MICRO-LEPIDOPTERA.

BY V. T. CHAMBERS, COVINGTON, KY.

Continued from Vol. III., page 224.

GRACILLARIA.

The species of this genus bear some resemblance—especially the smaller species—to Lithocolletis; but they may be distinguished by the attitude in repose in most species, and by the developed maxillary palpi in all. They usually sit (especially the larger species, for I have not observed it in some of the smaller ones), with the anterior part of the body elevated upon the anterior and middle legs, whilst the posterior legs are applied to the sides of the abdomen, the apex of which touches the surface upon which they rest. In some of the smaller species, the maxillary palpi are small, and sometimes almost concealed by the labial palpi. This is the case in Gracillaria robiniclla (Parcetopa robiniclla Clemens), and G. lespedezæfoliella (P. lespedezæfoliella Clem.), upon which Dr. Clemens erected the genus Parcetopa, as not having any visible maxillary palpi. I have found the maxillary palpi distinct, though small, in G. rebiniclla. G. lespedezæfoliella I have not seen; but from Dr. Clemens' description, it is very closely allied to G. robiniclla, and no doubt has the same structure.

But the genus is by no means a homogeneous nor a distinctly limited one. The species differ in many respects as to structure, as well as style or pattern of ornamentation, and habits of larvæ and pupæ.

The genus *Coriscium* was crected to include certain species having the second joint of the labial palpi tufted. But, as Mr. Stainton has well remarked, there is considerable variation among the species in this respect, and the genus seems to pass almost insensibly into *Gracillaria*. The only material point of difference between *Gracillaria* and *Parcetofa* was the supposed absence of maxillary palpi in the latter genus, and that was a mistake.

Herrich-Schaffer divides the genus, constructing a new genus, Euspilapteryx, for the smaller species, (and in which no doubt he would have included the Paratopa of Dr. Clemens), but which does not seem to me to be at all a natural division. And lastly, Zeller divides the genus into two sections, in one of which the discal cell gives off nine veins to the margin, whilst in the other it gives off only eight veins. This appears to