

---

Subject: : Hatch and Entomology Forum

Topic: : Dave Wolf's Sept-Oct 'Cream Cahill'

Re: Dave Wolf's Sept-Oct 'Cream Cahill'

Author: : pcray1231

Date: : 2012/9/19 11:31:27

URL:

I think common name usage is highly varied. Different between regions, streams, individuals, etc.

Being of the more "scientific" bent, I tend to opt for more, not less, names. They hatch from different parts of the stream, with different hatch characteristics, at different times of the year, in different sizes. The only thing they have in common is a yellowish-orange color. They are totally different bugs. They should have different names!

I tend to be able to excuse having one common name for a bunch of very similar bugs. Say, calling all of the bugs in the Baetis genus by the name BWO is ok. There's some slight differences but even experts struggle to distinguish, there's a lot more in common than there is separate. But then, you have, say, the Drunella genus, which isn't just a different genus, it's a totally different family. They're more closely related to true sulphurs and Hendricksons. Using the same common name of BWO bothers me. Fails to imply a distinction, whereas in my mind there's a huge difference to the fishermen.

In that vein, I tend to reserve "sulphur" for the species in the ephemera genus, namely dorothea and invaria. Epeorus vitreus, for example, should thus not be called sulphur, but "pink lady" or "little maryatt" would be ok. Same goes with the cahills, which should generally be reserved for members of maccaffertium.

At least that's my take on things, helps me keep things straight. I'm by no means an authority on such matters.