

## **\*A Life without Struggle? Paternal Influence and William Edward Nightingale<sup>1</sup>**

**Dr R. E. Foster, B.A., Ph.D., F. R. Hist. Soc.**

Shortly after 8am on Monday 5 January 1874, a month short of his eightieth birthday, William Edward Nightingale of Embley Park got up from his breakfast table to go upstairs to fetch the watch which he had forgotten to bring down with him. On the way back down the main staircase he collapsed and died. The following Saturday, 10 January, Mr Nightingale was buried after a traditional ‘walking’ funeral, at which his oak coffin was “was borne to the grave by labourers on the estate.” Upwards of a hundred people from the estate attended, whilst nearly 400 in all crammed the tiny church of St Margaret’s of Antioch in East Wellow.<sup>2</sup> He was finally interred in a newly-created family vault just a few feet from the church door.

Nightingale’s funeral obsequies, though hardly unimpressive, were relatively anodyne. They received little coverage, even in the provincial press. There was apparently little to say for, his famous daughter apart, what was he but a typical English country gentleman? *The Times* described him simply as a “gentleman;” Thomas Carlyle, when he met him in 1851, had characterised him only slightly more precisely as a “Liberal country gentleman.” In death his family’s chosen inscription proclaimed him as a gentleman of Hampshire and Derbyshire.<sup>3</sup>

Florence’s biographers, however, whilst acknowledging some personable traits and aptitudes, have tended to take a less than favourable view of her father. Sir Edward

Cook, for example, wrote that “Mr Nightingale was one of those amiable men who are inclined to take the line of least resistance,” whilst Woodham-Smith thought him “a dilettante, rich, appreciative, indolent, charming.” Most recently, Lynn McDonald, both downplays his influence upon Florence and denigrates his personal virtues in more or less dismissing him as “her rich, well-intentioned, but lackadaisical papa.”<sup>4</sup> In so doing, such writers have really only been following the assessment offered in the voluminous correspondence of the Nightingale family. And none was more damning than Florence herself. Reflecting after his death she described her father as having been “a weak, inexpressible man.” Better known still is the assessment contained in her general notes on family members of January 1851:

“My father is a man who has never known what struggle is. Good impulses from his childhood up and always remaining perfectly in a natural state, acting always from impulse and having never by circumstances been forced to look into a thing, to carry it out. *Effleurez, n'appuyez pas* [touch lightly, don't push] has not been the rule but the habit of his life. Liberal by instinct, not by reflection, but not happy. Why not? He has not enough to do; he has not enough to fill his faculties. When I see him eating his breakfast, as if the destinies of a nation depended upon his getting done, carrying his plate about the room, delighting in being in a hurry....I say to myself how happy that man would be with a factory under his superintendence with the interests of 200 or 300 men to look after.”<sup>5</sup>

It is right for the biographer to sympathise with their subject. As such the foregoing assessment has often been cited as evidence of Florence's mounting frustration against what for her was a seemingly pointless existence. But its truth, so far as her father is

concerned, has never been tested. Yet commonsense should instinctively make us wary of accepting Florence's assessment: one's family are hardly the best placed to offer objective assessments of each other; whilst children specifically are hardly in a position to empathise with the early lives of their parents. The aim in the present essay is thus to restore some much needed context to William Nightingale, to see him as his Hampshire contemporaries saw him, when he was the central figure in the Nightingale family story until his daughter's sudden celebrity from late 1854 onwards reduced him to the status of prologue in hers. What emerges is a man far more interesting than the simple label of country gentleman allows, and, surprisingly, one more exposed to struggles of sorts than Florence either realised or would admit.<sup>6</sup>

William Edward Shore, as he was born on 15 February 1794, grew up at Tapton Hall, in Eccleshall near Sheffield in Yorkshire. The family had a long history in the county but had advanced their prosperity only recently (one of his grandfathers had been a cobbler), by establishing Sheffield's first banking business in 1774. Woodham-Smith describes the young William as "an awkward lanky schoolboy, immensely tall, immensely thin, with a habit of always standing upright propped against mantelpieces and doors because he disliked folding himself into a chair."<sup>7</sup> He spent time at the University of Edinburgh and Trinity College, Cambridge, though failed to finish a degree at either institution. This was hardly unusual. Nor did it matter, for on reaching the age of 21 in 1815 he succeeded to the fortune - estimated at £7,000-£8,000 annually - of a great-uncle, Peter Nightingale, of Lea in Derbyshire. At the same time he took the Nightingale name by royal sign manual. Three years later in 1818, he married Frances Smith, one of the eleven children of the well-known reformer MP, William Smith of Essex.<sup>8</sup> The couple's

two daughters, Parthenope and Florence, were both born abroad during what was effectively an extended honeymoon, in 1819 and 1820 respectively.

On finally returning to Derbyshire, Nightingale oversaw the construction of a new house at Lea Hurst. But it quickly proved insufficient for the family's requirements: Florence was to complain that it had only 15 bedrooms! Additionally, the inclement Derbyshire weather for his daughters, particularly during the winter months, and the inaccessibility of London for the socially-ambitious Fanny, coalesced as factors in persuading William to seek a second estate that would serve as a main country home. When Sir William Heathcote's Embley Park estate in Hampshire came on the market in the summer of 1825, the Nightingales bought it.<sup>9</sup>

The Nightingale story, as agreed by Florence's biographers, can be briefly summarised as follows. Ensclosed in their new home, the family entered quickly and fully into both the social and formal life of Hampshire county society. Hence William, as well as acting as a good landlord and patron of local causes, was recognised by his peers in being chosen to fill the office of High Sheriff in 1829, and soon after gained the permanent badges of county society in being appointed a deputy lieutenant and justice of the peace. His hopes for a glittering political career, however, were dashed when he contested, but lost, the Andover borough constituency in 1835, a defeat ascribed in the family to his high-minded refusal to bribe any electors. But at least this afforded him the time to tutor his daughters, and to oversee the re-design and expansion of Embley, pending which the family were abroad between 8 September 1837 and 6 April 1839.<sup>10</sup> Thereafter, Embley, particularly its new Drawing Room, played host to grand social gatherings during the

1840s, albeit an existence best remembered today for engendering the frustrations in Florence's story too well-known to need repeating here.

One cannot dispute the factual elements of this. William Nightingale was, seemingly, an immediately important figure in Hampshire, whether it be through furthering existing familial relationships such as those with the Bonham Carter's; or in establishing new and significant ones such as those with their Broadlands neighbour, Lord Palmerston.<sup>11</sup> But it was the stake in the land that mattered. The Embley estate he purchased was not far short of 4,000 acres in size. Though there were to be some additional buying and selling, it remained at 3,596 acres at the time of his death, an acreage which yielded some £2,811 in rental.<sup>12</sup> Nightingale biographies describe this as making the family 'middle class.' This is a misleading term, both for the modern connotations it carries and because it inaccurately denotes what Nightingale's contemporaries would have understood as being middle class. Rather, the Nightingales joined what historians of landed society would more helpfully designate as the gentry class, specifically, if one accepts possession of 3,000 acres or more as the criterion, membership of the greater gentry. There were only 51 other families in Hampshire who could boast possession of similar or more acres, and only six of them had truly large estates of over 10,000 acres.<sup>13</sup> William Nightingale had, overnight, become one of Hampshire's landed elite.

But in citing Nightingale's serving the offices of High Sheriff and deputy lieutenant in Hampshire as proof of his making a name for himself, Florence's biographers succeed only in misunderstanding the nature of those offices at that time. The lieutenancy, for example, whose ranks Nightingale joined in 1831, could in theory be accessed by

anybody with landed property worth £300 per annum, a fraction of what the Embley estate yielded. It existed to raise and co-ordinate the county's regiments of militia, but the institution had largely ceased to exist in practice since the end of the Napoleonic Wars. It was not seriously to be revived until Napoleon III revived British fears of French imperialism around mid-century.<sup>14</sup> The office of High Sheriff meanwhile, which Nightingale filled in 1829, though of crucial importance in medieval times, had long since ceased to be so, its remaining functions being largely ceremonial. Rather than being prestigious, it was an office to be avoided, chiefly on the grounds of the personal expense which it entailed. As such, it tended to fall upon younger or newer members of county society. Nightingale, if not quite the former, was certainly the latter. His being made High Sheriff was consequently less a sought-after honour than a more or less inescapable burden. His year as High Sheriff at least proved unexceptionable. The most problematic episode with which he had to deal was a contested election for the ancient post of Regarder of the New Forest. But he could not avoid the dreaded personal expenditure the office entailed, for custom required that he both attend and fund the ceremonial for the judges of assize in their twice annual visits to the county. Those costs included such antiquated incidentals as providing gloves and wands for 22 javelin men, horses, trumpeters and train bearers, not to mention the cost of the judges' food and lodgings.<sup>15</sup> Nightingale's final bill for his year in office was a not inconsiderable £292 – and he escaped far more lightly than many. But at least there was one apparent social benefit in that it was the Duke of Wellington's custom as lord lieutenant of the county to invite both judges and High Sheriff to dine with him at Stratfield Saye prior to assize weeks.<sup>16</sup>

What Florence's biographers have insufficiently failed to grasp is that the local office that really mattered was that of county magistrate. Nightingale was duly recommended for Hampshire's commission of the peace and took the oaths to qualify as a JP in January 1831. Cook says that "Mr Nightingale was...zealous in county business...concerned in the administration of hospitals and asylums."<sup>17</sup> The truth of this assertion has never been questioned. It would indeed be nice to think of Nightingale as having paved the way for his daughter as an administrator – he took her along to the cathedral service at Winchester which preceded the assizes in 1829, for example - and that he showed an enlightened lead on social reform more generally, if only at the local level. Certainly it was possible for individuals to make a considerable impact at county level: one thinks most obviously of John Howard in Bedfordshire in the late eighteenth century who had helped fuel a national movement for prison and penal reform, whilst in Nightingale's Hampshire Sir Thomas Baring was devoting inordinate time to prison and lunacy reform.<sup>18</sup>

In fact Nightingale's county administrative record would appear to be ambivalent at best. His attendance at the Quarter Sessions in Winchester, the four annual gatherings of JPs to discharge county business, is hardly over-impressive. Between 1831 when he qualified as a JP and the end of 1852 - some 88 Sessions weeks – the official minutes record Nightingale as having been present at only 24 of them, barely better than one in four.<sup>19</sup> Those occasions he did attend included the special meeting of December 1839 which voted to set up a rural police constabulary (Nightingale siding with the majority), and the Easter 1849 Sessions which decided to erect a new county prison. In 'normal' times he was most likely to attend the Michaelmas and Epiphany Sessions (ten and eight

appearances respectively), and least likely to attend at Midsummer – which he managed only once, in 1845. This, of course, was the consequence of his unwavering determination to spend the summers at Lea Hurst in Derbyshire: only a minority of active magistrates had two estates as he did. But if this was a constant, it must also be admitted that his attendance record gradually grew worse. If one ignores the period when the Nightingales were abroad between 1837 and 1839 his attendance record during the 1830s approaches 50%; during the 1840s, there are two periods of two years or more when he never attended at all. This is arguably proof of the charge laid by both family and biographers that Nightingale was lazy. I am not altogether convinced. In the wider context of the attendance record of Hampshire magistrates at Quarter Sessions, Nightingale's lies somewhere in the middle: it was a cause of recurring concern to those who were more or less ever-present that on average only a quarter of the county's active magistrates turned up.<sup>20</sup>

One must also remember that county magistrates could act on a more localised basis, either individually, in pairs, or in smaller geographical bodies known as petty sessions. Nightingale does seem to have fairly active at this level, content as many were not, to discharge humdrum or tedious tasks. Thus, for example, in May 1831 he helped swear in those balloted for the militia, whilst in March 1834 he was amongst the handful who fixed opening hours for beerhouses. In November of the same year he took the chair at a meeting in Romsey town hall when residents met to consider how local parishes might come together to implement the terms of the Poor Law Amendment Act. The fact that when he wrote to Wellington in September 1837 advising him that his imminent absence abroad would occasion a shortage of active JPs locally was not gainsaid, and rather

confirms his industry in the interim.<sup>21</sup> It was a point which appears to have escaped the notice of his critical younger daughter.

The fact remains, however, that Cook's wider claim that Nightingale was zealous in county business - and specifically hospitals and asylums - cannot be substantiated. Though he was to be on the infirmary committee of the Royal Hampshire County Hospital, its historian notes that he was only "occasionally present." And though the county oversaw its privately licensed lunatic asylums via visiting justices committees, Nightingale never appears amongst their number. Neither was he on any of the crucial committees in Hampshire county government, such as those which visited the county's prisons; or the Finance and Road and Bridge Committee which was the real executive force in his era.<sup>22</sup> Partly this was a case of his lacking the judicial training which tended to characterise the most influential magistrates, such as his brother-in-law, John Bonham Carter; partly also, again, a case of his chosen social habits in regularly spending part of the year in Derbyshire. It was also though, as will be suggested below, a consequence too, of his natural reticence.

In any case, Nightingale's family's ambitions for him were to cut a figure on the national political stage, not the local governmental one. In Nightingale biographies this focuses around his candidacy for Andover borough in the general election of 1835. From his wife and both daughters, this provoked considerable excitement.<sup>23</sup> An exclusive focus on the Andover episode, however, obscures the fact that Nightingale's political career had started earlier. Like so many, he was galvanised by the fragmentation of Liverpool's longstanding Tory administration from February 1827, and the extra-parliamentary

movement for Reform which gathered pace in the wake of the economic downturn at the end of the 1820s: “How I hate Tories, all Beer and money,” he wrote to Fanny in 1830. In March 1831 he was one of the estimated 5,000 crowd who attended a county meeting at Winchester Castle, Hampshire’s biggest political gathering for at least a decade, to endorse the measures to reform parliament announced by Lord Grey’s Whig-Reformer ministry. He even spoke briefly in seconding the main motion.<sup>24</sup> During the ensuing county campaign for the general election of May 1831, when his brother-in-law, John Bonham Carter, the chief organisational force for the Reform cause in Hampshire, chaired the Reformer candidates’ committee, he spoke in Romsey on their behalf. In addition, he promised £100 to assist in taking Reformers to the poll should it prove necessary. He was also amongst 500 requisitionists who called for another county meeting in October 1831 when the House of Lords threatened to block the Reform measure, and was present at another meeting in Romsey the same month for a similar purpose.<sup>25</sup>

The Reform Act received its royal assent in June 1832. In redrawing Britain’s electoral map, it split the old Hampshire county constituency in two, creating a North and South division, each returning two MPs. Nightingale clearly stood out as one of the chief landed proprietors supporting the Reform cause in the latter when a further general election was called at the end of the year. Indeed, this made him a potential candidate; there was speculation to this effect in the local press. He could not, however, boast long residence, the unwritten qualification that accompanied broad acres as a prerequisite in a candidate for a prestigious county constituency. He did, however, agree to serve as chairman of the Reformers’ election committee for the Southern division, assisting

Bonham Carter in the search for candidates. Their efforts resulted in Lord Palmerston and Sir George Staunton being induced to come forward. This was, privately, a matter of some disappointment to the Tory opposition, one of whose candidates, John Fleming, had hoped that Nightingale “or some other thorough going Radical” would enter the fray. But Nightingale’s public role extended no further than seconding Palmerston’s nomination on the hustings.<sup>26</sup> The two Reform candidates were triumphantly elected.

When the next general election was called for January 1835, it was logical for the Reformers of South Hampshire to resurrect their successful team. Nightingale again chaired their committee, and again seconded Palmerston’s nomination. In a campaign that was even closer and more bitter than that of 1832 had been, however, it was the two Tories who now prevailed. Nightingale’s chairing a dinner to Palmerston at Romsey town hall in mid-February was thus more a wake than a celebration: it was also, quite possibly, the occasion of Florence’s first political meeting, noted by some of her biographers.<sup>27</sup>

But Nightingale’s main political focus in 1835, of course, was his own candidacy for one of the two Andover borough seats. On this occasion, at least, he appears to have acted impulsively and alone: Bonham Carter, for one, was surprised by the news of his standing. Nightingale, after all, had already agreed to chair the South Hants committee when one of the two successful Reform members for Andover in 1832 announced that he would not be standing again. But he duly acceded to a requisition sent to Embley by Andover Reformers to be the replacement. By early December, the *Salisbury and Winchester Journal* could report that he had undertaken “an extremely active canvass”

and “from the best intelligence we can gain, we are led to believe that the chances of success preponderate greatly in favour of Mr Nightingale.”<sup>28</sup> Small wonder the family was stunned by his subsequent defeat. His fellow Reformer, Ralph Etwall, headed the poll comfortably with 149 votes, but the Conservative candidate, Sir John Pollen, won the battle for the second seat, polling 104 votes to Nightingale’s 100.

The Nightingale family’s disappointment was only human. Fanny claimed privately that Pollen had prevailed “by Beer, Brandy, and Money”, though Nightingale toned this down for public consumption by alluding to “various circumstances which have led to our *apparent* defeat; it is not for me to point out the means resorted to by our opponents, since the manner in which they gained their feeble majority is too notorious.”<sup>29</sup> Neither he nor his wife was necessarily correct. In such a close contest, any number of reasons might have tipped the balance, not least the national swing towards the Conservatives in 1835. Among other factors, one must allow for Nightingale’s own naiveté, both about the state of the parties in Andover and post 1832 politics generally. It is not clear that he knew anything about Andover’s recent political history: he told Palmerston early in 1834 that he did not read the local press for news of local politics, since the details “seldom excite my curiosity.” Had he done so, he would have learnt that the borough had a colourful political past: in 1768 Sir Francis Delaval’s election attorney had included £500 in his expenses bill to cover medical costs and lost business on account of having suffered two broken legs when a colonel thrust him through the window of the George Inn!<sup>30</sup> Time had mellowed things somewhat, but the Andover Tories were visceral in their bitterness at having lost the town’s representation in 1831-2. With only 325 electors, Andover in 1835 was not a place for the politically squeamish, given that well-informed parties

agreed that the fight for second place between Pollen and Nightingale would be very close. Sir John Pollen was also a formidable opponent: he was one of the chief proprietors in the town and had sat for it until 1831. In his brother Richard, moreover, he possessed an electoral agent no less skilled and experienced than Bonham Carter was for the Reformers. No wonder the latter was surprised that Nightingale had agreed to stand: he warned him as early as 10 December 1834 that “I fear the Tories this time are doing things in better style.”<sup>31</sup>

It did not help his cause, therefore, that Nightingale could be portrayed as an outsider. Indeed, his fellow Reformer, Etwall, initially attacked him on this very point before the two got together and issued a joint address. On nomination day too, Nightingale arguably made mistakes. He allowed himself to be proposed by Henry Marsh, a non-gentry figure who had been one of the county’s best known Radicals for a generation. In his own remarks he declared himself in favour of shorter parliaments and implied that he inclined towards secret ballot – both highly advanced political stances for the time. This hardly endeared himself to moderates or the undecided, and the fact that he lost the show of hands which always preceded a poll suggests that popular support was genuinely against him.<sup>32</sup>

This is not to say that beer and money did not play a part too. The comment in the press that a surprising number of electors did not vote is suggestive that some were waiting for inducements which never materialised. But if it is true that Nightingale refused to countenance what was, after all, the accepted electoral practice of ‘treating’, he was being particularly naive. He had, after all, given money in the past to South Hampshire

campaigns, and also to Bonham Carter for his contests at Portsmouth – presumably amounting in total to several hundred pounds.<sup>33</sup> Whatever the truth, the belief that high-mindedness rather than other shortcomings proved his undoing in 1835 at least offered some solace. The Nightingale daughters were spared losing their father to Westminster.

Though the Reformer press encouraged him, Nightingale was not predisposed to ‘nurse’ Andover for the future. Woodham-Smith thus concludes that 1835 “proved a turning-point in the Nightingales lives,” that Nightingale thereafter shunned political meetings. This is not quite true; the closure of what might be called Nightingale’s political career can more accurately, and less definitively, be dated to around 1838. In that year Fanny still hoped and hinted that he would find a seat. In the interim he had still been prepared to chair political gatherings: in June 1835, for example, he presided at a Romsey meeting which established a registration committee, and subsequently agreed to serve on its governing body. He also seems to have played some part in political fundraising in 1842.<sup>34</sup> But when the next general election fell, unexpectedly in summer 1837, as a result of the death of William IV, Nightingale was in Derbyshire (as he was in July 1841 when the next election occurred), and took no part in any Hampshire contests. This is as likely to have been the result of greater political realism and personal preference as disillusionment in the wake of his Andover experience: privately, Reformers conceded that there was no chance of countering the onward march of a resurgent Toryism in South Hampshire. He was also, by then of course, too far advanced in his plans to take his family abroad to be persuaded to abandon them in favour of a renewed political venture.<sup>35</sup> Ironically enough, the best chance of a seat in parliament came in his absence in 1838

when the premature death of Bonham Carter left one of the Portsmouth seats vacant. But the former South Hampshire Reformer, Sir George Staunton, had superior claims.

More fundamentally, perhaps, one should question, as his immediate family seem not to have done, just how realistic Nightingale's aspirations to be an MP were. By the standards of the age he began too late. He was already forty when he contested Andover. By contrast, Sir William Heathcote became a Hampshire member at the age of 24, and Bonham Carter was 28 on his first election for Portsmouth in 1816. Palmerston was offered the Chancellorship of the Exchequer in 1809 at the age of only 24. Disraeli, famously, was an exception, finally winning a seat in 1837 at the fourth attempt. Yet even he was ten years younger than Nightingale.

It was also a case of temperament. The Disraeli comparison is again instructive. The latter was a performer who thrived on the adrenalin produced by appearing in the public arena. Nightingale patently did not enjoy the public stage. Though the local press devoted extensive coverage to the deliberation of the assembled magistrates in Quarter Sessions, for example, often reporting speeches verbatim, there is not a single occasion where Nightingale is recorded as having made a contribution. In the rare instances where he spoke at political gatherings during the Reform Bill period, his utterances as recorded by the press are both brief and banal. His most demanding appearance was to second the nomination of Palmerston in Southampton at the South Hampshire election of 1832. Bonham Carter, who knew him well, expressed reservations about the idea, warning Palmerston that "Nightingale has never had any experience in addressing a body of people." He would not have been surprised to read in the *Hampshire Advertiser* that Mr

Nightingale's speech seconding Palmerston in 1835 could not be reported because it was inaudible. Nightingale, by his own admission, was most at home in "the quiet and the shadows."<sup>36</sup>

Such details could be adduced as further evidence to corroborate the contention of Florence and her biographers that her father was weak. More accurately, it is argued here, they hint at a hitherto unappreciated theme in the Nightingale story, namely the prejudice which existed towards the Nightingale family in some quarters in Hampshire during their early years in the county; and towards Mr Nightingale in particular.

The ingredients of that prejudice were several. Initially, it consisted of a wariness of the newcomer, as exemplified by Palmerston's anxiety in 1825 that the Embley estate should be bought by himself and his neighbour, William Sloane-Stanley of Paultons, rather than pass into unknown hands.<sup>37</sup> On a lesser scale, as seen above, aversion towards an outsider was an issue held against Nightingale during his political foray into Andover in 1835. Heathcote's biographer made a similar point in writing that "The men who afterwards served together on the Bench and in the Yeomanry had visited one another's homes as boys, playing and riding together, so as to know each others traditions and characters." Nightingale, despite depictions of him to the contrary, was clearly not a Hampshire country gentleman: Cook, for example, says that "He shot and hunted, but was not ardently devoted to either sport."<sup>38</sup>

A related point lay in the type of newcomer which the Nightingales represented, for theirs was newly-acquired, not old landed money. Banking, it is true, the business in which the

Shores had prospered, was better than trade, but not by much. Hampshire already had a notable example of banking *arrivistes* in the Baring family. Their prominence in Hampshire was a fact which particularly annoyed that most famous of popular radicals, William Cobbett, in his celebrated *Rural Rides*, who argued that such people could not be in sympathy with the true interests of the rural community.<sup>39</sup> But to the existing landed elite, it was a simple case of social snobbery. A background in trade was sufficient to disqualify a family from the county bench for a generation or more. At least in moving from Derbyshire the Nightingales did not suffer from being remembered first hand as having been employed in non-landed pursuits. A self-conscious attempt to ‘invent’ lineage may possibly explain why Nightingale incorporated the armorials of the Nightingales of Warwickshire, capped with a knight’s helm – to which, he had neither right nor familial connection. Contemporary luminaries such as Sir Robert Peel, whose father made the family fortune from Lancashire cotton factories, was a victim of such social prejudice long into his political career.<sup>40</sup>

The real roots of the prejudice towards the Nightingales, however, were the intertwined ones of politics and religion. In terms of politics, the Nightingales could hardly have arrived at a worse time in Hampshire, the consensual uncontested county election of 1826 giving way to the passions aroused by the Reform issue which did not subside for a decade or so. Unfortunately for the Nightingales, they found themselves in South Hampshire where the political partisanship was most pronounced and the Liberal interest in an ever-increasing minority. It was a partisanship moreover, which spilled beyond the political arena. The number of known Liberal supporters amongst the magistracy was

fewer than one in five. Both Nightingale and Bonham Carter made recommendations for the magistracy, which, unbeknown to them, were blocked in part for party political reasons by the Tory lord lieutenant, Wellington, and his chief adviser on such matters, John Fleming. More generally, the unreconstructed Tory mindset of the Fleming and Sloane-Stanley families, both owning large estates close to Embley, seems to have ensured that they were never on more than polite terms with the Nightingales whose progressive liberal political stance on many issues was well known.<sup>41</sup>

But Liberals, even advanced ones, could be stomached by most Tories, especially if, like the Nightingales, they were substantial landowners. The real prejudice against the Nightingales, certainly before the 1840s took some of the passion away, was religious in motivation. Nightingale's parents had both been Unitarians; Fanny too, hailed from a Unitarian background. Though numerically few nationally - there were no others of note in Hampshire with that religious heritage other than the Bonham Carters - Unitarians, through the likes of intellectuals such as Joseph Priestley and Richard Price, were disproportionately influential in society. And Unitarians, in rejecting the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as upheld by the Church of England were making what one historian has recently described as "a stab at the symbolic heart of the Establishment."<sup>42</sup> And if they could question a central tenet of the state religion, might not Unitarians question all agencies and institutions of order? Certainly they tended to be political radicals. As articulate critics of England's *ancient regime*, defenders of the latter, such as Edmund Burke, equated them with Jacobins. The Anglican state treated them accordingly. Denial of the Holy Trinity was actually prohibited by statute until 1813; the repeal of the seventeenth century Test and Corporation Acts, which excluded nonconformists from

civil offices, only occurred in 1828. Unsurprisingly, the conviction held by many who could remember the French Revolution, that the Established Church and State were one and indivisible, persisted somewhat longer. There were plenty enlisted under Tory banners in the 1830s, Wellington for example, who regarded Unitarianism, albeit with more venom than accuracy, as being synonymous with atheism and republicanism. During the 1830s there were several well-attended public meetings in Hampshire, attended by some Liberals as well as Conservatives, to petition against the further claims of Dissenters being granted. Sir William Heathcote, from whom the Nightingales had bought Embley, made it a condition of tenancy on his estate, that occupants be practicing Anglicans.<sup>43</sup> There was no more potent rallying cry in rural England during the 1830s than ‘the church in danger.’ As O’Malley recounts it, not perhaps entirely ironically, in quoting a letter of Florence’s from 1839, the Nightingales’ great friend in Paris, Mary Clarke, “could have little conception of the social conditions of Hampshire, where ‘Unitarians and other Atheists’ were universally banned, and even an unexceptionable Church of England clergyman, like the Nightingales’ new Vicar, Mr Jervis Giffard, could hardly be called on, since he had been presented to his living by someone who was not ‘of the high Church.’<sup>44</sup>

Cook asserts several times that Nightingale was a Unitarian, a judgement which Quinn and Prest happily accepted as late as 1987. Recent writers, however, have cast serious doubt on whether Nightingale can meaningfully be described as a Unitarian by the time the family arrived in Hampshire, arguing instead that he and his family became more inclined to Anglicanism with time, if only for reasons of social convenience. Lynn McDonald for example, points out that they married in the Church of England, and that

they attended Church of England services at East Wellow or Romsey Abbey when in Hampshire. In later life, Nightingale was also happy to provide the land for a new Church of England school in Wellow.<sup>45</sup> But plenty of contrary evidence points to Nightingale being something less than an orthodox Anglican. When in Derbyshire, for example, the Nightingales attended nonconformist chapel, albeit not a Unitarian one. In the 1840s, they supported the establishment of a new British and Foreign School Society building in Romsey, which organisation provided non-sectarian education and whose projects were usually only funded by nonconformists and some liberal Anglicans. And Florence, though christened by an Anglican clergyman, also had her birth recorded in the Protestant Dissenters' register in London's Cripplegate. It is, perhaps, safest to conclude that Nightingale was an ecumenical cum freethinker, and only a liberal Anglican at best.<sup>46</sup>

In reality, the nuances of Nightingale's religiosity did not bother many of his Hampshire contemporaries, for they simply presumed him to be a Unitarian, a label he never publicly contradicted. The Tory *Hampshire Advertiser* explicitly described him as being Unitarian in 1832. In private, Richard Pollen described him as a Dissenter during the Andover election campaign. Worst of all, was the Tory MP for South Hampshire, John Fleming. In writing to Wellington about membership of the county bench in September 1837, he described Nightingale as the Unitarian Mr Nightingale, brother-in-law of the Unitarian Bonham Carter, adding that "I certainly should consider it a great misfortune if it contained many such avowed enemies of the Established church, & I may add of the Monarchy."<sup>47</sup> During the 1830s, to be thought anything other than a staunch supporter of the Church of England was likely to see one numbered amongst its opponents.

Certainly Nightingale was brought up in a Unitarian tradition. This does explain some things about him: why, for example, he went to Edinburgh and Cambridge as opposed to Oxford where non-Anglicans could not even matriculate. It is also suggestive that he only embarked upon a political 'career' after 1828 when the religious test to become an MP was repealed, surely a more plausible reason for the timing of his political baptism than Woodham-Smith's unsupported assertion that he would not enter the political fray until the worst excesses of the electoral system were reformed.<sup>48</sup> The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 also, arguably, paved the way for Nightingale to be recommended for appointment to the civil offices of deputy lieutenant and county magistrate, though the precise timing of his qualifying as a magistrate in 1831 appears to have been chiefly determined by the shock administered to southern rural counties such as Hampshire by the agricultural labourers' disturbances of autumn 1830.<sup>49</sup>

If much in his Unitarian heritage helped make life more difficult than it might otherwise have been for Nightingale, there was one compensatory positive which was to be of incalculable advantage to his younger daughter. Unitarians generally held that education was the key to social progress, an education, moreover, grounded not upon rote learning of facts, but upon nurturing the pupil to be reflective. More crucially still, Unitarians held that education should be extended to women as well as men. As Cook puts it, "...to her father's guidance she was indebted for the mental grasp and powers of intellectual concentration which were to distinguish her work in life." Thus, as is well known, from 1831 he took it upon himself to school his daughters in a range of subjects which included classical and modern languages, philosophy, history and mathematics. Perhaps

also, one should add architecture, for Nightingale helped design the family's Derbyshire home at Lea Hurst, and the refurbished Embley with his insistence upon bringing light and air into the hitherto modest Georgian building, the whole completed with artesian well and hypocaust heating systems.<sup>50</sup> In her more sanguine moments, Florence readily admitted her father's influence upon her own ideas. Is it entirely fanciful to suggest that her later plans for hospital design had their genesis in her father's library?

Even if it is, there can be little doubt that it was in his library, that Nightingale was most at one with the world. Parthenope's memoir of her father captured it best when she wrote that "...above all the house abounded in books. Old books in their staid brown bindings, foreign classics in white parchment, great folios & portfolios of choice engravings, formed a pleasant background while the best books of the day on all conceivable subjects were heaped on the tables & overflowed on every ledge or coign of vantage. It was a joke against Mr Nightingale to the end of his life that he could not get through a meal without covering the tablecloth with literature." In a different age, he would surely have found his niche in academia. The Master of Balliol, Benjamin Jowett, recognised as much in suggesting to Florence that a chair be established in her father's name.<sup>51</sup>

That Nightingale never became fully assimilated into Hampshire county society, therefore, was of no great concern to him. The suspicions and low regard entertained towards him were fully reciprocated. He quite happily allowed the nine year old Florence to use Wellington's 1829 letter of invitation to Stratfield Saye to devise a game. In 1845, when the main topic of local society's gossip was Queen Victoria's visit to the Duke, it was Florence herself who gave expression to her family's less than eulogistic view of the

Great Captain: “they say the old Duke now cares for nothing but flattery, and asks nobody but masters of hounds. He almost ill-treated the Speaker. After dinner, they all stood at ease about the drawing-room, and behaved like so many soldiers on parade.”<sup>52</sup>

Of course, the Nightingales did have Hampshire connections, but the families they mixed and got on best with tended to be either relations or Liberals, and those with horizons beyond the county. The most frequent visitors to Embley were the Bonham Carters, Palmerston, various members of the Baring clan, and Charles Shaw-Lefevre, the distinguished Speaker, described in 1839 by Florence as “a great friend of ours, and a very agreeable man.” This is not to say that there were no Conservatives, but they were few and erudite, notably Lord and Lady Ashburton, William Sturges Bourne, a former Home Secretary, and Sir William Heathcote, patron of John Keble and Fellow of All Souls, who was later to sit with Gladstone as MP for Oxford University.<sup>53</sup> This was exactly as Nightingale wanted it. The gatherings at Embley during the 1840s were to be intellectually rarefied: hence a roll call of non-Hampshire guests which included the novelist, Elizabeth Gaskell, the mathematician Charles Babbage, the astronomer Sir John Herschel, and Charles Darwin. To one fascinated observer, who witnessed one such gathering in 1842, it was “a glimpse of a great, gay, smart, clever talking party as seldom comes across me.” The aristocracy to which Nightingale aspired, and whose fringes he approached, was not the landed one but what Noel Annan famously identified as the intellectual one.<sup>54</sup>

By the highest standards (the ones invariably applied by his younger daughter!), Nightingale remains one of life’s under-achievers. Even before Florence’s celebrity, he was as likely to be mentioned as Bonham Carter’s brother-in-law or William Smith’s son-

in-law, as Mr Nightingale in his own right. Away from his home and the intellectual social milieu that were his comfort zones, he was, as Florence rightly noted at the time of his death, “as shy as a bird.”<sup>55</sup> He lacked the edge that was to propel her to greatness. Even if some of his nineteenth century contemporaries would not quite admit that he was a gentleman as they understood it, he was in the modern sense, undoubtedly a gentle man. But he had (contrary to what she had written in 1851), known struggle, struggle against political bias and social and religious prejudice, even if not of the pecuniary kind that she had in mind.

Florence was also wrong to contend in 1851 that her father was unhappy because insufficiently occupied. Nightingale had been more involved than many of his standing in local political and administrative affairs. He was also a more than usually active ‘father’ to those who lived on his land, a point that she did at least recognise at the time of his death when she wrote that he was “the truest father to his places, people and cottagers, which he so loved and cared for, never pauperizing by indulgence, wise and careful, always helping them to help themselves, even to seeing himself how the wives kept the rooms tidy.”<sup>56</sup>

In his private hours too, Nightingale was content with his world, with the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. On this point father and daughter disagreed, since for Florence the acquisition of knowledge was meaningless if not employed for some practical good. That he eventually came to empathise with her point of view and consequently to support her, is to his eternal credit. William Nightingale was, without doubt, the key formative and the most important, male influence in Florence’s life. He

would not have been unhappy with the verdict of their mutual friend, Benjamin Jowett, who wrote only days after his death to Florence that, “Your father was very proud & pleased about your work – though he did not understand it. I told him once that to have a daughter who would keep alive his name was better than to have many sons. He was greatly taken by this. And no doubt many persons will ask & talk about him, because he was your father.”<sup>57</sup>

- 
- The author is Head of History at Hampshire Collegiate School, Romsey, Hampshire. He can be contacted there by post or by email at [russ.foster@church-schools.com](mailto:russ.foster@church-schools.com). A shorter version of the paper was first delivered at Embley Park on 14 July 2010 as part of the conference proceedings ‘Florence Nightingale. Influence and Inspiration 1820-2010.’

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this paper, Nightingale refers to Mr Nightingale rather than Florence.

<sup>2</sup> *Romsey Register*, 15 January 1874. For Mr Nightingale’s death, Lynn McDonald *et. al.* (eds.), *The Collected Works of Florence Nightingale* [hereafter *CWFN*], 1, pp. 273-5, FN to Parthenope Nightingale, 8 January 1874.

<sup>3</sup> *Romsey Register*, 15 January 1874; Mark Bostridge, *Florence Nightingale. The Woman and her Legend*, London, 2008, p. 572 for Carlyle’s view.

<sup>4</sup> E. T. Cook, *The Life of Florence Nightingale*, 2 vols., London, 1913, I, p. 123; Cecil Woodham-Smith, *Florence Nightingale*, London, 1950, p. 4; Lynn McDonald, *Florence Nightingale at First Hand*, London, 2010, p. xv.

<sup>5</sup> *CWFN*, I, pp. 97-9, notes of 7 January 1851; F. B. Smith, *Florence Nightingale. Reputation and Power*, London, 1982, p. 19.

<sup>6</sup> It is important to emphasise here that the present essay is only concerned with the detail of Nightingale’s activities in Hampshire. A different story may well emerge from an investigation of his public life in Derbyshire. One might reasonably surmise, that with local roots, and the Nightingale name already known, the ‘struggles’ evident in Hampshire, were not experienced in Derbyshire. That would help explain why Nightingale apparently preferred Derbyshire to Hampshire. The fact remains, however, that Embley was the main family home and landed power base from 1825.

<sup>7</sup> Woodham-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 3; Bostridge, *op. cit.*, pp.17-22 for the Shore family background.

<sup>8</sup> For William Smith see Richard W. Davis, *Dissent in Politics 1780-1830: The Political Life of William Smith, MP*, London, London, 1971; Jenny Handley and Hazel Lake, *Progress by Persuasion. The Life of William Smith 1756-1835*, London, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Cook, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 7-9.

<sup>10</sup> All biographies more or less follow Cook, *op. cit.*, I, especially chapters 1-2, *passim*.

---

<sup>11</sup> On Palmerston see Kenneth Bourne, *Palmerston: The Early Years 1784-1841*, London, 1982, though David Brown's forthcoming *Palmerston*, is eagerly awaited. On the Bonham Carters see Victor Bonham Carter, *In a Liberal Tradition: A Social Biography 1750-1900*, London, 1960. John Carter (1788-1838), succeeded to his Uncle Thomas Bonham's name and property in 1826. He married Joanna Smith, Fanny Nightingale's sister, and was perhaps William Nightingale's closest friend.

<sup>12</sup> For a copy of the 1825 sale particulars see Hampshire Record Office [hereafter HRO], Heathcote Papers, 58M71/E/B82. For the 1874 details see 'Owners of Land, 1872-3 (England and Wales)', *Parliamentary Papers*, 1874 (1097) LXXXII. In addition Nightingale's Derbyshire holdings for the same date consisted of 2,238 acres yielding a rental of £3,966, presumably because of the ongoing revenues from lead mining. The total acreage was thus 5,834 and the total rental £6,777.

<sup>13</sup> R. E. Foster, *The Politics of County Power*, Hemel Hempstead, 1990, pp. 7-13; F. M. L. Thomspon, *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1963, chapter 5.

<sup>14</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-5. For good modern overviews see Bryan Keith-Lucas, *The Unreformed Local Government System*, London, 1980, and David Eastwood, *Governing Rural England. Tradition and Transformation in Local Government 1780-1840*, Oxford, 1994.

<sup>15</sup> For a detailed breakdown of costs as High Sheriff, see HRO, Drummond Papers, 3M60, bundle 31 for 1838. On the office generally see Eastwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-5.

<sup>16</sup> For Nightingale's expenses see HRO, Bonham Carter Papers, 94M72/F.47. These have erroneously been assumed to be have been John Bonham Carter's expenses, but he never served as High Sheriff. Wellington's letter is reproduced in Barbara Montgomery Dossey, *Florence Nightingale. Mystic, Visionary, Healer*, Philadelphia, 2010, p. 12.

<sup>17</sup> Cook, *op. cit.*, I, p. 138. HRO, Q27/3/300 for Nightingale's qualification as a JP. Southampton University Hartley Library [hereafter HL], Wellington Papers, 4/1/4/3/12, Wellington to Melbourne, 13 April 1831 for Nightingale's appointment as a deputy lieutenant. On the magistracy generally, see Eastwood, *op. cit.*, chapter 4. Magistrates were appointed for the crown by the lord chancellor, but the latter usually relied upon recommendations from a county's lord lieutenant.

<sup>18</sup> I. B. O'Malley, *Florence Nightingale 1820-1856. A Study of Her Life Down to the End of the Crimean War*, p. 29; Foster, *op. cit.*, chapter 3. For John Howard see Eastwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-6.

<sup>19</sup> This paragraph is based on an analysis of HRO, Quarter Sessions Order Books, Q.O.30-45. For the context, see Foster, *op. cit.*, chapter 3. Of course, Nightingale may have been active in Derbyshire too, but his relative infrequency there compared to Hampshire makes it impossible for him to be anything other than an occasional figure at the Derbyshire Quarter Sessions.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, especially, pp. 41-3. Palmerston is a good example of somebody, like Nightingale, with dispersed landholdings for whilst Broadlands was his main seat, he also owned several thousand acres in County Sligo in Ireland, where he liked to spend the summer months. Further, whilst active in Hampshire county politics and in its commission of the peace, he never chose to qualify - and thus act - as a county JP.

<sup>21</sup> *Hampshire Chronicle*, 14 March and 23 May 1831; 29 September 1834; HL, Wellington Papers, 4/2/7, Nightingale to Wellington, 4 September 1837.

<sup>22</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, chapter 3; Barbara Carpenter Turner, *A History of the Royal Hampshire County Hospital*, Chichester, 1986, p. 73.

<sup>23</sup> *CWFN*, V, pp. 330-2, especially Florence's letter to her mother.

- 
- <sup>24</sup> Woodham-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 6; *Hampshire Chronicle*, 21 March 1831. The best general account of events remains Michael Brock, *The Great Reform Act*, London, 1973.
- <sup>25</sup> *Hampshire Chronicle*, 9 May and 17 October 1831. For a fuller account, Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-15.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 116-17; *Hampshire Chronicle*, 17 December 1832; *Hampshire Advertiser*, 27 October and 15 December 1832; HL, Broadlands Papers, box 195, Nightingale to Palmerston, 3 October 1832 and Fleming to Palmerston, 22 November 1832.
- <sup>27</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 117; *Hampshire Chronicle*, 19 January and 23 February 1835; Cook, *op. cit.*, I, p. 6.
- <sup>28</sup> HRO, Bonham Carter Papers, 94M72/F.10, Bonham Carter to Nightingale, 10 December 1834; *Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, 1 and 8 December 1834; *Hampshire Chronicle*, 12 January 1835.
- <sup>29</sup> Cook, *op. cit.*, pp.5-6; CWFN, V, between pp. 466-7 for Nightingale's election poster address of 8 January 1835.
- <sup>30</sup> HL, Broadlands Papers, box 195, Nightingale to Palmerston, 22 February 1834; William White, *History, Gazetteer and Directory of the County of Hampshire*, London, 1878, p. 23.
- <sup>31</sup> HRO, Bonham Carter Papers, 94M72/F.10, Bonham Carter to Nightingale, 10 December 1834; J. H. Philbin, *Parliamentary Representation 1832, England and Wales*, New Haven, 1965, pp. 80-1.
- <sup>32</sup> *Hampshire Chronicle*, 12 January 1835.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*; Cook, I, *op. cit.*, p. 6; Bostridge, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-4.
- <sup>34</sup> Woodham-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 15; *Hampshire Chronicle*, 15 and 22 June 1835.
- <sup>35</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 117; Cook, *op. cit.*, I, p. 15-16; G. T. Staunton, *Memoirs of the Chief Incidents of the Public Life of Sir George Thomas Staunton, Bart*, London, 1856, p. 139.
- <sup>36</sup> HL, Broadlands Papers, box 195, Bonham Carter to Palmerston, 8 December 1832; *Hampshire Advertiser*, 17 January 1835; Woodham-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- <sup>37</sup> HRO, Sloane-Stanley Papers, 10M55/40/1-2, Palmerston to Sloane-Stanley, 25 March 1825.
- <sup>38</sup> F. Awdry, *A Country Gentleman of the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1906, p. 10; Cook, *op. cit.*, I, p. 41.
- <sup>39</sup> See Philip Ziegler, *The Sixth Great Power. Barings, 1762-1929*, London, 1988; William Cobbett, *Rural Rides*, London, 1967 edition, pp. 270-1.
- <sup>40</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-3; I am grateful to David Chapman for information on Nightingale of Warwickshire. One of Nightingale's grandfathers had been a cobbler, a fact that Nightingale, understandably, did not publicise. On Peel see Richard A. Gaunt, *Sir Robert Peel. The Life and Legacy*, London, 2010, pp. 7-8.
- <sup>41</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, especially pp. 29-32, 116-7; HL Wellington Papers, 4/2/7, Fleming to Wellington, 10 January 1837. William Sloane-Stanley (1781-1860), of Paultons Park in Romsey was a leading figure in Tory county politics. John Fleming (d.1844), of Stoneham Park near Southampton was county MP from 1820-1831 and later for South Hants, 1835-1844.
- <sup>42</sup> Boyd Hilton, *A Mad, Bad, & Dangerous People? England 1783-1846*, Oxford, 2006, p. 462. More generally see Michael Watts, *The Dissenters*, Oxford, 1995 and Stuart Andrews, *Unitarian Radicalism: Political Impact, 1770-1814*, London, 2003.

---

<sup>43</sup> Awdry, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

<sup>44</sup> O'Malley, *op. cit.*, p. 71. See also Bostridge, *op. cit.*, p. 565, note to p. 53. Nightingale owned the advowson, i.e. the right to select the priest for East Wellow.

<sup>45</sup> E. V. Quinn and John Prest (eds.), *Dear Miss Nightingale. A Selection of Benjamin Jowett's Letters to Florence Nightingale 1860-1893*, Oxford, 1987, p.xiii; McDonald, *op. cit.*, p. 8. For Wellow school, see *CWFN*, V, pp. 712-16. It should be remembered, of course, that before the Dissenting Marriages Act of 1836, all marriages had to take place according to Anglican rites if they were to be afforded legal recognition.

<sup>46</sup> McDonald, *op. cit.*, p. 8; Phoebe Berrow, Barbara Burbage and Pat Genge, *The Story of Romsey*, Chippenham, 1988, pp.47-8; Bostridge, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

<sup>47</sup> *Hampshire Advertiser*, 3 November 1832; HL, Wellington Papers, 4/1/6/3/21, R. Pollen to Carnarvon, 5 December 1834; 4/1/8/58, Fleming to Wellington, 7 September 1837.

<sup>48</sup> Woodham-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 15; Bostridge, *op. cit.*, pp.18, 560-1; Hilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 379-83. In practice, Protestant Nonconformists could get round the disqualification either by attending Anglican Communion once a year or by signing a certificate of indemnity.

<sup>49</sup> Foster, *op. cit.*, chapter 4, especially p. 79. The surviving evidence is, however, incomplete. Nightingale's name first appears in the commission of the peace dated 2 March 1828. No oath of qualification survives but *Hampshire Chronicle*, 31 January 1831 has him as one of 13 new JPs qualifying and one of 31 for the year. By contrast, only 67 qualified 1821-1830. Detail extracted from National Archives, C.234/14, Fiats for Justices of the Peace: Hampshire 1706-1923.

<sup>50</sup> Cook, *op. cit.*, I, p.13; on the general point see Kathryn Gleadle, *The Early Feminists. Radical Unitarians 1831-1851*, London, 1998. I am grateful to David Chapman for detail regarding the changes to Embley.

<sup>51</sup> Cited in Gillian Gill, *Nightingales. The Story of Florence Nightingale and Her Remarkable Family*, London, 2004, pp. 77-8.

<sup>52</sup> Dossey, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Cook, *op. cit.*, I, p. 36-7; *Hampshire Chronicle*, 25 January 1845.

<sup>53</sup> Cook, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 24-6, 36-7. For Shaw-Lefevre and Sturges Bourne see H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004, VI, pp.863-4 and XXXIII, pp.162-3.

<sup>54</sup> Bostridge, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-3; HRO, Sturges Bourne-Dyson Papers, 9M55/F.19/26, Angela Sturges Bourne to Marianne Dyson, November-December 1842. Noel Annan's essay is most easily accessible in *The Dons. Mentors, Eccentrics and Geniuses*, London, 1999, pp. 304-341.

<sup>55</sup> *CWFN*, I, pp. 273-5, FN to Parthenope, 8 January 1874.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Quinn and Prest, *op. cit.*, p.251, Jowett to FN, 8 January 1874. Nearly a year after his death, FN reflected that Nightingale's most appropriate epitaph would be 'seeking after wisdom': see *CWFN*, I, pp.277-8, FN to Sir Harry & Lady Verney, 28 December 1874.