

Metaphors and the Construction of Meaning in Visual Disability

Girlane Maria Ferreira Florindo
(Universidade de Brasília, Brazil)

Abstract: The present paper reports a field research, based on the principle of mixing cognitive linguistics, performed with blind subjects who attend the Braille Library “Dorina Nowill”, in order to investigate the understanding of metaphors supported in visuality by these subjects. The results show that blind individuals use metaphorical sentences linked to the sense of sight, but do not expand mental projections in the construction of other senses. Words that represent metaphors based on the visual field are rarely extended to a more connotative sense; they are commonly related to physical elements linking them to other perceptions that are part of their experiences.

Keywords: visual disability, conceptual metaphor, perceptions

1. Introduction

From my experience of studying and living in the field of visual disability, I try to reflect on issues that are related to the reality of knowledge that is still unknown, that is, to search for voices that are often ignored and to know their conceptions and interactions related to several experiences, especially linguistic and discursive.

We are often indifferent to other perceptions, as we are impregnated with the hegemony of normality and visuality, which fail to consider the multiple meanings and places of experience; we refer in this case to the person with congenital visual disability. One that has no visual memory. In this context, we refer to metaphors. Therefore, in this work, we consider metaphors as our object of analysis. What is the metaphor of looking and seeing? We know that this is a recurring theme that takes us to a world mediated by images. In the everyday uses we make of language, which is deeply governed by the preponderance of metaphors supported by the image on the worlds of reason and understanding, we ask ourselves: the visually disabled share metaphors that oppose blindness and knowledge, such as “Someone who is ignorant is in darkness, while someone unable to know is blind” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999)? Do blind subjects understand and make use of visual metaphors? Do they use the same metaphors as seers? How does the construction of meanings of these metaphors occur for the blind subject?

2. Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive Linguistics (CL) is not new. Its history is confused with that of pragmatics at different times. However, for the purposes of this text, we focus on a more current view, addressed by several authors who dedicated themselves to understanding the language and behavior of human beings, with emphasis on the studies developed by Lakoff and Johnson from 1980. Rejecting the postulates of modern linguistics based on the principle

of language autonomy, cognitive linguistics is opposed to the previous paradigms, to structuralism — for this understanding that language is a system that is sufficient in itself — and to the generativism of Chomsky and his followers — for this considers that the faculty of language is an autonomous component of the mind, and therefore a system independent of other types of knowledge.

Denying the thesis of language as an autonomous system, currently, cognitivists seek an integrative view of human language, no longer understanding it as an isolated element of our mind. It is totally acceptable, in this sense, that languages are related to processes of real contexts of linguistic use. In this way, cognitive linguists have demonstrated in their studies that the conceptualization of abstract domains is generally done through metaphors based on concrete and familiar domains. Therefore, it is considered the relevance of social relations, inserted in a cultural context and the respective experiences lived by human beings. Unlike generativists like Chomsky, for cognitivists, there are no ready meanings, but meanings constructed from social relationships. In this sense, cognitive linguistics seeks an approach to socio-linguistic studies, and assumes a position that differs from the autonomous theory of language acquisition — assumptions defended by generativism. In a non-autonomist context, the concept of language is dynamic, which is associated with cognitive routines that are transformed, shaped and constructed through use and social interaction.

Language, being integrated and not isolated, is constituted through the bodily experiences of human beings, being explained in semantic and functional terms. In other words, the way we live and interact with our bodies makes us develop the basis of our conceptual system, distinguishing us, even culturally. By developing a linguistic analysis based on linguistic usage, one can consider CL as a type of pragmatically oriented linguistics. This perspective of language understands that we think through all the experiences lived by our body and this process reflects in our linguistic development.

Any difference in the body will influence how the world is experienced. Without the sense of sight, for example, the way the blind person perceives what is around him/her is different from the subject who has his visual sense at work. The conceptualization of reality for the blind person will occur differently and, thus, the cognitive processes will undergo changes. However, the blind person also develops linguistically, as he makes use of his remaining senses, especially touch and hearing.

Still, as stated by Florindo and Conceição (2020, p. 4),

When we deal with the context of the blind person's experience and interaction, we are dealing with a non-hegemonic context, that is, a context of absence of visibility. The act of seeing takes place in the eye-stimulus-brain interaction, which constitutes vision, the sense that enables the perception of colors, distance, figure and background. The recognition of the world for a congenital blind person is done mainly by tactile images. Touching is necessary for a given object to have meaning. It is not, therefore, about the blind subject to supply, in some way, the sense of vision. What happens is the elaboration of new ways of using the other senses, called remaining senses.

In this way, it manages to conceive reality differently from those that have visibility, the hegemonic sense. However, when it comes to visual metaphors, which are made up of elements that cannot be glimpsed in a sense other than that of vision, what happens?

We will try to answer this question. However, before doing it, it is necessary to understand the mental relationships inherent to language according to the cognitive parameters, to then arrive at the metaphor itself. For Lakoff & Johnson (2002, p. 57), “metaphorical concepts can be extended beyond ordinary literal ways of thinking and speaking, moving to the domain of what is called figurative, poetic thought and language, colorful or fanciful”.

So ideas can be considered objects. “When we say that a concept is structured by a metaphor, we mean that it is partially structured and that it can be expanded in some ways and not in others” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2002, p. 57).

2.1 Mental Processing and Metaphor

As proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1999, 2002), the linguistic relationships that occur in our brain are dynamic and related to embodied experiences. Within the field of CL, we are particularly interested in the Theory of Conceptual Metaphor (TCM) proposed by the referred authors in the work entitled *Metaphors we live by*, which provides us with the concept of conceptual domains, as responsible for understanding the world in that we live. Such domains are divided into two groups: stable domains and local domains. Stable domains are groups of knowledge stored in personal or social memory, transmitted historically and culturally. They are subdivided into idealized cognitive models (ICMs), communicative frames and imagetive schemes.

Our knowledge is organized by structures that are the idealized cognitive models. When we talk about church, for example, we activate the ICM linked to this term, relating it to religious, worship, bible and a whole range of elements related to the item church. This entire universe on screen is culturally defined and perpetuated by the human species through the ages, acquiring new material according to social historicity. The procedures that identify social situations such as classes, services, masses, meetings, interviews, that is, those that show established behaviors in which each participant plays their role are the communicative frames. That is, they are structures of knowledge related to organized forms of interaction.

Imagetive schemes are very simple, broader and more flexible imagery structures, usually of a spatial nature. That is, they are structured by dynamic and imagery patterns of our movements in space, as well as our manipulation of objects and our perceptual interactions. The imagery schemes of “proximity-distance” and/or “connection-separation”, for example, are elaborated, in the domain of interpersonal relationships, as “*close relationship; close people*”.

The second type of conceptual domain, are the *local domains*, which are constituted by mental spaces, have a dynamic and sequential character and are formed during the conversation. These domains are structured internally by *stable domains*. In this way, the construction of meaning occurs as the result of the establishment of connections between cognitive domains, which CL calls projections, among which are *metaphors*.

As well defined by Lakoff & Johnson (2002), metaphors are the result of the interaction between certain aspects of the physical and cognitive apparatus of the human being together with his bodily and subjective experiences in the world. The mind presents a set of symbols that reflect what is apprehended by the being during its development, becoming a mirror of the nature in which we are inserted. The authors add, that metaphor is a property of concepts and not words. Based on this perspective, a metaphor is a phenomenon resulting from a conceptual mapping between two domains, causing blending¹ between them. That is why, when we hear the phrase *Our Teacher is brilliant*, we are able to understand the praise given to the teacher, because we activate in our mind elements that form a target domain in which we understand that brilliant is very good, because it shines, radiates, is strong and beautiful.

3. To See and Not to See

In the founding metaphors of modern thought, we have as an example according to Lakoff and Johnson

¹ Conceptual domains are categories constructed and filled with attributes. There is a source domain — of an experiential nature and a target domain — of an abstract nature (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

(1999) apud Camargos (2012), the construction that someone who is ignorant is in darkness, while someone who is unable to know is blind. To refuse the cultural conceptions that support these metaphors, associating visual disability with ignorance and disability, is equivalent to assuming that we all have partial perspectives. Furthermore, it implies assuming that hegemonic conceptions about visual disability are even more limited because they refuse to recognize the limits that an eminently visualistic experience places, either in apprehending a very rich multisensory reality, or in order to apprehend the rich experience of someone who uses — or uses in a mitigated way — the sense of sight.

As Camargos recalls (2012, p. 92),

The verb to look has become a substitute for countless others, including those related to the senses. To realize this, it is enough to stick to our daily lives, when we hear the recurring sentences: “Did you see this song?”; “Wow, did you see what a nice smell?” See takes on the connotation of knowing: “Don’t you see what you’re doing?”; “Look for you to see!”; this, without mentioning the expressions “love at first sight”, “point of view”, “angle of analysis”, “looking at a subject”, “evil eye”, “fat eye” etc.

Many authors emphasize that the whole vision is located in a body and in a context, therefore the emphasis on location urges us to accept the interpretive consequences of being in a particular incorporated place, from which we can only obtain partial perspectives.

José Saramago, in the “Essay on blindness” builds a profusion of metaphors and analogies, where the numerous symbolic ramifications that blindness offers in the Western conception are evident: ignorance, alienation, death, greed, blackness — in the end, the synonyms that blindness evokes in the entries of any dictionary. But, in a more imminent sense, blindness constitutes in Saramago’s essay the founding metaphor that competes for the denial of a humanity whose values are represented in the calamitous period caused by the blindness epidemic (Martins, 2006).

According to Martins (2006), Aristotle considered the vision the most developed sense. Plato, on the other hand, in the famous allegory of the cave establishes the hegemony of the vision, which emerges in the myth, either as a representation of a sensual involvement with the world, in this case the world of shadows of the cave, either as a metaphor for the knowledge of ideas and truth, which is represented by the vision of the world of light and sun.

For Martins (2006, p. 72), it is certain that this

Conceptualization starts from the importance that the vision has for anyone who can make use of it; the point is that the existence of a cultural framework that expands this importance, taking the part (vision) for the whole (knowledge), creates a serious cultural barrier, both for the perception of blind people as repositories of knowledge, and for the understanding of wealth that the world holds, even for those who know it in the absence of a sense of vision..

From the perspective of psychology, according to Camargos (2012), can we ask if there is a “drive” to see and be seen in those who do not have some of the organs in operation? We argue that yes, because we know blind people who care about their appearance, with the combination of colors they use, even though they have never seen any color. There are blind people who don’t like to go out without sunglasses, because they know their eyes are being watched, which causes discomfort. There are also cases of people who simply like dark glasses, and those who want to “see” everything around them, touching, smelling, being curious. And what about a blind photographer, who takes great pleasure in being able to take pictures, even though he doesn’t see them? (Camargos, 2012, p. 92).

From observation and coexistence, we have already seen some ways of “seeing” of visually disabled – some of them like to take my hands to talk, for example — and, in the group, the desire to establish relationships, to be heard, this is, to be seen. Certainly, it is worth saying that, although the blind cannot see — in a biological way, it does not mean that he/she does not have difficulties. But, it is essential to pay attention to their feelings linked to their way of seeing and looking at the world, to consider their way of perceiving and evaluating the acceptance of your reality, that is, their way of perception that is based mainly on the tactile and auditory systems.

4. Methodology Used

4.1 Subjects

The participating subjects are people with acquired visual disability, that is, they are not congenital blind. Thus, they have some visual memory. The group was invited to participate voluntarily in the discussion. The proposal was well accepted, since the mediator is known among them. The moderator encouraged everyone’s participation, there was no predominance of one person’s speech over the others, and the discussion was conducted in order to remain within the topics of interest. The moderator did not make a judgment, but instead highlighted the relevant ideas and encouraged the participants to segment the speeches regarding each topic presented. The subjects were identified as follows: A (65 years old: lost her sight at 24 years old, is studying Psychology); B (37 years old, severe low vision, has finished high school) and C (55 years old, 19 years of blindness, has training in social assistance).

4.2 Data Generation

In the process of data generation, we opted for an adaptation of the focus group methodology, because it allows narratives and is a small and informal discussion group, whose data obtained are of a qualitative nature in depth. The mediator-researcher outlined the purpose and format of the discussion at the beginning of the session. She informed the informal character of the discussion, whose participation by all would be important and that differences of opinion would be welcome. Participants have the common characteristic of being blind and share common experiences in the library space. Thus, the context was that of the Braille Library “Dorina Nowill”, located in the Cultural Center of Taguatinga, Federal District. The conversation was recorded by the mediator-researcher for an hour and a half. As the main objective of a focus group is to reveal the participants’ perceptions of the topics under discussion; the topics presented in this research proposal were potentially metaphorical themes, that is, metaphors supported in the imagery field.

For this work, which was intended to be an essay, a single group was sufficient for the generation and data in the search for the understanding of metaphors based on the visuality used by these blind subjects based on the assumptions of Cognitive Linguistics by Lakoff & Johnson (2002). In terms of linguistic choices, we see whether the blind seem to have a preference for using non-metaphorical sentences when they are linked to the sense of sight. If, when they use these sentences in a metaphorical way, they are able to understand them cognitively and how they learned to use them in social interactions. The topics chosen as a script for the conversation were: Horizon; Bright; Ocean; Eyesight; Spring; Margin; Cloud; Shadow; Darkness; “Green that rests”; Windstorm; Blindness.

When we went to the Library to schedule a visit for the Focal Group, we found the preparation for the event of launching a book of poetry and short stories called “The powerful Seer” that was organized by a worker of the library. In this book there are poems of those who would be our conversation participants. As a result, we won a

book from one of the authors (participant A); when looking at the titles of the texts, we noticed that many of them were potentially metaphorical themes, with which we would work on the discussion. Then we chose to present some themes found in the poems published in this book, which is the result of a literary contest held in the library space called “The old mathematician”. These were the themes found in the book: *Spring* (by A); *Margin*; *Cloud*; *Shadow*; *Darkness*; “*Verde que Descansa*” (authored by C). The last theme, *Blindness*, was presented because we started from the assumption (from the experience of living with the visually disabled public) that we can learn, based on the narratives of people with visual disabilities, the experience of blindness as a unique perception and how subjects with VD are related to the cultural obstacle that considers vision the source of knowledge par excellence.

5. Analysis of Results

The first three themes presented to the group were: “horizon”; “bright”; “eyesight”. The participants presented the following definitions or comments for each theme word presented by the mediator, as described below:

C: infinite; something far, infinite thing; away from me; remember me a Roberto Carlos’ song (infinito; algo longe, coisa infinita; longe de mim; lembro da música de Roberto Carlos).

B: we rarely use, when we travel and see those big plantations, what is far away, we don’t see the end, we see the horizon. (raramente a gente usa, quando a gente viaja e vê aquelas grandes plantações, aquilo que está longe, não se vê o fim, vê-se o horizonte)

A: I haven’t used (não tenho usado)

A: my life has shine (tem brilho a minha vida)

C: A reporter once asked a friend and me: “If you could see for a moment, what would each of you like to see?” I remember my friend, she said: “I wanted to see the horizon” (Certa vez, um repórter perguntou a mim e a uma amiga: “se pudéssemos ver por um instante, o que cada uma gostaria de ver?” Lembro que minha amiga, disse: “eu queria ver o horizonte”)

B: Brilliant is referring to a quality of a person, it may be too much light; very clear, it is a widely used word. (Brilhante é se referir a uma qualidade de uma pessoa, pode ser excesso de luminosidade; muito claro, é uma palavra muito usada.)

A: to see, not always who sees sees. My daughter may be blinded by that boyfriend; (ver, nem sempre quem enxerga vê. Minha filha pode estar cega por aquele namorado);

B: to see in the sense of perceiving; (ver num sentido de perceber;)

C: point of view is your opinion, what you think. I can see mentally, I can touch and say: I see. Seeing is something private. (ponto de vista é sua opinião, o que você acha. Eu posso ver mentalmente, posso tocar e dizer: estou vendo. Ver é algo particular.)

For the words “spring”; “margin”; “cloud”, “darkness” the comments were:

A: reminds me of the flowers, the colorful trees, the creeping flowers, the romanticism, the yellow ipe, “the fifteen years” (me lembra das flores, as árvores coloridas, as flores rasteiras, o romantismo, o ipê amarelo, “os quinze anos”)

C: when spring comes... Time for joy (quando a primavera chegar... Tempo de alegria)

B: the beautiful as opposed to winter (o belo em oposição ao inverno)

A: I have the image kept in mind (tenho a imagem guardada na mente)

B: margin, it is used in the social context, the one who lives on the margin, the excluded, which delimits the poor from the rich (margem, é usada no contexto social, aquele que vive à margem, os excluídos, o que delimita o pobre do rico)

A: used in different ways, notebook margin, highway margin... (usada de diversas formas, margem do caderno, margem da rodovia...)

B: cloud, poetic application ‘there’s a cloud of tear’. Cloudy different from sunny, physical sense, the sky is cloudy and in practice, it is better to walk in lighter weather, not so clear. Clouds shape the sky, a landscape lighting up the horizon. (nuvem, aplicação poética ‘há uma nuvem de lágrima’. Nublado diferente de ensolarado, sentido físico, o céu nublado e na prática, é melhor andar com o tempo mais leve, não tão claro. As nuvens moldam o céu, uma paisagem iluminando o horizonte.)

A: used romantically, the “shadow” appears; looking at the clouds, you can see different shapes, the cloud has many aspects. (usada romanticamente, aparece a “sombra”; olhando para as nuvens, se vê diversas formas, a nuvem tem muitos aspectos.)

C: I remember the cotton balls, I like cloudy days. In the shade the vision is much better, shade represents freshness, getting out of discomfort (me lembro das bolas de algodão, gosto dos dias nublados. Na sombra a visão é muito melhor, sombra representa o frescor, sair do desconforto)

A: darkness. I don’t use it on a day-to-day basis; sometimes someone says, “the blind man is in darkness”, I don’t have much to say... (escuridão. Não uso no dia-a-dia; às vezes alguém diz, “o cego está na escuridão”, não tenho muito o que falar...)

C: my vision is white, as if I were seeing a white curtain. I always ask: What color is that? I like to know the color. (a minha visão é branca, como se eu estivesse vendo uma cortina branca. Sempre pergunto: Que cor é essa? Gosto de saber a cor.)

B: the opposite of light, darkness is simply an absence, where there is light there is no darkness. It acquires a spiritual sense. “The light shone in the darkness”. Navigators need to look at the stars for guidance. The light that guides us... In addition to being physical, it is poetic, it is spiritual. Light is not only what we see, it is not just the physical, it is the psychological, it goes beyond borders. (o oposto da luz, a escuridão é simplesmente uma falta, onde há luz não há escuridão. Adquire um sentido espiritual. “a luz brilhou na escuridão”. Os navegadores precisam olhar as estrelas para se guiarem. A luz que nos guia... Além de ser físico, é poético, é espiritual. Luz não é só isso que a gente vê, não é só o físico, é o psicológico, ultrapassa fronteiras.)

On the theme “Green that rests” addressed to participant C (author of the poem with this title):

C: it refers to my eyes, people are delighted with my eyes. And I have to say: I don’t see. And to rest is to seek comfort, a sense of peace and tranquility. I think of the green horizon, nature, you rest your eyes on it. A tranquility. I remember one time I went to the open air museum. (refere-se aos meus olhos, as pessoas ficam encantadas com os meus olhos. E eu tenho de dizer: Eu não enxergo. E descansar é buscar o conforto, sentido de paz e tranquilidade. Penso no horizonte verde, a natureza, nela você descansa os olhos. Uma tranquilidade. Lembro de uma vez que fui no museu a céu aberto.)

Para o tema “ventania”:

A: tempestade, vento bravo, vento calmo

B: o mover do vento que faz barulho, o vento interagindo com o meio, indicando que a chuva vem. Lembro da música: “o barulho das folhas secas, a maré agitada, o atrito do portão. Pode te dar uma sensação de medo. É

bem poético.

Concluding the discussion, we present the theme “Blindness”:

B: “Lost like blind in shooting”. Although they see, they do not look. Situations where you don’t have the understanding to make a decision. It is not physical blindness, it is spiritual, it is profound, words are physical, they are psychological, emotional, they awaken. Blindness to others is ignorance, so I prefer to be called visually disabled. Blind has a double, pejorative sense. (“perdido igual a cego em tiroteio”. Embora vejam, não enxergam. Situações em que não tem o entendimento para tomar uma decisão. Não é a cegueira física, é algo espiritual, é algo profundo, as palavras são físicas, são psicológicas, emocionais, elas despertam. Cegueira para os outros é ignorância, por isso prefiro que me chamem de deficiente visual. Cego tem um sentido duplo, pejorativo.)

A: Blindness is that you see nothing, a term that is used a lot in different situations, I don’t see anyway, so I don’t care if they call me blind. (Cegueira é você não ver nada, termo muito usado em diversas situações diferentes, não enxergo mesmo, então não me importo se me chamam de cego.)

C: I prefer to be called blind to avoid confusion between low vision or visual disability. So say C is blind. The person with low vision suffers much more prejudice, he neither sees nor is blind. It helped a lot that I lost all my vision. For me it’s not pejorative (prefiro que me chamem de cega para evitar confusão entre baixa visão ou deficiência visual. Por isso digam C é cega. A pessoa com baixa visão sofre muito mais preconceito, ele nem vê e nem é cego. Ajudou muito eu ter perdido toda a visão. Para mim não é pejorativo.)

The results show that blind individuals produce metaphorical sentences linked to the sense of sight, but do not expand mental projections in the construction of other senses. Words that represent metaphors based on the visual field are rarely extended to a more connotative sense; they are commonly related to physical elements linking them to other perceptions that are part of their experiences. This study is insufficient to observe why there was no extension of the constructions. In the case of some metaphors, such as “cloud”, the domain constituted by them refers, using this element, to what they manage to experience through their body, experiencing their shadow and the resulting comfort. “*Cloudy, different from sunny, physical sense, the sky is cloudy and in practice, it is better to walk in lighter weather, not so clear. Clouds shape the sky, a landscape illuminating the horizon*” (B).

In general, participant **B** can even say that some words have another use, [...] *the words are physical, they are psychological, emotional, they awaken*, but he is not able to say, name those uses, or meanings that the words effectively indicate beyond the literal domain. This participant demonstrates to perceive the other meanings of some words, however he does not call such use as metaphorical, but as emotional, psychological or spiritual. We cannot say, however, that they are not able to build mentally the projections necessary for a full understanding of metaphors.

Regarding the question posed at the beginning of the paper, if the person with VD shares the metaphors that oppose blindness and knowledge, such as “Someone who is ignorant is in darkness, while someone unable to know is blind” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2002), we observe that they do not share, but know and perceive this understanding of society. For participants **A** and **C** this does not bother them, but for participant **B**, it does. For this reason, he prefers to be called visually disabled and not blind: *Blindness to others is ignorance, so I prefer to be called visually disabled. Blind has a double, pejorative sense.*

Visually disabled participants build a second domain for the terms at times, but do not actually constitute the *merge*. We did not notice that there was any communicative noise. In this sense, we observed that metaphors were not used as seers generally use them. As an example, the term “cloud”, for participants with VD, represents something positive, a comfort, similar to the tendency to connect the themes (elements) to their daily experiences

that are based on the other senses, the so-called remaining senses. The apprehension of the world and the way of “seeing” of blind subjects occur through the other channels, mainly the hearing and the haptic system (tactile), and not the vision. They depend significantly on other (perceptive) interactions to become linguistically and cognitively, as social subjects. As in the words of neurologist Oliver Sacks (1995, p. 129), “The world is not given to us: we build our world through experience, classification, memory and unremitting recognition.”

6. Some Considerations

The results presented in this analysis indicate the tendency that blind subjects find it difficult to make use of elements such as metaphorical concepts beyond what they can experience, proving the theory of CL that experience is part of the process of human understanding and linguistic development of the speaker/listener and not just as a simple speech adornment. Especially for the blind subject, the bodily foundation linked to sociocultural aspects are fundamental for the construction of language and, therefore, for the understanding of the world. Because they are non-congenital blinds, they keep a visual memory, which is always taken up, there is an attachment to that memory. The mind presents a set of symbols that reflect what is apprehended by the being during its development, as the non-congenital blind keep a visual memory, with the lack of vision this memory is constantly activated.

Metaphors, as shown by Lakoff & Johnson (2002), being the result of the interaction between certain aspects of the physical and cognitive apparatus of the human being together with his subjective experiences in the world, the experiences of blind subjects are based on other senses, called remaining senses. The blind man develops other strategies for his growth and for the effectiveness of his linguistic production and cognitive processing, according to the stimuli and experiences he has experienced.

The data and results presented here do not express the linguistic behavior of the blind individual, but that of a small analyzed section. It is necessary to make a qualitative and quantitative analysis that will present a more comprehensive study, whose findings must be generated and analyzed by other methods so that we can have subsidies to contribute, with broader and more consistent data.

References

- Camargos Liliane (2012). *Do ver ao perder de vista: A psicanálise do olhar (From Seeing to Losing Sight: The Psychoanalysis of The Gaze)* (1st ed.), KBR: Petrópolis.
- Florindo Girlane M. F. and Conceição Mariney P. (2020). “Identidades, investimento e comunidades imaginadas de aprendizes de Braille (Braille learners’ identities, investment and imagined communities)”. *The Specialist*, Vol. 41, No. 2, Acesso em: 01 ago. 2020, available online at: <https://revistas.pucsp.br/esp/article/view/46222/32510>.
- Lakoff G. and Johnson M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*, University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff G. and Johnson M. (2002 [1980]). *As Metáforas da Vida Cotidiana*, Campinas: Mercado de Letras.
- Martins B. S. E., *se eu fosse cego: narrativas silenciadas da deficiência (What If I Were Blind: Silenced Narratives of Disability)*, Porto: Afrontamento.
- Sacks O. Ver e não ver (1995). *Um antropólogo em Marte: sete histórias paradoxais (An Anthropologist on Mars: Seven Paradoxical Stories)*, Tradução de Bernardo Carvalho, São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Saramago J. (2001). *Ensaio Sobre a Cegueira*, São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.