

Review of: "The normalization of biradical roots: the origin of triradicals and the proto-semitic language"

Erond L. Damanik¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Medan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for trusting me to review this article. Definitely, an interesting article that attempts to find and discover the biradic roots that underlie the triradicals with linguistic decay formulas in Semitic studies. According to Author's test, the triradical root appeared around 3500 BC. More specifically for me, this breakthrough is certainly exciting.

However, by including some narration and quotations at the closing points, new debates arise over these findings and conclusions. For example, (1) Agmon and Bloch's dating argument is based on the cultural shift in the Ancient Near East from hunter/gatherer agriculture to agriculture, even paradoxically, with the new calculations placing the date of emergence of civilization with the Sumerians in Mesopotamia and the transition from the Predynastic Period to the Dynastic Period Early in Egypt. Then, (2) the rise of civilization and changes in material culture is the rise of Proto-Semites, both Kitchen et al., Bayesian, and Hecker. This debate comes at the end of the author's conclusions that look dubious. For example, (1) triradicalism can definitively be called a feature of Semitic languages. These are not simply odd aspects of child language like ours or abstract creations of the Semites but forms that developed during the same time that the language family itself was beginning to differentiate itself, and (2) it is unclear whether this feature existed. the driving force, or feature, behind the creation of the Semitic branch of the Afrasian or just one of a number of features that developed concurrently with the emergence of the Proto-Semitic branch, but the Proto-Semitic branch's agreement with triradicalism research makes the correlation interesting.

Supposedly, the author changes the style of language at the point of conclusion to strengthen the findings, assumptions and statements put forward by the author.

Regarding the formula used, of course I will not comment on it, and I consider this calculation to be correct and according to the procedure and approach used.