# Book Review

# Justice Holmes, Bad Boy

**OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES AND FIXATIONS OF MANLINESS, by John M. Kang. London and New York: Routledge, 2018. 174 pages. $145 hardcover.**

**Reviewed by Allen Mendenhall†**

John M. Kang published a curious little book on the alleged manliness of former Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. The volume, entitled *Oliver Wendell Holmes and Fixations of Manliness*,[1] undertakes a particularly charged subject in light of the #MeToo Movement and accumulating accusations of "toxic masculinity."[2] Misstatement of truth, unfounded assumptions, a poor choice of words, the wrong tone—any of these might make a study of manliness susceptible to charges of sexism.

So how does Kang's work fare in this climate? Not well.

His argument runs something like this: Holmes was inspired, not by his diminutive father, Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr., but by Ralph Waldo Emerson; he embraced manliness, even heroism, in the form of self-reliant individualism and defiant non-conformity; and he asserted his independence as a student at Harvard, displayed bravery during the Civil War, and exemplified courage in his famous dissenting opinions in *Abrams v. U.S.*[3] and *Gitlow v. New York*.[4] In short,

---

† Allen Mendenhall is associate dean at Faulkner University Thomas Goode Jones School of Law and executive director of the Blackstone & Burke Center for Law & Liberty. Visit his website at AllenMendenhall.com.

1. John M. Kang, *Oliver Wendell Holmes and Fixations of Manliness* (Routledge, 2018).
2. For a representative sample, see "Women Directors Accuse Venice Film Festival of 'Toxic Masculinity,'" *The Local* (29 Aug. 2018), https://perma.cc/L78P-T7YC; Abby Haglage, "The Mollie Tibbetts Killing is Not About Immigration, it's About Toxic Masculinity," *Yahoo Lifestyle* (23 Aug. 2018), https://perma.cc/E4CU-4SJM; Will Bunch, "A Senseless Murder in Philly is Latest Sign that Toxic Masculinity is Killing Us," *The Philadelphia Inquirer* (19 Aug. 2018), https://perma.cc/XJS2-NNPY; Jason Om, "Toxic Masculinity: Helping Men Understand the Impact of Their Behavior," *ABC Life* (19 Aug. 2018), https://perma.cc/Z3B6-H84Z.
3. *Gitlow v. New York*, 268 U.S. 652, 672-73 (1925) (Justice Holmes dissenting).
4. *Abrams v. U.S.*, 250 U.S. 616, 624-31 (1919) (Justice Holmes dissenting).

"manliness . . . informed the great [J]ustice's worldview."[5]

While Kang is right to recognize the abiding influence of Emerson on Holmes,[6] his construal of manliness or masculinity is generalized and ill-explained. What *is* masculinity, according to Kang? The lack of a clear definition for this term confounds his treatment of Holmes as a reckless youth and then as a grown man who admired soldierly courage. Devoid of references to scholarship in the field of gender studies, Kang's portrayal of manliness is predicated, not on relevant research or leading theories of gender politics, but on tropes of "merry defiance,"[7] masculine "refusal,"[8] manful "resistance,"[9] "manly nonchalance,"[10] "indifference" as "a species of courage,"[11] "genuine tough guys,"[12] "the nonpareil manliness that the trial of combat had bestowed upon [Holmes],"[13] and "martial heroism."[14] These are chiefly unfavorable, callous, or crude descriptors, coloring manhood as little more than petulant rebelliousness, quarrelsome selfishness, aloof coldness, or fearsome bellicosity. They do not demonstrate familiarity with the polemical, important theories associated with the schools that investigate manliness or masculinity, namely those respecting gender representation and performance, feminism, queer theory, sexuality, structuralism, post-structuralism, and gender identity. One might expect to find, for instance, references to R.W. Connell's notion of "hegemonic masculinity" to describe the "configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women."[15] Kang would not need to affirm or contest "hegemonic masculinity" to recognize it as a key concept that circulates in the discipline. His chosen descriptors reinforce negative stereotypes about bad boys and violent manhood, perpetuating oversimplified signifiers and cultural constructions. They cast the author of the "bad man" theory of law[16] as a bad boy and, later, a bellicose adult.

---

5. Kang, note 1, at vii.
6. See Allen Mendenhall, *Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., Pragmatism, and the Jurisprudence of Agon*, xx-xxii, 13-14, 23-24, 27-29, 49-50, 99-100, 114-16, 133 (Bucknell University Press, 2017); Allen Mendenhall, "Pragmatism on the Shoulders of Emerson: Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.'s Jurisprudence as a Synthesis of Emerson, Peirce, James, and Dewey," 48 *The South Carolina Review* 93 (2015); Allen Mendenhall, "Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. Is the Use of Calling Emerson a Pragmatist: A Brief and Belated Response to Stanley Cavell," 6 *Faulkner Law Review* 197 (2014).
7. Kang, note 1, at 20.
8. Id. at 25.
9. Id. at 40.
10. Id. at 81.
11. Id. at 102.
12. Id. at 103.
13. Id. at 126.
14. Id. at 156.
15. R.W. Connell, *Masculinities*, 77 (Polity Press, 1995).
16. Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., "The Path of the Law," 10 *Harvard Law Review* 457, 459-61 (1897).

Kang acknowledges that Holmes's purported manliness evolved over time.[17] To his credit, he does not describe Holmes as a one-dimensional figure with a fixed understanding of masculinity that invariably informed his everyday work. Yet, in each stage of Holmes's life, the version of manliness he embodied seems, in Kang's telling, decidedly negative.

The immaturity and rambunctiousness of the young Holmes represent, for Kang, sure signs of masculinity. To illustrate Holmes's "laddish manliness" and "independence on the road to manhood," Kang cites an incident in which "Holmes, drunk with other boys, had recklessly broken a dormitory window."[18] Other examples involve Holmes's "rebellion against the patriarchy of Harvard College"[19] in the form of skipping class, writing on the posts of a tutor's room, playing or whispering, not preparing for class, and "creating a disturbance in the College Yard."[20] Given these troublesome accounts, one comes away with the distinct impression that, whenever Holmes was acting like a puerile buffoon, he was exhibiting manliness. His sophomoric shenanigans, however, might just reveal adolescence or immaturity rather than features intrinsic to manliness. If these negative traits are manly, what do they have in common with the heroism and valor that Kang presents as positive traits? Does Kang think there are varieties of manliness, or does he consider these negative and positive traits to be inextricably tied in ways he never clarifies? We do not know because he does not say. Characterizing these negative traits as manly is unhelpful, moreover, because Kang does not adequately draw on existing literature or explain that these supposedly masculine traits are undesirable. One comes away wondering if Kang believes rowdiness and unruliness are necessary steps along a path toward chivalry.

Kang is on better footing in his discussion of the inherently violent ideals of chivalry and gallantry that characterized medieval knighthood.[21] He states that "Holmes saw himself as a gentleman in the classic sense of one who cherished a moral code, and he took up the sword to protect the nation."[22] He adds that, "for Holmes, the highest virtue a man could have was not measured by charity, chastity,

17. Kang, note 1, at 136 ("This book has argued that the soldier as symbol . . . memorialize[d] Holmes's elevation from a boy to a man."); see also id. at 125 (noting "a change in Holmes's understanding of manliness").
18. Id. at 65.
19. Id. at 20.
20. Id. (citing G. Edward White, *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: Law and the Inner Self*, 27 (Oxford University Press, 1993)).
21. Kang, note 1, at 45 (stating "[c]hivalry is the province of the knight, the warrior, one who will kill and die for others"). For more on medieval chivalry, see generally Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford University Press, 1999); Richard W. Kaeuper, *Holy Warrior: The Religious Ideology of Chivalry* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); Richard W. Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry* (Cambridge University Press, 2016). Regarding the influence of medieval chivalry on Holmes's nineteenth-century mind, see G. Edward White, *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.: Law and the Inner Self*, 71 (Oxford University Press, 1993).
22. Kang, note 1, at 43.

mercy, or moderation—none of the Christian virtues; for Holmes, a man's best virtue was manliness itself."[23] Thus, Holmes "yearned for the mythic pleasures of adventure promised by war, the highest test of manliness."[24] "Part of what made [war] divine for Holmes," Kang concludes, "was that it offered a man with an opportunity to garner unparalleled honor and to protect himself from what in Holmes's opinion was the equally unparalleled shame of cowardice that would dog those who fled military service."[25] Kang recognizes that chivalry and honor necessarily involve violence.

According to Kang, Holmes presumably viewed the Civil War as his defining moment, as his opportunity to realize the highest virtue—manliness. Yet Holmes grew disenchanted after the Civil War.[26] Kang submits that Holmes's changing attitude revealed an existential rejection of transcendental meaning or higher purpose and an inward turn toward individual agency as the source and expression of manliness.[27] Kang's account explains how Holmes's enthusiasm to enlist as a soldier and his tendency to favor the antislavery cause before the Civil War mutated into disillusionment and bitterness in the aftermath of the Civil War. According to Kang, Holmes's views about the Civil War prior to its commencement were ostensibly incompatible with his later views on the subject, but both views were equally manly—in different ways.

Kang squares Holmes's seemingly irreconcilable attitudes toward the Civil War, that of his youth and that of his more mature self, by highlighting that "Holmes's faith in manliness as a moral ideal—the same faith that he had exhibited as a college student—basically endured the Civil War and, actually, found stronger purchase thereafter."[28] The reason for the stronger purchase is that, "rather than dismissing the significance of individual agency, Holmes, after the war, reaffirmed his faith in the manliness of the lone individual."[29]

Scholars of gender have spent decades establishing critical frameworks for understanding masculinity. Kang's investigation of Holmes's so-called manliness fails to contribute to the field. Nor does he do much to advance the scholarly conversation surrounding Holmes. Kang does not consult the latest scholarship on Holmes,[30] for example, but relies heavily on well-trodden biographical material

---

23. Id. at 45.
24. Id.
25. Id.
26. Mendenhall, *Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., Pragmatism, and the Jurisprudence of Agon*, note 6, at 98-99, 115.
27. Kang, note 1, at 71 (regarding "the moral priority of individual agency in a universe devoid of higher meaning"). In addition, Kang states, "[i]nstead of harping on how the emotional resources of patriotism could nourish the besieged soldier, Holmes announced that the soldier could, in the end, rely only on his own manliness." Id.
28. Kang, note 1, at 64.
29. Id.
30. Frederic R. Kellogg's latest book on Holmes was published within months of the publication of *Oliver Wendell Holmes and Fixations of Manliness*; therefore, Kellogg's book would not have been available to Kang. See Frederic R. Kellogg, *Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. and Legal Logic* (University of Chicago Press, 2018). However, Kang would have had access to recent

by G. Edward White,[31] Mark DeWolfe Howe,[32] Sheldon M. Novick,[33] Liva Baker,[34] and Albert W. Alschuler.[35] He cites as scholarly evidence Catherine Drinker Bowen's *Yankee from Olympus*,[36] which has long been discounted as a "fictionalizing work,"[37] a "fictionalized story,"[38] and a "hagiographical portrait."[39] Kang's comparisons of Tim O'Brien's experiences during the Vietnam War to Holmes's during the Civil War[40] raise numerous questions, chief among them is what these two conflicts, separated as they were by a century of technological, political, military, and cultural change, have in common that would clarify research into Holmes and gender identity or masculinity.

Kang relies upon grand, sweeping claims that undermine his credibility. He avers, for instance, that "manliness's penchant for hierarchy bristles against democracy's ethic of equality, the idea that all persons are entitled to equal respect."[41] But does manliness necessarily have a penchant for hierarchy? Is there research to substantiate this assertion? Does democracy necessarily entail an ethic

---

work by Susan Haack, Brad Snyder, and Seth Vannatta. See e.g. Susan Haack, "Pragmatism, Law, and Morality: The Lessons of *Buck v. Bell*," 3 *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy* 65 (2009); Susan Haack, "On Legal Pragmatism: Where Does 'The Path of the Law' Lead Us?" 3 *Pragmatism Today* 8 (2012); Susan Haack, "The Pragmatist Tradition: Lessons for Legal Theorists," 95 *Washington University Law Review* 1049 (2018); Brad Snyder, *The House of Truth* (Oxford University Press, 2017) (Holmes receives extensive treatment in this book); Brad Snyder, "The House That Built Holmes," 30 *Law and History Review* 661 (2012) (a precursor to Snyder's *The House of Truth*); Seth Vannatta, *Conservatism and Pragmatism in Law, Politics, and Ethics*, 126-44, 149-51 (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). On Vannatta's work, see Allen Mendenhall, "Towards Pragmatic Conservatism," 41 *University of Dayton Law Review* 45 (2016); Allen Mendenhall, "Seth Vannatta's Justice Holmes," 15 *Contemporary Pragmatism* 534 (2018).

31. See note 15.
32. Mark DeWolfe Howe, *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Shaping Years, 1841-1870* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1957); Mark DeWolfe Howe, *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Proving Years, 1870-1882* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1963).
33. Sheldon M. Novick, *Honorable Justice: The Life of Oliver Wendell Holmes* (Little, Brown & Co., 1989).
34. Liva Baker, *The Justice from Beacon Hill: The Life and Times of Oliver Wendell Holmes* (HarperCollins, 1991).
35. Albert W. Alschuler, *Law Without Values: The Life, Work, and Legacy of Justice Holmes* (University of Chicago Press, 2000).
36. Kang, note 1, at 2 (citing Catherine Drinker Bowen, *Yankee from Olympus* (Little, Brown & Co., 1944)).
37. John T. Noonan Jr., "Commentary: The Secular Search for the Sacred," 70 *New York University Law Review* 642 (1995).
38. Sheldon M. Novick, "Justice Holmes and the Art of Biography," 33 *William & Mary Law Review* 1219, 1224 (1992).
39. John M. Breen & Lee J. Strang, "The Forgotten Jurisprudential Debate: Catholic Legal Thought's Response to Legal Realism," 98 *Marquette Law Review* 1203, 1221, 1220 footnote 114 (2015).
40. Kang, note 1, at 47, 105. Kang appears anachronistically to lump soldiers' military experiences from different eras and conflicts together as if they were uniform. He cites two books about World War II, for instance, in addition to O'Brien's collection of stories *The Things They Carried*, regarding the Vietnam War, in the context of a discussion of Holmes's service during the Civil War. Id. at 47-48. This decision does not strike me as historically sound or methodologically useful.
41. Id. at 131.

of equality when, in many states in the United States, *elected* officials formalized racial discrimination through statutory law while *unelected* federal judges, unaccountable to voters, sought to institute the equality that could not be achieved through the political processes?[42]

Another such claim that does not withstand scrutiny is that empathy is "a signal virtue in a democratic society where the strong are expected to feel sympathy for, and, where justified, come to the aid of, the weak," whereas "manliness is wont to regard with contempt those who appear unmanly."[43] Are these unqualified, categorical assertions true? Can complex concepts like empathy, democratic society, and manliness be reduced to such blanket proclamations? Kang declares that "Harvard College is now celebrated (or condemned) as a bastion of left liberalism where students are formally encouraged to be free thinkers who question intellectual orthodoxy," while much current commentary yields contrary accusations of "illiberal policies,"[44] "intolerance,"[45] and "pervasive progressive orthodoxy"[46] at Harvard, which allegedly attempts "to subordinate freedom of association and freedom of speech to a locally fashionable form of 'nondiscrimination.'"[47] The point here is not to indict Harvard or to endorse a revisionist perspective about its reputation for intellectual openness but to show that what Kang presents as plain, uncontroverted fact too often turns out to be a widely disputed opinion.

A more persuasive interpretation of the manliness that appears to characterize Holmes might be found in Harvey C. Mansfield's insightful yet controversial book *Manliness*,[48] which never mentions Holmes by name but rather discusses, among other things, the Darwinian, Nietzschean influences that shaped conceptions of manliness in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Such manliness, which Mansfield describes as "nihilistic manliness," is unbound or unfettered "because there is nothing outside manliness, or human assertion, to restrain it,"[49] no God, creator, or transcendent moral order to determine, limit, or

---

42. I have in mind the legislative enactments of the nineteenth-century Black Codes and the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Jim Crow laws in the South; these were products of democracy to the extent that they reflected the will of a political majority expressed through elected representatives. By contrast, cases like *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), were *counter*-majoritarian, and hence anti-democratic, in the sense that they were instituted not by the political branches but by the courts, and not by inhabitants of the states through popular vote but through formal, federal judicial decisions.
43. Id.
44. Jenna A. Robinson, "Harvard's New Rule Replaces Free Thinkers with Goose Steppers," *Holland Sentinel* (15 Feb. 2018), https://perma.cc/YK6D-FBF3.
45. Id.
46. Jack Goldsmith & Adrian Vermeule, "Elite Colleges are Making it Easy for Conservatives to Dislike Them," *The Washington Post* (30 Nov. 2017), https://perma.cc/QBA7-KLDS.
47. Harry Lewis, "Harvard's Nondiscrimination Hypocrisy," *The Washington Post* (21 Apr. 2017), https://perma.cc/3QBZ-6QTK.
48. Harvey C. Mansfield, *Manliness* (Yale University Press, 2006).
49. Id. at 83. "Nihilistic manliness" represents a combination of Darwinian evolution and Nietzschean willpower. Darwin's "theory of evolution," Mansfield submits, "not only denied the eternity of the species but also undermined all eternities, all permanence of meaning,"

otherwise control the baser elements of natural manly tendencies, most notably aggression and assertiveness.[50]

Although Mansfield does not make room for Emerson or Holmes in his study, he captures the Emersonian individualism that Kang identifies in Holmes, stating that, if we inhabit a nihilistic world, then "we human beings are under the necessity of creating ourselves."[51] One hears in this line echoes of Emerson: "*Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind.*"[52] "*Absolve you to yourself, and you shall have the suffrage of the world.*"[53] "*Place yourself in the middle of the stream of power and wisdom which animates all whom it floats, and you are without effort impelled to truth, to right, and a perfect contentment.*"[54] "*There are creative manners, there are creative actions, and creative words; manners, actions, words, that is, indicative of no custom or authority, but springing spontaneous from the mind's own sense of good and fair.*"[55]

Mansfield's focus on Nietzsche is striking in light of the philosophical nexus between Emerson and Nietzsche,[56] and indeed between Holmes and Nietzsche.[57] All three men wrote in aphorisms,[58] glorified heroes,[59] and celebrated genius as a

---

while Nietzschean views led to the notion that "man must go on without God and must make his own ideals to pursue, his own idols to worship, his own substitute God." Id.

50. Id. at 84.
51. Id. at 121.
52. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Self-Reliance," in *Essays and Lectures*, 261 (ed. Joel Porte, Library of America, 1983).
53. Id.
54. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Spiritual Laws," in *Essays and Lectures*, 309 (ed. Joel Porte, Library of America, 1983).
55. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The American Scholar," in *Essays and Lectures*, 58 (ed. Joel Porte, Library of America, 1983).
56. Seth Vannatta & Allen Mendenhall, "The American Nietzsche? Fate and Power in the Pragmatism of Justice Holmes," 85 *University of Missouri-Kansas City Law Review* 187, 201-04 (2016). See also George Stack, *Nietzsche and Emerson: An Elective Affinity* (Ohio University Press, 1992). I enjoy Harold Bloom's superlative take on the connection between Nietzsche and Emerson in *Harold Bloom, The Daemon Knows: Literary Greatness and the American Sublime*, 165, 174-75, 180 (Spiegel & Grau, 2015).
57. Vannatta & Mendenhall, note 56, at 193-201.
58. See generally Robert Danish, "Aphorism, Enthymemes, and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. on the First Amendment," 27 *Rhetoric Review* 219 (2008); see also Hermann Hummel, "Emerson and Nietzsche," 19 *The New England Quarterly* 63, 80 (1946) ("Nietzsche turned finally to the form of aphorism, as an expression of what Jaspers called his 'fragmentary thinking.' The aphoristic basis of Emerson's essays is only too apparent.").
59. On Holmes and heroism, see Mendenhall & Vannatta, note 56, at 203-04. On Nietzsche and heroism, see Ruth Abbey, *Nietzsche's Middle Period*, 90-93 (Oxford University Press, 2000); Robert Luyster, "Nietzsche/Dionysus: Ecstasy, Heroism, and the Monstrous," 21 *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 1 (2001); Marinos Pourgouris, "Nikos Kazantzakis, Nietzsche, and the Myth of the Hero," 32 *The International Fiction Review* 1 (2005) [available at https://perma.cc/AP4W-T3WA]. For a competing view, see Leslie Paul Thiele, *Friedrich Nietzsche and the Politics of the Soul: A Study of Heroic Individualism*, 22 (Princeton University Press, 1990) ("Nietzsche identified the romantic worshippers of the heroic as enemies, not allies, and treated them accordingly."). Regarding Emerson and heroism, see Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Heroism," in *Essays and Lectures*, 369 (ed. Joel Porte, Library of America, 1983).

creative faculty.[60] A direct line between Emerson, Holmes, and Nietzsche connects the concepts of "Man Thinking,"[61] "Representative Man,"[62] "Will to Power,"[63] and "*Ubermensch.*"[64] If Holmes's post-Civil War machismo and virility are, as they seem to be, Kang's intended focus in the book's concluding chapters, then Nietzsche more than Emerson would have been the appropriate emphasis.

Still, the matter of puerility fits uncomfortably with the militant manhood Kang renders in the adult Holmes. The transition from boyish rebel to bellicose man occurred during the Civil War, Kang intimates, but it happened in a natural progression rather than as a transformation from one state of mind or behavior to another. In other words, Kang's narrative would have us accept that the natural course for masculinity, as it is exemplified by Holmes, is from petulance in boyhood to violence in manhood, as though the development of manhood inevitably results in enlarged aggression or aggressiveness. Here again Kang would have benefited from engagement with Nietzsche, whose speaker or persona distinguished men (as strong and aggressive) from women (as weak, vindictive, and vengeful).[65] Kang's interpretation of manhood is Nietzschean, but there is little indication that he is aware of that fact.

Kang sees in Holmes a reflection of manhood; he does not sufficiently consider manhood—whatever that is—in light of Holmes. He never defines manhood, masculinity, or manliness; nevertheless, he employs phrases like "a paragon of manliness"[66] as if they were immediately self-evident and straightforward. Without properly explaining what manhood is, he looks to

---

60. For representative references to genius by Holmes, see Michael H. Hoffheimer, "The Early Critical and Philosophical Writings of Justice Holmes," 30 *Boston College Law Review* 1221, 1251, 1256-57, 1271, 1277, 1280 (1989). On Emerson and genius, see Harold Bloom, *Genius* 339-41 (Warner Books, 2002); Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The American Scholar" in *Essays and Lectures*, 54, 57, 58, 63 (ed. Joel Porte, Library of America, 1983). Regarding Nietzsche and genius, see Friedrich Nietzsche, "'Skirmishes of an Untimely Man,' Twilight of the Idols and The Antichrist," in *The Portable Nietzsche*, at 547 paragraph 44 (ed. & trans. Walter Kaufmann, 1968) ("*My conception of genius*—Great men, like great ages, are explosives in which a tremendous force is stored up; their precondition is always, historically and physiologically, that for a long time much has been gathered, stored up, saved up, and conserved for them—that there has been no explosion for a long time. Once the tension in the mass has become too great, then the most accidental stimulus suffices to summon into the world 'the genius,' the 'deed,' the great destiny. What does the environment matter then, or the age, or the 'spirit of the age,' or 'public opinion'!").

61. See Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Essays and Lectures*, 123, 129, 203, 242, 362, 403, 417, 633, 690, 710, 784, 806, 934 (ed. Joel Porte, Library of America, 1983).

62. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Representative Man: Seven Lectures," in *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 4 (ed. Joseph Slater, The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1987).

63. Compare Emerson's essay "Power" and Nietzsche's "Will to Power." See Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Power," in *The Annotated Emerson*, 429 (ed. David Mikics, The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2012). See also Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* (trans. Walter Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Vintage Books, 1967).

64. See Friedrich Nietzsche, "Thus Spoke Zarathustra," in *Ecce Homo*, at 72 paragraph 2, 76-77 paragraph 6 (trans. R.J. Hollingdale, Penguin Books, 1979).

65. Friedrich Nietzsche, "Why I Am So Wise," in *Ecce Homo*, at 17 paragraph 7 (trans. R.J. Hollingdale, Penguin Books, 1979).

66. Kang, note 1, at ix.

Holmes's life to supply its concrete manifestations. This organizing approach is so fundamental to his argument as to render his book fatally flawed. Holmes's view of masculinity is an oft-overlooked subject worthy of sustained exploration, but *Oliver Wendell Holmes and Fixations of Manliness* does not fill lacunae in the relevant research. Perhaps future work will take what is worthwhile in Kang's study and expand it into a more useful resource for students and scholars alike.