

*quis enim caneret bella melius quam qui sic gerit?* (*Institutio Oratoria* X.1.91). This question has significance beyond simple flattery of Domitian's poetry: with it Quintilian opposes himself both to Cicero in the *Brutus*, who fears that Julius Caesar will kill oratory by monopolizing all opportunities for achievement, and to the literary tradition of the Augustan poets, Horace in particular, of separating life and letters. Scholars' evaluations of and comments on this passage are for the most part limited to, on the one hand, criticism of Quintilian for such open servility to Domitian (W. Peterson 1891, xi; M.L. Clarke 1979, 35) and, on the other hand, defense of Quintilian for apparent sincerity (McDermott and Orentzel 1979, 15; J. Cousin 1979; Kennedy 1969, 110). The primary purpose of this paper is to argue that, while certain elements of panegyric in the passage are impossible to ignore, flattery is not the whole story: Quintilian's inclusion of Domitian in his list of authors to be read by the aspiring orator simultaneously engages with, and offers up a new direction for, the Roman literary tradition of attempting to define the relationship between the man of action and the man of letters. The unique feature of Quintilian's discussion of Domitian lies in his inclusion of the emperor in a literary history: by placing a discussion of the emperor's poetry among discussions of successful poets like Vergil and Lucan, Quintilian emphasizes the literary pursuits of this famous man of action.

Quintilian's inclusion of a notorious "man of action" in literary history interacts with Cicero's discussion of Julius Caesar in the *Brutus*, specifically with respect to the rule of constructing a literary canon which states that one does not discuss living authors. Oddly, the fact that Quintilian makes an exception to this rule has often been ignored (Feeney 2002, 175; Winterbottom 1975, 96). It should be noted, however, that in the *Institutio* and the *Brutus*, the respective presence of Domitian and Julius Caesar is anomalous in the same way: both discussions break the same rule governing the compilation of canonical literary lists, and both Cicero and Quintilian break this rule for the single most powerful man of the day, albeit with opposite purpose in mind. Quintilian's discussion of Domitian as author interacts similarly with Horace's *Epistle* II.1, wherein Horace, like Quintilian and Cicero, follows the rules of literary history by keeping silent about his contemporaries with one notable exception, that of himself. By asserting his role as the only poet of consequence left at Rome, Horace delineates a specific sphere of influence for himself as poet and emphasizes the distance between his poetry and Augustus' imperial responsibilities. Quintilian, by employing literary devices similar to those used by Cicero and Horace in discussing the relationship between the man of action and the man of letters, is using the literary devices of his predecessors to suggest a new and optimistic relationship between the man of action and the man of letters under the Empire.

