

## A COMMENTARY ON "*MARIA VALTORTA, DOSSIER DU VATICAN*" (*MARIA VALTORTA: THE VATICAN FILE*) BY ALEXIS MAILLARD

In this book published on May 30, 2025, and [available online](#), Alexis Maillard presents 428 points against the main work<sup>1</sup> of Maria Valtorta (1897–1961).

The main interest of his work lies primarily in the four unpublished documents he publishes on this occasion. These documents, extracted from the archives of the Holy Office,<sup>2</sup> are meant to support his thesis: that Maria Valtorta's work was condemned by the Holy Office with the full agreement of [Pius XII](#) because of the doctrinal errors and improprieties found within it. It was only published because of the disobedience of the [Servites of Mary](#) who promoted it.

The thesis is not new. It has been reiterated in some recent publications. The interest of Alexis Maillard's work lies in this selection of archival documents which, upon analysis of these documents alone, supports a thesis opposite to that defended by Maillard. Indeed, they demonstrate that, on the contrary:

Pius XII read Maria Valtorta's work favorably. He encouraged its publication. On February 17, 1949, he opposed the publication of a Notification from the Holy Office that would have "forbidden the publication of the work because the Ecclesiastical Authority found errors in it and that there was nothing supernatural in these visions." This disapproval of the Notification, which protected the work, its origin, and its content, remained constant throughout Pius XII's pontificate because, to this day, no facts have contradicted it, even when the first volumes of the work, forbidden according to Maillard's thesis, were published in 1956, 1957, and 1958.

They also show that the 'errors' now presented as the result of original and well-documented studies are in fact largely inspired by these archival documents that are three-quarters of a century old. However, these highly critical documents were not ultimately adopted by the Holy Office itself. In publishing the article in [L'Osservatore Romano on January 6, 1960](#), it found no formal errors in the work among all those mentioned in these documents. It identified only four 'non-conformist' positions—something common to private revelations, as Benedict XVI reminds us.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>[The Gospel as It Was Revealed to Me](#). Published continuously since 1956, initially under the title *The Poem of the Man-God*, the 10-volume work is now available in 30 languages.

<sup>2</sup> The Vatican archives for the pontificate of Pius XII (1939–1958) were opened to researchers on March 2, 2020.

<sup>3</sup> Post-synodal Exhortation [Verbum Domini](#), 2010, section 14, second part.

## The Vatican Dossier

According to Alexis Maillard's report, this file was communicated to him "providentially".

"Providentially and very easily, important parts of the official Holy Office file on Maria Valtorta came into my hands through three members of the clergy (in 2025, the Holy Office is called the 'Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith'). Maria Valtorta's file is in its Archives; it bears the number 355/45. It is about fifteen centimeters thick. It therefore seemed to us that God wanted us to publish these documents to inform people of good will who, like us in the past, were victims of Fr. Berti's lie regarding the false statement that Pius XII is said to have made during the audience that the Servites of Mary obtained on February 26, 1948." (p. 4)

Maillard thus claims to be following a divine mandate, a claim which we leave to him to validate. But he goes further in this regard: on his YouTube channel "[ValtortaCondamnée](#)" (ValtortaCondemned), he prefaces his comments with the expression "**Go ahead Mary | Passe devant Marie**", seeming to suggest that the Virgin Mary herself is fighting at his side.

[Robert Nugent](#), who has released several videos on the subject,<sup>4</sup> had the opportunity to chat with Alexis Maillard. He is surprised that Maillard created his YouTube account on February 19, 2025—three days before the Dicastery released its [statement](#) (February 22, 2025)—and that he published only the four selected documents from the 15cm thick file. Questions that remain relevant. Indeed, Maillard states very clearly that he does not take into account documents from the "Valtortist" file:

"The Valtortists explain, without credible evidence and despite evidence to the contrary, that [Pius XII](#), [Saint Padre Pio](#), [Saint Mother Teresa](#), [John Paul II](#), [Benedict XVI](#), [Cardinal Bea](#), etc., were favorable to *The Gospel as It Was Revealed to Me*." (p. 8)

The "Valtortists" do not explain; they expose, for all to see, the facts and documents now gathered in the [Maria Valtorta wiki](#), soon to be available in multiple languages. The evidence in their possession is there. It's up to each and every one of us to judge whether it's credible or not, but only after at least a minimal examination.

What does Maillard make of [Pope Francis' explicit letter of encouragement](#) to the Maria Valtorta Foundation in Viareggio: "I encourage you to continue with the same commitment your mission of making Maria Valtorta's life and literary work known, especially all that it can offer for the good of the Church and society. Onward!"? Maillard only focuses on the description of the work as "literary" to emphasize the absence of any divine attribution (p. 8). This is a consistent but provisional evasion, since he has yet to justify why Pope Francis encourages, "for the good of the Church," a work which, according to Alexis Maillard, contains

---

<sup>4</sup> [Finally Vatican Document proves Pius XII did allow Valtorta Writings to be published!!](#) | [New Leaked Congregation of the Holy Office Documents regarding Maria Valtorta from late 1940's](#)

“200 theological errors – 151 indecencies – 39 scientific errors – 18 vulgarities – 7 oddities – 7 remarks – 6 instances of antisemitism.”

We will not, in turn, engage in this kind of one-sided analysis, more biased and polemical than historical: it is precisely based on what is written in these four archival documents that we will demonstrate Pius XII’s encouragement of the publication of the work and the defense he made of it throughout the rest of his pontificate.

When Maillard, on his YouTube account, declares Maria Valtorta “condemned” in connection with the [Dicastery’s statement](#) (February 22, 2025), he is making an interpretative reading. If the Dicastery had intended to say that Maria Valtorta’s work was not of divine origin, it would have stated so as clearly as possible by using the official explicit formula: “*constat de non supernaturalitate*.” There are examples of this on the Dicastery’s website.<sup>5</sup> *This is not the case* with the statement in question. Similarly, there is no reference to a diocesan inquiry, even though this is required by law. For our part, we have explained and justified that this is an appeal to the “prudential reading of human faith,” which is both a right and an ancient practice for all private revelations, even those “recognized” by the Magisterium (see Cardinal Lambertini, Pius X, Cardinal Ratzinger).<sup>6</sup>

Here then is the analysis of the documents, opportunely drawn from the archives by Alexis Maillard:

-----

## WHAT THE ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS REVEAL

### 1 - MARCH 14, 1946: DID POPE PIUS XII REALLY PERSONALLY APPROVE THE DECISION TO CALL [FR. MIGLIORINI](#) BACK TO ROME SO THAT HE WOULD CEASE HIS UNTIMELY BROADCASTS?

The Secretariat of State — certainly **YES**; the Supreme Pontiff — certainly **NO**, for the following reasons:

1 - If the Pope has a secretariat of a hundred people just for general affairs, it's certainly not to deal with the spiritual direction of Maria Valtorta in Viareggio. He frankly has other matters to

---

<sup>5</sup> For example: The [case of Mrs. Gisella Cardia](#), one of the two cases judged negatively according to the [new norms](#), explicitly indicates the final judgment as “*constat de non supernaturalitate*” and references the bishop's judgment. These elements are completely absent from the statement regarding Maria Valtorta.

<sup>6</sup> Cardinal Ratzinger recalls this principle in his theological commentary on the [Secret of Fatima](#) (last part of the document). St. Pius X expressed it in his encyclical [Pascendi Dominici Gregis](#) (1907), section 75.

attend to. However, as the decisions of the Holy Office are subject to the Sovereign Pontiff, he had an undefined contact with the Secretariat of State at a level we don't know.

2 – Had they shared the assessment reported by Msgr. Pepe (p. 36), the Pope and his Secretariat would certainly not have accepted an audience (on February 26, 1948) with “an enthusiast who sees the intervention of angels and demons where there are only manifestations of hysteria.” Discipline is a matter for the Holy Office, as Msgr. Pepe himself says (p. 36), not for Pius XII.

3 – They would certainly not have accepted this audience if the promoters had acted “in open disobedience to the above-mentioned decree of the Holy Office of March 13, 1946, approved by His Holiness”, as Msgr. Pepe proclaims (p. 37).

For these three reasons, it is clear that Maillard's claim regarding Pius XII's approval of this decree is purely interpretive and, therefore, untenable. The Pope, in fact, took an opposing position, which Maillard fails to acknowledge.

## **2 – FEBRUARY 26, 1948: POPE PIUS XII POSITIVELY READ MARIA VALTORTA’S WORK AND ENCOURAGED ITS PUBLICATION**

Reporting on the audience of February 26, 1948, granted by the Holy Father (without the advice of the Holy Office), Monsignor Pepe notes (p. 37): “But His Holiness wisely instructed them to approach a diocesan Ordinary<sup>7</sup> in order to obtain the Imprimatur for the publication of the ‘Words of Eternal Life’ or ‘Gospel of Jesus Christ,’ which was the subject of their interest. And they went in search of this Ordinary.”

Why would an Imprimatur be requested if not for the purpose of publishing the work, as [Father Berti](#) reports? A negative opinion, disapproval, or a ban on publication would not have led to any further action following the audience.

Yes, the Holy Father had read the work favorably. Msgr. Pepe implicitly confirms this (p. 41). Why request a new examination? If the Holy Father had condemned the work he had read, there would have been no need for it. But if, as Father Berti reports, Pius XII had encouraged its publication, then the Holy Office had to find a new opportunity to ban it as an inevitable progression of its earlier stance.

For these two reasons, it seems that Alexis Maillard blatantly oversteps the bounds of reason when he notes (p. 4) the “lie of Father Berti regarding the false statement that Pius XII supposedly made during the audience that the Servants of Mary obtained on February 26, 1948.”

---

<sup>7</sup> Ordinary = bishop empowered to issue the imprimatur.

Father Berti's threefold public assertion that Pius XII concluded the audience with this recommendation has never been denied: "Publish the work as it is. There is no need to give an opinion as to its origin, whether it is extraordinary or not. Those who read it will understand". This public statement ([1970](#), [1978](#), [1980](#)), noted at the end of the papal meeting, was never denied or clarified.

### **3 - NOVEMBER 25, 1948: WAS POPE PIUS XII AWARE THAT THE HOLY OFFICE WAS CONTESTING THE SERVITES' PUBLICATION PROJECT?**

**Yes**, Pope Pius XII was aware. But were the Holy Father and the Holy Office talking about the same thing? Did they share the same judgment, as Msgr. Pepe seems to claim? It is highly doubtful when we compare the different sources from that period. They paint a chaotic picture:

**October 2, 1948:** Father Berti is warned of a covert action being prepared ([The Notebooks](#)).

**October 14, 1948:** Msgr. Pepe discovers a promotional article in *Giornale d'Italia* for the publication of *Paroles de Vie Éternelle* (*Words of Eternal Life* — another title of Maria Valtorta's work), bearing the imprimatur of [Msgr. Barneschi](#) (p. 37).

**October 25, 1948:** Maria Valtorta privately announces in a letter to her confidante the probable release of the first volume in November ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2). Later, she reports that on this day, the Procurator General of the Servants of Mary received a request from Pope Pius XII, transmitted by Monsignors G.B. Montini (future [Pope Paul VI](#)) and Domenico Tardini: that the forthcoming publication be secured by a second imprimatur in due form. They suggested seeking an imprimatur from outside the Vatican to avoid reactions from "certain hostile prelates." They proposed the Michele Pisani Publishing House (now the Centro Editoriale Valtortiano). The imprimatur was to be requested from the [bishop of Sora-Aquino-Pontecorvo](#), the diocese of the publisher, who agreed to grant it ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Volume 2, November 11, 1948, pp. 167-168).

**November 24, 1948:** According to Msgr. Pepe (p. 39), the Holy Office decided "to summon the Superior of the Servites regarding Fathers Berti and Cecchin (he does not specify the reason), to send the files to Fr. Alberto Vaccari for his review, and to halt the publication of the work." Pius XII is said to have approved this decree. However, no written record of his approval exists.

**November 29, 1948:** Just as the presses were about to start, the Holy Office summoned the Procurator General of the Order of the Servants of Mary and ordered him to tell Fathers Berti and [Migliorini](#) to cease work on the publication. They were warned that failure to comply would subject them to the decrees of the Holy Office for having illegally obtained the approval of Monsignor Barneschi, which violated the norms of Canon Law, as this bishop was neither the bishop of the publishing house nor the author's bishop,<sup>8</sup> and especially because, as stated, "He

---

<sup>8</sup> See the [1917 Code of Canon Law](#) in effect at the time. The relevant norms required the approval of the local bishop (or an authorized ecclesiastical authority) before a work could be published.

is the bishop of the Zulus." In response, Father Berti rushed to Father Bea, then to Archbishop Carinci and Archbishop Fontevicchia, as well as to other bishops and Jesuit Fathers, all of whom gave the same reply: "Go ahead anyway. They can't do anything to you." ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2, pp. 172-173).

**December 15, 1948:** The newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* mentions a private audience between Father Roschini (who was in favor of the publication, pp. 36 and 40) and Pius XII. The details of this meeting are unknown ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2, December 16, 1948).

**December 23, 1948:** The *Giornale d'Italia* again published an article supporting the publication.

**January 6, 1949:** Maria Valtorta's prophecies regarding the tomb of St. Peter, which was being sought at the time, gained attention within Pius XII's entourage. As a result, the Servites began to view her as a prophetess. Jesus, however, moderated them ([The Notebooks](#)).

**January 9, 1949:** Under the pressure of these alarming events, Maria Valtorta took the initiative to speak directly with Monsignor Alfonso Carinci (who had already made a special visit to her in Viareggio). She informed him that "there are continual and ever-increasing difficulties from certain prelates trying to prevent the proper completion of the work." Archbishop Carinci reassured her, stating that it was merely a verification process, not a condemnation.

**January 26, 1949:** Alberto Vaccari submits the highly critical report, which is found in the archive documents (pp. 49 and following).

**January 28, 1949:** Archbishop Carinci reads Maria Valtorta's letter to Pius XII, who appreciates both its form and content. The Holy Office is handling the publication, but Archbishop Carinci feels that it is not being approached in a favorable manner. ([Correspondence with Archbishop Carinci](#), p. 24)

**February 2, 1949:** During the offering of candles to His Holiness, Pius XII reiterated to Father Berti and a Servite of Mary student his desire *to approve the work quickly...* ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2, March 16, 1949).

**February 2, 1949:** Msgr. Pepe submits his brief note (pp. 35 and following).

**February 14, 1949:** The Consultors of the Holy Office adopt decisions that will be confirmed by their hierarchy on February 16:

1. To require the Servite Fathers to submit all manuscripts and copies to the Holy Office.
2. To issue a ban on the publication of the work on the grounds that the Ecclesiastical Authority has found errors in it and that there is nothing supernatural in the visions.

3. To prohibit Father Berti and the other Servite Fathers from having any contact with the seer.
4. To instruct the bishop to place the seer under the spiritual guidance of a prudent and pious priest.
5. To require the promoters of the project to return the funds already collected, while leaving the Order (which had allowed its members to become involved in this affair) responsible for covering any potential financial losses.

**February 16, 1949:** Father Berti writes to Maria Valtorta that everything seems to be moving in the right direction.

**February 17, 1949:** According to Msgr. Pepe's report, Pope Pius XII approves these decisions EXCEPT the Notification (point 2 of the decisions listed above).

**February 22, 1949:** Father Berti is summoned to the Holy Office. He is not allowed to speak, only to sign the letter from the Holy Office and hand over the manuscripts in his possession ([Testimony of Father Berti, 1978, Exposition, Section 4](#)).

**March 16, 1949:** Maria Valtorta attributes this decree to the fact that "the Fathers who have always wanted to publish the work without approval and as a human work are in league with the laity and the Holy Office, etc. They wanted to classify it as a 'scientific' work, but in doing so, they intended to label it as 'mediumistic,' thus dishonoring me both humanly and spiritually. This made me appear as a spiritist, who saw and heard what I described and wrote in the work in the manner of a medium (in other words, satanically)" ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2, pp. 187-188).

#### **4 - FEBRUARY 17 1949: POPE PIUS XII OPPOSES PLANS TO CONDEMN THE WORK**

This intertwining of strategies found its provisional epilogue in the decree of February 17, which took note of the precautionary decisions, but above all, of Pius XII's rejection of the condemnation of Maria Valtorta's work, which he deemed "*excessive or superfluous*", in the words of Msgr. Pepe.

A Notification is, in fact, an official act appearing in the "[Acts of the Holy See \(AAS\)](#)". In 1966, for example, it was a Notification that officially [abolished the Index of Forbidden Books](#).

What was this notification that Pius XII rejected? It is mentioned in point no. 2 of the decisions of February 14 (p. 47): "That the prohibition of the publication of the work be published because the Ecclesiastical Authority has found errors in it and there is nothing supernatural in these visions."



Here, Pius XII takes an authoritative stance, though it is expressed diplomatically, using terms like 'excessive' and 'superfluous'. The Pope's objections to the Holy Office's proposal concerned neither the ban on publication, the accusation of errors, nor the denial of the divine origin—issues Pius XII had left to the free will of individuals.

This disapproval is confirmed by the subsequent events: even though, according to Msgr. Pepe, this condemnation would have been legitimate in the case of disobedience (p. 48), nothing happened when the work was published in 1956, which would have constituted a serious "act of disobedience" if Pius XII had truly condemned the work. The Holy Office was, however, aware of it, as it pointed out this volume in the article in the newspaper [L'Osservatore Romano](#). There was also no action in 1957 or 1958 when the following volumes were released. It wasn't until after the death of Pius XII that the Holy Office took action.

Under Pius XII, there was therefore an explicit refusal to condemn Maria Valtorta and a lack of sanctions for her repeated publication.

The other measures outlined in the decision of February 14 should therefore be understood as precautionary actions taken in the face of a deadlock: the promoters had failed to raise the necessary funds and could only publish the first few volumes (p. 40). The initiative was not supported by the author (Maria Valtorta): "This plan was unfair to God and to me," she wrote ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2, p. 191).

## Human Views of God's Work

Listening to what was reported to her, Maria Valtorta noted that the motivation for the decree was not the work itself, but the fact that it had been published and promoted before receiving approval from the Holy Office. She was told that the reasons for the opposition were the attitude of [Fr. Migliorini](#), who had fallen into supporting dubious mystics, and the unusual imprimatur of [Monsignor Barneschi](#) ([Letters to Mother Teresa Maria](#), Vol. 2, p. 202).

Human motivations and power plays were thus at odds with a divine work. Maria Valtorta confided her great sorrow to Archbishop Carinci. But Heaven, which knows everything in advance, had asked that the originals of the revelations and a typed copy remain in Viareggio.<sup>9</sup> They were Maria Valtorta's indisputable property. Similarly, Pius XII knew how to distinguish the essential (the work) from the incidental (the Servites' attempts to turn it into a mere commercial success).

As for the Holy Office, it should be noted that in 1949, Msgr. Pepe suspected the Servites of having written Maria Valtorta's work undercover (p. 41). Ten years later, this thesis still underpins the *L'Osservatore Romano* newspaper article, to the extent that Father Roschini

---

<sup>9</sup> *Notebooks 1945 - 1950*, July 12, 1946, p. 269.



would later address it in his book,<sup>10</sup> proof that the Holy Office did not really investigate Maria Valtorta.

During the remainder of Pius XII's papacy, which ended in October 1958, confrontations played out behind closed doors. In early 1950, the Venerable Luigia Sinapi, based on what Jesus had revealed to her, came to [question the Holy Office](#) about its obstruction of the work. She was met with both verbal and physical threats. In early 1952, Archbishop Carinci collected [testimonies in favor of the work](#). Then came the editions we previously discussed. Little changed until the work was placed on the Index in December 1959. Four years later, on [November 8, 1963](#), the Holy Office was publicly challenged by the conciliar assembly (J. Frings commission). In December 1965, it was officially abolished (Motu proprio [Integrae Servandae](#)) by the same man who had once been a close collaborator of Pius XII. On June 14, 1966, the [abolition of the Index](#) gave way to the notion of "moral warning" and the "mature conscience of the faithful." This would later be codified in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, [Article 67](#): "Guided by the Magisterium of the Church, the sense of the faithful *knows* how to discern and welcome what in these revelations constitutes an *authentic* call from Christ or His saints to the Church."

"Knowing how to discern" is what Alexis Maillard and others are attempting to do. But instead of accepting what is true, as Scripture and the Church teach,<sup>11</sup> they focus on rejecting what is false. So, what is the value of this kind of negative discernment?

## WHAT ARE WE TO MAKE OF THE SERIOUS AND MINOR ERRORS MENTIONED?

### 1 - Alexis Maillard

It is not possible to comment here on the 428 points that Maillard raises against Maria Valtorta's work (200 theological errors – 151 indecencies – 39 scientific errors – 18 vulgarities – 7 oddities – 7 remarks – 6 instances of antisemitism). Indeed, a thorough refutation would require a much more extensive treatment, tripling the length of his 300-page report. Therefore, we will limit ourselves to a few examples.

---

<sup>10</sup> *La Madonna negli scritti di Maria Valtorta (The Virgin Mary in the Writings of Maria Valtorta)*, reprinted 2021, p. 27. This book was sent to Pope Paul VI in 1973/74, [who thanked him for it](#).

<sup>11</sup> Recalled by Cardinal J. Ratzinger in his [theological comments](#) (at the end of the document) on the Third Secret of Fatima: "The oldest letter of Saint Paul that has been preserved for us—the text which, in absolute terms, is perhaps the oldest in the New Testament, the First Letter to the Thessalonians—seems to me to give an indication. The Apostle writes there: 'Do not quench the Spirit, do not despise prophecies, but test everything; hold fast to what is good' (5:19–21). In every age, the Church is given the charism of prophecy, which must be examined, but not disparaged. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that prophecy, in the biblical sense, does not mean predicting the future, but explaining God's Will for the present, and thus showing the right path towards the future."

## Theological Error No. 1 (pp. 85-88):

Maillard criticizes Jesus' comment during His encounter with [Mary Magdalene](#) as the Risen One: "I do not let myself be touched by her. She is not the Pure One who can touch the Son returning to the Father without contaminating Him. She still has much to purify through penance, but her love deserves this reward (...)" ([GMV 620.6](#)).

For him, Mary Magdalene "touched Jesus, but He asked her to stop doing so." He cites numerous translations to support his objection and concludes: "This first error is a good example of Maria Valtorta's theological shipwreck [sic!]: she writes things directly contrary to what really happened in Jesus' life and leads her readers away from the treasures of the Church Fathers' and Doctors' commentaries on the Gospel."

What does Magisterium, an AI specializing in this issue, have to say?

"The scene takes place after Jesus' resurrection. Mary Magdalene recognizes him, but Jesus says to her: 'Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father. But go to my brothers, and tell them that I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God' (...) In short, the translation of "Non mi toccare" depends on which interpretation you prefer, but the central idea is that Mary Magdalene must change the way she perceives her relationship with the risen Jesus, and focus on the mission He entrusts to her.

"What does Maria Valtorta say?

The mission that Jesus entrusts to her is set out in the passage quoted by Maillard ([GMV 620.6](#)). Everyone can judge whether this passage hides 'the treasures of the commentaries of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church on the Gospel,' and whether what Maria Valtorta reports deviates from the Gospel in a 'theological shipwreck' or not."

As for the matter of touching or not, which according to Maillard seems to mark the boundary between heresy and orthodoxy, the answer can be found in [GMV 619.10](#).

## Theological Error No. 2 (pp. 87-88):

Maillard points to the statement: "Mary can be called the 'younger daughter' of the Father" ([GMV 1,2](#)). He argues that, since Christ is the only Son of the Father, He cannot have a "sister." He notes that this objection also appears in the words of "Msgr. Giovanni Pepe, who adopts the criticism of Father Alberto Vaccari, S.J., who calls it a gross heretical absurdity." The *L'Osservatore Romano* (6/1/60) echoed this view, though with a note exempting it from being considered an "authentic heresy." Other studies refer to it as well. Maillard adds: "False apparitions like to confuse the minds of the faithful under the pretext of glorifying Mary." It is unclear whether Maillard is himself confused or simply scandalized.

The answer can be found in the old Liturgy (before the 1962 reform). It applied Proverbs 8:22-35 to the Virgin Mary.<sup>12</sup> For Alberto Vaccari, Maria Valtorta's interpretation is a gross heretical absurdity, and Maillard makes it the subject of his theological error no. 10 (pp. 91-2). But neither the Liturgy nor Maria Valtorta's work is crude, absurd or heretical.

It is enough to read the [liturgical commentary](#) of Blessed Dom Prosper Guéranger (1805–1875) to understand the full theological depth of Maria Valtorta's affirmations, in conformity with the teaching "of the first centuries of Christianity." Dom Guéranger notably explains: "The Son of God, in order to be a man of our lineage, as required by the divine decree, had to be born in time, and born of a Mother. This Mother *was therefore eternally present in the mind of God* as the means by which the Word would take on human nature; the Son and the Mother are thus united in the same plan of the Incarnation; *Mary was therefore present, like Jesus, in the divine decree, before creation emerged from nothingness.*"

Restorer of the Benedictine Order in France, Blessed Dom Prosper Guéranger was the inspiration behind the powerful "liturgical movement" that lasted until the Second Vatican Council. Dom Guéranger is also known for his catecheses on the writings of Venerable [Mary of Agreda](#) (16th century), a Spanish mystic who was the first to receive complete vision of Mary's life. In her account, she affirmed the Immaculate Conception, which was hotly debated at the time and led to determined opposition against her, notably from the Sorbonne, among others.

### **Sickly-Sweet Style No. 1, 2, 3, and 4 (pp. 302–304):**

By using this very informal expression, Maillard intends to suggest that Maria Valtorta's style is laughably sentimental or naive. His reasoning? Because she makes frequent use of the word "*little*" (sic!)—a tendency he documents.

Maillard therefore wants Jesus—the "real" one, according to him—not to speak in a "sickly-sweet" style, but to speak grandly. In the reworking of Maria Valtorta's work that he envisions, one might read:

"And whoever gives even a cup of cold water to one of these Great Ones because he is my disciple, truly I tell you, he will not lose his reward" (Matthew 10:42); or "But if anyone causes one of these Great Ones who believe in me to stumble, it would be better for him to have a millstone tied around his neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea" (Matthew 18:6); or again: "And the King will answer them, 'Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me'" (Matthew 25:40), but with "Great" replacing "least."

On these four "little" points, Maillard is absolutely right: the Jesus of Maria Valtorta is a "little one" who is born in a manger, triumphantly enters Jerusalem on a donkey, and washes the feet

---

<sup>12</sup> See the facsimile of a 1933 Gregorian missal on the date of [December 8](#).

of His disciples. According to St. Paul, he even took on “the form of a slave, being made in the likeness of men” (Philippians 2:7).

### **Theological Error No. 24 and Indecency No. 4 (p. 102):**

Maillard considers that the invocation of Jehovah in [GMV 10.6](#) is “an indecency against the Virgin Mary because it accuses her of having gravely sinned against God, since it is strictly forbidden to pronounce His Most Holy Name.” He recalls that Alberto Vaccari had described this as “pure fantasy,” which is a different assessment from his own.

Maria Valtorta’s visions do not ignore this respect for the Divine Name: “We are good Israelites, and we fear God, almost to the point of being unable to say His Name,” recalls the apostle James son of Alphaeus ([GMV 515.2](#)). However, Maria Valtorta’s writings explain why the Tetragrammaton was pronounced “Jehovah” by the Galileans and “Yahweh” by the Judeans ([GMV 59.5, note 3](#)). Maria Valtorta even notes how Jesus vocalized it ([GMV 197.5](#)).

Are these insights “a huge mistake,” a “theological error,” “an indecency,” or “pure fantasy”? The Jerusalem Bible mentions the name Yahweh (or Jehovah) nearly 6,000 times because the prophets pronounced it before writing it down. It remains, then, to decide whether this reverence applied also to daily life or only to liturgical reading. And whether this “prohibition,” now upheld by the Catholic Church, was in force during Jesus’ time or if it arose after the destruction of the Temple.

The existence of theophoric proper names (formed from the Tetragrammaton) raises questions. The very name of Jesus (Joshua), YEHOASHUAH (Yeho + Shua), includes almost entirely the divine name YEHO...AH, as Maria Valtorta’s work points out twice.

### **Theological Error No. 59 and Antisemitism No. 1 (p. 126):**

According to Maillard, “Valtorta renews the antisemitic accusation that the Jewish people as a whole (he emphasizes) *are ill-willed*, whereas only the majority of their leaders were responsible for the assassination of Jesus.” In opposition to Maria Valtorta, he cites excerpts from paragraph [4 of \*Nostra Aetate\*](#), which condemns the attitude of “*indiscriminately all the Jews then living, or the Jews of our time*” for the fact that “According to the testimony of Sacred Scripture, Jerusalem did not recognize the time of her visitation; the Jews, for the most part, did not accept the Gospel, and many even opposed its spread.”

Maillard makes an unfortunate conflation. *Nostra Aetate* is aimed at the way in which our times view the witness of Scripture and the contemporary Jewish people. Maria Valtorta never uttered any words in her own writings that might suggest she was antisemitic.

The [736 named characters](#) featured in Maria Valtorta’s visions, which Maillard claims to know, prove that the accusation of a wholesale “rejection” by the Jewish people is manifestly untrue.

This panorama, which was studied in its time by Bishop René Laurentin,<sup>13</sup> is a reflection of what is reported in the four Gospels.

There are enough passages in the four Gospels where Jesus deplores the inability of Israel's heart to recognize His mission and to accept the message of peace and salvation He offers them, so it is superfluous to repeat them here. The [corresponding passages](#) in Maria Valtorta's work can be verified.

However, the historical panorama presented in Maria Valtorta's visions mentions the animosity and contempt that prevailed *at the time* between the Roman occupiers and the Jewish people, who in turn reciprocated these feelings. Likewise, contempt and hostility were evident in the relations—shaped by their history—with the Samaritans, and at times with the Galileans, the Phoenicians (to the northeast), or the Philistines (to the southeast). The four Gospels echo these tensions, sometimes allusively. Maria Valtorta's writings make them explicit.

The accusation of antisemitism has been repeated, notably by Father Dominique Auzenet.<sup>14</sup> For this, he relies on the claims and authority of Sandra Miesel, an American author of a highly critical article on Maria Valtorta. However, the accusation of antisemitism—laden with a strong emotional charge—cannot be applied to the historical context of Jesus' time, which one may attempt to forget but cannot erase. The demand for truth also requires that such an accusation be supported by proven facts, which are conspicuously absent from this so-called “theological error.”

## 2 – Fr. Alberto Vaccari, S.J.

The six pages of Alberto Vaccari's opinion (pp. 49–55), which appear late in the file, are not the basis of the Holy Office's negative judgment—it had already been made in 1946—but rather serve as a justification after the fact. Nevertheless, this line of reasoning would become the main pillar of the opposition to Maria Valtorta.

Vaccari studied the “voluminous work” over two months (November 25, 1948 – January 26, 1949) and concluded that it was worthless (“zero”). He admits in his text that he did not read the work “in its entirety or in depth, except for a few parts” (p. 55). He also states that he based his judgment on summaries.

On reading this opinion, and considering the way he treats the work, one can only attribute to him a virulent article that appeared on **July 1, 1961**, in the leading Jesuit journal *La Civiltà*

---

<sup>13</sup> [Dictionary of Gospel Characters, according to Maria Valtorta](#), Salvator Editions, 2012.

<sup>14</sup> Father Dominique Auzenet is an exorcist and the founder of SOS Discernment, a publication aimed at uniting opposition to Maria Valtorta.

*Cattolica* (issue 2665, page 37). Contrary to usual practice, the article is anonymous and comments on the publication of the second edition of Maria Valtorta's work.<sup>15</sup>

This commentary, believed to have been commissioned by "a Vatican authority," states that "Maria Valtorta is a poor visionary with a runaway imagination and afflicted with logorrhea." As for the second edition, the author considers it "placed in a well-known category of mental illness, and the additions in the second edition do not change the nature of the work, which remains a monument of childishness, imagination, and historical and exegetical errors diluted in a subtly sensual atmosphere created by the presence of a swarm of women following Jesus. In short, a monument of pseudo-religiosity." This unusually harsh verbal outburst, highly uncommon for the journal, prompted a letter from the publisher, Emilio Pisani, on July 11, 1961. Subsequently, the Jesuit review took a more moderate tone, even going so far as to reprimand a book that was outrageously insulting toward Maria Valtorta's work.<sup>16</sup>

### **Alberto Vaccari Versus Gabriele Allegra**

Another exegete, just as renowned<sup>17</sup> as Father Vaccari, did not take two months but two and a half years to study Maria Valtorta's work: this was the [Blessed Gabriele Allegra](#). He concluded that this work, "produces good fruit in an ever-increasing number of readers, and I think this comes from the Spirit of Jesus."<sup>18</sup>

He not only took much more time to examine the work than Father Vaccari, but also documented his study with numerous references. He concluded that it demonstrated "historical and doctrinal harmony" and expressed his conviction that "this masterpiece of Italian religious literature, and perhaps I should say, of world Christian literature," requires "a supernatural origin."<sup>19</sup> He was beatified in the final year of Pope Benedict XVI's pontificate, along with another "promoter" of Maria Valtorta's Work: [Blessed Mother Maria Inès of the Blessed Sacrament](#).

---

<sup>15</sup> Article reproduced in [Maria Valtorta - Qu'en penser? Éléments de discernement](#) - COLLECTIF, Centro Editoriale Valtortiano, 2025, pp. 126–127.

<sup>16</sup> See the article [Father Giandomenico Mucci and Maria Valtorta](#).

<sup>17</sup> [Blessed Gabriele-Maria Allegra](#) (December 26, 1907 – January 26, 1976) was a Franciscan known for producing the first complete translation of the Bible into Chinese (1968), the first biblical dictionary in Chinese (1975), and for founding, in 1945, the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum in Beijing (Franciscan Biblical School) together with several Chinese Franciscans.

<sup>18</sup> Conclusion of his analysis: [A gift from the Lord](#).

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

## Comments on the Charges Brought Against Maria Valtorta's Work

Setting aside the subjective judgments that clearly troubled Father Vaccari, we are left with several objections that were not addressed in the paragraph devoted to Alexis Maillard, or that will be taken up again in the article in *L'Osservatore Romano*.

One of Father Vaccari's accusations (pp. 50–51) concerns the primacy of Peter (Matthew 16:13–20), which he believes is undermined by the writings of Maria Valtorta. This is his assumption based on reading a summary of the work he is encountering for the first time. According to him, the force of Jesus' declaration—"You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church"—is diminished by the lengthy proclamations, found throughout Valtorta's narrative, in which Jesus, very early on and throughout his public life, openly declares himself the Messiah, the Son of God.

This criticism is echoed in [L'Osservatore Romano of January 6, 1960](#): "Jesus is excessively talkative, like a true advertiser, always ready to proclaim himself the Messiah and Son of God, and to deliver theological discourses in the very terms a modern-day professor would use."

That the Jesus of Maria Valtorta delivers theological discourses that are consistent is only logical, since this science is based on what He historically said. But what about this "appropriation of primacy"?<sup>20</sup>

It was God the Father himself who, at the baptism of Jesus—at the very beginning of His public life—publicly declared (and thus to the first apostles): "You are my beloved Son" (Matthew 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22).

Long before Peter, Nathanael exclaimed, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!" (John 1:49). Not to mention the apostles who, from the very beginning, used fitting titles for Jesus such as the Lamb of God, the One who was foretold, and others...

And above all, according to the Gospel, Jesus publicly proclaims himself the Son of God (John 10:36–37), which will even be the reason for his condemnation (John 5:18). Yet, he reserves this title exclusively for himself (Matthew 16:20 | Mark 8:30 | Luke 9:21) until the Redemption is accomplished. Maria Valtorta therefore develops visions perfectly in harmony with the Gospel, which is her hallmark.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the dogmatic constitution on Divine Revelation [Dei Verbum](#) (1965).

<sup>21</sup> Maria Valtorta's work encompasses all 373 narrative units (pericopes) of the canonical Gospels, without inconsistency or contradiction. It covers 98.5% of the 3,781 verses of the Gospels. Furthermore, the work includes implicit or explicit references to 1,166 chapters of the Bible out of the 1,334 that make up the whole—equivalent to 87% overall. This spans all 73 books and the entirety of the 150 Psalms.



## Excessive Turmoil

It's a less theological subject that really sticks in Vaccari's throat—and not only his—for he is joined in this by Msgr. Pepe: the evocation of nudity.

Such is the case of the *Beauty of Chorazin*, a woman of loose morals who, in old age and suffering from leprosy, is rejected by all. Hungry, she is covered only by “a shred of cloth, a torn piece of veil” thrown to her by the apostle [Andrew](#), who takes pity on her nakedness. At Jesus' invitation, she plunges into the lake and emerges naked and healed. This healing, not unlike that of Naaman the Syrian,<sup>22</sup> shocked Vaccari.

*L'Osservatore Romano* of 1960 does not mention this example but points to another, which it says is likely to trouble girls' boarding schools: “a dance performed certainly not modestly before Pilate, in the Praetorium ([GMV 604.26](#)). A scene which ‘could easily fall into the hands of nuns and the students of their colleges. In such a case, reading passages of this kind... could hardly be done without danger or spiritual harm.’ Does Maria Valtorta dwell on licentious descriptions? Let the following speak for itself: “Dancers enter... covered with nothing. A multicolored linen fringe girdles their slender bodies from waist to hips. Nothing else. Tanned because they are African, supple as young gazelles, they begin a silent, lascivious dance.” Such a dance, performed by Salome, had troubled Herod Antipas.<sup>23</sup>

Msgr. Pepe is no less disturbed, and repeatedly so, by the mere mention of nudity. Yet God created us naked and innocent. The Gospel itself mentions naked figures.<sup>24</sup> Nudity is not perverse to a doctor, a nurse, an artist... nor is semi-nudity on the beach. Only the thoughts it provokes can be shocking or troubling. “To the pure, all things are pure,” says St. Paul (Titus 1:15–16).

To this is added an overt misogyny in the *Civiltà Cattolica* article cited above: “a subtly sensual atmosphere created by the presence of a swarm of women following Jesus.” The presence of female disciples following Jesus—though clearly attested in the Gospels<sup>25</sup>—is enough, it seems, to create a “sensual” atmosphere.

This deep unease caused by the mere mention of nudity, along with the evident misogyny, seems to lend credibility to the account of the [Venerable Luigia Sinapi](#). In early 1950, when she confronted the Holy Office in the name of Jesus over the blocking of Maria Valtorta's work, she was threatened with physical violence (rape).

---

<sup>22</sup> 2 Kings 5:13-14.

<sup>23</sup> Matthew 14:6 | Mark 6:21.

<sup>24</sup> Mark 14:52 | John 21:7.

<sup>25</sup> Luke 8:1-3 | Matthew 27:55-56 | Mark 15:40-41 | Luke 23:27, etc.

## **The *Osservatore Romano* Article**

Instead of clearly linking the placement on the Index to the decree of February 17, 1949—which, according to Maillard’s thesis, was supposed to condemn Maria Valtorta—the article is less precise, more diffuse, and refers vaguely to “memories from about ten years ago.”

Does it speak of doctrinal errors or a lack of divine origin? No: it alludes without accusing. What it points to is a publication without authorization in 1949: “at a time when certain voluminous typewritten texts were circulating, containing alleged visions and revelations. It is known that, at that time, the competent ecclesiastical authority had prohibited the printing of these typewritten texts and had ordered that they be withdrawn from circulation.”

One should not misunderstand the use of the word “alleged,” which also appears in the communiqué from the Dicastery (2025). In the official language of the Church, this term refers to a vision or revelation that claims to be such—not necessarily one that is outrageously presumptuous.

The anonymous article in *L’Osservatore Romano* appears to be directly inspired by the Vaccari report written ten years earlier. There seems to have been no further in-depth investigation, as the underlying thesis—that the work was secretly written by the Servites—is present to such a degree that the article mentions the high theological value of the work three times, apparently to suggest that the Holy Office was not fooled.

Having failed to identify any formal doctrinal error, the Holy Office limited itself to noting four opinions deemed merely unconventional.

By 1959, the only grounds left to justify placing the work on the Index were the lack of an imprimatur and “serious disobedience.” Neither of these pertained to the work itself, but to its promoters. Nothing remains of the “serious” accusations of 1949. Nothing but a disciplinary procedure that was soon abolished—and is not even mentioned in the Dicastery’s most recent decree (2025).

## **3 - Fr. Augustin Bea, S.J.**

The least that can be said is that Father A. Bea was troubled by the re-examination he underwent on October 17, 1952 (pp. 63-77) at the request of the Holy Office following [the petition](#) sent to Pope Pius XII by Archbishop Carinci on January 29, 1952. Fr. Bea was one of the nine prominent figures who signed the petition asking the Holy Father to appoint an arbitrator to rule on the work of Maria Valtorta. A work that Fr. Bea, confessor to Pope Pius XII, supported, but within limits that he expanded on in the second examination he conducted. His initial conclusions, considering the remarkable points he had observed, led him to think that “The work of Maria Valtorta should not be published as coming from extraordinary visions or

spiritual states, but simply, and without the author's name, as a 'Life of Jesus, narrated and illustrated for the Catholic people.'”

A few months later, after examining the work more thoroughly, and troubled by what he encountered, what had seemed to him a good edifying book became a work marred by too many questions, and he requested that its publication be suspended. Throughout its pages, there are both reasons to be amazed and reasons to be shocked. Readers need to pay close attention, as Maillard intersperses his own comments with those of Fr. Bea, making it sometimes unclear who the author is.

One is sometimes surprised by Father Bea's oversights. This honest exegete repeats assertions made by Vaccari without critical reflection. For example, he wonders if the phrase spoken by Jesus about the Trinity in Maria Valtorta: “God only begets another of Himself” ([GMV 487.6](#)) did not refer to a different God than the one and only God (“Another God?” p. 75). Neither he nor Vaccari recognized that this is the same statement later found in the creed (Nicene Symbol), “He is God, begotten of God... begotten, not made.”

Similarly, when it comes to the incarnation of Satan in Judas as reported by Jesus in Maria Valtorta ([GMV 587.3](#)), they fail to recognize the meaning given by the Church Fathers (St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas) to the Gospel statement: “When Judas had taken the morsel, Satan entered into him” (John 13:27), or “Satan entered into Judas” (Luke 22:3). The media outlet *Marie de Nazareth* has thoroughly explained this point (and others) in its refutation of Don Guillaume Chevallier's study, which echoed the ideas of Alberto Vaccari.<sup>26</sup>

## **"I have found the one whom my heart loves. I have grasped Him and will not let Him go."**

Father Bea is not the only one to have judged Maria Valtorta's work as a book containing beautiful passages and demonstrating astonishing knowledge, but while wanting to amputate it of the descriptions and developments included in it. This was also the case for [Archbishop Carinci](#), [Bishop Ugo Emilio Lattanzi](#), and [Father Roschini](#) at first. They wanted to make this work conform to their own standards of thought. Alexis Maillard also says he is pursuing a similar goal. But had history followed through with these wishes, Maria Valtorta's work would have suffered the same fate as the visions of Mary of Agreda or Anne Catherine Emmerich, which were authentic yet lost their readership due to the tampering they underwent, whether from well or ill-intentioned people.

If Maria Valtorta had presented a work in which Jesus speaks scholarly about the hypostatic union and the kerygma, three readers would have been interested, and ninety-seven would have closed the book. On the other hand, a work describing Jesus as He truly was, historically,

---

<sup>26</sup> Marie De Nazareth: [Response to Don Guillaume Chevallier: There is no doctrinal error in the writings of Maria Valtorta](#), January 24, 2023.

in His divinity and, above all, His humanity (in which alone our Redemption was obtained), would be read by ninety-seven people and harshly judged by three others.

This postulate finds confirmation in one of Pope Francis' latest letters (July 17, 2024). He was interested in literature about Jesus and its importance in the formation not only of priests, but also of pastoral workers and all Christians.<sup>27</sup>

Shortly before (February 24, 2024), he had sent us a letter of encouragement in which he said: "I encourage you to continue with the same commitment your mission to make known the life of Maria Valtorta and her literary work, especially all that it can offer for the good of the Church and society. Onward!"

This encouragement becomes clearer with the letter on the role of literature that we just mentioned. In paragraphs 14 and 15, it proclaims "Never Christ without flesh." We quote these words at length, as they apply particularly to Maria Valtorta's work, embedded in the journey of the Church.

"Allow me," says Pope Francis, "to recall here a reflection on the current religious context: 'The return to the sacred and the spiritual search that characterize our time are ambiguous phenomena. But, more than atheism, today we are faced with the challenge of responding adequately to the thirst for God of many people, so that they do not seek to quench it in alienating proposals or with a Jesus Christ without flesh.' *The urgent task of proclaiming the Gospel in our time* therefore demands from believers, and priests in particular, a commitment so that everyone may encounter a Jesus Christ made flesh, made man, made history. We must all ensure that we never lose sight of the 'flesh' of Jesus Christ: that flesh made of passions, emotions, feelings, concrete stories, hands that touch and heal, gazes that liberate and encourage, hospitality, forgiveness, indignation, courage, fearlessness: in a word, love.

And it is precisely at this level that a diligent engagement with literature can make future priests and all pastoral agents even more attuned to *the full humanity of the Lord Jesus, in which His divinity is fully manifested*, and proclaim the Gospel in such a way that all, truly all, can experience the truth of what Second Vatican Council says: 'In reality, the mystery of man is only truly illuminated in the mystery of the Word made flesh.' *It is not the mystery of an abstract humanity, but the mystery of this concrete human being with all the wounds, desires, memories, and hopes of his life.*"

Three-quarters of a century later, beyond the ups and downs of a work that some sought to fight, destroy, or minimize, Pope Francis seems to be responding to Pius XII's recommendation to publish the Work "as is," leaving it to the reader to determine whether its origin is "extraordinary or not."

---

<sup>27</sup> [Pope Francis' letter on the role of literature in formation.](#)

In his time, [Gamaliel](#) gave this wise counsel to the [Sanhedrin](#), who were accusing the unruly apostles: "Do not concern yourselves with these men, leave them alone. For if their plan or enterprise is of human origin, it will fail. But if it is from God, you will not be able to stop them. So, do not risk finding yourselves at war with God."<sup>28</sup>

Over seven decades, hundreds of thousands of readers worldwide have embraced this work, proclaiming it through sharing, both in times of acceptance from others and in times of opposition. With the Song of Songs 3:4, they declare: "I have found the one whom my heart loves. I have grasped Him and will not let Him go."

François-Michel Debroise,  
June 17, 2025

---

<sup>28</sup> Acts 5:38-39