

HISTORY AND HISTORIAN: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

SILVIO TAMASO D'ONOFRIO

Silvio Tamaso D'Onofrio, Dr., independent researcher
São Paulo, Brazil
e-mail: opeltrezero@gmail.com

Silvio Tamaso D'Onofrio holds a Doctor of Science in Social History (2017) from the University of São Paulo, Brazil. Leader of the research group "REGIONEM – Regional Multidisciplinary Studies", he is also a member of the research group "Nucleus of Studies of Epistolography", of the Institute of Brazilian Studies, at the University of São Paulo. Born and raised in Brazil, the years of college have led Silvio D'Onofrio to Literary and Linguistic studies. In his graduate studies, he also approached other sciences, especially History and Archives – at this segment, his research helped in the constitution of a Public Archive in a State University. His Doctoral research contributed to the understanding of the spaces of action of young intellectuals in times of dictatorial political regime, through the analysis of a social collective based around the 1940s journalists and critics of the arts. Using state-of-the-art computerized resources, it attempted to investigate the extent to which cross-referencing a large amount of information can be indicative of social meanderings. Additionally, it analyses the symbol initiative of the group, a cultural weekly.

ABSTRACT

The article investigates some notions of the origin of universal historiography and promotes a reflection on the concept of History in antiquity and today, especially in classrooms of juvenile education. For that, a basic, exploratory, subjective, and inductive bibliographical research was carried out within the scope of the written production of classical and contemporary authors, with a view to contributing to a critical re-reading of the historiographic bases, something that is necessary given a characteristic of the constant evolution of science, which demands more and more technicality and specialization – and this happens to the historical discipline too. The purpose of reflection is to foster a critical discussion that contributes to the teaching of History in the classroom, in the present day, since the world today seems less and less prone to the study of the humanities, for several reasons. The conclusion is that we cannot forget the past teachings, much less how humanity faced and overcome its problems and challenges, with confrontations and solutions that transformed the past into a present, and from here arises the mission of building the future, aware that we will not evolve if we are not very clear about the notion of the human condition at all times.

Keywords: history, pedagogy, classics, teaching, humanities, historiography

INTRODUCTION

A frequent question among the educators of the area of History, which many ask themselves is: after all, what is it to teach History? This question, whose simplicity lies only in its appearance, can lead to other questions beneficial to the general understanding of the subject. Among them, the quest for prime issues, what was history to the earliest known thinkers? What are its characteristics and objectives? How should it be done? These are just a few questions that could be investigated in an attempt to improve the classroom teacher's performance. Once again, here too is the common sense of the study of history: who knows by studying and understanding the past, has answers to the questions of the present, and can thus better design future actions.

US AND THEM

Teaching History in class or defending an academic thesis on History may lead to the traditional questioning about the definition of the concept of History, about what it is and how History is made, in addition to the important question regarding the writing of History.

The historian Paul Veyne (1982) has already observed that the capacity of the present man to know history is much greater than that of the men of the ancient civilizations, like the inhabitants of classical Greek and Roman antiquity, for example. And this characteristic does not stem from the simple fact that millennia have passed, therefore more events have occurred, facilitating to the current observer a greater amount of information available.

According to Veyne, the ancients lacked experience because to them History seemed to be something monolithic, closed, which did not accept criticism, questioning or new versions if it had already been established previously.

What makes present man be able to know History more than the man of old times is his lack of naivety in front of History. He no longer believes that a story told, or a historiography, or what one seeks to know, is exactly what really happened, the true historical process – the actual process experienced – something which could be called the true History. Thus, probably the explanation of the clear distances, for the contemporaries, between History and Story.

It means that the present man is aware that the production of knowledge is inexorably dependent on multiple conditions, which makes this knowledge marked by different views and conceptions of the world and society – that is why it is said that there is always a theory chronologically before the historical fact, theory that would be elaborated, when it seeks to problematize the knowledge, or imposed, when one does not question the facts but only seeks a preconceived version. In addition, the present man is more aware of the injunctions to which scientific production is subjected because the scientific doing itself is not free from questions about its presuppositions and purposes. Brazilian researcher Déa Felon approaches this from the perspective of the very subjection of historical science to a debatable model of understanding of thought:

“In the present context of the organization and division of intellectual work, the position of History expresses a hierarchy and classification of the sciences corresponding to a conception of knowledge legitimating social division into watertight compartments.” (Felon 2008, 25)

Another aspect of the social division pointed out by Felon is the institutionalization of the University as a unique and privileged place for the production of knowledge. The author concludes, gravely, by pointing out that science can often hinder the understanding of thought rather than facilitating it because, at the limit, it may be at the service of interests, as Hobsbawm (1998) summed up, referring specifically to History: if there is no satisfactory past, it is always possible to invent it.

Done due reservations, however, man of the present day seems far more apt to construct historical knowledge than the man of earlier eras. And if it is true for these women and men of today, that to evoke the past is a condition for culturally orienting the human being in order to broaden his prospects for action in the future (Rüsen 2001), in a synthetic and elegant definition, it does not seem to be the historical knowledge that is being developed within the classrooms. Initially, due to the scarce supply of History classes at primary and secondary schools, so busy that these appear to be with the diffusion of contents related to the mathematical and Grammar sciences.

The original record of Jörn Rüsen, it is worth mentioning, is as follows:

“[the historical knowledge] encompasses the cultural practices of directing the actions of humans in time [...] places men in the temporal changes in which they have to suffer and act, changes that – in turn – are (co) determined and effected by the own act and to suffer humans. The historical culture is able to guide when it

allows that experiences with the human past be interpreted in such a way that, through them, one can understand the circumstances of the present life and, based on them, to elaborate future perspectives.” (Rüsen 2001, 217)

It is possible to make a brief digression about what was written immediately above because Mathematics and Grammar, elementary, are of absolute and recognized priority in the teaching of the human being. However, merely making math accounts and mastering grammatical rules do not guarantee the development of other important intellectual capacities that are also fundamental for the proper formation and emancipation of the human being, such are the arts of narrating, of understanding, of reasoning discursively, among many that make of the human being what he is in its integrality.

In addition to the limited supply of classes, the difficulty in modernizing curricula and customs, with prevailing of the permanence instead of innovations – what some call a tradition, seems to transform the activity of the History teacher into a mere parade of facts and dates, without criticism, reflection or attempt to approximate the practical life of students, which causes two immediate consequences: the content becomes meaningless for the needs of the student; the class becomes boring and here, the tragic corollary of the situation happens: in this context, a good teacher is the one who can teach students to memorize more and more quickly. Hence the contribution of the historical discipline to school failure, and immediately thereafter, the promise of the digital Pandora box appears: the wonders of the technological world of the twentieth century to aid the gritty lessons and disinterested students.

By the way, the historian Leandro Karnal comments on the use of the new resources and their relationship with History:

“A few decades ago, there was an expressive misunderstanding in the modernization of teaching. It was thought necessary to introduce machines to have a dynamic class. Multiplying back-projectors, slide projectors and, later, movies in the classroom. [...] It is needed to be said and repeated to exhaustion: a classroom can be extremely conservative and outdated with all the most modern audio-visual means. A classroom can be very dynamic and innovative using chalk, teacher and student. In other words, we can use new means, but it is the very conception of History itself that must be rethought.” (Karnal 2009, 9)

At the heart of the question seems to be a notion that History, as it is transmitted or assimilated, seems something immutable and indisputable that would just be enough to memorize to know, becoming something unnecessary and tiring. The fundamental notion

of how human problems, and the resulting solutions and confrontations, have been transformed from the past to the present, is being taken from the student's life as a primordial issue, and for which neither the Grammar nor even Maths can help to build the awareness of the human condition.

A first attempt at coping with the complex seems to be necessarily a search for a better definition of what History is for the teacher and what History is for the student. The mission of the well-trained teacher, aware that his discipline generates possibilities of actions and practices historically founded, for the present and future times, consists in helping his or her student leave the outdated conceptions of History in the past, so to speak. Students need to be encouraged to integrate the teaching-learning processes, as only then can they produce meanings.

There is an old adage, which is very conducive to this reflection, it says more or less the following: "Tell me what should be done and I will forget. Show me and I'll be interested, but only if I get involved will I understand".

Therefore, it is important to remember the origins of the historical discipline, even as an additional effort to get students involved, and to be able to evolve safely in Science. In this case, it may be useful again to return to the historian Paul Veyne, so the contemporary educator can face the difficulties to the understanding of History, those proposed by Veyne (1982): historical event is rupture, denoted by values contained in actions, not words. Moreover, the event usually entails a multitude of paradox, to which the historian must return infinitely in his quest for truths or appearances. One must be aware that historical facts and events are multidimensional and carry fragments of a kaleidoscopic image of the world: they are social, economic, cultural, etc.

STORY OR HISTORY?

The presented panorama suggests that the return to the origins, in terms of historical knowledge, in terms of first postulates about the office of the historian, can still yield fruitful reflections since the situation of academic everyday life is always different, it moves in perpetual transformation, and can generate a departure from the bases of historical knowledge by the specialization and increasing technicality – and increasingly demanded by Science.

In the light of the foregoing, it is worth raising some authors and works that may serve as a complementary reflection. It seems

consensual that, in the Western world, the Greeks Herodotus, Hesiod, and Thucydides, together with the Latins Salustius and Livy, are identified as responsible authors for what can be called the origin of Historiography, so it's worth to review questions and procedures adopted by the discipline's pioneers in classical antiquity. Tensioning the original meaning proposed by Walter Benjamin in his sixth thesis on the "Philosophy of History", his formulation "To articulate the past historically does not mean to recognize it 'the way it really was'. It means to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger" (Benjamin 1969, 258), in the context of the present work, could mean that the moment of danger would not be the moment in which one tries to glimpse the past as it actually was, in this sense following the German master's warning, but the moment when one tries to glimpse how one imagines it could have been, which is doubly inaccurate because it is where personal opinion arises, the inexorably limited reading of the observer when it tries to make sense of something in the past and of which only traces are known. It is like when one tries, through these rare signs, to give meaning to something that is not well known or comprehended how, in fact, it happened. It is at this moment that it may be useful to return to the earliest initiators, the first formulators, those who have encountered these and other questions at the primeval time, because they have tried to fill in gaps to give consistency to their work. It is to this type of situation that the scholar of Oral History, Paul Thompson, referred when he approached interpretive operations in the construction of History, with the difference that his method simulated an optimal situation in which the historian would have all the available sources: "The evidence is now collected, sorted and prepared in an accessible way: the sources are at our disposal. But how to articulate them? How to build the story from them? [...] How to evaluate and test our evidence?" (Thomson 1992, 299–300). These are key questions and for which, at the present time, one can only produce interpretations for meanings, rather than answers, as Geertz proposed, besides dealing with ethnography, in the chapter entitled "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture": "Doing ethnography is like trying to read (in the sense of 'construct a reading of')" (Geertz 2001, 10).

One of the references to these efforts, subsequent to the cited Greek and Latin authors, is Lucian of Samosata, better known for his jocular dialogues with the dead in the so-called menippean satire, a subject of little interest for the present moment. More seriously, Lucian of Samosata has a book titled "How to Write History", important to understand how these writings were given in antiquity because

it contrasts with those coming from people pointed out as the historians of his time, that did nothing but the clear and simple compliment to the emperors. In his work, Lucian of Samosata preaches that History must be fair, corresponding to the truth, so that it is lasting, thereby distinguishing very clearly History from Poetry – that the latter would allow the flow of feelings and fable, but the former, the History, would not. Lucian defended a history of scientific character, something away from the simple storytelling, thus posting himself as a continuator of Thucydides. And to avoid the fable, one must return to the question of what the truth is or how to write the truth of facts, a point alluded to by Walter Benjamin a few lines before this. Lucian of Samosata also invokes the image of danger, in this case referring to the moment in which the writer decides to undertake the historiography. According to him, the ideal of this writer would be to remain in a safe place so that the arrows of the critics did not reach him. Thus, the author recommends amidst the dialogues he builds:

“I shall prudently beware of those dangers and solitudes to which historians are exposed, and content myself with only giving a little advice to authors, and subjoin a few cautions, in order to have at least some share in the edifice they are raising [...] Most of them indeed fancy they have as little need of good advice in this business, as in walking, eating or drinking. They imagine nothing is easier than to write history. Everybody can do it, that can put on paper whatever comes into his head. But you, my friend, know better, that it is not a matter of such extreme facility, and does not admit of being treated so negligently. On the contrary, if there be any department in literature that demands great abilities and much consideration, it is this; if a man would produce a work, which, as Thucydides has it, shall remain an everlasting possession of its author.” (Lucian 1820, 44–45)

IN THE BEGINNING WAS HOMER

It is also to be considered that, even before the authors known as the first historians, Herodotus, Thucydides, among others, there is Homer, from the eighth century BC. Although he wrote his great works, “Iliad” and “Odyssey”, in verse, Homer is taken as reference even for those historians, possibly as historiographical inspiration. It is not by chance that Herodotus, for example, wrote in Book II of his “History”: “Hesiod and Homer are my Seniors” (Harrison, 1927). It seems acceptable to consider, therefore, the line “In the beginning was Homer”, which graciously comments the notorious opening of

the first chapter of the "Gospel of John" "In the beginning was the Word", signifying that everything, even historiographical writing, would have been initially focused by Homer. It is as if to everything that was discovered, thought, proposed, it would always be possible to add "But this was already in Homer". Plato, in "The Republic" (1991, 283), in the same sense, states that the *Paideia* [formation], therefore tradition and history too, of Greek man is made up of two authors: Homer and Hesiod.

Although Homer's work is not proposed as historiographical writing, it is still relevant to early historians, Herodotus in his "History", Thucydides in his "History of the Peloponnesian War", and Polybius in his "Histories", for example, because all will be discussing the story since Homer, often reverberating the Trojan war, first sung by Homer in the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey", but especially with these same historians commonly comparing themselves or approaching Ulysses, or Odysseus, a central character of the "Odyssey". Herodotus, for example, calls himself "companion" to Odysseus, in a frank attempt to increase the authenticity of the narrative. Polybius, for his part, argues that the good historian is not the one who travels through the books, in the comfort of the pillow, in the home environment or in the library – he is not the cabinet researcher at all, but on the contrary, is the one who goes to the field, "A historian needs to have been drenched by the sea-spray and been present in the fields of battle" (Hartog 2001, 164). He quotes the proposition of the "Odyssey" to show Odysseus as the first historian.

Thus, in antiquity itself, and among those who are now known as the earliest historians, there was already the discussion of the historiographical character in Homer. Concerning the testimonies, why does Herodotus claim to be a companion of Odysseus? And what does Polybius cite in defense of his argument that Odysseus was the first historian? The answer to these questions is pointed out in the opening of Homer's work. The proposition of the "Odyssey" occupies the first ten verses of this work, it is the place where Homer invokes the Muse so that it helps him with the content of the narrative, and says that he will talk about this man, Odysseus, a cunning man, and that its citadel of Troy was taken by the Greeks in the famous war:

"Sing to me of the man, Muse, the man of twists and turns
driven time and again off course, once he had plundered
the hallowed heights of Troy.
Many cities of men he saw and learned their minds,
many pains he suffered, heartsick on the open sea,
fighting to save his life and brings his comrades home.

But he could not save them from disaster, hard as he strove –
the recklessness of their own ways destroyed them all,
the blind fools, they devoured the cattle of the Sun
and the Sungod blotted out the day of their return.
Launch out on his story, Muse, daughter of Zeus,
start from where you will – sing for our time too.” (Homer 1996, 77)

Already the third verse of the “Odyssey” says that Odysseus knew the spirit of many men and saw the city. It is embedded in this idea the concept of the traveler who saw many places but not merely passed through them: investigated these cities, observed, knew and narrated these places.

In the eighth book of the “Odyssey” this question of testimony, of the necessary experience, returns to the discussion. Before returning to his home, Odysseus goes to the land of the Phaeacians and talks to King Alcinous. When Odysseus arrives at the palace of the king, the king offers a banquet to the visitor even though he does not know who he is, just another manifestation of the traditional custom of hospitality, so valued in other times. The king then summons a subject, a singer (poet) called Demodocus to sing and rejoice the banquet. The first thing that Demodocus sings is the dispute between Odysseus and Achilles in the Trojan War. Odysseus hears the song, he is the object and receiver of this song, and he, more than anyone else there, is able to know whether singer says the truth or not. At the end of the speech, Odysseus says:

“[...] surely the Muse has taught you, Zeus’s daughter, or god Apollo himself. How true to life, all too true [...] you sing the Achaean’s fate, all they did and suffered, all they soldiered through, as if you were there yourself or heard from one who was.” (Homer 1996, 547–551)

That is, it is as if Odysseus has said, “It is true what the singer sings, it was just as it happened”. At that moment, the “Odyssey” itself seems to address the question of truth and fiction, a pertinent theme in the discussion of Historiography. It occurs as an attempt to distinguish a fictional text, such as the “Odyssey”, from what would be a true text. That is, it gives the impression that the “Odyssey” itself already poses this problem. The character Odysseus testifies that the narrative of the singer is true because he is a character in that song and he has lived what happened in the narrated facts. The singer does not know what he sings because, as a medium, he needs someone to tell him what happened, this someone is the inspiration, the Muse, daughter of Memory (Mnemosyne, in mythology). This testimony, to gain authenticity, to be true and to have its *ethos* updated from inspiration, or to go from story to History, this testimony

requires the seal of someone who saw what happened, a witness, which was present. This is when the word of Odysseus renders the account truthful, it is the value of the testimony.

Therefore, from the beginnings of western culture the idea of the vision is taken as a fundamental point for the historiographic writing. There is a first opposition between the singer, who has not seen the events and tells what the muses have told him, and the character (in this case, Odysseus) who saw, witnessed, lived the facts.

Continuing the investigation, in this masterful situation constructed by Homer, in which a character appears within the narrative to assert authenticity to a story that in principle would be fanciful, Odysseus then suggests that the singer sings the third song, which is the episode of the horse of Troy, another moment where Odysseus is a character in the action and therefore a witness. He wants to see if what singer is going to tell is true. After the singing, Odysseus really confirms that singer sings the truth and goes on to tell the story – he gives his testimony, and then his words are confronted with other sources if they are available: in the conflict between the sources the researcher seeks History, although the source necessarily acquires a value that “at least in part”, depends on the very social and historical position of the researcher (Le Goff 1990, 547).

THE TRUTH AND THE APPEARANCE OF TRUTH

In Homer, when Odysseus confirms the story of the singer, the narration now given is no longer in the voice of the poet-singer, but is made in and by the voice of a participant in the action. At one point of the eleventh book, King Alcinous interrupts Odysseus' speech to state: “we know that you are no one who would cheat us – no fraud [...] what grace you give your words, and what good sense within! You have told your story with all a singer's skill” (Homer 1996, 412–418). That is to say, what he narrates, tells with truth, narrates in such a convincing form that it has to be true. At this point, another fundamental problem of the historian seems to have been posed: how can we distinguish the truth, on the one hand, from what is not the truth but, on the other, holds the appearance of one truth? With evidence? Trace elements? When someone records, for example, in memorialistic writings, that a certain thing happened, with no one else able to corroborate the information, how to confirm it?

If, however, all this is no more than supposition, speculation as to where the origin might be, and the possible unfolding of the writing of History, it is worth insisting on the ancestral investigation: after Homer there is Hecataeus of Miletus, from the sixth century BC, therefore a little before Herodotus. Unlike Homer again, Hecataeus wrote in prose. Also, unlike Homer, Hecataeus of Miletus claims for himself the authorship of his work, initiating his "Genealogies" in this way: "Hecataeus of Miletus thus speaks: I write what I deem true; for the stories of the Greeks are manifold and seem to me ridiculous" (Shotwell 1939, 172). Homer, on the contrary, affirmed himself a poet, or a singer, and the one who only registered what the inspiring Muse made him write. In that sense he refused the authorship of his own texts, putting himself as ignorant of the story that he narrated, so that even the figure of Homer (if he really existed – because even his existence is controversial), who is said to have been a man deprived of the capacity to see, blind, therefore deprived of the meaning that symbolizes the foundation of the search for knowledge, as it would be in the case of the person of the historian.

Hecataeus of Miletus is not considered the "father of history", because only fragments of his works have remained. None of his works arrived intact until our days, for this reason Herodotus ends up being known as the initiator of the historiographic writing.

It is not known whether Herodotus was aware of the work of Hecataeus of Miletus, however, it is perceived that he begins his work "History" in the same way Hecataeus began his "Genealogies", that is, claiming for himself the authorship of the book already in the words that begin the volume, making it very clear, from the very beginning, who the author of the work is: "This is the exposition of the investigation of Herodotus of Thorium" (Herodotus 1988, 16). It is interesting to note that the term "investigation" is spelled out in the Greek original transliterated into Western characters in the form of "history", which is quite symptomatic because it is the first action of this author in the work – to investigate. The Greek term "history" is also connected to two other Greek terms – "to see" and "to know". Therefore, the historian, the investigator, is also, and perhaps mainly – at that time, the one who sees and knows, not the one who is influenced by muses and only declaims what they inspire him with, thereby ignoring the content of what he declares: this is the model of Homer in his "Iliad" and "Odyssey". Therefore, to historicize is also to see and to know, according to the tradition of the time of Herodotus, who is the one who travels a lot, sees many cities and knows them. Ulysses, also known as Odysseus, is the main character of Homer's "Odyssey". This is the model for Herodotus. Because to

write his stories Herodotus traveled to many cities, saw many cities and when he could not see what he reported about, he reported it from someone who had seen, witnessed the facts reported. When it was not possible for Herodotus to witness events, or to rely on the testimony of those who had witnessed the events, Herodotus also used witnessing writings. It is evident, therefore, why Herodotus calls himself “companion” of Odysseus, since as in this example, he also traveled and knew, thus being authorized by this travel and knowledge to tell what he saw, what he knew, because what he writes about is not from hearing, saying, but from proving, experiencing it himself. Again, it is not for another reason that Polybius, a Greek historian of the second century BC, chose Odysseus as the first historian.

THE SEARCH FOR TRUSTWORTHINESS

In his work, in case Herodotus does not know the details of a certain fact or event, in the most impartial way he tries to present the collected versions and, at the same time, exposes his own opinions and assumptions, pointing out, when there is a plausible one, presenting the reasons why he considers the chosen version to have the greatest chance of authenticity. In this sense, he addresses another of the primeval questions of the historian: the search for trustworthiness. By registering the various points of view, or the different versions of the events, the historian tends to value the neutrality, the impartiality that would give more authenticity to his production.

It is the emergence of the bases of History, the autopsy, that is, “to see for yourself”, in the free translation of the Greek word, and then report what has been seen. And the efforts to acquire this knowledge, the fatigue provoked by so many journeys, the toil in the search for the knowledge of the facts, must be constantly emphasized, as to give even greater authenticity to the accounts: thus, Herodotus in his “History”, at every moment (something which has a direct relationship with Odysseus), affirms what he had experienced in his various journeys. However, even if he remembers every moment of the fatigue, also to value the report, the search for the truth must be exempt of fatigue, because the historian must travel, must see, must make sure of the things that he claims to be true. As most turn to what is easier, that is, to sing what is heard or what is read, the path of the historian must be the opposite: the historian is the one who goes to the place and reports.

Herodotus presents these guidelines already in the prologue of his "History". The full content of this prologue is as follows:

"This is the exposition of the investigation of Herodotus of Thorium, lest the events caused by men in time be erased, nor the great and admirable works brought to light by both the Greeks and the barbarians, become without fame; and, in addition, to investigate also the cause by which they made war against each other." (Herodotus 1988, 16)

The prologue of Herodotus further highlights two other points: by exposing the investigation undertaken, it seeks to prevent events from being forgotten; then he also points out his interest in unraveling the causes that trigger events, which again brings him closer to the foundations of classical historiography insofar as it at the same time pays particular attention to the understanding of historical causes.

INSTRUCT, TO HELP UNDERSTAND THE PRESENT

Another foundation of historiography, another common place, a *topos*, lies in the proposition that one of the functions of History would be to instruct, not to delight, as in the case of poetry. Apparently the first to raise this question would have been Thucydides, still in the fifth century BC, as he writes at the beginning of his work "History of the Peloponnesian War": "It may happen that the absence of the fabulous in my narrative seems less pleasing to the ear" (Thucydides 2001, 14), and he writes it to reference in this way the model of Odysseus, whom Homer posits as a narrator of fabulous passages, since this absence of the fabulous will seem unpleasant because it does not delight. But, more important, continues Thucydides, "Whoever wishes to have a clear idea both of the events that have occurred and of those which will someday occur in the same or similar circumstances as a result of their human content, will judge my history useful and this will suffice me" (Thucydides 2001, 14–15).

Therefore, Thucydides emphasizes the importance of the usefulness of the work, and not the delight it may provoke in the reader. And if the work is not useful for the present time, it will be for the future, for posterity, so that it can learn from the text: it is an acquisition forever, emphasized in the pages of his work.

Thucydides wants to put his work as exemplary, in a conception of History as something cyclical. If events recur, one learns to act from this account immortalized by him: this seems to be the pretense of Thucydides, which here points to another commonplace of the

work of the historian, that is, it is necessary to know the past because it is useful for understanding the present.

Recall also that the author opens his work with the following statement: "The Athenian Thucydides wrote the history of the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians" (Thucydides 2001, 1), something that the author does invoking for himself the authorship of the text, as seen previously. It is the model of Herodotus, which is the model of Hecataeus of Miletus, containing again the refusal of the inspiration of the muse when he points out the author of the work. Thus, from Thucydides it is clear that the author narrates what he himself had seen and experienced, since he had integrated one of the fighting armies in the Peloponnesian war, yet nevertheless he seeks the impartiality of the account, because he always tries to deal with both sides, tries to consider the two belligerent points of view to describe and understand the events. This dialogical relation, the confrontation between the sources, was sought since the beginning of time in History, the precedence of History before the opinions.

Another of the resources showing that the historian has to authenticate his narrative is the mention of geographical or historical landmarks that he may have seen in his research trips and search for information. And this reinforces the need for the description of what has been seen, that is, it is not enough to see but also to show, describe what has been seen, such is the meaning of the Greek noun *ekphrasis* [description], which means to expound in detail, to explain everything in detail, as well as is the verbal description of something through an exercise in rhetoric: a description that makes the reader see what is written. It is from the original Greek word *φράσις* *phrasis* [phrase] that, derived in Latin, gives rise to the word *evidentia*, evidence in English. Again, when the historian cannot see what he wants to describe, he seeks to hear the one who saw, seeks evidence, thus, the use of interviews is also justified.

Finally, on the return to the models of Herodotus and Thucydides, although Thucydides prime by the concision and Herodotus – by the abundance in the discourse; although Thucydides tells of his thinking to the posterity, it is a work for the future, and Herodotus tells the past to his contemporaries, they are writers and model works. Such conclusions could be drawn from the present article: the past is told to those present while counting from the present to the future.

CONCLUSION

Thinking in a rather broad and general way, it can be said that everything that the human being wants to develop and cultivate, demands monitoring and evaluation. The work to be developed in the classroom, aiming to develop the historical discipline with the students, could not be different. Integrating the evaluation part of the work into the development, recalling the fundamental concepts of the discipline can give the teacher new reflections capable of subsidizing adjustments in their activity.

REFERENCES

- Benjamin, W. (1969). *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Schocken.
- Fenelon, D. (2008). "A formação do profissional de História e a realidade do ensino." *Tempos Históricos* 12.
- Geertz, C. (2001). *The Interpretation of Cultures – Selected Essays*. USA: Basic Books.
- Harrison, J. (1927). *Myths of Greece and Rome*. New York: Forgotten Books.
- Hartog, F. (2001). *Memories of Odysseus – Frontier Tales from the Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Herodotus. (1988). *História*. Book I. Trans. M. Kury. Brasília: Editora da Universidade de Brasília.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1998). *On History*. USA: The New Press.
- Homer. (1996). *The Odyssey*. Trans. Robert Fagles. New York: The Penguin Group.
- Karnal, L. (2009). *História na sala de aula: Conceitos, práticas e propostas*. São Paulo: Contexto.
- Le Goff, J. (1990). *História e memória*. Tr. Bernardo Leitão. Campinas-SP: UNICAMP.
- Lucian of Samosata. (1820). *From the Greek – In Two Volumes*. With the comments and illustrations of Wieland and others by William Tooke. Vol. 2. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown.
- Plato. (1991). *The Republic of Plato. Translated, with Notes and an Interpretative Essay by Allan Bloom*. 2nd ed. USA: Basic Books.

- Rüsen, J. (2001). *Razão histórica: Teoria da História: Fundamentos da Ciência Histórica*. Trans. E. R. Martins. Brasília: UNB.
- Shotwell, J. (1939). *The Story of Ancient History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Thompson, P. (1992). *A voz do passado: História oral*. Trans. L. Oliveira. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Thucydides. (2001). *História da guerra do Peloponeso*. Trans. M. Kury. 4th ed. Brasília: EDUNB, Instituto de Pesquisas e Relações Internacionais; São Paulo: IMESP.
- Veyne, P. (1982). *Como se escreve a História*. 4th ed. Brasília: UNB.

