

ever thrown save in one instance on her fame. For the rest of her life, which was long, she gave herself up to her children. These were two in number, and they divided their mother's affections by no means equally. The eldest was a daughter, Françoise Marguerite de Sévigné, who was born on October 10, 1646, whether at Les Rochers or in Paris is not absolutely certain. The second, a son, Charles de Sévigné, was born at Les Rochers in the spring of 1648. To him Madame de Sévigné was an indulgent, a generous (though not altogether just), and in a way an affectionate mother. Her daughter, the future Madame de Grignan, she worshipped with an almost insane affection, which only its charming literary results and the delightful qualities which accompanied it in the worshipper, though not in the worshipped, save from being ludicrous if not revolting. As it is; not one in a hundred of Madame de Sévigné's readers can find in his heart to be angry with her for her devotion to a very undivine divinity.

After her husband's death Madame de Sévigné passed the greater part of the year 1651 in retirement at Les Rochers. She had, however, no intention of renouncing the world, and she returned to Paris in November of that year, her affairs having been put in such order as Sévigné's extravagance permitted by the faithful Coulanges. For nearly ten years little of importance occurred in her life, which was passed at Paris in a house she occupied in the Place Royale (not as yet in the famous Hôtel Carnavalet), at Les Rochers, at Livry, or at her own estate of Bourbilly in the Mâconnais. She had, however, in 1658 a quarrel with her cousin Bussy, which had not unimportant results, and at the end of the time mentioned above she narrowly escaped being compromised in reputation, though not politically, at Fouquet's downfall. Notwithstanding Bussy's unamiable character and the early affair of the proposed marriage, and notwithstanding also his libertine conduct towards her, the cousins had always been friends; and the most amusing and characteristic part of Madame de Sévigné's correspondence, before the date of her daughter's marriage, is addressed to him. She had a very strong belief in family ties; she recognized in Bussy a kindred spirit, and she excused his faults as *Rabutinades* and *Rabutinages*—the terms she uses in alluding to the rather excitable and humorist temper of the house. But in 1658 a misunderstanding about money brought about a quarrel, which in its turn had a long sequel, and results not unimportant in literature. Bussy and his cousin had jointly come in for a considerable legacy, and he asked her for a loan. If this was not positively refused, there was a difficulty made about it, and Bussy was deeply offended. A year later, at the escapade of Roissy (see *RABUTIN*), according to his own account, he improvised (according to probability he had long before written it) the famous portrait of Madame de Sévigné which appears in his notorious *Histoire Amoureuse*, and which is a triumph of malice. Circulated at first in manuscript and afterwards in print, this caused Madame de Sévigné the deepest pain and indignation, and the quarrel between the cousins was not fully made up for years, if indeed it was ever fully made up. This portrait, however, was more wounding to self-love than in any way really dangerous, for, read between the lines, it is in effect a testimonial of character. The Fouquet matter was more serious. The superintendent was a famous lady-killer, but Madame de Sévigné, though he was her friend, and though she had been ardently courted by him as by others (one quarrel in her presence between the Duke de Rohan and the Marquis de Tonquedec had become notorious), had hitherto escaped scandal. At Fouquet's downfall in 1651 it was announced on indubitable authority that communications from her had been found in the coffer where Fouquet kept his love

letters. She protested that the notes in question were of friendship merely, and Bussy (one of the not very numerous good actions of his life) obtained from Le Tellier, who as minister had examined the letters, a corroboration of the protest. But the letters were never published, and there have always been those who held that Madame de Sévigné regarded Fouquet with at least a very warm kind of friendship. It is certain that her letters to Pomponne describing his trial are among her masterpieces of unaffected, vivid, and sympathetic narration.

During these earlier years, besides the circumstances already mentioned, Madame de Sévigné conceived, like most of the better and more thoughtful among Frenchmen and Frenchwomen, a great affection for the establishment of Port Royal, which was not without its effect on her literary work. That work, however (if writing than which certainly none was ever less carried out in a spirit of mere workmanship can be so called), dates in its bulk and really important part almost entirely from the last thirty years of her life. Her letters before the marriage of her daughter, though by themselves they would suffice to give her a very high rank among letter-writers, would not do more than fill one moderate-sized volume. Those after that marriage fill nearly ten large volumes in the latest and best edition. We do not hear very much of Mademoiselle de Sévigné's early youth. For a short time, at a rather uncertain date, she was placed at school with the nuns of St Marie at Nantes. But for the most part her mother brought her up herself, assisted by the Abbé de la Mousse, a faithful friend, and for a time one of her most constant companions. La Mousse was a great Cartesian, and he made Mademoiselle de Sévigné also a devotee of the bold soldier of Touraine to a degree which even in that century of blue stockings excited surprise and some ridicule. But Mademoiselle de Sévigné was bent on more mundane triumphs than philosophy had to offer. Her beauty is all the more incontestable that she was by no means generally liked. Bussy, a critical and not too benevolent judge, called her "la plus jolie fille de France," and it seems to be agreed that she resembled her mother, with the advantage of more regular features. She was introduced at court early, and as she danced well she figured frequently in the ballets which were the chief amusement of the court of Louis XIV. in its early days. If, however, she was more regularly beautiful than her mother she had little or nothing of her attraction, and like many other beauties who have entered society with similar expectations she did not immediately find a husband. Various projected alliances fell through for one reason or another, and it was not till the end of 1668 that her destiny was settled. On January 29 in the next year she married François Adhémar, Comte de Grignan, a Provençal, of one of the noblest families of France, and a man of amiable and honourable character, but neither young nor handsome, nor in reality rich. He had been twice married and his great estates were heavily encumbered. Neither did the large dowry (300,000 livres) which Madame de Sévigné, somewhat unfairly to her son, bestowed upon her daughter, suffice to clear encumbrances, which were constantly increased in the sequel by the extravagance of Madame de Grignan as well as of her husband.

Charles de Sévigné was by this time twenty years old, but he had no doubt already learnt that he was not the person of chief importance in the family. He never, throughout his life, appears to have resented his mother's preference of his sister; but, though thoroughly amiable, he was not (at any rate in his youth) a model character. Nothing is known of his education, but just before his sister's marriage he volunteered for a rather hairbrained

expedition to Crete against the Turks, and served with credit. Then his mother bought him the commission of *guidon* (a kind of sub-cornet) in the Gendarmes Dauphin, in which regiment he served for some years, and after long complaining of the slowness of promotion rather rapidly rose to the rank of captain, when he sold out. But though he always fought well he was not an enthusiastic soldier, and was constantly and not often fortunately in love. He followed his father into the nets of Ninon de l'Enclos, and was Racine's rival with Mademoiselle Champmeslé. The way in which his mother was made confidante of these discreditable and not very successful loves is characteristic both of the time and of the country. In 1669 M. de Grignan, who had previously been lieutenant-governor of Languedoc, was transferred to Provence. The governor-in-chief was the young duke of Vendôme. But at this time he was a boy, and he never really took up the government, so that Grignan for more than forty years was in effect viceroy of this important province. His wife rejoiced greatly in the part of vice-queen; but their peculiar situation threw on them the expenses without the emoluments of the office, and those expenses were increased by the extravagance of both, so that the Grignan money affairs hold a larger place in Madame de Sévigné's letters than might perhaps be wished.

In 1671 Madame de Sévigné with her son paid a visit to Les Rochers, which is memorable in her history and in literature. The states of Brittany were convoked that year at Vitré. This town being in the immediate neighbourhood of Les Rochers, Madame de Sévigné's usually quiet life at her country house was diversified by the necessity of entertaining the governor, the Duc de Chaulnes, of appearing at his receptions, and so forth. All these matters are duly consigned to record in her letters, together with much good-natured raillery (it must be admitted that it is sometimes almost on the verge of being ill-natured, though never quite over it) on the country ladies of the neighbourhood and their ways. She remained at Les Rochers during the whole summer and autumn of 1671, and did not return to Paris till late in November. The country news is then succeeded by news of the court. At the end of the next year, 1672, one great wish of her heart was gratified by paying a visit to her daughter in her vice-royalty of Provence. Madame de Grignan does not seem to have been very anxious for this visit,—perhaps because, as the letters show in many cases, the exacting affection of her mother was somewhat too strong for her own colder nature, perhaps because she feared such a witness of the ruinous extravagance which characterized the Grignan household. But her mother remained with her for nearly a year, and did not return to Paris till the end of 1673. During this time we have (as is usually the case during these Provençal visits and the visits of Madame de Grignan to Paris) some letters addressed to Madame de Sévigné, but comparatively few from her. A visit of the second class was the chief event of 1674, and the references to this, such as they are, is the chief evidence that mother and daughter were on the whole better apart. 1675 brought with it the death of Turenne (of which Madame de Sévigné has given a very noteworthy account, characteristic of her more ambitious but not perhaps her more successful manner), and also serious disturbances in Brittany. Notwithstanding these it was necessary for Madame de Sévigné to make her periodical visit to Les Rochers. She reached the house in safety, and the friendship of Chaulnes protected her both from violence and from the exactions which the miserable province underwent as a punishment for its resistance to excessive and unconstitutional taxation. No small part of her letters is occupied by these affairs.

The year 1676 saw several things important in Madame de Sévigné's life. For the first time she was seriously ill,—it would appear with rheumatic fever,—and she did not thoroughly recover till she had visited Vichy. Her letters from this place are among her very best, and picture life at a 17th-century watering-place with unsurpassed vividness. In this year, too, took place the trial and execution of Madame de Brinville. This event figures in the letters, and the references to it are among those which have given occasion to unfavourable comments on Madame de Sévigné's character—comments which, with others of the kind, will be more conveniently treated together. In the next year, 1677, she moved into the Hôtel Carnavalet, a house which still remains and is inseparably connected with her memory, and she had the pleasure of welcoming the whole Grignan family to it. They remained there a long time; indeed nearly two years seem to have been spent by Madame de Grignan partly in Paris and partly at Livry. The return to Provence took place in October 1678, and next year Madame de Sévigné had the grief of losing La Rochefoucauld, the most eminent and one of the most intimate of her close personal friends and constant associates. In 1680 she again visited Brittany, but the close of that year saw her back in Paris to receive another and even longer visit from her daughter, who remained in Paris for four years. Before the end of the last year of this stay (in February 1684) Charles de Sévigné, after all his wandering loves, and after more than one talked-of alliance, was married to a young Breton lady, Jeanne Marguerite de Maunon, who had a considerable fortune. In the arrangements for this marriage Madame de Sévigné practically divided all her fortune between her children (Madame de Grignan of course receiving an unduly large share), and reserved only part of the life interest. The greed of Madame de Grignan nearly broke her brother's marriage, but it was finally concluded and proved a very happy one in a somewhat singular fashion. Both Sévigné and his wife became deeply religious, and at first Madame de Sévigné found their household (for she gave up Les Rochers to them) not at all lively. But by degrees she grew fond of her daughter-in-law. During this year she spent a considerable time in Brittany, first on business, afterwards on a visit to her son, and partly it would appear for motives of economy. But Madame de Grignan still continued with only short absences to inhabit Paris, and the mother and daughter were practically in each other's company until 1688. The proportion of letters therefore that we have for the decade 1677–1687 is much smaller than that which represents the decade preceding it; indeed the earlier period contains the great bulk of the whole correspondence. In 1687 the Abbé de Coulanges, Madame de Sévigné's uncle and good angel, died, and in the following year the whole family were greatly excited by the first campaign of the young Marquis de Grignan, Madame de Grignan's only son, who was sent splendidly equipped to the siege of Philippsbourg. In the same year Madame de Sévigné was present at the St Cyr performance of *Esther*, and some of her most amusing descriptions of court ceremonies and experiences date from this time. 1689 and 1690 were almost entirely spent by her at Les Rochers with her son; and on leaving him she went across France to Provence. There was some excitement during her Breton stay, owing to the rumour of an English descent, on which occasion the Breton militia was called out, and Charles de Sévigné appeared for the last time as a soldier; but it came to nothing. 1691 was passed at Grignan and other places in the south, but at the end of it Madame de Sévigné returned to Paris, bringing the Grignans with her; and her daughter stayed with her till 1694. The



year 1693 saw the loss of two of her oldest friends,—Bussy Rabutin, her faithless and troublesome but in his own way affectionate cousin, and Madame de la Fayette, her lifelong companion, and on the whole perhaps her best and wisest friend. Another friend almost as intimate, Madame de Lavardin, followed in 1694. Madame de Sévigné spent but a few months of this latter year alone, and followed her daughter to Provence. She never revisited Brittany after 1691. Two important marriages with their preparations occupied most of her thoughts during 1694–1695. The young Marquis de Grignan married the daughter of Saint-Amant, an immensely rich financier; but his mother's pride, ill-nature, and bad taste (she is said to have remarked in full court that it was necessary now and then to "manure the best lands," referring to Saint-Amant's wealth, low birth, and the Grignan's nobility) made the marriage not a very happy one. His sister Pauline, who, in the impossibility of dowering her richly, had a narrow escape of the cloister, made a marriage of affection with M. de Simiane, and eventually became the sole representative and continuator of the families of Grignan and Sévigné.

Madame de Sévigné survived these alliances but a very short time. During an illness of her daughter she herself was attacked by smallpox in April, 1696, and she died on the 17th of that month at Grignan, and was buried there. Her idolized daughter was not present during any time of her illness; it has been charitably hoped that she was too ill herself. Her known attention to her own good looks, and the terror of the smallpox which then prevailed, supply perhaps a less charitable but sufficient explanation. But in her will Madame de Sévigné still showed her preference for this not too grateful child, and Charles de Sévigné accepted his mother's wishes in a letter showing the good-nature which he had never lacked, and the good sense which, after his early follies, and even in a way during them, he had also shown. But the two families were, except as has been said for Madame de Simiane and her posterity, to be rapidly broken up. Charles de Sévigné and his wife had no children, and he himself, after occupying some public posts (he was king's lieutenant in Brittany in 1697), went with his wife into religious retirement at Paris in 1703, and after a time sequestered himself still more in the seminary of Sainte-Magloire, where he died on March 26, 1713. His widow survived him twenty years. Madame de Grignan had died on August 16, 1705, at a country house near Marseilles, of the very disease which she had tried to escape by not visiting her dying mother. Her son, who had fought at Blenheim, had died of the same malady at Thionville the year before. Marie Blanche, her eldest daughter, was in a convent, and, as all the Comte de Grignan's brothers had either entered the church or died unmarried, the family, already bankrupt in fortune, was extinguished in the male line by Grignan's own death in 1714, at a very great age. Madame de Simiane, whose connexion with the history of the letters is important, died in 1737.

The chief subjects of public interest and the principal family events of importance which are noticed in the letters of Madame de Sévigné have been indicated already. But, as will readily be understood, neither the whole nor even the chief interest of her correspondence is confined to such things. In the latest edition the letters extend to sixteen or seventeen hundred, of which, however, a considerable number (perhaps a third) are replies of other persons or letters addressed to her, or letters of her family and friends having more or less connexion with the subject of her correspondence. As a rule her own letters, especially those to her daughter, are of great length. Writing as she did in a time when newspapers were not, or at least were scanty and jejune, gossip of all sorts appears among her subjects, and some of her most famous letters are pure *reportage* (to use a modern French slang term), while others deal with strictly private subjects. Thus one of her best known pieces has for subject the famous suicide of the great

cook Vatel owing to a misunderstanding as to the provision of fish for an entertainment given to the king by Condé at Chantilly. Another (one of the most characteristic of all) deals with the projected marriage of Lauzun and Mademoiselle de Montpensier; another with the refusal of one of her own footmen to turn hay-maker when it was important to get the crop in at Les Rochers; another with the fire which burnt out her neighbour's house in Paris. At one moment she tells how a forward lady of honour was disconcerted in offering certain services at Mademoiselle's levée; at another how ill a courtier's clothes became him. She enters, as has been said, at great length into the pecuniary difficulties of her daughter; she tells the most extraordinary stories of the fashion in which Charles de Sévigné sowed his wild oats; she takes an almost ferocious interest and side in her daughter's quarrels with rival beauties or great officials in Provence who throw difficulties in the way of government.

Almost all writers of literary letters since Madame de Sévigné's days, or rather since the publication of her correspondence, have imitated her more or less directly, more or less consciously, and it is therefore only by applying that historic estimate upon which all true criticism rests that her full value can be discerned. The charm of her work is, however, so irresistible that, read even without any historical knowledge and in the comparatively adulterated editions in which it is generally met with, that charm can hardly be missed. Madame de Sévigné was a member of the strong and original group of writers—Retz, La Rochefoucauld, Cornielle, Pascal, St Evremont, Descartes, and the rest—who escaped the final and weakening reforms of the later 17th century, while for the most part they had profited by those earlier reforms which succeeded the classicizing of the Pléiade and the imitation of Spanish and Italian which marred some early work of Louis XIII.'s time. According to the strictest standard of the Academy her phraseology is sometimes incorrect, and it occasionally shows traces of the quaint and affected style of the *Précieuses*; but these things only add to its savour and piquancy. In lively narration few writers have excelled her, and in the natural expression of domestic affection and maternal affection none. She had an all-observant eye for trifles and the keenest possible appreciation of the ludicrous, together with a hearty relish for all sorts of amusements, pageants, and diversions, and a deep though not yulible or over-sensitive sense of the beauties of nature. But with all this she had an understanding as solid as her temper was gay. Unlike her daughter she was not a professed blue-stocking or philoposphy. But she had a strong affection for theology, in which she inclined (like the great majority of the religious and intelligent laity of her time in France) to the Jansenist side. Her favourite author in this class was Nicole. She has been reproached with her fondness for the romances of Mlle. de Scudéry and the rest of her school. But probably many persons who make that reproach have themselves never read the works they despise, and are ignorant how much merit there is in books whose chief faults are that they are written in a strongly marked and now obsolete fashion, and that their length (which, however, scarcely if at all exceeds that of *Clarissa*) is preposterous. In purely literary criticism Madame de Sévigné, few as were the aids she gave herself, was no mean expert. Her preference for Corneille over Racine has much more in it than the fact that the elder poet had been her favourite before the younger began to write; and her remarks on La Fontaine and some other authors are both judicious and independent. Nor is she wanting in original reflexions of no ordinary merit. All these things, added to her abundance of amusing matter and the charm of her bright and ceaselessly-flowing style, fully account for the unchanged and undiminished delight which half a dozen generations have taken in her work. But it cannot be repeated too often that to enjoy that work in its most enjoyable point—the combination of fluent and easy style with quaint archaisms and tricks of phrase—it must be read as she wrote it, and not in the trimmed and corrected version of Perrin and Madame de Simiane.

There can, moreover, be no one, however wedded he may be to the plan of criticizing literature as literature, who will not admit that great part of the interest and value of these remarkable works lies in the picture of character which they present. Indeed, great part of their purely literary merit lies in the extraordinary vividness of this very presentation. Madame de Sévigné's character, however, has not united quite such a unanimity of suffrage as her ability in writing. In her own time there were not wanting enemies (indeed her unsparing partisanship on her daughter's side could not fail to provoke such) who maintained that her letters were written for effect, and that her affection for her daughter was ostentatious and unreal. But few modern critics have followed these detractors, and it may be said confidently that no competent judge of character, after patiently reading the letters, can for a moment admit their view. But this kind of enemy has been followed by another, who, not overshooting his mark so conspicuously, has been somewhat more successful in persuading spectators that he has hit it. Her excessive affection for Madame de Grignan (the almost importunate character of which seems to

be proved by her own confessions of unhappiness if met of quarrel when they were together); her unhesitating blindness to anything but her daughter's interest (manifested especially in the part she took in most unjustifiable attempts of Madame de Grignan to secure her stepdaughters' dowries and to force themselves into a convent); her culpable tolerance of her son's youthful follies on the one hand and the uneven balance which she held in money matters between him and his sister on the other; the apparent levity with which she speaks of the sufferings of Madame de Brinvilliers, of galley slaves, of the peasantry, &c.; and the freedom of language which she uses herself and tolerates from others,—have all been cast up against her. Here the before-mentioned historic estimate sufficiently disposes of some of the objections, a little common sense of others, and a very little charity of the rest. If too much love felt by a mother towards a daughter be a fault, then certainly Madame de Sévigné was one of the most offending souls that ever lived; but it will hardly, even with the injustice which like all excessive affection it brought in its train, be held damning. Indeed, the guilty lady was evidently quite aware of her weakness in this respect, and it is one of the most noteworthy things of her literary capacity that, excessive as the weakness is, it does not disgust or weary the reader. The singular confidences which Madame de Sévigné received from her son and transmitted to her daughter would even at the present day be less surprising in France than in England. They are only an instance, adjusted to the manners of the time, of the system of sacrificing everything to the maintenance of confidence between mother and son, to which the almost invariable, and to foreigners sometimes rather ludicrous, but certainly not unamiable, adoration of Frenchmen for their mothers is due. Here too, as well as in reference to the immediately kindred charge of crudity of language, and to that of want of sympathy with suffering, especially with the sufferings of the people, it is especially necessary to remember of what generation Madame de Sévigné was and what were her circumstances. That generation was the generation which Madame de Rambouillet endeavoured with some success to polish and humanize, but which had barely recovered the hardening influences of the religious and civil wars when it was plunged into the Fronde. It was the generation to which belong the almost incredible yet trustworthy *Historiettes* of Tallemant, and in which, when she herself had already reached middle life, Bussy Rabutin's *Histoire Amoureuse* exposed him indeed to powerful resentments but did not make him lose all caste as a gentleman and man of honour. It is absurd to expect at such a time and in private letters the delicacy proper to quite different times and circumstances. Moreover, as to the charge of inhumanity not only do these considerations apply but there is more to be pleaded than mere extenuating circumstances. It is not true that Madame de Sévigné shows no sympathy with the oppression of the Bretons; it is very far from true, though her incurable habit of humorous expression—of *Rabbinage*, as she says—makes her occasionally use light phrases about the matter. But it is in fact as unreasonable to expect modern political views from her (and it is from certain modern political standpoints that the charge is usually made) as it is to expect her to observe the canons of a 19th-century propriety. On the whole she may be as fairly and confidently acquitted of any moral fault, save the one peccadillo of loving her daughter too exclusively and blindly, as she may be acquitted of all literary faults whatsoever. Her letters are wholly, what her son-in-law said well of her after her death, *compagnons délicieux*; and, far from faultless as Madame de Grignan was, none of her faults is more felt by the reader than her long visits to her mother, during which the letters ceased.

The bibliographic history of Madame de Sévigné's letters is of considerable interest in itself, and is moreover typical of much other contemporary literary history. The 17th century was *par excellence* the century of privately circulated literature, and from Madame de Sévigné herself we know that her own letters were copied and handed about, sometimes under specified titles, as early as 1673. None of them, however, were published until her correspondence with Bussy Rabutin appeared, in his *Memoirs and Correspondence*, partly in the year of her death, partly next year. The remainder were not printed in any form for thirty years. Then between 1725 and 1728 appeared no fewer additions from the authorized editions, containing more or fewer additions from the copies which had been circulated privately. The bibliography of these is complicated and curious, and must be sought in special works (see especially the *Grands Ecrivains* edition, vol. xi.). They have, however, abiding interest chiefly because they stirred up Madame de Simiane, the writer's only living representative, to give an authorized version. This appeared under the care of the Chevalier de Perrin in 6 vols. (Paris, 1734–37). It contained only the letters to Madame de Grignan, and these were subjected to editing rather careful than conscientious, the results of which were never thoroughly removed until quite recently. In the first place, Madame de Simiane, who possessed her mother's replies, is said to have burnt the whole of these from religious motives; this phrase is explained by Madame de Grignan's Cartesianism, which is

supposed to have led her to expressions alarming to orthodoxy. In the second, scruples partly having to do with the susceptibilities of living persons, partly concerning Jansenist and other prejudices, made her insist on numerous omissions. Thirdly, and most unfortunately, the change of taste seems to have required still more numerous alterations of style and language, such as the substitution of "Ma Fille" for Madame de Sévigné's usual and charming "Ma Bonne," and many others. Perrin followed this edition up in 1751 with a volume of supplementary letters not addressed to Madame de Grignan, and in 1754 published his last edition of the whole, which was long the standard (8 vols., Paris). During the last half of the 18th century numerous editions of the whole or parts appeared with important additions, such as that of 1766, giving for the first time the letters to Pomponne on the Fouquet trial; that of 1773, giving letters to Moulceau; that of 1775, giving for the first time the Bussy letters separate from his memoirs, &c. An important collected edition of all these fragments, by the Abbé de Vauxcelles, appeared in 1801 (Paris, An IX.) in 10 vols.; five years later Gouvelle (Paris, 1806, 8 vols.) introduced the improvement of chronological order; this was reprinted in 12 vols. (Paris, 1819) with some more unpublished letters which had separately appeared meanwhile. In the same year appeared the first edition of M. de Monmerqué. From that date continual additions of unpublished letters were made, in great part by the same editor, and at last the whole was remodelled on manuscript copies (the originals unfortunately are available for but few) in the edition called *Des Grands Ecrivains*, which M. de Monmerqué began, but which owing to his death had to be finished by MM. Regnier, Paul Mesnard, and Sommer (Paris, 1862–1868). This, which entirely supersedes all others (even a handsome edition published during its appearance by M. Silvestre de Sacy), consists of twelve volumes of text, notes, &c., two volumes of lexicon, and an album of plates. It contains all the published letters to and from Madame de Sévigné, with the replies where they exist, with all those letters to and from Madame de Simiane (many of which had been added to the main body) that contain any interest. The sole fault to be found with this excellent edition is the omission to add to each volume a table of contents giving each letter as it comes with a brief abstract of its contents. To it, however, must be added two volumes (printed uniformly) of *Lettres Inédites*, published by M. Ch. Capmas in 1876 and containing numerous variants and additions from a MS. copy discovered in an old curiosity shop at Dijon. Of less elaborate and costly editions that in the collection Didot (6 vols., Paris, v.d.) is by far the best, though, in common with all others except the *Grands Ecrivains* edition, it contains an adulterated text.

Works on Madame de Sévigné are innumerable. The biography by Paul Mesnard is nearly exhaustive, but the most elaborate biographical book is that of Walckenaer (3d ed., Paris, 1896, 5 vols.), to which should be added the remarkable *Histoire de Mme. de Sévigné* of Aubenas (Paris and St. Petersburg, 1842). In English an excellent little book by Miss Thackeray (Mrs Ritchie), Edinburgh and London, 1881, may be recommended. Most of the editions have portraits more or fewer. (G. SA.)

SEVILLE, a Spanish province—one of the eight into which Andalusia is divided—and formerly one of the four Moorish kingdoms, is bounded on the S. by Malaga and Cadiz, on the W. by Huelva, on the N. by Badajoz, and on the E. by Cordova. The superficial area is 5429 square miles, and in 1877 the population numbered 505,291. Northwards the province is broken up by low spurs of the Sierra Morena, the summits of which in the extreme north rise to a considerable height; but in the southern and larger half the ground is flat and fertile, and the only mountainous part is the frontier line formed by the Sierra de Ronda. The Guadalquivir traverses the province from north-east to south-west and receives in its course the waters of several streams, the chief being the Genil and the Guadaira on the left, and the Guadalimar to the right. The province is one of the most productive and flourishing in Spain, and grows all kinds of grain and vegetables. Oil and wine, oranges and olives, are among its chief exports, while tobacco, leather, paper, spirits, chocolate, textile fabrics of silk and wool, soap, glass, and earthenware are amongst its manufactures. Sheep and oxen, horses and asses, are reared on its pastures; and in the mountainous districts there are copper, silver, lead, iron, coal, and salt mines, and quarries of chalk and marble. Commerce has made great strides of late years owing to the opening up of the country by railways, and foreign capital has developed the natural resources of the district. The province is divided for administrative purposes into fourteen *partidos judiciales* and ninety-eight *ayuntamientos*,



and is represented in the cortes by four senators and twelve deputies. The following towns have a population of more than 10,000 within the municipal boundaries:—Seville (see below), Carmona (17,426), Constantina (10,988), Écija (24,955), Lebrija (12,864), Marchena (13,768), Moron de la Frontera (14,879), Osuna (17,211), and Utrera (15,093).

SEVILLE (Span. *Sevilla*, Latin *Ispalis*, Arabic *Ishbīliya*), capital of the above province and the seat of an archbishopric, with a population of 133,938 in 1877, is situated in 37° 22' N. lat. and 5° 58' W. long., 62 miles

(95 by rail) north-north-east of Cadiz and 355 miles south-south-west of Madrid, on the left bank of the Guadalquivir, which here flows through a level country as productive as a garden. The river is navigable up to the city, which is highly picturesque in its combination of ancient buildings with busy commerce. From the earliest times the port has been a chief outlet for the wealth of Spain. Under the Romans the city was made the capital of Bætica, and became a favourite resort for wealthy Romans. The emperors Hadrian, Trajan, and Theodosius were born in the neighbourhood at Italica (now Santiponce) where are the remains of a considerable amphitheatre. The chief existing monument of the Romans in Seville itself is the aqueduct, on four hundred and ten arches, by which the water from Alcalá de Guadaíra continued until recently to be supplied to the town. At the beginning of the 5th century the Silingi Vandals made Seville the seat of their empire, until it passed in 531 under the Goths, who chose Toledo for their capital. After the defeat of Don Roderick at Guadalete in 712 the Arabs took possession of the city after a siege of some months. Under the Arabs Seville continued to flourish. Edrisi speaks in particular of its great export trade in the oil of Aljarafe. The district was in great part occupied by Syrian Arabs from Emesa, part of the troops that entered Spain with Balj in 741 at the time of the revolt of the Berbers. It was a scion of one of these Emesan families, Abū 'l-Kásim Mohammed, cadí of Seville, who on the fall of the Spanish caliphate headed the revolt of his townsmen against their Berber masters (1023) and became the founder of the Abbádid dynasty, of which Seville was capital, and which lasted under his son Mo'tadid (1042–1069) and grandson Mo'tamid (1069–1091) till the city was taken by the

Almoravids. The later years of the Almoravid rule were very oppressive to the Moslems of Spain; in 1133 the people of Seville were prepared to welcome the victorious arms of Alphonso VII., and eleven years later Andalusia broke out in general rebellion. Almohade troops now passed over into Spain and took Seville in 1147. Under the Almohades Seville was the seat of government and enjoyed great prosperity; the great mosque was commenced by Yúsuf I. and completed by his son the famous Almanzor. In the decline of the dynasty between 1228



Plan of Seville.

and 1248 Seville underwent various revolutions, and ultimately acknowledged the Hafsite prince, who, however, was unable to save the city from Ferdinand III., who restored it to Christendom in 1248. The aspect of the town even now is essentially Moorish, with its narrow tortuous streets and fine inner court-yards to the houses. Many of these date from before the Christian conquest, and the walls and towers which until recently encircled the city for a length of 5 miles have a similar origin. The victory of

Ferdinand brought temporary ruin on the city, for it is said that 400,000 of the inhabitants went into voluntary exile, and some time elapsed before Seville recovered from the loss. But its position was too favourable for trade for it to fall into permanent decay, and by the 15th century it was again in a position to derive full benefit from the discovery of America. After the reign of Philip II. its prosperity gradually waned with that of the rest of the Peninsula; yet even in 1700 its silk factories gave employment to thousands of work-people; their numbers, however, by the end of the 18th century had fallen to four hundred. In 1800 an outbreak of yellow fever carried off 30,000 of the inhabitants, and in 1810 the city suffered severely from the French under Soult, who plundered to the extent of six millions sterling. Since that time it has gradually recovered prosperity, and is now one of the most busy and active centres of trade in the peninsula. Politically Seville has always had the reputation of peculiar loyalty to the throne from the time when, on the death of Ferdinand III., it was the only city which remained faithful to his son Alphonso the Wise. It was consequently much favoured by the monarchs, and frequently a seat of the court. In 1729 the treaty between England, France, and Spain was signed in the city; in 1808 the central junta was formed here and removed in 1810 to Cadiz; in 1823 the cortes brought the king with them from Madrid; and in 1848 Seville combined with Malaga and Granada against Espartero, who bombarded the city but fled on the return of Queen Maria Christina to Madrid.

Seville contains treasures of art and architecture which make it one of the most interesting cities in Europe. The cathedral, dedicated to Santa Maria de la Sede, ranks in size only after St Peter's at Rome, being 415 feet long, 298 feet wide, and 150 feet high to the roof of the nave. The west front is approached by a high flight of steps, and the platform on which the cathedral stands is surrounded by a hundred shafts of columns from the mosque which formerly occupied the site. The work of building began in 1403 and was finished in 1519, so that the one style of Spanish Pointed Gothic is fairly preserved throughout the interior, however much the exterior is spoiled by later additions. Unfortunately the west front remained unfinished until 1827, when the central doorway was completed in a very inferior manner; but this has now been renewed in a purer style. At the east end are two fine Gothic doorways with good sculpture in the tympana; and on the north side the Puerta del Perdón, as it is called, has some very exquisite detail over the horse-shoe arch, and a pair of fine bronze doors. The exterior of the cathedral may be disappointing, but the interior leaves little to be desired. It forms a parallelogram containing a nave and four aisles with surrounding chapels, a central dome 171 feet high inside, and at the east end a royal sepulchral chapel, which was an addition of the 16th century. The thirty-two immense clustered columns, the ninety-three windows, mostly filled with the finest glass by Flemish artists of the 16th century, and the profusion of art work of various kinds displayed on all sides produce an unsurpassed effect of magnificence and grandeur. The reredos is an enormous Gothic work containing forty-four panels of gilt and coloured wood carvings by Dancart, dating from 1482, and a silver statue of the Virgin by Francisco Alfaro of 1596. The archbishop's throne and the choir-stalls (1475–1548) are fine pieces of carving, and amongst the notable metal-work are the railings (1519) by Sancho Nuñez, and the lectern by Bartolomé Morel of the same period. The bronze candelabrum for tenebrae, 25 feet in height, is a splendid work by Morel. In the Sacristia Alta is a silver repoussé reliquary presented by Alphonso the Wise in the 13th century; and in the Sacristia Mayor, which is a good plateresque addition by Diego de Riaño in 1530, is a magnificent collection of church plate and vestments. At the west end of the nave is the grave of Ferdinand, the son of Columbus, and at the east end, in the royal chapel, lies the body of St Ferdinand, which is exposed three times in the year. This chapel also contains a curious life-size image of the Virgin, which was presented to the royal saint by St Louis of France in the 13th century. It is in carved wood with movable arms, seated on a silver throne and with hair of spun gold. The chief pictures in the cathedral are the Guardian Angel and the St Anthony of Murillo, the Holy Family of Tobar, the Nativity and La Generación of Luis de Vargas, Valdés Leal's Marriage of the Virgin, and Guadalupe's Descent from the Cross. In the Sacristia Alta are

three fine paintings by Alexo Fernandez, and in the Sala Capitular are a Conception by Murillo and a St Ferdinand by Pacheco. The organ is one of the largest in the world; it contains over 5300 pipes. A curious and unique ritual is observed by the choir boys on the festivals of Corpus Christi and the Immaculate Conception,—a solemn dance with castanets being performed by them before the altar; the custom is an old one but its origin is obscure. The Sagrario on the north of the cathedral is a Renaissance addition by Miguel de Zumarraga, which serves as the parish church. At the north-east corner of the cathedral stands the Giralda, a bell tower of Moorish origin, 275 feet in height. The lower part of the tower, or about 185 feet, was built in the latter half of the 12th century by Abu Yusuf Yakub; the upper part and the belfry, which is surmounted by a vane formed of a bronze figure 14 feet high representing The Faith, were added by Fernando Ruiz in 1568. The ascent is made by a series of inclined planes. The exterior is encrusted with delicate Moorish detail, and the tower is altogether the finest specimen of its kind in Europe. At the base lies the Court of Oranges, of which only two sides now remain; the original Moorish fountain, however, is still preserved. But the chief relic of the Arab dominion in Seville is the Alcazar, a palace excelled in interest and beauty only by the Alhambra of Granada. It was begun in 1181 by Jalubi during the best period of the Almohades, and was surrounded by walls and towers of which the Torre del Oro, a decagonal tower on the river side, is now the principal survival. Pedro the Cruel made considerable alterations and additions in the 14th century, and worse havoc was afterwards wrought by Charles V. Restorations have been effected as far as possible, and the palace is now an extremely beautiful example of Moorish work. The façade, the hall of ambassadors, and the Patio de las Muñecas are the most striking portions, after which may be ranked the Patio de las Doncellas and the chapel of Isabella. Among other Moorish remains in Seville may be mentioned the Casa O'Shea, which is somewhat spoiled by whitewash, and the Casa de las Dueñas, with eleven court-yards and nine fountains. The Casa de Pilatos is in a pseudo-Moorish style of the 15th century, and, in addition to its elegant court-yard surrounded by a marble colonnade, contains some fine decorative work. The Casa de los Abades is in the Sevillian plateresque style, which is strongly tinged with Moorish feeling. The following are the most notable churches in Seville:—Santa Maria la Blanca, an old Jewish synagogue; San Marcos, badly restored, but with a remarkable mudéjar portal; Omnium Sanctorum, erected upon the ruins of a Roman temple; San Juan de la Palma; San Julian; Santa Catalina; San Miguel; San Clemente el Real; the church of La Sangre Hospital; the Gothic Parroquia of Santa Ana, in the Triana suburb; and La Caridad. The last-named belongs to a well-conducted almshouse founded by the Sevillian Don Juan, Miguel de Manara. It possesses six masterpieces by Murillo, and two by Valdés Leal. The other churches, though generally deficient in architectural interest, are enriched by the products of the brush or chisel of Pacheco, Montañes, Alonso Cano, Valdés Leal, Roelas, Campaña, Morales, Vargas, and Zurbaran. The museum was formerly the church and convent of La Merced. It now contains priceless examples of the Seville school of painting, which flourished during the 16th and 17th centuries. Among the masters represented are Velazquez and Murillo (both natives of Seville), Zurbaran, Roelas, Herrera the Elder, Pacheco, Juan de Castillo, Alonso Cano, Cespedes, Bocanegra, Valdés Leal, Goya, and Martin de Vos. The university was founded in 1502, and its present buildings were originally a convent built in 1567 from designs by Herrera, but devoted to its present use in 1767 on the expulsion of the Jesuits. The Casa del Ayuntamiento, in the cinquecento style, was begun in 1545, and has a fine staircase and hall and handsome carved doors. The Lonja, or exchange, was built by Herrera in 1535 in his severe Doric and Ionic style; the brown and red marble staircase which leads to the Archivo de Indias is the best part of the design. The archives contain 30,000 volumes relating to the voyages of Spanish discoverers, many of which are still unexamined. The archbishop's palace dates from 1697; the most notable features are the Churrigueresque doorway and staircase. The royal cigar factory is an immense building 662 feet long by 524 feet wide, and contains twenty-eight court-yards. Employment is given in it to 4500 hands, who work up 2,000,000 pounds of tobacco yearly. The palace of San Telmo, now occupied by the duke of Montpensier, was formerly the seat of a naval college originally founded by the son of Columbus. The immense doorway is the principal architectural feature. The picture gallery is interesting and important. The chief squares in Seville are the Plaza Nueva, the Plaza de la Constitución, the Plaza del Duque, and the Plaza del Triunfo. The bull-ring accommodates 18,000 spectators, and is the next in size to that at Madrid. There are several beautiful promenades, the principal being Las Delicias, along the river bank below the town. The city also contains several theatres. Across the river, and connected with the city by a bridge, is the Gipsy quarter of the Triana. The navigation of the river has been improved of late years so that vessels of large draught can now ascend the stream. The results are shown in a larger trade, and in



1883 the aggregate burthen of vessels cleared amounted to 358,541 tons (65,324 British). The imports were valued at £1,879,522, and the exports at £1,190,625. In the latter were included 3110 tons of olive oil shipped to the United Kingdom, and 1610 tons of quicksilver from the Almaden mines, which had formerly sent their produce *via* Lisbon. In addition to strictly local industries the chief factories of the city are the tobacco factory, the cannon foundry, and the small-arms factory. There are also a petroleum refinery, some soap works, iron foundries, artificial ice and marmalade factories, and several potteries. The ancient sources of water supply having proved insufficient, a new system of waterworks was designed, and was brought to a successful completion in 1883 by a firm of English engineers. (H. B. R.)

SEVRES, a town of France, in the department of Seine-et-Oise, on the left bank of the Seine, midway between Paris and Versailles, with a population of 6768 in 1881, owes its celebrity to the Government porcelain manufactory, which dates from 1756. In 1876 a new building was erected at the end of the park of St Cloud to replace the older structures, which were in a dangerous state, but have since been transformed into a normal school for girls. In the museum connected with the works are preserved specimens of the different kinds of ware manufactured in all ages and countries, and the whole series of models employed at Sévres from the commencement of the manufacture, for an account of which see vol. xix. pp. 637-38. A technical school of mosaic was established at Sévres in 1875.

SEVRES, DEUX, a department of western France, formed in 1790 mainly of the districts of Thouars, Gâtinais, and Niortais, which constituted about one-fourth of Poitou, and to a small extent of a portion of Basse-Saintonge and Angoumois, and a very small fragment of Aunis. It derives its name from the Sèvre of Niort, which flows across the south of the department from east to west, and the Sèvre of Nantes, which drains the north-west. Lying between 45° 58' and 47° 7' N. lat. and between 0° 56' W. and 0° 13' E. long., it is bounded (for the most part conventionally) N. by Maine-et-Loire, E. by Vienne, S.E. by Charente, S. by Lower Charente, and W. by La Vendée. Part belongs to the basin of the Loire, part to that of the Sèvres of Niort, and part to that of the Charente. There are three regions,—the Gâtine, the "Plain," and the "Marsh,"—distinguished by their geological character and their general physical appearance. The Gâtine, formed of primitive rocks (granite and schists), is the continuation of the "Bocage" of La Vendée and Maine-et-Loire. It is a poor district with an irregular surface, covered with hedges and clumps of wood or forests. The Plain, resting on Oolitic limestone or the "white rock" (*Pierre blanche*), is a fertile grain country. The Marsh, occupying only a small part of the department to the south-west, consists of alluvial clays which also are extremely productive when properly drained. The highest point in the department (892 feet above the sea) is to the east of Parthenay; the lowest lies only 10 feet above sea-level. The climate is mild, the annual temperature at Niort being 54° Fahr., and the rainfall a little more than 24 inches. The winters are colder in the Gâtine, the summers warmer in the Plain; and the Marsh is the moistest and mildest of the three districts.

With a total area of 1,482,655 acres, the department contains 1,043,752 acres of arable ground, 125,534 acres of meadows, 49,129 of vineyards, 106,222 of forests, 20,429 of heath. The live stock in 1880 comprised 36,150 horses, 12,800 mules, 2012 asses, 217,935 cattle, 18,405 sheep (wool clip 102 tons) 78,930 pigs, 50,321 goats, 18,845 beehives (65 tons of honey). The horses are a strong breed, and the department raises mules for Spain, the Alps, Auvergne, and Provence. In 1883 there were produced—wheat, 3,909,260 bushels; meslin, 466,909; rye, 673,920; and in 1880 barley produced 1,293,600 bushels; buckwheat, 133,650; maize and millet, 508,062; oats, 2,744,500; potatoes, 4,812,000; pulse, 192,500 bushels; beetroot, 123,429 tons; hemp, 945 tons; flax, 245 tons; colza seed, 75,000 bushels (640 tons of oil). The wine and cider

amounted in 1882 to 2,859,912 and 210,914 gallons respectively. Vegetables (artichokes, asparagus, cabbage, pease, onions) are largely cultivated. Oaks, chestnuts, and beeches are the most important trees. The apple-trees of the Gâtine and the walnut-trees of the Plain are also of considerable value. Coal (200 miners, and 21,487 tons in 1882) and peat are worked; iron-ore, argentiferous lead, and antimony exist but are not worked; and freestone, both hard and soft, is very extensively quarried. There are several sulphurous mineral waters in the department. The most important industry is the manufacture of cloth—serges, druggets, linen, handkerchiefs, flannels, swan-skins, and knitted goods. Wool and cotton-spinning, tanning, and currying, glove, brush, and hat making, distilling, brewing, flour-milling, and oil-refining are also carried on. In 740 establishments water-power is used to the extent of 3000 horse-power; and 301 stationary and 165 movable steam-engines represent respectively 1895 and 677 horse-power. The commerce of the department, which supplies mules, cattle, and provisions for Paris and the neighbouring great towns, is facilitated by 21 miles of waterway (the Sèvre and its left-hand tributary the Mignon), 289 miles of national roads, 3535 of other roads, and 232 miles of railway. In density of population (350,103 in 1881) the department is below the average of France. It contains 38,000 Protestants, especially in the south-east, there being only three French departments—Gard, Ardèche, and Drôme—which surpass it in this respect. The four arrondissements are Niort, Bressuire (3549 inhabitants in the town), Melle (2433), and Parthenay (4842); the cantons number 31, and the communes 356. It is part of the diocese of Poitiers, where also is the court of appeal; its military headquarters are at Tours. St Maixent (4790) has an infantry school.

SEWAGE. See SEWERAGE.

SEWARD, WILLIAM HENRY (1801-1872), American statesman, was born May 16, 1801, in the town of Florida, Orange county, N.Y. He was graduated at Union College in 1820, and began the practice of law three years after in the town of Auburn, which became his home for the rest of his life. Several of his cases brought him reputation as a lawyer, but he soon drifted into the more congenial field of politics. After he had served for four years in the State senate, the Whig party of New York nominated him for governor of the State in 1834. Though then defeated, he was nominated again in 1838 and elected, serving until 1842. He then returned to his law practice, retaining, however, the recognized leadership of the Whig party in the most important State of the Union. During the next seven years slavery became the burning question of American politics. The purely ethical and the philanthropic sides of the anti-slavery struggle are represented by GARRISON and GREELEY (*q.v.*). Seward was the first to develop that purely political side, with an economic basis, which probably best met the desires and prejudices of the great mass of those who took part, willing or unwilling, in the struggle. The keynote of his theory was struck in 1848 in a speech at Cleveland:—"The party of slavery upholds an aristocracy, founded on the humiliation of labour, as necessary to the existence of a chivalrous republic." The absurdity of the conception of a civilized nation which, in flat opposition to historical development, should tolerate for ever a systematic humiliation of labour was only his starting point. His theory culminated naturally in his famous Rochester speech of 1858, in which he enumerated the inevitable direct and indirect consequences of a free-labour and a slave-labour system respectively, showed the two to be absolutely irreconcilable and yet steadily increasing their interferences with one another, and drew this pregnant inference:—"there is here an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slave-holding nation or entirely a free-labour nation." But the germ of the "irrepressible conflict" of 1858 lay clearly in the utterances of 1848, and Seward was even then most widely known as its exponent. When, therefore, the New York Whigs, who in 1849 controlled the State legislature, which elects United States senators, sent Seward to the senate with hardly a show of opposition, their defiance of

the southern wing of their party was a premonition of the general break-up of parties three years afterwards. In the senate Seward had at first but two pronounced anti-slavery associates. As anti-slavery feeling increased, and the Republican party was organized in 1855-56, he went into it naturally, for it was to him only an anti-slavery Whig party, and his pre-eminent ability made him at once its recognized leader. In the Republican convention of 1860 he was the leading candidate for the nomination for president; and it was only by a sudden union of all the elements of opposition to him that the nomination was finally given to Abraham Lincoln, whose name was then hardly known outside of Illinois. It has been an almost invariable rule that American presidents have found their most irritating difficulties in dealing with the New York leaders of their respective parties; Lincoln when elected removed any such possibility by offering Seward the chief position in his cabinet, that of secretary of state. Here, for at least four years, Seward did the great work of his life. His errors, whether of constitutional law, international law, or policy, are more clearly seen now than they were then. In spite of them all the estimate of the value of his work must be very high, if we consider the chances in favour of foreign intervention at some time during a four years' war, and his unbroken success in inculcating on other Governments the propriety and wisdom of neutrality. Much of this success was due to circumstances which he did not create, to his ability to rely solidly on the cordial friendship of the "plain people" (to use Lincoln's common phrase) of Great Britain and France; and particularly to the change of policy induced by the emancipation proclamations of 1862-63; but much is still left to the credit of the secretary, whose zeal, acuteness, and efficiency brought the ship safely through the intricacies of international relations while the crew were putting out the fire in her hold. In the process of reconstruction which immediately followed the war Seward sided heartily with President Johnson and shared his defeat. The Whig element had been burned out of the Republican party by the war; a new party had grown up, not limited by *ante bellum* notions, and it rapidly came to look upon Seward, its once trusted leader, not only as a traitor but as the main intellectual force which supported Johnson's clumsy attempts at treason. At the end of his second term as secretary of state in 1869 he retired to his home at Auburn, broken by loss of health, by loss of political standing, and by the death of his wife and daughter. He spent the next two years in foreign travel, and died at Auburn, October 10, 1872.

Of Seward's *Life and Works*, in 5 vols., edited by George E. Baker, the last volume deals with his career during his first term as secretary of state.

SEWERAGE is the process of systematically collecting and removing refuse from dwellings. The matter to be dealt with may conveniently be classified as made up of four parts:—(1) dust, ashes, kitchen waste, and solid matters generally, other than solid excreta; (2) excreta, consisting of urine and feces; (3) slop-water, or the discharge from sinks, basins, baths, &c., and the waste water of industrial processes; (4) surface water due to rainfall. Before the use of underground conduits became general, the third and fourth constituents were commonly allowed to sink into the neighbouring ground, or to find their way by surface channels to a watercourse or to the sea. The first and second constituents were conserved in middens or pits, either together or separately, and were carried away from time to time to be applied as manure to the land. In more modern times the pits in which excrement was collected took the form of covered tanks called cesspools, and with this modification the primitive system

of conservancy, with occasional removal by carts, is still to be found in many towns. Even where the plan of removing excrement by sewers has been adopted, the first kind of refuse named above is still treated by collecting it in pails or bins, whose contents are removed by carts either daily or at longer intervals. It therefore forms no part of the nearly liquid sewage which the other constituents unite to form.

The second constituent is from an agricultural point of view the most valuable, and from a hygienic point of view the most dangerous, element of sewage. Even healthy excreta decompose, if kept for a short time after they are produced, and give rise to noxious gases; but a more serious danger proceeds from the fact that in certain cases of sickness these products are charged with specific germs of disease. Speedy removal or destruction of excremental sewage is therefore imperative. It may be removed in an unmixt state, either in pails or tanks or (with the aid of pneumatic pressure) by pipes; or it may be defecated by mixture with dry earth or ashes; or, finally, it may be conveyed away in sewers by gravitation, after the addition of a relatively large volume of water. This last mode of disposal is termed the water-carriage system of sewerage.

It is the plan now usually adopted in towns which have a sufficient water supply, and it is probably the mode which best meets the needs of any large community. The sewers which carry the diluted excreta serve also to take slop-water, and may or may not be used to remove the surface water due to rainfall. The water-carriage system has the disadvantage that much of the agricultural value of sewage is lost by its dilution, while the volume of foul matter to be disposed of is greatly increased. But it has been found that, even when the excrement of a community is kept out of the sewers, and subjected to distinct treatment, the contents of the sewers are still so foul that their discharge into streams is scarcely less objectionable than when the water-carriage system is adopted; and, further, it appears difficult if not impossible to realize the agricultural value of excrement by any process of separate treatment that is not offensive or dangerous or inapplicable to towns.

When, in the water-carriage system, the same sewers carry foul sewage and surface-water due to rainfall, the sewerage is said to be "combined"; the "separate" system, on the other hand, is that in which a distinct set of sewers is provided to carry off rainfall. Each plan has its advantages. In the separate system the foul-water sewers need be large enough to take only the normal flow; they may thus be made self-cleansing much more readily than if their size were sufficient to carry the immensely greater volume to which (on the combined plan) sewage may be swollen during heavy rain. The amount of dangerously foul matter is also much reduced. On the other hand, the contents of the rain-water sewers are still too much tainted by the filth of the streets to render their discharge into rivers or lakes desirable; and the complication of two sets of mains and branches is a serious drawback. Where old sewers are giving place to new ones it is not unusual to retain the old sewers for the carriage of surface-water; but in new works a single system of sewers, provided with storm-overflows to relieve them of part of the rainfall during exceptionally heavy showers, would probably be preferred in nearly every case.<sup>1</sup> Since sewers should, in all cases, be water-tight, they do not form suitable collectors of subsoil water.

<sup>1</sup> An exception to this remark may be made in the case of London, where the enormous area to be drained, as well as the difficulty of disposing of the foul sewage on account of its large volume, has led the Commissioners on Metropolitan Sewage Discharge to advise (in their Report of 1884) that "in new drainage works the sewage should be, as far as possible, separated from the rainfall."

Water carriage system.

Combined and separate systems of water carriage.