

foundation. Our Lord has been inculcating upon his hearers the necessity and importance of prayer; he speaks of God's readiness and willingness to answer prayer, and this fact he puts forward as an argument why men should be guided by this golden rule in their dealings with their fellow-men. Note his words: "If parents being evil know how to give good gifts unto their children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good gifts unto them who ask him." "Therefore," he adds, "since this is so, since God is so willing to give you what you ask, see that whatsoever men shall do unto you ye do even so unto them." Such then is the connection, and such the force of the argument upon which the rule seems to be based.

But supposing our argumentative hearer should have demanded from our Lord a more explicit foundation or philosophy for the rule. The readiness of God to answer our prayer, he might say, enforces this rule and contains perhaps a motive which might lead us to do unto others what we would have others do unto us. But apart from this motive is there no solid foundation, no philosophy for the rule?

This foundation, my hearers, is not very far to seek—it is simply the equality, the natural equality of all mankind. I should do unto other men what I would that they should do unto me be-

cause they are, as far as human nature is concerned, my equals, and consequently deserve the same treatment from me as I have a right to expect from them. There is a sense, remember, in which all men are equal. Notwithstanding the different ranks and castes of society, the differences in character, the differences in education, the differences in capacities and all the other differences—notwithstanding these in one sense, and in a very deep sense, we are all equal—we all share the same common nature. The philosophy of our rule follows these at once. Let me express it thus: You are to yourself what I am to myself, and consequently you have a right to expect the same treatment from me as I would expect from you were our positions reversed. My property is as much mine as yours is yours and hence you have the same right not to steal mine as you have to expect me not to steal yours. The king should treat his message-boy in the same manner as he would expect his message-boy to treat him. Why? Simply because the message-boy is as important to himself as the king is to himself. You and yours is as much to you as I and mine to me, and hence the philosophy of the golden rule is as clear as the noon-day sun. You are to yourself what I am to myself, and you are to me what I am to you, and consequently we are under obligations to treat each other as we would be treated—in one