

2001

Ideal Darlings and Ministering Angels: Spheres of Action for Northern Women During the Civil War

Nina Clements
Denison University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/articulate>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clements, Nina (2001) "Ideal Darlings and Ministering Angels: Spheres of Action for Northern Women During the Civil War," *Articulāte*: Vol. 6 , Article 3.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/articulate/vol6/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Denison Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articulāte by an authorized editor of Denison Digital Commons.

Ideal Darlings and Ministering Angels: Spheres of Action for Northern Women During the Civil War

Nina Clements '01

Although the Victorian women Anne C. Rose researched and included in her book, *Victorian America and the Civil War*, "were unusually affluent and accomplished," Rose remarked with surprise that so "much of their work remained family-centered, unpaid, and repetitive by virtue of rendering service rather than progressive in the sense of forwarding personal and public advancement" (70). This statement contradicts the assumption of many scholars that the Civil War afforded women the opportunity to leap "from their sphere" and become more integrated into the public, and typically male, realm (Massey 3). This notion of a more fully integrated public sphere coincides with the purported weakening of class and gender stratification, which many attributed to the increase of industrialization, as well as to other effects of the war. However, although northern women's participation in the public sphere increased during the Civil War, their participation was in many cases only an extension of their domestic ideologies, and therefore women were subject to the same regulations and restrictions of the domestic sphere.

Rather than view women's activities and involvement in the United States Sanitary Commission as proto-feminist labor (as the majority of that labor was still *unpaid*), several of the authors represented in this essay view those efforts as merely extensions of their antebellum organizations, which were usually rooted in evangelical societies. While the majority of northern women were content to knit socks for local women's groups and serve as "nurses" or female superintendents at Sanitary Commission hospitals, members of the Woman's National Loyal League, urged for more political involvement on behalf of women. These women rejected the Sanitary Commission's call for patriotic feminine virtue and hoped to use the war as a springboard for the advancement of women's rights. The disparities of political and ideological positions of these white, middle class northern women, made manifest by their involvement in these two very different patriotic organizations, the United States Sanitary Commission and the Woman's National Loyal League, signal that despite their similarities of class and race, the war was not a total homogenizing or unifying force among them.

I. "Darling Is Ideal:" Separate Sphere Ideology and Women's Notions of Domestic Patriotism

Michael Perman explained that "women's ability to assume new and burdensome responsibilities as breadwinners and heads of household," was vital to the war effort. "When they did this," Perman contin-

ues, "women were stepping outside the 'woman's sphere' to which nineteenth-century men had consigned them" (246). During the reign of Victoria, 1837-1901, both American and British cultures espoused separate sphere ideology, which decried the home a sacred place, full of pure, womanly virtue. This separation of the public (work) and the private (home) spheres emphasized the purifying influence of the home, as sanctified by women, on men who became subjected to the corruption of business and industry. While industrialization took men away from the home, "women began to reign supreme over the day-to-day activities of the family" (Venet 3). This ideology emphasized "women's alleged physical and intellectual weaknesses," while simultaneously labeling them "as divinely gifted with the virtues of piety, purity and domesticity" (Venet 3).

In a diary entry from January 1862, Caroline Richards, a recent graduate of a small girls' seminary in New York remarked that "It is wonderful that young men who have brilliant prospects before them at home, will offer themselves upon the altar of their country" (139). While this remark speaks volumes about the sacrificial language of war and the indoctrination of sacrifice into a national and homogenous ideal, the remarkable aspect of this diary lies in the juxtaposition of ideas. For instance, the next sentence contains "Carrie's" description of her new patriotic stationary, with all the colors of the flag. This juxtaposition suggests women like Carrie viewed their own patriotism, this case in the form of stationary, as parallel to the male sacrifice. In many ways, Caroline Cowles Richards' diary is representative of what it proclaims to describe: "village life in America." As a girl of twenty, Carrie enjoyed attending prayer meetings, and other community activities, but was more interested in the social aspects of these functions than anything else. While her diary is full of large events such as the Emancipation Proclamation and both of Lincoln's Inaugural addresses, it is also full of Mrs. Grundy, the infamously caricatured upholder of Victorian restraint and propriety. Richards is equally concerned with the larger events of the war as she is with local events and gossip—at times the two become indistinguishable.

While this diary emphasized seemingly private events, it is important because, like other diaries of the period, it records the emphasis women placed on the sanctity of the home. The diaries of Samuel and Rachel Cormany also emphasized this sanctity. In contrast to Richards' diary, however, the Cormanys' stake in the war became more central due to Samuel's enlistment.

The diaries began during the courtship of Samuel and Rachel while at Otterbein and culminated with Samuel's return at the end of the Civil War, though perhaps the most interesting entries are those describing their honeymoon. Within five days' worth of entries, Samuel only refers to Rachel by name once; otherwise she is "Darling" (124-5). In their entries, both Cormanys emphasize the spiritual link of their marriage, which is a thread that runs throughout the entire diary, as devotion to spiritual growth and harmony. Samuel represents Rachel as "darling," and writes elatedly that "Darling is Ideal" (125). Rachel's life as an educated, accomplished and ideal woman, however, becomes largely restricted to the domestic realm.

Initially, this "darling" describes her post marital state with Samuel in terms of ownership. In one of the entries of 1860, she remarked that she does not "regret [that she has] given [her]self to such a noble man" coupled with the comment that "I love him more every day" (135). While Samuel works as a clerk in his brother-in-law's store, Rachel and her sister Lydia "commence the bonnet and dressmaking" of their millinery "business" (135). Interestingly, Samuel works with his brother-in-law in the front of the store while Rachel and Lydia work hidden away and unseen in the private realm. After Samuel enlists in 1862, Rachel's entries bear even more completely the language of confinement.

During his wartime involvement, Rachel does not enter the public sphere, but continues sewing for others in order to support herself and her child. Her place is unquestionably in the private sphere, as she is literally forced to occupy the "back room" of her husband's family home. She repeatedly questions this arrangement in her diary, wondering why she "was brought here among strangers [and] after a month's visiting was left here in a town of strangers-in a back room, among a selfish family, with my babe" (287). Although Rachel, unlike most southern women, remained sheltered from actual fighting for the duration of the war, she suffered economically as well as morally; she interacted with almost no one besides her child for the remainder of her husband's service.

II. The United States Sanitary Commission: The Appropriate Outlet for Women's Patriotism

According to Mary Livermore, an active officer of the Northwest Branch of the United States Sanitary Commission in Chicago, "the Sanitary Commission became the great channel, through which the patriotic beneficence of the nation flowed to the army," or rather, according to Jeannie Attie, it became a "scheme for mobilizing the female home front into a disciplined entity" (Perman 252; Attie 249). President Henry Bellows further commented that it was through the local aid societies, which eventually fed into the channel of the Sanitary Commission that "women rendered their immense service to the national struggle" (Massey 32).

The development of the Sanitary Commission in 1861 indicated not only a lack of faith in the government's administrative and medical powers, but also a desire for women to become involved, on a national level, in aiding the war.

During its first year, the Sanitary Commission was one of many relief organizations in the Northwest, competing with local and regional Christian aid societies. However, after this first year, several of these societies joined or became auxiliary to the Commission. Despite the corporate nature of the Commission, it is clear they played a large role in distributing the much-needed aid to soldiers in a centralized, efficient fashion. Nurse Cornelia Hancock wrote to her mother that she "could do no better than send your box [of supplies] to the Sanitary Commission People for they do business just right. And it would amount to just the same thing as sending it to me for they give me anything I want, even for the contrabands" (Jaquette 38). Despite this enthusiastic commendation of the Commission, however, Hancock continued to write home asking for specific items for her own personal use as well as for the soldiers under her care. Her mother's packages enabled her to win the prize nearly every week for the cleanest ward, and incited other nurses to rage, claiming that Hancock received an unfair share of supplies, which implied a scarcity in the face of the Commission's efficiency. Furthermore, this incident illustrated Hancock's own anxiousness to participate in the centralizing practice of the Commission as well as her hesitations about doing so.

Women's participation in aid, or charity work, was not a phenomenon specific to the Civil War. As Elizabeth Cady Stanton noted, "women... were accustomed to doing charitable work. Before the war they had participated widely in religious revivals, in Bible and track societies, in charity fund-raising on behalf of orphaned children and fallen women, even intemperance agitation," all of which were rooted in virtuous ideas of domestic femininity (Venet 101). Mary Livermore described her time as a leading officer of the Commission as a "variety of experience not often gained by a woman" (8). Patriotism, and specifically the kinds of organized patriotism practiced by the Sanitary Commission, "nourished the self-sacrifice of women, and stimulated to the collection of hospital supplies and to brave the horrors and hardships of hospital life" (Livermore 109). As far as Mary Livermore and other members of the Sanitary Commission were concerned, this self-sacrificing (and centralizing) patriotism was *preferred* for women. As "the great channel, through which beneficence" flowed into the army, the Commission became the amalgamation of local ladies' aid societies and centralized the domestic work of knitting socks, sewing uniforms, etc. Much of this "beneficence" received nationally by the Commission was in fact unpaid, domestic labor.

In her memoir, Livermore argued that through this beneficence and self-sacrifice Northern women experienced, "the fetters of cast and conventionalism [broke down], and they sat together, patrician and plebian, Protestant and Catholic, and scraped lint, and rolled bandages, or made garments for the poorly clad soldiery" (111). Women who contributed their unpaid labor, all of which could be done in the privacy of their homes, or in the society of other "ladies," were truly patriotic. Livermore's statement does support the idea that the war, for women, was not only a homogenizing experience, but also that it provided women with valuable experiences which they were able to exercise later on, towards the goal of enfranchisement. However, Livermore wrote her memoir in 1889, nineteen years after the 1870 appearance of the Fifteenth Amendment, which granted women the right to vote. Considering her retrospective lens, it is difficult to determine how deeply Livermore considered women's experiences at the Sanitary Commission as relevant to the enfranchisement

Livermore linked the initial lack of male organization in the army and on the battlefield with the lack of women's organization in relief aid. The local and regional women's Relief Societies were directly connected to the local regiment and it was "out of this chaos of individual benevolence and abounding patriotism" that the Sanitary Commission "finally emerged, with its carefully elaborated plans and marvelous system" (122). Livermore therefore viewed women's patriotism and the women's sphere as complimentary and parallel to the male patriotism and the public sphere.

Yet, Livermore all but condemns the thousands of unknown women who disguised themselves as men in order to face combat during the war. She condoned a few notable exceptions such as Mrs. Katie Brownwell, who accompanied her husband's 5th Rhode Island Regiment into battle. When Mrs. Brownwell's husband "was pronounced physically unfit for further service and discharged, she also sought a discharge and retired with him to private life and domestic duty" (119). Thus, it was permissible for women to accompany their husbands to battle in order to serve as caretaker, though over all it was far better to act as a "ministering angel" and heal a wound rather than inflict one (120).

III. Ministering Angels—Breaking or Enforcing Boundaries?

In Louisa May Alcott's (a former Civil War nurse) short story, "The Brothers," the role of the Northern Civil War nurse is nebulously defined. The short story opens with Miss Dane's chores as a seamstress, though we learn she is actually sewing a shroud for a dead soldier. Yet because of her abolitionist convictions, she views taking charge of a crazy rebel prisoner as perversity because, as she tells the reader, "I am an aboli-

tionist" and wishes to show "these people" that "though I cannot quite love my enemies, I am willing to take care of them" (13). Along with the rebel, she takes a contraband as her attendant. The conflict in the story hinges on the narrator's ability to distinguish between the contraband's status as a freedman and as a servant: although Miss Dane orders him about as a typical male orderly, she respects him infinitely more, which enables her to save him from the crime of murdering the Confederate rebel, his brother. Ultimately, Alcott uses the story as a means of preaching from an abolitionist standpoint upon the evils of war, though it makes the role of Civil War nurse rather unclear. For instance, how many servants did Miss Dane have working beneath her? What kind of interaction did these people of different classes and genders have?

Women nurses, or ministering angels, as they were sometimes called, caused quite a scandal in the North throughout the war years due to their (in some instances paid) entrance into the public sphere, or more specifically, into the masculine sphere of war. While many contemporaries and even current scholars compared their experiences to those of men, their duties, depending on their situation, were much more elusive of definition. In late April 1861, Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell formed the Woman's Central Relief Association, which established a training program for nurses. However, Dorothea Dix, and not Dr. Blackwell, was appointed Superintendent of Army Nurses by the government (Massey 98). Blackwell allied herself and her organization with the United States Sanitary Commission officially in September of 1861 becoming another one of its auxiliaries. However, though Blackwell continued to send trained nurses to Dix through October, they were not placed as head nurses, but "worn down with menial and purely mechanical duties, additional to the more responsible offices and duties of nursing" (Rose 98). Blackwell's nurses were not treated as women but as "the objects of continual evil speaking among coarse subordinates. . . with poor wages and little sympathy" (Rose 98).¹

Instead, Blackwell sent her Woman's Central Relief Association-trained nurses only to Sanitary Commission posts where "allied by class and social status with the officers and physicians of the Commission, these women were assured the supervisory powers and social deference which had escaped their nurses in Washington's military hospitals" (Rose 100). While this information testified to the inefficiency of government relief and aid, it also suggests that the disregard of gender and rank experienced by these women in military hospitals was utterly unacceptable. Underlying the inappropriate positions received by these highly qualified nurses lay the underlining principle that although these women were active in the public sphere, they

¹ The above sentences are quoted within the text from *Documents of the United States Sanitary Commission*.

deserved and required the same treatment they received in the domestic (women's) space.

Bruce Catton, in his "Foreword" to the letters of the young nurse Cornelia Hancock, noted that she had a similar experience to young men going off to war. At 23, Hancock rode to Gettysburg after the battle with Dr. Child, her brother-in-law. Catton explained that she went off to war as the men themselves had gone—totally unprepared and untrained, and responded without hesitation to the presentation of a challenge. Like the men, she found that war's reality was not much like its advance notices. Like the men also, she met with the reality head-on, without a whimper, and did her competent best to cope with it. (4)

According to Catton, then, Cornelia experienced a largely male reaction to the war; it could be assumed also that her response to the battlefield would be a largely "male" one, active, aggressive and unflinching. However, upon her arrival at the battlefield, Cornelia "went from one pallet to another with pencil, paper, and stamps in hand, and spent the rest of that night in writing letters from the soldiers to their families and friends" (Jaquette 7). Though it seems strange that she did not help to alleviate the soldiers' physical pain (this is not to say that the task of writing letters was an unworthy one), it is important to realize that Hancock was bound, even in the battlefield, by gendered constraints. As Hancock noted in her own introduction, "in those days it was considered indecorous for angels of mercy to appear otherwise than gray-haired and spectacled;" and was rejected as a nurse by Dorothea Dix herself (Jaquette 6). She burst boundaries enough by simply *being* a young, attractive, unchaperoned woman on a battlefield who refused to adhere to Dix's conventional authority. She constantly emphasized, in her letters home to family, the propriety of her position, emphasizing that the work "is more superintending than real work" (16). Many nurses, like Cornelia Hancock, were motivated to enlist their services out of feelings of patriotism, compassion and an opportunity to live independently of their families. Some desired fame or excitement and many nurses thought, including Hancock herself, they were doing something privileged, that other civilian women were incapable of doing (Massey 44).²

Katharine Wormeley also wrote to assure her friends and relatives of the safety of her virtue while aboard a Sanitary Commission floating hospital (a hospital on board a ship provided by the War Department)

during the Peninsular campaign. Female superintendents, like Wormeley and other women on board, "were expected to oversee the linen, the patients' clothing, the storeroom, and the household supplies" in addition to having the charge of other nurses in their wards (Ross 101). The floating hospitals (under the supervision of General Secretary of the Commission and abolitionist, Frederick Law Olmsted) "were organized along class, gender and racial lines. . . and presented an opportunity to prove that refined women had something unique to contribute to hospital management" (Ross 101). Olmsted or the rest of the Sanitary Commission, however did not mean these women, to become seasoned battle nurses, which is exactly what happened according to Kristie Ross. She argued that the experience of Katharine Wormeley and others on board the hospital boat evolved, and thereby undermined, "bourgeois gender distinctions" as a result of their esprit de corps" (Ross 98).

Olmsted and the Commission, as well as the initial female volunteers, viewed themselves as organizers, brought in to superintend the incapable government as well as members of the lower classes, who organizers characterized as "simple, irresponsible, and scatterbrained," (Ross 102). These lower class servants responsible for executing the orders of the women superintendents were paid male orderlies, contrabands as well as working class white and black women. These women, like Cornelia Hancock, had to explain their duties to concerned relatives. Harriet Whitten wrote in a letter to a disapproving relative that "You must understand that there are men nurses and orderlies detailed so that we volunteer ladies have nothing disagreeable to do. Administering medicines and food and caring for them in every way as if they were our brothers is what we have to do" (qtd. Ross 103). While statements such as these emphasize the very little these women had to do with the "real work" of a hospital, they also reveal the concern others felt about women's virtue. Therefore, while these women, according to Mary Livermore, learned to disregard class and creed resulting from the Sanitary Commission's development of a shared channel for the patriotism of all women, women aboard this transport hospital did not wash their own laundry or that of the men they cared for. While not all hospitals provided such easy superintending (indeed not all volunteer units were composed of members of the social elite), it seems clear that the heart of the Sanitary Commission's efforts were geared to-

² Massey and Ross both describe women nurses who regarded their situation as one requiring special stamina. Also, Cornelia Hancock writes in a letter to her niece that "I am doing all a woman can do to help the war along, and, therefore I feel no responsibility [about not being able to read the newspapers]. If people take an interest in me because I am a heroine, it is a great mistake for I feel like anything but a heroine" (21). It is unclear whether this comment directly refers to something her niece wrote in her last letter, or in a newspaper article featuring Hancock's activities, but what is clear is Hancock's awareness that she is doing something unusual. After leaving a hospital, she notes, almost impressed by her own stamina, that she "stayed longer in that place than any other white person in the United States would have" (48).

wards involving middle and upper-middle-class, refined women in the war effort. These women experienced the war differently than women laundresses or cooks who took their orders.

During the Civil War, 5,600 women acted as "Nurses" in Union hospitals, all of who were white members of the middle class. However, according to Elizabeth Leonard, 10,000 women worked in union hospitals, two thirds of whom were working-class white and black women (261). These working-class women took the jobs "that required contact with the bodily functions of strangers," which were deemed too indecorous for the white "nurses" superintending (Leonard 261). While superintendents such as Rebecca Usher of Maine simply "became. . . acquainted with and provid[ed] sisterly (or maternal) companionship to the men that surrounded [them]" the "other women" served as cooks or laundresses, standing "there in the steam all the time," doing the grueling menial labor. Usher, as a member of the middle-class remained separate even from the supervision of such work, as she had no desire to stand with women in the steam "arrang[ing] the work and see[ing] that it goes on well" (259; 258).

IV. Tempering the Ministering Angel of Mercy with the Angel of Justice

Although this can only be a very limited discussion of the radical women's movement as it continued throughout the Civil War, it is important to note that the goals of women's rights advocates such as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were almost in direct opposition to those of Mary Livermore and the Sanitary Commission. In May 1863, Stanton, Anthony and several other radical women's enfranchisement advocates gathered in New York City to form the Woman's National Loyal League, the first national *political* women's network. The organization, as Stanton and Anthony envisioned, "would not call upon women to knit socks, roll bandages, or make jam or jellies for the wounded soldiers" (Venet 102). Instead, the League "was dedicated to a radical principal of abolition of slavery-and would be based on the idea of female participation in the political sphere" (Venet 102). The League's initial objective was to collect petitions from every state of the Union calling for the abolition of slavery, and then to present that petition to Congress. As Venet's title so eloquently states, women had neither ballots nor bullets to ensure the consideration of the point of view; thus their petition campaign was their only means of penetration into the governmental arena.

While this essay is not the place to describe the radical protests against Stanton, and particularly, Anthony, it is worthy to mention that while they raised 100,000 signatures in February, 1864, they were extremely difficult to obtain (Venet 121). Stanton, by this time a gifted politician, urged women's activism in terms of morality and virtue, which parallels the strat-

egy for recruitment undertaken by the Sanitary Commission. She urged women to "remember the angels of Mercy and Justice are twin sisters, and ever walk hand in hand" (qtd. in Venet 116). Venet argued that by using "womanly" rhetoric and by participating in the language of the ideal woman, she obtained a broader appeal. However, she claimed that Anthony and Stanton went a step further, that in "founding a national women's organization with political aims, Stanton and Anthony were taking yet another step away from the emphasis on moral suasion that had characterized so much antebellum reform sentiment" (106). Unlike the Sanitary Commission, the League's underlying goals for women did not lie rooted to the domestic sphere. While the Sanitary Commission provided an outlet for women to express patriotism, they did so by distributing women's work, which they did mostly within the privacy of their own homes.

Activists like Stanton and Anthony envisioned a much broader and more continuous result from women's patriotic involvement in the public sphere. For women, the war was an opportunity for assertion, as it was for men: women must "prove their readiness for enfranchisement by patriotically supporting the war effort, by becoming informed on political questions, and by exercising their political right of petition on behalf of the slave" (Venet 116). The issue of slavery had an extremely broad moral appeal to women, however, the important aim of the petition, for Stanton, was to prove women as responsible, socially competent citizens. Although the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment passed *without* a clause ensuring the enfranchisement of women, the emergence of this type of political activism and awareness on the part of educated women not only foreshadows women's continued involvement in the public sphere, but also illustrates the variety of aims with which women became involved in the war.

V. Conclusion

Northern women during the Civil War experienced the actual horrors of war much more remotely than did women of the South. Their wartime experiences reinforced the structures of the antebellum period (local and regional aid and relief societies) while nationalizing that experience at the same time through large amalgamations like the United States Sanitary Commission. While this organization served as a nationalizing force, it is important to realize that it preserved the existing, race, class and gender definitions and distinctions of the pre-War period. Northern women relied upon an already existing and evolving structure of social codes and organizations to support soldiers during the Civil War, which does not make their actions radical or proto-feminist. Furthermore, women's experiences, regarding gender, were not necessarily uniform; lower-class women working as laundresses and cooks in hospitals had very different expe-

riences from the middle-class, white nurses who superintended them. Perhaps the war provided the kind of unifying experience for white middle-class women as Mary Livermore described, though, it appeared that the war polarized women, as represented by those women who joined the Woman's National Loyal League. These women used patriotism as a springboard for political activism for women's enfranchisement;

they became increasingly active and disruptive of gender boundaries after the Fourteenth Amendment's failure to incorporate women. While Northern women's contributions to the war were all valuable, it is important to understand the complexity of their range of positions and experiences in order to avoid generalizing them into a unified entity.

Bibliography

- Attie, Jeannie. "Warwork and the Crisis of Domesticity in the North." *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War*. Ed. Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber. Oxford: Oxford UP. 247—259.
- Catton, Bruce. "Foreword." *South After Gettysburg: Letters of Cornelia Hancock: 1863—1868*. Ed. Henrietta Stratton Jaquette. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1956.
- Jaquette, Henrietta Stratton, ed. *South After Gettysburg: Letters of Cornelia Hancock: 1863—1868*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1956.
- Leonard, Elizabeth D. "Civil War Nurse, Civil War Nursing: Rebecca Usher of Maine." *Major Problems in the Civil War and Reconstruction: Documents and Essays*. Ed. Michael Perman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998. 257—265.
- Livermore, Mary. *My Story: A Woman's Narrative of Four Years of Personal Experience*. Hartford: A.D. Worthington and Company, 1889.
- Massey, Mary Elizabeth. *Women in the Civil War*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.
- McSherry, Frank and Charles G. Waugh and Martin Greenberg, eds. *Civil War Women: American Women Shaped by Conflict in Stories by Alcott, Welty and Others*. Little Rock: August House, Inc. Publishers, 1988.
- Mohr, James C., ed. *The Cormany Diarie: A Northern Family in the Civil War*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982.
- Perman, Michael. "Women in Wartime." *Major Problems in the Civil War and Reconstruction: Documents and Essays*. Ed. Michael Perman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998. 246-276.
- Richards, Caroline Cowles. *Village Life in America: 1852—1872: Including the Period of the American Civil War as told in the Diary of a School-Girl*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1908.
- Rose, Anne C. *Victorian America and the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Ross, Kristie. "Arranging a Doll's House: Refined Women as Union Nurses." *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War*. Ed. Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber. Oxford: Oxford UP. 97—113.
- Venet, Wendy Hamand. *Neither Ballots nor Bullets: Women Abolitionists and the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1991.