

rounded, without dorsal setulæ. Costa extending nearly to middle of wing, noticeably thickened from near base to apex, the setulæ rather close, not much longer than diameter of costa, first section slightly longer than 2+3, third about half as long as second; fourth vein arcuate, ending well in front of apex of wing; all thin veins evanescent at apices.

Length 2.25 mm.

Type.—Cobden, Ill., May 9, 1918. One specimen.

This species differs from the only described North American one, *orphne-philoides* Malloch, in being yellow instead of black, in the armature of the frons, and the much shorter costal vein.

---

### A BUTTERFLY NEW TO KANSAS.

BY HORACE GUNTROP, WASHBURN COLLEGE, TOPEKA, KANS.

The capture of a specimen of *Eresai texana* Edwards in the city of Topeka by Prof. W. A. Harshbarger on October 24, 1918, adds a new species to the list of Kansas butterflies. The specimen, a female, was caught on a hedge on West Sixth St., near the city limits.

According to Holland\*, this species ranges from Texas into Mexico, so its presence as far north as Kansas must be looked upon as accidental rather than as an extension of its normal range. It is probable that the chrysalis was carried here upon some shipment of goods on the railroad, or by some other human agency.

---

### PISCATORIAL ENTOMOLOGY.

Entomologists not familiar with the classification of insects more or less current among fly fishermen, may be interested in a brief review of the subject based chiefly on an American book. The classification rests essentially upon the works of various English fly-fishermen but has been applied to American insects, worked out and illustrated in the book to which we refer, namely, "American Trout-Stream Insects," by Louis Rhead (1916).

The names for insects orders which differ most from those in ordinary use among entomologists are: drakes for the may-flies, browns for the stone-flies, duns for the caddis-flies, and spinners for the crane-flies. The nomenclature of species is more or less fanciful, for instance: brown buzz, nobby spinner, yellow sally, black dose. However, names of this sort cannot be entirely ignored by entomologists for among them are some genuine vernacular terms, viz., redbug for *Aphodius fimetarius* in the Catskill region of New York. Since common names for insects are so rare, yet desirable, all those actually in use should be noted.

Fishermen are not to be severely criticized for inventing a classification and nomenclature especially adapted to their special needs, but it should rest upon accurate observation, and reasons urged for adopting it should be the real and perhaps justifiable ones, honestly stated, not unfounded allegations regarding the lack or unreliability of scientific system.

---

\*W. J. Holland. The Butterfly Book. New York, 1904.  
November, 1919

The author here reviewed commits all these errors, and his book would have been better without them. As examples of mistakes in observation, we may point out the following: April Insect Chart., Fig. 1. The figure is said to represent one of the Trichoptera, which it illustrates with a caudal appendage having two pairs of branches, something no North American insect of any order has. May Insect Chart, Fig. 14. A crane-fly is drawn with netted venation a character which the artist should have restricted to his browns, duns and drakes, August Insect Chart, Fig. 14. This "fluffy spinner," said to be one of the Diptera, but is drawn with only four legs (all insects having six). The original of this sketch probably was a *Pterophorid* moth. The author speaks a number of times of his faithful representations of the insects and especially of getting the colours true, but to those accustomed to good entomological illustrations, these are crude, and the colours, as reproduced unsatisfactory.

Now, as to reasons for not adopting the classification of scientists Mr. Rhead says: "European entomologists have divided insects into various orders; each season finds them making new classifications so conflicting as to bewilder the lay mind," (p. XVII). Taxonomy has had to bear many reproaches, but this is the first we recall, to the effect that the insect orders are changed each season. Other reasons given by the author for disregarding scientific classifications are expressed in the following sentences: "I was asked by an angling expert who was examining my drawings, "Why don't you give the proper Latin names to each fly?" My answer was, "I would do so, but no entomologist has yet made any effort to classify American trout insects into orders or divisions, families and species as has been done in France and England." (p. 102).

It appears, therefore, that the works of Hagen and of Banks, culminating in the latter's catalogue of the Neuropteroid Insects (1907), which includes all the browns, duns and drakes of Rhead, go for nothing, so far as this author is concerned. Similarly, the works of Osten-Sacken, and of Alexander and the Aldrich Catalogue of Diptera (1905) take care of all of his spinners and other flies, but he knows it not.

Our author makes the remarkable statement also that "Inquiries from various State entomologists failed to locate a single volume or treatise on trout-stream insects" (p. VII). He surely did not inquire of his own State entomologist, for the fact is, that New York State issued long before the date of Rhead's work two very valuable and well illustrated reports on this very subject. These are Needham and Betten's "Aquatic Insects in the Adirondacks" (1901), and "Aquatic Insects in New York State," by Needham, MacGillivray, Johannsen and Davis (1903). The shorter papers bearing more or less on trout stream insects, and publications on kindred topics are numerous.

Another work entitled "Fishing with floating flies" (S. G. Camp, 1913), varies somewhat from the book reviewed in nomenclature of insects, calling the May-flies duns and the caddis-flies sedges. It has the commendable feature, however, of quoting most of its entomological material from a standard work, namely Kellogg's "American Insects" (1905).—W. L. MCATEE.