City Beat:
City PC 814 Frederick Holland
By Neil Bell and Robert Clack

‘Come with me’

City of London Police Constable 814 Frederick Holland was patrolling the south side of Aldgate High Street at around 1.46am on 30th September 1888 when he heard the shrill of a whistle. Looking towards the sound, which seemed to emanate from across the road, he noted an elderly man carrying a lamp coming out of Mitre Street opposite. The man stopped and talked to Holland’s fellow City Police Constable 964 James Harvey who was already on the street corner. The exchange between the old man and Harvey was brief. Looking across Aldgate, Harvey noted Constable Holland and called out: ‘Come with me.’

Heeding Harvey’s call, Holland crossed over and joined the pair. At some stage, either Harvey or the elderly man, whom Holland later learned was Kearley and Tonge night watchman George Morris, told him that a woman had been murdered in Mitre Square. As the three men entered Mitre Square, Holland noted in the dark corner another Constable, Watkins, checking over the prone body of a woman. Without hesitation, Holland immediately went to call the nearest Doctor for assistance.

Early Years in Norfolk

Frederick Holland was born sometime in early June 1863 in the small village of West Bilney, around five miles southeast of Kings Lynn in Norfolk. His father’s name was Robert1, a Labourer, and his mother was Ann2. Holland was baptised in the village at the Norman-built St Cecilia Church on 25th September 1864. The 1871 census shows the Hollands living at ‘Magpie’ 3. Along with 7-year-old Frederick lived older brothers William4 aged 21 and James aged 11 and sister Harriet5 aged 4.

By 1881 Frederick, then aged 17, had left his parents’ home and was living with elder brother William and his wife, Elizabeth6 at 29 Brickyard Cottages, West Bilney. While we do not know the reason he moved away from his parents, we might speculate that it might have been because of family death, disputes, work or the simple need to move into a less crowded home.

1 Robert Holland born to John and Margaret Holland (Frederick’s grandparents) in 1822. Robert was baptised on 24 November 1822. St Cecilia Baptism records 1813-1880.
2 According to the 1871 census, Ann Holland was born in Great Massingham, Norfolk. A picturesque village some 13 miles from Kings Lynn, Great Massingham was the location of the early education of England’s first Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole (1676–1745), first Earl of Orford. His descendants still live there today at nearby Houghton Hall.
3 As Robert Holland is listed as a Labourer, and the area of West Bilney was known then, as it still is, for its agriculture, it is possible the family were living at a farm location. There is currently a Magpie Farm in West Bilney but it is not known if this farm was running in 1871. It is possible that ‘Magpie’ was indeed Magpie Farm and that the family was living in one of the farm outbuildings.
4 Born in Pentney – 1881 Census.
5 Harriet Elizabeth Holland. Baptised 3 June 1866 — St Cecilia Baptism records 1813-1880.
6 Elizabeth Holland, 32 years old. The 1881 census states she was born in East Winch, just a couple of miles away from West Bilney.
In November 1882, Frederick Holland came into the employ of Robert Henry Household of West Bilney Hall upon the recommendation of Mr Household’s own Steward\(^7\). His application for the City of London Police Force lists Holland’s occupation as Labourer. His employer, Robert Houseman, was a Justice of the Peace (JP). Better known today as Magistrates, JPs originated under the name of ‘Keepers of the Peace’ in 1195. At that time, Richard I commissioned certain knights to be responsible for maintaining the law, the reasoning being that men who hold these positions of power and wealth would be respected to such a degree that their authority would not be disputed. By 1327, an act was passed where ‘good and lawful men’ were appointed in each county to uphold the law in civil matters. A 1361 act decreed that JPs should meet 4 times a year to discuss such matters and this became known as Quarterly Sessions. The practise was kept up right until 1972 when Crown Courts were introduced. Most JPs consisted of well-to-do land owners, such as Robert H Household, who could afford to waive the 4 shillings a day expenses and conduct the court’s business out of a sense of duty rather than for any financial gain.

According to the 1881 census, Robert Henry Houseman\(^8\) was a widower born in 1836. He lived at West Bilney Hall with his sons Horace West\(^9\) and Henry Barrows\(^10\), as well as his 53-year-old Housekeeper Sarah Langley along with servants Eliza Savage and Susan Aylmer\(^11\). The Hall itself still stands and is described as a handsome building, situated in a well-timbered park, surrounded by extensive plantations and drives. It was at this idyllic location that Frederick Holland worked on and off for the next two years\(^12\).

---

\(^7\) Testimony given by Robert H Household upon Frederick Holland application to join the City of London Police Force — 10 February 1885.

\(^8\) The 1881 census lists Household as a Magistrate Auditor of the Local Government Board London.

\(^9\) 11 years old — 1881 Census.

\(^10\) 9 years old — 1881 Census.

\(^11\) Eliza Savage 21 years old and Susan Aylmer 22 years old — 1881 Census.

\(^12\) Testimony given by Robert H Household upon Frederick Holland application to join the City of London Police Force — 10 February 1885.
Holland Joins the City of London Police

Holland, by now 21 years of age, left the service of Robert Household on 7th February 1885. Three days later, he handed his City of London Police Force application form to Chief Inspector Robert Sillcock. Holland gave his marital status as single and an address of 7 Canal Grove, Old Kent Road, South East London. Holland’s height was recorded as 5 foot 10½ inches; he had brown eyes, brown hair and a fresh complexion. As well as testimony from Robert Household, Holland had obtained a declaration from Reverend Edward John Alvis, Vicar of the Church of All Saints Benefice in East Winch, who stated he had known Holland since January 1883. One final testimonial was from a Blacksmith named Mr Richard Hammond, who stated that he had known Holland since 1866, when Holland was a mere 3 years of age.

As was procedure, the Superintendent of Kings Lynn Police issued a reference letter dated 26th February 1885. If a man wished to join the City of London Force a letter was sent to the constabulary from which the man hailed — in Holland’s case, Kings Lynn — requesting references. It was then up to that constabulary to go to the relevant parties in order to obtain those references. In this case, Superintendent G Ware stated: ‘. . . Frederick Holland is a very respectable man’.

On 24th April 1885, Holland was finally certified fit enough to conduct general duties. The period between his application and certification, 2 months, is an indicator that Holland struggled to adapt to life in the force. As was standard, he was placed on the 3rd class of pay of 25 shillings; however, the yearly review on 29th April 1886 brought Holland to the 2nd class rate and increased his pay to 28 shillings. Over a year later, on the 6th May 1887, Holland got himself into trouble. Fellow City Police Constable 898 William Savage was struggling with a thief who was in the process of trying to escape custody. It was noted that Holland failed to assist PC Savage. As it was Holland’s first offence, his punishment was a mere reprimand. There are no further reports against Holland for the remainder of that year. By 1888, Holland had married Roseanna and sometime later that year their first daughter, also named Roseanna, was born. Though we are not certain of baby Rosanna’s exact birth date, the timing of her birth was profound due to the fact that a serial killer, later to be known as Jack the Ripper, was taking lives in that very year, and little Rosanna’s father was about to become involved.

---

13 Robert A Sillcock is listed, along with his wife Susannah, two daughters, Ellen and Alice, and three sons, Robert A Jnr, Ernest and Harry, as resident at Snow Hill Police Station in 1881. He was also present at when City of London Police Constable 931 Louis Robinson (who arrested Eddowes for being drunk and Disorderly hours before her death) applied to join the same force. It would seem as if Sillcock oversaw all applications to join the City of London Police Force.

14 Reverend Edward John Alvis, Vicar of East Winch, 1872-1912. Born in Kings Lynn, Norfolk. Reverend Alvis was married to local girl Emma Ella with whom he was a father to four daughters. He resided at The Vicarage House, East Winch, Norfolk and had one domestic servant, 21-year-old Emily Lee. He also employed two young Nursemaid sisters named Hammond, Jessie (14) and Elizabeth (13) — 1881 Census.

15 The 1881 census states that Richard Hammond was born in 1842 in the same village as Holland’s elder brother William — Pentney, Norfolk. As well as working as a Blacksmith, Hammond was also a Grocer. He lived in West Bilney along with his wife Annie, four sons, Frank, William, Harry and Arthur, and one young daughter, Minnie. Due to the fact that West Bilney is a small village, it is possible that the Nursemaids to Reverend Alvis (mentioned above), were in fact related to Richard Hammond.

16 Superintendent George Ware of Kings Lynn Police, Norfolk was presented, in 1884, with a Gold Cameo ring in the will of James Fiddaman - http://www.thornbury-pump.myby.co.uk/KingsLynn/will.html.
Left: The cover of Holland’s application form to join the City of London Police Force.

Below: Page 1 from the application form, giving Holland’s description.

All photographs of Holland’s service records courtesy of Robert Clack.
As noted above, during the early hours of Sunday, 30th September 1888, Holland was patrolling the south side of Aldgate High Street when City PC 964 Harvey called him to cross the road. With Harvey was the elderly night watchman Morris. The pair informed Holland that there had been a murder akin to the recent ones committed upon two prostitutes, Mary Ann (‘Polly’) Nichols and Annie Chapman, in the weeks before in Bucks Row and Hanbury Street, respectively.

This was a major event, and the three swiftly covered the short distance to Mitre Square where they came upon City PC 881 Watkins crouched over the terribly mutilated form of a woman who would later be identified as an ‘unfortunate’ named Catherine Eddowes. It was clear she had been murdered and it was just as clear by whom. The man that had viciously murdered in the East End throughout the previous weeks had struck again, this time in the City of London.

As Holland looked down upon the lifeless body of Eddowes prone upon the damp flagstones he knew the procedure: a Doctor had to be called. Knowing the area, Holland immediately headed towards 34 Jewry Street where he knew Dr George Sequeria resided. Sequeria testified as follows:

Sequeria: On the morning of Sept. 30, I was called to Mitre-square, and I arrived at five minutes to two o’clock, being the first medical man on the scene of the murder. I saw the position of the body, and I entirely agree with the evidence of Dr. Gordon Brown in that respect.

Sequeria: I am well acquainted with the locality and the position of the lamps in the square. Where the murder was committed was probably the darkest part of the square, but there was sufficient light to enable the miscreant to perpetrate the deed. I think that the murderer had no design on any particular organ of the body. He was not possessed of any great anatomical skill.

Coroner: Can you account for the absence of noise?

Sequeria: The death must have been instantaneous after the severance of the windpipe and the blood vessels.

Coroner: Would you have expected the murderer to be bespattered with blood?

Sequeria: Not necessarily.

---

17 George Morris, night watchman to Kearley & Tonge situated in Mitre Square, was called to assist by PC 881 Edward Watkins who found the body of Catherine Eddowes in Mitre Square.

18 As with any beat Constable, Holland would have had to memorise where Doctors’ premises were located upon his beat. Just in case medical assistance was required. It is therefore possible Jewry Street was on Holland’s beat.

19 Doctor George William Sequeria. Born on 3rd December 1858, William Sequeria’s father was Dr Henry Little Sequeria and his mother Amelia Sequeria. George Sequeria was very much a local boy, baptised on 6th November 1864 at St Katherine Creechurch, a stone’s throw away from Mitre Square. His father ran a surgery at 1 Jewry Street. At the time of Eddowes murder, Sequeria was only 30 years of age — Information from Chris Scott, Casebook: Jack the Ripper, 8th February 2005 (post 1682) — http://www.casebook.org/forum/messages/4920/15977.html.
Coroner: How long do you believe life had been extinct when you arrived?
Sequeria: Very few minutes — probably not more than a quarter of an hour\textsuperscript{20}.

The \textit{Morning Advertiser} of 12th October reports City PC 964 James Harvey’s inquest testimony as:

\begin{quote}
On the night of the 29th ult. I went on duty at a quarter to ten, but I did not notice any suspicious person in the course of my beat. When I got into Aldgate, I heard a whistle and saw the witness Morris with a lamp in his hand. I immediately went to him and asked him what was the matter. He replied, ‘A woman has been ripped up in Mitre Square.’ I saw a constable on the other side of the street, and I said, ‘Come with me.’ We went together to Mitre Square, where we saw Police constable Watkins. The constable (Holland) who followed me went for a medical man, and private individuals were despatched for more police assistance. It came almost immediately. I waited there with Constable Watkins and information was at once sent to the inspector\textsuperscript{21}.
\end{quote}

\textbf{Reprimanded for Drunkenness}

Almost a year after assisting in the policing of the Catherine Eddowes murder scene and, coincidently, on the same day the Pinchin Street torso was discovered on the 10th September 1889, Holland was reduced to the 3rd Class rate. This meant a 3-shilling drop to 25s. The reason for this reduction was the fact Holland was found to be drunk coming off duty. Obviously, at some stage during his beat the young Constable had taken something a little stronger than tea. It usually takes a Constable 12 months to work himself back up to the higher rate, however in Holland’s case this did not occur. The main reason for this was that on 15th April 1890 he neglected to patrol his beat. This coupled with the fact that he also failed to remove an obstruction\textsuperscript{22} meant that Holland stayed at the 3rd rate of pay for another year. He also forfeited two days leave for this matter.

\textsuperscript{20} Testimony of Dr George William Sequeria made on Thursday 11th October 1888 at the Inquest into the death of Catherine Eddowes.

\textsuperscript{21} Testimony of City of London PC 964 James Harvey made on Thursday 11th October 1888 at the Inquest into the death of Catherine Eddowes.

\textsuperscript{22} We do not know for certain how Holland’s neglecting to patrol his beat manifested nor how it was found out. However due to the fact that another charge of neglecting to ‘remove obstruction (most commonly a cart in the way of a thoroughfare)’ was levelled at Holland, the most logical scenario was that the Beat Sergeant (who patrolled beats to ensure good practice), or a fellow Constable on an adjoining beat, was called to sort out this obstruction on Holland’s behalf. And it was for this reason that Holland’s absence was noted.
One interesting piece of information came to us via the 1891 census, which has Holland, wife Roseanna and little Roseanna living at 12 Royal Mint Square in Whitechapel. By this date, the family had a new edition, 1-year-old Louisa. The location of this address is extremely interesting. Royal Mint Square is only yards from a dank railway arch known as Swallow Gardens. In the early hours of 13th February 1891, a young prostitute named Frances Coles was found murdered at this location and it is possible that the Holland family was living close by at the time of this crime, which has been attributed by some to Jack the Ripper.

Holland seems to have redeemed himself in April 1891: he was promoted to 2nd Class with a pay increase to 32s 2d in that month.

Holland Is Made an Example and Reforms Himself

But just over a year later, Holland was in trouble again. On 11th July 1892, Holland was found to be drunk at Bishopsgate Police Station. He was off duty at the time and in plain clothes, however all City constables and officers were expected to maintain a high standard of decency and decorum. Holland’s seniors frowned heavily upon this obvious flaunting of these standards. In fact, the most senior officer in the City of London force, Commissioner Henry Smith, was not at all impressed with Holland’s actions on that July day and instantly reduced him to the 4th class rate of pay, which was 30s. Reading through the service records of other City Police Constables, Holland indiscretion does not seem that severe or uncommon. However, it may be a case of Smith setting standards and making an example out of this particular Constable as warning to others.
This major reprimand by his Commissioner seems to have had an effect on Holland. On 13 July 1893, he was advanced to 3rd rate of 32 shillings and a year later on 12 July 1894 he was boosted up again to the 2nd rate and 32 shillings. By 12th July 1895, PC 814 Frederick Holland finally made it to Constable 1st Class with its pay of 36 shillings. Within a period of 3 years Holland had worked his way from the bottom of a police constable’s pay structure to the highest he could obtain whilst on constable duties. This was quite some turn around and Holland maintained his 1st Class level for some years. However, a number of incidents would occur that would lead to the demise of his good character.

Last Two Years as a City Police Constable

On 1st December 1896, Holland failed to discover that a premises on his beat was unsecured for 3 and a half hours. He was pardoned for this supposed infraction and we can only assume that the allegation was difficult to prove or that possibly the censure was deemed harsh as the nature of the phrase ‘unsecured’ is not mentioned. Whichever it may be, Holland’s superiors felt the episode to be insignificant enough to enable them to pardon him.

The following month, on 13th January 1897, Holland was found ‘idling and gossiping’ with the liftman of Tower Bridge. Tower Bridge was one of London’s newest bridges and attractions. After the bridge was opened in 1894, pedestrians either had the option of taking the carriageway across or using the walkway situated higher up. The reasoning for the overhead walkways was that the pedestrians would not have to wait for the carriageway (or ‘bascules’ as they are known) to retract. And in 1896 the bascules were raised far more frequently than today due to tall ships coming and going along the Thames. Holland was evidently caught chatting with the bascule lift operator. He was punished and forfeited a day’s leave.

Five weeks later, on 20th February 1897, Holland was caught yet again ‘idling and gossiping’. This time he was talking with a soldier for ‘7 minutes’. For this infraction, he was fined a sum of 5 shillings. On 8th April 1897, it was alleged that he was drinking malt liquor whilst on duty. Commissioner Smith dismissed the allegation thanks to the evidence provided on Holland’s behalf by a Guardsman, who confirmed Holland’s story. On 3rd August 1897, Holland was due to muster at 5.45am but did not appear until some 45 minutes later. He forfeited another 3 days’ leave for this misdemeanour.

These indiscretions all occurred within 5 months and must have rung bells with Holland’s senior officers.

The year 1898 was not a good year for Holland. He was 20 minutes late for mustering on 12th February resulting in yet another forfeiting of leave, 1 day this time. He was further punished at the beginning of March. On 5th March, Holland failed to take action against the breaking of a window despite being asked to do so, one assumes by the aggrieved party. He was reduced to 2nd Class and formally cautioned by Commissioner Smith.

The final straw came on 5th July 1898 when Holland was found to be absent from his beat for 50 minutes. In his record of service, Commissioner Smith simply wrote in his distinctive scrawl ‘To send in his resignation forthwith’.

---

23 The Walkways were abandoned in 1912 due to lack of use. People preferred to wait for the Bascules to retract than to carry their bags up the stairs.
24 Mustering is the inspection all Constables had to go through prior to being allowed on duty.
25 Though it must be remembered the accusation of drinking on duty was dismissed.
Resignation from the City of London Police

In Holland’s Pay Record, the last entry reads ‘Resigned by order’. Two days later, Holland handed in his letter of resignation, which reads:

7th July 1898
Resignation

I beg to resign my appointment as
A Constable in the City of London
Police forthwith.

Frederick Holland
PC 814

Underneath can be seen the signature of Chief Inspector George Izzard and the approving initials of Commissioner Henry Smith himself. On the same day that he submitted his resignation letter, Holland presented Police Constable 90 Read with his uniform and equipment. Read noted Holland’s age as 35 years and 1 month, his height as 5 foot 11 inches, his hair as fair and his complexion as fresh.

Although we are unsure as to the exact date, we do know that at 6.00pm on one early evening not long after Holland had departed the force, the City of London Police force received a visit from a Mr Millar Wilkinson. A note of the visit was made and Mr Millar Wilkinson gave his address as No. 3 St Michaels Alley, Cornhill. He enquired as to Holland’s ‘13 year service in the force with a view to recommending him for work’. Millar Wilkinson also wanted to know why he left the force - the underlined word ‘wanted’ indicating that he required clarification as to Holland’s departure. Millar Wilkinson was informed that the information would be available to him at 10.00am the following day. Unfortunately, we do not know the outcome of this enquiry, as there are no further notes or memorandums concerning this matter on Holland’s file.

Holland’s Last Years

The 1901 census has the Holland family at 78 Brandon Street, Southwark. By this time, Frederick was listed as a Carman ‘in a hardware firm’. His wife, Roseanna, was living with him along with his 12-year-old daughter also named Roseanna. Unfortunately, daughter Louisa is missing from this census; however, the census does show three new additions to the family, all girls: 9-year-old Jessie, 4-year-old Emma and Edith, aged just under a month old at the time of the census.

27 We have an 1895 Kellys Directory reference to a Jeweller at that address under the name of Millar Wilkinson. Therefore, it is logical to assume that this person was indeed the same man and that Holland tried to obtain employment for or via Mr Millar Wilkinson.

28 A deliverer of goods. The Victorian equivalent of today’s lorry or van driver.
The 1911 census provides rather mixed news about the Holland family. A 47-year-old Frederick was still alive, along with his wife Roseanna\textsuperscript{29}, and they were living at 53 Brunswick Street, Blackfriars, with his occupation listed as Carter\textsuperscript{30}. Their eldest daughter, Roseanna, was still living with her parents and she was listed as single; 14-year-old Emma was also listed - but that is it. There is no mention of Jessie or baby Edith, and as stated earlier, Louisa was missing from the census in 1901 and she was still absent in 1911. The unique format of the 1911 census form has the addition of 3 columns regarding children. The first column reads ‘Total Children Born Alive’. The second column reads ‘Children still living’ with the final column stating ‘Children who have died’. Within the first column the census lists 7 children born alive to the Hollands. The second column tells us that 3 are still living in 1911. We know of only Roseanna and Emma, there is no mention of a 3rd child living with the family. This indicates that the ‘missing’ living child was either living with another branch of the family somewhere else, in service\textsuperscript{31} or was at large but known to be alive. The final column sadly informs us that Frederick and Roseanna suffered the pain of having 4 of their children die by 1911.

**Conclusion**

City Police Constable 814 Frederick Holland played only a bit part in the discovery of Catherine Eddowes’ body in the early hours of 30th September 1888. His service record indicates a mixed police career. His career began poorly, presumably because of two facts: 1) he was young and 2) he was reared in a rural community far from the bustling, exciting and sometimes downright dangerous East End of London. But between that poor beginning and the end of his police career was sandwiched a period of 4 years where his work was seemingly exemplary. In fact, he worked himself up to a Police Constable first class, which was no mean feat whilst under the gaze of his strict superiors. His demise though was swift as his performance became ever motley.

Holland’s service record shows no record of his private life. Yet, possibly the fact that the 1911 census shows Holland to have suffered the death of 4 children may give us a mitigating circumstance as to why his discipline slipped. However, that is pure speculation.

So far in this series we have reconstructed the private and working lives of five City of London Police Constables who were involved in the case of Catherine Eddowes. The majority of these Constables suffered in both their private and working lives, an indication of the pressures these men were under not only during the autumn of 1888 but throughout the majority of their careers.

It would seem as if those great Victorian operetta creators William Schwenck Gilbert and Arthur Sullivan were very shrewd in their view of the Victorian Police Constable, even in their comic operas:

*A Policeman’s lot is certainly not a happy one.*

\textsuperscript{29} The 1911 census reads ‘Roseannah’. The 1891 census reads ‘Roseanna’ and the 1901 census has ‘Rosana’. Whichever name is the correct spelling is not known.

\textsuperscript{30} Another name for Carman.

\textsuperscript{31} If this was the case then this could be Jessie, who would have been 19 at the time and more than old enough to enter service. There is a possibility of Louisa being this missing child; however, her absence from both the 1901 census as well as the 1911 census indicates the possibility she had died.
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