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of the aulos’). In the sources relating to the comic parabasis, however, the synonymic expression légein prós aulónt (‘reciting to the accompaniment of the aulos’, Schol. Aristoph. Av. 682–684) is also found. The aesthetic effect of this kind of performance is explained by pseudo-Aristotle (Pr. 19.6) as “tragic” in the sense of “moving” because of the pathetic result produced by the contrast between the recited and the sung sections. This compositional and performative complexity of the classic drama reaffirms what Chailley stated in 1979: the musical structure of a play is as important as its dramatic structure, and in it each choral song, as well as each actor’s song and, one may add, every single section be it sung or recited or recitative, is precisely characterized by a rhythm, which generates a particular type of expression.
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Sotera Rule

Penultimate and final syllables containing a long vowel or diphthong (VV-syllables) may host either an acute or circumflex accent (→ Accentuation). In accentuated final VV-syllables, the distribution of acute and circumflex is essentially morphological: in nominative and accusative forms, the accent is acute; in genitive and dative forms, it is circumflex. In contrast, in accentuated penultimate VV-syllables, the distribution is essentially phonological: if the final syllable contains a short vowel (V), the accent is realized as a circumflex, e.g. sótéra ‘savior’, oïkos ‘house’, and polupidax ‘with many springs/fountains’; if the final syllable contains a long vowel, it is realized as an acute, e.g. sótérōn ‘savior (gen. pl.)’, oikois ‘houses (dat. pl.)’. The Sotera Rule (‘sotéra rule’) is the name given to the realization as a circumflex. Since the distribution of acute and circumflex on accentuated penultimate VV-syllables is complementary, the Sotera Rule may be used to refer to the process governing that distribution, as below.

The Sotera Rule applies to persistent (i.e., lexically inherent) accents, e.g. sötéra with its inherently accented suffix -tēr, and to recessive accents, e.g. polupidax, khetima ‘that which is poured/flows’, whose accents are assigned by a phonological process that locates them as early in the word as the → Law of Limitation permits. The fact that the Sotera Rule applies to both shows that it is independent of the phonological process that assigns recessive accents. For both the Sotera Rule and the Law of Limitation, the final diphthongs -oi and -ai count as V-syllables (as if the -i were a consonant), e.g. oikoi ‘houses’ (cf. oikos), moißai ‘muses’ (cf. moißan ‘muse (acc. sg.)’), paideúais ‘to educate (aor. inf.)’, with the exception of locative sg. -oi, e.g. oikoi ‘at home’ (vs. oikois ‘houses’), and 3 sg. optative act. -oi and -ai, e.g. paideúoi (not *paideúoi or
*paideuoi) and paideúsai (vs. paideûsai ‘to educate (aor. inf.’), which behave as VV-syllables. There is as yet no communis opinio on the origin of these differences; the most recent analysis is Probert (2012, with refs.).

Circumflexes of the sótêra type arose from acute accents via a linguistic innovation within the history of Greek, e.g. *(w)oíkos > oíkos (cf. Ved. véśaḥ ‘house’), which affected Attic, Ionic, and the Koine. The Doric evidence is difficult to judge. It is often held that the Sotera Rule did not apply in Doric (e.g. Probert 2006:71), but a case has also been made for a phonologically and morphologically more restricted application (Hinge 2006:124–128). This, combined with meager and ambiguous evidence from Boeotian, makes it difficult to judge when the change took place. It could have been as late as Attic-Ionic or as early as Proto-Greek. Since the distribution of acute and circumflex in accented penultimate VV-syllables depends only on vowels and diphthongs, the tone bearing units of Greek, it is likely that the innovation originally had a tonal motivation (cf. Devine & Stephens 1994:155).
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Southeast Greek

1. Definition

The terms South or East Greek refer to one of the two major dialectal varieties reconstructed for the Greek of the second millennium BCE on the basis of studies by Porzig and Risch in the mid-20th c. The other major dialectal variety is referred to as North or West Greek (→ Northwest Greek). These terms are based on the geographical locations thought to have been occupied by these dialectal groups in the second millennium BCE. This system of classification is closely related to the reconstruction of the arrival of the Greeks in Greece. Before Porzig and Risch, it was generally postulated that the Greeks had arrived in three separate waves, in line with the theory upheld mainly by Kretschmer (1909) and based on the traditions of Antiquity. In the first wave, ca. 2000 BCE, the ancestors of the Ionic-Attic speakers were thought to have arrived; the second wave, ca. 1700–1600 BCE, saw the arrival of the so-called ‘Achaeans’, the ancestors of the Arcado-Cypriots and Aeolians and creators of the Mycenaean civilization; finally, the Dorians, who caused the fall of the Mycenaean civilization, were thought to have arrived with the third and last wave, ca. 1200 BCE. According to Kretschmer’s theory, the dialectal fragmentation of Greek began outside Greece, before the arrival of the first Greeks, and the dialectal situation in the first millennium BCE was the result of the superimposition of the three waves, giving rise to two types of dialect: “pure” dialects (with little or no dialect mixing) and "mixed" dialects (with dialectal features of varying origin).