

Ciprian SIMUȚ  
Emanuel University of Oradea, Romania

# UNITY IN DIVERSITY, A LESSON FROM THE PAST

Theoretical  
Article

---

## Keywords

Unity  
Diversity  
Relationships  
Collaborations

---

## JEL Classification

Z12

---

## Abstract

*The problem of unity in diversity is a real issue that affects human relations. There are various ways in which people learn to live together in unity. The purpose of this paper is to present the principles developed by Jeremiah Burroughs (1600-1646) that should enable people to live and work together in spite of their obvious and irreducible differences. Burroughs is aware of the differences between people in all areas, from the religious ones, to the political and relational ones. However, he strongly believes that his 14 joining principles are part of a theoretical system that not only explains the importance of unity in diversity, but it also shows how to implement the principles, both for the good of an individual, as well as the good of a community. These principles are applicable to all areas of human interaction because it appeals to the essence of humanity.*

## Introduction

In an over simplistic and general way history deals with the past or with past events. We have our sources and their interpretations throughout the ages. Although we are used to the expression that appears in various forms, of which one is that if one does not learn from history, one is doomed to repeat it, history has a practical side to it. It offers precedents to countless problems and situations that today's culture is facing. Of course that there is a matter of context, but the principles behind the actions are close or even identical to the principles that lie behind contemporary issues. Throughout the ages various scholars and specialists from both humanistic and technical circles tried to understand, explain and offer solutions to the problems that confronted their contemporaries. Most appealed regularly to past events, found in writings, in order to prove their arguments and offer an informed solution to current problems. This issue of problem solving is as actual as ever. Humanity is constantly faced with real life threatening situations that demand quick answers. The easiest way to offer such answers is to find what others did elsewhere or throughout history.

This paper aims to present the 14 joining principles that Jeremiah Burroughs (1599-1646), a puritan scholar and preacher, described in his work *Irenicum, To the Lovers of Truth and Peace*, described in order to help the Christian parties of his time to work in unity, in spite of their theological diversity. In other words, Jeremiah Burroughs argues that unity in diversity is possible and desirable. The purpose of such unity is to create a peaceful and respectful environment in which each individual, Christian or non-Christian, could live in peace, in spite of obvious and acknowledged differences in opinions. Even if his book was written in the religious context of mid-seventeenth century denominational variety, as well as a result of the debates within the Westminster Assembly, the question is whether his 14 joining principles apply today to modern issues in various fields. This paper argues that these principles can help in today's problems. Furthermore, Burroughs' principles constitute themselves as useful tools to aid future problems and inter-human relationships. His writings may be almost 400 years old, but the underlying teachings in his principles are valid for any generation or historical era.

The principles that Burroughs presents in his book are not left to the whims of human nature. Instead he anchors them into the never changing character of God. These principles are lived out by the Christians in relation with those who have the same theological perspective, as well as Christians of other denominations, (Burroughs, 1653, p. 254) but also with non-Christians. Burroughs argues that these principles will have an effect only when

anchored in the Person of God, not in man's person. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 256)

The "joining principles" is the first of five sections that are organized in the last part of the book. The other sections are "joining considerations", "joining graces", "joining practices" and an "exhortation". This article focuses on the first part, the "joining principles". The theory behind these principles is that if they are lived out by the members of churches or the members of society, the development of healthy interhuman relations will be facilitated at a greater speed. The principles are basic truths that underlie the argumentation of Burroughs, and he believes that in order to achieve unity in diversity these principles must be applied.

Burroughs is not an ecumenist, nor is he a pacifist. First, he is not an ecumenist because he does not believe that unity is based on a single theological system. He does not argue that those who believe differently from him should renounce their faith and accept his. The opposite is true. He does believe that there are differences between people, both religious as well as social, but he argues that these differences do not represent a cause for division and hatred. In fact, people should acknowledge that these differences exist, and they should not be the reason for division. He does believe in dialog, as well as in a sustained effort to work together at fundamental issues that face society. Second, he is not a pacifist because he argues in favor of war, provided it leads to peace, or if a war is aimed not to conquer, but to secure peace. This does not mean that he agrees with any kind of war, because he does admit that no war is a good war, but as a worst case scenario, if war does happen it should only happen with the specific purpose of securing peace. Therefore, if Burroughs is not an ecumenist, nor a pacifist, what is he? He is an irenicist. He joins a select group of religious scholars who wrote books with the title *Irenicum*, and they all argued in favor of various ways of obtaining peace between people, but not at the cost of religious abandonment or religious theological unity. Instead peace and unity can be achieved by following a set of principles that lead, inevitably, to a better relationship between people with differing perspectives on various subjects.

### **The first principle: in the midst of all differences of judgment and weaknesses of the Saints it is not impossible, but that they may live in peace and love together**

Burroughs' first principle states that in every-day life people have differences, not only of opinion, but also negative differences, as weaknesses. People constantly try to impose their opinions on others. (Edward Stillingfleet, 1842, p. xiv) As mentioned before, Burroughs is referring in

his book to relations between Christians, and their connection to the world outside the church. However, this principle helps to better understand the fact that the Church is not a perfect society of people, but rather a society that strives to live up to certain principles. The biblical Christian message is that the believers must strive to become more like Jesus Christ, through faith in God that is materialized in good deeds towards fellow Christians, and non-Christians. Burroughs offers a recipe for healing human relations through an appeal to reason and the heart.(Burroughs, 1653, p. 254)

Humans are not perfect, and their relationship with God is faulty. Burroughs argues that if that is true, than our relationships are polluted too. However, one of the first warnings is that people must renounce a preconception that says that if people differ in judgment and practice, here in matters of religion, there must necessarily be hatred and division. Historically church division were not caused by pure theological differences, but by pride and lack genuine Christian love.(Burroughs, 1653, p. 255)However difficult it might seem, the Christian religion, in spite of the commands is an easy, simple thing. (Edward Stillingfleet, 1842, p. 95)

Burroughs does not say that Christians should denounce their religious and theological identity, but rather by knowing it better, to work with others in the true and deep matters of Christianity and society.(Edward Stillingfleet, 1842, p. 157) He does argue for an implication in the world, but not through hate and bigotries, but though a genuine understanding of what Christianity is meant to be and do.(Burroughs, 1653, p. 255)

During this argumentation, Burroughs refers to a Latin and Greek saying which he translates by “variety of opinions and unity of those who hold them, may stand together”. After this saying he reminds his readers that there have been countless attempts to unite differing opinions, and these failed. Humans simply cannot all think in the exact same way. The solution is clearly not war, or any kind of violence. At times war is inevitable. (Forbes & Selwyn, 1923, p. 98) However, Burroughs argues that it might have started from the wrong end. This means that as humans, if one way doesn’t work, maybe we should find another way. The greater good, in Burroughs’ perspective is not an annulment of human individual identity, but the creation of an environment in which all humanity can flourish, in spite of the obvious differences.in order to prove his point, Burroughs makes two references to historical events.(Burroughs, 1653, p. 255) The first is the attempt of Emperor Constantine the Great to reconcile Arius and Alexander and the second is attitude of the Protestants at the Marburg Colloquy,

at the end of which they admitted they had different theological perspectives regarding the real presence of Christ in the Supper, but that is no reason for canceling genuine brotherly love. In the ending of the first principle Burroughs quotes Ephesians 4:11-12, in order to show that one day – he does not say when, presumably in the after-life – the believers will become perfect, and there will be no need for preaching and any kind of ministry.(Burroughs, 1653, p. 255)

Burroughs’ first principle explains that fellow people must be aware of their differences of opinion, but also they must work for their unity in understanding and love. If this principle is applied, people will keep to their cultural, theological, religious and artistic identities, without imposing on one another a certain view that would cancel such helpful and colorful diversity.

**The second principle: that shall never be got by strife, that may be had by love and peace**

Humanity has been seeking wealth in various ways, either by legitimate gains, or by illegal means. We also tried to conquer or wage war against enemies for various reasons, but one major reason was the desire to gain wealth. Wars are bitter ways to assure the wealth of a society, while the defeated were either killed, left for dead or brought down into poverty. Burroughs looks at the use of strife and argues that those who strive and contend should only do so as a last resort and only when there is no other way. This is one of the arguments against Burroughs’ pacifism. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 256)

Burroughs does speak about a person’s inner desires, presumably they are not evil or sinful. In spite of this Burroughs almost commands people to try every possible way to gain their desire by peace, not by strife, even if it takes a hundred trials. Burroughs argues that this principle will benefit the churches, the communities, the towns and the families. This is the practical side of his argument. He sees beyond the limit of the church when he argues for his principles. Even if they seem to apply only to church life, they also have a practical aspect that can help society as a whole. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 257)

In the church, according to the text in 1 Corinthians, the faithful have various spiritual gifts. Some have more than others, some are more important than the others. The purpose of these spiritual gifts is the benefit of the other. This means that if a believer has a spiritual gift, the only righteous and correct way of living it out is to invest in one’s neighbor. If these gifts are used for personal gain, than it invalidates the command of Scripture. For all these there is judgment. Burroughs argues that if personal gain is pursued, there is no place for love, and this is the only

ingredient that can lead to unity. The way of love is the engaging of hearts. Rules can set a frame for human interactions which can lead to wealth or control, however the best way, according to Burroughs, is to achieve everything through love. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 257) This kind of love is not a superficial feeling, but an informed one. It grows out of conviction and a knowledge of values.

**The third principle: it is better to do good, than to receive good**

Burroughs starts this argument by setting the stage of who is doing good and who is receiving it. The true good can only be done by God, His angels and the saints, but all the other creatures can only receive their good. Being a puritan, Burroughs believed that all believers are saints. Such an idea would have to be an encouragement for any believer because doing good would be considered as an act of pure love. He also believes that if one does good, regardless whether that good is received or not, there will be a desire to do more good. However, good deeds for their own sake are worth nothing. The logic is similar to the previous principle, meaning that goodness has to come from conviction and a good conscience. The love of one's neighbor should generate genuine, lively desire to do good on every occasion. (Forbes & Selwyn, 1923, p. 106) God's love increases the more goodness He pours into His creation. According to Burroughs people should see God as a benefactor, not as an avenging judge, although He is also a judge. God's love towards His creation is not infatuated be genuinely concerned for the good of all. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 259) The fact that there is injustice in the world is not explained by Burroughs. However, in the light of puritan theology, all evil is the result of sin, not the action of a vengeful God.

Burroughs presents the practical side of this principle by appealing to imagination, but inspired from real life. He says that genuine love for one's neighbor is manifested in the same way as a man who saves a child from the dung hill or from alms house, and makes the child the heir. The love of the master is increasing towards the child also because the child is now raised by the master. He can pour his love into the life of the child, in the same way that humans should pour their love into one another. If humans only do good out of a desire for greatness, the value of their deeds is diminished, the impact will not be as secure and as fulfilling as when the goodness is done out of conviction. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 259)

**The fourth principle: the good of other men is my good as well as theirs**

In the Protestant church the believers are considered the body of Christ. Each has a place and a purpose, and none is more important than the

other. The entire body suffers if one believer suffers and the entire body rejoices if the believer rejoices. This kind of communion (*Irenicum*, 1775, p. 60) should provide the church with a sufficient argument in order to pursue peace and unity in genuine brotherly love. (*Irenicum*, 1775, p. 152) Burroughs acknowledges that there is visible body of Christ, visible in the sense that it is constituted by the believers. In such a context Burroughs argues that if one believer enjoys a goodness, the entire body enjoys the same goodness. The believers should do good because that good is for the benefit of the entire body. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 260)

The biblical passage Burroughs turns to is 1 Corinthians 3:22, based on which he argues that the Church community should never divide over the preachers or the pastors, instead it should keep to the teachings of the apostles, because they are inspired by God. This is not blind faith, nor is it obscurantism. It is a practical faith, manifested through love. (Tennent, 1749, p. 130) The term *love* is fundamental for Burroughs because it involves an element of care and long suffering for all who seek the good of the other. A common misconception that Burroughs identifies is that people believe the good of the neighbor is necessarily evil for them. The result is that such a man will either try to take the other's good by force, or act in such a way that the man who has the good will not enjoy it. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 260)

The solution that Burroughs presents is that those who want to do good should work together in order to change the context they live in. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 260) At a much greater scale the change is to be done in the social, economic, political and religious environment. All these can be changed not by a certain church, but by the believers of all Christian denominations. Such a change will result in a system rearrangement that will also change the educational system. The future generations will learn in a natural, unforced, and well informed way that doing good will also benefit oneself, as well as others.

**The fifth principle: my good is more in the public than in the myself**

This is a sensitive issue because in spite of the interconnections of people via the internet and the social networks, there is still a sense of egotistic individuality, a strong sense of hedonistic gains, and a blatant disregard for one's neighbor. Burroughs did not have the social media or the social networks, but egotistic personal gain and seclusion was an issue of his time as well. He argues in favor of a simple idea: all tensions among Christians, as well the contentions with the non-Christians would simply vanish (Tennent, 1749, p. 74), if our spirits were more public, or people

oriented. In fact, it is not easy to be public. If people were secluded in Burroughs' time, they will surely be cautious with their actions in a society that is extremely visible and recorded. Burroughs expects sacrifice and involvement on the part of the Christians. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 261)

However, he does not disregard the grand gestures of those that never had his faith. He exemplifies with the gesture of Paulus Aemilius who shouted at the death of his children that the judgments of the gods should befall him, rather than the commonwealth. This example is relevant to prove that the earthly church is not perfect, but it should be made up of people who try to perfect themselves not for a purely selfish gain, but mainly for the good of the others. Burroughs is sickened, he writes, by the seclusion and non-involvement of some Christians. Being involved in the needs of the world, or even the needs of the local community would create an environment that generates healthier human relationships. An involved group of people who do good not for goods sake, but for the good of other fellow men, can raise a generation almost naturally inclined towards the needs of others. Cohabitation, collaboration and care, argues Burroughs, could severely limit evil and contentions. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 261)

**The sixth principle: what would I have others do to me, that will I endeavor to do to them**

Communion and human bonding require harmony in the relationship. Disruption can be caused by various factors, but the fellowship can be restored at any time. Burroughs identifies this principle as a means to join in the life of the other. When one suffers, the other shares the suffering, when one rejoices, the other rejoices as well. This idea was presented above, but in this context it gains a new facet. As humans we have expectations from others and we impose our will onto them. Here lies the problem that Burroughs mentions: if people want to be treated well, they must treat others as such. There must be an example of unity that Christians can relate to, namely the unity within God. (Johnson, 1847, p. 354) The same problem mentioned before appears here, as well: what if someone does good and receives evil? Burroughs does not answer such a question, but the idea behind the principle is that there is a community of fellowship that can protect, at times, and further a noble cause and a certain healthy behavioral pattern, such as caring for others. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 261)

The principle has a judicial side to it. Burroughs argues that it is a law of justice, which has peace as a direct result. Such a principle would require a constant search for the value of the neighbor. It is not a simple search, but one invested in praising the true nature of goodness. (Beveridge,

1842, p. 237) There are times when a single good word can make the difference between joy and sadness, if not worse. In the case of Burroughs, the example he gives from a sermon of Chrysostome has another facet. This principle is usually applied to the things such as praising. However, there is an aspect that can be overlooked. He argues that if someone cannot take criticism, he or she should not criticize others. He does not tell his readers to correct this flaw of not being able to take criticism. Instead he argues in favor of not expressing the thing one hates onto others. It is the same with deception, for example. He argues that someone hates to be deceived, he or she should not deceive others. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 262)

The practical side of this argument is that it can be applied to any human interaction level. There is no limit to what context it can be lived out. It can be put into practice by CEO's and janitors, by drivers and pedestrians, by presidents and other political representatives. It is of such universal value that if people were to live according to it, a great deal of tensions would be canceled. It does not solve all the problems, but it constitutes itself as principle that can be applied, and the only obstacle in applying it is will.

**The seventh principle: it is as great an honor to have my by yielding, as by overcoming**

This principle is perhaps the most difficult to apply. Burroughs describes the natural, but not normal, reaction that most people have when wronged, as a result of anger: revenge or getting even for an evil suffered. (Barrow, 1859, p. 195) Burroughs argues that if someone was truly wronged, the best way to become better than the man that wronged you is by forgiveness. This principle is not so much about the other, or control over one's enemy, as it is about self-control. The principle is best understood only relationally. It has a wide application, but the excuses against forgiveness can be countless. The problem faced by the wronged man is that there must be some justice at one point. The justice, in this case, is at the level of the individual. Forgiveness, honest and true, not simple words that are part of a plan of revenge, can make the other angrier, besides the fact that it makes the one who was wronged untouchable. Sometimes, though, there is need of excommunication from the church, as there is need for imprisonment for wrongdoing. None of the two cancel forgiveness. (Thorndike, 1844, p. 832) The act of forgiveness cancels a great deal of evil, but making the opponent incapable of reaction. Hatred is fuelled also by wrong reactions towards others. Strife is desired more than peace. And in this case, forgiveness can be most difficult expression of love and self-control anyone can exhibit. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 262)

The practical aspect of this principle is that applying it to the everyday events that can degenerate in contention and strife, a great deal could be disarmed. Coworkers and employers, school children and faculty, are just a couple of examples where such a deep reaction of genuine forgiveness can generate an environment of peace and collaboration that would benefit us more than the lack of it.

**The eighth principle: I will never meddle with any strife, but that which shall have peace to the end of it**

This the shortest argument of Burroughs. It refers to war. This is a delicate matter, but it shows that Burroughs was not a pacifist. He justifies war only if the end is peace. The difference between this idea and the countless wars waged in the name of this idea, is that Burroughs lays a great burden on the shoulders of leaders. First they should seek peace to the uttermost extreme. War should never be the fastest or the easiest way to solve the problems between nations, or within one's country. (Ben Salmon, 1921, p. 104) Burroughs argues that there is no good war, in spite of any justification one might bring in favor of it. However, there is, says Burroughs, only one true justification for war: if it aims at peace. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 263) The way this principle has been abused over the millennia is proven by the countless descriptions of wars and the reasons that started them. Burroughs refers to the club of Hercules that was made out of olive tree wood, a symbol of peace. In trying to deal with war, and the horrors of it, it is almost impossible to understand how a man of God can argue in favor of war.

**The ninth principle: no man shall be my enemy, that is not more his own than mine, more the enemy of god than mine**

This principle can be controversial, and could even be used as an excuse for strife and contentions. Burroughs believes there are various forms of offenses. The first one is the case of a man who wrongs someone else through weakness. This means that he does something involuntarily, not willfully, but rather as a reaction. In this case, argues, Burroughs, such a man is not an enemy to him who was wronged, nor to himself. Such a man should be understood and helped to get in control of his reactions. There is no need for any kind of punishment. (Hinton, 1864, p. 10) This kind of offence brings more inner distress to the one who offended, than to the one who was offended. Even if the one who was offended suffered some loss, it is not as big, or as important as the suffering of the offender. There should be no cause for worrying or revenge. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 263)

Burroughs describes another situation which is far worse than the first one. In this case,

Burroughs says that if someone is offended willingly and on purpose, the real enemy is not the one offended, but the one who offends. This kind of reaction, in Christianity, has a deeper meaning, because it places the offender face to face with God's anger. The offender is not only his own enemy, but the enemy of God, as well. This is not an image for peace, but God is just and this means that He will protect the spiritual status of the believers. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 263) This principle may not be adopted by nonbelievers, but there is no hindrance to behave in a forgiving way towards the offenders.

The practical application of this principle is reacting justly, but in love towards the offender, specifically because if no one corrects the wrongdoing, it will be repeated.

Burroughs does not argue in favor of a non-reactive pacifism. (Priestley & Rutt, 1817, p. 328) Instead he believes that the offended should correct the offender, but in a correct, wise and loving way. That means understanding that the offender is one's own worst enemy. The love must stem from the conviction that the offender is a valuable human being. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 263)

**The tenth principle: I had rather suffer the greatest evil, than do the least**

Of all the principles this might present itself as the most difficult to implement. If conscious and honest forgiveness is difficult, a conscious desire to suffer the greatest evil, without taking any measure to counteract the evil is defined by Burroughs as madness. One of the advice is not to care what others say. Burroughs argues that the opinions of other must be taken into account, but one must not be defined by such opinions. Not taking heed to what others say can be egocentrism. Burroughs believes that if someone inflicts suffering and the reaction is of the same kind, the offended will now have a new enemy, oneself. This is what the offended must avoid at all costs. The relationship between people is to be kept in perfect order and balance. Lack of unity can create persecution, for example, and with it great suffering. (James Dabney McCabe, 1874, p. 322) The power or the capacity to react properly is within the control of the offended. Burroughs ends this short principle by arguing that no man on earth can force someone to sin, except by their own volition. With this idea, Burroughs believes that each individual is responsible for their own actions, no one else can be blamed. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 264)

**The eleventh principle: I will labor to do good to all, but provoke none**

In contemporary society people are much more exposed to various cultures, trends, and specific behaviors found in certain parts of the

world. This kind of experience provides the basic understanding that we are all different and we share the same planet. When Burroughs wrote his book, in 1646, the geographical knowledge was not that which is today, neither was the knowledge about the variety of cultures that exist on earth. Burroughs' principle applies, in the same way the other principles do, to the relationship within the church, as well as outside. Burroughs believes that the balance in society is determined by the relationship within families. He argues that if a father, as the head of the household, can relate properly to his children, and the relation is reciprocated by the children, that man will have more influence and will impose respect in his friends, neighbors and even the superiors. (Mozley, 1892, p. 214) This kind of respect is earned, not imposed. In such a relationship care for one another's wellbeing will become a priority. This means that the good of one's neighbor will be a priority and people will not provoke a willful evil towards anybody else. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 264)

**The twelfth principle: peace with all men it is good, but with God and my own conscience it is necessary**

A good relationship does not start from outside, but from within. A great many people can come and teach us throughout our lives, but only if we decide to live the taught principles, do we begin to change. For Burroughs the goodness of any man begins with and in God, while the conviction to live out a good, loving and caring life for our fellow men must be a consequence of adopting the Biblical principles of love and care. If people have inner peace, born out of a rational and emotional process of inner development, can only flow to the outside as goodness towards any man. This is point that Burroughs makes clear. A good man will spread goodness towards any man, even if that man will be evil or will try to do evil. The satisfaction of doing good will cancel any hatred or long lasting offence. (Thomas Paine, 1859, p. 153) Such a man is like a river pouring out constantly, as a cleansing process. Even afflictions and troubles will be resolved much faster and easier. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 265)

This principle is applicable to everyday life, and it should be applied as such, because it requires a constant shaping of one's personality and the conscious effort to life in peace and goodness towards one's neighbors.

**The thirteenth principle: if I must need erre, considering what our condition is here in this world, I will rather erre by too much gentleness and mildness, then by too much rigour and severity**

All people make mistakes, and Burroughs argues that this is not something new or inevitable.

However, the way people react to others is what makes the difference between a good relationship and a bad one. Burroughs mentions the fact that there are two types of people: the rigorous and the lenient. The rigorous believe that they are behaving correctly and that God is rigorous just like them, only better, and that he is of sour spirit, just like them. The lenient this the same way about God, but in accordance to their way of being. Burroughs believes that God is both, and more, because there is love and hatred in Him, but not in the way people are evil and loving. (Thomas Scott, n.d., p. 286) In spite of this, Burroughs argues in favor of a God who works with His children in governing the church. This happens in spite of people's shortcomings. In other words, if God is good and gentle with the believers, the believers should be good and gentle with all people. This is because the church is not outside the world, but lives in the world. The goodness must be professed and lived out. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 265)

Being good and kind is not a sign of superficiality or a weak and shallow mind, but the mark of a mature mind and an experienced soul. Living out such a behavior is not impossible or difficult. It only requires the conscious exercise of the will.

**The fourteenth principle: peace is never bought too dear, but by sin and baseness**

This last principle is focused mainly on the wounds of the body and the wounds of the soul. Burroughs gives the example of Emperor Trajan who used to bind the wounds of his soldiers with his own clothes. Burroughs believes that we should take good care of soldiers, who suffer greatly to keep us safe, but these are not the only wounds that need healing. He argues that the wounds caused by divisions within the church and society are just as bad. These might cost us greatly, but the price paid for their healing is smaller than the price paid for leaving them open and unattended. There should be a constant care for the problems that society faces. (Harington, 185AD, p. 193) Answers can come from various fields of inquiry, but for Burroughs the answers are provided by theology. In his case, theology is not to be used only for the church, but also for the world. (Burroughs, 1653, p. 266)

Burroughs makes an interesting remark when he writes that we may give peace to buy truth, but we may not give truth to buy peace. Peace is based on truth, and peace is not always what it should be. Only the peace that is a direct consequence of truth can last and mend the wounds of bad relationships. (Burroughs, 1653, pp. 266–267) The Christians and non-Christians cannot be base in pursuing truth and peace, (George Bull (bp. of St. David's. ), n.d., p. 236) because these are the elements that can assure unity in diversity, and

healthy collaborations and interactions in a world of colorful and diverse minds and personalities.

### Conclusion

Human beings are diverse and in spite of their diversity they can come together in relationships and at their work place. The way they unite in their diversity is manifold, and the advice can come from various fields of expertise. In this paper the attempt was to prove that old ideas are relevant and useful, even applicable to modern day problems. The 14 joining principles of Jeremiah Burroughs prove this point by appealing not to some external factor for unity, but to the inner being of every man. Burroughs is a puritan theologian, so he has a specific theological identity. However, his principles manage to go beyond any theological barriers, as well as social, political or economic one. His principles are like the foundation on which all the interactions in various fields are built.

In order to live in peace and unity there is an existential need and desire to connect to others. Some connect in a positive, others in a negative way. Having considered this, a good relationship depends on what principles a person or a group will adopt. Burroughs believes that his principles, once adopted and spread, can become the healing factor for unity in diversity.

Unity, fellowship, collaboration, love, care, and valor, Burroughs' principles apply in, apparently, any historical context .the main issues with his works is that they are almost four centuries old, they are partly or completely unknown. This books might fall under the suspicion that they are useless because they are old. In order to stay united and develop our humanness, we have to explore and know the past. Books such as his do not only depict ancient times, but offer theoretical arguments that have practical application in real life relationships.

His arguments and principles may not be taken into consideration by non-Christians, or non-theologians, but that would prove counterproductive, because Burroughs himself uses various examples from older books, even ancient literature to prove his points. This, together with the way he builds his arguments, prove that the principles are easily applicable to non-ecclesiastical environment. This makes his work universally acceptable and easy to implement

### Reference

- [1] Barrow, I. (1859). *Theologicalworks*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/theologicalworks02barruoft>
- [2] Ben Salmon. (1921). *A CatholicCritique of Just War Doctrine*. American Civil

- Liberties Union. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/JustWarTheoryCritique>
- [3] Beveridge, W. (1842). *Theologicalworks*. Oxford: J.H. Parker. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/theologicalworks08beveuoft>
- [4] Burroughs, J. (1653). *Irenicum : tothelovers of truthandpeace: heart-divisionsopened in thecausesanddevils of them*. London: Printed for Robert Davvlman. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/irenicumtothelov00burruoft>
- [5] Edward Stillingfleet. (1842). *The Irenicum: Or Pacificator: Being a Reconciler as to Church Differences*. M. Sorin. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/irenicumorpacif00stilgoog>
- [6] Forbes, J., & Selwyn, E. G. (1923). *The FirstBook of theIrenicum; a contributiontothetheology of re-union*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/firstbookofireni00forb>
- [7] George Bull (bp. of St. David's. ). (n.d.). *The English theologicalworks of George Bull*. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/englishtheologi00davigoog>
- [8] Harington, E. C. (185AD). *Works on theologicalsubjects*. London: F. & J. Rivington. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/worksontheologi02hariiala>
- [9] Hinton, J. H. (1864). *The theologicalworks of John Howard Hinton*. London: Houlston& Wright. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/theologicalworks02hint>
- [10] *Irenicum: or, The importance of unity in thechurch of Christconsidered; andappliedtowardsthehealing of ourunhappydifferencesanddivisions ..* (1775). London: J. and F. Rivington [etc.]. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/irenicumorimport00londiala>
- [11] James DabneyMcCabe. (1874). *Cross And Crown By James Dabney Mc Cabe*. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/CrossAndCrownByJamesDabneyMcCabe>
- [12] Johnson, J. (1847). *Theologicalworks*. Oxford, Park. Retrievedfrom <http://archive.org/details/theologicalwork01john>
- [13] Mozley, J. B. (James B. (1892). *Essays, historicalandtheological*. London:

- Longmans, Green. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/essayshistorical02mozl>
- [14] Priestley, J., & Rutt, J. T. (1817). *The theological and miscellaneous works of Joseph Priestley*. [London: Printed by G. Smallfield. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/theologicalmisc05prie>
- [15] Tennent, G. (1749). *Irenicum ecclesiasticum, or, A humble impartial essay upon the peace of Jerusalem: wherein the analogy between Jerusalem and the visible church is in some instances briefly hinted ...; also, A prefatory address to the Synods of New-York & Philadelphia .. Philadelphia:*
- Printed and sold by W. Bradford. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/ireecclesia00tenn>
- [16] Thomas Paine. (1859). *The Theological Works*. J. P. Mendum. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/theologicalwork00paingoog>
- [17] Thomas Scott. (n.d.). *The theological works ...* P. Brown and T. Nelson, 1830. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/theologicalwork04scotgoog>
- [18] Thorndike, H. (1844). *Theological works*. Oxford: J. H. Parker. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/thorndikesworkp101thoruoft>