

3. **Eustictus grossus** (Uhler) 1887b:70*(Megacoelum grossum* Uhl.)

This species was correctly identified by Uhler. Knight and McAtee (1929) listed Heidemann's specimens from Washington and vicinity under the name *E. filicornis* Walker.

4. **Pilophorus amoenus** Uhler 1887a:30*(Pilophorus amoenus* Uhl.)

We have seen Heidemann's specimens collected from the Washington area during 1887-92. Uhler's determination was correct.

5. **Pilophorus crassipes** Heidemann 1892:225, new status*(Pilophorus crassipes* Uhl. MS)

Pilophorus crassipes, Felt 1906:686 (incorrectly credited to Uhler); Moore 1907:163 (incorrectly credited to Stål); Smith 1910:162 (credited to Uhler); Van Duzee 1917:380 (in part; Uhler MS name); Knight and McAtee 1929:14.

Pilophorus crassipes Poppius 1914:242 (in part); Carvalho 1958:146 (in part).

Pilophorus crassipes Van Duzee 1918:293.

Pilophorus vanduzeei Knight 1923:540; 1926a:19; Blatchley 1926:809; Knight 1928:123; 1941:120; Froeschner 1949:173; Carvalho 1958:149; Akingbohunge et al. 1972:12; Knight 1973:135. [NEW SYNONYMY].

Heidemann validated this Uhler manuscript name when he stated: "Allied to the former [*P. amoenus* Uhler], but more robust, and darker in color . . ." Van Duzee, however, believed that Heidemann had not validated Uhler's manuscript name and in 1918 redescribed this species as *crassipes*, using Heidemann's specimens. Knight and McAtee (1929:14), however, recognized Heidemann's description of *P. crassipes* and (p. 27) noted that *crassipes* Van Duzee 1918 was a primary homonym.

In 1914 Poppius described *P. crassipes* from Colorado and included a specimen from Washington, D.C. in the type series. Knight (1923) described *P. vanduzeei* from New York and Massachusetts but apparently was not aware that Heidemann's *crassipes* was the same species. Later, he stated that the Washington speci-