In Lord Walsingham and the Manchester Moth, Laurence Cook and Christian McConville explore an interaction between three naturalists of the 19th century. They were the sixth Baron Walsingham, John Hartley Durrant, and Robert Cribb. Baron Walsingham was known for his taxonomic work, while Durrant was a notable taxonomist. Cribb, on the other hand, was an artisan collector. Their activities contributed to the acquisition by the Manchester Museum of a collection of over two thousand specimens of micro-Lepidoptera in exchange for a single individual of the Manchester Moth, *Euclemensia woodiella*, which was found only once in Britain in 1829. The donation covered about 80% of the species known at the time in the groups represented. The Manchester Moth’s origin is considered, and the composition of the Museum’s comprehensive collection of British micro-Lepidoptera is briefly outlined.
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**Introduction**

The Victoria University of Manchester developed out of Owens College, founded in 1851. By 1870 more space was needed than could be provided at the original city centre location, and building started on a site on Oxford Road, a little to the south. The first buildings, designed by Alfred Waterhouse, architect of the British Museum (Natural History), were completed in 1873. On the north side there were premises housing departments of botany and zoology and, connected to them, galleries that would become the Manchester Museum. The impetus for the latter was the dissolution of an earlier museum belonging to the Manchester Society for the Promotion of Natural History. The Society had its own building and substantial collections but due to falling membership, debts and other factors it had become inviable (Kargon, 1977; Alberti, 2009). After discussion with the Corporation and with business and scientific figures, including Thomas Henry Huxley, a solution was found in the transfer to the University of the biological and geological holdings. The plan was to create a facility that would both promote scientific research and be open to the public. The University accepted responsibility for the collections in 1867 and the Museum first received the public in 1888. Subsequently, extensions were added and the range diversified to include Egyptology, archaeology and ethnography.

The Manchester Society for the Promotion of Natural History had come into being in 1821, initially to preserve the ornithological and entomological collections of deceased textile manufacturer John Leigh Philips (1761–1814). The collections were enlarged and a museum set up with a curator in charge (Alberti, 2009; Thackray, 1974; Kargon, 1977). Although the museum was open to the public the society remained essentially a gentlemen’s club not available to

**Synopsis**

An interaction is described between three 19th century naturalists of different background and character. They were the sixth Baron Walsingham, John Hartley Durrant and Robert Cribb, the first two of them noted taxonomists and the third an artisan collector. Their activities led to the acquisition by the Manchester Museum of a collection of over two thousand specimens of micro-Lepidoptera in exchange for a single individual of the Manchester Moth, *Euclemensia woodiella*, found only once in Britain in 1829. The donation covered about 80% of the species known at the time in the groups represented. The origin of the Manchester Moth is considered and the composition of the Museum’s comprehensive collection of British micro-Lepidoptera is briefly outlined.
artisanal or working class naturalists. An association that fulfilled this role was the Banksian Society, formed in 1824 and operating until 1836 (Cash, 1873; Kargon, 1977). It maintained a library and developed a collection of specimens with notes on their location, habits etc. Following its demise the bulk of its holdings found their way to the Natural History Society and from there to the Manchester Museum.

The Manchester Museum is the largest University-owned museum in the country. In entomology there are some three million specimens, curated separately in British and foreign sections (Logunov, 2010, 2012). Commencing with the material received on its foundation the collections have been continuously enlarged by successive curators, both by their own endeavours and through receipt of donations. The ultimate goal is to pool the entire holding, sorted fully into taxonomic order, but many specimens yet remain as they were acquired by the Museum. There is a clear practical advantage in combining the material, but until that is done some donations have interesting historical associations. The aim of this paper is to consider one such, the Walsingham collection of British micro-Lepidoptera, and the circumstances that led to its coming to Manchester. Three committed naturalists of very different character were involved.

The naturalists involved

**Thomas de Grey, sixth Baron Walsingham** (1843–1919) (Fig. 1)
The de Greys were squires in Norfolk from the fourteenth century, with a substantial estate at Merton, near Thetford, in the East Anglian countryside. The first Baron Walsingham settled there in 1780 on his retirement as Lord Chief Justice, after previously serving as Solicitor-General and Attorney-General (Wikipedia, 2017; Salmon, 2000). Successive generations had public positions, and Thomas, the sixth Baron continued the tradition. He was educated at Eton and Cambridge. After first considering a military career he became a Member of Parliament from 1865 until 1870, when he inherited his father's title. From then on he managed the family estates, while remaining active in politics in the House of Lords. He was a first class cricketer and celebrated in game shooting circles not only for his prowess on his Merton estate and his writings on the subject (Walsingham & Payne-Gallwey, 1887a, b) but also for a bag of 1070 grouse in a single day on his Yorkshire moorland shoot (Martin, 1987). In the academic field he was an FRS, Trustee of the British Museum, the Hunterian Museum (Royal College of Surgeons) and the Lawes Agricultural Trust, and was High Steward of Cambridge University (Rowland-Brown, 1920). In his capacity as a land owner he was president of the Ensilage Commission; as an entomologist he was an editor of the *Entomologist's Monthly Magazine* from 1893 to 1912 (Durrant, 1920) and wrote numerous specialist publications (see below). He married three times but without an heir, the title going to a relative.

Walsingham’s interest in natural history started at an early age. Durrant (1920) notes that at the age of eight he wrote that ‘I have found out that the catipillars hind feete are different from its froant ones’. From then on he was a keen entomologist, ornithologist and innovator in these fields, developing a bellows technique for inflating and drying larvae for preservation (Durrant, 1920), and
Fig. 1. Lord Walsingham. From Durrant (1920).

Fig. 2. John Hartley Durrant. By permission (17631) of Library and Archives of the Natural History Museum (London). Reproduced in Riley (1928).
shooting hummingbirds with dust shot to minimize damage to their skins (Martin, 1987). Throughout his life he travelled widely, not only collecting but making meticulous observations on the life histories, food plants and behaviour of his subjects of study.

A special interest was the smaller species of Lepidoptera, grouped loosely as micro-Lepidoptera and often overlooked by collectors. They were first brought to his attention at a sale at Stevens’ Auction house in London. He soon assembled over 50,000 specimens by his own efforts and through purchase (Durrant, 1920). He was also expert at rearing and preserving the larvae. His monographs on the family Tortricidae in the British Museum (Walsingham, 1879), the Tortricidae, Tineidae and Pterophoridae of North America (Walsingham, 1880, 1882, 1884, 1907a), the micro-Lepidoptera of Hawaii (Walsingham, 1907b) and the Tineidae and some smaller groups in central America (Walsingham, 1909–15) were standard works for many years. By the time he decided to leave it to the British Museum (Natural History) his collection had increased to more than 260,000 specimens (Brown, 2015).

**John Hartley Durrant (1863–1928) (Fig. 2)**

John Hartley Durrant was born in Hitchin, Hertfordshire. He was appointed as Private Secretary and Entomological Assistant to Walsingham in 1885 (Harvey, Gilbert & Martin, 1996). They formed a strong academic and professional relationship. A publication by one almost always referred to the other in some fashion, and by 1910 they had published more than 2000 pages jointly or separately (Riley, 1928). Durrant specialised in Lepidoptera and had a great personal interest in nomenclature (Tams, 1928; Turner, 1928). He and Walsingham cooperated to formulate the ‘Merton’ rules (named for Walsingham’s estate) designed to regularise and codify the naming and classification of insect species (Walsingham & Durrant, 1896). These rules were criticised at the time in reviews which, while applauding the authors’ general acceptance of Linnean usage, considered some of the proposals to be unduly restrictive (Coues & Allen, 1897). Durrant was secretary of the British National Committee on Entomological Nomenclature from 1913 to 1924 (Busck, 1928). At the time of the First World War he worked with General Sir W. W. O. Beveridge on the Army Biscuit Inquiry, a successful attempt to prevent the spoiling of military rations by insect pests, often micro-Lepidoptera and sometimes foreign introductions (Durrant & Beveridge, 1913; 1914). He was also worked with the Red Cross Society. This, coupled with the loss of his daughter during the same period, aggravated previous ailments which led to a decline in health during the post-war period (Busck, 1928). He was at various times member, fellow and vice-president (1912–1913) of the Royal Entomological Society of London as well as one of the editorial staff for the *Entomologist’s Record*. He died at his home in Putney, 1928, after a ‘troubling 13 month illness’ (Busck, 1928).

**Robert Cribb and the Manchester Moth**

Members of the Banksian Society tended to be ‘naturalists in humble life’ Cash (1873), or ‘ordinary mechanics’ (Anonymous, 1830). Robert Cribb was one of them, and as a consequence almost no information about him has been preserved. His interests led him to obtain an insect that Walsingham was very keen to possess, however, so that the story of the moth he discovered must stand
in lieu of biographical details. The outline of the events has been told several times (Sidebotham, 1884; Melvill, 1924; Brindle, 1952; Walker, 2001; Logunov, 2010, 2011; Ridout, 2016) with some variation in detail. The earliest account is perhaps the most lively. Cribb had been to Kersal Moor, north of Manchester, and collected 50 or 60 specimens of a small distinctive moth (Fig. 3) from a rotting tree stump. At some point he gave two to Samuel Carter, a fellow collector and he is said to have parted with another that has never been located. No one knew the species, however, and he gave one to R. Wood to send to the remarkable taxonomist and illustrator John Curtis (1791–1862) for examination. Curtis decided it was a new species, described it and gave it the specific name *woodiella* after Wood. Curtis (1830) referred it to a genus *Pancalia*, but the generic name has changed on grounds of priority and of supposed affinity. Sidebotham (1884) called it *Oecophora*, Brindle (1952) *Schiffermuelleria*, and it is now (Bradley, 1953) *Euclemensia*, a genus in the family Cosmopterigidae, superfamily Gelechioidea (Koster, 2002). Cribb was indignant that he was overlooked in the naming and refused to let any other specimens out of his possession. Some said it was foreign,
which annoyed him further; the rules of the Banksian Society made it clear that foreign specimens should be clearly distinguished from British ones (Cash, 1873). Subsequently Cribb used the box containing the remainder as surety against an advance in a beer house. When later he went to retrieve it the landlady said, in the words quoted by Sidebotham, ‘Oh! You have come for your box of flies, have you? I stuck it in the fire as you never came to pay your score as you promised.’ Three specimens were left and it has never again been found in Britain. The type, held by Curtis, went to the Museum Victoria in Melbourne, Australia (Walker, 2001). The two in Carter’s possession found their way to the Manchester Museum with other Banksian material. As to where the moth comes from and why it was not seen again the most recent research is due to Ridout (2016). The genus *Euclemensia* is North American. Larvae of some species at least attack scale insects of the genus *Kermes* (Hemiptera, Coccoidea) when the egg-filled females are firmly attached to tree bark, mostly oak. Ridout has shown that the British specimens closely resemble the American *E. schwarziella*. They could have arrived in England in a consignment of bark, imported for use in tanning or dying. The site of Cribb’s find is on the River Irwell which at the time carried barge transport, so that accidental escape from imported bark is a possibility, followed by subsequent extinction in this country. Early in the twentieth century this moth was of interest to the acquisitive Lord Walsingham.

**Walsingham and the Manchester Museum**

Papers relating to entomology in the Museum since its inception now form a classified archive (Logunov, 2010). Through them it is possible to follow the events that led to exchange of a specimen of the Manchester Moth for a significant part of Walsingham’s collection. When the correspondence starts the Director of the Museum was William Evans Hoyle (1855–1926). He was in charge from 1890 to 1908 when he left to direct the National Museum of Wales (Alberti, 2009). The Professor of Zoology, Sidney Hickson (1859–1940) then had oversight for six months until Walter Medley Tattersall (1882–1943) was appointed. He was Director until 1922, subsequently moving to the University of Wales in Cardiff. His place was taken on a temporary basis by the noted ornithologist and writer T. A. Coward (1867–1933), nephew of Joseph Sidebotham (Cook, 2015). Between 1881 and 1908 the entomology collection was the responsibility of J. R. Hardy (1844–1924) (see Logunov, 2010; Cook & Logunov, 2017). He was succeeded by Harry Britten (1870–1954) until 1938.

Information on the exchange comes mostly from the Manchester Museum archive of papers associated with the Walsingham collection, referred to here as MMW. A parallel section of the archive relating to the Manchester Entomological Society (Cook & Logunov, 2017) is referred to as MES. The Manchester Museum’s Reports to Committee are referred to as Report. From here on the London museum, known then as the British Museum (Natural History) and now as the Natural History Museum, will be referred to as the British Museum. The Manchester Museum will be called by its full name or simply, the Museum.

The first letter in the archive comes from Durrant to the Manchester Museum, dated 25 February 1899 (MMW, item 2, Appendix 1). It is a response to a previous contact in which the Manchester Moth was discussed. Without the original letter we cannot say exactly what was proposed; evidently Walsingham
wished to get possession of one of the two specimens of *E. woodiella*. At this time Hoyle was involved in several exchanges with individuals or institutions. One such was an offer of Lepidoptera to Ramsay M. Traquair (1840–1912) at the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art. On the 31 March 1898 Traquair wrote back (MES, item 28) with a list of Lepidoptera available in exchange, adding ‘Kindly return the list to me with anything you may wish to have marked and then I shall be able to estimate how far the exchange will have to be made up by coloured casts of fossils in our collection.’ Later (20 February 1900) Hoyle wrote to local collector Charles H. Schill thanking him on behalf of the Committee for the donation of his extensive Lepidoptera collection (MES, item 50. Dockery & Logunov, 2015). Hoyle was therefore familiar with such negotiations but could not have anticipated the vagaries to come. In his 1899 letter Durrant wrote at length about Walsingham’s interest in the Manchester moth and about his collection, with particularly emphasis on the fact that it was bequeathed to the British Museum. Although it would not be proper, he said, for a public museum to release material to a private collector it would be entirely appropriate to donate one of the two specimens to the British Museum. Giving it to Walsingham would achieve that end through an extended loan. Walsingham would, by way of thanks, give Manchester a representative selection of his duplicate specimens of British micro-Lepidoptera. Durrant went on to say, rather cheekily, that one of the two Manchester specimens of *E. woodiella* had lost its abdomen. From the Manchester point of view the insect simply showed that a rare species had been taken near the city. For that purpose a specimen without an abdomen ‘would amply suffice’, but for proper systematic study the complete insect should go to the British Museum (see Appendix 1).

Durrant soon received Hoyle’s response (1 March 1899, MMW, item 3) saying that the matter would be raised at the next committee meeting and that privately he hoped they would accept his Lordship’s proposal. Three weeks later he was informed that the museum committee had indeed decided that Lord Walsingham’s offer was a gracious one, which they were happy to accept (20 March 1899, MMW, item 4). One specimen of *E. woodiella* would be exchanged for a collection of British micro-Lepidoptera and, in addition, the re-arrangement of the Museum’s existing collection to bring its nomenclature up to date (MMW, item 3, Report, 1899). The copy of this letter is extremely faded and difficult to read so the exact particulars are lost but a small team, including J. Cosmo Melvill (1845–1929), Chairman of the Museum Committee, and Sidney Hickson, was to be formed to deal with the exchange. Hoyle closed by enquiring how and when Durrant would like to receive the Museum’s micro-Lepidoptera. Durrant wrote back (5 April 1899, MMW, item 5) in a very positive way but with an intimation of the delays that were to follow.

‘…. At the present moment I am working against time in finishing a faunistic paper on Hawaiia. In a few months’ time I will bring the collection to Manchester myself giving you due notice and can bring back the *woodiella* with me. There is no need to hurry about the actual exchange as I can give you a much better collection by taking my time about getting it together. If you will ask to see a copy of Doubleday’s, South’s, or Meyrick’s List of British Lepidoptera you will appreciate what a large number of species are included in the three [families] Pterophoridae, Tineidae and Tortricidae. Meanwhile will you please inform me of the internal height of your cabinet drawers. We mount all our specimens up on fungus stages and use this pin for the stage – but if your drawers are much shallower the length of the pin might perhaps be reduced. ….’
Fig. 4. Receipt for a consignment of Manchester Museum specimens for taxonomic revision, 1900. Written by the Curator J. A. Hardy and signed on behalf of Lord Walsingham by Durrant. Manchester Museum Archive (MMW Item 9).

Fig. 5. Example of the correspondence between Museum Director W. E. Hoyle and J. H. Durrant, promptly acknowledged by Hoyle. Durrant comments on a newspaper report and goes on to explain a delay. The enclosure referred to is a reprint of Walsingham (1902). Manchester Museum Archive (MMW Item 14).
The fungus refers to bracket fungus (*Polyporus*) pith, used for holding small insects, the pin was 40 mm long and the drawers usually 30 mm high; the specimens received the shorter pins recommended by Hoyle (MMW Item 6, 11 April 1899). Over the next few months letters discussed logistical matters, including the safe transport of specimens (in boxes wrapped in hay in a larger container). By April 4 1900 six drawers of the Manchester collection had passed into Durrant’s care for the agreed labelling and sorting. There is a hand-written receipt initialled by Hardy and signed by Durrant on behalf of Walsingham (MMW, item 9) (Fig. 4). The part of the Museum’s micro-Lepidoptera collection now in Durrant’s hands included the complete specimen of *E. woodiella* that Walsingham would take for himself (and by extension for the British Museum).

There is then no further correspondence for a year. On 25 April 1901 Hoyle wrote to Durrant asking for an update (MMW, item 10). Durrant replied soon after with a profuse apology, excusing his lack of contact, due to severe sunstroke and an attack of jaundice. He informed Hoyle that his health had shown some improvement, allowing him to come back to the arrangements with Manchester (1 May 1901, MMW, item 11).

---

**Fig. 6.** Walsingham material as maintained with other accessions from their arrival until the present reorganization. Manchester Museum photo.
Another year passed. In 1902 Hoyle questioned Durrant about a newspaper piece saying that Walsingham’s collection had become the property of the British Museum (15 March 1902, MMW, item 13). Durrant replied (Fig. 5) that the newspapers had been spreading ‘a lot of bosh’ since the collection was still at Merton (25 March 1902, MMW, item 14), and enclosed a note written by Walsingham to an entomological journal which stated the correct position (Walsingham, 1902). He made further apology for the long delay, due to other vital work which had not, however, prevented him beginning to prepare an exceptional selection of Walsingham’s specimens for the Museum. Yet another year passed. Hoyle then sent a more formal letter requesting immediate provision of at least an instalment of the promised specimens (October 18 1903, MMW, item 15). Several weeks later, the perfectionist Durrant explained that he had found a host of issues and problems of nomenclature that greatly slowed his revisions (1 November 1903, MMW, item 16).

From that point the twenty-eight letters subsequently exchanged over several years can be summarized by saying that no progress was made. Item 1 of the Walsingham Archive is a note of the first provision of specimens to Durrant on 4 April, 1900, followed by a list of 18 later dates headed, rather wistfully, ‘reminders’. Hoyle and others in the Museum wanted information and action. Due to illness, procrastination, pedantry or pre-occupation Durrant made empty promises or failed to reply. Hoyle left Manchester in 1908 to be replaced by Tattersall. On 25 May 1909 (MMW, item 31) he wrote from Cardiff to Sidney Hickson referring to yet another newspaper report of transfer to the British Museum (this time correctly), and pointing out that Walsingham still had both the *E. woodiella* specimens while failing to honour the promised exchange. A consignment of Museum drawers with mounted specimens was returned in 1910 (February 7, MMW Item 36) and a little later there was another delivery that included the *woodiella* without abdomen (4 March 1910, MMW Item 38). Hardy retired in 1918. Walsingham died in 1919. The last document in the archive is a letter from Tattersall to Coward (5 April 1918, MMW, item 44), written to bring him up to date. At that time Durrant still had six additional drawers that he had requested and received. He was, Tattersall added, ‘perfectly hopeless as a correspondent and still more so at keeping a bargain’.

The Walsingham bequest went to the British Museum in 1910. It comprised his collections and an extensive entomological library of books, manuscripts and correspondence. He also provided funds to support both Durrant, who moved there from Merton, and the lepidopterist Herbert Stringer to continue to work on the material (Harvey, Gilbert & Martin, 1996). It took until 1928, the year of Durrant’s death, for the exchange with Manchester to be finally completed. The Manchester Museum’s Annual Report (1928) contains the following passage.

‘The past year has been especially noteworthy for the completion of an exchange arranged some twenty years ago between the Manchester Museum and the late Lord Walsingham, whose great collections of Microlepidoptera have for years past been in the possession of the British Museum (Natural History). The Manchester Museum possessed two examples of the very rare oecophorid moth *Euclemensia woodiella* (Curtis) taken eighty years ago on Kersal Moor, North Manchester, and never since observed; only one other specimen (now in Melbourne, Australia) was preserved. One of the two Manchester specimens has been made over to the Walsingham collection, and for this 2,289 specimens representing almost every known species of British Microlepidoptera, localised and carefully determined, have been received. The selection of this valuable acquisition begun by the late Mr. J. H.
Durrant, was completed by Mr. H. Stringer, of the British Museum, who, with the kind sanction of Major E. E. Austen, Keeper of Entomology, brought personally to the Manchester Museum in June the final instalment (870 specimens) of the collection.’

This material, together with some other accessions, has for long been kept in drawers in a free standing wooden cabinet (Fig. 6).

The origin of *Euclemensia woodiella*

The initial letter in the Archive series (MMW, item 2, Appendix 1) is a remarkable document. It sets the scene, presenting Durrant as totally committed to his specialization and to his employer. At the same time it is arrogant and, one would suppose, could easily have offended the Director and members of the Museum Committee. With hindsight there is a hint in the postscript that a gift, offered, may take many years to be realized. An important contribution it does make, which has not hitherto been noted, is the suggestion that the Manchester Moth was an exotic, probably from North America. The value of the specimens is reduced, and Walsingham’s offer correspondingly more generous. Although no more than a bargaining point here, Durrant anticipates by a century Ridout’s (2016) independent investigation, which draws the same conclusion as to the origin. To support his claim Durrant made reference to similar American species, their feeding habits and possible dispersal in exported timber. He would have been familiar with Walsingham’s North American collections. *Euclemensia schwarziella*, the species Ridout concluded most closely resembled the Manchester Moth, was described by Busck (1900). The Danish American entomologist August Busck (1870–1944) was an expert on American micro-Lepidoptera and a friend of Walsingham’s, who later worked with him in England (Brown, 2015) and was to write his obituary (Busck, 1920). Ridout gives a thorough discussion of what we know about the assignment of the Manchester Moth to *Euclemensia*, which suggests that in 1910 Durrant followed his supposition by renaming the two available specimens. The Manchester specimen (Fig. 3) shows the characteristic Walsingham label with Durrant’s renaming, the date and his initials.

The micro-Lepidoptera collection in the Manchester Museum

During the nineteenth century the number of species of Lepidoptera recorded in Britain increased in a spectacular fashion. There were 740 species on a list made at the start of the century (Anonymous, 1802). The total rose to 1,838 in the next two decades (Stephens, 1829 and then more slowly. Later in the nineteenth century published lists show totals of 1862 (Wood, 1854), 1902 (Stainton, 1859), 2102 (Doncaster, 1887) and 2143 (Meyrick, 1895). The current figure in Agassiz, Beavan & Heckford (2013) is 2518, plus some questionable records. The greater part of the nineteenth century change was due to increasing attention paid to the micro-Lepidoptera, which comprise some 60 per cent of the total of the British Lepidoptera.

The term micro-Lepidoptera is generally applied to groups of moths with species having a wing span of 20 mm or below, several of which are agricultural or stored product pests. They usually belong to more primitive groups, and may have specialized patterns of life such as larval leaf mining, feeding on keratin,
wood boring or parasitism, but these are not well-defined criteria. Some Lepidopterists include primitive groups containing moths of large size (Hepialoidea, Cossoidea); some exclude groups of small moths that are systematically more advanced (Pterophoroidea, Pyraloidea). In his selection from the Walsingham material Durrant took a parsimonious view and excluded both. He left out the plume moths (Pterophoridae) despite having drawn attention to them in a letter in 1899 (MMW, Item 5). The Museum’s micro-Lepidoptera collection contains the superfamilies listed in Table 1, which shows the Walsingham contribution.

When he entered into the negotiations Hoyle was interested in bringing this section of the Lepidoptera up to date. A start was made in 1912, when the Museum Report (1912–13, Logunov, 2010) states: ‘A large and representative collection of British Micro-Lepidoptera was presented by the Rev. Canon Cremer, and much of Mr Hardy’s time has been occupied with incorporating this collection into the general collections of British Insects’. The donor was Frederic d’Austini Cremer (1848–1927), Vicar of the Parish Church of Eccles. Another figure who played an important part in the development of the Manchester collection was Joseph Sidebotham (1824–1885). He was an energetic collector, both in the field and through purchase and exchange. He amassed over 1900 species, many represented by series of specimens, over half of which were micro-Lepidoptera. They were given to the Museum by his heirs in 1919 (F3259, Logunov, 2010; Cook, 2015). The micro section is beautifully presented but not discussed in his numerous short publications; the nearest he came was the account of Robert Cribb and *E. woodiella* (Sidebotham, 1884). It is probable that, like Walsingham, he would have liked an example of that moth. Among other accomplishments he was a pioneer photographer and in the space in his cabinet that *E. woodiella* would have occupied, if available, he pinned a photograph of the

---

**Table 1.** Superfamilies in the Manchester Museum’s British micro-Lepidoptera collection and currently recorded representation in the Walsingham donation. Order of superfamilies and current number of British species from Agassiz, Beavan & Heckford (2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superfamily</th>
<th>British species</th>
<th>Walsingham species</th>
<th>Walsingham specimens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micropterigoidea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriocranioidea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepialoidea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepticuloidea</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeloidea</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tineoidea</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracillarioidea</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yponomeutoidea</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelechioida</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pterophoroidea</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrekensteinioidea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epermenioidea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choreutoidea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortricoida</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossoidea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesioidea</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zygaenoidea</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyraloidea</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drepanoidea</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two Manchester specimens (fig. 6 in Cook & Logunov, 2016). Due to the delays the importance of Walsingham’s material was somewhat lessened by these earlier accessions. Among the groups he provided, however, Durrant evidently made a conscientious attempt at representative coverage. There are 929 species from Walsingham listed in Table 1. The present total for the groups is 1291. In Meyrick (1895), who uses somewhat different groupings, the corresponding total is about 1137, giving over 80 per cent representation. On average there are 2.4 individuals per species. Often, although not always, there is an individual of each sex.

Later components of the Manchester micro-Lepidoptera holding in order of arrival have come from James Hignett (1882–1952, Museum Report 1951–2), L. Nathan, an active member of the Manchester Entomological Society (Museum Reports 1953–4, 1957–8), H. N. Michaelis (donated in 1964 and containing Tineidae given to him by Cosmo Melvill) and Robert C. R. Crewdson (in 1978). These collections, so far with the exception of Sidebotham’s, have been brought together into a common series, the data on status and accession number being initially recorded on index cards and subsequently on the Museum’s database. The next step in the consolidation process is the transfer by Assistant Curator Phillip Rispin of this combined collection, together with Sidebotham’s micro-Lepidoptera, to new pest-proof steel cabinets to create an accessible and efficient research facility (an ongoing project that was supported by a 2015 grant from the Arts Council PRISM Fund to the Manchester Museum). Each specimen (or group of specimens) now bears a unique MM identification number in addition to the historic labels. Each collector has his own reference code (F3260 for Walsingham specimens) plus an individual accession number. The Walsingham insects also have a characteristic black bordered label (Figs 3, 6).

**Conclusion**

The motto associated with the Walsingham coat of arms is ‘Excitari non Hebescere’, which may be translated as ‘to be excited, not dull’, or ‘to be spirited, not inactive’. Either way, the sixth Baron lived up to it. One can only wonder at the energy and application of such figures as Walsingham, Sidebotham, Curtis and the numerous other nineteenth century devotees who transformed our knowledge of the natural world. At the beginning of the century interest was often anecdotal and concerned with curiosities. By the end it was standardized, systematic and directed towards problem solving, both theoretical and applied. Walsingham, who had the means to do nothing, made a huge contribution to our knowledge of an important section of the class Lepidoptera. Having the fellow enthusiast Durrant as his assistant contributed greatly to this achievement. Walsingham’s donation to Manchester did not quite go to plan but it remains a generous exchange, adding substantially to an important modern working collection.
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Appendix 1. A copy of the manuscript letter from Durrant to Hoyle that initiated the eventual exchange (MMW, item 2)

TELEGRAPH STATION
WATTON

Merton Hall
Thetford
25 February 1899

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter re Oecophora woodiella:— You are rightly informed that Lord Walsingham is desirous of obtaining one of your specimens of this species.

Opinions might differ as to the propriety of your Museum parting with one of these specimens to a private individual but I think that all would agree that it is very desirable that one of them should be transferred to the National Collection in the British Museum.

For the information of your Committee I would wish to state that the whole of Lord Walsingham’s enormous collection is bequeathed to the British Museum. Should Lord Walsingham acquire one of these specimens it will with his collections go to the British Museum.

I would suggest that your Committee should regard the proposal made hereafter as an endeavour to obtain one of your specimens for the National Collection, Lord Walsingham giving you an exchange in consideration for the specimen remaining in his possession until his collections are transformed to the British Museum.

Looking at the proposed transaction from this point of view I think your Committee should have no difficulty in agreeing to the propriety of such an exchange for they will at the same time
be enriching the National Collection and their own. Should your Committee agree with me so far all that remains for discussion is the adequacy of the exchange offered by Lord Walsingham.

When Mr Hardy kindly allowed me to examine your specimens of *woodiella* it was at once apparent that you were badly in want of a good working collection of British micro-lepidoptera. Here there should be found a basis of exchange.

You have two specimens of *woodiella* – one has lost its abdomen. So far as your Museum is concerned I can only regard these specimens as of interest to you in that they illustrate the fact that many years ago (sixty) – specimens of this species were taken near Manchester. For this purpose the specimen without the abdomen would amply suffice – on the other hand for purposes of systematic study it would be desirable that the specimen with the abdomen should go to the British Museum.

For this specimen in Lord Walsingham’s behalf I make your Committee the following offer:

1) Lord Walsingham will put in boxes the names of all the British micro-Lepidoptera (i.e. Tortricidae, Tineidae and Pterophoridae). He will so far as it is possible give you correctly determined specimens of each species. A few British species are unattainable and some are extremely rare, but wherever it is possible Lord Walsingham will endeavour to give you two specimens of each species, he will not, however, limit his offer to two specimens for whenever he is able to do so he will gladly add more specimens.

2) Lord Walsingham will in the future endeavour to make this collection still more complete by adding species or specimens that are desiderata.

3) I will determine and incorporate the unarranged material belonging to these families already in your possession.

4) The collection will be arranged with a view to encourage the study of the micro-lepidoptera in your Museum and I will make it, as far as possible, valuable for educational purposes.

If your Committee will consent to an exchange on the terms mentioned we will during the next few months put together a really representative collection for you, and your Committee will then be able to judge that the offer now made by Lord Walsingham is one that they are not likely to receive again.

I shall be glad to hear that your Committee accept the basis of this proposed exchange – the adequacy of the offer made they will be able to judge from the collection itself.

You rightly remark that only three specimens of *Oecophora woodiella* are known to exist in collections. You have two of them and the third (which is Curtis’ type) is in the Melbourne Museum. I cannot regard *woodiella* as an extinct British species but am convinced that it is an exotic – accidentally introduced into England.

I was able to convince myself when in Manchester that your *woodiella* does not belong to the genus *Oecophora* but was more correctly placed by Curtis in *Pancalia*. I refer it without hesitation to the North American genus *Euclemensia*, Grote (= *Hamadryas*, Clemens) and have little doubt that its habitat will be found somewhere on the eastern coast of America (the larva of the allied species is insectivorous, feeding on *Kermes* sp. and could easily be introduced with timber in the rough). That the habitat of *woodiella* will eventually be discovered I have little doubt – then your specimens will deteriorate to the value of exotics accidentally introduced into this country while the value of the Melbourne specimen will remain unchanged. I make these remarks not to depreciate the value of your specimens but to indicate to your Committee a possibility which they should not ignore in coming to a decision – for should the species turn up elsewhere such an offer as is now made would be absurdly in excess of the value of the specimens.

I shall be obliged if you will communicate with me after having submitted Lord Walsingham’s offer to your Committee.

I am

Yrs. faithfully

Jno. Hartley Durrant

Entomological assistant to Lord Walsingham