

Christianity Applied to Some of our Social and Economic Problems.

The Coming Woman.

A SERMON BY REV. C. C. BROWN, D.D.

"Yea, I beseech thee also, true rofokellof, help these women, for they labored with me in the gospel."—PAUL. IV: 3.

"Labored with me in the gospel!" What do you suppose the women did who labored in the gospel? They had no mission societies, no sewing circles, no orphan homes, not even any christian homes to visit. What did they do as they labored? I am inclined to believe they did just what Paul did, and we can define their work by ascertaining his.

I am aware of the fact that I shall this night fly in the face of some of our Southern customs and institutions; but because they are Southern, it does not follow of necessity that they are correct; nor does it follow that because one thing is good, another cannot be better. The whole world is whirling along the ringing grooves of progress, and there is no reason why we should decline to keep step with the multitude, even if it be done at the cost of a notion that has been peculiarly ours, and cling to principally because we have come to believe we have a sort of monopoly in that direction. Old ideas and practices are not made correct always by being old. There is a good church not far away which has had but two pastors in a hundred years, and has had preaching on the first and third Sunday during all that time. Recently when a new pastor came, it was found necessary to change the preaching day. Some objected, on the ground that they did not wish to violate the usage made sacred by a hundred years of time.

New measures are generally opposed. Some imagine that opposition indicates the wisdom of caution. Sometimes it does; but sometimes it indicates deadness and fossilism. Galileo was imprisoned for introducing new ideas about the movements of the heavenly bodies; the churches, in many instances, were torn to pieces over the introduction of musical instruments; men opposed the printing press, and said it was a means of spreading heresy; the Chinese tore up the rails of the first railroad that was built on their sacred soil. Because men oppose a new measure, the thinking man need not turn aside from it as false.

But to lay aside prejudice and preconceived notions, so as to be able to pass honest judgment on all new things that are introduced, is no easy task. My way is very apt to be the right way in my eyes, and I dislike to surrender my darling notions which I have nurtured so long. Still, if we are on the side of progress, we should give a trial to new plans and methods; if they fail after testing, it is easy to let them go. It is very easy and cheap to say, "I don't believe it can be done." This was said about the telegraph, the telephone, the steam engine, and to say it does not require any special amount of mind power.

I want to make a confession before going further. I am generally in full sympathy with all Southern institutions and customs. For many years, I have been perfectly orthodox (?) concerning the matter I am to discuss to-night. I have been going with the multitude, and never before have taken time to give these questions the thought and study they deserved. I accepted the ready-made opinions of others, just as the majority of men do; but now, when I come to look into the matter for myself, I am forced to the conclusion that all the time I have been siding with the minority, while I thought I was with the majority, and that I have held to views that were more peculiarly Southern than any thing else. I am now in a happy frame of mind, and am ready to give up everything for the truth.

1. Woman as she used to be in the South.

Let me begin with this, and many of you will agree with me when I say that, up to the War, woman was a genuine aristocrat in these Southern States. An aristocrat is one who does nothing because he has nothing to do. That was woman. She was a sort of little queen who ruled her servants and had her behests obeyed. Everything was done for her comfort, and the head of the house found his pleasure in supplying her wants and satisfying her whims. In girlhood, she was sent to the best schools, no matter what the cost. She was taught books, music and painting, and the end in view was to prepare her to fill the place of queen in some happy home. She had from one to three servants awaiting her call, and it was understood that her hands were not to be stained with toil or hardened by labor. Her chief duty was to issue orders, according to her own sweet will. In some of our modern schools, the girls are taught to cook and sew; but such branches of study belong only to these last days that are so sorely out of joint. They, too, fly in the face of our Southern institutions, because our women did not once need to descend to this drudgery.

That our methods were wrong, that they could be revised, amended and improved never once occurred to us, and even a suggestion of this kind would have been set down as treason.

2. Woman in the world of work in the changed circumstances of these days.

Great and violent changes have come about. Revolutions have torn asunder the foundations of our chris-

ian institutions. The line between the rich and the poor has virtually been blotted out. Slavery of Negroes has been abolished, and the white women have been put into their place. The queen of the parlor has come down to be the maid of the kitchen.

Woman's responsibilities have been greatly increased. In many cases, she has been thrown on her own resources and yet, strange to tell, no adequate opening has been made for her to earn her living. For thirty-five years, even in these circumstances, our unwritten laws have allowed women to wear life away at the sewing machine or in the school-room; but beyond that she must not go. One of our papers has lately been discussing the question whether being a shop-girl injures a young woman's chances for matrimony. In the first place, why call her a shop-girl? and why not call her a clerk, just as her brother would be called. Is a woman a shop-girl who clerks in a store that does a hundred thousand dollars of business annually? No, the writer was hunting for a word that would sting, and found one to suit him.

But new conditions are forcing themselves upon us, and we are reluctantly falling back. The woman is coming to the front because necessity is urging her on. She must live; she must earn her bread, and yet there are not places for them all to fill as teachers, and hence the sphere of her labors is widening like the channel of a stream that is dug out by current and pressure. Dr. Burus, of Stanton, Mich., says woman is the strongest social force of the day, and all the doors are opening to her. Formerly the idea of adopting a profession never entered the head of any except the most audacious girl. The girl of to-day is born into conditions that did not exist for her mother. In the University of Michigan, last year, there were eighty-nine women who were studying medicine. In almost all the great newspaper offices, women are serving either as printers or editors, and some of our very brightest correspondents are women, and in stenography and typewriting she is fast driving men to the wall. In the stores, too, she is finding a place, and men are actually coming to believe that a woman has brains enough to sell two yards of cloth. So also in book-keeping and telegraphy she is finding an opening, and, like Esther, she seems to have come to the kingdom for such a time as this.

Has she taken the bit between her teeth? No, but she has declared that the world owes her the chance to make a living without causing her to be snubbed and trodden down under the iron heels of caste and foolish sentiment. The dormant forces of her nature are awaking to the call of the hour, and woman is being surprised at herself. Thirty-five years ago, but one woman was employed in the public departments at Washington. The men seemed afraid of her, and put her in an attic chamber, from which she sent her copying by a messenger. Her presence below was not desired. Today in the treasury building alone there are one thousand women doing government service, and when painstaking and accuracy are required, a woman is always put in to fill the place.

Some are asking, "Well, what next? want the women want to vote after awhile?" Suppose they do—what of that? Man as a law-maker, seems to be a monumental failure. We hold a legislative session this year to correct the mistakes of last. Under all the wise provisions devised by men, our criminal army is increasing fourfold as fast as our population. I do not think I should like to see the women going to the ballot-box at every petty election, but I should rejoice to have her there when great issues are before the people. I do not believe that men will ever have sense or courage to settle the whiskey question unaided, and there are other matters belonging to the world of moral reform that only the women will ever bring into proper adjustment.

Let us pass on, and discuss:

3. Woman's sphere of labor in the church.

"They talk about a woman's sphere. As though it had a limit, There's not a place in earth, or heaven, There's not a task to mankind given, There's not a blessing or a woe, There's not a whispered yes, or no, There's not a life, or death, or birth, That has a feather's weight of worth, Without a woman in it."

I confess it does seem odd to be talking about such a topic, when we are all free to confess that woman is the life and support of the church, and without her the organization would almost always be a poor and limping thing. To say that her sphere is coterminous with man's would be to give the truth in a sentence; but let us crush all cavil by getting our answer from the Bible.

1. She appears in the New Testament as a fellow-helper to the truth. The last chapter in the letter to the Romans makes special mention of numbers of women. Phoebe is commended as the servant or deaconess of the church at Cenchreae, and the early churches understood this to mean that a woman could be a church officer, for when a man was elected deacon, they often made his wife a deaconess. In some places the order of deaconess is still found.

That the early Christian churches appointed women to the diaconate is shown in the Apostolic Constitutions, a book dating no later than the fourth century. In Bk. viii, ch. xix and xx, we read: "Concerning a deaconess, I

Bartholomew make this constitution: O bishop, thou shalt lay thy hands upon her in the presence of the presbytery, and of the deacons and deaconesses, and shalt say: O eternal God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Creator of man and of woman, who didst replenish with the Spirit Miriam and Deborah and Anna and Huldah, who didst not disdain that thy only begotten Son should be born of a woman; who also in the tabernacle of the testimony, and in the temple, didst ordain women to be keepers of thy holy gates—do thou now also look down upon this thy servant who is to be ordained to the office of deaconess, and grant her thy Holy Spirit, and cleanse her from all filthiness of flesh and spirit that she may worthily discharge the work which is committed to her to thy glory, and the praise of thy Christ, with whom glory and adoration be to thee and the Holy Spirit forever. Amen."

"Salute Prisca and Aquila" says Paul, "my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus," putting the woman before the man doubtless because she was the more helpful of the two. Then come Tryphaena and Tryphosa and Persis, three women who labored in the Lord. He mentions also the mother of Rufus, and Julia and the sister of Nereus. All this shows clearly the part the women played in church work in the city of Rome. In almost every epistle the apostle wrote, there is some sort of mention like this, and we are driven to the conclusion that the women did a great deal towards building up and maintaining the churches of the apostolic day.

2. It is clear, too, from what Luke says in the Acts, that the women voted in the churches. When Peter, in that "upper chamber," advocated the election of some one to take the place of the fallen Judas, women were present, and the just supposition is that they voted along with the others. [Acts i: 14.] The "multitude of the disciples" elected the seven who were to minister to the wants of the poor, and no reason is given to lead us to suppose that the women were excluded. At any rate, it is sure that they are nowhere forbidden to vote in the New Testament.

3. It seems too that women prayed in the churches. Acts i: 14, says, after naming the apostles, "These all with one accord continued steadfastly in prayer, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren." In I Cor. xi: 5, we read, "But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head." This simply means that when she prays in the church, her demeanor must be decorous and her behavior modest.

4. Thus far, many of us go together. She can work, vote or pray in the church; but if one suggests that she be allowed to speak, the objection is raised that the Scriptures forbid such a thing. For many years I held to his view also. I now want to give you the result of an honest investigation of the matter, and let each reach his own conclusions.

There are two Scriptures used to prove that a woman should not speak in a mixed assembly. I will take them up in order.

In I Cor. xiv: 34, 35, Paul says, "Let the women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto the women to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." At first glance, this does seem to settle the question; but a little investigation shows differently. What is the apostle discussing? Order in the church is his subject almost throughout the whole letter. It seems it had been reported to him that many things unseemly were being done at Corinth, and this epistle was intended to correct them. But I will confine myself to this one chapter. His advice is as follows: v. 23, speak so as to be understood by the unlearned; v. 24, don't talk too much; v. 28, if one cannot speak intelligently, let him keep silent; v. 30, let one speak at a time; v. 33, God is not a God of confusion. Then he adds, "Let the women keep silence in the churches," that is, let them keep good order. V. 35, if they want to learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. I see nothing in this more than that the women, untaught and unlettered, deeply concerned now about this new doctrine, had fallen into the habit of asking questions during the service conducted in the church. This created disorder, and the Apostle advised that instead of asking questions at the meeting it would be better to wait until they reached their homes where their husbands could explain the teaching to them.

Let us now go into history of this matter. "It is not permitted unto them to speak." The word used is *lalein* which means to talk, to speak. The Greek word meaning to teach is *didaskien*; but it nowhere appears in this Scripture. These women, were not teaching as preachers or lecturers, but were talking to the disturbance of the meeting, and I construe the whole passage to mean about this: It is not proper for women to talk aloud and ask questions during religious service; so that Paul was teaching the same doctrine that we try to teach our children to day.

But—and mark this well—Paul writes this only to the church at Corinth. He gave no such counsel to the other churches nor had he any reason to believe that these other churches would ever see this letter. Hence they would never know what instructions he had imparted to the

Corinthians concerning this matter. But why, then, did he say this to the Corinthians? Because the occasion required it. The historical records go to show that at Athens and at the neighboring city Corinth, morals were of the lowest order, especially among the women. It came to pass, says Dr. Anthon, that the Greek word called "to Corinthianize" meant to play the wanton; and the very name of the city was the synonym of lewdness and immorality. There was scarcely a city in the world where women were so low in morals. Among them the order of things had been reversed. The wife was imprisoned at home, and kept as a slave, not as the companion and social equal of her husband. In the society of what we call the demi-mondes the man, married, or unmarried, passed his time and spent his evenings, and no law, social or civil, prohibited him. She was the educated woman, and no other woman was. She was allowed to appear in public, in the Agora, in private homes at feasts and dinings, and every woman who thus went out into the world was classed along with her.

Paul had been to Corinth, and was well acquainted with all this, and thereupon thought it necessary to advise the sisters in the church there to behave in the most quiet and seemly manner, in order that no evil might attach to their conduct.

Dr. Charles Anthon, in his Greek and Roman Antiquities, says in substance. The word *hetaira* originally signified a friend or companion, but at Athens and other towns of Greece, it came to be used as the synonym of *porne*, courtesan. The young men, previous to marriage, spent much of their time in the company of the *hetairai* without its being thought blamable in any sense whatever. Even husbands did the same without drawing upon themselves the censure of public opinion, so long as they did not entirely neglect their legitimate wives. A wife was but little regarded, and marriage was looked upon only as the means of producing citizens for the State. The education of women was entirely neglected; they were regarded as inferior beings, less endowed by nature, and incapable of taking any part in public affairs and of sympathizing with their husbands. Intellectually they were not fit to be agreeable companions to their husbands, who consequently sought elsewhere where they did not find at home. A woman had no right to proceed against her husband. The State tolerated the *hetairai*. They were generally not mere castaways, but acted as cithara and flute-players and as dancers, and were frequently employed to add to the splendor of family sacrifices and to enliven and heighten the pleasure of feasts and dinings. They were the most accomplished women in Greece, and paid much attention to the cultivation of their minds. It was because of their intellectual superiority that men preferred their company and conversation. The town most notorious in Greece for the number of its *hetairai*, as well as for their beauty and refined manners, was Corinth.

We gather from the above that the wife was required to remain at home, the *hetaira*, who was cultivated and educated, went abroad in the world of society and was allowed to appear in all public places. Paul knew all this, and in order to aid the Christian women in maintaining a good name and place, he advised them to be perfectly orderly in the churches, and not to do anything which would lead one to suppose that they belonged to the order named above. It was then perfectly natural that he should have advised them to keep quiet, and if one insists that the passage under discussion teaches that they must not make public addresses, then that too was perfectly natural for a city like Corinth; but because such a law prevailed there, it does not follow that it was necessary elsewhere. We have a similar case in the teachings of our Lord. He said that since he had washed the disciples' feet, the disciples should wash each others' feet. This statement was made without conditions, and yet the churches observe no such practice. But the reason is obvious. In those days, when men wore sandals, the feet were easily soiled by dirt and dust, and to wash them or have them washed by the host was just as much an act of courtesy as it is now for one to take your hat when you enter his house. Changed circumstances have abrogated what was once an actual law. Jesus was speaking for that day, not for this. Paul was speaking only for that day when he said to these same Corinthians, [I Cor. xvi: 20.] "Salute one another with a holy kiss;" so also when he advised them not to marry, as in ch. vi: 26-27.

The other passage adduced to uphold the law of silence on the part of women is [I Tim. ii: 8-12.] "I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing. In like manner that the woman adorn herself in modest apparel, with shamefastness, [modesty] and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but [which becometh a woman professing godliness] through good works. Let a woman learn in quietness, with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness." This Scripture is of a piece with the other, except that nothing is said here about the church. It was written to a man whose work lay principally among the Greeks. It is the custom to lay much emphasis on the fact that Paul says he does not permit a woman to

teach a man, while no attention is paid to the other injunctions which surely are just as important. A man will allow his daughter to go to church dressed in direct violation of all that Paul here urges; but nothing is said of it. If, however, the same daughter should arise to speak in a meeting, he would be glib enough in saying something about the holy Bible being despised and trampled upon.

"I permit not a woman to teach a man." Looking at things as they now are, and seeing the place to which Christianity has elevated woman, a man is almost compelled to ask, "Why did the apostle make use of such an expression?" The answer readily presents itself in the fact that the women of that day were not fitted to teach anybody.

Let us follow the injunction to its legitimate ends, and see where it will lead us. It will require us to expel the women from the Sunday School in many cases. Mrs. Dr. Pritchard, late of Wilmington, had a Bible class of forty young men whom she taught every Sunday. Mrs. Dr. Hatcher, I believe, does the same thing in Richmond. We must expel her also from our choirs, because even in singing an effort is made to impart spiritual instruction. We must recall her from the mission fields, because in many cases she is there working at the side of her husband among the men from day to day. If this is wrong, if we construe Paul to mean for us what he meant for others, we must hush a large part of our female workers.

In all these cases, we must remember that Christianity had just come into the world. By its leverage woman had not yet been lifted up. To put her forward too suddenly might have done harm in some cases, where she was not prepared for it, and these words of the apostle are only the warning of a wise and judicious teacher, and we must interpret them in such a way as to honor his wisdom and discretion, but not so as to stultify ourselves nor him. Great and marvellous changes have taken place. Women are now being admitted to our colleges; "she writes our books, and we read them with pleasure and profit. She edits our papers, and sometimes tries to teach us that she has no right to teach—magnificent, though, perhaps, unconscious inconsistency. If you would keep any one in subordination, you must keep him ignorant and helpless. The whole genius of Christianity is against the perpetuation of ignorance and helplessness among women, or forcing them to immorality, as was the case in Greece, if they would obtain culture or mingle with society." [Fulton.]

Now, once more—Weigh those words of Paul, "It is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." "Shameful" means injurious to character or reputation, disgraceful, dishonorable, scandalous, infamous. Is that a fact to-day, no matter what it once was? If a woman were to speak in this church, would she be disgraced? Paul said she would be at Corinth; but would she be at Sumter? No; it would be a violation of our established usage; many would open their eyes in amazement for a time; but the woman who speaks in a proper way would lose neither caste nor calling among her reasoning sisters. Therefore I insist that the conditions have passed away which would make it shameful for a woman to speak in a church.

Besides, if it is wrong for a woman to teach a man in the church, it is equally as shameful for her to teach him in a public school, and we are forced to do one of two things—limit the age of boys in the public schools, or expel the female teachers. The fact is if we are driven to consistency in this matter, we shall strangle ourselves with our own cord.

Brethren, let us move on. There is nothing in the way; no lion confronts us, but we are trembling and in despair because we do not wish to remove an ancient landmark. An issue has come upon us that startles us, which, like all new things, seems to be revolutionary until we become accustomed to it. I can see no reason why we should distrust the good sense of our women. Her fealty and loyalty to all our customs and institutions has kept her where she is for many years; when she has man's consent take a step onwards, her same good sense and good taste will be her safeguard and talisman. At the bare mention of these things, some fly into a sort of state of dementia, and see woman rushing madly to the polls or bartering a maddened multitude from the stump. But that is only a vision in some distorted brain. She will always be a lady, and the very term will prescribe the limits of her ventures. I am not prepared to say that it would turn our women into fools if we accord to them the rights that men claim and exercise.

To the women I say, the issues are upon you; arise to meet them. Buy up the opportunities, and enter the open doors; above all things, do not sleep away your rights. Fifty years ago, one morning in June, two dignitaries of the Church of England made their way from Windsor Palace where William IV had just breathed his last, to Kensington Palace, where the Princess Victoria lived. They called for the Princess, saying they desired an audience with her. The attendant replied, saying, "The Princess is in such a sweet sleep that she cannot be disturbed." "We are come," said the messengers, "on business of state to the Queen, and even her sleep must give way to that." What they meant was that they had come to tell Victoria that she was now the Queen of England. Let the women awake; the world is soon to give her a place—a place to live

and labor, a place among the workers where no dishonor will attach to her labor; a place among the writers and teachers, among the merchants and men of business, and she who has been grinding her life away at the sewing machine or suffocating in school rooms is to be led forth to stand in the great ranks of those who are freemen in a free world.

But I am anxious not to be misunderstood. Some one is now ready to say that I have advocated the appointment and calling of women as preachers of the gospel, and that I have argued that they should be put wherever man is put, and sometimes in his place to his discomfort. But I have not so argued. I do not find in the Bible any proof of the fact that a woman was ever ordained to preach the gospel or administer the ordinances. I am only desirous of going as far as the Scriptures go. Our methods make her out a figure-head in religious meetings, and to this I raise objections. To explain myself more fully, I will give an illustration. Some years ago, I was invited to hold a meeting with one of the Baltimore churches. The pastor was once a Carolinian, raised, as I had been, to require the women to keep silent. On our way to the first evening service, he asked me if I had ever heard women talk in a meeting. I told him no. He promised that I should hear it that day. I began to feel uneasy, and imagined that I could not preach if such an untoward thing should take place. But on we went to the church. The sun had not yet set. In a little while, the people commenced to gather, and each woman brought a little basket. What could this mean? When about seventy-five had come, the doors to the rear of the prayer-meeting room swung open, and lo! a supper had been spread—a church supper at which the brethren and sisters sat and ate and talked. This was all new to me. I had gone to church, but not to supper; and yet I soon found that that supper was the means of doing great good. It brought the members together in a social way, and opened up introductions which could not easily have been brought about otherwise. After a half hour's communion in this way, we filed out into the lecture room. I had been told the women were to take part, and I felt like one about to be initiated into a secret society. After a hymn and a prayer or two, the pastor asked if anyone had a word of testimony to render for Jesus. A woman advanced in years, arose and read some promise out of the Scriptures concerning God's love and care, and said, "I have received the fulfillment of that promise in my heart this week." Another sister made a statement concerning some answer to prayer about her child. A third recited a stanza from a hymn, and a dozen more repeated Scripture verses, and one motherly old soul led in prayer. I was converted. I had looked on with a critic's eye to find out the wrong, and it would have given me pleasure to be able to show the pastor the great evil I had discovered, but my eyes and ears had failed to detect the heresy that I sought, and from that day to this, I have never had the courage to open my mouth in opposition to testimony from the women, nor shall I ever teach that women must keep silence in the churches.

Whiskey was Responsible.

Special To The State.

DARLINGTON, March 19.—R. A. Mixon was shot by W. L. Best on Sunday afternoon and died early this morning. The shooting was done with a shot gun, the contents lodging in the stomach of the murdered man. The tragedy took place over twenty miles from town and no particulars have been received, except that whiskey was mainly responsible. Best has not been apprehended, but it is reported that he intends surrendering to the sheriff.

The most aggravated cases of rheumatism have been speedily and permanently cured by Salvation Oil. Every one should have it. 35 cents.

**THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK**  
RICHARD A. MCCURDY, PRESIDENT  
For the year ending December 31, 1893

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Income   |                    |
| Interest on Premiums                             | \$20,554,667 98    |
| Profit and other sources                         | 8,888,807 47       |
|  | \$29,443,475 45    |
| Disbursements                                    |                    |
| To Policy-Holders                                | \$20,885,472 46    |
| For all other accounts                           | 9,488,367 47       |
|  | \$30,373,840 93    |
| Assets   |                    |
| United States Bonds and other Securities         | \$72,936,522 41    |
| First Mortgages on Real Estate                   | 70,729,928 93      |
| Loans on Stocks and Bonds                        | 7,487,260 00       |
| Real Estate                                      | 18,089,518 69      |
| Cash in Banks and Trust Companies                | 10,844,667 72      |
| Accrued Interest, Deferred Premiums, &c.         | 4,600,028 39       |
|  | \$136,707,736 14   |
| Reserve for Policy-Holders and other Liabilities | 168,755,071 23     |
| Surplus  | \$17,952,698 91    |
| Income and Annuities                             |                    |
| Guaranteed and renewed                           | \$708,022,572 40   |
| Unrenewed  | 1,800,000,000 00   |
| Total  | \$2,508,022,572 40 |

I have carefully examined the foregoing Statement and find the same to be correct.

CHARLES A. FRITTLER, Auditor

From the Surplus a dividend will be apportioned as usual.

ROBERT A. GRANNISS, Vice-President

WALTER R. GILLETTE, General Manager  
ISAAC F. LOVAD, Ad. Vice-President  
FREDERIC CROMWELL, Treasurer  
GEORGE MCCLINTOCK, L.L.D., F.R.S., Actuary

**F. H. HYATT,**  
General Agent for South Carolina,  
COLUMBIA, S. C.