



ISSN: 2310-0036

Vol. 2 | Nº. 10 | Ano 2019

Pedrito Cambrão¹

Universidade Zambeze

From Memory and Oral Tradition to the Construction of an African Historiography

Abstract

Contemporary social theory has been emphasizing the relationship between memory and oral tradition in the production of knowledge, in its transdisciplinary aspect. This article seeks to bring up some meditations regarding the legitimacy of the contribution of memory and oral tradition in the production of historical knowledge and, simultaneously, its contribution to the formation of an African historiography. For this reason, the recognition of the contribution of modern historiography to the enhancement of a set of memorial and identity practices of a given society opens the way for us to reflect on memory and oral tradition. African oral traditions cover the vast universe of oral literature (proverbs, prayers, mythologies, legends, idioms, etc.), aspects that should not be ignored by historians, as they constitute what Maurice Halbwachs (2008) designates collective memory. Starting from a qualitative-hermeneutic perspective, it is assumed that the oral tradition is not limited to stories and legends, or even mythological reports, but, rather, it also reflects a great school of life, since it relates to and recovers vital aspects inherent to peoples. In this perspective, it is clear that both memories and oral tradition have a common functional substrate, which is to act as an antidote to forgetfulness or sources of immortality. Thus, by offering means for the preservation of collective memory, the oral tradition supports for its resumption and dissemination

Keywords: oral tradition; historiography; memory



Rua: Comandante Gaivão n° 688

C.P.: 821

Website: <http://www.ucm.ac.mz/cms/>

Revista: <http://www.reid.ucm.ac.mz>

Email: reid@ucm.ac.mz

Tel.: (+258) 23 324 809

Fax: (+258) 23 324 858

Beira, Moçambique

¹ PhD in Sociology at the University of Porto, Portugal, Assistant Professor, Researcher and Scientific Director of the Zambeze University (UniZambeze).

Introduction

“Writing is one thing, and knowledge is another. Writing is the photograph of knowledge, not knowing itself. Knowledge is a light that exists in man. The inheritance of everything that our ancestors came to know and that is latent in everything they transmitted to us, just as the baobab already exists in its seed potential”. Tiebno Bokar.

This article reflects on Oral Sources, especially Memory and Tradition/Oral History and its contribution to the construction of historiography, with a view to producing a reflection on oral sources in historical narratives in the field of social sciences and particularly in the field of modern African history. In fact, it seems to us important to meditate on research and knowledge production using methodological procedures from Oral Sources.

Many African countries face the problem of scarcity of research and recording of oral sources, hence the subsequent absence of written sources. In this sense, it is believed that the belief in the appreciation and collection of oral testimonies can be a valuable instrument that allows a response to this deficit and, consequently, contributes to the consolidation of modern African history. By their nature, oral sources can add a living dimension, bringing new perspectives to historiography, as the historian often needs a variety of documents that are not just the written ones.

If so, it is significant to show the evolution of an important practice that is part of contemporary historiography. Thus, the objective of this work is to clarify some doubts about the use of orality as a historical source using a literature review that allows for the assessment of its advantages based the arguments of some historians.

I. Africa in Universal History

Africa has always been present in all universal history. Humanity started, according to paleontology, in the Rift Valley, Kenya. The famous Greek civilization had contact with elements from the African continent, especially Egypt, located in the north of the African continent, one of the greatest civilizations of antiquity, which places Africa as an important element in all world history. So, contrary to what has long been thought, Africa has a history. This historical knowledge was always relegated to a secondary level, due to the ignorance of the historiographical, political and social thought, existing over several centuries, which considered it without history and which only began to possess some type of historiographic knowledge with the arrival of the colonizers.

The study of the History of Africa, until the 1950s, was done by Europeans in an attempt to prove that the African continent did not have something that could be called history before the arrival of the colonizers, delegitimizing any possibility that there was some kind of history and thus calling the indigenous peoples “barbarians” and “uncivilized”. Since the history of the

continent was seen from the Westerners' view, the view that Africans themselves could have a history of their continent was disregarded.

During Africa's decolonization processes, there was a new perspective on African history adopted by African historians. They showed a different view from what was studied in Europe, using new forms of sources, such as oral reports, linguistics and archeology. This reflection is appropriate here, by showing that the study of the History of Africa, in general, and of Mozambique in particular, also presents a particularity in relation to the study of world history based on the reassessment of the importance of oral reporting, that is, of oral tradition and memory. Most of the peoples and empires that existed on the African continent did not have writing, and their historical and social reports are based on oral tradition, whose generationality was carried out through legends, myths or reports that were passed on from generation to generation.

These oral sources constitute societies that considered the relationship between their peers of utmost importance, where historical knowledge was dispersed among them, being certain that some individuals specialized in memorizing and transmitting this knowledge to the following generations. Therefore, the oral report serves as a basis for further research, using archeology and comparative history of peoples who lived nearby in order to confirm the reports.

II. Memory (Collective)

“Every awareness of the past is based on memory. Through memories, we regain consciousness of previous events, we distinguish yesterday from today, and confirm that we already live in the past ”(Lowenthal, 1981: 75).

The introduction of memory as an object of analysis in the Social Sciences was due to Maurice Halbwachs who, in 1925, developed some studies on this theme, having configured a kind of Sociology of Memory. It is common sense among historians that the discussions on memory take as their starting point the works of Halbwachs - *Lês cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, 1925 and *La mémoire collective*, 1950. This author takes the aspect of the Emile Durkheim's French sociology, in which the social takes precedence over the spirit.

Thus, for Halbwachs (2011), the opposition between spirit and social facts has its equivalent in the duality between personal memory and social memory. The individual's memory translates an awareness reduced to its own resources, as a deformed and partial reproduction of memories that a group admits as common and its own. On the one hand, there is an individual memory, resulting from the “lived history”; on the other hand, the memory of moments lived by members of the group (or of the national collective) are assumed as the collective (or historical) memory.

Hence, Halbwachs continued to be concerned with research that dealt with collective memory, which culminated in the posthumous publication of his reference work in this aspect of studies, *The Collective Memory*. He saw memory as a reason for social cohesion, a kind of affective adhesion to the group, carried out by an alternative mechanism (not violence). He attested that each individual memory was a point of view of the collective memory, and that these memories

<http://en.wikipedia.org>
were always in accordance with common values and facts that were of interest to certain groups and not to others (Halbwachs, 1990: 33-34; 51).

According to Halbwachs, there is an essential interaction between individual and collective memory, as personal impressions are supported by collective memory to reach the group's point of view, creating a "group conscience", but collective memories are imposed on people. Individual memories (Halbwachs, 1990: 61-62). Thus, it constitutes a link between the individual and the group, and a living link from generation to generation. Therefore, the experience of an era is transmitted, which are the testimonies and behaviors: "the ways of thinking and of being from the past that are thus fixed within your memory" (Halbwachs, 1990: 66). In addition, the sociologist makes a distinction between collective memory and history. On the one hand, history is the "compilation of the facts", in a schematic way and composing a "total picture"; on the other, collective memory is a stream of continuous thought, with irregular limits and coexisting with other collective memories.

For Marieta Ferreira (2002: 111), memory "is a construction of the past based on emotions and experiences. It is flexible and events are remembered in the light of the subsequent experience and the needs of the present". In turn, oral tradition values representations of collective memory, since through narrative, it fertilizes memory, contributing to the reactivation of memories. Considering oral tradition means writing history without dogmatizing convictions. Thus, by offering means for the preservation of collective or social memory, oral tradition supports for its resumption and dissemination.

For Rousso (2000) memory is a psychic and intellectual reconstruction that brings, in fact, a selective representation of the past, a past that is never that of the individual only, but of an individual inserted in a family, social, national context. In turn, Le Goff (2013: 435) states that, "Memory is an essential element of what is considered to be identity, individual or collective, whose search is one of the fundamental activities of individuals and societies today, in fever and in anguish". In a similar tenor, Mata (2017: 8) considers it as:

"A fundamental element in the constitution of identity, one of the most privileged cultural and political phenomena in cultural studies, which should, therefore, be considered in relation to the social and historical dynamics that both subjects, ideas and products go through, as well as in relation to the context of changes caused by geographic, (multi)cultural and conceptual displacements".

According to Goody (1977: 35), "In most cultures without writing, and in numerous sectors of ours, the accumulation of elements in memory is part of everyday life." Therefore, the first domain in which the collective memory of unwritten peoples crystallizes is that which gives a basis - apparently historical - to the existence of ethnic groups or families, that is, of myths of origin. In other words, they are the memory of society, depositories of the objective and ideological history of society. However, the transmission of memory is not word for word, but, rather, through singing, stories, tales ... where more freedom and creative possibilities are attributed.

Memory, as a form of knowledge and as an experience, is, therefore, a possible way for subjects to cover the temporality of their lives. For Bobbio (1997), this possibility is so significant that, when reflecting on the act of remembering, he realizes that remembering is a mental action that we do not constantly develop because it is tiring or difficult. But it is a healthy activity. In remembrance, we review ourselves and our identity, despite many years having passed, the thousands of facts having been experienced. If the future unravels in the imagination, but it no longer belongs to us, the past world is one in which, using our memories, we can find shelter within ourselves, lean over ourselves and reconstruct our identity in it.

In times past, men had already identified the importance of memory as a support for constructing identities and solidifying consciences. Therefore, the concept of memory is crucial, because past, present and future intersect in it; temporalities and spatialities; monumentalization and documentation; material and symbolic dimensions; identities and projects. It is crucial, because memory and forgetfulness intertwine; the personal and the collective; the individual and society, the public and the private; the sacred and the profane. It is crucial, because registration and invention are intertwined; loyalty and mobility; data and construction; history and fiction; revelation and concealment (Neves, 1998: 218).

Memory, in its extensive potential, even exceeds individual life span. Through family histories, chronicles, which record daily life, traditions, stories told through generations and countless forms of narratives, the memory of a time that preceded that of a person's life is built. The current chronology is overtaken and man dives into his ancestral past. In this dynamic, individual and collective memories are found, merged and constituted as possible sources for the production of historical knowledge.

Thus, the concept of memory is not homogeneous and consists of multiple meanings, among which the following stand out: retention of elements inherent to acquired knowledge; establishing links between the present and the lived experiences; evocation of the past, through reminiscences and memories; actualization of the past in the eternal present; evocation of utopias, which liberate man, making the past support for the reconstruction of the present and for the construction of the future. There are, therefore, countless conceptions of memory, as we have seen, however, they have a common denominator: the fact that it is reminiscent of the past and, above all, the human capacity to retain and preserve the time that has gone by, saving it from total loss.

It is important to note that both memory and the means of facing it have changed, since the world has changed. In the global society, which is increasingly dynamic and accelerated and which has broken the old boundaries and ways of relating between individuals, memory has been affected and its transmission has been altered. Entire traditional memories collapsed, whether from the peasants or the workers' world, which created a social world without duration. The creation of several groups and uprooting was observed, which gradually undermined the traditional living memory. Also, the ends of revolutionary eschatologies and teleological visions obscured the horizon of expectations determined by the engine of history, which left subjects without referents, always connected to the present.

The traditional memory was already shaken, the ways of preserving and transmitting these memories no longer worked, which led the community to practice compulsive archiving. Pierre

<http://elsa.com.br/>

Nora (1993: 18) pointed out that, at the moment when history became detached from the documentary, society started to live in a conservative religion with strong archival production, which refers to Leibniz's "paper memory". The same French historian says that when memory is no longer everywhere, it would be nowhere if an individual conscience, in a solitary decision, did not decide to take charge of it. The less the memory is lived collectively, the more it needs private men who make themselves "memory men".

III. Oral Memory and Tradition (History)

Pierre Nora (1993) defines memory and history: memory is life, open to the dialectic of memory and amnesia. History is the problematic and incomplete reconstruction of what no longer exists. Memory is the place of the eternal present; history, a representation of the past. Memory is collective, while history is universal. Memory is rooted in the concrete, in objects and gestures. History is linked to temporal continuities. Memory is the absolute, while history is the relative. Thus, it constitutes a critical history of memory. In this context, according to Mata (2017: 9), "memory also presents itself as the fabric of history that, together with the 'official' scientific instruments, allows a holistic, or at least prismatic, view of performance in/of history, contaminating cultural and scientific discourses and operating in different territories, although complementary".

The project of studying the places of memory takes place at a time when there is a growing historiographical effort of critical knowledge that focuses on itself (a history-memory), while the commemorative consciousness (of the memory societies of the Old Regime) decreases. The places of memory are no longer "spontaneous" - because they are linked to the maintenance of the values of society and ideology - but, rather, they are a necessity of history (museums, archives, collections, monuments). For Nora, facing the feeling of loss of the current French society, there is an "obsession with the archive". History is constituted by the critical dissolution of memory, but it also demands, he explains, the maintenance of the depository places of memory.

However, there is no opposition between memory and oral history, but only differences between them. What brings them together are the constructions of identities, which have the past as a support and the visionary potential of the future and of power as possible objectives. What distinguishes them are their natures and strategies.

Memory, more related to fiction than history, defines relevance to everything that evokes what happened, guaranteeing its permanence is updated, or even re-signified in the present. Therefore, according to Nora (1993), memory is found in multiple places - the places of memory. It is materialized in the effort of the communities not to get lost in oblivion and the eternal present. The memory men make novels, poems and biographies places of memory. It is the history professionals, the museologists, the archivists, responsible for the preservation of traces and fragments of what happened, that make museums, archives and documentation centers, places in History.

For Marc Bloch (2002) History is the science that has to do with the life of men in time. Furthermore, history, while dynamic, is inscribed in time. The conceptions of history, which are polysemic, are also related to it and carry their marks, their nuances. On the other hand, those who identify history as the food of memory and vice versa, conclude the following: history enriches the possible representations of collective memory; history provides symbols and concepts for society to think about itself and its relationship with the past; by offering instruments for the preservation of social memory, history contributes to its recovery and dissemination; history, through narrative, fertilizes memory, contributing to the reactivation of memories.

Considering this list of arguments, it can be said that, in fact, there is no opposition, but an otherness between memory and history, with the construction of identities and the representation of the past bringing them together. Therefore, it is not without reason that Guarinello (1994: 198) finds: "The opposition between memory and history is largely at least false and hides another opposition, in my view equally inaccurate, between erudite and popular culture".

IV. Oral Tradition and African Historiography

When taking into account the nucleus in which memory was linked from that moment (years 1970-1980), which covered, at once, thorny issues for historiography, such as the present time, memory and oral sources, the attacks made and academic reticence regarding their viability were not surprising. The main challenges were based on allegations in the sense that memory could be distorted, nostalgic, selective and unreliable (Thompson, Frisch and Hamilton, 2000: 66- 67). Therefore, by using oral sources and interviews, the historian would obtain an act of partial and mythical remembrance of the source. However, it should be noted that such prejudices have lost strength and oral history has already taken its place in current historiography, being seen by some scholars, not only as an alternative route, but as a methodology of history.

It is clear that the debate on oral history and memory still raises many problems and highlights virtues, which submits this method of analysis to frequent reviews and the constant search for new ways of approaching oral sources. These questions aside, it should be noted that this new relationship between history and memory has led to interesting transformations. With oral history gaining ground and memory being re-discussed, it is undeniable that memory subverted history, insofar as it stimulated epistemological revisions and indicated other ways and possibilities of making history. Nevertheless, history has also subverted memory. What about the fact that history, from the moment it recovered and stimulated hidden and silent²

² In the sense of silenced memories, see: POLLACK, Michael (1989). Memory, forgetfulness, silence. *Estudos Históricos*, Rio de Janeiro, vol. 2, n° 3, p. 3-15. The author analyses the memories of Soviet dissidents, concentration camp prisoners and forced-labour workers in the Alsace, in order to explore the limits between the 'forgotten' and the 'not spoken of', showing that, many times, the memories exist but there is no opportunity to

<http://elsa.com.br>
memories, exposed problems that were hidden within society, bringing the excluded to the center of the debate?

It can be seen, therefore, that although memory today has another meaning, it does not separate itself from history as Halbwachs (1990) wanted to do. In fact, history uses memory to reach interpretations and information that other sources, perhaps, could not make possible, which contributes to the widening of the possibilities of knowledge within this new history that is still being structured. As Joutard (2000: 35) argues, “oral history has, more than ever, the imperative to testify, having the courage to remain history in the face of fragmented testimonies that have the feeling of a unique and non-transferable experience”. In this way, memory irrigates history and it submits memory to criticism. In fact, the relationship between history and memory is much more complex, and involves, concomitantly, appropriation, dialogue, destruction and contribution or deconstruction.

In order to understand how tradition is essential, when studying human societies, it is worth reflecting on oral tradition and its importance in the context of the African continent. The complexity of the oral tradition almost always leads to the question of its legitimacy as a historical source. This happens not only with oral tradition in Africa, but in all other societies where orality predominates. However, the main characteristic of societies of oral tradition is the commitment of its members in relation to the “facts of speech”. In writing societies, on the contrary, commitments are made according to official documents, authenticated by notary services and with tax stamps or seals. However, in societies of oral tradition, the word replaces this whole complex. The word is valuable and not only contains moral value, but it is also associated with divinity, with forces that act outside the will of the individual. In these societies, according to Hampâté (1977), man is linked to the word he enunciates. You are implied by it. He is the word, and the word encloses a testimony of what he is. The very harmony of society remains in the value of and respect for the word.

In this sense, oral tradition is not limited to stories and legends or even mythological accounts. Oral tradition is the great school of life, it recovers and relates all aspects of it. African oral traditions cover the vast universe of oral literature, such as proverbs, prayers, mythologies, legends, idioms, etc., which Maurice Halbwachs (2008) called historical memory.

There have already been many classifications for the term oral history. Some have already classified it as method, technique and theory. However, there is a consensus in academia to consider it as a research methodology. As Ki-Zerbo³ says, “The history of Africa, like that of all mankind, is the story of an awareness. In that sense, the history of Africa must be rewritten”. In turn, Alberti (2005: 155), states that:

“Oral history is a method of research and constitution of sources for the study of contemporary history, which emerged in the middle of the 20th

verbalize them, or the subjects remain silent owing to the trauma that these memories provoke. Herein lies the importance of oral history which makes it possible to rescue memories which would be lost, silenced or forgotten.

³ J. Ki-Zerbo, “Introdução geral”. In J. Ki-Zerbo (ed.), *História Geral de África I: Metodologia e pré-história da África*. Brasília: UNESCO, 2ª ed. Ver. 2010, p. XXXII.

century, after the invention of the tape recorder. It consists of conducting recorded interviews with individuals who participated in, or witnessed events and circumstances in the past and the present ”.

Above all, it should be noted that oral history can only be used in the existence of living sources. In this sense, Alberti (2005a: 21) suggests themes “that occurred in a span of approximately 50 years”, since it involves the memory of the interviewees. Then, by checking the possible “living sources”, the use of oral history can be confirmed, when the research addresses a topic still considered recent.

The choice of respondents can be guided by the research objectives. According to Alberti (2005b), in selecting “potential interviewees”, it is important to seek a heterogeneous set of people. However, it is worth clarifying that the option for oral history involves qualitative criteria. Therefore, there is no need to be concerned with the number of respondents, but with the contribution of this sample to the research.

There are authors who are particular in research in oral history, like Paul Thompson. His book, *The Voice of the Past*, is a mandatory reference not only for the clear narrative with which it presents a theory of oral history, but also for its defense and educational application. For this author, it is a matter of eminently speaking of a “method of oral history” (Thompson, 2002: 104). He emphasizes technology (the use of tape recorders), which is part of the rise of contemporary oral historiography. This line of reasoning arises from the understanding of oral history as a method. There is great care in obtaining oral evidence: preparation of basic information; identification of research “sources”; preparation of the questions to be asked to the “sources”; clear recording and annotation of additional information. And the methodological criticism of the interview is equivalent to the care of documentary research in archives: search for internal consistency, cross-checking with other sources; confrontation with the context. (Thompson, 2002: 176).

Oral history is now a dimension of history, being a recurring object. It is no longer just a source, as it was in the 1970s, but instead became the methodology of history. Its position is so established that it is common to carry out research on the history of memory today.

With the suppression of the radical separation between history and memory and the acceptance of the latter as a source and object of study, it was possible to glimpse and demystify the notion that historians are guardians of the truth, because between the history made by historians and the history apprehended by individuals, within a society, there is an often enormous gap (Rousso, 2000: 97-98). Finally, the theoretical and methodological advances, provided by the long debates about oral history, allowed for the distortions of memory to be taken as a resource and not as a problem, after all, the process of remembering can be a means of exploring the subjective meanings of lived experience and the nature of collective and individual memory. Oral history has already taken its place.

The study of the history of the African continent, and particularly in Mozambique, presents a peculiarity in relation to the study of universal history in general: the importance given to orality or tradition. It is true that oral reporting, despite being a very comprehensive form of knowledge, in the African context, presents some problems for historical research. One of them

<http://rel.scribd.me>

is the fact that the report of an event can change depending on the person who reports it and when he reports it, and it may happen that certain details, crucial for understanding the historical fact, are lost. Another aspect is that certain peoples are able to report facts that occurred up to 4 or 5 generations before the current generation, causing events that occurred longer ago, and that could be relevant, to be lost and not studied. However, as we have said, the oral report can serve as a basis for further research, using archeology, linguistics and history compared to that of peoples who lived nearby in order to confirm the reports.

Final remarks

The need to affirm Oral Tradition and Memories as sources for a modern history is particularly important, particularly for African/Mozambican historiography, which must be inclusive or comprehensive, as they (Oral Tradition and Memory) make it possible to hear the voices of those excluded from official / western history and bring out the indescribable realities, by revealing what is not written in official or “canonized” documents.

It is within this scenario that this article, “From Memory and Oral Tradition to the Construction of an African Historiography”, becomes relevant both for historical science and for the affirmation of African history in modern historiography. In many African countries - and Mozambique is no exception - oral sources are the main communication tool, the vehicle that allows for the transmission of generational knowledge.

Writing is still a privilege of large urban centers, although this does not mean that cities are exempt from oral tradition. As Amadou Hampâté Ba (1977) says, when we speak of oral tradition in relation to African history, we intend to reiterate that no attempt to penetrate the history and spirit of African peoples will be valid if it does not rely on this heritage of knowledge of all kinds, patiently transmitted from mouth to ear, from master to disciple.

In this context, it must be clear that, when working with oral sources, like any other sources, we will no longer be seeking to reach and present the past as absolute truth. On the other hand, this does not mean that a historian who relies on oral history should not redouble the care required by listing criteria and defining paths for a complex analysis of its sources.

As already said, oral narratives are narratives of memories. Therefore, one needs to be more cautious when dealing with oral sources, seeking to understand what such memories represent for the interviewee and how they are being (re) constructed and externalized at the time of the interview. Thus, the historian, who makes use of oral history, can approach his object from a more intersubjective contact. It is this intersubjectivity with the object, provided by ethnography in an anthropological work, for example, that will allow us to understand (or at least get closer to) how those truths were culturally constructed by the historical subject.

Both memory and oral history have a common substrate: they are antidotes to forgetfulness. They are sources of immortality. As a result, as Le Goff (1984) states, they are also spaces of power. History enriches the possible representations of collective memory; History provides symbols and concepts for society to think about itself and its relationship with the past; by offering instruments for the preservation of social memory, History contributes to its recovery

and dissemination; history, through narrative, fertilizes memory, contributing to the reactivation of memories.

Thus, and concluding, I recall Le Goff (2013: 435), who said that, “Memory, in which history grows, which in turn feeds it, seeks to save the past to serve the present and the future. We must work in such a way that collective memory serves as the liberation and not for the servitude of men”.

References

- ALBERTI, Verena (2005). *Manual de História Oral*. 3ª ed. Rio de Janeiro. Edição FGV.
- BLOCK, Marc (2002). *Apologia à História ou o Ofício do Historiador*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- BOBBIO, Norberto (1997). *O Tempo da Memória*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1997
- FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes; AMADO, Janaína (2000). Apresentação. In: ___ *Usos e abusos da história oral*. 3a ed. Rio de Janeiro: FGV.
- GUARINELLO, Norberto Luiz (1994). Memória Colectiva e História Científica. In. *Revista Brasileira de História* (28). São Paulo: ANPUH.
- HALBWACHS, Maurice (2008). *A Memória Coletiva*. São Paulo: Centauro.
- HALBAWACHS, Maurice (2011). “From the Collective Memory” in Olick, Jeffrey K.; Vinitzky-Serouss, Verd; Levy, Daniel (org.), *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HAMPÂTÉ – BA (1977). Fundamentos da Pesquisa Histórica. In: *História Geral da África – Metodologia e Pré-História da África*. Editor: Joseph Kizerbo
- JOUTARD, Philippe (2000). Desafios à história oral do século XXI. In: FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes; FERNANDES, Tânia Maria; ALBERTI, Verena (orgs.). *História Oral: desafios para o século XXI*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, pp. 31-45.
- Le GOFF, Jacques (1984). *Memória - História*. Lisboa: Imprensa Oficial/ Casa da Moeda.
- Le GOFF, Jacques (2013). *História e memória*. Trad. Bernardo Leitão et al. 7ª ed. Revista – Campinas, SP: 2013. Editora da UNICAMP.
- LOWENTHAL, David (1981). *Como Conhecemos o Passado. Projeto História* (17). São Paulo: EDUC.
- MATA, Inocência (coord) (2017). *Discursos Memorialistas Africanos e Construção da História*. Macau: Edições Colibri.
- NEVES, Margarida de Souza (1998). História e Memória: os jogos da memória. In: MATTOS, Ilmar Rohloff (org.). *Ler e escrever para contar: documentação, historiografia e formação do historiador*. Rio de Janeiro: Access Editora.
- NORA, Pierre (1993). *Entre Memória e História: a problemática dos lugares*. *Projecto História*, São Paulo, nº 10.
- ROUSSO, Henry (2000). A memória não é mais o que era. In: FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes; AMADO, Janaína. *Usos e abusos da história oral*. 3a ed. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, pp. 93- 102.
- THOMPSON, Alistair; FRISCH, Michael; HAMILTON, Paula (2000). Os debates sobre memória e história: alguns aspectos internacionais. In: FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes; AMADO, Janaína. *Usos e abusos da história oral*. 3a ed.

TOMPSON, Paul (2002). Vozes do Passado: História Oral. Ed. Paz e Terra s/a. Rio de Janeiro.