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In recent years, scholars have attempted to recover the work of nineteenth-century journalists, women in particular, who were often ignored or discounted in early studies of the field. One reporter who has yet to receive critical attention is Anna Mary Sparrow, who turned to journalism in the last decade of the century after a short literary career. During a time when women were largely restricted to reporting on domestic subjects, fashion, and high society, Sparrow conducted investigations of the working poor and life in London’s slums, which she published in prominent daily and monthly periodicals. However, even though Sparrow was as prolific and daring as several of her more well-known counterparts, she has been all but forgotten in recent scholarship. In this essay, I analyze key examples of Sparrow’s journalism to demonstrate how her work enriches our understanding of the history of investigative journalism. In particular, I argue that Sparrow’s rhetorical choices reflect a strategy for maintaining middle-class respectability while living and working among the poor. Publication venue also played a role in shaping her journalism. While consistently affirming her own class status, she adopted varied attitudes toward her working-class subjects that reflect the editorial stance of the periodicals that published her work. I also examine Sparrow’s career in the context of her contemporaries and consider why investigative reporters Elizabeth Banks and Olive Christian Malvery have received significant critical attention while Sparrow has been overlooked. This is surprising since she is more representative of English women freelance journalists of the period than Banks and Malvery. Her work and the trajectory of her career reveal the difficulties female journalists faced when negotiating the expectations of middle-class gentility and the demands of investigative journalism.
Anna Mary Sparrow, like many female journalists, was middle class. She was born at Woodfold Park, Lancashire (near Blackburn) on June 24, 1858, to John and Frances Sparrow. John was a magistrate and cotton merchant who employed 1,200 workers in his cotton mill. A family friend noted that Anna Mary was “brought up in every comfort,” but her family lost their fortune at some point and she turned to writing in order to support herself. At age twenty-three, she was living in London with her sister and brother-in-law while trying her hand at fiction. Between 1886 and 1891, she published a collection of children’s stories as well as poems, short stories, and serial novels, which mainly appeared in Catholic monthlies, the Lamp and the Month. Since there were two other A. Sparrows publishing when she started writing, she adopted “T. Sparrow” as her pen name, which referenced her nickname, “Tissie.”

By 1894, Sparrow, like many other single women who had to work for a living, turned to journalism. Journalism was an attractive option for women because, according to Frances Low’s 1904 guidebook Press Work for Women, “It is quite possible for the novice in journalism to make a small income from the start, a situation that exists in no other form of employment open to women.” Indeed, Sparrow had more success with reporting than with fiction. She published in a wide range of periodicals: daily newspapers, such as the Daily Chronicle and Pall Mall Gazette, and monthly magazines, like the conservative New Review, the popular Strand Magazine, and the religiously oriented Newbery House Magazine and Quiver. At the height of her career, Sparrow was earning £18 a week, far more than the £2 to £3 a week that Low estimated women could earn in the journalism field.

The journalistic genre Sparrow found especially remunerative was investigative reporting focused on the lives of London’s poor. Her first prominently placed article, appearing in the New Review in August 1894, was an exposé on women’s doss houses, which she wrote after spending several nights in a shelter. She then embarked on a thirteen-part series for the Quiver entitled “As One of the Penniless Poor.” As preparation for writing these articles, she lived with the poor in London’s East End and observed men, women, and children engaged in the occupations of palm-working, fur-pulling, and fish-curing. She also published articles on similar subjects for the Strand, Newbery House Magazine, Pall Mall Gazette, and Daily Chronicle between 1894 and 1900.

In adopting this mode of reporting, Sparrow was following a trend made popular by W. T. Stead, George Sims, and others in the 1880s. Even more immediately, she was following the example of American journalist Elizabeth Banks, who made a splash in 1893 with her series “In Cap and Apron: Two Weeks in Service,” for which she masqueraded as a parlor
maid in two London households. Banks continued in the same vein during the next two years, impersonating an American heiress looking for an introduction to British society and, at the other end of the economic spectrum, a crossing sweeper, flower girl, dressmaker’s apprentice, and laundry girl. Banks and her stunt reporting were the subject of letters to the editor in the *Weekly Sun*, articles and columns in other periodicals, and even satires in *Judy* and *Punch*. In some periodicals, she and her methods came in for criticism. For example, Mary Billington, in her 1896 article on “Leading Lady Journalists,” states that “English lady journalists have not so far descended to any of the vulgar sensationalism and semi-detective business which has discredited the American reporteresses in too many instances.”

Billington’s opinion that “gentlewomen” should not undertake social investigation was hardly new. In the introduction to “The Female Casual and Her Lodging” (1866), J. M. Stallard explains why a “lady” could not repeat James Greenwood’s famous feat described in “A Night in A Workhouse” (1866): “No rags would disguise her character, no acting would conceal her disgust; discovery would be all but certain, and one could scarcely tell where the disagreeables would end.” In short, a middle-class woman would not be able to carry off the charade due to her inability to pass as poor and to endure assaults on her sensibilities. While a gentleman could “pass safely through the wards with little chance of insult,” a lady could not enjoy the same security. Therefore, he employed Ellen Stanley, a working-class widow, as his surrogate investigator. And indeed, Stanley’s experiences demonstrate that a homeless woman or her imitator would almost certainly be exposed to physical violence, unwanted sexual advances, and illness-inducing sanitary conditions. While some, like W. T. Stead, advised aspiring female journalists to “not presume upon sex” for special treatment, many felt that a woman of genteel status could not be expected to undergo such an experience.

Stallard’s skepticism that a lady could carry off an incognito investigation, Billington’s professional opinion that the “semi-detective business” was not lady-like, and the very real dangers masquerading as homeless could pose to her person are some of the difficulties a middle-class female
reporter had to face when pursuing social investigation. As I demonstrate in the first two sections of this essay, Sparrow attempted to negotiate this difficult terrain by asserting her gentility, carefully fashioning her own middle-class identity, and constructing her working-class subjects as “other.” Sparrow made these rhetorical moves not only to appeal to the audiences of different periodicals but also to preempt criticism for assaying beyond domestic subjects. Incognito investigative reporting was a popular genre in the 1880s and 1890s that could bring fame to its practitioners. However, the celebrity resulting from the publication of these exposés also challenged the idea of middle-class female modesty and reticence. Sparrow, therefore, strove for a delicate balance in her career—as a middle-class woman who often lived among the poor, a well-published writer who did not seek fame.

“In a Woman’s Doss-House”:
Middle-Class Domestic Ideology and the Homeless

Given these challenges, it is perhaps not surprising that Sparrow’s 1894 New Review article “In a Woman’s Doss-House,” her first significant piece of investigative reporting, bears little resemblance to contemporary social investigations of housing for the homeless. Sparrow deviates from the common practices established by other social investigators in order to assert her middle-class identity. She maintains a sense of distance from her subjects by espousing domestic ideology where the home and cleanliness are concerned—all while pretending to be homeless.

Although Sparrow asserts in her 1913 application to the Royal Literary Fund that she “slept three nights in these shelters,” it is hard to tell if “In a Woman’s Doss-House” was the result of direct experience. Unlike most social investigative reporting, Sparrow provides a composite picture of her stay rather than a detailed narrative containing anecdotes and personal observations of each night and each shelter. For investigators of casual wards and cheap lodging houses, accounts typically included being bullied by a rude intake officer, bathing in dirty water, tasting inedible food, and sleeping in vermin-ridden bed clothes. Sparrow does not include these details or provide descriptions of the other residents and their conversations. No colorful characters like Kay or Cranky Sal add life to her report. Moreover, she avoids the first-person pronoun “I.” Instead, she employs a distant tone in her description of the conditions and experiences that “you” can expect to find. For example, she writes, “It is a rigorous rule that the sheets be changed weekly; if you happen to sleep on them the sixth or seventh night it is to be hoped that you are not sensitive or highly strung, otherwise you will suffer.” Did Sparrow sleep on seven-day-old sheets? Did she learn from direct experience that a clean pillowcase was
not worth the extra penny since other residents would harass her for such “finikin” tastes? She does not say. Sparrow also diverges from her fellow investigators in that she relates no specific horrors beyond dirty bedding and the sight of women immodestly bathing in used dishwater in full view of everyone in the kitchen. She avoids disgusting or frightening details, and the result is a generic and somewhat clinical depiction of a doss house. Thus, Sparrow departs from the conventions of much social investigative reporting—incognito investigations of homeless shelters, in particular—which depict the investigator situating himself or herself in the scene and then offering personal reactions to these circumstances.

Sparrow’s accounts differ from what I would like to suggest is a key element of readers’ fascination with incognito investigative reporting. Seth Koven has argued that sexual titillation caused an early example of the genre, James Greenwood’s “Night in a Workhouse,” to become a sensation. I propose another source of stimulation in Greenwood’s and others’ investigative reports: the vicarious pleasure of being frightened. Indeed, much investigative reporting might be understood as a late-century manifestation of the Gothic, since it borrows many conventions familiar to readers of this genre. For example, investigators are imprisoned not in castles or monasteries but in casual wards at night. Ellen Stanley finds these wards suffocating and even describes one as a “dungeon.” The threat of violence is often present, and female social investigators have their virtue imperiled not by Gothic villains but by intake officers who mistake them for prostitutes. Gothic supernatural occurrences become rhetorical flourishes, as in Greenwood’s description of the “covered corpses” of sleeping men and the “resurrection of the ghastly figures” in the morning. But there are still plenty of frights in these investigative reports. These scares are largely related to the unsanitary conditions in the wards and lodging houses. Stanley, for instance, builds suspense and dread in classic Gothic fashion in this passage: “I opened the door in the corner and found it [the water closet], and whilst I live I can never forget it. I thought it must be the dead-house, and that I had made a mistake; and when I lifted the seat-lid, I flew back, for there was no pan and the soil reached nearly to the top.” Like Emily St. Aubert discovering what she takes for a corpse behind a black veil in a darkened chamber in Ann Radcliffe’s Mysteries of Udolpho (1794), Stanley uncovers a reeking and overfull toilet. Jack London provides readers with the frisson of sudden shock when he moves abruptly from describing the noises that keep him from sleeping in the casual ward to being “awakened by a rat or some similar animal on my breast” and “rais[ing] a shout to wake the dead” in response. Thus he combines the physical terror of finding a rodent on his chest with the supernatural rhetoric of ghosts. While examples of horrific and danger-
ous conditions in casual wards and doss houses are undoubtedly meant to arouse sympathy in the middle-class reader for the plight of the homeless, they also provide the thrills of suspense, dread, and unexpected scares. As with Gothic fiction, incognito investigative reporting provides pleasure by allowing readers to experience danger and discomfort vicariously and from a comfortable distance.

Sparrow eschews such Gothic conventions, perhaps due to the character of the journal in which she published her article. *The New Review* began in 1889 as a serious monthly meant to compete with the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Fortnightly Review*, but in 1894 it began to shift its focus in order to remain profitable. As Anne Murtagh notes, 1894 marked a phase in the journal’s history when editor Archibald Grove, faced with competition from illustrated magazines, “struggled with the modernization of the periodical.” Grove wrote in a “Special Announcement” in January 1894 that he would “widen the scope” of the periodical to appeal to both intellectuals looking for “direct information on the burning questions of the day” and the newly literate desiring entertainment. In its “attempt to cater to two widely different audiences,” the review adopted elements of New Journalism, including illustrations, interviews, and gossip. *The New Review*’s pursuit of these two disparate audiences may account for the incongruities in Sparrow’s article. She addresses the *New Review*’s intellectual audience with her analytical tone, which enables her to avoid the sense of personality associated with New Journalism. This tone also allows her to critique the social factors leading to women’s use of doss houses, which I will discuss in more detail below. Moreover, she recommends that the London Common Council adopt reforms, such as replacing male inspectors with women, which will alleviate some of the problems she observes. Thus, her article fits Grove’s understanding of the purpose of a review—to discuss “seriously and authoritatively the problems of life.” Yet at the same time, Sparrow attempts “to appeal to the popular tastes of the day” by employing the New Journalism approach of stunt reporting as a means of gathering information about her subject.

While the publication venue likely influenced Sparrow, her avoidance of Gothic conventions may also be an attempt to project middle-class respectability. By remaining aloof from the people and the conditions that she encounters, Sparrow avoids the “descent from respectability” which, according to fellow social investigator Mary Higgs, was concomitant with “identification with the claimants for relief.” She does not situate herself in the doss house by using first-person narration and instead provides a composite picture of her three nights without colorful details about people and conditions—thereby refusing to identify with the women she encounters. Her clinical distance from these women and their sufferings signals
to the reader that she has not been soiled, literally or figuratively, in the process of slumming. She resists affinity with the homeless poor, their dirt, and their supposed moral degradation—elements that other investigators describe in Gothic terms—in order to protect her middle-class status. Koven argues that for upper- and middle-class female philanthropists and charity workers who were “raised in homes with armies of domestic servants,” the process of “immersing themselves in the dirtiness of the slums was a literal and symbolic act of independence and adventure.” While this may be the case for the elite women Koven describes, for a working journalist like Sparrow, whose financial and social status were more precarious, dirt was simply a marker of poverty. Association with dirt and dirty women symbolized danger rather than adventure.

Sparrow reaffirms her middle-class position in her assessment of the harm cheap lodging houses cause to society. The social evil she highlights is not prostitution, as one might expect from reading other investigative reports, but the fact that “doss-house life, run on its present lines, seems to have broken up the sanctity of the home.” According to Sparrow, doss houses encourage this first by providing housing to teenage girls who have escaped parental control. Teenagers “love to air their independence, and on the slightest pressure of parental authority they march away from the home-roof and trust to lodging-house luck. Formerly, a night in the streets—or a fear of it—soon reduced them to reason.” Since fractious girls do not have to return to their parental home and comply with parental rules to avoid sleeping on the streets, doss houses encourage teenage rebellion. The disobedient teen becomes what Sparrow terms the “doss-house girl,” who “has her bed made for her, her floor scoured, her kitchen utensils provided.” “She never thinks of patching her clothes,” Sparrow further notes, “but renews her raiment from the pop-shop.” To her, “domestic duties are unknown, the little unselfishnesses of family life never come her way, and she grows up thriftless, improvident, defiant of authority, ignorant of the rights of property, bold, shameless, and unconcerned.” Sparrow’s catalog of the negative effects of doss houses on teen girls reveals her entanglement in Victorian domestic ideology and her class-based attitude toward cleanliness. A lack of familiarity with “domestic duties,” such as making beds, cleaning floors, and patching clothes, could well describe an upper- or middle-class girl, who has servants to perform these tasks for her—just as Sparrow did growing up. Among the working-classes, however, a girl unaccustomed to domestic labor and “family life” is not socialized with the middle-class values of thrift, prudence, feminine modesty, and respect for authority and private property. Sparrow thus finds fault with cheap lodging houses for letting girls escape the middle-class values that she believed would be inculcated in the working-class
home. As a consequence, the doss-house girl who does not learn to clean up after herself creates a disorder that goes beyond unmade beds and dusty floors. She contributes to the disintegration of that bedrock of Victorian social order, the home.\textsuperscript{46}

Doss houses also destroy the sanctity of the home by housing working women who could live more economically elsewhere but do not want the housework that comes with living at home. Sparrow writes, “Love of home, however meagre, is no longer the aim and ambition of a working woman; the duties attached to it chafe her; the burden of possessing furniture irritates her; the necessity of keeping even one room clean weighs her down.”\textsuperscript{47} As with teenagers, doss houses encourage working women’s rejection of middle-class domesticity and its responsibilities. Once again, Sparrow elides the fact that many members of the middle class have help “keeping even one room clean.” Leaving aside any consideration of the middle classes themselves, she instead reinforces the notion that it is the “revolt of the Working Woman against home life and home cares” that keeps doss houses full.\textsuperscript{48}

Sparrow’s critique of doss-house residents works to affirm her middle-class status in several ways. First, her emphasis on how these shelters negatively encourage rebellion against middle-class values and middle-class femininity demonstrates that she herself embraces these values. Second, in focusing on teenagers and working women, rather than the prostitutes who often stayed in doss houses, she disassociates herself from women considered morally degraded. And finally, at a time when the New Woman and the woman journalist were popular figures in the media, Sparrow distances herself from working women’s independence and rejection of traditional domestic roles by criticizing working-class women’s freedom from domesticity.\textsuperscript{49} Sparrow’s assertion of her middle-class identity while immersing herself in working-class life points to the pressures facing female reporters to maintain their gentility while engaged in social investigation.

“\textit{As One of the Penniless Poor}”: Compassion and Class Stereotypes

Sparrow’s clinical and critical approach to incognito investigative reporting in her \textit{New Review} article sets her apart from her predecessors, such as James Greenwood and Ellen Stanley, and her contemporaries, such as Elizabeth Banks, Jack London, Olive Christian Malvery, and Mary Higgs. However, the sense of self-conscious distance in her investigative reporting was short lived. Sparrow published articles on similar topics for the religious \textit{Newbery House Magazine} and \textit{Quiver} in the following year but took a very different angle by evincing sympathy for and establishing a personal relationship with her subjects. Sparrow’s quick change of view-
point on the urban poor indicates the role publication venue could play in shaping an author’s rhetorical choices. *The Newbery House Magazine* (1889–94) was a monthly publication “intended especially for the clergy and laity of the Church of England.”50 It incorporated fiction as well as articles on Anglican topics, religious history, and social issues. *The Newbery House Magazine*’s stance on social issues was one of conservative sympathy; it deplored suffering and abuse but called for solutions that relied on individual responsibility or Church mediation.51 The nonsectarian *Quiver* (1861–1926), founded by John Cassell in 1861 to “promote proper appreciation of the Bible,” became less religious and more genteel in content in the 1880s and 1890s.52 It nonetheless continued to engage the minds and feelings of its readers, as is indicated by its cover design, which featured the slogans “Progress of Truth,” “Fireside Lectures,” and “Appeals to the Heart.”53 On social matters like poverty, the *Quiver* advocated individual charity and refused to blame the poor for their plight; however, it stopped short of critiquing the social factors that contributed to poverty.54

In her articles for these magazines, Sparrow replaced the authoritative discussion of social problems expected by readers of *New Review* with a more sympathetic attitude toward the urban poor, reflecting the more empathetic stance on poverty conveyed by the *Newbery House Magazine* and the *Quiver*. Yet she continued to remind readers of her class position by sharing personal information and relying on stereotypes to frame her subjects’ lives.

Sparrow quickly followed “In a Woman’s Doss-House” with a two-part series on “London Street Toilers” for *Newbery House Magazine* in September and December of 1894. In the first article on organ grinders, she does employ a clinical tone consistent with the point of view in her *New Review* article.55 However, in the second piece on watercress sellers, she closes the distance between herself and the people she writes about. In both articles she indicates that she lived with a family while undertaking their occupation, but with the watercress sellers, the family members are named and described. The family consists of a grandmother, Hannah; her daughter Grace, who is dying; and Grace’s newborn, her five-year-old daughter Sally, and her three-year-old son Artie.56 Sparrow also puts herself in the old woman’s shoes by attempting to sell watercress on an empty stomach while carrying a hungry child through the streets of London. She remarks, “I don’t suppose one of my readers can realise what it is to be hungry, lame with fatigue, and cold to pain, and yet not have a penny to pay for a ‘bus home.’”57 *Newbery House Magazine* readers might be physically removed from poverty and its hardships, but she is not. Unlike her stay in doss houses, Sparrow’s shared experience with Hannah results in pity rather than criticism, suggesting that she, like Higgs before her, now “identif[ies]
with the claimants for relief.” As such, she aligns herself with Newbery House Magazine’s conservative sympathy for the “deserving” poor—the working, the ill, and the aged.

Sparrow continued to explore this demographic in her thirteen-part series “As One of the Penniless Poor,” which ran from 1895 to 1896 in the Quiver. She explicitly states that her aim in this series is to “to enlist people’s sympathy” for the poorest of the poor by “liv[ing] among them, and practically test[ing] what they had to endure.” The articles in this series describe the lives of men, women, and children who work long hours at difficult and sometimes dangerous jobs for very little pay. These laborers rarely ask for sympathy even though “they were always hungry, short of fire in the winter, and with nothing in the world to look forward to but the workhouse as the end.” She presents their stories with pity and compassion, modelling this response for her readers. For example, in an article on “Men-Martyrs” (1896), she describes witnessing a thousand men arrive at 4:00 a.m. to apply for two hundred positions shoveling snow. Among them is a sixty-year-old man who can barely walk for coughing up blood. She remarks, “I generally have self-control, but the sight was too much for me. I turned to my companion with the tears rolling down my cheeks. ‘He will die,’ I whispered, ‘and I have a sovereign in my pocket; let me feed the whole lot of them.’” Her companion points out the impracticality of her desire and offers to give the old man sixpence instead. As with the watercress sellers, Sparrow is no longer immune to the suffering of her subjects, now offering tears and financial assistance as well as sympathy for their situation. She advocates individual charity rather than a systemic approach to poverty, which is consistent with the Quiver’s general attitude toward the poor.

However, Sparrow still takes pains to signal her middle-class status. Her generous charitable impulse may be checked, but it serves as a reminder that she, unlike her subjects, has a disposable income and can afford to spend £1 feeding strangers. In a similar vein, she communicates to her readers that residing among the poor is her choice and not the consequence her own economic misfortune. While she takes care to establish her proximity to the working poor, noting that she “liv[ed] among them,” she reiterates in her articles that these living arrangements were “for practical knowledge” or “for journalistic purposes” only. Though she may live with the poor, this temporary arrangement is expressly designed to satisfy professional objectives. She is not one of the “penniless poor.”

In the final article in this series, “The Gold-Beater’s Family” (1896), Sparrow includes personal details about herself, which is unusual in her journalism. These details attest to her middle-class background yet point to the effort that she puts into maintaining that status. Sparrow mentions that
she teaches French and shorthand to the gold-beater’s children; that she has a fur cloak, which she wraps a sick child in; and that she has published “magazine verses” and was formerly the subeditor of a woman’s journal. She thereby establishes that she is well-educated, wealthy enough not to worry about spoiling a fur cloak, and successfully employed in the field of journalism. However, while her knowledge of French suggests a middle- or upper-class upbringing, her knowledge of shorthand points to the sort of training a woman would undertake in order to support herself. This, along with the allusion to her work as a magazine journalist, indicates that her middle-class position is dependent upon employment and is therefore tenuous.

Sparrow also asserts her middle-class identity by depicting the working classes in stereotypical terms. For example, she states that “tragedies are common amongst the poor—partly because passions are more primitive than with us, and partly because they have not the same restraints of civilisation to keep them back from indulging them.” In addition to making this broad generalization, she repeatedly describes one working-class man she befriends, a shoeblack, as childlike. In another article, she claims that “if they made more money they would not know how to make good use of it,” particularly with regard to nutrition, since “their ideas of food are stupendous in their folly.” Her primary examples of this “folly” are a baby who is fed curry and a child who makes a meal of pickles and rancid fat. In her condemnation of the working-class diet, Sparrow does not make allowances for what foods might be available and affordable for the poor. Despite her sympathy for the plight of her subjects, she characterizes them as less advanced, less civilized, and less intelligent than the upper classes.

Sparrow’s complex attitude toward the urban poor in this series—expressing compassion for individuals on one hand yet relying on negative class stereotypes on the other—is perhaps most evident in her tendency to depict their lives in melodramatic and sentimental terms. For example, to prove that troubles start early for the male members of the penniless poor, she relates the case of a kidnapped child: “A boy with a beautiful voice was stolen by two wicked old men who were street imposters, and who made £3 a week by the child’s talent, yet who starved him, beat him, and made him sleep in a garret where the rats nibbled at his toes.” The innocent youth is exploited and oppressed by villainous men, only to be rescued by the virtuous heroine—Sparrow herself. She alludes to Stead’s “The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon,” which recounts his purchase of a young girl, when she confesses, “The only time I ever stole in my life was when I helped to steal that boy from the clutches of those old wretches.” In Sparrow’s melodramatic account, good triumphs over evil, and the story ends happily: the rescued boy immigrates to Canada and becomes a farmer.
While the boy’s story takes no more than a couple of paragraphs to tell, some articles are structured as more lengthy sentimental tales. “On Crutches for Life” (1896) details the story of Mike Maloney, a navvy who loses both legs when he saves another man from being struck by an oncoming train. He is then jilted by his cold-hearted fiancée and begins a life of drinking and homelessness. Lest the pathos of Mike’s situation be overlooked, Sparrow comments, “His fate is one that must fill every thinking heart with pity.” Likewise, in “A Chimney-Sweep’s Romance” (1896) we learn of Tom Rhodes, a dwarf who becomes heartbroken and suicidal due to his wife’s faithless behavior. He nevertheless bravely attempts to rescue a child from a sewer drain when no one else will venture into it. Sadly, the child is dead and Tom dies shortly afterward from the noxious sewer fumes. When Sparrow sees Tom’s body, she observes, “The peace of God’s Angel was imprinted for ever on that poor turbulent soul.” In both instances, inherently good men perform heroically selfless acts, but cruel circumstances lead to their misery and self-destruction, with death as the only escape. As if the day-to-day hardships and privations of the poor are not enough to spark reader empathy, Sparrow incorporates sensational scenes to encourage the Quiver’s readers to compassionate their suffering.

In contrast to these tales of heartbreak, despondency, and death, Sparrow offers the “Gold-beater’s Family” as an example of the rewards of middle-class domestic values for working-class families. Theirs is a case “where domestic happiness compensates for anxious poverty, where virtue shines with perhaps even greater lustre from the contrast of its surroundings, and where home, in the dear old-fashioned English meaning of the word, is the centre of the dear old-fashioned qualities of kindness and modesty and general uprightness of demeanor.” The hard-working gold-beater and his wife take good care of their fifteen children, going so far as to pawn a beloved violin when three-year-old Blanche becomes ill. While working-class domesticity is often threatened by dire poverty, as Sparrow makes clear in her exposé of women’s doss houses, some families are able to maintain their “kindness,” “modesty,” and “uprightness” in spite of challenges. Their devotion to “home” is recompensed when a rich uncle invites them to immigrate to Australia, where he will provide for them all. Unlike with Mike Maloney and Tom Rhodes, the family’s virtue and domestic values are rewarded (via a deus ex machina). Thus, Sparrow, perhaps influenced by her earlier career as a fiction writer, appeals to her readers with literary conventions that play on their emotions. She continues to avoid the Gothic conventions employed by other social investigators, opting instead for melodrama and sentimentalism. Rather than the thrill of fear and suspense, she invokes the pleasure of pathos, supporting the Quiver’s aim of providing readers with “Appeals to the Heart.”
In her articles for the *Quiver*, Sparrow closes the distance between herself and her subjects, both in tone and sympathy, in order to align with the magazine’s approach to poverty and pathos. Yet she still asserts her middle-class superiority by employing class stereotypes and sentimentalizing the poor. She employs these strategies to generate compassion for the plight of working classes, but, in doing so, she renders them flat characters in a melodramatic or sentimental story. Sparrow does not see her subjects as individual, complex human beings; rather, she views them as individuals who are distinct from herself and her readers and deserve pity for their straitened circumstances, their less evolved state, and their vulnerability to fate.

Sparrow demonstrates in her early journalism that, contrary to the opinion of Stallard and Billington, a middle-class woman could successfully undertake the “semi-detective business” and still retain her femininity and gentility. Perhaps to reinforce this sense of middle-class respectability, Sparrow’s next two series for the *Quiver* focus on material considered more appropriate for a lady. In “Poverty in Gloves,” a five-part series published in 1897, she provides sketches of gentlewomen living in a boarding house who struggle to make ends meet. The following year “Love in the Slums” appeared, which relates amusing stories of courtship among the poor by “ardent,” “phlegmatic,” and “fickle” lovers. In addition to these series, she also published individual articles, such as “Isles of Babylan” (1898), for which she visited crèches in England and Scotland, and “Poverty’s Pets” (1900), in which she shares examples of poor peoples’ love of animals. By focusing on impoverished middle-class women, romantic love, babies, and pets, she incorporated feminized subject matter into her repertoire as a means of affirming her middle-class gender identity. Of course, Sparrow was not unique among female reporters in utilizing this strategy. Elizabeth Banks focused solely on women’s occupations for her articles, and she refused assignments that would jeopardize her respectability. Likewise, Olive Christian Malvery centered her investigations on the work and lives of poor women and girls and “avoided all dealings with women of bad reputations” in her seven-part series “The Heart of Things,” which appeared in *Pearson’s Magazine* in 1904–5.

“The fact that I am so completely forgotten”

Despite engaging in the same work in the same time frame as Banks and Malvery, Sparrow has been neglected in recent scholarship. I would argue that this is due to three main factors: she was less willing to make a visual spectacle of herself in print, she was not as adept at self-promotion, and she was English and therefore not as exotic as the American Banks and Anglo-Indian Malvery. Banks’s and Malvery’s celebrity contributed to their
longevity in public memory, but, as Sparrow’s example demonstrates, fame could be a double-edged sword for female reporters.

Sparrow was as prolific as Banks and Malvery in the realm of incognito social investigation, but she stayed in the background of her articles, whereas Banks and Malvery sought the limelight. One way they did this was by publishing studio photographs of themselves in working-class costume. When Banks reprinted her investigative journalism in *Campaigns of Curiosity* in 1894, she added staged portraits of herself disguised as a housemaid, flower girl, laundry girl, and crossing sweeper. In *Pearson’s*, Malvery included studio portraits of herself costumed as a tramp, flower girl, and coster, as well as more candid photos of herself among the
working classes on the streets of the East End. These photographs served several purposes. First, they provided readers with the frisson of seeing middle-class women adopt working-class poses (see figures 1 and 2). At the same time, these photos demonstrated the reporters’ middle-class femininity, despite their working-class attire, by presenting them in tidy clothing and demure poses. Their attire is remarkably clean for women who supposedly work in the streets of London. Banks’s flower girl tilts her head submissively as she offers a flower to an imaginary customer. Malvery’s posture is less demure than Banks’s, but the photograph does not include the barrow heavily laden with vegetables usually featured in representations of costers. Missing, then, is a reminder of the physical labor required
to move a heavy cart from market to pitch; instead, Malvery holds a basket that can be easily managed by a delicate middle-class woman. Thus, both photos erase the grime and physical labor that were a part of working-class women’s lives. Banks and Malvery also introduced their work with portraits of themselves in appropriately feminine middle-class attire. In the frontispiece of *Campaigns of Curiosity*, Banks wears a stylish hat and cape, and the opening photo of Malvery’s *Pearson’s* series shows her in a skirt and blouse standing by her writing desk in a domestic interior. Both photos preface the women’s escapades with a reminder of their gentility and femininity. Such photos also draw attention to the reporters’ inventiveness and adaptability. As Judith Walkowitz notes, Malvery’s photos emphasize “her ability to transform herself through gesture, cosmetics, wigs, and stance” into various types of working-class women, and the same could be said of Banks. All of these functions—the photographs’ sensationalism and their depiction of femininity and artfulness—draw attention to Banks and Malvery themselves, indicating that they, as much as the working-class women they were emulating, were the focus of their articles.

Sparrow’s articles, on the other hand, are illustrated almost exclusively with line drawings that mainly depict her working-class subjects. There are drawings of fur-pullers, box-makers, muffin-sellers, servants, and factory girls, among other members of the working poor (figure 3). The absence of photographs accompanying her journalism may reflect the high cost of reproducing them in periodicals. However, in the 1890s the *Quiver* regularly illustrated similar articles with photographs, suggesting that Sparrow was less willing than her counterparts to make a spectacle of herself. The experiences of the urban poor, rather than her own artfulness and daring, are the focus of her articles.

Unlike Banks and Malvery, Sparrow had little talent for self-promotion. As a result of the public interest in Banks’s reporting, she was the subject of interviews, columns, poems, and satires in the periodical press. As Koven points out, Banks attempted to control her public image in press interviews in order to present herself as paragon of demure femininity, despite her journalistic exploits. Malvery took an even more active role in fashioning her public image. According to Walkowitz, “A heavy dose of theatricality and self-promotion was a consistent feature of [Malvery’s] cultural productions, including [. . .] her own wedding.” This wedding, in which coster girls from Hoxton served as Malvery’s attendants, was covered in the *Daily Mail*, *Daily Mirror*, *Lady’s Pictorial*, and *Musical Standard*. Both Banks and Malvery also capitalized on their popularity by publishing their journalism and other material in book form. Banks’s *Campaigns of Curiosity* appeared in 1894 and her *Autobiography of a “Newspaper Girl”* in 1902. Malvery revised and expanded her *Pearson’s* series for *The Soul Market*, published in 1906, and started her own periodical, *Mack-
Banks and Malvery were also exotic figures in fin de siècle London—Banks was an American and Malvery was of mixed British and Indian descent. They used this outsider status to generate interest in their work. Although Banks initially attempted to pass herself off as British in her “In Cap and Apron” series, she soon switched to highlighting her American origins, subtitling *Campaigns of Curiosity* with *Journalistic Adventures of an American Girl in Late Victorian London* and asking her agent to market her autobiography as the work of an American girl in London.87 Marion Leslie’s 1894 interview with Banks was likewise titled “An American Girl in London” and opens with Leslie speculating about “what particular type” of American girl Banks will be.88 Malvery drew attention to her Indian heritage from the start, first coming before the public in Indian attire as a public performer who read Indian legends and stories set to music.89 Malvery explained in *The Soul Market* that the trouble and expense of dealing with dressmakers was such that she “solved the difficulty for ever by electing to wear nothing but Indian dress for [her] public work.”90 She likewise reminded readers of her background by opening her *Pearson’s* series with a photograph of herself in Indian clothing and an anecdote about her child-

irdy’s *Weekly*, in 1914. Sparrow’s name, on the other hand, came before the public only in her journalistic publications.86

Figure 3. “If Fine, We Worked in the Doorway or Just Outside,” in “As One of the Penniless Poor. III.—Fur-Pullers,” by T. [Anna Mary] Sparrow, *Quiver* 30 (1895): 450. Courtesy of HathiTrust.
hood in India. Moreover, in one of the articles in the series, she mentions how her foreign appearance helped with her incognito investigations since the working-class women and girls she interacted with “made their own stories about me.” Her “mysterious and romantic” history made good copy for reporters writing about her as well. Banks and Malvery claimed their outsider status gave them unique insight into British life, but their foreignness also made them newsworthy in and of themselves. Sparrow, an English girl from Lancashire, had no stereotypes of American brashness or Indian mysteriousness to draw upon in order to promote herself or her work.

Sparrow had her own theory about her lack of renown. In a letter to the Royal Literary Fund she remarks, “There was always a feminine clique against me as they said I did it [investigative journalism] for vulgar notoriety.” Despite her continual efforts to position herself as middle class and genteel, Sparrow felt the sting of criticism. This critique attests to the vulnerability of female reporters who ventured beyond “feminine” subject matter. Given the publicity that reporters such as James Greenwood, W. T. Stead, and Elizabeth Banks received for their investigative work, it is perhaps not surprising that some would assume that Sparrow desired fame as well. Indeed, investigative reporters could use notoriety to spark reader interest and maintain visibility in the journalistic community. Banks writes in her autobiography that after the success of “In Cap and Apron” she had no difficulty getting assignments from editors who wanted more stunt reporting. The difficulty, she found, was getting “ordinary” assignments.

However, while celebrity could help advance a woman’s journalistic career, as in the case of Banks and Malvery, it could also create resentment among other female reporters. Sparrow does not specify who the members of the “feminine clique” were, but it is likely that they were women journalists since the charge that she “did it for vulgar notoriety” echoes Mary Billington’s comment about “reporteresses” who descend to “vulgar sensationalism.” Sparrow’s complaint hints at the peer pressure for female reporters to maintain their status as “gentlewomen.” Otherwise, female journalists like Billington might turn against one of their own if she were perceived as unwomanly and damaging to the profession. Indeed, Billington proudly states in “Adventures of a Lady Journalist” that she “[has] not slept in casual wards or spent a week in a Whitechapel women’s ‘doss-house’ in the search for sensational material,” thus distancing herself from reporters like Sparrow who did just that five years previously. While Banks and Malvery were subject to similar criticism, their outsider status seems to have insured them from damage to their careers. As newcomers to England, they may have been less invested in English cultural mores than the native Sparrow. Sparrow’s attempts to follow Victorian gender ideol-
ogy by turning (perhaps too late) to “feminine” subject matter, not making a spectacle of herself in print, and not promoting her own interests were not enough to satisfy her critics. Ironically, her self-effacing approach to her journalism, while in compliance with the social norms of her age, contributed to her disappearance from literary history.

After a decade of success as a journalist, Sparrow, like one of the sentimental working-class heroes she described in her journalism, fell victim to circumstance. She exhausted her savings from the salad days of her career when caring for her brother who was paralyzed due to sunstroke in Australia. In a letter to the Royal Literary Fund, she writes, “My last £5 buried him in his native county (Lancashire) & I returned to town, to begin at the bottom of the ladder.”

Starting on the ground floor of her profession meant “hack journalism on any penny or ½ [penny] journal that would take me.” In addition to this unsigned hack work, from 1897 to 1907, she was employed as a subeditor for various shilling weeklies, including the Household, Woman’s Herald, Vegetarian, and Pleasures: A Good Sporting Magazine. “I worked till I dropped on my knees—and worked after,” she lamented.

As she noted in her 1913 application to the Royal Literary Fund, at age 55 she was deaf, losing her eyesight, and could no longer work due to these disabilities. At the time of application, she was living on £1 a week supplied by another brother who was a solicitor and law professor. Other than a bequest from the Royal Literary Fund, her hopes for an income rested on the life insurance benefit she would receive when her brother died. Unfortunately, the Royal Literary Fund denied her application for financial assistance, asserting that her work did not have the necessary literary merit.

This is the last public record of Anna Mary Sparrow that I have found. I have not been able to determine her date of death since she spent the remainder of her days in obscurity.

Sparrow’s career provides a striking example of the vicissitudes of the profession of journalism in the late nineteenth century, in which freelance writers could attain great financial success but had little job security. For female reporters who chose to pursue investigative journalism, the profession came with additional challenges, including the burden of maintaining their reputation for respectability and femininity. Because Sparrow had to work to support herself, her hold on middle-class respectability was tenuous. She was just a paycheck or major family illness away from the poverty she described in some of her articles. Sparrow also struggled with shifting definitions of gender identity at the fin de siècle. Working outside the home was becoming more common as well as necessary for a growing number of middle-class women, a development which challenged traditional gender ideology. Sparrow, like many of her counterparts, criticized women for working outside the home while doing exactly that herself. As my overview
of Sparrow’s investigative journalism demonstrates, the pressure she felt to assert her middle-class identity while exploring the lives of the urban poor colors her depiction of her subjects, whether she is critiquing their lack of middle-class domesticity or placing them in melodramatic or sentimental plot lines. As a result, Sparrow reveals her class-based ideological biases as much as the living and working conditions of the poor she set out to describe.

While Banks, Malvery, and Sparrow all engaged in similar strategies to maintain their social position and femininity while investigating working-class people and places, Sparrow alone has been forgotten. An examination of the career of an investigative reporter who did not achieve the renown of Banks or Malvery reveals the challenges facing English women hoping to make a career in journalism beyond fashion, domestic, and society news—and the tensions among women reporters that this could arouse. Indeed, given the number of women working as journalists at the end of the nineteenth century, Banks and Malvery appear to be anomalies, whereas Sparrow is more representative of the typical female reporter. The contrast of these women’s careers suggests that while celebrity could be a boon to a female journalist, the idea that one was courting fame could also be detrimental. Seeking celebrity was not genteel, yet avoiding the limelight could lead to obscurity. As Sparrow herself noted, “The fact that I am so completely forgotten shows how little I cared for fame.”
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NOTES

1. See, for example, Onslow, Women of the Press; Lutes, Front Page Girls; Gray, Women in Journalism; and Gray and Hessell, “Gender and Journalism.”


5. “England and Wales Census, 1881.”
6. Her novels *Wyldedean* (1886), *The Bride of the Bruce* (1887), *With Sorrow Fraught* (1887), and *Rivals by Fate* (1887) were published anonymously or under the pseudonym Darcy Bryn in the *Lamp*. *Olympias* first ran in the *Month* from January through May 1889 and was published in a single volume by Remington that same year. Her collection of children’s stories, *Tom in a Tangle*, was published in 1890. She also published a short story, “A Spiritual Failure,” in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* in 1891.

7. Sparrow, Letter to the Royal Literary Fund, December 12, 1913.

8. According to census figures, the number of female authors, editors, and journalists nearly doubled between 1891 to 1901, from 660 to 1,249. Jordan, *Women’s Movement*, 79. However, Onslow notes that these numbers are inexact since census figures did not count freelance contributors. *Women of the Press*, 15.


10. Sparrow, Letter to the Royal Literary Fund, December 14, 1913, and January 13, 1914. Onslow notes that pay for periodical journalism varied widely, depending on factors such as the journal, the type of contribution, and the reputation and negotiating skills of the writer. *Women of the Press*, 87.

11. These include “London Street Toilers” and “London Street Toilers: Cress Sellers” for the *Newbery House Magazine* and “In the Heart of Hopland” for the *Strand Magazine*. In her Royal Literary Fund application, she mentions similar articles in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and *Daily Chronicle*, which I have been unable to locate.

12. Other possible inspirations include Beatrice Potter’s “Pages from a Work-Girl’s Diary” (1888) and Mary Spencer Warren’s “Life in the Streets: ‘Amateur Casual’ as Street Vocalist” (1891), which appeared in the *Lamp*, a journal that published several of Sparrow’s serial novels in 1886 and 1887. However, the tremendous publicity “In Cap and Apron” received makes Banks the more likely source.


14. Ibid.

15. Other examples of English women going under cover before 1896 include Beatrice Potter’s report on the working conditions in a Jewish sweatshop in the *Nineteenth Century* (1888), Mary Spencer Warren’s turn as a working-class street singer for the *Lamp* (1891), and Eva Bright’s article on “How the Other Half Lives: The Organ Grinder” for the *English Illustrated Magazine* (1894). It is unclear whether Billington was unaware of Sparrow’s and other English women’s investigative reporting or if she intended to imply that English women who engaged in this type of journalism were not ladies.


17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., 83. The female narrator provides several aliases when applying for shelter, including Ellen Stanley, Jane Wood, Ellen Smith, and Ellen Taylor.

19. Stead, “Young Women,” 12. In *Journalism for Women* (1898), Arnold Bennett argues that “there should not be any essential functional disparity between the journalist male and the journalist female” but acknowledges that the opposite attitude often prevails (9). He continues, “We leave it to be inferred that of the dwellers in Fleet Street there are, not two sexes, but two species—journalists and women journalists” (10).

20. Royal Literary Fund, Case File No. 2916, 2.


23. Ibid.

24. Koven has argued that sexual titillation is the defining effect of the genre. He acknowledges that not all social investigations included homoeroticism but argues in chapter 1 of *Slumming* that such themes in Greenwood’s “Night in a Workhouse” were hugely influential on other investigators, including Jack London and George Orwell.


29. St. Aubert later learns that the body is, in fact, a wax effigy.


34. “New Review,” 305. See also Murtagh’s “New Review” for the journal’s literary content and publication history.


36. Ibid., 128.


39. In chapter 4 of *Slumming*, Koven analyzes the complex relationship between upper- and middle-class philanthropic women, working-class women, and dirt.

40. Sparrow, “In a Woman’s Doss-House,” 184. Not only do casual-ward intake officers assume that Malvery and Higgs are prostitutes, but during another investigation, Higgs discovers the questionable “character of the [lodging] house” she and her friend visit. “The inmates,” she notes, were “probably about sixty, young and old” and “were living a life of sin.”
“Three Nights,” 275. Sparrow acknowledges that prostitutes frequent doss houses, but they are not her primary concern.

41. Sparrow, “In a Woman’s Doss-House,” 177.
42. Ibid., 183.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid.
45. The 1861 census lists eight servants in the Sparrow household: two nurses, two housemaids, two laundry maids, a cook, and a governess. “England and Wales Census, 1861.”
46. I am drawing on Douglas’s argument that “dirt is essentially disorder.”
47. Sparrow, “In a Woman’s Doss-House,” 181.
48. Ibid., 182. Sparrow may be borrowing a phrase from Crackanthorpe’s “The Revolt of the Daughters” (1894), which caused a stir when it was published in the Nineteenth Century six months before. Crackanthorpe argues that upper- and upper-middle-class girls should be allowed freedom for self-development and should not be hidden from the world until they are married. If the allusion is deliberate, Sparrow further undermines the plight of working-class women by linking their revolt to the plight of privileged young women.
49. Onslow explores the conjunction between the New Woman and New Journalism in “New World, New Woman.”
51. See, for example, Brabrook, “Provision for Old Age,” and Wilkins, “Church and the Labour Movement.”
52. Dehn Kubitschek, “Quiver,” 331, 333.
53. Ibid., 331.
54. Ibid., 333.
55. I discuss this article in more detail in “Playing Italian.”
57. Ibid., 493.
60. Ibid., 228.
63. Sparrow, “As One of the Penniless Poor. IV,” 483; Sparrow, “Chimney-Sweep’s Romance,” 639. Sometimes this involved sharing the same quarters. Indeed, when preparing to write “As One of the Penniless Poor. I.” and “As One of the Penniless Poor. II,” she stayed overnight with a family of palm workers and three young women who worked as fish-curers.
64. Sparrow, “Gold-beater’s Family,” 874, 875, 876.
69. Ibid.
73. Ibid.
74. Dehn Kubitschek, “Quiver,” 331.
77. For example, she refused an American editor’s request that she allow herself to be picked up as a prostitute. Banks, “American ‘Yellow Journalism,”’ 333–34; Banks, Autobiography, 205.
79. Some of these photos also appeared alongside interviews of Banks. See, for example, Leslie, “American Girl in London.”
81. Two exceptions are “London Street Toilers” and “Isles of Babyland,” which incorporate photo illustrations and photographs, respectively.
82. See, for example, Leslie, “American Girl in London,” “Wares of Autolycus,” “Journalistic Mare’s Nest,” “Our Harmonic Club,” and “Irrepressible She.” Banks quotes from Walter Besant’s poem “The Lady Housemaid” in her Autobiography, 297. The poem was originally published in the Queen.
83. Koven, Slumming, 147.
86. The only exception I have found is the review of Sparrow’s “In a Woman’s Doss-House” in the Review of Reviews, which identifies the author as “Mrs. Sparrow.” “Homeless Woman of 1894,” 144.
90. Malvery, Soul Market, 178. Walkowitz explores the complexity of Malvery’s identification as a woman, Anglo-Indian, and daughter of empire in “Indian Woman.” Rastogi argues that Malvery’s choice of Indian dress upturned colonial hierarchies by suggesting that Indian clothes were more appropriate attire for English public life. “Easterner in the East End,” 122. Likewise, Lahiri argues in Indian Mobilities in the West that Malvery’s performance of identity in her written work complicated stereotypical concepts of “Indians.”
96. Koven likewise notes that English women journalists feared that the introduction of “American style women’s reporting to the London press might jeopardize their own precarious standing within the overwhelmingly male profession of journalism.” Slumming, 141.
98. Sparrow, Letter to the Royal Literary Fund, December 14, 1913.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid.
101. Details in this paragraph are drawn from Sparrow’s application to the Royal Literary Fund, Case File No. 2916.
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