
Subject: : Beginner Forum

Topic: : "Emerger" pattern questions

Re: "Emerger" pattern questions

Author: : FrequentTyer

Date: : 2013/5/19 23:36:43

URL:

Quote:

tyeager wrote:

4) technically I would say any parachute pattern is considered a dry fly...now whether you consider an emerger a subset of dry flies is probably a personal opinion but I consider an emerger any fly tied to have part of the body purposely under the surface film and part purposely either in the film or above....but again this is my opinion

I wish more people had that opinion. It gets very confusing because there is no standard vocabulary for fly tying and a confusing and evolving vocabulary for biology. So it is really important to not confuse the stage of the insect with the purpose of the pattern. In general (ignoring special cases like the quill Gordon), once a nymph "decides" to swim to the surface and become a fly, it is in the process of emerging, so any nymph pattern swung or lifted could mimic an emerging insect. Adding a shuck or bead to imitate gas bubbles, or a split case would make the fly distinct from a nymph (i.e. a split case pheasant tail vs. a pheasant tail) so that would be a subsurface emerger. Grease either to fish in the film and both could be said to mimic emergers. Add a parachute or snowshoe wing, and you have what most would call an emerger pattern. So is a pheasant tail greased and fished in the film an emerger pattern or a nymph pattern fished as an emerger. I don't know, and I guess I don't really care but for the fact that it confuses so many new guys.

For what it's worth, I also consider an emerger PATTERN to be "any fly tied to have part of the body purposely under the surface film and part purposely either in the film or above" and therefore have to consider parachute patterns to be emerger patterns. And they are darn good too with the parachute Adams being about as close to a universal emerger as you can imagine.

Mike.