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## Vol. I.

## ERRATA ET CURRIGENDA.

Page 22 line 10 from the botom, and p. 106, line 12, for Villars, read Villers.
32 line penult. for tlongata, read elougatæ.
$\$_{5}$ line antepenult, for which Fabriciu, reparated from Apis, read into which Fabricius divided Apis
306 line 7 from the hotrom, for Tuberculi, read Tubercula.
130 and 134 note, line 1, dele Latr.
4. 46 line 11, afier Hopeeffufculo, infert punctis excavatis exafperato; ant line 4 from the bottom, after minuto, infert trunco punctis excavatis exifperato.
177 lines $\mathrm{r}, 2$, for ano, veritre, read anus, venter.
18, line 6 from the hottom, after minuto, put a comma, and infert interioribus lineari-lanceolatrs, quan exteriores bievioribus.
200 lines 3 , ti for abdomine oblonzo, interdum er ful triangulari, read abdomine fubtriansulari, incerdum sobngo.
217 line 4 from the bottom. after 2 , infert $\beta$.
218 line 5 for coaliti, read fubd:idincti.
229 line 4 from the wotom, for tead frati.
$23^{2}$ line u, for fpinula-ferriane ar foinula-ferrulata.
247 line 7 , for interioses, riad un : •,
248 line penult. for interiares, rad exteriores.
$2 j 8$ line is afier exutus, infert a a molecule.

## Vol. IY.

Page 13 line 5 from the hottom, for fupra nudiufella, read cinereo-fubpuhefcens.
14 line 1 , for cinereofobvillofa, read fupra nudiufoula.
15 line 3 from the bottom, for Lintella, read Linnæella. line ult. for Bankiana, read Bankiana.
37 line 9 from the bottom, and page 35, line 5, for Jacobex, read Jacotraze.
15 line 13, for ferrugineo, read forrusinea.
23 line 0, for fubrubefcens, read ruhpubefcente.
24 line 7 from the bottom, for wefcentibus, read flavefcentibus.
25 line 4, \&cc. alter the diffint:on thas: rotumita A. grifefeente-villofa; ore flavo; ablomine fegmentis marginefubrufis; thorace femineo nigricanti, maforlo fulvo.
27 line 2, for Francillonana, read Prancillonella,
28 line 6, for Scrimphirana, rad ScrimMirana.
41 line $1:$ for tuberculi hetei, read rubercula latea.
45 line so for 1, vead : 5 .
56 line 1 , after fopphrei, infert rufo-variegati.
58 line 4 from the hotem, afire nigre, infitt fuhtus ohfcure fulva.
135 line $: 2$ from the botcon, for hic, read huc.
186 line 12 from the bottom, for ferrusinew, read ferruginea.
25: lines 8,9 fron the bottom, after manifetatori, and juculatori, infert a comma.
309 line 3 from the bottom, after antenna, infort in noftro fpecimine.
$3: 6$ line $1_{7}$, for ansulum, eat angulo.
331 line 14, after latreille, irfert a comma.
332 line 3 from the hortom, for ad, read in.
$34 j$ line 16 , ajter D, add D.

## PREFACE.

WHEN the author of the following work first turned his attention to the English Apes, he had no expectation of meeting with half the number of species that he has now described; nor had he any other view, than to draw up a short paper to be read at the Linnean Society, and inserted, if deemed sufficiently interesting, in the Transactions of that learned body: but as he proceeded in his undertaking, so much was to be said, it seemed necessary to introduce so many alterations, and such a number of species unexpectedly flowed in upon him from a variety of sources; that, instead of a short paper, he found he had collected materials sufficient for more than a volume: upon this he changed his original intention, and determined to submit his performance himself, not without considerable apprehensions he confesses, to the eye of the public.

Having said this, it may not be improper to give the entomological reader a short sketch of what the author has attempted in this publication. In the
first place, in the Introductory Remarks, and Addenda to the first volume, he has given some account of the rise, progress, and present state of the class Hymenoptera; and pointed out such improvements, as he thinks it will admit: he then proceeds to examine what advances the genus of which he proposes to treat has made towards perfection. Under each of these heads he has introduced some strictures upon the system of Fabricius, which the occasion seemed to demand: and here he hopes that the friends and admirers of that celebrated entomologist will do him the justice to believe that he has been actuated solely by a desire to promote the cause of truth, and of his favorite science, which, as he conceives, have suffered very materially by the introduction of that system.

The work itself begins with a Tabula synoptica nomenclature partium. Upon the construction of this the author has bestowed the greatest attention; and he trusts that it will be found nearly, if not altogether, a complete enumeration of the external parts of the insects of which he treats. Their internal anatomy he has passed over, as not entering within the limits of his plan. This table, if he is not greatly mistaken, with a few slight alterations, may be made to agree with all Hymenopterous insects. In it he has introduced and named several parts unnoticed by Linneus, and most other writers in entomology. This is followed by an explanation of the terms used in this table, and the following
following work. Having thus prepared the way, he next points out those characters, which appear to him to distinguish the genus in question; and assigns his reasons for dividing into two genera those insects which by Linneus were considered as genuine Apes, subjoining their Essential, Artificial, and Natural Characters. With respect to the last, though he varies from the practice, yet he conforms to the precept of Linneus (a); and he thinks that Fabricius has rendered no small service to the science of entomology by the introduction of them. Then succeed, what appear to him, after combining anatomy with habit, economy, and affinities, the natural families into which these two genera may properly be divided.

And here, to trace the footsteps, and elucidate the system of nature, and nature's God, has invariably been his aim; to discover the wonderful works, and adore the wisdom of his Creator, his highest pleasure; and to point out his meaning, and see things where HE has placed them, his single desire. Unattached to hypothesis, he has made haste to give up errors as soon as he has detected them, and he has taken every step within his power to arrive at the truth. With respect to this part of his undertaking, he has not been satisfied with dis-
(a) Linneus, in his Methodus demonstrandilapides, vegetaliLia aut animalia, under the head Genus, includes as a necessary adjunct. "Character Naturalis omnes notas characteristicas possibiles exhivens."
secting a single insect in each family; on the contrary, he has omitted no opportunity of examination; and in those subdivisions in which the proloscis( $k$ ), and its parts seemed most subject to variation, he has inspected that organ in almost every individual that he has described. But still, notwithstanding all his care, he cannot flatter himself that he is altogether exempt from error. 'These minute parts, be their position varied ever so little under the lens, exhibit an appearance different in some respects. He has endeavoured to represent every thing as it appeared to his eye. Quite a novice in the arts of drawing and etching, his performance must of course be rude, and perhaps sometimes the relative proportion of parts to each other is not represented with entire accuracy; but in this respect he did his best: as to number of parts and general form, he can vouch for the truth of his figures.

These necessary preliminaries discussed, and adjusted, the author procceds to the description of individuals: and here he shought he could not pursue a better plan, than that excellent one marked out by the Rev. Dr. Goodenough, in his admirable pa-
(b) The term, Rostrum, has frequently been employed, by Linneus and orhers, to signify this part ; but such an application of it, if entomologists are expected to adhere to the definition of the Fundamenta Eniomologice, is extremely improper. Os in acumen productum rigidum, gives to that term a very distinct signification, and altogether at variance with the proloscis of a bee.
per on the British Species of the Genus Carex (c). He has therefore placed before his descriptions a $S_{y} y$ nopsis Specierum, and subjoined, to such as seemed to require it, some observations in English. In the determination of species, the result of his inquiries, he flatters himself, may prove useful; particularly as his frequent dissections of these insects, and his necessary attention to their most minute parts, have led him to discover those characters, exclusive of the organs of generation, which distinguish the male from the other sexes. By following this clue, he has found that several species, hitherto described as distinct, are only sexual varieties; and, by the assistance of the same circumstance, he has separated many insects of the same sex, which have usually been regarded as such. The opportunity afforded him, by the liberality of the President of the Limmean Society, of consulting the cabinet of Linnens, has empowered him to verify a number of species that have been very much mistaken, or very little known ; so that, for the future, he hopes there will be no room for either error or doubt concerning them. To put it as much as possible into the power of entomologists to be acquainted with the insects here described, under each species he has referred to those cabinets in which he knows it to be preserved.

With respect to synomyms, the author spared no pains that his situation permitted him to take. Not
(c) Lin. Trans, vol, 2. p. 126, \&ic.

$$
\text { a } 3 \quad \text { posse } \text { sser! }
$$

possessed of an extensive entomological library of his own, he has omitted no opportunity of consulting those of others; especially the magnificent col lection of Sir Joseph Banks, so liberally open to naturalists: but his distance from the metropolis prevented his having any other than occasional recourse to this invaluable treasure-house of Natural History. Knowing how customary it is with authors, not excepting Linneus himself, to adopt synonyms without sufficient examination, a practice that has proved a fruitful source of error and almost inextricable confusion, he has been particularly cautious to refer to no author, whose description or figure of any individual insect he has not compared with the insect itself. And, that he might trust as little as possible to memory in this case, he carried his whole collection of specimens both to London and Norwich ; so that in this department he hopes he has rectified many mistakes of his predecessors. There is one author, J. L. Christius, who has treated upon the Hymenoptera class, of whom he was not able to make so much use as he could have wished, from his ignorance of the German language: to his figures he frequently refers, but as he cannot consult the descriptions, he does this sometimes with less confidence, than if he could compare his insects with both. Mr. Marsham, however, upon whose judgment he places the greatest reliance, compared the specimens with this author's figures, and approved of the references made to them in this work.

To elucidate the whole, he has annexed a set of explanatory plates, etched by himself, from sketches of his own; rudely executed indeed, but he hopes sufficiently accurate to illustrate his system.

After all, the author is conscious that he brings far from a perfect work before the tribunal of the public. Much still remains incomplete; and many errors, no doubt, will require future correction. An account of any genus, perfect and elaborate in all its parts, must be the work of him who is versed in the history and economy of every individual that belongs to it, He, and he only can go upon sure grounds, for no other person can in all cases, with certainty, distinguish the species from the variety, and unite each sex to its legitimate partner. But so much knowledge, even with respect to a single genus, where the species are numerous, is not to be expected from one man : nor should the naturalist attempt, like the spider, to weave his web from materials derived solely from within himself; but rather let him copy the industrious bee, and draw genuine treasures from those flowers of science which have been reared by other hands, and combining these with his own discoveries, let him endeavour to concentrate all into one harmonious system, with parts curiously formed, arranged, and adapted to each other, and to the whole; and calculated to preserve the sweets of true wisdom pure and unsophisticated.

The author, in the following performance, may be thought by many, to have multiplied species without necessity; while others will probably object to his having put those together, whose primat facie appearance is entirely different. To the first he begs leave to observe, that insects are not so subject to vary as plants; moreover his discovery of the sexes enabled him to detect those differences that indicate gender, and therefore he could always reduce the question, with respect to any particular insect, into this small compass, viz. whether such variations were likely to occur in the same sex ? He does not, however, presume to affirm that he has fallen into no mistakes in this respect; for in two of his subdivisions of genuine Apes ( $d$ ), he fears he has not been so successful, in uniting the sexes, as in other families; and in general, where the males and females differ very materially, as they occasionally do both in colour and form, he has probably, in several instances, been led to regard them as distinct species. To the latter he must reply, that he has never united two insects before
(d) The author alludes here to those Vespiform Apes, which constitute a considerable part of the Fabrician genus Nomada, and also to the Bomlinatrices of Linneus. Of these, the former seems more subject to vary than any family of the genus; and almost all the distinctions of the latter being taken from the colour of their hirsuties (which varies much, and often in the same individual, in different periods of its existence) of course, in describing them, the entomologist must be liable to many mistakes.
considered as distinct, without very satisfactory proofs of their identity.

To some he may seem unnecessarily minute in the description of species, but the very nature of a Monograph seems to imply attention to every circumstance which distinguishes the objects of it (e): while, on the other hand, he who undertakes an entire department in Natural History, should select those features principally which distinguish the objects he describes from their congeners. As minute traits of character, and familiar anecdotes, which are beneath the dignity of the historic muse, are accounted a great beauty in biography; and enter into its essence, at the same time that they constitute its most agreeable ornament. Against this objection he cannot shelter himself more securely, and under a greater name, than that of the learned Professor Afzelius, who, in his papers on three species of Trifolium, and on the genus Pausus, in the Linnean Transactions $(f)$, has exhibited, as nearly as possible, a perfect example of a Monograph.

It may perhaps be urged, as another objection against the author, that he has taken an unwarrantable liberty in altering so frequently the Nomina Specifica of Limneus and other authors. His
(e) Monographi vegetabile unicum opere singulari proseculi sunt, ut eo accuratius constent omnia in particulari casu. Nature curiosorum institutum laudandum. Lin. Philos. Botan. §. 13.
(f) Vol. 1. p. 202, and vol. 4. p. 243.
reply to this must be, that he has never done this out of the love of change, but only where it seemed necessary to distinguish one species from another, and in strict compliance with the rules laid down by that great father of natural history, in his Philosophia Botanica, where he says, "Nomen specificum continet differentice notas essentiales." $(g)$ And again " Nomen specificum legitimun plantam ab omnibus congeneribus distinguat." $(h)$ When, therefore, the Linnean definition of any species does not contain all those characters which constitute its essence, or which distinguish it from its congeners, it is necessary that it be altered, provided this be done cautè, castè, judiciosè, according to the same rules. When Linneus published the last edition of his Systema Naturc, the known species of Apes, speaking comparatively, were but few, and therefore fewer notes of discrimination would sufficiently point out any individual then, than at this time, when the number of species is increased beyond measure. Much confusion has unavoidably been introduced into the genus by this brevity, for the same definition will now be found to agree with several distinct species $(i)$.
(g) §. 256.
(h) §. 257. He says under another section (294), Qui novam detegit speciem, addat et non mođ̀̀ ©jusdem differentiam, sed et in congeneri vel congeneribus differentias augeat, ut distinguantur in posterum species sufficienti differentiá.
(i) E.G. The definitions of Apis cunicalaria, centuncularis, conica, succincta, \&c.

The author has experienced no small difficulty in assigning Trivial Names to such species as appeared to be non-descript: his aim has been so to construct them, that they may point out some pro-minent feature of the insect which they denote, or allude to some remarkable circumstance in its economy: but the species of this genus are so seldom distinguished by singularity of form, or variety of colouring, that he has often been at a loss to fix upon an appropriate name; and he fears that many will be thought not so happily illustrative of their subject as he could wish. Where the same insect has been described by several authors under different Trivial Names, he has generally made it a rule to retain that imposed by him who first noticed it. Many of his non-descripts he has named after the entomologists of this country, whether writers or collectors only, distinguishing the former by the termination ella, and the latter by ana, in conformity to the practice of Linneus in the Tinece and Tortrices. If he has omitted any gentleman who is entitled to a place, he hopes it will be imputed to ignorance rather than design.

The author would be unpardonable, were he to conclude this preface, without acknowledging his obligations to those gentlemen, whose libraries and cabinets he has been allowed the liberty of consulting.

- To Sir Joseph Banks, Bart. this, and every work, in whatever department of Natural History, under-
taken in England, will of course be under the greatest obligations. His unrivalled library, stored with almost every publication that a naturalist can wish to consult, and his cabinet rich in exotic and indigenous treasures, and open to the most unreserved inspection, afford writers of this class, who reside in this country, a most decided advantage over those of every other.

To Dr. Smith, the President of the Linnean Society, he is indebted not only for the invaluable opportunity of consulting at his ease the Linncan cabinet and library, by which he has been enabled to determine so many dubious species, and to extricate the genus of which he treats from much of the confusion in which it was involved, but also for his personal kindness and constant encouragement.

He scarcely knows what terms to employ that will sufficiently express his obligations to Mr. Marsham; whose friendship, from the first to the last, has exerted itself with unwearied assiduity, to give, or procure him, every information in his power; securing him an access to all the cabinets of the metropolis; introducing him, a stranger, and unknown, to the most eminent entomologists; impoverishing his own collection to enrich that of the author: in a word, taking every occsion to serve him, and his friends, to the utmost of his power.

To Drs. Goodenough and Latham, Major Gen. Davies, and Messrs. Drury, Sowerby, Donovan, Mc Leay, Jones, Haworth, Hill, Coyte, Francillon, he
he begs to return his grateful acknowledgments, for the permission, with which they indulged him, of consulting their respective collections. To the Rev. Peter Lathbury, he is indebted for much assistance every way. To the industry, and accuracy of observation of his ingenious relation Mr. James Trimmer, he owes the discovery of several nondescripts, also much original matter, and many interesting particulars relative to the history and economy of several of the insects clescribed in the following pages.

- N.B. The reader is requested to observe that aij the descriptions in the following work were taken from insects titwtel ander a lens.
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## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

BEFORE I begin my description of the British species of the genus Apis, I propose to offer a few preliminary observations upon the Hymenoptera class; consisting of a short review of its history previous to the time of Linneus, an account of what has been done in it by him and his successors, and ending with a particular inquiry into the present state of the genus, which I have undertaken to elucidate. These, I hope, will furnish satisfactory reasons for those alterations which I have found myself under the necessity of making, and for that method of arrangement which I have adopted.

The Great Parent of the universe, when he furnished this terrestrial globe with its inhabitants, caused the earth and waters, as the sacred historian informs us(a), to produce every thing "according
(a) Genesis i. 11-25,
to its kind" $(b)$ : an expression, which if taken in its largest sense, as I think it will well bear in the places referred to in the margin, may be understood to signify the distribution of all created species, not only into Families and Genera, but also into Orders, Classes, and Kingdoms; and so into a harmonious system, every member of which, although it has a separate place and office assigned it, is connected, by certain common marks and characters, with those which precede or follow it. And the book of nature in this, as in all other respects, speaks the same language with the book of revelation; we see every where the traces of a natural system, and both reason and observation unite in declaring that such a system, with its regular divisions and subdivisions, does exist. Now if the glory of the Creator be, as it assuredly ought, the great end of the labours of the naturalist; then the most effectual way to promote this great end, is to aim at the elucidation of the genuine systema et oeconomia naturce, that we may see natural objects, as much as possible, in the places which the Divine Wisdom has assigned to them; and learn, every day, more and more of the natural juxtaposition of Species, Families, Genera, Orders, Classes; and of their individual and collective economy, \&c. \&c. It is true, in our present degenerate state, fallen from original knowledge
(b) Heb. למינהו. The root and its derivative מנה a imply distribution and orderly arrangement.
as well as virtue, having lost that genuine Clavis Naturce, which it is probable our primogenitor Adam possessed (c) ; by the use of which, in the creature he could discern the intention of his Creator: in this world and its productions, seen in their various affinities and economies, read his deity and attributes, his wisdom and will, and things spiritual : so that to him, the page of creation was a revelation by natural symbols and types, as the Jewish religion was by instituted, and the Christian by words, the arbitrary signs of ideas; and, in consequence of this knowledge, was enabled to impose upon the creatures, names adapted to their several natures. I say, in our present degenerate state, we cannot attain to this wisdom of the protoplast, for now "we know only in part $(d)$." Yet, by combining our own observations upon nature with those of others, who before us have laboured in the same field, we shall gradually approach more and more towards it, till, perhaps, if it be the Divine Will, we attain to the full day of the glory of our Creator, as manifested in his creatures. If that glorious day of true and genume science should ever come, we shall then behold each natural object in its proper place; we shall learn its history, economy, and uses, its moral and spiritual signification, and find
(c) Quod ad Historiam NTaturalem attinet, duce ejus partes, Zoologia et Botanica, testantilus hoc plerisque theologis et fhi?usophis, primi generis nostri parentis fuere studiu. Fundament. Entomolog. 4 to. P. 4.
(d) 1 Cor. xiii. 9 .

B 2
God's

God's works and God's word, "though each in different sort and manner," uniting to declare the same truths, and, with one voice, impelling us forward to the attainment of the true end of our being, the knowledge and enjoyment of him, who is essential power, wisdom, and Love, through that blessed person, who having first created us, afterwards assumed our nature and died for us, and in that world of realities of which this is only the type and the shadow. May that day ever more and more approach; to hasten its dawn is the peculiar office and duty of the naturalist, who is the Hierophant in the great temple of nature; and this can only be effected by opening our eyes to the light which nature herself affords to those who seek for truth: by recording, not our own private hypotheses, but our discoveries; by improving, instead of destroying, what others have done; by retaining what is already discovered of the natural system, and endearouring to add to it; remembering always that we are not the heralds of our own fame, but of the glory of our God. So that we may ever be willing to exclaim in the words of the divine psalmist: "The works of JEifovah are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein. His work only is excellent, and his praise above the earth and heaven."

Of all the departments of the anmal kingdom, the entomological affords the fairest opportunity of diseviering the natural classes; and accordingly
the penetrating genius of Linneus, enabled him, in the later editions of his Systema Nature, to arrange the insects he described as nearly as possible according to the natural system. A few genera, perhaps, in the Hemiptera and Aptera classes, may be placed in a wrong one; but these, compared with others which are stationed in the situation, as to class at least, in which nature has placed them, are but few. Where then is the force of the objection of Fabricius to Linneus, that " nimis naturam sequens, sapius amisit systema(e)?" The end of all artificial systems is solely to facilitate the study of nature, and to prepare the way for the discovery of that which is natural ; which, as Lin-. neus justly terms it, is the primum et ultimum $(f)$. Therefore, when we have a system that for the most part harmonizes with nature, is such an objection to be raised against the illustrious author of it? And are we to be told, with respect to natural classes, " that the proper time to elaborate them is not yet arrived, since we are as yet but tyros in the science $\left(g^{g}\right)$ !" To hear this author speak of the Limean system, one would suppose that entomology, instcad of being under any obligation to it, had received great injury from it, and that
(e) Philos. Ent. c. vii. § $2 . \quad(f)$ Philos. Bot. § 77.
(g) Naturales existere insectorum classes vix dulitandum. Suadent ralio, detecta, olservata. At nondum tempzes est eas elaborare, quam tyrones adluc scientice simus. Philos. Ent. c. vi. § 7.
he himself was its great upholder and restorer. Hear his own words: "Vidi vacillantem entomologian, classes ludicras, genera falsa, species haud determinatas, et nomina sapius absurda ( $h$ )."

If we compare the characters of the Linnean classes, with those of Fabricius, we shall find the former, simple, obvious, applicable, with few exceptions, to all the genera that compose each, and distinguished by a significant name; while those of the latter are seldom to be detected without dissecting the insect; and, if I may be allowed to form a judgment from the Hymenoptera class, not universally applicable; with a name assigned to each barbarous, ill-constructed, and far from significant. To give up the classical, harmonious, and connected names of the Linnean classes, for such barbarisms, as Eleuterata, Ulonata, Synistata, Piezata, Odonata, Mitosata, Polygonata, Kleistag natha, Exochnata, \&c. is what, I should apprehend, no naturalist, who is at the same time a scholar, and has any ear, will ever consent to.

The end of system, as I just now observed, is to facilitate study, but Fabricius, in his eagerness to innovate, has fixed upon characters taken from organs, which, in a large proportion of insects, are
(h) Philos. Ent. Præfat. p. 1, 2. When one sees Fabricius and his followers, in their Synonyms, placing his name before that of Linneus, under insects first described by the latter, one cannot help feeling some emotions of anger at the indignity thus put upon that illustrious naturalist,
absolutely invisible, or next to it; and for the sake of systematic confusion has discarded nature and all orderly arraugement, and instead of facilitating, has perplexed the study of entomology with difficulties that are innumerable and inextricable (i). The rage of the present unhappy æra is not for the amendment or improvement of what has been done
(i) If the reader will take the trouble to turn over the Supplement to the Entomologia Systematica, he will be convinced that the language here employed is far from being too strong. He will there see, to use an emphatic phrase, ommia misceri. Instead of a regular and harmonious system, like that of Linneus, a Babel of confusion and division. Instead of a gradual descent towards those insects which nature has placed next to the Vermes, he will find many of these stationed before the Lepidoptera!! For instance, after the Coleuptera and a few genera of Hemiptera, come some of the Neuroptera and Aptera mixed together ; these are followed by the Hymenoptera, which precede more Neuroptera. Then appear five classes of Aptera, the two last of which are made entircly out of the Linnean genus Cancer, divided into twenty-seven genera!!! These are succeeded by the Lepidoplera, followed by the rest of the Hemiptera; and the discordant catalogue, Purtium inter se non lene coherentium, concludes with Diptera and Aptera. If he turns his attention from the classification to the genera, he will be surprized to see families of the same natural genus forced violently asunder, and separated widely from each other. Thus Trichius, Cetonia, and Melulontha, disunited from Scaraleus, to which God and Nature had joined them, are placed next before Buprestis. Again, he will there see Fabricius deserting his own system, and taking the Artificial Churacters of no fewer than twenty-one genera in his Kleistagnatha and Exochnata classes from the Antenne solely, without making any mention of the instrumenta cibaria, upon which it is founded.
before,
before, but in these days a man thinks himself no philosopher, unless he can altogether obliterate, and for ever do away the collected wisdom of the ages that are past, in order, in its stead, to erect a novel system of his own: this is the case in religion, morals, politics, and philosophy; and in all these this K arvoucvoc has produced the most mischievous effects. But it ought to be recollected, that if the flimsy, and destructive web of a spider be the work of a single insect and spun in an hour, yet that to form and replenish the admirable structure sheltered by the hive, it requires, and for the best portion of the year, the united labours of myriads of industrious bees. Just emblems of the patient efforts of genuine science.

Had Fabricius, instead of overturning, employed himself in giving those improvements to the system of Linneus, of which it is capable, and which indeed it demands; the entomological world would have been his debtor; and under so skilful a hand, the science, instead of being thrown back, would have made considerable advances. Whereas, in the system that he has produced, what have we gained but a confused mass of unnatural classes, founded upon evanescent characters, designated by barbarous names, and puzzling the student with old terms turned aside from their original signification ${ }_{2}$ and improperly applied to new objects $(k)$ ?
(k) E. G. Maxilla, Lalium, Clypeus, \&c.

I should

I should not have taken so much liberty in my strictures upon the system of this celebrated author, had not many eminent entomologists upon the continent adopted it without reserve, and endeavoured to force it upon the public. A conduct which I conceive to be most prejudicial to the interests of science, and unjust to the merits of the greatest uninspired naturalist that ever lived. In justice to my own countrymen I must not omit to observe, that this system has gained very little ground in England.

At the same time, although I have spoken my sentiments so freely of the system of Fabricius, it is with pleasure I acknowledge that his Philosophia Entomologica is a work of standard merit, which deserves to be thoroughly studied by every entomologist, and if he had written nothing else, this alone would have entitled him to be ranked amongst the first philosophers of the age in which he lives ( $l$ ). The construction of Natural Characters, although chiefly drawn from those inconspicuous parts on which he builds his system, is a great point gained in the science; and ingeneral if, in some respects,
( $l$ ) I must except, however, from this praise, many of his definitions: E.G. Aldomen Conicum, Cylindricum, \&c. where the usual sense of these terms is clogged with unnecessary additions. Philos. Ent. c. ii. § 12.8 cc . It were to be wished that in all cases the definitions of the Fundamenta Entomologice of finneus had been primarily adhered to,
he has done great injury to it, in others he has certainly contributed much to its advancement.

But let us leave these general observations, and turn our attention to the class, of which we propose to give some account. It is curious, and not altogether unprofitable, to trace science from the cradle to its manhood, and pursue it through all its intermediate advances. Before I begin, therefore, with what Linneus, his disciples, and successors have effected, I shall give a short view of what had been done, in the Hymenoptera class, by the predecessors of that illustrious naturalist. If I mistake not, our own country had the honour of paving the way for the system of Linneus. A brilliant constellation of geniuses arose towards the close of the seventeenth century, who diffused new light over every department of natural history, and were the harbingers of that bright day, which the labours of the great Swedish naturalist have caused to dawn upon the three kingdoms of nature. In this constellation, the stars of the first magnitude and brightest lustre were John Ray, that glory of England, Dr. Martin Lister, and Francis Willughby, Esq. These great Men, by their separate and joint labours, prepared the materials for the present improved state of Natural History.

Before their time, some kind of form had been given to entomology by their predecessors, and the foundations of the class in question, rude indeed and imperfect,
imperfect, had been laid. In Charleton's Onomasticon Zoicon, a work of merit for the time, a distinct existence is given to those insects destitute of Elytra, which construct combs, denominated " Insectorum avsiurpar favificantium classis" $(m)$. This definition, imperfect as it is, for it excludes the major part of genuine Hymenopterous insects, possesses this merit, that it admits none that do not belong to that class. Ray, whose indefatigable exertions brought copious and bright accessions of genuine light to every branch of natural history, sensible of the deficiency of the old method, has elaborated this class with considerable care, extending indeed its limits too far, so as to include most of the present Neuropterous Genera; but at the same time taking in all the genuine Hymenoptera; and thus laying the foundation, with few alterations, for an appropriate and discriminative character of it. The following are the alterations that he has introduced. He puts into one subdivision, under the title of Tetraptera, all such insects, with four membranaceous wings, as are quiescent in their intermediate state, thus arranged:
( $m$ ) Onom. Zoic. p. 36. I quote this author because I have him at hand, and he professes to combine the information to be found scattered in the works of preceding naturalists. He borrows his method from Aldrovandus. Vid. Præf, p. 10.


From this view of what our great naturalist has done in this class, it appears that nothing was wanted to make it a natural class, but to fix upon a character in addition to "Ala quatuor membranacece," which would exclude those Neuropterous genera that he included in it $(n)$.

Dr. Martin Lister, in an appendix to Ray's Historia Insectorum, has included all insects, with four naked wings, in one division subdivided into
a Papiliones, Libella, \&c.
$\beta$ Apes, Vespre, Cralrones, \&c.
( $n$ ) We see in the foregoing table of the Raian system, as to this class, that he divides it into two orders, the first containing what may be denominated two subdivisions and four genera, and the other four subdivisions and as many genera.

We see what a near approach these illustrious Englishmen made to nature with respect to this class, and that in this country it assumed some distinct form, and those foundations were laid, upon which a perfect system might be erected. But though the class was nearly extricated, the genera still remained involved in confusion, distinguished by no certain characters, and often merely by names $(o)$.

Such was the state of this class, when Linneus, amongst his other immortal labours, undertook the reformation of entomology. The first outline of his Systema Naturce was published in 1735; whether at that time he was acquainted with what had been done in England in that science, I do not know, but I should think, if he had bestowed much attention on the Methodus Insectorum of Ray, he would have gone further than he did in that outline: for in it he puts into one class, the Lepidoptera, Neuroptera, Hymenoptera, and Diptera, to which he gives the name of Angioptera, a term of similar import with Neuropiera ( $p$ ). This class he defines "Alae omnibus datce elytris destituta." In it he gives the characters of only two genuine Hymenopterous genera, Apis and Ichueumon, which he draws from variations in the Aculeus $(q)$.
(o) I have passed over the system of Swammerdam, as built intirely on the metamorphoses of insects.
( $p$ ) Them. Airenv, vas, and $\pi \tau \varepsilon \rho \circ$, , ala.
(9) Afis cauda aculen simplici. Alse quatuor. Ichneumon cauda aculco partitn. Ale quatuor.

The first of these genera he divides into four famis lies, viz. Crabro, Vespa, Bombylius, and Apis; and the latter into two, viz. Ichneumon and Musca Tripilis. This outline contains no enumeration of species. In the second edition, published five years afterwards, (1740) the genuine Hymenoptera are at length placed by themselves under the name of Gymnoptera $(r)$, but the number of genera remains the same, only the order of families in Apis is changed $(s)$. This may be called the æra of this natural class, when it received a separate existence. In the fourth edition, which appeared in 1744, it had its present name assigned to it (Hymenoptera) and is defined, Ala Membranacece. Linneus now arranged the insects in it under four genera, viz. Tentredo $(t)$, Ichneumon ( $u$ ), Apis ( $x$ ), Formica ( $y$ ). In 1746 the first edition of that admirable work, the Fauna Suecica, was published, giving the same number of genera in this class, but reducing the families in Apis to three (z). Species are now enumerated for the first time with the addition of Nomina specifica, and descriptions. In this Tenthredo includes Cynips, Tenthredo, Sirex and some of the Ichneumones minuti. Ichneumon unites
(r) Them. rupvos, nudus, and $\pi$ repov ala. (s) Apis, Cralro, Bombylius, Vespa. (t) Aculeus ani dentatus.
(u) Aculeus ani triplex. (x) Aculeus ani simplex.
(y) Squama crecta thoracem ab abdomine distinguens, ala neutris mullie. (z) Viz. * Vespe. * * Apes propric dicta. ***Bombylii hirsuti.
some Spheces to the genuine Ichneumons. Apis comprehends Vespa, Sphex, Chrysis, and Apis. In all 101 species are described without Trivial Names. In the sixth edition of the Systema Naturce, which came out in 1748, the species are for the first time enumerated and defined; a new genus, Cynips, is introduced, and a new character formed for Tenthredo (a). This edition is also distinguished by the convenient adoption of Trivial Names. No further improvements were made by Linneus in this class, till the publication of the tenth edition in 1758, in which the present characters of both class and genera are finally given.

From this summary view of the progress of Linneus in perfecting the Hymenoptera class, it appears that he was long in giving it all the improvement of which he thought it capable. His original idea seems to hare been to construct his genera from variations in the Aculeus; to this he adhered through nine editions of his Systema, till at length, finding that the same kind of Aculeus was common to more than one natural genus, he had recourse to other parts for his characters; he still keeps it, however, at the head of his Essential Characters, and has added no other in his four first genera.

The orders into which Linneus thought of dividing this class, as appears from the Fundamenta
(a) Cynips Aculeus ani conico-carinatus. Larva intra gallam, Tenthredo Aculeus ani feminis serratus. Larra polypoda.

Entomologi.e,

Eniomologie (b), though not distinguished by his usual mark the asterisk, are $*$ aculeo miti, $* * a$ culeo punctorio. The former division including Cynips, Tenthriedo, Sirex, Ichneumon, and the latter the remaining genera.

The parts he uses in his definitions of the genera of this class, are 1. The Proloscis (c). 2. The absence of it (d). 3. The alsence of the Tongue(e). 4. The Palpi $(f)$. 5. The Maxille ( $g$ ). 6. The Antenn.e both with respect to form and number of articulations (h). 7. The Thorax (i). 8. The Scutellum ( $k$ ). 9. The Wings ( $l$ ). 10. The Abdomen (m). 11. The Aculeus (n). 12. Pubescence (o). 13. The absence of it $(p)$. 14. Colour $(q)$. To distinguish. his families he has recourse to the Antenn.e $(r)$, Aldomen (s), Hirsuties ( $t$ ), and Colour ( $u$ ) The number of species described in the twelfth edition of the Systema Nature in this class is 314.

Having given this short account of the labours of Linneus in this class, I shall bestow a few pages upon what his successors have attempted with the
(b) Hymenoptera (distinguuntur) secundum aculcum punctorium vel mitem. Fundament. Entomol. 4to. p. 29.
(c) Apis. (d) Cynips, Tenthredo, Chrysis, Vespa.
(e) Ichneumon, Sphex. ( $f$ ) Sirex. (g) All except Formica and Mutilla. (h) Sirex, Ichneumon, Sphex, Chrysis.
(i) Mutilla. (k) Tenthrerlo. (l) Tenthredo, Sirex, Sphex, Vespa, Apis, Formica. (m) Sirex, Ichneumon, Chrysis.
(n) All the genera. (o) Mutilla. (p) Vespa. (q) Chrysis.
(r) Tenthredo, Ichneumon. (s) Ichneumon. ( $t$ ) Apis.
(u) Ichneumon.
thew of improving upon him. The first that I shall mention is Professor Scopoli, a name dear to every lover of Natural History, and to whom entomology is under very considerable obligations. In his Entomologia Carmiolica, he has distinguished four of the Limnean classes by new names. I must confess I prefer the old ones, on account of that harmony of nomenclature which distinguishes them, from the same word entering into the composition of them all. The present he names Aculeata. Considered out of its connexion, this is certainly more expressive of the peculiar character of the class, than the word Hymenoptera. But, in a system, nothing ought to be taken by itself, and the general harmony and union of parts should be considered as well as individual propricty. I see no good reason, likewise, for his alteration of the Linnean definition of the class. "Alve quatuor membranaces plerisque. Aculeus caudie, sed mullus in maribus" is more appropriate, especially with respect to those genera which have two aculeate sexes, than "Ald quatuor, abdomen uni sexui aculeo armatum." In the genera, this author, instead of improving upon what Limeus had done, goes backward by reuniting Sirex with Ichneumon, and Chrysis with Sphex, genera surely sufficiently distinct. His alterations of the Limean Essential Characters do not seem always to be for the better $(x)$.
( $x$ ) E. G. He has altered the Limnean essential character of Mutilla. "Aculcus punctorius, alde neutris nullue" into "Alle nulle", when one sex in this genus has wings.

For the construction of these he has recourse to 1. The proloscis (y). 2. The alsence of it $(z)$. 3. The wings (a). 4. The absence of them (b). 5. The aculeus (c). The distinctions of his families are taken from the antennce ( $d$ ), wings ( $c$ ), abdomen $(f)$, aculeus ( $g$ ), and colour $(h)$. The genus Apis, as I shall afterwards have occasion to observe, is under considerable obligations to this author.

Next to Scopoli comes Geoffroy, a writer of considerable merit, but too much given to innovation; he had studied Linneus, and professes to follow nature (i), yet he falls into great errors by departing from both. After Ray, he reunites the Neuroptera and Hymenoptera classes under the denomination of "Insecta tetraptera alis mudis;" and thus loses all the ground that had been gained by Linneus. This class he divides into three sections, the frist of which contains such of these insects as have tarsi of three joints; the second, those whose tarsi have four joints; and the third, those whose tarsi consist of five joints. This last section puts together, contrary to nature, their economy, and affinities, Ephemera, Phryganea, Hemerolius, Myrmeleo, Panorpa, and the Hyme-
(y) Apis. (z a) Spher, Veipa. (b) Formica, Mutilla.
(c) Cynips, Tenthredo, Ichneumun, Sphex. (d) Tenthredo, Apis. N. B. In the latter, the circumstance which he has taken for the characteristic of a family, is only a sexual distinction.
(e) Ichneumon. ( $f$ ) Ichneeunon, Sphex. ( $g$ h) Ichneunoon,
(i) Hist. Ins, tom, 1. Disc. Prel, p. xyii.

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

noptera. His genera in the latter are Crabro (h), Urocerus (l), Tenthredo, Cynips (m), Diplalepsis (n), Eulophus (o), Ichneumon (p), Vespa (q), Apis, and Formica. In all these his generic characters are drawn from the mouth (os), stemmata, antennar, wings, abdomen, and aculeus, with the addition of lingua, glabrities, and hirsuties in Vespa and Apis. His families are taken from the number of articulations of the antenna $(r)$, and pubescence and hirsuties (s). The monotony of his generic characters is rather tedious, and his constant adherence to differences in the antennæ for them leads him into many errors. He has often fallen into the very faults that he objects to Limeus $(t)$; for the characters of his genera are not sufficiently descriminative, he unites those insects which nature has separated, and scparates those which she has united. For instance, the only distinction between Apis and $F_{\text {espar }}$, which he notices, is pubescence ( $u$ ) ; thus placing a considerable family of genuine Apes in the latter genus, which likewise includes Chrysis. Again, he separates Crabro from Tenthredo, and Eulophus from Ichncumon, merely on account of differences in the antenna,
(l) Tonthredo, Lin. (l) Sirex, Lin. (iil) Cynips and

Ichneumon, Lin. (n) Cynips, Lin. (i) Iftneamun, Lin. (p) Ichncumon, Sphex, Lin. (q) Vespa, Chrysis, Alnis, Lin. (r) Tenthredo, Cynips. (s) Apis. (t) Tom. 1. Prel. Disc. p. xiv. (u) Vespa corpus glabrum. Apis corpus rellosum. All the othei characters are rerbatim the same.
which in both these genera, I speak only of the minuti of the latter, are subject to continual variations. In Eulophous the antennae ramose are only a sexual distinction $(x)$. The separation of the mimuti from the genus Ichneumon by this author, appears to me to be a point gained in this class, but lie has intermixed these with Cynipes in his two gencra Cimips and Diplolepsis. The latter, according to his characters, should include the genuine Cymipes, and the former the Ichneumones mimuti.

The Earon De Gcer, who, like his illustrious predecessor Reaumur, penetrated into the dcepest recesses of nature in the pursuit of truth, and brought forth to light and notice innumerable anecdotes and facts, before unknown, relative to the history and economy of the minute, but wonderful, animals which belong to the entomological department; by this very circumstance was enabled, more than any of his predecessors, to improve the Linnean gencric characters in this and other classes, and to render them applicable with more certainty to the species which they were intended to distinguish. He has nearly inverted, with what propriety i shall not now enquire, the Linnean order of Itymenopterous genera ( $y$ ), and
(i) De Geer, tom. 2. p.2. Mem. 15. p. 901. Tab.31. fig. 14-17. Kirby in Lin. Trans. vol. 5. p. 109. note t.
(y) Thus: Aipis, Numadu, Iespa, Sphex, Chrysis, Sirex, Ichneumon, Cynips, Tenthredu, Furnica.
separated, with great judgment, the Proabeille of Reaumur from Apis. His generic characters are taken from the mouth (os), antenne, wings, abdomen, and aculeus, which are introduced into every genus. The proloscis, which not only distinguishes Apis and Nomada, but is also very properly noticed in Vespa. The eyes, Apis, Nomada, Vespa, and Sphex. This Linneus, in the twelfth edition of the Systema Naturic, has adopted with respect to Vespa. The anus, Chrysis and Sirex. His families, in which he has improved much upon Linneus, especially in Ichneumon and Formica, are taken from the antenne ( $z$ ), the alsence of the wings ( $a$ ), and the aldomen (b). Both this author and Geoffroy, without sufficient reason, have taken perpetual liberty to alter the Limean names of the genera, a practice which has occasioned a great deal of confusion and answered no good end.

Schrank, in his Emmeratio Insectorum Austrid, has added the following circumstance to the Linnean definition of the class, "Os maxillis transversis." This character, which runs through all the species, seems well introduced, and renders the endless repetition of " $O_{i s}$ maxillis," in the Artificial Characters of the genera, perfectly needless. He has also introduced some slight alterations into the gencric characters of Sirex, Ichueumon, Sphex, Chrysis, and Formica; but in the main he adheres to those of Linneus.
(i) Sphex, Ichneumon, 'fenthredo. (a) Ichneumon.
(b) Ichneu:non, Formica.
c 3
From

From this recapitulation of what has been done by Linneus and others, it will appear that no very essential improvements have been made in this class, from the time of the publication of the tenth edition of the Systema Nature in 1758, to the time when the system of Fabricius first made its appearance in 1775 . Only two good genera had been separated from those of Linneus; the Nomada from Apis, after Reaumur, by De Geer, and the minute Ichncumons by Geoffroy, but confounded with Cynips. A slow progress, and by no means equal to that of botany, considering the vast number of non-descript species discovered during this period.

I shall now call the reader's attention to what has been attempted by Fabricius in this class. Originally he united together Ephemera, Phryganea, Hemerolius, Tormes, Hyrmeleon, Panorpa, Raphidia, all the IIymenoptera, Monoculus, Oniscus, Lepisma, and Podura. "Turba sanè stupenda," as Villars justly exclaims (c), " insolita, sed instrumentis cilcariis approximata!" Probably the absurdity of uniting in one class so heterogeneous a mixture of genera, as opposite to and unconnected with each other as light and darkness, induced this author in his Entomologia systematica emendata et aucta, published in 1793, at length to give to the Hymenoptera class a separate existence, under the name of Piezata; a word, derived, I presume, from $\pi \operatorname{ls} \xi^{\omega} \omega$, premo. His definition of this

[^1]class is this: "Palpi quatuor; maxilla cornea, compressa, sope elongata.

Before I consider how far this character may be regarded as applicable, it will be proper to inquire into the meaning of the terms which Fabricius has employed to signify those parts from which he has borrowed the characters of the class and its genera; to point out by what names they are distinguished in the Tabula synoptica nomenclature partium of the present work, and to refer to the figures designed to represent them. This will enable the reader to judge with precision how far the author is warranted in the objections which he urges against the Fabrician system.

Fabricius, in his preface to his Genera Insectorum, has ausigned it as a reason for his omission of figures, that they would generate confusion in the determination of species, on account of the variations to which the Instrumenta cilaria are subject in individuals of the same genus ( $c$ ). But, how good soever this argument might hold with respect to generic characters; yet, when new terms are introduced into a scionce, or old ones used in a new sense, to prevent mistakes and confusion, it is extremely convenient, if not absolutely necessary, that they should be illustrated by figures. And when this author first laid his system befure the public, the Instrumenta ciburia, upon which it is founded, ought not only to have been defined (c) p. S 9 .
ca clearly,
clearly, but an accurate delineation of each part, and its natural situation, should have been made and referred to.

The parts from which Fabricius has taken his characters of this class and its genera, that seem to require explanation, are lingua, lalium, maxilla, palpi anteriores, palpi posteriores, mandibula, clypers.

LINGUA. Fabricius defines this part "Lingua spiralis inter palfos reflexos latens convoluta $(d)$." And at the end of his chapter on the fustrumenta çiburia (e), he says " Maxilla, labinmque elongata, memiranacen, inier mandilulas infiexa, linguam constiturnt." But this latter definition, from a subsequent observation, seems intended solely to denote what he means by lingua in Apis, and the genera he has scparated from it, \&ic. and the former to apply chicfly to the tongue of the Lepidoptera. From hence it appears that the term lingua, in this class, is equivalent to the Linnean term proboscis; including the whole machinery of that organ $(f)$. It seems to me that this term ought to be applied exclusively to the instrument which acts the part of a tongue.

LABIUM. The definition is "Labia os infernè claudentia, ne haust a cruant $(g)$. This term
(d) Philos. Ent. c. ii. § 3. In another place he defines it "Lingur spiralis comvoluta bifula, inter palpos stupasos inserta," manifestly referring to the Lepidoptera. Ibid. c. iii. § 1.
(e) Jbid. § $18 . \quad(f)$ Tab. 11. * *. d. 2. $\alpha$. fig. 1.
(g) Philos. Ent. c. ii. § 3.
is intended to denote that part of the proloscis which is seated between the maxille or valvulce, and from which the posterior palpi are produced; as applied by Fabricius, in his genera in this class, it includes both the real tongue, and that part which I have denominated tubus ( $h$ ), or its corneous base: if it had been confined to the latter, and called labium inferius, it would have been proper enough (i); but, as it now stands, that part which collects, absorbs, and passes the honey down into the stomach is called labium, which is certainly very improper, not to say absurd. Under this head are to be considered those parts, defending the tongue where it issues from the tube, which he calls setce, or linguce lacinice f. lamince interiores (h); which terms include what, in my first genus $M e-$ litta, are named auriculce ( $l$ ), and in Apis, lacinice interiores ( $m$ ). The term seta is often not properly applicable to them. His labii lacinia laterales ( $n$ ) f. exteriores ( $o$ ) answer to my lacinice exteriores ( $p$ ). MAXILLA, is thus defined. "Maxillce duce transversales, scepius membranacere, latera oris
(h) Tab. 11. ubi supra $d$.
(i) As this part embraces and seems connate with the lower part of the tongue. which it defends externally, I preferred another term to lalium.
(k) See his Natural Characters of Vespa, Andrena, Apis, \&ce.
(l) Tab. 2. * *, a fig, 1. $d l$, and b. fig. 2. aa.
(m) Tab. 11. * *. d. 2. a. fig. 1.ff. (n) See his Nat.

Char. of Apis. (o) Entom. Syst. tom: 3. p. 307. under Hylous Morio, and p. 343. under Eucera longicornis,
( $p$.) Tab. 11. ubi supra e e .
inferne includentes $(r)$. To this if we add what he says elsewhere, "Palpi antici maxillce dorso adnati," it will appear that his maxille are what I have termed valvulce in the following work (s), and are also equivalent to the valvie of the lower vagina of the Linnean character of Apis. In Hymenopterous insects these are longitudinal instead of transverse, and the term maxilla (jaw-bone) applied to a membrane is not a little absurd. In his Na tural Characters of some genera in this class, Fabricius calls this part, with respect to the whole proboscis, " linguce lamina exterior, or lacinia exterior ( $t$ ).

PALPI ANTERIORES, sometimes called antici : these answer to my palpi exteriores ( $u$ ), they emerge laterally from the maxilla or valvula.

PALPI POSTERIORES, sometimes denominated postici: they are equivalent to my palpi interiores ( $x$ ), and sometimes arise from the tongue just above the top of the tube ( $y$ ), and at others just below the apex of the exterior lacinia (z). I have altered both these terms in conformity to the opinion of Professor Afzelius (a), upon whose accuracy the greatest reliance may be placed; and indeed the epithets exterior and interior are much more applicable to them, than anterior and posterior.
( $r$ ) Philos.Ent. c. ii. §3. (s) Tab. 11.**. d. 2. a. fig. 1. cc.
(t) E. G. Sphex, Bembex, \&c. Andrena, Apis, \&-c.
(u) Tab. 11. ubi supra $h h$.
( $x$ ) Ibid. $i i$.
(y) Tab. 1. *. a fig. 3. $b \bar{b}$.
(z) Tab. 11. ubi supra.
(a) Afzelius in Lin. Trans. vol. 4. p. 250.

MANDIBULA. This is the maxilla of Linneus, and the present work, which professes to adhere as much as possible to the Linnean nomenclature.

CLYPEUS. This term is equivalent with labium of Linneus; and denotes a part which, by these insects, is used to answer the purposes of a lip. Galea might, with equal propriety, be applied to the dilated joint of the tarsus of Sphex clypeata, as clypeus to this part. Fabricius, indeed, himself, as well as his disciple Panzer, in their descriptions, have frequently used the term labium, not to signify the Fabrician, but the Linnean labium (b) ; of course I have employed this term instead of clypeus (c).

Having explained the terms employed by Fabricius, I shall now proceed to consider his characters of the class in question. When he published his Genera Insectorum, he, at the same time, constructed Natural Characters for the several classes under which at that time he had arranged them, but he neglected doing this for the new classes which he has since formed. It is, however, an excellent idea, and I mean to adopt it hereafter with respect to the Hymenoptera. His original Essential Character of his Piezata class, as I ob-
(l) The former in his Artificial Character of Bemlex, and in his description of Hylceus cylindricus, allilalris, \&c. The latter in Cralro and Nomada often.
(c) Tab. 10, **, c. 2. 8. fig. 12, and fig. 13, c.
served above, was this: "Palpi quatuor, maxilla cornea, compressa, sepe elongata."

In his supplement to his Entomologia Systemaー tica he omits the palpi, retaining only the last member of the character, perhaps with the view of rendering it less complex: but as the following class, Odonata, is distinguished by palpi duo, it seems to me no improvement to drop a character which certainly runs through the whole class, and which affords a more constant distinction than that which is retained. There appears to be no reference in this character to that of the Synistata, although both classes were originally united by our author. The first circumstance noticed in it is the substance of the maxilla or valuula. Maxilla rornea; this, generally speaking, holds good only with respect to the base of this part $(d)$; the apex $(e)$ is usually either wholly coriaceous, or partly corium and partly membrane. Nay, in nine of his genera $(f)$, Fabricius describes this part as entirely membranaceous, so little consistent is he with himself. The term, by which he denotes the next circumstance he fixes upon to distinguish this class, compressa, should point out an obvious character, as it supplies him with its name. Yet I do not see how this term, if we understand it according to his own

> (d) Tab. 1. *. a. fig. 4. a. (e) Ibid. $l$, $c$.
> (f) Viz. Cynips, Sirex, Ichneumon, Evania, Tiphia, Nomada. Gen. Ins. and Banchus, Ophion, and Foenus. Suppl.
> definition,
definition $(g)$, will well apply to this part. If confined to the base of the maxilla it will do in some cases, though not in all. The apex is usually either plicatus, subplicatus, or concave, so as to embrace and defend the tongue. At any rate the term is too obscure in its application, to be used as an index to point to what class any individual belongs. The last part of this character, sotpe elongata, is peculiar to Apis, I mean that of Linneus, and a very few other genera.

These observations, I think, will make it evident enough, that the characters, which Linneus has fixed upon to denote this class, are far preferable to those of Fabricius both for universality and notoriety.

I shall next proceed to notice the alterations introduced by this author into the genera. To those of Linneus he has added twenty-two. The whole are thus arranged: Cynips, Tenthredo, Sirex, Oryssus, Ichneumon, Banchus, Ophion, Foenus, Evania, Chalcis, Sphex, Pompilus, Larra, Tiphia, Scolia, Chrysis, Thynnus, Leucospis, Bembex, Vespa, Masaris, Mellinus, Philanthus, Crabro, Hylæus, Andrena, Apis, Eucera, Nomada, Formica, Dorylus, Mutilla: In this list the new genera are printed in Roman characters. Of these Oryssus is separated from Sirex; Banclus, Ophion, and Foenus, from Ichneumon; the first containing such Ichneumons as have a compressed subsessile
(g) Aldomen compressum, cujus diameter transversulis cedit vertirali. Thilos. Ent. c. ij. $\$ 12$.
abdomen, with an aculeus scarcely exerted ( $h$ ); the next, those that have a falcated abdomen and very short aculeus(i); the third, such as are distinguished by filiform antennæ with not more than fourteen joints ( $k$ ). Evania is taken from Sphex ( $l$ ), as is the case likevise with Chalcis ( $m$ ), Pompilus (n), Scolia (o), and Philanthus ( $p$ ); Bembex consists of Apes and Vespee (q) ; Mellinus and Crabro of Spheces and Vespee(r); Hylaus, Andrena, Eucera, and Nomada, are separated from Apis (s); and Dorylus contains merely Mutilla Helvola. The parts from which he takes the Artificial Characters of his genera, are the palpi, labium, maxillo, lingua, and antenna.

Fabricius seems to have made no attempt to improve upon the Linnean subdivisions of the genera, but to have adopted them as he found them, Apis only excepted, in which he drops them. In his Entomologia Systematica and its supplement, he has described 1207 species belonging to this class.
(h) E.. G. Ichneumon venator, Lin. (i) I. luteus and pugillator. (k) I.jaculator. (l) Sphex Appendigaster. (m) Sphex fissipes. (n) S.fusca, viatica, tropica.
(o) S. plumipes, Drury 1. Tab. 44. fig. 5. (p) S. urenaria.
(q) Vespa signata, Lin. Apis rostrata, Lin.
(r) Sphex mystacea and Vespa campestris belong to Mellinus, and Sphex cribraria and Vespa uniglumis, \&c. to Crabro.
(s) Apis maxillosa, florisomnis, \&c. are Hylai. A. ceerulescens, helvola, \&c. are Andrence. A. longicornis is a Eucera, and A. variegata, Fabriciana, 8.c. are Nomade.

Gmelin,

Gmelin, in his edition of the Systema Natura, has attempted to unite Fabricius with Linneus, usually drawing the first member of his Artificial Characters from the Natural Characters of the former, and subjoining the Artificial Characters of the latter $(t)$. His introduction of the mandibula (maxilla Lin.) is far from an improvement, as this part varies not only in the sexes, but often very much in the different families of the same genus $(u)$. This author has made a great mistake in four instances in copying the characters of Fabricius, by representing all the palpi as attached to the latium, when, in fact, this is only the case with the interior ones $(x)$. His Essential Characters exhibit a singular mixture of those of Limneus, Fabricius, and himself $y$ !. I do not, however, entirely dissent from the method which Gmelin has pursued. Under certain restrictions, the introduction of the labium (lingua) at least, might add a constant character in many genera in this class. But upon
(t) Fabricius, in the Preface to his Supplement, seems to allude to this: "Instrumenta cilaria introduxi," says he, "constantissima inveni, at nullo modo cum alis aliisque partivus jungenda. Mixta semper chaos preebent, et lacessitus demonstrationem suscipiam. p. 1. (u) Vid. Tab. nostr. ferè omnes.
(x) Viz, in Ichneumon, Tiphia, Formica, Mutilla.
(y) Thus he sometimes copies Linneus; in Sphex he mixes Fabricius with Linncus; in Scolia, Thynnus, and Tiphia he copies Fabricius. Leucospis mixes Fabricius with Gmelin, and Chalcis is entirely Gmelin; its character is taken from the antennæ only,
this head I purpose speaking more at large here-after. Gmelin has considered the Fabrician genus Evania as a family of Sphex; Bembex and Crabro as subdivisions of Vespa; and Andrena and Nomada of Apis. The number of species noticed by him from various authors in this class is 1241 , but the same insect, if I am not mistaken, often reappears under a new name.

It now remains that I offer a few observations upon the Linnean and Fabrician genera, so that, upon a comparison, the merits or defects of each may be readily perceived; and then conclude my remarks upon this class, by suggesting some improvements of which it seems capable.

Linneus has given only ten genera in this class. Of these, Cynips, Tenthredo, Sirex (z), Chrysis, Formica, and Muilla, seem to be natural genera, that admit of little alteration. If those species were excluded from Apis and Vespa, which do not agree with Linneus's character, they would justly claim the same appellation. The present definition of Ichneumon, if we rigidly adhere to : : , will exclude those legitimate Ichneumons that have not an exerted aculeus. This genus requires to have nearly the whole family of the Minuti, and some others separated from it. Sphex, as it now stands, is not a natural genus, but rather, like the Elongata family in Chrysomela, a receptacle for the rejecta-
(z) I know but few of the Linnean species of this genus, of course I camot speak positively concerning it.
menta of other genera. This genus wants to be thoroughly studied, it ought to be entirely taken to pieces and worked over again. Both its families contain a variety of insects that are at variance with eath other, and its Essenticl and Artificial Characters are by no means well constructed. The former will agree with many insects that Linneus has described as Vespce (a), and "Antennce articulis decem," in the latter, will apply to no Sphex that I have examined, without we suppose that he numbered only the joints of what I call the Apex. With respect to the other genera, this great author had selected discriminating characters, but he was not sufficiently attentive to these in the arrangement of species, so that individuals, toto cælo at variance with the character of a genus, are not seldom assigned to it. Had he bestowed that attention upon entomology that he did upon botany, his penetrating genius, provided it was furnished with sufficient materials, would have placed the Genera Insectormm upon the same admirable footing with the Genera Plantarum; but the botanical department absorbing his chief attention, only subordinate pains were bestowed upon insects: much, of course, was left to be done by those of his successors who directed their principal efforts to the improvement of entomology: the chief business of these is to extricate the natural genera.
(a) Vespa unighimis, minuta, sic.

Of all authors, Fabricius is the only one who has attempted much in this way. Let us now see how far he has succeeded. Of six of his new genera Oryssus, namely, Larra, Scolia, Thynnus, Leucospis, and Dorylus, it has never been my fortune to see a single species. Scolia and Leucospis, as far as I can form a judgment from figures, appear to be good genera. The former, from its thorax, retuse behind, and body usually hairy, I conjecture to have some affinity with Mutilla: the latter approaches near to Chalcis; its principal distinction is its aculeus reflected and laid upon the back of its abdomen (b). Banchus and Ophion, I think, are without sufficient reason separated from Ichneumon; but these may furnish a good hint for families in that genus. Foenus, especially if more species are discovered distinguished by the same peculiarities, may with propricty be considered as distinct. Evania, I have seen only Evania Appendigaster ( $c$ ), I conjecture to be too nearly related to some of the Pompili. Chalcis, Pompilus, Tiphia, Bembex, Philanthus, and Crabro, would furnish, I apprehend, the Linnean entomologist a clue for the formation of an equal number of natural genera, but many species now considered as belonging to them should first be excluded (d).
(b) See Adams on the Microsc. Pl. 17. fig. 1, 2, 3.
(c) This singular insect has been taken in England, with several others equally rare, by the Rev. Jas. Coyte of Ipswich.
(d) E. G. I should regard all those species of Bembex as illegitimate that want the Labium conicum.

I have no other idea of Masaris than what I have gained from the Masaris crabroniformis of Panzer (e); but this species seems to differ from the rest in having reniform or lunar eyes, a circumstance which distinguishes several other insects without plicate wings, which might go with that into one genus, though they have usually been referred to Sphex or Vespa. Mellinus seems a good genus, and contains the genuine petiolated Spheces, and some of those that hare no petiolus. It might be as well, perhaps, to distinguish this genus, or Crabro, by the name of Sphex. Upon the genera which Fabricius has taken from Apis, I shall have occasion to enlarge hereafter.

Having examined the Instrumenta cibaria of several individuals in many of the genera of this class, I shall now inform the reader in what respects the characters of Fabricius vary from those that I examined. In Tenthredo, with him the palpi are all filiform, and the interior triarticulate. In those that I inspected the exterior palpi are thickest in the middle $(f)$; the interior, instead of three, consist of four articulations and are clavate $(g)$. The latium he describes as cylindrical and trifid at its apex. Ours is rather flat with a tripartite apex ( $h$ ). In Ichneumon the exterior palpi are said to be sexarticulate, and the interior quinquearticulate; the valvule
(e) Panz. Fn. Germ. Init. N० $4 \%$ Tab. 22.
(f) Tab. 14. N ${ }^{\circ}$ 1. fig. 1 ih. (g) Ibid. fig. 2. c.
(h) Ibid. fig 2.
are described as bifid and rounded at the apex, and the labium (lingua) cylindrical and emarginate. In such, aculeo exerto, as I have examined, the exterior palpi are quinquearticulate, with the second joint larger than the rest and trapeziform (i). The labium is cylindrical, but not, so far as I could discover, emarginate ( $k$ ). In those whose aculeus is not exerted, the palpi are the same nearly as the other ( $l$ ), but the tongue is semicylindrical, and the valvulce are concave and truncate at the apex $(m)$. His character of Sphex is probably taken from Ammophila Vulgaris. He gives the interior palpi as quinquearticulate, and the latium as depressed, cylindrical and emarginate at the apex. In all the Ammophilce that I have examined, the interior palpi are quadriarticulate ( $n$ ), the valuule have a semisagittate apex (o), and the tongue is tubular, clavate, and cleft at its summit, the fissure being much the deepest on the upper side ( $p$ ). In Tiphia his character assigns five articulations to the interior palpi, and represents the labium as cylindrical. In Tiphia femorata the latter of these is flat $(q)$, and the number of joints of the interior palpi never exceeds four in any genus in this class, at least as far as I have examined it. The valuulde of his Chrysis are acute, mine has them obtuse $(r)$ :

[^2]and its interior palpi consist of three (s), instead of four joints. In his character of Pompilus the labium is described as rounded, corneous, and entire; whereas, in Pompilus viaticus, that organ is $\operatorname{trifid}(t)$. He takes no notice of the callous tips which distinguish the lobes of the tongue in Vespa (u), and he calls the valvulce acute, when they are rather rounded $(x)$. Whether, by his Philanthus, he intends those vespiform insects, the sides of whose abdomen are crenate, of which Panzer has figured so many under that name ( $y$ ), I am not certain, but if he docs, his characters are very different from those of such species as I have examined: for the valoulce instad of being bifid are entire ( $z$ ), and the latium is not entire and rounded, but divided at its apex into two laceratociliate lobes (a). The valucted in his genus Crabro are called bifid, and the latium obconic. In Crabro cribrarius the former are cntire and rounded at the tip $(b)$, and the latter is rather attenuated in the middle (c). From these remarks, we cannot avoid concluding, either that Fabricius is not altogether to be depended upon for accuracy, or
(s) Tab. 14. $\mathrm{N}^{\circ}$ 6. e.
(t) Ibid. $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 4$. fig. 2.
(u) Ibid.
$\mathrm{N}^{\top}{ }^{\circ}$ 8. fig. 1. cccc. $\quad(x)$ Ibid. fig. 2. 6 . Kirby in Lin. Trans. vol.4. p.212. Tab. 19. $\mathrm{N}^{\circ}$ 4. fig. 1. (y) E. G. Philanthus semicinctus, $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 47$. Tab.24. P. hortorum, $\mathrm{N}^{\circ}$ 63. Tab. 9. \&c. (z) Tab. 14. $\mathrm{N}^{\circ}$ 7. fig. 1. ab. (a) Ibid. fig. 2. (b) Ibid. No 5. fig. 2. b. (c) Ibid. fig. 1. b. and De Geer, tom. 2. Pie, 2. Tab. 25. fig. 12, e.
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that the Instrumenta cibaria vary too much in the same genus, to be assumed as a constant and certain criterion.

I know no reason why that liberty should be denied to the entomologist, which is allowed to the botanist, of forming new genera as occasion shall demand, provided this be done upon good grounds, and with due caution and judgment.

- hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.

That inundation of non-descript species which, since the time of Linneus, has overflowed the European Cabinets, renders it a work of charity to spare the entomologist the Herculean labour of going over the definitions of perhaps several hundred species before he can determine one. This can only be effected by the formation of new genera and families; and here, I think, a middle course ought to be steered between Linneus and Fabricius. The former having confessedly too few genera, and the latter having multiplied them beyond necessity, and mistaken the characteristics of families for the indications of genus. But, in the construction of genera, from what parts are we to draw our characters? With Fabricius, are we to confine ourselves to the Instrumenta cibaria et antennes? Or with Linneus and his followers, are we to take them indifferently from any part that will furnish them?

In botany, to draw the characters of classes and genera from the fructification alone is highly proper,
per, for in this consists the essence of the plant. To nourish and bring this to maturity the root sends its fibres downwards, the stem shoots upwards, the branches put forth, and the leaves unfold. But the proboscis and maxillce do not constitute the essence of the insect. On the contrary, the head and its organs are in some degree analagous to the root in plants, for they collect and absorb the nutriment; the truncus may be looked upon as representing the stem, the limbs the branches, the wings the leaves, the abdomen as a kind of calyx, including the fructification. Therefore, the great command, " increase and multiply," will direct us to those parts which constitute the essence of an insect; but these, if it were possible, it would be improper to use for characters $(g)$. Since then the Instrumenta cilaria do not constitute the essence of an insect, it is consequently a matter of indifference whether the generic characters be taken from them, or other parts that are more obvious ( $h$ ). In these small animals, I call that a generic character which is constant through a genus from whatever part it be taken. In some classes
(g) Genitalium curiosior indagatio alominalilis displicet quamvis varia et singularis, _unce tamen posset ad ordines naturales viam monstrare. Lin. de Nammalibus.
(h) In the Mammalia the teeth are easily examined, and therefore, if constant, afford good characters. Nor do I pretend to say that the Instrumenta cilaria of insects, assumed under proper limitations, might not afford such as were equally rood, if they were equally easy of inspection.
those parts distinguish the class, which in others are peculiar to certain genera. Thus, in the Coleoptera, the variations, with respect to number of joints, in the tarsus, will serve as an excellent characteristic of many genera, which, as they now stand, are not sufficiently discriminated $(i)$; while, in the Hymenoptera, the same number obtains in every genus. Again, in the same class, characters, which in some genera are constant and proper generic diagnostics, in others vary in the several families, and even in subdivisions of the same family. Thus, in most Hymenopterous genera, the number of the articulations of the palpi is constant, while in Apis it varies continually. Fabricius, had he been aware of this circumstance, would have divided this into more genera than he has done. This obscrvation shews the fallacy of his assumption, that the Instrumenta cibaria afford constant characters. The labium or lingua is the only one of his diagnostics, that, as far as I have examined it, does not vary in the same genus; and therefore, where it may be readily inspected, it will furnish an excellent one. Linneus has excluded this part and
(i) The present character of Chrysomela, for instance, is at variance with a large number of species that are arranged un1der it; but if the number of articulations of the tarsi, which is constant in the genuine Chrysomelo, was added to its character, it would furnish a clue to distinguish the true from the false, and be a great improvement. The same observation will apply to Tenelrio.
its vagina from most of his genera, either under the name of lingua or proloscis; but this is contrary to fact, for all Hymenopterous insects are furnished with a proboscis consisting of the following parts, viz. a central tongue defended by two valualoe ( $k$ ), laterally palpigerous ( $l$ ), and a tube ( $m$ ), just above the apex of which, or from the exterior lacinice the interior palpi emerge( $n$ ). This part, though not equally conspicuous in all, exists in all; and its mere direction, whether it is inflected or not, can make no difference as to its title to the name of proboscis. In Apis, Ammophila (o), the genuine Vespac, Philanthus, Crabro, many Spheces, Chrysis, and Tenthredo, this part may be examined with as much ease as the Instramenta oris of the Diptera. But in Cynips, Ichneumon Tiphia, Formica ( $p$ ), and the petiolated Spheces $(q)$, it is not so readily inspected, nor, in these, is it easy to get a distinct idea of it, unless it be nicely extracted from the head of the insect, and put under a strong magnifier.

In the construction of the Essentict Characters of the genera in this class, the form of the tongue, where sufficiently conspicuous, might be added to

the aculeus, and it might be placed at the head of the Artificial Character, in the formation of which recourse may likewise be had, where they are constant to the palpi $(r)$, the valvula $(s)$, the eyes $(t)$, the antennee $(u)$, collum $(x)$, thorax $(y)$, wings $(z)$, thighs $(a)$, abdomen $(b)$, its petiolus $(c)$, and the aculeus (d).

I shall now throw out a few hints concerning some improvements of which the characters of the different genera in this class seem capable. With respect to Cynips, after excluding the first member of the Linnean Artificial Character, which is partly common to the whole class, and partly not true, there will remain only the aculeus. To this I would add the following circumstances, which distinguish all the species of the genus that I am acquainted with.

CYNIPS. Lingua inconspicua. Antenna. filiformes articulis 15. (Geoffroy) (e). Ale subvenosæ. Abdomen compressum subtus carinatum. (De Geer). Aculeus spiralis sæpius reconditus. (Linneus).

[^3]The three intermediate members of this character will distinguish the species of this genus from the minute Ichneumons, some of which approach very near to it, and are furnished with the Aculeus spiralis reconditus $(f)$. The character of Tenthredo seems to require no material alteration; I would only insert, instead of the first member of the Linnean definition,

Lingua apice tripartita.
The genus Ichneumon, as it now stands, admits of considerable improvements, for its present character is at variance with innumerable species that are arranged under it. The Minuti, for instance, for the most part, have not half thirty joints in their antennæ, and most of them, as well as many of the other families, are not distinguished by the Aculeus exertus, and Abdomen petiolatum. In settling the species of this genus, Linneus seems to have been led merely by their economy, and to have looked upon all those as Ichneumons, which were found to deposit their eggs in living insects. But is it not at once giving up all system to make economy and habitat take place of those characters which nature has impressed upon her genera? Indeed we know too little of the economy of these insects, to say that it is the same in all, or even that it is not materially different, and with respect to their habitat, although it is in living insects, yet it is subject to considerable variations, which may furnish a
(f) Lin. Trans, vol. 5. p. 111. Tab. 4. fig. 5.
ground for distinctions; as for instance, whether they inhabit an insect in its first, second, or third state, or its eggs only; and again, upon what class they make their attacks. We never think of putting together into one genus those insects that prey upon dead animals, or live in dung, or upon the same plant. This is going back to the old entomologists who made Habitat a generic character (g). Many of the Ichneumones Minuti are likewise distinguished by another remarkable character, their wings are without veins. They vary much as to the form of their antennæ, in some these are ramose; in others filiform; in others again clavate; in a few capitate; and I possess one or two species in which they are curiously ornamented with verticilli of hairs. Whether these might be divided into more than one natural genus I cannot say, as I have not sufficiently studied them to offer any decided opinion upon the subject; with respect to their place in the system, I think they ought to follow Cynips, to which they are nearly allied: I mean if that genus continues at the head of the class. As to those which may be considered as genuine Ichneumons, I am not, as yet, sufficiently conversant with them to venture any other remark, than that those whose aculeus is not exerted, have the tongue, in such as I have examined, as I observed above, semicylindrical, and the valvulec truncate at the apex; whereas those whose aculeus is exerted,

$$
\text { (g) Rai. Hist. Ins. App. p. } 378
$$

are distinguished by a cylindricical tongue, and valvula rounded or obtuse at their tips. Such petiolated Spheces, as I look upon to be genuine, have a tongue similar to the former of these Ichneumons, and the second joint of their exterior palpi is also rather trapeziform $(h)$, but their economy, antennæ, general form, and habit, are very different. Chalcis, which, as well as Leucospis, is distinguished by incrassated posterior thighs, should, in my opinion, follow the Ichneumones Minuti, and be followed by Leucospis. I have not, however, by any means wholly made up my mind upon the natural juxta-position of the genera in this class, and therefore I shall not further commit myself upon that subject. Pompilus, by which I understand Sphex viatica of Linneus and its genuine congeners, is not only distinguished by a trifid tongue, with a hairy spot on each of its lateral lobes ( $i$ ), but its antennæ also are revolute and setaceous, and its eyes lateral and oval. Crabro has a prismatical head, with large ovate or subtriangular eyes which almost meet above the mouth $(k)$, with reticulations visible to the naked eye; its nose is usually covered with golden or silver pile: just above this the antennæ are inserted, so as to be properly defined by the terin anteriores or antica. Philanthus, of Panzer at least, is remarkable, not only for its bifid tongue with lateral hairy eleva-
(h) Tab. 14. No 3.
(i) Ibid. $\mathrm{N}^{\circ}$ 4. fig. 2. 6 c .
(k) De Geer, tom. 2. Pie. 2. Tab 25, fig. 11. y $y$.
tions, but the sides of the abdomen are always crenate, its eyes are lateral and oval, and its antennæ subclavate. No genus is more evidently distinct from all others than Chrysis. The antennæ are spiral, and, excluding the radicle and scapus, fusiform. Anus dentatus, ought to be thrown out of the Artificial Character, as many species want it, but it would form a good characteristic for a family. The tongue of these insects is emarginate ( $l$ ). The Linnean character of $V e s p a$ is very good, but instead of Os maxillis absque proboscide, Lingua quadriloba ought to be prefixed. This circumstance, in conjunction with Alce plicate, distinguishes this from every other genus. Masaris may be known by its reniform eyes, subclavate antennæ, wings not plicate, and body linear and very narrow. Tiphia, by which I understand T. femorata, Fab. and its congeners, has fusiform anterior antennæ, and a very short obtuse tongue. The character of Formica requires some alteration, for the squamula, as De Geer has well observed, is the character of a family and not of a genus $(m)$; this, to include all, might be altered to abdominis petiolo nodoso. I know too little of the genus $M u$ tilla to say much concerning it : but pubescence, I think, ought, if possible, to be excluded from its Artificial Character, and the apterous Ichneumons should be omitted. The antennæ of the few that I am acquainted with are like those of Chrysis.
(l) Tab. 14. No 6. (m) De Geer, tom. 2. Pie. 2. p. 1042.

Linneus,

Linneus, as observed before, thought of dividing the class into two orders, *Aculeo miti, ** Aculeo punctorio. I have been stung, however, pretty severely by one of those Ichneumons whose aculeus is recondite, which genus is placed in the first, and on the other hand, many insects which are put into the second, are perfectly harmless in this respect; for instance, the aculeus of Chrysis is flexile and can make no puncture. In fact, the term punctorius, when applied to the aculeus of these insects, must be regarded as relative, implying, not that it can make no puncture at all, but merely that it cannot penetrate the skin of the human body, for all can make a puncture in such substances as are proper to receive their eggs. The tibice of Hymenopterous insects are armed with minute spines, from the rariations of which, it is possible characters might be drawn for good orders in this class. Thus, for instance, the tips of all the tibice in Tenthredo are armed with two spines; in Ichneumon, the anterior have one only, and the others two; in Apis, the two posterior have two, and the four anterior one; and in Formica all the tibice are armed with a single spine only. These distinctions, I believe, have not before been noticed, but whether such orders would be natural or artificial, I am not prepared to say.

From this account of the origin, progress, and present state of the Hymenoptera class, it will appear sufficiently evident, that though the class
itself is natural and well defined, yet the known species are not as yet all distributed into natural genera. To discover a natural genus is, however, no very difficult task. Insects that agree in habit are soon detected, and when these are placed together; an attentive comparison of them, and inspection of their parts, will soon enable any philosophical entomologist, especially if he has any knowledge of their general economy, to trace out those common characters which nature has inscribed upon such as are nearly related. The connecting links between two proximate genera, which usually borrow their characters from both, will give some trouble, but if he follow the lead of the Essential Character, "Notan generi maximè propriam tradens," he will not be long at a loss to which he is to refer any species of this description.

In order to shew what may be done in this class, I shall, in the following pages, endeavour to divide into natural genera and families the numerous species of the Linnean genus Apis; such, I mean, as are natives of this country, including Hylreus, Andrena, Apis, Nomada, and Eucera of Fabricius: but I shall previously conclude these introductory remarks with some account of what has been done in it by my predecessors.

Before the time of Linneus, naturalists seem to have had little or no idea of constructing generic characters. In the present class, however, as before observed, Ray has attempted this, and with as much
much success as could be expected. The Apes that come under that subdivision of his Tetraptera, which he denominates Gregaria et Favifica, he considers as forming a distinct section, which he names Mellifica; this he divides into what may well be called two genera: viz. Apis. Corpore longiore, angustiore, et glabriore. Bomlylius. Corpore breviore, latiore, et hirsuto. These, probably, gave Limneus the hint for his two families. Ray seems to have paid particular attention to this genus, and has described several species with great accuracy.

Of the other predecessors of Limneus, I shall mention only that illustrious French naturalist Reaumur, to whom this genus is under greater obligations than to any entomologist who either went before or succeeded him. To him nature lifted up the veil that covers her awful face, and was delighted to initiate him into her most secret mysteries. Though not strictly a systematist, he las enriched his great work with imnumerable facts and observations, which may be made of the greatest use to the systematical naturalist. He did not usually construct generic characters, but in separating his Proateille from Apis, he laid a foundation for the division of this genus into two natural genera $(n)$. To
(n) "Peut-etre," says he, speaking of one of these, "qu'elles doivent être mises dans un genre particulier, qui auroit le nom de Proateilles. Leur trompe differe par quelques particularités

To pass by his admirable history of the hive bee; a considerable portion of his sixth volume is devoted to the wild species of the genus Apis, which he divides into seven families, according to their several modes of nidification, as follows:
I. Bourdons. These construct their nests of most. They are what I call gemuine Bombinatrices(o).
II. Des Aleilles Perce-bois. These form curious cells one above another in wood. They may be called false Bombinatrices ( $p$ ).
III. Des Abeilles Maçonnes. These make their nests of a kind of mortar, composed of agglutinated particles of sand or earth (q).
IV. Des Alveilles coupeuses de feuilles. The nidi of these are curiously formed of the leaves of trees, rolled up into a kind of cartridges $(r)$. This, with the preceding division, belongs to my family of the genus Apis, "Labio infexo elongato."
de celle des mouches à miel: elle est en grande partie renfermée dans un étri écailleux, et cylindrique: le bout de la trompe sort de cet étui, et est accompagné de quatre filets analogues aus quatre demi-fourreaux des autres trompes, mais autrement construits ; ils paroissent grainés. D'ailleurs au lieu que la trompe des abeilles, lorsqu'elle est dans l'inaction a son bout tourné vers le col, le bout de la trompe de ces Proalcilles se trouve sous les dents." Mem. 6. p. 96. Tab. 9. fig. 6, 7. Reaumur here mistakes the palpi for something analogous tothe valvula and lacinia.
( 0 ) Ibid. Mem. 1. ( $p$ ) Ibid. Mem. 2. (q) Ibid. Mem. 3.
( $r$ ) Ibid. Mem. 4. p. 97. usque ad fin.
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V. Des Abeilles qui creusent la terre pour y faireleur nids. This order, the individuals of which construct their cells in little burrows, which they excavate in banks, pathways, \&c. contains both genuine Apes and Proaleilles, (Melitta, K.) (s).
VI. Des Aleilles dont les nids sont faits d'especes de membranes soyeuses. The insects that nidificate in this manner, belong to the first family of my genus Melitta ( $t$ ).
VII. Des Abeilles Tapissieres. These insects excavate burrows in hard pathways, and line their little apartments in a most curious manner with the petals of the common poppy. I do not know that we have any of them in England (u).
Of these, the first, second, third, fourth, and sixth, are natural families, or subdivisions of families; but the fifth contain species not only of different families, but genera. Thus we see this great author, without any hypothesis in view, but solely by following hature, has furnished us with a clue for the construction of fire natural subclivisions in the genus Apis. This was doing a great deal before a genuine generic character had been formed. Bazin, a French author, or rather compiler, for he seems to have done little more then abridge Reauznur, has altered the names of some of his families,
(s) Ibid. ad p. 97.
(t) Ibid. Mcm, 5. ad p. 139.
(u) Ibid. a. p. 129. usque ad fin.
and left out the fifth. The Perce-lois he calls Menuisieres, and the Bourdons, Cardeuses ( $x$ ).

Limneus's characters of this genus, as they stand in the last edition of the Systema Nature, are these : APIS.

Character Essentialis.
Aculens punctorius : lingua inflexa.
Character Artificialis.
Os maxillis atque proboscide inflexâ, vaginis duabus bivalvibus.
Alce planæe in omni sexu.
Aculeus feminis et neutris punctorius, reconditus.
This character will exclude more than half those insects which Linneus and many other authors have regarded as belonging to this genus, and at the same time admit Sphex sabulosa and its congencrs, (Ammophila, K.) for the proboscis of the former, when not exerted, instead of being inflected, points to the maxillæ, and the terms, "Proloscide inflexâ vaginis duabus bivalvibus," will apply to the latter with stricter propriety than to most genuine Apes; for in these, the Nomada excepted and another small family $(y)$, one of the two vasince, if we may denominate it by that term, is in fact quadrivaluis (z).
( $x$ ) Abregé de l'Histoire des Insectes pour servir de suite a 1 histoire naturelle des Abeilles. A Paris, 1747.
(y) Tab. 5. *. b. fig. 3. Tab. 4. Apis *. a. fig. 4.
(z) Tab. 5. **. a. fig. 5. bl, cc. Tab. 10. **. d. 1. fig. 2 . $a a, b b$. Tab. 13. **. e. 2. fig. 1. ff, g g.

After

After this great naturalist had separated Sphex, Chrysis, and Vespa from this genus, he divided it into two families, viz. * Apes proprie dictıe. ** Bombinatrices hirsutissima. But, as the learned Scopoli well observes, "Somus et hirsuties, in his speciebus gradation ancta, incertos reddit ordines inde petitos (a). And, in fact, authors, misled by the mere circumstance of hirsuties, have inserted species into this family that have no pretensions to affinity with it: an error, which Linneus himself has not aroided; for Apis riolacea, astuans, \&e. are not genuine Bomlinatrices, as will be proved at large hereafter.

Considerable attention has been paid to this genus by Scopoli, and he seems to have exerted himself not a little to set it upon a good footing. With what success we shall now consider. In his Entomologia Carnialica he assigns to it the following characters:
APIS. Character Essentialis. Os rostro deflexo bivalvi.

Character Amifacialis.
Rostrum porrectum, infiexum, mellisugum, bivalve 1 - 3 setum.
He takes his families in this work from the antennæ, viz. *Antennis recis. ** Antennis Lasi infractis. Discovering, afterwards, the insufficiency of these characters to include all the species with
(a) Ent. Car. p. 298. Note $\dagger$.
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which he was acquainted, in his Annus historiconaturalis quartus, he divides Apis into three genera, and entirely omits his families, the characters of which, in fact, are only sexual distinctions. These three genera he names Eucera, Apis, and Nomada, and distinguishes them by the following characters:
EUCERA. Rostrum 1. Siphunculo medio attenuato.
2. Setulis binis margine glabris siphunculo brevioribus.
3. Valvis duabus convergentibus glabris.
4. Laminis binis, dicta organa protegentibus, basi coarctatis, ibique palpum setaccum e latere educentibus.

Before I make any observations upon this character, I must point out what parts, the terms used in it, denote. The Siphanculus answers to the labium of Fabricius and my lingua (b). The Setulce, to the linguce setce, or lingure lacinice interiores of that author, and to my lacinice interiores (c). The raluce to his labii lacinice laterales, or exteriores, and to my lacinia exteriores (d). And the lamina, to his maxillce and my valvulce (e).

The genus Eucera is intended to include such Apes as are distinguished by antennæ as long as the body, e.g. Apis longicornis, Lin. \&c.; but I
(b) Tab. 11. **. d. 2. a. fig. 1. g.
(c) Ibid. ff.
(d) Ibid. $e e_{0}$
(e) Ibid, $c$ c.
shall shew hereafter that this circumstance characterizes the male only. The number and description of the parts of the proloscis does credit to the accuracy of this great author; but the setulce, at least in $A$. longicornis, are not " margine glabra," for, if they are examined under a good magnifier, they will be found to be ciliate on one side $(f)$. He takes only the apex of the valuula for his laminue, for he describes them as "lasi coarctate et palpigere;" when, in fact, if the entire ralvula be separated from the proloscis, it will be found narrowest in the middle, with a feeler emerging from its lateral sinus $\left(\Omega^{\circ}\right)$. In other respects, this character is most accurate, and if he had examined the proboscis in his next genus with equal accuracy, he would have discorered the same number of parts, although not retaining the same proportion with respect to each other.

APIS. Rostrum ]. Siphunculo medio.
2. Faluis binis siphunculo brevioribus.
3. Laminis binis palpigeris.

This character is also accurate as far as it goes, but in it he omits the lacinise interiores, answering to the setule of his Eucera, which distinguish all genuine Apes, though in some they are not easy to be discovered $(h)$.
(f) Tab. 10. **. d. 1. fig. 3. c.
(g) Ibid, fig. 1. d.
(fi) Tab. 13.**. e. 2. fig. 1. ff.
E 4
NOMADA.
2. Valvis binis sub apice pal~ pigeris.
This character seems designed for those insects, which Reaumur has called Proakeilles, and De Geer Nomade. It is by far the most imperfect and faulty of the three; for the flat short tongue of these scarcely merits the name of siphunculus (i), the interior palpi are passed over without notice, and that part which really answers to the lamince in his other genera $(k)$, is here designated by the term valva. In this genus the valuule are usually, but not invariab!y, "sub apice palpigera." For want of due examination of the proloscis, he has inserted into this genus, under the name of Nomada ruficornis, a genuine Apis.

Geoffroy follows Scopoli, he distinguishes his Apis by the following characters:
APIS. Antennce fractæ articulo primo longiore.
Os maxillosum linguâ membranaceâ inflexâ. Aculeus ani simplex subulatus. Abdomen petiolo brevissimo thoraci connexum.
Ocelli tres.
Corpus villosum.
These characters are the same, word for word, as he has assigned to the preceding genus (Vespa), with the sole exception of "Corpus villosum" in-
(i) Tab. 2. **. a. fig. 1. c.
( $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$Ibid. $l$. $\& \&$ fig. 3.
stead of "Corpus glatrum." The first member of this character is often only a sexual distinction. The second is partly common to the whole class, and partly peculiar to genuine Apes. With respect to the third, the aculeus of all Iymenopterous insects, as far as I have had an opportunity of examining them, consists of the same parts, viz. two valves( $($ ), and a contral vagina ( $m$ ), exerting a pair of spicula ( $n$ ) barbed or serrated more or less on one side. In most genera the aculeus when unemployed is recondite, or withdrawn within the abdomen, but in a large proportion of the Ichneumons (o), Sirex $(p), \& c$. both values and vagina are exerted. So that the term " simplex" cannot with propriety be applied to one aculeus more than another. "Subulatus" very properly defines the vagina of the spiculc of an Apis. The next member of the character is common to many genera; the fifth to the whole class; and the last excludes all those Vespiform bees (Nomada, Fab.) which evidently belong to this genus. This author adopts the families of Limeus.

De Geer's definitions of the two genera, into which, after Reaumur, he divides Apis, are now to be considered, they are as follows:
(l) Tab. 13. fig. 27. 6b. fig. 28. aa. (m) Ibid. fig. 27. a 2S. c. and 29. (n) Ibid. fig. 28. 66. and 30, 31.
(o) Marsham in Limn. Trans. vol. 3. p. 29. Tab. 4. fig. 5.
(p) Reaum. tom, 6. Mum. 9. Tab. 31. fig. 3. fft.

APIS. Antenne fractæ articulo primo longiori. Os dentibus et rostro flexili fracto, sursum. que plicato. Alce planæ. Abdomen thoraci petiolo brevi adnexum. Aculeus punctorius in abdomine reconditus, Oculi reticulati ovales integri.

NOMADA. Antennee clavatæ vel filiformes articulis duodeoim.
Os dentibus et rostro porrecto vaginâ cartilagineâ cylindricâ. Ala planæ. Abdomen petiolatum. Aculeus punctorius in abdomine reconditus, Oculi reticulati ovales uniti.

The antennæ in both these genera, except in the two first families of Apis, are usually subclavate ( $q$ ) in one sex, and filiform in the other; those of the male consisting of fourteen joints, including the radicle $(r)$ or minute joint that unites them to the head, and thirteen in the females and neuters. The wings likewise, the petiolus of the abdomen, which is extremely short, the aculeus, and eyes are nearly the same in both genera. The second member of the definition constitutes their essential
(q) The definition of antenne clavata, in the Fundamenta Entomologia, is, qua versus apicem sensim incrassatce, and yet this term is often employed, and even by Linneus himself, for antennce capitatc. (r) Tab. 1. *. a. fig. 8. a.
distinction, but one of the terms employed, to my understanding at least, does not convey a clear idea, for I do not perfectly comprehend what is meant by "Rostrum sursum plicatum." In genuine Apes the proboscis is folded, as it were, in three lengths, with two elbows, so as, in the act of folding, to form the letter $\mathrm{Z}(s)$, the inflected end of the tongue constituting the exterior fold $(t)$, and the lora the interior $(u)$; and consequently there is a fold above, or between the middle fold and the head, as well as one beneath it. This is the only sense I can make of it: and, thus understood, it gives a good character of one difference between these genera, but not the best and most obvious: it might, I think, be better expressed sursum et deorsum plicatum. "Rostrum porrectum," the term employed to express the peculiar character of Nomada, must be understood to signify that the first motion in unfolding the proloscis is to push it forwards beyond the mouth and maxillæ(x), whereas in Apis it is to unbend the lower fold $(y)$. I shall hereafter have occasion to employ this term in the same sense.

Having considered what has been done in this genus by the predecessors of Fabricius, I shall next call my readers attention to the alterations introduced into it by that celebrated entomologist, and upon this head I must be more than usually par-
(s) Tab. 13. fig. 2.
( $t$ ) Ibid. $d d, f f, g$.
( $u$ ) Ibid. $b b_{\text {. }}$
( $x$ ) Tab. 3. **, b. fig. 1.
(y) Tab. 13. fig. 2. dd, ff, $g$. ticular,
ticular, for this genns appears to me capable of furnihing the best of all possible criterions for the trial of his system. The instrumenta cibaria are so conspicuors in most of the species that compose it, and so easy to be examined, that if he has made any mistake of consequence in the characters of this genus, it is evident that dependance cannot be placed upon those which he has assigned to others, where the organs, upon which he builds his system, are less obvious. It is not allowable to adopt, as a gratuitous assumption, that these organs are not subject to variation; and so to construct characters from them, as they appear in one or two species only, trusting solely to habit for the arrangement of the rest: but the several results of a careful inspection of them, in as many different individuals as possible, taken from all the subdivisions of a genus, should be attentively considered and compared, and the agreement and disagreement of them accurately noted. This is the only sure ground to go upon, and thus alone can it be ascertained whether any, and which, of these organs supply characters that are certain and constant. It will soon appear that Fabricius has not taken these pains with respect to those genera into which he has divided Apis. These are Bembex, Hylous, Andrena, Apis, Eucera, and Nomada.

The first of these, Bembex, I shall pass by, as it consists chiefly of insects taken from Vespa, and includes only one Linnean Apis, which, as far as I can

I can learn, has never been taken in England (z), and begin with Hylcus, which follows it.

HYLEUS. Character Naturalis.
Os maxillis, palpis, linguâque inflexâ trifidà.

> Palpi quatuor, inæquales, filiformes.
> Anteriores paulò longiores, sexarticulati, articulo secundo paulò longiori, adhærentes maxillæ dorso. Posteriores breviores, quadriarticulati, adnati laciniis exterioribus labii sub apice.
> Mandibula cornea, arcuata, inermis. Maxilla brevis, cornea, fornicata, apice rotundata.
> Lalium elongatum, basicorneum, com.. pressum, in medio flexum, trifidum; laciniis exterioribus corneis, compressis, sub apice palpigeris; intermediâ membranaceâ, planâ, emar-ginatâ.
> Antennce cylindricæ.
(i) Apis rostrata, Lin. In some M.S. notes in an interleaved copy of the Systema Nature, which belonged to the celebrated Mr. Gray, it is observed by Miller upon this species, "In Anglia inveniri audio." But as this is only hearsay evidence, it may very possibly be a mistake. I have never secn it in any cabinet of English insects,

Os maxillis, palpis, linguâque inflexầ; trifidâ.
Maxilla brevis cornea.
Latium in medio inflexum, trifidum laciniâ mediâ emarginatâ.
Antenne cylindricx.
The species arranged by Fabricius under this genus belong to three distinct and natural families; two of which I consider as forming a part of my genus Melitta, (Proabeille, Reaum. \&c. Nomada, Scopoli and De Geer) and the species of the other as genuine Apes. Hyleus annulatus belongs to one family of the former; H. cylindricus, quadricinctus, flavipes, allipes, \&c. are males of another; and $H$. truncorum, maxillosus, and forisomnis are genuine Apes. Now these three families differ very materially in their Instrumenta cibaria, as may easily be seen by comparing the sets of figures referred to below $(a)$. The question therefore is, from which of them Fabricius drew his characters? With respect to the anterior or exterior palpi of six articulations, they are one characteristic of the former genus, for in the Apes included in Hylaus, they consist only of two $(b)$. The posterior or interior palpi, he describes as consisting of four articulations, and as springing from the exterior lacinia

[^4]of the labium (or tongue) a little below their apex. Now this is a circumstance that takes place, not only never in these families, but likewise not in any one of the five genera into which he has divided Apis. For where the palpi emerge from the exterior lacinice, as they most commonly do in Apis, but never in Melitta, two is the most natural number of their articulations ( $c$ ), but in the subdivision to which Hylcus forisomnis and its affinities belong, they are exarticulate ( $d$ ). In Melitta they invariably consist of four joints, but in that genus they spring from the tongue itself, a little above the apex of the tube (e). The mandilule or maxillee, are inermes or edentulce, only in one sex of these families of Melitta $(f)$; but, in the Apes in question, they are bidentate at the apex in all the $\operatorname{sexes}(g)$. The maxill.e or valuulde are comeous only at their base, their tops are coriaceous; they can scarcely be denominated "breves" in any of these families $(h)$, and in two of them they are acute instead of bcing rounded at the apex (i). The characters he has assigned to the lalium or lingua will not entircly agree with it in any one of them. In the Apes in question it is elongate,
(c) Tab.6. $\because \%$ b. fig. 3. b. Tab. 12. \%*. e. 1. 'neut. fig. 4.
(d) Tab. 9. **. c. 2. $\%$ fig. 3. dd. and fig. 5. 1 .
(c) Tab. 1. *. b. fig. 1. ee. (f) Ibid. fig. 5, 6, 7. Tab. 3. **. b. fig. 3, 4. (g) Tab.9. **. c. 2. \%. fig. G. (i) Tab, 3. *. b. fig. 2. Tab.3.**. b. fig. 2. Tab.g. ubi supra fig. 3. a. (i) Viz, Tab, 1. *. b. and Tab. 9 ubi supra.

## INTRODUCTORY REMAKKS.

inflected, and furnished with exterior lacinice paipigerous just below their apex ( $k$ ), but the intermediate lacinia is neither flat nor emarginate. In the two families of Melitta, included in this genus, though flat, it cannot be called elongate, or emarginate ( $l$ ), and its lateral auricles $(m)$, are neither palpigerous nor corneous, but consist of a thin membrane. With respect to the term compressed, understood according to the definition of Fabricius, it will apply to neither of these linguce. That of Apis being cylindrical, and that of Melitta depressed or flat:

How are we to account for insects differing so widely in their Intrumenta cilaria being put into the same genus? The truth appears to be, that instead of taking the trouble of examining these organs in individuals, Fabricius referred all species to this genus, whose body was narrow and cylindrical: this is evidently the reason why the males of one family of Melitta, though agreeing with the other sex in their proloscis, are separated from them and inserted here. Any entomologist, who was at all in the habit of studying the genus Apis, upon a slight comparison of Hylaus truncorum, maxillosus, \&c. with $H$. amnulatus, or H. quadricinctus, or flavipes, \&c. without examining their oral instruments, would be convinced that they belonged to a different division. So that in the

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { (k) Tab. g.**. c. 2. } \gamma \text {. fig. 3. bb. dd. (l) Tab. 1. *. b, } \\
\text { fig. 1. c. and Tab. 2. **. b. fig. 2. } & \text { (m) Ibid. a a. } \\
& \text { arrangement }
\end{array}
$$

arrangement of them prim. $\hat{i}$ facie appearance could have been the only guide which Fabricius consulted. That one, who makes every thing depend upon these parts, should pay no regard to them himself is scarcely tolerable. Had he inspected the Apes he has inserted into this genus, he would have discovered that they were distinguished from the rest not only by their proloscis, but also by their lip, (Clypeus, Fab.) : since they form a subdivision of that family in which this part is inflected ( $n$ ) ; in Hylsus maxillosus it is remarkably elongated (o).

ANDRENA. Character Naturalis.
Os maxillis, palpis, linguâque inflexâ trifidâ.
Palpi quatuor inæquales, filiformes: Anteriores porrecti, longiores, sexarticulati articulis cylindricis, æqualibus, adhærentes flexuræ maxillx.
Posteriores brevissimi, biarticulati articulis æqualibus, cylindricis, sub apice setarum labii inserti.
Manditula recta, cornea, fornicata, inermis.
(n) Tab. 10. **. c. 2. §. fig. 13, c.
(o) Tab. 9. **。
c. 2. $\gamma$. fig. 2. $b$. In this fizure the lip is represented in the situation it assumes when the probuscis is unfolded; when that organ is fulded, the lip is inflected, and covers it.

Maxilla cornea, apice membranacea, compressa, inflexa, labio multò breviore, lingux lacinias exteriores constituens.
Lalium porrectum, cylindricum, basi corneum, apice membranaceum, inflexum, utrinque juxta flexuram setis duabus membranaceis, rectis, rigidis, exteriore longitudine dimidii labii, interiore brevissima, compressâ, incurvâ.
Antennce breves, filiformes, subpetiolatæ; articulo primo paulò longiori, secundo basi attenuato, reliquis xqualibus, brevibus.
Larva apoda, mollis, antice gibba, obtussa, postice attenuata.
Puppa quiescens inagini simillima.
Victus et larvar et imagimis e nectare florum.

## Character Artificialis.

Os linguâ trifidâ.
Labium cylindricum maxillâ longius, utrinque setis duabus membranaceis. Antenne filiformes.

Under this genus Fabricius has likewise arranged insects that differ greatly from each other in their Instrumenta cibaria. Thus Andrena bicolor, pilipes, latiata, helvola, and haemorrhoidalis, are Melittre
litte of one family; A. succinta belongs to another; while $A$. carulescens, cenea, and lidentata, are genuine Apes. Of these, Andrena bicolor is nothing more than the male of $A$ ibis thoracica, and has precisely the same oral organs $(p)$; and Andrena latiata is the male of Nomada cingulata. The exterior palpi are sexarticulate in all the Melitte (q), but in Andrena enea and carulescens they consist of four articulations $(r)$, and in $A$. lidentata, which, if I am not mistaken, comes into the same subdivision with Apis contuncularis (s), they are most probably biarticulate $(t)$. The interior palpi in all the Apes here quoted have two joints only, and emerge just below the apex of the exterior lacinice (u), which are here denominated setce, but in all the Melitto above-mentioned, these palpi are quadriarticulate, as I observed above, and arise from the tongue just above the tube. The manditula, in this genus, can be called "rectce" only in the Apes, in the Melittce they are usually incurvice. In the latter, in one sex, they are often, but not always, endentulae $(x)$; but in the former, their apex is furnished with teeth in both $(y)$. His characters, with respect to the maxille or valuulic, will apply
(p) Tab. 3. **. c. fig. 3-6. (q) Ibid. **. b. fig. 2. a. and c. fig. 6. $a$.
(r) Tab. 10. \#*. c. 2. 8. fig. 3. $a$.
(s) Tab. 8. \%*. c. 2. $\alpha$.
( $t$ ) Ibid. f.g.3. c.
(k) Ibid.
fig. 2. ff. and Tab. 10. **. c. 2. 8. fig. 2. aa. (x) Tab. 4. **. c. fig. 3-8. (y) Tab. 8. **. c. 2. a. fig. 9-16. and Tab. 10. **. c. 2. © fig. 9-11.
better to the Apes that he has included in this genus, than to the Melittre, the summit of whose valvulue, which are not much shorter than the tongue, is coriaceous. In the Apes, these have sometimes a membranaceous margin. The definition of the labium will apply only to Apis.

APIS. Character Natuiralis.
Os maxillis, palpis, linguâque inflexâ quinquefidâ.
Palpi quatuor brevissimi, inæquales, filiformes.
Anteriores paulò longiores, sexarticulati, articulis æqualibus, flexuræ maxillæ adhærentes.
Posteriores quinquearticulati articulis æqualibus, sub apice laciniarum cxteriorum labii inserti.
Mandibula porrecta, cornea, recta, obtusa, dentata.
Maxilla porrecta, cornea, basi cylindrica, cum labio comata, apice compressa, acuta, integra marginibus membranaceis, in medio inflexa, laciniam linguæ exteriorem constituens.
Lakium porrectun, corneum, basi cylindricum, apice trifidum, laciniis lateralibus dilatatis, membranaceis, sub apice palpigeris; intermediâ longiori, retractili, tereti, pilosâ, lacinias interiores linguæ constituens.

Antennce filiformes, breves, articulo primo longisfimo, incurvo, reliquis brevibus, æqualibus.
Larva apoda, mollis, gregaria intra cellulas hexangulares.
Puppa, quiescens, imagini simillima.
Victus, et larre et imaginis, e nectare florum, melle, fructibus dulcibus.

Character Artificialis.
Os linguâ inflexâ, quinquefidà.
Palpi brevissimi.
Antennce filiformes.
In his preface to his Genera Insecioram Fabricius has this observation, "Auctorum descriptiones, figuras, munquam ad scnerum determinationem adhilere valui.. Omnes oris partes planè omiserunt." This is an assertion much too large and unqualified; and had he consulted the descriptions and figures, which Swammerdam and Reaunur have given of the Instromenta cibaria in this genus, and which De Geer, (whose work is a rich mine from which much important information may be drawn relative to every part of the history of insects) has given in others; it would, perhaps, have prevented him from running into so many egregious errors. Nay, had he only examined the protoscis of the hive bee, or any common Bomlinatrix, he must have discovered the inaccuracy of the characters here given. But to come to particulars: this genus, like the F3 preceding
preceding, is a " rudis indigestaque moles" of Melitte and Apes, taken from all families, each distinguished from the others by peculiarities in its Instrumenta cibaria. Thus, Apis seiadonia belongs to one family of Melitta; Apis cunicularia, thoracica, cineraria, and vestita to another: the exterior palpi of all these consist of six articulations, and by no means agree with the term " brevissimi (z)," and the interior palpi of four. Apis latipes, violacea, cstuans, pilipes, rotundata, \&c. belong to a family of Apes, whose exterior palpi, like those of the preceding, are sexarticulate $(a)$; but their interior are only biarticulate (b). Apis mellifica and all the true Bombinatrices, A. terrestris, hortorum, \&c. have their exterior palpi extremely short; but, instead of six, they consist only of a single joint (c). The same remark extends to $A$. manicata (d), which belongs to a subdivision of that family remarkable for its inflected lip. Apis bicornis, tunensis, rufa, \&c. enter into another of its subdivisions, the same which includes Andrena carulescens and cenea, distinguished, as above observed, by exterior palpi of four articulations. Apis conica, quadridentata, and centuncularis appertain to two other branches of the same family,
(z) Tab. 3. $\because *$ c. fig. 6 a.
(a) Tab. 11. **. d. 2. a. fig. 2.
(b) Ibid. fig. 1. ii. (c) Tab. 12.**. e. 1. neut. fig.6.d.

Tab. 13. fig. 3. l. and fig. 4, 5, 6. (d) Tab. 9. **. c. 2. $\beta$. fig. 2. $d d$. and fig. 4.
whose exterior palpi are biarticulate (e); and Apis punctata, luctuosa, \&c. are of another family, related to the Nomad.e, with exterior palpi of five articulations $(f)$. The same objections attach to the characters of the mandibule as in the former genera. The maxilla or valvula is not connate with the latium or tongue in any species that I have examined, it may sometimes be attached to its base, or the upper side of the tube by mombrane: in that family which includes Apis violacea, \&c, or what I call the false Bombinatrices, its apex, instead of having a membranaccous margin, is entirely corncous.

## EUCERA. Character Naturalis.

Os palpis, maxillis, linguâque inflexâ, septemfidâ.
Palpi quatuor, inxquales, filiformes.
Anteriores quinquearticulati, articulo secundo longiori, crassiori, reliquis æqualibus, adharentes flexura interiori maxilla.
Posteriores breviores, quadriarticulati, articulis æqualibus, adnati laciniis exterioribus labii.
Mandilula cornea, incurva, acuta, cdentula.
Maxilla elongata, cornca, compressa, in
(e) Tab. 7. **. c. 1. a. fig. 3. a. Tab. S. **. c. 2. a. fig.3. c. (f) Tab.6. **, a. fig. 1. g.
medio flexa, apice membranacea, lateribus dilatatis.
Latium compressum, corneum, in medio flexum, quinquefidum ; laciniis membranaceis, exterioribus duabus dilatatis, apice palpigeris; sequentibus paulò brevioribus, tenuissimis, interiori tereti pilosâ.
Antenne cylindricæ, articulo primo globoso.

Character Artificialis:
Os linguâ septemfidâ.
Labium quinquefidum, laciniis intermediis majoribus, apice palpigeris.
Antenne cylindricx.
This genus seems free from adulteration, by the mixture of discordant species; but the characters are not accurate. The exterior palpi are sexarticulate ( $g$ ), and the interior, instead of being quadriarticulate, consist only of two joints ( $h$ ). The Artificial Character both of this genus and the preceding is well drawn up, and sufficient, when applied only to its proper subjects. But in Apis, "Lingua quinquefida is not applicable, for the proLoscis, if it be closely examined, it will be found to be septemfida (i). In the second member of the Artificial Character, instead of "intermediis," the
(g) Tab. 10. **. d. 1. fig. 1. d.
(h) Ibid. fig. 2. $c c_{\text {e }}$
(i) Tab, 13. fig. 1.

## INTRODUCTORY REMANKS.

term should be exteriorivus ( $h$ ). At first, Fabricius included only such male insects in this genus, as had antennee nearly as long as the body, but in his supplement he has inserted two species of the other sex.

NOMADA. Character Naturalis.
Os maxillis, palpis, linguâque inflexâ, trifidâ.
Palpi quatuor, inæquales, porrecti, filiformes.
Anteriores breviores, sexarticulati, articulis æqualibus, cylindricis, adhærentes flexure maxille.
Posteriores quadriarticulati, articulis cylindricis secundo longissimo, lin1gux formi; labii medio inserti.
Mandibula cornea, fornicata, acuta, integra.
Maxilla basi cornea, cylindrica, apice porrecta, compressa, membranacea, acuta, integra, linguæ exteriorem la. ciniam constituens.
Labium cylindricum, elongatum, basi corneum, apice membranaceum, acutum, compressum, integrum, lingua laciniam interiorem constituens.
Antenne filiformes, breves, articulo primo paulò longiori, reliquis æqualibus, brevibus, rotundatis.
(k) Tab. 10. ubi supra, fig. 2. a $a$.

Character

Character Artificialis.
Os linguâ inflexâ trifidâ.
Palpi quatuor inæquales; postici lin. guæformes articulo secundo longissimo.
Antennce filiformes.
In this genus, of which Fabricius has described only fifteen species, are included insects which belong to the third and fifth families of my genus Melitta, and to the second and fourth of Apis, all differing as to their Instrumenta cibaria, Besides these, others belong to a family of which we have no species in England; whose proloscis I have not had an opportunity of examining $(l)$; and Nomada punctata is either a variety of Vespa uniglumis, Lin. or nearly related to it. His description agrees exactly with my specimens of that insect, which is well figured by Panzer ( $m$ ), only the four posterior tibiæ are coloured black, instead of dusky ferruginous. Thus Nomada gibla belongs to the third family of Melitta, $N$. cingulata to the fifth $(n)$; N. ruficornis, rufipes, striata, Fabriciana, and fulvicornis to my second family of Apis; N. variegata to my fourth. N. Histrio and scutellaris seem connected with Apis punctata, but in these the "Scutellum porrectum et emarginatum," indicates
(l) Viz. N. histrio, scutellaris, \&ic. (m) Fn. Ins. Germ. Init. $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 64$. t. 14. Cralro uniglumis. (n) I observed above that Andrena laliata is the male of this.
that they ought to form a separate subdivision. N. punctata was accounted by Linneus a Vespa, but its tongue subemarginate, antennce anteriores, and silver nasus give it a nearer affinity to those Spheces, which Fabricius has arranged under his genus Crabro. In the two families of Melitta, above alluded to, the proloscis, the interior palpi and auricles being excluded, is trifid ( 0 ), but not inflected; in $N$. ruficornis, \&c. it is inflected and at first appears trifid, but if closely examined under a good magnifier, it will be found, exclusive of the interior palpi, to be quinquefid $(p)$. N. variegata is furnished both with interior and exterior lacinic, consequently in that the tongue is septemfid $(q)$. With respect to the palpi they are sexarticulate in Melitta, and I believe so in Nomada ruficornis, \&c. $(r)$, but in $N$. variegata they consist of only a single joint(s). The interior palpi are quadriarticulate in Melitta and N. ruficornis, \&c. (t), but in N. variegata they have two joints (u). With respect to the second joint of these palpi, in the form of which Fabricius makes the essence of the genus to consist, it is neither elongate nor linguæform in any of these families of either genus, the species of which I have had an opportunity of

| (o) T | 1. Tab. . a, c. .g. | (p) Tab. 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * b. fig. $2,3$. | (q) Tab.6. **. b. fig. 2, 3, | (r) Tab. 5. |
| *. b. fig. 4. d. | (s) Tab.6. **. b. fig. 4.d. | (t) Tab. 5. |
| $\therefore$ b. fig. 3.b. |  |  |

examining
cxamining $(x)$. What it may be in the family to which $N$. scutellaris belongs 1 am not able to say. The Mandibulce are entire only in the two families of Apis. In N. gibla they are deeply bifid at the apex in one sex $(y)$. The terms "cylindricum et elongatum" will apply only to the latiom of the genuine $\mathcal{A}$ Apes.

From this review of what Fabricius has done in this genus, one is almost led to suppose that he formed his Natural Characters, "undique collatis membris," and took one member from the proboscis of an insect of one family, a second from that of another, and so on. If this be the case it is a vain attempt to conjecture from what individuals such jarring definitions were derived.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {-_ cujus, velut ægri somnia, vanæ } \\
& \text { Fingentur species: ut nec pes nec caput uni } \\
& \text { Reddatur formæ. }
\end{aligned}
$$

It must now, I think, be evident to every un... prejudiced examiner, that this author has committed perpetual and unaccountable mistakes in the genus in question. That, in the arrangement of species, instead of abiding by his own characters, in a class of insects in which the Instrumenta cibaria are very easy to be examined, he has been led solely by habit, or rather primá facie appearance:
(x) Tab. 2.**. a. fig. 1.gg. Tab.3.**. c. fig.5.cc. Tab. 5. *. b. fig.3.l. Tab.6. **. b. fig.3. l. (y) Tab. 2. **. a. fig. 6 .
that he has done the utmost violence to nature, mixing distinct genera and families, and separating those that are most nearly related, even the sexes, placing the males in one genus and the females in another, though both have the same oral instruments ( $z$ ), and instead of order and true system, introducing the greatest confusion and disorder.

A system so constructed, which is the cause of so much confusion and distortion of nature, can never be lasting; the more closely it is examined, the more deficient will it be found, and probably it will not long survive its author. While that of Limneus, which Fabricius and his followers have treated with such undeserved contempt, receiving daily those improvements of which it is capable and which it demands, will descend, because founded on the sure basis of truth and nature, to the latest posterity, and, in conjunction with his other glorious labours, immortalize his name to all generations.

Gmelin has done little more than combine Linneus with Fabricius, adopting for families, the then new genera of the latter; I shall therefore altogether pass over his character of this genus.
(i) The mistake of scxual characters for those of genera or families, is so natural in those who do not examine insects, in this genus, anatomically, that it is not to be wondered at, and may be allowed for. But the case is much altered, when such nistakes are made by one, whose whole system is built upon those parts in which the sexes do agree.

## ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

AFTER the greatest part of the preceding remarks were printed, I met with two authors of whose labours in this class and genus it will be proper to take some notice. I mean Roemer and Latreille.

In the year 1789, Roemer published a very elegant work, entitled, "Genera insectorum Linnai et Fabricii iconibus illustrata." In this work he gives the following character of the class Hymenoptera, which adds several circumstances to that laid down by Linneus.

HYMENOPTERA. Alee quatuor, membranaceæ, nudæ, nervis pro alarum magnitudine fortioribus interstinctr.
Os maxillis duabus validis. Stemmata tria.
Cauda aculeo armata in feminis.

This character is very accurate, except the first nember of it, which will not hold good universally, since many Hymenopterous insects are distinguished by wings without veins: its application, therefore, ought to have been restricted by the term sapius or plerisque, as a general, but not invariably constant character. In his genera he has destroyed the
the simplicity of the Linnean definitions, by the insertion of a variety of additional characters. Some of these are common to the class; for instance, the stemmata, and number of articulations of the tarsi. Others are hastily adopted without sufficient examination, as where he assigns only two palpi to Cynips and several other genera, which in fact have four; and in his character of Tenthredo, in which, instead of naming six as the number of joints of the exterior palpi, and four of the interior, he attributes to the former, four only, and to the latter, two. Again, others of his additional characters are not universal, as when he says, under Tenthredo, "Lalio superiore constanter cum pedibus concolore." In several species of that genus this does not hold good (a). The character of Vespa he has much improved by introducing the tongue. I shall copy his defnition of Apis.
APIS. Os maxillis dentatis, atque proloscide inflexâ, vaginis duabus bivalvibus lingzan includentibus.
Caput triangulare, fronte planâ, flexum. Antenna sæpe pedatx, primo articulo reliquis longiore.
Alce planæ, in omni sexu.
Aculous punctorius reconditus, retractilis, serratus, feminis et neutris.
(a) E. G. In Tenthredo Vitellina, sericea, nitens, Lin. licolor, Enum. \&ic.

Tarsi quinque articulis, primo longitudine tibix, compresso, ciliato, transversim sulcato.

The greater part of the additional circumstances introduced into this character, belong only to certain families, and are not common to the whole genus; and the last, viz. the transversely sulcated first joint or planta of the tarsus, is peculiar to the neuter of Apis mellifica.

The other work which I mentioned, was published at Paris about six years since by M. Latreille, under the title of "Précis des caractères génériques des insectes, disposés dans un ordre naturel." This is a work of considerable merit, in which the author manifests no common degree of industry and accuracy, aided by great abilities. Though a professed admirer of Fabricius, he proves himself to be

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.
and with great grood sense rejects the Fabrician nomenclature of the classes, retaining, for the most part, that of Linneus. The Hymenopterous insects constitute his fifth class, which he thus defines:

HYMÉNOPTÈRES. Quatre â̂les inégales, nues,
Fymenoptera. veinées, inférieures plus petites.
Bouche munie de mandibules. Une langue ou lèvre inférieure renfér-
mée à sa base dans une gaine coriace qui s'emboîte sur les côtés, dans les mathoires.
This character agrees very well with the insects of this class, with the exception of ailes veinies, which, as I just now obsersed, are not common to the whole: but still I prefer that of Limnens, on account of its including the aculeus, its most remarkable and striking distinction.

Instead of subdividing his genera, this authot divides the class into sections and families, the characters of which are drawn from the antenne, os, lakium inferius, lingua, maxilla, Fab. tulus, and palpi. He gives forts-three Hymenopterous genera, without inciuding thoze of Fabricius's supplement: the characters of these are taken from the antemue, lalium superius, mandibuke, lingua, maxillce, Fab. the us, and palfi. There cannot be a stronger proof that diferences in the antenna and instirumenta cibaria are not the best foundation for characteristics of genus in this class, than the 2reat and umecessary multiplication of genera by those who build their system upon them. Characters of families are mistalen for distinctive marks of a genus; and thus natural genera are taken to pieces, and, if this prasice continues, wer shall have no such thing as a subdivision in ans: The different families of the Limem genus $T$ thredo, are all characterized from variation.

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

the antennæ; according to this principle, they ought to constitute so many different genera; and if it be applied to Apis, instead of five genera into which Fabricius has divided it, it should be frittered into eighteen, from differences observable in the instrumenta civaria of its numerous families. But to proceed with our author. The genera he has given are arranged in the following order.

1. Urocerus, after Geoffroy, taken from Sirex, Lin. 2. Sirex, taken from Sirex and Tenthredo, Lin. 3. Tenthredo, Lin. 4. Cimbex, Olivier. This is the Cralro of Gcofitroy, and consists of those insects which constitute Linneus's first family of Tenthredo. 5. Proctotrupes, Latr. If I am not mistaken in the insects which M. Latreille intends by this genus, it is a distinct one: I have always been at a loss where to refer the species that belong to it. I do not know that any other author has noticed any of them. 6. Cynips, after Geoffroy, this genus takes in no genuine Cymits, but includes a large proportion of the Ichnermones Mimuti of Linneus, the Eulophus of Geoffroy, and Chalcis of Fabricius. It would be a good genus without Chalcis, but it should have another name, as Cynips ought to be continued to the gall nut insects. 7. Leucospis, Fab. 8. Diplolepis, Geoff. Cynips, Lin. 9. Diapria, Latr. taken from the Ichneumones Minuti, Lin. 10. Orussus, Latr. Sphex, Scop. An Oryssus, Fab.? 11. Ichneumon, Lin. 12. Gasteruption, Latr. Ichneumon, Lin. This

This genus appears to me to be the same with Foonus of the supplement of Fabricius. 13. Evania, Fab. 14. Astata, Latr. 15. Sphex, Lin. This includes my genus Ammophila only. 10. Psammochares, Latr. taken from Sphex, Lin. This is probably the same with Pompilus, Fab. 17. Larra, Fab. 18. Tiphica, Fab. 19. Myrmosa, Latr. 20. Mutilla, Lin. 21. Dorylus, Fab. 22. Formica, Lin. 23. Tryporylon, Latr. from Sphex, Lin. 24. Psen, Latr. from Sphex, Fab. 25. Ceiopales, Latr. taken from Evania, Vespa, and Cralro, Fab. 26. Mellinus, Fab. 27. Nysso, Latr. from Crabro, Fab. 28. Chrysis, Lin. 29. Parnopes, Latr. from Chrysis, Fab. 30. Pemphredon, Latr. from Cralero, Oliv. 31. Oxylelus, Latr. from F'espa, Lin. and Cralro, Fab. 32. Crabro, Fab. 33. Bembex, Fub. 34. Masaris, Fab. 35. Vespa, Lin, 36. Philanthus; Fab. 37. Sapyga, Latr. from Scolia, Fab. 38. Scolia, Tab. 39. Ilyluens, Fab. 40. Andrena, Fab. 41. Nomaila, Fab. 42. Apis, Lin. 43. Eucera, Scop. and Tab.

The genera inte which our author, after Fabricins, has divided Apis are arranged under his tenth and eleventh families. The characters of the firet of these families belong to those insects which I have considered as constituting one genus under the name Helitte, those of the other as pect? to genuine stpes. They are both drawn up, " wery great accuracy, in the following terms.

$$
\because 2 \quad 7
$$

7. Fam. 10. Mâchoires et langue très-alongéés, deux ou trois fois plus longues que la tête, dirigées en avant dans linaction, et dont la base ressort inférieurement de la cavité ou elles sont logées. Partie saillant de la langue évasée, a trois divisions, plus courte que la gaîne: celle-ci longue, cylindrique. Antennules courtes, filiformes, de six et quatre articles.

The tubus, here called, la graine, in this division is often conical, and the palpi are setaceous rather than filiform. Here are arranged the two Fabrician genera Mylous and Andrena, with these characters:

HYL $A$ EUS. Antennes insérées au milien du front, courtes, grosses; premier article alongé, les autres formant presque whe masse cylindrique, divergente ; filiformes dans d'autres. Langue large ; division du milieu échancrée, dentelée, ciliée.
This characier was probably taken from Apis annulata, Lin., to which it applies very well, as does also his Caractere Habituel of this genus; but the intermediate piece of the tongue is truncate, rather than emarginate $(b)$. He would of course exclude from it $A$. maxillosa, truncorum, \&c. which belong to his next family, and I should suppose also $H y$ -

> (b) Tab. 1. *. b. fig. 1. c.
lecus albipes and its affinities, the tongue of these being that of his genus Andrenu.
ANDRENA. Autennes filiformes. Langue oblongue; division du milieu en point refenduc.
This genus would include all my familics of AKlitta but the first and second. The character is extremely accurate, but the point of the intermediate division of the tongue is lacerate rather than cleft (c).
8. Fam. 11. Langue tres-prolongée, Etroite, linéaire, presque cylindrique, un peu coriacée, is papilles vers l'extrémité, fléchio à la sortie de la gaine. Mâchoires fléchies. Antemnules anter:eurs très-courtes, presque obsolètes, sétacúes.

That part of this character which regards the exterior palpi is not accurate, for in the trae $\times$. madic, the Eucerce, and two other of my fanilies of genuine Apes, these are as long as in the Híclittor of the preceding famly, and consist of six joints (d). He probably took his idea of them from Apis mellifica, or the Bomúinatrices. Here are arranged the remaining genera which Fabricius separated from Apis: viz. Nomada, Apis, and Eucera.

*. b. fig. 4. d. Tab. 10. **. d. 1.f.e.1.d. Tab.11. ** d. 2. $\alpha$.fig. 2.9.

NOMADA. Langue d'une pièce, avec deux trèspetites soies latérales.
This character is accurate, but it would also take in my first family of Apis (e).
APIS. Langue de trois pièces. (Organes de la nutrition plus petits dans les mâles).
In this character the interior laciniz are overlooked. The Caractere Habituel of this genus seems to have been drawn from A. mellifica, for it thus describes the eyes: "Yeux entiers alongées, occupant tout le front dans les malles;" a circumstance which is peculiar to that sex of that species. And of the neuter it says, "Premier article des tarses trèsgrands, strié transversalement dans les mulets." which is the peculiarity of the working hive bee.
EUCERA. Langue de cinq pièces. Antennes souvent plus longues que le corps.
This character is accurate as far as it goes. The long antennce, as before observed, are a sexual distinction.

I cannot conclude these remarks without inserting: a passage which I lately met with in Ray's Letters, from which it will appear that that skilful entomologist Dr. Martin Lister had a distinct idea of the Hymenoptera class. "I cannot, methinks," says he, in a letter addressed to Ray, " exclude these hairtailed insects from the family or genus
(e) Tab. 4, \% a. fig. 4, an. Tab. 5. \%. b. fig. 3.
of wasps, although all of them, that I know, are neither favificous nor gregarious, nor have artificial meat stored up for them; yet have they the shape and parts of wasps exactly, as well in the worm and chrysalis, as when they are in perfection : besides, I have olserved a peculiar note lelonging to the lee kind which is not wanting in these; and that is, three lalls in a triangle, in the forehend of them all, which novody hitherto, that I know of, has taken notice of. But I much like the making of genus's and tribes ex moritus at vitu; though I would not as near as may be hare the form excluded ( $f$ )."

$$
(f) \text { p. } 81
$$
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## PARS PRIMA

## TABULAM SYNOPTICAM NOMENCLATUR』E PARTIUM,

 ATQUE TERMINUM EXPLICATIONEM SISTENS.Quam multiplicata sunt opera tua, Jehova! Omnia ipsa in sapientia fecisti: impleta est terra possessionibus uis. Ps. civ. 24 .

In his tam parvis, atque tam nullis, quæ ratio! Quanta vis! Quam inextricabilis perfectio! Plin.

Admiranda tibi levium spectacula rerum. Virg.

90 TABULA SYNOPTICA NOMENCLATURE PARTIUM


$$
(91)
$$

## 'TERMINUM EXPLICATIO,

CORPUS dico, ubi animal totum, simul sumptum, intelligi volo: hoc in tres partes primarias distribuo; caput, nempe, truncum, abdomen.

## I. CAPUT.

Pars antica corporis occiput, faciem, genas, gulam, et jugulum includens. Organa ejus mobilia sunt latium, maxilla, antenna, atque proboscis.

1. Occiput. Capitis pars postica collari applicans(a).
2. Facies. Capitis pagina superior verticem, stemmata, oculos, frontem, et nasum includens.
a. Vertex. Portio faciei inter occiput et oculos (b).
b. Stemmata. Puncta tria, convexa, chrystallina, ocelli forsan, quæ verticem signant $(c)$.
c. Oculi. Visûs organa ex innumeris hexagonis constantia.
d. Frons. Spatium interjectum inter oculos infra verticem unde proveniunt antennæ, quod in angulum acutum inter nasum et oculos sæpe excurrit ( $d$ ).
(a) Tab. 12. **. e. 1. neut. fig. 8. d.
(l) Ibid. $a$.
(c) Ibid.
(d) Ibid. $l$.
c. Nasus,
e. Nasus. Faciei portio sæpius elevata $\int$. gibba in* fra antennas, cui labium annectitur ; a fronte suturâ haud rarò separata (e).
3. Gence. Capitis latera turgida sub oculis $(f)$.
4. Labium. Pars transversa capitis, posticè naso subnexa, os supernè claudens, et proboscidem cohibens ( $g$ ).
5. Maxilla. Dentes transversi insecti os a latere includentes, apud basin sæpius puncto elevato notati ( $h$ ).
6. Gula. Inferioris paginæ capitis cavitas antica, fundo sæpius membranaceo, ubi proboscis plicata reponitur (i).
7. Jugulum. Capitis cavitas postica quà collo annectitur ( $k$ ).
8. Antenna. Cerebelli forsan speculatores sensiferi, articulati, radicula, scapo, pedicello, et apice constantes.
a. Radicula. Articulus primus minutissimus, capiti immersus ( $l$ ).
b. Scapus. Articulus secundus sæpius clongatus, quocum angulum sxpe facit apex ( $m$ ).
c. Pedicellus. Articulus tertius, in acetabulo scapi versatilis ( $n$ ).
d. Apex. Reliqui articuli simul sumpti (o).
(e) Tab. 12.**. e 1. neut. fig. 8. c. (f) Ibid. fig.9. a a.
(g) Ibid. fig. 8. e.
(h) Ibid. $f$.
(i) Ibid. fig.9. $c$.
( $k$ ) Ibid. $b$.
(l) Ibid. fig. 13. $a$.
( $m$ ) Ibid. $l$.
( $n$ ) Ibid. $c$.
(o) Ibid. $d$.
9. Proloscis.
10. Proloscis. Organum capitis os infernè claudens, linguâ centrali, et vaginâ, interdum multivalvi, constans ( $p$ ).
a. Lingua. Suctionis instrumentum cartilagineum in apicens et basin distinctum $(q)$.
a. Apex. Linguæ portio extra tubuin ( $r$ ).
B. Basis. Linguæ portio intra tubum (s).
b. Vagina. Liguam ex omni parte convolvens, muniens, ac forens, tulo, valuulis, palpis, loris,

- et amulo constans ( $t$ ).
a. Tubus. Theca cornea basis linguæ fulcrum, cuiriculas, laciniasque includens (u).
a. Fulcrum. Portio cornea cui insidet tubus ( $x$ ).
b. Airriculice. Valve dure membranacex, Melittis proprix, linguam apud apicem tubi munien$\operatorname{tcs}(y)$.
c. Lacinia. Sæpius quatuor, est ubi duæ, Abilus proprix, linguam apud apicem tubi vaginantes, in exteriores et interiores distincta.
*. Lacinice exteriores. Valvæ duæ, planiusculæ vel concavæ, biarticulatr, paulò infra apicem palpigere, linguæ apicem subtus munientes (z).
**. Lacinic interiores. Valvæ duæ sapius membranacex, que intra lacinias exteriores linguam amplectuntur (a).
( $f$ ) Tab. 12, \%*. f. I. ncut. fig. 1. (f) Tbid. f. i.
(r) Ibid. i. (s) Itid. $f$. (i) Ibid. $a, b, c, r, p, f, g, f$.
(u) luid. f. Tab. 1. *. b. ng. 1. a. (x) Tab. 12. ubi
supra, e. (y) Tab. 2. **. a fig. 1. dd. b. fig. 2. $a a$.
(z) Tab. 12. ubi supra, ${ }^{[ } g_{3}$. (a) Ibid. h h.

民. Fakula.
f. Valvuld. Laminæ $\int$. valvæ duæ apud basin tubi originem ducentes, et palpum e sinu laterali emittentes, in lasin et apicem divisæ (b).
a. Basis. Valvulæ pars cornea infra palpum, linguæ basin utrinque obvolvens, cardinem et pectinem includens (c).
*. Cardo. Portio cornea transversa inter basin valvulæ et lora interjecta (d).
**. Pecten. Setæ rigidiusculæ, incurvæ, quæ basis valvulæ apicem margine exteriori armant (e).
b. Apex. Valvulæ pars supra palpum, sæpe coriacea marginibus membranaceis, concava aut plicata, quæ linguæ apicem exteriùs convolvit, et, repositâ proboscide, apud sinum palpigerum inflectitur $(f)$.
\%. Palpi. Organa sæpius articulata, mobilia, sensifera, e vagina exorta, in palpos exteriores et interiores distincta.
a. Palpi exteriores. $1-6$ articulati e $\sin u$ laterali valvularum erumpentes ( $g$ ).
b. Palati interiores. 1-4 articulati ex linguâ paulò supra apicem tubi, vel ex laciniis exterioribus sub apice provenientes ( $h$ ).
8. Lora. Funiculi cornei membranâ connexi, qui-
(b) Tab. 12. ubi supra, $a, b$. and fig. 6. (c) Tbid. fig. 6. a.
(d) Tab. 13. fig.7. cc. (e) Tab. 12. ubi supra, fig. 6. c. Tab. 10. \%*. d. 1. fig. 1. c. (f) Tab. 12. ubi sup. fig. 6. bo
(g) Ibid. fig.5. Tab.8. fig.3.c. Tab.10. **. c. 2. 8. fig.3. a. 'Tab. 6. **. a. fig. 1. g. Tab.1. *. 2. fig. 4. d. (h) Tab.g. **. c. 2. $\gamma$. fig.5. b. Tab.5. **, a. fig.5. dd. Tab $1 . *$, a. fig.3. $b b_{\text {. }}$
bus insidet proboscis, et quibus retinetur aut immittitur (i).
©. Annulus. Gulæ ambitus quo terminantur lora ( $k$ ).

## II. TRUNCUS.

Intermedia pars corporis, collum, thoracem, scutellem, metathoracem, pleuras, pectus complectens. Artus ejus sunt alce et pedes.

1. Collum. Pars trunci anterior, quâ caput versatile est, collarem gestans (l).
a. Collare. Pars postica colli elevatiuscula, cui thorax annectitur ( $n$ ).
2. Thorax. Dorsum trunci suturis undique designatus tubercula includens ( $n$ ).
a. Tubercula. Puncta elevata duo, unum utrinque, sæpius apud angulos anticos thoracicos (o).
3. Scutellum. Trunci portio parva ponè thoracem, metathoraci sæpe immersa ( $p$ ).
4. Metathorax. Pars trunci postica, cui inseritur scutellum, et subnectitur abdomen ( $q$ ).
5. Pleura. Trunci latera turgida.
6. Pectus. Trunci pagina inferior cui inseruntur pedes, sternum complectens.
a. Sternum. Carina pectoris $\int$. processus corneus pectori immersus, inter basin pedum anticorum delitescens vix agnoscendus ( $r$ ).
(i) Tab. 12. ubi supra, fig. 1. dd.
(k) Tab. 13.
fig. 7. bb. (l) Tab. 5. \%. b. fig. 8. a. (m) Ibid. l.
( $n$ ) Ibid. e.
(o) Ibid. $c c$.
( $p$ ) Ibid. $f$.
(q) Ibid. g.
(r) Tab. 6. **, a. fig. 8. a.
7. Alce.
8. Alce. Volatûs instrumenta, apud thoracis sutu= ram lateralem trunco affixa, in alas superiores et inferiores distincta.
a. Alce superiores $\int$. anteriores includunt squamulam, anastomosin, costam, et nervos.
a. Squamula. Squama minutissima, cornea con-cavo-convexa, extrorsum rotundata, basin alarum superiorum muniens (s).
B. Anastomosis. Macula cornea marginalis, ubi inosculantur alæ superioris nervi $(t)$.
\%. Costa. Nervus validus marginalis (u).
§. Nervi. Alarum venæ.
b. Alce inferiores f. posteriores hamulos includunt.
a. Hamuli. Unci minutissimi in medio margine alæ inferioris, quibus alæ superiori, volante insecto, subnectitur ( $x$ ).
9. Pedes. Motûs instrumenta constant apophysi, femore, tibiá, manu, tarso.
a. Apophysis. Coxa biarticulata cui insidet femur, flocculum includens ( $y$ ),
a. Flocculus. Cincinnus parvus ex apophyse posteteriori exortus, quo pollen florum a Melittis quibusdam gestatur (z).
b. Femur. Pedis basis apophysi insidens (a).
c. Tibia. Pedis pars intermedia $\int$. crus, includens spinulas, scopam, et corbiculam (b).
(s) Tab. 5. *. b. fig. 8. dd.
(t) Tab. 3. **. b. fig. 5. b.
(u) Ibid. $a$.
( $x$ ) Tab. 13. fig. 19.
(y) Tab. 11. **.
e. 1. mas. fig. s. $a, b . \quad(\varepsilon)$ Tab. 4. **. c. fig. 10. $a$.
(a) Tab. 11. ubi supra, $c .1$ (b) Ibid. $d$.
a. Spinulce.
\&. Spinulce. Spinæ tenuissimæ, introrsum sæpius serrulate, tibiarum apicem intus armantes, velum complectentes (c).
a. Velum. Membrana tibix anterioris spinule intus annexa (d).
f. Scopa. Villi densi tibiam posticam sape vestientes, quibus pollen a floribus quasi verrunt, quod hisce villis involutum secum deportant (e).
\%. Corlicula. Pilorum incurvorum cilia, Api mellifica et Bombinatricibus propria, tibiarum posticarum e margine utrinque exorta, per quam cera retinetur, nec inter volandum amittitur $(f)$ 。
d. Manus. Pedis anterioris pars extima, articulata, palmam includens.
a. Palma. Manûs articulus primus elongatus, strigile instructus ( $g$ ).
a. Strigilis. Curvatura parva intus apud basin palmæ pectine sæpius instructa, cui ex adversa opponitur tibix anterioris spinula velata. His, sicut strigile, antemnas, ut opinor, detergunt insecta Hymenoptera ( $h$ ).
e. Tarsus. Pedum quatuor posteriorum pars extima, articulata, plantus et digitos complectens (i).
(c) Tab. 13. fig. 20. d. (d) Tab. 6. **. a. fig.\%.c.
(e) Tab. 4. **. c. fig. 10. $b$. (f) Tab. 12. ubi supra, fig. 19. bl. (g) Tab. 6. ubi supra, fig. 7. $a$, (h) Ibid. $b_{0}$
(i) Tab. 11. ubi supra, fig. 8. e, $f$.
a. Planta. Tarsi articulus primus elongatus, dilatatusque, scopulâ instructus ( $k$ ).
a. Scopula. Scopa parva setarum rigidiuscularum, quæ plantas intus vestit, præcipuè posticas, in Ape mellificâ insignis ( $l$ ).
f. Digitus. Tarsorum, item manûs, articuli uitimi quatuor, ungues et pulvillum includens ( $m$ ).
a. Unguis. Ungula digitos terminans et armans, unguiculis constans duobus ( $n$ ).
l. Pulvillus. Mollis digiti terminatio inter und gues ( 0 ).
III. ABDOMEN.

Pars corporis postica tergun ventremque complectens. Organa hujus mobilia sunt feminis aculeus, et penis maribus.

1. Tergum. Abdominis dorsum $\int$. pars supina, segmenta dorsalia, petiolum, basin, et anum includens.
a. Segmenta dorsalia. Tergi sectiones transversæ, ventralium segmentorum latera obvolventes, spiraculis pertusæ.
a. Spiracula. Pori laterales, in singulo abdominis segmento dorsali utrinque solitarii, per quos respirat animal $(p)$.
b. Petiolus. Pediceilus metathoraci basin abdominis subnectens,
(k) Tab. 11. ubi supra, e. (l) Tab. 12. ubi supra, fig. 20. ( $m$ ) Tab. 11. ubi supra, $f$. ( $n$ ) Ibid. fig. 9، aa. (o) Ibid. b. (p) Tab. 13. fig. 35, 36. a.
c. Basis

## TERMINTI.

c. Basis. Pars antica abdominis ex quâ oritur petiolus.
d. Anus. Abdominis apex genitalia exerens, fims briam, aculeum, et penem complectens.
a. Fimbria. Pilorum cilia densa anum vestiens, Melitiarum fanniliæ ultimæ propria $(q)$.
B. Aculeus. Instrumentum ovipositionis, et in quis busdam bellorum gladius timendus, valvas et vaginam includens $(r)$.
a. Valva. Laminæ duæ coriaceæ, quibus vagina retracta utrinque obtegitur ( $s$ ).
2. Vagina. Theca cornea spicula jaculans ( $t$ ).
*. Spicula. Aculei ipsissimi, intra vaginam retractiles, bini, filiformes, tenuissimi, apud apicemi hinc retrorsum serrulati, retinaculo instructi $(u)$.
f. Retinaculum. Squamula cornea, mobilis, quâ retinetur spiculum, ne juisto longiùs jacu. letur $(x)$.
$\gamma$. Penis. Genitale maris forcipem et phallum complectens.
a. Forcejs. Unci duo vel plures interdum internè ramosi, quibus mas corripit et comprimit anum femiriæ ( $y$ ).
b. Phallus. Organum masculum (z).
2. Venter. Prona pars abdominis segmenta vene tralia includens.
a. Segmenta ventralia. Ventris settiones transversm。
(q) Tab. 4. $\because$. c. fig. 1. a
(r) Tab. 13. fig. 27, 29,
(s) Ibid. fig. 27.vb. 28. aa,
(t) Ibid. fig. 29.
(u) Ibid. fig. 28. blb. fig. 3C.
( $x$ ) Ibid. fig. 30. $a$,
(y) Ibid, fig. 33. a a
(z) Ibid, $b$.
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## OBSERVATIONS.

LINNEUS, in the Fundamenta Entomologic, has given four primary divisions of an insect; but since those parts, which he has included under his division artus, are all attached to the truncus, it seems most natural to cousider them only as members of that part ; so the antenne, maxilla, labium, and prokoscis are included under the division caput, and the genitalia and aculeus under abdomen. I have therefore ventured, in this instance, to depart in some degree from the definitions of that admirable paper; and I do this with the less hesitation, since I have not been guided solely by my own judgment, but can plead the authority of Professor Afzelius, to whom I once shewed the outline of the above table, for this mode of division.

Facies. This term I have employed instead of frons, to denote the upper side of the head, using the latter in a more confined sense.
$\cdots$ Nusus. The part intended by this word, has been noticed particularly by no author, that I have had an opportunity of consulting, except De Geer, who mistakes it, in Formica, for the $\operatorname{lip}(a)$, from which it is very distinct, and Latreille, who names it le chaperon. It is often separated from the frons by a suture, and in some
(o) Tom. 2, p. 2. AIem. 18. p. 1056. Tab. 41. fig. 5. l.

TERMINI.
genera, the genuine Vespic especially (l); is very remarkable. Its situation is nearly that of the nose upon the human face, which circumstance induced me to give it this name.

Gula et Juguhum. These parts are both noticed by Reaumur (c), The bottom of the cavity of the former, he thinks, may be regarded as a kind of palate ( $d$ ).

Radicula. The first joint of the antenner, which I have denoted by this name, has been overlooked; in numbering the articulations of that part, by Linneus and most authors. De Geer has sometimes noticed, and at others omitted it $(e)$; though it exists in all Hymenopterous insects. The accurate eye of Reaumur discovered it, at least in $\mathcal{A}$. mellifica $(f)$.

Scapus. I have applied this term to the second joint of the antennæ, which has been usually denominated "antennarum articulus primus." Linneus occasionally distinguishes it by the name of lullus ( $g$ ). Reaumur calls it le fusean, on account of its fusiform shape in $A$. mellifica ( $h$ ).
(b) Panzer. Fn. Ins. Gern. Init. n.17. t.18. a. n.63. t.2. $a$,
(c) Tom. 5. Tab. 27. fig. 12. n, c. (d) Ibid. p. 335.
(e) He has noticed it in Furmira, \&c. Tom. 2. p. 2. Tab. 41. fig. 8. a. Tab. 28. fig. 9. a. and onitted it in Vespa, \&c. Tab. 27. fig. 5, 6. (f) Ubi supra, Tat. 25. fig. 4. 13. $l$.
(g) E. G. In his description of Scaralcous stercorarius, Fn. Suec. 388. ( $h$ ) Ubi supra, p. 327, 323.

Pedicellus. This joint is the pivot, turning in the socket of the scapus, upon which the remaining articulations taken together, here denominated the apex, sit, and by means of which they often form an angle with that part. Reaumur terms it le bouton (i).

Proboscis. This term, as I observed before, I have used to signify the tongue and all the machinery that belongs to it and its vagiria, in conformity to the practice of Linneus in Apis.

Lingua. De Geer sometimes calls this part "le lévre inférieur ( $k$ );". but certainly very improperly. It is possible that Fabricius might follow him in applying a similar term (labium) to the same part: In another place $(l)$, by this term the same author denotes the whole proboscis, expressing a suspicion that the central part may perform the office of a tongue.

Vagina. This term is designed to include every part, the office of which is to cover, defend, or support the tongue.

Tubus. This part is called by Fabricius the base of the tongue, but De Geer, in his account of the proboscis of the Proabeille, considers it as distinct, naming it the intermediate piece of the
(i) Ubi supra, Tab.25. fig. 4. 13. c. p. 326, 327.
(k) Tom. 2. p. 2, p. 1130. Tab.26. fig. 10, 11. bb, cc.
(l) Ibid. p. 112S. Tab. 25. fig. 12. aa, $b_{p} e_{\text {: }}$
sheath $(m)$. Swammerdam likewise names it the sheath of the tongue (n); and Latreille calls it la gaine. I think it ought to be distinguished from the tongue, though it includes its base, as it differs from it in substance, in this respect resembling the valvulce, and indeed performing a similar office.

Fulcrum. This part, upon which the tube sits, has been noticed both by Swammerdam and Reaumur, the former denominating it, as well as the cardines of the valvulc, "articulations ly which the proboscis is united to the head (v);" and the latter terming it le pivoi $(p)$.

Auriculce. De Geer has noticed and figured these in the rostrum of his Proakcille, and calls them "petites parties en forme de larbillons (q)." They are distinguished from the lacinice interiores of the genus Apis, by being usuaily lacerate at their apex.

Lacinisexteriores. These are to be met with in all the families of the genus Apis, the two first excepted, and in no other Hymenopterous insects that I know of. They are distinguished from the two first articulations of the interior palpi, to which they are analogous, by being flat, instead of cylin-
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drical, sometimes dilated at their base, and furnishei with a margin of membrane. By Swammerdam they are termed " the second pair of joints of thê. proloscis ( $r$ );" and by Reaumur "les demi étuis intérieurs ( $s$ )."

Lacinice interiores. These are peculiar to Apis, and embrace and defend the tongue where it enters the tube. They are called by Swammerdam " the third pair of joints of the proboscis ( $t$ ); Reaumur notices them as "piéces qui embrassent et fortifient la trompe (u);" Latreille, in Nomada, names them soies laterales.
$V$ vilula. These form the exterior sheath of the tongue; I have divided them into luasis and apex; which by Swammerdam and Reaumur seem to have been considered as distinct pieces. The former calls the basis, in conjunction with the tube, " the joints which form the lower part of the proloscis;" and the apex of the valvulæ " the first pair of joints of that part ( $x$ )." Reaumur denominates the latter "les demi étuis extérieurs," and the former "les tiges des demi étuis extérieurs (y)."

Pecten. This denotes the spines which arm one side of the upper part of the base of the valvules. These, as far as I know, are now first noticed.
(r) Ubi sup. p. 18. fig. 5. f,e. (s) Ubi sup. ee. (t) Ubi
sup. $k h$.
(u) Ubi sup. $g g$.
( $x$ ) Ubil sup. ac. qq.
(y) Ubi sup. fig. 9. $f ; f, k \hbar$.

Cardines. Thése intervene between the valvulæ and the lora, and seem to perform the office of hinges. They are mentioned by Swammerdam, as means, in conjunction with the fulcrum, by which the proboscis is united to the head. Reaumur terms them "filets tendineux par les quels les: tiges sont attachées à leurs appuis(z)."

Palpi exteriores. These are not noticed by Swammerdam, though his figure of the proboscis of the hive bee gives a rude sketch of them at $d$. By Reaumur they have been entirely overlooked not only in $A$. mellifica, in which they are very minute and consist only of a single joint, but likewise in $A$. violacea, where they are very easily seen and are sexarticulate. In his genus Proabeille he notices them, but there confounds them with the apex of the valvulæ (a). De Geer denominates them " les grands barlillons (b)."

Palpi interiores. These are called by Swammerdam " the two upper articulations of the second pair of joints of the proboscis (c)." Reaumur distinguishes them by the term " barbes" but he did not examine them so closely as might have been expected, for in his account of the proboscis of A. mellifica he represents them as consisting of from three to four articulations (d), when, in fact, they have only two. - His figures sometimes repre-

sent them accurately in this respect $(e)$. De Geer names them " les petits barbillons $(f)$."

Lora. These parts I have so named from their use, which seems to be to let out or pull in the proboscis; in the latter case, the angle on which the fulcrum of the tube sits points towards the breast $(g)$, in the other, towards the mouth $(h)$. These are named by Reaumur "les leviers (i)."

Annulus. By this term I distinguish the circumference of the gula, in which the lora terminate. The cavity of the former is the bed of the proboscis:

Collare. I have borrowed this term from Villars, the ingenious author of the Entomologia Europica. This part often requires distinct notice in the description of the Vespiform Apes.

Thorax. I have judged it best to confine this term to that piece which is terminated on all sides by the dorsal sutures.

Tuberculi. These, so far as I know, have not been distinguished by a particular name. They differ from the "punctum callosum ante alas" of Linneus and others, and are to be found in all the species of the two genera into which I have divided Apis; although in most, the Nomadie or Vespiform Apes excepted, not easily discoverable.
(e) Tom. 5. Tab. 28. fig. 7,8, 9, 12, 13. Wh. (f) Ubi sup. p. 1169 . Tab. 41. fig. 7. aa. (g) Reaum. ubi sup. Tab. 27. fig. 8. q. (h) Ibid. fig, 9. q. (i) Ibid. p. 334, Tab. 27. fig. 9. $r r_{\text {。 }}$

They are to be found also in many other Hymenopterous insects.

Metathorax. In this class this is so conspicuous a part, that I wonder no author has taken notice of it. It is separated from the thorax and scutellum by sutures, and, in some instances, might perhaps supply a good generic character.

Pleura. As the word costa, has been usually employed to signify the strong marginal nerve of the superior wings, I have fixed apon this to denote the sides of the truncus,

Sternum. In the genera treated of in this work, this part is immersed in the breast, and is not to be discovered without taking of the fore legs.

Squamula. Linneus in his descriptions notices the part intended by this term, sometimes simply as "punctum ante alas," and at others as "punctum callosum ante alas." It is a corneous concavo.. convex scale under which the base of the superio: wings plays.

Anastomosis. The term by which this part is denoted, in the Fundamenta Entomologice, is stigma; but as this is also employed to signify a par ticular spot in the wings of some Phalence, I thought it best to alter the term, and adopt one which I have seen used, I forget by whom, to denote this part, and which seems with more strict propriety applicable to it. Linneus, indeed, himself does not adhere to his own term, using often
punctum marginale, and sometimes macula margis nalis instead of it.

Hamuli. These are very minute hooks or crotchets, discoverable under a good magnifier on the inferior wings of many Hymenopterous insects, by means of which they are kept steady in flying. They have been noticed by no author, that I have an opportunity of consulting, except De Geer, and he observed them in no genus besides Formica ( $k$ ), in which they are not near so conspicuous as in Apis.

Apophysis. I find this term used by Schrank for the biarticulate piece upon which the thighs sit, and therefore I have retained it. Coxa probably might be a better term. De Geer calls the first joint of this part "la hanche ( $l$ )."

Flocculus. This woolly lock at the base of the posterior legs of one family of Melitta I find noticed by no author.

Spinulce. Linneus notices these occasionally, but as if they were peculiarities of a particular species only ( $m$ ), when in fact they attend the whole class. De Geer mentions them and calls them spines ( $n$ ) or spurs ( $o$ ).

Velum. This membrane, attached to the spine
(k) Ubi sup. Tab. p. 1171-2. Tab. 42. fig.3. cc.
( $l$ ) Ibid. p. 1147. Tab.32. fig. 12, a. , (m) Viz. Apis florisomnis. ( $n$ ) Ubi sup. p. (0) Ibid, p. $11 \%$ Tab, 41. fig. 12. $h^{2}$
of the anterior tibia, is figured though not particularly noticed, by De Geer ( $p$ ).

Scopa. This term, which is used by Schrank to denote another part, to which I have given its diminutive as a name, I have adopted to signify the thick coat of hairs which externally covers the posterior tibiæ of many of these insects, by means of which they probably brush the pollen from the flowers, and in which, when they have collected; they carry it.
$\therefore$ Corlïcula: Reaumur has noticed the fringe of hairs, which this term is intended to denote, from whom, indeed, I borrowed it. He says that it forms with the cavity of the tibia "une espéce de corbeille (q)."

Manus. The anterior legs of insects are dis tinguished from the four posterior ones by pointing towards the head instead of the aldomen, I have therefore denominated their tarsus by the term manus.

Palma. Planta. Digitus. The first of these terms I have restricted to the elongate joint at the base of the anterior tarsus or manus, and the second to the same part of the four posterior ones, em; ploying the word digitus to express the remaining articulations taken together. These parts in this genus, especially in the posterior tarsus, are so re(こ)
(p) Ubi.suy Tab. 32 fig. 11 interior part of $l$. (q) Ubi
 In markable
markable as to require a separate denomination, and as there appears to be a strict analogy between the planta or palma of these insects, and the dilated foot or palm in man, \&c. and the digitus and the jointed toe or finger, I thought it better to adopt these terms in preference to metatarsus, the term which Schrank has employed, but not with strict anatomical propriety, to denote this remark. able joint. Linneus, in A. mellifica, has mistaken the planta postica for the tilia.

Strigilis. This part, which distinguishes the base of the palma, and in Apis is extremely conspicuous, is a deep pectinated sinus. De Geer is the only author who notices it. He calls it simply a curvature, and its pecten "une frangé en brosse (r)."

Scopula. This is the name by which I denominate the hairs which cover the inside of the plantæ, called by Schrank scopa, and by Reaumur " la brosse (s)."

Pulvillis. I have seen this term employed to denote this part by some author, whom I do not fecollect: De Geer calls it "un petit mam. melon ( $t$ ):"

Valvie. These have been frequently noticed. Swammerdam calls them appendages of the sting;
(r) Ubi sup. p. 1170. Tab. 41. fig. 13. c, f, $g . \quad(s)$ Ubi sup. p. 330. Tab. 26. fig. 6, 7. 66.
(i) Ubi sup. p. 1147. Tab. 32. fig. 12. $n$.
and looks upon them as designed mercly for ornament ( $u$ ). Reaumur and De Geer term them demi-fourreaux $(x)$. Linneus, in his character of Ichneumon, calls them valves of the vagina of the aculeus. They are the covers of the geruine vagina.

Vagina: This is the part that generally goes under the name of the aculeus; but in all Hy -. menopterous insects, even lchneumons, it is no more than the sheath or quiver of the real aculei, as Swammerdam, Reaumur, and De Geer properly call it (y).

Spicula. This term I have borrowed from Virgil (z), to express the true aculei. These int Swammerdam are denominated "the shanks of the sting (a)." Reaumur and De Geer call them "des aiguillons (b)."

Retinaculum: This part of the spicilla, which was first pointed out to my observation by my in-
(u) Swamm. Explan. Tab. p. 20. Tab. 18. fig. 2. qq.
(x) Ubi sup. Mem.7. p.376. Tab. 29. fig. 1-3,7,9.10.cc. De Geer, ubi sup. p. 1129. Tab. 25. fig. 15. ff, \&c.
(y) Swamm. ubi sup. p. 20. Tab. 18. fig. 3. $a, l, c$. Reaum, ubi sup. p. 376-7. Tab. 29. fig. 4-6. $f$, \&c. De Geer, ubi sup, p. 1129. Tab.25. fig. 15. $a$.
(z) Illis ira modum supra est, læsæque venenum Morsibus inspirant, et spicula cxca relinquunt Affixæ venis. Georg. iv.1.236.
(a) Swamm, ubi sup. p. 20, 21. Tab. 18. fig. 3. $d d$, \&xc,
(b) Reaum, ubi sup, fig. 5. e, g. De Geer, ubi sup. cc.
genious friend Mr. Marcham, seems to have caught the attention of no naturalist besides himself, and the indefatigable Swammerdam, who calls them "cartilaginous processes serving instead of muscles to move the shanhs (c)." They seem to me rather designed to prevent them from being darted out too far.

Forceps. Swammerdam calls these hollow ap + pendages(d). Reaumur usually denominates them crochets $(e)$. De Geer une pince ecailleux $(f)$.
(c) Swámm. ubi sup. fig. 3. rrr.
(d) Ibid. p. 24, 25. ${ }^{\top}$ Tab. 21, 22. fig. 1. kk, \&c. (e) Ubi sup. Mem. 9. p. 51б. Tab. 33. fig. 9-11. cc. ( $\quad$ ( $)$ Ubi sup. p. 1130. Tab. 26. fig. $8,9 . \cdot a, b, c, d$.

MONOGAAPHIA

## APUNM $A \mathbb{N} G L I A E$

PARS SECUNDA.

GENERUM ATQUE FAMILIARUM CHARACTERES

TEADENS.

Unusquisque secundum linguam summ, et familias suas in nationibus suis. Cen. x. 5 .

## GENERA.

IN the preceding pages, I hopé, I have made it evident, that the characters at present in use to distinguish those insects, which Linneus considered as Apes, whether we follow his system or that of Fabricius, are not universally applicable to them : I shall, therefore, now proceed to offer my own ideas upon the subject, and to point out such characters as will most constantly distinguish the species they are designed to denote; which a close and frequent examination of the external parts of many individuals has enabled me to discover. But in order to prevent tautology, when I am drawing out the Natural Characters of my genera and families, that I may exclude from them such circumstances as appear to be common to all Hymenopterous insects, I shall previously attempt giving one of the Mymienoptera class.

## CLASSIS HYMENOPTERA.

## Character Naturalis.

CORPUS cute corneâ cataphractum.
Caput. Os proboscide 3-ヶ-fidâ, linguâ, ejusque
vaginâ, constante.
Lingua centralis, cartilaginea. Fagina 2-6-valvis.

> Taluule dur basi corner, e latere palpigeræ. 'I'ubus corneus.
Palpi quatuor, cornei, inæquales. Exteriores 1-6-articulati, e valvularum latere crumpentes; Interiores 1-4-articulati.
Vertex stemmatibus tribus lucidis (a). Maxilla transversæ, corneæ. Labium figura varium, proboscidem co~ hibens.
Truñus. Alce plerisque quatuor, incumbentes, membranaceæ, nudiusculæ, nervis sæpius validioribus interstinctæ.

Superiores majores, basi squamulà munitæ.
Inferiores margine anteriori hamulis haud rarò instructæ. Pedes sex, apophysi biarticulatæ articulis conicis insidentes.

Tilioe apice spinulis 1-2 armatr. Tarsi quinquearticulati, articulo primo sæpius elongato, extimo unguiculato.
Abdomen. Anus feminis et neutris aculeatus.
(a) In Formica and Mutilla, in most of our English species, the males and females, or winged sexes, only have stemmata, in the neuter they are obsolete; their place, in some instances, is - supplied by three points slightly impressed.

Aculeus valvis duabus, vaginâque univalvi spicula duo exerente, constans ( $b$ ).
When I first turned my attention to the subject of these pages, I thought of denoting all the species described in them by one generic character : but the more I studied them, the more strongly was I convinced that they belonged to two natural genera, essentially distinguished from each other; and this idea was further confirmed, when I found that Reaumur, and after him De Geer, had adopted the same opinion; although they did not sufficiently extend the limits of the genus, which they denominated Proabeille, for the insects that may be arranged under it are equally numerous with the genuine Apes. The characters which form the most striking distinctions of these two genera are furnished by the tongue; which organ, in the one, is short, flattish, usually acute with a lateral auricle, and not inflected; and in the other, elongate, slender, cylindrieal, and inflected. The first of these distinguishes the Proabeilles, or Apes minuis proprie dicter; and the other such as are genuine Apes.

De Geer has given the name of Nomada to those insects which, after Reaumur, he separated from
(6) Limeus, in his essential character of the genus Formica, colls their aculeus obsolete. De Geer represents the species of his first family as having no aculeus, and those of his second as armed with that instrument. Tom. 2, Pic. 2. Mem. 18.

Apis:

Apis: this name is also used by Scopoli; but as it has been usually employed by Fabricius and his followers to denote a very different family of $A$ Pes, the adoption of it might occasion some confusion. To avoid this I have called it Melitta, the Attic dialect of $\mu: \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \alpha$, the Greek name for Apis, which itself is pre-occupied in botany.

I shall now proceed to give the Essential, Artificial, and Natural Characters of both genera, beginning with
MELITTA. Character Essentialis.
Aculeus punctorins. Lingua apice brevis, porrecta, planiuscula, vaginâ subcylindricâ.

Character Artificialis.
Os proboscide subcylindricâ, porrectâ, linguam brevem, planiusculam, exerente.
Antennce mediæ, aculeatis subclavatæ articulis 13; maribus filiformes articulis 14 .
Oculi laterales, sub-ovales, integri. Alce planæ.
Aculeus punctorius, reconditus.
Character Naturalis (c).
Caput. Os proboscide subcylindricâ, trifidâ aut quinquefidâ.
(c) Tab. 1-4.

I $3 \quad$ Lingua

GENERA.
Lingua apice brevis, planiuscula, acuta ${ }_{2}$ vel acuminata, interdum sed rariis truncata, est ubi bifida; plerisque utrinque auriculata.
Vagina
Tubus apice tridentatus.
Valuulce lineares sub apice pal~ pigeræ, basi sæpe elongatæ, corneæ, apice breves, coriaceæ, inflexæ,
Palpi setacei.
Exteriores sexarticulati.
Interiores quadriarticulati.
Antennce mediæ, aculeatis breves, subclavatæ, fractre, articulis 13 ; maribus tenuiores, longiores, filiformes, vix fractæ, articulis 14 .
Oculi laterales, sub-ovales, integri, reticulati.
Tauncus. Alce planæ, cruciato-incumbentes.
Superiores subcuneiformes apicibus obliquis.
Inferiores hamulis instructæ.
Pedes cursorii, anteriores intermediis, intermedii posterioribus breviores.

Femora clavata.
Tibice clavatæ, subtrigonæ, extrinsecùs convexæ, anticis et intermediis apice spinulâ unicâ, illarum velatâ, posticis duabus, armatis.

Palme

GENERA．
Palma basi strigile intus instructre， segmento circuli dempto．
Planter，posticæ præcipue，scopulâ intus vestitæ．
Ungqees unguiculis bifidis in omni sexu．
AbDOMEn．Tergum aculentis sex segmentorum， maribus septem．
Aculeus sxpius punctorius，subulatus， retractilis．
Obs．Corporis pili plerumque plumosi．
Larea apoda，carnosa，plicata，supra convexa，subtus planiuscula，cel－ lulis subterraneis ut plurimum degens，polline antherarum melle mixto seppius enutrita． Pupa incompleta，folliculo inclusa． Imago mellisuga，sxpius pollinilega．

## Character Artificialis．

Os prodoscide fractâ，inflexâ，linguam cylindricam，elongatam，excrente． Antenux mediæ，aculeatis articulis 13； maribus articulis 14 ．
（d）The Hebrew name of the bee ホーブミ7，derived from 7 27 ，to speak，seems to direct us to the tongue for its Essen－ tial Character．
14
Oculi

Oculi laterales, subovales, integri.
Ale planæ.
Aculeus punctorius, reconditus.

## Character Naturalis (e).

Caput. Os proboscide elongatâ, fractâ, inflexâa 5-7-fidâ.
Lingua elongata, tenuis, cylindrica, sæpius pilosa, transversè striata. Vagina

Tubus linearis.
Lacinice plerisque quatuor.
Exteriores elongatæ, biarticulatæ, planiusculæ, paulò infra apicem palpigeræ (f.)
Interiores plerumque breviores, membranaceæ, linguam apud tubum amplexantes.
Falvulce lineares, angustæ, medio e sinu laterali palpigeræ, basi corneæ, apice sæpius coriaceæ, inflexæ.
Palpi Exteriores 1-6 articulati. Interiores 1-4 articulati.
Antennce mediæ, aculeatis articulis 13; maribus articulis 14.
Oculi laterales, subovales, integri, reticulati。
(e) Tab. 4-13. (f) In my two first families of this genus the exterior lacinix are wanting.

Truncus subglobosus.
Alce cruciato-incumbentes, planæ.
Superiores subcuneiformes apicibus obliquis.
Inferiores hamulis instructæ.
Pedes cursorii, anteriores intermediis, intermedii posterioribus breviores.
Femora clavata.
Tibice subclavatæ, trigonæ, extrinsecius convexæ, anticis et intermediis apice spinulâ unicâ, illarum velatâ, posticis duabus $(g)$, armatis.
Palma basi strigile intus instructæ, segmento circuli dempto.
Planta, posticæ præcipuè, scopulâ densâ intus vestitæ.
Abdomen. Tergum aculeatis segmentis sex, maribus plerumque septem $(h)$.
Aculeus punctorius, subulatus, retractilis.
Obs. Corporis pili plumosi.
Larva apoda, mollis, plicata, supra convexa, subtus planiuscula.
$P$ upa incompleta, folliculo inclusa.
Imago mellisuga, sxpius pollinilega, interdum cerifica.
That there is an essential distinction between Melitta and Apis, the above characters will, I hope,
(g) The posterior tibix of all sexes of $A$. mellifica are without spines. This is the only insect in the class Hymenoptera, that I have examined, in which this defect occurs.
(h) In the males of one family of this genus the seventh dorsal segment of the abdomen is usually obsolete.
satisfactorily demonstrate to the learned entomo logist; especially if he will take the trouble to consider attentively the set of plates belonging to each genus: and though the principal difference lies in the tongue, he will experience but little difficulty in determining to which any particular individual ought to be referred; for the long, inflected, cylindrical, and often subinvolute tongue of a genuine Apis, is usually very easily examined without the assistance of a lens; all that is necessary in most species is with a pin, when it is concealed by them, to lift up the valvulæ. In some species of Melittie, which seem intermediates of the two genera, the apex of these is nearly as long as the base ( $i$ ); and as the former are inflected, these might be mistaken for Apes; but the tongue will not be found inflected under the valvulæ. Indeed, a little practice will enable any one to distinguish the species of each genus, without even this trouble; especially when he becomes conversant with the characters of the several families into which it may be subdivided. I should recommend it strongly to every collector to take the pains to unfold the proboscis of such individuals as he may collect, this is easily done with a pin before the insect stiffens, and it may be made to continue unfolded by being set out, and its various parts separated, by pins or braces of card.

Bat though it is so easy to distinguish these two genera from each other, it may not be equally easy
(i) Tab. 3. **, c. fig.9. a.
to separate them, Melitta especially, from others. Had I thrown out the two first families of that genus, one of which has a bifid and the other a truncate tongue, all difficulty would have vanished, for the acute tongue of the rest furnishes a peculiar and striking characteristic: but as it was my wish to avoid, as much as possible, all unnecessary multiplication of genera, I was unwilling to do this, especially as these families seem more nearly related to Melitta in habit than to any other genus. The genera, to which by the form of their tongue they are somewhat approximated, are Crabro and Philanthus of Fabricius; but in Crabro the proboscis is shorter, triangular rather than cylindrical. The valvulæ are more dilated, and rounded at the apex, and the palpi are thickest in the middle. The eyes, likewise, in that genus are very large, subtriangular, and by no means lateral. The antennæ are anterior, and of a different form. Philanthus may readily be distinguished from those Melittoe which it somewhat resembles in the form of its tongue, by the hairy lateral angles of that organ. Besides, the apex of its valvulæ is not plicate, its body is without hair, and the sides of its abdomen are crenate ( $k$ ).

The only genus, I am at present acquainted with, which, like Apis, has an inflected proboscis, is Ammophila; but this is striking!y distinguished by its clavate tongue, bificl at its apex with acute
(k) Tab. 14, n, 5 and $\frac{7}{}$, compare with Tab. 1. *. a. b.
lobes. The apex also of its valvulx is semisagittate $(k)$; besides, its general habit will at first sight evince its difference from all Apes.

Having done with the generic characters of Melitta and Apis, I am now to proceed to the mention of those distinctions which divide them into families. In this part of my undertaking my aim has not been so much to fix upon artificial characters, which often disunite those insects which nature has put together, but to discover whether the all wise author of nature, who is a God of order, has not subdivided these genera, and impressed certain common characters upon such subdivisions, by which one who studies his works under no influence but the love of truth, and led by the single desire of finding out his system, might be enabled to arrange them according to their natural affinities.

My first step was to place together all those individuals, which appeared to me to agree in habit, adopting the sentiment of Linneus, that habit would often lend a clue to discover nature ( $l$ ). At first, of course, I made many mistakes, often placing, as all who, with Fabricias, rely solely on habit for the arrangement of species, will inevitably do, the males in one subdivision, and the females
(k) Tab. 14. n. 9, with Tab. 5-13.
(l) Halitus, uti in quadrupedibus distinguit feras a pecoribus quamvis dentes non inspicerentur, sic etiam in plantis sapius harum ordines naturales primo intuitu manifestat. Lin. Philos. Bot. § 163.
in another. By pursuing this method, however, I got my species into some order, and they were arranged, the above great mistake excepted, very nearly according to their natural affinities. I then proceeded to examine the proboscis, and external anatomy of those which were found to agree in habit, and by this method I soon arrived at their distinguishing characters, and was enabled to detect those marks, exclusive of the organs of generation, which are the constant characteristics of the males in these genera. I found that some of those insects which I had considered as belonging to distinct families, had invariably one joint more in their antennæ, and generally one segment more in their abdomen than others $(m)$, that their bodies were proportionably narrower, and their antennæ and legs longer and more slender. It soon occurred to me that these were only sexual distinctions, an idea which was confirmed by pressing the anus of such as I had an opportunity of taking alive, and inspecting their genitalia. The mistake above alluded to was in this manner rectified; and, instead of confusion, lucid order now took place in my arrangement. Thus, beginning with habit and
( $m$ ) Both these circumstances, with respect to some individuals in this class, hare been noticed by De Geer, but he did not follow up this discovery, and examine whether it would hold good in the whole genera. My observations were made before I was aware that this illustrious author had made the abore discovery. De Geer, 2. p. 2. pp. 772. 796.817.
ending
ending with anatomy and econiomy; descending from generals to particulars, and then tracing back: my steps from particulars to generals; using both the synthetical and analytical modes of reasoning; as mathematicians speak, by a series of observations and experiments, frequently repeated, I was enabled to trace the labyrinth of nature, and, by the assistance of this double flum Ariadneum, to establish my system upon a sure basis. I do not pretend; however, to have exhausted the subject, much will still remain to be done, and much improvement may be given to what is here attempted, by those who possess the opportunity of examining the exotic species of these two genera; but, I hope; I have opened the way for the discovery of the natural arrangement.

I shall first draw out a synoptical table of my families and their subdivisions, exhibiting at one yiew their Essential Characters, and next offer some observations upon each, with a general account of its history and economy, as far as I am at present acquainted with them, prefixing what may be called its Natural Character, or Habitus. To enable my readers to determine with greater facility to what division any particular insect belongs, in my Synopsis Specierum, I shall place at the head of each family an Artificial Character of it.

## FAMILIARUM $\int$. ORDINUM SYNOPSIS.

MELITTA. * Linguâ obtusâ.
a. Linguâ obtusâ, apice bilobâ ( $n$ ).
b. Linguâ obtusâ, apice truncatâ(o).

*     * Linguá acutâ.
a. Lalio inflexo, emarginato $(p)$.
b. Labio appendiculato, appendiculâ inflexâ $(q)$.
c. Lalio obtusangulo, tuberculo munito $(r)$.
APIS. * Proloscide laciniis exterioribus nullis ( $s$ ).
a. Antennis subclavatis in omni sexu $(t)$.
b. Antennis filiformibus in omni sexu $(u)$.
** Proboscide laciniis exterioribus instructâ $(x)$.
a. Palpis exterioribus 5-articulatis. Labio subquadrato $(y)$.
b. Palpis exterioribus exarticulatis. Latio anticè curvo (z).
c. Lalio inflexo, elongato (a).

1. Ventre femineo glabro.
a. Abdomine femineo conico, acutissimo ( $b$ ).
(n) Tab. 1. *. a. fig. 2, 3.
(o) Tbid. *. b. fig. 1.
(p) Tab. 2. **. a. fig. 4.
(q) Ibid. 뿌. b. fig. 4, 5 .
(r) Tab. 3. **. c. fig. 10, 11.
(s) Tab. 4. *. a. fig. 4. Tab.
2. \%. b. fig. 3. (t) Tab. 4. \%. a. fig. 8, 9. (u) Tab. 5. *.
b. fig. 16, 17. (x) Tab. 5-13. (y) Tab. 6. **. a. fig.
3. g. \& Tab. 5. **. a. fig. 7. ( $\approx$ ) Tab.6. **. b. fig. 4. d. \& fig. 6. (a) Tab. 7 -10. (b) Tab. 7 . **. c. 1. ©. fig. 11, 12. F. Aldomine
B. Abdomine feminco subcylindrico, obtuso (c).
4. Ventre femineo hirsuto (d). a. Palpis omnibus biarticulatis (e).
B. Palpis exterioribus exarticulatis( $f$ )。
\%. Palpis interioribus exarticulatis $(g)$.
§. Palpis exterioribus 4 -articulatis $(h)$.
d. Proboscide rectâ, apice subulato-conicâ; palpis exterioribus 6-articulatis (i).
5. Laciniis interioribus involutis, exteriorum longitudine ( $k$ )
6. Laciniis interioribus rectis, quàm exteriores brevioribus ( $l$ ).
a. Labio quadrato inermi ( $m$ ).
f. Labio emarginato, tuberculo munito ( $n$ ).
e. Proboscide subinvolutâ, palpis exterioribus exarticulatis (o).
7. Corpore villoso ( $p$ ).
8. Corpore hirsutissimo (q).

I could have wished that there had been more connection and harmony between the characters
(c) Tab. 7. **. c. 1. $\beta$. fig. 4, 5.
(d) Tab. 8. fig. 22.
(e) Ibid. fig. 2. d, f. fig. 3. c.
(f) Tab. 9. **. c. 2. $\beta$.
fig. 2. $d d$. \& fig. 4. (g) Ibid. c. 2. \%. fig. 3. dd. \& fig. 5. b.
(h) Tab. 10. **. c. 2. 8. fig. 3. a. (i) Tab.11. **. d. 2 ,
a. fig. 3. d. \& fig. 2. (k) Tab. 10. **. d. 1. fig. 2. bl.
(l) Tab. 11. **. d. 2. a. fig. 1. ff. (m) Ibid. fig. 5.
( $n$ ) Ibid. fig. 20. (o) Tab. 13. fig. 1. $k k$. fig. 4-6.
(p) T ~ 11, 12. (q) Tab. 13.
of the different families of Apis, and that it had been in my power to have drawn them all from rairations of the same part, but this was not possible, without doing the utmost violence to nature. To make this erident, to the satisfaction of the judicious naturalist, I will draw ont a scheme of an artificial division of the species of this genus, in which all the characters of the families and their subdivisions shall be taken from the exterior and interior palpi, and he will see what confusion will be the result.

APIS. * Palpis exterioribus sexarticulatis.
a. Palpis interioribus quadriarticulatis.
b. Palpis interioribus biarticulatis.
** Palpis exterioribus quinquearticulatis.*
*** Palpis exterioribus quadriarticulatis. **** Palpis exterioribus biarticulatis.
a. Palpis interioribus biarticulatis.
b. Palpis interioribus exarticulatis.
***** Palpis exterioribus exarticulatis.
This scheme looks rery fair and harmonous upon paper, but if we arrange our Apes according to it, our cabinets will exhibit a scene of confusion and discord. Apis violacea and its affinities will be separated from the Bombinatrices, to which they are most nearly allied, and be placed by the side of the Vespiform Nomadie, which they resemble in nothing but the number of the articulations of the exterior palpi: the whole natural family disy. tinguished
tinguished by an inflected lip, will be broken up, and Apis manicata and variegata will go into the same family with the Bombinatrices.

I shall now proceed, as I proposed above, to offer a few obscrvations on each family, with some account of its history and cconomy, preceded by a synopsis of its peculiar characters.

## MELITTA. *. a. ( $r$ )

Hujus Familiæ Aculeatis Corpus oblongiusculum, villosum; Capite trunci latitudine, subtriangulari; Proboscide glabriusculâ; Linguâ tubulosâ, bilobâ lobis divaricatis, apice laceris; Tulo conico, apice tridentato; Valvulis apice plicato, rotundato, margine cxteriori ciliato, basis longitudine; An mulo subrotundo; Stemmatilus in lineâ curvâ; Oculis distantibus; Labio anticè obtusangulo; Maxillis subedentulis; Antennis basi approximatis, scapo elongato, pedicello subgloboso, apice articulo primo conico; Trunco subgloboso; Pedibus, posticis præcipuè, polliniferis; Abdomine declivi, vel ovato, vel subconico, acuto.

Maris Corpus angustius. Maxilla apice bidentatæ. Pedes minùs villosi.

I have placed this family at the head of the genus because, in the form of its tongue, it approaches to Philanthus, as observed above, and also to Vespa. The shape of this organ seems
(r) Tab. 1. ※. a. Andrena, Fab. Latr. Des Alieilles dont les nids sont fuits d'especes de mentranes soyeuses. Reaum.
calculated to assist it in the construction of the membranaceous cells, which the Wise Author of nature has instructed it to form to receive its eggs. I have not been fortunate enough to meet with its nidi myself; but Reaumur has given a very entertaining account of them, which, as his work is not in every bodies hands, I cannot do better than abridge. It is contained in the fifth Memoir of his sixth volume, upon those bees "dont les nids sont faits d'especes de membranes soyeuses." From the figure which he has given of the proboscis and of the insect ( $s$ ), there can be no doubt of his intending an individual of this family. "They make their nests," this author informs us, " in the earth that fills the vacuities of certain stone walls : some of them choose a northern aspect sheltered by trees. These nests are cylindrical, and consist of from two to four cells, placed end to end, each of which is shaped like a thimbic, the end of the second fitting into the mouth of the first: the cells are not all of an equal length, some being five, others only four lines long: their diameter is about t̂wo lines. The cylinder usually runs in a horizontal direction, but sometimes, from the intervention of a stone or other obstacle, it takes a different course, so that the last cell or cells form an angle with the first: it is distinguished by transverse bands of different colours; the narrowest bands, which are at the junction of the cells, are white; the broadest, (s) Reaum. tom. 6. Mem. 5. p. 131-139. Tab. 12. fig. 1-13.
which
which point out their body, are reddish brown; between these are others, some inclining to red, and others to brown. The cells are composed of many layers of a very thin and transparent membrane; the red colour arises from the substance with which they are replenished; this is sometimes nearly liquid, at others it is merely a paste made of pollen and honcy. After the larva is hatched it soon innbibes all that is liquid, and when arrived at its full dimensions, it quite fills its cell : it resembles the larva of the hive bee. Whence these bees procure the membrane with which they form their cells our author could not ascertain, but he conjectures it to be a secretion of the insect analogous to what is used by many others for similar purposes." Thus far Reaumur.

Grew seems to have met with the nidi of one of these bees in a singular situation; the following are his words. "Another sort of wild bee with their bags. They are about half an inch long, of a cylindrical figure, very thin and transparent like the inner coats of the eye, admirably placed for warmth and safety; sc. lengthways one after another in the middle of the pith of an old elder branch, with a thin boundary betwixt each bag. The little bees are somewhat thicker than the flying ant, and their bellies marked with four or five white rings ( $t$ )."
(t) Grew's Rarities, §7. c. i. p. 154.

Willughby,

Willughby, also, appears to have found the nidi of one species of this family; for in his description of his "Apis sylvestris in terrá firamen sibi fodiens," in Ray's Historia Insectorum (u), he says, " mullas omnino mmphas imeni, sed cellas quasdam rotundas ex allà et tenui cute, in guitus mel densum sordidum ;" which words evidently describe the membranous cells of the insects of this family. His description of the individual seems to point out our Melitta fodiens, which I believe nidificates under ground. Of his insect he observes, "Multa simul halitant et foramina in terrâ fodiunt, terram egerentes ad modum vermium."

I have found the males of one species of this family fluttering about a southern bank, when the sun shone; but though I took some pains, I could discover no nest, nor a single individual of the other sex. I have seen only two species taken in England, but I believe there are several foreign ones: there is one in the Limean cabinet labelled Apis marginata, and I think I observed others in Sir Joseph Banks's collection. They appear with us in the autumn, about the time that Senecio Jacobea is in flower. Reaumur supposes that two gencrations of them are produced in the course of twelve months, from one spring to another.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
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$$
\text { *. b. }(x)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus sublineare, glaberrimum; Capite trunci latitudine, subtriangulari; Proboscide brevi, crassiusculâ, glabrấ; Linguâ brevissimâ, truncatâ, utrinque auriculatâ ; Tulo conico, apice tridentato, dente intermedio majori; Valvulis apice lanceolato, acuto; Annulo subrotundo; Facie maculatâ ; Stemmatibus in triangulo; Oculis distantibus; Naso distincto, planiusculo, apice truncato; Labio anticè obtusangulo; Maxillis apice bidentatis; Antennis pedicello, apicisque articulo primo, subconicis; Trunco ex ovali-oblongo; Alis anastomosi magnâ; Aldomine subconico, declivi, basi subretuso, supra gibbo.

Maris Corpus paulò angustius, Facies infra antennas albida aut lutea.

Historia et oeconomia adhuc latent. Imago vix pollinilega, odore Melissce f. potiùs Dracocephali Moldavici gratissima.

The present, as well as the preceding family, departs a little from the genuine character of Me litta, and it is not without some hesitation that I have retained them in that genus, the tongue in all the other families being acute. Hereafter, perhaps, when the class Mymenoptera comes to be more attentively studied and better understood, it may be found necessary to separate these two families from Melitta : in the mean time, as they
(x) Tab. 1. *. b. Hylaus, Fab. and Latr.
appear to be more nearly connected with that genus than any other, it seemed to me most adviseable to consider them as belonging to it, and connecting it with other genera. Two species of the present family have been figured by Panzer as Spheces ( $y$ ) ; but though their tongue bears some resemblance to that part in some of the Limean species of Sphex, or the Cratro of Fabricius, the proboscis, valvulæ, and palpi, as well as the cyes, and the antennæ with respect to their situation, are different, and are those of genuine Melitto. Linneus regarded the several species of this family, as far as he was acquainted with them, as mere varieties of Apis anmulata; but the cilaracters of families have so often been mistaken for diagnostics of a single species, as I shall have occasion to prove more at large hereafter, that this need not be wondered at. The dilated scapus of the antennæ, which distinguishes, in so remarkable a manner, the male of one species $(z)$, while the same sex of others have it not, must be the mark of more than a variety.

The insects of this family appear to be furnished with no apparatus for conveying pollen. They most commonly frequent the flowers of the different species of Reseda, and do not usually make their appearance till they are in blossom. When
(y) Sphex annulate, Panz. Fn. Germ. Init. n. 53. Tab. 1. and Sphex signata, ibid. Tab. 2.
(z) Tab. 1. *. b f s . S.

$$
\text { K. } \quad \text { pressed }
$$

pressed between the fingers, they emit a powerful, and at the same time agreeable, odor, resembling the scent of Balm, or rather Dracocephalum Moldaricum (a).
(a) I have often thought that if gentlemen, who amuse themselves with chemical experiments, would direct their attention to insects, it might lead to the discovery of some powerful medicincs. The variety of strong scents, which these little creatures enit, is wonderful. I remenber once, when I was walking with the ingenious Mr. Sowerby, we took a petiolated Sphex, ncarly related to the S. gilla of Villars, (Ent. Eur. 3. n. 23.) if it be not the same, and to the Cralro U flavum of Hellwig, (Panzer. Fn. Germ. Init. n. 17. tab. 20.) and were much struck with the very stimulating effluvia of æther which issued from it, when slightly pressed. This insect is extremely common upon unbelifirious plants, and might with ease be collected in considerable numbers. Few entomologists are ignorant that a delightful odor of roses is diffised by Cerambyx moschatus; this is sometimes so copious as to fill a whole apartment. Many Melitte, besides those of this family, havs a strong scent, in some apprcaching to that of garlick or onion. The same remark may be extended to a number of Ichneumons, which enit a most powerful, but at the same time not very agreeable, scent. A rost singular mixture of the odor of spices, with something indescribably fetid, proceeds from Stapiylimis Lrunipes, Fab. The universal use of Meloe vesicatorius, the most active of stimulants, is a sufficient and well-known pronf of the powerful effects which insects are capable of producing upon the human frame. A circumstance which ought to encourage us to inquire further into the viftues of which they may be possessed. The ancients seemn to lave had recourse to more than one species in medicine, for the Heliocantharus or Scarabaus solaris, which was probably the Scarabeus pilularius of Limeus, is said to have been a remedy in quartan agues, Gee Scapuix Lex. under $\mathrm{K} \alpha \alpha_{i} \alpha_{j}{ }_{j}$ :
**. $a_{\text {s }}$
H. F. A. Corpus oblongiusculum, subpilosum; Capite trunco latiori, rotundato; Proloscide angustâ, glabrâ ; Linguâ acutâ, utrinque auriculatâ ; Tulo conico, apice obsoletè tridentato; Valuulis apice brevissimo, obtuso, ciliato, intus fisso ; Palpis interioribus fractis, articulo primo longiori, arcuato, incurvo; Annulo lineari; Stemmatitus in triangulo; Oculis distantibus; Naso inæquali; Labio inflexo, anticè emarginato, setis ciliato ; Maxillis forcipatis, apice bidentatis dente exteriori longiore; Antemis approximatis, scapo elongato, pedicello subgloboso, apice articulo primo subconico; Trunco ovato; Metathorace ruguloso, inæquali; Aldomine subovato, supra gibbo.

Maris Corpus angustum, subcylindricum. Facies infra antennas tomentosa. Lalium angustius, anticè subemarginatum. Maxillo edentulæ. Antennce submoniliformes.

Imago pollinilega.
From an insect of this family Reaumur constructed the genus which he has called Proabeille. It begins what I regard as legitimate Melittoc, distinguished by an acute tongue, furnished on each side with a membranaceous auricle, the three last joints of the interior palpi forming an angle with the first. By the assistance of this tongue, as I
(a) Tab. 2. **. a, Proaleille, Reaum. Nomada, De Geer, Scop. and Fab.
conjecture, the individuals of this, and the remaining families of the genus, render even and smooth the sides of the cells which they excavate for their young, and besmear them with a kind of gluten to prevent their falling in. The Nelittce now before us, though possessed of all the genuine characters of that genus, have a primâ facie resemblance to Sphex, arising principally from the paucity of their hairs. This, probably, induced Linneus to consider one species as belonging to that genus. De Geer has given a figure both of the proboscis and of the lip of one of these insects $(b)$. They make their nests in bare sections of banks exposed to the sun and nearly vertical: these usually swarm with their little burrows, which they excavate, according to Reaumur, to the depth of nine or ten inches, and in which they deposit their egg, inclosing with it a small mass of pollen moistened with honey (c). They are common during the summer months.

> **. b. (d)
H. F. A. Corpus oblongiusculum, villosum; Capite trunco paulò angustiori, subtriangulari; Proboscide angustâ glabrâ ; Linguâ acutâ, utrinque auriculatâ; Tuto conico, apice tridentato dente intermedio emarginato; Valvulis apice bre-
(b) De Geer, tom. 2. p. 2. tab. 32. fig. 7, 8. l.
(c) Reaum. tom. 6. Mem. 4. p. 96, 97.
(d) Tab. 2, 3. **. b. Hylaus and Apis, Fab.
vissimo, obtusiusculo, ciliato, intus fisso; Palpis interioribus fractis, articulo primo longiori, arcuato, incurvo; Loris proboscilem longitudine æquantibus; Annulo lineari; Stemmatibus in lineâ curvâ; Oculis distantibus; Naso convexo, distincto; Labio anticè setoso-pectinato, appendiculato, appendiculâ inflexâ ; Maxillis apice bidentatis; Antennis approximatis, scapo elongato, pedicello subgloboso, apice articulo primo conico; Trunco sæpius ovato; Tibiis posticis scopâ haud densâ polliniferâ, spinulis scrrulatis; Aldomine subovali, ano rimâ perpendiculari, segmento ultimo minutissimo.

Maris Corpus cylindricum. Nasus apice plerumque albido, ant luteo. Latium angustum lineare, appendiculâ nullâ. Maxillce edentulæ, acutr. Antennce articulis subarcuatis. Tibia postica scopâ nuliâ. Aldomen lineare ano integro.

Imago pollinilega.
This family is distinguished from all others by some very striking peculiarities: the intermediate tooth of the tube is emarginate; the lora are as long as the rest of the proboscis; the lip, in one sex, is furnished with a singular appendicle; and the apex of the abdomen has the appearance of a cleft perpendicular to the horizontal fissure of the anus. The males are all remarkable for an elongate cylindrical body, and, as I observed before, have been considered by Fabricius as belonging to his genus Hylcous: they are extremely similar to those of the preceding family; but the extraordinary
dinary length of the lora, the different form of their lip, and the white tip of the nasus, will sufficiently point them out. The wings of some of the smaller species are most splendidly decorated with the hues of the heavenly bow. The insects of this, nidificate much in the same manner with those of the preceding family, in bare banks: it includes Hylcus albipes, arbustorum, abdominalis, cylindricus, annulatus, interruptus, and Apis subaurata and favipes of Panzer's elegant work, in the two last, which are of an aculeate sex, he has noticed the anal rima ( $e$ ).

$$
\text { **. c. }(f)
$$

H.F.A. Corpus oblongum, villosum; Capite trunci latitudine, nunc rotundato, nunc subtriangulari, depressiusculo; Proboscide crassiusculâ villosâ; Linguâ utrinque auriculatâ, auriculis linguæ lateribus sæpius perpendicularibus, unde has-. tata evadit, apice reflexo $f$. sursum plicatili; Tulo lineari, apice tridentato dente intermedio majori; Valuulis apice semicordato, acuminato, brevi, est ubi cultriformi, ciliato; Palpis interioribus fractis, articulo primo longiori, arcuato, incurvo; Annulo subovato; Stemmatibus in triangulo, interdum et in lineấ curvâ; Naso convexo, distincto; Labio
(e) Fn. Germ. Init. n.7. t. 15. n. 46. t.14. n.53. t.18. n. 55. t. 2, 3, 4. n. 56. t. 4. 17. (f) Tab.3, 4. **. c. $A n-$ drena, Apis, Nomada, Fab. Des Aleilles qui creusent la terre pour y faire leur nids. Reaum.
anticè obtusangulo, supra tuberculo munito; Maxillis apice bidentatis dentibus obtusis; Antennis pedicello subgloboso, apice articulo primo sæpius longiori, basi attenuato; Trunco subgloboso; Pedilus posticis basi flocculo instructis; Tiliis ultimi paris scopâ densâ polliniferâ vestitis; Plantis dilatatis; Abdomine plerisque ovali $f$. elliptico, ano rotundato, fimbriato.

Maris Corpus angustius. Caput sape thorace latius. Maxillce interdum edentulæ. Pedes et flocculo et scopâ destituti. Plantre vix dilatatæ. Aldomen sæpius lanceolatum, ano nudo.

Imago pollinilega.
The individuals of which this family consists are very easy to distinguish from those of any of the preceding. The proboscis is downy and thicker, the auricles are nearly perpendicular to the sides of the apex of the tongue, which, when the proboscis is folded, instead of retaining its clirection to the maxillæ and lip, as in other Melittce, or forming the exterior fold of that organ as in Apis, is reflected or folded upwards pointing towards the tube $(g)$, so as to form the interior fold, or that next the head: the lip in these insects is strengthened by a tubercle, the postcrior legs of the aculeate sex have a flocculus at their baze, the tibie a thick scopa, and their anus is covered by a fringe of hairs.

The species of this family usually nidificate under ground in a light soil, some choosing grass
(g) Tab, 3. **. c. fig. 5. b.
banks over which bushes are scattered, others bare perpendicular sections, Dut all secm to delight in a south aspect. They excavate cylindrical burrows from five inches to near a foot in depth, and of a diameter sufficient only for the Melitta to go in and out at. When they make these holes, they remove the earth grain by grain which forms a small hillock near the mouth; they sometimes run in a perpendicular, and at others in a horizontal direction. The cell at the bottom of these burrows, they replenish with pollen made into a paste with honey, and in this they deposit their eggs. The poilen they carry not only upon the scopa of their posterior tibiæ, but also upon their flocculus, and the hairs of their metathorax. I have often been highly amused with seeing the female sitting and sunning herself at the mouth of her burrow, while the male kept wheeling round and round her, sometimes very near, and sometimes at a distance, with great velocity. When the female has committed her egg to the pollen paste she stops the mouth of her burrow very carefully, to prevent the ingress of ants and other insects $(h)$. I suspect that Reaumur's Abeilles Tapissiéres appertain at least to this genus. His account of their mode of nidification is so very curious, that I cannot resist the temptation of inserting an abridgment of it, although I cannot find that any species, nidificating
(hi) Vid. Reaum. tom. 6. Mem. 4. p.93-96.
in the manner he has described, have been discovered in England.
" It usually excavates," says he, " its little burrows in a path-way to the depth of nearly three inches, they are cylindrical to within seven or eight lines of the bottom where the animal gives it a form which approaches to hemispherical. When the ingenious architect has given its little apartment its due proportions and dimensions, and made the walls even, for their covering she prepares a splendid kind of tapestry, selecting the scarlet flowers of the wild poppy for this purpose; from these, with great dexterity, she cuts pieces of a proper form and size, which she conveys to her cell, and beginning at the bottom, with no small care and skill, overlays the walls of the mansion, destined for the habitation of her future progeny, with this hanging, as singular as it is brilliant. Sometimes this covering not only overlays the interior of the cell, but also an extent of some lines round its orifice. The bottom is rendered warm by three or four coats of poppy leaf, and the sides have never less than two. The little upholsterer, having completed the hanging of her apartment, next fills it with paste made of pollen and honey to the height of seven or cight lines, and then, after committing an egg to it, she closes its mouth with earth so nicely, that it ceases to be distinguishable from the adjoining soil; but previous to this she pushes downwards the poppy lining till it com-
pletely covers the cell where her eggs are deposited (i)."

It is pity Reaumur did not give a more minute description of this ingenious little animal. He only informs his readers that it is a small bee, more hairy than Apis mellifica, with a body proportionably shorter, but nearly of the same colour. His figure conveys no adequate idea of it $(k)$. In my frequent walks in the corn fields in this neighbourhood, I have never observed the poppy petals with portions taken from them in the manner he has described.

The English species of this family are extremely numerous, and I have not hitherto been able to discover any clue for a natural subdivision of it: the last forty species are distinguished by white abdominal fasciæ. To this family belong Panzer's Andrena succincta, hirtipes, equestris, plumipes, Austriaca, lucida, nitida, derasa, vaga, aterrima, flavibes, licolor and hcemorrhoidalis; and his Apis pilipes, vestita, farfarisequa, varians, dumetorum, atra, albilabris, and Sphegoides (l).

$$
\text { APIS *. a. ( } m \text { ) }
$$

H.F.A. Corpus oblongiusculum, subpilosum; Capite trunco paulò latiori; Linguâ acutâ; Tubo
(i) Reaum. ubi supra, Mem.5. p. 139-149. Tab. 13. fig. 1-11. (k) Ibid. fig.5. (l) Fn. Germ. Init. n.7. t.10. n. 46.t. 15, 17. n. 46.t. 16. n. 53. t. 19. n. 56. t. 1, 2. n.64.t. 17-20. n.65.t. 19, 20. n.7.t.13. n. 55. t. 9.14. n. 56. t. 12 -14. 23, 24. ( m ) Tab.4. Apis. *. a.
subconico, apice tridentato dentibus æqualibis; Fulcro subtriangulari; Laciniis exterioribus nullis; interioribus lincari-lanceolatis, acutis; Valvulis apice lineari-lanceolato, incurvo; submembranaceo; Palpis exterioribus sexarticulatis, interioribus articulis quatuor, primo elongato; Stemmatilus in triangulo; Naso convexo; Lalio ovali; Maxillis edentulis; Antennis approximatis, subclavatis, pedicello globoso, apice articulo primo longiori, conico; Tiliis, plantisque posticis, scopâ polliniferâ; Unguiculis, in omni sexu, bifidis; Aldomine ovali, ano fimbriato.

Maris Caput anticè truncatum. Tilice, plantæque posticæ, nudiusculæ. Aldomen lanceolatum. Imago pollinifera.
The present family of Apes scems to form the connecting link between that genus and Melitta. Its general form and habit, its palpi, posterior legs, and anal fringe, evince its affinity to the fifth family of the latter; but its proboscis is that of a gentine Apis. It is distinguished from all the families, in both genera, by this singularity, that the antennæ of the males, as well as of the females, are subclavate. The number of species belonging to it, that I have hitherto seen, are but few, and I have only had an opportunity of inspecting the proboscis of a male: I had extracted that organ from the only female I ever possessed, but I unfortunately lost it before I could put it under the lens. This sex, in the woolly sovering of its posterior legs, resembles Melittc Swammerdamella, but its maxilla are without teeth,
and in general habit it so entirely resembles the males, which are indubitably Apes, that I have little hesitation in placing it with them in this family: of the mode of nidification of the individuals that belong to it I know nothing, having taken only a single specimen upon an extensive heath.

$$
\text { *.b. }(n)
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H. F. A. Corpus oblongiusculum, subvillosum; Capite latiori quàm longo, trunco paulò angustiori, posticè obsoletè obtusangulo, supra depressiusculo; Ore crassiusculo; Proboscide glabrâ incurvâ; Linguâ planiusculâ; Tubo lineari, apice tridentato, dente intermedio majori; Fulcro subtriangulari; Laciniis exterioribus nullis, interioribus subsetaceis; Valuulis apice lineari-lanceolato, concavo, acuto, submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ; Palpis exterioribus sexarticulatis articulo primo minutissimo, interioribus quadriarticulatis articulo primo elongato; Stemmatibus in triangulo; Oculis magnis, prominulis, fundo favoso; Naso convexo, distincto; Labio ovali, verticali; Maxillis edentulis; Antennis approximatis, filiformibus, rectis, articulis distinctis, scapo brevi, pedicello minuto; Alis corpore longioribus; Squamulis magnis, sæpius coloratis; Scutello tuberculis duobus plerumque munito; Tibiis posticis nudis; Unguiculis in omni sexu bifidis; Abdomine ovali,

[^6]foo ovato-lanceolato, glaberrimo, variegato, segmento ultimo minuto et fere retracto, ano setoso.

Maris Abdomen lanceolatum, segmento ultimo exerto.

Imago in aggeribus viarum ct foribus frequens obvia, non pollinilega, Tenthredinum tacito volatut notanda.

The gay colours which variegate the indivividuals of this family, in this respect so dissimilar to other Apes, and the want of hirsuties upon their abdomen, has occasioned them to be mistaken by some authors for Vespce. That they do not belong to the genus Vespa their proboscis and elongate tongue sufficiently evince, and the same circumstances clearly prove that, after Fabricius, who has arranged them with his Nomadce, we ought not to separate this family from Apis, A yast number of the species that compose it have, by many authors, been considered as nothing more than varieties of the Apis ruficomis of Linneus, who himself has led the way to this crror by confounding, at least two distinct species, in the description he has given of that insect. It has happened here, as often in other instances, that the distinctive marks of a family have been mistaken for indicacations of a single species; and the red antentro and ferruginous legs, which Limens sciected for the diagnostics of Apis ruficomis, are common to a great number of the individuals which this division includes: he has, however, considered

$$
\text { I. } 3 \text { Falri- }
$$

A. Fabriciana, ferrusinata, and cariosa, all of which, I believe, belong to it, as distinct species. All the Nomade of Panzer, N. scutellaris and crucigera excepted, are to be referred here.

The history, economy, and mode of nidification of the insects of this family; as jet remains a secret: they frequent warm dry banks, out of the holes of which I have often seen them issue. They seem to be furnished with no means of carrying pollen. Their flight is silent, unattended by any hum. Their eyes, when they are first taken, exhibit a remarkable appearance, through the external reticulated covering a surface of hexagons is visible, which kecps shifting with the light. This appearance is also observable in Apis Conica, and some individuals of other families.

* *. a. (o)
H. F. A. Corpus oblongum, villosum; Capite trunco paulò angustiori, rotundato, posticè obsoletè obtusangulo; Ore crasso; Proloscide subinvolutâ; Tubo lineari, apice tridentato; Fulcró elongato; Laciniis exterioribus corneis, articulo primo longiori, interioribus setaceis; Valvulis apice lanccolato-lineari, coriaceo, subplicato, linguam arcte amplexanti; Palpis exterioribus quinquearticulatis; interioribus biarticulatis; Stemmatibus in lineâ curvâ; Oculis prominulis; Naso convexo; Lakio concavo-convexo, subquadrato, verticali;
(o) Tab. 5, 6. **. a. Appis, Fab.

Maxillis

Maxillis dente obsoleto, laterali; Antennis filiformibus, pedicello subgloboso, apice articulo primo longiori, conico; Squamulis magnis; Tibiis posticis scopâ nullâ polliniferâ; Unguiculis integris; Pulvillo emarginato; Aldomine ovato, acuto, segmento ultimo minuto.

Maris Unguiculi dente interiori submembranaceo. Pulrillus integer. Alàs femine mas simillimus, et, nisi numero antcunæ articulorum, et segmentorum abdominalium, yix distinguendus.

Imago non pollinifera.
Of this family I have as yet discorered only a single English species, viz. Apis punctata of Fabricius; I have observed several exotic insects in Sir Joseph Banks's Cabinet which belong to it, as does likewise the Ápis luctuosa of Scopoli. These insects, aithough at first sight they appear very different, if closely examined will be found to be nearly related to the preceding family $(p)$. Their antennæ are similar, as are likewise their maxillæ, and their posterio: tibie are also without the polliniferous scopa.

Mr. James Trimmer has discovered both the sexes of $A$. punctata in the nidi of $A$. retusa. I. have observed it follow that bee into its burrows in gravelly banks in the spring; I have also seen it enter holes in clay walls which might probably lead
(p) An hujus generis? Lubenter ad Nuimadas proscriberem. Panzer, de Ape punctata, n. 35: t. 23.
to nests of the same insect. Ray suspects it to be the male of a bee, now known by the name of Apis pilipes $(q)$, but which is itself the male of A. retusa, Lin. and this probably from observing it enter the same nest. From all these circumstances, combined with the want of means to convey pollen, I cannot help entertaining some suspicion that this family contains insects, somewhat analogous to the Cuculi amongst the birds, which deposit their eggs in materials collected by more industrious animals for their own offspring. The analogy observable between the instincts of animals, which belong to different departments in Zoology, furnishes a field for curious inquiry hitherto little explored: I wish this hint may direct to thai subject the attention of some gentleman who possesses the opportunity of contrasting the modes of life of the different classes of animals.

The sexes are less easy to be distinguished in this, than in any family with which I am acquainted: the additional joint in their antennæ and segment in their abdomen, are almost the only notes of difference.

$$
\text { * *. b. }(r)
$$

H.F.A. Corpus lineari-lanceolatum, tomentosomaculosum. Capite lato, rotundato, trunco paulo angustiori; Ore crassiusculo; Proboscide rectiuse
(q) Hist. Ins. p. 243. Species ultima,
(r) Tab, 6. **. B. Nomada, Fab.

$$
\underset{\varepsilon}{c} u l a d
$$

cnlâ, glabrâ; Tulo lineari, apice tridentato dente intermedio majori; Fulcro elongato, subclavato; Laciniis exterioribus articulis æqualibus, interioribus brevibus, lineari-lanceolatis, acutis; Valvulis rectiusculis, apice lanceolato, obtuso; Palpis exterioribus minutissimis, exarticulatis; Stemmatilus in lineấ curvấ; Oculis magnis, prominulis; Naso convexo; Lakio anticè curvo; Maxillis edentulis; Antennis filiformibus, scapo brevi, pedicello minutissimo; Scutcllo tuberculis duobus; Tiliis posticis scopâ nullâ; Unguiculis integris; Aldomine conico, acuto, ano dehiscenti.

Mas adhuc latet.
The only species belonging to this family with which I am acquainted at present, is the Apis variegata of Linnens, a gay insect which Fabricius has arranged with his Nomada. It is, however, quite distinct from them, being furnished with exterior lacinix, which are wanting in them; its exterior palpi, likewise, consist only of a single joint and are very minute, so as not to be easily discoverable except under a lens. The spots which rariegate its body are produced by decumbent hairs. Its conical abdomen and dehiscent anus connect it with the family to which Apis conica belongs, but it wants the inflected lip. Though the females in some summers are not rare flying about warm dry banks, I never yet met with a male. Nomada crucigera of Panzer appears to be merely a variety of this insect.

$$
\text { **. c. 1. } \alpha .(s)
$$

II. F. A. Corpus lineari-lanceolatum subvillosum; Capite trunco angustiori, rotundato; Proboscide incurvâ; Linguâ planiusculâ; Tubo lineari, apice tridentato dente intermedio longiori; Fulcro elongato, subclavato; Laciniis exterioribus articulis subæqualibus, interioribus linearibus;' Valvulis apice lanceolato-lineari, concavo, submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ; Palpis omnibus biarticulatis, exterioribus acutis; Facie planiusculâ; Stemmatious in triangulo; Oculis distantibus, pilosulis; Labio inflexo, elongato, concavo-convexo; Maxillis apice dentatis; Antennis distantibus, filiformibus, pedicello, apiceque articulo primo, subconicis; Squamiuilis magnis; Scutello obtusangulo; Tiliis posticis scopâ nullâ polliniferâ; Unguiculis integris, pulvillo obsoleto; Aldomine recto, acutò f.acuminato, basi retuso, ano dehiscenti, ventre glabro.

Maris Unguiculi apice bifidi. Aldomen segmento septimo obsoleto, ano spinoso,

Imago vix pollinifera.
The individuals of the family of the first section, of which this is a subdivision, are invariably distinguished by one remarkable feature, the labium, or lip, is clongate and inflected under the maxillæ, (which are remarkably large and strong with several teeth at their apex) so as to defend

> (s) Tab. 7. **. c. 1. a. Apis, Fab,
the lower fold of the proboscis from all injury, when the insect is employing them; a peculiarity, which, at least in the leaf cutter bees, did not escape the accurate eye of Reaumur. "Elles ont toutes un trompe," says he, "qui pour l'essentiel est composée comme celle des mouches à miel, mais qui à son origine est recouverte en dessus et par les côtés par une sorte d'étui écailleux, qui n' a point été accordé à la trompe de ces derniéres mouches. Cette piéce sert à empêcher que la trompe ne soit trop rudement frottée par les bords de la piéce que lạ coupeuse détache. Elle a peutêtre encore d'autres usages: pent-être donne-t-elle plus de facilité aux dents pour couper juste; elle leur offre un appui, elle tient lieu d'une espece de petite table, d'une espece d'établi $(t)$." The males of this family are usually without the additional abdominal segment observable in those of others.

I have divided this family into two sections, the second distinguished from the other by a remarkable covering of hair for conveying pollen upon the venter of the female. The subdivision of the first section which we are now considering, is characterized by the conical and very acute abdomen of the female, with an anus not at all incurved, and by the singular spines which arm the anus of the males. These two sexes have been usually accounted distinct species, under the names of Apis conica and quadridentata; and all such insects as
(t) Reaum, tom. 6. Mem, 4. p. 122. Tab. 11. fig. 5-9.e. have
have a conic acute abdomen have been referred by most entomologists to the one, and those that have similar anal spines to the other. This is the effect of fixing upon such characters to distinguish a species, as are rather the sexual distinctions of a family or subdivision. I have seen more than one good species amongst the exotic Apes of Mr. Drury's museum : and there is another in Sir Joseph Banks's, that came from New Holland, with violet coloured wings, which appears to me very distinct, though Fabricius has given it as variety $\beta$ of Apis conica, Apis tridentata, and perhaps $A$. barbara of Linneus, belong to the present subdiyision. A. lidentata of $\operatorname{Panzer}(u)$, is the genuine A. conica of the Linnean cabinet. The $A$. conica of Fabricius appears to be the other sex of that species which in this work I have named A. inermis, Upon the mode of nidification of the insects that belong to this subdivision, I have nothing to communicate, nor do I recollect a single author who has given any account of it; for that Apis in Reaumur ( $x$ ), to which Linneus has too hastily referred as Apis conica, is the male of one of the leaf cutter bees, and belongs to the first subdivison of the second section of this family.

$$
\text { * *. c. 1. } \beta .(y)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus lineare, cylindricum, subvillosum; Capite trunco angustiori, rotundato; Pro-
(u) Fn. Germ. Init. n. 59. t. 7.
( $x$ ) Tom. 6. Mem. 4. p. 121. Tab. 11. fig. $4 . \quad(y)$ Tab. 7. **. c. 1. $\beta$.
boscide
boscide incurvâ; Tubo lineari, apice dentibus lateralibus obsoletis; Fulcro elongato, subclavato; Laciniis exterioribus articulis subæqualibus, interioribus brevibus, setaceis; Valvulis apice linearilanceolato, concavo, submembranaceo, lineâ intermediâ, longitudinali, corneâ; Palpis omnibus biarticulatis; Stemmaiibus in triangulo; Lakio elongato, inflexo, concavo-convexo; Maxillis apice dentatis; Antennis filiformibus, pedicello, apiceque articulo primo, subconicis; Scutello, subprominulo obtuso; Tilizis posticis scopâ nullâ polliniferâ; Unguiculis apice bifidis; Aldomine incurvo, ano obtuso, subdehiscenti, ventre glabro.

Mas adhuc latet.
The insects included in this subdivison, differ principally from those of the preceding in the form of their abdomen; which, instead of being conical and very acute, is cylindrical and obtuse: the claws also in the aculeate sex are bifid. Whether the anus of the males is armed with spines or not I cannot tell, having never taken an individual of that sex belonging to this subdivision; and of the other sex I have only met with three specimens. I had originally included the two species that I possess in the last subdivision of my second section of this family, mistaking them for male insects; but when I found that they were females, that their exterior palpi consisted only of two joints, and that the under side of their abdomen was without hair, I was under the necessity of forming
a subdivision to include them. Upon their ecos nomy and history I can say nothing.

$$
\text { **. c. 2. } \alpha .(z)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus oblongum, villosum; Capite trunci ferè latitudine, rotundato; Linguâ subinvolutâ; Tubo apice tridentato dentibus æqualibus; Laciniis exterioribus articulis æqualibus; interioribus brevibus, acutis; Valvulis apice lanceolatolineari, concavo, incurvo, submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ; Palpis omnibus biarticulatis; Facie planiusculâ; Stemmatibus in triangulo; Lalio inflexo, elongato, concavo-convexo; Maxillis prominentibus, validissimis, apice dilatatis et dentatis; Antennis subfiliformibus, pedicello teretiusculo, apice articulo primo subconico; Tibiis posticis scopâ, haud densâ, polliniferâ; Plantis dilatatis; Unguiculis latere interiori denticulo armatis. Abdomine horizontali vel ascendenti, basi retuso, tergo planiusculo, yentre lanâ densâ polliniferấ vestito.

Maris Planta angustiores. Unguiculi apice bifidi. Anus obtusus, incurvus, interdum emarginatus, segmento ultimo minuto, inflexo.

The second section of this family includes all those insects the under side of whose abdomen, in the aculeates, as clothed with a coat of hairs, usually very thick, and set like those of a brush, involved in which they convey the pollen to their cells. The
(i) Tab. 8. Andrena, Apis, Fab. Coupeuses de feuilles, Reaum.
individuals
individuals of its first subdivision are distinguished by biarticulate exterior and interior palpi, and a horizontal abdomen, flattish above, or not so convex as in the other subdivisions, which the insect will sometimes elevate so as to form an obtuse angle with thorax. The entertaining history of the insects that form this subdivision has attracted the attention of many naturalists: so early as the year 1670 it was noticed by Ray, Dr. M. Lister, Willughby, and Sir Edward King (a). The Divine Wisdom has instructed these insects to form very wonderful cells for their young of singular materials, the leaves of trees, especially the rose, from which circumstance they have been known by the name of leaf cutter bees. (coupcuses de feuilles. Reaum). Reaumur has given a very particular account of their history, preceded by a humorous story of the alarm spread by the discovery of their nidi in a country village in France. This story is so admirably abridged in a paper, entitled, miracula insectorum in the third volume of the Amonitates Academica, that I think my readers will not be displeased at my inserting it here.
" De hortulano historiam Nob. Reaumur, Galliæ decus, adfert, qui hortum fodiens plurimos invenit centunculos adeò mirificè convolutos, ut vi naturale extitisse nunquam sibi imaginari posset,
(a) Ray's Letters, p. 72-74. Histor. Insect. p. 245. Philosoph. Transact. abridged, by Lowthorp, vul. 2. chap. 6. §. 17. p. 1-4.
potiùs credens sagas vel aniculas quasdam veneficas veneficium hoc, ad prædium incolasve prædii lædendum, defodisse: Nudis manibus cos minimè tangere audebat, sed manicis munitus vicinis suis ostensurus colligit, qui non nisi magias esse horribiles cum eo concinnebant. Anxius itaque sacerdotem adit, ei affatus lamias vel magas in ecclesiâ ejus reperiri, quæ insidias prædio pararent. Sacerdos timore perculsus, se de ejusmodi nodis magicis legisse, eos verò nunquam antea vidisse, confitebatur; signoque crucis ter quaterque posito, hortulanum ad dominum suum, Parisiis degentem, proficisci desperatus suadet, ut hosce repræsentando, ab omni culpâ venturì mali liberatus esset. Parisios ille petens, pallido colore et sono rauco, quæ invenerat patrono indicat, qui horum ignarus chirurgum suum consulit; sed nee is ulteriore cognitione instructus erat; conveniunt ea propter ut sententiam peterunt experientissimi physici Dni. Nollet, qui advocatus horum visu lætebatur, et similes adferens; centunculos illos dicit esse domicilia insectorum, unumque eorum aperire incipit, cum capilli hortulani præ timore erigebantur, metuendo aliquid mali eis certo contingere. Absque periculo autem D . Nollet embryonem apis, quæ de foliis roseis nidum condiderat, detrahit; et sic tota magia in naturale domicilium innocentis apis, commutata fuit (b)."

It has often happened in natural history, and more particularly in entomology, that characters
(b) P. 319-20.
and modes of life have been regarded as peculiar to a single species, which, in fact, are the prominent features of a family, or a subdivision. This, as I have just had occasion to observe, has happened to those Apes, whose acculeates are distinguished by a conical and very acute abdomen: the same error has taken place in the present subdivision, for all those Apes which construct centunculi, or cases made of the leaves of trees, to receive their eggs; have been looked upon by Linneus, and most writers, as varieties of one species, which that great naturalist has named $A$. centuncularis, and denoted it chiefly by the orange coloured hairs which cover the under side of its abdomen, a character which it possesses in common with a large number of species in this family. A similar mode of nidification may be, and indeed very often is, the characteristic of a family or genus rather than a species: thus, the cells of the different species of the Bombinatrices are composed of similar materials and resemble each other in form; and the various genuine species of the genus Vespa construct cells, for the most part, of the same figure, and employ the same kind of materials $(c)$; the mode of nidification, therefore, should never be assumed as characteristic of a species, but after the most mature consideration, and the closest and most attentive investigation of its history, economy, \&-c. for it generally happens that those insects which agree together in

[^7]habit,
habit, and belong to the same natural divisions of subdivisions of a genus, are connected likewise by their mode of life. As to characters, before any particular one is selected for the definition of $a$ species, inquiry should first be made whether it may not be a sexual distinction common to many individuals. But the science of entomology is far behind botany; in innumerable instánces we are at a loss to discover and discriminate the sexes. The present work, I flatter myself, may contribute to remove some of the difficulties which stand in the way of our attaining this knowledge. The sexes of the two genera, to which these pages are devoted, may now be detected with ease; and, perhaps; the discovery of a similar circumstance may enable some future entomologist to point out the sexes in all the classes of insects. If some of the largest and most common individuals in each were dissected, and examined with sufficient attention, probably this desideratum might soon be attained. But to return from this digression.

The aculeates in this family furnish no very striking and prominent features for specific definitions, they are so extremely similar to each other, that it iṣ not wonderful that they have been so much confounded, but this difficulty is, in a great degree, removed by the males, which will supply the describer with some very strong characters. Thus, the male of the genuine Apis centuncularis, which makes its centunculi of rose leaves;
leaves, has an entire anus, while that of the species, which perforates the oak or elm, is emarginate ( $d$ ). Several are distinguished by the remarkable form of the fore leg, especially the paim, which is dilated and singularly ciliated on one side (e) ; the males that exhibit this peculiarity, have been all confounded under the name of $A$. lagopoda. This; conformation, however, of the fore leg is common to several distinct species, which are separated froni each other by very striking differences. The genaine $A$. lagopoda of the Limean cabinet is larger than any other that I have seen, with filiform antennæ, and posterior tibiæ very large and incrassate. A small one that stands by this, as a variety, in the same caimet, seems distinct; it is black, less hairy, and its tibiæ are proportionably smaller, it may be the $\mathcal{A}$. lagopodit of Panzer $(f)$. The male of the willow bee, so well known to English naturalists, which is the only male, of this description, that I have known taken in England, is distinguished from both these by its capitate antemnæ, like those of a Papilio $(\mathrm{g})$. The male of that species, the centunculi of which so alarmed the poor gardener and the priest, as described by Reaumur, has the same kind of fore legs, and is also remarkable for a quadridentate anus ( $h$ ). This is the insect referred to by Linneus as Apis conica. The male
(d) Tab. 8. fig. 25, 26.
(e) Ibid. fig. 25. g.
(f) Fn. Insect. Germ. n. 55. t. 7. (g) Tab. 8. fig. S. a.
(h) Tom, 6. Mcm. 4. Tab. 11. fig. 13-16.
of Andrena bidentata of Fabricius, is another very distinct species of this kind, which I have seen in Sir J. Banks's cabinet. Of this, that author observes, "Nidum in muris e foliis arborum convolutis struit (i);" from which circumstance, it is evident, that its female is one of the centunculares. I have another exotic male, given me by Mr. Sowerby, which comes very near this, if it be not the same insect.

Reaumur informs us, that he was acquainted with five species which construct their nests in this way, and he suspects that there are many more ( $k$ ). All those, to which he had attended, lodged their centunculi under ground ( $l$ ). Geoffroy represents his $A$. centioncularis as making its nests in the trunks of decaying trees $(m)$. This is the case with three at least of our English species; two of them, I believe, nidificate under ground ( $n$ ). These reasons, I hope, will justify me sufficiently for having made so many species out of what before had been accounted only one.

I shall now abridge Reaumur's interesting account of the history of these most ingenious insects, and add to this what I have been able to collect from other quarters.
"The nests they construct," our author informs us, " are cylindrical, sometimes of the length of
(i) Ent. Syst. Em, n. 27 .
(k) Reaum. ibid. p. 119-20.
(l) Ibid. p. 123. (m) Hist. Ins. tom. 2. p. 410 . n. 5.
(n) Viz. Apis circumcincha and ranthomelana of this work.
six inches, and composed entirely of the leaves of the rose and other trees. They consist usually of six or seven cells ; cach cell is shaped like a thimble, the conve:: end of the second fitting closely into the open end of the first, the third into the second, and so on with respect to the rest. Although these cells are honey tight, which is sometimes found in them in a liquid state, yet the portions of leaf of which they are made are not glued together, neither is there any other art used to fasten them, than what appears in the nicety with which they are adjusted to each other. The interior surface of each cell consists of three pieces of leaf of equal size, narrow at one end, but growing gradually wider towards the other, where the width equals half the length. One side of each of these pieces is the serrate margin of the leaf from which it was taken. In forming the cell, the pieces of leaf are made to lap one over the other, so that the serrate side is kept on the outside, and that which bas been cut, within: thus a tube is first formed, and in this way it is coated with three or four layers (o), the exterior covering being made of larger pieces than the interior. In coating, the provident little animal is careful to lay the middle of each piece of leaf over the margins of those that form the first tube; thus the junctions are covered and strengthened. At the closed end, or narrow extremity of the cell, the leaves have a bend given
(o) Sometimes there are more, K .
them so as to form a convex termination : when a cell is formed in this manner, her next care is to fill it with honey and pollen, which make a rosecoloured paste or conserve $(p)$ : when it is filled to within about half a line of the orifice, she deposits her egg in it, and closes it with three pieces of leaf $(q)$, whicli are so accurately circular, that a pair of compasses could not define their margin with more truth: these coincide exactly with the walls of the cylindrical cell, and are retained in their situation by no gluten, but merely by the nicety of their adaptation. After this covering is fitted in, there remains still a concavity which receives the convex end of the succeeding cell. In this manner the patient and indefatigable little animal proceeds, till she has completed her cylinder of six or seven cells. This cylinder is coated externally by other pieces of leaf of larger dimensions than those used in making the cells, and of a different form, for they are nearly oval ; those at the ends are bent inwards, to cover each extremity. These nests are usually made in fistular passages, which these indefatigable creatures bore under ground, in a horizontal direction: their diameter is exactly that of the cylinder, to which indeed they give its form, and their bend to the pieces
(p) They usually collect their honey and pollen from the thistles and Onopordum, the pollen of which is rose-coloured, K .
(q) I have taken nine of these covers from the mouth of a cell of $A$. ligniseca, K.
that compose it. If, by any accident, their labour is interrupted or their edifice deranged, it is astonishing with what persevering patience they set themselves to put all things again to rights.
" The mode in which they cut the pieces of leaf, of which their nests are made, descrves particular notice. Nothing can be more expeditious; they are not longer about it than we should be with a pair of scissars. When one of these bees select's a rose bush with this view, sl.e does not immediately alight upon it, but keeps hovering over, and flying round it , for some moments, as if reconnoitring the ground to discover the spot best adapted to her purpose. Whien she has chosen a leaf, she alights upon it, sometines taking her station on its upper surface, sometimes undemeath it, and at others upon its edge, so that the margin passes between her legs. Her first attack, which is generally made the moment she alights, is usually near the footstalk, her head being turned towards the apex. Now and then, however, she places herself near the apex, facing the footstalk. As soon as she has made a beginning, slie continues cutting, with her strong maxillæ, without intermission, till she has finished her work. As she proceeds, she keeps the margin of the detached part between her legs, those of one side being above and the other below it, so that the section keeps giving way to her, and does not interrupt her progress. She makes her incision in a curve line, м 3 approach-
approaching the rachis at first, but when she has reached a certain point, she keeps receding from it towards the margin, still cutting in a curve. When she has nearly detached the portion she has been employed upon from the leaf, she balances her little wings for flight, lest its weight should carry her to the ground, and the very moment it parts from its parent stock, she flies off with it in triumph; the detached portion remaining bent between her legs, and being perpendicular to her body. She pursues the sams mode whatever be the form or size of the piece necessary for her purpose.
"The larvæ of these bees do not differ from those of the hive bee; when arrived at their full size, they spin a cocoon of silk, thick and solid, which they attach to the sides of their cell. The outside of this cocoon is covered with coarse brown silk, but its interior is lined with very fine threads cf silk of a whitish colour and close texture, which shine like satin. These larvæ are exposed to the attacks of some Dipterous insect, which makes its way into the cells and there deposits its eggs." Thus far from this illustrious author $(r)$.

I cannot help suspecting that, in this account, he has fallen into one error, with respect to the little animals mode of building her cylindrical nest, for he seems to think that the cells are first made, and then their exterior covering : but if we con?
(r) Reaum, tom. 6. Mem. 4, p. 97-124.
sider all circumstances, that the nest takes its form, and the leaves that compose it their bend, from the tubular passage in which it is built; it seems not possible that the interior part should be first formed, for in this case the tube, composed of the three first pieces of leaf, must be smaller than the mould in which it is made, and then how could these retain the bend the insect gave them, and without any gluten adhere together before they grew știff? As soon as the little animal quitted them, they would lose the form she had given them, and fly to the sides of the passage. Besides, supposing this not to take place, how could she get between the cells, and the sides of the passage, to lay on the exterior coat of the cylinder? It is most natural to suppose that this is first formed, taking its figure from the pipe in which it is built, and the interior part last.

I shall next insert an extract from a letter of my venerable friend, the Rev. George Ashby, of Barrow in Suffolk, well known as a learned antiquarian, addressed to a gentleman who had sent him a specimen of the nest of the Willow Bee. c "The curious specimen you obliged me with yesterday is the workmanship of a small taper bee, velvetty or hairy all over, black on the back, and yellow or tawney beneath. Limneus calls it centuncularis, from the patch-work case or coverlit which it makes to lodge its eggs, and future grubs or maggots in : it seems there are two sorts of M. 1 them;
them; at least as to disposition and economy: that best known bores its fistular passage under ground, and there constructs its cases.
"The cases look like pellets from pop-guns, ar small rockets made on a mandrill in an hollow tubular mould, $\frac{7}{x}$ of an inch long, or near inch; more than inch round. Each end is covered with a circular piece of leaf of the proper size, and is alternately convex and concave; and so inosculates closely that the junction is hatily preceptible. I started a difficulty yesterday, how the first laid egg, after being a maggot, and a chrysalis, and last of all a bee, got out through all the superincumbent houses, whose inhabitaints were not yet ready to quit them. But nature is nerer to be caught at fault, and the lowest and first born passes out through the bottom of its own (lowest) cell, and so escapes without disturbing any of the rest, who are not yet ready to emigrate: when they are, they do the same successively, and pass on through the empty cases of their predecessors, till they reach day-light; and a long journey the last hatched must have: and if only the mother bee makes the original pipe, considering the quantity you mentioned, how vast is such a little creature's labour.
" After boreing the hole, the bee who works in the center, and consequently may be considered as the mandril, or rather as the paperer, lines the insinde of the wooden pipe with rose leaves; and
every now and then, at stated distances, finishes her work with a covering, and so proceeds."

I shall next transcribe the account given by Mr . Willughby of the nidification of the same bee from Ray's Historia Insectorum (s).
"Thecas cylindraceas e segmentis foliorum rosaceorum artificiqee convolutis et agglutinatis efformant hæ Apes: Anglicè Cartrages dici possunt, ab exactâ similitudine quam habent cum papyraceis involucris pulvere pyrio repletis pro bombardis majoribus. Figurà sunt cylindraceâ, basi rotundiusculâ et parum convexâ, summitate e contra excavatâ, longæ $\frac{5}{8}$, diametro $\frac{3}{8}$.
"In salicum trancis jam mollibus et putrescentibus varios effodiunt cuniculos cylindraceos exactè æquales capsulis jan descriptis. Foramina isthæc vel sursum, vel deorsum tendunt, secundum pectines seilicet seu fibras ligni, nunquam transversim. Multa horum foraminum communem habent introitum, per quem Apis ingreditur et egreditur cùm cuniculos dentibus erodit. In cunuculi fundo infima, (vel quando cuniculi sursum tendunt) suprema capsula locatur, et exactissimè spatium implet, fundo seu convexâ extremitate capsulæ fundo cuniculi adjacente. Hujus (capsulæ) summitati concavæ alterius convexus fundus arctè applicatur, et sic deinceps, ita ut 5, 6, vel 7, in uno cuniculo inveniantur capsulæ, aliæ aliis superimpositæ. Capsulæ implentur crasso, rubenti, acido et (s) P. 245.
grave-olente liquore, syrupi violacei aut conservæ rosarum rubrarum ferè colore, cui innatat nympha ab ovo quod ibi deponit Apis orta, quæ usque ad mutationem liquore illo vescitur, jamque mutatura thecâ se includit. Nymphæ $\frac{3}{4}$ tas unciæ longæ sunt, plusquam $\frac{1}{4}$ tam latæ, rugosæ, colore albo, forcipibus nigricantibus, capitibus fere eruciformibus. Infimæ apes semper seniores sunt et majores; foramini seu exitui proximæ minores et juniores, sed omnes simul efformantur, et calor irritat ad exitum foramini proximas. Per integrum ferè annum in capsulis latent."

Can we consider this curious history without adoring that divine wisdom which teaches these diminutive creatures to provide in so wonderful a manner for the security and sustenance of their young? Who is it that instructs them to bore a fistular passage either under ground or in the trunk of a tree for the reception of their nests? What rule do they take with them to the shrub from which they borrow their materials to assist them in meting out their work, by which they cut some pieces into portions of an ellipse, others into ovals, others into accurate circles, and to suit the dimensions of the several pieces of each figure so exactly to each other? Where is the architect who can carry impressed upon the tablet of his memory the entire idea of the edifice he means to erect, and without rule, square, plumb-line, or compass, can cut out all his materials in their exact dimensions, without
without making a single mistake or a single false stroke? And yet this is what these little animals invariably do, and thus teach us how much more wonderful and certain instinct is, than all the efforts of our boasted reason, which after many painful processes interrupted by numerous errors and failures, and by a long train of deductions, cannot arrive at that expertness and certainty, which these creatures manifest spontancously, working at all times with unerring precision. What is this instinct but the teaching of the Almighty, the manifestation of his eternal wisdom infinitely diversified $(t)$, sustaining, directing, impelling all things, and making all things work together for the good of the whole? Which, like its great emblem and instrument the light, acts every where and upon all, and while it guides the planets in their courses, directs the minutest animalcule to do those things that are necessary to its preservation and the continuation of its kind. "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! Of him and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen (u)."

$$
\text { **. c. 2. } \beta .(x)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus oblongum, villosum, sæpius flavo variegatum; Capite trunco paulo angustiori,

[^8]rotundato; Linguâ subinvolutâ; Tubo dentibus lateralibus obsoletis; Fulcro elongato, subclavato; Lacinies exterioribus articulis subæqualibus, interioribus lineari-lanceolatis, acutis; Valvulis apice lanccolato-lineari, concavo, incuryo, submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ; Palpis exterioribus exarticulatis, pilosis; Stemmatibus in triangulo; Naso convexo, distincto; Labio elongato, inflexo, concavo-conrexo; Maxillis forcipatis, validissimis, apice dilatatis et multidentatis; Antennis subclavatis, pedicello, apiceque articulo primo, subconicis; Plantis dilatatis; Unguiculis apice bifidis; pulvillo minutissimo; Abdomine subgloboso, convexo, basi subretuso, incurvo, ventre lanâ polliniferâ vestito.

Maris Maxille apice tridentatæ. Antennce filiformes. Anus inflexus, spinosus. Plantce angustiores.

## Imago pollimifera.

The insects of this subdivision, of which at present I know only one English species, viz. Apis manicata, Lin. are distinguished from those of the last, not only by exarticulate exterior palpi, but likewise by the form of their abdomen, which is convex and rather globose with an incurved anus, in the male often inflected and armed with long spines $(y)$. They are also adorned with gayer colouring than the individuals of the other sections of this family, the abdomen being usually variegated with yellow spots.

$$
\text { (y) Tab. 9. } \because *, \text { c. 2. } \beta . \text { fig. } 11 .
$$

Linneus

Linneus observes upon this bee " In arloribus cavis nidos construit;" but he takes no notice of the materials of which the nidi were made: this deficiency has been supplied by Mr. James Trimmer and Sir Thomas Cullum. The former of these gentlemen sometime since informed me, that having frequent opportunities of watching the motions of Apis manicata, and finding that it constantly attended Stachiys Germanica, Agrostemma coronaria, and other woolly leaved plants which grew in his garden; he was curious to know the reason of this preference. It was not long before his curiosity was gratified, and he discovered that it was the wool which covers the surface of the leaves of these plants, that was the attraction; for he observed the little animal, with her strong maxillæ, scraping it off with great industry and perseverance; and while these were thus employed, rolling it up, with her fore legs, into a little ball; making all the time a considerable hum. The use to which she applied the material thus collected Mr. Triminer could never discover, we only conjectured that she employed it in the construction of her nest. Our conjecture is almost turned into certainty, by the following account, given, by my ingenious friend Sir Thomas Cullum, to Mr. Marsham, of a nest which he found made of similar materials. He thus expresses himself concerning it in a letter to that gentleman. "I observed in a look to one of my garden gates, that the
the key did not turn round easily, and upon looking into the key hole I saw something white. I had the lock taken off, and it was completely full of a downy substance, containing the pupa of some bee, I conclude. Upon examining the downy substance, I am certain it is the fine pappus, or down, from the Anemone sylvestris, of which I had two plants in my garden. I have preserved the whole as I found it, but the bee has not yet made its appearance in its perfect state. I shall watch their progress, and send them to you, or to Mr. Kirby." This letter is dated October 10, 1800. Sir Thomas has since had the goodness to send me the nidus, the pupæ are still quiescent, (April 2, 1801) and probably will not be disclosed till after midsummer. Upon comparing it with the anecdote, which I have just related of $A$. manicata, I cannot help' being of opinion that it is the nidus of that Apis. It is with some hesitation that I venture to differ from so accurate an observer as Sir Thomas Cullum, but it appears evident to me that the wool which envelopes the nest and the cells, is scraped from the leaves of one of the plants mentioned above. I gathered some leaves of Agrostemma coronaria, and with my pen-knife shaved off some of its down, and upon comparing it with that used in the nest under a magnifier, I found that they were exactly the same. This, in conjunction with Mr. Trimmer's account, persuades me that the material employed in this instance is not the
pappus of Anemone sylvestris, which is of a more silky texture.

There were several cells, or cases, included in the lock, unconnected with each other, except by the wool which was their common covering. These cases were of an oval form ( $\approx$ ) , and consisted of an exterior coat of wool; under this was a membranaceous cell, of a pale colour, which was covered with a number of small vermiform masses of a brown substance, seemingly made of pollen and honey, in shape and size much resembling Spheria canaliculata, and like that fungus distinguished by a longitudinal furrow slightly impressed (a). These were laid, without any regular order, over the cell; and by means of them the wool which formed its exterior coat was made to adhere. It is remarkable that this bee should employ those materials to cover its cells, which others use only as food for their larvæ. At the summit of this membranaceous case is a small chimney with an orifice (b), and within it contains another cell, which is rather coriaceous, strong, and of a brown colour, in the inside shining very much as if covered with tin. foil $(c)$. This may be the folliculus or coccoon made by the larva, prerious to its assuming the pupa. I opened one of these in the autumn, and another in the spring. In both the animal was still in its larva state, but had no food remaining in
(x) Tab. 14. n. 11. fig. 13.
(a) Ibid. fig. 14. a a fig. 17.
(b) Ibid. fig. 15, 16.
(c) Ibid, fig. 16 .
its cell. In that opened in the spring it appeareat to be dead. I imagine, when Sir Thomas Cullurn first took them, that they were just ready for their first change; but that the alteration occasioned by remoring the nest from the situation the parent insect had chosen for it, was fatal to some, if not all, of its inhabitants. The larva does not differ naterially from those of other Apes ( $d$ ). Amongst the wool, which, I suppose, formed the general envelope of the nest, were masses of honey, or a sweet pollen paste.

This bee is very common in gardens in towns, or in the neighbourhood of towns. I never met with it in my own garden, or in the country.

$$
\text { **. c. 2. } \gamma \cdot(e)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus elongato-cylindricum, subpilosum; Capite trunco paulò latiori, subgloboso; Linguâ tenui; Tubo apice tridentato, dente intermedio majori; Fulcro subtriangulari; Laciniis exterioribus articulo primo brevessimo; Valvulis apice lanceolato-lineari, concavo, submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ ; Palpis exterioribus biarticulatis, interioribus exarticulatis; Stemmatibus in triangulo ; Naso convexo ; Labio elongato, inflexo, concavo-convexo; Maxillis basi latioribus, apice bidentatis; Antennis subclavatis, pedicello magno, subovato; Aldomine sublineari, anum ver-sus paulò latiori; Ventre lanâ polliniferâ subhirsuto.
(d) Tab. 14. n.11. fig. 18. (e) Tab.9. **. c. 2. \%. Hylieus, Fab.

Maris

Maris Antenne filiformes. Ano incurvo, sæpius dentato. Ventre anum versus cavitate notando.

The third subdivision of this section, is distinguished by a peculiarity which exists in no other Hymenopterous insects that I have examined; the interior palpi of the species that belong to it consist only of a single joint $(f)$. Their body is very long, slender, and cylindrical; the venter of the males, near the anus, is remarkable for a singular cavity, usually covered with down of a pale colour and resembling satin, to answer which, at its base, there is either a kind of horn, or a protuberance (g). These insects, when asleep, roll themselves up something like Oniscus Armadillo, the horn or protuberance fittirg into the anal carity: they nidificate in posts and rails. The males usually take their luxurious repose in the lap of a flower: that sex of $A$. Campanularum, selects for this purpose the bells of the different species of Campanula, which the female also frequents for the sake of the honey. Hylceius florisomnis, maxillosus, and truncorum ( $h$ ), figured by Panzer, belong to this subdivision.
**.c. 2. §. (i)
H. F. A. Corpus cylindricum, villosum, sæpe hirsutum; Capite trunci ferè latitudine, subglo-
(f) Tab. 9. $\gamma$. fig. 5. l. (g) Ibid. fig. 11. 13. a
(h) Fn. Germ. Init. n. 40. t. 13. n. 53. t. 17. n. 64. t. 15.
(i) Tab.10. **. c. 2.8. Audrena, Apis, Fab. Aleilles magniner, Reaum.
boso; Linguâ longissimâ, subinvolutâ; Tubo apice tridentato, dentibus lateralibus interdum obsoletis; Fulcro elongato; Laciniis exterioribus articulo ultimo longiori, interioribus lanceolatis, acuminatis; Valvulis incurvis, apice lanceolato-lineari, membranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ ; Palpis exterioribus quadriarticulatis, interioribus biarticulatis; Stemnatibus in lineâ curvâ ; Naso convexo; Latio elongato, inflexo, concavo-convexo; Maxillis ferè in angulum protensis; Antennis plerisque subclavatis, pedicello, apiceque articulo primo, subconicis; Unguiculis integris; Abdomine declivi, supra convexo, ano sæpius incurvo ; Fentre lanâ polliniferâ hirsuto.

Maris Antenno pedicello subgloboso. Unguiculi apice bifidi. Aldomen segmento septimo obsoleto. Anus sæpe emarginatus, aut dentatus.

This last subdivision of the second section of this family, contains a greater number of species than the preceding ones: they are distinguished by a cylindrical, but not elongate, body; and their exterior palpi, in which circumstance they differ from all the other subdivisions, consist of four joints. Their abdomen is very convex, and that of the males furnished with no ventral concavity. The Aleilles Maçonnes of Reaumur appear to me to belong to this subdivision; I shall, therefore, insert in this place an abridgment of his interesting account of the mode of nidification of those insects.

He informs us, that the nests of these little bees are constructed of a kind of cement or mortar, in the following manner. "The female (for the males, like the drones of the hive bee, do no work, and these insects have only two sexes) undertakes the whole labour of the building, and is, at the same time, both architect and mason. Her first step is to fix upon an angle, sheltered by any projection, on the south side of a stone wall. Sometimes she contents herself with a more exposed part of the surface, where the stone happens to be uneven and fit for her purpose. Having chosen a spot proper to receive the foundations of the future mansion of her offspring, her next care is to provide materials. As her house is to be built entirely of a kind of mortar, the basis of which, as it is of ours, must be sand; she is very curious in her choice of it, sclecting it, grain by grain, from such as contains some mixture of earth. To shorten her labour, before she transports it for use, by means of a kind of salira which is very viscid, she glues as many grains as she can carry into a little mass, about the size of small shot. Taking this up with her maxille, she conveys it to the spot she has fixed upon for the scite of her castle. A circular plane, composed of many of these little masses, forms the basis on which it is to be erected ; it contains from three to eight ceils $(\xi)$, which are similar to each other in their form, and cqual
(i) Geoffroy says twelve or ifteen.
in dimensions. Each cell is about an inch in length, and six lines in diameter ; and, before its orifice is closed, in form resembles a thimble. When its walls are raised to a sufficient height, our little mason lays up in it a store of pollen seasoned with honey, for the sustenance of its future inlabitant; sometimes the proportion of honey is so great, that this provision is entirely liquid. This business seltled, she deposits her egrg, finishes and covers in the cell, and then procecds to the erection of a second, which she furnishes and finishes in the same manner; and so on with respect to the whole nest. These cells are not placed in a line, or any regular order : some are paralle! with the wall, others are perpendicular to it, and others are inclined to it at different angles: this occasions many empty spaces between the cells, which this laborious architect fills up with the same kind of cement, and then bestows upon the whole group a common covering, made with coarser grains of sand; so that at length the nest becomes a mass of mortar, very hard and not easily penetrated, eren by the blade of a knife. In form, it is more or less oblong; its colour depends upon the colour of the sand employed in its construction, and is different in different countries. These bees sometimes repair old nests, for the possession of which they have often very desperate combats.
" When the larva of this bee is arrived at its full size, it spins itself a cocoon of silk, in which it reposes during its intermediate state.
"Strongly fortified as these animals appear to be in their little castles, they are exposed to the attacks of a peculiar Icinzoinion. Atelabus apiarius likewise contrives to deposit its eggs in their cells, and its larva devours their inliabitants (l)."

Other bees, that belong to this subdivision, usc only fine earth (which they form into a kind of mortar with gluten) in the construction of their nests, which are usually placed in situations sheltered from wet. Apis Licomis selects the hollows of large stones for this propose ( $m$ ). Others, again, make their cells of carth in holes in wood. Alpis carulescons, of which Ajpis denea is the male, constructs its nests, as we learn from De Gcer ( $n$ ), of argillaceous earth mixed with chalk, upon stone walls. I have reason to think that it also nidificates in chalk pits.

The males, in this subulivision, often differ wery widely from the other sex, so as to have been described, in more than one instance, at distinct species, as I shall have occation to show more at large hereaiter. The fimale of Reammes Atcille maconne is black, while the mate is ret ( 0 ).
(l) Reaum. tom. 6. Mem. 3. p. 5T--ss. ( m ) Thin. p 80.
 ubi supra, p.60,61.

The following insects, figured in Panzer's work, appear to belong to this subdivision: viz. Apis cornigera, adunca, rufa, fusca, aterrima, fuliginosa, fulviventris, ventralis, lyssina, globosa, fronticornis, aurulenta $(p)$, and Andrena anea and carulescens (q).

$$
\text { **. d. } 1 .(r)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus oblongum, villasum; Capite trunco paulò angustiori, subtriangulari, ore crassiusculo; Proboscide apice subulato-conicâ, rectiusculâ; Linguâ involutâ; Tubo apice tridentato; Fulcro elongato; Laciniis exterioribus articulo primo longiori, interioribus exteriorum longitudine, involutis, intus ciliatis; Valvulis apice recto, lan-ceolato-lineari, acuminato, subplicato, coriaceo; Palbis exterioribus sexarticulatis, interioribus biararticulatis; Stemmatilus in lineâ curvâ; Oculis prominulis; Naso convexo, distincto; Labio anficè emarginato ; Maxillis subedentulis ; Antennis subclavatis, pedicello subgloboso, apice articulo primo elongato, basi attenuato; Tibiis posticis scopâ polliniferâ; Plantis posticis dilatatis, hirsutis; Digitis infra apicem plantæ insertis; Unguiculis apice bifidis; Abdomine oblongo, basi subretuso, segmento ultimo minuto.

[^9]Maris Antenne corporis longitudine, articulis arcuatis, ex hexagonis innumeris constantibus, apice articulo primo minuto. Planto postica tenuiores.

The individuals of the family of which this is a section, are distinguished from the Bombinatrices, to which they approach, and with which many of them have hitherto been confounded, by the form of the inflected part of their proboscis; the tops of the ralvules having no bend, and comiving into a figure more or less conical, somewhat resembling the beak of a bird $(s)$; by their exterior palpi of six joints $(t)$; by their elongate interior lacinix ( $u$ ) ; by the shape of their maxillæ, which are not dilated at their apex $(x)$; by the want of the corbicula and aurick, which distinguish the posterior tibia and plante of the aculeate sex of the Bombinatrices; and by several other peculiarities which will appear upon a comparison of their respective characters.

The species which I have arranged under the first section of this family, belong to the genus Eucera of Scopoli and Fabricius, so named from the long antenne for which the males are remarkable. This circumstance, in conjunction with the interior lacinix, which are as long as the exterior, and have involute summits, forms the distinctive
(s) Tab. 11. **. d. 2. a. fig. 3. $d$. (t) Ibid. fir. 2. a. and Tab. 10. **. d. 1. fig. 1. d. (u) Ibid. fig. 2. bb. and Tab. 11. ubi sup. ff. (x) Tab. 10. ubi sup. fig. 4, 5. and Tab. 11. fig. $6,7,8,21$.
character of the section. The extraordinary length of the antennæ of the males, does not arise from an increased number of articulations, for they consist only of fourteen, but from the unusual length of each joint. A singular circumstance distinguishes these antennæ, which, to the best of my knowledge, has never before been noticed, and which may possibly lead to the discovery of the use of these organs. Placed under a powerful magnifier the ten last joints appear to be composed of innumerable hexagons, similar to those of which the eyes of these insects consist ( $y$ ). If we reason from analogy, this remarkable circumstance will lead us to conjecture that the sense, of which this part so essential to insects is the organ, may bear some relation to that conveyed by their eyes. As they are furnished with no instrument for receiving and communicating the impressions of sound, similar to the ear, that deficiency may be supplied by extraordinary means of vision. That the stemmata are of this description seems very probable, and the antennæ may, in some degree, answer a similar purpose: the circumstance just mentioned furnishes a strong presumption that they do this, at least in the case of these males: else why do they exhibit that peculiar structure which distin. guishes the real eye?

The great use which insects make of their antennx in collecting information is described in a very
(y) Tab. 10 ubi sup. fig. 8.
entertaining
entertaining manner, in Mr. Marsham's interesting paper upon the history of Ichneumon manifestator, in the third volume of the Transactions of the Linnean Society. "It moved rapidly," says he, " over the top of the post, having its antennæ bent in the form of an arch, and with a strong vibratory motion feeling about until it came to a hole made by some insect, into which it thrust its antennæ quite to the head. It remained a minute at least in this situation apparently very busy, and then drawing out its antennæ came round to the exactly opposite side of the hole, again thrust in its antennæ and remained nearly the same time. It next proceeded to one side of the hole, repeating the operation, the antennæ quivering in a surprizing manner; and having now acain drawn out its antennæ, tumed about, and dexterously mcasuring a proper distance, threw back its abdomen over the head and thorax, at the same time projecting its long and delicate tube into the hole.__after remaining near two minutes in this posture, it drew out the tube, turned round, and again applied its antennæ to the hole for neariy the same time as before.-I again paid very particular attention to some I saw in Kensington gardens, but more immediately to the action of the antennæ, which they thrust into many holes and crevices, but soon drew them out, not finding, I presume, a proper situation for their eggs $(z)$." Thus far this inge-

$$
\text { (z) P. 25, } 28 .
$$

nious entomologist. In this instance, the antennæ appear to have been the instrument which informed the little animal both where the holes were that she was in search of, and also whether the larva, to which the Author of Nature had instructed her to commit her eggs, was in them. I have often seen the hive bee insert one of its antennæ into the blossom of a flower previous to exerting its tongue to collect the honey, as if to inform itself first whether there was any; and insects in general, when they are walking, keep perpetually moving their antennæ from side to side, as if, by their means, they were collecting information concerning what was going forward around them.

But to return to the insects of which we are treating. Miller in the MS. notes before quoted (a), gives the following short history of Apis longicornis. "Mense Julio medio copulantur prope terram volitantes in gramine detonso. In puteo cylindrico terre ova femina deponit." These cells are two or three inches below the surface of the ground; they are very smooth within, and of an oval form. I found several in the southern declivity of a grass walk, which had been frequently mowed.

$$
\text { **. d. 2. } \alpha .(b)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus oblongum, villosum, interdum hirsutum; Capite trunco angustiori, vel subtri-
(a) Vide supra, p. 61, note $x$. Apis, Eucera, Fab.
(l) Tab. 11. **. d. 2. $\alpha$. angulari,
angulari, vel rotundato; Ore crasso; Proloscide apice subulato-conicâ, rectâ; Linguâ subinvolutâ ; Tubo apice tridentato dente intermedio longiori; Fulcro elongato; Laciniis exterioribus articulo ultimo brevissimo, interioribus lanceolato-linearibus, quàm exteriores brevioribus; Valvulis rectis, apice lanccolato-lineari, subplicato, coriaceo; Palpis exterioribus sexarticulatis, interioribus biarticulatis; Stemmatibus in triangulo; Oculis prominulis, magnis; Naso convexo, distincto; Lalio quadrato; Maxillis apice sæpius bidentatis; Antennis subclavatis, pedicello globoso, apice articulo primo elongato, basi attenuato; Tibiis posticis scopâ polliniferâ; Plantis posticis dilatatis; Digitis infra apicem plantæ insertis; Unguiculis apice bifidis; Aldomine vel oy̧ato, vel subgloboso, basi retuso, segmento ultimo minuto.

Maris Antennce thorace breviores. Plante posticæ angustiores, digitis ex apice plantæ provenientibus.

The insects of this section are distinguished from the preceding by two principal circumstances, the interior laciniæ are much shorter than the exterior with tops not involute, and the antennæ of the males are not so long as the thorax. The species that enter into the present subdivision of the section, differ from those of the next, in the form of their proboscis, which is subulato-conical; in the substance of the apex of the valvulæ, which is coriaceous; in the figure of their lip, which is
square; besides several other circumstances which will appear upon a comparison of their several characters. Their mode of nidification is various, which makes me suspect that there may be room for another subdivision, but this I have not yet been able to trace out. Apis retusa makes its nest with us in hard banks of gravel or clay, containing several cells, of an oval or elliptical shape, covered within with a thin white membrane, each being about threc-fourths of an inch in length, and not quite half an inch in diameter; they are placed in no regular order. In Northamptonshire, as we learn from Kay, it makes its cells in stone walls. I found it myself in great abundance frequenting the walls built with Kettering stone at Wansford and Ufford in that county; and once, at Norwich, I was much amused at secing a female, one sunny morning, very busily employed upon a brick wall, and exerting all her might to pull the mortar from between the bricks; but whether this was to prepare a place for a cell, or only a sheltered cavity to pass the night in, according to the observation of Rossi, I could not ascertain. Another species, belonging to this subrlivision, nidificates in a manner similar to Apis violacea, in pieces of putrescent wood. In these they bore a longitudinal pipe, which they divide into nine or ten oval chambers, separated from each other by a sharp kind of cornice, which form the shells of an equal number of oval cells; these are made of the scrapings of the wood
wood much masticated. Each cell is rather more than half an inch in length, and about three tenths of an inch in diameter: the partitions which separate the cells from each other are made of the same material, and are about a line in thickness. The pipe runs nearly parallel with the sides of the piece of wood in which it is bored, making an angle where it begins and where it ends, and having its entrance on the opposite side to its exit. Probably the inhabitants of the lowermost cells make their way out at the exit, and those of the uppermost at the entrance $(c)$. To this subdivision belong Apis Hispanica, pilipes, bimaculata, vulpina, quadrimaculata, furcata, rotundata (d), and Andrena strigosa of Panzer (e).

$$
\text { * *. d. 2. f. }(f)
$$

H. F. A. Corpus oblongum; Capite trenco angustiori, lato, rotundato, depresso ; Prokoscide breviusculâ, coniĉ̂, rectâ, fornicatâ; Linguâ brevi, rectiusculâ ; Tulo apice tridentato, dentibus æqualibus; Laciniis extcrioribus articulo ultimo brevi; $I^{\prime}$ alvulis apice semicordato, acuto, corneo, concavo, basis rertice eroso, sinu pectinato; Palbis exterioribus sexarticulatis, interioribus biarticulatis; Facie inæquali; Stemmatilus in triangulo, infra verticon sitis; Oculis distantibus, prominulis;
(c) Apis furcuta makes these nests. (id) Panzor Fn. Ins. Germ. Init. n. 55. t. 6, 8, 17. in. 50. t. 6, 7, 8, 9 . (e) libid. n.64. t.16. (f) Tab.11.**. d. 2. \& fit. 19, 20, 21 . Apis, Fab. Latr.

Naso planiusculo, tuberculo munito; Labio anticè emarginato, setoso; Maxillis apice bidentatis; Antennis subclavatis, pedicello globoso, apice articulo primo elongato, basi attenuato; Trunco plerisque hirsuto; Alis subcoriaceis, coloratis; Tibiis posticis brevibus, scopâ polliniferâ vestitis; Plantis posticis elongatis, hirsutissimis; Digitis ex apice piantæ provenientibus; Unguiculis bifidis; Abdomine oblongo, basi retuso, supra plerisque glabriusculo, lateribus hirsutis, ano rotundato, ventre planiusculo.

Maris Oculi magni, sæpe approximati. Tarsi tenuiores, minùs hirsuti.

This subdivision, which contains Apis violacea, Lin., and its affinities, may be known by the following peculiarities. The summits of the valvulæ, which are short, wide, and of a hard, corneous substance, connive into the longitudinal section of a cone, and form a strong arch over the tongue. The head is rounded, the space between the eyes is ample, the lip is strengthened by a tubercle, and is emarginate before, and beset with numerous bristles. The abdomen, in most, is hairy only on its sides, rather convex above, and flattish underneath. The wings are coloured, often of a brilliant purple or violet, and usually of a substance between coriaceous and membranous. Concerning the proboscis of these insects, I am able to say but little, except as to its exterior figure, since I have had an opportunity of examining only one, that
that I had extracted from an old specimen of Apis violacea, in which it was mutilated, so that I could not discover the shape of the interior lacinix. The valvulæ, however, exterior laciniæ, and palpi were uninjured. The only species that I have ever seen, belonging to this subdivision, which claims to have been taken in England, is Apis iricolor of the following pages; but its claim is not established with certainty, for Dr. Latham, from whose collection I received it, is not quite decided in his opinion upon this point; but as he has always placed it in his cabinet with his English insects, I have considered it as such; which I was the more inclined to do, in order to lay down the characters of the subdivision to which it belongs, the individuals of which have been universally confounded with the Bomlinatrices; from which, however, they are distinguished by the striking characters mentioned in my observations upon the first section of the family $(g)$. Whether all of them nidificate in the same way with Apis violacea, I am not able to say, it is probable they may. Reaumur has given us a very interesting account of the proceedings of that bee, which I shall now abridge.
"The mother bee usually makes her appearance early in the year, as soon as the winter is over; she may then be met with in gardens, visiting such walls, as are covered with trees trained upon trellis work, in a warm sumny aspect; when once she has

$$
\text { (g) Vide supra, p. } 183 .
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begun to make her appearance, she frequently returns, and during a long period; and she may always be known by her size, and her hum, which much resembles that of the Bombinatrices. The object of her earlier visits is to fix upon a piece of wood proper for her purposes. She usually selects the putrescent uprights of arbours, espaliers, or the props of vines; but sometimes she will attack garden seats, thick doors, and window shutters; the piece that she chooses is commonly cylindrical and perpendicular to the horizon. Her strong maxillæ are the instruments which she employs in boring it: beginning on one side for a little way she points her course obliquely downwards, and then proceeds in a direction parallel with its sides, till she has bored a tunnel of from twelve to fifteen inches in length, and seven or eight lines in diameter. Sometimes three or four of these tunnels, or pipes, nearly parallel with each other, where the diameter will admit of it, are bored in the same piece. A passage is left where she enters or first begins to bore, and another at the other end of the pipe. As the industrious animal proceeds in her employment, she clears away the wood, which she detaches, throwing it out upon the ground, where it appears like a small heap of saw-dust. Thus we see she has prepared a long cylinder in the middle of the wood, sheltered from the weather and external injuries, and fit for her purposes. But how is she to divide it into cells? What materials can she

employ

employ for making the floors and ceilings of her miniature apartments ? Why, truly, God " doth instruct her to discretion, and doth teach her $(h)$," the saw-dust just mentioned is at hand, and this supplies her with all that she wants to make this part of her mansion complete. Beginning at the bottom of the cylinder she deposits an egg, and then lays in a store of pollen mixed with honey sufficient for the nutriment of the little animal it is to produce. At the height of seven or cight lines, which is the depth of each cell, she next constructs, of particles of the saw-dust glued together and also to the sides of the tunnel, what may be called an annular stage, or scaffolding; when this is sufficiently hardened its interior edge affords a support for a second ring of the same materials, and thus the ceiling is gradually formed of these concentric circles, till there remains only a small orifice in its center, and this is also filled up with a circular mass of agglutinated particles of the saw-dust. This partition exhibits the appearance of as many concentric circles as the animal has made joinings (i), and is about the thickness of a French crown-piece; it serves for the ceiling of the lower, and the floor of the upper apartment. One cell being completed, she procceds to another, which she furnishes and finishes in the same manner, and so on till she has divided her whole tumnel into apartments, which are usually about twelve. The

[^10]larvæ and pupæ of these, do not differ materially from those of other Bees; when the former assumes the pupa, it is placed in its cell with its head downwards, a very wise precaution, for thus it is prevented, when it has attained to its perfect state, and is eager to emerge into day, from making its way out upwards, and disturbing the tenants of the superincumbent cells, who being of later date, each than its neighbour below stairs, are not yet quite ready to go into public $(k)$." Thus far, for the most part, from our author.

To this subdivision belong, besides A. violacea, A. Caffra, latipes, nigrita, Tranquebarorum, astuans, Brazilianorum, Virginica, cingulata, Africana, \&c. \&c.

$$
\text { * *. e. } 1 .
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H. F. Neut. Corpus ferè lineare, pubescens; Capite trunci propè latitudine, triangulari; Proloscide subinvolutâ; Linguâ rimâ longitudinali; Tubo sublineari, apice truncato; Fulcro subtriangulari; Laciniis exterioribus membranaceis lineâ longitudinali corneâ, articulo extimo breviori; interioribus brevibus, obtusis, linguæ basin arctè amplectentibus; Valvulis apice lineari-lanceolato, subplicato, ex corneo submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ; Palpis exterioribus exarticulatis acutis, interioribus biarticulatis; Facie inæquali;
(k) Reaum. tom. 6. Mem. 2. (l) Tab. 11. **. e. 1. and tab. 12. Adams on Micros. tab. 12. fig. 3. Apis, Fab. Latr.

Stemmatibus

Stemmatibus in triangulo ; Oculis pilosis; Naso distincto, convexo; Labio transverso, sublineari, planiusculo; Maxillis forcipatis, medio constrictis, apice edentulis obliquis; Antennis filiformibus, scapo fusiformi, pedicello subgloboso ; TTiliis posticis compressis, supara glabris, margine omni recurvo-ciliatis f. corbiculâ instructis, apice inermibus f. absque spinulis; Plantis posterioribus dilatatis, basi auriculatis auriculâ acutâ, intus scopulâ transversè striatâ strïs setoso-pectinatis, vestitis; Unguiculis bifidis; Aldomine subprismatico, basi retuso, tergo convexo.

Feminæ Proboscis brevis. Lingua paulò infra apicem constricta. Tubus apice tridentatus, dentibus lateralibus obsoletiusculis, intermedio subemarginato. Valvule rectiusculæ. Maxilla apice dentibus armatæ. Tilise posticæ supra, nee margine, pilosæ. Plantce posticæ absque auriculà. Abdomen elongato-conicum

Maris Corpus crassius; Caput ex globoso depressum, ferè circulare. Proboscis brevis, crassior. Lingua tenuis. Valvula latiores. Maxillce apice dentibus armatæ. Tiliae posticæ corbiculâ nullâ. Plantce postice absque auriculâ et scopulà. Abdomen subcordatum, obtusum.

The family of which this is the first section, is distinguished from that which precedes it by a subinvolute proboscis, and a triangular fulcrum; by membranaceous exterior lacinire and valvule, with a longitudinal corneous line; by exterior palpi, consisting, as far as I can discover, of a single
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\circ 2 \text { joint }
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joint only; by maxillæ dilated at their apex ; by filiform antemæ, the first joint of the apex not being attenuated at its base; by posterior tibiæ furnished with a corbicula or little basket for carrying wax; by the auricles which are observable at the base of the posterior plantæ, and by their prismatical abdomen. Besides these differences, the individuals of it are distinguished in their economy from all other bees, by two remarkable circumstances, they are gregarious, and they make wax : reasons surely sufficient and satisfactory for separating them from the false Bombinatrices, $A$ violacea and its affinities. Agreement with the genuine Bomlinatrices in these peculiarities will sufficiently justify me for considering $A$. mellifica as belonging to a subdivision of the same family. Indeed, the single circumstance that the ALL Wise author of nature has instructed these alone of all others to make wax and live together in societies, is the strongest of all possible proofs of their affinity. Reaumur, whose judgment ought to have great weight in these matters, was evidently, in this respect, of the same opinion with myself, for he places the Bombinatrices next to $A$. mellifica, and looks upon them as related to each other in the same degree that the rude cottagers of a country village are to the more polished inhabitants of a populous city ( $m$ ).
( $m$ ) Reaum. ubi supr. Pref. p. 3.

This section, besides $A$. mellifica, contains several other species, three very distinct ones I observed in Mr. Drury's cabinet, of which one came from Bengal, another from Madras, and a third from the Cape of Good Hope ; an equal number, still different, may be seen in Sir J. Banks's rich collection. All these species have the transversely striated posterior scopulæ, which has usually been looked upon as the exclusive character of the common hive bee, like this too they have no spines at the apex of the third pair of tibie, a very peculiar crrcumstance by which the insects of this section of the present family are distinguished, not only from all other Apes, but also from every other individual of the Class Hymenoptera that I have had an opportunity of examining. It is worth inquiry whether the mode of nidification of all, or any of the wild bees that belong to this section, be similar to that of the cultivated one; should it turn out so, as I think it most probably would, as all have the same instruments, they might, perhaps, be domesticated in countries where the common one may not yet be introduced; or some of them may have been domesticated and mistaken for the common one.

Linncus, in his Systema Naturee, says under $A$. mellifica: "Femina—antennis articulis decem-Mares-antennis undecimarticulatis-Operarixantennis quindecimarticulatis." In every one of these assertions, with due deference to a name so deservedly great be it spoken, he is mistaken, for 03 the
the antennæ of the female and neuter consist of the same number of articulations exactly, viz. thirteen, including the radicle $(n)$ : those of the male have fourteen joints (o), although the fourth and fifth, counting from the head, under any but a very powerful magnifier, appear to be but one. Many other authors have fallen into similar mistakes on this head. Swammerdam says, if Hill rightly translates him, for I have not the original by me, that the antennæ of the working bees have only five joints, while those of the males and females have eleven $(p)$. Reaumur gives only twelve joints for the antennæ of the neuter, including the radicle $(q)$. Geoffroy says that those of the female and neuters consist of fifteen articulations, and those of the male of eleven only, he affirms also that the abdomen of the female consists of seven segments, instead of six, which is the real num$\operatorname{ber}(r)$. Scopoli finally reduces the number of articulations of the antennæ of the female to ten $(s)$.

A bulky volume would scarcely suffice for a complete account of the history, economy, mode of culture, $\& \mathrm{cc}$. of the hive bee; I shall not, therefore, at this time enter upon $i t$, but content myself. with referring my reader to the elaborate treatises
(n) Tab. 12. e. 1. fem. fig. 6. and neut. fig. 13.
(o) Tab. 11. e. 1. mas. fig. 5.
( $p$ ) Hill's Swam. pt. 1.
p. 167. I think there must be some mistake here.
(q) Reaum. tom. 5. Mem. 6. p. 282. tab. 25. fig. 4.
(r) Geoff. Hist. Ins. 2. p. 386, 38\%: (s) Ent, Car, n. 811.
of Swammerdam, Reaumur, Huber, Wildman, the entertaining dialogues of the Spectacle de la Nature, \&c. where he will see what a wonderful display of the Divine Wisdom these little creatures exhibit, and in how extraordiary a manner, by their various instincts and operations, ws $\delta_{t}=50 \pi 7 p s=v \operatorname{cow} \gamma \mu \alpha \pi t(t)$, if he can solve it, they reflect the glory of God.
**. e. 2. (u)
H. F. A. Corpus oblongum, hirsutissimum; Capite trunco angustiori, sæpius triangulari; Proloscide plùs minùs involutâ ; Linguâ , rimâ longitudinali; Tubo lineari apice acuto ; Fulcro subtriangulari ; Laciniis exterioribus membranaceis lineâ longitudinali corneâ, articulo extimo brevi; interioribus brevissimis, obtusis, linguam arctè amplectentibus; Valvulis apice lanceolato-lineari, submembranaceo, lineâ longitudinali corneâ; Palpis exterioribus exarticulatis, interioribus biarticulatis; Vertice calvo cruce impresso; Stemmatibus in lineâ currâ, in crucis fossulâ transversâ sitis; Naso distincto, convexo, glabro, nitido ; Labio transverso, sublineari, inæquali; Maxillis supra sulcatis sulcis tomentosis, apice dilatatis subedentulis; Antennis filiformibus, scapo subclavato, pedicello globoso, apice articulo primo longiori subconico; Tilizs posticis corbiculâ instructis, supra inæquaiibus, glabris, apice setoso-pectinatis; Plantis posticis cillatatis, basi auriculatis auriculâ obtusầ, apice pec-
( $t$ ) 1. Cor. xiii. 12 .
(u) Tab. 13. Apis,
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tine e setis instructis; Digitis articulis spinulososetosis; Scopulis plerumque auratis; Unguiculis apice bifidis; Abdomine oblongo, interdum et subtriangulari, subprismatico, basi retuso, supra convexo, ano acutiusculo.

Maris Maxillce minores, apice bidentatæ, dente interiori minuto, barbatre barbâ incurvâ, supra tomentosæ. Tibice posticæ nec corbiculà neque pectine instructæ, plerisque supra pilosæ. Plante posticæ absque auriculâ. Anus obtusiusculus.

Obs. In hâc familiâ In alce superioris reticulationis areoláa marginali striga nigricans plerumque includitur $(x)$; pedum geniculi extus sapius tomentoso-pallidi; tarsi e pilis sparsis decumbentibus certo situ vel subincani vel fulvescentes; sub luce scopula plurimorum aureo splendore micant.

The principal characters, besides their hirsute body, which distinguish the Bombinatrices from the hive bee and its affinities, are the cross impressed upon their vertex, their stemmata arranged in a curve, instead of a triangle, their lip unequal in surface, their maxillæ sulcate on their upper side, and the spines which arm the apex of their posterior tibix; besides this the females, as well as the neuters, are furnished with the corbicula, and with the auricle at the base of the plante of the last pair of legs, not to mention other slighter differences; in other respects the individuals of both sections of this family exactly agree together.
( $x$ ) Tab. 13. fig. 17. $a_{3}$

With respect to the history, economy, \&c. of the Bombinatrices, I cannot do better than abridge the account of these which Reaumur has given us, first observing that the females usually make their appearance early in the spring, as soon as the catkins of the different species of Salix are in blossom, upon which at this time they may commonly be seen, collecting honey from the female, and pollen from the male catkins, although I have also seen them employ their tongue in the latter; the appearance of the neuters is later, and the males are most common in the autumn, when the thistles are in blossom, upon the flowers of which they are abundant, sometimes seemingly asleep, or torpid, at others acting as if intoxicated with the sweets they have been imbibing. When these animals, of any sex, are walking upon the ground, if a finger be moved to them, they lift up the three legs of one side to defend themselves, which gives them a very grotesque appearance. Their nests are often found in meadows and pastures, sometimes in groves and hedge-rows, where the soil is entangled with roots, and now and then in heaps of stones.
"When they do not meet with an accidental cavity ready made, they excavate one themselves with great labour, which they cover with a thick convex vault or coping of moss, the interior surface or roof of which is sometimes cased or ceiled with a kind of coarse was, in order to keep out the wet. At the lower part of the nest is an opening for
for its inhabitants to go in and out at; this entrance is often through a long gallery, or covered way, sometimes more than a foot in length, by means of which the nest itself is more effectually concealed from observation. The mode in which they transport the moss they use is singular : it must be observed that they employ such only as grows upon the ground. When they have discovered a parcel of this conveniently situated, they place themselves upon it, with their anus towards the spot to which they mean to convey it: they first take a small portion, and with their maxillæ and fore-legs, as it were, card and comb it ; when the pieces are sufficiently disentangled, they are placed under the body by the first pair of legs, the intermediate pair receives them, and delivers them to the last, which pushes them as far as possible beyond the anus. When, by this process, the insect has formed behind it a small mass of moss well carded, then, either the same, or another who takes her turn in the business, pushes it nearer to the nest. Thus small heaps of prepared moss are conveyed to its foot, and in a similar manner they are elevated to its summit, or wherever they may be most wanted. A file of four or five insects is occupied at the same time in this employment. These nests are often six or seven inches in diameter, and elevated to the height of four or five above the surface of the ground. When the covering of moss is taken from the nest, the first thing that presents itself is
an irregular comb, composed of an assemblage of oval bodies disposed one against another: under this there is sometimes another, which itself is placed upon a third, none of these are united together: sometimes, however, there is only one. These combs vary in size, and are not to be compared, either for the regularity of their form, or of the parts that compose them, wifh those of the hive bee. They consist of a number of oblong or oval cells, or coccoons, spun by the larvæ when they are about to undergo their first change, for these insects make no waxen cells for their young: they are made of a kind of silk, and fastened together. These cells are of three dimensions, answering to the three sexes, which circumstance produces the inequalities observable in the surface of the combs. The void spaces between the cells are filled with masses of brown paste, made of gross wax, or pollen much wrought, and honey. Besides the masses, they attach to every comb, particularly the uppermost, three or four cells in the shape of goblets, open at the top, and full of liquid and very sweet honey, and made of the same kind of coarse wax that the roof is ceiled with. The first step towards furnishing a nest is to make a mass of the brown paste, and one of thesc honey-pots. The masses of paste, which are sometimes as big as small nuts, are intended for the food of the larva, and in them the eggs are deposited. These vary in number, from three to thirty being to be found in one
mass, but not all in the same cavity : they are oblong, of a bluish white, a line and half in length, and half a line in diameter. The larvæ are similar to those of the hive bee, but their sides are marked by irregular transverse black spots. These larvæ, after they are hatched, separate from each other, eating the paste which surrounds them. The bees of the nest, it is probable, discover the places where the layers of this material become too thin, or where the larva is in danger of eating through it, and lay upon such parts fresh paste, that it may be sheltered from the air. The honey-pots may be intended to supply honey for the occasional moistening of the paste. The pupa in each cell is placed with its head downwards, and makes its way out at the bottom of its coccoon. When the larva has spun this, the bees probably take the pains to clear it from the paste that may remain upon it.
" The nests seldom contain more than fifty or sixty inhabitants, these are of three different sizes; the females, of which there is more than one in a nest, are the largest, and probably alone survive the winter; the males are of the middle size, as is also one description of working bees, or neuters; the other neuters are the smallest, and not bigger than the hive bee $(y)$. These two sorts of neuters, it is most likely, are appropriated to different kinds of work; the largest being the strongest, and the others the most lively, active, and expert. Amongst
(y) They are often much smaller. K.
the Bombinatrices, the females and males have not the privilege of doing nothing, as is the case with the hive bee, but all work in concert to repair any damage or derangement that may befall their habitation. Every nest of these bees, as our author supposes, is at first very small, being originally constructed and inhabited by a single female, but the eggs which she there deposits soon produce her a numerous progeny. The nests of the Humble Bees are exposed to the depredations of various foes ; ants, the larva of Asilus crabroniformis, several other Diptera, and some Tinere attack them, but the field mice and polecats are their greatest enemies (z)."

Thus far this admirable author. He suspects that these insects swallow the pollen which they use for making their paste, and return it again properly moistened, as he did not often observe any little masses of wax, or wrought pollen (a) upon their posterior tibiæ, at least not so constantly as would be necessary to supply the quantity requisite for their consumption; yet the females and neuters are furnished with the corbicula, or little basket necessary for that purpose, and I have myself frequently seen them with these masses.

Geoffroy has given an account of the nidification of these insects, totally at variance with this of
( $x$ ) Reaum. tom. 6. Mem. 1.
(a) Much curious information upon this subject, is contained in a paper, sent by M. Huber the younger, to the Linnean Society, which I do not think it right to furestall,

Reaumur,

Reaumur, and equally so, I apprehend, with truth and nature. He says, " that they make spacious subterraneous apartments, in which they construct their combs, consisting, like those of the hive bee, of hexagonal cells, but composed of different materials, their substance being like parchment, and made of small particles of rotten wood formed into a paste, by means of a glutinous liquor with which nature has furnished them: that in these cells they deposit their eggs, supplying them with a sufficient quantity of honey: that these combs are surrounded with a thick border, consisting of thin laminæ resembling dry leaves, and made of the same material with the cells(b)." This account so accurately describes a wasp's nest, that I cannot help suspecting that it was taken from one. ' I believe no Bombinatrix was ever found to nidificate in this manner.

I shall add here what Ray has observed upon the same subject. "Eulæ," says he, " ut et aliorum generum, glabræ sunt, colore carneo-albicante, in annulos divisæ, ventre planiore, dorso gibbo et elato, rostro acutiore, caudâ obtusiore ; erithacâ aut materiâ quâdam erithacæ simili circundatæ, quæ eis pro alimento inservit, in quâ latitantes, in globulum ferè convolvuntur, caudâ ad caput adductâ, Asellorum instar. Cum justam magnitudinem adeptæ sunt, folliculos validos et velut coriaceos sibimetipsis texunt, iisque inclusæ in nymphas mu-
(b) Hist. Ins. Par. 2. p. 404, 405.
tantur,
tantur, cùmque maturuere, ut ita dicam, et debitam perfectionem et partium soliditatem assecutæ sunt, disrupto aut exeso folliculo Apum formâ prodeunt. In folliculos unde Apiculæ evolârunt mel congerunt (c)."

I know no family of which it is more difficult to distinguish the species than the present; for there is little difference in the form of the Bombinatrices, and the hue of their bodies, at least of all our English ones, is the same, so that the describer must rely almost solely upon the colour of their hirsuties for his characters, and this is so subject to vary, even in the same individual, in different periods of its existence, that it is not safe to depend upon it but under particular restrictions. An insect recently disclosed, in this respect, appears a different species from the same when it has been long exposed to wind and weather. Thus, for instance, A. Muscorum, which, when fresh from the pupa, is distinguished by a thorax covered with hair of a fine orange colour, and by an abdomen whose coat is a rich yellow, when it grows old, especially the male, exchanges these brilliant colours for a cinereous hue, which circumstance misled Fabricius to give it as a distinct species, under the name of $A$. senilis. But not only yellow and red, but even black and white hairs are apt to change their colour through age. All these circumstances make it a matwer of some importance, to be able to distinguish a
(c) Ray. Hist. Ins. p. 246-7.
recent insect from one that has been long disclosed: this may often be done by inspecting the state of its wings, for in the latter, especially in males, they are usually lacerate at the apex, the body too has frequently a good deal of its hair rubbed off. It will not be without use to know into what the predominant colours fade: yellow will usually first turn pale, and then cinereous; red will turn through tawny to yellow, and sometimes to cinereous; white will turn to pale, and sometimes to tawny, and black will now and then turn white. But this is not all the difficulty with which the describer of the Bombinatrices has to struggle: the males in general resemble the females sufficiently to be known as such, but there are several so unlike them, as to be easily mistaken for different species; and I am by no means certain that I have not, in more instances than one, described the sexes under different names: till all can be traced to their nidi this is not easy to be avoided. In my arrangement of the species of this section, I have observed the following rules, which, for the most part, were suggested by the evident affinities of these insects. I begin with those whose general hirsuties is pale yellow, while that of the thorax is orange; after these follow such as have the same coloured hair, but whose thorax has a black band $(d)$; next I place such as are distinguished by the colour
(d) A. sylvarum, Lin. has a red anus, but its general habit gives it a strong affinity with those that precede it.
of their anus, whether yellow, white, or red, and finally come such as are entirely black.

After my Synopsis Specierum, containing the above arrangement, was printed, I discovered, what had escaped me before, that four different species, one of which had a yellow, two a white, and one a red anus, were deprived of some of the characters of the Bombinatrices, having neither corbicula, nor pecten at the apex of the tibix, nor auricle at the base of the plantre, of the posterior legs, at the same time exhibiting some peculiar to themselves. This circumstance offers an opportunity for a natural subdivision of this section of the family, founded upon other characters than colour; the following peculiarities distinguish the members of it; in their proboscis, and other respects, they agree exactly with the others.

Labium antice obtusangulum (e).
Maxillue forcipatr, apice obliquè truncatæ $(f)$. Tilica posticæ supra convexæ, pilosæ, nec corbiculâ, neque pectine instructex (g).
Plantce posticæ absque auriculâ ( $h$ ).
Abdomen oblongum, ano, in mortuo, sæpius inflexo; ventre segmento ultimo in angulum utrinque protenso (i).
Maris Maxill.e apice bidentatie. Aldomen triangulare, incurvum, subacuminatum.
(e) Tab. 13. fig. 12. (f) Ibid. fig. 3\%.
(g) Ibid. fig. 22. a. ( $k$ ) Ibid. fig. 23.
(i) Ibid. fig. 25. $a a$.

The females and neuters of these insects, it is probable, do not, like the rest of the Bombinatrices, carry masses of wrought pollen upon their hindlegs, or they would have been furnished with a corbicula for that purpose; from the absence of the pecten of the posterior tibia, and of the auricle at the base of the planta, which are usually concomitants of the corbicula, we may conjecture that these instruments, which are over against each other, are given to the insects which have them, for the purpose of preparing their little masses of pollen; the pecten, which consists of strong bristles, probably breaking the grains, and the auricle assisting to knead them into a paste, previous to their being laid upon the tibia. It is remarkable that the females and neuters of these Apes, should exhibit those characters which are peculiar to the males of the rest of the family. I suspect that they nidificate under-ground.

To this subdivision belong $A$. campestris $(k), A$. Barbutella ( $l$ ), A. vestalis ( $m$ ), and A. rupestris ( $n$ ) of this work; likewise, as I suspect, $A$. mystacea of Christius (o), and A. arenaria of Panzer ( $p$ ).
(k) Tom. 2. p. 335.
(l) Ibid. p. $343 . \quad$ (m) Ibid. p. 347.
( $n$ ) Ibid. p. 369.
(o) Hymenopt. p. 124. tab.6. fig. 3.
( $p$ ) Fn. Ins. Germ. Init. n. 74. tab. 12.

## A D DENDA.

HAVING had an opportunity, since the preceding pages of this volume were printed, of examining a large number of Hymenopterous insects, and having likewise made some forther observations upon the foregoing families, more particularly with respect to the wings, that had before escaped me, I shall subjoin them here, beginning with the latter.

I must first observe in general, that the surface of every superior wing may be looked upon as divided into three parts, which may be denominated Alæ Basis, Medium, et Apex.

Basis. Alæ portio thoraci proxima ex areolis tribus elongatis constans, intermediâ breviori, inter alæ nervos divergentes inclusis $(q)$.

Medium. Alæ portio intermedia, reticulata, areolas sex vel septem, figurâ et magnitudine varias, et anastomosin includens $(r)$.

Apex. Alæ portio extima, dilatata, obliquè truncata, in angulum obtusum cum margine tenuiore, f. basis areolà infimâ, subtus concurrens ( $s^{\prime}$; in areolas tres subæquales, mediantibus venis duabus rectis, sæpius distincta; superficie undulato-crispante, plerisque punctulatà $(t)$.
(q) Tab. 3. **. b. fig. 5. $d$.
(r) Ibid. $\boldsymbol{e}$.
(s) Ibid. g.
(t) Ibid. $f$.

The

The inferior wings, as to superficies, are similar to the superior, only they want the reticulate portion or medium, and therefore can only be distinguished into Basis and Apex, which are divided into areasin a similar manner with the superior wings $(u)$.

## MELITTA.

*. a. Alac Superiores. Nervi costales distincti. Anastomosis distincta. Medium areolis septem.
_Inferiores semi-ovales, sessiles; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori trifido.
*. b, Alce Superiores. Nervi costales distincti. Anastomosis distincta. Medium areolis sex $(x)$. Apex impunctulatus.
__Inferiores semi-ovales, sessiles; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori trifido.
As a further proof that the insects of this family are not all varieties of the same species, I shall describe one belonging to it, which is evidently distinct. It is in Sir Joseph Banks's cabinet, and came from New South Wales. It should come next to M. signata ( $y$ ), which stands with it in the same cabinet, from the same country.
cyanura. M. atra; fronte maculata; scutello puncto flavo; abdomine atro-cærulescenti.
mus. D. Banks, Sphex, in serie quintầ a sinistr. e trilus ultimis specimen medium.
(u) Tab. 13. fig. 18.
(x) Tab. 1. *. b. fig. 7. 6.
(y) Tom. 2. p. 41.

Loner

> ADDENDA.

Long. Corp. Lin. $3 \frac{1}{2}$.
Hal. In Norà Cambriâ.
DESCR. Acul.
CORPUS atrum, glabrum.
Caput. Frons utrinque ad oculos maculâ magnâ irregulari flavescente. Antennce nigræ.
Truncus. Collare utrinque flavum. Tubercula flava. Scutellum puncto rotundo flavicanti insignitum. Squamulce nigræ. Alce subhyalinæ, nervis nigris. Pedes nigri.
Abdomen nitidissimum, atro-violaceum, lucidum, levissimè punctulatum.
**. a. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales distincti. Anastomosis distincta. Medium areolis septem. Apex minutissimè punctulatus.
__Inferiores semi-ovales, sessiles; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori trifido.
**. b. Alae Superiores. Nervi costales distincti. Anastomosis distincta. Medium areolis septem. Apex minutissimè punctulatus. __Inferiores semi-ovales, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori trifido.
**. c. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales distincti. Anastomosis distincta. Medium areolis septem.
_Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori trifido.
P 3
Obs.

Obs. M. Swanmerdamellæ alarum superioru* nervi costales subcoaliti, medium areolis tantummodo sex, unde Apum familice *. a. forsan amandanda.

Since I wrote my observations upon this family, I have received, by the kindness of M. Latreille, that curious insect, hitherto unknown to other entomologists, the Abeille tapissiére of Reaumur $(z)$, under the name of $A$. Papaveris. Upon examining it, I find that it is no Melitta, as at first I suspected, but a genuine Apis, belonging to the second section (**. c. 2.) of my family "labio inflexo elongato." In habit it approaches nearest to the Leaf Cutters ( $\alpha$ ), but its abdomen is more convex, and as its habits and economy are somewhat different, it may belong to a new subdivision. As I could not examine its proboscis without running risk of destroying my only specimen, I am unable to say of how many joints the palpi consist. As M. Latreille intends to describe it himself, in a paper he is preparing upon the Bees of the environs of Paris, I must refer my reader to that paper, when it makes its appearance.

## APIS.

*. a. Alae Superiores. Nervi costales subcoaliti. Anastomosis subdistincta. Medium areolis sex.
(z) Supra p. 142, 143.

Ala Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori trifido
*. b. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis distincta. Medium areolis septem.
__Inferiores semi-ovales, sessiles; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori bifido.
**. a. Alca Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis septem, marginali nebulam includente. Apex valde dilatatus.
_Inferiores semi-ovales, subpetiolatæe margine crassiori subpetiolato tenuiori trifido.
**. b. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis subdistincta. Medium areolis septem.
__Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subsessiles; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido.
**. c. 1. a. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti。 Anastomosis vix distincta. Medium areolis sex, marginali nebulam includente. Apex admodum dilatatus. __Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subsessiles; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido.
**. c. 1. $\beta$. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti。
P 4 Anastomosis

Anastomosis obsolcta. Medium areolis sex, marginali nebulam includente. -_Inferiores semi-ovales, sessiles; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori bifido.

* *. c.2. a. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis subdistincta. Medium areolis sex.
__Inferiores semi-ellipticæ, sessiles; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido.
**. c. 2. . Ale Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis sex, marginali nebulam includente. Apex admodum dilatatus.
Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido.

Since I wrote my remarks upon this family, during my absence from home, five of the pupæ which Sir Thomas Cullum sent me, produced perfect insects, viz. three males, and two females; which proved, as I suspected, A. manicata, Lin. They make their way out at the perforated end of the cell, separating a circular portion from it (a).
**. c.2. $\gamma$. Al.e Superiores. Nervi costales subcoaliti. Anastomisis distincta. Medium areolis sex. Apex vix punctulatus.
(a) Vid. supra, p. 173, \&sc.

## ADDENDA.

Ale Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subsessiles; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori trifido.
**. c. 2. §. Ala Superiores. Nervi costales subcoaliti. Anastomosis subdistincta. Medium areolis sex, marginali nebulam includente.
_Inferiores semi-ovatæ, petiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido.
**. d. 1. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales distincti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis sex. Apex venis abbreviatis.
__Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori trifido. Apex venis tribus.
**. d. 2. $\alpha$. Alce Superiores. Nervi costales subcoaliti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis septem. Apex dilatatus admodùm, avenius, venarum loco lineis duabus elevatiusculis, impunctulatis insignitus.
_Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido. Apex venis duabus.
**.d.2. . Alce Superiores coloratæ, coriaceæ. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis septem. Apex dilatatus admodùm.

Alse Inferiores coloratæ, coriaceæ, se-mi-ovatæ, magnæ, subpetiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori trifido.

* *. e. 1. Alca Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis septem, marginali lineari, elongatâ. Apex minutissimè punctulatus. __Inferiores semi-ovatæ, subsessiles; margine crassiori rectiusculo, tenuiori bifido. Apex venis tribus.
Maris Alce Superiores majores, nervis costalibus distinctis. Inferiores latiores, semi-ovales, sessiles.
**. e. 2. Alco Superiores. Nervi costales coaliti. Anastomosis obsoleta. Medium areolis septem, marginali nebulam includente. Apex dilatatus admodum. _Inferiores semi-ovatr, petiolatæ; margine crassiori subundulato, tenuiori bifido.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS on the HYMENOPTEROUS GENERA.

SIREX. Linneus's Artificial Character of this genus wants some correction. " $O s$ maxillis duabus validis," for reasons before assigned (b), should

> (b) Supra, p. 21.
be omitted. "Palpi duo truncati," would be better altered, admitting it to be a constant character, to "Palpi exteriores capitati;" since these insects, unless they depart from the general analogy of the class, have four palpi. It having never been my fortune to take one of this genus, I have not had it in my power to examine the proboscis. In S. gigas the exterior palpi are capitate, with a subrotund capitulum, in a male sent to Mr. Marsham as $S$. Mariscus, (but which appears to me a distinct insect), this capitulum is obliquely truncate, in both these the palpi are very hirsute. The next of the characters of Linneus "Antennc-articulis ultra 24," is contrary to fact. In no species, that I have had an opportunity of examining, do they exceed 24. The antennæ of S. Columba, fem. counting the minute joint that connects them with the head, and those of S. Camelus, have only fourteen. Those of that above-mentioned, labelled $S$. Mariscus, have sixteen. In $S$. Spectrum, mas, $S$. albicornis, fem. Fal. and S. Juvencus, fem. they amount to twenty-two. In one very like $S$. Juvencus, from America, given me by Major General Davies, they have eighteen joints; in S. Drometarius they have ouly thirteen; and finally in $S$. gigas, they reach the number, which Linneus has given as less than their lowest sum, twenty-four. From these facts I cannot help thinking that Linneus intended to have given it "Antennce articulis infra 24," and that the word ultra got in accidentally.
dentally. "Abdomen sessile mucronatum" is an excellent character, and in my idea distinguishes the genuine from the illegitimate Sirices. Other characters constantly distinguish this genus, some of the most prominent are the following: the tarsi are remarkably elongate; the truncus is retuse at each end, so as to receive both the head and abdomen; when these sit close to it, the body looks as if it was formed of one piece; the body is cylindrical, and in the male every where of equal diameter, or filiform; in the females, at the insertion of the aculeus, the venter swells into an obtuse angle. In common with Tenthredo, with which it has considerable affinity, this genus, upon each side of the metathorax, has what Linneus terms "Granum," or a small white spot. In some species the apex of each tibia is armed with a single spine, for instance, S. Columba, \&c. while in S. Juvencus, and others, the posterior are armed with two.

EVANIA. Upon comparing E. appendigaster with E. maculata, Fab. I am inclined to think that it is a good genus. I suspect that more species than one are confounded under the name of $A$. appendigaster. That figured by Panzer (c), with yellow antennæ, and brown feet and abdomen, seems quite distinct from those I have scen, in which these are all black.

AMMOPHILA. The Fabrician character of Sphex seems designed for those insects that I have
(c) Fn. Ins. Germ. Init. n. 68. tab. 12 .
called by this name. I find the foreign species to be extremely numerous, some of them are the most splendid insects in the class. My observation, in my paper upon this genus $(d)$, that colour seems constant, I find upon a view of the exotic specimens, is not founded in fact, although a considerable proportion are distinguished by the same colours. The antennæ of all are revolute, a circumstance not noticed in that paper.

TIPHIA. This genus, T. femorata, at least, and its affinities, is nearly related both to Scolia and Mutilla. Its eyes are oval and remarkably small; its antennæ are anterior, and spiral with a fusiform apex; its truncus is retuse at both ends, and nearly cubical, and its collum is larger than the thorax. Some of the Tiphice in Sir Joseph Banks's collection, which, if my recollection does not mislead me, were labelled by Fabricius, belong to a separate genus, intermediate between Vespa and Bember. Their tongue, and wings seem to come near the former genus, and their large oval eyes, and conic abdomen, to the fatter, but they have not the conic inflected labium, which is its most striking distinction. Christius has figured one of these under the name of Vespa biclypeata $(e)$. T. collaris of Fabricius has reniform eyes, and is a true Scolia. $T$. pedestris of the same author, if I do not mistake his insect, seems rather to belong to Mutilla; it is
(d) Lin. Trans. vol. 4. p. 200.
(e) Hymenopt. p. 223. tab. 19. fig. 6.
apterous, and has no stemmata; its body is, however, without hairs, in which it departs from both genera; it is probably one of the links which connect these proximate genera.

SCOLIA. This genus, at first sight, has a very strong resemblance to Tiphia, and also to Mutilla. The body is usually very hairy, the truncus retuse before and behind, and rather cubical, but it is distinguished from both by the following circumstances; its eyes are larger and reniform: its antennæ are inserted in the middle of the face, they are recurve, but not at all spiral; their apex sometimes is slightly fusiform, but more generally atte-nuate only at its base; its summit is often very obtuse, or rather truncate. The body of these insects is usually very hairy, and the anus is not seldom spinose.

THYNNUS. No genus in the class seems to be less known than this. There is no specimen of it in the French cabinets. Fabricius described his four species from insects in Sir Joseph Banks's collection, of these, two, viz. T. dentatus $(f)$ and $T$. emarginatus, are certainly congenerous insects, $T$. integer is doubtful, and T. abdominalis is an Apis of my family "labio inflexo elongato", of the section " ventre femineo glabro", and of the subdivision "abdomine femineo subcylindrico, ano obtuso." Of the two genuine Thynni, the antennæ are filiform, of fourteen joints, inserted in the middle of the
( $f$ ) Rœmer. Gen. Ins. tab. 35. fig. 8.
face: the lip is very minute: the maxillæ are bifid at their apex : the eyes are lateral, inclining to an oval figure : the collum is transverse before, and behind subrepand: the thorax is subquadrate: the scutellum, which is as large or larger than the thorax, is triangular, and terminates in a second piece besides the metathorax, so that it may be defined by the term duplex: the abdomen is elongatoconic, and the anus is spinose. In habit it approaches Bembex.

Thynnus integer varies from the others in the following particulars. The maxillæ are entire at their apex : the eyes are rather round : the collum receives the head and thorax into a sinus, which is the segment of a circle: the scutellum is single, (simplex) with a trnncate apex: the abdomen is subulato-conic, and the ventral segment of the anus terminates in a recurve spine.

DORYLUS. The only species of this genus known as yet, is the Mutilla helvola, Lin. which is certainly no Mutilla, and cannot well be arranged under any known genus: Fabricius has therefore, with great propriety, placed it by itself. In my idea it is more nearly related to Formica than Mutilla, for its abdomen is connected with the truncus by the intervention of a globose petiolus. It is a most singular insect; the following are its most prominent features. Its maxillæ are acute, without teeth, forcipate, immensely large: its eyes are hemispherical: its antcnme are filiform, inserted in
the middle of the face, and consist of thirteen or fourteen joints: its stemmata are very large and prominent : its face behind the antennæ swells into two protuberances: its thorax is extremely gibbous: and overhangs the head: its scutellum is large and gibbous: the base of its wings is not defended by squamulæ: its legs are veryshort; the second joint of their apophyses is of a very singular shape, being con-cavo-convex, very thin, and emarginate at its apex ; the thighs are compressed, very flat and thin, and the tibiæ and tarsi short and slender : the abdomen is elongate : the spiracula, which is remarkable, are easily discovered in its dorsal segments, and the last ventral segment terminates in two truncate setæ, like some of the Neuroptera, with which class this insect seems to have some affinity. If Termes was placed at the end of that class, and Dorylus at the head of this, I think we should not depart far from the order of Nature. I know not whether the neuter of Dorylus be apterous or not, but I suspect it may.

MUTILLA. The Linnean Artificial Character of this genus is very insufficient. One drawn up in the following terms would apply well, at least to all the species that I have had an opportunity of examining.

Os proboscide brevi, palpis setaceis :
Antennce anteriores, spirales, articulis 13-14, apice fusiformi:
Oculi minuti, subrotundi, laterales:
Alce et Stemmata neutris nulla:
Aculeus reconditus.
I have

I have omitted the Linnean character, " thorax posticè retusus," because it is not by any means peculiar to this genus, and the above seem fully sufficient without it. T. pedestris, Fab. I just now observed, belongs to this genus; more of the same habit may be seen in Mr. Francillon's rich cabinet, these are all "corpore glaberrimo;" the shape of their abdomen is similar to that of Formica, and they seem to be intermediate between that genus and the hirsute Mutillic. The latter genus, if these prove at last genuine Mutillce, might be divided into two families, *. corpore glabro. **. corpore pubescenti. I have examined only one male insect of this genus, M. Europcea. It varies from the female in the shape of its eyes, which are somewhat reniform, and its anus has a minute spine on each side, circumstances which give it considerable aff nity with Scolia, and shew how the genera shade one into another. Its squamulæ likewise are very large, and its neck embraces the anterior part of the thorax.

## TABULARUM EXPLICATIO.

## TABULA PRIMA(a). <br> MELITTA. *. a.

FIG. 1. CAPUT subtriangulare. a. Stemmata in lineâ curvâ.
2. Proboscis. a a. Valvule linguam amplectentes. bb. Palpi exteriores. c. Lingua apice biloba lobis divaricatis.
3. Lingua valde aucta. a. Tubus conicus, apice tridentatus. bl. Palpi interiores, setacei, quatuor articulorum. c. Linguæ Apex ciliatus, lobis apice laceris.
4. Valvula valde aucta, sublinearis. a. Valvulæ Basis. bc. Valvulæ Apex plicatus, rotundatus. b. Plica inferior. $c_{\text {, }}$ Plica superior. d. Palpus exterior, setaceus, sexarticulatus. ee. Seta rigidiusculæ.
5. Maxilla aculeatæ, subedentula.
6. a. Labium antice obtusangulum. b. Faciei portio antica cui Labium annectitur.
(a) N.B. In sequentibus tabulis figura omnes sunt plùs minùs aucta.

FIG.
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TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Melitta. *. a. b.)
FIG. 7. Maxilla maris, apice bidentata.
8. Antenna aculeatæ subclavata, 13 articulorum. a. Radicula. b. Scapus elongatus, arcuatus. c. Pedicellus subglobosus. d. Apex articulis cylindricis, primo conico.
9. Antenna maris, filiformis, 14 articulorum. 10. Abdomen aculeate, subconicum, subacutum, sex segmentorum.
11. Aldomen maris, procedente angustius, septem segmentorum.
12. Unguis. a. Pulvillus. bb. Unguiculi bifidi.

> MELITTA. *. b.

FIG. 1. Lingua valde aucta, brevis. a. Tulus conicus, apice tridentatus. $l$. Tubi dens intermedius lateralibus major. c. Linguæ Apex truncatus, ciliatus. dd. Auriculae obtusæ. e. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum.
2. Valvula valde aucta, linearis. a. Lori portio. l. Valvulæ Basis. c. Membrana. d. Valvulæ Apex subacutus. e. Palpus exterior setaceus, sex articulorum.
3. Caput subtriangulare. a. Nasus distinctus, apice truncatus.
4. Labium valde auctum, anticè obtusangulum, setoso-pectinatum.

Q 2
FIG.

FIG. 5. Maxilla aculeatæ, apice bidentata dente interiori subemarginato.
6. Maxilla maris, apice bidentata dente interiori integro.
7. Ala superior. a. Basis. b. Medium areolis sex. c. Apex. d. Nervus costalis exterior. e. Nervus costalis interior. f. Anastomosis.
8. Portio Antennæ M. dilatate mas, (vol. 2. p 39 ) a.Scapus dilatatus, patelliformis.
9. Antenna aculeatæ, apicis articulo primo pedicelloque subconicis.
10. Aitenna maris.
11. Adomen aculeatæ subconicum, basi retusum, segmentis sex.
12. Aldomen masculum septem segmentorum.

## TABULA SECUNDA.

MELITTA. **. a.
FIG. 1. Proloscis valde aucta. a.Tubus conicus, apice obsoletè tridentatus. $l b$. Falvulce. c. Linguce apex, acutus vel acuminatus. dd. Auricula apice laceræ. ee. Lora. f. Membrana lora connectens. g.g. Palpi interiores fractæ, articulis 4, articulo primo longiore arcuato.
2. Valvula linearis. a. Palpus exterior sex articulorum. b. Valvulæ Basis. c. Valvulæ

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { L5AR }
\end{aligned}
$$



Valvulæ Apex brevis, rotundatus, hinc intus fissus.
FIG. 3. Caput rotundatum.
4. Latium aculeatæ valde auctúm, anticè emarginatum, setoso-pectinatum.
5. Labium masculum valde auctum, anticè subemarginatum.
6. Maxilla aculeatæ, apice bidentata dente exteriori longiore.

- Maxilla mascula, apice edentula.

8. Antenna aculeatæ, subclavatæ. a. Scupus elongatus. l. Peclicellus subglobosus.
9. Antenna maris, filiformis, submoniliformis. a. Scapus brevis.
10. Aldomen aculeatæ, ovatum, sex segmentorum, ultimo minutissimo.
11. Aldomen masculum sublineare, septem segmentorum.

MELITTA. $\because \because$.
PIG. 1. Proloscis. a a.Lora proboscidis longitudine. b. Tubus conicus.
2. Lingua valde aucta. a a. Auriculce apice laceræ. b. 'Tuli portio apice tridentato, dente intermedio emarginato. cc. Palpi interiores fractic, articulis quatuor, primo longiori arcuato. d Lingure ippex acutus, lacerns.
3. Caput subtriangulare. a. Jasus.

FIG. 4. Labium aculeatæ valde auctum, anticè appendiculatum, et setoso-pectinatum. a. Appendicula. b. Labium.
5. Labium aliud figurâ diversum.
6. Labium masculum, valde auctum, lineare, absque appendiculâ.
7. Abdomen aculeatæ subovale, sex segmentorum, ultimo minutissimo.
8. Anus aculeatæ valde auctus. a. Rima analis. $\quad b$. Abdominis segmentum ultimum.
9. Abdomen masculum, lineare, septem segmentorum.
10. Anterior pars capitis M.quadricinctre mas, (tom. 2. p. 51.) a. Labium. b6. Maxillce basi dilatatæ.
11. Maxilla ejusdem seorsum conspecta.
12. Anterior pars capitis M.rubicundoe mas, (tom.2.p.53.) a.Labium.bl.Maxills.

TABULA TERTIA.
MELITTA. **. b. cont.
FIG. 1. Caput a latere conspectum ad modum exhibendum proboscidem explicandi. $a$. Lora. b. Proboscis apice maxillas versus.
2. Valvula valde aucta, linearis. a. Palpus exterior, setaceus, sex articulorum. $b$. Lorum valde elongatum. c. Valvulæ Basis.
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TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Melitta. **. b. c.)
Basis. d. Apex obtusus, intus hinc fissus.
FIG. 3. Maxilla aculeatæ, apice bidentata.
4. Maxilla mascula, arcuata, apice edentula, acuta.
5. Ala superior. ab. Nervi costales. c. Anastomosis. d. Basis alæ. e. Medi$u m$ areolis septem. f. Apex. g. Concursus apicis et basis alæ.
6. Antenna aculeatæ, subclavata. a. Scapus elongatus. b. Pedicellus subglobosus.
7. Antenna maris, filiformis, scapo brevi, apice articulis subarcuatis.
8. Aculei Vagina subulata.
9. Spiculum. a. Retinaculum.
10. Spiculi apex hinc retrorsum serrulatus.

## MELITTA. **. c.

FIG. 1. Caput subrotundatum. aa. Tulercuta apud basin Maxillarum.
2. Caput masculum, maxillis forcipatis.
3. Proboscis basi subtus villosa. aa. Auriculc. b. Linguæ apex acutus. cc. Valvulce. d. Tubus linearis, apice tridentatus. ee. Palpi exteriores. ff. Palpi interiores.
4. Lingua valde aucta, apice hastata. $a a$ Auriculce recurvæ, apice laceræ.
5. Linguæ plicatæ positionem exhibet. aa. Valvu.

TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Melitta. **. с.)
Valvularum Apex. b. Linguæ apex sursum plicatus, acumine gulam versus. cc. Palpi interiores.
FIG. 6. Valvula valde aucta. a. Palpus exterior, setaceus, sex articulorum. b. Valvulæ Apex semi-cordatus, acuminatus. c. Basis villosus.
7. Linguæ Apex valde auctus, seorsum conspectus, acuminatus acumine lacero, rimâ longitudinali, dimidiato-trans-versè-striatus.
8. Lingua M. Swammerdamella (tom. 2. p. 174.) a a. Auricula acutæ. b. Linguæ Apex subsetaceus. cc. Palpi interiores.
9. Valvula ejusdem valde aucta. a. Apex cultriformis. b. Basis. c. Palpus exterior.
10. Labium maris. a. Tuberculum.
11. Labium aculeatæ. a. Tuberculum.
12. Capitis pagina inferior. a. Gula. b. Annulus. cc. Valvularum Basis.

TABULA QUARTA.
MELITTA. **. c. cont.
FIG. 1. Abdomen aculeatæ, ovale, sex segmentorum ultimo minutissimo. a. Fimbria anum vestiens.
2. Avdomen masculum sublanceolatum, septem segmentorum.

3. Maxilla aculeatæ, apice bidentata.
4. Maxilla maris.
5. Maxillce pars M. denticulatex (tom. 2. p. 133.) a. Denticulus basin maxillæ armans.
6. Maxilla M. angulosic (tom. 2. p. 127.) portio. a. Basis obtusangula.
7. Maxilla M. armatce (tom. 2. p. 124.) a. Dens basin armans.
8. Maxillce M. spinigerce (tom. 2. p. 123 ) portio. a. Spina basin armans.
9. Metathorax M. combinatice (tom. 2. p. 153.) utrinque fimbriata. ca. Fimbria. 10. Pes posticus. a. Flocculus. b. Scopa. c. Apophysis articulus primus. d. Apophysis articulus secundus. e. Femur. f. Spinuld. g. Planta.
11. Antenna aculeate. a. Apicis articulus primus elongatus, basi attenuatus.
12. Antenna maris scapo villosissimo.
13. Caput M. angulosa (tom. 2. p. 127.) a latere conspectum. a. Gena postice rectangula.
14. Pes posticus M. Swammerlamellce (tom. 2. p. 174.)
15. Abdomen M. Shawellic (tom. 2. p. 160.)
16. Capitis portio. aa. Maculec duæ sericeæ apud oculos. b. Occiput. cc. Vertex. a. Stemmata.
17. Antenna maris M. chrysurce. (tom. 2. p.172.) apice subtus subdentato.

FIG.

FIG. 18. Labium M. tridentatce (tom. 2. p. 132.) a ventre conspectum.

## APIS. *. a.

FIG. 1. Maris Caput anticè truncatum.
2. Proboscis. a. Fulcrum. b. Tubus conicus, apice tridentatus. c. Valvula linearis. dd. Palpi interiores quatuor articulorum, primo elongato. e. Lingua setacea.
3. Valvula valde aucta, linearis. a. Basis. b. Apex lanceolato-linearis, incurvus. c. Palpus exterior subsetaceus, sex articulorum.
4. Linguce portio valde aucta. a a. Lacinice interiores lineari-lanceolatæ, acutæ. b. Tubi pars. c. Palpi interioris pars. d. Linguce pars.
5. Linguæ Apex valde aucta, villosa, transversè striatula.
6. Labium valde auctum, subovale, anticè barbatum.
7. Maxilla edentula.
8. Antenna aculeatæ.
9. Antenna maris.
10. Abdomen aculeatæ, ovale, sex articulorum, ultimo minutissimo. a. Ani Fimbria.
11. Abdomen maris, ovato-lanceolatum.
12. Pes posticus A. ursine (tom. 2. p. 178.)

FIG.


FIG. 13. Unguis unguiculis bifidis.
14. Tibia postica A. Linnceellce (ubi supr. 179.) dolabriformis.

## TABULA QUINTA. APIS. *, b.

FIG. 1. Caput posticè obtusangulum.
2. Proboscis. a. Tubus linearis, apice tridentatus, dente intermedio majori. $b$. Fulcrum subtriangulare. cc. Lora. dd. Lacinice interiores. e. Lingua. ff. Palpi interiores. gg. Valvulıe. hh. Palpi exteriores.
3. Lingua valde aucta. a a. Lacinice interiores subsetaceæ. b. Palpi interiores quatuor articulorum primo elongato.
4. Valvula valde aucta, sublinearis. a. Apex lanceolato-linearis. b. Basis. c. Lorum. d Palpus exterior sex articulorum, primo brevissimo.
5. Labium ovale.
6. Maxilla maris.
7. Maxilla aculeatæ.
8. Truncus. a. Collum. b. Collare. cc. Tulercula dd Squamulce. e. Thorax. f. Scutellum. g. Vetathorax. h. Cavitas ubi inosculatur abdominis petiolus.
9. Abdomen aculeatæ, sex segmentorum, ultimo minutissimo.
10. Anus valde auctus, apice setosus.

FIG.

FIG. 11. Abdomen maris, lanceolatum, septem segmentorum.
12. Anus valde auctus, apice emarginatus.
13. Unguis aculeatæ valde auctus. a. Pulvillus.
14. Unguis alius valde auctus. a. Pulvillus petiolatus.
15. Unguis maris valde auctus. a. Pulvillus elongatus.
16. Antenna aculeatæ.
17. Antenna maris.
18. Caput A. cornigere (tom. 2. p. 190) a latere conspectum. a. Labium. b. Cornu.
APIS. **. a.

FIG. 1. Caput posticè obtusangulum.
2. Proboscidis pars inferior, valvulis linguam obvolventibus. aa. Valvularum Apex. bl. Basis.
3. Proboscidis pars superior. aa. Valvularum Apex. b. Tubus. c. Fulcrum. dd. Lora.
4. Proboscis a latere conspecta. a. Valvulæ Apex. b. Basis. c. Labium. dd. Lora. e. Fulcrum. f. V/embrana lora connectens. g. Haxilla.
Obs. Hee tres ultime figure linguam valvulis munitam et convolutam exhibent.
5. Proloscidis portio a Tubus a latere conspectus. bb. Lacinio interiores setaceæ.

UN1


## tabularum explicatio. (Apis. **. a.)

setacer. cc. Lacinice exteriores. $d d$. Palpi interiores biarticulati.
FIG. 6. Tubus linearis, apice tridentatus dentibus æqualibus.
7. Labium valde auctum, subquadratum, concavo-convexum. aa. Puncta duo fenestrata.
8. Naxilla aculeatæ.
9. Maxilla maris.
10. Unguis maris valde auctus, unguiculis bifidis, dentibus intermediis membranaceis. a. Pulvillus integer.
11. Unguis áculeatæ unguiculis integris. a. Pulvillus emarginatus.

## TABULA SEXTA.

APIS. **. a. cont.
FIG. 1. Valvula valde aucta. a. Tubi basis. b. Fulcrum elongatum. cc. Lora. d. Mfembrana lora connectens. e. Valvulæ Basis. f. Apex. g. Palpus exterior filiformis, quinque articulorum, articulo intermedio attenuato.
2. Scutelli pars. aa. Dentes sub hirsutie ocultati.
3. Antenna maris, quatuordecim articulorum.
4. Antenna aculeatæ, tredecim articulorum.
5. Abdomen aculcatre, ex ovato subglobosum, ano mucronato.

FIG.

FIG. 6. Anus maris, segmento ultimo subemarginato.
7. Portio Pedis antici valde aucta. a Pars Palma segmento circuli dempto. $b$. Strigilis f. pecten setarum c Velum. d. Spinula utrinque serrulatæ. e. Tiliae portio.
8. a. Sternum. bl. Pectus.
APIS. **. b.

FIG. 1. Caput.
2. Proboscis. a. Fulcrum elongatum, subclavatum. b. Lori pars. c. Valvulæ Cardo. dd. Valvulas. ee. Palpi exteriores. $f$. Tubus linearis, apice tridentatus dente interiori majore. $g g$. Laciniae exteriores. h. Lingua.
3. Lingua valde aucta. a a . Lacinia interiores, lineari-lanceolatæ. b. Palpus interior biarticulatus. c. Lacinia exterior e duobus æqualibus articulis constans.
4. Valvula valde aucta, linearis. a. Lorum. $b$ Valvulæ Basis. c. Valvulæ Apex lanceolatus, obtusus. d. Palpus exterior minutissimus, exarticulatus.
5. Maxilla apice acuta, edentula.
6. Labium anticè curvum, f. subarcuatum.
7. Antennce aculeatæ tredecim articulorum.
8. Trunci portio. a a. Dentes thoracem posticè armans. b. Scutellum tuberculis duobus munitum.

FIG.


FIG. 9. Abdomen aculeatæ conicum, sex segmentorum.
10. Unguis unguiculis integris.

TABULA SEPTIMA.
APIS. **. c. 1. $\alpha$.
FIG. 1. Caput. a a. Oculi pilosissimi.
2. Proboscis a. Palpus exterior. b. Valvulæ Basis. c. Apex. d. Fulcrum. e. Tubus linearis, apice tridentatus, dente intermedio longiori. ff Lacinice exteriores. gg. Palpi interiores biarticulati h. Lingua.
3. Valvulce portio valde aucta. a. Basis. b. Spex. c. Palpus exterior, biarticulatus, acutus, pilosulus.
4. Proloscidis portio valde aucta. a a. Lacinice interiores, lineares. b. Lacinia exterior.
5 Labium.
6. Maxilla aculeatæ.
7. I. axilla maris.
8. Antenna aculeatæ tredecim articulorum.
9. Antenna maris quatuordecim articulorum.
10. Scutellum A. conicre (tom. 2. p. 224.) dente incurvo utrinque.
11. Abdomen aculeatæ.
12. Anus dehiscens a latere conspectus. a. Segmentum ultimum tergi. $b$. Segmentum ultimam ventris. c. Aculeus. FIG.
14. Anus a dorso conspectus. aa. Dentes furcati terminales. $b b$. Dentes laterales integri
18. Dens terminalis furcatus a latere con.spectus.
16. Aldomen masculum A. inermis (tom. 2. p. 229 ) ano octodentato.
17. Unguis aculeatæ, unguiculis integris.
18. Unguis maris, unguiculis apice bifidis.

$$
\text { APIS. **. c. 1. } \beta \text {. }
$$

FIG. 1. Proboscis. a. Fulcrum elongatum, subclavatum. b. Tubus linearis. c. Valvula. d. Palpus exterior. ee Lacinia exteriores. ff. Palpi interiores. g Lingua.
2. Valvulce portio valde aucta. a. Valvulæ Basis. b. Apex. c. Palpus exterior biarticulatus.
3. Proboscidis portio. a. Lacinia interior brevis, setaceus. b. Lacinia exterior.
4. Abdomen aculeatæ, incurvum.
5. Idem a latere conspectum. a. Anus subdehiscens.
6. Anus rectangulus $A$. phapoptere (tom. 2.
p. 232.)
7. Maxilla aculeatæ apice tridentata.
8. Antenna aculeatæ tredecim articulorum.
9. Caput rotundatum.

TABULA
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## TABULA OCTAVA.

$$
\text { APIS. **. c. 2. } \alpha .
$$

FIG. 1. Caput rotundatum, maxillis prominentibus, validissimis.
2. Proboscis. a. Labium. b. Maさilla. c. Valvula. d. Palpus exterior. e. Tubus. ff. Palpi interiores. 5. Lacinie exteriores. $h$. Lingua
3. Valvula valde aucta. a. Basis. b. Apex. c. Palpus biarticulatus.
4. Portio Proboscidis. a a Lacini e interiores, breves, acutæ. b. Tuli portio, apice tridentato dentibus æqualibus.
5. Labium.
6. Antenna aculeatæ, tredecim articulorum.
7. Antenna maris quatuordecim articulorum.
8. Anterna mascula $A$. Willughliellae (tom. 2. p. 233, 234.) a. Articulus extimus reliquis major.
9. Maxilla aculeate ejusdem (ibid. p. 233.)
10. Maxilla maris cjusdem (ibid. p. 23-4.)
11. Marilla aculeatr A. centuncularis (ibid. p. 239.)
12. Maxilla maris ejusdem (ibid. p. 240.)
13. Maxilla aculeate A. maritimes (ibid. p. 242.) 244.)
17. Maxilla maris ejusdem apice bidentata, dente interiori brevissimo segmento circuli dempto.
15. Maxilla aculeatæ, A. circumcincta (ibid. p. 246.)
16. Maxilla aculeatæ A. xanthomelance (ibid. p. 247.)
18. Abdomen aculeatæ $A$. centuncularis (ibid. p. 239.)
19. Abdomen aculeatæ A.maritimac (ibid. p. 242.)
20. Abdomen aculeatæ A. Willughbiella (ibid. p. 234.)
21. Aldomen aculeatæ A. ligniseçe (ibid. p. 244.)
22. Venter hirsutie densâ tectus.
23. Abdomen masculum.
24. Anus masculus $A$. Willughbielle (ibid. p. 234.)
25. Anus masculus A. lignisecre (ibid. p. 244.)
26. Anus masculus A. centuncularis (ibid. p. 240.)
27. Apophysis mascula A. Willughliella (ibid. p. 234.)
28. Pes anticus masculus ejusdem (ibid) a. Apophysis articulus primus. b. Articulus secundus. c. Articuli primi Mucre.

UNH: 2 . MOIS


TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis. **. c. 2. व. . .)
Mucro. d Femur. e.Tilia. f.Tarsus. g. Cilia incurva tarsi.

FIG. 29. Femur.
30. Maris Unguis unguiculis apice bifidis.
31. Aculeatæ Unguis unguiculis hinc dente instructis.

> TABULA NONA.
> APIS $\% *$ с. $2 . \beta$.

EIG. 1. Caput rotundatum. a. Nasus
2. Proboscis. a a. Lora. l. Membrana lora connectens. cc. Valuulce. dd. Palpi exteriores. e. Fulcrum elongatum. $f$. Tubus linearis. gg. Lacinice exteriores. h. Lingua.
3. Lingure Portio. aa. Licinice interiores lineari-lanceolatæ, acutæ.
4. Palpus exterior exarticulatus.
5. Lalium.
6. Maxilla aculeatæ A. manicata (tom. 2. p. 249.)
7. Maxilla maris ejusdem (ibitl. p. 250.)
8. Antenna aculeatæ tredecim articulorum.
9. Antenna maris quatuordecim articulorum.
10. Aldomen aculeatæ, subglobosum.
11. Anus masculus apice spinis quinque armatus. a a Segmentum antepenultimum utrinque in angulum protensum (ibid. p. 250.) b6. Spince segmenti penultimi. c. Spince anales. R. 2

IIG. culus secundus obtusangulus (ibid.)
13. Unguis unguiculis apice bifidis. $a$. Pulvillus minutissimus.

$$
\text { APIS. **. c. 2. } \gamma .
$$

FIG. 1. Caput subglobosum.
2. Caput A. maxillosa (tom. 2. p. 251.) aa. Maxillse. b. Labium. c. Squamula nasi.
3. Proboscis. a. Valvula. bb Laciniae exteriores articulo primo brevi. $c$. Lingua. dd. Palpi interiores. e. Tubus linearis, apice tridentatus. f. Fulcrum. sg. Lora.
4. Valvulse portio valde auctæ. a. Basis. b. Palpus exterior, biartículatus. c. Apex.
5. a. Lacinice exterioris pars. b. Palpus interior exarticulatus.
6. Maxilla seorsum conspecta.
7. Antenna aculeatæ tredecim articulorum, clavata.
S. Antenna mascula, quatuordecim articulorum.
9. Antenna mascula $A$. forisomnis (ibid. p. 254) articulis intermediis subtus obtusangulis.
10. Abdomen aculeatæ.
11. Abdomen masculum $A$. florisomnis (ibid.). a. Cornu ventris. b. Anus apice



TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis.**. c. 2. $\gamma, \delta$.)
apice bidentatus. c. Cornu ani ventralis, $\int$. segmentum ultimum recurvum. $d$. Cavitas tomentoso-pallida.
FIG. 12. Amus ejusdem. a a. Dentes dorsales ani. bし. Dentes ventrales ani.
13. Abdomen masculum A. Campanularum (ibid. p. 257.) a. Ventris segménti secundi tuberculum.
14. Anus ejusdem apice bidentatus dentibus acutis.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { 15. Unguis aculeatæ } \\ \text { 16. Unguis maris }\end{array}\right\}$ unguiculis integris.
17. Unguis masculus aliûs speciei, unguiculis bifidis.

## TABULA DECIMA.

APIS. **. c. 2. \&.

FIG. 1. Caput subglobosum, maxillis prominentibus.
2. Proloscis explicata unà cum capite. a. Gula. b. Jugulum. c. Lora. d. Fulcrum. ee. Palpi interiores biarticulati.
3. Valvula valde aucta. a. Palpus exterior quatuor articulorum. $b$. Valvule $B a-$ sis. c. Apex.
4. Tubi portio valde aucta. a. Fulcrum elongatum. b. Tubi pars.
5. Lingua valde aucta, pilosissima, transversè striatula, apice subcapitata. aa.

$$
\text { R } 3 \quad \text { Lacinia }
$$

246 TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis.**. c. 2. 8. d. 1.) Lacinice interiores lanceolatæ, acuminatæ. b. Lingua.
FIG. 6. Capitis A. licornis (tom. 2. p. 271.) portio. a a. Cornua rigida quæ faciem armant.
7. Cornu præcedentis, valde auctum, seorsum conspectum.
8. Cornu Var. $\beta$ (ibid. p. 273 ) valde auctum.
9. Maxilla aculeatæ.
10. Maxilla maris.
12. Labium.
13. Capitis pars prona ad Latii situm exhir bendum. aa. Gence. bl Maxille. c. Labium. d. Proboscidis apex.
14. Antenna aculeatæ.
15. Antenna maris.
16. Alvdomen aculeatæ.
17. Abdomen masculum.
18. Anus masculus A.spinulosa (ibid. p. 262.)
19. Anus masculus A. crerulescentis (ibid. p. 266.) a a. Dentes ani ventrales.
20. Anus masculus A. Vicornis (ibid. p. 273.)
21. Segmentum ultimum ventrale maris $A_{0}$ Tunensis (ibid. p. 270.)
22. Unguis maris unguiculis bifidis.
23. Unguis aculeatæ unguiculis integris.

$$
\text { APIS. } \% \text { \%. d. } 1 .
$$

FIG. 1. Valvula portio valde auctr. $a$. Valvule Basis. b. Pili plumosi. c. Pecten. d. Palpus


d. Palpus exterior sexarticulatus. e. Valvulæ Apex.
FIG. 2. Proboscidis portio. a a Lacinice exteriores. bl. Lacinise interiores pilosæ apicibus involutis. cc. Palpi interiores biarticulati.
3. Linguce portio et Lacinice interiores valde aucta. a. Lingua. bb Basis laciniæ interioris linguam vaginans. c. Cilia.
4. Maxilla maris.
5. Maxilla aculeatæ.
6. Labium anticè emarginatum.
7. Antenna maris elongata articulis arcuatis. 8. Antennee articulus valde auctus ex hexagonis innumeris constans.

## TABULA UNDECIMA.

$$
\text { APIS. **. d. 2. } \alpha . \beta .
$$

FIG. 1. Proboscis explicata. a. Fulcrum. U. Lora. c. Valvulce. d. Tubus. ee. Lacinice exteriores. ff. Lacinice interiores. g. Lingua. hh. Palpi exteriores. ii. Palpi interiores.
2. Valvula portio valde aucta. a. Palpus exterior, sex articulorum. b. Valvula.
3. Proloscis plicata extracta, ut interiora ejus in situ naturali exhibeantur. aa. Basis Valvularum. l. Lora. c. Fulcrum. d. Valvularum Apex. c. Tubus. R 4 FIG.

TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis. **. d. 2. a. 阝. e. 1.) FIG. 4. Caput. a. Nasus.
5. Labium quadratum.
6. Maxilla aculeatæ.
7. Maxilla aculeatæ A.furcate (tom. 2. p. 288.)
8. Maxilla maris.
9. Falvula $A$ cyanere (tom. 2. p. 308) a. Apex incurvus.
10. Proboscidis ejusdem pars. a. Lacinice. interiores.
11. Antenna maris.
12. Antenna aculeatæ.
13. Antenna aculeatæ A. cyanere.
14. Aldomen aculeatæ.
15. Aldomen masculum $A$. furcato (tom. 2. ubi supr.) $a$. Furca ani.
16. Abdomen aculeatæ $A$. cyanere (ubi supr. p.309.)
17. Pedis postici pars: a. Tibia. b. Tarsus infra apicem tibiæ insertus.
18. Pes intermedius maris $A$. retusa (ubi supr. p. 299.) abcd. Barba tarsi.
19. Valvulæ Basis A. violacea, Lin. a. Pecten.
20. Labium ejusdem anticè emarginatum,
21. Maxilla ejusdem apex.
APIS. **. e. 1. mas.

FIG, 1. Proboscis. a. Fulcrum. b. Tubus, cc: Valvulce. dd. Lacinice interiores. ee; Palpi exteriores. f. Lingua.
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nenut.

$(x)$


FIG. 2. Caput oculis posticè concurrentibus.
3. Maxilla valde aucta, apice bidentata, dente interiore truncato.
4. Labium.
5. Antenna valde aucta, apice articulis duobus primis brevissimis.
6. Aldomen.

7 Anus a latere conspectus.
8. Pes posticus. ab. Apophysis. c. Femur. d. Tilia. e. Planta. f. Digitus.
9. Unguis. a a. Unguiculi. b. Pulvillus.

## TABULA DUODECIMA.

APIS. **. e. 1. fem.
FIG. 1. Proboscis. a. Fulcrum. b. Tubus dente intermedio emarginato. c. Cardo. d. Lorum. e. Valvula: f. Palpus exterior. g. Lacinice exteriores. $h h$. Palpi interiores. i. Lingua.
2. Linguє apex constrictus.
3. Caput.
4. Maxilla valde aucta, apice bidentata, dente interiore segmento circuli dempto.
5 Eadem in situ diverso conspecta.
6. Antenna valde aucta.
7. Abdomen elongato-conicum.
8. Pes posticus.
9. Unguis valde auctus.
APIS. **. e. 1. neut.

FIG. 1. Proboscis explicata. aa. Valvularum Basis. bb. Apex. cc. Palpi exteriores;
ores. d. Lora. e. Fulcrum. f. Tubus. gg Laciniae exteriores. $h h$. Lacinice interiores. i. Lingua. $k$. Palpi interiores.
2. Linguce pagina inferior.
3. Linguce pagina superior.
4. Palpus interior valde auctus, articulo primo bifido.
5. Palpus exterior valde auctus, setâ terminatus.
6. Valvula valde aucta. a. Valvulæ Basis. b. Apex. c. Pecten. d. Palpus exterior.
7. Tubus. a a. Lacinice interiores obtusæ.
8. Caput. a. Vertex. b. Frons. c. Nasus. d. Occiput. e. Labium. f. Maxilla.
9. Capitis pagina inferior. aa. Gence. b. Jugulum. c. Gula annulo circundata.
10. Maxillse superficies exterior.
11. Maxillce superficies interior.
12. Labium.
13. Antenna.
14. Ala superior. a. Squamula.
15. Ala inferior. a. Fissura marginis tenuioris.
16. Abdomen.
17. Abdominis basis intima, f. segmentum primum.
18. Anus a latere conspectus.
19. Pes posticus. a. Tibia. bb. Corbicula. c. Planta. d. Auricula.

FIG.


TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis.**. e. 1.2.)
FIG. 20. Planter valde auctæ pagina interior. a. Auricula.
21. Pedis antici portio. a. Tibia. b. Velum. c. Spinula. d. Strigilis.
22. Unguis valde auctus.
23. Aculei Vagina.
24. Spiculum. a. Retinaculum.
25. Spiculi apex valde auctus, hinc serrulatus.

## TABULA DECIMA-TERTIA. <br> APIS. **. e. 2.

FIG. 1. Proboscis explicata. aa. Lora. bb. Cardines. cc. Valvulce. d. Tubus. e. Fulcrum. ff. Lacinice interiores gg Lacinice exteriores. h. Lingua.
2. Proboscis in actu explicandi. a. Membrana lora connectens. bl. Lora. c. Valvulæ Basis. dd. Ejusdem Apex. e. Fulcrum. ff. Lacinice exteriores. g. Lingua. h. Tubus.
3. Valvulce pars valde aucta. a. Pecten. b. Palpus exterior.
4. 5. 6. Palpi exteriores varii.
7. Proboscidis et Capitis portio. a. Gula. bl. Annulus cc. Lora. dd. Cardines. e Fulcrum. ff. Valvularum Basis. g. 'Tubus. h. Jugulum.
8. Lingua portio. aa. Lacinice interiores. b. Linguce pars.

FIG.

TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis. **. e. 2.)
FIG. 9. Caput A. hortorum (tom. 2. p. 340.)
10. Caput A. Scrimshirance (ibid p. 342.)
11. Labium.
12. Labium A. rupestris (ibid. p. 369.)
13. Maxilla aculeatæ.
14. Maxilla maris.
15. Antenna aculeatæ.
16. Antenna maris.
17. Ala superior. a. Nebula marginalis.
18. Ala inferior.
19. Ala inferioris margo crassior. a. $H \alpha$ muli.
20. Pedis postici portio. a. Tibia corbiculâ cincta. b. Planta. c. Auricula. dd. Spinula.
21. Planta postica seorsum conspecta. a Auricula.
22. Pedis postici pars $A$. campestris \&c. (tom. 2. p. 335, 43, 47, 69)
23. Planta postica præcedentium sine auria culâ.
24. Aldomen aculeatæ.
25. Anus A. rupestris (tom. 2. p. 369, 70.) $a$. Segmentum ani dorsale. bb. Ani segmenti ventralis latera in angulum protensa.
26. Abdomen maris.
27. Aculeus inter valvas repositus. a. Acum leus. bb. Valva.
28. Idem valvis patentibus. aa.Valva. bb. Spicula. c. Vagina.
UNNEROM U A NOLS


TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Apis. **. e 2)
FIG. 29. Vagina extractis spiculis.
30. Spiculum. a. Retinaculum.
31. Spiculi apex valde auctus, hinc retrorsum serrulatus.
32. Unguis valde auctus. a. Pulvillies. 33. Penis. a a. Forcipes. b. Phallus.
34. Pilus plumosus.
35. Segmenti dorsalis abdominis sectio transversa. a. Segmenti basis intima sub præcedentis segmenti margine delitescens. $\quad b$. Segmenti pagina aperta. c. Spiraculum.
36. a. Spiraculum valde auctum.

Obs. Spiracula difficillimè deteguntur, nisi sub
lente forti, vix ac ne vix, conspicienda.
37. Maxilla aculeatæ, A. Barbutellce.

## TABULA DECIMA.QUARTA.

 MISCELLANEA, No. 1.FIG. 1. Proloscis generis Tenthredo, Linn. a a. Valvularum Cardines. b. Tubi Fulcrum. cc. Valvularum Basis. dd. Apex earundem. e. Lingua. fs. Tulus. hh. Palpi exteriores medio crassiores, sex articulorum. ii. Palpi interiores.
2. Lingua seorsum conspecta. a. Linņaæ Basis. b. Apex tripartitus. c. Pulpus inferior subclavatus, quatuor articulorum.

No. 2.

No. 2.
FIG. 1. Proboscis generis Ichneumon, Linn. acu• leo retracto. a. Tubus. b. Valvulæ Basis. c. Apex truncatus, concavus. d. Palpus exterior quinque articulorum secundo trapeziformi. e. Lingua truncata, semi-cylindrica. f. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum, intermediis crassioribus.
2. Proboscis generis Ichneumon, Linn. aculeo exerto. aa.Valvulce. b.Tubus. c. Palpus exterior quinque articulorum secundo trapeziformi. dd. Palpi interiores quatuor articulorum, articulis intermediis crassioribus.
3. Lingua cylindrica.

No. 3.
FIG. 1. Proboscis Sphecis cujusdam petiolatæ. $a$. Valvula. b. Tubus conicus. c. Palpus exterior sex articulorum articulo tertio trapeziformi. d. Palpus interio ${ }^{\circ}$ quatuor articulorum. e. Lingua concava.

$$
\text { No. } 4 .
$$

FIG. 1. Proboscis generis Pompilus, Fab. aa. Cardines. bl. Valvularum Basis. c. Apex. d.Tubus apice bifidus. $e_{0}$ Palpus exterior setaceus, sex articulorum.

TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Miscellanea.)
rum. $f$. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum. g. Lingua.
2. Lingua valde aucta. a. Linguæ Basis. b. Ejusdem Aper, trilobus. cc. Maculæ duæ pilosæ.

$$
\text { No. } 5 .
$$

FIG. 1. Proloscidis pars generis Crabro, Fab. a. Tubus conicus. b. Lingua apice subemarginata. c. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum.
2. Valvula. a. Basis. b. Apex rotundatus. c. Palpus exterior sex articulorum intermediis crassioribus.

No. 6.
Proboscis generis Chrysis, Linn. a a Valvulce. b. Tulus. c. Valvulæ Apex rotundatus. d. Palpus exterior quinque articulorum. e. Palpus interior trium articulorum, h. Lingua apice biloba.

No. 7.
FIG. 1. Proloscis generis Philanthus, Fab. a. Valvulæ Basis. b. Apex. c. Palpus exterior filiformis, sex articulorum. d. Tulus linearis. e. Lingua apice biloba. f. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum.
2. Lingua valde ancta. a a. Ejusdem latera in angulum pilosum protensa.

No. 8 ,

No. 8.
FIG. 1. Lingua quadriloba Vespa muraria, Linn. a a. Lobi laterales. b. Linguce pars intermedia apice biloba. cccc. Calli quibus lobi terminantur. d. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum.
2. Valvula. a. Basis arcuatus. b. Apex. c. Palpus exterior sex articulorum.

No. 9.
FIG. 1. Proboscis generis nostri Ammophila. aa. Basis valvularum. b. Tulus. cc. Aper valvularum. d. Palpus exterior sex articulorum. e. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum. f. Lingua.
2. Lingua valde aucta, subclavata clavấ bifidâ.
3. Valvula valde aucta. a. Lori pars. $b$. Cardo. c. Basis. d. Apex semi-sagittatus. e. Palpi exterioris pars.

No. 10.
FIG. 1. Proboscidis pars generis Tiphia, Fab. a. Tubus triangularis. b. Lingua brevissima, apice rotundata. c. Palpus interior quatuor articulorum.
2. Valvula valde aucta. a. Basis. b. Apex rotundatus. c. Palpus exterior sex articulorum, intermediis crassioribus.

No. 11.
FIG. 1. Stylops Melittic (tom. 2. p. 113, 14.) a. Caput anticè obsoletè trilobum. $b \downarrow$. Antennarum articulus primus. cc. Earundem ramus interior unius articuli. dd. Ramus exterior trium articulorum. ee. Articulus extimus. $f f$. Oculi pedunculati. gg. Elytra. $h$. Scutellum abdomen obtegens. ii. Processus corneus scutellum utrinque muniens. k. Abdomen carnosum. ll. Ala magnæ, plicatæ.
2. Capitis portio ejusdem a fronte con. specta. a. Palpus exterior biarticulatus. b. Palpus interior exarticulatus. c. Antenna ramus interior. d. Ejusdem ramus exterior.
3. Antenna. a. Articulus primus. b. Ra= mus interior. c. Ramus exterior.
4. Antenne visus alter. a: Articulus primus. b. Ramus interior. c. Ramus exterior.
6. Palpi seorsum conspecti. a. Palpus exterior. b. Palpus interior.
6. Corporis pars a latere conspecta. $a$. Thorax. b. Scutellum. c. Abdomen. d. Processus corneus supra dictus.
7. Larva insecti præcedentis. a. Os? b. Concavitas sub capite.

TABULARUM EXPLICATIO. (Miscellanea.)
FIG. 8. Capitis ejusdem pagina superior. a. Os? b. Occiput.
9. Abdominis Melitta portio. a. Larva Stylopis Melittce capite solo exerto.
10. Pediculus Melittce valde auctus (tom. 2. p. 168.)
11. Antenna ejusdem.
12. Pes ejusdem.
13. Folliculus A. manicata (tom. 1. p. 175. 2. p 248.) tomento tectus.
14. Idem parte tomenti exutus.
15. Apex ejusdem ad caminulım $\int$. spiramentum exhibendum.
16. Idem cum tegumento exteriori ex parte abscisso, ut folliculus interior pateat.
17. Moleculæ vermiformes e polline melle humectato confectæ, quibus folliculus obducitur, et mediantibus quibus tomentum ei adhæret.
18. Larva A. manicata.
J. Raw, Printer, Ipswich.
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