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Abstract.—*Fulvius slateri*, new name, is proposed in the family Miridae as a replacement name for *F. brunneus* of authors, not Provancher, 1872. *Fulvius brevicornis* Reuter (1895a) is shown to be an unnecessary new name, and *F. anthocoroides* Reuter (1875) is restored.

The name *Fulvius brunneus* (Provancher) was used in a recent review of the Miridae in Wirtner’s (1904) list of western Pennsylvania Hemiptera (Wheeler and Henry, 1977). In a footnote it was indicated that a decision on the validity of Provancher’s name would be forthcoming. A review of pertinent literature has revealed that a new name is necessary for *F. brunneus* of authors.

Peripheral to the renaming of *F. brunneus* of authors, I found additional nomenclatural problems in the genus which are deserving of mention: That Reuter’s *F. brevicornis* 1895a is an unnecessary new name for his own *F. anthocoroides* 1875; that *F. uhleri* Reuter 1895a is an overlooked name; and that the establishment of *F. brunneus* Provancher 1872 as a junior synonym of *Plagiognathus obscurus* Uhler 1872 (Kelton, 1968) necessitates an attempt to date these two 1872 publications.

*Fulvius slateri* Wheeler, new name


*Fulvius brunneus*, Reuter, 1895a:140.

Provancher’s (1872) original description of *brunneus* is incomplete and vague. Kelton (1968) reviewed the problems encountered in attempting to establish the identity of Provancher’s species of Hemiptera and stated that his descriptions often were based on single specimens, that types were not designated, that different catalogue numbers were sometimes assigned to the same species, and that from time to time his collection was “revised.” Van Duzee (1912) and Kelton (1968) re-examined the Provancher collection and came to slightly different conclusions regarding the status of *F. brunneus*. Van Duzee stated that the specimen labeled as *brunneus* was an example of *Plagiognathus politus* Uhler. However, since Provancher’s description did not fit a species of *Plagiognathus*, Van Duzee believed that the original specimen had been lost and one of
P. politus substituted. Kelton (1968) found that the specimens of brunneus in the Provancher collection were Plagiognathus obscurus Uhler. He considered that Provancher’s original description closely fit P. obscurus and pointed out that the statement by Provancher that brunneus is common on plants is more characteristic of Plagiognathus species than of Fulvius species, which are usually collected on fungus-covered trees and logs. He therefore synonymized Provancher’s species under P. obscurus and designated a male as lectotype. The U.S. National Museum collection has an additional Provancher specimen labeled as brunneus (catalogue no. 33) which also is P. obscurus. I am following Kelton’s opinion because of the vagueness of Provancher’s original description and because of his lectotype designation. This action by Kelton leaves F. brunneus of authors, not Provancher, without a name.

The next available name for F. brunneus of authors is anthocoroides Uhler 1877, described in the genus Pamerocoris and based on specimens from Ontario (Grimsby), Colorado (Denver), Maryland (Baltimore), and eastern Massachusetts. Provancher himself (1887) synonymized Uhler’s name under his own P. brunneus, apparently basing his decision on the similarity of the scutellum and cuneus in the two descriptions and possibly also because Uhler had a Canadian specimen in his type-series. However, Provancher erred in establishing that synonymy; Uhler’s species belongs to the genus Fulvius rather than to Plagiognathus. His name anthocoroides is available but is a junior secondary homonym of Fulvius anthocoroides (Reuter, 1875).

The new name F. slateri is being proposed for F. brunneus of authors and for Uhler’s preoccupied name, anthocoroides. As lectotype of Uhler’s P. anthocoroides, I am designating a specimen found in the U.S. National Museum’s Type Collection, labeled in Uhler’s handwriting, and without much doubt the specimen from Grimsby listed in his original description. The specimen, a female, has been assigned USNM Type No. 75318 and is labeled: Grimsby (handwritten); 2.507 (pink); 3. PR Uhler Collection; 4. Pamerocoris (underlined) anthocoroides Uhler—Canada (handwritten); 5. Pamerocoris (underlined) anthocoroides Uhler—Canada (black bordered).

Fulvius slateri is named in honor of the well-known hemipterist and lygaeid specialist at the University of Connecticut, Dr. James A. Slater, who first recognized the need of a replacement name for F. brunneus of authors.

Fulvius anthocoroides (Reuter)

Teratodella anthocoroides Reuter, 1875:8.
Fulvius brevicornis Reuter, 1895a:138 (unnecessary new name).
Stål (1862:322) described *F. anthocorides* (a species distinct from *F. anthocoroides* Reuter 1875) but Walker (1873:160) spelled Stål's name as *anthocoroides*. Under Article 33b of the Code, this constitutes an “incorrect subsequent spelling,” although Hussey (1954) referred to it as an emendation. With the exceptions of Distant (1883:281) and Bergroth (1920:75) subsequent authors have followed Walker. Hussey (1954) stated that Stål's original spelling *anthocorides* is “grammatically and orthographically correct.” The two spellings are not variable spellings under Article 58 of the Code, and thus *F. brevicornis* Reuter 1895a is an unnecessary new name for *F. anthocoroides* Reuter 1875. It might be argued that to have an *anthocorides* and an *anthocoroides* in the same genus leads to undue confusion and that an application for an exception to the Rules should be made to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. However, these names have been seldom used in the literature and similar specific names in the same genus can be found scattered through zoological nomenclature.

**Fulvius uhleri** Reuter, An Overlooked Name

An overlooked name in the genus *Fulvius* and one that at first appeared to be available for *F. brunneus* of authors is *F. uhleri* Reuter 1895a. In his review of the genus *Fulvius*, Reuter (1895a) appears to have realized that *P. anthocoroides* Uhler belonged in *Fulvius* and that Uhler's name was preoccupied by his own (Reuter's) *anthocoroides* of 1875. He apparently was prepared to propose the new name *F. uhleri*, but Provancher's (1887) placement of *anthocoroides* Uhler as a synonym of *brunneus* rendered a replacement name unnecessary. Reuter (1895a) appears inadvertently to have left the name *uhleri* on p. 148 of his manuscript, although he replaced *uhleri* with *brunneus* on p. 136 of his key and on p. 140 in his discussion of species, as he later noted (Reuter, 1895b). On p. 148 Reuter states how his new species *F. dubius* differs from *uhleri*, cites specific characters for *dubius*, but does not validate the name *uhleri* by providing characters. Hence, *F. uhleri* is a nomen nudum.

**Priority:** *Plagiognathus politus* Uhler 1872 or *Fulvius brunneus* (Provancher) 1872?

Kelton (1968) synonymized *F. brunneus* (Provancher) 1872 under *Plagiognathus obscurus* Uhler 1872 but made no mention of trying to determine priority of the two names. The Provancher paper appeared in the April 1872 number of *Naturaliste Canadien*, a copy of which at the USNM is stamped “April 26, 1872.” The Uhler paper, published in U.S. Geologist F. V. Hayden's Fifth Annual Report of Progress, is for the year 1871 but is dated 1872. I found that the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Archives,
and the Government Printing Office were unable to supply a more precise date of publication.

Hayden's letter of transmittal to his Secretary of the Interior (p. 3) is dated 20 February 1872, and this may be the date the report was sent to Congress and thus date of publication. As internal evidence of date of publication is the copy of an Act of Congress establishing Yellowstone Park on 1 March 1872. In addition there is a supplement dated 7 May 1872 in which the main report is noted to have already been published. Since exact dates of publication could not be established, it seems logical to follow Kelton's (1968) decision, probably based on the fact that Uhler was a more careful worker in the Hemiptera than was Provancher, and the desire to maintain stability by retaining priority of the much-used name *Plagiognathus obscurus*.
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