

«...» [3, .3].
(),
«...».
«...» [2, .163].
«...» [2, .164].

«

» [4, .236].

case study,

»

» [8, p.16].

«...» [1, .83].

», «» (,) «...» ?

» [1, .87].

«».

«»,

« » [7, .567].

» [7, .567].

« »

» [5, .128-129].

(),

« »

« »

[6, .191].

1. / ; [.]. – : , 1998. – 480 .
2. / ; [. , ,]. – , 2004. – 328 .
3. : ? [.] / //The general science journal – .1-6. – <http://gsjournal.net/physics/kalanov9r.pdf>.
4. – +, 2004. – 384 .
5. / [. ,] ;] . – , 2006. – 288 .
6. : / [. ,] ;
7.] . – , 1999. – 402 .
8. Carson D.A. Dangers Delights of Postmodernism /D.A.Carson //Modern Reformation. –2003. – Vol. 12 No. 4 – P. 11-17.

Summary

Kadykalo A. Postmodern Attribute of Modern Natural-Scientific Knowledge. The article considers the problem of formation, interpretation, and operation of knowledge in science. The author pays attention to the main points of knowledge in terms of subjectivity not as a single knowledge of “individual”, but as an opportunity to interpret this knowledge by “other” or “different”. Keywords: knowledge, scientist, language, subjectivity, concept.