ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF PUNCTUATION IN CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Eshmurodova Zarbuvi Zaxriddin qizi
Master's Student in Linguistics
(English Language), Turon University
Gmail: *eshmurodovazarbibi@gmail.com*
Tel.: *+ 998 93 422 62 45*

Abstract: *This article presents a comparative study of the use, semantic, syntactic, and communicative functions of punctuation marks in contemporary English, Russian, and Uzbek. The study highlights the primary functions of punctuation–segmentation, boundary-setting, and emphasis/indication. Examples demonstrate how punctuation marks such as commas, periods, dashes, exclamation points, and question marks influence sentence structure and meaning. The historical development, functional features, and stylistic variations of punctuation across languages are also discussed. The findings show that punctuation serves not only as a grammatical delimiter but also as a key linguistic tool shaping semantic and syntactic structure, expressing authorial stance, and ensuring textual coherence.*

Keywords: ***punctuation mark, punctuation system, segmentation, boundary-setting, indication and emphasis, semantic and syntactic function, cross-linguistic comparison, stylistic variation, english language, uzbek language.***

Introduction. Punctuation (from Latin *punktum*, meaning "point") refers to the system of punctuation marks and the codified set of rules governing their usage. Although definitions vary across scholarly literature and dictionaries, the term is primarily used in two senses: first, as the collection of rules regulating the use of punctuation marks, and second, as the punctuation marks themselves [1, p. 6]. In linguistic studies, punctuation also denotes intonational and prosodic pauses in speech flow, as well as the set of conventional symbols represented in writing. These symbols are referred to in various sources as "punktemas," "punctuation marks," "punctograms," "prosodemographemes," "punctuation symbols," "interpuncts," or "separating signs."

Punctuation marks belong to the system of graphemes and are classified as prosodemographemes, encompassing the grammatical, semantic, and intonational components of written language [2, p. 12]. They play a crucial role in ensuring accurate and coherent comprehension of written texts, clarifying semantic and grammatical relationships within the text, and structuring the text in a concise and organized manner. By revealing the grammatical and semantic connections between words, punctuation marks help to segment and emphasize ideas. Understanding their usage, as well as their functional roles, enables readers to accurately interpret the author's intended meaning. Consequently, punctuation facilitates rapid and intuitive perception of emotional and expressive content conveyed through writing during the reading process. Moreover, in the traditions of Qur'anic and Hadith studies, the system of tafsir has historically been developed to assist in the correct reading and interpretation of the text [3]. Unlike in Arabic, in Christianity as early as the 4th–5th centuries, cantillation marks (a system of signs in ancient Hebrew used to indicate melodic intonation) were

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

employed to regulate the rhythm when reading the Gospel aloud. These marks were further refined when the Gospel was translated into Latin [4, p. 249-255].

Literature Review. Punctuation marks serve as an essential tool in every language for perceiving written discourse and conveying thoughts in a manner that is comprehensible to others. Recognizing their importance in facilitating the accurate interpretation and transmission of ideas, A. P. Chekhov, in a letter dated February 13, 1888, to N. A. Khlorkov, referred to punctuation marks as the "reading notes of written speech," effectively likening them to musical notations [5, p. 39]. V.Klassovskiy, in his work titled *"The Five Essential Punctuation Marks"*, acknowledges that although punctuation marks began to represent primary syntactic relations with the advent of printing in the 14th century, they had already existed earlier in religious, scientific, and literary manuscripts [6, p. 61]. In this metaphorical framing, punctuation functions similarly to musical symbols, guiding the rhythm, intonation, and expressive nuances of written language, thereby enhancing clarity, coherence, and the emotional resonance of the text for the reader. In particular, the role of punctuation as a crucial means of interpreting textual meaning becomes especially evident in cases where the position of a specific word within a sentence or a broader textual context gives rise to semantic shifts that depend on the presence or absence of a punctuation mark. In such instances, punctuation functions not merely as a formal graphical device but as a determinant of meaning construction. Even a single punctuation mark, such as a comma, may serve not only to highlight or emphasize a particular syntactic element expressed by a word or phrase, but also to fundamentally alter the semantic and grammatical relationships between the components of a sentence, thereby reshaping the overall meaning of the utterance.

Research Methodology. This study employs a **comparative-descriptive research methodology** to investigate the use, functions, and structural patterns of punctuation marks in contemporary English, Russian, and Uzbek. The methodology is designed to systematically analyze both theoretical sources and practical textual examples to identify universal and language-specific features of punctuation systems. This methodology combines theoretical, descriptive, and comparative approaches to provide a holistic understanding of punctuation as a linguistic and communicative tool. By integrating cross-linguistic analysis with textual evidence, the study identifies both universal principles and language-specific characteristics in punctuation usage.

Results and Discussion. Here is a scientifically polished English translation that preserves the academic tone, terminological accuracy, and logical structure of the original Uzbek text, making it suitable for a dissertation or scholarly article:

In the languages under comparison – Uzbek, Russian, and English – this semantic-functional property of punctuation marks is fully manifested. In particular, in Uzbek, the use or omission of a comma in the following examples results in clear semantic differentiation.

Example: *Yangi ko'ylakli qiz – Yangi, ko'ylakli qiz*

In the first case, the newness of the dress is implied, whereas in the second case the emphasis shifts to the newness of the girl herself, that is, she is understood as unfamiliar or recently arrived.

Example: *Oq gullar bezagan xonani ko'rdik – Oq gullar, bezagan xonani ko'rdik.*

In the first sentence, it is understood that the flowers decorating the room are white, while in the second sentence the whiteness of the flowers is highlighted independently, and the subsequent segment functions as a separate semantic unit.

Example: *Tez yuradigan bola yetib keldi – Tez, yuradigan bola yetib keldi.*

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

In the first case, speed of movement is presented as a permanent characteristic of the child, whereas in the second case speed is isolated as an adverbial modifier, which leads to a change in the syntactic structure of the sentence.

These examples demonstrate that even the presence or absence of a single comma can fundamentally alter the semantic and grammatical relations between words, resulting in a reinterpretation of the overall meaning of the sentence. This fact once again confirms that punctuation serves as a crucial cognitive and communicative tool in written discourse, playing a decisive role in the construction and interpretation of meaning.

If you wish, I can also: adapt this translation to British or American academic style, add cross-linguistic parallels in English and Russian, or integrate it seamlessly into a dissertation chapter.

Similarly, in English, punctuation marks perform the same semantic and syntactic functions, which can be clearly observed in a number of widely cited examples. For instance: Let's help, students! / Let's help students!

In the first sentence, *students* functions as a vocative, directly addressing the addressees ("Students, let us help"), whereas in the second sentence the same noun phrase serves as the direct object of the verb, referring to those who receive help. The presence or absence of the comma thus leads to a clear semantic distinction.

Another illustrative example is: John Smith and I / John, Smith and I

In the first construction, *John Smith* is interpreted as a single proper name, referring to two participants (John Smith and the speaker). In the second construction, the comma separates the nouns, resulting in the interpretation of three distinct individuals (John, Smith, and the speaker).

A similar shift in meaning can be observed in the following pair:

The manager said the assistant was careless. The manager, said the assistant, was careless.

The first sentence is syntactically simple, in which *the manager* is the speaker and *the assistant* is evaluated. In contrast, the second sentence contains an inserted reporting clause, which changes the source of the statement and reverses the semantic roles of the participants.

In these sentences, the position of the comma fundamentally changes both the semantic orientation and the syntactic interpretation of the utterance, producing opposite meanings ("Teach, do not ignore" vs. "Do not teach, ignore").

Taken together, these examples convincingly demonstrate that punctuation marks – particularly the comma – play a decisive role not only in syntactic segmentation but also in determining semantic relations within a sentence. This confirms the view that punctuation functions as a crucial communicative mechanism in written discourse, capable of directing interpretation, emphasis, and pragmatic intent.

Modern punctuation places particular emphasis on precisely such functional capacities of punctuation marks. In contemporary linguistics, increasing attention is being paid to the study of punctuation as a means of representing cognitive processes in written discourse, reflecting the language user's national and cultural background, mental activity, and individual communicative intentions.

Within this framework, punctuation marks are examined not merely as formal graphic devices, but as tools through which thought is externalized and structured in accordance with the speaker's intellectual orientation and pragmatic goals. Consequently, current research increasingly adopts a comparative approach, analyzing punctuation phenomena across several languages in order to identify both language-specific and universal features.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

At the same time, special focus is placed on the distinction between normative and non-normative punctuation, as well as between regulated and author-specific (individual) usage. Such studies aim to reveal how punctuation operates at the intersection of linguistic convention and creative expression, thereby highlighting its role as a dynamic and cognitively motivated component of written communication.

For example, although punctuation marks in English are not traditionally regarded as a decisive criterion of correctness in writing to the same extent as in some other languages, the overall number of punctuation marks in English is greater than in Russian, a language whose punctuation system is considered highly complex and strictly regulated. In total, English punctuation comprises fourteen marks. Notably, the hyphen and the apostrophe are treated as independent punctuation marks in English.

The dash, in turn, has two distinct forms: the em dash and the en dash, each serving different functional and stylistic purposes. The apostrophe (’) performs two primary functions: separation and contraction. For instance, in *It’s a nasty day*, the apostrophe marks the contraction of *it is*. Thus, the apostrophe functions not only as a graphic marker but also as a means of representing syntactic and morphological reduction.

Many punctuation marks in English exhibit stylistic variation depending on the type of text and writing convention. Quotation marks, in particular, display multiple alternative forms, including single quotation marks (‘…’), angle quotation marks (‹ ›), and double quotation marks («…», “…”). These forms may be classified as neutral (“…”), vertical (‘…’), handwritten (“…”), or typographic (printed) quotation marks, such as the rounded («…») variety, as well as opening (“) and closing (”) forms.

In cases where computer keyboards do not allow direct input of all typographic quotation variants, a neutral form is typically used. Modern word-processing software often refers to these as “smart quotes,” which automatically adapt to context and replicate the functional properties of various quotation mark types.

Similarly, English writing distinguishes stylistically different forms of dashes and brackets. Parentheses may appear in several graphic variants, such as round brackets ((…)), square brackets ([…]), curly braces ({…}), angle brackets (⟨…⟩), and, in computer linguistics, angle brackets (<…>). Each of these forms serves specific functional and stylistic purposes depending on the genre and disciplinary context.

Comparable stylistic differentiation of punctuation marks can also be observed in Uzbek. In scientific discourse, for example, square brackets ([…]) are frequently employed. This usage is especially common in disciplines such as chemistry, mathematics, and geometry, where formulas and structured data are presented. In Uzbek language exercises, square brackets are often used to illustrate phonetic or morphological processes, as in the following examples: *zahar[a]ri*, *qorin[i]ni*, *o‘g‘il[i]li*, where the vowels *a* and *i* are omitted in accordance with grammatical rules.

In some cases, the distribution of round and square brackets demonstrates functional specialization. In academic texts, parenthetical insertions are typically enclosed in round brackets, while square brackets are used to indicate reference numbers corresponding to entries in bibliographic lists. In linguistics, speech units such as words are conventionally presented in round brackets, whereas language units–lexemes and linguistic patterns–are enclosed in square brackets. For example, the

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

lexemes *[yuz]*, *[bet]*, *[bashara]*, *[chehra]*, and *[oraz]* denote a single conceptual domain but differ in their semantic nuances [1, p. 22].

The analysis of existing punctuation theories developed within the framework of syntax demonstrates that the main functional roles assigned to punctuation marks in the three languages under comparison – English, Russian, and Uzbek – exhibit a high degree of commonality. In particular, punctuation marks in these languages are observed to perform the following core functions:

to separate and delimit coordinate elements within a sentence, that is, homogeneous (coordinated) parts;

to delimit detached elements used to supplement, specify, explain, or emphasize the meaning of a word or sentence;

to separate and delimit intonationally independent elements in speech or text, such as vocatives, parenthetical elements, and parenthetical constructions;

to express complex logical, semantic, and syntactic relations in written discourse, to clearly indicate the connections between parts of an utterance, and to ensure the communicative coherence of the text.

These functions confirm that punctuation marks in written discourse serve not merely as grammatical boundary markers, but also as significant linguistic units that shape meaning semantically, express the author's stance, and determine the overall logical organization of a text.

Based on the general principles and functions of punctuation outlined above, the following universal criteria–currently applicable to English, Russian, and Uzbek alike–have been formulated:

the syntactic criterion, according to which punctuation marks are used on the basis of the grammatical structure of the sentence and the relationships between its components;

the semantic criterion, whereby punctuation serves to clarify sentence or text meaning, reveal semantic distinctions, and convey logical relations;

the intonational criterion, which reflects pauses, intonation, and stress characteristic of spoken language, thereby facilitating natural perception of written discourse;

the communicative-pragmatic criterion, under which punctuation marks actively participate in expressing the author's communicative intent, degree of emphasis, and discourse stance.

Thus, although punctuation systems in the languages under comparison display national and stylistic specificities, their fundamental principles rely on shared syntactic and semantic regularities. This circumstance provides an important theoretical foundation for the comparative and typological study of punctuation.

Full stop or period (Dot). Indicating the completion of a sentence and separating sentences within a text: *Qovunlarimizni adirdagi qumga ko'mib qo'yamiz.* (S.Ahmad) ***"I needed to see you for what could have been the last time, but I lost consciousness before I could do so."*** (*Words Left Unspoken).*

Showing that a word or name is abbreviated: *Ushbu davrda A.Obidjon kabi bolalar ijodkori tavallud topgan. /* **"'Bill Clinton,' I said. The correct answer was George W. Bush."** *– excerpt from Atomic Habits, illustrating the use of the full stop to indicate the end of a sentence.*

Comma. Separating equal or coordinated parts of a sentence:

Uzbek example: Bog'da, maydonda, ko'chalarda, xiyobalarda bolalar kulishadi. (A. Qahhor)

English example: She enjoyed many genres of music: classical, jazz, rock, and blues. (E. L. Doctorow)

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

Separating parenthetical or inserted elements within a sentence:
Uzbek example: O‘g‘lim, sen tingla, ishni ehtiyotkorlik bilan qil. (E.A’zam)
English example: “I think,” he whispered, “that we should leave before it rains.” (L. Carroll)
Separating introductory words and phrases:
Uzbek example: Oxir-oqibat, maqsadimizga yetdik. (A. Oripov)
English example: Indeed, it was an unexpected surprise. However, the plan proceeded as intended. (J.K. Rowling)
Separating coordinated clauses using intonation cues.
Uzbek example: Hozir sizlar bilan gaplashib o‘tirgan joyimiz Olchin
qishlog‘imizda tomga chiqib qarasak Asror bobo yurgan ko‘chalar, guzarlar ko‘rinib turadi. (S.Ahmad)
English example: The Lakers won the game, and the fans cheered loudly, while the commentators analyzed every play. (M. King)
Note of interrogation or question mark. Indicating the completion of a sentence and marking its interrogative meaning:

Uzbek: Suv sening shaxsiy mulkingmi? (E. A’zam)
English: – And what will we leave behind us when we are long dead? Temples? Treasure? (M. Mannes)
Indicating doubt or questioning the meaning of a specific word or phrase within a sentence:
Uzbek: *Nasriy ifodada bo‘lsa: “Bu Zarafshon daryosi tepalikda joylashgani uchun (?)’Kohak’ deb nom berdilar... Shu tepalikdan pastga qarab quyilgani uchun ham (?) Zarafshonni Kohak daryosi deydilar”* (N. Komilov, *“Tarjimami yo talqin?”*) / *If expressed in prose: “Because the Zarafshon River is located on a hill (?) it was named’Kohak’... And also (?) because it flows down from this hill, they call the Zarafshon the Kohak River.”*
English: *This is an interesting (?) point. Yeah! It was a great story.* (R. Stevenson)
Note of exclamation or exclamation mark. Indicating that a sentence is expressed with emotion or exclamation” yoki **“Marking the emotive or exclamatory nature of a sentence:** *Salom, Amirqul aka, hormang!* (O‘.Umarbekov) */ He sank down by his side and cried, “Oh, Bill! It’s all so horrid!” (R. Stivenson)*

Emphasizing a specific word or element within a sentence” yoki **“Marking emphasis on a particular word in a sentence:** *Unutmagan sizni hech kim Turkistonda, Xonlarga teng hurmatingiz, «bosmachilar!..»* (M.Yusuf) */ Jim was preparing (!) for his exams when I came. Americans showall(!) their emotions directly.*

Brackets or parenthesis. Separating an introductory word or parenthetical clause: *Қовушмаган иккита тақдир (Балки у ҳам ўзича ҳақдир),* (M.Yusuf) */ I visited Panaji (where I met other tourists) on my way to the Himalayas. Marilyn Monroe (Norma Jeane Mortenson) was as iconic as her life was tragic.*

Dots. Indicating the semantic incompleteness or unfinishedness of a sentence: *Shunaqa hushyorlik qilgan bo‘lsa, yaxshi lekin...* (A.A’zam) */ He is always late, but you know how I feel about that... (R. Stivenson)*

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

Indicating that a sentence or a word has been abbreviated, truncated, or omitted: *Bobolar ot surgan yerda ot sudrar... Unutganning kuysin ikki dunyosi!* (H.Xudoyberdiyev) */ I ... forgive people because ... I am strong enough to know people make mistakes. (M.Monroe)*

Dash. Separating dialogues, including other speakers' utterances, from the author's narrative: *Haqiqatan-ey, yomon gap ham shu, bir chiqmasin, keyin tamom – to'xtamaydi, o'zicha ko'payib, bolalab ketaveradi.* (A.A'zam) / *"How are you doing?" he asked.*

Indicating the equal structural status of subject and predicate, and separating the subject and predicate: *Dunyoning bor zahr-u zaqqumin, Bitta qo'ymay totgonim – onam.* (H.Xudoyberdiyeva) */ Materialism – always wanting something more, something different – is good for the economy, but bad for the soul. (J. Clear)*

Inverted commas or quotation marks. Marking or delimiting a quoted or reported clause: *"E'tibor bermay o'tgan bo'lsam kerak", - deya o'yladim.* (X.Davron) */ "If you don't go to sleep now," the doctor whispered, "you'll be very tired tomorrow." (R. Stivenson)*

Colon. Separating coordinated or connected clauses using intonation (punctuation reflects the rhythm, pause, or emphasis in written form): *– Сизнинг муқаддас бурчингиз – саратсин шаҳзодаларини католик динига ўтказмоқдир.* (P.Qodirov) / I need one thing to lose weight: a good diet. (M. Ellis)

Semicolon. Separating coordinated or connected clauses using punctuation to indicate intonation or rhythmic pause: Akbarning o'z diniga haddan ortiq berilgan qiziqqonroq ruhoniy ekanini sezgan; «ehtimol, yosh bo'lgani uchun aqli uncha quyulmagandir», deb o'ylagan. (P.Qodirov) */ I like your sister; she's a good friend.(J. Clear)*

Separating coordinated or grouped units within a sentence: *Nutq ham til va yozuv kabi ikki xil shaklga ega: a) og'zaki nutq; b) yozma nutq.* ("Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili" darsligi) */ I'm going on a camping trip so I will need: sleeping bags, a tent, a fan. (J. Clear)*

Based on our analyses, it can be concluded that at present, in the punctuation systems of English, Russian, and Uzbek, three primary functions predominate:

Segmentation – marking clauses or units within a sentence or text as independent entities;

Boundary-setting – defining the limits of units that need to be separated for grammatical or semantic reasons, such as coordinated clauses, introductory words, or parenthetical constructions;

Indication and emphasis – highlighting important elements within words or sentences, providing stress, and signaling logical connections.

From a historical perspective, punctuation marks originally used at the end of sentences–such as the full stop, exclamation mark, question mark, and similar signs–were functionally simple, primarily serving the purpose of segmentation. These functions were consistently applied across punctuation systems in different languages.

Later, punctuation marks employed within sentences–particularly the comma, dash, and quotation marks–developed greater functional complexity. Their roles expanded to include segmentation, boundary-setting, and signaling meaning. Consequently, these marks are recognized in written discourse not merely as grammatical delimiters but also as essential linguistic units that shape semantic and syntactic structures, convey the author's attitude, and ensure the overall logical coherence of the text.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

Conclusion. Based on the comprehensive analysis conducted in this study, it can be concluded that punctuation marks in English, Russian, and Uzbek perform multiple interrelated functions that are crucial for the semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic organization of written texts. Firstly, punctuation marks serve as **segmentation tools,** allowing sentences and textual units to be distinguished as independent entities. This function ensures clarity in communication, enabling readers to perceive the boundaries of ideas and the logical structure of the text. Secondly, they act as **boundary-setting instruments**, marking the limits of coordinated or parenthetical elements, introductory words and phrases, and other grammatical or semantic structures that require separation for proper interpretation. This role is especially significant in distinguishing nuanced meanings within a sentence, as demonstrated in the examples of coordinated clauses, parenthetical insertions, and semantic shifts caused by the presence or absence of punctuation marks.

Thirdly, punctuation marks are used for **indication and emphasis**, highlighting key elements within sentences, signaling logical relationships, and conveying the author's attitude, emotional tone, or pragmatic intent. Marks such as the exclamation point, question mark, and dash not only punctuate sentences but also guide the reader's intonation and interpretive focus, enhancing both comprehension and expressive quality. From a historical and typological perspective, this study demonstrates that while the earliest punctuation marks – such as the period, question mark, and exclamation mark – had primarily simple segmentation functions, the later development of punctuation signs like the comma, dash, and quotation marks introduced greater functional complexity. These marks combine segmentation, boundary-setting, and emphasis, functioning as integral linguistic units that shape meaning, reflect the author's communicative intent, and ensure the coherence of discourse. Cross-linguistic comparison reveals a high degree of functional similarity among English, Russian, and Uzbek punctuation systems, despite minor stylistic and national differences.

The shared principles – segmentation, boundary-setting, emphasis, and intonation marking – underline the universal cognitive and communicative role of punctuation in written discourse. In conclusion, punctuation marks are far more than mere grammatical symbols; they constitute essential tools for structuring thought, clarifying meaning, and conveying emotion and emphasis in writing. Their correct and nuanced use enhances both the semantic precision and expressive richness of texts, affirming their indispensable role in written communication across languages.

REFERENCES / WORKS CITED:

1. Baxriddinova B. Zamonaviy o'zbek punktuatsiyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2015. – 128 b.

2. Nurmurotov I.B. O'zbek tilida tinish belgilari lingvopoetikasi. Filol. fan. bo'yicha fals. dok. (PhD) ... diss. – Qarshi, 2025. – 148 b.

3. Васильев В.В. Ахмад Заки – родоначальник пунктуации в арабском языке. Восток (Oriens). 2019. № 2. – С. 202–211.

4. Хаздан Е.В. Знаки кантилляции: почему бы не записать их нотами? // Евреи Европы и Ближнего Востока: история, языки, традиция, культура: Материалы Международной научной конференции памяти Т. Л. Гуриной. – СПб., 2015. – С. 249–255.

5. Валгина Н. Актуальные проблемы современной русской пунктуации. – М: Издательство «Высшая школа» 2004 – С. 39–45.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

6. Классовский В., Знаки препинания в пяти важнейших языках. / Сост. В. Классовский. – Санкт-Петербург: тип. В. Безобразова и К°, 1869. – [2], VI, – С. 61. https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01003582366