

and *memoria*. There is, however, a sepulchral stone, which, if my reading be correct, furnishes a term that I have never met with in any other inscription. As the examination of it may be of some interest, I shall devote the next article to the consideration of it.

33. In Horsley's *Britannia Romana* (Yorkshire n. 15) we have the following inscription :

DMS
CADIEDI
* IAE FO *
TVNA *
PIA·V·AX *

Mr. Horsley expands it thus : *Dis Manibus sacrum Cadiediniæ Fortuna Pia vixit annos decem*. Mr. Ward had previously read it : "*Cadillae Jeriae Piae Fortunata Pia*, all which names are in Gruter." It is obvious that Mr. Ward's reading should be at once rejected. According to the process which he adopted, almost anything could be made out of anything with the help of Gruter's Index. I am not satisfied, however, with Horsley's expansion. The chief objection, which I have to it, arises from the singularity of the names *Cadiedinia*, and *Fortuna Pia*. There can, I think, be no doubt that *pia* is not a name, but an adjective expressing the character of the deceased female. There are many examples of this use of *pius* and *pia* (not *pie*) e. gr. Renier's *Inscriptions de l'Algérie*, n. 2814 :

D M S
SITTIA
MENOPHI
LA · PIA · VIX
ANXXV
H S E

i.e. *Dis Manibus sacrum. Sittia Menophila. Pia vixit annis viginti quinque. Hic sita est.*

If this view be adopted, it follows then that there are not two persons named in the inscription under consideration, but only one, whose second name is FORTVNA or FORTVNATA. The question then, is as to her first name. Adopting Horsley's conjecture, I would supply N as the first letter of the third line, but would limit the name to the letters EDINIAE, which I regard as used for the