

How the Orthodoxy of Maria Valtorta's Work Shines Even More Brightly and Exposing the Methodological and Theological Errors of Marian Horvat: A Complete Refutation of Horvat's Flawed Anti-Valtorta Article

Theological Errors and Incompetency, Methodological Flaws, Distortions and Misrepresentations, Lack of Objectivity, and Ignorance on the Subject She is Writing About: How Horvat's Anti-Valtorta Article Lacks Substance and Credibility and Stands Completely Refuted

By Stephen Austin, January 2016 (Updated May 2017)

Tradition in Action (www.TraditioninAction.org) is a traditional Catholic website which is associated with a group that broke away from the SSPX. They have posted several anti-Valtorta articles on their website, one of which is an anti-Valtorta article by Marian Horvat.

The most widely-read anti-Valtorta articles in English-speaking countries are those published on EWTN or by those who work for them. I don't feel the need to discuss concerns about this particular organization here because others have already done thorough investigation and studies of EWTN (such as Christopher Ferrara's book [EWTN: A Network Gone Wrong](#)) and the refutations their anti-Valtorta articles speak for themselves and are readily available here: [An Analysis and Refutation of All the Top Anti-Valtorta Articles](#).

However, I do feel the need to address traditioninaction.com because, since they are a traditional Catholic media outlet, they are considered by some traditional and conservative Catholics to ordinarily be more trustworthy than many organizations of the mainstream Catholic media. On some topics and in certain cases, this is true. Unfortunately, on this particular topic, they have proven not to be trustworthy or reliable as my refutations of their anti-Valtorta articles and this article demonstrate.

In reading the refutation of her article, it is not difficult to see very quickly that her article does not stand up to scrutiny, and is in fact filled with serious methodological errors. Someone commented, after reading the refutation of her article, saying, "I am blown away. I find TIA [Tradition in Action] sometimes a bit too stuffy at times, but I did not think that they would have done such a poor job on the *Poem*." Unfortunately, it appears that Tradition in Action trusted Horvat too much, which was a mistake because Horvat displays a notable level of ignorance on the subject she is writing about and her article is riddled with falsehoods, deficient theology, wrenching of statements out of context with false unsubstantiated insinuations, poor research, ignorance of too many relevant facts, sweeping generalizations, lack of objectivity, and an obvious unjustified bias against the *Poem*. It is readily apparent from her article that she carried out a cursory, non-in-depth investigation into Maria Valtorta's writings and based most of her article on only one source (Br. James's article: a source which has proven to be highly incredible). After accounting for her falsehoods and false insinuations which are easily shown as wrong, most of her remaining arguments are based on unsubstantiated subjective impressions which are contradicted by those of greater learning and authority than her.

Below is a Table of Contents of the various parts of the refutation of Horvat’s article. If you don't want to read the whole article from top to bottom, you can skip to whatever section is of interest to you. You can click on any of the sections in the Table of Contents and it will jump you directly to that section.

1.	Assessing the Introduction to Her Article
2.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “A humanized Christ” (First Paragraph)
3.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “Jesus suggests a love-affair between St. Peter and Our Lady”
4.	Refuting Her “New Age” Insinuation of the Face of Jesus Portrait
5.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “A sensual Eve tending toward bestiality”
6.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “Like Luther, Mary thinks: Let us sin to be forgiven”
7.	Refuting Her Statement About Blessed Gabriel Allegra, O.F.M.
8.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “An Adult with homosexual tendencies”
9.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “A humanized Christ” (Second Paragraph)
10.	Refuting Her Claim About Progressives
11.	Refuting Her Claim that the <i>Poem</i> Contains "Endless Idle Conversations"
12.	Refuting Her Section Entitled “An Infant conceived with original sin”
13.	Refuting the Concluding Remarks of Her Article (and Discussing Her Seven Wrong Page Number References and Failure to Reference All Her Citations)

The first topic starts on the next page.

Assessing the Introduction to Her Article

Horvat writes that her friend wrote to her:

“I have not read this book,” my friend continues, “but, for Heaven’s sake, why didn’t Bishop W. recommend reading the wonderful, approved, written-by-a-canonized saint 4-volume *City of God* by Mother Mary of Agreda? But that is beside the point. I really do wish to know if you approve of the *Poem of the Man-God*. Even the title upsets my Catholic sensibilities.”

To answer her friend’s question about why the bishop and many others who know about the *Poem* would recommend the *Poem of the Man-God* over Mary of Agreda’s work, see the chapter of [this e-book](#) entitled “*How does the Poem of the Man-God Compare to the Revelations of Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich and Venerable Mary of Agreda’s Mystical City of God?*” That should answer all your questions. But just to give you a taste, I’ll quote Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M.

Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., was a world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome, professor at the Lateran Pontifical University, and a Consultant to the Holy Office and the Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints. An article on Gabriel Roschini relates:¹

During the pontificate of Pope Pius XII, he worked closely with the Vatican on Marian publications. In light of the encyclopedic accuracy of his work, Roschini is considered as one of the top two Mariologists in the 20th century. His first major work, a four-volume Mariology, *// Capolavoro di Dio*, is judged to be the most comprehensive Mariological presentation in the 20th century. Several theologians called him "one of the most profound Mariologists" and "irreplaceable".

He was highly esteemed by all the Popes during his priestly life (especially Pope Pius XII). Fr. Roschini has written over 790 articles and miscellaneous writings, and 130 books, 66 of which were over 200 pages long. Most of his writings were devoted to Mariology. Lest someone automatically think he’s a modernist whose writings can’t be trusted, it is good to note that he was born in 1900, became a priest in 1924, and spent most of his priestly life prior to the crisis in the Church that has broken out during the past 50 years. All of his writings on Mariology are completely traditional/orthodox. An article relates, “During the pontificate of Pius XII, ‘the most Marian Pope in Church history,’ Roschini worked closely with the Pontiff, arranging his own publications parallel to Papal Mariological promulgations... Together he published over 900 titles, mostly on Mariology, in addition to his encyclopedic works, reviewing the Mariological contributions of saints like Bernard of Clairvaux and Anthony of Padua. In 1950, he explained the Mariology of Thomas Aquinas. He detailed his Mariology in a major work in the year 1952.”² He was also at some time Prior General of the Order of the Servants of Mary, Vicar General, and General Director of its studies. He was also a member of several scholarly academies, and vice-president of the Pontifical Academy of Our Lady Immaculate (founded in 1847).³

Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., in his last book, *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*, outlines the greatest female Marian mystics of all time:⁴

III. THE GREATEST FEMALE MARIAN MYSTICS

The greatest female Marian mystics in ancient and modern times are:

- St. Hildegard of Bingen, Benedictine (1098-1179), known as “the Sibyl of the Rhine”;
- St. Mechtildis of Helfta (St. Matilda), Cistercian (1241-1299);
- St. Gertrude the Great, Cistercian (1256-1302 or 1309), the greatest mystic of the 13th century;
- Blessed Angela of Foligno, secular Franciscan (1246-1309);
- St. Bridgè of Sweden (Birgitta) (1309-1373), “the Northern Mystic”;
- St. Catherine of Siena, tertiary Dominican (1347-1380), Doctor of the Church;
- St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi, Carmelite (1566-1607);
- Venerable Maria de Agreda, Franciscan (1602-1665);
- St. Veronica Giuliani, Capuchin (1660-1727);
- Blessed Mary-Magdalen Martinengo, Capuchin (1687-1737);
- Servant of God Mary of St. Theresa Petit, Third Order Carmelite (1623-1677);
- Venerable Mary-Archangel Biondini, of the Handmaids of Mary (1641-1712);
- Servant of God Cecil Bay, Benedictine (1694-1766);
- Venerable Anne Catherine Emmerich, Augustinian (1774-1824);
- Servant of God Marie Véronique of the Heart of Jesus, founder of the Institute of the Victims of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (1825-1883);
- Guglielmina Ronconi (1864-1936);
- Servant of God Lucia Mángano, Ursuline (1896-1946);
- Maria Valtorta, tertiary of the Order of Servants of Mary (1897-1961).

Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., then writes in the preface of this same book, *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*:⁵

I have been studying, teaching, preaching, and writing Mariology for half a century already. To do this, I had to read innumerable works and articles of all kinds on Mary: a real Marian library.

However, I must candidly admit that the Mariology found in all of Maria Valtorta's writings – both published or unpublished – has been for me a real discovery. No other Marian writings, not even the sum total of everything I have read and studied, were able to give me as clear, as lively, as complete, as luminous, or as fascinating an image, both simple and sublime, of Mary, God's Masterpiece.

It seems to me that the conventional image of the Blessed Virgin, portrayed by myself and my fellow Mariologists, is merely a paper mache Madonna compared to the living and vibrant Virgin Mary envisioned by Maria Valtorta, a Virgin Mary perfect in every way.

...whoever wants to know the Blessed Virgin (a Virgin in perfect harmony with the Holy Scriptures, the Tradition of the Church, and the Church Magisterium) should draw from Valtorta's Mariology.

If anyone believes my declaration is only one of those ordinary hyperbolic slogans abused by publicity, I will say this only: let them read before they judge!

Fr. Roschini has written over 790 articles and miscellaneous writings, and 130 books, 66 of which were over 200 pages long. Most of his writings were devoted to Mariology.

For a theologian, such as Fr. Roschini, O.S.M., to be so well-read and so learned as to have written 130 totally orthodox books about Our Lady, and to be a decorated professor at the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome (which he founded), an advisor to the Holy Office, and to be called by a Pope “one of the greatest Mariologists who ever lived”, it is not presumptuous to assume that he has probably read every single great work ever written about Our Lady – including Venerable Mary of Agreda’s *Mystical City of God*, the revelations of Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich, the revelations about Our Lady given to St. Bridget of Sweden, and almost every single other major work about Our Lady. Yet – even so – Fr. Roschini declared: “No other Marian writings, **not even the sum total of everything I have read and studied**, were able to give me as clear, as lively, as complete, as luminous, or as fascinating an image, both simple and sublime, of Mary, God's Masterpiece.” Such a declaration from such a theologian as he carries a *lot* of weight!

In fact, Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., had personally met Valtorta, but admitted that, at first, like many others, he was a respectful and condescending skeptic. But after carefully studying her writings for himself, he underwent a radical and enthusiastic change of heart, later declaring Valtorta to be “one of the eighteen greatest mystics of all time.”⁶ As material for a course which he taught at the Marianum Pontifical Theological Faculty in Rome on the Marian intuitions of the great mystics, Fr. Gabriel Roschini used both Maria Valtorta’s *The Poem of the Man-God* as well as her other mystical writings as a basis for his course.⁷

I mentioned earlier that Horvat based most of her article on only one source. I’d also like to point out the interesting coincidence that this same site which hosts this article she quotes against the *Poem* also hosts on the website an article criticizing Mary of Agreda’s *Mystical City of God*, which is here: [A Critical Review of Mary of Agreda's Mystical City of God](#).

The above article ends with: “Time has cost *The Mystical City of God* whatever credibility or spiritual value it once had, leaving Mary of Agreda as a curious footnote in Church history.”

But what about what Horvat’s friend said about the title of the *Poem of the Man-God*: “I have not read this book... Even the title upsets my Catholic sensibilities”?

Below is a website providing excellent answers to 13 of the most common questions and misconceptions about the *Poem*: [Answers to Common Questions and Misconceptions about the Poem](#).

Examples of some of the common questions/misconceptions answered are the claim that using the term “Man-God” in the title of her work is heresy, the claim that there were no screwdrivers in Jesus’ day but Maria Valtorta mentions a screwdriver in one of her visions, etc.

Regarding the use of the term “Man-God” in the title “Poem of the Man-God”, you should note that many saints have used the term “Man-God” (see the link above), and there is no actual or implied heresy in using that term instead of “God-Man” when referring to Jesus. You should note that Maria Valtorta’s work contains both a very strong affirmation of the divinity of Christ as well as His humanity. Furthermore, this title was chosen by the publisher (not Maria Valtorta), is now being replaced with a new title in the newest editions, and has nothing to do with Maria Valtorta or the doctrinal integrity of the work itself. The actual title given by Maria Valtorta herself for her own work when she was still alive was “The Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ as it was revealed to Little John”. A similar title to this, “The Gospel as Revealed to Me”, is now being used to replace the older title “The Poem of the Man-God” for newer editions of her work. This new title is already incorporated in the Italian, French, and Spanish translations, and recently now in the English second edition of her work released in 2012.

The few critics (usually those who are less knowledgeable in theology) who think that the term “Man-God” is a problem don’t know what they are talking about and are getting tripped up on a non-problem. Knowledgeable theologians know that there is not a problem with it as evidenced by the multiple imprimaturs and episcopal endorsements this work has received under both titles by trustworthy, very knowledgeable bishops (for one, Bishop Roman Danylak, S.T.L., J.U.D., issued an official letter of endorsement of the English translation of the *Poem of the Man-God*, and he has a License in Sacred Theology and Doctorates in both Canon Law and Civil Law from the Pontifical Lateran University in Rome).

Bishop Roman Danylak, S.T.L., J.U.D., wrote: “Secondly, [a critic] takes issue with the title of the book: *The Poem of the Man-God* inferring that Christ should be more properly called the God-Man. I wish to refer to the work of Saint Alphonsus Ligouri on “The Passion and the Death of Jesus Christ.” I quote from the 1983 English edition of the 1927 translation by Rev. Eugene Grimm, CSsR., which I have at hand. It will not be difficult to correlate the translation with the original work of Saint Alphonsus. Quoting from Saint Augustine, St. Alphonsus reverses the words of St. Augustine, ‘Deus-Homo’, and writes: “Nothing is more salutary than to think daily on what the Man-God has endured for us.” (p. 159). This Name of Christ, the Man-God apparently is common Italian usage, L’Uomo-Dio’. Cardinal Pietro Parente, one of the foremost Italian theologians before and during Vatican II, a Secretary of the Holy Office under Card. Ottaviani, in his article on the Incarnate Word in *Euntes Docete* (1952) titles his treatise “Unità ontologica psicologica dell ‘Uomo-Dio’”; this expression is often found throughout his writings on Christology.”⁸

However, I agree that the former title “The Poem of the Man-God” is a poor title, and I like the new title better as it more accurately reflects the true nature of these revelations. Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., Lèsl., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., agrees, and relates concerning the title (on the next page):⁹

The Poem of the Man-God: A Bad Title for a Wonderful Work

The English translation (1986-[2012]) of Maria Valtorta's Life of Jesus was published under the lame, provisional title of *The Poem of the Man-God*.

What a faulty title! It's not a poem, it's prose; and it would have been better to have *God-Man* instead of *Man-God*.

(To the best of our knowledge, that title was not the translators' fault. It was not really the publisher's fault either, though he unfortunately trusted another Italian whose knowledge of English was quite rudimentary).

The Gospel as it was Shown to me: That's the title that the Maria Valtorta Research Center would have chosen for Maria Valtorta's Life of Jesus.

Fortunately, the new title "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" is now being used to replace the older title "The Poem of the Man-God" for newer editions of her work. As mentioned earlier, this new title is already incorporated in the Italian, French, and Spanish translations, and recently now in the English second edition of her work released in 2012. Personally, I put much more stock in the numerous bishops and renowned theologians who have approved the *Poem of the Man-God* in editions that had this title over the "Catholic sensibilities" of a lay woman who admitted she has never read the book. I don't like the old title either, but considering many saints explicitly used the term "Man-God" in their writings, I don't let that stop me from reading this profound work of theology, exegesis, and Mariology, and it hasn't stopped countless others.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “A humanized Christ” (First Paragraph)

Horvat’s analysis is riddled with falsehoods, deficient theology, wrenching of statements out of context with false unsubstantiated insinuations, poor research, ignorance of too many relevant facts, sweeping generalizations, lack of objectivity, and an obvious unjustified bias against the *Poem*. It is readily apparent from her article that she carried out a cursory, non-in-depth investigation into Maria Valtorta’s writings and based most of her article on only one source (a source which is highly unbelievable). After accounting for her falsehoods and false insinuations which are easily shown as wrong, most of her remaining arguments are based on unsubstantiated subjective impressions which are contradicted by those of greater learning and authority than her. I am going to go through each of her statements in this section and refute each of her claims and show all of its errors and falsehoods.

David Webster, M.Div., summed up the objections to the *Poem of the Man-God* well when he wrote:¹⁰

Though there have been claims of error in *The Poem* we have not seen *one single example* of such error within *The Poem* that has not either been *based on pure ignorance or a wrenching of statements completely out of context*. Most of the charges against this work have been so glaringly false and libelous that villainous intent cannot be denied.

Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., LèsL., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., wrote:¹¹

Let us return to the alleged dogmatic or moral errors which some opponents of the *Poem of the Man-God* claim to find in it. The alleged errors result from the opponents’ own doing: they rarely present complete quotations, they mutilate them; they wrench the quotations out of context, when only the context gives them their proper meaning; they sometimes even go so far as to falsify certain texts. Also, the testimony of those opponents often is not credible because of their lack of knowledge in mystical theology, their ignorance of Valtorta’s work, or their prejudice against it. Some have even gone so far as to declare publicly that they had not read it and did not intend to in the least.

David Webster, M.Div., says in another document:¹²

In my 6 years of research I have not discovered a single criticism leveled against the revelation in this work that is valid.

Horvat writes:

It is Jesus as a man that Valtorta presents: a babe suckling greedily at his Mother’s breasts

Horvat’s above insinuation is a distortion of Valtorta’s text that is tantamount to lying. Her gratuitous insinuation about “greed” is calumnious and unfounded, and shown to be absolutely

false when read in context. I address this objection in detail in the upcoming section entitled: "Refuting Her Section Entitled 'An Infant conceived with original sin.'"

Horvat writes:

It is Jesus as a man that Valtorta presents: ...a youth hardly aware of Who He is

I don't know where Horvat got that daring claim that Valtorta describes a Jesus Who is "hardly aware of Who He is". That is completely false! Let me quote an excerpt of what the 12-year-old Jesus says in the Temple to the doctors and scribes in Valtorta's vision. In this dialogue Jesus talks about the prophecy of Daniel concerning Himself and shows clearly that He knows full well Who He is! This excerpt is from *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 1, Chapter 41, pp. 212-219; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 41, pp. 256-264:

I see Jesus. He is an adolescent. He is dressed in a tunic which I think is made of white linen, and it reaches down to His feet. Over it, He is wearing a pale red rectangular piece of cloth. He is bare headed, His long hair reaches down to half His ears and it is somewhat darker in hue than when I saw Him as a child. He is a strong boy and very tall for His age, which is still relatively young, as is obvious from His countenance.

...When I awake with its memory in my heart, after I have recovered some of my strength and my mind is at peace, because they are all asleep, I find myself in a place which I have never seen before. There are yards and fountains and porches and houses, or rather pavilions, because they look more like pavilions than houses. There is a large crowd of people dressed in the ancient style of the Jews, and there is a lot of bawling. When I look round I realize I am inside the large building which Jesus was looking at, because I see the embattled wall surrounding it, the tower watching over it and the imposing building that rises in the center, and round which there are beautiful and large porches, where many people are intent on activities.

I understand that I am in the enclosure of the Temple in Jerusalem. I see Pharisees in long flowing dresses, priests dressed in linen and wearing precious plates at the top of their chests and on their foreheads and with other sparkling points here and there on their varied robes, which are very wide and white, tied to their waists by precious belts. There are also others with fewer decorations, but they must still belong to the sacerdotal caste and are surrounded by younger disciples. I realize that they are the doctors of the Law.

Among all these people I am lost, because I do not know why or what I am doing there. I go near a group of doctors where they have just started a theological dispute. Many people do the same.

Amongst the « doctors » there is a group headed by one whose name is Gamaliel and by another old and almost blind man who is supporting Gamaliel in the dispute. This man, whose name I hear is Hillel (I am writing it with an 'h' because I hear an aspiration at the beginning of the name) seems to be a teacher or relative of Gamaliel, because the latter treats him with familiarity and respect at the same time. Gamaliel's group is more broad-minded, whereas another group, and it is more numerous, is led by one whose name is Shammai, and is noticeable for its conservative, resentful intolerance which the Gospel has clarified so well.

Gamaliel, surrounded by a compact group of disciples, is speaking of the coming of the Messiah, and founding his observations on Daniel's prophecy, he states that the Messiah must

have already been born, because the seventy prophesied weeks, from the time the decree of the reconstruction of the Temple was issued, expired some ten years before. Shammai opposes him stating that, if it is true that the Temple has been rebuilt, it is also true that the slavery of Israel has increased and the peace, which He Whom the prophets called « Prince of Peace » was to bring, is quite far from being in the world and in particular is far from Jerusalem. The town is in fact oppressed by an enemy who is so bold as to exert his domination inside the enclosure of the Temple, dominated by the Antonia Tower, full of Roman legionaries, ready to put down with their swords any riot which may break out for the independence of the country.

The dispute, full of captious objections, is dragged on endlessly. All the doctors show off their learning, not so much to beat their opponents as to display themselves to the admiration of the listeners. Their aims are quite obvious.

From the close group of the believers the clear voice of a boy is heard: « Gamaliel is right. » There is a stir in the crowd and in the group of doctors. They look for the interrupter. But it is not necessary to search for him, because he does not hide. He makes his way through the crowd and goes near the group of the « rabbis ». I recognize my Jesus adolescent. He is sure of Himself and open-hearted, His eyes are sparkling with intelligence.

« Who are You? », they ask Him.

« I am a son of Israel, who has come to fulfill what the Law prescribes. »

His bold and frank reply is appreciated, and it gains Him smiles of approval and favor. They take an interest in the young Israelite.

« What is Your name? »

« Jesus of Nazareth. »

The feeling of benevolence fades away in Shammai's group. But Gamaliel, more benignly, continues his conversation with Hillel. It is indeed Gamaliel who with respect suggests to the old man: « Ask the boy something. »

« On what do You base Your certainty? » asks Hillel. (I will now put the names in front of the replies for the sake of brevity and clarity.)

Jesus: « On the prophecy which cannot be wrong about the time and the signs which took place at the time it came true. It is true that Caesar dominates us, but the world and Palestine were in such peace when the seventy weeks expired, that it was possible for Caesar to order the census in his dominions. Had there been wars in the Empire and riots in Palestine, he would not have been able to do so. As that time was completed, so the other period of sixty-two weeks plus one from the completion of the Temple is also being completed, so that the Messiah may be anointed and the remainder of the prophecy may come true for the people who did not want Him. Can you doubt that? Do you not remember the star that was seen by the Wise Men from the East and stopped over the sky in Bethlehem of Judah and that the prophecies and the visions, from Jacob onwards, indicate that place as the one destined as the birthplace of the Messiah, son of the son of Jacob's son, through David who was from Bethlehem? Do you not remember Balaam? "A Star will be born of Jacob". The Wise Men from the East, whose purity and faith opened their eyes and ears, saw the Star and understood its Name: "Messiah", and they came to worship the Light which had descended into the world. »

Shammai, glaring at Him: « Do you mean that the Messiah was born in Bethlehem-Ephrathah at the time of the Star? »

Jesus: « I do. »

Shammai: « Then he no longer is. Don't you know, Child, that Herod had all the born of woman, from one day up to the age of two years, slaughtered in Bethlehem and surroundings? You, Who are so wise in the Scriptures, must know also this: "A voice is heard in Ramah... it is Rachel weeping for her children". The valleys and the hills in Bethlehem, which gathered the tears of the dying Rachel, were left full of tears, and the mothers have wept again on their slaughtered children. Amongst them, there certainly was the Mother of the Messiah. »

Jesus: « You are wrong, old man. The weeping of Rachel turned into a hosanna, because there, where she gave birth to "the son of her sorrow", the new Rachel has given the world the Benjamin of the Heavenly Father, the Son of His right hand, Him Who is destined to gather the people of God under His scepter and free it from the most dreadful slavery. »

Shammai: « How can that be, if He was killed? »

Jesus: « Have you not read about Elijah? He was carried off by the chariot of fire. *And could the Lord God not have saved his Immanuel that He might be the Messiah of His people?* He, Who parted the sea in front of Moses that Israel might walk on dry ground towards its land, *could He not have sent His angels to save His Son, His Christ, from the ferocity of man?* I solemnly tell you: *the Christ is alive and is amongst you, and when His hour comes, He will show Himself in His power.* » Jesus, in saying these words, which I have underlined, has a sharp sound in His voice which fills the air. His eyes are brighter than ever, and with the gesture of command and promise He stretches out His right arm and hand and lowers them as if He were swearing. He is a boy, but is as solemn as a man.

Hillel: « Child, who taught you these words? »

Jesus: « The Spirit of God. I have no human teacher. This is the Word of the Lord Who speaks to you through My lips. »

Hillel: « Come near us that I may see You, Child, and my hope may be revived by Your faith and my soul enlightened by the brightness of Yours. »

And they make Jesus sit on a high stool between Gamaliel and Hillel and they give Him some rolls to read and explain. It is a proper examination. The people throng and listen.

Jesus reads in His clear voice: « Be consoled, my people. Speak to the heart of Jerusalem and call to her that her time of service is ended... A voice cries in the wilderness: "Prepare a way for the Lord... then the glory of the Lord shall be revealed... " »

Shammai: « See that, Nazarene. It refers here to an ended slavery, but never before have we been slaves as we are now. And there is the mention of a precursor. Where is he? You are talking nonsense. »

Jesus: « I tell you that the admonition of the Precursor should be addressed to you more than anyone else. To you and those like you. Otherwise you will not see the glory of the Lord, neither will you understand the word of God because meanness, pride, and falsehood will prevent you from seeing and hearing. »

Shammai: « How dare You speak to a master like that? »

Jesus: « I speak thus. And thus I shall speak even to My death, *because above Me there are the interests of the Lord and the love for Truth of which I am the Son.* And I add, rabbi, that the slavery of which the Prophet speaks, and of which I am speaking, is not the one you think, neither is the royalty the one you consider. On the contrary, by the merits of the Messiah man will be made free from the slavery of Evil, which separates him from God, and the sign of Christ will be on the spirits, freed from every yoke and made subjects of the eternal kingdom. All the nations will bend their heads, o household of David, before the Shoot born of you and which will grow into a tree that

covers the whole world and rises up to Heaven. And in Heaven and on the earth every mouth will praise His Name and bend its knee before the Anointed of God, the Prince of Peace, the Leader, before Him Who by giving Himself will fill with joy and nourishment every disheartened and famishing soul, before the Holy One Who will establish an alliance between Heaven and earth. Not like the Covenant made with the Elders of Israel when God led them out of Egypt, treating them still as servants, but infusing a heavenly paternity into the souls of men with the Grace instilled once again by the merits of the Redeemer, through Whom all good people will know the Lord and the Sanctuary of God will no longer be demolished and destroyed. »

Shammai: « Do not blaspheme, Child! Remember Daniel. He states that after the death of Christ, the Temple and the Town will be destroyed by a people and a leader who will come from afar. And You hold that the sanctuary of God will no longer be demolished! Respect the Prophets! »

Jesus: « I solemnly tell you that there is Someone Who is above the Prophets, and you do not know Him and you will not know Him because you do not want to. And I tell you that what I said is true. *The true Sanctuary will not be subject to death.* But like its Sanctifier it will rise to eternal life and at the end of the world it will live in Heaven. »

Hillel: « Listen to me, Child. Haggai says: "... The One Expected by the nations will come... great then shall be the glory of this house, and of *this last one* more than of the previous one". Does he perhaps refer to the Sanctuary of which You are speaking? »

Jesus: « Yes, master. That is what he means. Your honesty leads You towards the Light and I tell you: when the Sacrifice of Christ is accomplished, you shall have peace because you are an Israelite without wickedness. »

Gamaliel: « Tell me, Jesus. How can the peace of which the Prophets speak be hoped for, if destruction is going to come to this people by war? Speak and enlighten also me. »

Jesus: « Do you not remember, master, what those said who were present on the night of Christ's birth? That the angels sang: "Peace to men of good will" but this people is not of good will and will not have peace. It will not acknowledge its King, the Just Man, the Savior, because they expect Him to be a king with human power, whereas He is the King of the spirit. They will not love Him, because they will not like what Christ preaches. Christ will not defeat their enemies with their chariots and their horses, He will instead defeat the enemies of the soul, who endeavor to imprison in hell the heart of man which was created for the Lord. And this is not the victory which Israel is expecting from Him. Your King will come, Jerusalem, riding a "donkey and a colt", that is, the just people of Israel and the Gentiles. But I tell you, that the colt will be more faithful to Him and will follow Him preceding the donkey and will grow in the ways of Truth and Life. Because of its evil will, Israel will lose its peace and suffer for centuries and will cause its King to suffer and will make Him the King of sorrow of Whom Isaiah speaks. »

Shammai: « Your mouth tastes of milk and blasphemy at the same time, Nazarene. Tell me: where is the Precursor? When did we have him? »

Jesus: « He *is*. Does not Malachi say: "Here I am going to send My messenger to prepare the way before Me; and the Lord you are seeking will suddenly enter His Temple, and the angel of the Covenant Whom you are longing for"? Therefore the Precursor immediately precedes Christ. *He already is, as Christ is.* If years should elapse between him who prepares the ways for the Lord and Christ, all the ways would become obstructed and twisted again. God knows and arranges beforehand that the Precursor should precede the Master by *one hour only*. When you see this Precursor, you will be able to say: "The mission of Christ is beginning". And I say to you: Christ will

open many eyes and many ears when He comes this way. But He will not open yours or those of people like you, because you will be putting to death Him Who is bringing you Life. But when the Redeemer sits on His throne and on His altar, higher up than this Temple, higher than the Tabernacle enclosed in the Holy of the Holies, higher up than the Glory supported by the Cherubim, maledictions for the deicides and life for the Gentiles will flow from His thousands and thousands of wounds, because He, o master who are unaware of it, is not, I repeat, is not the king of a human kingdom, but of a spiritual Kingdom and His subjects will be only those who for His sake will learn to regenerate in the spirit and, like Jonah, after being born, will learn to be born again, on other shores: "The shores of God", by means of a spiritual regeneration which will take place through Christ, Who will give humanity true Life. »

Shammai and his followers: « This Nazarene is Satan! »

Hillel and his followers: « No. This child is a Prophet of God. Stay with me, Child. My old age will transfuse what I know into Your knowledge and You will be Master of the people of God. »

Jesus: « I solemnly tell you that if there were many like you, salvation would come to Israel. But My hour has not come. Voices from Heaven speak to Me and in solitude I must gather them until My hour comes. Then with My lips and My blood I will speak to Jerusalem, and the destiny of Prophets stoned and killed by her, will also be My destiny. But above My life there is the Lord God, to Whom I submit Myself as a faithful servant, to make of Myself a stool for His glory, waiting that He will make the world a stool at the feet of Christ. Wait for Me in My hour. *These stones shall hear My voice again and vibrate hearing My last word.* Blessed are those who in that voice will have heard God and believed in Him because of it. To them Christ will give that kingdom which your selfishness imagines to be a human one, whereas it is a heavenly one and therefore I say: "Here is Your servant, Lord, Who has come do to Your Will. Let it be consummated, because I am eager to fulfill it". »

And here, with the vision of Jesus with His face burning with spiritual ardor and raised to Heaven, His arms stretched out, standing upright in the midst of the astonished doctors, the vision ends.

[End of the excerpt from the *Poem of the Man-God* and back to my comments]

Now tell me if the 12-year-old Jesus does not know Who He is! Horvat is clearly wrong when she writes that Valtorta presents Jesus as "a youth hardly aware of Who He is". Her argument is proven to be unfounded and false.

Horvat writes:

It is Jesus as a man that Valtorta presents: ... a Man who laughs and jokes with His Apostles.

In Maria Valtorta's visions, Jesus *sometimes* laughs (as we would expect since He was man and that is one of the things that distinguishes men from animals who do not have reason and a soul: he is capable of laughing). However, Jesus rarely laughs in the *Poem*, and when He does, He does so at the most appropriate times and for the most appropriate reasons that are perfectly consistent with a perfect man, Who is also God.

In fact, Maria Valtorta, in a couple of excerpts, has given us a good introduction to the personality and general behavior of Jesus Christ as she saw Him in her visions. This will provide better context of the way Jesus *really* is depicted in her visions. In one of these excerpts, she writes:¹³

Jesus is never sullen, not even when He is more disgusted with something that has happened, but is always majestically dignified and communicates such supernatural dignity to the place in which He moves. **Jesus is never a jolly fellow or a complainer laughing coarsely or looking hypochondriac, not even in the moments of greatest delight or deepest depression.** His smile is inimitable. No painter will ever be able to reproduce it. It is like a light emanating from His heart, a bright light in the hours of greatest joy because a soul has been redeemed or approaches Perfection: I would say a rosy smile, when He approves of the spontaneous deeds of His friends or disciples and enjoys their company; a blue angelical smile, to remain in the field of hues, when He bends over children to listen to them, teach them, and then bless them; a smile mitigated by piety when He looks at the miseries of the flesh or the spirit; finally a divine smile, when He speaks of His Father or Mother, or looks at or listens to His Most Pure Mother.

I have never seen Him hypochondriac, not even in the hours of bitter torment. During the torture of being betrayed, during the anguish when He sweated blood, and the spasm of His Passion, if melancholy overwhelmed the sweet refulgence of His smile, it was not sufficient to cancel the peace, which is like a diadem shining with heavenly gems on His smooth forehead and enlightening His divine person. **Neither have I ever seen Him indulge in immoderate merriment. He is not averse to a hearty laugh, when the case demands it, but He immediately resumes His noble serenity.** But when He laughs, He prodigiously looks younger, to the extent of looking like a twenty-year-old man and the world seems to blossom through His lovely, hearty, loud, melodious laughter. Neither can I say that I have seen Him do things hurriedly. Whether He moves or speaks, He does so calmly, without, however, being sluggish or listless. It is probably because, tall as He is, He can stride, without running, to go a long way and He can likewise reach at distant things without having to stand up to do so. Even the way He moves is certainly gentlemanly and majestic. [emphasis added]

I have read the *Poem* (unlike Horvat, I have reason to believe) and I witness to the fact that in every one of the few instances when Christ laughs, it is perfectly consistent with Jesus Christ, Who is the Messiah and Promised One – both God and Man, perfect in every way: physically, spiritually, mentally, psychologically, emotionally, and in His divinity. Not only I, but also the following authorities have verified the perfect and realistic Jesus that Valtorta describes.

These bishops who approved the *Poem* after a thorough investigation of her writings include Pope Pius XII (who, in 1948, ordered it to be published), the Holy Office, 13 years later, in 1961 (and again in 1992) granted permission for the publication of her work, Bishop Roman Danylak, S.T.L., J.U.D. (who issued an official [letter of endorsement](#) of the English translation of the *Poem of the Man-God* in 2001), and Archbishop Soosa Pakiam M. of Trivandrum, India (who granted the [imprimatur](#) of the Malayalam translation of the *Poem* in 1993). It has also received the documented approval of three Consultants to the Holy Office in 1951-1952, five professors at pontifical universities in Rome, Blessed Gabriel Allegra, O.F.M. (a world-renowned exegete and

theologian), Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M. (world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome, Consultor of the Holy Office, and who wrote over 130 totally orthodox books about Our Lady), and many other cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and priests.

None the least of these was Archbishop Alphonsus Carinci, who was the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites from 1930 to 1960 (which was later renamed the Congregation for the Causes of Saints in 1969). Archbishop Carinci was in charge of investigating causes for beatification and canonization. He was conversant in recognizing true and false sanctity and was of distinguished repute. He visited Maria Valtorta three times, said Mass for her, read her writings in depth, wrote many letters back and forth with her, and analyzed her case. He was so convinced that her writings were inspired by God, that eyewitnesses report he would say to Maria Valtorta: “He is the Master. He is the Author,” and in his letters to Maria Valtorta, he wrote “Author” with a capital “A”.¹⁴ Archbishop Carinci was one of two prominent authorities who advised Fr. Corrado Berti to deliver typewritten copies of the *Poem of the Man-God* to Pope Pius XII, which led to his papal command to publish it in 1948.¹⁵ In January 1952, Archbishop Carinci also wrote a thorough certification and positive review of Valtorta’s work (four pages long when typed), which has been published.¹⁶ That same year, he also wrote a letter on behalf of himself and eight other prominent authorities (among them, two Consultants to the Holy Office, three professors at pontifical universities in Rome, a Consultant to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and the Prefect of the Vatican Secret Archive) to be delivered to Pope Pius XII in an audience, although the audience wasn’t able to be arranged.¹⁷ Archbishop Carinci is also one of the authorities whose favorable certifications about Maria Valtorta was given to the Holy Office in 1961 by Fr. Corrado Berti, which led the Holy Office to grant their approval of the publication of the second edition of her work.¹⁸

Among the other bishops who officially approve and promote the *Poem of the Man-God* are: Archbishop Alberto Ramos of Belem, Brazil, who granted the imprimatur to an anthology of the *Poem of the Man-God* that was published in 1978; Archbishop Nuncio Apostolic Pier Giacomo De Nicolò, who preached about Maria Valtorta and her writings with positive approval for the 50th anniversary of Maria Valtorta’s death in 2011 in the basilica where she is buried; Bishop John Venancio (former Bishop of Fatima and learned theologian who taught dogmatic theology at a pontifical university in Rome and who provided [important evidence](#) about the Third Secret of Fatima); Archbishop George Pearce, S.M., D.D.; and seven bishops in India who sent out letters to the translator of the Malayalam translation of the *Poem* praising and endorsing its translation and dissemination, stating that there is nothing against faith or morals in the *Poem* (one of them was a cardinal, another one was an archbishop, and the other five were regular bishops – two of whom were later appointed archbishops).

There are also documented eyewitness accounts by several trustworthy sources that Saint Padre Pio approved and encouraged the reading of Maria Valtorta’s works, and that he had mystical experiences with Maria Valtorta during the time when they were both alive (see the chapter of [this e-book](#) entitled “*Padre Pio and Maria Valtorta*” to read about these accounts).

There are also many other trustworthy and well-learned bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and theologians not mentioned above who approve of and endorse the *Poem of the Man-God*.

In addition to the significant ecclesiastical approval of the *Poem* – many of whom testify that they are certain that this is an authentic private revelation from God – there are a multitude of experts in a great variety of the secular sciences and arts that attest to the evidence of the divine origin of the *Poem*, writing authoritatively in their particular field and area of expertise.

Horvat implies in her article that the instances of Jesus laughing and joking in the *Poem* is inconsistent with the way Jesus was truly like (as if she knew) and is too "human". The above authorities disagree, and the above authorities have greater learning and experience in discernment than Horvat. And the above authorities haven't discredited themselves with an abundance of errors, poor research, and false insinuations like Horvat, nor did they use hopelessly ludicrous arguments like Horvat's section on one artist's portrait of Jesus based on Valtorta's description (more on that later). Those who have actually read the *Poem* in context can see very clearly, once again, that Horvat has made an unfounded accusation and is grossly misrepresenting the truth in her insinuations.

Lastly, Horvat's remaining objection in the first paragraph of her article about the occasional kisses and embraces that Valtorta described Jesus gave in her visions (which are perfectly consistent with the Hebrew customs of the day for every male Jew as even Scripture, authoritative writings of the time, and the imprimatured Catholic encyclopedia confirm and reference) as well as Horvat's groundless accusation that these are homosexual tendencies based on her mutilated out of context quotations are dealt with in detail in the upcoming section entitled "Refuting Her Section Entitled 'An Adult with homosexual tendencies.'" Her insinuations are shown to be without foundation and are thoroughly refuted. See that section for complete details.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “Jesus suggests a love-affair between St. Peter and Our Lady”

Horvat writes:

Jesus suggests a love-affair between St. Peter and Our Lady: Jesus even jokes with impropriety with his apostles. Here, Jesus stands up and calls out loudly and angrily to Peter:

“Come here, you usurper and corrupter!’

“Me? Why? What have I done, Lord?’

“You have corrupted My Mother. That is why you wanted to be alone. What shall I do with you?’

“Jesus smiles and Peter recovers his confidence. ‘You really frightened me! Now You are laughing.’ (Vol. II, n. 199, p. 185)

Again, we have Horvat quoting a passage out of context with a false unsubstantiated insinuation based on a gross misrepresentation tantamount to lying and contradicted by the obvious context.

Let’s read the context and you will see that her insinuation of a “love affair” is absolutely, unquestionably untrue and cannot in any way be implied by what is written in the *Poem*.

Here’s a little background. The apostolic college had adopted an orphan boy who they named Marjiam. Marjiam was a boy who was starving, living by himself in the woods because his whole family died from a mudslide, and his only relative left alive was his grandfather, who couldn’t house him because he was a slave of a cruel and wicked Pharisee. The grandfather was extremely overworked and ill-treated (like a brute animal) and Marjiam was too young to work and hence wouldn’t be housed by the Pharisee. His grandfather fed Marjiam in secret but Marjiam was otherwise alone, heart-broken, and living in dire poverty in the wilderness. The apostolic group came across Marjiam and adopted him. They kept Marjiam with them for a time prior to finding pious foster parents for him. In any case, Peter was always grieved that he and his wife were not able to have children (due to sterility). He had the heart of a loving father and wanted to be a father. Unlike in modern society, children were considered to be the joy and glory of family life in the Jewish nation in the first century. Peter begged Jesus to let him be the foster father of Marjiam, but Jesus kept on refusing him. Jesus didn’t want Peter to become too attached to Marjiam because that might interfere with his divine calling to be the head of the Apostolic college and the future Pontiff of His Church. Since Peter did not have success with convincing Jesus directly by himself, he thought that he might have recourse to asking Mary, Jesus’ Mother, to see if she could present Peter’s desires to Jesus for him.

Peter was hoping for an opportunity to talk with Our Lady about his requests, and the opportunity came when Peter asked to go into town with Mary and Marjiam to buy some clothing material to make clothes for Marjiam. This was needed since Marjiam was still in his poor ragged clothes from being alone in the wilderness for such a long time. Jesus approved, and so Peter, Mary, and Marjiam went into town to do shopping. I will start quoting the context of when they left:¹⁹

[A few disciples] would like to keep the Master with His Mother. But Jesus promises to go back some other day, He blesses them and says goodbye. Peter goes away with Mary and is very happy. They are both holding the boy [Marjiam] by his hands and they look like a happy family. Many people turn round to look at them. Jesus watches them go away smiling.

« Simon is happy! » exclaims the Zealot.

« Why are You smiling, Master? » asks James of Zebedee.

« Because I see a great promise in that group. »

« Which promise, Brother? What do You see? » asks Thaddeus.

« This is what I see: that I shall be able to go away with a peaceful mind, when the time comes. I need not be afraid for My Church. Then it will be small and slender like Marjiam. But My Mother will be there to hold it by the hand and to be its Mother; and there will be Peter as its father. In his honest rough hands I can place the hand of My dawning Church without any worry. He will give it the strength of his protection. My Mother the strength of Her love. And the Church will grow... like Marjiam... He is really the symbol-child! May God bless My Mother, My Peter and their child and ours! Now let us go to Johanna's. »

Peter, Marjiam, and Our Lady do their shopping in the town and come back. Later that evening, Jesus is sitting with His Mother on the terrace of a roof, as the *Poem* relates:²⁰

... And once again, in the evening, we are in the little house in Bethany. Many have already withdrawn, because they were tired. Peter is walking up and down the path, often looking up to the terrace where Jesus and Mary are sitting talking. John of Endor, instead, is speaking to the Zealot sitting under a pomegranate-tree in full blossom.

Mary has already spoken a great deal because I can hear Jesus say: « Everything You told Me is just and I will bear in mind its justice. And I say that also Your advice concerning Annaleah is right. It is a good sign that the man has accepted it so readily. It is true that the people high up in Jerusalem are dull-minded and envious, I could also say that they are filthy. But in the humble people there are pearls of unknown value. I am glad that Annaleah is happy. She belongs more to Heaven than to the earth, and perhaps the man, who has now understood the concept of the spirit, realizes that and he respects her almost religiously. His intention to go elsewhere, so that no human sentiment may upset the pure vow of his girl, proves it. »

« Yes, My Son. Man perceives the perfume of virgins... I remember Joseph. I did not know which words to use. He was not aware of My secret... And yet he helped Me to disclose it with the intuition of a saint. He had perceived the scent of My soul...

Also John, see?... How peaceful he is! And everybody seeks him. Even Judas of Kerioth, although... No, Son. Judas has not changed. I know and You know. We do not speak because we do not want to start war. But even if we do not speak, we know... and even if we do not speak, the others realize... Oh! My Jesus! The younger apostles told Me today, at Gethsemane, the episode at Magdala and the other one of Sabbath morning... Innocent children speak... because they see through the eyes of their angels. But also old people have an idea... They are not wrong. He is an elusive being... Everything is elusive in him... and I am afraid of him and I

have on My lips the same words of Benjamin at Magdala and of Marjiam at Gethsemane, because I feel the same disgust for Judas as children do. »

« Not everybody can be John!... »

« I do not pretend that! In that case, it would be paradise on the earth. But, see, You told Me about the other John... A man who killed... but I feel only sorry for him. Judas frightens Me. »

« Love him, Mother! Love him, for My sake! »

« Yes, Son, I will. But not even My love will serve. It will only make Me suffer and make him guilty. Oh! Why did he come to You? He upsets everybody, he offends Peter who deserves all respect. »

« Yes. Peter is very good. I would do anything for him, because he deserves it. »

« If he heard You, he would say with his good frank smile: "Ah! My Lord, that is not true!" And he would be right. »

« Why, Mother? » But Jesus smiles, because He has already understood.

« Because You are not satisfying him by giving him a son. He told Me all his hopes, his desires... and Your refusals. »

« And did he not tell You the reasons justifying them? »

« Yes, he did and he added: "It is true... but I am a man, a poor man. Jesus persists in seeing a great man in me. But I know that I am a poor fellow, and so... He could give me a child. I got married to have them... and I will die without any". And he said – pointing at the boy who, delighted because of the lovely dress bought by Peter, had kissed him, saying: "Beloved father" – he said: "See, when this little creature, whom only ten days ago I did not know, says that to me, I feel that I become softer than butter and sweeter than honey and I weep, because... every day that goes by, takes this child away from me". »

Mary becomes silent, watching Jesus, studying His face, waiting for a word... But Jesus has placed His elbow on His knee, resting His head in His hand and is silent, looking at the green expanse of the orchard.

Mary takes His hand and caressing it She says: « Simon has this *great* desire... When I went with him, he did nothing but speak to Me about it, and his reasons are so good that... I could say nothing to keep him quiet. They are the same reasons that all women and mothers think of. The boy is not strong. If he were as strong as You were... oh! he could have faced the life of a disciple without any fear. But he is so thin!... He is very intelligent, very good... but nothing more. When a little dove is so delicate, you cannot throw it in the air to let it fly very early, as you do with strong ones. The shepherds are good... but they are still men. Children need

women. Why do You not leave him with Simon? While You refuse him a son of his own, born of him, I understand the reason. A son is like an anchor. And Simon, who is destined to such a great task, cannot be hindered by anchors. But You must agree that he is to be the "father" of all the sons You will be leaving him. How can he be a father if he has had no training with a child? A father must be sweet. Simon is good, but not sweet. He is impulsive and intolerant. Only a little creature can teach him the fine art of being indulgent to whoever is weak... Consider Simon's destiny... He is Your successor after all! Oh! I must say that cruel word! But for all the sorrow it causes Me saying it, listen to Me. I would never advise You anything unless it were good. Marjiam... You want to make a perfect disciple of him... But he is only a boy. You... You will be going before he is a man. To whom then can You give him, to complete his formation, better than Simon? Finally, poor Simon, You know how much trouble he has had, with his mother-in-law, also because of You. And yet he has not picked up a tiny part of his past, of his freedom of a year ago, to be left in peace by his mother-in-law, whom not even You have been able to change. And his poor wife? She is longing so much to love and be loved. Her mother... oh! Her husband? A dear domineering man... No affection is ever given to her without exacting too much... Poor woman!... Leave her the boy. Listen, Son. For the time being we will take him with us. I will come to Judaea, too. You will take Me to one of My companions of the Temple, who is almost a relative, because she is of the House of David. She lives at Bethzur. I will be pleased to see her, if she is still alive. Then, when we go back to Galilee, we will give him to Porphirea. When we are near Bethsaida, Peter will take him. When we come here, so far, the boy will stay with her. Ah! You are smiling now! So You are going to please Your Mother. Thank You, My Jesus. »

« Yes, let it be done, as You wish. » Jesus stands up and calls out loud: « Simon of Jonas: come here. »

Peter starts and rushes down the steps. « What do You want, Master? »

« Come here, you usurper and corrupter! »

« Me? Why? What have I done, Lord? »

« You have corrupted My Mother. That is why you wanted to be alone. What shall I do with you? »

But Jesus smiles and Peter recovers confidence. « Oh! » he says. « You really frightened me! But now You are laughing... What do You want from me, Master? My life? I have but that, because You have taken everything... But if You want, I will give it to You. »

« I do not want to take anything from you. I want to give you something. But do not take advantage of your victory and do not disclose the secret to the others, you most artful fellow who defeats the Master by means of the weapon of His Mother's word. You will have the boy, but... »

Jesus can say no more, because Peter, who had knelt down, bounces to his feet and kisses the Master with such delight that he makes the words die on His lips.

« Thank Her, not Me. But remember that this must be of assistance to you, and not an impediment... »

« My Lord, You will not have to repent of the gift... Oh! Mary! May You be always blessed, You holy and good... » And Peter, who has fallen on his knees again, weeps, kissing Mary's hand...

Now it is clear from the context of the *Poem* that when Jesus said to Peter “you have corrupted My Mother” (a more proper translation of the original Italian is “you have bribed My Mother”) He was speaking allegorically, and not literally, referring to the fact that Peter convinced Mary to intercede on his behalf to ask Jesus to reconsider allowing Peter to adopt Marjiam for a time. The sense of this word is meant allegorically (not literally) to refer to the fact that Peter convinced Mary to agree with him instead of going with what the Lord would have said otherwise without her intercession with regards to adopting Marjiam. I personally do not find that comment, in its proper context and with its proper distinctions, as objectionable or unrealistic. And neither do many high-ranking clerics and theologians in Rome, among them Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M. – very likely the greatest and most learned Mariologist of the 20th century – who wrote a 395-page study of the Mariology in Maria Valtorta’s writings and found it inspiring and in perfect line with Tradition, true Catholic doctrine, and orthodox Mariology.

As a matter of fact, Fr. Gabriel Roschini specifically quoted this exact passage at length in his book and commented on it in this way:²¹

Mary’s name is most powerful at her Son’s side! The secret to obtain graces from Jesus is precisely to use “the weapon of His Mother’s word.” Such is the lesson resulting from a graceful, idyllic, and significant episode that took place in Jesus’ second year of Public Ministry. Peter, though married, was childless. For this reason, he wished to adopt little Marjiam, an orphan, and leave him with his wife [when he would be called to travel]. He made his request of Jesus, but Jesus refused. Peter went to Mary, begging her to intercede in his favor with her Son. She agreed to help. Thus, during a conversation with Jesus, she skillfully led the topic to Peter, and said: [here Fr. Roschini quotes almost the entire conversation between Jesus and Mary which I also quoted on the past several pages].

Fr. Kevin Robinson wrote:²²

With Valtorta, as with the canonical Scriptures, there are difficulties that are easily resolved by distinction from Thomistic philosophy such as: general vs. specific, strictly vs. broadly, properly vs. allegorically, *in fieri* vs. *in facto esse*, *ad esse* vs. *ad melior esse*, *simpliciter* vs. *quodammodo*. These distinctions are usually not needed for the simple faithful as the context gives them the truth without danger.

Horvat presents a completely absurd, unsubstantiated claim: “Jesus suggests a love-affair between St. Peter and Our Lady”. That is absolutely absurd because Peter was never alone with Mary, but

was **with Marjiam in a public place** doing shopping! When Jesus said, “That is why you wanted to be alone” it meant “not with Him and all the other Apostles present.” Peter was “alone” with Mary and Marjiam, in a public place. There is absolutely no grounds based on the context for anyone to possibly consider that what Jesus was referring to was an adulterous love affair between St. Peter and Our Lady! To say something so gross, calumnious, and unfounded is just as bad as the liberals who misinterpret Mary Magdalene’s encounters with Our Lord in the canonized Gospels and try to portray Jesus as having a love affair with St. Mary Magdalene.

Horvat is guilty of exactly what Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., LèsL., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., says here.²³

Let us return to the alleged dogmatic or moral errors which some opponents of the *Poem of the Man-God* claim to find in it. The alleged errors result from the opponents’ own doing: they rarely present complete quotations, they mutilate them; they wrench the quotations out of context, when only the context gives them their proper meaning; they sometimes even go so far as to falsify certain texts. Also, the testimony of those opponents often is not credible because of their lack of knowledge in mystical theology, their ignorance of Valtorta’s work, or their prejudice against it. Some have even gone so far as to declare publicly that they had not read it and did not intend to in the least.

It doesn’t seem that Horvat ever read the whole context of these passages which she quotes out of context, because if she actually read the context, and still believed that it implied a love affair, then she has some very serious problems with being able to critically analyze a text.

The above demonstration not only refutes Horvat’s out-of-context quote in this section of her article, but also exposes once again the untenable, unfounded, misleading, and calumnious method that she is using to try to argue against the *Poem*.

Refuting Her “New Age” Insinuation of the Face of Jesus Portrait

Another glaring misrepresentation of Horvat’s is a picture of a painting of Christ’s Face with the caption “An illustration of Valtorta’s Jesus, a somewhat occult figure with a magnetic gaze”. First off, the orthodoxy, doctrinal soundness, and literary value of Maria Valtorta’s description of Christ’s Face in her work can in no way be judged by *someone else’s* personal drawing of Jesus based on a description in her works! Go and ask ten different skilled artists to draw Christ’s Face based on the description of it in Maria Valtorta’s writings and you’ll end up with ten different renditions with very different nuances and “feels” to it. Maria Valtorta even said herself: “I am convinced that a human hand cannot recreate that Face.”²⁴ The ludicrousness of judging her writings based on one artist’s personal portrayal or rendition formed from his own imagination is like trying to judge the worth of the canonized Gospels based on one artist’s paintings of the Gospel scenes and Gospel characters. That is ludicrous!

Nowhere in Maria Valtorta’s descriptions of Jesus and His Face can you find anything which is “occult,” an unsubstantiated distortion tantamount to lying.

Second, I disagree with her opinion that the picture shown is a “somewhat occult figure with a magnetic gaze”. I don’t believe that Christ actually looked like that picture nor do I believe it perfectly captures the description of Christ’s Face in Maria Valtorta’s descriptions (it is one artist’s attempted portrayal of Christ). However, I personally find the image a well done painting and do not find it objectionable in the least. I have asked many others and they think/feel the same way concerning this painting. It seems to me that Horvat was reading into things too much in a desperate attempt to try to find fault where there is none to match her unfounded thesis. If one were to apply the subjectivist method of Horvat in a similar fashion, you could paste a picture in an article of the much-revered icon of Our Lady of Czestochowa or other famous, highly approved icons and paintings of Our Lord and find subjective derogatory adjectives to put underneath the painting to try to portray it in a bad light as well. For example, if I were an anti-Catholic trying to write against the Catholic Church, and I were to apply the weak and calumnious subjective argumentation tactic of Horvat, I could paste the icon of Our Lady of Czestochowa below in an article with the following caption:



An illustration of the Catholic version of Jesus’ Mother, an occult and distorted alien-looking figure with a magnetic gaze revered by Pope Clement XI and Pope Pius X

I need not elaborate further on the groundlessness and weakness of this type of subjective, calumnious argumentation by Horvat.

Third, do you want to know what picture Maria Valtorta testified was the most accurate picture of Jesus' Face as she saw It and described It? It wasn't the rendition given in Horvat's article, but another picture. Maria Valtorta wrote:²⁵

In all the art and religious article shops I have looked for a Face of Jesus like the one I saw [by supernatural means]. But I have never found one. On one there was the oval, but not the gaze. On another, the gaze, but not the mouth. On still another, the mouth, but not the cheeks. I am convinced that a human hand cannot recreate that Face... I have often dreamed of Jesus, after that occasion, and He always had that Face, that stature, and those Hands. For some time I have been having something more than a dream... [visions] And I always see Jesus with that Face, that stature, those Hands. When you gave me that book, Father, on the **Holy Shroud**, it shook me, for, though it was altered by the sufferings undergone, **I saw that Face, along with that stature and those Hands...** [emphasis added]

The actual author of the work in question (Maria Valtorta) testified that the best illustration of Jesus' Face as she saw Him and described Him is the Shroud of Turin. I doubt Horvat would gratuitously call the Shroud "a somewhat occult figure with a magnetic gaze".

Her insinuation with the illustration of one artist's portrayal of Christ is not only unfounded, but quite frankly highly unscholarly and even calumnious.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “A sensual Eve tending toward bestiality”

Horvat writes:

The work is also not without doctrinal errors, such as when Valtorta asserts the sin of Eve was not disobedience, but a sexual act. There is also an insinuation of a tendency toward bestiality in Eve. This erotic description was supposedly made by Jesus:

“With his venomous tongue Satan blandished and caressed Eve’s limbs and eyes... Her flesh was aroused ... The sensation is a sweet one for her. And ‘she understood.’ Now Malice was inside her and was gnawing at her intestines. She saw with new eyes and heard with new ears the habits and voices of beasts. And she craved for them with insane greed. “She began the sin by herself. She accomplished it with her companion.” (Vol. 1, n. 17, p. 49)

This is another common, outdated, already-refuted argument against the *Poem* that has been sufficiently refuted by numerous very learned theologians. I discuss this argument elsewhere in my [e-book](#), but I’ll repeat the facts here as well.

Dr. Mark Miravalle, S.T.D. (Doctor of Sacred Theology), responds:²⁶

A number of other posed objections against *The Poem* appear lacking in serious theological foundation... The objection posed that *The Poem* makes reference to a sexual element in the Original Sin and therefore is doctrinally erroneous also cannot be theologically substantiated. The Church has always permitted a significant diversity regarding concepts of the nature of the Original Sin committed by Adam and Eve, and both St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas in fact held that the material element of Original Sin (*peccatum originale materialiter*) included to some degree the aspect of concupiscence. Such theological opinion certainly does not indicate a doctrinal error, regardless of a legitimate difference of opinion concerning the potential element of sexuality in relation to the first sin of Adam and Eve.

Fr. Kevin Robinson wrote:²⁷

The Vatican newspaper in 1960 hinted at an error in Valtorta's account of the sin of Eve. Fr. Roschini, O.S.M., exposes the falsity of this charge in his book *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta* (Kolbe’s Publications, Sherbrooke, Canada. 1986, pp. 276-279). He points out that *The Poem* teaches precisely what St. Thomas Aquinas taught; that the first sin was a complex one involving pride, disobedience, gluttony, and finally lust (*‘fuerunt plures deformitates’*, *Summa Theologica* I-II, Q. 82, Art. 2, ad. 1). He goes on to quote 10 saints and numerous other theologians in support of Valtorta!

An article relates:²⁸

[Regarding] the *Poem's* description of the first sin of Adam and Eve being sexual in nature[,] it should be noted that the tradition of the Church allows for some room for interpretation of Genesis, being that the creation account is largely anthropomorphic.

Horvat tells a falsehood by saying, "The work is also not without doctrinal errors, such as when Valtorta asserts the sin of Eve was not disobedience, but a sexual act". Valtorta never said that the Original Sin was "not disobedience" but "only a sexual act". Valtorta's writings clearly indicate it was first disobedience, and then the other deformities which followed it.

In fact, here is an excerpt from one of her dictations, which sheds more light on what Valtorta *actually* wrote:²⁹

They committed the first act against love with pride, disobedience, diffidence, doubt, rebellion, spiritual concupiscence and *lastly*, with carnal concupiscence. I say, *lastly*. Some believe that carnal concupiscence was instead the first act. No. God is order in all things.

Even in the offences towards the divine law, man sinned *first against* God by wanting to be similar to God: "god" in the knowledge of Good and Evil, and in the absolute and thus illicit freedom to act as he pleased and wished against all advice and prohibition of God; then against love, by loving himself disordinately, by denying God the reverential love that He is due, by placing the *I* in God's place, and by hating his future neighbor: his own offspring to whom he brought about the inheritance of sin and condemnation; *and lastly, against his dignity as the regal creature* who had had the gift of perfect dominion over the senses.

The sensual sin could not have occurred for as long as the State of Grace endured and the other consequent states. *There could have been temptation but not the consummation of the sensual sin for as long as innocence lasted, and therefore, the dominion of reason over the senses.*

Horvat's superficial examination of Valtorta's writings proves once again to be clearly erroneous and without any foundation. What Valtorta wrote above is not only 100% theologically sound and not contrary to faith and morals, but actually above-average insight into the Original Sin in conformity with the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas ("*fuere plures deformitates*", *Summa Theologica* I-II, Q. 82, Art. 2, ad. 1), many Fathers of the Church, and many other trustworthy theologians.

I will quote what Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., says about this. Fr. Gabriel Roschini was a world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome in 1950 under Pope Pius XII, professor at the Lateran Pontifical University, and a Consultant to the Holy Office and the Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints. He was praised by all the Popes during his priestly life and is considered by many to be the greatest mariologist of the 20th century. Fr. Roschini has written over 790 articles and miscellaneous writings, and 130 books, 66 of which were over 200 pages long. Most of his writings were devoted to Mariology. He

was also at some time Prior General of the Order of the Servants of Mary, Vicar General, and General Director of its studies. He was also a member of several scholarly academies, and vice-president of the Pontifical Academy of Our Lady Immaculate (founded in 1847).³⁰ He was completely traditional/orthodox in all of his writings.

Fr. Roschini, O.S.M., writes in his book *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*:³¹

The question now arises: what kind of sin was Adam and Eve's original sin? St. Thomas Aquinas answered this question. He maintained that there were "many deformities" in the sin of our first parents, viz., pride, disobedience, gluttony, and so forth." ("fuerunt plures deformitates", *Summa Theologica* I-II, Q. 82, Art. 2, ad. 1; English Translation: New York, Benziger Brothers, 1947. Vol. I, p. 957)

In other words, it was not a simple sin, but a *complex* one. This is precisely what Maria Valtorta teaches in her writings.

According to her, the various disorders of Adam and Eve's original sin were: pride (wanting to be like God through the communication of life to others); disobedience (disobeying God's command under the impulse of pride); "gluttony" or concupiscence of the spirit (wanting to know the mystery of the transmission of life); and lust (the "gluttony" of sexual pleasure).

We must note along with Valtorta the sequence in which these disorders followed one another in the original sin of our first parents:

"[Adam and Eve] committed the first act against love [for God] with pride, disobedience, diffidence [towards God], doubt [concerning the foundation of His precept and authority], revolt [against God's precept], the lust of their spirit, and *last of all*, the lust of the flesh. I have said, '*last of all*.' Some think, on the contrary, that the lust of the flesh was the first act. No.

"... [Adam and Eve] sinned *first of all against God*, when they wanted to be like Him. They wanted to be 'God' in the knowledge of good and evil. They wanted to be absolutely free to act at will, according to their own pleasure, with no regard to God's advice and law. That was illicit.

"*Then they sinned against love* when they loved themselves in a disorderly fashion. They denied God the reverential love that is due to Him. They put their own egos in the place of God. In so doing, they despised their eventual neighbor – their own offspring – bequeathing to them a hereditary fault and condemnation.

"*Last of all, they sinned against their dignity as royal creatures*. They had received the gift of perfect mastery of the senses. There could be no sin of the senses as long as they remained in the state of Grace and the other states resulting from it [the gift of integrity]. Though they could be tempted, the sin of sensuality could not be consummated as long as innocence lasted and, due to innocence, reason's control over the senses." (*Lezioni sull'Epistola di Paolo ai Romani* [Lessons on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans by Maria Valtorta], p. 138-139).

In short, then, this is what Adam and Eve's original sin was:

“the first link of the chain by which the Word of the Father was dragged to death, the Divine Lamb to the slaughter-house” (*Poema*, I, 118-119).

In his book, Fr. Gabriel Roschini wrote a detailed footnote for the above text wherein he demonstrates that Valtorta’s interpretation of Adam and Eve’s sin is in conformity with Scripture, nine Church Fathers, nine canonized saints, and over a dozen other esteemed theologians. This footnote is copied below:³²

Valtorta’s interpretation of Adam and Eve’s original sin is founded: 1) on the biblical text; 2) on some ancient rabbinical interpretations; and 3) on patristic literature (early Church Fathers in both the East and the West). It has been adopted by a fair number of famous exegetes and writers in our own time.

1) It is an interpretation *founded on the text of Genesis*, since it is implied or insinuated in Genesis. “Both the Bible and human experience show that pride and sensuality go hand in hand. As a reflection attributed to Saint Augustine has it, what begins in the spirit ends in the flesh. Furthermore, it seems that pride of the spirit hurls its victims into sexual permissiveness. “Whoever tries to be an angel, especially a rebel angel, becomes a beast” (Professor J. Coppens, in *Ephem. Theol. Lov.*, 24 [1948], p.396) Eve’s sin began in her spirit (the pride of becoming “like God, knowing good and evil”) and consummated itself in the flesh. Adam’s love for Eve was instrumental in his sin — as Saint Augustine pointed out (*De Genesi ad litteram [Concerning Genesis]* 42, PL 34, 452-454).

The matter in hand, then, is disorderly love not at all in harmony with the supreme love owed to God. Adam and Eve’s love was carnal and illicit, since it did not heed God’s commandment. What caused Adam’s original sin was precisely an excessive love for Eve. After they sinned, “the eyes of them both were opened: and when they perceived themselves to be naked,” they covered themselves (Gen. 3:7; [Douay]). In other words, they were troubled and felt an imbalance in the area of sexuality: this links original sin to lust. The fact that God inflicted a greater punishment on the woman than on the man, and the very nature of this punishment (“In sorrow shalt you bring forth children, . . . and [the man] shall have dominion over you” [Gen 3:16; Douay]) seem to indicate the nature of the fault.

2) It is an interpretation *founded on a few ancient rabbinical traditions* (see J Coppens *La connaissance du Bien et du Mal et le Péché du Paradis [The Knowledge of Good and Evil, and Sin in the Garden of Eden]*, Bruges, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer. 1948, p.24).

3) It is an interpretation *founded on eastern and western patristic literature*. Among the Eastern Fathers we find St. Justin, St. Epiphanius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Clement of Alexandria, St. Maximus the Confessor, and St. John Damascene. Among the Western Fathers: St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Isidore. Among medieval writers: Alcuin, a Medieval Anonymous, St. Bernard, Hugo of Saint-Victor, Duns Scotus, and the blessed John Ruysbroek (see Coppens, *op.cit.*; *Ephem. Theol. Lov.*, 24 [1948], p.402-408).

On the other hand, Father Felix Asensio, S.J. (*Tradición sobre un pecado sensual en el*

Paradiso? [Tradition about a Sensual Sin in the Garden of Eden?], in *Gregorianum* 30 [1949], p.490-520; 31 [1950], p.35-62, 162-191) expresses the opinion that none of the Fathers mentioned by Coppens, whether in the East or the West, would sufficiently prove the legitimacy of an interpretation of original sin in terms of sexuality.

In view of a fair judgment, it is necessary to be aware of original sin's *complexity* (its multiple deformity), as it appears in Valtorta's writings. *Pride* (the desire to be like God in determining good and evil) led our first parents to *disobey* the divine commandments. This disobedience immediately resulted in the loss of integrity (the revolt of the flesh against the spirit) followed by sexual sin.

4) Finally, it is an interpretation *adopted by a fair number of famous exegetes and modern writers*. Among exegetes, there are professor Joseph Coppens (of the Catholic University of Louvain, in the two previously mentioned works) and Father Emanuel Testa, O.F.M., in [*The Holy Bible*], under the direction of Most. Rev. Salvatore Garofalo, *Genesi* (Introduction — Primitive History), Turin-Rome, 1968, p. 307ff; p. 318ff). Among writers, there are Jean Guitton of the French Academy, in "*Le développement des idées dans l'Ancien Testament [The Development of Ideas in the Old Testament]*," (in *La pensée moderne et le catholicisme*, issue #9, Aix-en-Provence, 1947, p.89-130), and Louis Bouyer, Oratorian, in his work *Le trône de la Sagesse*, Paris, Cerf, 1957, p.21. [English Translation: *Woman and Man with God. An Essay on the Place of the Virgin Mary in Christian Theology and its Significance for Humanity*. London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1960, p.58.; republished under the title *The Seat of Wisdom. An Essay on the Place of the Virgin Mary in Christian Theology*, N.Y., Random, 1962 (Panther Books), p.5-8.]

It is also important to note that Fr. Corrado Berti, O.S.M., provided a detailed commentary on original sin as it is presented in Valtorta's writings. Fr. Berti was a professor of dogmatic and sacramental theology at the Pontifical Marianum Theological Faculty in Rome from 1939 onward, and Secretary of that Faculty from 1950 to 1959. He supervised the editing and publication of the critical second edition of the *Poem*, and from 1960 to 1980 provided the extensive theological and biblical annotations that accompany that edition and all subsequent editions (totaling over 5,675 footnotes). He visited Maria Valtorta often (totaling over 180 visits). He was one of the three priests who had an audience with Pope Pius XII about the *Poem of the Man-God* in 1948 wherein Pope Pius XII commanded him to publish the *Poem of the Man-God* "just as it is". He also dealt with the Holy Office concerning Maria Valtorta's works. He wrote a signed testimony on Maria Valtorta, *The Poem of the Man-God*, his audience with Pope Pius XII, and his dealings with the Holy Office regarding Valtorta's work. It is available here: [Testimony of Fr. Corrado Berti, O.S.M.](#)

An English translation of his commentary on original sin as it is presented in Valtorta's writings can be read here: [Commentary of Fr. Corrado Berti, O.S.M., on Original Sin in Valtorta's Writings.](#)

Fr. Berti starts out his commentary with:

In order to know exactly the thought of this Work in regard to Original Sin, it is opportune to recall Genesis and to gather together in an orderly manner the various elements scattered in these and other writings of the writer [Valtorta], and above all in paragraphs 24-26 and 48 [of this Work].

His commentary is a proper and scholarly framework in which to analyze Valtorta's writings as it pertains to original sin. Comparing Fr. Berti's commentary (as well as Fr. Gabriel Roschini's commentary) on original sin as it is in Valtorta's writings to Horvat's article will emphasize and illustrate how the commentary and studies of the former two renowned theologians were imbued with thoroughness, depth, and honest objectivity, while Horvat's analysis and comments about original sin in Valtorta's writings contained theological incompetency and errors, lack of thoroughness, and lack of objectivity. I refer you to read Fr. Berti's commentary at the link above and will not quote it in full in this refutation for the sake of brevity.

Maria Valtorta wrote in *The Notebooks* that Jesus said to her:³³

The work is more for the teachers than for the throngs. The teachers will give the multitudes the essence of the work. But, in order to give that honey, they need to feed on the flowers of truth which I have given.

Everything is true in Religion. It is just that for thousands and thousands of years some truths have been given and stated with figures or symbols. And this is no longer enough now, in this century of rationalism and positivism and—why not say so?—incredulity and doubt working their way even into My ministers.

It is no longer enough. The fable of the apple, as it is called, is not convincing and is not accepted. It does not increase faith, but, rather, weakens faith in the truth of Original Sin and thus in the truth of My coming to redeem Original Sin and thus in My preaching, for I was the Teacher among the throngs, and thus in the divine establishment of the Church and thus in the truth of the Sacraments—and I could continue at length to list what is brought down by not accepting the fourth truth of faith—that is, Adam's sin.

The first truth is the existence of God.

The second, Lucifer's rebellion and thus the free transformation of the archangel into the Devil, into Satan, and thus the spirit of Evil and Darkness opposed to the spirit of Good and Light.

The third, creation.

The fourth, Adam's sin, foreseen in its divine consequence by Lucifer, who became Satan so as not to worship Me, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Redeemer of Man, his Adversary and

Victor over him.

The fable of the apple no longer suffices for today's multitudes and, above all, for today's teachers, who teach it poorly because their thought cannot accept it any longer. Let an open, clear, plausible, credible, serious version—as is fitting for a question related to God, which is a proof provided by God to His creatures—the only *sincere, real* version of the first sin, be set against the subtle, methodical erosion and corrosion of rationalism and other current tendencies. And the teachers will believe more and be able to bring the faithful to believe more. What was good at the dawn of Humanity, in the dimness of the early ages, is insufficient and even harmful at Humanity's dusk, when spirits are adult and have been rendered so astute by many things.

Let us shed light! Shed light! For life is in the light.

Horvat writes:

The work is also not without doctrinal errors, such as when Valtorta asserts the sin of Eve was not disobedience, but a sexual act. There is also an insinuation of a tendency toward bestiality in Eve. This erotic description was supposedly made by Jesus:

“With his venomous tongue Satan blandished and caressed Eve's limbs and eyes... Her flesh was aroused ... The sensation is a sweet one for her. And 'she understood.' Now Malice was inside her and was gnawing at her intestines. She saw with new eyes and heard with new ears the habits and voices of beasts. And she craved for them with insane greed. “She began the sin by herself. She accomplished it with her companion.” (Vol. 1, n. 17, p. 49)

Let's read the context and you will see that her insinuation of a “bestiality” is absolutely, unquestionably a lie and cannot in any way be implied by what is written in the *Poem*.

Here is the context:³⁴

If you knew how to question your soul, you would be told that the true, extensive meaning – as comprehensive as creation itself – of the words "that he might rule" is this: "That man might dominate *everything, that is his three states*. The lower state, *the animal one*. The middle state, *the moral one*. The superior state, *the spiritual one*. And all three of them are to be directed to one sole aim: to possess God." To possess Him by deserving Him through a strict control which subdues all the power of one's *ego* and conveys it to one only purpose: to deserve to possess God. Your soul would tell you that God had forbidden the knowledge of good and evil, because He had already granted good to His creatures gratuitously, and He did not want you to know evil, because it is a sweet fruit to taste, but once its juice becomes part of your blood, it causes a fever that kills you and produces a parching thirst, so that the more one drinks of that false juice, the more thirsty one becomes.

You may object: "And why did He put it there?" Because evil is a force that originated by itself like certain monstrous diseases in the most wholesome body.

Lucifer was an angel, the most beautiful of all the angels, a perfect spirit, inferior only to God, and yet in his bright essence a vapor of pride arose and he did not scatter it. On the contrary, he condensed it by brooding over it. And Evil was born of this incubation. It existed before man. God had hurled him out of Paradise, the cursed incubator of Evil, who had desecrated Paradise. But he is the eternal incubator of Evil and as he can no longer soil Paradise, he has soiled the earth.

That metaphorical tree proves this truth. God had said to the man and the woman: "You know all the laws and the mysteries of creation. But do not infringe on My right of being the Creator of man. My love will suffice for the propagation of the human race and it will spread among you and will excite the new Adams of the race without any lust of the senses but with purely charitable pulsations. I have given you everything. I am only keeping for Myself this mystery of the formation of man."

Satan wanted to deprive man of this intellectual virginity and with his venomous tongue he blandished and caressed Eve's limbs and eyes, exciting reflections and a perspicacity which they did not have before, because malice had not yet intoxicated them.

She "*saw*". And seeing, she wanted to try. Her flesh was aroused. Oh! If she had called to God! If she had hurried to Him saying: "Father! The Serpent has caressed me and I am upset." The Father would have purified and healed her with His breath, which could have infused new innocence into her as it had infused life. And it would have made her forget the snake's poison, nay it would have engendered in her a disgust for the Serpent, as it happens in those who bear an instinctive dislike for diseases of which they have just been cured. But Eve does not go to the Father. Eve goes back to the Serpent. The sensation is a sweet one for her. "Seeing that the fruit of the tree was good to eat and pleasing and agreeable to the eye, she took it and ate it."

And "*she understood*". Now Malice was inside her and was gnawing at her intestines. She saw with new eyes and heard with new ears the habits and voices of beasts. And she craved for them with insane greed.

She began the sin by herself. She accomplished it with her companion. That is why a heavier sentence is laid on woman. Because of her, man has become rebellious towards God and has become acquainted with lewdness and death. Because of her, he was no longer capable of dominating his three reigns: *the reign of the spirit*, because he allowed the spirit to disobey God; *the moral reign*, because he allowed passions to master him; *the reign of the flesh*, because he lowered it down to the instinctive level of beasts. "The Serpent seduced me" says Eve. "The woman offered me the fruit and I ate of it" says Adam. And the triple greed has ruled the three dominions since then.

Only Grace can relax the hold of this ruthless monster. And if Grace is alive, nay thoroughly alive, and kept more and more alive by the good will of a faithful son, it will succeed in strangling the monster and will no longer have anything to fear. It will not be afraid of internal tyrants, which are the flesh and passions; neither will it be afraid of external tyrants, these are

the world and the mighty ones on the earth. It will dread neither persecutions nor death. It is as Paul the Apostle says: "I fear none of these things, neither do I care for my life more than I care for myself, provided I carry out the mission and the ministry the Lord Jesus gave me, and that was to bear witness to the Good News of God's Grace."

Now that we have read it in context we see that there is no bestiality implied in the text in any way whatsoever. Let's ask: what is meant by the phrase "hearing the habits and voices of beasts, and she craved for them with insane greed"? What is meant by the word "them"? Is it "beasts" or the "habits and voices of beasts" (which is essentially animal lust for her own kind: Adam)? Horvat seems to imply that "them" is "beasts", and hence implies that Eve lusted after non-human animals, hence a "tending toward bestiality"; but the context *clearly* indicates "them" refers to the "habits and voices" (which is unrestrained concupiscence) and that the only concupiscible sin was committed with a human – namely, Adam. Therefore, there is no bestiality implied in this, and it is obvious! Horvat is reading things into the text that is beyond what is there! The context makes it clear: "She began the sin [of rebellion and concupiscence] by herself. She accomplished it with her companion" (the sin was committed with humans only). It did not say that she engaged in sexual activity with animals, which is what "bestiality" is defined as. Either Horvat doesn't know what the definition of "bestiality" is or she is relying on her own personal wrong interpretation of the text (most likely only reading it out of context). The text clearly does not indicate or support her faulty interpretation and implications.

Now what about the phrase "Satan wanted to deprive man of this intellectual virginity and with his venomous tongue he blandished and caressed Eve's limbs and eyes, exciting reflections and a perspicacity which they did not have before, because malice had not yet intoxicated them. She 'saw'. And seeing, she wanted to try. Her flesh was aroused."?

Horvat's out-of-context quote was as follows: "With his venomous tongue Satan blandished and caressed Eve's limbs and eyes... Her flesh was aroused ..."

It is very clear that Horvat's incomplete quote, selectively choosing only *certain* phrases, was constructed in such a way as to try to give the readers the impression that Jesus' speech refers to a *physical* action of Satan's "tongue" touching Eve. However, when you read it in context, it becomes very apparent that the phrase about his venomous tongue is referring to *the words of his tongue*, and hence is meant *allegorically*, and excited Eve only through her own intellectual reflections on his suggestions. This is especially apparent by the use of the phrase "Satan wanted to deprive man of this *intellectual* virginity." [emphasis added] People often refer to the "tongue" not as a physical thing in itself, but what it represents: which is speech. For example, one can say, "When I offended Mrs. Smith, I got an ear-full and got completely battered by the tongue of that woman by so many insults that she threw at me!" Is the speaker referring to being hit with Mrs. Smith's tongue physically and literally? Obviously not! It is meant *allegorically* to refer to her speech/words.

St. James uses this same *allegorical* use in Scripture here:

If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man. He is able also with a bridle to lead about the whole body...Even so the tongue is indeed a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold how small a fire kindleth a great wood. And the *tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity*. The tongue is placed among our members, which defileth the whole body, and inflameth the wheel of our nativity, being set on fire by hell. For every nature of beasts, and of birds, and of serpents, and of the rest, is tamed, and hath been tamed, by the nature of man: But the tongue no man can tame, an unquiet evil, full of deadly poison. (James 3: 2, 5-8)

Is St. James referring to the *physical* tongue itself being literally “a fire”, “a world of iniquity”, and an “unquiet evil, full of deadly poison”? No! He’s referring to what the tongue represents and does, which is words/speech/talking. I have yet to see inside someone’s mouth a tongue which is literally “a fire”.

Likewise, the passage in Valtorta refers *only* to the words of Satan, which is what is represented by his “venomous tongue”. Also, answer me this: what does the text indicate her flesh was aroused directly as a result of? The answer: “She ‘saw’. And seeing, she wanted to try. Her flesh was aroused.” It was the intellectual reflections as a result of Satan’s words which made her “see”, and in seeing, desiring, and in desiring, her flesh was aroused. The text does not lend itself to the interpretation of a physical caressing! How can a serpent caress someone’s eyes with its tongue?

How did Satan “blandish and caress Eve's limbs and eyes”? The text says by “*exciting reflections and a perspicacity which they did not have before, because malice had not yet intoxicated them. She ‘saw’. And seeing, she wanted to try.*” Any reader with at least average common sense and critical reading skills can understand that this refers to caressing *allegorically* by suggesting intellectual thoughts. In the same way, poets or playwrights (like Shakespeare) would not hesitate to write things like, “The young man caressed her with his many words of devotion and praise.” How can someone’s words “caress”? Allegorically!

The text clearly does not indicate or support Horvat’s faulty interpretation and insinuations. As Fr. Kevin Robinson wrote:³⁵

First there is verbal or literal context. The Bible has these words: “...There is no God” (Ps. 52), and “Christ died in vain” (Gal. 2:21). No one can say that the Bible says (affirms) these statements, because in context we have: “...The fool says in his heart, there is no God”; and “If justice comes by the law, then Christ died in vain”. Yet the verbal context could also be made clear somewhere else, e.g., St. Paul saying, “I would wish to be anathema from Christ”, in Romans 9:3, can only be understood rightly in the light of verses 38/9 of the previous chapter, and the rest of Chapters 9, 10, and 11. Likewise with Our Lord's words about cutting off a hand or plucking out an eye (Matt. 5: 29-30), in a true verbal context we must understand the literary expression of hyperbole. It would be wrong to take it too literally. In the same way, Our Lord has given Maria Valtorta some surprising expressions, which the context makes quite clear.

The Vatican newspaper in 1960 hinted at an error in Valtorta's account of the sin of Eve. Fr. Roschini, O.S.M., exposes the falsity of this charge in his book *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta* (Kolbe's Publications, Sherbrooke, Canada. 1986, pp. 276-279). He points out that *The Poem* teaches precisely what St. Thomas Aquinas taught; that the first sin was a complex one involving pride, disobedience, gluttony, and finally lust ('*fuerunt plures deformitates*', *Summa Theologica* I-II, Q. 82, Art. 2, ad. 1). He goes on to quote 10 saints and numerous other theologians in support of Valtorta! *This is context.*

With Valtorta, as with the canonical Scriptures, there are difficulties that are easily resolved by distinction from Thomistic philosophy such as: general vs. specific, strictly vs. broadly, properly vs. allegorically, *in fieri* vs. *in facto esse*, *ad esse* vs. *ad melior esse*, *simpliciter* vs. *quodammodo*. These distinctions are usually not needed for the simple faithful as the context gives them the truth without danger.

Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., LèS.L., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., wrote:³⁶

Let us return to the alleged dogmatic or moral errors which some opponents of the *Poem of the Man-God* claim to find in it. The alleged errors result from the opponents' own doing: they rarely present complete quotations, they mutilate them; they wrench the quotations out of context, when only the context gives them their proper meaning; they sometimes even go so far as to falsify certain texts. Also, the testimony of those opponents often is not credible because of their lack of knowledge in mystical theology, their ignorance of Valtorta's work, or their prejudice against it. Some have even gone so far as to declare publicly that they had not read it and did not intend to in the least.

I put much more stock in the very numerous traditional and trustworthy theologians who have evaluated this statement and others far more in depth than Horvat, and who have declared there is nothing against faith, morals, truth, realism, or decency in them; authorities who are much more learned than her. I especially trust these competent and trustworthy theologians way more than Horvat's article, which has shown, time and time again, to be riddled with falsities, wrenching of statements out of context with false unsubstantiated insinuations, deficient theology, poor research, ignorance of too many facts, distortions and sweeping generalizations tantamount to lying, and an obvious unjustified bias against the *Poem*. It is readily apparent from her article that she carried out a cursory, non-in-depth investigation into Maria Valtorta's writings and based most of her article on only one source (a source which is highly unbelievable), and on her unsubstantiated subjective impressions which are contradicted by those of greater learning and authority than her.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “Like Luther, Mary thinks: Let us sin to be forgiven”

Horvat writes:

Some passages are tantamount to heresy. For example, Valtorta presents the child Mary as expressing her desire to be a big sinner in order to merit the grace of Redemption.

This is a very old common argument against the *Poem*. This has already been completely refuted and addressed in the subchapter of [this e-book](#) entitled “*Analyzing Quotes That Might Seem Wrong Taken Out of Context*”. This subchapter shows how this argument/concern has already been addressed and refuted thoroughly by very well-researched publications and articles. In fact, I quoted from a 395-page book on the Mariology of Maria Valtorta’s writings written by Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., who discusses the passage of the Child Mary just referred to and who fully approves it as perfectly consistent with Catholic Tradition and theology. It is to be noted that Fr. Roschini was a world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor at the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome (which he founded in 1950 under Pope Pius XII), he was a Consultor of the Holy Office, and wrote over 130 totally orthodox books about Our Lady. He worked closely with the Vatican under Pope Pius XII on Marian publications and is considered by many theologians to be the greatest Mariologist of the 20th century. I go into great detail showing how this out-of-context objection that Horvat rehashes here is completely unfounded when analyzed in context and according to Catholic theology.

Refuting Her Statement About Blessed Gabriel Allegra, O.F.M.

First, who was Blessed Gabriel Allegra? Blessed Gabriel Allegra was a very learned and world-renowned exegete, theologian, and missionary priest in the Order of the Friars Minor, which he entered into at the age of 16. After being ordained in 1930, he departed to China and distinguished himself as an exemplary missionary and man of culture. As a St. Jerome of our time, he was the first to translate the entire Bible into Chinese, and his work had the support and acknowledgement of successive popes from Pius XI to Paul VI. His Cause was opened in 1984, just eight years after his death; he was elevated to "Venerable" only 10 years later in 1994, and the decree of a miracle and his beatification was approved by the Holy See in 2002. He was finally beatified on September 29, 2012, at the Cathedral of Arcireale, Catania, in Sicilia. Gabriel Allegra is the only biblical scholar of the 20th century who has been beatified. He had a strong reputation for holiness. An article relates:³⁷

Although the translation of the Bible was the main focus of his life, and he has usually been viewed as primarily a scripture scholar, he took time to help the poor and the sick, particularly the lepers. Although he frequently visited his "beloved lepers" in Macau, he never contracted the disease. He used to spend many of his holidays (often also Christmas and Easter) with them.

In his later years he suffered severely from heart trouble and high blood pressure. A rest and recovery period was recommended in Italy, but he chose to return to the Studium Biblicum in Hong Kong to work to the end. He wrote: "Everybody thinks that I'm sick: I can still work, so let's go on! The ideal is worth more than life!"

Another article relates:³⁸

Father Gabriel of the Friars Minor, a compatriot of Valtorta, was both a missionary to China and a biblical exegete. He is renowned for having started the first Biblical Institute in China and for translating the entire Bible into Chinese. His work as a scripture scholar had enjoyed the support and grateful recognition of successive popes from Pius XI to Paul VI. For some time he also resided in Hong Kong. There he became a friend and frequent visitor at the Cistercian Trappist monastery of Lantao in Hong Kong, where he preached a retreat and gave scripture conferences to the monks, one of whom described him as "a very humble man."

Blessed Allegra is well known as an expert on the writings of Blessed Duns Scotus, who had written about the primacy of Christ and was a saintly contemporary of St. Thomas Aquinas. As a side note, Blessed Duns Scotus was the one who wrote against St. Bonaventure's and St. Thomas Aquinas' error that Mary could not have been redeemed if she had not been subject to sin—at least, to Original Sin. Blessed John Duns Scotus (d. 1308) argued against them, and showed that God had sanctified Mary at the moment of her conception in His foreknowledge that the Blessed Virgin would consent to bear Christ, and we now know that Blessed Duns Scotus was right. An article relates (on the next page):³⁹

Although [Blessed Allegra's] main focus was the translation of the Bible, he was also well read on other biblical and philosophical matters. He was an expert on the philosophy of Blessed Duns Scotus and introduced Teilhard de Chardin to some aspects of it that shaped de Chardin's thoughts on the subject. His expertise on that topic was internationally respected and Oxford University invited him to give the 700th centenary lecture on Duns Scotus.

In Horvat's article, a caption under the image of Blessed Gabriel Allegra, O.F.M., reads "Recently beatified Gabriel Allegra, a Teilhard de Chardin colleague, was a promoter of the Man-God Poem". Considering the anti-*Poem* context of her article, this statement seems calculated to give the reader the impression that Blessed Gabriel Allegra endorsed the errors of the modernist Teilhard de Chardin, and hence his approval of the *Poem* indicates that the *Poem* is modernist. This is unfounded and false. Blessed Allegra indeed spoke to Chardin in order to defend and promote solid Catholic teaching; however, nowhere did Blessed Allegra endorse the modernist ideas that Chardin developed in spite of Allegra's attempt to lead him away from modernism and towards the truths of the Catholic Faith. In fact, Blessed Allegra is attributed to convincing Chardin that Christ has primacy based on the traditional teachings and arguments of the Catholic Faith. Without providing any evidence whatsoever, Horvat gratuitously defames Allegra based on the fallacy of association, and defames Allegra by a misleading, ambiguous off-hand statement. Many saints in the history of the Church were contemporaries (or "colleagues") of heretics and argued with them to try to convince them of the truths of the Catholic Faith while not endorsing or being tainted by their heresies themselves. Sometimes the saints were successful, sometimes they were partially successful, and sometimes the saints failed at converting the heretics or turning them away from their heresies. In the case of Blessed Allegra, he was partially successful with convincing modernist Chardin of the teaching of the Church on Christ. It is calumny to try to gratuitously lump modernist Chardin and orthodox Blessed Allegra in one category without providing any evidence to support her deceptive implications.

Horvat's methods would be the same as calling St. Dominic a "colleague of the Albigensianist heretics" because St. Dominic spent a lot of time arguing with them to try to convince them to return to the Catholic Faith and convince them of the error of their wrong ideas.

Even if we were to leave out Blessed Allegra for the sake of argument, there are still tremendous numbers of trustworthy, very learned, competent authorities and ecclesiastics who approved her work who cannot be defamed by alleged allegations of modernism, such as Archbishop Carinci (Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites from 1930 to 1960), and Fr. Gabriel Roschini (world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome, and Consultor of the Holy Office and the Congregation for the Causes of Saints). Horvat's superficial analysis of Maria Valtorta's work never mentions any of these authorities because she is apparently ignorant of them. See the upcoming section entitled "Refuting Her Claim About Progressives" for more details.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “An Adult with homosexual tendencies”

Horvat writes: “Valtorta’s Jesus suspiciously displays homosexual tendencies since he is constantly kissing and embracing the Apostles” and then quotes four passages from the *Poem* out of context in an attempt to demonstrate this.

Let’s analyze these cases. First off, it is false that Jesus is “constantly kissing” His Apostles on the lips. That does happen occasionally (consistent with Hebrew customs of the day for every male Jew), but that happens rarely in her writings. Therefore, the use of the phrase “constantly kissing” is inaccurate and misleading. Furthermore, many of the kisses were on the head such as parents do when they kiss their child on the hair of their head. Jesus also embraces His Apostles, but not “constantly” as Horvat claims, or excessively, but to a degree that was normal and expected for male Jews of the time perfectly consistent with the Hebrew customs of the day and within proper bounds for the culture and without any unnatural or sexual connotations.

Fr. Kevin Robinson discusses this:⁴⁰

Second is the cultural and temporal context. It comes as a surprise for some to realize that Christ our Savior was truly human, and with other characters of the Gospel, was of quite a different cultural stock (from ourselves). Jewish first century styles and customs greatly differ from Western twentieth century ones. Even today, what is normal and proper in Palestine or Italy might be considered queer and sinful in America or England. In these latter countries we know it is not proper for men to kiss each other unless they are of close family, or they are enthusiastic U.K. soccer players kicking a goal. Yet in the East it is entirely proper and even expected. Sometimes they even may kiss on the lips as a sign of special affection without any unnatural or sexual connotation. Recall Our Lord at the house of Simon the Pharisee rebuking him for not giving the customary kiss (Luke 7:45). It would be calumny in trying to impute evil motives in the chaste, loving, and manly kisses revealed in *The Poem*. No one who has read it in context entertains any suspicion on this score, even if they are surprised.

Let’s look at what Scripture and authoritative sources, including the imprimatured 1910 Catholic Encyclopedia, reveal about first century Jewish customs for kissing. First, let’s look at what Holy Scripture relates.

Here Christ is rebuking the *male* Pharisee Simon for not giving *Himself* (Jesus) the customary kiss:

And turning to the woman, [Jesus] said unto Simon [the Pharisee]: Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest Me no water for My feet; but she with tears hath washed My feet, and with her hairs hath wiped them. **Thou gavest Me no kiss**; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss My feet. (Luke 7: 44-45)

That Scripture passage alone is enough to refute all objections that Horvat and others could possibly bring up that it is wrong to write that Jesus would have kissed or allowed Himself to be

kissed by another male adult. Here Christ not only reveals that it was the custom of the times, but rebuked the Pharisee for **not kissing Him!**

What does Scripture reveal the Apostles thought about kissing? Well, let's see.

St. Peter wrote in his epistle:

Salute one another with a holy kiss. Grace be to all you, who are in Christ Jesus. Amen. (Peter 5:14)

St. Paul wrote in multiple epistles:

Salute one another with a holy kiss. All the churches of Christ salute you. (Romans 16:16)

All the brethren salute you. **Salute one another with a holy kiss.** (1 Corinthians 16:20)

Salute one another with a holy kiss. All the saints salute you. (2 Corinthians 13:12)

Salute all the brethren with a holy kiss. I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen. (1 Thessalonians 5:26)

The Acts of the Apostles further demonstrates this historic reality:

And when [St. Paul] had said these things, kneeling down, he prayed with them all [his disciples]. And there was much weeping among them all; **and falling on the neck of Paul, they kissed him,** being grieved most of all for the word which he had said, that they should see his face no more. (Acts of the Apostles 20: 36-38)

An article relates:⁴¹

It was the widespread custom in the ancient western Mediterranean for men to greet each other with a kiss on the cheek. **That was also the custom in ancient Judea and practiced also by Christians. In the Gospels, greeting with a kiss was also the custom practiced by Jesus.**

However, the New Testament's reference to a holy kiss (*en philemati hagio*) and kiss of love (*en philemati agapēs*) transformed the character of the act beyond a greeting. Such a kiss is mentioned five times in the New Testament: [quoted above]

The writings of the early Church Fathers speak of the holy kiss, which they call "a sign of peace", which was already part of the Eucharistic liturgy, occurring after the Lord's Prayer in the Roman Rite and the rites directly derived from it. St. Augustine, for example, speaks of it in one of his Easter Sermons:

“Then, after the consecration of the Holy Sacrifice of God, because He wished us also to be His sacrifice, a fact which was made clear when the Holy Sacrifice was first instituted, and because that Sacrifice is a sign of what we are, behold, when the Sacrifice is finished, we say the Lord's Prayer which you have received and recited. After this, the 'Peace be with you' is said, **and the Christians embrace one another with the holy kiss**. This is a sign of peace; as the lips indicate, let peace be made in your conscience, **that is, when your lips draw near to those of your brother, do not let your heart withdraw from his**. Hence, these are great and powerful sacraments.”

Augustine's Sermon 227 is just one of several early Christian primary sources, both textual and iconographic (i.e., in works of art) providing clear evidence that the "kiss of peace" as practiced in the Christian liturgy was customarily exchanged for the first several centuries, **not mouth to cheek, but mouth to mouth (note that men were separated from women during the liturgy)** for, as the primary sources also show, **this is how early Christians believed Christ and His followers exchanged their own kiss**. For example, In his *Paschale carmen* (ca. 425-50), Latin priest-poet Sedulius condemns Judas and his betrayal of Christ with a kiss thus, "And leading that sacrilegious mob with its menacing swords and spikes, you press your mouth against His, and infuse your poison into His honey?" The kiss of peace was known in Greek from an early date as *eiréné* (εἰρήνη) ("peace", which became *pax* in Latin and peace in English). The source of the peace greeting is probably from the common Hebrew greeting *shalom*; and the greeting "Peace be with you" is similarly a translation of the Hebrew *shalom aleichem*. In the Gospels, both greetings were used by Jesus – e.g. Luke 24:36; John 20:21, 20:26. The Latin term translated as "sign of peace" is simply *pax* ("peace"), *not signum pacis* ("sign of peace") nor *osculum pacis* ("kiss of peace"). So the invitation by the deacon, or in his absence by the priest, "Let us offer each other the sign of peace", is in Latin: *Offerte vobis pacem* ("Offer each other peace" or "Offer each other the peace").

From an early date, to guard against any abuse of this form of salutation, women and men were required to sit separately, and the kiss of peace was given only by women to women and by men to men. [emphasis added]

Notice from the above article how men kissed mouth to mouth in the first centuries of the Church, with St. Augustine and other Church Fathers talking about it without any disapproval. Furthermore, notice how the early Christians believed that Christ and His followers exchanged holy kisses. Notice also – for those who rashly try to insinuate that Christ is portrayed as a homosexual in Valterra – how men gave men kisses in these early Christian assemblies and that there was no homosexual or unnatural connotations associated with them. Obviously, their culture was much more ennobled than ours and they could exchange such signs of fraternal affection without the sensual connotations that our thoroughly corrupt modern society projects onto everything. Obviously, such customs should not be readopted in modern society because our society is too corrupt and far gone, and what was once proper, now longer is – at least in Western countries. However, in some countries even today, particularly in the Middle East, the custom of non-sensual kisses – even between those of the same gender – has continued without any scandal or sexual connotation because it is part of their culture, just as it once was in Christ's culture and time.

So now let's look at what the 1910 Catholic Encyclopedia says. This article has the imprimatur of John Cardinal Farley, the Archbishop of New York from 1902 to 1918. The 1910 Catholic Encyclopedia even discusses how exchange of chaste kisses extended *even* into the Middle Ages.⁴²

Four times in the Epistles of St. Paul we meet the injunction, used as a sort of formula of farewell, "Salute one another in a holy kiss" (*en philemati hagio*), for which St. Peter (1 Pet., v, 14) substitutes "in a kiss of love" (*en philemati agapes*). It has been suggested by F. C. Conybeare (The Expositor, 3rd Ser., ix, 461, 1894) on the ground of two passages in Philo's "Quæstiones in Exodum" (ii, 78 and 118) that this was an imitation of a practice of the Jewish synagogues. The evidence adduced, however, is very slight. **In any case it seems probable that in these very early days the custom of Christians so saluting each other [with kisses] was not necessarily confined to the time of the liturgy.** Such salutations were no doubt used somewhat promiscuously even between those of opposite sexes in token of fraternal solicitude and charity (*pietatis et caritatis pignus*, as St. Ambrose, "Hexaem.", VI, ix, 68, points out), and the modesty and reserve which so many of the pre-Nicene Fathers inculcate when speaking of this matter must be held to have reference to other occasions than the kiss of peace in the liturgy. This is also implied by Tertullian, who speaks of the pagan husband's reluctance that his Christian wife should "meet one of the brethren with a kiss" (*alicui fratrum ad osculum convenire*, "Ad Uxor.", ii, 4). Not improbably St. Paul's injunction was so interpreted that any synaxis of the faithful where there was reading of the Scriptures terminated in a salute of this kind, and it is even possible that the appearance of the kiss in certain liturgies at the Mass of Catechumens is due to the same cause. **In any case we have definite evidence that a kiss was on some occasions bestowed outside the actual liturgy.** After baptism the newly initiated, whether infants or adults, were embraced first by the baptizer and then by the faithful who were present (see Cyprian, "Ad Fidum Epis.", Ep. lix, 4, and Chrysostom, Hom. I, "De Util. leg. Scrip."). The use of the formula Pax tecum in some of the later rituals of baptism is probably a survival of this practice.

Again a kiss was and still is given to the newly ordained by the bishop who ordains them. Similarly after the consecration of a bishop and, at a later date, after the coronation of a king, the personage so exalted, after he was enthroned, was saluted with a kiss, while a kiss, no doubt suggested by the Scriptural example of the prodigal son, was enjoined in many of the rituals for the absolution of a penitent. Of the kiss solemnly exchanged between those newly betrothed something will be said under MARRIAGE, but we may note here the custom for Christians to bestow a last kiss, which then had a quasi-liturgical character, upon the dying or the dead...**It may be added that throughout the Middle Ages an almost religious solemnity attached to the public exchange of a kiss as a token of amity. Remarkable examples of this may be found in the history of the quarrels of Henry II with St. Thomas of Canterbury, and of Richard Coeur de Lion with St. Hugh of Lincoln.** In the latter case the bishop is recorded to have taken hold of Richard by his mantle and to have positively shaken him until the king, overcome by such persistence, recovered his good humour and bestowed on the saint the salute which was his due. [emphasis added]

The above article shows clearly that it was a custom of the first century and even for many centuries afterwards in the Holy Catholic Church for kisses to be exchanged among the faithful of

the same gender as a chaste non-sensual token of amity. We even have two documented cases of *canonized saints* who publicly received a kiss which resolved a quarrel!

Horvat wrote:

It is Jesus as a man that Valtorta presents: ... a Man who is constantly kissing them on the mouth and embracing them closely. Yes, at the least, it is difficult not to suspect this showy Jesus pictured in such way as having homosexual tendencies.

This is a false unsubstantiated insinuation based on a gross misrepresentation contradicted by history and evidence, and based on poor research and ignorance of too many documented historical and cultural facts. This is one among many other examples which illustrates that Horvat seems to have carried out a cursory, non-in-depth investigation into Maria Valtorta's writings bringing with her an unjustified bias against the *Poem* and basing her arguments (including this one) on subjective, personal opinions and impressions which are contradicted by those of greater learning and authority than her.

Notice that the above articles explain that men kissed mouth to mouth in the first centuries of the Church, with St. Augustine and other Church Fathers talking about it without any condemnation of the practice. Furthermore, notice how the early Christians believed that Christ and His followers exchanged holy kisses (they were much closer to Christ's time than we are). Notice also – for those who rashly try to insinuate that Christ is portrayed as a homosexual in Valtorta – how men gave men kisses in these early Christian assemblies and that there was no homosexual or unnatural connotations associated with them. Obviously, their culture was much more ennobled than ours and they could exchange such signs of fraternal affection without the sensual connotations that our thoroughly corrupt modern society projects onto everything. Obviously, such customs should not be readopted in modern society because our society is too corrupt and far gone, and what was once proper, now longer is – at least in Western countries. However, in some countries even today, particularly in the Middle East, the custom of non-sensual kisses – even between those of the same gender – has continued without any scandal or sexual connotation because it is part of their culture, just as it once was in Christ's culture and time.

Obviously, there is no unnatural or sexual connotation meant in such kisses in Christ's time and in the early Church (and in the Middle Ages), and neither is there any in the *Poem of the Man-God*. Every single instance of Christ kissing, when read in context, eliminates any suspicion! As Fr. Kevin Robinson wrote:⁴³

It comes as a surprise for some to realize that Christ our Savior was truly human, and with other characters of the Gospel, was of quite a different cultural stock (from ourselves). Jewish first century styles and customs greatly differ from Western twentieth century ones. Even today, what is normal and proper in Palestine or Italy might be considered queer and sinful in America or England. In these latter countries we know it is not proper for men to kiss each other unless they are of close family, or they are enthusiastic U.K. soccer players kicking a goal. Yet in the East it is entirely proper and even expected. Sometimes they even may kiss on the lips as a sign of special affection without any unnatural or sexual connotation. Recall Our

Lord at the house of Simon the Pharisee rebuking him for not giving the customary kiss (Luke 7:45). It would be calumny in trying to impute evil motives in the chaste, loving, and manly kisses revealed in *The Poem*. No one who has read it in context entertains any suspicion on this score, even if they are surprised.

Horvat's insinuations are without foundation. If anything, the fact that Valtorta shows Jesus to have exchanged chaste kisses with His Apostles is actually more historically accurate than describing a Jesus who completely contradicted the customs of His race, religion, and time period, which would have happened if Maria Valtorta wrote that Jesus never exchanged such customary kisses of chaste affection ever. Such a case would offend some modern people less who have difficult sensibilities and pre-conceptions based on what they thought things were like, but it wouldn't be historically and culturally accurate.

Need I repeat what canonized Scriptures reveal again? Here Christ is rebuking the *male* Pharisee Simon for not giving *Himself* (Jesus) the customary kiss:

And turning to the woman, [Jesus] said unto Simon [the Pharisee]: Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest Me no water for My feet; but she with tears hath washed My feet, and with her hairs hath wiped them. **Thou gavest Me no kiss**; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss My feet. (Luke 7: 44-45)

That Scripture passage alone is enough to refute all objections that Horvat and others could possibly bring up that it is wrong to write that Jesus would have kissed or allowed Himself to be kissed by another male adult. Here Christ not only reveals that it was the custom of the times, but rebuked the Pharisee for ***not kissing Him!***

What about the fact that Christ embraced His Apostles? There's nothing out of place with that! Jesus was not seen in Maria Valtorta's visions as "constantly embracing them closely" as Horvat wrote. He does embrace them and is embraced by them (consistent with Hebrew customs of the day for every male Jew), but that happens every so often in her writings at the proper time, place, and circumstances. He did not embrace them excessively. At least half of the embraces were the Apostles (or children) embracing Jesus and were initiated by them (not Him). Would He Who is Love Itself refuse a loving, chaste embrace of a child or an Apostle? No! He didn't even refuse the kiss of Judas at Gethsemane when He was betrayed! (Luke 22: 47-48) Therefore, the use of the phrase "constantly embracing" is inaccurate and misleading. Jesus embraces His Apostles, but not "constantly" as Horvat claims, or excessively, but to a degree that was normal and expected for male Jews of the time perfectly consistent with the Hebrew customs of the day and within proper bounds for the culture and without any unnatural or sexual connotations. In our thoroughly corrupt society, we have a society which is sort of "touch-phobic" outside of a context of sexuality. Our mass media tries to poison people's minds with the lie that free-for-all sexual activity is fine (fornication, etc.), but when it comes to someone other than a sexual partner, hugging and kissing is frowned upon or viewed as sentimental. But nobler cultures of the past were able to distinguish the two and allow chaste, non-sensual, non-provocative kisses and embraces that are purely legitimate signs of friendship or affection – even between those of the same sex. Scripture proves it. History proves it. Therefore, it is completely groundless for 21st century man to be scandalized

at reading that Jesus kissed His Apostles and embraced them. It is even more groundless, untenable, and calumnious to try to claim that these were homosexual tendencies! If you could justify that, then apparently the entire Jewish first century culture was homosexual. Therefore, all the early Christians were as well. And those in the Middle Ages – including canonized saints – had homosexual tendencies as well. I believe Horvat’s insinuations are more than sufficiently refuted.

I will go and analyze the apparently most troubling quote of hers which she quoted out of context. I will show what she quoted out of context with her false unsubstantiated insinuation, and then we will look at the passage in context, and then you will see just how well the context clears it up. Horvat’s method of out-of-context quoting is tantamount to deception. This tactic is based on taking isolated statements from the *Poem* out of its context, misrepresenting the quote by implying a distorted meaning which does not match the actual intended meaning in the *Poem*, and which is shown to be an obviously incorrect interpretation when you read the statement in its original context. How easy it is to deceive people by taking isolated statements and throwing them in an article, without giving the readers a chance to read the surrounding context themselves! A famous saying goes, “A text without a context is a pretext”.

Here is her out-of-context quotes:

After John professes his belief and love in Jesus as Son of God, **“he smiles and weeps, panting, inflamed by his love, relaxing on Jesus’ chest, as if he were exhausted by his ardor. And Jesus caresses him, burning with love Himself.”**

John begs Jesus not to tell the others of what has passed between them. Jesus replies, “Do not worry, John. No one will be aware of your wedding with the Love. Get dressed, come. We must leave.” (Vol. 2, n. 165, pp. 57-58)

Let’s look at this passage in context. First, it is helpful to understand that the Apostles did a rigorous retreat in the desert with Jesus to prepare for the Public Ministry. It was conducted much like a modern-day Ignatian retreat, with total silence and each Apostle having their own “cell” (that is, a cave dwelling), but with the added aspect of difficult fasting and long periods of intense fruitful prayers. Apostles could visit Jesus to consult Him, but notice that St. John never did so – he was always alone in his own cave without Jesus. He was alone – just Him and God the Father. The “retreat” has ended, and in the morning Jesus is calling His Apostles to come out of their dwellings to meet with Him to hear His instructions and conclude the retreat. Jesus comes in to wake up St. John because he was still asleep and didn’t wake up at Jesus’ call, and St. John explains the fiery consolations which the Father showered on Him while he was alone in his cave. Here are the passages in context:⁴⁴

« And now let us go and wake up these other children of Mine » says Jesus, and He walks down, as His cave is the highest one, and He enters the various caves calling the sleeping apostles by their names.

Simon, Bartholomew, Philip, James and Andrew reply at once. Matthew, Peter and Thomas take a little longer to reply. And while Judas Thaddeus goes to meet Jesus as soon as he sees

Him appear at the entrance of his grotto, as he is already ready and wide awake, the other cousin, the Iscariot and John are fast asleep, so much so that Jesus has to shake them on their beds, made with tree branches and leaves, in order to wake them up.

John, the last one to be called, is so sound asleep, that he does not realize Who is calling him, and in the haze of his interrupted sleep, he whispers: « Yes, mother, I am coming at once... » But he turns round on his other side.

Jesus smiles, sits on the rustic mattress made of foliage picked in the wood, He bends and kisses the cheek of John, who opens his eyes and is dumbfounded at seeing Jesus. He sits up and says: « Do you need me? Here I am. »

« No. I woke you up as I did the others. But you thought it was your mother. So I kissed you, as mothers do. »

John, half naked in his undertunic, because he used his tunic and mantle as bed covers, clasps Jesus' neck and lays his head between Jesus' shoulder and cheek saying: « Oh! You are much more than a mother! I left her for You, but I would not leave You for her! She bore me to the earth. You are bearing me to Heaven. Oh! I know! »

« What do you know more than the others? »

« What the Lord told me in this cave. See, I never came to You and I think my companions said it was due to indifference and pride. But I am not concerned with what they think. I know that You know the truth. I was not coming to Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, but to what You are in the bosom of the Fire that is the eternal Love of the Most Holy Trinity, its Nature, its Essence, its Real Essence – oh! I cannot tell, however, what I have understood in this dark gloomy cavern that has become so full of light for me, in this cold grotto where I have been burnt by a featureless fire that has descended into the depth of my being and has inflamed me with a sweet martyrdom, in this silent cave, which has, however, sung celestial truths to me – but to what You are, the Second Person of the ineffable Mystery, which is God and which I penetrated because God has drawn me to Himself and I have always had Him with me. And I have poured all my desires, all my tears, all my requests on Your divine bosom, Word of God. Amongst the many words I have heard from You, there never was one so comprehensive as the one You told me here, You, God the Son, You, God like the Father, You, God like the Holy Spirit, You, centre of the Trinity... oh! perhaps I am blaspheming, but that is what I think, because if You were not the love of the Father and the love for the Father, then the Love, the Divine Love would be missing, and the Divinity would no longer be Trine and it would lack the most becoming attribute of God: His love! Oh! I have so much in here, but it is like water gurgling against a dam and cannot flow out... and I seem to be dying of it, so violent and sublime is the turmoil in my heart, since I have understood You... but I would not like to be freed of it for the whole world... Let me die of that love, my sweet God! » John smiles and weeps, panting, inflamed by his love, relaxing on Jesus' chest, as if he were exhausted by his ardor. And Jesus caresses him, burning with love Himself.

John composes himself and with deep humility he begs: « Do not tell the others what I told You. I am sure that they too have lived with God as I did during these past days. But leave the stone of silence on my secret. »

« Do not worry, John. No one will be aware of your wedding with the Love. Get dressed, come. We must leave. »

Jesus goes out on to the path where the others are already gathered. Their faces look more venerable and serene. The old ones look like patriarchs, the younger ones have a maturity and dignity, which were previously concealed by their youth.

Notice that John never visited Jesus at all, and so Jesus' reference to John's "wedding with the love" refers to a purely spiritual martyrdom and consolation of love that John experienced in being united to the Father and the Holy Spirit in his solitude in the cave. Horvat's out-of-context insinuations give readers the impression that this "wedding with the love" refers to homosexual activity with Jesus which is absolutely calumnious and absurd, especially with the context which clearly shows that John was the one Apostle *who never even physically visited Jesus and was never near Him during that entire retreat*. It is also very clear that this "wedding with the love" refers to the purely spiritual consolation John received from the Father and doesn't have any sexual connotation. What is meant by "wedding with the love" is especially apparent to those who have knowledge of mystical theology. Analogies with weddings are used all of the time in Christ's parables and in His Church. Priests are said to be "married to the Church" but that doesn't imply any sexual activity with the priests and Church members! Also note that the term "caressing" is the English translation of the original Italian word *carezza*. What we mean today by "caressing" in our modern society tends to imply a sexual connotation. However, the use of the term caressing in the 1940s in Italy (which, by the way, had kissing as greetings and signs of affection as part of its culture and was less "touch-phobic" than the West) can mean like a pat on the head or a touch on the cheek or the hand or similar things, and has *no* sexual connotation. Synonyms for *carezza* and "caress" are stroke, pat, touch, embrace, etc. In fact, in some instances in the *Poem*, the word *carezza* has been translated into English as "caress" and in other instances as "pat" (i.e., on the head) depending on the context. Canonized scripture accounts that Jesus "imposed His hands upon [the children]" to bless them (Matthew 19:15). Do you honestly think that He imposed His hands in a touch-phobic, cold, 20th century fashion, when the culture of the Jews was so much more affectionate than ours to such an extent that it was even normal and proper for men to even kiss each other as a greeting? The caresses described in the *Poem* do not have any unnatural or sexual connotation. Fr. Kevin Robinson wrote:⁴⁵

Second is the cultural and temporal context. It comes as a surprise for some to realize that Christ our Savior was truly human, and with other characters of the Gospel, was of quite a different cultural stock (from ourselves). Jewish first century styles and customs greatly differ from Western twentieth century ones. Even today, what is normal and proper in Palestine or Italy might be considered queer and sinful in America or England. In these latter countries we know it is not proper for men to kiss each other unless they are of close family, or they are enthusiastic U.K. soccer players kicking a goal. Yet in the East it is entirely proper and even expected. Sometimes they even may kiss on the lips as a sign of special affection without any

unnatural or sexual connotation. Recall Our Lord at the house of Simon the Pharisee rebuking him for not giving the customary kiss (Luke 7:45). It would be calumny in trying to impute evil motives in the chaste, loving, and manly kisses revealed in *The Poem*. No one who has read it in context entertains any suspicion on this score, even if they are surprised.

Horvat also insinuates by her out-of-context quoting that John not wanting Christ to tell the others what had occurred between him and God is really not wanting to tell others about supposed homosexual activity that took place. That is ludicrous! When you read the passages in context, it is obvious that St. John did not want Christ to tell his story about what had occurred between his soul and God when he was *alone in the cave*. Furthermore, he didn't want Jesus to tell the other Apostles about His consolations from God out of humility because it is pride and very displeasing to God to want your spiritual consolations made known, which might discourage others who did not receive as much. It is plainly obvious from the context that this is what John was referring to, and it is doubly undeniable because the passage mentions that John is the only Apostle who didn't actually physically visit Jesus during his "wedding with the Love" (union with the Father in prayer) and so it had no physical dimension at all. As for John resting his head on Jesus' chest when he was awoken and explaining what had occurred during his retreat, with burning love, it should be noted that the canonized Gospels also reveal that John rested his head on Christ's chest after receiving the first Holy Communion at the Last Supper, where, beyond doubt, he was probably burning with love as well. As it is written: "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved." (John 13:23)

The above demonstration not only refutes Horvat's most troubling out-of-context quote in this section of her article, but also exposes the untenable, unfounded, misleading, and calumnious method that she is using to try to argue against the *Poem*.

As Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., LèsL., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., wrote:⁴⁶

Let us return to the alleged dogmatic or moral errors which some opponents of the *Poem of the Man-God* claim to find in it. The alleged errors result from the opponents' own doing: they rarely present complete quotations, they mutilate them; they wrench the quotations out of context, when only the context gives them their proper meaning; they sometimes even go so far as to falsify certain texts. Also, the testimony of those opponents often is not credible because of their lack of knowledge in mystical theology, their ignorance of Valtorta's work, or their prejudice against it. Some have even gone so far as to declare publicly that they had not read it and did not intend to in the least.

What about the fact that Maria Valtorta wrote that John was "half naked in his undertunic, because he used his tunic and mantle as bed covers"? Is that scandalous? No! There is quite a room for interpretation of what "half naked" means. For example, men at swimming pools who have on swimming trunks but no shirt can be said to be "half naked" depending on your interpretation of that phrase. What the 1940s Italian writer Maria Valtorta meant by "half naked" is probably far less scandalous than what we, 70 years later – in a whole different culture, continent, and time period – interpret "half naked" to mean.

To understand what Maria Valtorta meant by “half naked” we can refer to another passage in the *Poem of the Man-God* where she explicitly says what she means. This is from chapter 462 in Volume 3:⁴⁷

John is half-naked, **that is, he is wearing the short tunic of fishermen**, his hair is stiff and smooth as is typical of people who have been in water, he is panting and nevertheless wan. [emphasis added]

On the following page in this chapter, she refers to John again with the same description: “John half-naked, **with a damp tunic**, frozen and barefooted.” [emphasis added]

The fact that tunics sometimes covered less of the body than pants and a shirt do (such as when the man was sleeping alone as John was) was the *reality* of the way tunics were back then and had no sexual or un-ordinary aspect to it. To prove it – and to show how you cannot be scandalized by what Maria Valtorta wrote without also being scandalized by the canonized Scriptures themselves – I quote just two Scripture passages:

[Jesus] saith to them: Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and you shall find. They cast therefore; and now they were not able to draw it, for the multitude of fishes. That disciple therefore whom Jesus loved, said to Peter: It is the Lord. Simon Peter, when he heard that it was the Lord, **girt his coat about him, (for he was naked)**, and cast himself into the sea. But the other disciples came in the ship, (for they were not far from the land, but as it were two hundred cubits), dragging the net with fishes. (John 21: 6-8)

And Jesus answering, said to them: Are you come out as to a robber, with swords and staves to apprehend Me? I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and you did not lay hands on Me. But that the scriptures may be fulfilled. Then His disciples leaving Him, all fled away. And a certain young man followed Him, having a linen cloth **cast about his naked body**; and they laid hold on him. But he, casting off the linen cloth, **fled from them naked**. (Mark 14: 48-52)

A little common sense and cultural/historical understanding can go a long way against the ill-disposed and dishonest calumniations of those who try to find faults by groundless out-of-context insinuations.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “A humanized Christ” (Second Paragraph)

Horvat writes:

Valtorta’s natural approach is supposed to attract the modern man to the Life of Christ. It is in tune with the progressivist doctrine that tries to deny the supernatural and instead presents Our Lady as a simple Jewish woman and focuses on Our Lord as being a man “like us.” As Atila Guimaraes points out in *Animus Injuriandi I*, the progressivist Church aims to de-mythify and de-supernaturalize Christ and His Mother under the guise of presenting a natural “historical” Christ and Mary.” I believe Valtorta’s Jesus and Mary fit this mold.

Valtorta’s Man-God depiction is the opposite of the God-Man portrayed by Anne Catherine Emmerich and Ven. Mary of Agreda, whose life of Christ is presented from an elevated, supernatural vantage point. One cannot help but wonder why the traditionalist Bishop would not recommend these works, instead of the Valtorta tomes.

What Horvat wrote above is not true and has no foundation. I have already refuted every point of hers in the preceding paragraph that she states to try to substantiate her claim of error in the *Poem* in the depiction of Christ’s humanity. The *Poem of the Man-God* is not “in tune with the progressivist doctrine that tries to deny the supernatural” in the least! In fact, tremendous numbers of non-modernist, trustworthy, very learned, competent authorities and ecclesiastics have approved her work who cannot be defamed by alleged allegations of modernism, among them being Pope Pius XII (who, in 1948, ordered it to be published), the Holy Office, 13 years later, in 1961 (and again in 1992) granted permission for the publication of her work, Bishop Roman Danylak, S.T.L., J.U.D. (who issued an official [letter of endorsement](#) of the English translation of the *Poem of the Man-God* in 2001), and Archbishop Soosa Pakiam M. of Trivandrum, India (who granted the [imprimatur](#) of the Malayalam translation of the *Poem* in 1993). It has also received the documented approval of three Consultants to the Holy Office in 1951-1952, five professors at pontifical universities in Rome, Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M. (world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome, Consultor of the Holy Office, and who wrote over 130 totally orthodox books about Our Lady), Archbishop Alphonsus Carinci, who was the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites from 1930 to 1960 (the one in charge of investigating causes of beatifications who had visited Maria Valtorta multiple times and reviewed her writings in depth and approved them), St. Padre Pio, and many other cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and priests.

Furthermore, there are many progressivists who hate it (contrary to what Horvat asserts). In fact, my e-book shows convincing evidence that modernists tried to destroy and illegally censure the *Poem of the Man-God* because it conflicts with modernist tendencies and doctrine. For more details, see the subchapters of [this e-book](#) entitled “*The Position of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (the Holy Office)*” and “*About the Anonymous Letter in the L'Osservatore Romano and a Thorough Analysis and Refutation of This Letter*”.

The *Poem of the Man-God* does not deny the supernatural in the least. It extols it, and equally reveals both the humanity and the divinity of Christ. For the demonstration of this fact and for further details of why Horvat's claim is groundless, see the subchapter of [this e-book](#) entitled "*Analyzing and Refuting Some Critic's Arguments that it Appeals Too Much to the Sensitivity or Presents a De-Supernaturalized Christ Because it Contains So Many Details of the Human Side of Our Lord's Life*".

Camillo Corsánego (1891-1963), who was national president of Catholic Action in Italy, Dean of the Consistorial Lawyers, and a professor at the Pontifical Lateran University in Rome, wrote:⁴⁸

Throughout my life, by now fairly long, I have read a very large number of works in apologetics, hagiography [saints' lives], theology, and biblical criticism; however, I have never found such a body of knowledge, art, devotion, and adherence to the traditional teachings of the Church, as in Miss Maria Valtorta's work on the Gospels.

Having read those numerous pages attentively and repeatedly, I must in all conscience declare that with respect to the woman who wrote them only two hypotheses can be made: a) either she was talented like Manzoni or Shakespeare, and her scriptural and theological learning and her knowledge of the Holy Places were perfect, at any rate superior to those of anyone alive in Italy today; b) or else "*digitus Dei est hic*" ["*God's finger is here*"].

Obedient as I am (and as, with God's grace, I intend being all my life) to the supreme and infallible Magisterium of the Church, I will never dare take its place. Yet, as a humble Christian, I profess that I think the publication of this work will help to take many souls back to God, and will arouse in the modern world an apologetic interest and a leavening of Christian life comparable only to the effects of the private revelation [of the Sacred Heart] to St. Marie Alacoque.

It has been said that the Work lowers the adorable Person of the Saviour. Nothing could be more wrong: Christians, I believe, usually after having affirmed faith in Jesus Christ, God and man, always forget to consider the humanity of the Incarnate Word, Whom He is regarded as the true God, but rarely as true Man, frustrating the invitation to many ways of sanctification, which is offered to us by the exemplary human life of the Son of God.

Anyone who reads [even] a limited number of these wonderful pages, literally perfect, if he has a mind free of prejudices, cannot not draw from them the fruits of Christian elevation.

The above review by the very learned, trustworthy professor in Rome completely disagrees with Horvat's unfounded claim that the *Poem* denies the supernatural. What about Horvat's claim that Valtorta's writings about Jesus and Mary "aims to de-mythify and de-supernaturalize Christ and His Mother under the guise of presenting a natural 'historical' Christ and Mary"? Again, this is not only absolutely false, but is unsubstantiated calumny.

Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M., world-renowned Mariologist, writes in the preface of his book, *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*:⁴⁹

I have been studying, teaching, preaching, and writing Mariology for half a century already. To do this, I had to read innumerable works and articles of all kinds on Mary: a real Marian library.

However, I must candidly admit that the Mariology found in all of Maria Valtorta's writings – both published or unpublished – has been for me a real discovery. No other Marian writings, not even the sum total of everything I have read and studied, were able to give me as clear, as lively, as complete, as luminous, or as fascinating an image, both simple and sublime, of Mary, God's Masterpiece.

It seems to me that the conventional image of the Blessed Virgin, portrayed by myself and my fellow Mariologists, is merely a paper mache Madonna compared to the living and vibrant Virgin Mary envisioned by Maria Valtorta, a Virgin Mary perfect in every way.

...whoever wants to know the Blessed Virgin (a Virgin in perfect harmony with the Holy Scriptures, the Tradition of the Church, and the Church Magisterium) should draw from Valtorta's Mariology.

If anyone believes my declaration is only one of those ordinary hyperbolic slogans abused by publicity, I will say this only: let them read before they judge!

Fr. Gabriel Roschini was a world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome in 1950 under Pope Pius XII, professor at the Lateran Pontifical University, and a Consultant to the Holy Office and the Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints. An article on Gabriel Roschini relates:⁵⁰

During the pontificate of Pope Pius XII, he worked closely with the Vatican on Marian publications. In light of the encyclopedic accuracy of his work, Roschini is considered as one of the top two Mariologists in the 20th century. His first major work, a four-volume Mariology, *Il Capolavoro di Dio*, is judged to be the most comprehensive Mariological presentation in the 20th century. Several theologians called him "one of the most profound Mariologists" and "irreplaceable".

Fr. Roschini has written over 790 articles and miscellaneous writings, and 130 books, 66 of which were over 200 pages long. Most of his writings were devoted to Mariology.

For a theologian, such as Fr. Roschini, O.S.M., to be so well-read and so learned as to have written 130 totally orthodox books about Our Lady, and to be a decorated professor at the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome (which he founded), an advisor to the Holy Office, and to be called by a Pope "one of the greatest Mariologists who ever lived", it is not presumptuous to assume that he has probably read every single great work ever written about Our Lady – including Venerable Mary of Agreda's *Mystical City of God*, the revelations of Blessed Anne Catherine

Emmerich, the revelations about Our Lady given to St. Bridget of Sweden, and almost every single other major work about Our Lady. Yet – even so – Fr. Roschini declared: “No other Marian writings, **not even the sum total of everything I have read and studied**, were able to give me as clear, as lively, as complete, as luminous, or as fascinating an image, both simple and sublime, of Mary, God's Masterpiece.” Such a declaration from such a theologian as he carries a *lot* of weight!

I don't know about you, but I put much more stock in the opinion of a world-renowned Mariologist who worked closely with Pope Pius XII, is highly regarded by multiple Popes and many theologians, who has written over 790 articles and miscellaneous writings, and 130 books, 66 of which were over 200 pages long (most of which are about Mariology), and who backs up what he says with facts (including his 395-page study of Maria Valtorta's writings)... I put much more stock in such a theologian than Horvat, who shows throughout her article, time and time again, ignorance on the subject she is writing about, deficient theology, methodological errors, wrenching of statements out of context with false unsubstantiated insinuations, misrepresentations and sweeping generalizations tantamount to lying, and basing most of her article on only one source (a source which has proven to be highly incredible) and on unsubstantiated subjective impressions which are contradicted by those of greater learning and authority than her.

I can also add an excerpt from the testimony of another noteworthy professor concerning his commentary on the issues under discussion. *Pro e Contro Maria Valtorta* relates:⁵¹

Professor Vittorio Tredici was a highly experienced mineralogist, president of the Italian Metallic Minerals Company, vice-president of the Extractive Industries Corporation, and president of the Italian Potassium Company.

The other types of offices he held were those of Senior Inspector in the National Insurance Institute, Mayor of Cagliari and Member of Parliament during the Fascist era (he joined the National Fascist Party after having belonged to the Sardinian Action Party). He had not been removed from his field of research, so he also acted on behalf of mining companies, specializing in the study of phosphates in the Transjordan.

Married and father of nine children, Professor Tredici was a devout Catholic. Impressed by Maria Valtorta's writings, he went to meet her in Viareggio. In 1952, he issued his “declaration” as a man of science and of faith.

In a signed testimony dated January 1952, he wrote:⁵²

I read a few volumes of the "Words of Life" written by Miss Maria Valtorta. [“Words of Life” is how Tredici referred to Valtorta's *The Poem of the Man-God*].

To the extent that I must consider myself as simply a layman from the viewpoint of theological training, the immediate impression that I got was that this Work could not be the fruit of simple human will, even if she was gifted with knowledge of the doctrine and the culture, and with truly superior capabilities.

I sensed here the unmistakable imprint of the Divine Master, even if He presents Himself to the eyes of the reader under so realistically human a light than would be apparent from just reading the Gospels. Yet this Humanity—while humble and natural—remains throughout the Work the true Humanity of Our Lord Jesus Christ—always, unmistakably—just as in our meditations and our aspirations we have continually envisioned Him near us in all our life as sinners. I also get the impression that while the Work is able to stir up an immense tumult of thoughts, feelings, and good works from the depths of our being, at the same time it convinces us—I dare to say definitively—that the truth exists solely and exclusively in the Gospel because – even in our highest concepts—He is accessible in a clear and perfect way in everyone’s mind.

What struck me most deeply in the Work, from a critical point of view, was the perfect knowledge the writer had of Palestine and areas where the preaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ took place. This is knowledge that in some passages surpasses your average geographical or panoramic knowledge, becoming specifically topographical and even, geological and mineralogical. From this viewpoint, no publications exist —as far as I know—in such detail as in this account, above all for the area beyond the Jordan (now also Jordanian), that would allow even a scientist who has not physically been to the site, to imagine and describe whole paths and roads with such perfection as would perplex [or astound] those who have in fact had the opportunity of actually going there.

[I am omitting five paragraphs from his testimony here since they deal with the astounding scientific accuracy of her work in fields in which he is an expert in, but right now we are dealing with the depiction of the humanity of Our Lord and so I omit these paragraphs for the sake of brevity.]

[...] These facts and others, which I do not quote for the sake of brevity, have struck my critical spirit and have reinforced in me the absolute conviction that this Work is the fruit of the Supernatural; if not, I would not be able to find a humanly convincing explanation for these facts that I have cited and which are nevertheless completely verifiable. But, more than my critical spirit, it is my heart that feels better every time I read more pages from this Work, which assures me that it is "God's Work".

With all my being, I hope that this Work will become the heritage and dominion of all mankind, as soon as possible – to be urgently propagated – because I think and I feel that through these Works many, many, many wandering souls will return to the Fold.

Rome, January 1952, Vittorio Tredici.

An article relates:⁵³

The *Poem* is wholly orthodox, and in fact promotes "traditional values" such as the role of the husband and the wife, children to their parents, obedience and respect due to priests, reverence due to the Eucharist, etc. And while the text presents the life of Jesus horizontally in His day-to-day life, it is also distinctly vertically-oriented as well, always directing the

reader's gaze upwards towards sublime spiritual realities, such as Christ's majesty and magnificence as King. There is quite a profound Marian component in the writings as well, which magnify and glorify the deeper Mysteries of the Faith, such as the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption, the role of Mary as Queen of Heaven and sharer in Christ's suffering as Co-Redemptrix.

Let us note also that those who opposed the *Poem* are often those who never actually read it – or, if they have, have only briefly thumbed its pages in cursory fashion. For if they took the time to read it, they would not have tolerated the anonymous letters in *L'Osservatore Romano*, one of which called the *Poem* a "mountain of childishness" – a most peculiar claim, since even an atheist can admit that its content is more than merely indiscernible ramblings of a delusional woman. It is a brilliantly written narrative – written in the same tradition of private revelation as Catherine Emmerich or Maria Agreda – that keeps perfect track of Jesus, Mary, and over five-hundred characters, none of whom are in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Horvat wrote: "Valtorta's Man-God depiction is the opposite of the God-Man portrayed by Anne Catherine Emmerich and Ven. Mary of Agreda, whose life of Christ is presented from an elevated, supernatural vantage point."

I agree with her that Maria Valtorta's visions differs from the written record of Anne Catherine Emmerich's visions and Mary of Agreda's *Mystical City of God*. In fact, if you were to compare the latter two works, you'll see that they greatly contradict each other as well and hence it cannot be maintained that both are completely accurate.

In fact, history shows us (and Vatican investigations have confirmed) that the poet Brentano ruined Anne Catherine Emmerich's work by embellishing things and adding false information from other sources. Mary of Agreda's spiritual directors ruined her work by one commanding her to burn her original work, another commanding her to burn her second work, and then her third spiritual director commanding her to rewrite the third work *18 years* after she had her original visions. This process caused many of her visions to be flawed and no longer real, as the following excerpt from a dictation of Jesus to Maria Valtorta explains:⁵⁴

Every describer and prophet is a slave to his time while he writes and sees (I am speaking of those writing by God's will), he writes by describing exactly, even in a manner contrary to his mode of seeing, in keeping with his times. He is astonished, for instance, at not seeing one thing or another or at noticing objects and ways of life different from those in his time, but he describes them as he sees them. When having to repeat a whole series of visions without seeing them anymore, however, some time after the visions were received, he falls over and over into his own personality and the customs of his time. And those coming after are then dismayed by certain excessively human traces in the sketching of a picture from God.

Mary of Agreda, in the descriptive part, thus fell into the frills of Spanish humanism, turning the holy poverty in which My Mother lived, Her sublime creation on earth, and Her reigning in Heaven into a bundle of elements of rutilant pomp from Spain's royal court in the most

pompous era there has ever been. Her tendency as a Spaniard, and a Spaniard of her time, and suggestions by others—who, because they were Spaniards, and of that time, were led to see, dream, conceive of, and *transfer* into the eternal and supernatural domain what was temporary and human—adorned the descriptions with the tinsel which deforms without honoring.

It is a big mistake to impose certain remakes! The human mind! *Perfect and very imperfect*, it cannot repeat something—especially a work of this kind and these proportions—without falling into errors—involuntary ones, but doing harm to what was perfect because it was illuminated by God.

Why don't I illuminate the instrument again? *For the sake of the instrument, I would. But the incredulous deserve a punishment. I am not man's servant, but man is Mine. God comes, halts, acts, and passes on. When man says, "I don't want this" and destroys God's work or skeptically and incredulously says, "I don't believe" and wants imprudent proofs, God does not always return. And who is stricken? God? No, man.*

The critical review of Mary of Agreda's *Mystical City of God* I mentioned earlier agrees and points out these unrealistic factors in Mary of Agreda's writings: [A Critical Review of Mary of Agreda's Mystical City of God](#).

For more details about the writings attributed to Anne Catherine Emmerich's visions, see the following article about what Valtorta wrote (and the dictations she received) about how Brentano ruined the recording of Anne Catherine Emmerich's writings in spite of the fact that Emmerich was an authentic mystic and had authentic, true visions: [Maria Valtorta's Writings and Dictations About the Writings Attributed to Anne Catherine Emmerich](#).

Here is just a part of what she wrote:⁵⁵

Among the books, I see "Revelations – The Life and Passion of the Lord Jesus Christ – Anne Catherine Emmerich." I say, "This time, then, I [will] read it." And I do read it... What a disaster! I remain disgusted and bewildered, because except in a few points (5 or 6), I do not sense Jesus. While I close the book in disgust, in my heart I ask myself: "But has this woman really seen? and seen the divine? Or has she been deceived by Satan, or is a fraud?"

Jesus appears to me and dictates to me about Emmerich, saying: "she was a true seer illumined by God, but men altered the truth of her visions, spoiling everything...", and He ends, "You will show this to the Father."

Jesus:

The Church has reason to be perplexed about the work of Emmerich, because that work has been corrupted. But concerning yours and that of Sister Josefa Menendez, the Church should not be perplexed, because I am there.

See what damage the work of man can do to a revelation? Even if he works with the intention of honoring Me more, he spoils the gift of God. Every infidelity in things of revelation ruins them, because it is a wound introduced into the truth, which remains soiled by it.

Therefore I do not want [even] a syllable changed of what you have written. You were faithful in your writing. Let the others be faithful in leaving your writing intact.

The work of Brentano is thus detached from the Gospels, from the truth. Only in those points taken just as they are described in the Gospels, is there truth in this book. The rest is a magnificent painting by a very bad retoucher.

Valtorta:

[Jesus] is right. Reading such a ruin, I wept. And I really said: "The Church is right in wanting to be meticulous in examining revealed writings after such examples!"

In the margin by the true points – very rare – Jesus had me write: "here it is true." But how few there are! The rest is all fantasy.

Ah! That Brentano! What an ugly service he has done to Emmerich, and to souls in general. I have been so nauseated that...I do not read books like this anymore, even if they bring me mountains of them. This has been the first and remains the last. What a disappointment!

I maintain that the *Poem of the Man-God* is extremely realistic to the way things actually happened in Christ's and Mary's lives. I maintain, however, that Brentano's writings about the visions of Anne Catherine Emmerich's writings are untruthful and untrustworthy in many points (and the Vatican investigation agrees). Furthermore, I maintain that the third and final work of Mary of Agreda's *Mystical City of God* (the one we have) is also inaccurate in the descriptive part, and hence is also untrustworthy. Therefore, Horvat's objection in comparing the *Poem* to these two unreliable works is unfounded. If you look at the way Maria Valtorta recorded her revelations and the protection she was given in doing so, it is undeniable that it is *far* more reliable than the writings attributed to the other two visionaries.

For further details and a very detailed analysis of how the *Poem* compares to Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich's writings and Mary of Agreda's *Mystical City of God*, see the chapter of [this e-book](#) entitled "*How does the Poem of the Man-God Compare to the Revelations of Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich and Venerable Mary of Agreda's Mystical City of God?*"

Refuting Her Claim About Progressives

Horvat writes:

After Vatican II, Paul VI abolished the *Index of Forbidden Books*, and Valtorta's supporters claim this nullifies the suppression of 1959. Unfortunately, the official position of the Church today is less than clear, with important Prelates and Catholic figures on both sides of the issue. Obviously, the progressivists, almost to the man, defend it.

The Poem of the Man-God, I believe, is riddled with banalities, vulgarities, blasphemies and even doctrinal errors. There are endless idle conversations between Our Lord, Our Lady and the Apostles, all on a natural level.

The official position of the Church is very clear. It is succinctly explained here: [What is the Position of the Church on Maria Valtorta's Main Work?](#)

It is not true nor is it a valid argument to claim that whether contemporary faithful Catholics can licitly read Valtorta's work "is still unclear."

For many Valtorta critics (such as Horvat), they simply have not investigated this topic and the relevant issues in depth sufficiently and so when they claim that the issue "is still unclear," it is merely a reflection and further evidence of their lack of having invested the necessary scholarly research, diligence, and time to evaluate all of the necessary facts and factors involved that are necessary to form a judgement on this matter that can be considered informed or credible.

If someone does not invest the effort, time, and energy to investigate this topic to the necessary degree to form a credible and reliable judgement on it, then by their very own choice, they forfeit their right to publicly issue a judgement on this topic, passing themselves off as credible on this subject and influencing other people.

An analogy is this: If someone says, "It's not worth researching who to vote for in government. It's too complicated and requires too much energy and time. However, I'm still going to go on TV and publish articles telling other people who to vote for." The person, by virtue of not investing the required time and effort to research the candidates adequately, thus forfeits his ability to be taken seriously when he presents his opinion or analysis on the matter.

Therefore, if someone does not invest the effort, time, and energy to investigate this topic to the necessary degree to form a credible and reliable judgement on it (such as, with all due respect, I have found with most Valtorta critics who have published articles on this subject, Horvat among them), then they should not issue public statements on it but instead should favor being neutral and they should not expect people to take their opinion on the matter seriously nor do they have the right to view with negativity Valtorta readers or the many bishops or renowned theologians who have approved her writings or tell people that they shouldn't be reading her writings.

For some Valtorta critics, many Valtorta supporters view the claim that it is “still unclear” as a type of dishonest tactic of the cherry picking fallacy. Cherry picking is a type of fallacy defined as “(suppressed evidence, incomplete evidence) – act of pointing at individual cases or data that seem to confirm a particular position, while ignoring a significant portion of related cases or data that may contradict that position.”⁵⁶ Another false generalization committed by Valtorta critics is hasty generalization defined as “(fallacy of insufficient statistics, fallacy of insufficient sample, fallacy of the lonely fact, leaping to a conclusion, hasty induction, secundum quid, converse accident) – basing a broad conclusion on a small sample.”⁵⁷ Because there is substantial evidence and strong arguments that contemporary faithful Catholics can licitly read Valtorta’s work, these critics usually ignore and fail to mention this evidence and all of the relevant facts and testimonies, and then in their ignorance of this subject, they claim things are still unclear which only serves to mislead readers and keep them ignorant of these facts and serves to dissuade them from researching this matter more in depth where they might discover this evidence.

A good analogy is the following: there is substantial evidence in the Holy Bible that Jesus claimed that He was God. It might not be immediately apparent unless one were to study the scriptures closely and had a certain minimum level of intelligence, critical reading skills, and exegetical ability to understand the importance of certain phrases that Jesus used in the context of His culture and time (such as when He used the important phrase “I am” in John 8:58). Yet, there do exist anti-Christian apologists who claim that “whether Jesus claimed He was God is still unclear.” To most Christians, they will view this claim as merely a reflection of the ignorance and lack of scholastic ability of the anti-Christian apologist or a type of dishonest tactic meant to confuse and mislead people and try to dissuade them from researching the matter sufficiently in depth where they might discover the evidence that Jesus did indeed claim that He was God.

Likewise, many Valtorta critics out of ignorance or out of feigning ignorance will throw their hands up and say, “the canonical status of Valtorta is unclear,” when it is clear that one can licitly read her writings if one bothers to investigate the evidence.

For a refutation and fully documented details about the anonymous *L'Osservatore Romano* article, see the subchapters of [this e-book](#) entitled “*The Position of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (the Holy Office)*” and “*About the Anonymous Letter in the L'Osservatore Romano and a Thorough Analysis and Refutation of This Letter*”. It is an undeniable, established fact that Pope Pius XII ordered it to be published in 1948, that the Holy Office approved the publication of the second edition in 1961 according to the testimony of Fr. Berti, and that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has in recent times given permission to the publisher to publish it and the faithful to read it as it is. Horvat shows in her article complete ignorance of all of these things and she simply throws her hands up in the air saying, “Unfortunately, the official position of the Church today is less than clear”. Well, it is clear if one bothers to take the time to research it!

For more details about the whole issue of the *Poem* being placed on the Index of Forbidden Books, see the subchapter in [this e-book](#) entitled “*An Analysis and the Full Details Regarding the First Edition of the Poem Being Placed on the Index of Forbidden Books*” under the higher hierarchical chapter entitled “*Critics and Arguments Against the Poem of the Man-God and Answers to These Arguments*”.

However, I want to address the current canonical status of Valtorta's writings in terms of the Index of Forbidden Books in further depth.

To start out, I recommend readers check out the article of Dr. Mark Miravalle, S.T.D. (Doctor of Sacred Theology) where he succinctly explains why *The Gospel as Revealed to Me / The Poem of the Man-God* cannot any longer be considered forbidden to Catholics and why every Catholic is free to read it. He also refutes some of the most popular (flawed) objections to Valtorta's work. His article can be read here: [In Response to Various Questions Regarding "The Poem of the Man-God"](#).

Throughout the history of the Church, many times books that were placed on the Index of Forbidden Books were later removed from the Index. Even the works of St. Thomas Aquinas were condemned on January 18, 1277 by Pope John XXI, and the condemnation later annulled.⁵⁸ Venerable Mary of Agreda's *Mystical City of God* was examined for fourteen years and afterwards placed on the *Index of Forbidden Books* for three months, before it was later vindicated by Pope Clement XI who strictly prohibited the *Mystical City of God* from ever being put on the *Index of Forbidden Books* again in two decrees of June 5, 1705 and September 26, 1713. Her *Mystical City of God* was furthermore vindicated by two Popes of the past century who went so far as to give an Apostolic Blessing to readers and promoters of the *Mystical City of God*, much in contrast to the actions of the Hierarchy which once put this work on the *Index of Forbidden Books*.⁵⁹

The placement of a work on the Index was not an infallible act, and, contrary to popular belief, was not always done because a book had an error against faith or morals or was obscene. Other reasons for why books were placed on the Index of Forbidden books were for disciplinary reasons, or simply because a book requiring prior Church approval before publishing was published without prior approval (not necessarily because of harmful content), or because it was judged that the book might be dangerous for groups of people at that time in history (and when the conditions changed such that such dangers were no longer present, these books could be removed from the Index).⁶⁰ During the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, the pontiff revised the Index of Forbidden Books and dropped about a thousand books from it.⁶¹ He also overhauled the rules at that time, something done by Popes multiple times during the history of the Index, with the last one being the abolishment of the Index by Pope Paul VI in 1966.

In the case of the first edition of Maria Valtorta's main work, *The Poem of the Man-God*, it is clear from the explanatory letter which accompanied the notification of its placement on the Index that the reason for its placement on the Index was not due to any errors against faith or morals, but because of a disciplinary matter due to allegedly grave disobedience by an unspecified person (presumably Fr. Berti).

Fr. Berti gives details of relevant events and facts in his signed testimony. The charge of disobedience is untrue and perhaps represents a misunderstanding on the part of some individuals. The explanatory letter did not tell the whole story nor did it even mention a name of who was supposedly disobedient. The facts are that Fr. Berti chose to obey the order of Pope Pius XII who had commanded him to publish the work in 1948. The two officials in 1949 who called him to a private meeting the year after the Pope had commanded him (in front of two other eyewitnesses) to publish it refused to let him speak so that he could tell them the Pontiff's

command to publish it. The Pope had higher authority and jurisdiction than these two officials. He was given contradictory orders and so he obeyed the orders of the highest authority (the Pope). Regardless, what is relevant for this present discussion is his testimony of how Fr. Giraudo, O.P., Commissioner of the Holy Office, later gave permission to continue publication of the second edition in 1961.

First, let's give some details about Fr. Berti. Fr. Corrado Berti, O.S.M., was a professor of dogmatic and sacramental theology of the Pontifical Marianum Theological Faculty in Rome from 1939 onward, and Secretary of that Faculty from 1950 to 1959. He is one of the three priests who had an audience with Pope Pius XII about the *Poem of the Man-God* wherein Pope Pius XII commanded him to publish the *Poem of the Man-God* "just as it is". Fr. Berti is also the one who supervised the editing and publication of the critical second edition of the *Poem* and provided the extensive theological and biblical annotations that accompany that edition and all subsequent editions. Fr. Berti was the theologian assigned by the Servites in 1946 to study Maria Valtorta's writings in depth, as she was a Third Order Servite. Below is an excerpt from his [signed testimony](#) on December 8, 1978 (note that Fr. Berti refers to himself in the third person):

8. SECOND EDITION OF "THE POEM OF THE MAN-GOD"

Sir Michael Pisani was not impressed by the aforesaid *Life of Jesus* being placed on the Index. But feeling somewhat aged and suffering, he instead entrusted the task of publishing the Valtorta writings to his son, Doctor Emilio Pisani, a doctor of jurisprudence and at that time in the prime of life.

It was then that the Pisani Publishing House, with full confidence in God's help and in the future, conceived and decided on the publication of a second edition of *The Poem*, with a better cover and better paper, with newer and cleaner type, and in less thick volumes. Moreover, Dr. Emilio asked Fr. Berti to provide the new edition with explanatory notes of difficult passages, and to point out the biblical substrata of the Work. The edition was provided also with illustrations redacted by professor Lorenzo Ferri, under the personal guidance of Maria Valtorta.

Thus this Work on the Gospel came out in ten fine volumes, provided with an introduction and notes, and was pleasing to all. The previously mentioned Fr. Gabriel M. Roschini, consultant of the Holy Office, customarily repeated that such a new edition was not to be considered to be on the Index, because it was totally renewed, conformed in all to the original, and provided with notes that removed any doubt and which demonstrated the solidity and orthodoxy of the Work.

9. ATTEMPTED INTERVIEW WITH HIS HOLINESS POPE PAUL VI

Fr. Berti was nevertheless always worried and very anxious because of the placing of *The Poem* on the Index, though it was only of the first edition; and, in his confidence of having the decision revoked and obtaining security for the Second edition, he began by asking for an

audience with Msgr. Pasquale Macchi, the faithful and dynamic private secretary of Pope Paul VI. (1963).

Msgr. Macchi engaged in an amiable dialogue with Fr. Berti for about an hour during which, with lively astonishment, he was heard to repeat that the Work was not on the Index and that the Pope [Paul VI], when he was Archbishop of Milan, had read one volume, had appreciated it and sent the whole Work to the Seminary [of Milan].

The secretary accepted the various volumes of the Second edition, which had meanwhile come out, but after a few days, he diplomatically had them returned to Fr. Berti with a note in which he suggested that [Fr. Berti] direct himself to the Secretary of State, in the event he wished to approach His Holiness in person. And thus evaporated the desire and project of an interview with Paul VI.

10. THE HOLY OFFICE AUTHORIZES THE SECOND EDITION

In December of 1960, Fr. Berti was called to the Holy Office and was received by Fr. Mark Giraud, O.P., Commissioner of that Congregation, who was very amiable. Fr. Berti, seeing that this time he could handle it calmly, related to the Commissioner the words ("Publish [it]") given in audience by Pope Pius XII in 1948, and brought to him photostats of the certifications on the *Life of Jesus* [i.e., *The Poem*...] by Maria Valtorta —three of these certifications turned out to be drawn up by the consultants of the Holy Office, that is, those by Fr. [later, Cardinal] Bea, S.J., by Msgr. Lattanzi, and by Fr. Roschini, OSM.

Fr. Giraud, who knew nothing of the words of Pius XII and of the certifications of these three personages of the Holy Office itself, after having received Fr. Berti many times, after having himself consulted with his Superiors and having pondered on the certifications, spoke these words: "Continue to publish this second edition. We will see how the world receives it."

And thus *The Poem* came out, and continues to come out, not only by order of Pius XII, but also with the approval of the Holy Office. (1961).

11. SUPPRESSION OF THE INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS

But in 1966, Pope Paul VI, who carried the II Vatican Ecumenical Council forward, as well as to its completion, who effected the reform of the Roman liturgy, who brought about the renewal of the Curia, including the Holy Office, also accomplished the courageous act of suppressing the Index of Forbidden Books on which *The Poem* written by Maria Valtorta had strangely been placed. And thus, from 1966 on, *The Poem*... found itself free of any ecclesiastical sanction.

Perhaps it was of this [Papal] act, already known only to him, that Msgr. Macchi was thinking, when in his interview he asserted to Fr. Berti that *The Poem* was not on the Index. [...]

12. VALTORTA WRITINGS EDITED THROUGH 1978

The first work published was the *Life of Jesus*. [...] Two editions, quite different, of this life of Jesus [*The Poem...*] have been published. The first, printed in the years 1956-59 [as stated above in #6], was very modest: four overly thick volumes, without an introduction, unprovided with even the most prudent notes. It was imperfect even as regards the text, because it did not directly reproduce the Valtorta manuscript, but a typewritten copy very unfaithful and incomplete. And this was the edition that met the difficulties described in their place (#7 above).

The second edition, instead, under the editorship of Dr. Emilio Pisani, printed in the years 1960-67 in ten manageable volumes, was redacted on the basis of a strict comparison with the original Valtorta manuscript and was provided with thousands of theological notes, especially biblical, prepared with years of intense labor by Fr. Corrado M. Berti of the Order of the Servites of Mary, professor in the Pontifical "Marianum" Theological Faculty at Rome. And this second edition is the one which has met with no trouble, but had been authorized in 1961, even by the Holy Office, now called the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, as was related above in these pages at the proper place (#10 above).

Because the placement of the first edition of *The Poem of the Man-God* on the Index was not due to any errors against faith or morals, the reasons for why it was placed on the Index were deemed by the Holy Office in 1961 as no longer applicable and they approved its publication. In more recent times in 1992, in a letter dated May 6, 1992 (Prot. N. 324-92), addressed to Dr. Emilio Pisani (the publisher of Maria Valtorta's works), Monsignor Dionigi Tettamanzi, secretary to the Italian Episcopal Conference, gave permission for the work to continue to be published for the "true good of readers and in the spirit of the genuine service to the faith of the Church". Note that in each country, it was the secretary of the episcopal conference who transmitted the official position of the Church on such works. Dr. Pisani relates concerning this letter:⁶²

Our comment immediately points to the conclusion that the Work of Maria Valtorta does not contain errors or inaccuracies concerning faith and morals; otherwise Monsignor Tettamanzi would have asked the Publisher to correct or eliminate such specific errors or inaccuracies "for the true good of readers."

Monsignor Tettamanzi did not even ask that any form of expression that declares the supernatural origin of the Work be corrected, because he maintained that the only declaration that the Publisher had to make at the beginning of the volumes would be enough "for the true good of readers," and to act "in the spirit of an authentic service to the faith of the Church": thereby signifying that the content of the Work is sound. In fact, the Church has condemned books that are contrary to faith and morals and which did not claim to be a revelation or even inspired at all.

Approved in content and exonerated in its form. This is how we can sum up the latest position taken by the Ecclesiastical Authority on Maria Valtorta's Work.

Such a position was confirmed verbally to the publisher, Emilio Pisani, in the Palace of the Holy Office at the Vatican, 30 June 1992. On that occasion, he learned that the letter of the Secretary General of the CEI had been suggested by an office of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, as it had been decided “on High” that the Work of Maria Valtorta could be read by everyone “like a good book.”

Everything had returned to where it first started, in essence, to the views expressed unofficially by Pope Pius XII before the Holy Office blocked attempts to publish the Work without any prior accurate examination. In the Audience granted 26 February, 1948 to three Religious of the Order of the Servants of Mary, the Pope, who had previously had the typewritten documents, advised him to publish the work without a preface that would illustrate the nature of this Work and without any formal editing. He concluded: “The reader will understand.” (We refer to the chapter on p. 61).

Even if critics wanted to pretend or try to argue that the placement of *The Poem* on the Index was due to an error against faith or morals, approval for publication of the second and subsequent editions implicitly negates the placement of the first edition of the work on the Index. These points may help illustrate this fact more clearly:

1. Normally, in the days that the Index was maintained, after the first edition of a work had been condemned due to an error against faith or morals, the approval of the second edition of that work did not automatically reverse the condemnation of the first edition: that statement of normality assumes the normal functioning of the index used for its purpose of forbidding the reading of something heretical or immoral. If the condemnation of the first edition of something had been validly done because of proven heresy or immorality, there is nothing that could ever be done afterwards to exonerate that first edition from condemnation.
2. In the case of Valtorta’s Work, however, it has been demonstrated that the putting on the Index of its first edition was not done for heresy or immorality, because even the article in the *Osservatore Romano* purporting to explain why the work had been put on the Index failed to list even one heresy or one passage that promoted immorality. The end of the article revealed the real reason for the putting on the Index: it was a “punishment” due to allegedly grave disobedience. However, the article did not tell the whole story nor did they even mention a name of who was supposedly disobedient. The facts are that Fr. Berti chose to obey the order of Pope Pius XII who had commanded him to publish the work in 1948. The two officials in 1949 called him to a private meeting the year after the Pope had commanded him (in front of two other eyewitnesses) to publish it. They refused to let him speak so that he could tell them the Pontiff’s command to publish it. The Pope had higher authority and jurisdiction than these two officials. He was given contradictory orders and so he obeyed the orders of the highest authority (the Pope). Even in that meeting with those two officials, besides silencing him, they tried to get him to hand over the typescripts and manuscripts of the work to them so that they could bury them forever. Fr. Berti testified that Msgr. Pepe even verbally admitted that this was his intention, when the latter exclaimed, “Here they will remain as in a tomb.” But, even if Fr. Berti had been guilty of disobedience, the putting on the Index of the work on merely the grounds of disobedience, even grave disobedience, would not have been because of any error against faith or morals and thus is

easily overturned by subsequent authorities in the Holy Office. When all of the facts (especially concerning Pope Pius XII's command to publish the work) are brought to light, even the pretext of punishment for alleged disobedience could not justify the putting of the first edition on the Index, but even this question is a moot point at this point in history because the work has since been permitted for publication.

3. Now, what is very interesting is that the text of the first edition was not modified in any substantial way in the second, third, or fourth editions of the work. The only changes were fixes of very minor typographical mistakes or misreadings of very secondary words that had no theological or moral impact on the text. The second edition did see the addition of many footnotes and some appendices, but the underlying text was not changed as far as the theological or moral meaning went.

4. The second edition was approved for publication, which meant that the Holy Office did not consider that it contained any theological or moral errors in either the underlying text (which was substantially the same as in the first edition) or the added footnotes or appendices.

5. Because the text of the second edition contained all the contents of the first edition with no alterations that might have impacted the Faith or moral contents of the work, that means that if the text of the second edition was approved for publication, the text of the first edition was implicitly approved by the officials who approved the second edition.

6. Thus the approval of the second edition, in the particular case of Valtorta's work, amounted to an implicit discreditation of the placement of the first edition on the Index.

7. For those who claim the placement of the first edition on the Index was due to a demonstrated error against faith or morals (which a careful examination of the explanatory letter shows it was not), were it not for the fact that no change in wording between the first and second editions of the work had an impact on its Faith and moral meaning, then one could not say that the approval of the second edition had implicitly reversed the alleged condemnation due to faith or morals of the first edition. Had there really been heresy or immorality in the first edition, then the second edition would not have escaped condemnation, because no changes had been made to the passages that would have been heretical or immoral. But because no changes with a theological or moral impact were made and the second (and later in 1992, even a newer than second) edition was approved for publication, then the first one, logically, should have been approved for publication as well (if the true reason for its placement on the Index was because of errors against faith or morals). The only other possible reasons why the first edition could have been placed on the Index would be due to disciplinary reasons, publication without prior required permission to publish (which it had in Pope Pius XII), or because it was judged that the book might be dangerous for groups of people at that time in history. By allowing publication of the second edition, these reasons are no longer considered an issue. Thus, regardless of the reason that the first edition was placed on the Index, the placement of the first edition on the Index of Forbidden Books was implicitly repealed by those who approved the second and subsequent editions.

Now getting back to Horvat's arguments and claims: further betraying the bias and significant lack of knowledge Horvat has on this subject matter, Horvat goes so far as to make the sweeping claim: "Obviously, the progressivists, almost to the man, defend [the *Poem of the Man-God*]."

Honest and knowledgeable scholars would never make such an outlandish unsubstantiated generalization like that which is easily contradicted by verifiable facts and dozens of contrary testimonies. Those who actually have studied this subject in depth would argue (with good reason and evidence) that, in fact, the trend is that the opposite is true. See my e-book for details.

I merely need to give one prominent example among the tremendous number of other non-progressives who hold Maria's writings in high esteem to show the ridiculousness of Horvat's unsubstantiated falsehood:

William F. Buckley, Jr. is considered the grandfather of the American conservative movement. He was a famous talk show host for decades where he hosted 1,429 episodes of the acclaimed television show *Firing Line* for 33 years (which featured many of the most prominent intellectuals and public figures in the United States and won an Emmy Award in 1969). He was also a politician, a famous speaker, an author, and founded the highly influential magazine *National Review*. He had very high standards of professionalism, journalism, and scholarliness. In fact, he received so many awards and was such a media giant, that he makes Horvat seem insignificant by comparison. He held Valtorta's writings in high esteem after reading it for himself, as he relates in his spiritual memoir, *Nearer My God*. And by the way, he was a traditional Catholic who disapproved of many of the reforms of Vatican II and attended the Latin Mass. Considered the grandfather of the American conservative movement, William F. Buckley, Jr. was hardly a "progressive". An article relates:⁶³

As a mature man Buckley also exuded an interesting faith. He was a traditional Catholic who attended the Latin Mass, even after Vatican II reforms—many of which Buckley disagreed with. His son, the novelist Christopher Buckley, explained: "Pop was a defiantly pre-Vatican II Catholic." To the point that he had a priest say "a private Latin Mass for him" every Sunday. Yet, at the same time, William Buckley held a personal devotion to the works of the Italian mystic Maria Valtorta, a significant but controversial figure within the Church.

In his spiritual memoir, *Nearer, My God*, William Buckley wrote of how he first encountered the revelations of Valtorta. "My nephew Fr. Michael Bozell thought to send me a few years ago some pages from Maria Valtorta, Italian writer and mystic (1897-1961). She wrote a huge five-volume book called *The Poem of the Man God*, and one part of the fifth volume was her fancied vision of the Crucifixion."

"My friend and theological consultant Fr. Kevin Fitzpatrick, who is also a doctor of theology, was a little alarmed with the prospect of my using Valtorta," Buckley wrote. "Not so much because her work was, for a while, on the Index of prohibited reading—that kind of thing happens, and there is often life after death." No, Fr. Kevin's concern stemmed from a different matter.

Father Kevin wrote to Buckley: “My main problem is the use of private revelations not approved by the Church. This is not a legalistic concern, but a concern based on some experience of people who, to be blunt, are not satisfied with Revelation which ended with the death of the last Apostle.”

Interestingly, despite his cautious approach, once Fr. Kevin, the doctor of theology, began to read Valtorta’s works to further advise Buckley, what he found – in Valtorta’s revelations – surprised the knowledgeable priest greatly.

“In fact, Valtorta seems to have solved the Synoptic problem that’s been plaguing scholars for centuries, viz., the contradictions between Matthew, Mark, and Luke,” Fr. Kevin wrote Buckley. Her revelations, instead of replacing the Gospels – what Fr. Kevin feared – filled in the gaps that the Gospels possessed which, as Fr. Kevin noted, had confused scholars for centuries. Thus, Valtorta’s revelations helped reconcile for the priest seeming contradictions that exist in the Synoptic Gospels of the New Testament.

...The Crucifixion details of Christ’s Passion were so powerful in Valtorta’s writings and revelations that William Buckley decided to reproduce them in his own spiritual memoir, dedicating 18 pages of his book *Nearer, My God*, to Valtorta’s visions of Christ’s sacrifice and suffering on the Cross.

...there is no question that Buckley was very open minded toward Valtorta’s work. He admitted, after all, that part of the ecclesial controversy surrounding Valtorta stemmed from the fact that, at one point, her writings were placed on the Church’s (now-abolished) *Index of Forbidden Books*. However, Buckley was astute enough to recognize that “that kind of thing happens, and there is often life after death.” He was quite correct with this insightful observation.

To this list of esteemed Catholics, deeply moved and supportive of Maria Valtorta’s writings and mystical experiences, add another influential Catholic: one of the most significant voices on American political discourse in the twentieth century – William F. Buckley, Jr.

The fact is that the *Poem of the Man-God* has been approved by such a tremendous number of very learned, competent, non-modernist theologians and bishops (some of whom were world-renowned theologians with a strong reputation for holiness and some of whom were pre-Vatican II Consultants to the Holy Office and the Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints) that you cannot possibly justify looking at the *Poem* in a negative light due to possibly cherry-picking the data for a handful of “progressives” who may either like or are indifferent about the *Poem*. If any progressives do like it, it is likely due to (1) they never read much of it at all and hence don’t have an accurate idea of what it really is or what is said in it; or (2) they are starting to convert to be non-progressivist, good Catholics. I say the latter because I think that it is truly impossible to read Christ’s Words as they are in the *Poem* and not be converted to a holy life if you receive them with good will and strive to put them into practice. Many progressives also like the Holy Bible (including heretics like Protestants), and so is the Bible bad because a certain percentage of those who like the Bible are progressives?

The reality is that highly educated, pious, traditional authorities and clerics who have studied Valtorta's work in depth approved it and affirmed it is free of error in faith and morals. I honestly am finding it difficult in my research to find very many learned progressive/modernist authorities who approve the *Poem* who have actually studied it in depth and knew what it was.

If anything, my e-book shows evidence that progressives tried to destroy and illegally censure the *Poem of the Man-God* because it conflicts with progressivist tendencies and doctrine. For more details, see the subchapters of this e-book entitled "*The Position of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (the Holy Office)*" and "*About the Anonymous Letter in the L'Osservatore Romano and a Thorough Analysis and Refutation of This Letter*".

Dr. Emilio Pisani (the editor and publisher of Maria Valtorta's works) testifies in one of his publications:⁶⁴

Gift of Valtorta's Work to Pope John Paul II – Blocked

Toward the end of the year 1978, a Monsignor of the Roman Curia, a reader and profound admirer of Valtorta's work, and previously a friend of Cardinal Wojtyla, induced the editor, Pisani, to offer to the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, the homage of the ten volumes of Valtorta's work. In January of 1979, this same Monsignor brought the small box with the ten bound volumes to the Apostolic Palace, accompanied by a long letter of his own together with a shorter one from the editor. It was an attempt at feeling out the new Pontiff who so loves direct contact with every man without any discrimination. But we have reason to believe that our initiative, marked by an authentic spirit of devotion, was blocked by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State at that time was Cardinal Jean-Marie Villot. The news media often described him as a "leftist" and "progressivist" (a.k.a. modernist). In fact, he is the cardinal who traditional Catholics (Horvat among them) believe "deceive[d] the Holy Father into believing Archbishop Lefebvre had his priests sign a declaration against the pope (Archbishop Lefebvre, *Fideliter*, no. 59, pp. 68-70)."⁶⁵

Antonio Socci, a leading Italian journalist, TV show host, author, and public intellectual in Italy, wrote about the *Poem of the Man-God*:⁶⁶

For twenty years, after having laboriously stumbled through trying to read hundreds of biblical scholars' volumes, *I can say that – with the reading of the Work of Valtorta – two hundred years of Enlightenment-based, idealistic, and modernist chatter about the Gospels and about the Life of Jesus can be run through the shredder.*

And this perhaps is one of the reasons why this exceptional work – a work which moved even Pius XII – is still ignored and "repressed" by the official intelligentsia and by clerical modernism.

In spite of that, outside the normal channels of distribution, thanks to Emilio Pisani and Centro

Editoriale Valtortiano, the Work has been read by a sea of people – every year, by tens of thousands of new readers – and has been translated into 21 languages.

Every serious argument against the *Poem* has been thoroughly refuted, as shown in the subchapter of this e-book entitled “*Refutations of All of the Top Anti-Valtorta Articles*”. To the contrary, the evidence of the divine origin of the *Poem*, its spiritual value, its historical accuracy, and its theological and exegetical value is demonstrated and has never been refuted.

Among ordinary lay faithful, who are not very learned and experienced in discernment, you will find all types of people who approve it and all types of people who oppose it. Such a similar scenario has also happened in previous authentic apparitions and private revelations, such as Fatima and Our Lady of La Salette, which was very controversial for a time. The fact is that a private revelation cannot be judged by numbers alone. But even if you were to try to judge it by numbers alone, the fact is that among those who read the *Poem*, there is a tremendous springing forth of great fruits, as attested by countless trustworthy testimonies (far more good than bad, both among the most learned clerics in Rome and among ordinary lay faithful). There are far more good fruits than supposed bad from the *Poem*. For more details, see the subchapter of this e-book entitled “*Proof by the Testimony of Countless Trustworthy Clerics, Authorities, Experts, Scientists, and Pious Lay Faithful and the Tremendously Good Fruits Produced in Individuals and in the Church as a Whole*”. I have found that with over 90% of the critics of the *Poem*, they have hardly read any of it or only glossed over it in cursory fashion.

Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., LèsL., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., wrote:⁶⁷

Let us return to the alleged dogmatic or moral errors which some opponents of the *Poem of the Man-God* claim to find in it. The alleged errors result from the opponents’ own doing: they rarely present complete quotations, they mutilate them; they wrench the quotations out of context, when only the context gives them their proper meaning; they sometimes even go so far as to falsify certain texts. Also, the testimony of those opponents often is not credible because of their lack of knowledge in mystical theology, their ignorance of Valtorta’s work, or their prejudice against it. Some have even gone so far as to declare publicly that they had not read it and did not intend to in the least.

Horvat is one of these critics because she hasn’t even read it or studied it in depth, unlike the tremendous number of theologians, Scripture scholars, Church authorities, priests, and pious lay faithful who have studied it in depth and approved it. Furthermore, I have shown many times in the previous pages and upcoming pages how she wrenches quotations out of context, is highly ignorant of Valtorta’s work and ecclesiastical approval, gives calumnious, unsubstantiated insinuations, uses unreliable sources (the few she used), and betrays an obvious unjustified bias towards the *Poem*.

Refuting Her Claim that the Poem Contains "Endless Idle Conversations"

Horvat gives a huge distortion of Valtorta's text that amounts to falsehood when she wrote: "There are endless idle conversations between Our Lord, Our Lady and the Apostles, all on a natural level."

This distortion represents a subjective impression by someone who – very likely – never read the *Poem* herself, but only glossed over it in cursory fashion with an ill-disposed and superficial attitude and an obvious bias. Here are some opinions from those who actually read it, are more learned than Horvat, and who completely disagree with her biased opinion (and I daresay, very poor judgment):

Archbishop Alfonso Carinci, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites from 1930 to 1960, fully approved Maria Valtorta and the *Poem*, writing in 1952: "There is nothing therein which is contrary to the Gospel. Rather, this work, a good complement to the Gospel, contributes towards a better understanding of its meaning... Our Lord's discourses do not contain anything which in any way might be contrary to His Spirit."⁶⁸

Archbishop Carinci also stated: "...it seems impossible to me that a woman of a very ordinary theological culture, and unprovided with any book useful to that end, had been able on her own to write with such exactness pages so sublime. [...] Judging from the good one experiences in reading it [i.e., *The Poem*], I am of the humble opinion that this Work, once published, could bring so many souls to the Lord: sinners to conversion and the good to a more fervent and diligent life. [...] While the immoral press invades the world and exhibitions corrupt youth, one comes spontaneously to thank the Lord for having given us, by means of this suffering woman, nailed to a bed, a Work of such literary beauty, so doctrinally and spiritually lofty, accessible and profound, drawing one to read it and capable of being reproduced in cinematic productions and sacred theater."⁶⁹

If the conversations in the *Poem* were "endless" and "idle" and "all on a natural level" as Horvat gratuitously claimed, I very much doubt the pre-Vatican II Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (of distinguished repute) would call this book "so sublime" and affirm "Our Lord's discourses do not contain anything which in any way might be contrary to His Spirit", referring to it as "a Work of such literary beauty, so doctrinally and spiritually lofty, accessible and profound."

Nor would the illustrious Mariologist, Fr. Gabriel M. Roschini, O.S.M. (considered by many to be one of the greatest Mariologists who ever lived), write about the *Poem*:⁷⁰

No other Marian writings, not even the sum total of everything I have read and studied, were able to give me as clear, as lively, as complete, as luminous, or as fascinating an image, both simple **and sublime**, of Mary, God's Masterpiece. [emphasis added]

If the conversations in the *Poem* were “endless” and “idle” as Horvat gratuitously claimed, I very much doubt Msgr. Hugo Lattanzi, Professor of Fundamental Theology at the Lateran Pontifical University in Rome, would write:⁷¹

...these are truly splendid pages both in thought and in form; descriptions of psychological situations worthy of Shakespeare, dialogs conducted in a Socratic manner worthy of Plato, and descriptions of nature and the environment worthy of the most imaginative writer.

Or, as Msgr. Maurice Raffa, Director of the International Center of Comparison and Synthesis, wrote:⁷²

...I found therein incomparable riches...Wanting to express a judgment on its intrinsic and aesthetic value, I point out that to write just one of the many volumes composing the work, it would need an author (who today does not exist) who would be at once a great poet, an able biblical scholar, a profound theologian, an expert in archaeology and topography, and a profound connoisseur of human psychology.

If the conversations in the *Poem* were “endless” and “idle” as Horvat gratuitously claimed, I very much doubt Camillo Corsánego, former national president of Catholic Action in Italy, Dean of the Consistorial Lawyers, and a professor at the Pontifical Lateran University in Rome, would write:⁷³

Throughout my life, by now fairly long, I have read a very large number of works in apologetics, hagiography [saints' lives], theology, and biblical criticism; however, I have never found such a body of knowledge, art, devotion, and adherence to the traditional teachings of the Church, as in Miss Maria Valtorta's work on the Gospels...Having read those numerous pages attentively and repeatedly, I must in all conscience declare that with respect to the woman who wrote them only two hypotheses can be made: a) either she was talented like Manzoni or Shakespeare, and her scriptural and theological learning and her knowledge of the Holy Places were perfect, at any rate superior to those of anyone alive in Italy today; b) or else "*digitus Dei est hic*" ["*God's finger is here*"]. Obedient as I am (and as, with God's grace, I intend being all my life) to the supreme and infallible Magisterium of the Church, I will never dare take its place. Yet, as a humble Christian, I profess that I think the publication of this work will help to take many souls back to God, and will arouse in the modern world an apologetic interest and a leavening of Christian life comparable only to the effects of the private revelation [of the Sacred Heart] to St. Marie Alacoque. It has been said that the Work lowers the adorable Person of the Saviour. Nothing could be more wrong: Christians, I believe, usually after having affirmed faith in Jesus Christ, God and man, always forget to consider the humanity of the Incarnate Word, Whom He is regarded as the true God, but rarely as true Man, frustrating the invitation to many ways of sanctification, which is offered to us by the exemplary human life of the Son of God. Anyone who reads [even] a limited number of these wonderful pages, literally perfect, if he has a mind free of prejudices, cannot not draw from them the fruits of Christian elevation.

Cardinal Giuseppe Siri praised the manuscript of the *Poem* that he read in 1956, stating in a signed letter on March 6, 1956:⁷⁴

"...my impression from reading the typescript is excellent... I would willingly read some more. A larger volume would further substantiate a judgment, even if it be as modest as mine."

Blessed Gabriel Allegra, O.F.M., a very learned and world-renowned biblical scholar, theologian, and missionary priest, whose exegetical work had the support and acknowledgement of successive popes from Pius XI to Paul VI, wrote about Valtorta's work:⁷⁵

This double series of discourses is completed by the conversations of Jesus with the Apostles, by His polemics in the Temple and at Jerusalem or on the roads of Palestine, and finally, by His gracious, heavenly confidences with the Apostles, the men and women disciples, and especially with His Most Holy Mother.... What a work, this *Poem*! No, it is not a poor human work. There is in it the Finger of God. [...] The language, more than being dignified, is fascinating; and when the Madonna is spoken of, there is a sweetness and a true heavenly enchantment.

I now end with a quote from a professor who actually read the *Poem* in depth and hence is also at least ten times more credible than Horvat.

Prof. Leo A. Brodeur, M.A., Lèsl., Ph.D., H.Sc.D., wrote:⁷⁶

Theologically: Valtorta's writings exude a great, all-encompassing breadth of knowledge and a clear-mindedness and loftiness of concepts worthy of the greatest theologians, of the Church Fathers, and of the greatest mystics... Furthermore, she had never studied philosophy or theology either at school or on her own. The only education she had received was the average education of upper-middle class Italian girls of the early 1900s. How could she have composed her lofty writings?

Spiritually: Valtorta's writings are outstandingly practical, drawing the reader to practice the Faith in everyday life. They are not in the least dry theological textbooks. They bring spirituality alive, they bring it home, to the reader's heart, by showing us Jesus intimately, personally. Many a reader has exclaimed that reading *The Poem* is like living with Jesus as the apostles did. As depicted in *The Poem*, His character – the perfect blend of warmth and reason, of mystical outlook and practical attentions, of holiness and love – has helped many a reader to reform a life of sin, to increase love for our Lord, to become holier. Jesus is portrayed in *The Poem* as in perhaps no other mystical work. It is quite doubtful that Valtorta could have produced such an uplifting portrait on her own, when she was the first to admit her "nothingness" and ascribed everything to Jesus.

Even scientifically: Valtorta's *The Poem of the Man-God* exhibits an uncanny accuracy with regard to the archeology, botany, geography, geology, mineralogy, and topography of Palestine in Jesus' time, an accuracy commended by various experts in those fields. Yet, given her lack of education and reading in those fields, and given the fact that she never traveled to

Palestine, how could she have given accurate descriptions of places she never went to and never read about in any detail?

Finally, from the literary point of view: Valtorta wrote on the spur of the moment, without preliminary plans, without rough drafts. She wrote fast – over 10,000 handwritten pages in three years – with great consistency of thought and purpose, in masterly Italian combining the highest achievements of the Florentine style of the 1930s with the vividness and spontaneity of common folks when they are quoted. Few writers throughout the history of humanity have been that good and that prolific in that short a period of time; perhaps none of these wrote without rough drafts. Yet, she was bedridden and subjected to frequent physiological crises and down-to-earth interruptions by her relatives or neighbors. How then could she have written so well, when most writers crave solitude to be able to write?

When one ponders the theological and spiritual loftiness of Maria Valtorta's *The Poem of the Man-God*, as well as its scientific and literary remarkableness, in the light of her average education, lack of health, and in the light of her speed, accuracy and greatness of achievement, how could one seriously entertain the thought that she accomplished all that without supernatural help? When one also ponders her personal lifestyle as a generous victim soul who practiced the virtues heroically, when one also ponders the sufferings which she daily offered to the Lord, then with all due respect, how could [anyone] casually dismiss her claims to supernatural visions and dictations without a full-fledged investigation into her case?

Just like the above authorities and theologians, I find the conversations between Our Lord, Our Lady, and the Apostles to be most agreeable, enlightening, engaging, and worthwhile. I find them a rich source of knowledge, deep, very supernaturally oriented, and instructive. Jesus' many speeches are almost always entirely on supernatural topics. The day-to-day conversations revealed in the *Poem* in the travels are a mix of both natural and supernatural elements. But insofar as the natural is part of the conversations, I find it particularly instructive, just as Fr. Kevin Robinson wrote:⁷⁷

...The works of St. Ignatius encourages the use of all five senses, plus imagination, in his 'Spiritual Exercises'. The Biblical Book 'Canticle of Canticles' could be charged with the same falsehood by the spiritually immature. [Just like him], Valtorta always leads from the senses to the spiritual, the sublime, and the supernatural.

There is a book entitled *In the Likeness of Christ* (originally published in 1936) written by Rev. Fr. Edward Leen, D.D. (1885-1944, a Holy Ghost Father who earned a Doctorate in Divinity and was an author of several highly acclaimed books in the 1930s and 1940s). Here is an excerpt which reinforces this truth, which it seems Horvat might be insufficiently instructed in:⁷⁸

Now what the soul, eager to advance, and completely won to the ideal of "putting on Christ," desires above all else to know is, how is this to be done? What practical co-operation is it called on, itself, to furnish, in order that its lofty ambition be gratified? In effecting divine instincts in the soul, the Holy Ghost is principal agent. Results of a divine kind can proceed only from a cause which is, itself, divine. But God deigns to make use of an instrument in

carrying out this work of the sanctification of His creatures. That instrument is the Sacred Humanity of Jesus—it is Jesus, as expressed in the whole sum of His earthly experience, active, as well as passive. All know this.

...Few grasp the far-reaching significance of the well-known words of St. Paul: “Whether you eat or drink, or whatever else you do, do all to the glory of God.” (1 Cor. 10:31). This is more than a pious exhortation to the cultivation of a right intention; it is the formulation of a profound truth—a truth too little understood. The supernatural life, as has been so often repeated in these recent years, is not something apart from, or beside, much less in opposition to, or destructive of the natural. It is the natural elevated, transmuted, penetrated through and through with a divine leaven. Grace necessarily implies the existence of what it elevates. It presupposes human life, not partially or in some scattered and isolated elements, but in its totality. It is the life of man, as man, that grace sets out to sublimate and refine unto the refinement of God. It is through man’s own life, taken in all its activities and passivities, in its thoughts, views, judgments, decisions, in its deliberate emotions and reactions; in its outward activities as guided by his rational faculties, in all its willed contact with circumstances, with things, with men, and with God; it is through and by means of all this that man is to be wrought to a better, to a divine form.

The instrument of man’s sanctification is, in a subordinate sense, man’s own human life. This conclusion is not in contradiction to, but supplementary to, the statement made above, namely, that the human life of Christ is the instrument of the divinity in the divinization of the human soul. For the work of sanctification consists, precisely, in establishing vital contact between two life experiences—the life experience of Christ and the life experience of the Christian. Everything is in that.

...The first step in the spiritual ways is to aim at developing and cultivating a strong personal admiration for Jesus of Nazareth—Who loves to style Himself the Son of Man. By a psychological law, admiration begets love, and love inspires imitation. He who admires the Man Jesus will feel impelled to imitate Him in His life, His principles, and His actions. It is a matter of common observation that those who look up to and admire other characters tend, insensibly, to shape their thoughts and conduct to the pattern of the thoughts and conduct of such characters. The willing and devoted follower is gradually molded to the form of his chief...In a somewhat similar way, the human character of the Christ gradually forms to its own likeness those who strive to cultivate an enthusiastic admiration for Him.

...The divinity works through the Sacred Humanity and directly gaining the hearts and souls of men can work transforming effects there. Grace reinforces and gives supernatural energy to the natural psychological influence of a Great Personality on its admirers. When one has learnt to admire Jesus, and through that admiration is insensibly drawn to imitate Him, the grace of the Man-God enters into action to make that imitation real and effective, in the inner dispositions of the soul and in the outward forms of conduct.

Refuting Her Section Entitled “An Infant conceived with original sin”

Horvat writes:

An Infant conceived with original sin: Valtorta portrays the Christ Child as a greedy infant of a sentimental Mother. It is difficult to find the respect we owe to Our Lord Jesus Christ in this imaginary immodest description of a nursing scene.

Let's quote the context of the passage she is referring to in the *Poem*. This is from Chapter 35, The Flight into Egypt, right after St. Joseph told Mary that they must flee Bethlehem imminently so that Jesus won't be slain by Herod's soldiers, and Mary needs to nurse the Baby Jesus before they depart on the road where it will be difficult to nurse. The nursing scene constitutes only 7.6% of the written text of Chapter 35 (and so isn't the focus of the chapter), but since Horvat is looking for faults with the *Poem*, she focuses on this small portion of the vision and quotes it out of context to make a false insinuation. Unlike Horvat's quotes, I am going to quote that entire scene in full with all of the surrounding context.⁷⁹

« Do you need help? » Joseph asks now and again, peeping into the room through the door ajar.

« No, thank you » replies Mary every time.

Only when Her sack is full, and it is obviously very heavy, She calls Joseph to help Her to close it and take it off the bed. But Joseph does not want any help, he prefers to do it himself, and he takes the long sack into his little room.

« Shall I take also the woolen blankets? » asks Mary.

« Take as much as You can. We will lose the rest. Do take as much as You can. Things will be useful because... because we will have to stay away for a long time, Mary!... » Joseph is very sad in saying so. And one can easily imagine how Mary feels. She folds Her blankets and Joseph's, sighing deeply. Joseph ties the blankets with a rope and while doing so, he says:

« We will leave the quilts and the mats. Even if I take three donkeys I cannot overload them. We will have a long and uncomfortable journey, partly in the mountains and in the desert. Cover Jesus well. The nights will be cold both up in the mountains and in the desert. I have taken the gifts of the Magi because they will be very useful down there. I am going to spend all the money I have to buy two donkeys. We cannot send them back, so I will have to buy them. I'll go now, without awaiting dawn. I know where to find them. You finish preparing everything. » And he goes out.

Mary gathers a few more things, then, after looking at Jesus, She goes out and comes back with some little dresses which appear to be still damp: perhaps they were washed the day before. She folds them, wraps them up in a cloth, and adds them to the other things. There is

nothing else. She looks round and in a corner She sees one of Jesus' toys: a little sheep carved in wood. She picks it up sobbing, and kisses it. On the wood there are traces of Jesus' little teeth and the ears of the little sheep are all nibbled. Mary caresses the thing without any value, a plain piece of light wood, which, however, is of great value to Her, because it tells Her of Joseph's love for Jesus and speaks to Her of Her Child. She adds it to the other things placed on the closed coffer.

Now there is really nothing else. Except Jesus in the little cradle. Mary thinks She ought also to prepare the Child. She goes to the cradle and shakes it a little to wake up the Baby. But He whimpers a little, turns round and continues to sleep. Mary pats His curls gently. Jesus opens His little mouth yawning. Mary bends down and kisses His cheek. Jesus wakes up completely. He opens His eyes, sees His Mother and smiles and stretches His little hands towards Her breast.

« Yes, love of Your Mummy. Yes, Your milk. Before the usual time... But You are always ready to suck Your Mummy's breast, My little holy Lamb! »

Jesus laughs and plays, kicking His little feet out of the blankets, moving His arms happily in a typical childish style, so beautiful to see. He pushes His feet against His Mummy's stomach, He arches His back leaning His fair head on Her breast, and then throws Himself back and laughs, holding with His hands the laces that tie Mary's dress to Her neck, endeavoring to open it. He looks most beautiful in His little linen shirt, plump and as rosy as a flower.

Mary bends down and in that position, looking through the cradle, as if for protection, She smiles and cries at the same time, while the Child prattles, uttering words which are not the words of all little children; among them the word « Mummy » is repeated very clearly. He looks at Her, surprised to see Her crying. He stretches one little hand towards the shiny traces of tears and it gets wet while patting Her face. And, very gracefully, He leans once again on His Mother's breast, He clings to it and pats it with His hand.

Mary kisses His hair, takes Him up in Her arms, sits down and dresses Him. His little woolen dress has now been put on Him and His sandals have been tied on His feet. She nurses Him and Jesus avidly sucks His Mother's good milk, and when He feels that only a little is coming from Her right breast, He looks for the left one, laughing while doing so and looking up at His Mother. Then He falls asleep again on Her breast, His rosy round little cheek resting against Her white round breast.

Mary rises very slowly and lays Him on the quilt on Her bed. She covers Him with Her mantle, She goes back to the cradle and folds its little blankets.

Horvat seems to have a problem with the fact that there is a description of the Baby Jesus nursing because it shows His human nature. That is entirely unfounded. He was a human! He was a baby! He had to nurse! Horvat makes a calumnious assertion that Jesus is suckling "greedily". "Greedily" is an adjective that implies imperfection or a sin. There is no sin or nothing "greedy" about a hungry baby in need to nurse. In this passage, there is no undue "greed" but normal, natural

hunger of a rapidly growing baby. Furthermore, if this description would upset the sensibilities of some people, and hence make them doubt the authenticity of this vision, then answer me this: Do the following passages upset your sensibilities and hence cause you to want to calumniate the following with false insinuations “of greed” and throw it out as not possibly being capable of being from God?

“Let your fountain be blessed, and rejoice in the wife of your youth, a lovely deer, a graceful doe. **Let her breasts fill you at all times with delight; be intoxicated always in her love.**”

“Rejoice with Jerusalem, and be glad for her, all you who love her; rejoice with her in joy, all you who mourn over her; **that you may nurse and be satisfied from her consoling breast; that you may drink deeply with delight from her glorious abundance.**”

“And it came to pass, as He spoke these things, a certain woman from the crowd, lifting up her voice, said to [Jesus]: Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, **and the paps that gave Thee suck.** But [Jesus] said: Yea, rather, blessed are they who hear the word of God, and keep it.”

“Who shall give thee to me for my brother, **sucking the breasts of my mother**, that I may find thee without, and kiss thee, and now no man may despise me?”

“Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth: **for thy breasts are better than wine.**”

Now, let me reveal the sources of the above five quotes:

Quote #1: Proverbs 5: 18-19

Quote #2: Isaiah 66: 10-11

Quote #3: Luke 11:27

Quote #4: Song of Songs 8:1

Quote #5: Song of Songs 1:1

Those five quotes are from the infallible Word of God in the Holy Scriptures. Yet, it seems to me, that based on the way Horvat has treated the *Poem of the Man-God*, that she would not hesitate to make false gratuitous insinuations based on the above passages and declare that they are irreverent and that others might complain that it offends their modern “sensibilities” – she probably would not hesitate to do this were it not for the fact that this is the Word of God and already established to be 100% holy and divine.

There are very many Scripture passages which talk about breasts, breastfeeding, breast milk, etc. Here is a website that lists 26 of these instances: [Breastfeeding Scripture Passages](#).

Horvat's gratuitous lie that Valtorta presents an "infant conceived with original sin" is calumnious and unfounded.

But what can remain of an argument against the scene is that perhaps it is immodest or unfitting to include. The nursing scene constitutes only 7.6% of the written text of Chapter 35 (and so isn't

the focus of the chapter), but a secondary detail – a reality – that Maria Valtorta saw, and judged fit to include. Her 1940s Italian cultural upbringing is less scandalized by the holy act of motherly nursing than our once puritan American culture, which has had a history of looking down on breastfeeding at certain times in its history and considers the topic somewhat taboo. The Hebrew culture was much more accustomed to openly speaking of breastfeeding as a necessary and non-sinful part of life. This is evident by the Scripture:

“And it came to pass, as He spoke these things, a certain woman from the crowd, lifting up her voice, said to [Jesus]: Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, **and the paps that gave Thee suck.** But [Jesus] said: Yea, rather, blessed are they who hear the word of God, and keep it.” (Luke 11:27)

Imagine going up to the Pope or a cardinal nowadays and saying to him, “Blessed are the breasts that gave you suck!” But Jesus is above the Pope as Son of God and yet He wasn’t scandalized by this woman’s remark.

What is described in the scene in chapter 35 is also perfectly natural, normal behavior common to all human babies. It is normal for babies to reach for the source of food (the breast) and even the tendency to try to remove the clothing to gain access to the source of food (the breast) is normal actions for a nursing infant. Ask any mother who has nursed who had a normal relationship with their baby and they will confirm that this is normal behavior and that their infants displayed the same or similar behavior.

Even if you are surprised by the vision, it is to be noted that there is no heresy or anything against morals in this vision, and many reputable, trustworthy Church scholars and theologians are not offended by it. Many of the pre-Vatican II Italian theologians who approved the *Poem* are also not as tainted by certain tendencies in the late 20th century and 21st century in American culture, which tends to be more cold, touch-phobic (outside of a context of sexuality), and has its roots in Puritanism which has produced a society much more opposed and uncomfortable with breastfeeding compared to other cultures, especially the Hebrew and Roman cultures of the first centuries.

Personally, I don’t find the scene objectionable, irreverent, or unfitting in the context. I have talked to many women and men who have read the *Poem*, and they agree as well. In fact, mothers who have nursed their own children tend to be more open to the scene than those women who have never had a child, never nursed, and don’t know anything about this perfectly normal human phenomenon.

Horvat also makes the untenable assertion that Our Lady was being sentimental! That is ludicrous and unfounded. For those who want to try to criticize Our Lady weeping, keep in mind that the Holy Family is fleeing from their home and homeland as fugitives because someone is trying to kill Jesus (which reminds Mary of what the prophets foretell His future fate will be – “a sword shall pierce your heart”, Luke 2:35), they are losing most of their belongings, no longer being able to be around family and friends, etc. It is not sentimentalism. It is *realism*! The Church approved the

Seven Sorrows devotion about which Our Lady had appeared to many Church-approved mystics, and one of these famous Seven Sorrows is “The Flight into Egypt”.

With regards to Mary’s loving, motherly comments to the baby Jesus, those are not only not sentimental in a bad sense, but very edifying and holy! It furthermore represents normal and natural words that are the common experience of mothers who have nursing infants. Ask any balanced mother who has nursed who had a normal relationship with their baby and they’ll most likely enlighten you on the reality that what was described was perfectly normal and typical of a healthy mother. Also, perhaps Horvat has not considered the fact that our modern 20th/21st century culture is also (in general) much more reserved and less openly demonstrative than the first century Hebrew culture; so she shouldn’t project her subjective, biased, personal, unfounded assertion that the showing of love and sentiment as expressed in the *Poem* is sentimental in a derogatory sense of the term. Ironically, the best refutation of Horvat’s argument is a dictation of Jesus Christ Himself given at the end of the *Poem of the Man-God* when He gave the reasons for this work and His concluding remarks. Even if you doubt whether this comes from a divine origin or not, just consider the argument in and of itself.⁸⁰

Jesus says:

« The reasons that have induced Me to enlighten and dictate episodes and words of Mine to [Maria Valtorta] are, in addition to the joy of communicating an exact knowledge of Me to this loving victim-soul, manifold.

But the moving spirit of all of them is My love for the Church, both teaching and militant, and My desire to help souls in their ascent towards perfection. The knowledge of Me helps to ascend. My word is Life.

I mention the main ones:

[Note: I am skipping reasons #1-3 in this present excerpt and jumping to reason #4 below because it is the most relevant for this section]

4. To reinstate in their truth the figures of the Son of Man and of Mary, true children of Adam by flesh and blood, but of an innocent Adam. The children of the Man were to be like Us, if our First Parents had not depreciated their perfect humanity – in the sense of man, that is of a creature in which there is the double nature, spiritual, in the image and likeness of God, and the material nature – as you know they did. Perfect senses, that is, subject to reason even in their great efficiency. In the senses I include both the moral and the corporal ones. Therefore total and perfect love both for Her spouse, to whom She is not attached by sensuality, but only by a tie of spiritual love, and for Her Son. Most loved. Loved with all the perfection of a perfect woman for the child born of Her. That is how Eve should have loved: like Mary: that is, not for what physical enjoyment her son was, but because that son was the son of the Creator and out of obedience accomplished His order to multiply the human race.

And loved with all the ardor of a perfect believer who knows that that Son of *Hers*, is not figuratively but *really* the Son of God. To those who consider Mary's love for Jesus too affectionate, I say that they should consider who Mary was: the Woman without sin and therefore without fault in Her love towards God, towards Her relatives, towards Her spouse, towards Her Son, towards Her neighbor; they should consider what the Mother saw in Me besides seeing the Son of Her womb, and finally that they should consider the nationality of Mary. Hebrew race, eastern race, and times very remote from the present ones. So the explanation of certain verbal amplifications, that may seem exaggerated to you, ensues from these elements. The eastern and Hebrew styles are flowery and pompous also when commonly spoken. All the writings of that time and of that race prove it, and in the course of ages the eastern style has not changed very much.

As twenty centuries later you have to examine these pages, when the wickedness of life has killed so much love, would you expect Me to give you a Mary of Nazareth similar to the arid superficial woman of your days? Mary is what She is, and the sweet, pure, loving Girl of Israel, the Spouse of God. The Virgin Mother of God cannot be changed into an excessively morbidly exalted woman, or into a glacially selfish one of your days.

And I tell those, who consider Jesus' love for Mary too affectionate, to consider that in Jesus there was God, and that God One and Trine received His consolation by loving Mary, Who requited Him for the sorrow of the whole human race, and was the means by which God could glory again in His Creation that gives citizens to His Heavens. And finally, let them consider *that every love becomes guilty when, and only when, it causes disorder, that is, when it goes against the Will of God and the duty to be fulfilled.*

Now consider: did Mary's love do that? Did My love do that? Did She keep Me, through selfish love, from doing *all* the Will of God? Through a disorderly love for My Mother, did I perhaps repudiate My mission? No. Both loves had but one desire: *to accomplish the Will of God for the salvation of the world.* And the Mother said all the farewells to Her Son, and the Son said all the farewells to His Mother, handing the Son to the cross of His public teaching and to the Cross of Calvary, handing the Mother to solitude and torture, so that She might be the Co-Redeemer, without taking into account our humanity that felt lacerated and our hearts that were broken with grief. Is that weakness? Is it sentimentalism? It is perfect love, o men, who do not know how to love and who no longer understand love and its voices!

And the purpose of this Work is also to clarify certain points that a number of circumstances has covered with darkness and they thus form dark zones in the brightness of the evangelic picture and points that seem a rupture and are only obscure points, between one episode and another, indecipherable points, and the ability to decipher them is the key to correctly understand certain situations that had arisen and certain strong manners that I had to have, so contrasting with My continuous exhortations to forgive, to be meek and humble, a certain rigidity towards obstinate, inconvertible opponents. You all ought to remember that God, after using all His mercy, for the sake of His own honor, can say also "Enough" to those who, as He is good, think it is right to take advantage of His forbearance and tempt Him. It is an old wise saying.

I think that this more than adequately refutes Horvat's objection that Mary was a "sentimental Mother" (in the derogatory sense of the term that Horvat was using). There are far, far too many extremely learned and trustworthy clerics, authorities, experts, scientists, and pious lay faithful who approve what is written in the *Poem* and do not find it sentimental in a derogatory sense (among them Pope Pius XII, St. Padre Pio, Fr. Gabriel Roschini, the authority during Maria Valtorta's lifetime in charge of causes of saints, and many others). For further refutations of her claims, see the subchapter of [this e-book](#) entitled "*Analyzing and Refuting Some Critic's Arguments that it Appeals Too Much to the Sensitivity or Presents a De-Supernaturalized Christ Because it Contains So Many Details of the Human Side of Our Lord's Life*".

Refuting the Concluding Remarks of Her Article (and Discussing Her Seven Wrong Page Number References and Failure to Reference All Her Citations)

Horvat writes:

These are some excerpts I offer to my readers to evaluate Valtorta's work. I believe they are sufficient for the reader to make a judgment of the whole.

It is thus understandable that the Holy Office placed the work on the *Index of Forbidden Books*, which is reproduced *below*. It is also understandable that the Salesian Brother James concluded his critique of the first two volumes with these words: "*Poem of the Man-God* is so demonic that without a special grace from Our Lord Jesus, we could be deceived by the seemingly harmless statements by Valtorta's Jesus, but they enclose lies and heresy, contrary to the teachings of One, Holy Catholic Church."

Her excerpts certainly are **not sufficient** for the reader to make a judgment of the whole. I have proven this by showing how her excerpts are always taken completely out of context, and are coupled with (1) proven falsities, (2) huge distortions and false unsubstantiated insinuations tantamount to lying, (3) poor research, (4) ignorance of too many documented facts, (5) ignorance of and a lack of reference to the theological commentaries on the *Poem* written by trustworthy, learned theologians (such as Fr. Berti's 5,678 theological annotations of the *Poem*), and (5) are tainted by her unsubstantiated subjective impressions which are contradicted by those of greater learning and authority than her.

Like I mentioned earlier, Horvat based most of her article on only one source, which was written by a Brother James. I have reviewed Brother James's article and I have to point out:

(1) The worst out-of-context quotations Brother James gives in his article, Horvat reproduced in her article. All of these out-of-context objections, insinuations, and errors have been refuted in [this e-book](#).

(2) All of the other arguments based on the out-of-context quotations Brother James gives in his article are easily refuted by reading the *Poem* in the proper context. See the subchapter of [this e-book](#) entitled "*Analyzing Quotes That Might Seem Wrong Taken Out of Context*" to understand the issue of context, and this present refutation of Horvat's anti-Valtorta article refutes his main out-of-context arguments.

(3) Anyone who takes even a modest amount of time and effort reading the *Poem* in context can readily see that the "hack-job" Brother James did is so false that it is tantamount to lying. One can take almost *any* book (including the Holy Scriptures) and use Brother James's method to make it sound bad. Furthermore, his article is riddled with falsehoods, deficient theology, wrenching of statements out of context with false unsubstantiated insinuations, poor research, ignorance of too many relevant facts, sweeping generalizations, lack of objectivity, and an obvious unjustified bias against the *Poem*. His article is filled with such obvious errors, poor theology, and ridiculous

arguments that it is absurd to think of taking his article seriously. See the subchapter of [this e-book](#) entitled “A Refutation of Brother James’s Article” to see why.

There have been four Italian editions of the *Poem of the Man-God*. In the first Italian edition, it was released in four volumes under the title *Il Poema dell'Uomo-Dio (The Poem of the Man-God)*. In later editions, it was released in ten volumes under the new title *L'Evangelo come mi è stato rivelato (The Gospel as Revealed to Me)*. The English translation of the *Poem of the Man-God* had its second edition released in 2012 (now under the title *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*).

The difference between the Italian versions and the English translations are that the Italian versions have many scholarly footnotes of Fr. Corrado Berti, O.S.M. To remind you, Fr. Berti was a professor of dogmatic and sacramental theology of the Pontifical Marianum Theological Faculty in Rome from 1939 onward, and Secretary of that Faculty from 1950 to 1959. He is one of the three priests who had an audience with Pope Pius XII about the *Poem of the Man-God* wherein Pope Pius XII commanded him to publish the *Poem of the Man-God* “just as it is”. Fr. Berti is also the one who supervised the editing and publication of the critical second edition of the *Poem* and provided the extensive theological and biblical annotations that accompany that edition and all subsequent editions. Fr. Berti wrote in his [signed testimony](#) on December 8, 1978: “I read and annotated (by myself from 1960 to 1974; with the help of some confreres from 1974 on) all the Valtorta writings, both edited and unedited.”⁸¹

Fr. Berti was an extremely learned and traditional/orthodox scholar who thoroughly analyzed Maria Valtorta’s writings and provided **more than 5,675 scholarly footnotes and appendices** for her work, including for difficult passages that critics have or could potentially criticize. This averages about 568 footnotes per volume and averages slightly more than one footnote per page throughout the whole 5,264 printed pages. In 1961, the second critical Italian edition of the *Poem of the Man-God*, published by Knight Michele Pisani's son Emilio Pisani, contained these scholarly footnotes and appendices by Fr. Berti. The subsequent editions, including the current fourth edition released in 2001, have many of these footnotes.

Fr. Gabriel Roschini, Consultant of the Holy Office, stated in 1961 that the new critical second edition “was not to be considered to be on the *Index*, because it was totally renewed, conformed in all to the original, and provided with notes that removed any doubt and which demonstrated the solidity and orthodoxy of the work.”⁸²

Fr. Kevin Robinson makes a reference to these footnotes:⁸³

I have read about a 1,000 pages a year of Valtorta for 20 years.

I have in my office a huge file “**pro**”, and a small file “**con**” of the works of Maria Valtorta. I have the 10-volume Italian edition for reference with its many profound footnotes. The pros far outweigh the cons.

The holiest and most learned clergy I know are those who appreciate Valtorta.

The objections raised so far are meaningless in context. There is only one genuine mistake in all the 20,000 pages (plus) of Valtorta's writings that I have read: On Good Shepherd Sunday, the commentary on the Mass (*Book of Azariah*) includes the word "Maronite" among the schismatics. The original probably has "Mariavites", a Polish schismatic sect that St. Pius X condemned.

There is already enough demonstration of the orthodoxy of Maria Valtorta's writings and solid refutations of all arguments against her works for us to trust her writings completely. However, if someone wants to criticize her writings, and they are honest, they need to consult with the scholarly footnotes of the Italian edition and contend with those (as well as the detailed critiques of the *Poem* published by extremely learned and trustworthy authorities and scholars such as Archbishop Carinci's analysis, Fr. Gabriel Roschini's published work on her writings, Blessed Gabriel Allegra's critiques and writings on the *Poem*, etc.) A would-be critic must be a serious scholar (I have yet to find very many Valtorta critics who are) who reads Fr. Berti's footnotes for the passages under investigation. There should be no quoting out of context and no distorting. There should be a clear reference to the passage and a clear explanation as to why there might be an error, based on clear-cut theological and moral criteria with references to authoritative Catholic sources like Denzinger, St. Thomas Aquinas, etc. The seeming doctrinal errors in the *Poem* are not difficult to explain, one by one, with Fr. Berti's notes and appendices. I have yet to find a single critic of Valtorta who is as learned and experienced as Fr. Berti was (not to mention a critic who has as much authority as Fr. Berti did, as a professor of dogmatic and sacramental theology of the Pontifical Marianum Theological Faculty in Rome from 1939 onward, and Secretary of that Faculty from 1950 to 1959).

Brother James's article consists of a series of out-of-context quotes, all of which are easily refutable. But the "worst" ones, which Horvat took to try to prove her unfounded thesis, have been thoroughly refuted above.

There are many reasons to not trust Brother James's out-of-context article which has already had a tremendous number of his out-of-context objections and insinuations refuted. See the subchapter of [this e-book](#) entitled "*A Refutation of Brother James's Article*" to see why. Instead, I have reason to trust these authorities and scholars of much greater learning and authority than Brother James:

Bishops who approved the *Poem* after a thorough investigation of her writings include Pope Pius XII (who, in 1948, ordered it to be published), the Holy Office, 13 years later, in 1961 (and again in 1992) granted permission for the publication of her work, Bishop Roman Danylak, S.T.L., J.U.D. (who issued an official [letter of endorsement](#) of the English translation of the *Poem of the Man-God* in 2001), and Archbishop Soosa Pakiam M. of Trivandrum, India (who granted the [imprimatur](#) of the Malayalam translation of the *Poem* in 1993). It has also received the documented approval of three Consultants to the Holy Office in 1951-1952, five professors at pontifical universities in Rome, Blessed Gabriel Allegra, O.F.M. (a world-renowned exegete and theologian), Fr. Gabriel Roschini, O.S.M. (world-renowned Mariologist, decorated professor and founder of the Marianum Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Rome, Consultor of the Holy Office, and who wrote over 130

totally orthodox books about Our Lady), and many other cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and priests.

None the least of these was Archbishop Alphonsus Carinci, who was the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites from 1930 to 1960 (which was later renamed the Congregation for the Causes of Saints in 1969). Archbishop Carinci was in charge of investigating causes for beatification and canonization. He was conversant in recognizing true and false sanctity and was of distinguished repute. He visited Maria Valtorta three times, said Mass for her, read her writings in depth, wrote many letters back and forth with her, and analyzed her case. He was so convinced that her writings were inspired by God, that eyewitnesses report he would say to Maria Valtorta: “He is the Master. He is the Author,” and in his letters to Maria Valtorta, he wrote “Author” with a capital “A”.⁸⁴ Archbishop Carinci was one of two prominent authorities who advised Fr. Corrado Berti to deliver typewritten copies of the *Poem of the Man-God* to Pope Pius XII, which led to his papal command to publish it in 1948.⁸⁵ In January 1952, Archbishop Carinci also wrote a thorough certification and positive review of Valtorta’s work (four pages long when typed), which has been published.⁸⁶ That same year, he also wrote a letter on behalf of himself and eight other prominent authorities (among them, two Consultants to the Holy Office, three professors at pontifical universities in Rome, a Consultant to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and the Prefect of the Vatican Secret Archive) to be delivered to Pope Pius XII in an audience, although the audience wasn’t able to be arranged.⁸⁷ Archbishop Carinci is also one of the authorities whose favorable certifications about Maria Valtorta was given to the Holy Office in 1961 by Fr. Corrado Berti, which led the Holy Office to grant their approval of the publication of the second edition of her work.⁸⁸

Among the other bishops who officially approve and promote the *Poem of the Man-God* are: Archbishop Alberto Ramos of Belem, Brazil, who granted the imprimatur to an anthology of the *Poem of the Man-God* that was published in 1978; Archbishop Nuncio Apostolic Pier Giacomo De Nicolò, who preached about Maria Valtorta and her writings with positive approval for the 50th anniversary of Maria Valtorta’s death in 2011 in the basilica where she is buried; Bishop John Venancio (former Bishop of Fatima and learned theologian who taught dogmatic theology at a pontifical university in Rome and who provided [important evidence](#) about the Third Secret of Fatima); Archbishop George Pearce, S.M., D.D.; and seven bishops in India who sent out letters to the translator of the Malayalam translation of the *Poem* praising and endorsing its translation and dissemination, stating that there is nothing against faith or morals in the *Poem* (one of them was a cardinal, another one was an archbishop, and the other five were regular bishops – two of whom were later appointed archbishops).

There are also documented eyewitness accounts by several trustworthy sources that Saint Padre Pio approved and encouraged the reading of Maria Valtorta’s works, and that he had mystical experiences with Maria Valtorta during the time when they were both alive (see the chapter of [this e-book](#) entitled “*Padre Pio and Maria Valtorta*” to read about these accounts).

There are also many other trustworthy and well-learned bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and theologians not mentioned above who approve of and endorse the *Poem of the Man-God*.

In addition to the significant ecclesiastical approval of the *Poem* – many of whom testify that they are certain that this is an authentic private revelation from God – there are a multitude of experts in a great variety of the secular sciences and arts that attest to the evidence of the divine origin of the *Poem*, writing authoritatively in their particular field and area of expertise.

Finally, Horvat pastes the decree of the Holy Office's placement on the Index in her article. For a refutation and fully documented details about the anonymous *L'Osservatore Romano* article, see the subchapters of [this e-book](#) entitled "*The Position of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (the Holy Office)*" and "*About the Anonymous Letter in the L'Osservatore Romano and a Thorough Analysis and Refutation of This Letter*". It is an undeniable, established fact that Pope Pius XII ordered it to be published in 1948, that the Holy Office approved the publication of the second edition in 1961 according to the testimony of Fr. Berti, that this work has received imprimaturs and endorsements from multiple bishops, and that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has in recent times given permission to the publisher to publish it and the faithful to read it as it is. Horvat shows in her article complete ignorance of all of these things and she simply throws her hands up in the air saying, "*Unfortunately, the official position of the Church today is less than clear*". It is, however, quite clear if one takes the time to research it adequately. Horvat's superficial analysis of Maria Valtorta's work obviously never mentions any of these authorities and statements/facts because she is most likely ignorant of them. See the section of this refutation entitled "Refuting Her Claim About Progressives" for more details.

Since Horvat refers readers to her out-of-context citations which she attempts to reference, I'd like to take some time here to point out that Horvat's references of the *Poem* in her article are both strange and absolutely incorrect as they do not at all correspond with either the English first edition of the *Poem*, the English second edition of the *Poem*, or the latest Italian edition of the *Poem*. They are absolutely inaccurate. I checked Br. James's article which she quoted as her main (and pretty much only) source and he actually uses the correct page numbers so her mistakes couldn't be attributed to wrong copying from his references.

I give her the benefit of the doubt that she didn't purposefully use incorrect page number references to make it difficult for people to look up the actual original context (which is the solution to easily show her mutilated quotes and arguments as untrustworthy, unfounded, and misleading). Her mistake was highly convenient to deter people from actually being able to find and read the context (at least easily). She gets the correct chapter numbers in her references, but the page numbers are off by tremendous amounts, including an instance of it being off 124 pages (which is 23 chapters off from the actual chapter) which can only serve to confuse people trying to look up the original context and perhaps cause them to get frustrated and give up. It's not like she only got one reference wrong either, but all of her references are off by differing and varying amounts. It is furthermore strange that she uses the convention "n." for chapter. I have never seen that convention used in any article ever in my life and Br. James's article (which is her only source) also doesn't use that convention so it's not like she took the convention from him. That is indeed strange. She also fails to cite all of her quotes. For example, in the quotes she uses around the picture of Blessed Allegra, she takes quotes from chapters 165 and 257, but she only references chapter 165.

For interested readers, below are the *actual* places in Valtorta's work which correspond to Horvat's incorrect references:

Her reference "(Vol 1, n. 35, p. 106)" is actually in reality: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 1, Chapter 35, pp. 181-182. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 35, p. 219.

In the quotes above the picture of Blessed Allegra, she is taking her quotes from: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 257, p. 650. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 4, Chapter 258, p. 224-225.

In the quote left of the picture of Blessed Allegra, she is taking her quote from: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 165, pp. 94-95. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 3, Chapter 165, pp. 37-38.

Her reference "(Vol 2, n. 165, pp. 57-58)" is actually in reality: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 165, p. 95. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 3, Chapter 165, p. 38.

Her reference "(Vol II, n. 199, p. 185)" is actually in reality: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 199, p. 309. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 3, Chapter 199, p. 301.

Her reference "(Vol 1, n. 7, p. 23)" is actually in reality: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 1, Chapter 7, p. 40. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 7, p. 51.

Her reference "(Vol 1, n. 17, p. 49)" is actually in reality: *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 1, Chapter 17, pp. 83-84. In the second English edition it is: *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 17, pp. 103-104.

I would expect a significantly higher degree of accuracy from somebody who wants to put herself forward as credible and scholarly. It appears that possessing a Ph.D. doesn't guarantee that the person knows how to accurately cite sources and perform the basics of writing and checking their work. These mistakes are almost as bad as her ludicrous argument trying to discredit the *Poem* based on one artist's personal painting formed from his own imagination. But in comparing these errors, in the end, I think the latter wins the award...

References

¹ *Gabriel Roschini*. Wikipedia.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gabriel_Roschini

² *ibid.*

³ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. By Fr. Gabriel M. Roschini, O.S.M. Kolbe's Publications Inc. 1989. Page XIV in the Foreword. ISBN-13: 9788879870863.

⁴ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 8-9. *Op. cit.*

⁵ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. Foreword. *Op. cit.*

⁶ *An Introduction to Maria Valtorta and Her Epic Narrative The Poem of the Man-God*.

<http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Valepic.html>

⁷ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. Page XIII in the Publisher's Notice. *Op. cit.*

⁸ *In Defense of the Poem*. By The Most Rev. Roman Danylak. Original article published in *A Call to Peace*, August/September 1992, Vol. 3, No. 4, published monthly by the Mir-A-Call Center, 1515 N. Town East Blvd. – Suite 138, Mesquite, TX 75150.

<http://www.SacredHeartofJesus.ca/MariaValtorta/inDefense.htm>

Note: The original URL above has since become dead, but an archive of it can still be viewed here:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20150512182741/http://www.sacredheartofjesus.ca/MariaValtorta/inDefense.htm>

⁹ *Fireworks: Sunrise of Truth Encyclopedia, Vol. 1*. The Maria Valtorta Research Center. Kolbe's Publications: Sherbrooke, Canada. 1996. p. 15. ISBN: 2920285009. This book is also available online here:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20130106000533/http://valtorta.org/FIREWORKS.htm>

¹⁰ *Introduction: The Poem of the Man-God. The Dated Parallel Harmony of the Gospels*. By David J. Webster. 2007. Page iii. Available for purchase at: www.saveourchurch.org/catalog2006.pdf

¹¹ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta*. By Msgr. Vincenzo Cerri. Kolbe's Publications Inc. 1994. pp. 219-220. ISBN-13: 9782920285125.

¹² *Maria Valtorta was an Eye-Witness to the First Century Life and Ministry of Our Lord Jesus! Her Numerous Strikingly Accurate Descriptions of First Century Palestine Prove it!* By David Webster. November 15, 2004.

<http://www.saveourchurch.org/descriptionspoem.pdf>

¹³ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 242, pp. 550-552; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 4, Chapter 243, pp. 102-104.

- ¹⁴ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 218-219. *Op. cit.*
- ¹⁵ *A Testimony on Maria Valtorta's Poem of the Man-God*. By Rev. Corrado Berti, O.S.M. December 8, 1978.
<http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Corberti.html>
This is the English translation of a photostated copy of Fr. Berti's original signed Italian typescript testimonial, which is in possession of Dr. Emilio Pisani in Isola del Liri, Italy. A photocopy of Fr. Berti's original signed Italian typescript is viewable and downloadable here:
<http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Testimony%20of%20Fr.%20Berti.pdf>
- ¹⁶ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 68-74. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.
- ¹⁷ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 91-94. ISBN-13: 9788879871528. On page 92 is a photocopy of Archbishop Carinci's original signed handwritten letter dated January 29, 1952.
- ¹⁸ *An Introduction to Maria Valtorta and Her Epic Narrative The Poem of the Man-God*. *Op. cit.*
- ¹⁹ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 199, p. 306; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 3, Chapter 199, pp. 297-298.
- ²⁰ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 199, pp. 306-309; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 3, Chapter 199, pp. 298-301.
- ²¹ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. p. 203. *Op. cit.*
- ²² *Apologia Pro Maria Valtorta*. By Fr. Kevin Robinson, FSSPX. Updated 2012.
<https://www.scribd.com/doc/3983225/Apologia-Pro-Maria-Valtorta>
- ²³ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 219-220. *Op. cit.*
- ²⁴ *Autobiography*. By Maria Valtorta. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 1991. p. 163. ISBN-13: 9788879870689.
- ²⁵ *Autobiography*. By Maria Valtorta. pp. 163-164. *Op. cit.*
- ²⁶ *In Response to Various Questions Regarding "The Poem of the Man-God"*. By Dr. Mark Miravalle, S.T.D. April 15, 2006.
<http://www.motherofallpeoples.com/2006/04/in-response-to-various-questions-regarding-qthe-poem-of-the-man-godq/>
- ²⁷ *Apologia Pro Maria Valtorta*. *Op. cit.*

²⁸ *A Critical Analysis of the Explanatory Letter of Condemnation*. Maria-Valtorta.net.
http://maria-valtorta.net/letter_condemnation.html

²⁹ *Lessons on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*. By Maria Valtorta. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. May 21, 1948. pp. 147-148. ISBN-13: 9788879871471.

³⁰ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. Page XIV in the Foreword. *Op. cit.*

³¹ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 276-277. *Op. cit.*

³² *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. Footnote #137 on pp. 277-278. *Op. cit.*

³³ *The Notebooks: 1945-1950*. By Maria Valtorta. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. November 4, 1947. pp. 438-439. ISBN-13: 9788879870887.

³⁴ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 1, Chapter 17, pp. 83-84; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 17, pp. 102-104.

³⁵ *Apologia Pro Maria Valtorta*. *Op. cit.*

³⁶ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 219-220. *Op. cit.*

³⁷ *Gabriele Allegra*. Wikipedia. Accessed online January 2013.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gabriele_Allegra

³⁸ *Blessed Gabriel M. Allegra, O.F.M. – Critiques, Notes, Letters on Maria Valtorta’s Poem of the Man-God*.
<http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Gablegra/Alegintr.html>

³⁹ *Gabriele Allegra*. Wikipedia. *Op. cit.*

⁴⁰ *Maria Valtorta*. Angelqueen Forums. Fr. Kevin Robinson’s Comments about the *Poem of the Man-God*. Posted on April 25, 2006, and April 28, 2006.
<http://iloughnan.tripod.com/valtorta.htm>

Note: The original URL above has since become dead, but an archive of it can still be viewed here:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20150912200311/http://iloughnan.tripod.com/valtorta.htm>

⁴¹ *Kiss of Peace*. Wikipedia. Accessed online January 2013.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kiss_of_peace

⁴² *Kiss*. 1910 Catholic Encyclopedia. Nihil Obstat: October 1, 1910; Remy Lafort, S.T.D., Censor. Imprimatur: John Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York. Accessed online January 2013.
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08663a.htm>

⁴³ *Maria Valtorta*. Angelqueen Forums. Comment by Fr. Kevin Robinson. *Op. cit.*

⁴⁴ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 2, Chapter 165, pp. 94-95; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 3, Chapter 165, pp. 37-38.

⁴⁵ *Maria Valtorta*. Angelqueen Forums. Comment by Fr. Kevin Robinson. *Op. cit.*

⁴⁶ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 219-220. *Op. cit.*

⁴⁷ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 3, Chapter 462, p. 322; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 7, Chapter 464, p. 273.

⁴⁸ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 75-77. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁴⁹ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. Foreword. *Op. cit.*

⁵⁰ *Gabriel Roschini*. *Op. cit.*

⁵¹ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 89-91. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁵² *ibid.*

⁵³ *Common Questions and Misconceptions*. Maria-Valtorta.net.

http://www.maria-valtorta.net/common_questions.html

⁵⁴ *The Notebooks: 1944*. By Maria Valtorta. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. September 24, 1944. pp. 570-571. ISBN-13: 9788879870429.

⁵⁵ *Maria Valtorta on Anne Catherine Emmerich*. Letter of Maria Valtorta to the Discalced Carmelite Mother Teresa Maria of Saint Joseph. May 21, 1949. Accessed online April 2013.

<http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Emmerich.html>

⁵⁶ *List of Fallacies*. Wikipedia.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_fallacies

⁵⁷ *ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Condemnations of 1210-1277*. Wikipedia.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Condemnations_of_1210%E2%80%931277

⁵⁹ *In Defense of the City of God: Part Two*. Daily Catholic.
<http://www.dailycatholic.org/issue/05Jun/jun17tim.htm>

⁶⁰ *The Roman Index of Forbidden Books (3rd Edition)*. By Francis S. Betten, S.J. Published by B. Herder: St. Louis, MO. 1912. p. 18. Available online here:
<http://www.saintsbooks.net/books/Francis%20S.%20Betten,%20S.J.%20-%20The%20Roman%20Index%20of%20Forbidden%20Books.pdf>

⁶¹ *The Roman Index of Forbidden Books (3rd Edition)*. p. 12. *Op. cit.*

⁶² *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 263-265. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁶³ *William F. Buckley Jr's Fascination with Italian Mystic Maria Valtorta*. By Daniel Klimek, T.O.R. ChurchPop.
<https://churchpop.com/2016/04/05/william-f-buckley-devotion-mystic-maria-valtorta/>
Also available here:
<http://www.valtorta.org.au/William-Buckley-Valtorta.html>

⁶⁴ *The Church and Maria Valtorta's Poem of the Man-God*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani.
<http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Chrchval.html>

⁶⁵ *Wasn't the SSPX Lawfully Suppressed?* SSPX.org
https://web.archive.org/web/20130501104817/http://spx.org/SSPX_FAQs/q3_spx_suppressed.htm

⁶⁶ *A wonderful gift to our generation: "The Gospel as was revealed to me" by Maria Valtorta*. By Antonio Socci. Blog of Antonio Socci. April 7, 2012. Accessed online April 2013. Translated from the original Italian.
<http://www.antoniosocci.com/2012/04/un-regalo-meraviglioso-alla-nostra-generazione-levangelo-come-mi-e-stato-rivelato-di-maria-valtorta/>
A full English translation of Socci's article is viewable here:
<http://www.valtorta.org.au/Socci.html>

⁶⁷ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta*. pp. 219-220. *Op. cit.*

⁶⁸ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 68-74. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁶⁹ *ibid.*

⁷⁰ *The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta*. Foreword. *Op. cit.*

⁷¹ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 80-82. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁷² *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 86-89. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁷³ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 75-77. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.

⁷⁴ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition)*. By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 95-96. ISBN-13: 9788879871528. On page 96 is a photocopy of Cardinal Siri's original signed letter dated March 6, 1956.

⁷⁵ This contains excerpts from two sources:

- *Bollettino Valtortiano*. No. 31, January-June 1985. p. 122. Edizioni Pisani / Centro Editoriale Valtortiano srl. Viale Piscicelli, 89/91, 03036 Isola del Liri (FR), Italia. Also quoted online here: <http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Gablegra/Allegra4.html>

- *Bollettino Valtortiano*. No. 29, January-June 1984. pp. 114-116. Edizioni Pisani / Centro Editoriale Valtortiano srl. Viale Piscicelli, 89/91, 03036 Isola del Liri (FR), Italia. Also quoted online here: <http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Gablegra/Allegra2.html>

⁷⁶ *The Valtorta Newsletter*. No. 7, Summer 1993. Maria Valtorta Research Center. 31, King St. West, #212, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, J1H 1N5. pp. 5-6. Also quoted online here: <http://www.bardstown.com/~brchrys/Chrchval.html>

⁷⁷ *Apologia Pro Maria Valtorta*. *Op. cit.*

⁷⁸ *In the Likeness of Christ*. By Fr. Edward Leen. Sarto House: Kansas City, MO. Originally published in 1936. Reprinted in 2000. pp. 2-7. ISBN-13: 9780963903280.

⁷⁹ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 1, Chapter 35, pp. 180-182; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 35, pp. 218-220.

⁸⁰ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Last Chapter, pp. 946-952; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 10, Chapter 652, pp. 541-553.

⁸¹ *A Testimony on Maria Valtorta's Poem of the Man-God. Op. cit.*

⁸² *ibid.*

⁸³ *Maria Valtorta. Angelqueen Forums. Comment by Fr. Kevin Robinson. Op. cit.*

⁸⁴ *The Holy Shroud and the Visions of Maria Valtorta. By Msgr. Vincenzo Cerri. Kolbe's Publications Inc. 1994. pp. 218-219. ISBN-13: 9782920285125.*

⁸⁵ *A Testimony on Maria Valtorta's Poem of the Man-God. Op. cit.*

⁸⁶ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition). By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 68-74. ISBN-13: 9788879871528.*

⁸⁷ *Pro e contro Maria Valtorta (5th Edition). By Dr. Emilio Pisani. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano. 2008. pp. 91-94. ISBN-13: 9788879871528. On page 92 is a photocopy of Archbishop Carinci's original signed handwritten letter dated January 29, 1952.*

⁸⁸ *An Introduction to Maria Valtorta and Her Epic Narrative The Poem of the Man-God. Op. cit.*