



# Annals and Magazine of Natural History

## Series 4

ISSN: 0374-5481 (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah10>

## On the Endomycici

Rev. H.S. Gorham

To cite this article: Rev. H.S. Gorham (1874) On the Endomycici, Annals and Magazine of Natural History, 13:74, 185-185, DOI: [10.1080/00222937408680837](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222937408680837)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222937408680837>



Published online: 13 Oct 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1



View related articles [↗](#)

general form and its relations with the siphon are the same as in all the Ammonites. It is generally spheroidal when the turns of the spire are free, and ovoid when they are contiguous.

In the tetrabranchiate Cephalopoda which live in our present seas and in all those which swarmed by thousands in the ancient seas, the presence of an ovisac has never been detected. In *Nautilus* and *Aturia* the siphon originates upon the inner walls of the first chamber. It is completely closed at its posterior extremity by a part of the calcareous prolongation of the septum which assists in its formation. The external transverse cicatrix observed by Mr. Hyatt can never have been in communication with the siphon; its purpose is still completely unknown. It has been indicated by M. Barrande upon a great number of Silurian Tetrabranchiata.

Thus it results from these observations that at the Silurian epoch the tetrabranchiate Cephalopoda were as clearly separated from the dibranchiate as at the present day. The only modifications that we can recognize are of generic rank; in fact the Ammonites which, when young, have septa like those of *Deroeras* and *Goniatites*, appear to be derived from one of those types.—*Comptes Rendus*, December 29, 1873, pp. 1557–1559.

*On the Endomycici.* By the Rev. H. S. GORHAM.

*To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.*

GENTLEMEN,—My attention has been called to a brief notice you have given of my descriptive catalogue of the Endomycici. The question of classification, I venture to submit, is rather an experimental than a logical one, and must be influenced by the amount of knowledge possessed of the objects to be classified; so that a group of genera which fifteen years ago were united into a family may now, by the addition of fresh genera, require subdividing into a group of families; and yet it may be convenient to retain as nearly as possible the original title for the whole group, though of course the patronymic termination must be altered.

Had the reviewer, however, been acquainted with Gerstäcker's 'Entomographien,' he would have known that that author recognized two 'groups,' "zwei sehr ungleiche Gruppen"—I. Endomychidæ genuini, II. Endomychidæ adsciti.

Whether it is illogical to attempt the union of these, or unnecessary to reconstruct the latter (which is a heterogeneous miscellany), I will leave to those who follow me to determine.

As your reviewer is so hard to please in the selection of names, he should at least have quoted correctly the one he terms awkward. I have no family "Paussidoidæ," but one Paussoideidæ.

The only genus in this family is *Trochoideus*, Westw. Would he have thought Trochoideidæ less awkward or more expressive?

I am, Gentlemen, yours truly,

H. S. GORHAM.

Shiple, January 19, 1874.