

Dr. Clemens gave names to several species which were known to him only by the food plant, larval case or larva. Among these he mentions a species feeding on Hickory leaves under the name of *caryaefoliella*. He also describes a captured imago under the name of *cretaticostella*, but the description is so very brief and insufficient that without seeing his specimen I cannot be altogether certain that it is identical with that bred by me from larvæ feeding on Hickory leaves. His description, however, of *cretaticostella*, such as it is, is applicable to the Hickory-feeding species bred by me. I know three species feeding on Hickory leaves, but have only succeeded in rearing the imago from one, and as that one agrees in the characters of the case and larva with the case and larva mentioned by Clemens, I adopt the name suggested by him. His species *cretaticostella* was described in January, 1860, and his mention of the larva and case of *caryaefoliella* under that name was in 1861, so that the former name would be entitled to priority; but as there may be doubt whether the species are the same, and as the description of *cretaticostella* is so imperfect, and as, on account of the case with which bred species may be identified, it is always desirable that the specific name should be derived from the food plant, I adopt *caryaefoliella* for this species.

*C. rufoluteella* Cham. is known only from captured specimens. I have always found it in abundance about the middle of July, resting upon palings in Linden Grove Cemetery, in Covington, Ky., a mile away from any Hickory trees. There it always makes its appearance suddenly and in considerable numbers, so that I have always supposed it to be a feeder on some species of plant found in the cemetery enclosure. I am, however, utterly unable to distinguish it from specimens bred by me in the latter part of June from larval cases found feeding on Hickory leaves in the manner described by Dr. Clemens for *caryaefoliella*, and I believe it to be the same species.

The species of this genus pass by such gentle gradations from those having the antennae densely clothed with scales, or the basal joint of it tufted or greatly enlarged, and with the second joint of the palpi distinctly tufted, to those in which both antennae and palpi are simple, that these characters afford little assistance in subdividing the genus. It is sometimes difficult to determine whether we should say "the basal joint of the antennae tufted," or only "enlarged," and so as to the palpi. Thus formerly (CAN. ENT., v. 6) I placed *rufoluteella* in the section "basal joint of antennae with a small tuft, palpi simple." But it now seems to me that