
« , »
« »

[13].

« »

70- « »

[5; 12],

[14],

[4],

[10],
[7].

« »

[1, .145].

?, (techne)

techne.

«techne»

« »

« »

« »

» [15, .8].

XIX

XX

[7, .62].

«

» [7, .63-64].

» [3, c.14].

[9].

XIX

(« »)

1. ... « » ... « »:
 2. ...
 3. ...
 4. ...
-
1. ... , 1994. – 352 .
 2. ... / –
 3. ... , 1986. – 256 .
 4. // ...
 5. ... , 1991. – .268-272.
 6. ... , 1994. – 162 .
 7. ... –1972.– 11.– .14-79.
 8. // ... – 1988. – 1.– .56-70.
 9. ... , 1977. – 301 .
 10. // ... : ... 20- – 30- // ... :
 11. ... , 1990. – .154-186.
 12. //
 13. ... , 1993. – .1.– .112-124.
 14. « » // ... , .XXVII. – - :
 15. Cogito – ... , 2008.– .146-155.
 16. ... , 1977. – 574 .
 17. // ... - . 4. , 2001, 1.– .3-11.

Summary

*Afanasyev A. Human Paradigm and the Paradigm of the Humanities. This article analyzes the concept, built around a methodological construct of "paradigm" in the context of the human knowledge. The possibility of scientific and non-scientific (cultural- behavioral, world-creative, literary- research, axiological) paradigms in the humanitaristics is grounded. The specific features of the paradigms of human knowledge are highlighted, the paradigms of natural sciences and humanities are compared. Two types of paradigms in the human sciences are differed, in accordance with a focus on non-rigid and rigid scientific standards. Contrary to Kuhn's idea of struggle and exclusion of paradigm, the possibility of their coexistence in culture and science, including in the mainstream of the principle of subsidiarity, is affirmed. **Keywords:** paradigm, humanitaristics, natural sciences, science, theory, paradigm of humanities, the coexistence of paradigms, complementarity.*