

this section very time consuming, but leads the reader to believe that it does not exist. The introduction explains how the book is organized, the interpretation of range maps, the terminology used in the text, and includes a section on bird conservation. The part on bird topography lacks any figure illustrating the body of a bird (it contains figures of heads and appendages) leaving such terms as breast, belly, flanks, and rump undefined. Here is an innovation that should not be repeated.

All the Birds, contrary to the claim on the book's cover, is not the most useful guide available. The guide's best features, its durability, compactness, and esthetic appeal, are nice but not fundamental. The most important qualities are accuracy and thoroughness in presenting field marks, but this field guide has a substantial number of errors, and its text is excessively brief. Though all field guides have shortcomings, this one is no better than average, when compared with them. Because only the best guides deserve recommendation, I do not recommend *All the Birds*.—MICHAEL MLODINOW, Apt. E, 545 N. Gregg Ave., Fayetteville, AR 72701.

Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Maryland and the District of Columbia.—Chandler S. Robbins, Senior Editor, and Eirik A. T. Blom, Project Coordinator. 1996. University of Pittsburgh Press. Pittsburgh, PA. xx + 479 pp., 18 figures, numerous maps and drawings. ISBN 0-8229-3923-1. \$55.00 (cloth).

The Maryland and District of Columbia atlas is a fine example of what state atlases can be—would that states like my own Oklahoma could hope to produce such a document. Of course, small states in heavily populated areas have an advantage over us westerners in their ability to reach high coverage. The Maryland atlas project surveyed nearly all blocks (each one-sixth of a 7.5 minute USGS quad map), included mini-routes (similar to Breeding Bird Survey routes but only 15 stops long) in nearly every block, and in some cases recorded data by quarter blocks. Of all 1,262 blocks in the state, only 6 were not covered, and a total of 194 species were confirmed breeding in the state.

The Maryland atlas is similar in format to other state atlases, such as the recent *Missouri Breeding Bird Atlas 1986–1992* (B. Jacobs and J. D. Wilson, 1997, Missouri Department of Conservation Natural History Series No. 6) or *The Atlas of Breeding Birds of Michigan* (R. Brewer, G. A. McPeck, and R. J. Adams Jr., 1991, Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, Michigan). It contains an opening section of background information, coverage data, habitat maps, historical perspective, and conservation discussion, followed by species accounts for 201 species (8 species were not confirmed breeding, but 4 of these have been confirmed since 1987). Each species account is laid out on two facing pages, with text giving pertinent details of biology and breeding, dates of migration for migratory species, and conservation status. Fifty-four authors and co-authors wrote the species accounts, and the editors have done an admirable job of maintaining style and quality from author to author. In addition to the distribution map for each species, most accounts also include a comparison with historic data from the

Birds of Maryland and the District of Columbia (R. E. Stewart and C. S. Robbins, 1958, North American Fauna 62, Washington, D.C.). For 129 reasonably abundant species, contoured relative abundance maps also are given, based on the mini-route data, along with a graph showing trends from an analysis of Breeding Bird Survey data. The index in the back includes references to all species by common and scientific names, and to names of all species account authors and co-authors.

This atlas has one problem that some other atlases have had, in that its publication was long delayed (nine years) after the fieldwork was completed in 1987. This produces a historical document. It is no less useful than a current one would be, but nine-year-old maps do not necessarily represent the current status or distribution of the birds of Maryland. Breeding bird atlases are large projects, requiring much coordination among account writers, editors, data analyzers, and mapmakers, but nonetheless this long lag time produces a document that is less than up-to-date. Of course, once printed, all atlases will age, but it would be nice if they were once current.

This is a well designed and executed atlas, and would be a fine resource for those studying birds, their populations and distributions, and what may be causing changes in those distributions. This atlas provides an excellent baseline for studies comparing bird population changes in an area experiencing rapid development and growth of its human populations. And the atlas can have its fun side, too—it's an excellent resource for bird watchers and hobbyists.—DAVID A. WIEDENFELD, George M. Sutton Avian Research Center, P.O. Box 2007, Bartlesville, OK 74005, e-mail: dwieden@aol.com

Shrikes: A Guide to the Shrikes of the World.—Norbert Lefranc; illustrated by Tim Worfolk. 1997. Pica Press and Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. 192 pages, 16 color plates. ISBN 0-300-07336-4. \$35.00 (hardbound).

True Shrikes are an interesting family of birds that have attracted a lot of attention in recent years owing to their world wide declines and the campaign of the International Shrike Working Group. Thus, it is no wonder that one of its most prominent members has authored the book that offers us a glimpse into the complicated lives of these conspicuous birds. Norbert Lefranc is a well-known shrike biologist who has dedicated almost three decades in the field to their study. This comes through in the book and in the very unique way of presenting the reader with the biology of the True Shrikes.

I make it a point to keep writing "True" because in ornithological circles when we say only shrikes, we usually relate also to a whole slew of other genera (e.g., helmetshrikes *Prionops* sp., Vanga Shrikes, boubous and bushshrikes, *Laniarus* sp.). This is one of the few negative comments I have about the book. The author would have avoided a lot of confusion if they would have named the book—*True Shrikes of the World*—and this would then justify why they have included only 27 species in *Lanius* and two each of *Corvinella* and *Eurocephalus*. I agree that they have pre-