

vague resemblance to the palmar aspect of a clenched left hand suggested the name of,—

PUGNUS, gen. nov.

By its thrice folded columella, anterior canal, thickened outer lip, and sculpture of spiral grooves crossed by transverse striæ, this very distinct genus takes a place in the family Ringiculidæ. From the only other surviving genus *Ringicula*, *Pugnus* is separated by its involute shell and buried spire. In the shortness of the spire the Cretaceous fossil *Avellana* occupies a position intermediate between these two. Its contour is however more globose, and those subordinate groups which agree with *Pugnus* in possessing a smooth lip, appear to differ by having one columella plication only. The type and only species is,—

PUGNUS PARVUS, sp. nov.

Shell minute, white, solid, oblong, involute, spire buried, imperforate at either extremity, the posterior of the inner portion of the last whorl obliquely sloped. Sculptured by about thirty spiral grooves, whose interstices are three times their breadth, and are cut by longitudinal striæ into squarish facets. Aperture as long as the shell, vertical, contracted in the middle, expanded anteriorly and posteriorly, inner lip overlaid with callus; outer lip smooth, greatly thickened externally and internally, springing from a false umbilicus in the vertex, arched higher than it, arcuate peripherally, curving below the whorl up to the columella and channelled at the junction; anteriorly the columella bears a strong entering fold, posterior and parallel to which is a weaker one, and posterior to this again a small deeply-seated third fold is just distinguishable. Length, $1\frac{1}{2}$; breadth, 1mm. Animal unknown.

Loc.—Manly, near Sydney, alive, at low tide on rocks, and dead in shell sand from Middle Harbour. (A. U. Henn).

Type.—Australian Museum, C. 2524.

DESCRIPTION OF A *DAPANOPTERA* FROM AUSTRALIA.

By FREDERICK A. A. SKUSE.

(Entomologist to the Australian Museum).

In the present contribution it appears advisable that it should be prefaced by an explanation of the reason why scientific names and descriptions, which the majority of the public does not seem to quite understand, are published in the manner they are, and why such a course is necessary to the end for which they are written.

It is frequently asked "Why do you naturalists put long-winded Latin or Greek names to your specimens?" "Why not do so in plain English?" This is, however, not so easily complied with as may be imagined, and where done, it is in many cases, only calculated to mislead. Popular names are usually bestowed upon objects existing in nature by local consent and usage: that is by the folk inhabiting the particular district or region where the animals, plants, or whatever else they may be, exist; and these names convey to them, only, perhaps, an idea of what is meant. Professor Bell, a celebrated authority on British Crustacea, visiting a seaport town, enquired at a fishmonger's stall, on which was a plate of crabs for sale, whether that particular kind of crabs was eaten in the locality? With great surprise at his apparent ignorance, the reply came, "They ben't crabs, sir; them's *spiders!*" But to come nearer home. What is ordinarily known in Sydney as the "lobster" or "crayfish" is really a crawfish, recognised in science as *Palinurus Huegeli* and throughout the world as such. So that what is called a "lobster" by many people, will be known by the name of "crawfish" or "crayfish" by some, and maybe a dozen other local appellations by as many others to whom the identical animal may be familiar. But lobsters, crawfish, and crayfish are totally distinct from each other in structure and with different habits. And thus it is that mistakes happen in giving names to animals which to the popular eye exhibit a more or less fanciful resemblance; but in many other cases there is not the slightest likeness or even affinity. What are commonly styled "locusts" in this country are really *Cicadæ*, belonging to a totally distinct and widely separated order of insects. And, moreover, the same kind of *Cicada* is known by different names in different localities, such as "Miller," "Mealy-back," etc. The true locusts belong to the grasshoppers, whilst the Homopterous Cicadidæ have been known as "Cicadas" from times of remote antiquity. Instances such as these may be multiplied, but those cited should be sufficient to demonstrate the uselessness of the adoption of local names for the purpose of general information.

Popular names, if general, would be of great advantage in assisting to gain a scientific knowledge of the objects themselves, but they rarely can be said to assist specialists in their investigations for the public weal in this respect. And herein lies the secret. Specialists of all nationalities must compare notes as to the affinities and geographical distribution of the objects under investigation, in discussing their properties and utility. In order to attain this end, it is absolutely necessary to adopt an universal language as the medium for exchanging ideas before the result of their combined researches can eventually be made popularly intelligible in different languages. To this end Greek and Latin are employed.