

A NEW NAME AND RESTORATION OF AN OLD
NAME IN THE GENUS *FULVIUS* STAL
(HEMIPTERA: MIRIDAE)¹

A. G. Wheeler, Jr.

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

Lygus brunneus, Uhler, 1886:18, and authors, not Provancher, 1872:104.

Pamerocoris anthocoroides, Uhler, 1877:425 (preoccupied).

Fulvius anthocoroides, Van Duzee, 1889:4.

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