ECDYONURUS LONGICAUDA STEPH. (EPHEMERIDAE) REINSTATED
IN THE BRITISH LIST.

BY K. G. BLAIR, B.SC., F.E.S.

Students of the British mayflies have long been aware that more than one species have been confused in this country under the name Ecdyonurus venosus F. In his earlier monograph (Trans. Ent. Soc., London, 1871) the Rev. A. E. Eaton admitted two species, Heptagenia venosa F. with Baetis dispar Curtis in synonymy, and H. longicauda Steph. with H. subfusca Steph. in synonymy; but in the same author's Revisional Monograph (1887) these were combined under the name Ecdyurus venosus F., and so the matter has remained ever since.

Eaton's original opinion appears to have been the more correct. The main distinctions between the forms may be briefly stated as follows:—

E. venosus F. (the March Brown). Basal joint of anterior tarsus of \circlearrowleft about half as long as second joint; sides of abdomen with strong oblique dark streaks; crossveins of wings of subimago edged with black; mainly spring and early summer.

E. longicauda Steph. (the August or Autumn Dun). Basal joint of anterior tarsus of ♂ only one-third as long as second; oblique streaks of abdomen indistinct; crossveins of wings of subimago not bordered with black—hence the wings appear uniformly tinted, slightly yellow; mainly late summer.

Specimens of both these have been sent to Dr. Georg Ulmer of Hamburg for determination, and returned by him as E. venosus F. and E. fluminum Pict. respectively.

With regard to the correct name for the latter insect, it may be noted that in the Stephensian collection now preserved in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) there is no specimen bearing the name longicauda. A specimen bearing the name subfusca is a Q agreeing well with the description and may be taken as the type of that species. There is however no reason to suppose that Eaton was wrong in associating H. longicauda Steph. with H. subfusca Steph. as Q and Q of one species, and since longicauda has page priority over subfusca there seems no good reason why this should not be accepted as the name of the species. The name fluminum Pictet is of eight years later date (1843).

The matter unfortunately is not quite so simple as would appear, for there seem to be at least two further species involved in the same complex, but of these too little material has as yet come to hand to warrant definite separation. The writer would be very grateful for the loan of any material in this group for critical examination.

120 Sunningfields Road, Hendon, N.W.4. February 11th, 1930.

