patients while Seacole just helped to make their lives a little easier with provisions like the handkerchief which, according to source V, were not there “until Mary Seacole established her stores”. This description of ‘stores’ suggests Seacole essentially held a shop and a place that the soldiers could go to for provisions but that didn’t necessarily help them huge amounts like Nightingale’s hospital would have done. Source V not only mentions “Nightingale’s admirable hospital” and “formidable gifts of organisation” but also describes Seacole as “attentive to their practical needs” which suggests that her British Hotel made their lives a little easier by selling them food and medicine but didn’t do much else to actively help the soldiers. The boarding house also mainly took in officers so was not helping all the soldiers wile Nightingale’s hospital was for all injured British military. From this we can establish that maybe Mary Seacole’s achievements have been some-what extorted and that although she helped the soldiers she was nowhere near Nightingale’s achievements of actively saving their lives. Although she was positioned closer to the frontline and so was considered more brave, we know that the Scutari Barracks were equally dangerous with disease posing a great threat to Nightingale – it seems Nightingale may have been painted the original ‘angel of mercy’ for the simple reason that she was, she saved the soldiers lives and put herself under threat of succumbing to disease herself in doing so.

One of the things that should be taken into consideration is that maybe both Seacole and Nightingale are both angels to some respect and that they would not have been able to achieve the things they did without each other. In Source U, through an unreliable depiction, we can perhaps make a judgement from the empty bed that without Seacole looking after the lesser needs of the soldiers, Nightingale’s hospitals would be even more full than they already were as soldiers would become ill more easily if those things like handkerchiefs that Seacole provided were not there. Seacole would also have benefitted from Nightingale treating the injured as she didn’t know how to. In Source V we can also see how while Seacole looked after “the ranks who had a fear of hospitals”, Nightingale treated those who were “wounded or fell sick” which suggests they were both angels in a sense but worked with each other indirectly, Nightingale doing the official nursing while Seacole looked after the men “in the long months when nothing much appeared to be happening” and offered them friendship and a boost in morale during this time. Using this idea that they relied on each other to be angels of mercy it is almost impossible to choose one over the other and it must be said they while Nightingale was an angel in that she saved hundreds of lives by actively treating the wounded and sick with her nursing expertise at her Barracks in Scutari, Seacole was an angel by being present for the soldiers and boosting their morale as well as in some cases preventing future illnesses by providing medicine and things like handkerchiefs to the soldiers in her British Hotel.

In conclusion, while it could be argued that both Florence Nightingale and Mary Seacole were angels of mercy in their own respect and even that they would not have achieved such things without each other, it all seems to boil down to the real definition of an angel of mercy. After analysing the evidence from Source U and V the complexities are clear in that from the soldier’s point of view, Seacole would probably have seemed more of a present angel who made their everyday lives easier and in that respect should be labelled the real angel of mercy. However, in the grand scheme of things, Florence Nightingale had much more of an impact and saved huge numbers of lives by actively treating the patients. Being able to save