

Supplement to the Article “Refutation of the Claim that There is Error in Valtorta’s Work with Regards to Jesus’ Deliberate Display of Emotions and Reaction to Sense Stimuli (and Church Teaching on Passions, Sense Stimuli, and Control of Emotions in Jesus)”: Refutation of the Critic’s Objections About the Other Scenes that He References

By Stephen Austin, May 2017

To return to the main article, click [here](#).

In this supplement, Fr. Berti’s footnotes 3 and 4 are sometimes referenced. They are copied below for your convenience.

Fr. Berti Footnote 3: The writer, using the expression “But He controls Himself,” intended to say that, even in such circumstances, Jesus wills the predominance of His prerogative and mission of “Savior” to that of “Judge”, reserved above all for the end times (see John 3:17; Matthew 25: 31-46). This interpretation flows from and is authorized by passages of this same paragraph, marked by the notes 7, 10, 17, and 21.

Fr. Berti Footnote 4: People tend to think back to the attitude assumed by Jesus with the money changers and merchants, violators of the Temple. See: Matthew 21: 12-17; Mark 11: 15-19; Luke 19: 45-46; John 2: 13-17.

The seminary professor referred to various pages from a chapter in Valtorta’s work that contain descriptions that seem to him to support his erroneous thesis (which is based on a faulty presumption and misinterpretation of the text). He referred to pp. 223, 228, 232, 234, 608, and 507. So far in the refutation in the main article, we have already addressed one of the specific passages he quoted (namely, the one on p. 223), including giving Fr. Berti’s footnotes for that passage. We will now analyze the other cases which he quoted or gave page numbers for. Fortunately, there are Fr. Berti footnotes for nearly all of the specific cases he referenced.

Now let’s quote the remaining relevant excerpts from that chapter along with Fr. Berti’s footnotes:¹

[...] « Well? Do I hate you? I could strike you with My foot, I could tread on you calling you "worm", I could curse you, as I freed you from the power that makes you rave. You thought that My impossibility to curse you was weakness. Oh! it is not weakness! It is because I am the Saviour. And the Saviour cannot curse.⁷ He can save. He wants to save... You said: "I am the strength. The strength that hates You and will defeat You". I also am the Strength, nay, *I am*

the only Strength. But My strength is not hatred. It is love. And love does not hate and does not curse, *never*.

The Strength could also win single battles, like this one between you and Me, between Satan who is in you, and Me, and remove your master from you, for good, as I did now by transforming Myself into the sign that saves, the Tau that Lucifer abhors. It could win also these single battles as it will win the oncoming one against incredulous murderous Israel, against the world and against Satan defeated by Redemption. It could win also these single battles as it will win the last one, remote for those who count by centuries, close at hand for those who measure time with the measure of eternity. But of what avail would it be to infringe the perfect rules of My Father? Would it be justice? Would it be merit? No. It would be neither justice nor merit. It would not be justice with regard to guilty men, who have not been deprived of the freedom of being so, and who on the last day could ask Me the reason for their damnation and reproach Me for My partiality for you alone. Ten thousand and one hundred thousand people, seventy times ten thousand and one hundred thousand people will commit the same sins as yours and will become demons through their own wills, and they will be the offenders of God, the torturers of their fathers and mothers, killers, thieves, liars, adulterers, lewd and sacrilegious people, and in the end deicides, killing the Christ materially on a day close at hand, killing Him spiritually in future times. And each of them could say to Me, when I will come to separate lambs from billy-goats, to bless the former and curse, then, yes, *to curse the latter*, to curse them because there will be no further redemption then, but glory or damnation,¹⁰ to curse them once again after cursing them individually at their death, first, and at their individual judgement. Because man, and you know this because you have heard Me say so a hundred, a thousand times, because man can save himself while he is alive, up to his last breath. An instant, a thousandth of a minute is sufficient for a soul to say everything to God, to ask to be forgiven and obtain absolution... Each of them, I was saying, each of these damned souls could say to Me: "Why did You not tie us to Good, as You did with Judas?". And they would be right. [...]

Fr. Berti Footnote 7: See: previous note 3.

Fr. Berti Footnote 10: See: previous note 3. For the allusion to the universal Last Judgment, see: Matthew 25: 31-46.

Note 3 was given in full earlier in this refutation.

Later on, from that same chapter in Valtorta's work:²

[...] Jesus, Who had become more and more animated in speaking, without ever assuming a violent tone or threatening punishment, suddenly utters a cry of authority, I would say a cry of

anger. He darts a furious look at Judas who has raised his face to speak those words and imposes « Be quiet! » in a voice that sounds like the roar of thunder.

Judas falls back on his heels again and speaks no more.

There is silence and Jesus with visible effort recomposes His humanity in such a composure and with such powerful control that testifies by itself the divinity that is in Him.¹⁷ He resumes speaking in His usual voice that is warm and kind also when it is severe, persuasive, conquering... Demons only can resist that voice.

« I am not in need of information from Samuel or anybody else to know what you do. But, you wretch! Do you know in front of Whom you are? It is true! You say that you do not understand My parables any longer. You no longer understand My words. Poor wretch! You do not even understand yourself any more. You do not even understand good and evil any more. Satan, to whom you have given yourself in many ways, Satan whom you have followed in all the temptations he presented to you, has made you stupid. And yet once you understood Me. You believed that I am "He Who I am". And you still retain a clear memory of that. And can you believe that the Son of God, that God needs the words of a man to know the thought and the actions of another man? You are not yet perverted to such an extent as not to believe that I am God, and that is where your greatest fault lies. The proof that you believe Me to be such is that you are afraid of My wrath. You realise that you are not struggling against a man, but against God Himself, and you shiver. You shiver, Cain, because you can but see and think of God as the Avenger of Himself and of innocents. You are afraid that it may happen to you as it happened to Korah, Dathan and Abiram and their followers. And yet, as you know Who I am, you struggle against Me. I should say to you: "Cursed!". But I would no longer be the Saviour...²¹

You would like Me to reject you. You do everything, you say, to achieve that. Such reason does not justify your actions. Because it is not necessary to commit sin in order to part from Me. You can do that, I tell you. I have been telling you since Nob, when you came back to Me, one pure morning, filthy with lies and lust, as if you had come out of hell to fall into the mud of a pigsty, or on the litter of libidinous monkeys, and I had to struggle against Myself²² not to repel you with the point of My sandal like a revolting rag and to check the nausea that was upsetting not only My spirit but also My bowels. I have always told you. Even before accepting you. Even before coming here. Then, I made that speech *just for you, only for you*. But you always wanted to stay. For your own ruin. You! *My greatest grief!* But you, o heretical founder of a large family that will come after you, you think and say that I am above sorrow. No. I am only above sin. I am only above ignorance. Above the former, because I am God. Above the latter, because there can be no ignorance in the soul unspoiled by the Original Sin. But I am speaking to you as a Man, as the Man, as Adam Redeemer Who has come to make amends for the Sin of Adam sinner, and to show what man would have been if he had remained as he was

created: innocent. Among the gifts given by God to that Adam was there not an intelligence without impairment and a very great science, as the union with God instilled the light of the Almighty Father into His blessed son? I, the new Adam, am above sin *through My own will...*²⁴
[...]

Fr. Berti Footnote 17: See: previous notes 3 and 4.

Notes 3 and 4 were given in full earlier in this refutation.

Fr. Berti Footnote 21: See: previous note 3.

Note 3 was given in full earlier in this refutation.

Fr. Berti Footnote 22: See: footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6.

This footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6 will be quoted further below in this refutation, with original context.

Fr. Berti Footnote 24: So, joining what He asserted above: (“I am above sin...because I am God”) to what He affirms here (“I, the new Adam, am above sin, by My own will”), one concludes that Jesus is said [to be] above sin: inasmuch as He is God (“...I am God...”), because He is God; inasmuch as He is Man (“...new Adam...”), “by His own will”. And therefore in an infinitely meritorious way.” See: the following notes 25 and 27.

Later on, from that same chapter in Valtorta’s work:³

[...] Although I did not say that to you then, I told you that I had come just for men, not for the angels. I have come to give back to men their royalty of children of God teaching them to live as gods. God is without lewdness, Judas. But I want to show to all of you that man also can be without lewdness. I wanted to show you that one can live as I teach you. To show you that I had to take a real body and thus be able to suffer the temptations of man and say to man, after instructing him: "Do as I do". And you asked Me whether I had sinned when I was tempted. Do you remember? As I saw that you could not understand that I had been tempted without sinning, because you thought that temptation was unbecoming for the Word and that it was impossible for the Man not to sin, I replied to you that everybody can be tempted, but only those are sinners who want to become so.³³ Great was your surprise and you were incredulous, so much so that you insisted saying: "Have You ever sinned?". It was then possible for you to be incredulous. We had known each other only for a short time. Palestine is full of rabbis whose lives are the antitheses of their doctrine. But now you know that I have not sinned, that I do not sin. You know that even the fiercest temptation provoking a healthy virile man, who lives among men and is circumvented by them and by Satan, does not disturb

Me to the extent of making Me commit sin. *On the contrary, every temptation, although its virulence increased when it was rejected, because the demon made it fiercer to overcome Me, was a greater victory.* And not only with regard to lewdness, *a whirl that revolved around Me without succeeding in shaking or scratching My will. There is no sin where there is no consent to temptation, Judas. There is instead sin, even without consummating the act, when one accepts the temptation and contemplates it. It may be a venial sin, but it prepares the way to mortal sin in you. Because when one accepts the temptation and allows one's thought to linger over it, following the phases of a sin mentally, one grows weaker. Satan is aware of that, and that is why he repeatedly hurls blazing thrusts, always hoping that one may penetrate and work inside... Afterwards... it would be easy to change the person who is tempted into a sinner.*

You did not understand that then. You could not understand it. You can now. Now you are less deserving to understand than you were then, yet, I repeat those words that I spoke to you, for you, because it is in you, not in Me, that the repelled temptation does not subside... It does not calm down because you do not repel it completely. You do not consummate the act, but you brood over the thought of it. That is what happens today, and tomorrow... Tomorrow you will fall into real sin. That is why I taught you, then, to ask the help of the Father against temptation, I taught you to ask the Father not to lead you into temptation. I, the Son of God, I, Who had already defeated Satan, asked the Father for help, because I am humble. You did not. You did not ask salvation and preservation of God. You are proud. That is why you collapse...

Do you remember all that? And can you now understand what it means to Me, true Man, with all the reactions of man, and true God, with all the reactions of God, to see you thus: lustful, liar, thief, betrayer, homicide? Do you realise what a stress you impose on Me, having to put up with your being near Me? Do you know how laborious it is for Me to control Myself,³⁶ as I am doing now, to fulfil My mission for you till the very end? Any other man would have seized you by your throat, seeing you, a thief, intent on picking the lock of a coffer and stealing money, and learning that you are a traitor, and worse than a traitor... I have spoken to you, still with pity. Look. It is not yet summer and the cool breeze of the evening is coming in through the window, and yet I am perspiring as if I had been working at a very hard task. But do you not realise how much you cost Me? Or what you are? Do you want Me to drive you away? No, never. When a man is drowning, he who lets him go is a murderer. You are between two forces attracting you, Satan and Me. But if I leave you, you will have him only. And how will you save yourself? And yet you will leave Me... *You have already left Me with your spirit...* Well, I will still keep Judas' chrysalis near Me. Your body deprived of the will to love Me, your body inert towards Good. I will keep it until you exact also this nonentity, that is, your mortal remains, to join them to your spirit and sin *with your whole self...* [...]

Fr. Berti Footnote 33: D2 <at the bottom> Note. As Adam, innocent and full of grace was tempted, Jesus too, the second Adam, innocent and, as a man, full of Grace, was also tempted, and by the same Tempter. But the second Adam did not yield to the temptation. It is said of Him that this was so “because He was God”. Though being God, hence eternal and impassive, He died on the cross! And He died there because he was true man. As a true man He was thus also tempted; but, because He did not will [or want] to sin, He did not sin. < For the human will, see: footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6 >

Fr. Berti Footnote 36: As the previous note 22.

The previous note 22 is: “See: footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6.”

This footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6 will be quoted further below in this refutation, with original context.

You will have noticed that footnotes 22, 33, and 36 earlier in this refutation refer to “footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6”. This footnote will be quoted now below. First, the context:⁴

[...] « Come into the Light. Come out of the burning confusion of sensuality, which is so fierce. It will cost you at first... But it would cost you much more to lose a good wife and deserve hell, expiating your sins of lack of love, slander and adultery, and hers as well, because I remind you that who drives a woman to divorce, places himself and her on the way to adultery. If you can resist your demon for one month, at least for one month, I promise you that your nightmare will come to an end. Will you promise Me? »

« Oh! Lord! Lord! I would like to... But it is a fire... Put it out, You are powerful!... » John [a member of the Sanhedrin] has fallen on to his knees before Jesus and is weeping with his head in his hands as he kneels on the floor.

« And I will appease it. I will limit it. I will check and restrain this demon. But you have sinned much, John, and you must work by yourself at your revival. Those who have been converted by Me, came to Me willing to become new, free... They had already worked, with their own strength only, the beginning of their redemption.⁴ Such as Matthew, Mary of Lazarus and many more. You have come here only to find out whether she is guilty and to be helped by Me not to lose the fountain at which your pleasure drinks. I will limit the power of your demon for three months, not for one. During that time meditate and rise. Resolve to start a new life as a husband. The life of a man gifted with soul. Not the life of a brute as you have led so far. And fortified by prayer and by meditation, by the peace which I will give you as a gift for three months, learn to struggle and conquer eternal Life and win back the love and peace of your wife and of your home. Go. » [...]

Fr. Berti Footnote 4 (this is the footnote that has been referred to as “footnote 4 on page 766 of volume 6”):⁵

"They had already worked out with their own strength, the beginning of their redemption." < To understand this statement correctly, we must consider it in connection with its own context and with several similar phrases, even scattered in only a few paragraphs that follow. The doctrine that results can be condensed and expressed thus: a) it is God who has given and gives man free will, that is, free choice, and He respects it; b) it is God who gives to [our] free choice the strength to will, and with supernatural aid helps it to will the good; c) but in fact the willing of good or evil depends on man, that is on his free choice which freely chooses and executes the good or the evil, meriting eternal life in the first case, [and] demeriting it in the second. To be convinced that this is the genuine thought of the Work, it is enough to recall a small piece of the dialogue between Jesus and Judas, which appears in the fourth paragraph of page 870: "... I am God and I respect your free choice. I'll give you the strength to come to 'will.' But to will not to be a slave must come from you." Other passages to keep in mind are located in the following paragraphs: from the last [paragraph] of page 892 to the next to last [paragraph] of page 893: "... But remember ... Merciful Love ...," from the second to the fourth [paragraphs of] page 899: "They were saints because of Israel ... if it's bad...," from the third page of 920 to the first page of 924: "Okay. Listen ... I withdraw to pray..." So the aforesaid phrase should be understood and completed thus: "Those converted by Me had worked out the beginning of their redemption with just their own strength, coming from God, supernaturally helped by God, but freely deciding [on] the good for themselves." And, in fact, God, who is Love, always wants and promotes and helps the redemption of all (see 1 Timothy 2: 3-6): from the moment that a man freely begins to want this as God's will and to collaborate with it, he in fact begins his redemption. >

Now that we examined the relevant passages that the critic referred to, we can see that every passage the critic objected to was specifically addressed by Fr. Berti in his footnotes. The information given thus far (including the [main article](#)) speaks for itself. One of the remaining passages that the critic referred to was p. 507. This is addressed below.

In the chapter of the Last Supper, Valtorta writes:⁶

[...] Jesus sits on His own, still between James and John. But when He sees that Andrew is about to sit in the place left by the Iscariot, He shouts: « No, not there. » An impulsive shout, that His great prudence does not succeed in preventing. He then modifies His expression saying:⁶³ « We do not need so much room. If we sit down, we can stay only on these. They are enough. I want you to be very close to Me. » [...]

Fr. Berti Footnote 63: The writer here is expressing herself a bit humanly, as in Genesis 6: 5-7.

I quote here Genesis 6: 5-7:

“And God seeing that the wickedness of men was great on the earth, and that all the thought of their heart was bent upon evil at all times, **it repented Him that He had made man on the earth.** And being touched inwardly with sorrow of heart, He said: I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth, from man even to beasts, from the creeping thing even to the fowls of the air, **for it repenteth Me that I have made them.**” [emphasis added]

A biblical commentary says: “It repented him: God, who is unchangeable, is not capable of repentance, grief, or any other passion. But these expressions are used to declare the enormity of the sins of men, which was so provoking as to determine their Creator to destroy these his creatures, whom before he had so much favored.”⁷

Hence, if the inspired author of Genesis (Sacred Scripture) described the movements in God in human terms, it is inconsistent (some may say: hypocritical) for a critic to complain about Valtorta choosing to do so in a similar way in her personal description of her authentic vision of Jesus (Who is not only God, but also man, unlike God the Father, Who is spirit only). This fact alone is enough to refute the objection of the critic in this passage.

But, to examine this further and provide additional evidence for why this passage under question is acceptable, it is to be noted that competent theologians who examine mystical writings such as descriptions of visions of authentic mystics distinguish between subjective personal descriptions originating from the mystic (the author writing it down) – such as a personal subjective description of a scene, image, or vision – and objective revealed truths which come entirely from another source, and are tried to be written as accurately as possible, such as dictated words. For example, Sr. Lucy of Fatima said in one of her famous visions (the Third Secret): “**we saw in an immense light that is God: ‘something similar to how people appear in a mirror when they pass in front of it’ a Bishop dressed in White ‘we had the impression that it was the Holy Father.’**”⁸ [emphasis added] Having the “impression” of something is far from certainty. Did the Fatima visionary’s lack of perfect understanding of the vision or lack of being able to perfectly describe what she saw make her vision no longer authentic or true? Absolutely not. In a similar manner, it is possible that Valtorta choosing to use the expression “impulsive shout” and “He then modifies His expression” are actually her own personal *impressions* (to borrow the term Sr. Lucy used) in her subjective description of her authentic vision, but these didn’t perfectly match the reality that was occurring inside of Jesus (namely, the operation of His sense stimuli and normal human passions; or more specifically: *propassiones*). Maria Valtorta herself sometimes mentioned that her descriptions were sometimes imperfect. In many instances, just like Sr. Lucy of Fatima did in her vision of the Third Secret, Maria Valtorta uses qualifiers such as; “what looks like...” or “I think it is a...” (for example, *Poem*, Volume 1, Chapter 42, p. 223; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 1, Chapter 42, p. 272).

In this case, the critic is complaining about a portion of this chapter which was Valtorta's subjective description of the authentic vision she sees, and therefore, there is room for some margin of error or lack of clarity in her personal descriptions which would not invalidate the authenticity of her vision and which are not a harm to faithful Catholics when properly understood in the same way that confusing and potentially scandalous Scripture passages are not harmful to readers when properly understood (which is why Scripture is loaded with footnotes). One simple example: "And **the Lord sent a very evil spirit between Abimelech and the inhabitants of Sichem: who began to detest him.**" (Judges 9:23) "But the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and **an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him.**" (1 Samuel 16:14) How can God send an evil spirit!? Isn't this harmful to readers who can easily misinterpret it? That's where common sense exegetical understanding and footnotes come in. Likewise, a proper interpretation applied to this passage in Valtorta resolves any doubt or concern, just as common sense and footnotes do countless times in Holy Scripture.

The author of Genesis was allowed to take the liberty of describing a movement in God in human terms. Valtorta did likewise in using the expression "His great prudence does not succeed in preventing". One must not take it literally any more than Genesis which described God the Father **repenting** of the creation of man (as if God could make a mistake) and which even describes God Himself saying, "I will destroy man [...] **for it repenteth Me that I have made them**" (as if God – whose every action is perfect and good – could ever repent of something He has done or a decision that He has made).

In any case, even if her description of her authentic vision is 100% accurate, it is still not a problem because, as explained in *Summa Theologica* III, Q. 15, Art. 7, Jesus did not have the necessity of human emotions (fear, sorrow, anger, etc.), but to show the reality of His human nature, He voluntarily assumed fear and sorrow (and other emotions). In this case, Jesus voluntarily assumed the emotions which constitute urgency (in declaring the proper place for seating), and His reactions were normal and proper for a healthy man.

Now, I return to the seminary professor's objections. The seminary professor referred to various pages in Valtorta's work that contain descriptions that seem to him to support his erroneous thesis (which is based on a faulty presumption and misinterpretation of the text). He referred to pp. 223, 228, 232, 234, 608, and 507. So far in this analysis, we have already addressed the specific passages he quoted (namely, those on pp. 223 and 507), and addressed several of the other pages he referred to but he did not quote from (namely, pp. 228 and 232), including giving Fr. Berti's footnotes for those passages. We will now analyze the other cases which he quoted or gave page numbers for.

The critic mentions p. 234. It seems that the critic would be referring to this part of page 234:⁹

Judas goes out without replying. Jesus, now all alone, drops on a seat near the table and with His head resting on His arms folded on the table He weeps distressingly.

The critic referred to this passage in an attempt to try to claim that Jesus did not have control over His emotions. That is unfounded. Jesus voluntarily allowed Himself to experience emotions for a definite purpose. All you need to do is to look at Scripture:

“And when he drew near, seeing the city, **He wept over it**, saying [...]” [emphasis added] (Luke 19:41)

If Jesus wept over the city of Jerusalem for its lack of repentance, how is it any different that He would weep over Judas Iscariot’s lack of repentance?

“And said: Where have you laid him? They say to him: Lord, come and see. **And Jesus wept.**” [emphasis added] (John 11:35)

If Jesus wept over the death of Lazarus, how is it unfitting for Him to weep over the comparatively worse *spiritual* death of Judas Iscariot? Furthermore, Jesus even knew He would raise Lazarus that same day, and yet He still wept! Anti-Christian critics could even say, “That is ridiculous that Jesus would weep over the death of Lazarus when He knew that He was going to raise him minutes later. That is so stupid! Why? That doesn’t make any sense.” If Jesus wept over Lazarus whom He would raise moments later, how much more fitting, then, for Jesus to weep over the death of Judas Iscariot, who Jesus knew would have no resurrection of the soul or body unto eternal life, but would be damned: “But woe to that man by whom the Son of man shall be betrayed: it were better for him, if that man had not been born.” (Matthew 26:24)

“For in that, wherein **He Himself hath suffered** and been tempted, He is able to succor them also that are tempted.” [emphasis added] (Hebrews 2:18)

“Who can have compassion on them that are ignorant and that err: because **He Himself also is compassed with infirmity.**” [emphasis added] (Hebrews 5:2)

“And taking with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, **He began to grow sorrowful and to be sad.** Then He said to them: **My soul is sorrowful even unto death:** stay you here, and watch with Me. And going a little further, **He fell upon His face**, praying, and saying: My Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from Me. Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt.” [emphasis added] (Matthew 26: 37-39)

Isn't this similar to the actions of Jesus in the episode that Valtorta wrote? In this passage, Jesus "fell upon His face". In Valtorta's passage, Jesus "drops on a seat near the table". In this Scripture passage, Jesus experiences sorrow and sadness to such a point that it is "even unto death". In Valtorta's passage, Jesus weeps due to sorrow.

St. Thomas Aquinas relates in his *Summa Theologica* (III, Q. 18, Art. 5, ad. 3):

Reply to Objection 3: Christ was at once comprehensor and wayfarer, inasmuch as He was enjoying God in His mind and had a passible body. Hence things repugnant to His natural will and to His sensitive appetite could happen to Him in His passible flesh.

I believe that the objection of the critic in quoting p. 223 of Valtorta's work to try to substantiate his unsubstantiated presumption and failure of proper distinction is more than sufficiently refuted. Finally, the last page that the critic referred to that we have yet to address is p. 608. This is the chapter of the Crucifixion of Jesus. The critic objects to the part of Valtorta's vision concerning the nailing of Jesus' feet to the cross, quoted here:¹⁰

It is now the turn of His feet. At two metres and more from the foot of the cross there is a small wedge, hardly sufficient for one foot. Both feet are placed on it to see whether it is in the right spot, and as it is a little low and the feet hardly reach it, they pull the poor Martyr by His malleoli. So the coarse wood of the cross rubs on the wounds, moves the crown that tears His hair once again and is on the point of falling. One of the executioners presses it down on His head again with a slap...

Those who were sitting on Jesus' chest, now get up to move to His knees, because Jesus with an involuntary movement withdraws His legs upon seeing the very long nail, which is twice as long and thick as those used for the hands, shine in the sunshine. They weigh on His flayed knees and press on His poor bruised shins, while the other two are performing the much more difficult operation of nailing one foot on top of the other, trying to combine the two joints of the tarsi.

The critic is objecting to the fact that Valtorta wrote that Jesus withdraws His legs "involuntarily" upon seeing the very long nail. So, let's think about this. Jesus was struck dozens (if not hundreds) of times during His Passion. Some of those strikes were on His face, such as: "And they blindfolded Him, and smote His face. And they asked Him, saying: Prophecy, who is it that struck Thee?" (Luke 22:64) Any doctor would almost guarantee you that if Jesus saw the approach of the hand that was approaching His face, He would "involuntarily" blink. In fact, scientists have defined the term for this reflex as the "menace response", which is one of the three forms of blink reflex and it occurs when the brain is aware of the rapid approach of an object. So if Valtorta had written that Jesus involuntarily blinked when the hand was approaching His face to strike Him, would this Valtorta critic then object, claiming that this is evidence that Jesus did not have self-control over

His body or first reactions to sense stimuli? That is ridiculous! Such reflexes are proper to man, and Jesus “Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man.” (Philippians 2:6-7) The same principle applies to the case of the nailing of His feet. It is only natural for man to shrink from such bodily pains. It is not indicative of Jesus not accepting to lay down His life for His sheep. It is a normal human reaction!

St. Thomas Aquinas states in his *Summa Theologica* (III, Q. 18, Art. 5, ad. 3):

Reply to Objection 3: Christ was at once comprehensor and wayfarer, inasmuch as He was enjoying God in His mind and had a passible body. Hence things repugnant to His natural will and to His sensitive appetite could happen to Him in His passible flesh.

St. Thomas Aquinas also states (*Summa Theologica* III, Q. 18, Art. 5):

I answer that, as was said (AA[2],3), in Christ according to His human nature there is a twofold will, viz. the will of sensuality, which is called will by participation, and the rational will, whether considered after the manner of nature, or after the manner of reason. Now it was said above (Q[13], A[3], ad 1; Q[14], A[1], ad 2) that by a certain dispensation the Son of God before His Passion "allowed His flesh to do and suffer what belonged to it." And in like manner He allowed all the powers of His soul to do what belonged to them. **Now it is clear that the will of sensuality naturally shrinks from sensible pains and bodily hurt. In like manner, the will as nature turns from what is against nature and what is evil in itself, as death and the like; yet the will as reason may at time choose these things in relation to an end, as in a mere man the sensuality and the will absolutely considered shrink from burning, which, nevertheless, the will as reason may choose for the sake of health.** Now it was the will of God that Christ should undergo pain, suffering, and death, not that these of themselves were willed by God, but for the sake of man's salvation. Hence it is plain that in His will of sensuality and in His rational will considered as nature, Christ could will what God did not; but in His will as reason He always willed the same as God, which appears from what He says (Mat. 26:39): "Not as I will, but as Thou wilt." For He willed in His reason that the Divine will should be fulfilled although He said that He willed something else by another will. [emphasis added]

Jesus willed to undergo the Passion for the salvation of men. During a brief few moments within His Passion, Jesus' naturally "shrink[ing] from sensible pains and bodily hurt" (to quote St. Thomas Aquinas) is entirely acceptable and was not against what Jesus' reason would dictate. In fact, in another place in the *Summa Theologica*, St. Thomas Aquinas writes (III, Q. 15, Art. 7):

I answer that, as sorrow is caused by the apprehension of a present evil, so also is fear caused by the apprehension of a future evil. Now the apprehension of a future evil, if the evil be quite certain, does not arouse fear. Hence the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 5) that we do not fear a

thing unless there is some hope of avoiding it. For when there is no hope of avoiding it the evil is considered present, and thus it causes sorrow rather than fear. Hence **fear may be considered in two ways**. First, **inasmuch as the sensitive appetite naturally shrinks from bodily hurt**, by sorrow if it is present, and by fear if it is future; **and thus fear was in Christ, even as sorrow**. Secondly, fear may be considered in the uncertainty of the future event, as when at night we are frightened at a sound, not knowing what it is; and in this way there was no fear in Christ, as Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iii, 23).

[...] Reply to Objection 2. Hilary excludes fear from Christ in the same way that he excludes sorrow, i.e. as regards the necessity of fearing. **And yet to show the reality of His human nature, He voluntarily assumed fear, even as sorrow.** [emphasis added]

The above quotation suffices to entirely refute the objection of this critic, using the very same source that the critic misapplied and tried to rely on.

According to St. Thomas Aquinas, what Valtorta wrote Jesus did during His passion in moving His feet away from the nail (naturally shrinking from bodily hurt), *did* happen in Jesus. Not only that, even if Valtorta wrote that Jesus did this out of fear, St. Thomas Aquinas indicates that is acceptable. St. Thomas Aquinas even applies a motive for why Jesus would voluntarily display such signs of “naturally shrinking from bodily hurt” even though He could have by will and reason chosen to not do this: it was “to show the reality of His human nature.”

But what about the word that Valtorta used when she said “involuntarily”? That is a subjective, personal description of the scene she saw in her authentic vision as an eyewitness. There is room for error or misunderstanding or lack of clarity in her personal description of her vision, just like Sr. Lucy of Fatima had a lack of clarity and admitted possible misunderstanding in her description of the vision of the Third Secret of Fatima, as discussed earlier in this refutation. This topic is discussed in detail in my [e-book](#) in the chapter entitled, “An Analysis and Refutation of Other Objections”, specifically in the fifth section of that chapter, “Apparent Contradiction? The Nailing of the Hand/Wrist”. One must not always take the descriptions of visions too literally. What Valtorta probably meant by “involuntarily” was like a type of reflex that is normal and proper for all human beings, much like the menace response blink reflex discussed earlier. Jesus’ action was not truly involuntary as if it had happened against His will, which was subjected to perfect reason. He willed to allow Himself to shrink from bodily pain in order to (to quote St. Thomas Aquinas) “show the reality of His human nature.” There was a purpose behind Jesus’ voluntarily choosing to withdraw His feet when He saw the nail. At the very least, it shows us that His flesh truly suffered because His flesh (the “will of sensuality” as St. Thomas Aquinas called it) naturally shrank from sensible pains and bodily hurt. If Jesus had undergone the entire Passion with a perfectly calm, stoic face without showing any external sign of suffering at all, what good would that have done? It would only make people doubt His humanity and make them think He was only divine, or an angel, or an illusion (*cf. Summa Theologica* III, Q. 14, Art. 1). Nor would it be an aid for us to

experience the full compassion that we ought to have for Him when we meditate upon His sufferings that He endured for us. The very fact that Jesus allowed Himself to withdraw His feet from the nail is a noteworthy sign to us of just how much He truly suffered. It is a good thing willed by Him; *not* a bad thing. When examining the argument of this critic, it is obvious that in his critique of Valtorta's work, he has failed to consider all the relevant passages in St. Thomas Aquinas and has misapplied the ones he quotes. As is demonstrated above, using all the relevant passages in St. Thomas Aquinas shows the falsity of this critic's reasoning and how St. Thomas Aquinas actually confirms the legitimacy of this passage in Valtorta.

In another place in the *Summa Theologica*, St. Thomas Aquinas writes (III, Q. 14, Art. 1):

From the natural relationship which is between the soul and the body, glory flows into the body from the soul's glory. Yet this natural relationship in Christ was subject to the will of His Godhead, and thereby it came to pass that the beatitude remained in the soul, and did not flow into the body; but the flesh suffered what belongs to a passible nature; thus Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iii, 15) that, "it was by the consent of the Divine will that the flesh was allowed to suffer and do what belonged to it."

For Jesus' body to naturally shrink from sensible pains in the approach of the nail (much like a blink reflex) is normal and proper for what belongs to flesh and "it was by the consent of the Divine will that the flesh was allowed to suffer and do what belonged to it."

St. Thomas Aquinas also writes (III, Q. 14, Art. 2):

I answer that, Necessity is twofold. one is a necessity of "constraint," brought about by an external agent; and this necessity is contrary to both nature and will, since these flow from an internal principle. The other is "natural" necessity, resulting from the natural principles--either the form (as it is necessary for fire to heat), or the matter (as it is necessary for a body composed of contraries to be dissolved). Hence, with this necessity, which results from the matter, Christ's body was subject to the necessity of death and other like defects, since, as was said (Article 1, Reply to Objection 2), "it was by the consent of the Divine will that the flesh was allowed to do and suffer what belonged to it." And this necessity results from the principles of human nature, as was said above in this article. But if we speak of necessity of constraint, as repugnant to the bodily nature, thus again was Christ's body in its own natural condition subject to necessity in regard to the nail that pierced and the scourge that struck. **Yet inasmuch as such necessity is repugnant to the will, it is clear that in Christ these defects were not of necessity as regards either the Divine will, or the human will of Christ considered absolutely, as following the deliberation of reason; but only as regards the natural movement of the will, inasmuch as it naturally shrinks from death and bodily hurt.** [emphasis added]

This again affirms that what Valtorta described occurred with Jesus is completely in accord with Catholic theology.

This is the end of the supplement. To return to the main article, click [here](#).

Fr. Berti Footnote References

All of the following footnotes are found in *Il Poema Dell'Uomo-Dio (Second Italian Edition)*. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano srl. Viale Piscicelli, 89/91, 03036 Isola del Liri (FR), Italia. 1986, albeit on different pages, as specified below:

Footnote 3: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 278. Footnote 3.

Footnote 4: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 278. Footnote 4.

Footnote 4: Volume 6, Chapter 98, p. 766. Footnote 4.

Footnote 7: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 281. Footnote 7.

Footnote 10: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 282. Footnote 10.

Footnote 17: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 284. Footnote 17.

Footnote 21: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 285. Footnote 21.

Footnote 22: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 285. Footnote 22.

Footnote 24: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 286. Footnote 24.

Footnote 33: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 289. Footnote 33.

Footnote 36: Volume 8, Chapter 28, p. 290. Footnote 36.

Footnote 63: Volume 9, Chapter 19, p. 217. Footnote 63.

References

¹ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Chapter 565, pp. 225-226; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 9, Chapter 567, pp. 143-144.

² *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Chapter 565, pp. 228-229; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 9, Chapter 567, pp. 146-148.

³ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Chapter 565, pp. 231-232; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 9, Chapter 567, pp. 150-152.

⁴ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 3, Chapter 407, pp. 787-788; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 6, Chapter 490, p. 355.

⁵ *Il Poema Dell'Uomo-Dio (Second Italian Edition)*. Centro Editoriale Valtortiano srl. Viale Piscicelli, 89/91, 03036 Isola del Liri (FR), Italia. 1986. Volume 6, Chapter 98, p. 766. Footnote 4.

⁶ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Chapter 598, p. 507; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 9, Chapter 600, p. 496.

⁷ *Genesis: Chapter 6*. The Holy Bible Douay-Rheims Version. With revisions and footnotes by Bishop Richard Challoner, 1749-1752. Taken from a hardcopy of the 1899 Edition by the John Murphy Company.
<http://www.drbo.org/chapter/01006.htm>

⁸ *The Message of Fatima*. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_200006_26_message-fatima_en.html

⁹ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Chapter 565, p. 234; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 9, Chapter 567, pp. 153-154.

¹⁰ *The Poem of the Man-God*, Volume 5, Chapter 605, pp. 608-609; *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, Volume 10, Chapter 609, p. 123.