michel de Certeau (1982) to designate the social practice of narrating the past. For the author, that practice is linked to a social place and, far from being only a technical activity, it is associated with intuitions governed by silent laws that circumscribe a space managed by its own rules allowing or forbidding topics of interest within the field.

The author suggests that these processes must break with the idea that “[...] gave texts and works an intrinsic, absolute, unique meaning – which critique must identify” (CHARTIER, 1988, p. 27).

The representations underscored by Marinho in his historical operations allow us to see the places and spaces he strategically and/or tactically occupied in development policies in the History of Physical Education under the general framework of the Education field. Thus, we understand that the place claimed by the author for the History of Physical Education is the place claimed by himself as the official voice of the field’s historiography, which would be able to speak with authority based on research on the historical setting of that space. That is how we use the theories of Certeau (2004), stating that the place is that instituted, known, identifiable while space is where this place is delimited, used, lived, mocked and negotiated. That allows us to see strategy as a concept that helps to understand “[...] the calculation [...] of the power relations that become possible from the moment a subject of will and power [...] can be isolated” (CERTEAU, 2004, p. 99).

Based on these notions, we say that the place is strategically instituted while space is tactically practiced. Therefore, the notion of tactics refers to “[...] the calculated action which is determined by the absence of a proper locus. [...] tactics has no place but the other’s” (CERTEAU, 2004, p. 100). Based on these notions, we discuss the materiality of practices, objects and their uses, building a way of seeing and questioning Marinho’s work.

In order to show the representations that Marinho developed in his historiographical operation (CERTEAU, 1982), we use his studies presented as articles and books as primary sources. Journals were selected based on research conducted on the Catalog of Physical Education Journals (*Catálogo de periódicos de educação física*, 1930-2000), Ferreira Neto *et al.* (2002). The books included: Marinho (1943, 1952, v. 1 and v. 2, 1953, 1954, 1972, 1980).

2 INEZIL PENNA MARINHO: FROM DOCUMENT PRESERVATION TO HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

In the introduction to his *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil*, Marinho (1943, p. 7) reveals that the main purpose of his work was offering the existing documentation on Physical Education to all. In order to do that, “[...] as much data as possible should be brought together and packaged into a volume that facilitated any information to scholars looking into the subject”. He also highlights that this work “[...] does not represent the history of Physical Education in Brazil; only a contribution to it” (MARINHO, 1943, p. 7), since he had not found any similar research conducted until the year of its publication, in 1943. That is an indication that Marinho worked to gather documents to preserve the memory of Brazilian Physical Education.

However, Marinho’s statement as to the absence of previous studies in the area of Brazilian Physical Education does not reflect the vast bibliography to which he resorted. For example, the following scholars were cited by the author: Fernando Azevedo (1920), Hollanda Loyola (1939, 1940, 1941), Laurentino Lopes Bonorino (1931), Antonio de Mendonça Molina (1930, 1931, 1932, 1936), and Lorenzo Filho (1938) (MARINHO, 1943).

We found that, by stating that there was no production related to the History of Physical Education in Brazil, he wanted to establish his studies as a pioneer work in the field, aimed, contrary to what he sustains, at the accumulation of symbolic capital² when he says that he used the most accurate and reliable sources for the construction of historical thinking in Brazilian Physical Education.

In reviewing one of his first works, we can approximate content and form with the Methodical School approach. Ernest Lavissee, one of the signatories of that historical view during the 1890s in France, gathered a team of historians in order to reconstitute the national past. In 1900, that reconstitution influenced the publication of *Histoire de France*. That work is useful for our studies because it highlights some often implicit principles that guide the work of Methodical School historians. First, the title shows that the research focuses on a nation-state as an object; second, timeframe is organized in terms of government models that serve as chronological milestones. Along the same vein come illustrious men. Third, political, military and diplomatic events are underscored. However, economic and cultural facts sometimes receive less attention and are always placed in a subordinate position, under a political strategy (BOURDÉ; MARTIN, 1983).

That historical school's foundations spread in Europe and also in Brazil, since the historiography that guided studies on Brazilian Physical Education came from Europe, especially the so-called "gymnastic methods" presented in an evolutionary way.

The Methodical School was based on a historiographical writing model which may have influenced Marinho's intellectual production in 1943, when he publishes *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil*.

In that book, the author divided what he called the evolutionary cycle of Physical Education in Brazil as follows: Colony – 1500-1822; Empire – 1822-1889; Republic – 1889-1937. The latter contains a subdivision into three phases: 1889-1930; 1930-1937; 1937 on.

Marinho's division was not arbitrary; it followed facts marking real stages in Brazil's political history, which served as milestones: a) Independence; b) the Proclamation of the Republic; c) The 1930 Revolution; d) the advent of the "New State" (MARINHO, 1943).

In 1952-1954, Marinho publishes *História da educação física e dos desportos no Brasil: Brasil Colônia – Brasil Império – Brasil República* (documentary and bibliography), with the same characteristics of that made in 1943.

In 1984, he published the 119-page *História da educação física no Brasil*, raising the same themes and structures of the texts of the 1943 book and in volumes produced between 1952 and 1954. In addition to eliminating some topics of previous publications, this strategy allows the author to synthesize information, keeping himself circulating and visible in the scientific field.

As for *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil (1942-1943)*, it should be noted that, politically, the country was undergoing a period marked by change, recorded by a culture aimed at establishing and confirming the New State represented by Getúlio Vargas's government in 1937-1945.

2 According to Bourdieu (1990, p. 296), "[...] struggles for recognition are a fundamental dimension of social life" and they are born out of the realization that there is a game to be played, in which "[...] accumulation of a particular form of capital is at stake" (BOURDIEU, 1990, p. 36). Therefore, symbolic capital is projected as possibility for "[...] being known and recognized, [which] also means having the power to successfully recognize, acknowledge, that is, to what deserves to be known and acknowledged" (BOURDIEU, 2001, p. 296).

In this regard Nascimento (1997, p. 26), points out:

The New State's cultural policy sought to create collective memory, i. e., to recreate a national tradition. One of the possible ways to achieve it would be the dissemination of Brazilian history. A story built on the whole set of achievements accumulated over a time, plus current events, that is, the New State would be part of that history emphatically as the New, modern, industrial State geared to the country's development, culture, education, growth.

Marinho built his historiographical version according to a trend that pervaded historical works in Brazil, such as those produced by authors like Fernando Azevedo, Hollanda Loyola, Lourenço Filho and Aluizio Freire Ramos Accioly. In addition, he acted strategically and tactically according to cultural politics governed by the New State – the Getúlio Vargas government – which, under the pretext of recovering the past, was presented in historical texts and was the result of careful research and data collection through which he organized and selected the texts he would use to present objective and true History without expressing opinions about it.

From perspectives desirable for that time, “doing history” meant allowing written documents to speak – the so-called “official documents”, which gave soundness and veracity to historiographical work. Thus, the author sought to distance himself from his object, since otherwise it would lose the prerogative of neutrality. However, that strategy did not exempt him from criticizing both the History of Physical Education in Brazil and the policies and reforms that introduced Physical Education into the educational system.

Although Marinho worked for the Brazilian Ministry of Education and Health, where he served as director of the Department of Education's Physical Education Division, he did not spare the gymnastic methods adopted in Brazil from criticism – most of which came from European countries, as well as sports models imported from England and the United States.

Marinho (1954) criticized and reflected on government policies from his positions as a public figure, departing from the perspective and the theory applied to the study of the History of Physical Education, which should be done through a neutral and documented narrative. In his view, that would allow his readers to come to their own conclusions.

When asked about his critical stance on governments and actors of national politics, Marinho said:

My criticism has always been aimed at actions rather than at the people responsible for the Ministry of Education. I had little interest in the latter, since my concern is always focused on the problems faced by education in Brazil. When high offices of the Ministry of Education are occupied by people who know its most important problems and who, given their resources, are able to improve the country's educational situation, it is clear that a ray of hope enlightens us and the flame of enthusiasm awakens us from the contagious torpor that mobilizes everyone when there are changes in the ministerial administration (MARINHO, 1947, p. 5).

While criticizing the government of which he participated in public offices, he strategically used the space to spread his proposal for understanding the History of Physical Education in Brazil. And it was in this context that the author created his work.

As we have seen, his historical production may be seen as affiliated to the so-called Methodical School, which, according to Karnal and Tatsch (2005), is based on the historical perspective called traditional, concerned about the “truth” viewed from above and based on official documents – the maximum expression of the event.

Referring to the Methodical School, Bourdé and Martin (1983, p. 97) claim that this school, also called “[...] more abusively, ‘positivistic’, appears, manifests itself, extends over the period of the Third Republic in France”. Its fundamental principles are exposed in two program-texts: The manifesto, written by G. Monod to launch the *Revue Historique* in 1876, by G. Monod and G. Faginie, and *The manual*, drafted for students by Ch. V. Langlois and Ch. Seignobos in 1898. The authors also assert that that school “[...] continued to dominate History teaching and research at universities until the 1940s, and placed a mythical evolution of French collectivity [...] in the memory of generations of students until 1960” (p. 97)...

Bourdé and Martin (1983, p. 97) point out that:

The methodical school wants to impose a type of scientific research by drawing away any philosophical speculation and aiming at absolute objectivity in the domain of History; it plans to reach its goals by applying rigorous techniques in terms of inventory of sources, critique of documents, organization of tasks in the profession.

This historical perspective tends to present the object of study in a linear, static and snapshot-like way by recording and confusing itself with political and economic history, focusing on the history of great civilizations and pointing at power from a macro and general view (CHARTIER, 1991).³

Le Goff (1993, p. 156) believes that “[...] this way of doing history was interested almost exclusively in individuals, the upper layers of society, its elites [...] and events [...] or institutions [...] dominated by those elites.”

From the perspective of the Methodical School, the written and official document is considered the means to rebuild reality and is used as an extremely precious resource in the composition of the Marinho's works, for instance, the books *Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil: Brasil Colônia – Brasil Império – Brasil – República*; *História da educação física no Brasil*; and *Rui Barbosa: o paladino da educação física no Brasil*, in which the author seeks to build the great history of Brazilian Physical Education.

In accordance with that historical perspective, the policy was admitted to be essentially related to the State. This stance offers a view from above, in the sense that it has always focused on the great deeds of great men, statesmen, generals or religious men, while forgetting common characters and not regarding them as part of history (BURKE, 1992).

We realize that Marinho initially seeks to do non-speculative, extremely linear and subjectivity-free History, in the way proposed by the historiographic model that believes that, in order to be valid, science must be neutral and objective. Examples of this way of narrating history can be seen in the works written by the author as articles, organized as books with several reprints (1943, 1952-1954, 1980), in which he records History based on official sources produced by government institutions. Thus, assuming the voice of the winners as true or as a means to access historical truth, document critique is carried out in order to validate sources as official, coming from different administrative instances of the State.

Although Marinho can be linked to Methodical History as a result of a particular methodology used in the selection, organization and use of sources, in addition to the approach, script and narrative used to record the History of Physical Education during the period in which

³ By citing Chartier (1991), Le Goff (1993) and Burke (1992), we understand that the concept of Traditional History can be associated with the Methodical School, given that those scholars are participants in the New Cultural History. All that goes against what is novel is seen as traditional.

he exercises his historical writing, he also presents other historiographical perspectives beyond the normative way of doing history called traditional.

3 INEZIL PENNA MARINHO: HISTORY, ART AND SCIENCE

By analyzing some of Marinho's works, we can see an author transiting through other ways in which Methodical History is in the background so that he can produce other narratives on the History of Physical Education. At that moment, we see attempts to establish dialogues with other perspectives that are non-historical, but are brought together so he can dialogue with the documents. This dialogue is important for the author to develop the History of Physical Education at the interface of Culture, History, Science and Art.

Through dialogues between History, Art and Science, Marinho departs from the principles of the Methodical School while approaching other ways of narrating History. However, as we can see in the following quote, he does not abandon the basic idea that it is possible to seek good and bad examples in the past to solve the problems of the present or the future:

Historical culture is the key for modern man to open all doors, the key which enables him to decipher all the enigmas, the magic formula that teaches him the medicines he needs for his ills. History offers man the opportunity for scientific and artistic equilibrium, which should preside over the achievements of his spirit as it develops (MARINHO, 1958, p. 127-131).

According to this reflection, we see him departing from the principles proposed by the Methodical School – but not all of them – and opening up to other interpretative possibilities when establishing dialogue between History and Culture which, for him, would be the key that allows analyzing sources. Therefore, he approached what he called opportunity for balance: relating scientific work to art work.

We cannot restrict the author's work to a single historical model; he also sought to experiment by doing more than recording events and dates that would serve future historians of Physical Education. Thus, Melo's (1998) criticism and classification of Marinho's historical perspective must be discussed because it not only reflects the way of researching and presenting data proposed by the Methodical School, but also indicates a departure from the original model. Another issue is the period in which the work is performed. Document critique has been conducted only recently,⁴ observing issues such as context and place for production of sources, their institutional uses and the document as monument.

When analyzing criticism to Marinho's (1997) work, Nascimento realizes that the author does not use the theoretical resources of the Methodical School in all of his books. According to Nascimento (1997, p. 143), "[...] Marinho went far beyond writing a history 'said to be' positivistic".

By studying Marinho's work, we find a restless intellectual who occupies different spaces and places, who seeks thematic variations on Physical Education, bringing it closer to Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology and History. The author was open to theoretical experiments by reviewing concepts, creating new reflections on the History of Physical Education in Brazil and worldwide, especially from the second half of the twentieth century on.

⁴ Although Marc Bloch (2001), in his *The Historian's Craft* (1949 – posthumous publication), outlined the principles of a Document Critique, the use of this methodology of analysis gains momentum with New Cultural History, especially Chartier's (1988) studies, when it became more common to understand that the document is more than its textual dimension.

Marinho's start as a professor at the National School of Physical Education and Sports seems to be a milestone in his production on the History of Physical Education. From that moment on, his work follows a different direction in which he tries to approximate Physical Education to Brazilian culture, criticizing imported European gymnastic methods and proposing the recognition of capoeira as Brazil's gymnastics method.

These considerations gain strength when he takes on the chair of History and Organization of Physical Education and Sport, giving up Methodology of Physical Education and Sports Training. However, Marinho points out that the experience with the discipline of Methodology would be crucial for studies he would conduct in the area of History, because, as he says:

Experience has taught me that the content of the chair of Methodology of Physical Education is unstable, renewing itself every year, which does not allow for culture to sediment. Furthermore, with the passage of time, knowledge has been transferred from the methodological field of the historic domain. [...] The instability of the content of methodology programs opposes the stability of matters pertaining to History programs, which enable teachers to know them increasingly deeply. In conclusion, in time and space, methodological knowledge tends to transfer to the domain of History; the latter is the most legitimate heir to the former (MARINHO, 1958, p. 128).

In his analysis, the use of methodology is essential, and History is not possible without method. Method enables differentiating the historian and the artist. Contrary to his own expectations, the author also points out the possibility that imagination be used for the process of understanding reality, but that imagination should be conditional on empirical observation – in his case, sources. For Lacerda (2009), Comte's theorizations did not suppress imagination; they rather subordinated it to the laws of science, curbing speculation and stimulating logic.⁵ Therefore, Methodical history, although extremely rational in order not to succumb to a sterile accumulation of incoherent facts, should allow logic to organize dispersion of data in an artistic way. Following this order, Marinho stated:

Considering that History aims at investigating and exposing historical facts in their evolution in time and space, it is able to satisfy the requirements of the scientific spirit and the artistic needs of the soul. When we undertake the investigation of historical facts, we are subject to a number of laws, a method, a procedure that has pre-established standards; therefore, it is science that dominates us. But when we expose the results of our research, giving facts a purely personal interpretation, we enter in the domains of art, because it is evident that we are creating something; here, History loses its scientific nature to win the artistic one; and the historian ceases to be the scientist to become the artist (MARINHO, 1958, p. 131).

When proposing the investigation and presentation of facts, Marinho (1972) works with the concept that science is responsible for dealing with what is, for checking facts and finding out, among them, constant relations which are called laws. Therefore, it carries what might be called reality judgment. That is to say, the production of historical knowledge requires a method and analyses grounded on theories. Thus, Marinho (1972, p. 3) understands that:

Scientific knowledge is the one that presents not only the fact, but also the causes that explain it; it is the right and methodical, systematic knowledge that enables man to explain phenomena and often their own reproduction [...]. Scientific knowledge is said to be general, because it always includes the laws governing the phenomena

with which it is concerned; it is true because it explains the facts according to their causes and laws, proven by experience; it is right because it satisfies the requirements of our reason; it is methodical because all of its elements are ordered according to logical requirements; it is systematic and unified because it represents a set whose parts are concatenated in order to build a single whole.

These excerpts show his adjustment to the Methodical School. History writing becomes more conscious and directive. In taking on the chair of History of Physical Education, the author seeks to become less amateurish. He believed that methodology and the mastery of method could turn historical research into scientific knowledge. However, he also recognized the need for Art as a means for data exposure. Narrative would be the moment when the author would replace the scientist with the artist, and subjectivity would be allowed as a means to organize knowledge.

The possibility of giving vent to interpretation, without the mediation of sources – which, according to the author, are purely personal – would place the artist in confrontation with the scientist, because, according to the logic of the Methodical School, that action would interfere in the production of neutral and impersonal knowledge. We realize that Marinho is following a distinct path, ensuring scientificity of History by employing method, selection, organization, and use of sources, but reading through his experiences and an exposure driven by his interests. Thus, he says that he is producing a non-traditional “new history”, but he is not quite sure about how to classify it.

We note that at that time, Marinho was not simply concerned with understanding the concept of history. For him, when studying/teaching History of Brazilian Physical Education, it was necessary to go beyond, to be in contact with the original source, thus enabling the primary information and avoiding noise between the instrument and those communicating, with no importance given to memorizing facts and dates. He wanted to encourage investigation of the facts, to awake an interest in the use of other peoples’ experiences; he sought the conscious interpretation of data offered to his reason (MARINHO, 1958).

I already felt the need for a careful review of information sources, responsible for the knowledge that had been transmitted and retransmitted for decades, almost always through a number of translations. It was necessary to correct concepts that had been mistakenly spread, fragile interpretations that could not resist a deeper analysis or a more severe critique [...] (MARINHO, 1958, p. 135).

This need expressed by Marinho to preserve the sources was already manifested in his *Contribuição para a História da Educação Física no Brasil*, highlighting the importance of the sources to organize the history of Brazilian Physical Education:

[...] The poverty of our archives and even the lack of documents on the subject – until very recently unimportant to the authorities – [and] the dispersion of information sources hamper any attempt in this regard (MARINHO 1953, p. 7).

Such importance given to sources, seen from the perspectives of the New History, is evidenced by Bloch, who does not understand the source as something finished because, according to him, “[...] texts or archaeological documents, even those that seem most clear and complacent, only speak when we know how to interrogate them” (Bloch, 2001, p. 79).

The author also considers sources as primary resources for understanding man, since everything that is produced and consumed is made because of human beings, and a thorough

study of the sources can be favored by the “[...] diversity of historical testimonies [which] is almost endless. Everything that man says or writes, everything he makes, everything he touches can and should inform about him” (BLOCH, 2001, p. 79).

In Marinho (1958), History is intrinsically linked to the work of the researcher. In fact, the historian, before narrating the events in which he or she is interested, is an investigator, a researcher in search of knowledge.

Marinho associates History to Art, but when he analyses the importance of the method for History, he distinguishes the historian’s role from the artist’s role. At that point, he underscores how careful we must be with the personal interpretation of what we analyze, showing that historians analyze while artists conduct personal interpretation. Therefore, his conclusions should use those two resources, so that one side was not just a compendium of dates and facts, and the other would not turn into fiction. Thus, Science and Art would regulate one another to produce historical narrative that would be employed in the writing of the History of Physical Education.

3 FINAL REMARKS

Studying Marinho’s education, action and production, we noted a perspective on History that, being based on his *Contribuição para a História da Educação Física no Brasil* and the papers presented as a result of that publication, shows an approximation to the principles of the Methodical School.

Given his way of organizing and presenting documents as well as the absence of analyses, Marinho initially reveals the idea that the sources speak for themselves so that they do not need to be analyzed and interrogated – a stance that marks his historiographical production.

When we analyze the approach to History he advocated as early as 1958, we see a departure from the conceptual foundations that support the Methodical School. In this case, the author associates History and Art, stressing that it is up to the historian do be suspicious of sources and problematize them, indicating rigor in the use of methodologies and analyzes.

Based on Marinho’s definitions after his time at the National School of Physical Education, we noted that the author approaches another historical perspective. We seek to understand that concept of history and to examine other texts produced by him that could establish a correlation with this new perspective.

Other aspects of Marinho’s work still need to be dealt with, such as the relationship he established between the educational theories of his time to design a Physical Education based on Brazilian culture, especially that of African origin. From the 1940s on, he seeks to conceptualize Physical Education by using different knowledges from both Natural Sciences and the Humanities and Social Sciences, with special focus on Biology, History, Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology and Philosophy. Therefore, Marinho exceeds the restricted anatomical and physiological understanding of Physical Education and adopts an expanded concept, which he calls biopsychological and sociopsychological.

REFERENCES

- BLOCH, Marc. **Apologia da história**: ou o ofício do historiador. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2001.
- BOURDÉ, Guy; MARTIN, Herve. **As escolas históricas**. 2ª ed. Sintra: Publicações Europa-América, 1983.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Coisas ditas**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1990.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Meditações pascalianas**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2001.
- BURKE, Peter. **A escrita da história**: novas perspectivas. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 1992.
- CERTEAU, Michel de. **A escrita da história**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1982.
- CERTEAU, Michel de. **A invenção do cotidiano**: artes de fazer. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2004.
- CHARTIER, Roger. **A história cultural**: entre práticas e representações. 2.ed.. Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1988.
- CHARTIER, Roger. O mundo como representação. **Estudos Avançados**, São Paulo, v. 5, no.11, p. 173-1991 Jan./Apr. 1991.
- COMTE, Auguste. **Os pensadores**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.
- FERREIRA NETO, Amarílio *et al.* **Catálogo de periódicos de educação física e esportes (1930-2000)**. Vitória: Proteoria, 2002.
- FERREIRA NETO, Amarílio. **A pedagogia no exército e na escola**: a educação física brasileira (1880-1950). Aracruz/ES: Facha, 1999.
- GOELLNER, Silvana Vilodre. (Ed.). **Inezil Penna Marinho**: coletânea de textos. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Colégio Brasileiro de Ciências do Esporte, 2005.
- GOELLNER, Silvana Vilodre; SILVA, André Luiz dos Santos (Ed.). **Nos recônditos da memória**: acervo pessoal de Inezil Penna Marinho. Porto Alegre: Gênese, 2009.
- KARNAL, Leandro; TATSCH, Flavia Galli. A memória evanescente. In: PINSKY, Carla Bassanezi (Ed.). **Fontes históricas**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2005. p. 9-27.
- LACERDA, Gustavo Biscaia de. Augusto Comte e o “positivismo” redescobertos. **Revista de Sociologia e Política**, Curitiba, v. 17, no. 34, p. 319-343, Oct. 2009.
- LE GOFF, Jacques. **A história nova**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1993.
- LE GOFF, Jacques. **História e memória**. 5. ed. Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, 2003.

MARINHO, Inezil Penna. **Contribuição para a história da educação física no Brasil**: Brasil Colônia – Brasil Império – Brasil República. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional, 1943.

MARINHO, Inezil Penna. Dez mil classes para a educação de adultos. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Física**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 4, no. 35, p. 5, Feb. 1947.

MARINHO, Inezil Penna. Discurso de posse de cátedra de História e Organização da Educação Física e Desportos. **Arquivos da ENEFD**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 11, no. 12, p. 127-144, Dec. 1958.

MARINHO, Inezil Penna. **História da educação física no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Educação e Saúde, Divisão de Educação Física, 1952-1954. v. 1-4.

MARINHO, Inezil Penna. **Metodologia filosófica e científica aplicada à educação física e aos desportos**. Brasília: Horizonte, 1972.

MARINHO, Inezil Penna. **Rui Barbosa**: o paladino da educação física no Brasil. 2. ed. Brasília: Horizonte, 1980.

MELO, Victor Andrade de. Inezil Penna Marinho: notas bibliográficas. *In*: FERREIRA NETO, Amarílio. (Ed.). **Pesquisa histórica na educação física**. Aracruz: Faculdade de Ciências Humanas de Aracruz, 1998. v. 3, p. 48-68.

NASCIMENTO, Célia Carvalho do. Inezil Penna Marinho: o tempo de uma história. *In*: FERREIRA NETO, Amarílio. (Ed.). **Pesquisa histórica na educação física**. Vitória: Ufes, Centro de Educação Física e Desportos, 1997. v. 2, p. 121-156.