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§ 1 Recently, Schaffner (2010), noticing the dismal fate of existing etymologies of Lat. *radius* based on etyma representing some kind of elongated physical object and observing also the wealth of early records of the word and its derivatives exhibiting the ‘ray of light’ meaning, has suggested a new etymology connecting the word primarily with OIcel./ONorw. *rœull* m. a-st. ‘glory, halo’, OE (Angl.?) *rador*/(WS) *rodor* m. a-st. ‘ether, (radiant, glittering) sky/heavens’, OS *radur* ‘id.’.

While Schaffner is to be congratulated for embarking on this new departure, there are two observations to be made.

§ 1.1 Schaffner illustrates the early attestation of *radius* and its derivatives presenting the meaning ‘ray of light’ with a representative selection of literary quotations beginning with Plautus and ending with Cicero (106–43 BCE) and Lucretius (c. 94–55 BCE), i.e. up to about the time of Varro’s (116–27 BCE) phrase *rota radiata* ‘spoked wheel’ (De re rustica 3.5.15), but does not document the history of attestation of the ‘elongated object’ meaning at all. Yet without this latter, the degree of the priority
of the ‘light’ meaning cannot be properly assessed. Certainly long before writers such as Cicero and Lucretius were born, M. Porcius Cato (234–149 BCE) mentions the kind of elongated olive called *radius maior* in *De re rustica (= De agricultura)* 6.1, the name doubtless referring to the shape of the olive rather than any particular sheen. This work is dated by Gou­jard (1975: xxxiii) to c. 182–177 BCE on the basis of the birth of Cato’s first son in 192. Since the play *Miles gloriosus*, from which the found­ing quotation of Plautus is drawn, is dated by Sonnenschein (1911: 829a) to approx. 206 BCE, this means a lead time for ‘ray’ of hardly more than three decades. But that may not be all: given that spoked wheels have been known since about 2000 BCE it seems not beyond the bounds of probabil­ity that Schaffner’s quotation from Ennius (239–169 BCE) (Annales 558) *inde patefecit radiis rota candida caelum* (‘then the bright wheel threw open the heavens with its rays’) could contain a poetic double entendre hinting at the meaning ‘spoke’ as well as the obvious meaning ‘ray’. If this is so, then since Ennius’ text is placed before Plautus’ second text, taken from Stichus, which is dated by Sonnenschein (1911: 829a) to 200 BCE, the lead time of ‘ray’ over ‘spoke’ would shrink to about half a decade. It is worth mentioning this, because the lack of clarity revealed by the chronology of attestation no doubt played a part in the reluctance of older scholars to change their views about the primary meaning of the word. So much the greater, consequently, is the cudos that accrues to Schaffner for being the first to strike out in this new direction.

§ 1.2 Schaffner’s etymology will be acceptable to many Indo-European­ists, but not to all because it is based on a PIE ablaut *â/a* that is not acceptable to everybody, including the present writer.¹ It is appropriate therefore to seek to provide an alternative analysis with the potential to enjoy a wider appeal, i.e. one that does not depend on PIE *a* but still

---

¹ Even the typological argument in favour of PIE *a* is a nonstarter. The *Tel(l)-el-* found at the beginning of versions of Middle Eastern placenames, such as *Tel(l)-el-Amarna* and *Tel(l)-el-Kebir*, reflects two instances of the “elsewhere” allophone of the solitary non-high vocalic phoneme of Written Arabic generally denoted /a/ by Western linguists. This phoneme has “conditioned” allophones that Indo-Europeanists might well write a and o in the vicinity of certain sets of consonants and is opposed to two high phonemes denoted by linguists /i/ and /u/. To this simple /â i u/ vocalic structure PIE adds an originally unstressed /a/ which, by contrast with the regular unstressed vowel realized as zero, is treated as long and develops, as often, to â, with length conditionally preserved in Sanskrit and Anatolian (see Woodhouse (in press), § 2).
relies on much the same semantic insight invoking not only the clarity, revelation and enlightenment but also the cheerfulness, joy and happiness associated with light as opposed to the ignorance and despondency associated with darkness and gloom.

§ 2 First it will be as well to establish some limits on the formal side. The root syllable of Lat. *radius*, with its short vowel, can result either from tautosyllabic PIE *rd-* in *rd-io-*, in which *i* would be consonantal (Schrijver 1991: 477–485) or from *rHd(h)*- by Beekes’ law (not **HrHd(h)**-) which, contra Beekes (1988: 39–41), Schrijver (1991: 304–316) and other Leiden Indo-Europeanists, would give Lat. **rād-**, cf. Woodhouse 2011: 158–162).

In either case we have zero grade of the root. This agrees with Schaffner’s (2010: 112) morphological analysis of *radius* as a nomen agentis with suffix *-io-*, which I am happy to accept and which Schaffner exemplifies with several other items having zero grade of the root, such as Ved. jūrya- ‘aging’, tāya- ‘strong’, OHG luggi ‘false, deceitful, lying’ = OCS břž ‘id.’, Lat. pluvius ‘rainy’, fluvius ‘river’.

§ 3 That it might be possible to establish a connection between Lat. *radius* ‘ray of light; pointer’ and Lith. rōdyti ‘show, demonstrate, display, perform (tricks), clarify something’, Latv. rādīt ‘show’, on the basis that the agent of clarity could be light, was first made apparent to me for Latv. rādīt at a Christmas celebration by a line of the song ‘Sidrabiņa lietiņš lija’ (Silver rain was falling), viz. menestītis ceļu rāda which my Latvian hosts translated ‘moonlight brightly lit a path’. For Lith. rōdyti an indirect connection with seeing and light is suggested by the German glosses supplied by Kurschat (1968–1973: s. v.) for the active, viz. ‘zur Schau stellen’ (lit. ‘put on show’) and ‘erklären’ (lit. ‘clarify’), as well as those for the reflexive rōdytis (= Latv. rādītīs) ‘erscheinen, scheinen’ and man rūdos ‘mir scheint’ in which the concepts ‘seem’ and ‘shine’ are inextricably entangled. Further evidence for the connection can be seen in derivatives like Lith. rodįklė ‘pointer’ (with metatony, Derksen 1996: 180), Latv. rādītājs ‘id.’.

The connection can be supported in part by the parallel development seen in Lipp’s (LIV²: s. v. *kšēk*) proposal to derive AV sām kāšayati ‘makes visible’ and OCS kažō kazati ‘show’ from a “Kausativ” *kšōk/g-ie- to *kšēk/g- ‘see’ (tentatively accepted by Derksen 2008: s. v. *kāzāti*). As is the case with our Baltic verbs, the base form of this causative is miss-
ing in Slavic,² where the bare verb also develops the meaning ‘say, tell’ (e.g. Ukrainian kaza' kazyATy, SerboCroat kazyem kazyati, Bulgarian kaza). Further, the gloss ‘makes visible’ (“macht sichtbar”) supplied by Lipp for the Vedic item suggests the form is factitive rather than causative (for the editors of LIV² causative clearly includes factitive), a judgement that must also be applied to our pair of Baltic verbs since both are constructed with the dative of the entity that perceives what is shown or made apparent.³

The parallelism is not quite complete, however: the acute in the Baltic words, which Derksen (1996: 180) clearly regards as original, makes it unlikely that they reflect the same form of the causative/factitive that Lipp finds in OCS kažo kazyati with its accented lengthened grade root, since such a form would yield a circumflex in Baltic even if the lengthened grade vowel was originally followed by a laryngeal (Kortlandt 1985: 115). Instead the acute points to the alternative formation with unaccented o-grade of the laryngealized root and accented suffix. The retraction of the accent and the resulting acute are then both explicable by Hirt’s law. The only remaining formal difficulty is that the expected *ô-grade has been replaced by a secondary Baltic *ã-grade, but this a common problem – or nonproblem – in Baltic linguistics (Stang 1966: 39–41; LIV²: loc. cit.) and merely closes one more door on any possibility of determining the precise nature of the laryngeal on the basis of the Baltic forms.

Based on the above, Stang’s (Stang 1942: 148, repeated in Stang 1966: 326) semantically uncompelling suggestion that Lith. rodyti, Latv. rādit are (genuine) causatives to rañda rasti ‘find’, which is rightly ignored by Mann (1984–1987: s.vv. radh-, rādh-) and given a lukewarm mention by Smoczynski (2007: s.v.), though accepted by Fraenkel (1962–1965: s.v.), Karulis (1992: s.v.) and LIV²: 497f. can be decisively rejected on

² Connection with the apparently homophonic root in *dëznqti ‘go/be missing/wanting, want, yearn for’, is rightly rejected by Derksen (2008: s.v. *kaziti ‘ruin, destroy’). ³ A true causative, on the hand, typically governs the accusative of the agent of the basic action as in, e.g., RV 1.48.5, the relevant part of the text in the present context being ā gha yोṣeva sūnāry uṣā yāti ... | ... uṭpātaṇati pakṣinah ‘thus like a merry girl the dawn approaches ... I ... (and) makes winged creatures fly up’. Note that my translation ‘like a merry girl’ is authorized by glosses in Monier-Williams (1899: 858c, 1242b s.vv. yōshanā = yōshā, sū-nāra) and seems to me to fit the context of startling birds into the air; Griffith (1896), no doubt following Sāyaṇa (sūṣṭha grhakṛtasya netṛ grhīṇiva ‘like a wife, excellently a director of household duties’), translates ‘like a good matron’.
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both syntactical and formal grounds: the rectio is wrong; and the other causative/iteratives mentioned by Stang (1942: 148) in support of his etymology show no sign of the metatony that would be required to explain absence of the acute in the proposed source item.


If cognate, the Vedic and Germanic words point to PIE root final *dʰ* and Goth. *ga-redan* specifies the laryngeal as *h₁*, but note that Mayrhofer (EWAia: 2, s. v. *rādh*) does not connect the Baltic or Celtic words or Goth. *rodjan* with *rādhat(i)* (see also § 4 below on OCS *raditi*).

On the other hand, the somewhat popular connection of Ved. *rādhat(i)* ‘perform successfully’ and Goth. *ga-redan* with OCS (ne) *radit/roditi* (e.g. Matasović l.c.; Fasmer 1986–1987: s. v. *radēt*; Kümmel in LIV²: s. v. *reh₁dʰ*–; Mayrhofer l.c.) cannot be supported; but since the phonology of this Slavic word group is important for a later section of this paper it deserves a section of its own, as follows.

§ 4 The connection of Ved. *rādhat(i)*, Goth. *ga-redan* with OCS (ne) *radit/roditi* just alluded to is not mentioned by Derksen (2008: s. vv. *raditi* and *roditi/2) who presumably does not approve of it – and I agree. According to Kümmel (LIV²: s. v. *reh₁dʰ*-,*sed*–), the present of *roditi* continues pres. *rh₁dʰ*-ie–, that of *raditi* continues caus.-iter. *roh₁dʰ*-ie– (p. 499f.) while those of *xoditi* and *saditi* continue caus.-iter. or denom. *sod*-ie– and caus.-iter. *sod*- with the original *ie*-suffix replaced by *-ie*– (p. 513f.). It is noteworthy that the SCr. forms of *raditi* and *saditi* recorded by Derksen (2008: s. vv.) correspond item for item with each other accentually, thus inf. *råditi* : *sáditi*, 1 sg. *rådīm* : *sādīm*, Čak. (Vrg.) inf. *råditi* : *sāditi*, 2 sg. *rådīš* : *sādīš*. Also to be noted is that the forms of the *sod*- group would develop a quasi-laryngeal in Slavic by Winter’s law, meaning that they could hypothetically represent *s?d*-ie and *so?d*-ie, i.e. ultimately the same two formations as those proposed by Kümmel (l.c.) for *rød*-, provided the sequences *s?d*- and *r?d*- can be regarded as yielding Slavic *sod*- and *rod*-, which is usually denied (e. g.

---

4 Matasović’s (l.c.) “Lith. *rodýti* ‘show’” evidently contains a misprint.
Kortlandt 1975: 3; Beekes 1988: 27, 36 etc. on OCS lóky, Lith. lazdà etc.). It is odd therefore that the lack of acuting in the *sod-/sad- group can be explained relatively easily by Meillet’s law, while this explanation is less easy with the rod-/rad- group because stress should have been retracted from the suffix to the first syllable by Hirt’s law, unless the PIE root was actually not *reh₁dʰ- but *rh₁edʰ-, on which possibility see Kortlandt 1975: 3. It also seems odd that two Slavic verbs of identical meaning based on rod-/rad- should originate in semantically different formations, while two verbs of markedly different meaning based on *sod-/sad- should both be regarded as caus.-iter. of the same root. It seems likely therefore that the rod-/rad- group has similar origins to those Kümmel (l.c.) ascribes to the *sod-/sad- group and should be based on *red(h)-, possibly even the same as the BSI. ‘birthing’ root, since only Slovene appears to show any accentual differences between the two (see Derksen 2008: 437 s. vv.), while the basic meanings ‘nurture’ → ‘bear fruit’ and ‘care (about)’ seem also compatible.

Even without this connection it is clear that the circumflex descendents of raditi indicated above point to differentiation from roditi by intra-Slavic morphological lengthening of the root vowel. Consequently this length has nothing to do with that of the Germanic and Vedic forms indicated above.

§ 5 For light as cheerfulness, joy and happiness, an obvious comparison, despite a small prosodic problem of which more shortly, is with Slavic radostъ ‘joy’, the metaphorical connection of ‘joy’ with ‘radiance’ being probably universal, cf. Russ. sjat’ ot udovol’stvija, radosti, scast’ja ‘shine/glow/be radiant with pleasure, joy, happiness’ in SSRLJa: 13, 867a; Arabic kāna ‘alā wajhihā ḍiyā’wm min faraḥin lam yaši‘a ‘alayhi munḏu zamān’in ‘on her face was a glow of joy that had not beamed upon it for some time’ (Awwād 1983: 78; my transl. – RW).

Formally more satisfactory is the base from which radostъ is derived, viz. Slavic râdь, râda ‘glad, willing’, with laryngealized root (Kortlandt 1975: 62), cf. SCr. rãd, râda, Sln. råd, ráda, Bulg. rad, ráda, Cz. rád, rada, which as it stands, though with a nonzero ablaut grade, is certainly compatible with all three of the theoretically possible protoforms indicated above (§ 2). The apparent semantic degradation from the ‘joy’ and ‘gladness’ of radostъ to the ‘willingness, preparedness’ of râdь, râda is about the same as in those English expressions involving glad and happy
with infinitive (e.g. *I'd be happy to help you with that any time*) that generally indicate simply willingness, preparedness to undertake a particular action, and not that the speaker expects to enjoy real gladness or happiness through so doing.

This etymology will necessitate severing the direct connection that is sometimes made between *rādō, rāda* and *roditi/raditi* 'care about, heed' (e.g. Machek 1957: s. v. rád; Fasmer 1986–1987: s. v. rad; ignored by Derksen 2008: s. vv. *raditi, *roditi/2), since, as argued above (§ 4), the latter group has no laryngeal. The urging of such a connection can, however, be invoked instead as an argument for folk etymological influence between the two groups. And it is this influence, I propose, that explains the lapse of the acute in Czech *radost* and Pleteršnik's (1894–1895: s. v.) Slovene *radōst*, a form now characterized by the Slovene Academy (Černelič 1980–1991: s. v.) as stylistically coloured beside its preferred variant (with tone) *rádost*. That this agrees with with Bulg. *rādost* in preserving the original acute emerges from the following considerations.

Slovene dial. *radōst* has evidently undergone the same development as *mladōst* with which it shares the same pattern, having secondarily acquired a long falling vowel in the first syllable which was then shortened according to the rule described by Kortlandt (2002: § 9.4) with stress subsequently shifted to the second syllable according to ibid. § 10.7, the short vowel in the first syllable preventing the word from having been input to the stress retraction described ibid. § 10.10; hence we can be confident that Slovene *rádost* is not output from this last rule, leaving preservation of the acute as its only rational explanation.

Incidentally, this same influence probably explains the prosodic variation observable in representatives of Slav. *radi* 'for the sake of' (approx. = ‘for the happiness/well-being of’) and/or ‘because of’, whatever its ultimate origin (possibly Iranian loan, according to Derksen (2008: s. v.));

---

5 SCr. *rádōst* is ambiguous: it can either preserve the original acute or it can have undergone part of the same development as Slovene *radōst*, secondarily acquiring a falling long vowel in the first syllable that was subsequently shortened according to the same rule. Russ. *rādōst* is no doubt also ambiguous.
possible connection with \textit{rad} mooted by Fasmer 1986–1987: I.c.), thus: SCR. \textit{rādi} with acute vs. SCR., Slovene \textit{rādi}⁶ without.⁷

Since these Slavic words are best compared with OE \textit{rót} ‘glad, cheerful, bright’, \textit{rētan/rētan} ‘delight, cheer, comfort’, ON \textit{rētask} ‘become cheerful’ (Fasmer 1986–1987: s.v.),⁸ the root final \textit{t} of which is unlikely to be due to Kluge’s law, this etymology points to PIE protoforms \textit{*reh₂} or \textit{*roHd}–, which can be compatible with Lith. \textit{rōdyti}, Latv. \textit{rādīt} (§ 3 above) if we follow Mayrhofer in refusing to recognize any connection between these Baltic words and the group of Ved. subj. \textit{rādh} at(i) ‘perform successfully’ and Goth. \textit{ga-redan} ‘provide for, aim at’ (§ 3 above), and if we exclude in addition Goth. \textit{ro}djan ‘speak’. This will presumably entail also the exclusion of OIr. \textit{ro-rādīd} ‘id.’, though not necessarily Welsh \textit{rhawdd} ‘clarity’, since, despite Slavic \textit{*kāzāti} ‘show’ and ‘tell’, there is no obligatory connection between the concepts ‘speech’ and ‘clarity’.

---

⁶ Derksen’s (2008: s.v. \textit{*radi}) claim that the SSlov. forms with circumflex mean only ‘because of’ appears to reflect a minority opinion: It is not borne out for SerboCroat by Karadžić (1818) or Ristić & Kangrga (1928), both works recording only \textit{rādi} for both meanings, nor by Tolstoj (1957) who also gives only \textit{rādi} but only in the meaning ‘for, for the sake of’, nor for Slovene by Kotnik (1967), whose tone-free dictionary refers \textit{rādi} to \textit{zarādi} (á denotes here long \textit{a}) which, contra Derksen, is glossed here merely ‘on account of, for the sake of, because of, owing to’, while the Slovene Academy (Černelič 1980–1991) classes \textit{radi} (with long or short \textit{a}) as a nonstandard equivalent of \textit{zaradi}, and, accordingly, Grad (1982) omits \textit{radi} and gives the same glosses for \textit{zarādi} as Kotnik, adding only ‘for’.

⁷ It seems doubtful that the circumflex of Lith. \textit{rōds} ‘willingly; admittedly, to be sure’ has much bearing on these conclusions, despite Smoczyński’s (2007: 519) proposal to derive \textit{rōds} by contraction from 3.pres. \textit{rōdos(t)} ‘it seems’, since Fraenkel (1962–1965: 741) is almost certainly correct in viewing \textit{rōds} as a later form of the adverbial use of \textit{rōdas} ‘willing, welcome, pleasant’, which in turn represents a loan of Polish or Belarusian \textit{rad} ‘glad’. A different Slavic loan results eventually in Lith. \textit{rōdyti} ‘advise’ but this does not seem to have led to any confusion between these similar word families in Lithuanian.

⁸ Fasmer also records here an alternative connection with the first component of the name of a Slavic chieftain attested in Greek text as \textit{Ἀρδαγόστος} (or \textit{Ἄρδαγοστός} – Shevelov 1964: 395, who raises the problem of the etymology as well), which in Greek could mean ‘admirably dirty’ and anyway offers nothing substantive by way of etymology despite Slavic \textit{Radogostu}, the meaning of the first element of which can only be guessed at. It is not clear why Fasmer thinks that this form in particular predisposes to comparison with Gk. \textit{ἐραμώς}, though if this is related to our Latin word it can simply represent PIE \textit{*r₂h₂}– (with genuine prothetic \textit{ɛ}– brought on by PIE anlaut \textit{*r}-) the full grade of which plus \textit{*d}-extension could, but need not, form the basis of our Slavic words.
On the other hand it remains the case that Ved. subj. rādhati(i) ‘perform successfully’ makes a good semantic match with Lith. rōdyti ‘perform tricks’.

§ 6 In view of the difficulty just encountered it may be worth having another look at Schaffner’s etymology. The critical item in Schaffner’s equation is West Saxon rodor since, as things stand, the vowel of the first syllable may either represent a case of spontaneous assimilation to the vowel of the next syllable, (OE [Angl.??]) rador > WS rodor, or continue the zero grade, *rd- > *rud- > rod-. Schaffner (2010: 116f. n.17) supports the zero-grade interpretation by comparing Goth. lustus ‘desire, lust’, OE lust ‘pleasure’ < *ls-tu- and OE/WS nosu f. u-stem ‘nose’ allegedly < *nusu- < *ns-u- beside OE/Kent. nasu ‘id.’ allegedly < PIE *nas-u-.9

I think Schaffner’s version of the zero-grade interpretation is wrong and the assimilation interpretation not quite right. With regard to Schaffner’s alleged development of OE/WS nosu, it must be said that genuine OE u-stems with Germanic u in the root syllable, such as duru ‘door’ sunu ‘son’, wudu ‘wood’, and even some that have transferred to the a-declension, such as grund ‘ground’ and lust, retain root u throughout the paradigm (see examples in J. Wright & E. M. Wright 1925: 199–201). It is therefore somewhat doubtful that nosu could have escaped this general principle. Since a (rather than **æ) in the root syllables of OE (Kent.) nasu and OE (Angl.) rador is due to the presence of (*u in the following syllable (ibid. 39) and the alternation of OE a and o in certain environments is well known, it seems more likely that, just as eo is a special West Saxon development in hweogol ‘wheel’, sweotola(e) ‘plain(ly), clear(ly)’, weotuma ‘dowry’, sweostor ‘sister’ (ibid. 53) beside hvegl, swetole, sweater, wetuma of other dialects, so the two West Saxon forms nosu and rodor represent two somewhat isolated but mutually supporting West Saxon instances of a more exaggerated form of the same u-umlaut, thus PIE *HnHs-u- > PGm. *nasu- > OE/WS nosu and PIE *rHdброuro- > PGm. *radura- > *rođura- > WS rodor. The catalyst for this more extreme process, which seems not to have been noticed before (probably thanks to unwarranted reliance on PIE *a), may have been the presence

---

9 Schaffner cites OS sultia ‘brine’ etc. in order to vouch for a normal zero grade beside alleged a-grade in *sal- ‘salt’ but Boutkan & Siebinga (2005: s. v. salt) give the protoform of this zero grade sult- as PIE *sh2ld- > *sHld-; the correct reconstruction of the ‘salt’ word goes back to Kortlandt (1985: 119).
of anlaut resonants in these two words; in which case it may have been blocked in lagu ‘sea, flood’ and magu ‘son’ by the medial velars.

Among Schaffner’s (2010: 121) examples of the PIE suffixes *-uro- and *-ulo- are several based on zero grade of the root, viz. Lat. *satur ‘satisfied’ < *sh₂t-, Toch. B pärkär ‘long’ < *bhrgʰ-, Gk. γλαφυρός ‘hollow(ed); smooth, refined’, even if this last does represent a blend of γλυφ- ‘carve, engrave’ and γραφ- ‘scratch, write’ (Beekes 2010: s.v.), perhaps assisted by dissimilation, in which case < *grbʰ-. Consequently, nothing prevents our reconstruction *rHdʰ-ul/ro- for the Germanic forms.

Schaffner (2010: 122-129), by reconstructing an acrostic u-stem with ablaut either *rāḍʰu-/*rāḍʰu- or *rōḍʰu-/*rāḍʰu- connects his Germanic words with Ved. Rā́hū- as ‘possessor of the light’, the name of a demon said to cause eclipses by swallowing the sun and the moon. If necessary, the same connection can be achieved by substituting our *rōHdʰu- for Schaffner’s *rōḍʰu-. Schaffner (2010: 129-133) supplies parallels for an u-stem with o-grade of the root so that his eventual (133-135) decision in favour of lengthened a-grade can be discounted because it is based entirely on his original unnecessary positing of an a-grade root.

As for the Norwegian river name Radund-: in the light of *h₂rg-n-to- yielding Old Iranian words for silver (Schaffner 2010: 136), nothing forbids our *rHcJh-n-to- > Radund-.

§ 7 As things stand, we thus have several possible etymological combinations for Lat. radius depending principally on which Germanic words we wish to include in the equation and partly on how we view the semantics.

If we prefer the connection with OE rôt ‘glad, cheerful, bright’, rætan/rētan ‘delight, cheer, comfort’, ON rætask ‘become cheerful’ then it is possible to include both Slavic *rādž rāda ‘glad’ and Lith. rūdyti, Latv. rādīt ‘make clear, illuminate, show’, and even Welsh rhawdd ‘clarity’, all possibly < PIE *re/oHd- , so separating the Welsh word from other Celtic and Germanic words meaning ‘speak’ and discarding the attractive, but quite possibly secondary, semantic similarity of Ved. subj. rādhat(i) ‘perform successfully’, as well as our amended form of Schaffner’s semantically attractive etymology.
If, on the other hand, we wish to include all those elements that would need to be discarded in the alternative just indicated, then we would have to reconstruct instead PIE *re/oHdʰ-, leaving to one side the somewhat isolated group of OE rót, though not necessarily the Slavic *rād- group that is usually equated with it.

A third alternative is to include all of the above on the basis of the reasonably well documented possibility of alternation between stops of different laryngeal settings in PIE. No doubt it would be preferable if a decision could be made between the first two alternatives, but it would seem that at present this is not possible.

Finally we reiterate our conclusion that Slavic roditi/raditi ‘care’ contains no radical laryngeal and consequently cannot be directly related to either of the groups proposed here as potential cognates of Lat. radius.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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