of Norway infringed upon Ulfeldt’s functions as lord treasurer of the whole realm; in November 1647 Ulfeldt carried his point, and a decree was issued that henceforth the Norwegian provincial governors should send their rents and taxes direct to Copenhagen. On the accession of Frederick IH. (1648), Sehested strove hard to win his favour ; but an investigation into his accounts as viceroy, conducted by his enemies, brought to light such whole­sale embezzlement and peculation that he was summoned to appear before a *herredag,* or assembly of notables, in May 1551, and give an account of his whole administration. Unable to meet the charges brought against him, he compromised matters by resigning his viceroyalty and his senatorship, and surrendering all his private property in Norway to the crown. Throughout his trial Sehested had shown consummate prudence. He surrendered voluntarily thrice as much as he had ever embezzled, and, calculating on the secret fondness of Frederick III. for a man of his monarchical tendencies, carefully abstained from the wild and treasonable projects of revenge which were the ruin of Korfits Ulfeldt. From 1651 to 1660 he lived abroad. At the end of 1655 met the exiled Charles II. of England at Cologne, and lived a part of the following year with him in the Spanish Netherlands. In the summer of 1657 he returned to Denmark, but Frederick III. refused to receive him, and he hastily quitted Copenhagen. During the crisis of the war of 1658 he was at the headquarters of Charles X. of Sweden. In seeking the help and protection of the worst enemy of his country, Sehested ap­proached the very verge of treason, but he never quite went beyond it. When, at last, it seemed probable that the war would not result in the annihilation of Denmark, Sehested strained every nerve to secure his own future by working in the interests of his native land while still residing in Sweden. In April 1660 he obtained permission from Frederick III. to come to Copenhagen, and was finally instructed by him as pleni- potentiary to negotiate with the Swedes. The treaty of Copen­hagen, which saved the honour of Denmark and brought her repose, was very largely Sehested’s work. He was one of the willing abettors of Frederick III. at the revolution of 1660, when he re-entered the Danish service as lord treasurer and councillor of state. Both at home and on his frequent foreign missions he displayed all his old ability. As a diplomatist he, in some respects, anticipated the views of Griffenfeldt, supporting the policy of friendship with Sweden and a French alliance. He died suddenly on the 23rd of September 1666 at Paris, where he was conducting important negotiations. His “ political testa­ment ” is perhaps the best testimony to his liberal and statesmanlike views.

See Thyra Sehested, *Hannibal Sehested* (Copenhagen, 1886); Julius Albert Fridericia, *Adelsvaeldens sidste Dage* (Copenhagen, 1894). (R. N. B.)

SEHORE, a British station in Central India, within the state of Bhopal, with a station on the Bhopal-Ujjain section of the Indian Midland railway, 24 m. E. from Bhopal. Pop. (1901) 16,864. It is the headquarters of the political agent for Bhopal, and a British military cantonment. For many years it was also the headquarters of the Bhopal contingent, raised in 1818, which was in 1903 incorporated in the Indian army. It is an important centre of trade.

SEICHE (Fr. *sèche,* fem. of *sec,* dry), in limnology, an irregular fluctuation of the water-level of lakes, first observed and so named in Switzerland. (See Lake, and Geneva.)

SEIDL, ANTON (1850-1898), Hungarian operatic conductor, was bom at Budapest on the 7th of May 1850. He entered the Leipzig Conservatorium in October 1870, and remained there until 1872, when he was summoned to Bayreuth as one of Wagner’s copyists. There he assisted to make the first fair copy of *Der Ring des Nibelungen.* Thoroughly imbued with the Wagnerian spirit, it was natural that he should take a part in the first Bayreuth Festival in 1876. His chance as a conductor came when, on Wagner’s recommendation, he was appointed to the Leipzig Stadt-Theater, where he remained until, in 1882, he went on tour with Angelo Neumann’s *Nibelungen Ring* com­pany. To his conducting the critics attributed much of such

artistic success as attended the production of the Trilogy at Her Majesty’s Theatre in London in June of that year. In 1883 Seidl went with Neumann to Bremen, but two years later was appointed successor to Leopold Damrosch as conductor of the German Opera in New York, and in the same year he married Fräulein Kraus, the distinguished singer. In America Seidl’s orchestra became famous. In 1886 he was one of the conductors at Bayreuth, and in 1897 at Covent Garden, London, He died in New York on the 28th of March 1898.

See the memorial volume prepared by II. T. Finck, H. E. Krehbiel and others (New York, 1899).

SEIGNIORAGE, the due levied by the authority that possesses the right of coining on the metal that it manufactures into coin. The term “ brassage ” has been used to describe this due, when confined to the mere cost of the process; the wider term “ seigniorage ” being employed when the charge is so raised as to become a profit to the imposer. The exercise of the right of seigniorage has been the instrument by which most of the debasements of currency have been carried out. Under feud- alism, especially in France, the chief nobles had this prerogative. In the modern state it is reserved for the sovereign authority. Most countries adopt a moderate seigniorage charge. Thus the fundamental currency law of France (1803) provides that “ only the expense of coining ” shall be charged. At present this due is 6 fr. 70 c. per kilo. of gold 9/10 fine, or 0∙24%. The charge by the same law on silver was 3 fr. per kilo. or 1∙66%. The limita- tion on the coinage of silver in practically all countries has made the seigniorage on that metal very heavy. The policy of England in respect to gold has been peculiar. Since 1664 it has been freed from any charge, though the delay in return amounts to a small due. In consequence of this gratuitous coinage, English gold has been regarded as equivalent to bullion, and exchange fluctuations have been reduced. The policy was severely criticized by Adam Smith, and it does in fact amount to a bounty on the coinage of gold. The amount is, however, too insignificant to deserve attention, especially as there are compensating gains. The employment of a seigniorage of about 1 % on the “ sovereign ” was suggested by the proceedings of the Paris Monetary Conference of 1867, in order to bring about an assimilation of English and French money. By reducing the amount of gold in the sovereign to that in the proposed 25-franc piece an exact *par* would have been created, and, so it was hoped, the English currency and accounts need have undergone no change. The scheme was, however, rejected by a Royal Commission on the ground that an adjustment of obligations would be required.

The theory of the effects that a seigniorage produces have been discussed at length. The definitive results obtained may be briefly stated as follows:—(1) A seigniorage charge is the same as a debasement, but its evil effect may be avoided by limiting the amount of coin issued. (2) Seigniorage operates as a tax on the metal subject to it, and this tax tends ultimately to fall on the producers, or rather on the rent obtained through the pro- duction. A heavy seigniorage on gold would tend to lower the profits derived from the gold mines of the world, and might even compel the abandonment of the least productive ones.

See Money, Monetary Conferences, and Token Money.

(C. F. B.)

SEIGNORY, or Seigniory (Fγ. *seigneur,* lord; Lat. *senior,* elder), in English law, the lordship remaining to a grantor after the grant of an estate in fee-simple. There is no land in England without its lord: “ Nulle terre sans seigneur ” is the old feudal maxim. Where no other lord can be discovered the crown is lord as lord paramount. The principal incidents of a seignory were an oath of fealty; a “ quit ” or “ chief ” rent; a “ relief ” of one year’s quit rent, and the right of escheat. In return for these privileges the lord was liable to forfeit his rights if he neglected to protect and defend the tenant or did anything injurious to the feudal relation. Every seignory now existing must have been created before the Statute of *Quia Emptores* (1290), which forbade the future creation of estates in fee-simple by subinfeudation. The only seignories of any importance at present are the lordships of manors. They are regarded as incorporeal hereditaments,