

External Factors: the Archaeology of Early Roman Gaul

Although the internal explanation may be satisfactory on an individual level it does not explain the progression among these authors from a basic level of civilization in the characterization of Gaul to one more and more Roman, a progression that results in Tacitus' depiction of the Gauls as equals. One possible explanation for this progression is the physical changes in landscape and material remains from Gaul during this time, which presumably would have affected the perception of the province for any Roman who came into contact with Gaul.¹ It is important to recognize that underlying the pervasive ethnographic tradition and the stereotyped depiction of the other, there was a constant stream of cultural exchange—information passing between Romans and provincials that could subsequently affect how Romans perceived and presented provincial and foreign populations.² In order to identify how this external factor may have influenced Roman perception and presentation of Gaul during this time, it is first necessary to summarize the development of Gaul in the 1st centuries BCE and CE.

Although our period of interest was a time of major change and transition (the fall of the Republic and the establishment of the Empire), and Gaul and its political relationship with Rome were undergoing major changes with its conquest and then subsequent grants of Latin Rights and Roman citizenship to Gallic communities and individuals, this report focuses specifically on the landscape of Gaul and the transformations in material culture from around 100 BCE to 100 CE. During this time,

¹ Both Caesar and Claudius spent time in Gaul; Strabo explicitly mentions his use of informants for his geography (3.4.3); Tacitus frequently provides detailed information on local practices and beliefs only attainable through investigation (e.g. *Germ.* 1.2; 43.3).

² Woolf 2008.

Gaul, the archaeological evidence suggests, was becoming increasingly more ‘romanized’. The term “Romanization” generally refers to the process by which a province or people increasingly adopt Roman culture represented by the presence of certain Roman material remains, such as pottery and architecture.³ This term has come under much scrutiny and debate over the last decades and many scholars have attempted to do away with its use entirely.⁴ For the purposes of this report, however, we are fortunate enough to be able to skirt the debated issues of “Romanization”—namely how or why did such provinces adopt Roman culture—and rather focus on the actual increasing presence of artifacts that we consider Roman in Gaul. Specifically, we are looking for evidence in the material culture that the inhabitants of Gaul were becoming more receptive of Roman culture because that is the picture created by Caesar, Strabo, Claudius, and Tacitus. In other words, if we can identify a prevalence of Roman (or Roman-influenced) cultural material in the archaeological evidence from Gaul, we can argue that from an ancient Roman perspective, the Gauls appeared Roman by speaking Latin, living in Roman cities or villas, consuming Roman goods, and employing classical styles in art.⁵

³ For an excellent summary on the history of scholarship on “Romanization”, see Freeman 1997; Hingley 2005; for recent case studies on “Romanization” in the western provinces, see Millett 1990; Woolf 1998.

⁴ For recent debates surrounding “Romanization” and its scholarly application, see Barrett 1997; Webster 2001; 2003.

⁵ This survey avoids one issue surrounding “Romanization”, specifically the question of identity. Many times, material evidence will be used as an indicator that certain belief systems or identities were internalized by the producers of such objects. This report makes no such claim and leaves the debate of Gallic identity untouched; it is enough for this report to simply show that the Gauls appeared Roman (to other Romans).

For that reason, this section will attempt to provide the ‘cultural geography’ of Gaul from just before its conquest to around 100 CE.⁶ This section will create such a geography for Roman Gaul by examining the presence of Latin inscriptions, urbanization (in Roman form), the consumption of Roman goods, the intensification of agriculture, and the adoption of Classical forms in Gallic sculpture, tracking their presence and developments both geographically and chronologically. This cultural geography will show that the adoption of Roman material culture in Gaul matched the developing rhetoric of Gaul in the literary record discussed in the previous section. By demonstrating this similar development, I hope to show that perhaps the authors who deviated from the ethnographic tradition were influenced by more than personal motivations; there is the possibility that their writings were influenced by their knowledge of the developing landscape of Roman Gaul.

One means of tracking the cultural change in Gaul is through the analysis of Latin epigraphy.⁷ The well-catalogued inscriptions from Roman Gaul provide us with evidence for a variety of different practices—political, funerary, cultic—and a variety of different aspects of Roman influence—the spread of the Latin language, the adoption of Roman names, the establishment of Roman institutions. These inscriptions are also a good source of evidence because they are numerous and easily datable and provenanced.⁸ In fact, inscriptions in general often have been used by scholars as a means of mapping

⁶ See Woolf 1998, chap. 4.

⁷ See Woolf 1998, Chap. 4 for what follows.

⁸ For the inscriptions from Gaul, see *CIL* XII (Narbonensis), and XIII (three Gauls and the two Germanies), along with their supplements.

cultural change and “Romanization” in the provinces.⁹ It is important to keep in mind, however, that this brief survey of the spread and use of Latin inscriptions in Gaul during this time is not meant to assert that the Gauls were presenting themselves as Romans; rather, this survey merely is intended to track the adoption of distinctly Roman practices and Roman institutions across a provincial landscape, an adoption that caused the Gauls to appear to be Roman from both ancient and even modern perspectives.

While thousands of inscriptions do survive from Gaul, overall they are few compared to many parts of the Western Empire, such as Italy and North Africa.¹⁰ But the inscriptions do come from a relatively wide range of social classes, demonstrating that the spread of Roman culture went beyond the local elites. The results of Woolf’s analysis of inscriptions shows that the larger cities—those along major routes or serving as seats of provincial administration—produced the highest number of inscriptions, especially Narbonne and Nîmes, each of which produced over one thousand inscriptions.¹¹ Inscriptions also were concentrated along the frontier lines at the Roman military settlements in the Rhineland and around Roman colonies, such as Narbonne, and the veteran colonies of Arles and Orange.¹² Some of these inscriptions, particularly the funerary commemorations, were largely Roman in form (i.e. *tria nomina*) and a study of these monuments shows their dissemination from Roman colonists and soldiers to Gallic

⁹ Mócsy 1970, pp. 199-212; Nicols 1987; Cepas 1989.

¹⁰ Harris 1989, pp. 266-268.

¹¹ The number includes inscriptions first appearing in the late first century BCE and ending in the 3rd century CE. For more discussion and detailed maps of the distribution of inscriptions in Gaul, see Woolf 1998, pp. 83-88, figs. 4.1-6.

¹² A similar phenomenon occurs along the northern frontier of Britain, see Mann 1985, p. 205 and Biró 1975, pp. 32-45.

elites and finally to their dependents, which also implies the dissemination of Roman burial practices.¹³

These inscriptions did not begin with Roman contact with Gaul or even directly after the conquest. Hardly any such inscriptions have surfaced from Gaul in the Republican period.¹⁴ The earliest Latin inscriptions were concentrated around the colony of Narbonne, and none appear in the north until the reign of Augustus.¹⁵ The concept of writing or inscribing, moreover, was not new to the inhabitants of Gaul. Already by the 5th century BCE various communities had adopted Greek, Phoenician, or Etruscan scripts and Celtic inscriptions survive on pottery as well as coins.¹⁶ Overall, the spread of Celtic (or pre-Roman) inscriptions is heavily parochial, with some communities using epigraphy very early while their neighbors never do (or not in a demonstrable way).¹⁷ Thus, when Latin does appear throughout the province of Gaul (albeit concentrated in urban areas) it marks both the adoption of the Latin language and also the adoption of a wholly Roman practice of epigraphy.¹⁸

The practice of public epigraphy in Latin began in Gaul around 20 BCE, first in the south around Narbonne and Nîmes, then spread throughout all of Gaul. Latin epigraphy immediately replaced the previous manners of inscription, a phenomenon quite different from the unsystematic way that writing had spread through the province before

¹³ Hatt 1951, pp. 157-163; Woolf 1998, p. 102.

¹⁴ A milestone along the Via Domitia bears an inscription that may date to the mid-first century BCE or earlier, see Christol (1995, pp. 174-80) for the dating.

¹⁵ Barruol 1976, p. 402.

¹⁶ Many inscriptions may be lost to us because they were written on perishable materials, such as wood (Caesar *BG* 1.29); for more on Celtic inscriptions, see *RIG* 1985; *RAN* 21 1988.

¹⁷ See Woolf 1994 for chronology and discussion; for the regionalism in Late Iron Age Gaul, see Woolf 1997.

¹⁸ A similar phenomenon takes place at around the same time Iberia, see Untermann 1992.

Roman power. The use of Latin rises dramatically in the mid-second century CE, finally peaking in the early third century before a decline.¹⁹ These inscriptions, found on funerary commemorations as well as votive offerings, also indicate the spread of other Roman cultural practices, such as burial practices and ritual, following along the same timeline.²⁰ Thus, based on this study, we can see that little change occurred immediately after conquest, but beginning in the reign of Augustus, the inhabitants of Gaul readily adopted the Roman practice of Latin epigraphy, which continued to spread throughout the province for the next few centuries.²¹ This chronological map of development will become the paradigm for all rates of change in the material culture of Gaul.

Another area of change for Roman Gaul was the urban landscape and settlement patterns, specifically the founding of cities and their subsequent monumentalization. Like the use of epigraphy, Late Iron Age Gaul settlement patterns were highly regionalized. Although most of the larger settlements throughout pre-Roman Gaul were *oppida* (hillforts), some of the sites in Southern Gaul were heavily influenced by the surrounding Mediterranean culture, while northern settlements were similar to other Iron Age sites in continental Europe with post-hole constructions, wattle, and daub.²² The northern *oppida* were much larger than those in the south and many were built in what appears to be a period of economic prosperity in the early 1st century BCE (80-70 BCE).²³

¹⁹ For comparable timelines in other provinces, see Mrozeck 1973.

²⁰ Saller and Shaw 1984; Meyer 1990.

²¹ Woolf 1998, p. 96.

²² On urbanism in Roman Gaul in general, see Drinkwater 1985; Bedon et al. 1988; for Late Iron Age settlement patterns in Southern Gaul, see Py 1990; for northern Gaul, see Collis 1984; Ralston 1992.

²³ Audouze and Buchsenschutz 1989, pp. 196-213; Buchsenschutz and Colin 1990; Woolf 1998, pp. 108-110; Woolf (1998, pp. 107, 111) notes the ambiguousness of such *oppida* in the eyes of Romans and also modern scholars. As for modern debates, whether or not they are concerned cities or evidence of pre-Roman urbanism largely depends on your definition of a city. As for the Roman perspective, Woolf

In his study of the urbanization of Gaul, G. Woolf divides the process into four steps: relocation of sites, organization of urban space, provision of monuments, and changes in domestic housing.²⁴ First, most of the Gallo-Roman cities shifted down from the late Iron Age hillforts to the plain below, although some cities simply built new Roman foundations directly on top of previous ones. The settlement shift is less prevalent in the south, where cities were already being built of stone, but most of the *oppida* in the north, built largely of timber, wattle, and daub, were abandoned at the end of the 1st century BCE. New city foundations start appearing around 30 BCE and continue well into the 1st century CE.²⁵ In the south, the cities that did undergo a shift down from the hilltops did so around the same time, late 1st century BCE. Thus, again we see that the landscape of Gaul experienced a rather uniform transformation, with a disturbance in settlements around 70 BCE; late Iron Age cities are abandoned in favor of new Roman foundations around 30 BCE; this transformation continues so that most of Gaul has a Roman landscape by about 50 CE; the process is finally complete throughout the provinces by around 80 CE.²⁶

Second, these cities adopted Roman city-planning. Most, when geography allowed, were laid out on a grid-plan, aligned along two main axes. Cemeteries were moved to outside of the city limits. Temples were either centrally located or on the edge

says, “Roman writers were certainly capable of interpreting such centres as urban when it suited them, for example to enhance their victories...and equally they were capable of treating them as the typical habitations of barbarians” (1998, p. 111).

²⁴ Woolf 1998, p. 113; see Woolf chap. 5 for what follows.

²⁵ Collis 1984, pp. 49-50 (abandonment of sites); Chevallier 1985 (for a regional survey of new sites); Mertens 1985 (for the founding of new cities in the 1st century CE, especially in the north-east region of Gaul).

²⁶ Woolf 1998, p. 116.

of town as suburban sanctuaries. The construction of Roman monuments also does not begin until this time; many of the forum complexes were not built until the reigns of Tiberius or Claudius.²⁷ Forums and temples to the Imperial family were among the first Roman monuments to appear, followed shortly by theatres.²⁸ Amphitheatres, Roman baths, and aqueduct began appearing about the mid-first century CE.²⁹ The growth of these urban centers did not happen immediately after conquest or even after re-foundation, but was dictated by the difficulties in acquiring the right building materials and specialized craftsmen, as well as having the support of the local elite for funding such expensive developments.³⁰

A final area that Woolf analyzes as part of urbanization is changes in the domestic architecture. Although minor changes in domestic architecture began at the end of the 1st century BCE, the characteristic elements of an aristocratic Roman house, such as mosaic floors and tile roofs, did not appear in Gaul until the second half of the 1st century CE. Under the reign of Augustus, one main difference throughout Gaul was the appearance of larger domiciles amongst smaller constructions, when previously the houses of Iron Age settlements were generally undifferentiated. By the second half of the 1st century CE, around the same time as the theatres and bathhouses were being built, large Roman—or Mediterranean—style houses can be found all over the provinces, with painted walls,

²⁷ Frere 1997; Goudineau 1980, pp. 261-272; Pinon 1988; for an example of these early forum complexes, see Roth Congès' discussion of Glanum (1992, pp. 49-55); Goudineau 1991, pp. 7-9; Garmy 1992.

²⁸ Aupert and Sablayrolles 1992; Goudineau 1980; Dumasy and Fincker 1992.

²⁹ See Bouley 1983; Futrell 1997.

³⁰ Tardy (1989, pp. 15-30) gives evidence for specialized craftsmen employed in Gaul; Bedon (1984) tracks the development of stone quarrying in Gaul; Frézouls (1984) uses epigraphic evidence to demonstrate the role of local aristocrats in building the monuments.

mosaic floors, and peristyle courtyards.³¹ To a visiting Roman, not only would the city and its public monuments seem familiar, but so would the private dwellings (both in the urban center and those scattered through the countryside). Thus city planning, monumentalization, and domestic architecture all appeared within a relatively narrow time frame. The building of forums and temples began shortly after the settlement shift of 30 BCE and continued into the first century CE. The monumentalization process took off in the second half of the 1st century CE at the same time that large, Roman-style houses began appearing in the urban centers.

A third type of material evidence that continues our survey of Roman Gaul is the Gallic consumption of Roman goods. Just as Latin inscriptions and forum complexes were recognizably Roman, the presence of Roman goods is another example of how the Gauls were becoming more Roman. The late-Iron-Age inhabitants of Gaul had sophisticated material culture, including fibulae, iron tools, glass working and ceramics. Two major Roman/Mediterranean products that appeared in Gaul before the conquest were wine amphorae and Campanian fine ware.³² Although such Roman and Mediterranean artifacts appear at some pre-Roman sites in Gaul, their use does not necessarily conform to “Roman styles of consumption”; that is to say, the appearance of these products at this time does not indicate that the Gauls had adopted Roman dining practices, only that such goods were incorporated into Gallic customs and patterns of

³¹ Goudineau 1979; Fiches 1986; for a specific example see the houses at Amiens (Bayard and Massy 1983, pp. 114-126).

³² For the distribution and consumption of wine in Gaul, see Will (1987); Fitzpatrick 1989); for Campanian ware, see Morel 1981.

consumption.³³ There is regional diversity in goods and the incorporation of these Mediterranean products into the local practices of pre-conquest Gaul differs from south to north, and then from site to site.

The Roman conquest brought new technology and new products, including medical instruments and new textiles, and overall the conquest caused a shift to Roman practices of consumption.³⁴ Tastes changed and the quantity and variety increased. One example is the shift in amphora use in Roman Gaul. As mentioned above, pre-Roman Gaul consumed Italian wine sent in Italian amphorae. There is not much noticeable change in patterns of consumption until around 30 BCE, when the variety of goods shipped to Gaul in Mediterranean amphorae now included olive oil, fish sauces, and different vintages of wine. This range of products in Gaul is very similar to the range of products found in amphorae from Rome and Italy at the same time.³⁵ These developments in consumption occurred in the northern regions of Gaul as well, where previously the distribution of wine amphorae had been scarce.³⁶ The transition from the single import amphorae to a greater variety of amphora-types carrying different products from different provenances occurred quickly in Gaul—between 30 and 1 BCE.³⁷ This change in consumption also indicates an adoption of Roman practices, such as the use of olive oil in cooking, lamps, and bathing, and the use of fish sauce in dining. Woolf sees this change as dramatic and rapid enough to be considered a ‘consumer revolution’.³⁸

³³ Woolf 1998, p. 176.

³⁴ Woolf 1998, p. 174.

³⁵ Guilhot and Goy 1992, pp. 188-212.

³⁶ Laudenheimer 1992.

³⁷ Hesnard 1990; Woolf 1998, p. 184.

³⁸ Woolf 1998, p. 185 and chap. 7 *passim*.

A similar phenomenon occurred in the use and distribution of Roman pottery in Gaul. The ceramic deposits from late-Iron-Age Gaul were diverse and highly regionalized, but starting around 30 BCE, there was a dramatic shift in both kind and quantity.³⁹ Although Campanian ware had spread into Gaul earlier in the first century BCE, it was primarily distributed along the Mediterranean coast. But once Arrentine ware, a type of *terra sigillata*, was introduced in Italy (ca. 50 BCE) and Gaul (ca. 30 BCE) it spread quickly. Although in Rome and Italy, this was not considered an elite form of tableware, in Gaul it served as a status indicator for the first few decades of its circulation, even appearing as part of the grave assemblages of Gallic elites, before it began to be used by larger sections of the population.⁴⁰ The *sigillata* pottery became so popular that local producers began making imitation wares to circulate through the province. The sudden appearance and distribution of this Italian pottery in Gaul is important not only because it shows the spread of another kind of Roman product, but also because the use of such objects signifies a shift in Gallic practices. Arrentine ware was designed for Mediterranean styles of dining, such as personal place settings for private meals and the consumption of bread, as opposed to the central European practices of communal feasts and the consumption of porridge.⁴¹ Again, we see the distinct regionalism of pre-Roman Gaul dramatically affected by Roman presence and suddenly adopting Roman forms of pottery (and therefore Roman forms of consumption) beginning with the elite from 30-1 BCE and then spreading to the rest of the population.

³⁹ For example, see the study of La Tène pottery at Feurs (Vaginay and Guichard 1988); see also Bats 1988.

⁴⁰ For example, see the aristocratic burials at Berry (Ferdrière and Villard 1993).

⁴¹ Woolf 1998, p. 191.

There were also changes in the countryside and production, particularly agriculture. Woolf notes that all aspects of Gallic life were affected by Roman rule to some degree and the countryside was no different.⁴² Roman conquest introduced new crops and new technologies. The most dramatic change, however, was in northern Gaul, which experienced major agricultural intensification. Although the inhabitants of this region practiced agriculture and used iron tools, the degree of production was minimal—probably just above subsistence—since there was not a large non-agriculture population (i.e. no standing army, no urban populations). Something of an ‘agricultural revolution had begun just before the conquest with the appearance of iron tools, but the Roman presence brought about a major shift in the rural landscape. In the Early Roman Period there was a move from the small dwellings in the countryside to a “villa-dominated landscape.”⁴³ Along with this shift, the use of iron tools substantially increased and a more advanced plough was implemented.⁴⁴ Changes even occurred on the fringes of Roman control. Although the northern frontier of Gaul is characterized by its absence of villas, we do find changes in the organization of the landscape with an increase in nucleated and enclosed settlements, as well as the employment of ditch systems and field boundaries.⁴⁵ Overall, in terms of agriculture, the evidence suggests that the Gallic interior experienced a shift from the subsistence farming of the later La Tène Period to the intensification of agriculture centered around the new Roman villas.⁴⁶

⁴² Woolf 1998 chapter 6; Ferdière 1988; Leveau 1991.

⁴³ Purcell 1990; Slofstra 1991; 1995; Collart 1996; Roymans 1996.

⁴⁴ Maisant 1970; Cüppers and Neyses 1971.

⁴⁵ Roymans 1996, 73. For an exception, see Bloemers 1978, 88ff.

⁴⁶ van der Vliet 1977, p. 296; Edmondson 1990, p. 151.

A final area of material culture from Gaul in our survey is Gallic sculpture. Although a full discussion of the developments in Gallic sculpture (or Roman sculpture in Gaul) is beyond the scope of this report, I will mention briefly a few developments that occur soon after Roman conquest.⁴⁷ As mentioned above, the Gallic urban landscape contained a number of Roman monuments built over the course of the 1st centuries BCE and CE. These monuments were Roman in form and decoration, such as the Maison Carrée in Nîmes built by Agrippa at the end of the first century BCE. This temple has traditional Roman frontality, a high podium, and attached columns (Corinthian). Roman architectural elements and Classical style also appear in more personal sculptures, especially in the representations of divinities and in funerary art. Prior to the Roman conquest, many Gallic divinities were not regularly represented anthropomorphically; instead they appeared in abstract or zoomorphic forms.⁴⁸ Beginning in the first century BCE, Gallic deities, such as Epona, Cernunnos, and Sucellus, are represented as humans following the Classical tradition. Furthermore, we find classical representations of Roman divinities as well, especially Mercury and Mars, all of which began to appear in the last century BCE and increased in frequency through the next two centuries.⁴⁹ The inhabitants of Gaul also began adopting Roman styles of funerary monuments. This transformation from previous traditions took place in the first century CE, when Gallic elites adopted Roman forms of funerary monuments, decorated with Roman style

⁴⁷ Scholars have also examined how the representation of the barbarian in general and the captive Gaul in particular changed in Greek and Roman art, especially on Roman victory monuments and triumphal arches, see Silberberg-Peirce 1986; Ramsby and Severy-Hoven 2007; for depictions of other captive provinces, see Picard 1957; Smith 1988; Ferris 2000.

⁴⁸ Megaw 1970; Megaw and Megaw 1989.

⁴⁹ Pobé 1961; Green 1986; 1989; Nerzic 1989, pp. 47-68; Webster 2003, p. 48.

portraiture, and inscribed in Latin.⁵⁰ Overall, through the course of the first century CE, sculpture in Gaul, both public and private, incorporated Roman and Classical style and forms.

From this brief survey of a few select areas of material culture, we can map the cultural geography of Gaul from the first century BCE to the end of the first century CE. Overall, Gaul at the time of Roman conquest was divided culturally into regions with few similarities running across the province. There were few inscriptions (almost none in Latin), and fortified hilltop sites in the north and south. Amphorae of wine have been found at some sites. The most identifiable Roman elements were concentrated in the south in Gallia Narbonensis, and especially around the colony of Narbonne, an area in frequent contact with Rome and by geography part of Mediterranean culture. Beginning in 30 BCE, however, all of this began to change—Latin inscriptions became frequent in the south and began to appear in the north; previous sites relocated or were refounded, and the local elites began to import olive oil, use Italian pottery, agricultural production increased, and Gallic sculpture employed Classical style. Over the next century, this dramatic change continued, as inscriptions became more and more frequent on both public monuments and epitaphs, cities built forum complexes, theatres, and baths, Italian pottery began to be used by the non-elite, villas dominate the countryside, and Roman funerary monuments increase. All of these things—epigraphy, city-planning, architecture, products, pottery, agriculture, and sculpture—are recognizably Roman in form and origin, and recognizable to modern scholars. More importantly, they were

⁵⁰ Nerzic 1989, pp. 207-268; Woolf 1998, p. 99-100; Carroll 2006.

recognizable to the Romans themselves. Beginning in the reign of Augustus, the landscape of Gaul, its material culture, began to change dramatically. Gradually, adopting more and more Roman artifacts and practices, Gaul ‘became Roman’ over the course of around 150 years.

The logical question that follows such a discussion would be to ask how and why the landscape was affected in this way. It is these questions that scholars of “Romanization” hotly debate, particularly regarding the agency of change. A proper study of the agents of and reasons for the “Romanization” of Gaul lies outside the scope of this report. In fact, for the present purpose, these questions are irrelevant. Regardless of who implemented them and why they did so, changes occurred. The nature of these changes was such that Gaul, as an entire province, demonstrated a level of cultural unification. The culture that emerged from Roman conquest was one that largely resembled Roman culture, both to modern scholars, to the ancient Romans. And this is what is relevant for this report. In order for us to say that the deviations from the ethnographic tradition were influenced by the developments in Gaul, we must show that Gaul and its inhabitants began to appear more Roman because that is the picture of Gaul that emerges from the writings of Caesar, Strabo, Claudius, and Tacitus.

Furthermore, the timeline for the changes in the material culture summarized in this section coincide almost exactly with the developing picture of Gaul summarized in the previous section. Caesar depicts Gaul with a basic level of civilization in 50 BCE, and we have seen from the archaeological record that there were literate communities, living in settled villages (or cities), and using some Roman products. Under Augustus,

Strabo describes the Gauls as more civilized: they had taken up the practice of farming and laying down their weapons. Around this same time, Latin inscriptions were appearing, the first forum complexes were being built, and we see the first signs of agricultural intensification. By 50 CE, Claudius has admitted Gauls into the senate saying that they are peaceful and loyal subjects, worthy of the office. His depiction does complement the fact that at this time, Gaul as a whole had become quite recognizably Roman with monumentalized cities and private Roman funerary monuments. Finally, Tacitus has the Gauls sharing in Roman customs and equal to Italian senators. Writing in the beginning of the second century, the province had, in Woolf's terms, 'become Roman' with numerous cities equipped with forum complexes, theatres, bath houses, aqueducts, and Roman houses. Inscriptions were written in Latin, products were being imported from across the empire, *sigillata* pottery was being imported and locally produced for all, there was intense agricultural production, and public and private art had employed Classical elements.