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This volume is a collection of articles that stems from a conference, held at the University of Chicago in 2017, on the relationship between rhetoric and what is natural in the writings of Michel de Montaigne. The editors are Philippe Desan, an extremely prolific and well-known researcher on Montaigne and professor at the University of Chicago; Déborah Knop, a professor at the Université de Grenoble; and Blandine Perona, a professor at the Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France. This book is addressed to Renaissance specialists. The articles all show a great depth of thought and a rigorous approach; many are written in a very clear and logical fashion. There is an index but no bibliography, which may seem surprising given the status of its contributors; however, the book is intended not as a general take on the rhetoric of Montaigne so much as an analysis of the specific relationship that Montaigne had between rhetoric and what is natural. The book is divided into four parts: an introduction by Blandine Perona, a section on Montaigne’s rhetoric, a section on the resistance to that rhetoric from what was natural, and a section on the sublime and irony as ways of naturalizing his rhetoric.

This book deserves to be read because it is a profound and well-organized discussion of two opposing facets of Montaigne’s writing, by some of the great researchers on this Renaissance philosopher. There are many interesting and profound articles here. For example, Francis Goyet details how Montaigne
used historical examples to arouse the interest of the reader. Thomas Mollier discusses the way in which Montaigne questioned the foundations of rhetoric. Olivier Guerrier discusses the liberties and limits of Montaigne’s writing. Philippe Desan examines Montaigne’s rapport between the social and the solitary, and Olivier Millet offers an interpretation of the relationship between Montaigne’s letter on the death of Étienne La Boétie and the *Essais*. The articles are well laid out, easy to follow, and subtle in their analyses.

Although the articles are small in number, relative to other collections, they are all of great depth. Their authors tackle many different subjects relating to rhetoric and the natural in Montaigne. For example, they put forth the judicial aspects of Montaigne’s rhetoric, they highlight Montaigne as a skeptic, and they are careful to point out the limits of his thought.

It is a strength of the volume that it tackles a precise question instead of trying to be more general. While not exclusively a long analysis of the question it poses, it is an indispensable contribution to Montaigne scholarship—because of its solid research and clear writing. It is important to note how well structured each article is. This leads to little guesswork on the part of the reader. Moreover, this book is not written in language or phrases that are overly technical. It is therefore accessible to graduate students in Renaissance studies.

The book lays bare the subtle writing of Montaigne and the limits of his thought; indeed, it is admirable how much it says on the ambiguities of Montaigne’s writing. In this way, this volume is a fine contribution to Montaigne scholarship and is recommended to all Renaissance specialists. It is hoped that many more books along this line will be published.

VIVEK RAMAKRISHNAN
Burlington, Ontario