

sonal Religion. It is comforting to remember that of all the well-attended meetings at this year's Congress the most crowded and the most serious and attentive was that on Personal Religion. The President on that occasion very naturally declared that such a meeting bore testimony to the fact that the spiritual life in the Church could not possibly be at such a low ebb as some would make out. Our Methodist friends acknowledge the power of such an assembly. 'It is interesting to notice,' says the *Methodist Recorder*, 'that the attendance at the section which was dealing with the subject of Ecclesiastical Courts was meagre, while crowds attended to hear the speakers on Personal Religion. A good omen—would it were always so!'

"After all, the true test of spiritual life is vigour and activity in work, and we can safely leave results; but it does good now and then to remind each other that the Catholic Church of this country is not so dead to spiritual things as many would fain have her be—that the spirit and mantle of early confessors and saints have fallen upon not a few who in the same Church carry on the Apostolic line and teach the Apostolic doctrine. The more each individual member of the baptized lives in the spirit of perpetual prayer, and as in the presence of God the Holy Ghost, so much the more will the Church in her corporate capacity become the mighty power and standing witness her Divine Lord intended she should be."

Who can question the importance, not only to the individual, but to the Church and to Christianity, that Churchmen and Christians should let their light so shine before men that they may see their good works and glorify their Father which is in Heaven. In the midst of strife let Churchmen hold their hands and betake themselves to prayer for meekness and gentleness, for wisdom and Spiritual power, that they may be enabled to understand one another better, and live as brethren "in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace." To influence others, we must be influenced ourselves, and when the outside world shall be able to point to us, and say, "see how these Christians love one another," we may rejoice at the commencement of a great and glorious revival which shall bring many into the fold of Christ's Church.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### The Female Name Didamia.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian.

SIR,—Sometime ago one of your correspondents, whose suggestions were in the main valuable, denied the existence of this name, referring the name pronounced by ignorant people "Didamy" to the Greek or Latin word "diadema," a crown, and declaring it to be the feminine counterpart of the Greek "Stephanos." I had remarked that the name was an English adaptation and form of the Greek "Deidamia," the ei being treated as a diphthong, and the accent thrown back *more anglicano* to the ante-penult; and I cited the name of the mother of Pyrrhus by Achilles, and the sister or daughter of Pyrrhus, King of Epirus. That Greek names adopted into modern English often undergo such changes of pronunciation we need no stronger illustration than the name Eunice, from Eunique. Your correspondent did not think our common people knew anything about those quasi-mythological characters; but I knew a person named Urania, whose parents never heard of the nine muses; and how many Alexanders are there who never heard of the great Conqueror or his exploits! To pronounce the terminal *ia* like *y* is a very common fashion

among the vulgar; Lydia becomes Liddy; Urania, Urany; Didamia, Didamy, &c.\* I would not have revived the subject at this time if my eye had not chanced lately to fall on the name in the Index to Rollin's Ancient History, where its accent is given as we pronounce it, retaining, however, the *e* in the first syllable—thus, Deidamia. On turning to the place indicated, Vol. 3, page 298, we find that "Demetrius had withdrawn himself to Ephesus after the battle of Ipsus, and from thence embarked for Greece; his whole resources being limited to the affections of the Athenians, with whom he had left his fleet, money and wife, Deidamia." Ambassadors from Athens met him, and together with some news less agreeable, "informed him that his wife Deidamia had been conducted to Megara with all the honors and attendance to her dignity." On the next page we learn that "during these transactions of Demetrius, Deidamia, one of his wives, who had taken a journey to meet him in Greece and had passed some time with him in that country, was seized with an indisposition that terminated in her death." I make these extracts to shew that a knowledge of the name in question is accessible to any female servant who dusts a gentleman's library, provided only that she can read English. But in truth, names of this class, derived from classical sources, like Diana and Didamia, were quite common among the aristocratic and non-puritan people of England two or three centuries ago. A lineal ancestor of my own, born about the middle of the last century, bore this name, and transmitted it to some of her posterity, just as she herself had doubtless derived it from some female ancestor or relation in whose honor it had been given to her. The female counterpart of the Greek Stephanos was Stephane; of the Latin Stephanus, Stephana; and that of the English Stephen is Stephena. The use of a neuter noun as a name for a person would have been inconsistent with the form and genius of the Greek and Latin languages; and the attempt to impart such a name now to an English girl would be a solecism. The fact that it would apply as much to a male as to a female shews how absurd it would be. Why is Margaret applied to girls and never to boys? Simply because Margarita, a pearl, in the original language is feminine. Why is Peter never applied to a woman? because Petros, a stone or piece of rock, is masculine. But diadema, besides being neuter, is by no means synonymous with stephanos, a crown. Its strict meaning is a band or fillet; the blue band which went round the turban of the Persian King; and it was only metaphorically used, as its English translation now commonly is, for the crown itself. I have known people, ignorant of the true origin of the name in question, but having your correspondent's idea of it suggested to them, write and spell it *Di dama*, the tenacity with which the syllable *da* is nevertheless retained, giving still a clue to the real origin as I have pointed it out. I will hazard the conjecture that the name is a common one in modern Greece. I conclude that however repellent the name might be to your correspondent's or any other clergyman's taste, he would be acting incorrectly in refusing to call a child by that name if required to do so at the baptismal font, or to so enter it in the Parish records; that he would be perpetuating, if not originating, an error and a solecism if he should inform the parents that they should pronounce and spell the name "Diadema." Now, do any of your subscribers ever meet the name Urella as a Christian or given name? I met it once, but seeing the form Orrilla in family pedigrees, almost concluded the latter to have been the real name intended. But where does the name Orrilla come from?

ACADIENSIS.

\*This may come from desiring to use a diminutive or pet name, as Johnny for John. Dama was the name of an Epidaurian deity, supposed to be the same as Ceres. But the modern Didamia is often colloquially abbreviated Dama.

### Tithes.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—Under the caption "The Board of Mis-

sions Address," "Layman," of Brockville, introduces the subject of tithes. I am entirely at one with him on the subject, and believe that "the miserable state of the Canadian Church" arises from the general ignoring of the solemn truth that "a tenth is God's." Men talk of what they *give* to the Church and to the poor; they *give* nothing until this *tenth* is all rendered to Him Whose it is. But I am happy to believe that this is more thought of and acted upon than "Layman" imagines. I have known some who regularly and upon system laid by the tenth of their incomes. I know many more who do it and beyond it without system. And I have heard the subject preached upon and have preached upon it myself on both sides the Atlantic. An unanswerable pamphlet was published and read by me as long ago as 1849 by one who I then knew (Rev. Edward Huff, Rector of Little Cawthorpe, Lincolnshire) on the subject. I know not if it be still in print. In England, of course, the older Parishes are supported by their own property of tithes given them time out of mind (though a large portion of these have been for 300 years in lay hands *misappropriated*.) But the clergy themselves in England, out of their means, do more annually than the laity. Some years ago a calculation was made on the S. P. G., S. P. C. K. and other society lists, when the proportion was—laity 7 parts, clergy 60!! In these voluntary churches, St. Paul's rule "each first day" "as God hath prospered." "Lay by in store" will apply to tithes, and if one-tenth were *paid*, then men might begin to *give* afterwards of what is left for their own use. The Irvingites have prospered so well thus. In their glorious church in Gordon Square, London, are two boxes—one for *tithes*, the other *offerings*.

CLERIC.

### "Free Churches" and "Surpliced Choirs."

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—Permit me to say that in my perusal of your paper or periodical of Jan. 2nd I find two articles containing sentiments of special value, and which, in my opinion, are entitled not only to the cordial endorsement of every true Churchman, but demand the outspoken approval and commendation of all members of our beloved Church everywhere. The first respecting "Free and Open Churches," in which you have an admirable and, it would seem, unanswerable argument. "The cause," as you say, "commends itself to common sense, true instincts of religion, and the glorious freedom of the Gospel." Surely this is a thought which will be suggested to every devout soul. The second article to which I refer, and which is found in the same column, is in regard to "surpliced choirs," and the foolish as well as groundless prejudice against them. The quotation from the Charge of the good and really very moderate Bishop of Rochester is so true and so much to the point that it ought to give great force to the argument. For how true is it, that, as he says, "It is only unreasonable bigotry that identifies surpliced choirs with party." Well was it added by Mr. Rainsford, from whose communication this is taken, "Do let us turn attention to really needful things, and gladly, not grudgingly, admit fullest Christian liberty in such matters of expediency as this."

\*\*

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—I have been pained at some of the references to our Bishop in connection with the late Mission in Halifax, and have heard contrasts drawn between his Lordship and his predecessor, as if he had introduced High Churchmanship, which the other would not have tolerated. Reading this morning I happened to come across an entry in the diary of an American Bishop, who was on board the Caledonia S. S. in June, 1841, just the time of Tract 90, &c. I will simply give it:—"June 3, 1841—On shore at Halifax by ten a. m. Terra Firma has a natural feeling after all. Called with Mr. H— on Bishop Inglis,