Managing Information in Modern Greek: Parallel Focus Markers

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discuss the use of some expressions in Modern Greek for marking what is usually called parallel focus. This paper is part of a larger project whose aim is to describe the functions (syntactic, semantic and pragmatic) of Standard Modern Greek and to compare them with their Spanish equivalents.

1. Introduction

Grammars cover only a small fraction of the grammaticalized functions and markers available in languages. Furthermore, for the few markers that are mentioned, not every meaning is described. The purpose of this article is to describe certain aspects of the meaning of some of these expressions: the adverb αντιθέτως, the prepositional phrase σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and the conjunction ενώ. Although this last one is mentioned in grammars, mostly in its temporal meaning and sometimes in its so-called ‘adversative’ sense, the first two are not. As I will try to prove, despite their many differences, all of them can mark parallel focus in Modern Greek. In this sense, they operate on the information structure of the sentence.

The article is organized as follows: (i) Section 2 gives a small introduction to focalization in Modern Greek; (ii) Sections 3–8 discuss some common features of these focusing devices; (iii) the last section summarizes the findings and gives a general view.

2. Information structure

Before undertaking the task of describing these parallel focus expressions, I would like to define information structure (Lambrecht 1996). This label includes the different ways of packaging information for the same state of affairs, depending on the assignment of the pragmatic functions Focus and Topic. As example [1] illustrates, the same state of affairs can be presented from different informational perspectives according to the speaker’s pragmatic intentions.

This paper has been written within the framework of the research projects “Funciones y marcas del griego moderno” (HUM2007–61974) and “Corpus Morfológico y Formación de Palabras en Griego Moderno” (FFI2012–31567) financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation. I want to express my gratitude to Hartley Ferguson for making my English more understandable.

1 See Holton et al. (2012, 556) and Mackridge’s (1985, 240, 272) brief mention of ενώ as an adversative conjunction (without discussion of examples) and the description of the close connection between time and adversativity in Κλαίρης et al. (2005, 807).

2 In the examples small caps letters mark the focus entities and sometimes their alternatives. In fact
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[1] a. Εγώ έστειλα ένα γράμμα στον Πέτρο
(What happened is that I sent a letter to Peter)
b. Εστείλα ένα γράμμα στον Πέτρο
(It was me who sent a letter to Peter)
c. Εγώ έστειλα ένα γράμμα στον Πέτρο
(It was a letter that I sent to Peter)
d. Εστείλα ένα γράμμα στον Πέτρο
(It was Peter to whom I sent a letter)

Version [1a] presents the whole SoA as information new and unknown to the addressee, whereas [1b] presupposes that the addressee knows that someone sent a letter to Peter, but ignores the identity of the sender. In [1c] the information provided is the identity of the object sent and in [1d] the identity of the recipient.

The so-called focus particles (König 1991) interoperate with these different informational versions of the same SoA, as in the following examples. In each sentence, the adverb και/κι ‘also/too’ associates with a different focus.

[2] Κι Εστείλα ένα γράμμα στον Πέτρο
a. I sent a letter to Peter (assertion)
b. Somebody else (≠ me) sent a letter to Peter (presupposition)

[3] Εστείλα και ένα γράμμα στον Πέτρο
a. I sent a letter to Peter (assertion)
b. I sent something else (≠ a letter) to Peter (presupposition)

[4] Εστείλα ένα γράμμα και στον Πέτρο
a. I sent a letter to Peter (assertion)
b. I sent a letter to somebody else (≠ Peter) (presupposition)

The above examples can be decomposed into two meaning postulates (see assertion ‘a’ and presupposition ‘b’).3 The meaning postulate ‘a’ corresponds to the sentence’s meaning without the adverb. The second meaning postulate ‘b’ captures the contribution of the adverb to the global meaning of the sentence and it can be expressed through a presupposition referring to an alternative to the sentence’s focus. In all three examples the assertion is the same: the speaker has sent a letter to Peter. In contrast, the presupposition introduced by the adverb differs according to the sentence focus: (i) in [2] it is presupposed that there is at least one entity different from the speaker (subject) who has carried out the same action; (ii) in [3] it is presupposed that there is another entity different from a letter (the direct object) that the subject has sent to Peter, and (iii) in [4] it is presupposed that there is an entity different from Peter (the indirect object) who has received a letter.

There are different kinds of foci (Dik 1997; Dik et al. 1981). These foci and their focusing markers are used by the speaker, among other purposes, in order to interoperate with the addressee’s pragmatic knowledge (or rather what the speaker pre-

every sentence in this paper contains two foci, but only the main has been highlighted in order to simplify the discussion of the data.

3 For meaning definitions, meaning postulates and their assertive or presuppositional nature, see Dik (1978; 1997, 59, 78, 97–103).
supposes is the addressee’s knowledge, or \((P_A)_S\). The speaker may want to modify the addressee’s pragmatic information according to his own pragmatic representation \((P_S)\) or he may modify his own, taking as his source the addressee’s pragmatic information, as represented in the following table (see Dik 1997, 326–38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of focus</th>
<th>((P_A)_S)</th>
<th>(P_S)</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(???？)</td>
<td>(???？)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completive</td>
<td>(???？)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>not (X)</td>
<td>not (X!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
<td>(not (X), but) (Y!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X) and (Y)</td>
<td>also (Y!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricting</td>
<td>(X) and (Y)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>only (X!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting</td>
<td>(X) or (Y)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Focus typology*

For example, in expanding focus, if the speaker thinks that the addressee believes something about an entity \(X\) and \((s)\)he thinks that that piece of information additionally applies to another entity \(Y\), \((s)\)he can use the expression ‘also \(Y\)’ in order to modify and extend the addressee’s knowledge to include it. On the other hand, if the speaker presupposes that the addressee believes something about the entities \(X\) and \(Y\), and the speaker thinks it only applies to \(X\), she can use the expression ‘only \(X\)’ to modify the addressee’s knowledge (restricting focus).

There are many good candidates for the label ‘focus devices’ in Modern Greek. Although adverbs are the most extensively studied in the literature, both prepositional phrases and conjunctions can operate as focusing devices, as the following table shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Restricting</th>
<th>Parallel</th>
<th>Particularizing</th>
<th>Replacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>και, ακόμα και, μέχρι και, (ω) και, μέχρι που, (ώ)σπου, (επ)ίσης, (ό)ύτε, (ό)ύτε και, (ό)ύτε καν, (δ)ε(ν)… (καν)</td>
<td>μόνο, αποκλειστικά</td>
<td>αντιθέτως, (ισα) (ισα), (του)ναςιον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>εκτός από, πέρα από</td>
<td>εκτός από, (πλην), (μέ) (εξαίρεση, εξαιρουμένου) (του)ν</td>
<td>(αν) μη (τι) (άλλο)</td>
<td>αντι (για)/αντι (γι’) (αυτό)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>καθώς και ((επ)ίσης), (ό)πως και ((επ)ίσης), (ό)χι (μόνο)… (α)λλά και…</td>
<td>(δ)εν… (παρά) ((μ)ό)νο(ν))</td>
<td>(\epsilon)νώ</td>
<td>(δ)εν… (α)λλά…, (δ)εν… (παρά)... ((μ)ό)νο(ν))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Focus particles in SMGrk*

In this paper I am going to concentrate on parallel focus markers: the adverb \(αντιθέτως\), the prepositional phrase \(σε \(αντιθέση\) \(με/προς\)\) and the conjunction \(\epsilon\)νώ.
3. The markers

Despite their many other different meanings, the expressions αντιθέτως, σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and ενώ share at least one common meaning: they are used for contrasting the information about the sentence focus and its alternative. In this section this common meaning will be presented.

Αντιθέτως

In some cases the adverb αντιθέτως conveys that there is an alternative to the focus entity – in the example below, a different work of literature – for which something different is true.

[5] Στην Πανουκλα ο Καμύ έθετε, αν δεν με απατά η μνήμη μου, μια σειρά ζητημάτων ηθικής τάξης όταν η συμφορά χτυπάει την πόρτα. Στη Λυσσα ο ηθικός προβληματισμός αντιθέτως απουσιάζει. (HNC 76340)

a. In The Rabies the ethical problems are absent (assertion)
b. In Χ (= The Plague) the ethical problems are NOT absent (presupposition)

In this example the speaker states that the ethical problems are absent from Auguste Corteau’s work, The Rabies: this is the assertive contribution of the sentence without the adverb αντιθέτως (see [5a]). The contribution of the adverb to the meaning of the whole sentence can be captured through a meaning postulate (see [5b]) where the opposite is presupposed about an alternative entity to the sentence focus Πανούκλα (Camus’ The Plague).

Σε αντίθεση (με/προς)

The expression σε αντίθεση (με/προς) exhibits a similar behaviour. It can work as a preposition (σε αντίθεση με/προς) and in this case, unlike αντιθέτως, it explicitly states the identity of the entity contrasted with the sentence focus, as in the following example.

[6] Το κοινό αγαπάει το Ολντ Βικ, σε αντίθεση με τον Τυπο. (HNC 2532029)

a. The public loves Old Vic (assertion)
b. The press does NOT love Old Vic (presupposition)

In example [6] the prepositional phrase heads the nominal phrase ‘the press’ and presupposes about it the opposite information (see the negation) to that provided about the sentence focus (‘Old Vic’). The expression σε αντίθεση without με/προς operates as an adverb in the same way as αντιθέτως:

[7] ο Δαρειος [...] κράτησε ξάγρυπνο τον στρατο του εξαντλώντας τον σωματικά και ψυχολογικά. Ο Αλεξανδρος, σε αντίθεση, ήταν ξεκούραστος (http://goo.gl/RldFtx)

a. Alexander was rested (assertion)
b. X (= Darius and his army) were not rested (presupposition)
The focus devices most frequently studied are adverbs and secondly prepositional phrases, but even subordinators can be used with the same purpose. The conjunction ενώ can be used for expressing temporal simultaneity, but its meaning expands far beyond temporal limits and this subordinator can express parallel focus, as in example [8]. In this example the temporal overlapping does not exist, since, as the time adverbs highlight (see τότε and σήμερα), both states of affairs take place in different points in time.

[8] Το πρωθυπουργικό αεροσκάφος κόστιζε τοτε 25 εκατομμύρια δολάρια ενώ σημερα η τιμή του ξεπερνά τα 30 (HNC 263758)
   a. The presidential plane cost 25 million dollars at that time (assertion)
   b. The presidential plane costs more than 30 million dollars today (ενώ’s contribution)

The function of the subordinate clause in [8] is not to locate the main clause in time, but rather to contrast the information provided in both the main and the subordinate clauses. The complex structure (subordinate plus main clause) contributes to the comparison of information available about the Primer Minister’s airplane: in the past its value was 25 million dollars, whereas today it surpasses 30 million.

Main differences

Once it is clear that the three expressions allow a contrast between the information available about two entities, their differences can be more accurately specified through the following minimal pairs.

[9] Ο Πετρος, αντιθέτως, αγαπούσε τη Μαρία
   a. Peter loved Mary (assertion)
   b. X (≠ Peter) did not love Mary (presupposition)

[10] Ο Πετρος, σε αντίθεση με τον Γιαννη, αγαπούσε τη Μαρία
    a. Peter loved Mary (assertion)
    b. Giannis (≠ Peter) did not love Mary (presupposition)

    a. Peter loved Mary
    b. Giannis (≠ Peter) hated (≠ loved) Mary

In the first example the adverb αντιθέτως (the same applies to σε αντίθεση) does not specify the exact identity of the entity (see ‘X’) contrasted with the sentence focus, and it presupposes that the information about that entity is just the opposite (see ‘did not love’). In the second example, the prepositional expression σε αντίθεση με/προς explicitly states the identity of that entity (see ‘Giannis’). In the third example, apart from making this identity explicit (see ‘Giannis’), the conjunction ενώ can specify the identity of the opposite information available about the alternative (see ‘hated’ ≠ ‘loved’).
4. Combinations

The fact that all the expressions discussed in this paper belong to the same semantic domain is reflected in their frequent redundant combinations, as illustrated in examples [12] to [14].

[12] Ενώ 4 στις 10 επιχειρήσεις προχώρησαν σε τεχνολογική αναδιάρθρωση, οι εργαζόμενοι, σε αντίθεση με τους εργολότες, δεν ωφελήθηκαν από την εισαγωγή της νέας τεχνολογίας. (HNC 782105)
‘While four out of ten companies undertook technological restructuring, employees, unlike employers, have not benefited from the introduction of new technology’

[13] Οι Chief Marketing Officers […] αλλάζουν κάθε 22,9 μήνες, ενώ σε αντίθεση οι διευθυντικοί συμβούλιοι […] αλλάζουν κάθε 53,8 μήνες. (HNC 49427)
‘The Chief Marketing Officers […] change every 22.9 months, while in contrast CEOs […] change every 53.8 months’

[14] Στην Ολλανδία, με νόμο του 1976 απαγορεύεται να ανοίξουν τα καταστήματα τις Κυριακές, ενώ αντιθέτως στην Πολωνία δεν υπάρχουν πλέον περιορισμοί. (HNC 1163282)
‘In the Netherlands, a 1976 law prohibited opening shops on Sundays, whereas in Poland there are no such restrictions anymore’

If the contrast is between the states of affairs referred to by the main and subordinate clauses, there are only two possible patterns:

(a) if the subordinate clause precedes the main clause, as in example [12], the expressions σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and αντιθέτως may optionally appear in the main clause;

(b) if the subordinate clause follows the main clause, as in examples [13] and [14], the expressions σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and αντιθέτως may only appear within the subordinate clause.

Both σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and αντιθέτως may appear in the second of the two clauses, but they cannot not appear in the first one.

The same applies to other languages: (i) in example [15] the English⁴ expression in contrast to appears in the main clause in a redundant way underlining the contrast introduced by whereas; (ii) in example [16] the Spanish adverbial expression por el contrario ‘in contrast’ underlines the contrast introduced by mientras que ‘whereas/while’; (iii) in example [17] the contrast established by the German subordinate während ‘whereas/while’ is underlined by the adverb hingegen ‘in contrast’.⁵

[15] Whereas the US has immense mineral wealth, Japan (in contrast) has comparatively very little (Quirk et al. 1985, § 15.32)

[16] Durante el invierno hay solo luz solar desde las 8 am hasta las 4 pm, mientras que, por el contrario, en verano hay sol durante todo el día.
‘In winter there is sunlight from 8 am till 4 pm, whereas in contrast in summer there is sun all day long’ (El País, http://goo.gl/zayAxg)

⁴ Swan’s (1996, § 159.2) description of these uses of whereas and while as ‘balancing contrasting points’ is more adequate than the label ‘concession’ by Quirk et al. (1985, § 15.39–40, 15.43).

⁵ For the German data, see Lang (1988).
The station B5 transmits all games of the German national team live on the radio, while in contrast other radio channels transmit only parts of the games’ (http://goo.gl/vTqkNk)

5. Different focus-topic assignments

The focus of the adverb (αντιθέτως, σε αντίθεση), the prepositional phrase (σε αντίθεση με) and the conjunction (ενώ) can vary according to the informational structure they operate upon. The three expressions establish a contrast between two or more alternatives to two sentence constituents, as in the following English example:

[18] a. Who (Subject) read what (Object)?
   b. Peter (Subject) read a book (Object), whereas John (Subject) read a magazine (Object)

   The entities/constituents contrasted depend on the speaker’s informational needs. In example [19], the entities contrasted are the subjects and the time (‘who retires when?’), whereas in example [20] these entities are the subjects and the indirect objects (‘who speaks to whom?’).

[19] Οι δύο πρωτοί συνταξιοδοτούνται σε δύο χρόνια, ενώ ο τελευταίος του χρόνου. (HNC 10794)
   a. Who (Subject) retires when (Time)?
   b. The first two (Subject) retire in two years (Time)
   c. The last one (Subject) retires next year (Time)

[20] Ο Άνδρεας Παπανδρέου απευθυνόταν περισσότερο στη λαϊκίζουσα Αριστερά, ενώ ο Κώστας Σιμιτής στο ορθολογικό και ‘νοικοκυρεμένο’ Κέντρο (HNC 14795)
   a. Who (Subject) speaks to whom (IO)?
   b. Andreas Papandreou (Subject) speaks to the popular left (IO)
   c. Kostas Simitis (Subject) speaks to the rational […] Center (IO)

Subjects are not necessarily in contrast, as in the following example, where the entities contrasted are the time and the actions carried out by the soul (‘When did the soul do what?’)

[21] Το ίδιο και η ψυχή, όταν βαλεί δύναμη, μπορεί να απαλλαγεί από όλα τα βάρη που την πιέζουν, ενώ όταν χαλαρώνει την προσπάθεια επιβαρύνεται τόσο πολύ που δεν μπορεί να σταθεί στα πόδια της. (HNC 49269)
   a. When (time) did the soul do what (Predication)?
   b. When it makes an effort (Time), the soul can liberate itself from all its burdens (Predication)
   c. When it relaxes (Time), the soul is so overloaded that it cannot keep its balance (Predication)

6. Behaviour under negation

Parallel focus markers presuppose an opposite piece of information to the sentence focus. Many times that contrary information can be formulated as a negation, as in the following example (see the positive assertion and the negative presupposition):

[22] Ο Αλεξέι [...] προσποιείται τον φιλοσταλινικό και ενσωματώνει στην κομματική νομοθετική κλαστικότητα [...] Η Μαρία, αντιθέτως, έχει ασυμβίβαστο χαρακτήρα. (HNC 105601)
   a. Mary has an uncompromising character (assertion)
   b. X (= ο Αλέξει) does NOT Y (= have an uncompromising character) (presupposition)

When the focusing expressions operate upon negative clauses and the negation is within their scope, the presupposition is positive, since two negations cancel each other (see the negative assertion and the positive presupposition):

[23] Ο Φογκτς δήλωσε πως βγάζει το καπέλο του στην άψογη μενταλιτέ του Κιρστεν [...] Στον Αντι Μελερ, αντιθέτως, ο Φογκτς δεν έχει κανένα καπέλο να βγάλει. (HNC 784731)
   a. Fogs does not take (Verb) his hat off for Andy Miller (Beneficiary) (assertion)
   b. Fogs does Y (= take) (Verb) his hat off for X (= Kirsten) (Beneficiary) (presupposition)

The same applies to the other markers σε αντίθεση (με/προς), ενώ and their combinations (for example ενώ αντιθέτως):

[24] Όταν έγιναν σίριαλ οι Πανθεοι το βιβλίο πούλησε σαν τρελό. Ο Τάσος Αθανασιάδης αγόρασε διαμέρισμα. Σε αντίθεση, η Λωξαντρα της Μαρίας Ιορδανίδου δεν πούλησε περισσότερα απ’ ό, τι πουλούσε. (HNC 877207)
   a. Maria Iordanidou’s Loxandra (Subject) did not sell (Verb) more than it sold before (predication) (assertion)
   b. The Pantheoi by Tassos Athanassiadis (Subject) sold (Verb) more than it sold before (presupposition)

[25] Οι κ. Κ. Καραμανλής και Γ. Παπανδρεού θα προτείνουν τον κ. Παπούλια, ενώ ΚΚΕ και ΣΥΝ δεν θα προτείνουν κανέναν υποψήφιο. (HNC 3124)
   a. The Communist Party and the Alliance Party will NOT propose (Verb) any candidate (assertion)
   b. Mr. Karamanlis and Mr. Papandreou will propose (Verb) a candidate (presupposition)

[26] Είναι βέβαια σχετικά εύκολο να αλλάξει ο αριθμός κλήσης μιας κινητής τηλεφωνικής συσκευής ενώ, αντιθέτως, ο κωδικός αριθμός δεν αλλάζει με τίποτα (HNC 1172847)
   a. The code number of a mobile device does NOT change (Verb) at all (assertion)
   b. The call number of a mobile device changes (Verb) (presupposition)

When the negation is out of the adverb’s scope, both the assertion and the presupposition triggered by the focusing marker are negative, as in the following example (‘who did not have what’):

[27] Οι στυνομορικοί συνέλαβαν 5 νεαρούς, από αυτούς οι 3 δεν είχαν διπλώματα οδηγήσεως, ενώ οι δύο άλλοι δεν είχαν άδειες κυκλοφορίας. (HNC 1949565)
The focusing markers can just combine with the focalizing negation όχι with elipsis of the remaining sentence (the information provided about the sentence focus):

\[ \text{Στη Γερμανία θα παίξει προεκλογικά πολύ και το θέμα της ανεργίας (12%), ενώ στην Ολλανδία όχι. (HNC 439865)} \]

a. In Germany (Location) unemployment will play an important role before the elections (Predication)
b. In Holland (Location) unemployment will NOT play an important role before the elections (Predication)

Examples like this show that these constructions are in fact double focus structures (‘where does unemployment do what?’), since negation affects the focus sentence.

7. Discursive contribution

Apart from having a local effect as a focusing marker, the expressions studied in this paper can play a global role in discourse, as in the following example.

\[ \text{Ο κ. Σημιτής, με γκρι κοστούμι και ασημί γραβάτα, δεν προσέφερε ιδιαίτερες… σημειολογικές συγκινήσεις – δεν το περιμέναμε άλλωστε. Σε καμία περίπτωση το χαμόγελό του δεν εξετράπη τόσο, που να μας δώσει λαβή για περαιτέρω συμπεράνσματα. Ήταν, όπως πρέπει να είναι, ένα ανερμήνευτο χαμόγελο. Κάπως θλιμμένος ήταν ο κ. Αντωνης Σαμαρας. Όταν τολμήσαμε την – άκομψη, είναι αλήθεια – ερώτηση “πώς πάει, πρόεδρε, η ‘Άνοιξη’;”, απάντησε, όπως πάντα, ποιητικά: “Έχω ανάγκη να μείνω μόνος με τον ήλιο”… Απομακρυνθήκαμε, σκέφτομεν ότι η ανάγκη του έχει ήδη αρχίσει να ικανοποιείται. Μένει μόνος… Όχι όμως και ο Αρχιεπισκοπός! Εκεί ήταν, βεβαίως. Και δεν άφησε κανέναν που να μην χαιρετήσει. Μόνο που, μερικές φορές, μπέρδευε λίγο τα ονόματα! Όπως, ας πούμε, όταν τον πλησίασε για να τον χαιρετήσει ο κ. Μαντέλης, και ο Μακαριότατος του είπε: “Γειά σου, Τάκη μου”. “Τάσος, Τάσο”, τον διόρθωσε ο υπουργός Μεταφορών… Ο κ. Στεφανοπούλος, αντιθέτως, εκτός του ότι χαιρετούσε τους πάντες με τα μικρά τους ονόματα (σωστά), είχε και με τον καθένα μια κουβέντα επί της ουσίας να ανταλλάξει. (HNC 268854)}

a. Mr. Stephanopoulos did X (assertion)
b. Someone (= Mr. Stephanopoulos) did NOT do X (presupposition)

The passage describes the behaviour of some guests at a public reception organized by the President of the Greek Republic, Mr. Stephanopoulos: Mr. Simitis, Mr. Samaras, the Archbishop and Mr. Stephanopoulos himself. These are the topic entities around which the discourse is organized. When Mr. Stephanopoulos (the fourth topic) is mentioned, the adverb αντιθέτως allows a contrast of the information provided about him with that of the previous topics: unlike them Mr. Stephanopoulos was talkative, approached everyone and did so using the right names.

The adverb αντιθέτως operates here on two different levels: it operates as a focus device on the local level (the sentence), but on the global level (the discourse) it
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contrasts the information available about two or more topical entities. Therefore it operates as well as a kind of topic changer (see Revuelta 2009). The following figure depicts the effect of the adverb αντιθέτως in the previous example on the discourse level.

```
Discourse
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse unit1</th>
<th>Discourse unit2</th>
<th>Discourse unit3</th>
<th>Discourse unit4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic1</td>
<td>Topic2</td>
<td>Topic3</td>
<td>Topic4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Simitis</td>
<td>Mr. Samaras</td>
<td>The Archbishop</td>
<td>Mr. Stephanopoulos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

αντιθέτως

The prepositional locution/adverb σε αντίθεση (με/προς) can operate as well on a discourse level contrasting the information provided about different topics.

[30] Οι κύριοι εκτείνοντες του άκρου ποδιού, είναι οι μυς του γαστροκνημιού, [γασ- στροκνημικός και πελματιαίος], οι οποίοι προσφέρονται μέσω του Αχιλλείου τένοντα στο οπίσθιο τμήμα της πτέρνας. Με τη συστολή τους η πτέρνα ανυψώνεται και το σώμα σηκώνεται από το έδαφος, όπως όταν στεκόμαστε στις μόνες των δακτύλων μας (και με τα δύο πόδια) ή κατά την προώθηση μέσω των δακτύλων κατά την δίποδη βάση (κάθε πόδι εναλλάξ). Οι καμπτηρες μυς του άκρου ποδιού είναι σε αντίθεση ελάχιστα ανεπτυγμένοι στον άνθρωπο. Υπάρχουν επίσης άλλες οι οποίοι περιστρέφουν και στρέφουν το άχρο πόδι και από την άλλη πλευρά, μιμες οι οποίοι ενασχόντος τους συνδέσμους και την πεπλατά της αντίθεσης των τόξων κατά την κίνηση, καθώς και μυες των δακτύλων [χεριών]. (Rodman & McHenry 1980). (HNC 1377447)

[31] Όπως όμως ανέφεραν στο βιβλίο τους Σταλίνισμο και Ναζισμός ο Μοσέ Λεβίν και ο Ιαν Κέρσοου η έννοια του απολυταρχισμού διαστρεβλώνει την πραγματικότητα. “Η αναζήτηση κοινών στοιχείων είναι γονιμότερη από την ταύτιση, ταυτόχρονα με τον καθορισμό των κρίσιμων διαφορών. “Το ναζιστικό καθεστώς, σε αντίθεση με το σταλινικό, δεν μπορεί να θεωρηθεί μία σύγχρονη δικτατορία. (HNC 607)

In the first example the author discusses the behaviour of different muscles and the adverbial expression σε αντίθεση is used to contrast the different behaviour displayed by the first two groups. In the second example the topics are the Stalinist and the Nazi regime. The expression σε αντίθεση με allows the writer to contrast the information provided about the second topic with that available about the first.

7 The partial overlapping of topic and focus is a theoretically agreed issue (see Dik 1997, 312–13) and from a typological point of view there are other particles that operate both as focusing and topicalizing markers: see autem in Latin (Kroon 1995) and αὖ/αὖτε/πάλιν in Ancient Greek (Revuelta 2006; 2009).
8. (In)equality markers

Parallel focusing markers operate as the negative counterpart of some comparative structures headed mainly by ὁπως (και) and less frequently by σαν (see Revuelta forthcoming). In the first of the next two examples, as we have seen before, the expression σε αντίθεση με introduces the presupposition that the information asserted about the main character does not hold for the remaining characters (see the negative meaning postulate at [32b]). In contrast, in the second example ὁπως και introduces the presupposition that the information asserted about the subject (Mrs Papandreou) does hold about the Prime Minister (focusing meaning): both speak about the many billions paid by the Greek people.

[32] Ο πρωταγωνιστής, σε αντίθεση μ’ ολογε τούς αλλούς, μιλάει... σωπώντας. (HnC 1648376)
   a. The main character speaks by keeping silent (assertion)
   b. The remaining characters do NOT speak by keeping silent (presupposition)

[33] Πάντως, η κ. Παπανδρεου, οπως και ο πρωθυπουργος, μήλησε για τα πολλά δισεκατομμύρια που έχει πληρώσει ο ελληνικός λαός στις ΔΕΚΟ (HNC 1263124)
   a. Mrs. Papandreou spoke about the many billions spent by [...] (assertion)
   b. The Prime Minister spoke about the many billions spent by [...] (presupposition)

Therefore the PP σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and the remaining parallel focus expressions (αντιθέτως and ενώ) behave as the negative version of the focusing combination ὁπως (και) and σαν: the parallel focus constructions presuppose the opposite information about the alternative to the focus, whereas the comparative expressions presuppose the same information.

9. Summary and conclusions

The aim of this paper has been the description of expressions belonging to different categories (adverbs, prepositional phrases and subordinators), which nevertheless convey the same meaning: these expressions are: the adverb αντιθέτως, the adverb/prepositional locution σε αντίθεση (με/προς) and the conjunction ενώ. Despite their differences (all of them exhibit several different additional meanings) all three expressions share at least one common meaning: they are used for contrasting the information available about two or more entities (parallel focus) and are therefore used for managing information in Modern Greek. Apart from this common meaning, they can also be combined in a redundant way and exhibit many other common features: (i) they show the same behaviour under negation; (ii) they contribute in the same ways to discourse coherence (through a contrast of topical entities); (iii) they all contrast in similar ways with equality markers.
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