

## Discussion Note

### Why Greek is one of *The World's Major Languages*\*

**Brian D. Joseph**

Department of Linguistics, The Ohio State University, Columbus,

OH 43210-1298, USA

E-mail: [joseph.1@osu.edu](mailto:joseph.1@osu.edu)

---

#### Abstract

The inclusion of Greek in Bernard Comrie's edited volume *The World's Major Languages* (Croom Helm, 1987; second edition, Routledge, 2008) prompts the question of why Greek was so designated. Two arguments supporting the editor's choice are presented here by way of assessing the place and status of Greek among languages of the world, offering some thoughts on the notion of "major language", and considering the question of whether Greek constitutes "one language".

#### Keywords

diachrony; dialects; language unity; major language; Nobel Prize; sociology of language

In 1987, Croom Helm Publishers of England brought out a book entitled *The World's Major Languages*, edited by Bernard Comrie. It was updated recently and a second edition has now appeared, being published in 2008 by Routledge.

The book contains descriptions of 40 languages considered by the editor to be "major languages". The 40 languages (grouped here roughly by geography and language family) are Malay, Tagalog, Korean, Japanese, Burmese, Chinese, Vietnamese, Thai, Tamil, Turkish, Arabic, Hebrew, Hausa, Swahili, Yoruba, Finnish, Hungarian, Bengali, Hindi, Sanskrit, Pashto, Persian, Czech, Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, French, Italian, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish, Latin, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Dutch, English, German, and Greek.

---

\* Preliminary versions of this discussion note were presented at the University of Patras (March 31, 2007) and St. Petersburg University (September 27, 2008); I thank the audiences at those venues for their feedback. A highly abbreviated version covering just a part of the material presented here appeared as Joseph 2008.

I am proud to say that I was asked to write the chapter on Greek for the first edition, and to update it for the second edition. I consider that chapter to be one of the most important of my various publications on Greek over the years. My task was to discuss the history of the language, to give a characterization of its structure, and to provide basic demographic and sociolinguistic facts, all in about 30 pages (some languages with shallower histories had proportionally more space—Romanian, for instance, was allocated about 20 pages).

So why was Greek included in such a volume? The criteria that Comrie used to decide which languages are “major” are varied and, as he himself admits, rather subjectively applied too. Still, he lists considerations like the following, even though not all are necessarily applicable to each of the languages chosen (p. ix):

- a. number of speakers
- b. status of the language within nation-states (official language or not)
- c. use of the language in several countries
- d. associated with a long literary tradition (cultural importance)

Ultimately, therefore, he recognizes that “the notion of ‘major language’ is primarily a social notion” (p. 1) and he states that all languages are potentially “major” in terms of what they tell us about the linguistic abilities of humans and about language as a general human phenomenon. Moreover, he observes that the “majorness” of a language can come and go: among ancient languages, he notes that Sumerian once was a major language, some 4,000 or more years ago, but it no longer is; on the other hand, Latin is included in the volume because even though “long since deprived of native speakers [it has] immense cultural importance” (p. ix).

So where does Greek fit in? As noted, it is among the 40 “major” languages of the world as far as the volume is concerned, and the editor is careful to point out (p. 4) that for Greek we generally use a single basic designation for all of its stages of development and in that way the language and its temporal scope are unlike Latin and the Romance languages (French, Spanish, Italian, etc.). And indeed, in writing the chapter on Greek, I treated it as a single entity with variously differentiated stages of development, more or less as I had been asked to do (that is, the editor did not single out any one stage of the language that I was to focus on; rather I was to write simply on “Greek”).

While the inclusion of Greek in the volume surely makes sense to all Hellenes and Hellenophiles, for various reasons, Greek might be considered a difficult choice.

First, as compared with the other 39 languages, with regard to the first criterion above, Greek has a relatively small number of speakers, perhaps some 10,000,000 at the time the book was conceived twenty or so years ago. Some

of the languages included have fewer speakers, e.g. Slovak has only 4,500,000 but it was bundled together in a single chapter with its very closely related sibling Czech, with its 9,500,000 speakers; Pashto is estimated to have about the same number of speakers as Greek today; and Malay, though widely used in four countries, is a second language for most of those who use it, not a native language, thereby making the notion of “speaker” for this exercise a bit tricky to apply.

Second, as compared with the other 39 languages, Greek occupies a relatively small territory, though some comparisons are hard to make since such a large part of Greece’s national territory includes the open waters of the Aegean Sea; still, it is currently the official language of two nation-states, Greece and Cyprus, bearing on Comrie’s criteria (b) and (c) above.

Third, to turn to another possible consideration not mentioned specifically by Comrie but consistent with the external, socio-historical nature of his criteria, there are some languages in the book that are somewhat comparable (more or less) to Greek in terms of number of speakers and geography, at least as far as a “homeland” might be concerned, but which have had a far-reaching spread from having been associated with relatively recent colonization, for instance, Dutch, with some 20,000,000 speakers in the 1980s, and Portuguese with some 10,000,000 in Portugal. But Portuguese, due to colonial expansion since the 1500s, spread to Brazil and several other parts of the world (including some areas in Africa and Asia) and so is robustly represented with over 200,000,000 speakers now. And Dutch, even though geographically concentrated in The Netherlands and Belgium, gave rise, again through colonial enterprises, to Afrikaans in South Africa, and was influential in the formation of some Creole languages in the Caribbean. By contrast, the time of great expansion and spread for Greek and of its considerable influence over other languages came much earlier, in the Hellenistic period and into the Byzantine period, and so has less relevance for deciding major languages of the *modern* world. And, unlike Latin, another ancient language with a wide expanse of use in earlier times, Greek has not (that is, not necessarily, though see below) spawned a whole host of well-populated languages, as Latin has with the Romance languages.

Fourth, even though association with a long literary tradition is a criterion for Comrie, it is not clear that the significant literary contributions of *ancient* Greek writers should count for Modern Greek, even if we accept the premise that all of historical Greek is one language, a topic discussed further below.

So, based on such considerations, we might well ask whether Greek actually does belong in such a catalogue of the “world’s major languages”? I would argue yes, based on some other criteria that Comrie does not mention.

First, going back to the matter of a literary tradition, one can note that *Modern* Greek is the native language, and the medium of writing, for two Nobel Prize winners in literature—Georgos Seferis in 1963 and Odysseus Elytis in 1979.<sup>1</sup>

A search through the Nobel Foundation's website ([www.nobel.org](http://www.nobel.org)) reveals that other languages on Comrie's list, e.g. French, German, and English, have done better than Greek as far as garnering Nobel Prizes is concerned, and that some of the smaller languages, especially Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish, have multiple winners, even more than Greek. Interestingly, though, there are some "larger" languages on Comrie's list that have no winners, e.g. Hindi or Korean or Thai, and some that have fewer than Greek, e.g. Arabic, Chinese, or Turkish, each of which has one Nobel laureate. It is important to note here that for each of these last three languages, their one winner came several years after Comrie's book had appeared, so that at the time that Greek was selected as a major language, it was far ahead of these vastly more populous and regionally influential languages. And, some had fewer than Greek at the time of the publication of Comrie's book only to catch up with Greek later, e.g. Japanese had its first laureate in 1968 and gained a second only in 1994.

It is important here of course (something the Nobel Foundation itself does *not* do) to distinguish between country of birth, country of residence, ethnicity, and language used in writing; for instance, the 1981 winner, Elias Canetti, was born in what is now Bulgaria, but was a Sephardic Jew who wrote in German. Also, there are four Nobel laureates in literature from Ireland, but they wrote in English (William Butler Yeats, George Bernard Shaw, and Seamus Heaney) or French (Samuel Beckett—also English in his case). None wrote in Irish, the indigenous language of Ireland, which was not included in Comrie's book; yet, surely Comrie's exclusion of Irish had more to do with the number of speakers and limited geographic reach of the language, and the fact that there have actually been *no* Nobel laureates writing in Irish is likely to be just coincidental to its exclusion.

Moreover, there are some languages represented in the list of Nobel literature laureates that are not in Comrie's book—Yiddish, through the work of Isaac Bashevis Singer (1979), is a notable example. Still, for the most part, no language with two Nobel prize winners in literature is excluded from Comrie's book.

---

<sup>1</sup> One can add that Nikos Kazantzakis was seriously considered for a Nobel Prize and probably would have been awarded one, but that effort was blocked by the Greek government for political reasons due to Kazantzakis's political views.

We can therefore add the evidence of these two Nobel laureates to the reasons for it being right to include Greek on the list of major languages. That is, there is a *modern* literary tradition that places Greek today in a key role, quite apart from the literary contributions of the ancient Greek writers or questions of Greek as a single language; this is significant for the matter at hand since Comrie's book focused mainly on contemporary languages.<sup>2</sup>

Second, even though Comrie says, quite rightly, that any language can be a major language with regard to what it potentially tells us about the human linguistic abilities and the nature of human language, it is the case that Greek offers the world something that very few languages can, namely a virtually unbroken roughly 3500-year documentation of the language. In the case of Greek, this stretches from Mycenaean Greek of the 14th century BC right up to the present day, with only a gap of a few hundred years between Mycenaean Greek and the earliest alphabetic inscriptions and the language of Homeric epic. In this regard, only a few languages, such as Chinese or, if we take the languages of India that are descended from Old Indic (as represented essentially by Sanskrit) as showing a single line of descent, then languages like Hindi and Bengali too.

Thus this second point distinguishes Greek from just about every other language and language group in the world, and thus makes Greek a stunningly important laboratory for the study of language change. Indeed, Greek offers the linguist, and thus scientific knowledge more generally, a wealth of information about variously motivated types of change: internally motivated structural change in language, where the structure of the language system itself is the cause of the change; socially motivated change based in the indigenous society using the language, where the social setting for the language itself plays a key role in change—especially important here is the diglossic situation that Greek has struggled with for so many centuries; and also externally motivated change, where contact with speakers of other languages has an effect on the language itself—relevant here are not just the effects of the expansion of Greek during the period of the Hellenistic Koine, but also the interactions with other languages of the Balkans during the Ottoman period (leading to widespread convergence and to the so-called Balkan “Sprachbund”).

---

<sup>2</sup> This argument has its origins in a conversation I had years ago (surely in the 1990s, though my memory fails me here) with Geoffrey Pullum, then at University of California at Santa Cruz and now at University of Edinburgh, about Greek as a major language; though doubting at first whether Greek belonged to that “class” of languages, he was persuaded by my mentioning Seferis and Elytis to him. So, thanks, Geoff!

Still, this second point, especially when we consider that what is conventionally called “Chinese” is really a group of several languages (Mandarin, Cantonese, etc.), and that in adding a language like Hindi to the list of languages with long histories we have already made allowances for figuring language split into our calculations, leads into the question of whether Greek indeed is “one” language across its entire history. We must ask at this point what it means to talk about Greek as “one” language throughout all of its history; some have done just this, e.g. Browning (1983:vii; my emphasis/BDJ):

The Homeric poems were first written down in more or less their present form in the seventh century B.C. Since then Greek has enjoyed a continuous tradition down to the present day. Change there has certainly been. But there has been no break like that between Latin and the Romance languages. Ancient Greek is not a foreign language to the Greek of today as Anglo-Saxon is to the modern Englishman. The only other language which enjoys comparable continuity of tradition is Chinese. ... *It cannot be too much emphasised that Greek is one language, and not a series of distinct languages.*

To some extent, talking about unity of a language over time is a misrepresentation (as the comments of Hamp 2003 on this very quote of Browning’s suggest), since all languages show some continuity with their past and some deviation from that past; that is, all languages are a mix at any one time of old features carried over from earlier stages of the language and new innovative features that are supplanting older ones. This is true whether we talk about the passage from Latin into French, or Sanskrit into Hindi, or Archaic Chinese into modern Mandarin, or Ancient Greek into Modern Greek, or, for that matter the passage from the English of Shakespeare into the English of hip-hop, or even from the English of the 20th century into English of the 21st century.

The divisions that we as linguists so readily place on the timeline as demarcating Old English as something distinct from Middle English, or for that matter as demarcating Latin as distinct from French, need always to be recognized as really just arbitrary divisions.

In this regard, we can wonder if Greek scholars have done a disservice to their language by being comfortable with the idea of Greek as “one” language across all the historical periods of its development (as contrasted, for instance, with Latin and the Romance languages). That is, there is remarkably great diversity across all of the pieces that go into what we call “the Greek language” and it might even be possible to discern four, and maybe more, Greek languages in the present-day (based largely on the criterion of mutual intelligibility as a measure, as flawed as that notion is as a decisive criterion for determining language versus dialect status): standard Greek and its dialects, Pontic Greek

(note that Drettas 1997 treats it as a separate language), Tsakonian Greek (note that its historical descent is different from that of the standard language and regional dialects, as it derives from the classical Doric dialect rather than from the Hellenistic Koine), and perhaps also Cypriot Greek (whether we are talking about the “deep” and now-receding older dialect or the Cypriot regional variety of the standard language). And further divisions could perhaps be made: is Cappadocian Greek, at least of the early 20th century (Dawkins 1916) to be considered a separate (but related) language, for instance? By doing this, we would not be diminishing the unity of Greek any more than recognizing distinct Latin-derived languages diminishes the unity of the Romance languages. And, by doing so, we would be giving the modern form of the language some integrity distinct from earlier stages. It is relevant to note here that the default in (most of) the West is to think of the unmarked sense of ‘Greek’ as being the ancient language, so that the adjective “Modern” has to be added to signal the contemporary language; the same is not done with other language names like Russian, or Spanish, or French, as for them, it is the earlier stages that get an adjectival modifier, since we talk about Old Russian, Old Spanish, Old French, etc. But Greek would lose neither its link with a long literary tradition nor with its long history, any more than recognizing the diversity of Chinese or of modern languages of India separates those modern languages from their past.

To some extent, the operative sensibility here is, as Shakespeare put it in *Romeo and Juliet* (II, ii, 1-2), “What’s in a name?”, recognizing that it is irrelevant, or at least arbitrary, how we label the language or conceptualize its relation with its past. Still, it is fair to wonder if Greek would have been “major” if it were just one of a cluster of languages. But this is actually the case for *all* of languages in Comrie’s book (note how many varieties of English there are, or of German, or Hindi, or Thai) since the notion of “distinct language” is largely a *social* construct.

What is clear about Greek, however many Greek languages there are, is that it is well-deserved as an object of intense interest, and thus, on a personal level for me, but also for all readers who have put considerable amounts of time into studying and analyzing this language, our time has been well spent!

## References

- Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard, ed. 1987. *The World’s Major Languages*. London: Croom Helm Publishers [Second edition, 2009, Routledge (Oxford/New York)].

- Dawkins, R.M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor. A study of dialect of Silli, Cappadocia and Pharasa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drettas, Georges. 1997. *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Arp (Association de recherches pluridisciplinaires).
- Hamp Eric. P. 2003. Prehistoric Greek phonological chronology, with some reflections on sibilance, aspiration, and spirancy. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 4: 65-68.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2008. MODERN GREEK, One of the *World's Major Languages*. *Greek Ethos* 8 (September 2008).