

Robert J. De Pietro and Edward Ifkovic, eds., *Ethnic Perspectives in American Literature: Selected Essays on the European Contribution*. (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1983) iv, 333 pp., \$22.50, \$12.50 paper.

Because of the present concentrated push to reshape our view of American literature, the battle to include more ethnic and female writers in the traditional stream of our literature is clearly being won, and the salad bowl is replacing the melting pot as a central metaphor in our writing. Correctly, editors DePietro and Ifkovic in this source book emphasize that now various European ethnic groups have been sparked to cultural pluralism by the raising of our consciousness during the past two decades to the riches in black, brown, and red literatures. Further, they indicate that several bibliographies of ethnic writings now exist, a half-dozen decent anthologies of ethnic writing have been made available, and MELUS (Multi-ethnic Literature of the United States) is a solid, sustained entity in the Modern Language Association. The editors could also have added that the MLA has been pushing these frontiers by publishing other pragmatic works such as *Studies in American Indian Literature: Critical Essays and Course Designs*; *Three American Literatures: Essays in Chicano, Native-American and Asian-American Literature*; *Minority Language and Literature: Retrospective and Perspective*; and *Afro-American Literature: The Reconstruction of Instruction*. This accelerating concern has led many universities and colleges to include courses in these hitherto underrated ethnic literatures.

Because of this burgeoning interest, the editors see another vital need: "to make available to the teacher-researcher a handy volume focusing on major writers and themes associated with European ethnic groups in the United States." They have attempted, mainly successfully, to meet this need by having each of twelve white ethnic scholars write about his or her specialty; these are French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Jewish, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Scandinavian, and three South Slavic-American literatures.

The book is a valuable one. However, it is disappointing because there is some inconsistency as to what writers and writings shall be considered "ethnic"; it seems that not enough editorial control was established to ensure at least minimal uniformity of approach to the problem. Further, the organization of individual essays seems simply idiosyncratic—some essays are genre-oriented, others almost rigidly chronological. The book also would have benefitted strongly if it contained a selective bibliography for each group and a generalized bibliography for each group and a generalized bibliography for the whole field of American ethnic literature.

The level of competency of the essays is high, ranging from an acceptable soundness of scholarship to the sharply insightful. The essays uniformly demonstrate an awareness of the important literary artists in each ethnic group and usually in the notes for each essay are found, rather haphazardly, some important sources for further reading. Of the twelve essays, the most valuable seem to be the four relating to the German, Italian, Portuguese and Russian-American authors.

As a source book this volume could be used effectively by undergraduate students, for it supplies a good short introduction to the literature of each ethnic group; in a basic multi-ethnic American literature course it could supplement a strong anthology such as Faderman and Bradshaw's *Speaking for Ourselves*. However, for the professional scholar the book has minimal value.

—Stewart Rodnon
Rider College

A. Portes and C. Hirschman, eds. "Special Issue: Theory and Methods in Migration and Ethnic Research." *International Migration Review* 16 (Summer 1982).

The summer, 1982, edition of the *International Migration Review* is a special issue. It contains eight articles which are revisions of papers presented at the Conference on Immigration and Ethnicity Theory and Research, held at Duke University in May, 1981. The purpose of this meeting was to assess the state of knowledge in the field, present new findings and ideas, and identify areas for future investigation. Special attention was given to the determinants of migration, the reception of ethnic minorities, and changes over time.

The first four articles focus on migration within the context of the controversy between equilibrium and structural theories. In the first article Wood recommends the household as the unit of analysis in migration studies. He contends that this unit of analysis permits an integration of structural and equilibrium (individual) theories. For Wood the study of households reveals the interactions between structural and behavioral factors that determine migration. The second article by Bach and Schraml criticizes Wood's proposal. They conclude their paper by vaguely suggesting that other alternatives "constructed out of the principles of collective behavior" (339) be explored. Pessar's article on out-migration from the Dominican Republic attempts to