

Radial formula.—D. VII, I, 9; A. II, 7½; P. 16; V, I, 5.

Scales, in lateral line, 45; above lateral line, 3; below, 9.

Color nearly uniform light, reddish brown, with no blotches. Scales finely punctulate with black. —/l

Our description is based upon museum specimen No. 26228.

Among the other interesting forms collected in the same locality is a young specimen of *Hoplostethus mediterraneus*, and also a species of *Scorpaena*, soon to be described.

METALLIC CASTINGS OF DELICATE NATURAL OBJECTS.

[Translated.]

The following process is recommended by Abbass for producing metallic castings of flowers, leaves, insects, &c. The object, a dead beetle for example, is first arranged in a natural position, and the feet are connected with an oval rim of wax. It is then fixed in the centre of a paper or wooden box by means of pieces of fine wire, so that it is perfectly free, and thicker wires are run from the sides of the box to the object, which subsequently serve to form air-channels in the mold by their removal. A wooden stick, tapering toward the bottom, is placed upon the back of the insect to produce a runner for casting. The box is then filled up with a paste of three parts of plaster of Paris, and one of brick-dust, made up with a solution of alum and sal ammoniac. It is also well first to brush the object with this paste to prevent the formation of air bubbles. After the mold thus formed has set, the object is removed from the interior by first reducing it to ashes. It is therefore dried slowly, and finally heated gradually to a red heat, and then allowed to cool slowly to prevent the formation of flaws or cracks. The ashes are removed by pouring mercury into the cold mold and shaking it thoroughly before pouring it out, and repeating this operation several times. The thicker wires are then drawn out, and the mold needs simply to be thoroughly heated before it is filled with metal in order that the latter may flow into all portions of it. After it has become cold it is softened and carefully broken away from the casting.

THE OCCURRENCE OF THE CANADA PORCUPINE IN MARYLAND.

By OTTO LUGGER.

Referring to the paper on the occurrence of the Canada Porcupine in West Virginia by Mr. Goode, in Vol. I, Proceedings U. S. National Museum, page 264, I wish to mention that this Porcupine, *Erethizon dorsatus*, is still, though rarely, found in Maryland. In the museum of the Maryland Academy of Sciences is a specimen from Alleghany

County, Maryland. Another specimen I saw living in confinement in the Blue Ridge Mountains, where it was caught two years ago. One was killed quite recently near Ellicott City, Maryland.

MARYLAND ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
Baltimore, May 22, 1881.

NOTE ON THE LATILOID GENERA.

By THEODORE GILL.

In a late number of the Proceedings of the U. S. National Museum (Vol. IV, p. 53), Messrs. Jordan and Gilbert have accepted the name *Dekaya* instead of *Caulolatilus* for a genus of the family *Latilidae*, with a foot-note, "*Caulolatilus*, Gill: *nomen nudum*." In order that the adoption of this view may be at once arrested, it is advisable to give a history of those names.

In 1862, in the "Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia" (p. 240), the name *Caulolatilus* was proposed as the generic denomination of *Latilus chrysops* and its allies, in the following terms:

"The *Malacanthini* of Poey form a natural family. The *Latilus chrysops*, Val., does not, however, appear to be congeneric with the type of *Latilus*, but is distinguished by its form and the structure of the fins. It may be called *Caulolatilus chrysops*."

It will be thus seen (1) that the respects in which *Caulolatilus* differs from *Latilus* were indicated; (2) the relationships were exactly appreciated; (3) a specific type was mentioned. There could consequently be no doubt as to what was meant nor as to the characters by which it should be distinguished.

In 1864, in the "Proceedings of the California Academy of Natural Sciences" (Vol. 3, p. 70), Dr. Cooper proposed the name of *Dekaya* for a supposed new fish, concerning which he had not the slightest conception as to its proper relationships, considering it "to be a very aberrant form of the *Percoid* family, having many of the characters of other orders" [sic!], but that on the whole it seemed to be most nearly related to "the genus *Heterognathodon*, of Bleeker." The remarks respecting the "other orders" and the affinities indicated the most complete misapprehension as to the type. The description was equally at fault. The "general shape" was said to be "elongated and fusiform," although a shape less "fusiform" could scarcely be associated with moderate elongation. In other respects the description was faulty and erroneous or vague, but these lapses need not detain longer.

The question arises in such a case, What is the advantage of any description? According to the rules of the British and American associa-