

**SENSITIVE EYES ON VISITS TO THE MONJARDIM SOLAR MUSEUM:
MEMORY AND HISTORICAL FORMATION**

***OLHARES SENSÍVEIS EM ESTUDO DE CAMPO AO MUSEU SOLAR MONJARDIM:
MEMÓRIA E FORMAÇÃO HISTÓRICA***

***MIRADAS SENSIBLES EN VISITAS AL MUSEO SOLAR MONJARDIN: MEMORIA Y
FORMACIÓN HISTÓRICA***

Regina Celi Frechiani BITTE¹
Sônia Maria dos SANTOS²

ABSTRACT: The objective is to reflect on the theories and methodologies that permeate historical formation, initiated from field studies carried out at the Monjardim Solar Museum with students from the Pedagogy Course at the Federal University of Espírito Santo. In the search to map and awaken alternatives that provide sensitive views to historical and cultural aspects present in museums, the qualitative research methodology was adopted. We used several fragments of the debates held in the classroom, from observation to the museum space and the reports produced by the students after the field study. The results of the visits to the museum demonstrate a “rough” reading and can be seen as a fabric woven from the students' sensitivity to what was presented to them. In their narrative skills, their own historical meanings appear in relation to the museum, memory and history.

KEYWORDS: Historical formation. Story. Memory. Museum.

RESUMO: *Objetiva-se refletir sobre as teorias e metodologias que perpassam a formação histórica, encetadas a partir dos estudos de campo realizadas no museu Solar Monjardim com alunos do Curso de Pedagogia da Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. Na busca por mapear e despertar alternativas que propiciem os olhares sensíveis para aspectos histórico-culturais presentes em museus, adotou-se a metodologia qualitativa de pesquisa. Utilizamos vários fragmentos dos debates realizados em sala de aula, da observação ao espaço museal e dos relatos, produzidos pelos alunos após o estudo de campo. Os resultados das visitas ao museu demonstram uma leitura a “contra pelo” e podem ser vistos como trama tecida a partir da sensibilidade dos alunos ao que lhes foi apresentado. Em suas competências narrativas aparecem os seus próprios sentidos históricos que atribuem em relação ao museu, à memória e à história.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Formação histórica. História. Memória. Museu.*

¹ Federal University of Espírito Santos (UFES), Vitória – ES – Brazil. Associate Professor I and Professor at the Education Center. Doctorate in Education (UFES). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6819-3900>. E-mail: bitterregina@gmail.com

² Federal University of Uberlândia (UFU), Uberlândia – MG – Brazil. Retired Full Professor of the College of Education (UFU). Doctorate in Education (PUC-SP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7217-1576>. E-mail: soniaufu@gmail.com

RESUMEN: *El objetivo es reflexionar sobre las teorías y metodologías que permean la formación histórica, iniciadas a partir de estudios de campo realizados en el museo Solar Monjardim con estudiantes del Curso de Pedagogía de la Universidad Federal de Espírito Santo. En la búsqueda de mapear y despertar alternativas que brinden visiones sensibles a los aspectos históricos y culturales presentes en los museos, se adoptó la metodología de investigación cualitativa. Utilizamos varios fragmentos de los debates realizados en el aula, desde la observación al espacio del museo y los informes elaborados por los estudiantes después del estudio de campo. Los resultados de las visitas al museo demuestran una lectura “contra la piel” y se puede ver como una tela tejida a partir de la sensibilidad de los estudiantes hacia lo que se les presenta. En sus habilidades narrativas aparecen sus propios significados históricos en relación con el museo, la memoria y la historia.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Formación histórica. Historia. Memoria. Museo.*

Introduction

This text presents the results of research related to the exercise of our teaching practice as an educator of educators in the discipline of 'History: Content and Methodology', in the degree course in Pedagogy at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES). Its general objective is to reflect on the theories and methodologies that permeate historical formation, starting from field studies carried out at the Monjardim Solar Museum.

Pursuing our objective, we sought to investigate what knowledge students of Pedagogy carry in their formation, as triggering devices for cultural practices in the museum-school relationship, memory and heritage with a view to historical formation, aligning sensibilities and critical analysis of social life, material and cultural of the same.

We assume that in the construction of historical formation, historical knowledge is not directly processed between the subject and the object to be known, and between them there is the mediating action of the teacher, the mediated action of language, signs and tools (SIMAN, 2003).

Thus, we highlight the museum as a mediating space in the construction of historical knowledge, as one of the places where various objects (signs and tools) that speak of an individual and collective history can be kept, as part of a community that lived in a certain historical time and space. In this sense, contact with objects sometimes forms a complex discourse from the perspective of the subjects, and these discourses can be mediated by the teacher, raising questions related to the construction of memory and representations of the past.

According to Meneses (1992), memory refers more to the present than to the past. Therefore, removing its dimension of the past would be not to understand it as a force of the

present. That is, without memory there is no human present, let alone a future. In this way, memory would revolve around a basic data: change. With this understanding of the relationship between memory and present life, reflections were developed based on field studies carried out at the museum, considering the constitution of memory as a possibility for reflection on the past, closely related to the transformations of the present.

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

We are also based on the theoretical framework of cultural history, which became the paradigm for us to understand the practices, appropriations and representations that are carried out by the students of the Pedagogy course, understanding the representations “[...] not as simple true or false reflections of reality, but as entities that build their own divisions of the social world” (CHARTIER, 2009, p. 7, our translation).

Thus, in the preparation of the text, we used various fragments arising from the debates held in the classroom, the observation of the museum space and the 83 written reports produced by the students after the field study, carried out with five classes of the Pedagogy course during the years 2017, 2018 and 2019, covering the morning and night shifts. For the making of this work, the fragments of the students' reports were identified in the text with fictitious names.

By following the field studies at the museum, we aim to identify: what are the relationships established with the museum space; how they position themselves in relation to their memories and the cultural mediators present there; and which memories are raised, re-signified and shared in the lived experiences.

We start, therefore, from the principle that it is of great relevance, for the academic world and for the educational practice as a whole, to investigate, from the confluence of the paradigms of Cultural History, how historical formation has been constituted, based on the relationship established between museum, memory and history.

Preparing for the visit: trivia and anxieties

The subject 'History: Content and Methodology' is offered in the seventh period for students in the Pedagogy course. The Discipline Program's syllabus includes studies related to heritage and memory. To contemplate this content, we dedicate a teaching unit entitled 'The use of documents/sources in the teaching of History', which aims to discuss memory and heritage from archives, libraries, museums, among others. We opted for the museum. The field studies were carried out with four groups over the years 2017 to 2019, at the Monjardim Solar Museum, located in the Jucutuquara district, on Avenida Paulino Muller S/N, in Vitória, in the state of Espírito Santo.

To support field studies, classes were intended for readings and discussions on memory, heritage and museum, anchored in texts by Oriá (2013), Carvalho and Porto (2012), and Siman (2003). In these discussions, we were picking out which knowledge students bring in their cultural baggage related to memory, heritage, history and museum. In the making of this work, the subjects' narratives are identified by fictitious names.

Regarding memory, the following voices of students stood out in the discussions held in the classroom: 'Memory serves to learn from what happened and not repeat the same mistakes'; 'Without memory we won't know about our past' and 'Memory doesn't change, it tells us about something from the past'. Based on these statements, we asked the following questions: Can memory be re-signified? Could it be a link between the succession of generations and historical time? If so, is it possible that when making this link, the memory is not being rethought, reconstructed from the concerns we experience in the present?

By instigating and disturbing the students, our objective was to think, formulate and discuss with them the concept of memory. From the lines that emerged tacked to the readings they made, the concept of memory was collectively constructed. Initially, we evoke Meneses (2000), who works with memory as an elaboration of the present to respond to requests from the present (MENESES, 2000, p.93). So, we were talking and expanding our understanding. Advancing the debate, Clara points out that:

[...] memory is very important for the preservation of our cultural identity. Without it, it is not possible to know about our past history, experiences and struggles to get where we are now. See the question of quotas to enter universities. If we want to understand the process, we have to search for our people's memories of liberation. (CLARA, 2018, our translation).

Thus, we come to the conclusion that memory is an action found by the subjects of updating and interpreting experiences that may come to corroborate with concerns experienced in the present.

We took advantage of the heat of the debate and, in order to broaden the reflections, involving representations about the museum, the students were asked about the museum and how they would define it. Thus, Rosângela replied:

They thought I was going to say that the museum is a place to store old things, right. And also. But it's a powerful place that tells the story of important, powerful people. This was an idea I had before reading Siman's text [she is referring to the text indicated for reading]. But then I stopped to think and saw that the museum is a nice place, that keeps objects, actually old, but depending on the questions we ask, we will know a little about history and memory. It is also a place to talk, learn and playfulness (ROSANGELA, 2018, our translation).

Based on Rosângela's speech, I invited them to make another connection: that of a museum with heritage. What can we infer from the texts read in relation to heritage? In a very shy way, Fátima in the back of the room expressed in her speech that:

From what I understand, not always in our history everything has been preserved. What was preserved was the memory, the heritage of the elite, the powerful. I always had the idea of a museum as something monumental, grandiose. And when I started to read the texts I saw that the museum was not just that. Which can also be a pleasant place for learning. (FÁTIMA, 2018, our translation).

We started our dialogue by highlighting that today the preservation of historical heritage is seen, mainly, as a matter of citizenship, of interest to all. But it was not always so. In the past, preservation was restricted to material goods of great architectural value and that were representatives of remarkable facts in our history. This idea of preservation was based on Decree-Law no. 25/37, which was in force in our country until the 1988 Constitution. Such decree, in its art. 1st, brings the concept of 'historical and artistic heritage' as one that:

Historic and artistic and national heritage is the set of movable and immovable property existing in the country and whose conservation is of public interest, either because of its link to memorable facts of the History of Brazil, or because of its exceptional historical or ethnographic, bibliographical or artistic value (BRASIL, 1988, our translation).

For Oriá (2013), priority was given to material, built and architectural heritage, to the detriment of many other heritages that were relegated to oblivion. This perverse form of preservation has been inculcated in our memory. What is not related to memorable facts of

our history is not worth preserving, it is not memory and, consequently, is not part of our heritage. Within this understanding, they preserved the mansions and relegated the *senzalas* (slave quarters) to oblivion.

If, on the one hand, the implementation of laws in defense of the Historic Heritage represented an advance in the field of preservation of social memory in Brazil, on the other hand, its foundations ended up causing the expropriation of memory and history of the vast majority of the population, which it was not recognized in sumptuous works such as manor houses, mansions, churches, town halls, fortifications, among other buildings. The population was thus deprived of collective memory that would allow them to have historical awareness (FENELON, 1992).

Pressure from civil society through various associations such as the Institute of Brazilian Architects (IAB), the Association of Brazilian Geographers (AGB) and the National Association of History (ANPUH) strongly contributes to the new change in the current Brazilian Constitution, which it adopts the terminology 'cultural heritage' replacing 'historical and artistic heritage'. (ORÍÁ, 2013)

Thus, the current Constitution in its article 216, Section II - CULTURE defines:

Brazilian cultural heritage consists of goods of a material and immaterial nature, taken individually or together, bearing references to the identity, action, memory of the different groups that make up Brazilian society, including:

I – the forms of expression;

II – ways of creating, doing and living;

III – scientific, artistic and technological creations;

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

V – urban complexes and sites of historical, scenic, artistic, archeological, paleontological, ecological and scientific value (BRASIL, 1988, our translation).

As we can see, the text of the Constitution of 1988 preserves all assets, whether natural or cultural, tangible or intangible, material or immaterial, and it is understood that all these assets constitute the cultural heritage of the country, provided that they bear the identity and of the constituent memory of the Brazilian nation.

In this way, we bring to our debate the attentive eyes that we must have in the field study of museums, as spaces of both memory and oblivion. We approach the museum as a space that represents disputes between narratives. For Pollack (1989), distinguishing between favorable and unfavorable circumstances for marginalized memories is at the outset to recognize the extent to which the present colors the past. For the author, depending on the

circumstances, certain memories emerge, the emphasis is given to one or another aspect “[...] thus, there is also a permanent relationship between the lived and the learned, the lived and the transmitted” (POLLACK, 1989, p. 9, our translation).

In a way, bringing the lived past as an option to question the social fabrics existing in the present will depend on the questions we establish with the discourse presented to us in museums, as well as the questions we can ask the objects present there. That is why we look carefully when studying the museum in the field.

Our students' narratives revealed that the museum appears as a learning space. I agreed and complemented that it can indeed be a place of historical learning and historical formation, including, in the perspective of Rösen (2007), as a capacity for a determined constitution of meaning narrative, whose learning process is operationalized through experience, interpretation and guidance because:

[...] learning can be considered historical when it produces an expansion of the experience of the human past, an increase in the competence for the historical interpretation of this experience and the ability to insert and use historical interpretations in the framework of guidelines for practical life (RÜSEN, 2007, p. 110, our translation).

And what would this orientation for practical life be? It would be to build a historical sense based on the interpretation of his world and himself, defended by Rösen as a narrative competence. Thus, the narratives constructed by the 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 formation. The historical experience in the field study is related to how each one understands historical temporality, how each one relates to the past, present and future, how it colors this past in the present and how it corroborates the future. Still on this contact with the experience of the past in the formation process, the objectivity versus subjectivity discussion is re-placed. That is, the contact with the experience of the past, in addition to expanding the historical orientation through past facts, in a temporal process in which past and present are constantly contrasted, guarantees the subjects new internal spaces to perceive the 'I' in a process of gain of freedom and recognition of the 'other' (BAROM; CERRI, 2011).

Temporarily concluding our first impressions about the museum, memory, history, heritage and historical formation, I will briefly present the Monjardim Solar Museum, where the field study was carried out. Historical information was taken from the document

'Visitation Protocol for the Monjardim Solar Museum', which is given to all teachers when they schedule their field studies, with the aim of contributing to learning.

The Monjardim Solar Museum currently has an area of just over 16,000 m², land that was left over from the former Jucutuquara Farm. In the 16th century, the property belonged to the Jesuits and their land was already cultivated. However, with the expulsion of the Jesuits, which occurred in 1759, there were changes related to the ownership of the lands administered by them.

In the second half of the 18th century, the former Jucutuquara Farm already belonged to Gonçalo Pereira Porto, a wealthy merchant and rich landowner. From the marriage of his daughter Francisca de Sampaio Pereira Porto to Captain-Major Francisco Pinto Homem de Azevedo, the Jucutuquara Farm came to belong to the latter, through a marriage dowry. They had a daughter, D. Ana Francisca Maria da Penha Benedita Homem de Azevedo, who married Colonel José Francisco Monjardim, who received the house and the farm in the form of a dowry. From then on, their descendants started using the house until the 1940s.

On the Jucutuquara farm, sugarcane and cotton were cultivated, as well as different agricultural products for subsistence. Part of its area was also used for raising cattle. In addition to the sugar mill, the farm had homemade industries, such as the manufacture of manioc flour, cotton spinning, extraction of berry oil, candy, among other products.

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

Wanderers in the Monjardim Solar Museum

In the space of the Solar Monjardim museum, our eyes turned to identify how the Pedagogy students built their memories based on the exhibition that was presented to them. Several thematic approaches are presented by the museum, which include contents related to: the relationship between man and nature; History of Victory; eating habits; hygiene and health; religiosity; media; means of transport; working relationship, among others. As the museum monitor points out, the emphasis given to the exhibition also depends on the objectives explained by the professor.

The field study began in the living room and went on to other spaces, taking the routes stipulated by the museum and those taken by the Pedagogy students. These paths were made both in the act of walking in physical space and also in the imaginary act.

If, at times, the paths were shown to work certain stories to the detriment of others, the students took their shortcuts, with concerns and questions, in front of the stories that were presented to them. The museum, by portraying the daily life of a wealthy family, instigated them to think about how other families lived.

Thus, from the objects observed and from the exhibition of the Museum's monitor, several questions arose, such as in relation to work, the role of women and food. In reality, the students created different meanings from those presented by the museum. At times, these meanings were produced by absence. This was registered when Alice questioned why people did not talk, or did not talk much, about the presence of black people in the big house, as they were the ones who did the housework. According to Chartier (1990), representation is also made by absence.

The effects of the senses produced by the students from the objects that were presented to them mobilized feelings and memories. They produced different meanings for materiality, made connections with their personal and social trajectory. In addition, students made their own perceptual maps. They made relationships between the past and the present, they perceived the ruptures, permanencies, continuities and discontinuities in the historical process.

As they entered space, the buzz increased. As they made their perceptual movements, they built the maps of meaning that were shared among them. Therefore, we recorded a 'damage' (RAMOS, 2004) caused not only by the students, but also by the objects on display. At various times the exhibition touched the students. From situations experienced in the present, students established relationships with what they did not experience. We realized that the movement they made was not intended to live the past, the story was sought through objects, opening up countless possibilities for interpretation (RAMOS, 2004).

When looking for these countless possibilities of interpretation, the students made connections with other knowledge that they dominated. As Tardif (2012) reminds us, the knowledge of teacher education is constituted by the amalgamation of different types of knowledge: those that derive from the contribution that the human sciences offer to education and pedagogical knowledge, and are transmitted by teacher formation institutions; the knowledge of the disciplines incorporate social knowledge, defined and selected by the university institution and correspond to the different fields of knowledge; curricular knowledge is presented as a form of curricular programs and corresponds to discourses, objectives, contents and methods; and the knowledge of experience, in turn, is constituted in the exercise of the daily practice of the profession, in a context of multiple interactions. In their perceptual maps, students articulated the reflections made in the classroom with the

knowledge of museums, with the specific knowledge and other knowledge pointed out by Tardif (2012).

In this way, the museum is no longer just a methodological resource and becomes an integral part of the historical learning process and historical formation, as students perceive it as a place of preservation, dissemination and research. And why not say entertainment?

Field study became a possibility for academic and professional formation, going beyond the school space. This reflection is well exemplified by Ana's narrative as she said goodbye to the museum monitors:

This visit was an incredible experience and one that will be valid in my future as a teacher, as I was able to understand even better the importance of History and of a teacher who knows how to work it, so that her students can understand what and why things are put as they are and how they happen (ANA, 2017, our translation).

The conclusion of the work of our field studies always ended with a delicious breakfast (it was arranged that we take drinks, cookies, cakes and fruits) in an appropriate place in the backyard of the Monjardim Solar Museum. After all, the museum is also a place of socializing and joy!

What do the reports say about the lived experiences

The fragments of reports from the field studies that I am going to describe are productions of historical meaning built from the interpretations that students make of their world and of themselves, defined by Rösen (2007) as narrative competence. This narrative competence, in turn, synthesizes the historical consciousness, which has as its pillar the experience of the past, the interpretation of that past and the meaning produced from this interpretation, as described above. Thus, the students wove their historical narratives.

Upon reading the reports, we identified that several issues in relation to the conception of history, museum, memory and the museum/school relationship that were discussed in the classroom are taken up again.

In one of the reports, we highlight how the student perceives the historical version presented by the museum monitor and the organization of the exhibition of the objects:

The previous readings carried out gave me a new look upon arriving at the museum and verifying that most of the stories that were presented there and of the objects, referred to wealthy families, from a strongly established class, and that the history of slaves and their trajectory they were little reported, a

fact that stimulated me to search for new stories, those narrated by those who for centuries were made invisible (VITÓRIA, 2018, our translation).

The referenced fragment takes us back to the “writing and reading protocols” that “[...] go back to the elements that a given author disseminates throughout the text in order to ensure the correct interpretation that one should give to it” (CHARTIER, 1996, p. 10, our translation). This is a desired reading that is expected to be performed. The student goes beyond this protocol. From what is exposed, she makes other readings and reaches her conclusions: the search for other stories, those that are rarely talked about or represented in museums.

Little by little, students are realizing that, at times, the discourse present in the museum touches on the heterogeneity and diversity that must make up the historical formation. There is a lot of talk about the history of the white man, to the detriment of others.

In another account, the museum is taken beyond the methodological resource and seen as a research site, in order to work on historical temporality with its future students, linking memory and history.

In that small space, we were able to identify several historical temporalities that passed, but that still remain, through the representations present there (objects, paintings) that allow the student to critically and automatically build their historical memory, through visualization and experience in that museum space, seen who were not present at that time (CÉLIA, 2018, our translation).

For Ramos, the exhibition must touch visitors through certain memory arrangements, the affectivity that composes the act of remembering what we do not live, but that somehow moves us (RAMOS, 2004, p. 38). The student was touched by the exhibition. She did not live that moment and neither did her future students, but both could learn through the objects on display, as they speak of a specific historical time, are bearers of memories and pregnant stories for being discovered and narrated.

Among these discoveries, Paula narrates in her account:

Through this field class, I understood that by making reflections between the past and the present, understanding the relationship between them, I was exercising my "right to memory", since those objects were full of meanings and culture, that is, they represent my past and my history (PAULA, 2017, our translation).

In the reports, the museum was also discovered as a living space:

The Solar Monjardim museum, in a way, enchanted me in a special way, generally a museum is considered a “dead” space, with repetitive visits, loaded with long speeches/presentations of the objects. We had the opportunity to make a “live” visit, full of care, preparation, dedication and affection on the part of the exhibitors. We saw in that space a moment of great learning and teaching potential. (PAULO, 2017 our translation)

The narrative above takes us back to Chagas (2006), when he states that “there is a drop of blood in each museum” (p. 29). The expression blood used by Chagas (2006) brings life, the human, a pulsating place to the museum. This new reading presented in Paulo's report (2017) contrasts with the recurrent representation of the museum as a dead, neutral and apolitical space, as the museum is a place of learning, fruition and joy.

Another issue that we can pick out in the light of the reports are the reflections that the students made about history, as a discipline, and the field study in connection with their present time:

While studying history at university, I was able to understand issues that had intrigued me until now, issues that often the school, not even my parents, much less life, managed to clarify. Although I loved history from an early age, I didn't understand why we needed to study this subject. From the readings of the text, these questions were gradually stopped, because from them I could understand that only knowing the past can we understand the present, and that through thinking historically we can think about the historical manipulations that were presented to us. The field studies also provided me with a new look.

However, something contributed a lot to my formation, not only as a pedagogue, but above all as a human and participant in a not very rich historicity, of a simple family in a community that lives on the margins. Therefore, the way in which we explore the discipline of history in this penultimate period of our formation constituted our pedagogical practices for a historical formation of subjects (ALESSANDRA, 2018, our translation).

The student's report is in line with what has been researched, debated and produced a lot: the relationship between the theory of history and the teaching of history. This relationship is processed as we understand as a dimension of the specialized science of history the relationship established between history and the daily lives of historical subjects, with a view to orienting practical life. Orientation essentially linked to the idea of identity that passes through the school environment and goes beyond it (BAROM; CERRI, 2011).

And last, but not least, we highlight the museum/school relationship, as explicit in the narrative below:

When coming into contact with these places, we must bear in mind that the educational action is not limited to the exhibition, it must extrapolate the

exhibition and reach the classroom. In this way, the school has to interact with these spaces more frequently and not sporadically. Furthermore, the guides or even the teacher must find the best ways to mediate the exposure, facilitating the understanding, the perception of the information exposed to the students, helping them to build their own meanings, reflections and conclusions (MARIA, 2017, our translation).

The student's narrative invites us to think about the importance of planning activities that can be developed outside and inside the school. Going to museums can and should be a place of entertainment, but not only that. We know how difficult it is to get funding for activities outside the classroom. Therefore, we cannot let these moments that are so rich in learning slip through our fingers.

Considerations, even if partial

The students of the Pedagogy course made their own tours in the museum space and demonstrated that they are 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 them to other teaching methodologies that had been studied and experienced in their training so far.

In this way, visiting the museum is analyzing it as a tool for future visits, accompanying their own students. When reading the reports, we highlight the articulation of teaching knowledge, which also make up the historical formation, made up of the amalgamation of diverse knowledge arising from professional formation, knowledge of disciplines, curricula and experience (TARDIF, 2012). The amalgamation of this knowledge helped to compose the act of looking and helped in the making of meanings produced in the narratives contained in the reports.

The reports of the visits demonstrate a rough reading, at various times, of the one presented by the museum monitor, and can be seen as a plot woven from the sensitivity of the Pedagogy course students to everything that was presented to them. In their narrative skills, their own historical meanings appear, which they attribute in relation to the museum, memory and history. A narrative that goes against what has already been established by institutionalized power.

Pertinent, in this sense, is Silvia's narrative (2018), present in her report, emphasizing that 'Going to the Monjardim Solar Museum made me reflect on everything that was discussed in class from two different perspectives: that of a student (undergraduate) and that of future teacher'.

And perhaps, reflections that generate new practices...

REFERENCES

- BAROM, W. C. C.; CERRI, L. F. **O ensino da história a partir da teoria de Jörn Rüsen**. Universidade Estadual de Maringá 2011. Available: http://www.ppe.uem.br/publicacoes/seminario_ppe_2011/pdf/1/006.pdf. Access: 20 Apr. 2019.
- CARVALHO, M. C.; PORTO, C. Crianças e Adultos em Museus e Centros Culturais. *In*: KRAMER, S.; NUNES, F.; CARVALHO, M. C. (org.). **Educação Infantil: formação e responsabilidade**. Campinas: Papirus, 2013. p. 133-150.
- CHAGAS, M. S. **A uma gota de sangue em cada museu**. Chapecó: Argos, 2006.
- CHARTIER, R. **A história cultural: entre práticas e representações**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1990.
- CHARTIER, R. **A história ou a leitura do tempo**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2009.
- FENELÓN, D. R. Políticas Culturais e Patrimônio Histórico. *In*: FENELÓN, D. R. **O direito à memória: patrimônio, história e cidadania**. São Paulo: DPH, 1992.
- MENESES, U. T. B. 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, 1992.
- MENESES, U. T. B. Educação e museus: sedução riscos e ilusões. **Ciências; Letras**, Porto Alegre, n. 27, p. 91-101, jan./jun. 2000.
- ORIÁ, R. Memória e ensino de História. *In*: BITTENCOURT, C. (org.) **O saber histórico na sala de aula**. 12. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013. p. 128-148.
- POLLAK, M. Memória, esquecimento, silêncio. **Estudos Históricos**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 3, p. 3-15, 1989.
- RAMOS, F. R. L. **A danação do objeto: o museu no ensino de história**. Chapecó: Argos, 2004.
- RÜSEN, J. **História Viva: teoria da história: formas e funções do conhecimento histórico**. Brasília: UnB, 2007.
- SIMAN, L. M. C. Práticas culturais e práticas escolares: aproximações e especificidades no ensino de história. **Revista do Laboratório de Ensino de História/UUEL**, Londrina, v. 9, p. 185-204, 2003.
- TARDIF, M. **Saberes docentes e formação profissional**. 13. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2012.

How to reference this article

BITTE, R. C. F.; SANTOS, S. M. Sensitive eyes on visits to the Monjardim Solar Museum: memory and historical formation. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. 4, p. 2866-2880, Oct./Dec. 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16i4.14533>

Submitted: 08/07/2021

Required revisions: 10/08/2021

Approved: 13/09/2021

Published: 21/10/2021