erect a separate family for it. If this third section is rejected, there is no ground for the retention of Psithyridæ. The family Stelididæ of Schmiedeknecht is in the same case.

The presence of a distinct malar space is a common thing in the Apygidialia, occurring in all of the principal groups. It is rare in the Pygidialia.

The Pygidialia form a more recent, continuous series. I would separate the Halictidæ from the Andrenidæ on account of their structural differences, their different flight, and the fact that they have produced their own inquilines. The structural characters of Paranomia, etc., seem to justify their separation as a family. Macropis is separated in the same way. I do not think it is closely related either to Panurgidæ or to Melitta. Halictoides is referred to Dufoureidæ. This family differs from Panurgidæ by the cell III_{1+2} being pointed on costa; the mandibles bidentate; labrum without basal space or process; the scopa femorilegid, the females collecting loose pollen; the face without coloured marks and without foveæ. Both families show considerable variation in the structure of the mouthparts. Indeed, Rhophites, in Dufoureidæ, has the labial palpi more highly specialized than in any other bee I have seen, joints 1-3 being flattened and 4 being simple and lateral. Protandrena I would refer to Protandreninæ, a sub-family of Panurgidæ. Panurgus is one of the exceptions among the Andrenoidea in having crurilegid scopæ and collecting loose pollen. The scopa is consequently less localized than in the local Panurgidæ, all of which mix the pollen with honey.

In Melectidæ I would include a number of genera referred by Ashmead to Stelididæ—Ammobatoides, Biastes, Pasites, Neopasites. In *Ammobatoides punctatus* the female does not show a distinct pygidial area, but the male shows a distinct pygidial process. The postscutel in Ammobatoides and Biastes differs from that of local species in being more protuberant and surpassing the scutel.

The Euceridæ and Emphoridæ are separated in families which seem sufficiently distinct from Anthophoridæ.

Finally, there remains a possibility that the Pygidialia and Apygidialia had an independent origin from the pygidial and apygidial Sphecoidea. In that case, the Anthophila would not form a natural group.

In the description of the venation the nomenclature of Comstock and Needham, Am. Nat. 32: 414, 423, has been followed, except that III, IV and V are used for R, M and Cu; V_1 for M_4; V_2 for Cu_1;