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Abstract
This study aims to compare the metaphors used to conceptualize danger and their force dynamic patterns in the dharma books of two prominent monks, the Venerable P.A. Payutto and Buddhadas Bhikkhu, who represent Normative Buddhism and Intellectual Buddhism, respectively. Three dharma books of each monk were selected for analysis and they were read to determine dangerous concepts. Metaphors that are used to conceptualize concepts that pose a threat or danger to humans physically or mentally were analyzed and compared in terms of conceptualization and force dynamism. This paper discusses three prevalent source domains which have force dynamics: MOVEMENT, FIGHTING and OBJECTS. This paper argues that Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s emphasis on mental practice to reach the state of void results in the metaphorical conceptualization of danger as residing in the mind and forcing movement. In contrast, Venerable P.A. Payutto, as an academic monk who is more conventional, conceptualizes danger as external to humans and restrict humans’ movement. This paper concludes that integrating frameworks in cognitive linguistics in the analysis of religious discourse can shed further light on intra- and inter-religious comparison, offering a more profound understanding of religious belief.
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1. Introduction

Religion has an influence on various aspects of human life, one of which is the danger inherent in life and how to cope with it. In fact, it has been argued that religion aims to protect humans from harmful behaviour (McCullough and Willoughby, 2009). It is of interest to investigate how religion constructs a discourse of danger. If religions do indeed aim to protect humans from harm, discourse can be a crucial tool to influence their perception of danger, which can potentially steer them away from risky or dangerous behaviour.

This research investigates how metaphors and force dynamics discursively construct the concept of danger in Buddhism discourse. In particular, it seeks to compare metaphors in the discourse of two prominent monks in Thailand, the Venerable P.A. Payutto and Buddhadas Bhikkhu, who represent Normative Buddhism and Intellectual Buddhism, respectively (Sirikanchana, 2014), and to identify how metaphors and force dynamics are used to conceptualize danger. The research questions addressed in this paper are as follows:
1. What are the similarities and differences between the target domains related to danger in Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s and Venerable P.A. Payutto’s discourse?
2. What are the similarities and differences between the source domains of movement, fighting and object and their metaphorical expression in Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s and Venerable P.A. Payutto’s metaphors conceptualizing concepts that are construed as being dangerous to humans?
3. What are the similarities and differences between the force dynamic patterns of the metaphorical conceptualization of concepts that are construed as being dangerous to humans in Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s and Venerable P.A. Payutto’s discourse?

2. The Context of Buddhism in Thailand

Buddhism is the national religion of Thailand (Taweesak, 2016: 159) and it has been practised in Thailand for millennia. In fact, it is an important sociocultural institution which plays a major role in Thai culture, politics and society (Sukwandee, 2007). Buddhism is not homogenous due to there being many movements and little has been done to compare the metaphors used in texts of different Buddhism sects or movements. Since Buddhism can be divided into sects and movements, which share similarities but also have differences in terms of ideas and teachings, it is of particular interest to compare how different sects or movements of Buddhism conceptualize DANGER. This study focuses on the traditional mainstream Buddhism and intellectual Buddhism in Thailand.

Traditional mainstream Buddhism is influential in Thailand and one of its prominent proponents is the Venerable P.A. Payutto, a monk and an academic with substantial publications that disseminate Buddhism and Buddha’s teaching in Thailand and abroad. He has published several widely acclaimed books and received UNESCO’s Education for Peach Award as well (Tonpo, 2013). According to Phiutongngam (2016), the Venerable P.A. Payutto is a national and international philosopher who encourages the application of Buddhism and Buddha’s teaching in various areas of life, such as career, education, self- and social development. Taweesak (2016) states that the Venerable P.A. Payutto interprets Buddhism in light of modern knowledge,
applying Buddhist principles to individuals and social morality to address political, economic and educational problems.

In Thailand, intellectual Buddhism is a Buddhist movement that distinguishes itself from mainstream Buddhism (Sirikanchana, 2014). This movement was led by Buddhadas Bhikkhu, who initially trained as a traditional Buddhist. According to Jackson (2003), Buddhadas Bhikkhu still studied Buddhism after he was ordained and had a keen interest in many disciplines, such as science, philosophy and so on. He read original scripts and was not satisfied with formal Buddhist education, which contained a supernatural element. With his knowledge of science, philosophy, logic and other disciplines, he engaged in a radical reformist reinterpretation of the Buddha’s teaching, deconstructing it at the root. He viewed Buddhist discourse as figurative in nature, and thus Buddha’s teaching requires an in-depth interpretation of symbolic meanings, not a literal one. The supernatural element was reinterpreted as different states of the mind. Buddhadas Bhikku’s teaching led to a new movement which Sirikanchana termed Intellectual Buddhism. It focuses on enlightenment via deep contemplation to understand the truth about life so that people can emancipate themselves from attachment. In fact, this movement is now widely recognized and practised nationally and internationally.

This paper compares the discourse of Buddhadas Bhikkhu and the Venerable P.A. Payutto because they are influential figures who represent different movements of Buddhism. Hence, their discourse deserves further investigation.

3. Metaphor and Force Dynamics in Religious Discourse

One of the linguistic features characterizing religious discourse is metaphor (cf. Charteris-Black, 2004; Richardson and Nagashima, 2018). Metaphor is thinking and talking about one thing in terms of another. According to Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), metaphors are not only a prevalent feature of language but also a crucial cognitive process. Therefore, an analysis of metaphors in discourse can cast light on how religion plays a role in the human conceptualization of danger. Examples of metaphorical expressions in everyday life which shows the conceptualization of life as a journey is shown below:

“He’s without direction in life.
I’m where I want to be in life.
I’m at a crossroads in my life.
She’ll go places in life.
He’s never let anyone get in his way.
She’s gone through a lot in life.” (Kovecses, 2010: 3)

In the domain of religion, research has been conducted on metaphors in Christianity (cf. Pihlaja, 2017; Koller, 2017; Charteris-Black, 2004), Islam (cf. Al-ali and El-sharif, 2016), Buddhism (cf. Pattarakup, 2010) and other religions from various perspectives and text types, and metaphors have been found to be a crucial tool to conceptualize religious concepts. Furthermore, research has also compared metaphors across religions. In Buddhism, studies have investigated how metaphors are used in canonical and contemporary texts. Lu & Chiang (2007) focused on metaphors conceptualizing EMPTINESS and its embodiment grounded in Buddhism Heart
Sutra, while Marino (2017) studied metaphors in two Sūtras from the Gāndhārī manuscripts. Work done on more recent Buddhist texts has investigated metaphors used for conceptualizing LIFE (Obpat, 2009), Death (Pattarakup, 2010) and DHARMA (Chiengchaovai, 2014) in the dharma books and speeches of prominent monks in Thailand. In these studies, metaphors have been found to be an important tool to explicate complicated and abstract concepts, rendering them more vivid and accessible.

Even though studies have yielded insights into metaphors in Buddhist discourse, a few issues remain under-investigated. First, Buddhism is not homogenous due to there being many movements and little has been done to compare the metaphors used in texts of different Buddhism sects or movements. Since Buddhism can be divided into sects and movements, which share similarities but also have differences in terms of ideas and teachings, it is of particular interest to compare how different sects or movements of Buddhism conceptualize DANGER. Moreover, while dharma concepts such as LIFE and DEATH have been investigated, to the best of my knowledge, no study has compared the metaphors used to conceptualize DANGER in different movements of Buddhism, though Richardson & Nagashima (2018) compared metaphors of danger in Christian sermons and Buddhist dharma talks. Furthermore, few studies incorporate other cognitive linguistics frameworks, which can shed further light on how metaphor use in religious discourse may influence cognition.

Another framework in cognitive linguistics used in this study is force dynamics (Talmy, 2000). As noted by Charteris-Black, (2018), this framework can offer insights into the force exchange between two entities. Danger involves an entity that causes danger (antagonist) and an entity on the receiving end (agonist). There are four patterns of force exchanges:
1) Resistance to a force: agonists can resist the force from the antagonist.
2) Overcoming resistance: The antagonist can overcome the agonist who tries but fails to resist.
3) Force blocking: The agonist tries to move but the antagonist can block the agonist.
4) Blockage removal: The agonist overcome the blockage from the antagonist.

The analysis of the interplay between metaphorical conceptualization and force dynamics can cast light on the conceptualization of danger, its interaction with humans and how different movements of Buddhism discursively construct concepts of danger. Consequently, this study seeks to offer an intra-religion perspective on the metaphors used to conceptualize DANGER in Buddhism discourse and to make a further interpretation based on the force dynamics framework.

4. Methodology

This study analyzes the metaphors in the dharma books of Buddhadas Bhikkhu (henceforth BB) and the Venerable P.A. Payutto (henceforth PP). The selection of these books was based on the Trilakbooks website, which sells dharma books (http://www.trilakbooks.com). This website offers many dharma books and claims to be one of the main websites for dharma book sales. Thus, it arguably has a large readership. The three books by each monk that are the most frequently viewed were selected for analysis because viewing rates suggest great public attention and thus, the most frequently viewed books potentially have higher impact and readership than
others. The titles of the books by each monk are shown in Table 1 (unless the books have an English title, I provide the translation of the book titles myself).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venerable P.A. Payutto</th>
<th>Buddhadas Bhikkhu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ก้าวไปในบุญ (Walking into Merit)</td>
<td>กิเลสปุจริต ปัญญาเฉลย (Kilesa Questions, Wisdom Answers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ก้าวไปในบุญ (Walking into Merit)</td>
<td>1. กิเลสปุจริต ปัญญาเฉลย (Kilesa Questions, Wisdom Answers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พระไตรปิฎก: สิ่งที่ชาวพุทธต้องรู้ (The Pali Canon: What a True Buddhist Should Know)</td>
<td>ภาษาคน ภาษาธรรม (Human Language, Dharma Language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. พระไตรปิฎก: สิ่งที่ชาวพุทธต้องรู้ (The Pali Canon: What a True Buddhist Should Know)</td>
<td>ภาษาคน ภาษาธรรม (Human Language, Dharma Language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>สามธรรม (The Three Dharmas)</td>
<td>ยาระงับสรรพโรค (Medicines for All Illnesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. สามธรรม (The Three Dharmas)</td>
<td>3. ยาระงับสรรพโรค (Medicines for All Illnesses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Dharma books for the analysis

These books were read manually to identify metaphors. The target domains related to danger are established by reading the books manually and identifying all the concepts that might pose danger to humans physically and/or mentally. If any concepts co-occurred with words associated with danger, such as “ภัย” or “อันตราย”, both of which mean danger, they were noted for further analysis. Furthermore, this study also focused on instances where danger is implicitly mentioned along with words associated with physical, mental, spiritual or social danger.

Then, metaphorical expressions used to refer to these concepts were identified. When these concepts are mentioned later in the text, even without mentioning danger, they were also included in the analysis because the danger or threat of such concepts had been established earlier in the texts. Thus, the metaphors used to conceptualize danger were analysed in terms of the source and target domains.

This study employed the metaphor identification process (MIP) created by the Pragglejaz Group (Pragglejaz, 2007) to identify metaphors in dharma books. Each book was read thoroughly so that metaphorical expressions could be identified in context. Metaphorical expressions were then determined based on the procedure established by the Pragglejaz Group as follows.

“1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
(b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be —More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
—Related to bodily action; —More precise (as opposed to vague); —Historically older; Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
(c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical”. (Pragglejaz, 2007: 3)

5. Results and discussion

The frequency comparison of metaphorical source domains in P.A. Payutto’s and Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s discourse is shown in Table 2. The frequency information in Table 2 indicates similarities and differences in the metaphor used in each data set and that metaphors occur more frequently in BB data both in terms of frequency (198 vs. 82) and types (15 vs. 9) of source domains. This is probably because Buddhadas Bhikkhu tried to deconstruct the Buddha’s teaching and expounded on his reinterpretation (Sirikanchana, 2014); thus, metaphor might be heavily used to deconstruct and conceptualize ideas about what was a risk or threat to humans. Furthermore, as noted by, Buddhadas Bhikkhu used a radical reformist approach to reinterpret Buddhism and views Buddhism discourse as metaphorical in nature (Jackson, 2003). It follows that his writing is replete with metaphorical expressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target domain</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th></th>
<th>BB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual problems</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>76.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mind</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Frequency information of the target domains

Regarding PP data, the frequency of metaphorical expressions is much lower probably because his teaching is from the established and conventional ideas in traditional Buddhism. Moreover, he also tried to apply it to everyday life and thus, the topic of his teaching is possibly closer to human’s everyday life and more concrete. Thus, literal language can be used to clearly explain his teaching. Still, we can observe that OBJECT and WATER are much more frequent but these are mostly conventional metaphorical expressions used in Buddha’s teaching.

Regarding the similarity between the two data sets, the source domains with almost the same frequency in both data sets is fighting. The idea of humans having to fight with danger is then prevalent and equally salient in both data sets. There are also 9 source domains present in both data sets: FIGHTING, FIRE, FOOD, ILLNESS, JOURNEY, OBJECT, SPACE, WATER and orientational metaphor.
With respect to the differences between the 2 data sets, the source domains which have the highest frequency in BB is ILLNESS. This is a central source domain used to discursively construct the concepts of danger in Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s discourse, particularly in the book Medicine for All Illnesses. Sirikanchana (2014) noted that Buddhada Bhikkhu’s teaching was intellectually driven, looking at various abstract concepts. The concept of illness can offer a vivid image to readers. Moreover, as Buddhadas Bhikkhu is a monk of the forest tradition, he describes dharma as herbal medicine in the book “Medicine of All Illness,” the source domain of illness is consistent with the cure of dharma teaching.

The overall frequency starts to shed light on the differences between the two monks and a closer look at the source domains, their conceptualization and the associated force dynamics patterns unveils more profound differences in the belief of these two monks. The sections that follow elaborate on the three source domains that are the focuses of this paper. Although many other source domains are used to conceptualize danger, due to space limitations, this paper can only address the source domains of MOVEMENT, FIGHTING, and OBJECTS. This is because these three source domains frequently occur in both data sets, as shown in Table 2, and they all have dynamic force patterns while the rest do not. In what follows, each source domain is discussed in terms of aspects that are mapped onto the target, metaphorical expressions and conceptual metaphors identified, as well as dynamic force patterns. A selected excerpt where metaphorical expressions are identified includes an English translation provided by the authors. It should be noted that the authors try to keep the translation as close to the source language as possible, even though the more sophisticated language might be more appropriate to the religious register. This is because the purpose of the translation is to facilitate the international audience’s understanding of arguments in this paper. However, it is important to note that the analysis is based on the Thai language, not the translation.

5.1 Movement

The metaphorical expressions and force dynamic patterns associated with the MOVEMENT source domain discursively construct danger inherent in the path towards achieving religious goals, conceptualized as the destination. The movement source domain occurs in both data sets but they instantiate different conceptualizations. That is, while Buddhadas Bhikkhu construes journey, which does not require travelling to reach a destination, Venerable P.A. Payutto construes a problematic journey where there is no movement. These patterns are consistent with the dharma teaching of each monk; that is, while Buddhadas Bhikkhu advocates mental and spiritual practice to see all things as nothingness, Venerable P.A. Payutto focuses on applying dharma teaching in everyday life. This observation can be made based on the following excerpts:

*An excerpt from Venerable P.A. Payutto data*

(2) ถ้าเราเข้าใจแล้วก็ต้องมั่นใจให้จริงใจอย่างยั่งยืนก็จะทำให้เราเห็นธรรมเป็นอันหนึ่งอันเดียวกัน ก็จะเกิดความสามัคคีได้จริง เมื่อใจขึ้นไปถึงธรรมเป็นอิสระ
Once we understand and wholeheartedly embrace dharma, our minds will rise above the ‘self’ and the attachment to our egos. All our minds will coalesce in dharma, becoming one, creating true harmony. Once the mind reaches dharma, it will be free. It will not be obstructed by egoistic attachment.

Dharma is conceptualized as an upward journey. There are obstacles of various kinds such as mental defilements, which can endanger the journey. These can be seen from the words จักติปิดกัน (obstruct) in the excerpt. The force blocking pattern was identified. The agonist is the mind, which has a natural tendency to move towards dharma. Yet, Kilesa and egoism are antagonists exerting forces on the mind, preventing it from moving towards the destination.

An excerpt from Buddhadas Bhikkhu data

Regarding the word ‘stop’ in the Lord Buddha’s language, even though you are running, you still stop, meaning you stop all the desires caused by Kilesa and lust. There is no ‘I’ who wants anything or runs anywhere.

Buddhadas Bhikkhu discusses a path of dharma towards one’s destination, i.e., nirvana. It is a path on which the further one walks, the further away from the destination one will go. To reach the destination requires not walking. Dharma is a path towards non-movement. In terms of force dynamics, danger is conceptualized in terms of overcoming resistance, where humans are supposed to stay still and stop but are swayed by worldly affairs, putting themselves in danger.

5.2 Fighting

The source domain of fighting is used to conceptualize the interaction between humans and dangers as opponents fighting each other. While Venerable P.A. Payutto used metaphor to conceptualize unspecified dangers external to humans, Buddhadas Bhikkhu used metaphor to conceptualize dangers, which often refer to emotions, as inherent in the mind. This is probably due to Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s reinterpretation of Buddhism and his emphasis on mental and spiritual practice to achieve the state of void.
An excerpt from Venerable P.A. Payutto data

พระพุทธศาสนาตามพระพุทธพจน์ในพระไตรปิฎกบาลีมีลักษณะพิเศษที่สอนระบบจริยธรรมแห่งการพัฒนาตัวของมนุษย์เองให้หลุดพ้นจากปัญหาหลาย ซึ่งความเป็นอิสระที่แท้จริงโดยไม่ต้องไปเรื่อยอยู่บนบางการจากภายนอก (What a True Buddhist Should Know about the Pali Canon, p.31)

According to the Lord Buddha’s words in the Pali Tripitaka, Buddhism has a special characteristic in that it teaches humans the ethics of self-development so that they can emancipate themselves from all problems, have true freedom and free themselves from external controlling forces.

From the excerpt above, external forces or causal factors are conceptualized as holding humans in captivity, and thus they need to be eliminated or humans need to free themselves from them. The mind is construed as moving and being hindered by antagonists. That is, the force block pattern is used to conceptualize the interaction between humans and dangers.

An excerpt from Buddhadas Bhikku data

คำว่าศัตรูในภาษาธรรมะนั้นหมายถึงจิตใจของตัวเองที่อยู่ตั้งอยู่ผิดๆ จิตใจของตัวเองและตนเองนั้นแม่ที่อยู่ไม่ผิดๆ แม่และศัตรูไม่ต้องมาจากภายนอก (Human Language, Dharma Language, P. 40)

The word ‘enemy’ in the dharma language refers to the human mind, which has been put in the wrong place. Your mind and your ‘self,’ which have been misplaced, are enemies, not somebody external to us.

From the excerpts, something risky or dangerous is conceptualized as an enemy, as shown in the word “ศัตรู” (enemy). The mind creates ‘self’ and emotions, which then destroy itself. This suggests the conceptual metaphor emotion is the enemy. In terms of force dynamics, data from Buddhadas Bhikkhu construes humans and the mind as standing still but being forced towards movement or the overcoming resistance pattern.

5.3 Objects

This metaphor makes use of various aspects of objects to conceptualize abstract concepts that could pose a risk, mainly to the human mind and spirituality. This source domain concretizes dangers which are often abstract or related to emotion and the mind.

An excerpt from Venerable P.A. Payutto data

ความรู้สึกเกี่ยวกับตัวตน ที่อยู่ตั้งอยู่ในตัวตน ที่จะให้ความรู้สึกว่ายอมกันไม่ได้ (The Three Dharmas, p.11)
Your feelings and attachment to the ‘self’ result in the feeling that you cannot give in to others.

The feeling of ‘self’ is conceptualized as an object that can be attached, as shown in the word “ยึดติด” (attach) It portrays a sense of restriction. Emotion and self-attachment restrict the mind, preventing humans from giving in to others. Therefore, this shows the pattern of force blocking.

An excerpt from Buddhadas Bhikkhu data

23) จิตใจที่เราตั้งไว้ผิดๆนั่นแหละคือศัตรู (Human Language, Dharma Language, p.40)
A mind which we put in the wrong place is the enemy.

In Buddhadas Bhikkhu’s books, humans are at risk when their minds are put in the wrong place.

Putting one’s mind in the wrong place refers to thinking about and focusing on the wrong things, which may lead us astray. The mind is the agonist, whereas humans themselves are the agonists in the excerpt. The mind has a natural tendency to stay still but since humans, antagonists, move it to the wrong place, it becomes our enemy. Thus, in terms of force dynamics, the interaction between danger and humans is metaphorically conceptualized as overcoming resistance.

6. Conclusions

This paper compares metaphors used to conceptualize danger and force dynamic patterns in dharma books written by the Venerable P.A. Payutto, representing Normative Buddhism, and Buddhadas Bhikkhu, representing Intellectual Buddhism. The source domains that are the focus of this article are MOVEMENT, FIGHTING and OBJECT. Unlike other studies that investigate metaphorical expressions used in dharma books by various authors without comparison across authors, this study compares how different authors use metaphorical expressions to conceptualize concepts that can pose a danger to humans’ life. It was found that the concept of danger is abstract and, in Buddhism, metaphors play a crucial role in providing an understanding of danger in humans’ life.

Disparities between the two monks are due to their different beliefs. Buddhadas Bhikkhu emphasized the notion of dying before death and nothingness; that is, he encouraged people to conceptualize themselves as nothingness, like they already died and thus do not exist. That way, people will not be affected by the sense of self, which is the source of suffering. This belief is reflected in the way metaphor often conceptualizes danger as resulting from movement and danger is frequently construed as forcing humans or their minds to move. The Venerable P.A. Payutto, on the other hand, follows the traditional teaching of Buddhism. The Buddha’s teaching is a didactic discourse which is full of action. His metaphors conceptualize danger as dynamic entities moving to exert force on humans or restricting movement.

This study furthers our understanding of how danger is discursively constructed in Buddhist religious discourse. Within Buddhism, there are different movements and
different ideas. Framework in cognitive linguistics, especially metaphor and force dynamic, can yield insights into the conceptualization of religious concepts, which are deeper than investigating ideas through content analysis alone. Therefore, this study also has implications for comparative religion studies, offering a way to compare the beliefs of different religions using cognitive linguistics frameworks.

This study is a small scale focusing on a small number of dharma books of two prominent monks. Given that these monks have written hundreds of dharma books, other studies can compile a corpus of these books and make a comparison, using corpus linguistic methodology. Apart from the concepts that pose a threat to human life, other concepts can also be investigated, such as globalization or capitalism, which have also been written by these two others and other monks as well.

The cognitive linguistics frameworks offer a window into the mind and cognitive makeup of believers of different religions or even different sects of religion. Indeed, they offer a subtler understanding of how religious discourse may influence our conceptualization and understanding of the world, and how we should live our lives. In so doing, it can enhance inter- and intra-religious communication, promoting mutual understanding of the different standpoints. This can hopefully lead to peaceful coexistence among believers of diverse religions.
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