

5. . . . ; . . . , 2000. – 315 . – (« . . . »).
6. . . . / . . . //
7. . . . ( . . . ) / . . . //
8. . . . – 2000. – 5. – .5-32. : : [ . . . ] / . . . . – . . . : , 2003. – 216 .
9. . . . / . . . . – . . . : , 1999. – 156 .
10. . . . , 1999. – 464 .
11. . . . / . . . ; [ . . . ]. – [5- . . . ]. – . . . : , 2002. – 688 .
12. . . . : . . . / . . . . – . . . : . . . , 2002. – 207 .
13. . . . / . . . ; [ . . . ]. – . . . : , 1992. – 543 .
14. . . . (« . . . ») // . . . . – 1996. – 9. – .3-16.
15. . . . / . . . //
16. . . . . – . . . : , 2004. – .3 (21). – .25-33. / . . . ; [ . . . ] . – . . . : , 2000. – .3. – 415 .

### Summary

**Kuz O. Concept of Sociality in the Post-classical Social Science.** The article is devoted to the definition of the cognitive status of the philosophic-anthropological reflection both in the field of philosophy and within the frames of its interdisciplinary links with social humanities. This circumstance facilitates the appeal to the theoretical prerequisites and perspectives of philosophical-anthropological reflection of sociality. It has been emphasized the formation of such theoretical discourse of sociality which overcomes disciplinary limits of social philosophy, philosophic anthropology and sociology integrating their achievements. It has been shown that philosophic-anthropological reflection concentrating its attention on the perfect features of human existence in the world, appears in the ontological sphere and exactly here finds sociality as the essential constitutive sign of a human being. Keywords: human being, sociality, social reality, philosophic-anthropological reflection, postmodernity.

316.277

©

« »

« »

« »

« »

[1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].

« »

» [8, .193].

» [3, .298].

« »

» [9, .174].

« »

» [9, .175].

« »

» [9, .177].

« »



... : « ... » [4, .42].

« ... » — : « ... » [4, .45].

« ... » ( « ... » ).

« ... ».

« ... »: «1) ... 2) ... 3) ... » [6, .1126].

« ... », « ... », « ... »

