Nowadays, when Buddhism is an active participant in the dialogue with Western Sciences and Academic community faces with the issue of intercultural philosophy [1], it is very important to comprehend the approaches that are used to study the Buddhist tradition. These approaches develop in frame of different discourses, that influences to the possibilities of the dialogue between Buddhism and Western Sciences.

There are two main approaches to studying Buddhism: traditional (through the prism of the views of the followers of the Buddhism), and non-traditional (through the prism of the views of the Buddhism critics). We will consider the academic approach, which is the non-traditional in more degree.

The academic approach itself generates various discourses, which are associated with paradigms the researchers work in: philological, esoteriological, historical-philosophical, neurocognitive, or philosophical discourse. Moreover, in different historical periods, academic researchers emphasize on different approaches.

The shift of the emphasis is next: the philological discourse develops the ideas of contextuality and interpretation (particularly, in translations by Newman J., Wallace V., Andresen J.); the esoteric studies discourse develops the ideas of hidden gnos (particularly, in researches of Roerich Yu., Eliade M., which lead to the special translations of Buddhist texts [2]); the historical discourse develops the ideas of political background and cultural borrowings [3] [4]; the neurocognitive discourse develops the ideas of mindfulness and body-mind with a bias to contemplative sciences (like Alan Wallace’s approach) or Secular Buddhism [5]; the philosophical discourse develops the ideas of transcendence [6], the cultural archeology [7] and methodological pluralism (according to Andresen J. [8]). However, there is something in common among all of these academic approaches: they study the tradition as Text. And the process of deciphering of that Text includes two levels: the hermeneutics level for the immersion to the traditional context; and the deconstruction level for the immersion to a non-traditional context.

As for the Buddhism itself, traditional exegesis is applicable to the decoding of sutras, understood literally or interpretably (nītārtha or neyārtha). However, the tantras, written in the twilight language (sandhyābhāṣa), do not imply a similar
decoding – rather, they require an overview of the entire space of all meanings, which is held by the binary oppositions (masculine and feminine, method and wisdom, vajra and mudrā, samsāra and nirvana, etc.). Besides, the two-stages practice of the highest tantra (anuttarayogatantra, rnal ‘byor bla med kyi rgyud) recreates the perfect mandala of the deities in the space of consciousness (utpattikrama, bskyed rim), and then dissolves (actually, deconstructs) it in order to release the clear light (‘od gsal) of true knowledge (sampañnakrama, rdzogs rim).

In the context of the academic researches, it would be helpful to consider the questions: does the Buddhist tradition itself really use deconstruction, like the Western researchers do it?

Current Buddhist Studies demonstrate that Mahayana's debates with non-Buddhist or Early Buddhist schools were based on deconstruction and used the Buddhist theory of the meanings apoha [9]. At the same time, in these studies the concept of “différance” from the Derridian deconstruction is associated with the Buddhist concept of sameness “samatā”. However, I should remark that the certain elements of deconstruction appear in the Buddhist tradition not only as the method of debates, but as the method of profound mental practice. In particular, the experience of direct perception is realized by deconstructing the ontology of self-existence [10]. And on my opinion, we can see on the research material of the highest tantra Kālacakra (particularly, the Fifth Chapter), that deconstructing the ontology of self-existence is exactly realized through the deconstruction of own discourse by the practice of mantra: the recitations of sequences of zero-meaning semantemes (bijā mantra) allow to stop the process of conceptualization in our mind and to free oursleves from prejudices and passions.

**Summing.** If we recognize that academic studies of Buddhism are primarily textual studies, then we will immediately notice that the chosen discourse always influences the interpretation of texts. To get to certain "pure meanings" of the text and bring ourselves into creative contact with it, we should resort to deconstruction. The applying of deconstruction methods to Buddhist Studies is sanctioned by the Buddhist tradition itself, because these methods are similar to not only its scholastic debates methods, but to the methods of the Buddhist tantric practice, associated with the deconstruction of the discourse itself. And that approach to Buddhist Studies helps us to raise the dialogue between Buddhism and Western Sciences to the higher level – to the level of intercultural philosophy.
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