

7 (1956); 12 (1961). [L. G. OWENS] R. E. BROWN, *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus* (New York 1973). R. E. BROWN et al., *Mary in the New Testament* (New York, Philadelphia, Toronto 1978). J. F. CRAGHAN, "The Gospel Witness to Mary's 'Ante Partum' Virginity" *Marian Studies* 21 (1970) 28–68. J. A. FITZMYER, "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament," *Theological Studies* 34 (1973) 541–575. F. M. JELLY, "Mary's Virginity in the Symbols and Councils," *Marian Studies* 21 (1970) 69–93. J. MCHUGH, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (New York 1975). M. MIGUENS, *The Virgin Birth: An Evaluation of Scriptural Evidence* (Westminster, Md. 1975). K RAHNER, "Virginitas in Partu: A Contribution to the Problem of the Development of Dogma and of Tradition," *Theological Investigations* 4, tr. K. SMYTH (Baltimore 1966) 134–162.

[L. G. OWENS/F. M. JELLY]

VIRGINES SUBINTRODUCTAE

Latin term, corresponding to the Greek παρθένοι συνείσακτοι [virgins brought in with (a man)] given to the virgins or widows who were referred to as ἀγαπηταί or beloved and lived with a man dedicated to celibacy to care for his domestic needs. The term *virgines subintroductae* appears in the 3d century in a pejorative sense and is the result of the accusation that such virgins or widows considered themselves united to the ascetic in a spiritual marriage for mutual assistance in achieving a high spirituality. In the 5th century the term was applied almost indiscriminately to women, whether relatives or not, who lived as domestics in the houses of ecclesiastics.

In the New Testament. It is uncertain whether the words of St. Paul in 1 Cor 7.36–38 can be understood as referring to this or a similar custom. The passage is difficult. The Apostle is applying to a particular case his teaching on the superiority of celibacy and virginity over marriage in the Christian dispensation. Someone must decide whether this virgin should get married or continue a virgin. The main difficulty is to determine the relationship to the virgin of the man who must make the decision. Is he her father or a man who can marry her? The traditional exegesis, which was unquestioned until the close of the 19th century, understands Paul to be referring to the father (or guardian) of a virgin daughter (or ward) who is fully of an age to marry. Should he give her in marriage or keep her a virgin? The difficulties to this interpretation are the plural γαμείτωσαν (let them get married: v. 36) and the terms by which the Apostle designates the man and maid, τις (anyone) and παρθένος (virgin). The subject of the plural "let them get married" can only be a man and a woman who may licitly become man and wife. The τις would, consequently, be the girl's fiancée. It was probably in order to obviate this difficulty that the Western text, followed by the Vulgate, changed the plural verb to a singular, γαμείτω (let her get married), *si nubat*

(if she get married) in the Vulgate. Neither the Church Fathers who condemned the συνείσακτοι nor the συνείσακτοι themselves ever appealed to this text of Paul. Apart from the obscure passage of 1 Cor 7.36–38, there is no evidence for the existence of any such custom in the 1st-century Church. Consequently very few exegetes would read the custom into the text of Paul. But a growing number of exegetes do see in the passage a case analogous to the later *Virgines subintroductae*. A betrothed Christian couple, inspired by Paul's teaching on celibacy, must make a difficult decision: should they get married or continue simply as betrothed? This interpretation, however, which is adopted by the Revised Standard Version, has its own difficulties. The adjective ὑπέρρακιος (v. 36) and the participle γαμίζων (twice in v. 38) are given unusual meaning. The adjective is taken as a masculine modifying τις and describing the sex urge of the man: "If anyone . . . if his passions are strong." But usage hardly supports such a meaning. The adjective ὑπέρρακιος should mean, etymologically, beyond the ἄκμή (high point, i.e., prime of life). In this passage it would be made to mean, therefore, sexually well developed or fully of an age to marry; it could, indeed, refer to the maiden as well as to the man. The participle γαμίζων (from γαμίζω) would normally mean giving in marriage, so that it would seem to indicate that the τις who must make the decision is the girl's father or guardian. The fiancé interpretation can be maintained only on the supposition that γαμίζων is here a synonym for γαμῶν (from γαμέω) in the sense of take in marriage.

Bibliography: *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible*, translated and adapted by L. HARTMAN (New York, 1963) 2547–48. R. KUGELMAN, "1 Cor 7:36–38," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 10 (Washington 1948) 63–71. J. J. O'ROURKE, "Hypotheses regarding 1 Cor 7:36–38," *ibid.* 20 (1958) 292–298. W. G. KÜMMEL, "Verlobung und Heirat bei Paulus," *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (Berlin 1954) 275–295. R. H. A. SEBOLDT, "Spiritual Marriage in the Early Church: A Suggested Interpretation of 1 Cor 7:36–38," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 30 (1959) 103–119.

[R. KUGELMAN]

In the Primitive Church. There is almost no evidence for this practice in the primitive Church despite apparent references in the Shepherd of HERMAS (ch. 9), the DIDACHE (11.11), IRENAEUS (*Adv. Haer.* 1.6.3), and TERTULLIAN (*De exhort. cast.* 12). Later attempts to justify the practice by St. Paul's reference to a woman companion (1 Cor 9.5) were offset by his cautions: *adulescentiores viduas devota* (1 Tim 5.11–13). The custom is known mainly through condemnations by the Fathers and councils, which indicate that this system, without being general, had a considerable diffusion particularly in connection with the Gnostic sects. It is explicitly referred to by St. CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE (*Epist.* 4), the synod of Antioch,

which condemned PAUL OF SAMOSATA and his companions in 268 (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 7.30.12), the Pseudo-Clementine *Epistula ad Virgines*, Jerome (*Epist.* 22), and in the synods of ELVIRA 306 (c.27), Ancyra 314 (c.19), and Nicaea 325 (c.3), which discouraged spiritual marriages.

With the condemnation of the practice by JOHN CHRYSOSTOM in two pastoral letters written shortly after he became patriarch of Constantinople (*Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne 47:495–532) and the prevalence of clerical celibacy particularly in the West, many councils prohibited the custom outright: Orléans in 549 (c.3), Tours in 567 (c.11), and Toledo IV in 633 (c.42). The Council of Bordeaux in 663 or 675 (c.3) seems to be the only Merovingian synod to speak of the practice by name. Justinian I legislated against it (*Novel.* 123.29) as did Gregory I in a letter to the bishop of Spoleto (*Epist.* 13.39).

In Celtic countries during the 5th and early 6th centuries monks and nuns lived in separate buildings but within the same monastery walls (see MONASTERIES, DOUBLE). There seems to be a reference to the designation of *virgines subintroductae* in the so-called Synod of Bishops Patrick, Auxilius, and Isnerius c. 459 (c.9), and in Armorican Brittany in the early 6th century these virgins and widows, referred to as *conhospitae*, assisted the priest in the celebration of Mass and in presenting the chalice to communicants, a practice that horrified certain Gallican bishops. There is evidence for a similar practice among the Syrian Nestorians in the early 6th century.

Bibliography: J. SCHMID and D. MISONNE, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. HOFER and K. RAHNER, 10 v. (2d, new ed. Freiburg 1957–65); suppl., *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil: Dokumente und kommentare*, ed. H. S. BRECHTER et al., pt. 1 (1966) 9:1229–31. A. ADAM, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 7 v. (3d ed. Tübingen 1957–65) 6:560–561. H. ACHELIS, *Virgines subintroductae* (Leipzig 1902). P. DE LABRIOLLE, *Revue Historique* 137 (Paris 1921) 204–225, spiritual marriage. G. MORIN, *Revue Bénédictine* 47 (Maredsous 1935) 101–113. E. KÄHLER, *Die Frau in den paulinischen Briefen* (Zürich 1960) 38–41, 215–218.

[F. X. MURPHY]

VIRGINIA, CATHOLIC CHURCH IN

The first of the thirteen colonies, one of the four commonwealths in the U.S., bordered on the north by Maryland and West Virginia, on the south by North Carolina and Tennessee, on the east by Maryland and the Atlantic Ocean, and on the west by Kentucky and West Virginia. Richmond is the capital and Norfolk the largest city. The two Catholic dioceses in Virginia, Richmond (1820) and Arlington (1974) are suffragan of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. In 2001 Catholics numbered some eight percent of the total state population of 6.9 million.

Early History. Colonial Virginia was not a friendly place for Catholics. In 1570 eight Spanish Jesuits from Florida established a mission near the future Jamestown, but were betrayed by their Native American guide and massacred. When the Virginia colony was founded at Jamestown in 1607, its charter from James I stated: “We should be loath that any person should be permitted to pass, that we suspected to affect the superstitions of the Church of Rome.” Nominally, the Church of England was officially established. In 1634 hostility toward Catholicism increased with the settlement of Maryland under Catholic auspices. In 1642 Virginia enacted laws banning priests and prohibiting the exercise of Catholicism. Despite these restrictions, in 1651 Giles Brent, a Catholic, and his family, moved from Maryland and settled in Stafford County, between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers. Throughout the colonial period, the Brents remained loyal to the Church, and some held public office. Two sisters of John Carroll, the future bishop, married Brents. In 1784 Carroll was named superior of the American mission. In his first report to the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, the missionary arm of the pope, he stated that “there are not more than 200 [Catholics] in Virginia who are visited four or five times a year by a priest.”

In 1789 Carroll was named the first bishop of Baltimore with jurisdiction over the entire nation, including Virginia; in 1808, he was named archbishop. By the 1790s Catholics had settled in Alexandria, part of the District of Columbia until 1846, and in Norfolk. In 1791 Jean Dubois said Mass for a small congregation in Norfolk, but then moved to Richmond where he taught school for over a year and established friendships with leading Protestants, including Patrick Henry. Once in Richmond, he received a request from Colonel John Fitzgerald, George Washington’s aide-de-camp, to say Mass in Alexandria from time to time. While he never visited Alexandria, he did go at Carroll’s request to Emmitsburg, Maryland, where he was one of the founders of Mt. St. Mary’s College before becoming the third Bishop of New York. The church in Alexandria was then served—and owned—by former Jesuits, suppressed as an order in 1773 and restored in the U.S. in 1805.

By 1817 lay trusteeism had arisen in Norfolk. Though most of the congregation were Irish, a Portuguese physician, Oliviera Fernandez, was their leader. In a series of long, learned, and tedious broadsides, he rejected the authority of Father James Lucas, appointed to Norfolk by Archbishop Leonard NEALE, Carroll’s successor, and refused to accept the jurisdiction of Carroll’s second successor, the French-born Archbishop Ambrose MARECHAL. He argued that the trustees were the heirs to the *patronato real* and that, just as the pope signed a con-