

The museum in History teaching*¹

Regina Celi Frechiani Bitte²

ORCID: 0000-0001-6819-3900

Abstract

The article aims to reflect on the museum space as a locus for initial teacher training and on the teaching and learning process from field studies carried out at the Solar Monjardim Museum. For this purpose, we sought to investigate Pedagogy students' knowledge during their training as a device that trigger practices focused on the use of museum spaces, memory and heritage, intertwining sensitivities and critical analysis of their social, material, and cultural experiences. In the search for mapping and founding alternatives that provide sensitive views of historical-cultural aspects present in museums, the qualitative research methodology based on cultural history was used. In the preparation of this text, one used fragments of the reports presented in the discipline of History: Content and Methodology, product of the classroom debates about the observation of the museum space, in addition to the production of the exhibition entitled *Leitura de objetos museais* [Reading of museum objects]. These instruments have revealed that it is possible to go beyond the sensitive look at objects without disregarding the rigor of their content. If, before, the act of looking at the object, whether in the museum, in the classroom or in everyday life, was a contemplative act or within a supposed neutrality, we proposed, based on our educational practice, an interpretative, creative, sensitive reading, with the expansion of meaning, in a construction process that is not restricted only to questions and answers, but that can start from them and go beyond, giving the History teaching an orientation for practical life.

Keywords

Teacher training – History – Memory – Museum.

*English version by Tikinet. The authors take full responsibility for the translation of the text, including titles of books/articles and the quotations originally published in Portuguese.

1- The reports which this article was based on are documents from the Education Center of Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES). They are available to be check out online at: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1heEX9isdeKK-tvGqla-CsTiyPPvz7Bqb?usp=sharing>. Students agreed upon the publication of their reports, as long as they were not identified. Students' names are fictitious when mentioned in the text.

2- Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES), Vitória, ES, Brazil. Contact: bittereregina@gmail.com



<https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202450272477en>

This content is licensed under a Creative Commons attribution-type BY 4.0.

Introduction

This text presents reflections on our teaching practice as a trainer of teachers in the discipline of History: Content and Methodology, in the Pedagogy Teacher training Degree Program at Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES). Its objective is to reflect on the museum space as a locus of initial teacher training and on the teaching and learning process from field studies carried out at the Solar Monjardim Museum.

For this purpose, we sought to investigate Pedagogy students' knowledge during their training as a device that trigger practices focused on the use of museum spaces, memory and heritage, intertwining sensitivities and critical analysis of their social, material, and cultural experiences.

We start from the assumption that, in teacher training, historical knowledge is not processed directly between the individual and the object to be known. Between them, there is the teacher's mediating action, the mediated action of language, signs and tools (Siman, 2003). We agree with Martins, Picosque and Guerra (1998) when they state that mediation goes beyond the cognitive perspective, as it implies stimulating the possibilities of enjoyment and experiences, opening doors and windows to the senses, sensations and feelings, instigating the imagination and the production of knowledge. Therefore, we chose the Solar Monjardim Museum as our research universe. Our choice is justified by the ease of access and visits to the aforementioned museum, highlighting it as a mediating space in the tripod of education, teaching, and learning. The museum has the conditions to be one of the places where various objects (signs and tools) that speak of an individual and also collective history can be kept, objects that are part of a community that lived in a certain historical time and space. Coming into contact with such objects has the potential to form a complex discourse based on the individuals' perspective when mediated by the teacher, raising questions related to the construction of a memory and representations of the past.

According to Meneses (1992), memory refers more to the present than to the past. However, removing its past dimension would be to misunderstand it as a force of the present. Without memory, there is no human present and, much less, a future. Memory revolves around a basic fact: change. With this understanding of the relationship between memory and present life, reflections were developed based on field studies conducted at the museum, considering the constitution of memory as a possibility of reflection on the past, closely related to the transformations of the present.

Due to the theme and the issues related to it, a qualitative research methodology was adopted – whose approach was based on cultural history, which seeks to “[...] identify the ways in which, in different places and moments, a given social reality is constructed, thought about and given to be interpreted” (Chartier, 1990, p. 17, our translation). In our specific field study, we thought about history based on the daily life of the family that lived in the mansion – today called Solar Monjardim Museum – in the 19th century, in Espírito Santo. And, perhaps, go beyond it.

We are guided by the theoretical framework of cultural history, which has become the paradigm for understanding the practices, appropriations, and representations used

by Pedagogy students, understanding representations “[...] not as simple true or false reflections of reality, but as entities that construct the very divisions of the social world” (Chartier, 2009, p. 7, our translation).

Therefore, when writing this text we used several fragments taken from the reports produced by the students, resulting from the classroom debates before the visit, from the observation of the museum space, from the dialogues upon returning to the classroom, and from the production of an exhibition called *Leitura de objetos museais*, also using Ramos (2004) as theoretical support.

By following the field studies at the museum, we aimed to identify: the relationships established with the museum space; the way in which the students position themselves in relation to their memories and the cultural mediators present there, and the memories raised, reinterpreted, and shared in the experiences lived, which could contribute to the History teaching as a guide for everyday life.

From classroom to the museum

The discipline of History: Content and Methodology is offered during the seventh term for Pedagogy students. The course syllabus includes studies related to heritage and memory. To cover this content, we dedicated a teaching unit to it entitled *O uso de documentos/fontes no ensino de História* [The use of documents/sources in *History teaching*], which aims to discuss memory and heritage based on archives, libraries, and museums, among others. We chose the museum. Field studies were carried out with five classes throughout the years 2017, 2018 and 2019, covering the morning and evening periods, at the Solar Monjardim Museum, located in the Jucutuquara neighborhood, on Avenida Paulino Muller, s/n, in Vitória, state of Espírito Santo.

Eighty-three reports were produced (Relatório [...], 2017; Relatório [...], 2018; Relatório [...], 2019). When reading these reports, we observed that some issues were present in all of them, such as the idea that the museum is a place that stores old things, and, through readings and discussions, other perceptions of the museum space were being thought or rethought. Thus, the reports selected to compose the documentary corpus of this text express conceptions in relation to memory, history, and teacher training.

To support the field studies, classes were dedicated to readings and discussions about memory, heritage, and museums, anchored in the texts of Oriá (2013), Carvalho and Porto (2013), and Siman (2003). In these discussions, we were able to select the knowledge that the students brought in their cultural baggage related to memory, heritage, history, and the museum. The individuals' statements below are identified by fictitious names.

Regarding memory, the following students' statements stood out in the discussions held at the classroom: “[m]emory leads us to learn from what happened and not repeat the same mistakes”; “[w]ithout memory we will not know about our past”; and “[m]emory does not change, it tells us about something from the past.” Based on these statements, we began to ask the following questions: can memory be reinterpreted? Can it be a link between the succession of generations and historical time? If so, could it be that, by

establishing this link, memory is not being rethought, reconstructed based on concerns that we experience in the present?

By instigating and disturbing the students, our objective was to think, formulate, and discuss the concept of memory with them. Based on the statements that emerged, aligned with the readings they had done, the concept of memory was constructed collectively. Initially, we evoked Meneses (2000, p. 93, our translation), who works with memory as “elaboration of the present to respond to demands from the present.” Thus, we started talking and broadening our understanding. Advancing in the debate that took place in the classroom, Clara observes that:

[m]emory is very important for the preservation of our cultural identity. Without it, it is not possible to know about our past history, the experiences we have lived and the struggles to get where we are. Consider the issue of quotas for admission to universities. If we want to understand the process, we have to look for the memories of the liberation of our people. (2018)

Thus, we came to the conclusion that memory is an action carried out by individuals to update and interpret experiences that may corroborate the concerns experienced in the present.

We took advantage of the heat of the debate in order to broaden the reflections involving the representations of the museum, to question the students about this institution, the uses of its space, and how they would define it. Thus, contributing to the debate in class, Rosângela replied:

[you] thought I was going to say that the museum is a place to keep old things, right? Yes, that's right. But it's a powerful place that tells the story of important, powerful people. That was an idea I had before reading Siman's text [she is referring to the text recommended for reading]. But then I stopped to think and realized that a museum is a cool place that keeps objects, old ones in fact, but depending on the questions we ask, we will learn a little about the history and memory. It is also a place to talk, learn and enjoy ourselves. (2018)

Then, we asked the class about possible visits they had made to museums. We asked: What can you tell me about your experiences of going to museums? Did you go alone? With your family? With classmates? With teachers?

There was a long silence regarding the questions. It was clear from the students' speeches that a significant number of them, in all classes, had never been to a museum. They only recounted a few memories of going to museums with family members, even when they were children, and some recent experiences visiting historical heritage sites, already in higher education.

Continuing her speech, still in the classroom, Rosângela shares her experience of going to the museum: “*So... it wasn't a very nice experience. The guide talked all the time. I found the visit tiring and boring I was in high school*” (2018).

Following our discussion in class, we asked her if she remembered the place where the field study was carried out, how the visit was planned and organized, and also if she had reflected on the activity in any way upon returning to school. Rosângela stated that

[it] was at the School of Science, Biology and History. We were studying fauna and flora in Biology and the teacher took us to learn more about Espírito Santo's fauna and flora. The place itself was very beautiful, with some very large display cases. But the way everything was approached was not good. When we returned, we were asked to write a report on what we saw at the exhibition. (2018)

We can conclude that, based on the experience reported and the indications from the readings related to our theme, the mediation was possibly not adequate for Rosângela to feel attracted and motivated by what was presented to her. There was no time for contemplation (Siman, 2003). And the sole objective of the visit was writing a report. Here we ask ourselves: a report with what purpose? To record a grade? From the student's report, it seems to us that it was indeed, since no other way was used in order to share the report production with the class and, based on discussions, to revisit or add content and curiosities that could be raised by the students.

According to studies carried out by Barbosa (2009) with regard to the mediation used in museums, fixed itineraries still persist in these spaces that direct the visitors' gaze to the works that the mediators studied and in relation to which they probably feel confident to present, relegating the visitor's perspective to a secondary plane. The author points out that this behavior makes it impossible for the mediator to rethink their practices and, perhaps, envision new itineraries from the visitor's perspective.

For Cury (2007), the educational potential of museums lies precisely in the communication of content in a dynamic and interactive manner. In this way, we understand that, by working on the education of the senses, good fruits can be harvested in educational practices in museum spaces and in the teachers' practices. It is important to perform actions that are not only limited to the object contemplation, but that also promote the critical interpretation of the heritage on display. It is necessary to promote experiences that awaken the senses, sensations, imagination, perception, and critical thinking.

During the classroom debate, we highlighted the importance of teacher training focused on readings related to memory, heritage, and history. These readings can give us clues about how to make better use of time and space when conducting field studies at museums, with the aim of working on historical consciousness as "[...] something that occurs when inert information, progressively internalized, becomes part of the individual's mental tool and is used, with some awareness, as guidance in everyday life" (Schmidt; Barca; Martins, 2011, p. 16, our translation).

Continuing our debate, we invited students to make another connection: that of museums with heritage. What can we infer from the texts read in relation to heritage? Does the relationship between entities, as it was constructed, have repercussions on museum educational programs, more specifically, on the dialogue with their audiences?

Very shyly, Fátima, at the back of the room, stated:

[f]rom what I understand, not everything in our history has always been preserved. What has been preserved is the memory, the heritage of the elite, of the powerful. I have always had the

idea of a museum as something monumental, magnificent. And when I started reading the texts, I saw that the museum was not just that. It can also be a pleasant place for learning. (2018)

We began our dialogue by emphasizing that the preservation of historical heritage is a matter of citizenship, of interest to all. As early as 1922, Mario de Andrade called attention to a more comprehensive view of historical heritage. In the past, preservation was restricted to material assets of great architectural value (we will return later to discuss the issue of the word “value” in the constitutional text) and that were representative of notable facts in our history. This idea of preservation was based on Decree-Law No. 25/1937 (Brasil, 1937), which was in force in our country until the *1988 Constitution*. This decree, in its art. 1, establishes that:

The national historical and artistic heritage is the set of movable and immovable assets existing in the country and whose conservation is of public interest, whether due to their connection to memorable facts in the History of Brazil, or due to their exceptional historical or ethnographic, bibliographic or artistic value.

For Oriá (2013), priority was given to material, built, and architectural heritage to the detriment of many other heritage sites that were relegated to oblivion. This perverse form of preservation was instilled into our memory: anything that is not related to memorable events in our history is not worthy of preservation, is not memory and, consequently, is not part of our heritage. According to this understanding, the mansions were preserved and the slave quarters maintained in limbo.

On the one hand, the implementation of laws in defense of Historical Heritage represented an advance in the field of preserving social memory; on the other hand, in Brazil, its foundations ended up causing the expropriation of the memory and history of the vast majority of the population, who did not see themselves recognized in sumptuous works such as mansions, churches, city councils, and fortifications, among other buildings. The population was thus deprived of a collective memory that would allow historical awareness (Fenelon, 1992).

Pressure from civil society, through various associations, such as the Brazilian Institute of Architects (IAB), the Association of Brazilian Geographers (AGB), and the National History Association (Anpuh), contributed strongly to the new change in the current Brazilian Constitution, which adopts the term *cultural heritage as a replacement for historical and artistic heritage* (Oriá, 2013). Thus, the current Constitution, in its art. 216, Section II – Culture, defines:

Brazilian cultural heritage consists of assets of material and immaterial nature, taken individually or as a whole, which bear reference to the identity, action and memory of the various groups that form Brazilian society, therein included:

- I – forms of expression;
- II – ways of creating, making and living;
- III – scientific, artistic and technological creations;

IV – works, objects, documents, buildings and other spaces intended for artistic and cultural expressions;

V – urban complexes and sites of historical, natural, artistic, archaeological, paleontological, ecological and scientific value (Brasil, 1988).

Without disregarding the approaches of Oriá (2013) and advancing the reflections on cultural heritage, we present for the debate the contributions of Meneses (2009, p. 33, our translation) when highlighting “[...] the matrix of value. If value is always an attribution, who assigns it? Who creates the value.” The author emphasizes that the great novelty in relation to art. 216 of the 1988 Constitution is not the extension of the horizon of (intangible) heritage, but a shift in the matrix. Decree-Law No. 25/37 (Brasil, 1937, our translation), in its art. 1, paragraph 1, highlights:

The assets referred to in this article will only be considered an integral part of the historical and artistic national heritage after being registered separately or gradually in one of the 4 Heritage Listing Books, as referred to in article 4 of this law.

According to Meneses (2009), the Government established cultural heritage. The listing role was to establish cultural value, which accredited the inclusion of the asset in a formally defined list. The 1988 Federal Constitution recognized values (values, in general) that are not created by the Government, but by society. The State and the government can participate in the creation of these values, privileging or marginalizing some and others, as in Decree-Law No. 25/37 (Brasil, 1937), but in line with social practices.

According to Meneses (2009), cultural heritage is always supported by material vectors. All material heritage has an immaterial dimension of meaning and value; in turn, all immaterial heritage has a material dimension that allows it to be realized. The author makes this statement very clearly when he addresses the 1988 Constitution, which included intangible heritage, as if this, in its knowing-doing, were something abstract, immaterial, although in reality it is an embodied knowledge, since the ways of expressing, creating, and living also involve the body.

As we can see, the text of the 1988 Constitution preserves all assets, whether natural or cultural, whether tangible or intangible, whether material or immaterial. It is understood that all these assets constitute the country’s cultural heritage, as long as they are bearers of the Brazilian nation’s identity and constituent memory.

In this way, we bring to our debate the attentive focus that we must have on field studies at museums as spaces of both memory and forgetfulness. We approach museums as spaces that represent disputes between narratives. For Pollak (1989), distinguishing between favorable or unfavorable situations for marginalized memories is, from the outset, to recognize to what extent the present colors the past. For the author, “[...] depending on the circumstances, certain memories emerge, emphasis is given to one aspect or another [...] thus, there is also a permanent relationship between what is lived and what is learned, what is lived and what is transmitted” (p. 9, our translation).

In a certain sense, showing the lived past as an option to question the social plots that exist in the present will depend on the questions we establish based on the discourse

presented to us in museums, as well as on the questions we can ask the objects present there. Therefore, it is necessary to pay close attention to the field study at the museum.

The readings carried out by the students revealed that the museum appears as a learning space. We agree and complement this idea that it can indeed be a place for historical learning and historical formation; in fact, considering the perspective of Rüsen (2007, p. 110), it can develop the ability to constitute a certain narrative of meaning, whose learning process is operationalized through experience, interpretation, and guidance

[...] learning can be considered historical when it produces an expansion of the experience of the human past, an increase in the competence for historical interpretation of this experience and the ability to insert and use historical interpretations in the framework of guidelines for practical life.

And what would this guidance for practical life be? It would be to construct historical meaning based on the interpretation of one's world and oneself, an idea defended by Rüsen (2007) as narrative competence. Thus, the narratives constructed by students, after field studies carried out at the museum, also signal their own knowledge in relation to the history and memory that surround them and the relationships they establish with the museum.

Another important issue that was highlighted refers to historical training. The historical experience in field studies is related to the way each one understands historical temporality, how each one relates to the past, present and future, how each one colors this past in the present and how it corroborates the future. Still regarding this contact with the experience of the past in the training process, one raises the discussion: objectivity versus subjectivity. In other words, contact with past experiences, in addition to expanding historical orientation through past events, in a temporal process in which past and present are constantly contrasted, provides individuals with new internal spaces to perceive the self in a process of gaining freedom and recognizing the other (Barom; Cerri, 2011).

Provisionally concluding our first impressions about museums, memory, history, heritage, and historical formation, we will present, in a very succinct manner, the Solar Monjardim Museum, where the field study was carried out. The historical information was taken from the document *Protocolo de visitaç o do Museu Solar Monjardim* [Protocol for visiting the Solar Monjardim Museum], which is given to all teachers when they schedule their field studies, with the objective of contributing to students' learning and the training of teachers who will in the future take their students to field studies at museums.

Today, the Solar Monjardim Museum has an area of just over 16,000 m², land that is left over from the old Jucutuquara Farm. In the 16th century, the property belonged to the Jesuits, and their lands were already being cultivated. However, when they were expelled in 1759, there were changes in the ownership of the lands they managed.

In the second half of the 18th century, the old Jucutuquara Farm belonged to Gonalo Pereira Porto, a wealthy merchant and rural landowner. With the marriage of his daughter, Francisca de Sampaio Pereira Porto, to *capit o-mor* [captain-general] Francisco Pinto Homem de Azevedo, the Jucutuquara Farm came to belong to Francisco Pinto, through a marriage dowry. The couple had a daughter, D. Ana Francisca Maria da Penha Benedita Homem de Azevedo, who married Colonel Jos  Francisco Monjardim. He

received the house and the farm as a dowry. From then on, his descendants used the house until the 1940s.

The Jucutuquara Farm was used to grow sugar cane and cotton, as well as other agricultural products for subsistence. Part of the area was also used for raising cattle. In addition to the sugar mill, the farm had home industries, such as the production of cassava flour, cotton spinning, extraction of oil from cassava berries, and sweets, among others.

From the 1940s onwards, it housed different museums, until, on August 1, 1980, it was reopened and received the name Solar Monjardim Museum, with the concept of reconstructing a rural residence and the sociocultural context of a wealthy family from the 19th century.

The museum: a place where memories and stories meet

Once inside the museum, our attention was focused on identifying how the Pedagogy students constructed their memories based on the exhibition presented to them. Several thematic approaches are presented during the visit to the museum, covering content related to: the relationship between man and nature; the history of Vitória, capital of Espírito Santo; eating habits; hygiene and health; religion; means of communication; means of transportation, and labor relations, among others. As the museum monitor points out, the emphasis given to the exhibition also depends on the objectives set by the teacher.

The field study began at the visiting room and moved on to other spaces, following the routes established by the museum and the Pedagogy students. These routes were taken both by walking through the physical space and by the imaginary act.

If, at times, the routes were designed to work on certain stories to the detriment of others, the students took shortcuts, with concerns and questions, in the face of the stories presented to them. The museum, by portraying a wealthy family's daily life, encouraged them to think about how other families lived.

Thus, based on the objects observed and the exhibition by the museum monitor, several questions arose, such as those related to work, women's role, and food. Throughout the visit, the students created meanings that were different from those presented by the museum. At times, these meanings were produced by absence. This was recorded when the student Alice (2018), for example, questioned why there was no talk, or little talk, about the presence of black people in the mansion, since they were the ones who carried out the domestic work. According to Chartier (1990), representation is also made by absence.

The effects of the meanings produced by the students from the objects that were presented to them mobilized feelings and memories, produced varied meanings for the materiality, and generated connections with their personal and social trajectories. Furthermore, the students made connections between the past and the present, perceived the ruptures, continuity, and discontinuity in the historical process, and also used their own present as a reference.

As they walked around the place, the buzz grew louder. When making their perceptive movements, they constructed maps of meaning that were shared among them. Therefore, we recorded a *damnation* (Ramos, 2004), which lies in the confusion of meanings caused by the objects on display in the museum, by disturbing, instigating the

visitor to ask, question, and want to know more. The exhibition touched the students on several occasions. Based on situations experienced in the present, the students established connections with what they had not experienced. We realized that the movement that occurred did not aim to live the past, but sought history through the objects, opening up countless possibilities for interpretation (Ramos, 2004).

By seeking these innumerable interpretative possibilities, the students made connections with other knowledge that they mastered. As Tardif (2012) rightly reminds us, teacher training knowledge is constituted by the amalgamation of diverse knowledge: that which derives from the contribution that the human sciences offer to education and pedagogical knowledge and is transmitted by teacher training institutions; knowledge coming from the disciplines, which incorporates social knowledge, defined and selected by the university institution, and corresponds to the diverse fields of knowledge; curricular knowledge, which is presented in the form of curricular programs and corresponds to discourses, objectives, contents and methods, and knowledge of experience, which, in turn, is constituted in the exercise of the daily practice of the profession, in a context of multiple interactions. In their perceptual maps, the students articulated the reflections made in the classroom with the museum knowledge, with specific knowledge, and also with other knowledge pointed out by Tardif (2012).

Referring to the breakfast in the museum's backyard in her report, Carla narrates that:

[...] we can say that, on this visit, the class had the privilege of being accompanied by a guide who allowed us to gather information, to ask questions and learn more about these incredible places, taking away that vision of a simple class trip or of seeing the museum as something old, distant from us and meaningless. Despite the challenges faced, the visit was incredible. In addition, we understand that museums are magical, they stir our imagination, memory and fantasy. They are pleasant places, places of appreciation, of encounter, which help us to weigh history. Therefore, when we come into contact with these places, we must keep in mind that educational action is not limited to the exhibition alone, but it is also a learning space, rich in knowledge and that helps preserve our history and memory. The guides or even the teacher should find the best means to mediate the exhibition, facilitating the understanding of the information, helping students to get to their own meanings, reflections, and conclusions. (2018)

In this way, the museum ceases to be just a methodological resource and becomes an integral part of the teaching, learning and teacher training process, as students perceive it as a place for preservation, dissemination, and conduction of research.

Field study has become a possibility for academic and professional training, going beyond the school environment. Ana's narrative exemplifies this reflection well:

[t]his visit was an incredible experience that will be valuable in my future as a teacher, because I was able to understand even better the importance of History and of a teacher who knows how to work with it, so that their students can understand what it is and why things are placed the way they are and how they happen. (2017)

The conclusion of our field studies always ended with a delicious breakfast (it was agreed that we would bring drinks, cookies, cakes and fruits) in an appropriate place in the Solar Monjardim Museum's backyard. After all, a museum is also a place for getting together and enjoying ourselves!

From the museum to the classroom

In the classroom, before going to the museum, I told the students I wanted them to choose, during the visit, individually or in groups, an object that most caught their attention so that, when we returned, we could develop our concluding activity: the exhibition *Leitura de objetos museais*.

We were inspired to carry out this activity by reading the work *A danação do objeto: o museu no ensino de história* [The damnation of the object: the museum in history teaching], by Ramos (2004), in which the author proposes working on the pedagogy of the *generating object*, in dialogue with the ideas of Paulo Freire (1987), mainly that of the methodology developed by the *generating word* (Ramos, 2004).

We emphasize that, when choosing the work of Ramos (2004), it was not our intention to work with cultural assets [...]

identifying intrinsic meanings, specific to things in themselves, [...] but to talk about things (or practices) whose properties, derived from their material nature, are selectively mobilized by society, social groups, communities [...] (Meneses, 2009, p. 32, our translation).

In short, it is necessary to perceive in cultural assets their cognitive, formal, affective, pragmatic, and ethical values.

The proposal to work with the pedagogy of the *generating object* aims to “[...] motivate reflections on the plots between subject and object: to perceive the life of objects, to understand and feel that objects express cultural traits, that objects are creators and creatures of the human being” (Ramos, 2004, p. 32, our translation). Much can be done from objects, because the new is not imprisoned in things or images. The new can emerge from the relationships we are able to maintain with things or images, since the latter also look at us, teach us, and exert the power to affect and be affected by us (Chagas, 2004).

In this manner, the object is treated as evidence of cultural traits that can be explored in the museum space, as well as in the classroom. Thus, before carrying out our field study, we took an old object, – a stirrup with a peculiar design (one in the shape of a shoe and the other of a handle, with a lower support to support the foot) – to the classroom with the aim of sharpening the reading of the object, of sensitizing those who would see it. According to Ramos (2004), when developing activities that seek to work on the historicity of objects, already in the classroom, the teacher incites curiosity, the students' perception, the desire to be in the museum, the sharpening of the senses, the proposals for reflection that can be offered by the museum. Thus, “[...] one looks with a gaze filled with questions, and not from the presentation of the guide conducting the visit” (Ramos, 2004, p. 27, our translation).

The second step – after the groups had chosen the generating object – was to enhance the field of perception, learn to reflect based on material culture, problematize the object that was chosen to be the generating object and, finally, read it to be part of the exhibition. In dialogue with each class, we mapped out our work path by seeking the history of the object and then thinking about why it was created, who used it, what its uses were, and whether it played a decisive role at some historical moment. From this inquietude, several other questions could be raised. Although it was not explicitly highlighted, the concept of time should permeate the approach to content worked on by the teacher, appropriating/re-signifying it in the teaching and learning process.

We understand that, based on the discussions held previously, the object becomes a starting point for arriving at various statements and information, by contributing to the understanding of the diversity of social and historical experiences of the individuals in time. The objects can become mediators of the individual who learns regarding their understanding that there are other times, other social groups, and other histories. The professors of the Pedagogy Teacher training Degree Program, when reading the objects, can become mediators between the time lived (by the student) and the historical time (not experienced by the students).

The objects, depending on the questions we ask or the inquietude they raise in us, can tell us about the Monjardim family's life, but also about other families' lives. The students can think about how families lived at that time and, with the professor mediation, make conjectures with the present and identify the ruptures and continuity in the historical process, or perceive traces of the past in the present. Thus, the students will understand that different ways of thinking and acting can coexist in parallel.

Finally, we sought to construct a problem-story, based on the generating object, which would have as its reference the historicity of the various dimensions of the social life, instead of a story that collects singular, curious facts. We worked on a story that perceived the past as a source of reflection for present-day issues, investigating its ruptures, permanence, changes, tensions and conflicts, with the aim of understanding how society works.

The third step was to make the objects. In agreement with all the classes, we chose to make them using recyclable materials, as far as possible. The objects enchanted us with their beauty and creativity: a *comua* (old toilet), made from pieces of cardboard boxes and margarine containers; a spittoon, using the paper folding technique; porcelain sets, made from PET bottles and the papier-mâché technique, and a calendar clock, made from two cardboard boxes, among many other interpretations of museum objects.

The last step was to organize the exhibitions. All of them were held in the corridor of the IC-IV building of the UFES Education Center, with the aim of allowing visitors access. On the day of the exhibition opening, each group presented, to the other groups in the room and the visiting public, the history of the object and the relationships they established so that such object was chosen as the generating object.

Closing these meetings, envisioning others

The Pedagogy students made their own journeys through the museum space and demonstrated that they were not mere spectators of what was presented to them. They recalled visits made to these spaces in Basic Education, confronted experiences and memories, made connections with the texts discussed in class and related this form of teaching with other methodologies studied and experienced in their education.

Upon returning to the classroom, Elisa narrates in her report that:

[the] visit and the classes with dialogue contributed to not thinking about time, historical moment and epochs as an immutable historical line, thus expanding the act of coming closer to and obtaining new knowledge. To date, we have been taught, since Elementary School, that History was presented as something immutable.

We were not allowed to reflect on it. As well as the vision regarding heritage, often left aside due to the importance given to other content. [...] The visit and the classes gave me a different perspective on what I was taught and how I can teach it to my future students. Education that is not limited to the classroom. The visit to the Solar Monjardim Museum was dynamic, light and fun. The knowledge was present at all times, allowing for a historical journey. Still, it was adapted to what was discussed in the classroom. Let the student be free so that they can enjoy the moment of the visit, without pressure. This way, the visit will have meaning and recognition of this heritage being part of their history. (2018)

Visiting a museum is analyzing it as a tool for future visits by university students, in the company of their own future students. In the interweaving of the classroom with the museum, and of the museum with the classroom, there seems to have been an articulation of the diverse knowledge arising from professional training, disciplines, curricula, and experience (Tardif, 2012). The amalgamation of this knowledge helped compose the act of looking at and helped in creating the objects, in producing meanings – expressed in the choice of the generating object – in the museum space, which were also manifested in the sparkle in the eyes of several students who, for various reasons, had not yet entered a museum. This can be seen in the classroom, based on the students' accounts of their experiences of being at the Solar Monjardim Museum on rainy or sunny mornings, or on Sunday afternoons, with the night class.

If, before, the act of looking at the object, whether in the museum, in the classroom or in everyday life, was a contemplative act or within a supposed neutrality, we proposed, based on our educational practice, an interpretative, creative, sensitive reading, with the expansion of meaning, in a construction process that is not restricted only to questions and answers, but that can start from them and go beyond, giving the History teaching an orientation for practical life. Thus, we hope that our teaching practice will be incorporated and/or modified, transformed into new practices, driving new knowledge and actions in the teaching profession.

The ideas defended here are part of our experiences as professors who train teachers, which we have been modestly developing with great dedication – in the Pedagogy Teacher



training Program and also in the History Teacher training Program at UFES – and which we seek to renew daily.

[...] a esperança
Nova aurora a cada dia
E há que se cuidar do broto
Pra que a vida nos dê flor
Flor e fruto
(Coração de Estudante – Milton Nascimento).

References

BARBOSA, Ana Mae. Mediação cultural é social. *In*: BARBOSA, Ana Mae; COUTINHO, Rejane Galvão (org.). **Arte/educação como mediação cultural e social**. São Paulo: Unesp, 2009. p. 13-22.

BAROM, Wilian Carlos Cipriani; CERRI, Luiz Fernando. O ensino da história a partir da teoria de Jörn Rüsen. *In*: SEMINÁRIO DE PESQUISA DO PPE, 2011, Maringá. **Seminário...** Maringá: Universidade Estadual de Maringá, 2011. p. 1-9. Disponível em: http://www.ppe.uem.br/publicacoes/seminario_ppe_2011/pdf/1/006.pdf. Acesso em: 20 abr. 2019.

BRASIL. [Constituição (1988)]. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil**. Brasília, DF: Casa Civil, 1988.

BRASIL. **Decreto-Lei nº 25, 30 de novembro de 1937**: organiza a proteção do patrimônio histórico e artístico nacional. Brasília, DF: Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, 1937. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/del0025.htm. Acesso em: 22 dez. 2020.

CARVALHO, Maria Cristina; PORTO, Cristina. Crianças e Adultos em museus e centros culturais. *In*: KRAMER, Sonia; NUNES, Maria Fernanda; CARVALHO, Maria Cristina. (org.). **Educação infantil: formação e responsabilidade**. Campinas: Papyrus, 2013. p. 133-150.

CHAGAS, Mário de Souza. Diabruras do Saci museu, memória, educação e patrimônio. **Iphan - Revista Brasileira de Museus e Museologia**, Brasília, DF, n. 1, p. 106-146, 2004.

CHARTIER, Roger. **A história cultural: entre práticas e representações**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1990. 243 p.

CHARTIER, Roger. **A história ou a leitura do tempo**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2009. 80 p.

CURY, Marília Xavier. Exposição: uma linguagem densa, uma linguagem engenhosa. *In*: VALENTE, Maria Esther (org.) **Museus de ciências e tecnologia**. Rio de Janeiro: MAST, 2007. p. 69-76.

FENELON, Déa Ribeiro. Políticas culturais e patrimônio histórico. *In*: FENELON, Déa Ribeiro (org.). **O direito à memória: patrimônio, história e cidadania**. São Paulo: DPH, 1992. p. 29-33.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987. 256 p.

MARTINS, Mirian Celeste Ferreira Dias; PICOSQUE, Gisa; GUERRA, Maria Telles Terezinha. **Didática do ensino de arte**: a língua do mundo: poetizar, fruir e conhecer a arte. São Paulo: FTD, 1998. 197 p.

MENESES, Ulpiano Toledo Bezerra de. A história cativa da memória? Para um mapeamento da memória no campo das ciências sociais. **Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros**, São Paulo, n. 34, p. 9-24, dez. 1992.

MENESES, Ulpiano Toledo Bezerra de. **Educação e museus**: sedução riscos e ilusões. Ciências; Letras, Porto Alegre, n. 27, p. 91-101, jan./jun. 2000.

MENESES, Ulpiano Toledo Bezerra de. O campo do patrimônio cultura: uma revisão de premissas. *In*: FÓRUM NACIONAL DO PATRIMÔNIO CULTURAL, 1., 2009, Ouro Preto. **Anais [...]**. Ouro Preto: [s. n.], 2009. p. 25-39.

ORIÁ, Ricardo. Memória e ensino de história. *In*: BITTENCOURT, Circe (org.) **O saber histórico na sala de aula**. 12. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013. p. 128-148.

POLLAK, Michel. Memória, esquecimento, silêncio. **Estudos Históricos**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 3, p. 3-15, jun. 1989.

RAMOS, Francisco Régis Lopes. **A danação do objeto**: o museu no ensino de história. Chapecó: Argos, 2004. 178p.

RELATÓRIO apresentado na disciplina de história conteúdo e metodologia. Vitória: UFES, 2017. Relatório (Pedagogia) – Centro de Educação, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, 2017.

RELATÓRIO apresentado na disciplina de história conteúdo e metodologia. Vitória: UFES, 2018. Relatório (Pedagogia) – Centro de Educação, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, 2018.

RELATÓRIO apresentado na disciplina de história conteúdo e metodologia. Vitória: UFES, 2019. Relatório (Pedagogia) – Centro de Educação, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, 2019.

RÜSEN, Jörn. **História viva**: teoria da história: formas e funções do conhecimento histórico. Brasília: UnB, 2007. 160p.

SCHMIDT, Maria Auxiliadora; BARCA, Isabel; MARTINS, Estevão de Rezende (org.). **Jörn Rüsen e o ensino de história**. Curitiba: UFPR, 2011. 150 p.

SIMAN, Lana Mara de Castro. Práticas culturais e práticas escolares: aproximações e especificidades no ensino de história. **Revista do Laboratório de Ensino de História/UEL**, Londrina, v. 9, p. 185-204, out. 2003.

TARDIF, Maurice. **Saberes docentes e formação profissional**. 13. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012. 325p



Received on February 28, 2023

Reviewed on December 1, 2023

Approved on April 8, 2024

Editor: Prof. Dr. Roni Cleber Dias de Menezes

Regina Celi Frechiani Bitte is a professor in the Professional Graduate Program in Education at the Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. She is a researcher in the area of History teaching.