

his colleague in 253, but I think that this tablet, bearing, as it does, the name of an imperial legate of the *Augusti*, was not erected before the death of the *Galli*, and the recognition by the senate. But the Reviewer gives a modern authority in support of his view, the Baron Marchant. On the other side, I may be permitted to refer to Fynes Clinton, whose opinion on such subjects is justly held in the highest estimation. That learned investigator, in his *Fasti Romani*, A.D. 254, remarks :

"Gallienus is associated in the empire." "The son of Valerian [*i.e.* Gallienus] was acknowledged by the senate in June, A.D. 254."

In A.D. 260, he gives the following notes :

"Saloninus slain." "Saloninus was still living, August 29, A.D. 259, and is mentioned in *Cod. Justin.* at May 15, A.D. 260; see col. 3. His death may therefore be placed about June, A.D. 260."

The notices in the Justinian Code are the same which I have already mentioned. Clinton adds the remark : "The Cæsar Valerian is named in only three out of seventeen laws [of the year 260]. If he is rightly inserted, he was still living in May, 260." Here, it must be admitted, is the expression of a doubt as to the correctness of the insertion of the name in this year, but the author's estimation of the value of this doubt is manifest from his disregarding it, and placing the death of Saloninus, and giving the authorities, in 260.

In the 'Chronological Tables of Roman History,' subjoined to Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, we have the following notices on the subject :—

"254. Valerianus emperor. His son Gallienus is made Augustus.

"260. Saloninus, the son of Valerian, put to death by Postumus."

The statement that "Gallienus was made Augustus" is correct, for he was in this year not only *Cæsar* but *Augustus*; but "Valerian," in the words "son of Valerian," is a mistake for "Gallienus."

63. In the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, there is a "fragment of a rudely carved monumental stone;" from Risingham, which bears an inscription of more than ordinary interest, if my view of it be correct. It is figured in the *Archæologia Æliana*, new series, i. p. 257; and "the letters which appeared [to Dr. Bruce] most probable when the stone was placed under a strong light, are :