



Research Paper

The ('Another') Portuguese childhood: Etymologic conception of in dictionaries and the sociolegal discourses (19th and 20th century)

Ernesto Candeias Martins

(Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco)

(Escola Superior de Educação – Rua Prof. Faria de Vasconcelos
– 6000–262 Castelo Branco – Portugal; Email: ernesto@ipcb.pt)

ABSTRACT: This social history study with hermeneutic methodology addresses the prevailing conceptions or designations in dictionaries and (scientific) discourses on Portuguese 'child/childhood' in the 19th century and part of the 20th century, with a special reference to 'another children/childhood'. This conceptualization implies that there is not a single child or a single childhood, but children and childhoods, transformed in accordance with social needs and impositions. The objectives, sparse in three points of the text, are based: to understand the meanings and conceptions of children/childhood in the dictionaries and discourses of the time; to analyze the conception of 'Another childhood' in the etymology of dictionaries and in the legal-social discourse. Children and childhood are a social construction that is structurally part of a historical and cultural time of a society, becoming approaches and values in the social history of childhood.

KEYWORDS: Children and Childhood conception, The Other Childhood, Jury-social discourse, Social childhood representation, Social History of Childhood.

Received 23 Jan, 2021; Revised: 04 Feb, 2021; Accepted 07 Feb, 2021 © The author(s) 2021.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

In this historical-educational essay, we will reflect on the conceptions of children/infancy in the period of the 19th century and part of the 20th century. The aim is to analyse how these conceptions varied etymologically and conceptually, using the dictionaries and scientific discourses of the time. We will use a hermeneutical analysis of the documentary sources of research and referenced in the bibliography, seeking the understanding of the meanings of children and ('Another') childhood with an objective structural analysis and respective semantic understanding of their conceptions, within the temporal arc of the study. On the basis of this hermeneutics, we will rethink the reality of the child/childhood in the contexts of the time in a critical disposition with the semantic differences. In establishing these relationships, we base our methodology of argumentation on temporality and historical, educational and socio-cultural contexts. It is by understanding these conceptions and conceptualizations of the child/infancy that we unveil their existential structures, questioning and bringing their unfolding through analysis. We will therefore deal with the conception of the child/infancy, taking into account that we consider the term 'conception' as the conferring of meaning represented as ways of perceiving or knowing. When we have a conception of something, it implies an influenced representation of idiosyncrasy, ideology and other historical and cultural (social) connotations of the time. Thus, the conception of the child, both in the common language and in the social and educational practice, is full of social representations that translate the way the child has been treated from the adult.

We know that socialization and education in children's development have sought to teach them to read and write, based on two perspectives which have been present since the end of the century. The child/infancy, considered normal (normalization to the rules of the society of the time) with an education aimed at its normalized development in the context of schooling (compulsory schooling); the child/infancy, called 'another child/infancy' to which it was subjected to assistance and education measures (rudimentary or preparatory), with the help of philanthropy (creation of nursing homes and correction houses), hygiene, specific care (physical, food, clothing, formation of a trade) to be able to insert themselves into society.

Historiographical, there is a distinction between: the child, as a social historical and cultural subject; and 'childhood' as the stage of life of the human being corresponding to periods of development with influences

from pedagogical discourses (paedology) and psychological discourses. C. Heywood [1] considers in this distinction childhood as an "[...] abstraction that refers to a certain stage of life, differently from the group of people suggested by the word children". We need to remember that there are (multiple) conceptions of childhood(s) listed in historical time, in which child/infancy correlated with those of society and culture. This unveiling of what it was like to be a child, according to the situations and social conditions in time and space, assumed that there was no universal childhood. This argument takes us back to the studies of Ph. Ariès that the idea of childhood (and the feeling towards it) has a very local historical origin in the West. This historian considers the feeling of childhood understood in two different historical moments [2]: a period of 'pampering' related to the family environment (16th and 17th centuries), where the child is the object of decoration and entertainment in the middle and the eyes of adults; a period of moralization at the end of the 17th century in a religious or ecclesiastical context.

If we contrast Ariès' theses historically, societies, including families, have dealt with children and childhood based on some necessary care (ways of dressing) coming from adults, which has given rise to some peculiar characteristics in childhood, regardless of time and space. For Stearns [3] "[...] childhood can present impressive variations, from one society or from one time to another", such as the length of childhood itself, child labor, punishment for offences and forms of disciplinary normalization. We deduce, therefore, that the conception of childhood has existed in different contexts, situations and social conditions, being considered as a dialectic process of normality and abnormality, with advances and setbacks and, therefore, not being a linear construction, it is dependent on several factors, which bring about changes in its conception and by correlation there have been different types of childhood [4]. That is, according to the historical period children lived in different contexts the I imply different conceptions about childhood in different times and spaces. The concept given to the child has undergone significant changes from modernity, accompanying the very institutionalization of the school and the meaning of childhood [5]. The very relationship 'childhood-power-pedagogy' has identified a consensus among historians on the definition of childhood as a historical phenomenon of social construction.

Our study is guided by a hermeneutical analysis of the conceptions and social or both representations of 'child/infancy' and, in particular, 'Another children/childhood', using the definitions and designations prevailing in the dictionaries and scientific and legislative discourses of the time. We recognize it is difficult to conceive the 'Other child/infancy' concept, which emerged in the social emergency of society which forced social reformers to take protective (political) measures. This childhood must be incorporated into the social history of education, whether in the historiographic, anthropological, sociological and educational field or in understanding its modes of being, which were not always recognized by the (public) social policies of the time. Our objectives, spread across three points, are the following: a substantiated understanding of meanings and conceptions of child/infancy in the dictionaries and (scientific) discourses of the time; to analyse the conception of 'Another Childhood' in the context of juridical-social discourse and protection at the beginning of the 20th century.

All our conceptualization analysis implies that there was not one child or one childhood, but rather children and childhoods, transformed and differentiated in accordance with the needs and social impositions and the conditions of the family and surroundings. The 'Another children/childhood' in their situations, contexts and conditions of social conflict had designations and/or concepts, which accompanied the changes in the political-ideological, economic, social, cultural/educational and legal systems.

II. THE CONCEPTUAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHILD/INFANCY IN DICTIONARIES AND SPEECHES

Using the common thread of the child's historical journey in its various conceptions, according to H. Hendrick [6], the following names emerge: romantic child (17th century); working child who, at an early age, was wandering through profound social, family and economic changes as a result of the industrial revolution and, therefore, works in agriculture, factories, mines, services (for example, street vendors, teller's assistant), contributing to the family economy and to whims or both; delinquent children who, because of their anti-social, transgressive and indigent behavior, were a threat to public order, having had the sensitivity of philanthropists, which gave rise to social reforms; child-students who arose from the 18th century with the expansion of the public school, demanding a good and moralizing education and socializing action of the school so that it would be educated (educability); medical-psychological children from the end of the century. It was legitimated in the eighteenth century and deepened by medical, biological, hygienic, pedagogical, child psychology and psychoanalysis discourses and knowledge from later periods, in such a way that it deserved a scientific analysis clarifying its behavior, qualities and rhythm of development; child welfare, from the 19th century, by being socially and legally recognized its childlike nature, through a conception materialized by the appearance of new services of social prevention, health and education; child of psychological jurisdiction in need of counselling,

accompaniment and psychological and educational guidance; child of a family that includes the public child, children placed in families of care, reception and adoption.

In fact, children and their childhood require epistemologically a conceptual and terminological clarification, either in analogy and/or synonyms and meanings and/or designations, in historical time and political-ideological regimes, or by the influence of the discourses of various sciences that addressed those concepts in the 19th and 20th centuries. The historical variability of the concept of childhood seems to be common to all Western societies, as it has accompanied the evolution of European political-ideological thinking and the experienced social processes of successive generations. It is from the middle of the last century that we have witnessed a process of reconstruction of the conceptions of childhood, inherited from eight hundred. According to Donzelot [7], children and their "childhood" came to be legitimized by scientific discourses, by the material support of philanthropy and charity, with the State (guardian) intervening in the process of child and youth socialization, through moralization, normalization and contract-tutorship (tutelary right).

Let us then analyse the terminological meanings, referred to in Portuguese language dictionaries and the respective discourses of the eight hundred's and part of the nine hundred's about childhood/infancy, in order to have a holistic conceptual view and this representation adjusted to the ideas of the time (historical time).

A)-The Child.

It is a fact that after the influence of J. J. Rousseau's naturalism or pedagogical environmentalism, the child came to be seen in eight hundred as a phase of life which was specific to him, filling his definition with medical, hygienic and pedagogical discourses, which implied dependence on the act of being created and provided with sustenance. F. Constâncio [8] defined it in the dictionary as "[...] a new child, boy or girl, raised, little, very young". Later, in the early nineties, besides the change of spelling from 'creança' (for children), the Dictionary of the Portuguese Etymological and Orthographic Language [9] refers to it as "[...] individuals of both sexes in the period of childhood". However, the meaning given in F. J. Caldas Aulete's Dictionary [10] is more explicit and broader in designating it as "[...] an individual of the human species who are in the period of childhood. Breast child and still mamma. To be a child, to entertain oneself with childish things, to be frivolous, not to treat business seriously". If we resort to the Portuguese Language Dictionary of Aurelio, in its 3rd edition [11], the child is a human being in the infancy phase, which goes from birth to puberty, and infancy is the period of development of the human being from birth to early adolescence, childhood and pre-adolescence.

The child began to be seen as a stage in the life of the human being which is specific to them and which was called 'childhood', in addition to indicating depending on being raised by someone who provides for them [12]. In the 20th century, Torrinha [13] reduces the concept of the child to that of "[...] a human being who is beginning to be created; boy or girl", thus consolidating that definition of "[...] the first period of human life associated with children" [14]. In Heywood's [15] historiographic perspective, children were considered to be mere imperfect adults who were subordinate to them and, therefore, considered to be "abnormal" (an outlaw of society) and/or disabled. Children being recognized as members of a distinct social group, based on age, their childhood becomes the stage in the vital cycle of their development. Childhood, as a stage in life, which has emerged in Modernity, has implied a new social reality within the family and society, promoting the creation of welfare and educational institutions for its support (asylums, orphanages, gatherings), in addition to the school. Thus, the understanding of the conceptions of childhood began to take into account the period of time (extension), its nature (qualities, capacities), its various dimensions (perspectives, attributes) and its meaning. Any unique conception of a child/child functioned more as a social construction than as a reality, in which this representation depended very much on the type of family and the socio-cultural, economic, political-ideological, ethical, pedagogical, judicial and medical contexts.

From the end of the 19th century, medical and psycho-pedagogical discourses began to give visibility to the nature of the child and their childhood, to such an extent that an ideology of the defense of the mother and her motherhood (care and services) was generated, that is, the idea that the child should have a good 'family' or a good mother was spread. This led to the emergence of socialization processes of acceptance of this condition, to dignify the maternal and family function, in its domestic and socio-educational skills. Based on those medical sciences (and psychiatry), the actions of assistance and education (including the popular) sought to generate habits, customs and values in the most vulnerable, poor or disadvantaged social classes and families. We were in a society that valued the family so much as the center of development of the capitalist (liberal) economic model, which knew the social inequalities and the unsustainable situation of the living conditions of many working-class families, as well as proposing interventions (social prophylaxis, social hygiene, mother and childcare, health care) and founding or helping to create institutions of closure to carry out its parallel action and even to replace the education of the child. The intention was to submit the 'Another childhood', which emerged out of normality and without schooling, to the moral, civic, welfare and socio-educational standards considered necessary for society.

In this sense, we agree with M. Sarmiento [16] that in history the child has been defined invisibly, since their history is narrated and written from the perspective of adults and, therefore, the vision of the child is the way we perceive it, through the discourses of adults and society. In this sense, childhood in modernity has become universal in the ideal and desirable child pattern, concerning the bourgeois class. The other children with their childhood remain invisible to the understanding of society, with an abnormal developmental path.

B)-A Childhood.

Etymologically the term childhood comes from the Latin 'in-fans', which is referred to without language, which implied in the Western tradition not having thought, knowledge or reasoning. The child was someone to be trained, moralized and educated in his periods of development. In the various Portuguese dictionaries from the eight hundred to the nine hundred, the term childhood referred to: the period from birth to early adolescence; childhood and pre-adolescence; the set of children; the beginning, the birth of something; the lack of maturity; naivety, innocence [17]. The Dictionary of José da Fonseca [18] refers childhood to "[...] the beginning; the age of the boy up to seven years", considered as an attribute of being masculine and at that age.

In the nine hundred the term, in the Dictionary of Caldas Aulete [19], came to designate the state or age of life of the child, delimited by the absence of speech or imperfect speech (we would say proto-language today), up to the age of seven, also including that documental source of a disadvantaged childhood which is in the asylums. At the beginning of the 20th century, the new social reality made that term precise as a stage of life in which the child presents a lack of moral discernment in his acts (juridical-social sphere), which extended until childhood (10 or 12 years of age), that is, there were at that stage some specific attributes and characteristics up to adolescence. In the *Torrinha* dictionary [20] the definition of childhood means the first period of human life associated with children. Gradually childhood came to mean the stage of the vital cycle of the child's development, and the understanding of its conceptions varied according to its boundaries (beginning and end of childhood), its dimensions (different perspectives and attributes) and divisions into 1st, 2nd and 3rd childhood and adolescence. In other words, any conception of childhood was in function of the frontiers mentioned above and also between the frontiers of 'normality' (schooling, normalization) and 'abnormality' (outside social norms). The singular concept of a child or childhood functioned more as a social (and cultural) construction, in the historical time of representations [21]. Therefore, the term childhood brought together the senses and meanings that societies attributed, and attribute, to this period of life.

Societies have adopted a concept of childhood and an idea of this stage of the human, even though there are various conceptions since the term requires children to differentiate themselves from adults according to a range of attributes. In fact, the conception of childhood would be the specification of these characteristics proper to the child, knowing that each society has, according to the culture and historical moment, a concept of childhood united to an awareness of these particularities. If P. Stearns [22] justifies the 'model of modern childhood' by relying on the changes that have taken place in the West and America (since the 17th century) with historiographic approaches (cultural construction) of ideas on the way childhood has varied in different cultures and with different values, Heywood [23] through an analysis of the historical studies of childhood, sought to analyse the different conceptions in the different historical periods, to explain, with the support of the sources and cultural conditions prevailing in those periods, of the conflicting or ambivalent concepts of childhood in each society. The historiographic emphasis on children reveals the specific nature of childhood, even if it implies different interpretations of the consideration of childhood as a social construction since it has varied and varies in different societies.

III. THE CONCEPT OF 'ANOTHER' CHILDHOOD': FROM NOMENCLATURES TO ADJECTIVES

We consider the 'Another Childhood' as that child who in his childhood had no fixed home, no means of subsistence, no educational and affective attention from his family (abandonment, helplessness), no assistance and, therefore, wandered the streets and lanes of the cities begging and begging, in addition to moving illegally on public transport and committing crimes (theft, robbery, assault) or crimes (delinquent). The irregular and wandering form of these children, with an 'abnormal' childhood (they did not meet the norms of society nor did they go to school) leads us to classify them as children 'from the street' and 'in the street'. In these terms the subject and the space are identical, but the difference lies in the relationship the child has or not with their family and/or guardians. In the category "street children" we include offenders (pre-offenders) and those in moral danger or at risk, who have no or little contact with their family/guardians, the street being their means of subsistence and survival, through theft and robbery with or without aggression. In essence, these were children who had exchanged schooling for the 'school of the street', manifesting deviant, antisocial, delinquent or delinquent behaviour with illegal acts or criminality. Furthermore, their socialisation process expressed instability in relationships and aggressions with repercussions on the identity of the 'I', but moulded themselves

to the private space of the 'street', where they carried out their criminal activity. In the 'street child,' we include those who had assiduous contact with family/guardians, who due to specific work situations (sporadic employment, unemployment, long hours of work) or impediments (legal-penal and moral), did not give them sustenance or education, as they still exploited them at work or through begging or encouraged them to commit crimes. Hence these children/young people took refuge in the street during the day to carry out their activities and survive in the immediacy of satisfying basic needs, without having a normal childhood or schooling.

Of course, childhoods, on the margins of the society of their time, were given definitions/designations in dictionaries that illustrated (new) realities (representations) about their condition of poverty, abandonment, begging, vagrancy, marginality and social deviation which, in extreme cases, were situations of delinquency and infringement of offences punished by the penal codes in the 19th century (1850, 1878, 1890) and later by the IPL - Childhood Protection Law [24] of the 1911. These social situations and/or conditions of conflict were reflected in the very concepts and nomenclatures attributed, changing the social approach to this 'Another childhood'. In this term we have integrated a panoply of meanings of our own (dictionaries of the time), for example: poor, beggar or idle, abandoned, unprotected/disfavoured, helpless, vagrant or slut (whore), wandering, and also infringing (= transgressor) or delinquent. In order to understand their nomenclatures and adjectives, we have recourse to dictionaries, in the historical period of our study, identifying their concepts and/or conceptualisations, which have been associated with the discourses of some sciences (medical, pedagogical), especially the juridical-social ones. Let us look at these etymological acceptances of some of the categories integrating the 'Another childhood'.

A)- Poor child (idle, beggars).

During the 19th and 20th centuries, Portugal had periods with high rates of poverty and misery (material and moral) in families (poor, disadvantaged, excluded), high illiteracy (infant/juvenile), large urban concentration in the metropolises of Lisbon and Oporto, lack of housing conditions or homeless (lived in huts, slums), high unemployment, people begging and vagrancy. Well, it was necessary to understand these indicated social scourges, especially that of (family) poverty, because only in this way can we weave the relations of the poor child with the help/action of philanthropy and charity.

In the Dictionary of the Portuguese Language (2005, p. 1180) poor and/or poverty "[...] was associated with agricultural land which did not produce or was infertile". With time, the word poor came to have various meanings, some related to food, housing, health care, disabilities, lack of education and access to culture, and other meanings relating it to the lack of essential goods, forming the idea of misery in the human condition. Another element associated with poverty was pauperism, which was the most dramatic form of poverty and which presumed the survival of some and dependence aids. In fact, the poor in the 19th century defined themselves as "[...] lacking what was necessary to live, not very fertile, begging" [25] or, in the case of the Dictionary of Caldas Aulete [26]:

"[...] Lacking or deprived of what is necessary; living with few possessions. It is said of those whose possessions are inferior to their position or social condition. Poorly endowed, little favoured. Unhappy, unprotected; worthy of pity or compassion. Who inspires pity. Particularly a person who lives on alms, who begs."

Torrinha [27] considers poor a "person who does not have what is necessary for life; unhappy; beggar", who lived in begging and human charity, often begging. Thus, in the 19th century, the poor was a being "[...] unprotected, worthy of compassion - indigence, misery, penury" [28]. For E. C. Martins [29] "[...] poor is someone with a lack of resources, being excluded from the habits, social norms and customs of the society in which he lives". If we unite the state of poverty implied social exclusion, whose notion, according to A. Bruto da Costa [30] indicated: "[...] their resources (of the poor) are so seriously below those controlled by the individual or family that they are excluded from the standards of life, custom and activities". In this way, social exclusion was connoted with poverty, unemployment, begging (the homeless), poorly deformed people with low self-esteem, precariousness and social vulnerability. All these deprivations in the most disadvantaged families, in vulnerable groups and collectives, had consequences on the education of children and/or young people (without schooling), on health and medical assistance, on living conditions, on the deficit or lack of food (malnutrition), on clothing, on how to move around, but to name a few. The consequence of this family poverty led to situations of abandonment, helplessness and marginality in the children/young people, which caused (since the creation of the mercies) the emergence of religious and philanthropic social charity (eugenicists), the creation of various institutions of shelter, assistance and education, social prophylaxis measures, etc. There was a need to prevent situations of 'moral danger', wrongdoing, social deviation, delinquency and criminality, which called into question social security and peace. Since IPL [31] these situations have been mitigated by legal, social and tutelary measures, with the creation of the tutelary right of minors.

B)- Abandoned and helpless children.

Abandoned (compared to the adjective helpless) means a kind of generic term, referring to the helpless, which included [...] children without parents or of unknown parents, illegitimate or without whereabouts", according to the Dictionary of Caldas Aulete [32]. Even if the child had a family, it was in an unstructured situation, in precariousness and/or poverty, with diseases and vices (syphilis, alcoholism, tuberculosis, mental illness) or in detention, constituting situations that prevented the tutelage of children and, for this reason, many children/young people suffered from helplessness and abandonment. For these children, care and education through work in nursing homes was the possible way out for them to regenerate themselves morally.

In the dictionaries of the 19th century, of Francisco Solano Constâncio [33] and A. Falcão [34] abandoned meant helpless (moral and material), that is, "[...] he who was left to be abandoned". Later, in the eighteenth century, José da Fonseca in his Dictionary (1874, p. 3) associates this designation with that of a 'solitary being', in the sense of dissolute, lost, left to idleness, begging and vagrancy. Already in nine hundred Caldas Aulete [35], it relates abandonment and/or abandonment to those exposed (in foster care), that is, it was the state of those children whose parents/family had no care with them, due to lack of means and conditions, or because they were orphans, illegitimate children or unknown parents. The term abandoned does not appear in Torrinha's Dictionary [36].

In fact, childhood abandoned in the discourses of the time could be:

(i)-Material abandoned childhood included: the orphans; the exposed ones delivered on Childcare Wheels (legal ordinance of 9/10/1839 which was in force until the end of 800); the children over 7 years old, in a situation of helplessness and/or material abandonment (without basic necessities to live); the poor or miserable children, in which the family had no means of subsistence and therefore fell into indigence, idleness and begging and/or almsgiving the people and, therefore, were a reason for detention and institutional closure (asylums, houses of correction).

(ii)-morally abandoned children included: children in a state of vagrancy, loitering and truancy, usually dedicated to habitual begging; children who because of mistreatment, family violence and other acts of cruelty, abuse of authority and neglect, are exploited by their parents, guardians or gang leaders, becoming victims of physical abuse, punishment, labour exploitation in inhuman and immoral situations (p. e. the unloading of coal from boats at Cais do Sodré in Lisbon, work in factories/metallurgy, commerce), prostitution, crime, etc.; children/youths who, having family or guardians, were engaged in extorting, committing robbery/theft, delinquency or executing offences/crimes punished by the Penal Codes of eight hundred and then with the Child Protection Law in 1911.

Those situations of abandonment and helplessness were due to various reasons: Family economic conditions (poverty, misery); marital illegality or family disorganisation; orphanage (lack of father/mother or both); immoral situations and ill-treatment/abuse; the social status of the parents (unemployed, the practice of addictions, diseases, begging and idleness [37]; lack of a home or degraded housing (they lived in huts, tents, dugouts or Lisbon yards or islands in Porto); criminal egoism, etc. Demographically, these families contributed the largest number of abandoned or helpless 'children', while the illegitimacy of new-borns (incognito parents) at the time was significant [38]. These circumstances constituted a step for the child to be an offender and a delinquent and, therefore, we associated it with a disadvantaged childhood and social deviance, due to exogenous factors, especially the street.

C)- Homeless (disfavoured) childhood.

The understanding of a childhood that was "*homeless*" (disfavoured) ('des' confers the situation of not being valid, from the physical, material and cultural point of view) pervades the conception of the child and/or young person, because the concept "*homeless*" (disfavoured) referred to the one that "[...] has no value towards someone, who has no person to protect them, who is valid for them" [39], that is, the abandoned, helpless, wretched or miserable childhood that needed support, education and assistance (institutional in nursing homes). The term was understood to mean the lack or loss of favour, of protection, of worth [40]. This meaning is similar to that indicated in dictionaries of the 20th century, for example, in Caldas Aulete which associated 'poor' and 'unfortunate' [41], that is, the disadvantaged would be the unprotected child, disadvantaged by fate and left to 'God will give' in the street. In the Dictionary of the Portuguese Language (1927) it was defined as unprotected, helpless, poor or destitute, and in the Aurélio Dictionary [42] it is called "[...] who has no value, is unprotected, helpless, miserable". In fact, more than a meaning, the "*homeless*" legitimised social neglect and, as a result, the "*homeless*" and mistreated childhood took its place in the medical-pedagogical and legal denunciations of the disadvantaged classes.

Historically, childhood in the 19th century was an exposed and/or rejected child, associated with the state of orphanage and poverty [43], and then referred to the abandoned, the poor and the beggar, that is, the one who was in a situation of transient marginality, in need of assistance and education measures and of social

insertion through work. For this 'Another childhood', asylums were created, which together with those for begging was one of the main public charity institutions in Portugal. In 1834, the Association of Asylum Homes asylums set up asylums for the Homeless Childhood, the first of them in Lisbon, then in Oporto, Coimbra, Leiria and Aveiro, and in other cities or provincial capitals with the designation 'District Asylums for the 'Homeless Childhood' [44]. These closing institutions, coming from a philanthropic initiative and/or with the public stimulus (municipal support), have mobilised the participation of philanthropists in childcare, under the double designation of charity and interest in maintaining the current social order. There was a time when, due to a lack of hygiene conditions, the inmates were afflicted with viruses and illnesses, increasing the rates of infant sickness and mortality. This medical-hygienist concern brought to the debate the defence of nursing homes and their effectiveness in prevention; however, the disciplinary character of these institutions became the focus of the juridical-social discourse on the situation of the morally and materially abandoned child (disadvantaged), who represented a social threat and, therefore, with 'abnormality' (social, school).

D)-Delinquent child.

For Caldas Aulete [45] delinquency was a "[...] state, character or quality of delinquent" since delinquent meant minors who "[...] delinquent [...] person who has committed a crime, criminal", guilty or offender. This term was not to be confused with the "homeless" (disfavoured), since a "homeless" childhood was the poor, helpless, unprotected, miserable, wretched [46]. Now, juvenile offenders between the ages of 14 and 16 or 18, with few exceptions, were committing offences, transgressions and/or criminal offences, also known as misleads, misfits, perpetrators or accomplices of facts qualified as crimes or contraventions. This 'Another childhood' entered the legal-social and/or criminal regime of the 19th century due to the offences or crimes committed and, after the LPI, of the 1911 with the implementation of the tutelage right of minors.

E)- Marginalised childhood.

Marginalisation included a multiplicity of designations associated with the situation of childhood, on the margins of the society of its time, in which many of the words related to it are considered synonyms, but which express different meanings, according to the historical era. Examples are the names of children: poor, exposed, beggars, abandoned, helpless, outcasts, bitches, delinquents or offenders. The term marginalised in the dictionaries of eight hundred does not exist, only the term 'marginal' [47]. In the thirties F. Torrinha [48] gives it the meaning of "[...] relative or belonging to the margin (of the river, of the book)" or which is on the borderline of being outside the normality imposed by society. In fact, the IPL of 27/May/1911 (G.D. 137, 14/06/1911) was the referential beginning of the protection, prevention, assistance and (re)education to childhood in Portugal, which was one of the pioneering European countries in this field. This diploma contained a set of statements and purposes, already referred to in Decree 01/January/1911, which indicated the conditions of poverty and social exclusion existing in the country and the lack of protection for many children/youths. The concern for this 'Another childhood', deserved the anchoring of studies (statistics, observations and experiments) and speeches of politicians, intellectuals and scientists, some from the medical field (social, hygienist, psychiatry), others from paedology/paidologia, psychology and sociology and others from law and criminology, all to propose measures of intervention and protection. The Preamble of that diploma already expresses the intention that "it aims at education, purification, the exploitation of the child", seeking the recovery of childhood, because "[...] the assistance, the protection of childhood has not until now, progressed from the melancholic aspirations of the legislators of the future! To protect and to regenerate morally are the watchwords of this idea of 'Saving the Race' in the terminology of Father António d' Oliveira [49], recognising the need to prevent the child. The questions of imputability deserved extra attention, with the application of the curative scope, and the need to change the age of this imputability, prohibiting the trial of minors up to 16 years of age, who should not be considered ordinary criminals, since it was indispensable to exercise the action, as it says in the Preamble of the LPI [50]: "...] the character of those who prevent, protect, guide, educate, than of those who punish acts resulting from the thoughtlessness of age, and especially of the environment, from the atmosphere saturated with poisons that these irresponsible little ones breathe". This legislative discursive tutelage defined, from a preventive point of view, the guidelines of protection, of preparing and reinvigorating the characters of minors and seeking to encourage them to find useful energies [51]. Thus, the concept of delinquency modified to a broader, subjective sense by integrating the pre-offenders: strays, idlers, libertines, with vicious tendencies, etc. The diploma consigned the fight against bad influences (family, social, surrounding environment, bad companies, etc.) to the child.

The tutelary right expressed in the IPL of the 1911 established several legal categories (art.º 10) used to judge the causes of crime or infraction of minors: in moral danger (Dec. Nº. 10767 of 15/05/1925), helpless and delinquents. For these categories, protection measures were prescribed from custody, surveillance, (definitive) placement, (re)educational or tutelary treatment, associating the Federation of Child Protection, patronage and public assistance to the guardianship of the minors handed over to them. Thus, minors 'in moral danger' (art. 26)

included: those without a home and means of subsistence, because they were orphans, or from unknown parents or without guardianship; abandoned minors collected by the institutions of the Federation or of assistance which took them in and educated them (art. 27). Poor children under 12 years of age under State guardianship, requiring a social enquiry into the children's pious/family and whether they were ill and could be banned from being taken into care institutions (art. 39); those mistreated by the family/parents, from whom parental power/guardianship was taken away (inhibition process) (art. 41 to 57). The category of 'helpless' meant that the minor, alone or in the company of others, were considered "idle, vagrants, beggars, alcoholics, thieves, ruffians, troublemakers, tolerated or other immoral or criminal entities, living in a habitual state of idleness, vagrancy, begging or licentiousness" (art. 58). In the designation of libertine, they were considered to be the minor who lived from the prostitution of others, performed obscene acts, frequented immoral sites of 'tolerated', taverns, brothels, pornographic shows, forbidden gambling houses, etc., and was therefore equal to the helpless (art. 59). In the category of delinquent were the minors who were offenders or criminals, undisciplined and pathologically abnormal. In other words, the law considered as a delinquent the minor tried for misdemeanours, offences, cover-up/collusion of crimes or punished for (antisocial) behaviour regulated by criminal law (art. 62).

In relation to the designation of 'undisciplined', the diploma considered minors to be incorrigible (art. 69) who were locked up in care and education establishments, since their behaviour and attitudes required a more rigorous model of medical-pedagogical treatment than that used in reform schools and/or correctional agricultural colonies (art. 70 and 122). Minors considered 'pathological abnormal' (art. 73) were those who presented: deficiencies (mental illness or intellectual abnormalities), weakness of spirit, epilepsy, hysteria or mental instability, and even those who were in a situation of abandonment, poverty or mistreatment, helplessness or delinquency.

The Central Tutorship's of Childhood (those that had annexes to the Refuges) and the counties were responsible for sending minors to the medical and educational institutes of Aurélio da Costa Ferreira (male) of Casa Pia (and also the Adolfo Coelho Institute) and the Countess Rilvas (female) linked to the Church. At the same time, the system of minors had jurisdictional services whose first general inspector was Fr. António d' Oliveira [52]. This 'social' pedagogue analysed the minors interned in the institutions of those services, describing a series of differentiated denominations according to their intellectual, moral, physical and behavioural characteristics [53]. Their studies were relevant for establishing re-education strategies in these specific establishments (retirement schools, reformatories, agricultural colonies). The pedagogue observed the minors in the Lisbon Reform School in such a way that he classified them as misguided, retarded, weak, peasants, brons, strays and the recruit. Mistakes included those who were "[...] primitively good and who, at a certain point in life, became bad and dangerous, already through contact with certain companies". [54]. The retarded, who appear in the medical-pedagogical discourses and/or paedology of the time, corresponded to the minors who had some 'impetus' in the intellectual apparatus, for lack of use, so that the designations of weak (influenced by Itard and E. Séguin), were the minors whose "intellectual apparatus is weak and sick" [55]. While the 'bronco' referred to those who had "[...] the brain numbed by drink or food, damaged by the abuse of certain vices" [56], the peasants, the recruit and the Strays corresponded to those who "[...] move more by instinct, by instinctive mass and by habit than by intelligence or conscience, are those who stand but do not understand". [57].

Therefore, concern for children's interests was the ideology of the republicans, evident in the number of institutions set up in practice - nurseries, care homes for underprivileged children, workshop and municipal schools, boarding schools, retirement schools and then reformatories, from 1919 to 1962. After the publication of LPI, the 'Another Childhood' came under the tutelage of the Childhood Tutorship's, remaining temporarily (up to 6 six months or one year) in the Refuges attached to the Central Tutorship's (Lisbon, Oporto, Coimbra) and interned in tutelary institutions or both. In fact, the juvenile offender, delinquent was an idler or criminal who had to be regenerated by the correction and discipline of work (agricultural, craft trades), in a situation of institutionalisation or under the supervision (at liberty) of the delegates of the Tutorship [58]. Thus, juridical-legal and juridical-social discourses or both generated their conceptions/presentations of these minors, becoming a juridical category, integrated into the penal codes of eight hundred and then, in the twentieth century, into the tutelage law of minors, according to the type of offences committed [59].

IV. BAY WAY OF CONCLUSION

Children/Childhood was a social and/or cultural construction of modernity, also the result of the practices spread in a certain time and historical space, becoming categories established by the sciences (medical, pedagogical, legal and psychological), due to their research. These categories and their representations implied concepts of appropriation which, according to Chartier [60] were aimed at the elaboration of a "[...] social history of uses and interpretations", related to their fundamental determinations and inscribed in the specific practices which construct them. In other words, this appropriation was part of the genesis of the cultural history

of medical-pedagogical, legal and criminological, hygienic (eugenic) and psychological or psycho-pedagogical knowledge, in historical time and assumed by the public authorities, who implemented social policies (services) on the basis of the model of assisting, educating, disciplining and regenerating the 'Another childhood' and, in particular, in the resolution of its problems or conflict situations [61]. Through hermeneutic analysis of the various denominations of this childhood, we have verified, through political-ideological, scientific discourses and journalistic columns, the preponderance of the assistance and medical-pedagogical model, of a philanthropic and religious nature, in the provision of services and re-education and in its rational organisation, being later replaced by the psycho-pedagogical model. All children and/or childhoods especially the one we call 'Another childhood' were the reason for social policies, with answers/measures of welfare and educational nature and even repressive, associated to the practical models of correction and regeneration at the time. The social and welfare reforms brought a concern for the protection and social and educational intervention of minors, especially in institutionalization, with the aim of educating and socially reinserting them. It was a strategy for the regeneration of the Nation which, little by little, emphasized the preventive character and the social and pedagogical action of re-education.

In the nine-hundreds, the child became a quantifiable and research object, which gradually became a cultural, educational and moral content, in its own time and space (family, school, social), in a controlled, disciplined and regulated way. It has become a centre of scientific study of various sciences (such as paedology, law/criminology, psychiatry and paediatrics, psychology, childcare), many of them under the positivist influence, generating movements or associations concerned with the 'salvation of the child' and the status of the child. All these actions materialised in legal-social and medical-pedagogical devices of protection, prevention, help services and prohibitions (begging, child labour), and a vast typology of care institutions emerged. Childhood has come to be observed as 'childhoods', due, on the one hand, to its social plurality and, on the other, to the fact that its cultural practices and ways of life have been taken into account as configurators in its life in different socio-historical, family and political contexts. Contemporary society has been responsible for the emergence of a concept of childhood, instituted by modernity and the action of the various sciences that have taken care of it, and for this reason, it has come to be considered a 'becoming' [62]. The childhood/infancy was a social construction, in a socio-historical and cultural period of a time or society, being decisive for the social history of childhood, as a valuable focus.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Heywood, C. *Uma História da Infância: da idade Média à época contemporânea no Ocidente* (trad. Roberto Cataldo Costa). Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2004, p. 22
- [2]. Ariès, P. *A criança e a vida familiar no Antigo Regime*. Lisboa: Relógio d'Água, 1988
- [3]. Stearns, P. N. *A infância*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2006, p. 12
- [4]. Heywood, C. *Uma História da Infância: da idade Média à época contemporânea no Ocidente* (trad. Roberto Cataldo Costa). Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2004, p. 35-42.
- [5]. Corsaro, W. A. *The sociology of childhood*. 2nd ed. London: Pine Forge Press, 2005.
- [6]. Hendrick, H. *Constructions and reconstructions of British Childhood: an interpretative survey, 1800 to the present*. In: James, A. & A. Prout (orgs.). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the study of childhood*. London: The Falmer Press, 1990, p. 41-43
- [7]. Donzelot, J. *A polícia das famílias*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1977, p. 29.
- [8]. Constâncio, F. S. *Novo Dicionário crítico e etimológico da Língua Portuguesa*. Paris: Angelo Francisco Carneiro, 1844, p. 330.
- [9]. *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa. Dicionário Etimológico e Ortográfico* (16ª ed.). R. Janeiro: Liv. Francisco Alves, 1918 (Paris/Lisboa: Liv. Aillaund e Bertrand), p. 278.
- [10]. Pereira, A. Mª. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa – feito pelo plano F.J. Caldas Aulete*. (2ª ed.). Lisboa: Parceria A. Mª Pereira e Caldas Aulete, 1925, p. 597.
- [11]. Ferreira, Aurélio B. H. *Novo Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. 3ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Régis Ltda, 2004.
- [12]. Bastos, José Timóteo da Silva. *Dicionário Etimológico, Prosódico e Ortográfico da Língua Portuguesa*. (2ª ed.). Lisboa: Parceria António Mª Pereira, 1913.
- [13]. Torrinha, F. *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa para os estudantes e para o povo. Ortográfico, prosódico e morfológico*. Porto: Livraria Simões Lopes de Domingos Barreira (editor), 1931, p. 408.
- [14]. Torrinha, F. *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa para os estudantes e para o povo. Ortográfico, prosódico e morfológico*. Porto: Livraria Simões Lopes de Domingos Barreira (editor), 1931, p. 770.
- [15]. Heywood, C. *Uma História da Infância: da idade Média à época contemporânea no Ocidente* (trad. Roberto Cataldo Costa). Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2004.
- [16]. Sarmiento, M.J. *A Infância: Paradigmas, Correntes e Perspetivas*. Braga: Instituto de Estudos da Criança – Universidade do Minho, 2000.
- [17]. Houaiss, A. & Villar, Mauro de Salles. *Dicionário Houaiss da Língua Portuguesa*. 6 vols. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 2002-2003.
- [18]. Fonseca, J. *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. Paris: J. Marques Nogueira, 1874, p. 604.
- [19]. Pereira, A. Mª. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa – feito pelo plano F.J. Caldas Aulete*. (2ª ed.). Lisboa: Parceria A. Mª Pereira e Caldas Aulete, 1925.
- [20]. Torrinha, F. *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa para os estudantes e para o povo. Ortográfico, prosódico e morfológico*. Porto: Livraria Simões Lopes de Domingos Barreira (editor), 1931.
- [21]. Chartier, R. *El mundo como representación*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa, 2002.
- [22]. Stearns, P. N. *A infância*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2006.

- [23]. Heywood, C. *Uma História da Infância: da idade Média à época contemporânea no Ocidente* (trad. Roberto Cataldo Costa). Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2004.
- [24]. LPI. Lei de Proteção à Infância, 27 de maio de 1911 (D.G. nº 137, 14/06/1911), 1911.
- [25]. Fonseca, J. Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa. Paris: J. Marques Nogueira, 1874, p. 604.
- [26]. Pereira, A. M^a. Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa – feito pelo plano F.J. Caldas Aulete. (2.^a ed.). Lisboa: Parceria A. M^a Pereira e Caldas Aulete, 1925, p. 278.
- [27]. Torrinha, F. *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa para os estudantes e para o povo. Ortográfico, prosódico e morfológico*. Porto: Livraria Simões Lopes de Domingos Barreira (editor), 1931, p. 104.
- [28]. Michaelis. *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. S. Paulo: Melhoramentos, 2002, p. 610.
- [29]. Martins, E. C. *Infância Marginalizada e Delinquente na 1^a República (1910-1926). De Perdidos a Protegidos...e educados*. Lisboa: Palimage/Terra Ocre, 2015, p. 159.
- [30]. Costa, A. Bruto. *Exclusões Sociais*. Lisboa: Gradiva, 1998, p. 13.
- [31]. LPI. Lei de Proteção à Infância, 27 de maio de 1911 (D.G. nº 137, 14/06/1911), 1911.
- [32]. Aulete, F. J. Caldas. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora S.A., 1958, Vol.1, p. 10.
- [33]. Constâncio, F. S. *Novo Dicionário crítico e etymologico da Língua Portuguesa*. Paris: Angelo Francisco Carneiro, 1844, p. 330-331.
- [34]. Falcão, Agostinho de M. *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. 6.^a ed. Vol. 1.^o. Lisboa: Typographia de António José da Rocha, 1858, p. 4.
- [35]. Pereira, A. M^a. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa – feito pelo plano F.J. Caldas Aulete. (2.^a ed.)*. Lisboa: Parceria A. M^a Pereira e Caldas Aulete, 1925, p. 5.
- [36]. Torrinha, F. *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa para os estudantes e para o povo. Ortográfico, prosódico e morfológico*. Porto: Livraria Simões Lopes de Domingos Barreira (editor), 1931.
- [37]. Martins, E. C. *Infância Marginalizada e Delinquente na 1^a República (1910-1926). De Perdidos a Protegidos...e educados*. Lisboa: Palimage/Terra Ocre, 2015.
- [38]. Lopes, M^a A. *Proteção social em Portugal na Idade Moderna: guia de estudo e investigação*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2010.
- [39]. Falcão, Agostinho de M. *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. 6.^a ed. Vol. 1.^o. Lisboa: Typographia de António José da Rocha, 1858, p. 683.
- [40]. Figueiredo, C. *Novo Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa (4^a ed.)*. Lisboa: A. Brandão, 1926 [11.^a ed. Lisboa: Bertrand & W.M. Jackson, 1945; 14.^a ed. Lisboa: A. Brandão, 1949].
- [41]. Pereira, A. M^a. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa – feito pelo plano F.J. Caldas Aulete. (2.^a ed.)*. Lisboa: Parceria A. M^a Pereira e Caldas Aulete, 1925, p. 715.
- [42]. Ferreira, Aurélio B. H. *Novo Aurélio Século XXI: O Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa (2^a ed.)*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Fronteira, 1998, p. 352.
- [43]. Aulete, F. J. Caldas. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora S.A., 1958, Vol. IV, p. 3598; Constâncio, F. S. *Novo Dicionário crítico e etymologico da Língua Portuguesa*. Paris: Angelo Francisco Carneiro, 1844, p. 405.
- [44]. Martins, E. C. *Infância Marginalizada e Delinquente na 1^a República (1910-1926). De Perdidos a Protegidos...e educados*. Lisboa: Palimage/Terra Ocre, 2015.
- [45]. Aulete, F. J. Caldas. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora S.A., 1958, Vol.II, p. 1321.
- [46]. Aulete, F. J. Caldas. *Dicionário Contemporâneo da Língua Portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora S.A., 1958, Vol.II, p. 1474.
- [47]. Constâncio, F. S. *Novo Dicionário crítico e etymologico da Língua Portuguesa*. Paris: Angelo Francisco Carneiro, 1844; Falcão, Agostinho de M. *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. 6.^a ed. Vol. 1.^o. Lisboa: Typographia de António José da Rocha, 1858.
- [48]. Torrinha, F. *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa para os estudantes e para o povo. Ortográfico, prosódico e morfológico*. Porto: Livraria Simões Lopes de Domingos Barreira (editor), 1931, p. 869.
- [49]. Martins, E. C. *Proteção Social e (R)Educação de menores – O Padre António d’Oliveira (1867-1923)*. Lisboa: Editora Cáritas Portuguesa, 2012.
- [50]. LPI. Lei de Proteção à Infância, 27 de maio de 1911 (D.G. nº 137, 14/06/1911), 1911.
- [51]. Oliveira, Augusto de. *Proteção Moral e Jurídica à infância*. Lisboa: Typ. do Reformatório Central de Lisboa Padre António d’Oliveira, 1929.
- [52]. Oliveira, Pe A. *Deixemos os pais e cuidemos dos filhos*. Lisboa: Edição Autor, 1923.
- [53]. Martins, E. C. *Proteção Social e (R)Educação de menores – O Padre António d’Oliveira (1867-1923)*. Lisboa: Editora Cáritas Portuguesa, 2012.
- [54]. Oliveira, Pe A. *Deixemos os pais e cuidemos dos filhos*. Lisboa: Edição Autor, 1923, p. 218.
- [55]. Oliveira, Pe A. *Deixemos os pais e cuidemos dos filhos*. Lisboa: Edição Autor, 1923, p. 238.
- [56]. Oliveira, Pe A. *Deixemos os pais e cuidemos dos filhos*. Lisboa: Edição Autor, 1923, p. 241.
- [57]. Oliveira, Pe A. *Deixemos os pais e cuidemos dos filhos*. Lisboa: Edição Autor, 1923, p. 242.
- [58]. Oliveira, Augusto de. *Proteção Moral e Jurídica à infância*. Lisboa: Typ. do Reformatório Central de Lisboa Padre António d’Oliveira, 1929.
- [59]. Martins, E. C. *Infância Marginalizada e Delinquente na 1^a República (1910-1926). De Perdidos a Protegidos...e educados*. Lisboa: Palimage/Terra Ocre, 2015.
- [60]. Chartier, R. *El mundo como representación*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa, 2002, p. 184.
- [61]. Corsaro, W. A. *The sociology of childhood*. 2nd ed. London: Pine Forge Press, 2005; Hendrick, H. *Constructions and reconstructions of British Childhood: an interpretative survey, 1800 to the present*. In: James, A. & A. Prout (orgs.). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the study of childhood*. London: The Falmer Press, 1990, p. 90-96.
- [62]. Prout, A. *The future of childhood*. N. York: Routledge Falmer, 2005.
-

e