

Nicolaos Th. Constantinides

(PhD. Department of Language, Literature and Culture of the Black Sea Countries, Democritus University of Thrace)

A Contemporary Folkloristic view on the phenomena of Indefiniteness, Definiteness and Tripartite Determiner in Pomak variety of Greek Thrace: Convergences and Divergences

Abstract

The present paper is a brief attempt to research aspects of human identities through linguistic phenomena of the Pomak variety spoken in Greek Thrace, under a folkloristic point of view.

The concept of definiteness in Pomak is expressed in a complicated way, namely through the system of the suffixed tripartite definite article, the systems of personal, demonstrative and definite pronouns, as well as the indicative mood within the verb system. Moreover, there are hints that there exists an *indirect indefiniteness* or rather a *semi-definiteness*, expressed by means of an evidential mood within the verb system, which has not yet been fully studied in Pomak, although it does exist in Bulgarian and Turkish as well.

Concerning the definite article system, Pomak has a suffixed tripartite article expressing a tripartite definitive contrast of proximity or distance, which is part of a broader phenomenon, that of tripartite determiner contrast. These tripartite links initially appearing as a tripartite definite article, spread to multiple levels such as space, time, quantity, reference, situation, manner, etc.

The above mentioned tripartite determiner is expressed by the three deictic morphemes /-s-/, /-t-/, /-n-/, mostly functioning as a tripartite definite article. However, they are also used either as suffixes or prefixes in the transformation of pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions in order to express a tripartite determination of various adverbial constructions. In addition, the tripartite linguistic phenomena create a link complexity concerning human identity and otherness, which can be traced back to the social transformation of space and time; those two dimensions are applied unconsciously by natural speakers, a fact that does not cease to reveal the complex expression possibilities of Pomak.

Key-words: indefiniteness, definiteness, tripartite article, tripartite determiner, Pomak, Pomaks, Greek Thrace

1. Introduction

This paper is a Contemporary Folkloristic approach to indigenous phenomena of Pomak (as it is spoken in many parts of Greek Thrace), which concern indefiniteness and definiteness, as well as tripartite determiner of space, time and various related socially conditioned aspects.

Pomak (or Pomátsko - Pomatsko - as its natural speakers call it) is the language variety used by the Pomaks as their mother tongue. As far as Greek Thrace is concerned, it has been proved that Pomak is a Slavic macro-dialect within the South Balkan Slavic dialectological continuum (Constantinides, 2007: 35). It is considered a

Slavic language because it belongs to the Slavic sub-branch of Indo-European languages; moreover, at least within Greece, the Pomak language may be called just “Slavic”, given that the World Linguistic Commission for the Compilation of the Slavic Dialectological Charter (*Общеславянский Лингвистический Атлас*) states that all Slavic varieties in the territory of non-Slavic national states are simply called “*Slavic*” (Ioannidou, 1997: 96-97); it is a macro-dialect because it comprises an extensive set of language varieties, as internationally defined (Underwood 1980: 86; Maguire - Timberlake 1993: 363; Timberlake 1993: 882). According to the above mentioned and internationally accepted criteria, Pomak in Bulgaria may be considered to be a Bulgarian macro-dialect.

It has also been shown, on one hand, that Pomak derives from the language known as Old Church Slavonic (Kyranoudis, 1995-1998: 165) and, on the other hand, that it has followed its own course, while it has been syntactically influenced by medieval Greek and borrows words and structures from modern Greek (Krimpas, 2017: 196); besides, it contains several nominal and verbal loans from Turkish (Constantinides, 2008: 286).

The research of Pomak phenomena in this paper has been mainly based on the variant of Myki-Mantaina area of Xanthi region, since it is the only variant that has been richly recorded (Theocharidis, 1996a; Theocharidis, 1996b; IV Army Corps 1996; IV Army Corps 1997; IV Army Corps 1998a; IV Army Corps 1998b; Karahotza, 2021). Some production of original written language does exist (Karahotza, 2007), while there have been attempts to translate European literature into Pomak (Karahotza, 2017); Pomak has also been taught as a foreign language to Greek-speaking students (Kokkas, 2004a; Kokkas, 2004b; Kokkas, 2004c).

This research has been based on the principles of the Socio-Historical Method, as it has been established by Michael Meraklis (Sergis, 2000: 14; Meraklis, 2004; Vozikas 2006: 86, 100), while it has been using conclusions from other disciplines (Meraklis, 2004: 16) such as Sociology, Philology and Linguistics. Meanwhile, in order to identify convergences and divergences, Pomak has been compared with neighboring languages such as Greek (both ancient and modern), Bulgarian and Turkish. Regarding the type of research, it has been mostly based on library research, as well as on field study, in a way described in detail by various scholars (Mazarakis 1964; Varvounis, 1994; Lydaki 2001; Thompson 2002; Copans 2004; Tsiolis 2011). Finally, it is essential to make clear that the concepts of *Indefiniteness*, *Definiteness* and *Tripartite Determiner* are used as broader logical categories, rather than narrow concepts, within the cognitive scope of a given science.

2. Indefiniteness in Pomak

By indefiniteness a situation is meant in which no description or an exact name are given, whether intentionally or due to inadequacy. In other words, it is a situation where no clear or defining characteristics are set. This situation is similar to the definition of indefinite pronouns (Eleftheriadis, 2002: 244).

2.1. Indefiniteness in Pomak is mainly expressed via the systems of the indefinite article and the indefinite pronouns.

2.1.1. The system of the indefinite article is expressed by means of the following lexemes, here appearing in three genders and three different dialectal versions

(Theocharidis, 1996a: 41), as shown in Table 1. Do note that Pomak, like all Slavic languages and Greek, has three genders (masculine - feminine - neutral). In the tables that follow all articles, nouns, adjectives and pronouns are given in their three gender forms, when all three forms do exist :

Table 1		
The Pomak system of Indefinite Article in three genders		
edín - enná - ennó = a	adín - anná - annó = a	idín - inná - innó = a

2.1.2. The system of the indefinite pronouns is expressed by means of the lexemes listed in Table 2 (Theocharidis, 1996a: 67-68; Papadimitriou, 2008: 213-215):

Table 2	
The Pomak system of Indefinite Pronouns	
edín - enná - ennó = one	nókakna = something
adín - anná - annó = one	níkotrik - níkotra - níkotro = no one
bádin = someone (indefinitely)	nókutrik - nókutrika - nókutriko = someone
bayá = some	nókakvof - nókakva - nókakvo = someone of a certain kind
botín - boná - bonó = someone	nótshiye = of someone specific
drug - drúga - drúgo = other	sákedín - sákenná - sákennó = everyone, each one
kakná = what	sákutrik - sákutra - sákutro = everyone, each one
kaknánu = whatever	sákyedin - sákyenna - sákyenno = everyone, each one
kanátu = everything	yedin - yenná - yennó = one
nákna = something	yenígof - yenígva - yenígvo = some
náknu = something	yétkakvof - yétkakva - yétkakvo = of a certain kind
náko = something	yétkutri - yétkutra - yétkutro = such and such
nákuf - nákva - nákvo = anyone	yétkáchkishi = such and such people
náchiye = someone's	yétshiye = of so and so
níkakna = nothing	

2.1.3. However, there is another form of indefiniteness concerning the verb system, the so called *evidentiality*, which expresses an *indirect indefiniteness* or a *partial semi-definiteness*. When, for example, in Bulgarian evidentiality is carried out as: “обичал съм = **it is said that** I love” or in Turkish in the following form: “gelirmişim = **it is said that** I am coming”, it is obvious that a fact or an action takes place, which however it is not defined completely by an eye-witness, but the information comes from an indirect testimony. Thus, it is a form of an *indirect indefiniteness* or/and a *partial semi-definiteness*. Current works on Pomak do not mention an evidential mood (Theocharidis, 1996a), while others explicitly deny its existence (Papadimitriou, 2008: 243). Yet, Pomak natural speakers attest to the limited use of some form of functional evidentiality (i.e. not in the form of a morphological mood), which is expressed through periphrases, but is not widespread. They say that it is mainly used

in order to narrate a dream, in which case it is accompanied by the adverb “géyki = allegedly”: “géyki gáel som = I allegedly love” (Spoken Testimony R.B., E-63-02, Nicolaos Th. Constantinides Archive of Oral History). Of course, the field of evidentiality in Pomak remains vague and available to new researchers for further study and justification (Adamou, 2008).

2.2. In ancient Greek indefiniteness is mainly expressed via the system of indefinite pronouns, while no existence or use of an indefinite article system has ever been identified (Tzartanos, 2005: 26). It is a fact that Tzartanos refers to the definite article simply as “*article*”, showing that there exists no other kind of an article. Anyhow, the system of indefinite pronouns includes a variety of lexemes such as e.g. “τις - τις - τι (all forms are enclitic) = someone”, “ὁ δεῖνα - ἡ δεῖνα - τὸ δεῖνα = such and such” etc. (Tzartanos, 2005: 77-78).

2.3. In modern Greek indefiniteness is mainly expressed via the system of the indefinite article “ένας - μία - ένα = a(n)” by using the same lexemes as the numeral adjective for ‘one’; it is also carried out by the system of indefinite pronouns, e.g. “ένας - μία - ένα = one”, “κάποιος - κάποια - κάποιο = someone”, etc. (W.G.C.E.S.R.: 73, 136-137).

2.4. Indefiniteness in Bulgarian is mainly expressed via the system of indefinite pronouns and verb (i.e. morphological) evidentiality.

2.4.1. An indefinite article is absent from some grammars of standard Bulgarian (Lampsidis, 1968; Leafgren, 2011; Raltseva, 2015). However, in colloquial Bulgarian the numeral adjectives [числителни бройни] for ‘one’ i.e. “един - една - едно = one” are used instead of an indefinite article (Lampsidis, 1968: 106; Alexander-Mladenova, 2000: 55), exactly as in Greek. Yet, this use is not standardized, that is why Olga Mladenova states that an indefinite article is still in an “*embryonic*” state (Mladenova, 2007: 4).

2.4.2. The system of indefinite pronouns [неопределителни местоимения] comprises a number of lexemes e.g.: “някой - някоя - някое = someone”, “нещо = something”, etc. (Lampsidis, 1968: 134-137; Leafgren, 2011:59).

2.4.3. The verb evidentiality is expressed by means of the evidential mood [преизказно наклонение] sub-system within the inflected verb system. It comprises four periphrastic forms and nine tense structures, as shown in Table 3 (Lampsidis, 1968: 234-242). It is here presented in detail for comparison purposes.

The Bulgarian sub-system of Evidential Mood and its tenses		
1.	Сегашно време	обичал съм
	Present	it is said that I love
	Минало несвършено	обичал съм
	Imperfect	it is said that I was loving
	Минало свършено	обичал съм
2.	Simple Past	it is said that I loved
	Минало неопределено	бил съм обичал

	Present Perfect	it is said that I have loved
	Минало предварително	бил съм обичал
	Past Perfect	it is said that I had loved
3.	Бъдеще време	щял съм да обичам
	Futur	it is said that I will love
	Бъдеще в миналото	щял съм да обичам
	Futur in Past	it is said that I would love
4.	Бъдеще предварително	щял съм да съм обичал
	Futur Perfect	it is said that I will have loved
	Бъдеще предварително в миналото	щял съм да съм обичал
	Futur Perfect in Past	it is said that I would have loved

2.5. Indefiniteness in Turkish is mainly expressed by means of the system of indefinite adjectives or pronouns, (morphological) evidentiality, causative verbs, as well as various idiomatic structures of indefiniteness.

2.5.1. It is well known that Turkish has no articles, whether indefinite or definite. Thus indefiniteness is colloquially expressed by the use of the indefinite pronoun (literally numeral) “bir = one” in place of an indefinite article: e.g. “bir gömlek = one/a shirt” (Zeginis & Hidiroglou, 1995: 65). This “embryonic” state of the indefinite article appears also in some idiomatic phrases, where indefiniteness is transformed into an adjective determiner of the noun to-be-defined, e.g. “güzel bir çanta aldım = beautiful one/a bag I bought” (Nesne, 2017). Moreover, the same structure, calqued in Turkish, is used by some Greek refugees from eastern Thrace, who may say for example: “Ο Γιώργος είναι εξαιρετικός **ένας** άνθρωπος = George is excellent **a** person”, where the indefinite article is placed between the adjective and the noun rather than before the adjective: “Ο Γιώργος είναι **ένας** εξαιρετικός άνθρωπος = George is **an** excellent person” (Spoken Testimony G.A., E-04-34, Nicolaos Th. Constantinides Archive of Oral History).

2.5.2. The system of indefinite adjective or pronoun [belirsiz önadlar] consists of the lexeme: “bir = one” (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 46).

2.5.3. The verb evidentiality is expressed by the sub-system of evidential mood within the inflected verb system. It comprises five temporal structures, as it is shown in Table 4, where we present the verb “gelmek = to come” > “geliyorum = I come” > “geldim = I came” > “gelmiş = it is said that I came” (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 113, 156, 159, 161 and 164). It is here presented in detail for comparison purposes.

The Turkish sub-system of Evidential Mood and its tenses			
1.	Berlirsiz (miş'li) Geçmiş Zaman		gelmiş
	Unspecified Dissemination	Past of	it is said that I came

2.	Şimdiki Zamanın Rivâyeti	geliyorumuşum
	Present-Imperfect of Dissemination	it is said that I am coming / it is said that I was coming
3.	Geniş Zamanın Rivâyeti	gelirmişim
	Present-Imperfect Continuous of Dissemination	it is said that I am coming continuously / it is said that I was coming continuously
4.	Berlirsiz Geçmiş Zamanın Rivâyeti	gelmişim
	Complex Past of Dissemination	it is said that I have come
5.	Gelecek Zamanın Rivâyeti	gelecekmiş
	Futur of Dissemination	it is said that I will come

2.5.4. The causative verbs express a state of indefiniteness, where the action is defined, the initial subject or the acting person (who transfers the task to someone else) is known, but the final one that carries out the act remains undefined due to various reasons. In Turkish the causative verbs [ettirgen eylem] are formed by adding a suffix /-t-/ or /-dir-/ to the stem of the verb and may express a multitude of persons transferring the act, but only the initial remains defined, e.g.: “yazmak = to write” > “yaz-**dir**-mak = to have someone write for me” > “yaz-**dir-t**-mak = to have someone via an other person write for me” (Zeginis & Hidiroglou, 1995: 169).

2.5.5. One of the Turkish idiomatic structures of indefiniteness is the "without ending (or suffix) determiner" [eksiz (or takısız) tamlama], where two nouns are placed in nominative case, a situation that usually refers to the material, e.g. “ipek gömlek = silk shirt”. The same may be carried out by attached morphemes (or by one of their allomorphs subject to vowel harmony) (Göknal, 2012: 17, 22-27); this may take place either by an ablative case suffix -den / -dan or by a content suffix -lı / -li / -lu / -lü, e.g. “ipekden gömlek = from silk a shirt = a silken shirt” or “ipekli gömlek = a silken shirt” (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 39-40), where: “ip = silk” and “gömlek = shirt”.

2.5.6. A second idiomatic structure that expresses indefiniteness in Turkish is the “without specification noun determiner” [belirtsiz ad tamlaması] or else “genitive of abstract form” (Spoken Testimony X.O., G-07-01, Nicolaos Th. Constantinides Archive of Oral History). This consists of a noun placed before an other noun, which carries the suffix of 3rd person in the possessive case, i.e. a bound morpheme (or one of its allomorphs according to the vowel harmony) -ı / -i / -u / -ü e.g. “kadın çantası = a woman's bag” και “kadın pamuk çantası = a woman's cotton bag” (Daphnopatidis - Sanlioglou 2011: 39-40). Yet, In Ottoman Turkish the syntax was slightly different, because there existed the so called “izafet”, an influence from Arabic (originating from Persian) in the form of a standard suffix /-i / (Mingazova, Subich, Carlson, 2018), while the word order was inverted; so, where Modern Turkish structure is formed as “kadın çantası”, the Ottoman Turkish structure would be “çanta-ı kadın” or rather “فادين چانطی”.

2.5.7. A third idiomatic and important structure is that of the indefinite object [belirtsiz nesne], where the object is placed in the nominative case, e.g. “Ver canta = give (any) bag” (Nesne, 2017).

2.6. Therefore, as far as indefiniteness is concerned, Pomak presents a convergence with Greek in terms of the indefinite article and the indefinite pronoun systems, but a divergence to the phenomenon of evidentiality. Pomak converges to Bulgarian with respect to the indefinite pronoun system (both in terms of lexemes and structures), as well as in the emergence (in Pomak) of an embryonic evidentiality system, while it diverges from standard Bulgarian with respect to the indefinite article system. Pomak also converges with Turkish in terms of the indefinite pronoun system and the subsystem of an evidential mood (within the inflected verb system), as far as structure is concerned; but it diverges from Turkish in the fields of causative verbs and the idiomatic structures of indefiniteness. However, all the above mentioned language varieties (in terms of lexemes and semantics) use a numeral lexeme in place of an indefinite article, which is equivalent to the Pomak numeral lexeme “edín - enná - ennó / adín - anná - annó / idín - inná - innó = one”; this fact may detect another phenomenon within the *Balkan Linguistic Contact Zone* (Krimpas, 2007) otherwise known as *Balkansprachbund*.

3. Definiteness and the tripartite definite article in Pomak

By definiteness a state is meant in which a complete description is given, so as to highlight a contrast with a distinction from other similar situations; this definition may be in accordance to the description of definite pronouns (Eleftheriadis, 2002: 239) or to more detailed ways of expressing definiteness (Mladenova, 2007: 9-11). Nevertheless, definiteness is a state, in which clear and defining characteristics of a concept are explicitly presented. In Pomak the main ways of expressing definiteness are the systems of personal pronouns, the definite article, as well as the definite and demonstrative pronouns. It has also been shown that the definite article originates from definite and demonstrative pronouns standardized via a complex mechanism (Anagnostopoulos, 1922: 169; Lazarou 2000: 20-24; Constantinides, 2007: 68-74; Lazarou, 2017: 108-116).

Definiteness is also expressed by means of the verb inflection system, namely the indicative mood, since “*indicative is called the verb mood that presents the act as a certain one*” [originally expressed: «Ὀριστική λέγεται ἡ ἔγκλισις τοῦ ῥήματος, ἡ ὁποία παριστᾷ τὴν πράξιν ὡς βεβαίαν»] (Tzartanos, 2005: 95). This means that the indicative mood specifies the meaning of a verb as something certain and real, with no assumptions, desires, telicities, or commands (W.G.C.E.S.R.: 73,144), e.g. “fchéra letâsho = yesterday it rained”, where a certain action and the time that it takes place are both defined.

3.1. Definiteness in Pomak is mainly expressed in three basic ways: the system of the tripartite definite article, the systems of personal, definite and demonstrative pronouns, as well as the inflected verb system of the indicative mood.

3.1.1. As far as Pomak is concerned, the definite article appears as a tripartite suffix according to the following Table 5, e.g. “máykasa = the mother next to me” - “máykata = the mother next to you” - “máykana = the mother somewhere far”.

Type	Gender	Singular	Plural
1 st	masculine	-os	-se
	feminine	-sa	-se
	neutral	-so	-sa
2 nd	masculine	-ot	-te
	feminine	-ta	-te
	neutral	-to	-ta
3 rd	masculine	-on	-ne
	feminine	-na	-ne
	neutral	-no	-na

When the above articles are combined with nouns their declension in all genders, cases and numbers is structured as shown in the following table:

Type	Noun	Article	1 st /-s-/	2 nd /-t-/	3 rd /-n-/
Cases					
Masculine					
Singular					
Nominative	dado	-os/-ot/-on	dados	dadot	dadon
Gen./Dat.	dâdu	-se/-te/-ne	dâduse	dâdute	dâdune
Accusative	dâda	-se/-te/-ne	dâdase	dâdate	dâdane
Vocative	dâdo	—	dâdo	dâdo	dâdo
Plural					
Nominative	dâdove	-se/-te/-ne	dâdovese	dâdovete	dâdovene
Gen./Dat.	dâdovem	-se/-te/-ne	dâdovemse	dâdovemte	dâdovemne
Accusative	dâdove	-se/-te/-ne	dâdovese	dâdovete	dâdovene
Vocative	dâdove	—	dâdove	dâdove	dâdove
Feminine					
Singular					
Nominative	zhoná	-sa/-ta/-na	zhónasa	zhónata	zhónana
Gen./Dat.	zhónoy	-se/-te/-ne	zhónoyse	zhónoyte	zhónoyne
Accusative	zhóno	-so/-to/-no	zhónoso	zhónoto	zhónono
Vocative	zhóno	—	zhóno	zhóno	zhóno
Plural					
Nominative	zhónĩ	-se/-te/-ne	zhónĩse	zhónĩte	zhónĩne
Gen./Dat.	zhónom	-se/-te/-ne	zhónomse	zhónomte	zhónomne
Accusative	zhónĩ	-se/-te/-ne	zhónĩse	zhónĩte	zhónĩne
Vocative	zhónĩ	—	zhónĩ	zhónĩ	zhónĩ
Neutral					
Singular					
Nominative	sélo	-so/-to/-no	sélosó	séloto	sélonó
Gen./Dat.	sélu	-se/-te/-ne	séluse	sélute	sélune
Accusative	sélo	-so/-to/-no	sélosó	séloto	sélonó
Vocative	sélo	—	sélo	sélo	sélo
Plural					

Nominative	selá	-sa/-ta/-na	selása	seláta	selána
Gen./Dat.	sélom	-se/-te/-ne	selómse	selómte	selómne
Accusative	selá	-sa/-ta/-na	selása	seláta	selána
Vocative	selá	—	selá	selá	selá

3.1.2. Personal pronouns in Pomak are expressed by means of the following lexemes (Theocharidis, 1996a: 58-59; Kokkas, 2004a: 244):

Table 7	
The system of Personal Pronouns in Pomak	
Primary	Secondary
“ya = I”	“to = he” - “te = she” - “to = it”
“tī = you”	“envá = he” - “enás = she” - “envá = it”
“toy = he” - “tya = she” - “to = it”	“enozí = he”
“níye = we”	“aynvák = he” - “aynvá = she” - “aynází = it”
“vīye = you”	“ináy = she”
“tīye = they” - “tīye = they” - “to = they”	“izí = it”
	“aysvák = he” - “aysvá = she” - “aysvá = it”

3.1.3. The system of definite pronouns in Pomak is expressed by means of the following lexemes (Theocharidis, 1996a: 64-65):

Table 8	
The system of Definite Pronouns in Pomak	
tósi - tyási - tósi = the same	yénnakof - yénnakva - yénnakvo = the same
samíchek - samíchka - samíchko = alone	atvábsi = the same (feminine in accusative) aitvási = the same (neutral)

3.1.5. The system of definite pronouns in Pomak is expressed by means of the following lexemes (Theocharidis, 1996a: 63; Papadimitiou, 2008: 209):

Table 9	
The system of Demonstrative Pronouns in Pomak	
aynvák - aynóva - aysvá = that one	inází - ináy - inází = that one
aysiés - aysiéva - aysiés = this	itází - itáy - itází = this
aysvák - aysvá - aysvá = this	isakvónef - isakváne - isakvóne = this much
aynekózen = such	isákvozen - isákvazne - isákvozne = this much here
aytólkus = this much	itákvozen - itákvazne - itákvozne = such
eynazí - eynáy - eynazí = that one	inákvozen - inákvazne - inákvozne = this much there
isází - isáy - isází = this one	

3.1.6. Regarding the inflected verb system in Pomak, the following table presents the declension of a model verb in the 1st singular person of the indicative mood in twelve

tenses and two voices (Constantinides, 2007: 47-49). The Pomak verb forms are given in black bold letters:

Table 10		
Indicative Mood of the verb “kólem = slaughter”		
Tense	Active Voice	Passive Voice
Present	kólem I slaughter	kólem so I am slaughtered
Imperfect	kólesho I was slaughtering	kólesho so I was being slaughtered
Simple Future	she zakólem I will slaughter	she so zakólem I will be slaughtered
Future Continuous	she kólem I will be slaughtering	she so kólem I will being slaughtered
Simple Past	zакláh I slaughtered	zакláh so I was slaughtered
Simple Present Perfect	som zакlál I have slaughtered	zакlál so som I have been slaughtered
Present Perfect Continuous	som klal I have been slaughtering	klal so som I have being slaughtered
Simple Past Perfect	bésho zакlál I had slaughtered	zакlál so beh I had been slaughtered
Past Perfect Continuous	bésho klal I had been slaughtering	klal so beh I had being slaughtered
Future Perfect	she som zакlál I will have slaughtered	she so som zакlál I will have been slaughtered
Future in the Past	te beh zакlál I would slaughter	te beh so zакlál I would be slaughtered
Future Perfect in the Past	mózhazho da beh zакlál I would have slaughtered	she som so zакlál I would have been slaughtered

3.2. Definiteness in ancient Greek is expressed by means of the system of the definite article, the system of personal, definite and demonstrative pronouns, as well as the inflected verb system of the indicative mood spread in seven tenses, about which no further discussion is needed here. The definitive article in singular nominative case is formed by the lexemes “ó - ή - τό = the”, the personal pronouns by “έγώ = I” - “σύ = you” - “(ού) = (his)” etc., the definite pronouns by “αὐτός = he” - “αὐτή = she” - “αὐτό = it”, while the demonstrative pronouns have a variety of types such as “οὗτος - αὕτη - τοῦτο = this one” and “ὅδε - ἥδε - τόδε = this one here”, the latter converging to the definite article in terms of lexemes (Tzartanos, 2005: 73, 75-76, 74-75, 83-85).

3.3. In modern Greek definiteness is expressed by means of the systems of the definite article “ο - η - το = the”, of personal pronouns “εγώ = I” - “εσύ = you” - “αυτός = he” - “αυτή = she” - “αυτό = it”, of definite pronouns “ο ίδιος = himself” - “η ίδια = herself” - “το ίδιο = itself”, “μόνος - μόνη - μόνο = alone” etc., of demonstrative pronouns “αυτός - αυτή - αυτό = this”, “ετούτος - ετούτη - ετούτο = this one”, “τέτοιος - τέτοια - τέτοιο = such and such”, “τόσος - τόση - τόσο = so and so”

(W.G.C.E.S.R.: 72, 129-130, 133-134), as well as by means of the inflected verb system in the indicative mood, about which no further discussion is needed here.

3.4. In Bulgarian definiteness is expressed via the system of the definite article and the systems of pronouns (personal, definite and demonstrative), as well as via the inflected verb system of the indicative mood.

3.4.1. The system of the definite article [определителен член or членуване] in Bulgarian, as in Pomak, is a suffix, but it exists only in one form with three genders and two numbers (the masculine definite article has two case forms) (Lampsidis, 1968: 75-82):

The System of Definite Article in Bulgarian			
Uniform type	Gender	Singular	Plural
	Masculine		-ЪТ , -ЯТ
Feminine		-ТА	-ТЕ, -ТА
Neutral		-ТО	-ТА, -ТЕ

The definite article is post-posed as a suffix at the end of a noun (adjective or pronoun), forming thus an “articled form of noun”: “мъж = man > мъжът = the man”, “жена = woman > жената = the woman”, “село = village > селото = the village”.

3.4.2. The system of personal pronouns [лични местоимения] is expressed by means of the following lexemes: “аз = I” - “ти = you” - “той - тя - то = he - she - it” (Lampsidis 1968: 109).

3.4.3. The system of definite pronouns [обобщителни местоимения] is expressed by means of the following lexemes: “всеки/всеки - всяка/всяка - всяко/всяко = everyone” (Lampsidis 1968: 139).

3.4.4. The system of demonstrative pronouns [показателни местоимения] is expressed via the below lexemes: “този/тоя - тази/тая - това/туй = this”, “онзи/оня - онази/оня - онова/онуй = that” (Lampsidis, 1968: 123).

3.4.5. The system of the inflected verb in the indicative mood takes place in nine tense structures (Lampsidis, 1968: 234), given here for comparison reasons:

The Bulgarian sub-system of Indicative Mood and its tenses		
1.	Сегашно време	обичам
	Present	I love
2.	Минало несвършено	обичах (обичах)
	Imperfect	I was loving
3.	Минало свършено	обичах (обичах)
	Simple Past	I loved
4.	Минало неопределено	обичал съм
	Present Perfect	I have loved
5.	Минало предварително	бях обичал

	Past Perfect	I had loved
6.	Бъдеще време	ще обичам
	Futur	I will love
7.	Бъдеще в миналото	щях да обичам
	Futur in Past	I would love
8.	Бъдеще предварително	ще съм обичал
	Futur Perfect	I will have loved
9.	Бъдеще предварително в миналото	щях да съм обичал
	Futur Perfect in Past	I would have loved

3.5. In Turkish, where there is no article at all, definiteness is mainly expressed by means of the systems of personal pronouns, indicative demonstrative adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, idiomatic structures of definiteness, as well as the inflected verb system that comprises seven tenses (Dimitriadis, 1962: 10), about which no further discussion is needed here.

3.5.1. The system of personal pronouns [kişi-şahis adilları] is expressed via the below lexemes: “ben = I” - “sen = you” - “o = he - she - it” (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 62).

3.5.2. The system of definitive demonstrative adjectives [belirtme gösterme önadları] consists of the lexemes “bu = this here” - “şu = the one by you” - “o = that”, which define a noun, in order to express its accurate place in accordance to the distance from the person speaking (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 45).

3.5.3. The system of demonstrative pronouns [işaret adilları] “bu = this here” - “şu = the one by you” - “o = that”, that converge in terms of lexemes and semantics with the demonstrative adjectives (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 65-66).

3.5.4. With respect to the idiomatic structures of definiteness there exists the one of "specific noun determiner" [belirtli ad tamlaması] or otherwise "genitive of specified form" (Spoken Testimony H.O., G-07-01, Nicolaos Th. Constantinides' Archive of Oral History - At this point I would like to express my gratitude to my professor in Turkish, Mr Hamza Osman, an excellent teacher full of innovations and a totally integral person). This consists of a noun in genitive case placed before an other noun, which bears the suffix of 3rd person in possessive case, i.e. an attached morpheme (or one of its allomorphs according to the vowel harmony) -ı / -i / -u / -ü , e.g. “kadının çantası = the (specific) bag of the (specific) woman”, etc. (Daphnopatidis & Sanlioglou, 2011: 39-65).

3.5.5. Finally, there is the idiomatic structure of the definite object [belirtili nesne], where to object is placed in accusative case e.g. “ver cantayı = give the (specific) bag” (Nesne, 2017; Heusinger & Kornflit, 2005: 5).

3.6. Therefore, as far as definiteness is concerned, Pomak presents a convergence with Greek in terms of structures in exhibiting a definite article system and a system of definite and demonstrative pronouns, but a divergence in terms of the existence of the definite article in a tripartite and suffix form. Pomak converges to standard Bulgarian

by expressing the definite article system in a suffix form, but divergences in the existence of a tripartite system, even though a tripartite article exists in the idioms of various regions in Bulgaria (Petkov, 2000: 240-241); it also converges by expressing the definite and demonstrative pronoun system (both in terms of lexemes and structures). Pomak also converges to Turkish by implementing a system of demonstrative pronouns, but convergences from the Turkish idiomatic structures of definiteness. In comparison to all languages, Pomak convergences by materializing a sub-system of indicative mood within the verb system, but divergences in the number of tenses and their forming.

4. The Tripartite Definite Article

As mentioned above, Pomak has a tripartite definite article in a post-posed morpheme form, which is suffixed to the nominal lexeme it defines, making it difficult to distinguish between the two. In terms of structure, the post-posed suffix definite article is characteristic of Balkan languages, dialects and idioms, i.e. Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian, FYROM Slavic, as well as varieties spoken in Greece, such as Aromanian or Vlach (its natural speakers prefer the term *Armanian*, Lazarou, 2017: 117), Arvanitic (or *Arvanitika*, as the natural speakers call it, is a south Tosk dialect of Albanian, Hamp 2020) and Slavic vernaculars of Macedonia.

4.1. The phenomenon in Pomak and FYROM Slavic

Nevertheless, a tripartite definite article is traced in Pomak (both in Greece and Bulgaria), in standard FYROM Slavic, in several Slavic speaking villages of Albania, as well as in various idioms of Bulgaria and FYROM. More specifically, in Bulgaria the tripartite article extends among the local varieties of Rhodope Mountain area (Родопски Говори) and especially the sub-groups of Smolyan (Смолянски Говор), Нвоунен (Хвойненски Говор), as well as the region of Trin (Трънски Говор). Beyond the Bulgarian borders, the tripartite article is found in the areas of Tetovo (Тетовски Говор), Beles (Велешки Говор), Bitola (Битолски Говор), Debir (Дебърски Говор) and Prespa (Преспански Говор) (Stoykov, 2002: 129-135, 167-168, 171-177, 179-180). There is also a tripartite article in several Slavic-speaking villages in Albania, in the areas of Gora - Prizrenka Gora, Kukâska Gora, and Golo Bârdo (Constantinides, 2007: 42).

Concerning the tripartite definite article in the FYROM Slavic language and according to the official grammar classification, the first type denotes generality or vagueness, the second denotes proximity and the third, distance. This classification was reset in following Table 13, in order to make easier a comparison and a semantic correspondence to Pomak.

Tripartite Definite Article System in Nominative Case						
Pomak	FYROM Slavic					
Gender	Type	Singular	Plural	Type	Singular	Plural
masculine	1 st	-os	-se	2 nd	-он	-не
feminine		-sa	-se		-на	-не
neutral		-so	-sa		-н	-на

masculine	2 nd	-ot	-te	3 rd	-OT	-TE
feminine		-ta	-te		-TA	-TE
neutral		-to	-ta		-TO	-TA
masculine	3 rd	-on	-ne	1 st	-OB	-BE
feminine		-na	-ne		-BA	-BE
neutral		-no	-na		-BO	-BA

The three types of Pomak article have to do with the distance of the object in reference from the speaker or the listener (Kokkas, 2004: 46, 72, 88). The use of the three formulas usually implies the following:

1. The first formula indicates the proximity of the object in reference to the speaker, e.g. “máykasa = the mother here next to me > this mother”.
2. The second type denotes the proximity of the object in reference to the listener, e.g. “máykata = the mother next to you > that mother”.
3. The third type shows the distance of the object in reference from the speaker or the listener; it is also used to state objects in reference which are absent from the occasion or to state a definiteness in general. (Kyranoudis, 1996-1998: 172), e.g. “máykana = the mother in general > the mother somewhere far away”. Somehow this situation could be described as *a spatial or partial indefiniteness within a definiteness!*

4.2. Points of view on the origins of the phenomenon

As for the existence of a tripartite article, there are various opinions, the main ones of which are:

1. As early as the 13th century, the deictics of Old Church Slavonic had been grammaticalized into inflected deictics to then turn into inflected articles (Adamou, 2009: 6).
2. Another point of view insists that tripartite definitives are innovations of certain varieties, but did not evolve equally within all the south Slavic languages (Adamou, 2009: 6-7).
3. Undoubtedly, the existence of a tripartite article in Pomak derives from the system of tripartite demonstrative pronouns of the Old Church Slavonic *съ - сѹ - се / тѣ - та - то / онѣ - она - оно* in a post-posed suffix position (Kanevska-Nikolova, 2006: 21, 207; Lunt 1966: 52).

Of course, as mentioned before, the phenomenon of the definite article in an post-posed and suffix form exists as a structure in the Balkan Language Contact Zone (Balkansprachbund), since it also takes place in Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian and FYROM Slavic, as well as in varieties spoken in Greece, such as Armanian, Arvanitika and Slavic ones.

It should also be mentioned very briefly that the post-posed article in the above varieties has followed a long way. Ancient Greek has provided, on one hand, the phenomenon of a definite article, on the other hand the plasticity of repositioning the terms (article, noun, adjective, pronoun) within a sentence. Vernacular (Eastern) Latin and Slavonic offered the possibility of post-posing the familiar demonstrative pronouns, that the corresponding definite post-posed article has emerged from, which has been suffixed to the defined term by pronouncing them together. Then, the Gothic language appeared in the Balkans and acted as a catalyst, since it had already been using a rather comparable phenomenon of suffixed demonstrative and relative pronouns (Lehmann 1994: 27, 29). Finally, the action of the “semi-educated” scholars

with a strong desire for over-correction (while translating texts from vernacular medieval and early modern Greek) contributed to the spread and consolidation of the phenomenon (Anagnostopoulos, 1922: 169; Lazarou, 2000: 20-24; Constantinides, 2007: 68-74; Lazarou, 2017: 108-116).

5. The tripartite determiner

As seen from all the above, Pomak varieties have a definite article system, which is expressed in a tripartite suffix form that highlights a tripartite deictic contrast of either proximity or distance. Recent research shows that this is part of a greater phenomenon, that of tripartite determiner contrast.

5.1. The phenomenon of the tripartite determiner contrast

According to all the above mentioned and concerning the tripartite article in Pomak, we may note the following:

1. It is obvious that it originates in the Old Church Slavonic demonstrative pronouns *съ - си - се / мъ - ма - мо / онъ - она - оно* (Kanevska-Nikolova, 2006: 21, 207; Lunt 1966: 52). This fact provides an additional argument to the opinion that Pomak emerged from Old Slavonic and followed its own course.
2. This means that it is expressed by means of the three deictic phonemes / -s- /, / -t- /, / -n- /, which indicate “the contrasts of proximity ~ distance, in accordance to the reference points of the speaker and the listener” (Papadimitriou 2008 : 209; Kehaya 2015: 50).
3. Thus, tripartite relationships occur, which are expressed as: near determiners / distant determiners / general determiners. This fact, in its turn, encompasses a variety of semantic features of diffusion, time, communication or situation (Kanevska-Nikolova, 2006: 21, 207).
4. In addition, the main result appears to be the imprint of a tripartite contrast in space and time (Constantinides, 2007: 74; Adamou, 2011).

5.2. Depiction on space - time and other determiner links

Thus, in Pomak the tripartite contrast creates grammatical phenomena at various levels, such as time, place, quantity, reference, situation, manner, etc., either in the inflected or the uninflected system. This part of the tripartite contrast is excellently valuable, because it is expressed by means of either a suffix or a prefix, while it may provide explanatory keys into the context of the transition from the pre-position to the post-position of the definitive article.

5.2.1. The tripartite definite article and its possessive links

As far as the inflected system is concerned, within the system of the definite article, the deictic phonemes of the tripartite determiners (/ -s- /, / -t- /, / -n- /) are used to express possessive relationships (within the division between space and time) as well, since it has been shown that the tripartite suffix article in Pomak also functions as a possessive marker depending on the context, thus specifying the spatial or temporal proximity of the persons involved, e.g.

1. “máyka = mother” >
“máykasa = the mother here next to me ” therefore “my mother”
(Constantinides, 2007: 42-43).
2. “stóri húbavo da naydэш belóto” =

“do good, so as to find *the trouble next to you*” therefore “to find *your trouble*”: a popular proverb from the village Prosilion of Xanthi Prefecture (Kokkas, 2006: 304).

Yet, it should be noted that in Pomak there are two additional ways of expressing possessive links:

1. The system of possessive pronouns “móy = my”, “tvóy = your”, “tógof = his” - “tóyin = her” - “tógof = its”, “nash = our”, “vash = your”, “tâhan = their”) (Kokkas, 2004: 88)
2. By producing possessive adjectives from original words with the addition of suffixes **-f**, **-va**, **-vo**. (e.g. “Rahmí = Rahmi (a person's name)” > “Rahmief = Rahmi's”, “kâmen = stone” > “kâmenövo = made of stone” (Constantinides, 2007: 44).

5.2.2. The tripartite determiner and the system of demonstrative pronouns

Regarding the inflection system, within the demonstrative pronoun system one finds differences of the tripartite contrast, that are expressed by means of the three deictic phonemes, which imprints a strong trace in space as follows (Papadimitriou, 2008: 209):

Deixis	Determinative Deictics			Qualitative Deictics		
	masculine	feminine	neutral	masculine	feminine	neutral
proximity to the speaker /s/	isázi this one	isázi this one	isázi this one	isákvozen such one here	isákvazne such one here	isákvozne such one here
proximity to the listener /t/	itázi this	itázi this	itázi this	itákvozen such one	itákvtazne such one	itákvozne such one
distance from both /n/	inázi that	inázi that	inázi that	inákvozen such one there	inákvtazne such one there	inákvozne such one there

5.2.3. Tripartite determiner in the uninflected system

Regarding the uninflected system, the differences of the tripartite contrast with the three deictic phonemes are implemented in various ways, creating corresponding adverbial links, while an intense division of space and time is formed (Constantinides, 2007: 75; Adamou, 2009: 3; Papadimitriou, 2013: 369):

Deixis	(/s-/) identification with the speaker / here / now	(/t-/) identification with the interlocutor / there / in the past	(/n-/) identification with someone else / in the future / repeatedly
Original lexemes			
Suffixed			
kugá	[kugása]	kugáta	kugána

when;	when / whenever (regarding me / in the present)	when / whenever (regarding you / in the past)	when / whenever (regarding him - her - it / in the future)
kólku how much?	kólkuso so much (for me)	kólkuto so much (for you)	kólkuno so much (for him)
kák how?	kákxa as I	kákta as you	kákna as he - she - it
kadé where?	kadésu where I	kadétu where you	kadénu where he - she - it there
Prefixed			
(kólku) how much ?	isélkus so much here / so much for me	itélkus so much there / so much for you	inélkus so much over there / so much for him
-îy here / there	isîy near here	itîy there by you	inîy far there
Notes: 1. A Pomak lexeme in brackets [] is very rare (Spoken Testimony R.B., E-63-02, Nicolaos Th. Constantinides' Archive of Oral History). 2. A Pomak lexeme in parentheses () is likely to be the original form for the corresponding derivative.			

In addition, it should be noted that the phenomenon of tripartite contrast concerning time also occurs as an early stage and in Old Slavonic, but the pronoun stem is prefixed to the temporal morpheme “/-gda/ < godŭ = year, time”: “kogda = when” - “togda = then” - “ovogda = now” (Lunt, 1966: 67).

5.2.4. The tripartite determination in the system of subordinate clauses

The variety and the tripartite dimension of the uninflected lexemes of space, time, quantity, reference, situation, manner, etc. creates respective phenomena of a tripartite contrast, when these lexemes introduce subordinate clauses (Adamou, 2009: 3). For example, those subordinate temporal sentences introduced by a tripartite lexeme of time: “kugása” - “kugáta” - “kugána” acquire the semantic values that are shown in Table 14 above.

5.2.5. The tripartite determiner in other languages

The tripartite determiner in most languages is mainly expressed at the level of demonstrative pronouns:

1. In Greek there is the system “αυτός - αυτή - αυτό = this” - “εκείνος - εκείνη - εκείνο = that” - “ο άλλος - η άλλη - το άλλο = the other”, which extends to limited adverbial relationships.
2. In Turkish there is the system of definitive demonstrative adjectives “bu = this here” - “şu = the one by you” - “o = that” (which may be etymologically linked to the personal pronouns “ben = I”, “sen = you”, “o = he - she - it”, where the tripartite relationships originate from). These produce a variety of lexemes (inflected or uninflected), that create adverbial relationships referring to time, place, manner, quantity, reference, situation, etc., as shown in Table 16 below.

Table 16

Tripartite Determiner of Adverbial Links in Turkish				
Part of Speech	prefix phoneme	/b-/	/s- /, / ş-/	/o-/
	Type	1 st	2 nd	3 rd
Personal Pronouns [Kışı Adılları]	uninflected	ben = I	sen = you	o = he - she - it
Adverbs of Manner [Durum Belirleçleri]	uninflected	bence = in my opinion	sence = in your opinion	once = in his - her - its opinion
Demonstrative Pronouns [İşaret Adılları]	uninflected	bu = this	şu = the one by you	o = that
Adverbs of Manner [Durum Belirleçleri]	uninflected	bunca = this big / this time	şunca = by you big / by your time	onca = that big / that time
Local Adverbs [Yer Belirleçleri]	inflected	Cases		
	Nominative	[bura] = here	[şura] = by you	[ora] = there
	Genitive	buranın	şuranın	oranın
	Dative	buraya	şuraya	oraya
	Accusative	burayı	şurayı	orayı
	Locative	burada	şurada	orada
Local Adverbs [Yer Belirleçleri]	Ablative	buradan	şuradan	oradan
	uninflected	burası = here	şurası = next to you	orası = there
Local Adverbs [Yer Belirleçleri]	uninflected	buradaki = here below	şuradaki = by you below	oradaki = there below
Demonstrative Adverbs [Gösterme Belirleçleri]	uninflected	böylesi= as such here	şöylesi= as such there	öylesi= as such over there
Notes: 1. The Table has been based on (Zeginis - Hidiroglou 1995: 109, 112, 113, 114, 186, 187). 2. Turkish lexemes in brackets [] are almost inexistent.				

3. Nevertheless, most European languages have a bipartite rather than tripartite determiner: In English e.g. the demonstratives “this” and “that” are used to express such bipartite relationships.

5.3. To summarize all the above, it is ascertained that in Pomak a complex of tripartite relationships is created, which initially is expressed via the system of the tripartite definite article, then spread to multiple determiner levels (of space, time, quantity, reference, situation, manner, etc.). It should be noted that many of the above

phenomena may be unconsciously applied and evolve independently by a natural speaker; however these phenomena do not cease to reveal the complex possibilities of expression in Pomak.

6. From language, time and space, to identity-otherness.

Summarizing all the above, it is found that in Pomak, apart from the tripartite division of the acting persons in 1st / 2nd / 3rd (which is namely expressed by the system of personal pronouns, i.e. “ya = I” - “tī = you” - “toy - tya - to = he - she - it” and which forms a tripartite distinction between identity and otherness), at the same time a tripartite system of determiners and contrasts occurs, which adds extra categorizations to the ‘identity-vs.-otherness’ system itself. In order to understand the further relationships of identity-otherness within the phenomenon of the tripartite determiner-contrast, it is necessary to seek several components of human identity and otherness, in more general terms.

6.1. According to Plato, one of the five main “principles” of the human soul is “identity”. In his work, *Timaeus* he writes: “... it is said that the origins of all beings (lie in) existence, identity, otherness, movement, stasis” [«...ἔλεγεν ἀρχὰς πάντων τῶν ὄντων, τὴν οὐσίαν, τὴν ταυτότητα, τὴν ἑτερότητα, τὴν κίνησιν, τὴν στάσιν»]. More specifically, in order to describe identity, he defined otherness at the same time: “... there is also identity, since it is from the same origin that we have otherness too, because there is a great variety of beings, and where (one finds) multitude, there (one finds) otherness” [«...ἔστι καὶ ταυτότης, καθὸ ἐκ μιᾶς τῆς τῶν ὄντων ἐσμέν ἀρχῆς ἔχομεν δὲ καὶ ἑτερότητα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πλῆθος ἐστὶ τὰ ὄντα, ὅπου δὲ πλῆθος ἐκεῖ ἡ ἑτερότης»]. Indeed, “because it is said that identity and otherness originate in the same essence, but an essence (that is) not random, but (deriving) from the indivisible essence and from the one which is divisible for bodies; for it is said that the essence of the soul is made of both, so that it is cognizant of both” [“φησὶ γὰρ ἐξ οὐσίας τε αὐτὴν εἶναι καὶ ταυτότητος καὶ ἑτερότητος, οὐσίας δὲ οὐ τῆς τυχούσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς τε ἀμερίστου οὐσίας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ σώματα μεριστῆς· ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γὰρ τούτων γενέσθαι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς οὐσίαν φησὶν, ἵνα καὶ γνωστικὴ ἦ ἀμφοτέρων”] (Philoponi 1896: 74-75). After all, identity constitutes an additional foundation of the subjective certainty of existence (Christakis, 1997: 213).

In other words, where there is “edín - enná - enno = one”, there exists also “taftótita = identity”; where there is “mlógo = many”, there exists also “líchen = otherness” (Spoken Testimony R.B., E-63-03, Nicolaos Th. Constantinides’ Archive of Oral History. At this point I would like to express many thanks, as well as my gratitude, to my “Pomak daskaliye”, Mr. Rahmí Bassiá, an excellent person and a pioneer in the field of teaching).

Nevertheless, many similar people form a “collective identity”, that differs from an other identity, which in comparison to the initial identity consist an otherness. Identity and otherness constitute at the same time a union and a distinction, as characteristically said by Empedocles: “... it is seen in all an identity and an otherness, as well as a union and a diversity” [«...ἑώρα ἐν πᾶσι καὶ ταυτότητα καὶ ἑτερότητα, καὶ ἔνωσιν καὶ διάκρισιν»] (Philoponi 1896: 74). In addition, the concepts of “self” and “other” are considered to be complementary ones, since they constitute a sense of personal identity, while the concept of “otherness” is “a key element for any

socio-cognitive system of categorization and representation of the environment” (Kortsari, 2005: 12).

The most important manifestation of a given identity is the common language of the respective group, which in addition to religion, value system, manners, customs, ethics, aesthetics, and the general way of life, make up their collective identity. Furthermore, the integration into a collective identity is marked at the same time with the birth of every person (Isaacs, 1975: 32). This is one of the reasons why UNESCO considers that the concept of “culture” includes everything that is socially transmissible or inherited and whose carrier is a language (Tsitselikis, 1996: 96). It is typically stated that, until a person manages to acquire the structures of a language, he/she can neither speak nor understand his/her fellow-persons; thus he/she remains, in a way, an “intruder”, a fact that has been happening since the human species acquired speech (Encyclopædia Britannica, 1969: 665).

Yet, speech shapes forms of culture. For Classical Folkloristics, “*popular speech*” is included in the “*monuments of speech*” (Politis, 1909: 10; Loukatos, 1963: 91), which are expressed through a formulated and technically processed speech, set in a chronological sequence. However, there are also oral narratings, which exhibit a genuine expression of “popular speech”, since they are produced in a spontaneous, idiomatic, artless and instantaneous speech, in contrast to the folk narrative, which is “*after the song, the most important linguistic and literary manifestation of the people, a mirror of spirituality and social life*” (Loukatos, 1957: ζ'). This kind of speech expresses, on one hand, the identity of the narrator, since it reveals his/her personal idiom and, on the other hand, the collective identity of the narrator’s group of origin, as it is a subset of the local variant of his place of origin. Therefore it constitutes a popular speech form coming from a person who carries a dual characteristic: on one hand, he/she has an (individual) identity and, on the other hand, he/she is a member of a specific collective identity, i.e. a social group, which constitutes otherness to other individual and collective identities (Constantinides & Stylianidou, 2017: 54).

The first grammarians (the Alexandrian scholars studying the structures of the ancient Greek language) distinguished that the linguistic structures included “... *the three persons of speech, i.e. this one that speaks (I, or the first person), the one to whom the speech is addressed (you, or the second person) and that one whom the speech is about (he/she/it, or the third person)*” [originally: «...τὰ τρία πρόσωπα τοῦ λόγου, ἤτοι ἐκεῖνον, ὁποῖος ὁμιλεῖ (ἐγώ, πρῶτον πρόσωπον), ἐκεῖνον πρὸς τὸν ὁποῖον ἀπευθύνεται ὁ λόγος (σύ, δεύτερον πρόσωπον) καὶ ἐκεῖνον, περὶ τοῦ ὁποῖου γίνεται λόγος (ὄδε, οὗτος, τρίτον πρόσωπον)», Tzartanos, 2005: 73]. This structure is expressed in a corresponding manner, when it concerns two or more persons, in which case we are talking about either a dual or a plural form.

The above three-person classification covers almost all European languages, including all the Slavic ones (hence also Pomak). In addition, the above structures are tantamount to some identity-vs.-otherness expression, which can be illustrated as follows:

Expression of Identity and Otherness			
No	Kind	Person	Pronoun
1.	Identity	1 st singular	“ya” or “I”

2.	Collective Identity	1 st plural	“níye” ή “we”
3.	Otherness	2 ^{ns} & 3 rd singular	“tī” ή “you” “toy-tya-to” ή “he-she-it”
4.	Multitude of Otherness	2 nd & 3 rd plural	“vīye” ή “you” “tīye-tīye-to” ή “they”

1. Identity appears as “the first singular person”, which consists of the personal pronoun “ya” or “I”, both in Pomak and English.
2. Collective identity occurs as “the first plural person”, which is expressed by means of the personal pronoun “níye” or “we”.
3. Otherness comes out as “the second singular person”, which is realized by the pronoun “tī” or “you”; it also shows up as “the third singular person”, which comprises three genders expressed via the personal pronouns “toy-tya-to” or “he-she-it”.
4. The multitude of otherness exists as “the second plural person”, which is presented by the personal pronoun “vīye” or “you”; it also appears as “the third plural person”, which comprises three genders expressed via the personal pronouns “tīye-tīye-to” or “they”.

6.2. However, Pomak does not stop at the usual, but evidences further levels of identity and otherness; it structures them in space and time, since the primary principle of the three persons acquires additional categorizations in the system of identity-otherness by the use of the Tripartite Determiners / -s- /, / -t- /, / -n- /, as shown in Table 18 below:

Table 18									
A Complex Combination of Tripartite Determiners / -s- /, / -t- /, / -n- / with Identity-Otherness in Pomak									
No	1 st person	2 nd person	3 rd person						
1.	ya	concerning me	-s	tī	concerning me	-t	toy-tya-to	concerning me	-n
2.	ya	concerning you	-t	tī	concerning you	-s	toy-tya-to	concerning you	-t
3.	ya	concerning him-her-it	-n	tī	concerning him-her-it	-n	toy-tya-to	concerning him-her-it	-s
4.	ya	concerning us	-s	tī	concerning us	-t	toy-tya-to	concerning us	-n
5.	ya	concerning you (plural)	-t	tī	concerning you (plural)	-s	toy-tya-to	concerning you (plural)	-t

6.	ya	concerning them	-n	tī	concerning them	-n	toy-tya-to	concerning them	-s
7.	nīye	concerning me	-s	vīye	concerning me	-t	tīye-tīye-to	concerning me	-n
8.	nīye	concerning you	-t	vīye	concerning you	-s	tīye-tīye-to	concerning you	-t
9.	nīye	concerning him-her-it	-n	vīye	concerning him-her-it	-n	tīye-tīye-to	concerning him-her-it	-s
10.	nīye	concerning us	-s	vīye	concerning us	-t	tīye-tīye-to	concerning us	-n
11.	nīye	concerning you (plural)	-t	vīye	concerning you (plural)	-s	tīye-tīye-to	concerning you (plural)	-t
12.	nīye	concerning them	-n	vīye	concerning them	-n	tīye-tīye-to	concerning them	-s

It is, therefore, noted that (through the system of the three deictic phonemes of the tripartite determiner / **-s** /, / **-t** /, / **-n** /, as originally expressed by the definite article to be then transferred to the tripartite determiner of space, time and manner) Pomak defines at least thirty-six indexes of the distinction “identity-otherness”, which can simultaneously evolve and be defined in many different categorizations within the social dimension of time and space.

7. Conclusions

In the language varieties of Pomak spoken in Greek Thrace, indefiniteness is mainly expressed by means of the system of the indefinite article and the system of indefinite pronouns. The intermediate category of evidentiality could be labelled as *indirect indefiniteness* or *partial definiteness*, which in Bulgarian and Turkish is expressed within the inflected verb system as the sub-system of evidential mood, but in Pomak has not yet been sufficiently studied, even though its natural speakers confirm a limited use of it.

As far as definiteness is concerned, in the above language varieties it is mainly expressed by means of the systems of the definite article, of the definite and demonstrative pronouns, as well as of the inflected verb system in the indicative mood.

The existence of a system of a tripartite definite article, which is expressed through the three deictic phonemes / **-s** /, / **-t** /, / **-n** /, gives rise to subsequent tripartite determiners, which are reflected in time, space, manner and the quantitative qualities. Besides, proximity, distance and generality are principally expressed by a tripartite system, which shapes possessive relationships among the definiteness subjects, while, at the same time, it expresses delicate relationships among bonds of

identity and bonds of otherness, then being traced back to the dimensions of time and space in a social context.

The existence of such native and yet complex systems that express delicate relationships at multiple levels (even unknowingly -in most cases- by its natural speakers), means that Pomak is a complete and mature language, which needs to be brought forward at the level of society, literature, politics and even international relations.

Bibliography

- Adamou, E. (2008). Sur les traces d'une dégrammaticalisation: le médiatif en pomaque (Grèce), Manuscrit auteur, publié dans "14^e Congrès international des Slavistes". Ohrid.
- Adamou, E. (2009), *Deixis and Temporal Subordinators in Pomak (Slavic, Greece)*, Retrieved on 11/09/2017 from: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00398498>.
- Adamou, E. (2011), *Temporal uses of Definite Articles and Demonstratives in Pomak (Slavic, Greece)*. Reterieved on 11/09/2017 from: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00556520>.
- Alexander, R. - Mladenova, O. (2000). *Intensive Bulgarian - A Textbook and Reference Grammar - Volume 1*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Anagnostopoulos, G. P. [Αναγνωστόπουλος, Γ.Π.] (1922), *Συμβολή πρώτη εις ιστορίαν τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης. Περὶ τοῦ ἄρθρου. Ἦτοι ἱστορικὴ ἔρευνα τῆς ἀναπτύξεως καὶ τῆς χρήσεως αὐτοῦ ἔν τε τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ καὶ τῇ νεωτέρᾳ ἑλληνικῇ*. [*First contribution to the history of Greek Language. About the Article. Namely a historic research of its development and its use in the Ancient and Modern Greek Language*], Ανατύπωσις εκ του ΛΔ' τόμου της ΑΘΗΝΑΣ. Εν Αθήναις: Τύποις Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου.
- IV Army Corps [Δ' Σώμα Στρατού] (1996). *Γραμματική Πομακικής Γλώσσας [Grammar of Pomak Language]*. Ξάνθη: Δ' Σώμα Στρατού.
- IV Army Corps [Δ' Σώμα Στρατού] (1997). *Συντακτικὸ Πομακικῆς Γλώσσας [Syntax of Pomak Language]*. Ξάνθη: Δ' Σώμα Στρατού.
- IV Army Corps [Δ' Σώμα Στρατού] (1998a). *Ελληνο-Πομακικὸ Λεξικὸ [Greek-Pomak Dictionary]*. Ξάνθη: Δ' Σώμα Στρατού.
- IV Army Corps [Δ' Σώμα Στρατού] (1998b). *Πομακικὸ -Ελληνο Λεξικὸ [Pomak-Greek Dictionary]*. Ξάνθη: Δ' Σώμα Στρατού.
- Bell, J. (1997), *Μεθοδολογικὸς σχεδιασμὸς παιδαγωγικῆς καὶ κοινωνικῆς ἔρευνας, [Methodological design of pedagogical and social research]*. Αθήνα: Gutenberg.
- Christakis, N. [Χρηστάκης, Ν.] (1997). Ομοιότητα και διαφορά, ομαδικότητα και ατομικότητα: ορισμένα από τα παράδοξα της ταυτότητας [Similarities and differences, groupness and individuality: several paradoxes of identity] in Navridis, K., Christakis, N. (ed.) [Ναυρίδης, Κ., Χρηστάκης Ν. (επ.)], *Ταυτότητες - Ψυχοκοινωνική συγκρότηση [Identities - Psychosocial formation]*. Αθήνα: εκδ. Καστανιώτης, pp. 213-238.
- Constantinides, N. [Κωνσταντινίδης, Ν.]. (2007). *Η πομακική πολιτισμική μονάδα στην ελληνική Θράκη από άποψη Παρευξινίων Σπουδών. Σύντομη ιστορική επισκόπηση, γλώσσα, ταυτότητες [Units of the Pomak Civilization in Greek*

- Thrace. Brief historical review, language and identities]. Μεταπτυχιακή Διατριβή [M.A.Thesis]. Δημοκρίτειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θράκης.
- Constantinides, N. [Κωνσταντινίδης, Ν]. (2008). Η πομακική πολιτισμική ενότητα στην ελληνική Θράκη. Σύντομη επισκόπηση ιστορικής, γλώσσας και ταυτοτήτων [The Union of Pomak Civilization. Brief overview of History, Language and Identity] in Varvounis, M. G., Tzoumerkas, P. (Ed) [Βαρβούνης, Μ. Γ., Τζουμέρκας, Π. (επ.)]. *Αλεξαδρινός Άμυτος. Αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη του Ι. Μ. Χατζηφώτη*, [Essays of Honour: Alexandrinos Amitos. Dedicated to the memory of I.M Xatziphotes] τόμος Α'. Αλεξάνδρεια: Έκδοση της Πατριαρχικής Βιβλιοθήκης του Πατριαρχείου Αλεξανδρείας, pp. 283-288.
- Constantinides, N., Stylianidou, V. [Κωνσταντινίδης, Ν., Στυλιανίδου, Β.] (2017). Συμβολή στη λαογραφική έρευνα: μνήμη και προφορικές μαρτυρίες [A contribution to folkloristic research: memory and oral narrations], *MARE PONTICUM* 6, pp. 50-70. Available on: http://mareponticum.bscc.duth.gr/vol_6.htm.
- Copans, J. (2004). *Η Επιτόπια Εθνολογική Έρευνα* [Field Ethnological Research]. Αθήνα: Gutenberg.
- Daphnopatidis, B., Sanlioglou, H. [Δαφνοπατίδης, Β., Σανλιόγλου, Χ.] (2011). *Τουρκική Γραμματική στα Ελληνικά* [Turkish Grammar in Greek]. Αθήνα: Perugia.
- Dimitriadis, M. [Δημητριάδης, Μ.] (1962). *Λεξικόν Ελληνο-Τουρκικόν Τουρκο-Ελληνικόν* [Greek-Turkish Turkis-Greek Dictionary]. Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Eleftheriadis, P. [Ελευθεριάδης, Π.] (2002). *Γραμματική της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας* [Grammar of Ancient Greek Language]. Αθήνα: Πόντος.
- Encyclopædia Britannica (1969). Grammar. *Encyclopædia Britannica, INC*, 10, pp. 663-668.
- Göknel, Y. (2012). *Turkish Grammar - Academic Edition*. Istanbul: Vivatinell Cosmopharmaceutics.
- Hamp, E. P., (2020). Albanian Language. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved on 07/12/2020 from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Albanian-language>.
- Isaacs, H. (1975). Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe in Glazer, N., Moynihan, D., (ed.), *Ethnicity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts-London: Harvard University Press.
- Ioannidou, A. [Ιωαννίδου, Α.] (1997). Τα σλαβικά ιδιώματα στην Ελλάδα, Γλωσσολογικές προσεγγίσεις πολιτικές αποκλίσεις [Slavic idioms in Greece, Linguistic approaches and political differences], in Gounaris, B., Michailidis, I., Angelopoulos, G. (ed.) [Γούναρης, Β., Μιχαηλίδης, Ι., Αγγελόπουλος, Γ. (επ.)], *Ταυτότητες στη Μακεδονία* [Identities in Macedonia]. Αθήνα: Παπαζήση, pp. 89-102.
- Kanevska-Nikolova, E. [Κανевска-Николовна, Ε.] (2006). *Тройното Членуване В Родопските Говору* [Tripartite Article in the Rhodope Dialects]. ΠΛΟΒΔΙВ: Университетско Издателство Паисий Хилендарски.
- Karahotza, R. (2021). *Rodopsky Dictionary, Online Pomak-Greek and Greek-Pomak Dictionary*. Retrieved on 20/02/2021 from: <https://pomlex.blogspot.com/2021/02/blog-post.html>.
- Karahotza, S. [Καραχότζα, Σ.] (2007). *Isíy zhivot Pomátsise- Έτσι ζούνε οι Πομάκοι* [That is how Pomaks live]. Ξάνθη.

- Karahotza, S. [Καραχότζα, Σ.] (2017). *Μεταφράσεις ελληνικής και αγγλικής ποίησης στην πομακική γλώσσα [Translation of Greek and English Poetry to Pomak Language]*. Ξάνθη: Πολιτιστικός Σύλλογος Πομάκων Ν. Ξάνθης.
- Kehaya, S. (2015). *An analysis of the Pomak language based on fieldwork research data*. M.A. Thesis. Aristotele University Thessaloniki.
- Kokkas, N. [Κόκκας, Ν.] (2004a). *Uchem so Pomatsko - Μαθήματα πομακικής γλώσσας [I learn Pomak - Lessons of Pomak Language]*. Ξάνθη: Π.Α.ΚΕ.ΘΡΑ.
- Kokkas, N. [Κόκκας, Ν.] (2004b). *Uchem so Pomatsko - Τεύχος Β' Ανθολόγιο Κειμένων [I learn Pomak - Issue B Anthology of Texts]*. Ξάνθη: Π.Α.ΚΕ.ΘΡΑ.
- Kokkas, N. [Κόκκας, Ν.] (2004c). *Uchem so Pomatsko - Βασικό λεξιλόγιο [I learn Pomak - Basic Vocabulary]*. Ξάνθη: Π.Α.ΚΕ.ΘΡΑ.
- Kokkas, N. [Κόκκας, Ν.] (2006). Η προφορική παράδοση των Πομάκων της Ροδόπης in Varvounis, M. (ed.) [Βαρβούνης, Μ. (επ.)], *Θράκη Ιστορική και Λαογραφική Προσέγγιση του Λαϊκού Πολιτισμού [Thracian Historic and Folkloristic Approach of Folk Civilization]*. Αθήνα: Αλήθεια, pp. 271-310.
- Kortsari, O. [Κορτσάρη, Ο.] (2005). *Μορφές του "Άλλου" σε ξενόγλωσσα μεταφρασμένα βιβλία λογοτεχνίας για παιδιά πρώτης σχολικής ηλικίας [Forms of the "Other" in foreign language translated literature books for primary school children]*. Μεταπτυχιακή Εργασία [M.A. Thesis]. Εθνικό Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών.
- Krimpas, P. G. [Κριμπάς, Π. Γ.] (2007). *Επιδράσεις της Νεότερης Ελληνικής στις Βαλκανικές Γλώσσες [Effects of Modern Greek to Balkan Languages]*. Αθήνα: εκδ. Γρηγόρη.
- Krimpas, P. G. [Κριμπάς, Π. Γ.] (2017). Η γλώσσα και η καταγωγή των Πομάκων υπό το φως της Βαλκανικής Ζώνης Γλωσσικής Επαφής [Language and origin of Pomaks under the light of the Balkan Linguistic Contact Zone] in Varvounis, M., Bartsiakas, A., Maha-Bizoumi, N. (ed.) [Βαρβούνης, Μ., Μπαρτσιώκας, Α., Μαχά-Μπιζούμη, Ν. (επ.)], *Οι Πομάκοι της Θράκης: Πολυεπιστημονικές και διεπιστημονικές προσεγγίσεις [Pomaks of Thrace: Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches]*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κ&Μ Σταμούλης, pp. 167-204.
- Kyranoudis, P. [Κυρανούδης, Π.] (1995-1998). Συμβολή στην ιστορία του Παπικίου Όρους [A contribution to the History of Mount Papikion] in *Θρακική Επετηρίδα* 10, pp. 163-191.
- Kyranoudis, P. [Κυρανούδης, Π.] (1996-1998). Οι Πομάκοι και η γλώσσα τους [Pomaks and their language]. *Ελληνική Διαλεκτολογία* 5, pp. 141-191.
- Lampsidis, I. [Λαμψίδης, Ι.] (1968). *Γραμματική της Βουλγαρικής Γλώσσας [Grammar of the Bulgarian Language]*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εταιρία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών - Ίδρυμα Μελετών Χερσονήσου του Αίμου.
- Lazarou, A. [Λαζάρου, Α.] (2000). *Οικογενειακοί δεσμοί και κοινότητα [Family Bonds and Community]*. Νομαρχιακή Αυτοδιοίκηση Ανατολικής Αττικής.
- Lazarou, A. [Λαζάρου, Α.] (2017). Γλώσσες Νοτιοανατολικής Ευρώπης με άρθρο επιτασσόμενο [Languages of Southeastern Europe with post-posed suffix article] in Lazarou, G. A. (ed.) [Λαζάρου, Γ. Α. (επ.)], *Αβελτηρίες Μεταπολιτευτικές [Post-Regime Change Atrocities]*. Αθήνα: Γ. Α. Λαζάρου, pp. 108-116.

- Lazarou, A. [Λαζάρου, Α.] (2017). Τα βλάχικα: γλώσσα ή διάλεκτος ή ιδίωμα; [Vlach: A Language or a Dialect or an Idiom?] in Lazarou, G. A. (ed.) [Λαζάρου, Γ. Α. (επ.)], *Αβελτηρίες Μεταπολιτευτικές [Post-Regime Change Atrocities]*. Αθήνα: Γ. Α. Λαζάρου, pp. 117-119.
- Leafgren, J. (2011). *A Concise Bulgarian Grammar*.
- Lehmann, W. P. (1994). Gothic and the reconstruction of Proto-Germanic. In E. König & J. van der Auwera (eds.), *The Germanic Languages*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge, pp. 19-37.
- Loukatos, D. [Λουκάτος Δ.] (1957). *Νεοελληνικά κείμενα [Modern Greek Texts]*, Αθήνα: Ζαχαρόπουλος.
- Loukatos, D. [Λουκάτος Δ.] (1963). *Σύγχρονα Λαογραφικά (Folklorica Contemporanea)*, Αθήνα.
- Lunt, H. G. (1966). *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Lydaki, A. [Λυδάκη Α.] (2001). *Ποιοτικές μέθοδοι της κοινωνικής έρευνας [Qualitative Methods of Social Research]*. Αθήνα: Καστανιώτης.
- Mazarakis, E. [Μαζαράκης, Ε.] (1964). *Η λαογραφική έρευνα και η συστηματική οργάνωσή της [Folklore research and its systematic organizing]*. Αθήνα.
- Maguire R., Timberlake, A. (1993). *American contributions to the eleventh international congress of slavists*. Slavica Publishers.
- Meraklis, M. [Μερακλής Μ.] (2004). *Ελληνική Λαογραφία [Greek Folkloristic]*. Αθήνα: Οδυσσέας.
- Mingazova N., Subich V., Carlson C. (2018). *Izafet vs non-Izafet genitive patterns in non-related languages*, DOI: 10.18355/XL.2018.11.02.04, Retrieved on 08/12/2020 from: http://www.xlinguae.eu/2018_11_02_04.html.
- Mladenova, O. (2007). *Definiteness in Bulgarian. Modelling the Process of Language Change*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nesne (2017). *Düz Tümluç, ders ve çalışma notu*. Retrieved on 21/11/2017 from: https://www.dersimiz.com/ders_notlari/Nesne--Duz-Tumlec-oku-21645.html.
- Papadimitriou, P. [Παπαδημητρίου, Π.] (2008). *Τα Πομάκικα [Romak]*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Αδελφοί Κυριακίδη.
- Papadimitriou, P. [Παπαδημητρίου, Π.] (2013). *Λαλιές των Πομάκων της ελληνικής Ροδόπης [Romak Speeches of Greek Rhodope]*, Τόμος Γ'. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ίδρυμα Μελετών Χερσονήσου του Αίμου.
- Petkov, G. [Петканов, Г.] (2000). *Ποгляд в миналото на село Соколовчи [A look into the past of the village of Sokolonchi]*. Смолян.
- Philoponi, I. (1896). *In Aristotelis de anima libros commentaria*. Berolini: Michael Hayduck.
- Politis, N. [Πολίτης, Ν.] (1909). Λαογραφία [Folkloristic]. *Λαογραφία Δελτίον της Ελληνικής Λαογραφικής Εταιρείας Α'*, p. 10.
- Raltseva, N. [Ράλτσεβα Ν.] (2015). *Βουλγαρική Γλώσσα Λειτουργική Γραμματική [Bulgarian Language Functional Grammar]*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Αφοι Κυριακίδη.
- Sergis, M. [Σέργης Μ.] (2000). *Εφημερίδες και λαογραφία. Η ταυτότητα μιας Ναξιακής εφημερίδας. Διαθλάσεις της Ιστορίας και της Ελληνικής κοινωνίας του 19^{ου} αιώνα και των αρχών του 20^{ου} [Newspapers and folklore. The identity of a Naxian newspaper. Refractions of History and Greek society of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th]*. Αθήνα.
- Stoykov, S. [Стойков, С.] (2002). *Българска Диалектология [Bulgarian Dialectology]*. София.

- Theocharidis, P. [Θεοχαρίδης, Π.] (1996a). *Γραμματική της Πομακικής Γλώσσας* [Grammar of Pomak Language]. Θεσσαλονίκη: εκδ. Αίγειρος.
- Theocharidis, P. [Θεοχαρίδης, Π.] (1996b). *Ελληνοπομακικό λεξικό* [GrecoPomak Dictionary]. Θεσσαλονίκη: εκδ. Αίγειρος.
- Thompson, P. (2002). *Φωνές από το παρελθόν – Προφορική Ιστορία* [Voices from the Past - Oral History]. Αθήνα: Πλέθρον.
- Tzartanos, A. [Τζάρτζανος, Α.] (2005). *Γραμματική της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας* [Grammar of Ancient Greek Language]. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυριακίδης.
- Timberlake, A. (1993). Russian in Comrie B., Corbett, G. (ed.), *The Slavonic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, pp. 827-886.
- Tsitselikis, K. [Τσιτσελίκης, Κ.] (1996). *Το διεθνές και ευρωπαϊκό καθεστώς προστασίας των γλωσσικών δικαιωμάτων των μειονοτήτων και η ελληνική έννομη τάξη* [The international and European regime for the protection of the linguistic rights of minorities and the Greek legal order]. Αθήνα-Κομοτηνή: Σάκκουλας.
- Tsiolis, G. [Τσιώλης, Γ.] (2011). Η σχέση ποιοτικής και ποσοτικής έρευνας στις κοινωνικές επιστήμες: Από την πολεμική των “παραδειγμάτων” στις σύνθετες προσεγγίσεις [The relationship between qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences: From the war of "examples" to complex approaches] in Dafermos, M., Stamatas, M., Koukouritakis, M., Chiotakis, S. (ed.) [Δαφέρμος, Μ., Σταματάς, Μ., Κουκουριτάκης, Μ., Χιωτάκης, Σ. (επ.)], *Οι κοινωνικές επιστήμες στον 21^ο αιώνα. Επίμαχα θέματα και προκλήσεις* [Social sciences in the 21st century. Controversial issues and challenges]. Αθήνα: Πεδίο, pp. 56-84.
- Underwood, G. (1980). American English Dialectology: Alternatives for the Southwest in Dillard, J. (ed.), *Perspective on American English*. The Hague-Paris-New York: Mouton Publishers, pp.71-94.
- Varvounis, M. [Βαρβούνης, Μ.] (1994). *Συμβολή στη μεθοδολογία της επιτόπιας λαογραφικής έρευνας* [A Contribution to the Methodology of Field Folklore Research]. Αθήνα: Οδυσσέας.
- von Heusinger, K., Kornflit, J. (2005). The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages* 9, pp 3-44.
- Vozikas, G. [Βοζίκας, Γ.] (2006). *Το πανηγύρι της Αγίας Μαρίνας στην Ηλιούπολη. Η σύγχρονη μορφή ενός πολιτισμικού φαινομένου στον ελληνικό αστικό χώρο και το κοινωνικό-οικονομικό του πλαίσιο*. [The celebration of Agia Marina in Plioupoli. The modern form of a cultural phenomenon in the Greek urban space and its socio-economic context]. Διδακτορική Διατριβή [PhD Thesis]. Εθνικό Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών.
- W.G.C.E.S.R.: The Working Group of Center for Educational Studies and Reeducation [Ομάδα Εργασίας Κέντρου Εκπαιδευτικών Μελετών και Επιμόρφωσης] (χ.χ). *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική Αναπροσαρμογή της Μικρής Νεοελληνικής Γραμματικής του Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη* [Modern Greek Grammatical Adaptation of the Little Modern Greek Grammar by Manolis Triantaphyllidis]. Αθήνα: Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Διδακτικών Βιβλίων.
- Zeginis, E., Hidiroglou, P. [Ζεγκίνης, Ε., Χιδίρογλου, Π.] (1995). *Τουρκική Γραμματική Türkçe Dilbilgisi* [Turkish Grammar]. Θεσσαλονίκη: Βάνιας.