

was, however, opulent, and by the time when he went forth as the chief apostle of human liberty and equality had by his thrift increased the number of his slaves from thirty to fifty. Cultivated and scholarly, he was able to frame the plan for a university, and, unlike the common demagogue, to offer up knowledge and intelligence, as well as conscience and self-respect, on the altar of the democratic idol. To Alexander Hamilton's Ormuzd, Jefferson played Ahriman. Democracy in its loosest and most unbridled form was his religion, at all events till he held power. 'Monocracy,' perhaps the secret ideal of his great rival, was the object of his fanatical hatred and ever-haunting suspicion. In theory he was an anarchist, and his utterances on this subject severely try the patience of a biographer who would fain be sympathetic. He was fond of saying that we could not find angels to govern, but he assumed that we could find angels to be governed or to govern themselves. If he had to choose between a government without a press and a press without a government, he said that he should at once choose the latter. In New York, under the reign of Tammany, with Barnard and Cardozo for judges, he might almost have enjoyed the realisation of his ideal. Of three states of society, that of the Indians without any government, that with a democratic government, and that with a government other than democratic, he was not sure that he did not prefer the first. Shays's rebellion, which on other extreme democrats acted as a warning, drew from him the remark that a rebellion now and then was a good thing, and that republican rulers ought not to discourage them too much. 'God forbid,' he ejaculates, 'that we should ever be twenty years without a rebellion! What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.' Again it must be said that George the Third and Lord North are not answerable before the tribunal of history for not having fulfilled such an ideal as an ultra-democratic government with a rebellion once in every twenty years. Whether Jefferson was a French revolutionist from the beginning, or was made one by his sojourn in France, is a question on which his biographers differ. He was certainly a Rousseauist from the beginning in his belief that agriculture was the only moral or healthy pursuit, and that the mechanical arts and commerce were corruptors of society. Rousseauism seems strange in a Virginian slaveowner, but Rousseau himself squinted towards slavery, and in the essentially Rousseauist tale, *Paul and Virginia*, the lovely children of nature are supported by the labour of two old slaves. What is certain is that Jefferson became a French revolutionist of the most genuine breed. It was after the September massacres, of all the Jacobin atrocities perhaps the most hideous, that he wrote that 'the struggle was necessary, though in it many guilty persons fell without the forms