

bore numbers, probably indicating that they or their duplicates had been submitted to an expert, and it may be possible in some cases to make guesses at associating these specimens with similar numbers amongst the numerous notes and correspondence pertaining to the collection, but which we did not then have time to look through. I cannot recall that we found one single instance in which a Cartwright label was attached to a specimen. But, as I believe Heath to have collected at Cartwright exclusively for about 35 years, we decided that it would be reasonable to assume any specimen to be of Cartwright origin unless any other locality or collector's name was pinned below it, as, for instance, I found was always the case with specimens which I had sent him myself. Heath, though a most energetic collector and ardent lover of nature, had, unfortunately, a poorly developed faculty for recognising a species. I had long previously discovered this from correspondence and exchange of specimens with him, though, as a matter of fact, he cared little for specimens not from Cartwright, and so rarely accepted in exchange. During Smith's lifetime, Heath had relied almost exclusively upon him for names in the Noctuidæ, and very rarely, either openly or privately, disputed a name that was given him. Now, Smith's determinations for corresponding collectors were very frequently, to say the least of it, hasty, and very often, alas, culpably careless. In my own experience, in my earlier collecting days in the west, I not infrequently found that if I sent Smith specimens of a species—it might be of a well known and not very variable species either—twice or three times, he would apply a different and very distinct name to it each time. Heath evidently met with this trouble, and got over the difficulty by dividing a species, not always very variable, into two or three. We frequently found a series of good or tolerably good specimens standing as one species, and a series of bad specimens of the same as distinct. And perhaps a series of smaller specimens of the same thing as something else, such as "probably new J.B.S." Nor was that all. Besides the frequency with which one species stood for two or more, it was deplorable the number of very distinct and often dissimilar species which were arranged in one series under the same name. In short, the errors and mixtures were appalling.