Torre's subfamily II is Coelioxynæ, including *Coelioxys*, which I regard as a nudigaster, and *Anomobates*, which I regard as a nudipede.

From the analogy of *Bombus* and *Psithyrus*, I claim that *Coelioxys* is related to *Megachile*, *Stelis* to *Anthidium*, *Melecta* to *Anthophora*, *Nomada* to *Andrena*: not only, however, on this analogy, but also on morphological grounds, from the venation and other characters.

Assuming that the inquilines arose from some of their hosts, as is certain in the case of *Bombus* and *Psithyrus*, we would expect the most resemblance between host and inquiline in the recent cases of the highly specialized bees, as *Bombus* and *Psithyrus*, and the least in the oldest cases of the least specialized bees, as *Andrena* and *Nomada*.

In Della Torre's classification, as above stated, *Psithyrus* follows *Bombus*, though in different subfamilies. I would give *Psithyrus* the same position, but put both in the same subfamily. *Stelis* follows *Anthidium* in a separate subfamily, whence I would remove it to follow *Megachile* in Megachilinæ. Also *Melecta* and *Epeolus* follow *Anthophora*, but in a separate family. I would separate *Anthophora* from *Mellissodes*, etc., and put *Melecta* and *Epeolus* with it.

Nomada must seem the most far-fetched of my cases. Although it has a long first discoidal cell, I think other characters of the venation separate it far from *Melecta* and *Epeolus*, especially the large stigma and pointed marginal cell. I think *Nomada* is an ancient offshoot from *Andrena*, and is not related to any other genus. Its differences from *Andrena* and resemblances to other bees I hold are acquired, not inherited. After *Andrena* I would place *Parandrena*, a more recent offshoot, and then write *Nomada*.

In this connection I think the taxonomic proposition will hold that an offshoot from a certain group is related to that group. It may acquire resemblances to the other forms, but not relationship.

That Mr. Ashmead is right in interpolating the inquiline bees among the host bees is no doubt correct, but this has been done by Della Torre to such an extent as to destroy the contrast which exists between Mr. Ashmead's arrangement and the old-fashioned and unnatural arrangement of Schmiedeknecht. As in the Della Torre arrangement, I hold that Mr. Ashmead does not go far enough; indeed, it seems to me that he refutes his own scheme by the very arguments which he cites in defence of it. In his section III. Schmiedeknecht arranges certain bees whose differences