

# A Theological Response to the Korean Bishops' Document on Luisa Piccarreta

By Daniel O'Connor

Copyright © 2024 St. Joseph's Solutions.  
Rensselaer, New York.

[www.SunOfMyWill.com](http://www.SunOfMyWill.com)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## A THEOLOGICAL RESPONSE TO THE KOREAN BISHOPS’ DOCUMENT ON LUISA PICCARRETA..... I

<b>1. PREFACE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
THE PRESENT SITUATION, AND THE APPROACH OF THIS RESPONSE .....	1
ABOUT THE AUTHOR .....	1
NOTES .....	2
<b>2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON LUISA</b> .....	<b>3</b>

## RESPONSES TO EACH SECTION OF THE KOREAN BISHOPS’ DOCUMENT (KBD) ..... 5

<b>3. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>4. “OVERVIEW”</b> .....	<b>7</b>
THE “THIRD FIAT”: NOT A NEW PUBLIC REVELATION; ON THE INFERIORITY OF LUISA TO THE VIRGIN MARY .....	8
THE PROPER LIMITATIONS OF PRIVATE REVELATION VS. ILLICIT LIMITATIONS THEREOF .....	11
<b>5. “SERIOUS ERRORS IN THE ‘BOOK OF HEAVEN’”? .....</b>	<b>14</b>
WHAT WAS ALREADY ACCOMPLISHED IN CHRIST REMAINS TO BE FULLY ACCOMPLISHED IN THE CHURCH .....	14
<b>6. “RE-WRITING THE HISTORY OF SALVATION”? .....</b>	<b>16</b>
“THE FIAT” IS FROM JESUS AND FROM HIS PUBLIC REVELATION—NOT FROM LUISA OR HIS PRIVATE REVELATIONS TO LUISA .....	17
REDEMPTION IS ORDERED TOWARDS SOMETHING: THE TRADITIONAL CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE .....	18
A “NEW ERA” OF HOLINESS: A COMMON THEME IN APPROVED 20 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY MYSTICISM .....	20
THIS “NEW HOLINESS” IS NOT RESTRICTED TO LUISA OR TO THOSE WHO READ HER WRITINGS.....	22
LUISA’S WRITINGS CONFIRM AND GLORIFY THE CATHOLIC VIEW OF SALVATION HISTORY.....	25
<b>7. “IDENTITY AND MISSION OF LUISA PICCARRETA” .....</b>	<b>31</b>
ANYONE WHO LIVES IN THE DIVINE WILL IS “FIRST,” IN ONE SENSE .....	32
<b>8. “A ‘LIVING SACRIFICE’ ON BEHALF OF JESUS” .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>9. A “SUBSTITUTIONARY MEDIATOR”? .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>10. “UNDERSTANDING OF THE SACRAMENTS” .....</b>	<b>39</b>
CATHOLIC TEACHING HOLDS THAT HEAVEN IS SUPERIOR TO THE SACRAMENTS.....	41
SACRAMENTS REMAIN NECESSARY IN THE KINGDOM OF THE DIVINE WILL .....	42
THE DIVINE WILL IS NOT AN “8 <sup>TH</sup> SACRAMENT” .....	44

STILL MORE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SACRAMENTS FOR THOSE LIVING IN THE DIVINE WILL.....	45
<b>11. “EUCHARIST IS MISUNDERSTOOD AS A REPETITION OF JESUS’ SACRIFICE”?</b>	<b>47</b>
.....	
<b>12. THE “STATUS OF THE VIRGIN MARY”</b> .....	<b>49</b>
THE VIRGIN MARY AS A “PRE-EXISTING IDEA” IN THE MIND OF GOD IS NOT UNORTHODOX.....	50
LUISA’S WRITINGS REPEATEDLY AFFIRM THE INFERIORITY OF LUISA TO THE VIRGIN MARY.....	52
<b>13. “HUMAN WILL AND FREE WILL”</b> .....	<b>55</b>
LUISA’S WRITINGS AFFIRM THE GOODNESS OF THE HUMAN WILL AND REJECT QUIETISM.....	56
CATHOLIC TEACHING HOLDS THAT THE HUMAN WILL IS INDEED THE SOURCE OF ALL EVIL .....	59
<b>14. “OTHER ISSUES”</b> .....	<b>61</b>
LUISA’S WRITINGS NEVER ASSERT “THREE GODS” .....	61
LUISA’S WRITINGS AFFIRM CHRISTOLOGICAL ORTHODOXY .....	63
LUISA’S WRITINGS PROPERLY DEPICT THE SUFFERINGS OF JESUS.....	66
LUISA’S WRITINGS ARE NOT “GNOSTIC” .....	67
LUISA’S WRITINGS PRESUPPOSE AND CONFIRM THE ENTIRETY OF THE CATHOLIC “JOURNEY OF FAITH” .....	71
LUISA’S WRITINGS REJECT A “FEAR-BASED” ESCHATOLOGY .....	73
<b>15. “CONCLUSION”</b> .....	<b>79</b>
“THREE AGES” THEORY AND LUISA’S WRITINGS.....	80
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC REVELATION, REVISITED .....	81
“DEVELOPING INTO AN ANTI-CHURCH GROUP”? .....	84
<b>16. “PASTORAL RECOMMENDATIONS”</b> .....	<b>85</b>
 <b>APPENDICES</b> .....	 <b>86</b>

<b>17. ON THE VALID CONCERNS ABOUT LUISA’S WRITINGS</b> .....	<b>86</b>
AN ADMONISHMENT TO THE UNORTHODOX DIVINE WILL FOLLOWERS.....	87
SOURCES OF UNORTHODOX INTERPRETATIONS OF LUISA.....	88
<b>18. SEVERAL TRUTHS (CONFIRMED IN LUISA’S WRITINGS) THAT DIVINE WILL FOLLOWERS MUST BE SURE TO REMEMBER IN PRESERVING ORTHODOXY</b> .....	<b>90</b>
HEAVEN ALONE IS OUR ULTIMATE DESTINY. ....	90
UPON THE DEATH OF THE APOSTLE JOHN, PUBLIC REVELATION WAS RENDERED COMPLETE. ....	90
JESUS WILL NEVER WITHIN HISTORY REIGN VISIBLY ON EARTH. ....	91
JESUS HAD A HUMAN WILL, NOT ONLY THE DIVINE WILL .....	91
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH—IN HER ENTIRE ESSENTIAL NATURE; DOCTRINES, HIERARCHY, SACRAMENTS, ETC.—WILL EXIST UNTIL THE END OF TIME.....	92
ST. JOSEPH IS THE GREATEST SAINT AFTER THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.....	92

THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY IS THE GREATEST SAINT. SHE IS VASTLY ABOVE LUISA.....	93
ABSOLUTELY NOTHING IS GREATER OR POSSIBLY COULD BE GREATER THAN THE EUCHARIST ITSELF. ....	94
BAPTISM IS NEEDED AND WILL ALWAYS BE NEEDED TO WASH AWAY ORIGINAL SIN. .....	95
THE HUMAN WILL IS A VERY GOOD THING. WE ARE NEVER CALLED TO QUIETISTICALLY SEEK TO EXTINGUISH IT OR RENDER ITS OPERATIONS ENTIRELY PASSIVE. ....	95
NEVER NEGLECT “ORDINARY” PIETY. ....	96
THE GIFT OF LIVING IN THE DIVINE WILL ENTAILS AN “ACCIDENTAL,” NOT ONTOLOGICAL, CHANGE IN THE HUMAN PERSON.....	97
IN SOME SENSES, “ORDINARY” CHRISTIAN HOLINESS, EVEN ASIDE FROM THE GIFT OF LIVING IN THE DIVINE WILL, IS ALREADY SUPERIOR TO ORIGINAL HOLINESS. .....	99
MAN’S DIVINIZATION WILL NEVER BE LITERAL AND COMPLETE. THE GIFT ONLY OPERATES “AS MUCH AS IS POSSIBLE FOR THE CREATURE.” .....	101
<b>19. DISCERNING PRIVATE REVELATION .....</b>	<b>103</b>
A CLOSING QUESTION .....	104
<b>ENDNOTES.....</b>	<b>106</b>

# 1. Preface

## **The Present Situation, and The Approach of This Response**

In January 2024, the Committee on the Doctrine of the Faith of the Korean Bishops' Conference issued a decree banning the meetings of groups dedicated to the spirituality of the Servant of God Luisa Piccarreta. In addition to this prohibition, a seven-thousand-word document was issued detailing their concerns about and objections to Luisa's writings that led to this decision.

In the following pages, I will address each of the theological concerns contained in this Korean Bishops' Document (henceforth KBD). Before doing so, a few words are in order to relay my own approach to the present matter, so that readers will understand my perspective. Although I am a devotee of Luisa's writings, I am first and foremost a Catholic who submits, without exception, to all of the teachings of the Church. Scripture, Tradition, and Magisterium form the foundation of my Faith and determine my beliefs, not any private revelation. Moreover, my life of Faith is concretely nourished, at its most basic level, not by any private revelation, but rather by the Sacraments: especially daily Mass and Communion, and monthly Confession (which have been the bedrock of my life for many years).

### **About the Author**

Daniel O'Connor has been studying the writings of the Servant of God Luisa Piccarreta for almost 15 years. He has read all of Luisa's volumes, and has been both writing about them and speaking internationally on the topics of Living in the Divine Will and Our Lord's private revelations to Luisa for almost 10 years. Daniel has published several books, including four about the Divine Will and Luisa's writings (most recently, *Thy Will Be Done*, which was published in 2021).

In 2013, Daniel received a master's degree in theology from Holy Apostles College & Seminary in Cromwell, CT. He currently serves as an adjunct professor of philosophy and religion at a State University of New York Community College (Hudson Valley), where he has taught for over seven years. He has thus far completed several years of post-master's study towards a PhD in philosophy. Daniel lives in New York with his wife, Regina, and their five children, Joseph, David, Mary, Luisa, and John Paul.

## Notes

- Emphasis contained within quotations such as bolding or underlining have been added by me.
- Some sections in this book are adapted from my earlier publications. I have noted where this is done in what follows.
- The document produced by the Korean Bishops' Conference will be referred to as the "KBD." Quotes from it will be emphasized by a vertical bar running along the left-hand side of each.
- The bulk of what follows consists in responses to the KBD. However, important appendices are included within the last several pages of the book (see the Table of Contents above for page numbers) addressing related matters.

## 2. Background Information on Luisa

The Servant of God Luisa Piccarreta\* was an Italian mystic who died in the year 1947 and recorded thousands of pages of messages from Jesus and Mary, primarily about the “Gift of Living in the Divine Will.”

St. Hannibal di Francia—an Italian priest and founder of religious orders who was canonized by Pope St. John Paul II in 2004—dedicated the later years of his life to promoting Luisa’s revelations. The Vatican’s official biography of Luisa, *The Sun of My Will* (SunOfMyWill.com), recounts the saint’s words about her:

[Luisa] emerges to be a singular predilection of the Divine Redeemer, Jesus Our Lord, who century after century, increases ever more the wonders of His love. It seems that He wanted to form this virgin, whom He calls the littlest one He found on earth, and bereft of any education, **into an instrument of a mission so sublime, that is, the triumph of the Divine Will...** (*The Sun Of My Will*, Page 122)

St. Hannibal—who was also appointed by the Archbishop to be Luisa’s spiritual director—was so convinced of the authenticity of Luisa’s revelations that he personally bestowed nineteen of his own *nihil obstat* (he was appointed *ensor librorum*) to them, which were all followed up with corresponding *imprimaturs* from the Archbishop.

St. Hannibal, however, was not the only saint who knew Luisa and endorsed her. The Vatican’s biography of Luisa also recounts the strong support she received from St. Padre Pio:

**There are countless testimonies** beyond these [i.e., those recorded from Federico Abresch and Mrs. Caterina Valentina] that talk about the mutual esteem and faith Luisa and Padre Pio had in each other ... **Even the residents of San Giovanni Rotondo knew how much respect Padre Pio had for Luisa.** (*The Sun Of My Will*, Pages 174-175)

Luisa’s life was filled with miracles which were all rigorously scrutinized and documented by priests, Bishops, theologians, doctors, and scientists, who successively ruled out any possible non-supernatural explanation. She even lived for decades subsisting solely on the Holy Eucharist (although when she was required by her directors to attempt to eat once a day—orders which, though painful, she always

---

\*Several of the following paragraphs are adapted from *Only Man Bears His Image* (2023)

obeyed—such food would always come back up after she had consumed it, in precisely the same form it was swallowed). Her messages from Jesus are filled with prophecies that have been clearly fulfilled; including repeated descriptions of a Second World War, even while the first was still in progress. (See Part Four of *Thy Will Be Done* for a partial overview of these.)

Since her death almost 77 years ago, Luisa's legacy of holiness has only grown, and confirmations of the orthodoxy of her messages have multiplied. Indeed, not only was she declared a Servant of God (in 1994), but her holiness and orthodoxy was thereafter confirmed by her diocese (in 2005), and her cause is now in its Vatican stage, notwithstanding a present "pause." Multiple Church-approved religious orders exist that are dedicated to Luisa's revelations (including the Benedictines of the Divine Will). A superabundance of good fruit has flowed from devotion to Luisa's writings: repentance, conversions, increased prayer and works of charity, vocations to the priesthood and religious life, and even a number of clear miracles from Luisa's intercession. Cardinal José Saraiva Martins, the Prefect of the Congregation for the Causes of Saints under Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI, strongly endorsed Luisa and her revelations from Jesus in a preface he wrote for the Vatican's aforementioned biography of her.

One will not find a single mystic, from any point in the entire history of the Church, who has seen such verifications of authenticity as these, only to later be proven a fraud.

"Father [di Francia], this book [Luisa's *Hours of the Passion*] should be read while kneeling: it is Jesus Christ who is speaking!"<sup>1</sup> — Pope St. Pius X

"What have you come here for? You have Luisa, go to her."<sup>2</sup> — St. Padre Pio

"[St. Hannibal saw] the means God himself had provided to bring about **that 'new and divine' holiness with which the Holy Spirit wishes to enrich Christians at the dawn of the third millennium**, in order to 'make Christ the heart of the world.'"<sup>3</sup> — Pope St. John Paul II

"[Luisa's writings] **must be made known to the world**. I believe they will bring about great benefits. For as sublime as this science of the Divine Will is, these writings of Divine dictation are nonetheless understandable and clear. In my opinion, **no human intellect would have been able to create them.**" — St. Hannibal di Francia; quoted in *The Sun of My Will*. Page 117.



# RESPONSES TO EACH SECTION OF THE KOREAN BISHOPS' DOCUMENT (KBD)

In the following sections, I will respond – in the same order in which they were presented – to each of the concerns detailed in the Korean Bishops' Document (KBD).

## 3. Introduction

The KBD states:

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of the Catholic Bishops' conference of Korea (hereinafter referred to as "CDF") carefully and cautiously reviewed the "Book of Heaven" (Korean version, volumes 1-20) by Luisa Piccarreta... it is true that the "Book of Heaven" has positive parts ... [but] it cannot be denied that it contains many doctrinal and spiritual errors that are inconsistent with or even contrary to the Scripture and the traditional teachings of the Church in terms of content and form. ... the "Book of Heaven" is spreading false beliefs among the faithful ... I would like to add a brief explanation while glancing at the serious errors in the "Book of Heaven." (KBD 1. Introduction)

We must first observe that the object of the KBD's critique is almost entirely comprised by those volumes which already received the *Nihil Obstat* from St. Hannibal di Francia and the *Imprimatur* from Archbishop Joseph Leo (namely, volumes 1-19; whereas the KBD is assessing volumes 1-20). Whoever would assert that "doctrinal errors" exist in these first 19 volumes is contradicting the judgment that the Church has already expressed by way of these ecclesiastical approbations.

Obviously, such *imprimaturs* are not strictly speaking infallible (nor are they acts of Papal magisterium); therefore, it is not necessarily entirely inadmissible to relay concerns about texts containing them. Nevertheless, we must proceed with the understanding that any such "errors" ascribed by the KBD to Luisa's first 19 volumes are so ascribed in opposition to the existing ecclesial judgment – one promulgated by an Archbishop who personally knew Luisa and scrutinized the mystic's own writings in the original language. Clearly, he was in a far more appropriate position to judge them than are those current critics of Luisa who are not only many decades removed from her life,

but who are also not even reading the original writings themselves (but only poor translations thereof).

Because of these existing approbations, Archbishop Giovanni Battista Pichierri (the local ordinary of Luisa's diocese) promulgated a notification on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012,<sup>4</sup> wherein he rebuked those who "*claim [Luisa's] writings contain doctrinal errors,*" stating that the Holy See has never endorsed such a claim, and lamenting that such people scandalize the faithful. While it is true that a confidential 2022 document from Cardinal Semeraro expressing concerns about Luisa's writings was recently "leaked," even this document remains general in its claims. Unlike the KBD, it does not attribute any specific doctrinal error to any particular quotation from Luisa's writings.

Indeed, at this point, it appears outside of the legitimate jurisdiction of any ecclesial authority aside from the Holy See itself to levy such a charge.

"All of these events [miracles in Luisa's life] I observed, scrupulously controlled and subjected to careful examination by many doctors and professors of dogmatic, moral, ascetic and mystical theology" -Fr. Benedetto Calvi

**"With no more than an elementary school education, Luisa composed works of theological depth rivaling great theologians."\***

---

\* Bret Thoman, OFS. *A journey to the home of Luisa Piccarreta, the contemplative and mystic.* Aleteia. March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

## 4. "Overview"

After its initial introductory section, the KBD moves on to provide an "overview" of its concerns, the relevant portions of which are as follows.

... following God's will, 'Fiat', ultimately means following the words of prophecy about the new era that will be initiated through Piccarreta. However, in this book, through the work of 'Fiat', Piccarreta is elevated to a special position in the history of salvation, comparable to, and even surpassing, Jesus and the Virgin Mary. Piccarreta is described not simply as a collaborator in salvation or a recipient of God's special revelation, but as a person prepared 'in advance' by the eternal Will of God, a 'predestined person', a person sent to complete the work of salvation, an 'instrument' in the work of salvation, the 'eldest daughter' of God's Will, a being who opens a 'new era,' etc., and her mission also occupies a 'special position' in God's work of salvation for all mankind. ...[this] tarnishes the work of salvation achieved through Christ, but also ... subordinates Christ's work of salvation to the work of 'Fiat.' Emphasizing the 'Third Fiat', the work of salvation of the new era, and elevating the identity and mission of Piccarreta accordingly, this leads to undervaluing or ignoring the salvation of Jesus. In fact, the "Book of Heaven" focuses on highlighting the status and role of Piccarreta as an individual rather than Christ's work of salvation, and portrays Piccarreta as an indispensable being to complete Jesus' work of salvation. Therefore, it denigrates the plan of salvation realized through Christ or renders it incomplete. It portrays as if Christ's work of salvation is insufficient and salvation cannot be achieved without Piccarreta. It even says that the long-awaited 'Fiat' (Luisa Piccarreta) surpasses the long-awaited Savior (Jesus Christ). Piccarreta's claim about her private revelation not only infringes on the public revelation realized through Jesus Christ, but also leads to ignoring the unique and decisive characteristics of public revelation.

These depictions of Luisa's writings exhibit a deep misunderstanding of their content that is radically at odds with what Jesus actually tells Luisa (even if, tragically, it is an understanding promoted by a few Divine Will groups who themselves misinterpret Luisa). This paragraph from the KBD also attributes to Luisa's writings teachings that are found nowhere within them.

Catholic teaching certainly holds that no private revelation may "improve or complete... surpass or correct" Public Revelation (cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, §67), and that this Public Revelation has been rendered complete with the death of the last Apostle, St. John.

Luisa's private revelations, however, never claim such a relationship to Public Revelation.

We do indeed find, repeated throughout Luisa's volumes, the teaching that the Divine Will is the "Third Fiat." Far from implying that we are here confronted by a "new public revelation," this nomenclature actually refutes any such dispensationalist interpretation of Jesus' message to Luisa, as we will consider next.

## **The "Third Fiat": Not a New Public Revelation; On the Inferiority of Luisa to the Virgin Mary**

We need only consider that Jesus tells Luisa that the First Fiat was Creation itself, and the Second Fiat was the Redemption. What, however, was the relationship between the Second and First Fiats? Did the Second abrogate or replace the First? Of course not. Redemption took place fully within the context of Creation and presupposed its entirety. The Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Our Lord did not alter the earth itself, the human body, or anything else about Creation. Rather, it—among other things!—opened the doors of Heaven.

So too, by defining "Living in the Divine Will" as the Third Fiat—not as a new religion, public revelation, or dispensation—Jesus' words to Luisa confirm that everything He is telling her about what is now offered with the Gift, and what is yet to come in the Reign of the Divine Will, is taking place (and will continue to take place) entirely within the context of the Catholic Faith; just as Redemption took place entirely within the context of Creation. Jesus does not tell Luisa that the triumph of the Divine Will on earth will constitute the Age of the Church passing away for the sake of some "Age of the Spirit" that some dispensationalists, new-agers, or Joachimite devotees anticipate. Quite the contrary, He tells her that this Fiat will entail the Catholic Church acquiring her "full vigor" (September 2, 1901), with the Sacraments not at all passing away or becoming unimportant, but rather triumphing and flourishing. He tells Luisa:

**"Then will My Sacramental Life have Its complete fruit; and as the species are consumed, I will no longer have the sorrow of leaving My children without the food of My continuous Life ... everything I did in Redemption will serve no longer as remedy, but as delight, as joy, as happiness, and as beauty ever growing. So, the triumph of the Supreme Fiat will give complete fruit to the Kingdom of Redemption."** (November 2, 1926)

More importantly still is the fact that the Third Fiat itself is *not* from Luisa (whereas the essence of the Second Fiat truly was and is from

Jesus Christ). Luisa is simply the messenger, and the first contemporary person to receive the Gift (of Living in the Divine Will) now offered to us all. Jesus even very clearly tells Luisa that she is no Virgin Mary, and that Luisa's mission is *not* itself salvific like Jesus and Mary's, but rather is only one of *making known* something that God Himself is going to do (and has done):

“Now, my daughter, listen to me; the most serious doubts, the gravest difficulties that they [Luisa's critics] found in your writings are precisely these: that I told you that I was calling you to live in the Kingdom of my Divine Will, **giving you the special and unique mission to make It known**, so that, as I Myself said in the ‘Our Father’, and the Holy Church says still now, ‘Thy Kingdom come’ – that is, your Will be done on earth as It is in Heaven. It does not say in the ‘Our Father’ that this Kingdom is on earth, but it says: ‘Come’; and I would not have composed a prayer if I were not to obtain its effects. ... [but] when [these critics] read that I was placing you near the Sovereign Queen, so that, She having lived in the Kingdom of my Divine Fiat, you might imitate Her, wanting to make of you a copy that resembles Her; and I placed you in Her hands, that She might guide you, assist you, protect you, so that you might imitate Her in everything – this seemed so absurd to them; and sinisterly misinterpreting the sense, they spoke as if I had told you that you were as though another Queen. **How much nonsense – I did not say that you are like the Celestial Queen, but that I want you similar to Her, just as I have said to many other souls dear to Me that I wanted them similar to Me; but with this they would not become God like Me.** And then, since the Celestial Lady is the true Queen of the Kingdom of my Will, it is Her task to help and teach the fortunate creatures who want to enter, to live in It. ... [some act] as if I did not have the power to elect whom I want, and when I want. But, after all, time will say everything, and just as they cannot deny that the Virgin of Nazareth is my Mother, so will they not be able to deny that I have elected you for the **sole purpose of making my Will known**, and that, through you, I will obtain that the ‘Thy Kingdom come’ may have Its fulfillment. It is certain that creatures are an instrument in my hands... [the critics] have calculated only your person, but have not calculated what my Divine Will can do...” (Jesus to Luisa. Mary 19, 1931)

It is obvious enough that no creature can compare to, much less surpass, Jesus Himself – He is God. But the passage above from Luisa's volumes also makes clear that Luisa is by no means an equal to the Virgin Mary. Jesus calls that notion itself utter “nonsense”! Whoever

claims that Luisa's writings exalt Luisa above the Virgin Mary, therefore, is not only making a claim without basis in these writings; he is affirmatively contradicting what the writings teach.

Twice in this passage alone, Jesus says that Luisa's "special and unique" mission is simply *making known* this "Fiat" – this "Living in the Divine Will." He even says that is the "**sole purpose**" of Luisa's calling. Therefore, Luisa is *not* the one causing the Fiat. *Jesus* is.

Moreover, Luisa's vast inferiority to Our Lady is, in fact, a reason for her being chosen for this mission. Jesus explains to Luisa that if He had done all this work in preparing for the reign of the Divine Will only through His Mother, or even through someone else immaculately conceived (though no one else ever will be), then we would all be tempted to regard our own participation in its triumph as too lofty a task for us considering the utterly supreme holiness of the Blessed Virgin, which all should know is unreachable. Luisa, on the other hand, was not immaculately conceived; she was and is an entirely ordinary creature like us, and for Jesus to open the doors to the Divine Will through Luisa – as He did – is for Him to show us all that *we too* can enter through them by joining hands with Luisa (cf. June 6, 1926); by heeding the revelations Jesus gave to her.

Similarly, St. Faustina is *not* the source of the Divine Mercy; she is its secretary; notwithstanding the fact that Jesus told the saint, in her fully approved and indisputably authentic revelations, that she truly would prepare the world for His final coming:

When I [Faustina] became aware of God's great plans for me, I was frightened at their greatness and felt myself quite incapable of fulfilling them ... **I soon recognized it was not true humility, but rather a great temptation from the devil** ... I heard these words spoken distinctly and forcefully within my soul, **You will prepare the world for My final coming.** These words moved me deeply, and although I pretended not to hear them, I understood them very well and had no doubt about them. (*Divine Mercy in my Soul*, §429)

And although Faustina and Luisa were "secretaries" of these great acts of God, this does not impinge upon their unique importance. It is a false dichotomy to say one must choose between, on the one hand, a certain mystic's private revelations being "non-essential," and, on the other hand, such revelations claiming to "improve, complete, surpass, or correct" Public Revelation.

Salvation and Sanctification: these are the two great acts of God after Creation. St. Faustina is the mystic Jesus chose as the virgin through whom He would undertake His *final act* of Salvation, and the

Servant of God Luisa Piccarreta is mystic Jesus chose as the virgin through whom He would undertake His *final act* of Sanctification. It is no coincidence that both of their private revelations are replete with striking parallels (or that both had content that was misunderstood and thus sat alongside each other on the Index!).

## **The Proper Limitations of Private Revelation vs. Illicit Limitations Thereof**

Perhaps Bishop Paul Tchang-Ryeol Kim put it best when he wrote the following in a Pastoral letter to his flock:

**Our age is indeed an age of private revelations. However ... disturbing remarks are now being heard within the Church... words of apprehension are being uttered by most of the shepherds. Such apprehension, however, is groundless, caused by lack of proper understanding of private revelations ...** false revelations unavoidably have been occurring also, causing confusion. However, should we throw away money because there is counterfeit money? Because there are false private revelations, should we frown upon and ignore private revelations and inspirations themselves? All of the devotional movements and apostolates such as the Eucharistic devotion, the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the Stations of the Cross, the rosary, novena devotions, ... Third Orders of the Franciscans, of St. Vincent, of St. Damian, etc. could not have started in the Church without private revelations ... **One cannot lead a life of faith with public revelations alone.** That is because the life of faith is a living communion with God. A church that only has organization, dogmas and theology would be a cold, lifeless organization ... **This is the very reason why our Church has untiringly defended the need for and the important role of private revelations** by both explanations and actions despite the persistently recurring false private revelations and their harmful effects.<sup>5</sup>

A gravely mistaken notion holds that private revelation may be important to a limited extent, but still cannot make claims which are too lofty, and instead may only sit quietly in a corner and make occasional polite suggestions about a few pious devotional practices.\*

This idea is based on an elementary misreading of the Catechism's text which teaches that no private revelation may claim to **"improve or complete ... surpass or correct"** Public Revelation (§67).

---

\* This and the following paragraphs are adapted from *Thy Will Be Done* (2021)

From the misreading, it then draws a fallacious conclusion, contained nowhere in the Magisterium, and pretends that “*no private revelation may make claims about something surpassing anything found anywhere within Public Revelation.*”

In fact, neither the Catechism nor the Magisterium in general implies that no private revelation may ever *speak of* matters of the greatest possible importance. Approved revelations to many canonized saints, for example, speak much about Heaven—a far more important thing than is spoken of in many portions of Scripture and Magisterium, for the latter have no choice but to often concern themselves with relatively smaller matters when circumstances demand doing so (e.g., St. Paul’s request, in 2 Timothy 4:13, that his cloak left with Carpus be returned!)

Here, the Catechism only declares that private revelation may not claim to *itself* constitute an improvement, completion, surpassing or correcting of Public Revelation. Therefore, there is nothing to preclude even the *greatest* claims being made *within* a private revelation, so long as first, these claims themselves are in accord with Catholic orthodoxy (and as we will see, all of Luisa’s writings are), and second, the texts providing the claims do not propose to *themselves enjoy* superiority to Public Revelation (Luisa’s writings never claim or imply this).

Unfortunately, many examples *can* be given of supposed “revelations” that *do* claim to improve, complete, surpass, or correct Public Revelation, in contradiction of this norm. Hence we can see the great importance of the inclusion of this teaching within the Catechism and the wisdom of its authors.

For example, Islam’s foundational text, the Quran, claims to respect the Bible but also to be a completion and correction of it. The Book of Mormon does not claim to correct the Bible, but it does claim to be a new public revelation, capable of adding to the very foundation of the Christian Faith, and serving as a lens through which to understand the Bible. The wildly popular 20<sup>th</sup>-Century “Catholic” movement, the “Army of Mary,” was based on false “private revelations” which, though pretending to respect the inerrancy of Public Revelation and not proposing to correct it, do claim to *improve and complete it*: for example, these false revelations claimed (among other heresies) that the New Testament’s revelation of the Holy Trinity was true, but only *part* of the Truth: they heretically taught that God really was a “Quinternity” of five Divine persons (including the Virgin Mary, and, conveniently, their own foundress) in one Divine Nature.



In each of these cases (and there are countless others like them), we find an example of an alleged revelation claiming to *itself* “surpass or correct” Public Revelation. But so long as Public Revelation’s superior authority is respected and orthodoxy is maintained, nowhere does the Church place any limits on the magnitude of the claims which a private revelation may make.

The Church, however, has gone further than simply not condemning the existence of tremendous claims in private revelation; it has affirmatively rebuffed the placement of limitations on the significance of private revelation’s claims through the immense degree of approval and exaltation given to the mystic quoted above, St. Faustina. Faustina’s revelations make the most tremendous claims one can imagine. Within the saint’s Diary, we see already saw Jesus’ insistence that her revelations constitute *the* very preparation of the *world* for the Coming of Christ (§429). But they also the demand for the institution of a new Liturgical Feast (Divine Mercy Sunday; §570); the insistence upon the veneration a particular image (the Divine Mercy Image; §49) – a veneration which ensures that the soul who undertakes it “shall not perish” (Ibid.); the clear revelation of a *New and Divine Holiness* (as we will see in the upcoming chapters); and even the offer of an absolute promise, unprecedented in all Church history, that the faithful undertaking of its requests will result in complete remission of all sin *and* punishment – a veritable second Baptism, for it does not entail the same requirements as a plenary indulgence (§300, §699).

None of these extraordinary, unprecedented claims prevented the Church from giving these private revelations the highest possible levels of approval – even though these claims did incite St. Faustina’s writings to spend some time wrongly condemned, placed on the Index of Forbidden Books! Indeed, whenever and wherever God moves to enact His most important plans in the world, one can be certain it will be emphatically opposed by the Pharisees.

While an unfaithful interpretation of some out-of-context excerpts from Luisa’s volumes might incline an unscrupulous reader to succumb to unorthodoxy, a fair assessment of the same yields a clear picture of a private revelation which, though immensely important, nevertheless always and everywhere respects the relationship between private revelation and Public Revelation. We will consider this point further in the chapter dedicated to the KBD’s Conclusion.

## 5. “Serious Errors in the ‘Book of Heaven’”?

At this point, the KBD moves on from the more general concerns, addressed above, and begins quoting selections from Luisa’s volumes. First, the document provides its own text purporting to summarize the quotations from Luisa’s volumes that follow:

[The Book of Heaven] subordinates the salvation of Jesus to the work of ‘Fiat’ through Piccarreta.”...The work of ‘Fiat,’ centered on Piccarreta, who will perform the ‘Third Fiat’, is to complete creation and salvation. (KBD. 1.1)

As we have already seen, this is not true. The Fiat is not “centered on Piccarreta” (it is centered on Jesus and Mary; Luisa’s role is to be the one with whom *Jesus* opens the doors, and the one through whom He will *make it known*), nor does it subordinate the salvific work of Jesus Christ to anyone else. Moreover, the Third Fiat does not so much “complete creation and salvation” as it heralds the “complete *fruit*” of these works of God – *which were already complete in themselves* – being borne out in time.

### What Was Already Accomplished in Christ Remains to Be Fully Accomplished in the Church

“Now in putting everything in subjection to him, he left nothing outside his control. **As it is, we do not yet see everything in subjection to him.**” (Hebrews 2:8)

This is a recurring theme in Luisa’s volumes; namely, that what Jesus accomplished fully *in Himself* still remains to be fully accomplished in His mystical body, the Church. Far from being unique to Luisa’s writings, however, this theme is found throughout both Scripture and Sacred Tradition. The Magisterium teaches:

“This tradition which comes from the Apostles develops in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. For there is a growth in the understanding of the realities and the words which have been handed down ... For as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward toward the fullness of divine truth until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her.” – *Dei Verbum*, §8

“... Even if Revelation is already complete, it has not been made completely explicit; it remains for Christian faith gradually to grasp its full significance over the course of the centuries.”

– *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, §66

The Fathers of the Church were similarly insistent that Public Revelation being complete did not mean that the mission revealed therein was to be forever deprived of great advances in glory. Instead, they taught:

“In His manifestation of truth God does not proceed by violence but by conviction, **gradually integrating truth up to its fullness.**” –St. Gregory of Nazianzus

“Certainly **there is progress [in the Church], even exceedingly great progress! For who is so envious of others and so hateful toward God as to try to prohibit it?** ... It is necessary, therefore, that understanding, knowledge, and wisdom should grow and advance vigorously in individuals as well as in the community, in a single person as well as in the whole church, and this gradually in the course of ages and centuries.” –St. Vincent of Lérins

Assuredly, the mere fact that history has not yet been consummated indicates that God is likewise not yet finished with His work. He will continue to propel the Church forward in holiness until the End of Time, so that when He comes again in the Flesh to command the General Resurrection and the Last Judgment, He finds the Church “made ready as a bride adorned for her husband” (Revelation 21:2) for the great wedding feast of eternity.

“O God, who from living and chosen stones prepare an eternal dwelling for your majesty, increase in your Church the spirit of grace you have bestowed, **so that by new growth your faithful people may build up the heavenly Jerusalem.**” –Collect for the Feast of the Dedication of the Lateran Basilica. Roman Missal.

Seeing, then, that Scripture, Magisterium, and Tradition all make clear the fact that the Church is called to tremendous growth in holiness until the end of time, we are confronted with a simple question: “*What is to prevent Jesus from bringing about the final development in the Church’s sanctity through the instrument of a lowly virgin?*”

**All moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected.** (Pope Pius XII. *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. §47)

## 6. "Re-Writing the History of Salvation"?

In Section 1.2, the KBD states:

'Fiat' is more final and decisive than salvation, and the work of 'Fiat' takes precedence over Jesus' work of salvation. As a result, Christ's salvation becomes incomplete, and all of Jesus' activities are subordinated to 'Fiat.' "...my Will is greater and more endless than Redemption Itself." (19.7.22 – March 19, 1926) "In fact, the Creation was the beginning of Our work toward the creatures, the Redemption was the means, and the Fiat will be the end." (19.12.20 – April 16, 1926) "Therefore, Creation and Redemption must be enclosed in the Supreme Fiat." (19.12.21 – April 16, 1926) (KBD 1.2)

Among 20<sup>th</sup> century mystics, Luisa is far from alone in receiving messages from Jesus which speak of a "New and Divine Holiness" that truly consists in the sanctity of Heaven itself, though is now accessible on earth. Various beatified and even canonized mystics from the 1900s have insisted upon this, and in a moment we will review several such teachings. For now, let us simply take that assertion for granted and consider what it entails, with respect to Catholic dogma, for the relationship between the work of Redemption and the graces of Heaven itself.

It is indisputable that ends are superior to means; this, in fact, is a first principle of rational thought. The relevance of this axiom for the matter at hand is straightforward: the contents of Redemption are not ends in and of themselves; they are means to some other end; namely, Heaven. Had man never fallen, Redemption would not be necessary, yet he would still be called to Heaven.

To illustrate this dynamic, we need only consider that the primary ways Redemption propagates its effects throughout history are found in the Sacraments. Yet, Catholic teaching is clear that in Heaven, there are no more Sacraments. Since the Sacraments are means ordered toward Heaven, there is no reason for the means to be preserved when their own end has been definitively attained. (Although the Sacraments will *always* be needed on earth; even when the Divine Will reigns – we will discuss this point in detail later.)\*

---

\*Although Luisa, and other approved Catholic mystics of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, have indeed described a new era of holiness wherein we may enter into the very state of sanctity enjoyed by the elect in Heaven, it is also true that very important distinctions remain. We will never have the Beatific Vision while on earth; the sanctity now available on earth, instead, consists in doing God's *Will* like the saints in Heaven do; it does *not* consist in enjoying God's unveiled presence like the saints do. Therefore,

## **“The Fiat” is From Jesus and From His Public Revelation – Not From Luisa or His Private Revelations to Luisa**

It is from this perspective that we must approach the tensions noted in the KBD. Whenever Jesus might appear, in His messages to Luisa, to be placing the Third Fiat (Living in the Divine Will) “above” the Second Fiat (Redemption), *this is never an exaltation of Luisa herself above Jesus, Mary, the Apostles, etc.*; nor is it ever an exaltation of her private revelations above those books which constitute Public Revelation, or the Deposit of Faith more broadly. On the contrary, it is simply a recognition of the rudimentary fact that the very highest heights of sanctity are what the Sacraments (and all of the contents of Redemption) are ultimately *ordered towards*.

The Third Fiat already is contained within that Public Revelation (even though, admittedly, Scripture is *primarily* about Redemption). For within that Public Revelation, we read:

“Thy Kingdom Come. **Thy Will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.**” (Matthew 6:10)

“... until **the times of universal restoration**, which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets, from the beginning of the world.” (Acts 3:21)

“**For the creation waits with eager longing** for the revealing of the sons of God; for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope; because the **creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God**. We know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now.” (Romans 8:19-22)

“...it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me...” (Galatians 2:20)

“For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will, according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth.” (Ephesians 1:9-10)

---

even with the “Third Fiat,” that is, “Living in the Divine Will,” the sacraments are always necessary, Faith is always necessary, confirmation in grace is not thus bestowed (sin is still possible), etc. Luisa’s writings affirm all of these important points of Catholic orthodoxy. Although it is true that even the Sacraments themselves are ordered toward Living in the Divine Will, it nevertheless remains the case that even if a soul were known to be living in the Divine Will on earth, the Sacraments (and everything else constitutive of the Catholic Faith) would still be necessary for him; since – among other reasons--nothing is absolutely definitive until Heaven.

**“Therefore, a sabbath rest still remains for the people of God.”**  
(Hebrews 4:9)

Obviously, Luisa’s writings expound upon the Third Fiat much more than Scripture does. This does not mean the Third Fiat is “from” Luisa, or even “from” Jesus’ private revelations to her. It is not. It is *from* Him, and it is *from* His Public Revelation.

“Stir up the will of your faithful, we pray, O Lord, that, striving more eagerly to **bring your divine work to fruitful completion**, they may receive in greater measure the healing remedies your kindness bestows.” –Collect for the 34th Week in Ordinary Time. Roman Missal.

**“For He did not at all say, “Thy will be done” in me, or in us, but everywhere on the earth;** so that error may be destroyed, and truth implanted, and all wickedness cast out, and virtue return, and no difference in this respect be henceforth between heaven and earth. “For if this come to pass,” saith He, **“there will be no difference between things below and above,** separated as they are in nature; the earth exhibiting to us another set of angels.” (St. John Chrysostom. Homily XIX, §7)

Finally, let us recall something absolutely basic and common sense: **“First in intention is last in execution.”** This is a foundational philosophical axiom. From its consideration, we can clearly see that God is at work leading the Church towards something greater--by the mere fact that we still exist in time. Our time on earth is not merely a waiting room for Heaven. It is, rather, the theater of salvation and sanctification; whereas the acts within this theater are destined to grow ever more greater until the arrival of the dénouement. As we have already noted, this “greater” thing is most emphatically not a new Public Revelation (that will never happen). But it is certainly the bearing of the complete fruit which ultimately derives from the seed contained within Public Revelation.

## **Redemption is Ordered Towards Something: The Traditional Catholic Perspective**

Although the distinction we are now considering is, in Luisa’s writings, presented through new terminology, it is nevertheless one as old as the Faith itself.

Only a Protestantized approach to Christianity exalts Redemption itself to a definitive and supreme status. The Catholic understanding—from the beginning—has always held that our calling is

not merely to be redeemed, but to aspire towards Divinization. (And, in the Gift of Living in the Divine Will, we find this process of Divinization actualized to the fullest extent possible for a creature.) Redemption is simply the beginning of that process. The Fathers of the Church taught:

**St. Augustine:** "Of [Christ's] own will he was born for us today, in time, so that he could lead us to his Father's eternity. God became man so that man might become God." (Office of Readings. Saturday before Epiphany)

**St. Gregory of Nazianzus:** "[God] continues to wear the Body which He assumed, **until He make me God by the power of His Incarnation.**" (*Oration* 30. Paragraph XIV)

**St. Irenaeus:** "The Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who did, through His transcendent love, become what we are, **that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself.**" (*Against Heresies*. V)

**St. Clement of Alexandria:** "The Word of God became man, **that thou mayest learn from man how man may become God.**" (*Exhortation to the Heathen*. Chapter 1)

Therefore, it has been clear from the earliest ages of the Church that Redemption is ordered towards something beyond itself. Public Revelation gave us a complete foundation which details Redemption. Yet foundations exist to be *built* upon; to support perhaps even a breathtaking cathedral topped with a solid gold steeple.

"Brothers and sisters: You are God's building. According to the grace of God given to me, like a wise master builder I laid a foundation, and another is building upon it." -1 Corinthians 3:9-10

This analysis does not constitute a mark against Redemption, or Public Revelation, or the salvific work of Jesus Christ, any more than looking at a young tree and awaiting the day when that tree bears its *own* fruit is a mark against the sapling.

"I dwelt in the apostles, and they did not experience My presence in the way that you do. ... I will bestow on [souls] even greater graces there than on the saints of centuries past." (Jesus to Bl. Angela of Foligno, 14<sup>th</sup>-Century Franciscan mystic.) [Bl. Angela:] "[Jesus] promised to give to His new friends, if He finds them, greater graces than He gave to the ancients."<sup>6</sup>

Having established the fact that Redemption is ordered towards something beyond itself, and that God – throughout the centuries – imparts growth to the Church *towards* this pinnacle of sanctification, we should accordingly *expect* to see this growth reach its climax in

“later times.” And this is exactly what we see across 20<sup>th</sup> Century Catholic mysticism. A thorough treatment of this matter can be found in *Thy Will Be Done* (2021); for now, a few brief teachings will suffice.

## A “New Era” of Holiness: A Common Theme in Approved 20<sup>th</sup> Century Mysticism

The eminent Dominican theologian, Fr. Marie Michel Philipon, saw clearly that we had arrived at a unique moment in Church History. While commenting on the revelations of Blessed Conchita Cabrera de Armida (beatified in 2019), in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, he wrote: **“We are incontestably in a new era of spirituality.”**<sup>7</sup> His assessment is confirmed by the contents of this Beatified mystic’s writings, in which we see the Gift of Living in the Divine Will clearly revealed, though referred to by another name, the “Mystical Incarnation”:

My soul empty of all else, I [Conchita] received [Jesus] in Communion ... [Jesus said to me:] “Here I am, I want to incarnate Myself mystically in your heart ...” [Conchita responds:] **“Would it be, my Jesus, Spiritual marriage?”** [Jesus says:] **“Much more than that... it is the grace of incarnating Me, of living and growing in your soul, never to leave it, to possess you and to be possessed by you as in one and the same substance ... in a compenetration which cannot be comprehended: it is the grace of graces ... It is a union of the same nature as that of the union of heaven, except that in paradise the veil which conceals the Divinity disappears ... For you [will now] keep ever in your soul my real and effective presence.”** – A dialogue between Jesus and Bl. Conchita<sup>8</sup>

Another 20<sup>th</sup> century mystic, Blessed Dina Belanger, received similar revelations from the Lord. Jesus told her:

**I wish to deify you in the same manner that I united my Humanity to my Divinity in the Incarnation ...** The degree of holiness that I desire for you is my own Holiness, in its infinite plenitude, the Holiness of My Father realized in you by Me.<sup>9</sup>

Explaining these graces in her own words, Bl. Dina writes:

This grace which the Trinity of my God grants me with so much love is a foretaste of my participation in the divine life; I say a foretaste, **because it is the state of the elect in heaven, yet I, in bodily form, am still on earth...**[Now] my soul can dwell in heaven, live there without any backward glance toward earth,



and yet continue to animate my material being ... My union with the Heart of Jesus has been like his Real Presence after holy communion, while the consecrated Host is still with me.<sup>10</sup> [Jesus] gave me His spirit in place of my own; His judgment so that I might appreciate things, happenings, people in the way He wished. After that, **He replaced my will with His own**; then I felt a great strength which urged me on towards good and compelled me to refuse Him nothing.<sup>11</sup>

St. Faustina's private revelations, contained in her Diary, *Divine Mercy in My Soul*, express the same teaching. She referred to the Gift as an "unprecedented grace" causing the divinization and "transconsecration" of the soul, wherein the Will of God takes the place of the human will. One day she prayed:

"O Divine Will, You are the delight of my heart, the food of my soul, the light of my intellect, the omnipotent strength of my will; for **when I unite myself with Your will, O Lord, Your power works through me and takes the place of my feeble will.**" (Diary, §650)

Jesus Himself even told this saint:

"You will cancel out your will absolutely in this retreat and, instead, My complete will shall be accomplished in you. [On the following page in her diary a large "X" appears, and these words of Faustina are seen:] "From today on, my own will does not exist." (§374)

"Host pleasing to My Father, know, My daughter, that the entire Holy Trinity finds Its special delight in you, because you live exclusively by the will of God. No sacrifice can compare with this." (§955)

St. Faustina also wrote:

"However, the soul receiving this **unprecedented grace of union with God** cannot say that it sees God face to face, because even here there is a very thin veil of faith, but so very thin that the soul can say that it sees God and talks with Him. **It is "divinized."** God allows the soul to know how much He loves it, and the soul sees that **better and holier souls than itself have not received this grace.** Therefore, it is filled with holy amazement, which maintains it in deep humility, and it steps itself in its own nothingness and holy astonishment; and the more it humbles itself, the more closely God unites himself with it and descends to it." (§771)

In perfect agreement with the private revelations of Luisa, Bl. Conchita, and Bl. Belanger, St. Faustina insists that this “unprecedented grace of union with God” was precisely the holiness of Heaven itself:

“The veils of mystery hinder me not at all; I love You as do Your chosen ones in heaven,” (§1324)

“I live Your divine life **as do the elect in heaven...**” (§1393)

## **This “New Holiness” is Not Restricted to Luisa or to Those Who Read Her Writings**

Clearly, something “new” is happening here. The mystics quoted above repeatedly speak of an even higher degree of holiness, now available, which was previously inaccessible on earth (pre-20<sup>th</sup> century mysticism never spoke of a degree of holiness, accessible on earth, that surpassed even spiritual marriage). Many of their contemporaries could also be quoted here, but are excluded for the sake of space.

Equally clear, however, is the fact that it would be illicit to accuse such claims of constituting “doctrinal error,” since they have already received the very highest levels of Church approval, and the mystics themselves have been Beatified and even Canonized.

Moreover, the magnitude of the claims in Luisa’s writings is *not* beyond those made in the mystics quoted above. Although Jesus’ words to Luisa go into greater detail on the nature of this holiness, all such details merely consist in further commentary on those basic words, “Thy Will be done on earth as it is in heaven.” (Matthew 6:10)

Luisa is indeed the first contemporary soul called into this type of sanctity, wherein the holiness of Heaven is lived on earth (*it is no mere coincidence that we see a deluge of mystics, speaking of the “holiness of Heaven now on earth,” but only saying this after 1889, when Luisa first received the Gift*)—and, as we have already discussed, she is the primary soul through whom Jesus has chosen to make this message known.

Neither of these considerations, however, present any doctrinal concerns whatsoever. If God is going to do something new in the world, then obviously *someone* must be the first to receive it, and someone must be the primary channel through which this new thing becomes known. And I repeat that it should not be scandalizing to hear that, for such a great task as “Living in the Divine Will,” Jesus chose an ordinary, lowly virgin.

A few promoters of the Divine Will have, unfortunately, made false claims with no basis in Jesus’ words to Luisa. They have implied

that it is impossible for anyone to receive the Gift of Living in the Divine Will except through rigorous study of Luisa's own writings. This, indeed, constitutes an illicit and even unorthodox exaltation of Luisa herself. But this view is contradicted by none other than Jesus' words to Luisa. He told her:

"Therefore, my daughter, it can be said that with you I have opened the doors, to let you enter to live in Our house, in Our Divine Will." (February 11, 1930)

"Now, **since I have opened the doors, others may enter, provided that they dispose themselves for such a great good.**" (January 24, 1923)

This is not to detract from the great value of reading Luisa's writings. Jesus often reminds Luisa of how much power is contained within them and how much grace flows into our hearts when we meditate upon them.

On the other hand, Jesus explicitly contradicts the view that either Luisa herself, or Luisa's writings, are strictly necessary to live in the Divine Will. For He clearly tells her that, now that the doors have been opened to living in the Divine Will by one contemporary soul first entering (that is, by way of Luisa first receiving this gift in the year 1889), any people who "dispose themselves" to live in the Divine Will can do so. Jesus even tells Luisa what exactly this "disposition" consists in, saying:

"My good daughter, **it is very easy to enter My Will**... You must know that the first indispensable thing in order to enter My Fiat is wanting and firmly yearning to Live in It. The second thing is to take the first step since, once the first step is done, My Divine Will surrounds the creature with so much Light and attraction that she loses any desire to do her own will." (May 6, 1938)

Even though this passage is found in Luisa's final volume (the 36<sup>th</sup>), it nevertheless contains Jesus' insistence that living in the Divine Will simply requires "firmly yearning" to do so and "taking the first step." There is nothing "Gnostic" here (we will address that accusation later), nor is there any illicit emphasis placed on Luisa's writings as if they were categorical necessities in order to receive God's grace. In another passage, Jesus tells Luisa:

"... if [your will] wants the life of Our Will into its own — [which is] wanted, commanded by Us with such great longing ... it will have the great good of possessing Our Will as life. And if it were not so, the sanctity of living in my Will would be a difficult sanctity, and almost impossible, while neither do I know how to teach

difficult things, nor do I want impossible things. On the contrary, it is my usual way to make easy, as much as it is possible for the creature, the most difficult things and the hardest sacrifices..." (March 19, 1935)

In both instances (and there are many others we could cite), neither devotion to Luisa herself, nor even any knowledge of her writings, is described as a prerequisite for the Gift.

This flexibility is in stark contradiction to that of Redemption and Public Revelation, wherein explicit knowledge of these great goods is absolutely necessary; indeed, the Sacraments are objectively necessary for salvation, hence the urgent need of evangelizing the world. Here, too, we see that although Jesus is announcing a great message through Luisa, her role is *not* comparable to (much less is it superior to!) that of Jesus, Mary, or the Apostles. Neither Luisa nor her writings are even objectively necessary for Living in the Divine Will, much less for salvation.

Indeed, none of the mystics quoted earlier had any knowledge of Luisa, yet they all clearly lived in the Divine Will; even describing this Gift in strikingly similar terms (often times identical ones) as we see it described by Jesus to Luisa.

\*\*\*

While the "newness" of what we are here discussing cannot be denied, these teachings are in fact as solidly established in Scripture and Tradition as one could ever expect any development to be. While various false "private revelations" (some of which we referenced earlier) propose a development in blatant rupture with Scripture and Tradition, Luisa's writings are as harmonious with the same as is the crescendo of a classical masterpiece with the movements that precede it and build up to it. For 2,000 years, the greatest developments of Sacred Tradition's growth have consisted in those teachings within it—proposed by Fathers, Doctors, Popes, and Saints—that have led us, step by step, towards an ever greater and deeper understanding of the extraordinary union of wills God ultimately desires from His creatures. This process is described in detail within Part Two of *Thy Will Be Done* (2021).

And while some are, sadly, bound to be scandalized by anything new, the Magisterium of the Church rejects such a spiritual posture:

**All moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected.** (Pope Pius XII. *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. §47)

## Luisa's Writings Confirm and Glorify the Catholic View of Salvation History

The present section of the KBD claims that Luisa's writings purport to "rewrite the history of salvation." (KBD 1.2) But this is simply not true. In the volumes, Jesus repeatedly discusses the intricacies of Salvation History, and in each such case He not only confirms the Catholic understanding of the same, but beautifully and powerfully expounds upon it.

The KBD does not note which passages from Luisa's writings allegedly undertake this "rewriting," therefore, without anything specific to address, we will here simply consider excerpts from several passages that contain teachings on this matter; teachings that Jesus did in fact give to Luisa:

**...do you want to know why Adam sinned? Because he forgot that I loved him, and he forgot to love Me ... So, love ceased first, and then sin began;** and as he ceased to love his God, true love towards himself also ceased ... This is why, in coming upon earth, the thing on which I placed greatest importance was that they love one another as they were loved by Me, in order to give them my first love, to let the love of the Most Holy Trinity hover over the earth... (September 6, 923)

My daughter, terrible indeed was the moment of the fall of Adam. As he rejected Our Divine Will to do his own, Our Fiat was in act of withdrawing from the heavens, from the sun and from all Creation to reduce It to nothing ... **If it wasn't that the Eternal Word offered His foreseen merits of the future Redeemer, as He offered them to preserve the Immaculate Virgin from original sin, everything would had gone to ruin:** the heavens, the sun, would have withdrawn into Our source; and as Our Divine Will withdraws, all created things would lose life. But the Word [foreseen Incarnate] presented Himself before the Divinity, and making present all of His foreseen merits, all things remained in their place, and my Fiat continued His creating and preserving work, waiting for my Humanity in order to give it as legitimate gift, which I deserved; so much so, that the solemn promise was given to man, after his fall, that the future Redeemer would descend to save him, so that he would pray and dispose himself to receive Him ... **If it wasn't for my Humanity, everything was lost for man. (October 7, 1929)**

My daughter, my Love was not extinguished because of the fall of man, but became more ignited; and even though my Justice justly punished him and condemned him, **my Love, kissing my**

**Justice, without delay promised the future Redeemer, and said to the deceitful serpent, with the empire of my Power: 'You have made use of a woman to snatch man from my Divine Will, and I, by means of another woman, who will have in Her power the Power of my Fiat, will knock down your pride, and with Her immaculate foot, She will crush your head.'** These words burned the infernal serpent more than hell itself. (May 19, 1931)

... in the Flood, in which only **Noah, by obeying Our Will and through the prolixity of his long sacrifice of building the ark, deserved to be saved with his family, and to find in his acts the continuation of the long generation in which the promised Messiah was to come.** A prolonged and continuous sacrifice possesses such attraction and enrapturing force before the Supreme Being, as to make Him decide to give great goods and continuation of life to the human kind. **If Noah had not obeyed and had not sacrificed himself in carrying out a work so long, he himself would have been swept away in the Flood, and since he would not have saved himself, the world, the new generation, would have ended.** (March 12, 1930)

My daughter, it is indeed true that the Supreme Being made Its marriage with humanity at the beginning of Creation; and it happened as to a husband, when his wicked wife induces him to separate in court. But, in spite of this, an affection remains in his heart, and he thinks and yearns that, if his chosen one should change, "who knows... I may once again be able to unite and bind myself with her with the bond of marriage"; and therefore he often lets news reach her ear through messengers – that he loves her. So God did: even though the marriage with humanity was unbound in the divine court, He kept an affection and, though far away, he longed for the new bond of marriage with humanity; so much so, that He did not destroy the palace which He had formed with so much sumptuousness and magnificence, nor did He take away from her the good of the sun that formed the day, but He left everything, so that the very one who had offended Him might make use of it. Even more, He maintained the correspondence by choosing, from the very beginning of the world, now one of the good, now another, who were like messengers. And like many postmen, some brought the little letters, some the telegrams, some the phone calls from Heaven, in which it was announced that the far away spouse had not forgotten her, that he loved her, and that he wanted the return of the ungrateful spouse. **So, in the Old Testament, the more I multiplied the good, the patriarchs and the prophets, the more pressing were the invitations and the mail that ran between Heaven and earth,**

through which God was sending news—that He desired the new union. This is so true that, unable to contain the ardor of His love any longer, and since decayed humanity was not yet disposed at that time, He made an exception, espousing the Virgin Queen [the Virgin Mary] and the Humanity of the Word with bond of true marriage, so that, by virtue of them, decayed humanity might be lifted up again and I might form the marriage with the entire humanity. (June 16, 1928)

My daughter, all the Good of the history of the world is founded upon the sacrifice that is wanted of creatures by My Supreme Will; and the greater the sacrifice that We ask of her, the more Good We enclose in it. ... you must know that at that point of the history of the world creatures deserved to exist no more—all should have perished. Noah, by accepting Our Mandate and by exposing himself to the great sacrifice, and for so many years, of building the ark, bought back the world and all the future generations. As he went on sacrificing himself for so prolixious a time, of hardships, of toils, of sweat, so did he pour out the coins, not of gold or silver, but of his whole being in act of following Our Volition. In this way he put in enough coins to be able to buy back what was about to be destroyed. So, if the world still exists, they owe it to Noah who, with his sacrifices and by doing Our Will the Way We wanted him to do it, saved man and everything that was to serve man. ...After another length of time of the history of the world, Abraham came, and Our Volition commanded him to sacrifice his own son. This was a hard sacrifice for a poor father; it can be said that God put the man to the test and demanded a proof that was inhuman and almost impossible to execute. But God has the Right to ask whatever He wants and any sacrifice He wants. Poor Abraham—he was put in such constraints that his heart bled, and he felt death within himself, and the fatal blow that he was to strike over his only son. The sacrifice was exuberant; so much so, that Our Paternal Goodness wanted the execution of it, but not the completion, knowing that he could not have lived—he would have died of grief after an act so harrowing, of killing his own son, because it was an act that surpassed the strengths of his nature. But Abraham accepted everything—he was heedless of everything, either of his son or of his very self, while feeling consumed with sorrow in his own son. If Our Volition, just as It commanded it, had not prevented the fatal act, even though he would have died together with his beloved son, he would still have accomplished the sacrifice wanted by Us. Now, this sacrifice, wanted by Us, was great, exuberant and **unique in the history of the world**. Well then, this very sacrifice elevated

him so high, that he was constituted by Us head and father of the human generations; and by the sacrifice of sacrificing his son, he poured out coins of blood and of intense sorrow to buy back the future Messiah, for the Jewish people and for all. In fact, after the sacrifice of Abraham, We made Ourselves heard often in the midst of creatures, that which We did not do before. The sacrifice had the virtue of drawing Us closer to them; and We formed the Prophets, up to the time when the longed-for Messiah came. ... Daughter, when I want to give a Great Good, a New Good to creatures, I give New Crosses and I want a New and Unique sacrifice—a cross for which the human can give itself no reason; but **there is My Divine Reason, that man is obliged to not investigate, but to lower his forehead and adore it.** (June 26, 1932)

Listen then: **my conception in the womb of a Virgin was the greatest work of the whole history of the world.** By Our Fiat just wanting it so, It incarnated Itself, without anyone one forcing Us, or deserving it, and with no need on Our part. The need was Our love, and only because it wanted it so. It was an act so great as to enclose and embrace all, and it contained so much love as to seem incredible, so much so, that Heaven and earth are still astounded and enraptured, and all felt invaded by so much love as to be able to feel my Life conceived within all. (September 28, 1935)

My daughter, if Rome has the primacy of my Church, she owes it to Jerusalem, because the beginning of Redemption was precisely in Jerusalem... the first people who received the good of It, were from this city. The first criers of the Gospel, those who established Catholicism in Rome, were my Apostles, all from Jerusalem—that is, from this fatherland. Now there will be an exchange: if Jerusalem gave to Rome the life of religion and therefore of Redemption, Rome will give to Jerusalem the Kingdom of the Divine Will. And this is so true, that just as I chose a Virgin from the little town of Nazareth for the Redemption, so I have chosen another virgin in a little town of Italy belonging to Rome, to whom the mission of the Kingdom of the Divine Fiat has been entrusted. And since It must be known in Rome, just as my coming upon earth was known in Jerusalem, Rome will have the great honor of requiting Jerusalem for the great gift received from her, which is Redemption, by making known to her the Kingdom of my Will. Then will Jerusalem repent of her ingratitude, and will embrace the life of the religion which she gave to Rome; and, grateful, she will receive from Rome the life and the great gift of the Kingdom of my Divine Will. And not only Jerusalem, but all the other nations will receive from Rome the great gift of the



Kingdom of my Fiat... (October 3, 1928)

My daughter, when Adam sinned God gave him the promise of the future Redeemer. Centuries passed and the promise did not fail, therefore human generations enjoyed the blessings of the Redemption. **Now, by My coming from heaven to form the Kingdom of Redemption, I made another more solemn promise before departing for heaven: The Kingdom of My Will on earth, which is contained in the 'Our Father' prayer... So after I formed this prayer in the presence of My heavenly Father, certain that he would grant Me the Kingdom of My Divine Will on earth, I taught it to My apostles so that they might teach it to the whole world, and that one might be the cry of all: 'Your Will be done on earth as it is in heaven.'** A promise more sure and solemn I could not make [...] My very prayer to the heavenly Father, 'May it come, may your kingdom come and your Will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' meant that with My coming to earth the Kingdom of My Will was not established among creatures, otherwise I would have said, 'My Father, may Our kingdom that I have already established on earth be confirmed, and let Our Will dominate and reign.' Instead I said, 'May it come.' This means that it must come and souls must await it with the same certainty with which they awaited the future Redeemer. For My Divine Will is bound and committed to the words of the 'Our Father.' And when My Divine Will binds itself, whatever it promises is more than certain to come to pass. Furthermore, since everything was prepared by Me, nothing else is needed but the manifestation of My Kingdom, which is what I am doing." (February 5, 1928)

[Luisa writes:] After this, I continued my round in all that Our Lord did on earth and I stopped in the Act of Resurrection. What Triumph, what Glory. Heaven poured Itself on earth to be spectator of such a great Glory. My beloved Jesus said: "**My daughter, in My Resurrection, the right was given to creatures to Rise Again in Me to New Life. It was the Confirmation, the Seal of My whole Life, My Works and My Words. If I came on earth it was to give to each and every one My Resurrection,** as their own-to give them Life and make them Rise Again in My own Resurrection." (April 20, 1938)

"Now, the portent of my Redemption was the Resurrection, which, more than refulgent sun, crowned my Humanity, making even my littlest acts shine, with such splendor and marvel as to astonish Heaven and earth. The Resurrection will be the beginning, the foundation and the fulfillment of all goods - crown and

glory of all the Blessed. My Resurrection is the true sun which worthily glorifies my Humanity; It is the Sun of the Catholic Religion; It is the glory of every Christian. Without Resurrection, it would have been as though heavens without sun, without heat and without life." (April 15, 1919)

\*\*\*

One would be hard pressed to find messages given in any other private revelations throughout history that describe the Catholic view of Salvation History so beautifully as these. It is radically unjust to accuse Luisa's writings of "rewriting" or "replacing" Salvation History.

## 7. "Identity and Mission of Luisa Piccarreta"

The following section (§2) of the KBD states that "*Piccarreta is depicted as a replacement for Jesus' role in the salvation history. Piccarreta is a person chosen in advance to be an instrument to replace Jesus' salvation.*" As we have seen from the selections above from Luisa's writings, no assessment could be further from the truth.

There is absolutely no teaching presented, anywhere in Luisa's writings, wherein she is treated as a "replacement" for Jesus Christ. If we were to collate here the passages from Luisa's volumes wherein it is emphasized everything about The Fiat proceeds entirely from Jesus alone, the present document would quickly become hundreds of pages long. Indeed, Luisa's volumes are all radically and thoroughly Christocentric. He is repeatedly described as the source of everything. For now, it will suffice to note that all such passages relay the same understanding conveyed in the ones below:

"...grace is nothing other than to possess Me, and since I alone am the enchanting object that enchants the whole of paradise and forms all the contentments of the Blessed, the soul, by possessing grace, possesses her paradise wherever she is." (November 27, 1899)

"Only your Jesus can and knows how to love in this way. **No one can claim to be able to reach Me in my Love**; and I Myself can do this for one who lives in my Will." (June 6, 1938)

"...do you think that your patience, the constancy and the peace of this state of yours is your own, or rather, the fruit and the grace of the One who dwells in you? I alone possess these gifts" (September 12, 1906)

"Only your Jesus contains the virtue of forming all things, and the greatest things, with one single act, because I contain the creative power. But the creature, by dint of repeating the same act, forms the good she wants to do, bit by bit." (October 4, 1925)

"My daughter, all human lives are in my Humanity in Heaven as though inside a cloister; and since they are inside my cloister, the regime of their lives comes from Me. Not only this, but my Humanity, being the cloister, conducts the lives of each soul. (December 28, 1903)

"I want to Honor My Celestial Mother. I want to narrate the story of Her Immaculate Conception. Only I can speak of it, being Author of so Great a Prodigy...We centralized everything in this Conception of the Virgin. In Our Divine Fiat, in which past and future do not exist, the Incarnation of the Word was held present,

and It made Her Conceived and incarnated in the same Incarnation of Me, future Redeemer. My Blood that was in act as if I Myself were shedding it, continually sprinkled Her, embellished Her, Confirmed Her, and fortified Her in a Divine Way." (December 8, 1936)

Clearly, these writings cannot be accused of neglecting the primacy of Jesus Christ, much less of "replacing" Jesus with Luisa. The KBD next states:

Piccarreta is a missionary of a new era who will fulfill the will of Jesus in the era of 'Fiat', a person prepared in advance from the eternal will of God, and a privileged being who opens the new era. She is even described as someone who existed before Adam and Eve.

Although the first sentence above is not entirely inaccurate, the following claim—that Luisa existed before Adam and Eve—would certainly constitute a uniquely bizarre one, as it is widely known that Luisa was born on the second Sunday of Easter (now known as Divine Mercy Sunday) in the year 1865. In fact, no claim is found within Luisa's volumes that she existed before her conception in the womb of her own mother in 1864, much less that she existed before Adam and Eve! We will consider this point in detail next.

## **Anyone Who Lives in the Divine Will is "First," in One Sense**

The KBD presents one quotation from Luisa's volumes allegedly supporting its accusation, but only a grave misinterpretation of that passage would lead one to conclude that Luisa existed before her own conception. The passage, as presented in the KBD, is as follows:

"I was fusing all of myself in the Holy Divine Will, and in doing this, as the littlest of all, I place myself ahead of all generations, even before Adam and Eve were created, so that, before they would sin, I may prepare, ahead of them, the act of reparation to the Divine Majesty, ... so as to cover all the acts of creatures with His Divine Will, and therefore be able to bind the human will, which had split off, with the Divine, and make them one." (16.39.1-2–February 8, 1924)

As even the quote provided in the KBD indicates, this "placing oneself before Adam and Eve" is *only and entirely* described within the context of "fusing oneself in the Divine Will." This "fusing," and the concomitant undertaking of the "Rounds," is a recurring theme in Luisa's writings. Through the "Rounds," one offers back to God—in the Divine Will—all that He has done, thereby glorifying Him as we

“impress” our own praise and adoration of Him even in those acts of which we obviously had no literal, physical part. Here we should also note that everyone is just as capable of doing this as Luisa is; there is nothing unique about Luisa undertaking the “Rounds” and even, in the Will of God, “placing oneself before Adam and Eve.”

Even later sentences within the very same passage the KBD here quotes (but which it excludes) give important context for understanding what was said. The following sentences of the message from February 8, 1924, read:

I [Luisa] said to myself: *‘Instead of placing myself ahead of everyone in the Most Holy Will, I should rather put myself behind everyone, even behind the last man who will come. Since I am the most abject and the most miserable of all, it is the last place that befits me.’* Now, while I was doing this, my beloved Jesus came out from within my interior, and taking my hand, told me: “My little daughter, in my Will **the little ones** must be ahead of all; even more, inside my womb. ... And since Our Will envelops everyone, may that thought of yours... in Our Will be the thought of all, that act, that love, shine in each thought, word and act of all generations, and in the power of Our Will, may they become antidotes, defenders, lovers, operators, etc. If you knew with what love Our Celestial Father awaits you, and the joy, the contentment He feels in seeing you, so little, bring the whole Creation onto His lap, to give Him the requital of all.... He feels the glory, the joys, the amusements of the purpose of Creation come back to Him.” (February 8, 1924)

As we can see, Luisa thought nothing of herself. (Jesus even tells Luisa that He chose her precisely because of her “littleness.”) This littleness of Luisa is intended to inspire all who read her writings to realize that, no matter how unworthy they may feel, they too are called to live in the Divine Will. They too are called to do these “Rounds,” thereby spiritually “placing themselves within all God has done,” so as to offer it all back to Him – even in the Divine Act of Creation itself, before Adam and Eve existed. Note that Jesus says the little “ones” (in the plural) are those who must come “first.” Therefore, this placement is in no way unique to Luisa.

It is from this same perspective that we must understand the other quotes from Luisa’s writings that the KBD presents under this heading. For example, the document also quotes the following passage:

“And this, by right and with justice, because, as firstborn, to her [Luisa] did my Will entrust everything—gave everything, therefore

in her is the origin of all things, the cause for which Creation was created, ... She who was to be the firstborn daughter of Our Will was the primary cause of all the works of a God..." (20.9.7–October 12, 1926) (KBD 2.1)

Here, too, Luisa only contains the “origin of all things” in a similar sense *anyone* who enters into the Divine Will contains them, inasmuch as they dwell fully within the same Divinity from which all things proceed. Later in the same passage quoted by the KBD, Jesus tells Luisa: **“one who lives in my Will is always the first before her Creator; and even if she is born later in time, this says nothing: in Our Will, one who has never gone out of It is always first.”** (October 12, 1926) Jesus is speaking generally to *any* “one” who “lives in His Will,” not only to Luisa. He also reiterates the obvious truth: nothing can alter the chronological placement of our birth.

Therefore, nothing changes the fact that, literally speaking, we had nothing to do with anything that came before our own existence, which began only with our own conception. However, a fundamental theme of Luisa’s writings is that, by entering into the Divine Will, we—in a certain sense—“take possession” of all that God has done (again, simply in order to offer it back to Him with our own adoration and praise “impressed” upon it). Now, it is true that Luisa was the first contemporary soul to live in the Divine Will; the one with whom Jesus, as we noted above, “opened the doors.” This primacy is not unimportant, nor is it inconsequential. There is no denying that many passages in Luisa’s writings contain teachings from Jesus emphasizing Luisa’s importance *with respect to this mission*. But the differences such primacy entails between Luisa and anyone else who lives in the Divine Will are differences of degree, not of kind. On the other hand, the difference between Luisa and Jesus, or even the difference between Luisa and the Virgin Mary, are *radical differences in kind*.

It would obviously be utterly outlandish to claim certain prerogatives for ourselves, as if someone who lives in the Divine Will (Luisa, or anyone) literally *caused* Creation, or Redemption, etc. Such a claim as this would, in fact, be *so* bizarre and heretical that it would be similarly outlandish to suppose that the Church would grant an *imprimatur* to a text that actually proposed such a notion. The Church, however, *did* grant many *imprimaturs* to Luisa’s texts precisely because it is clear to those who read them in context that such notions (as those which the KBD falsely attributes to Luisa’s writings) are grave misinterpretations of Jesus’ words to Luisa.

## 8. “A ‘Living Sacrifice’ On Behalf of Jesus”

In Section 2.2, the KBD states:

Piccarreta gives the same effect and value to her suffering as the suffering of Christ, and understands her suffering as an act of reparation for the sins of mankind (KBD 2.2)

On the contrary, Luisa only ever thought and spoke about her own status in the very lowliest and most humble of terms. Moreover, at no point is Luisa’s suffering placed on the same level as Christ’s. In fact, among the most important aspects of Luisa’s writings are the “Hours of the Passion,” wherein Luisa (and all of those who read them), meditate on the Passion of Jesus and re-offer all of His pains to the Father in reparation for sins.

Luisa was, however, certainly a “victim soul.” She—like other victim souls (many of whom are canonized saints)—did indeed become a living sacrifice in reparation for the sins of mankind. This is a thoroughly Catholic notion, based on Scripture (“*Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I am filling up what is lacking in the afflictions of Christ on behalf of his body, which is the church...*” Colossians 1:24), and there is nothing problematic, much less heretical, found within it.

All of the allegedly problematic quotes from Luisa’s writings presented in this section by the KBD are as follows:

“Come to offer yourself before Divine justice as victim of reparation for the offenses that are given. (In Korean translation: cont. A living sacrifice that makes amends for the countless sins that continue to be committed.” (1.18.16)

“I accepted everything the Lord wanted, and so in the evening I was surprised by that state of sufferings, and I remained in it for three consecutive days.” (1.24.17)

“If you are willing to sacrifice yourself entirely, to abandon yourself into my arms as a living sacrifice of love, expiation, and reparation for the eternal salvation of all...” (1.27.8)

“My daughter, I make use of you in order to continue my Passion. Since my glorified body can no longer be capable of suffering, by coming into you, I make use of your body just as I used mine during the course of my mortal life, to be able to continue to suffer my Passion, and therefore to be able to offer you as living victim of reparation and propitiation before Divine Justice.” (2.45.3—July 9, 1899)

There are no doctrinal problems or even difficulties in any of these quotations. They resemble what one will find in many canonized and beatified mystics. For example, St. Faustina wrote:

At eight o'clock I was seized with such violent pains that I had to go to bed at once. I was convulsed with pain for three hours; that is, until eleven o'clock at night. .... At times, the pains caused me to lose consciousness. Jesus had me realize that in this way I took part in His Agony in the Garden, and that He himself allowed these sufferings in order to offer reparation to God for the souls murdered in the wombs of wicked mothers. (*Diary*, 1276)

Jesus even told St. Gemma Galgani:

"My child, I have need of victims; strong victims, in order to appease the just anger of my Divine Father. I need souls who, by their sufferings, trials and sacrifices, make amends for sinners and for their ingratitude. Oh, if I could make all understand how angry My Father is by the impious world!"<sup>12</sup>

And St. Gemma herself wrote:

"I am happy in every way that Jesus wills, and if Jesus wants the sacrifice of my life, I give it to Him at once. If He wants anything else, I am ready. One thing alone is enough for me; to be his victim, in order to atone for my innumerable sins, and if possible, for those of the whole world...

Jesus knows of my disposition to suffer everything to make reparation for my sins. He sees once again the pain I feel at all my ingratitude and also the pain I suffer when I see Him so mistreated. On Friday then I propose to do this: with a contrite heart I will go in front of Jesus ready to receive from His hand anything that will please Him in reparation for the many outrages that He receives. Strike me; strike me Jesus. I will bless a million times the hand that will exert upon me a most just chastisement. So dear Dad, I ask Jesus to have me suffer; and to suffer much...

...Therefore Jesus do not abandon poor sinners. I am ready to do something. You died on the Cross, make me die also on the cross. They [sinners] are all your children... do not abandon them. Jesus, I want to save them all... am I not the one that must suffer for them? Therefore cast Your anger at me. You have so many sinners, but You have so few victims."<sup>13</sup>

Countless other canonized and beatified mystics could here be cited. These holy men and women relayed teachings that are identical to those found in Luisa's volumes on the call to be a true "living sacrifice on behalf of Jesus."



## 9. A “Substitutionary Mediator”?

Section 2.3 of the KBD states:

Piccarreta is a substitutionary mediator who prevents the wrath to come by receiving the suffering of Jesus instead.

Jesus is portrayed as someone who seeks to relieve His own pain by bringing wrath and punishment on the world, and Piccarreta as the only one who remains as the true mediator and redeemer who exempts the world from wrath and punishment. Jesus is depicted as a subordinate person who continually seeks Piccarreta's consent and permission to impose punishment. (KBD 2.3)

We have already addressed some of the concerns within this paragraph in the section above. Indeed, there is nothing problematic or unorthodox about the notion of victim souls on earth averting Divine punishments through their willing suffering.

What remains to be addressed is the KBD's claim that Luisa's writings “depict Jesus as a subordinate person” and that these writings depict Luisa as “the only one who remains as the true mediator and redeemer who exempts the world from wrath and punishment.” Both depictions are entirely false; they misrepresent Luisa's writings.

All of the quotes from Luisa's volumes that the KBD presents as justifications for its claims in this section are as follows:

“I am doing this because when you are in that position of the crucifixion, you come to placate Me; and since I want to chastise the people, I am tying them up.” (3.4.11 – November 6, 1899)

“Your position of victim and your continuous waiting for Me already break my arms.” (4.15.4 – October 2, 1900)

“Why my state of victim, if it is not given to me to spare your so very dear members, ...?” (4.16.10 – October 4, 1900)

“I [Jesus], too, was victim; it was not given to Me to spare the world all the chastisements.” (4.16.11 – October 4, 1900)

“My daughter, you have disarmed Divine Justice many times, contenting yourself with receiving Its blows upon yourself.” (4.26.2 – October 31, 1900)

As we can see, however, none of these quotes contain the depictions that the KBD attributes to Luisa's writings. Luisa is not described as the “only” victim who spares the world chastisements, nor is Jesus depicted as “subordinate” to her.

It is true that, within these quotes and elsewhere, one will find rather colorful *mystical* descriptions of what transpires in the relationship between Jesus and a victim soul. Such descriptions as these are

not unique to Luisa's writings (here as with many other concerns relayed in the KBD, many canonized mystics' writings contain identical themes), nor are they heretical or problematic.

Moreover, any claim that Luisa's writings depict Jesus as "subordinate" is contradicted by Luisa's writings themselves. Such passages as those quoted above are important refutations of a defeatist mentality which supposes that no chastisements may ever be averted or mitigated. Scripture itself, however, rejects this view:

"I have seen this people, how stiff-necked they are, continued the LORD to Moses. Let me alone, then, that my anger may burn against them to consume them. Then I will make of you a great nation. But Moses implored the LORD, his God, saying, "Why, O LORD, should your anger burn against your people, whom you brought out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a strong hand? Why should the Egyptians say, 'With evil intent he brought them out, that he might kill them in the mountains and wipe them off the face of the earth'? Turn from your burning wrath; change your mind about punishing your people. Remember your servants Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, and how you swore to them by your own self, saying, 'I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky; and all this land that I promised, I will give your descendants as their perpetual heritage.'" So the LORD changed his mind about the punishment he had threatened to inflict on his people." Exodus 32:10-14

There are certain Chastisements that can be changed, and certain ones that cannot be. We should not be surprised to see those belonging to the former category becoming the objects of dialogue between God and His creatures, nor should we be scandalized if God seems to, as it were, "change His mind" in response to the faithfulness of certain souls. This does not mean that God becomes "subordinate" to people. It did not mean that in Exodus, or in the case of Ninevah, or in any of the cases mentioned above in Luisa's writings. It means, rather, that God loves us and gives us as many chances as He can.

## 10. “Understanding of the Sacraments”

Section 3 of the KBD addresses the Sacraments. The first part of this section states:

‘Fiat’ is the ‘eternal Eucharist’ that has an outstanding sacramental effect that surpasses and replaces the sacraments.

It contrasts the ‘sacramental Eucharist’ received during Mass with the ‘eternal Eucharist, which is Fiat.’ The Eucharist is disparaged as only effective for 15 minutes, and in comparison, the ‘Fiat’ is exalted as an ‘eternal Eucharist.’ ‘Fiat’ is identified with the sacrament, and Piccarreta is depicted as someone who makes the Eucharist on behalf of Jesus. There are many expressions that deny the efficacy of the sacrament. It is even said that people who live in the ‘Fiat’ no longer need the sacraments. (KBD 3.1)

This statement contains multiple misunderstandings and falsehoods. Before addressing each, let us state the truth of the matter in general terms. (*Note: Absolutely nothing is greater than the Eucharist itself. It is, indeed, the “source and summit” (Lumen Gentium, §11) of our lives! Luisa’s writings affirm this truth and never contradict it. We will consider this particular point in more detail in the Appendices.*)

**“I like to hear that you always receive Communion. Never leave it, either out of disturbance, or distress, or fears.** Nothing which is not peace ever comes from God, but always from our enemy, who gains a lot when he sees us disturbed. And we lose true trust; we lose our arms to take refuge in Jesus. Therefore, in order to become saints, nothing is needed but courage, trust and peace, in order to live in the immense sea of the Divine Will. “

– Letter of Luisa to “Francesca”

“... when you abstain [from receiving the Eucharist] because of fear, you form firewood for Purgatory, and the Communion you do not receive on earth, you will receive with fire in Purgatory, because **Jesus burns with love in the Most Holy Sacrament and wants to come into our hearts in order to pour out His flames ...**

**Oh, how good is Jesus! If we knew Him, we would die enraptured with love ...”** – Letter of Luisa to a Mother Superior, Sister Maddalena del Moro, from Santa Chiara, Ravello

The Sacraments are necessary, and they always will be necessary, until the End of Time. They communicate the very grace of Christ throughout all ages. Moreover, their necessity applies to all; including Luisa and all who live in the Divine Will. Recall that daily Communion remained the foundation of Luisa’s own life. When circumstances

outside of her control prevented her from being able to receive Communion, she lamented this loss more passionately than perhaps any other cross. She frequented Confession her whole life and admonished others to do the same. She had the greatest reverence for priests and the Church.

Luisa's writings greatly exalt the Sacraments—they do not “denigrate” them, as the KBD claims. Moreover, Jesus never tells Luisa that the “effects” of the Eucharist only last that long (as the KBD falsely claims); He merely says that the Eucharist *itself* only lasts that long (a statement we will address in a moment). On the contrary, Jesus explicitly teaches Luisa that each Communion worthily received produces enormous *and enduring* positive effects in the soul! He tells her:

**“The Sacrament of the Eucharist is not only their own life that souls receive, but is my very Life that gives Itself to them. So, the fruit of this Sacrament is to form my Life in them, and each Communion serves to make my Life grow, to develop It, in such a way that one may be able to say: 'I am another Christ'.”**

(November 5, 1925)

Needless to say, these are not the words of a text which “disparages” or “denigrates” Holy Communion. These words, rather, speak with both dogmatic precision and spiritual power about the glory of the Eucharist. Note that Jesus specifically teaches Luisa that the effects of receiving Communion *do* persist; He affirms that they are *not* only restricted to 15 minutes, as the KBD asserts.

However, as noted earlier, it is Catholic dogma that the Sacraments cease in Heaven. If the Sacraments were *categorically unsurpassable in every respect*, then this would mean that our entry into Heaven is a great evil, since that very entry itself would directly cause the cessation of the unsurpassable good. Obviously, this is absurd. Therefore, from this observation it follows that it would be erroneous—even heretical—to assert that the Sacraments are supreme and unsurpassable goods.

Finally, acknowledging that the Sacred Species only remain in a communicant's body for about 15 minutes after reception of the Eucharist is not a “disparagement” of the Blessed Sacrament; it is merely a statement of fact. Catholic teaching holds that once the Sacred Species are materially dissolved, the Real Presence is likewise no longer there—and it is widely understood that this process generally takes approximately a quarter hour. It is puzzling to see Luisa's writings reproached—as if they “denigrate” the Eucharist—merely for noting this fact.

"The Eucharistic presence of Christ begins at the moment of the consecration and endures **as long as the Eucharistic species subsist**" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, §1377).

## Catholic Teaching Holds that Heaven is Superior to the Sacraments

The Catechism of the Catholic Church teaches:

"Through the Church's sacraments, Christ communicates his Holy and sanctifying Spirit to the members of his Body. ... These "mighty works of God," offered to believers in the sacraments of the Church, **bear their fruit in the new life in Christ**, according to the Spirit." (§739-740) **The fruit of sacramental life ... is life for God in Christ Jesus...**(§1134) The seven **sacraments are the signs and instruments** by which the Holy Spirit spreads the grace of Christ the head throughout the Church which is his Body. (§774)

As we can see from Church teaching, the Sacraments *are ordered towards* something other than themselves; they are not "final ends." Moreover, they are "signs and instruments" intended to spread grace. That "something" they are ultimately ordered towards as their own *end* is called, by the Catechism, "the new life in Christ," or "life for God in Christ Jesus." One can fairly say that they are ordered towards "living in God," or even "living in the Divine Will."

"So often we say that God dwells in us, but it is better to say that we dwell in him" (*Gaudete et Exsultate*. §51)

Now, it is clear that the sacraments themselves are not absolutely synonymous with this type of "life," since, tragically, many people who are living in radical contradiction to Christ nevertheless do receive the Sacraments. Instead, they are powerful (and necessary) outward signs instituted by Christ to give grace. By definition, therefore, the *grace of graces* (however one wishes to name it) must itself bear some manner of supremacy over even the Sacraments.

Let us recall that the fundamental point of Luisa's private revelations can be summarized as follows: *the holiness of Heaven, the grace of graces, is now available on earth; specifically, through "Living in the Divine Will."* We have already seen that this claim is found in various canonized and beatified mystics of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, therefore accusing it of doctrinal error is illicit.

Furthermore, as soon as one grasps that this is indeed what Luisa's writings are saying, it becomes immediately apparent that to

fail to acknowledge—in *one sense*—the superiority of the Fiat to the Sacraments would itself entail a heretical claim. It is supremely ironic, therefore, that Luisa's critics accuse her writings of doctrinal error precisely on a point that must be granted in order to preserve orthodoxy. To at once claim that the holiness of Heaven is available on earth, while also claiming that this holiness is in all respects inferior to the Sacraments, would be a deeply unorthodox claim.

We should hasten to note, however, that acknowledging this superiority of the Fiat to the Sacraments is *not* an assertion that Luisa herself is, or that her writings are, superior to the Sacraments! That claim would obviously be false. Luisa's writings are not *themselves* the Fiat; they are merely a set of volumes that speak *about* the Fiat. More obviously still, Luisa herself is *not* the Fiat! She is simply the soul through whom Jesus is making it known.

Similarly, many saints throughout Church History have been given revelations about the life of Heaven itself. Thus, the object of their writings is and was a thing superior to the Sacraments. As we can see, the distinction necessary to properly understand Jesus' teaching in Luisa's volumes is not new, nor is it esoteric.

## Sacraments Remain Necessary in the Kingdom of the Divine Will

The present section of the KBD presents 10 different selections from Luisa's volumes as justification for its concerns. Most of them have been adequately treated by what is discussed above. Two, however, should be specifically addressed; namely:

"This is why I want to make the sanctity of living in my Will; in them, I will have no need of priests for Me to be consecrated, nor churches, tabernacles or hosts." (12.27.12–November 27, 1917)

"Ah! Yes, I confirm it to you, I repeat it: my Will is Sacrament, and It surpasses all the Sacraments together." (12.119.8–December 26, 1919)

It is true that these two passages have been misinterpreted; but this is the fault of a few Divine Will followers, not of Luisa's writings themselves.

In the first passage (from November 27, 1917), Jesus does not say (nor does He ever say) to Luisa that priests will not be needed for *Transubstantiation*, or that they will not be needed for the *Eucharist*. He uses the more general term here, "consecration," and in this immediate context He is *not* referring to Transubstantiation. As the Catholic Encyclopedia says, "consecration" simply refers to any "**act by which**

**a thing is separated from a common and profane to a sacred use.**"<sup>14</sup> Indeed, this word has many uses beyond its application to Transubstantiation.

In fact, priests will *always* be needed for the Blessed Sacrament, and Luisa's writings never contradict this truth. Only an ordained priest will ever be able to consecrate the Eucharist (i.e., efficaciously utter the words of institution, thus causing the Transubstantiation).

Moreover, Jesus does not say that there will ever be a time when there *will not be* priests, or when there *will not be* churches, tabernacles, hosts, etc. He merely affirms here that He is capable of bestowing the Gift of His Will upon a soul *even if, tragically, those things are lacking in some time or place*. In fact, in other passages, Jesus explicitly contradicts the absurd notion that priests, Churches, etc., will ever be unnecessary. He declares that the Kingdom of the Divine Will shall consist in the sacraments bearing their full fruit – not passing away – and that Catholic priests are called to be the primary heralds of it.

Even if one proposes a time on earth wherein mortal sin has ceased, this too does not dispense of the immense importance of Confession. In one sense, it would not be "necessary," inasmuch as Confession is only an absolute requirement for absolving mortal sin. In a far more important sense, however, Confession *would* certainly remain necessary, since confessing even venial sins and imperfections is extremely important. Therefore, Confession will, at the bare minimum (even in the best-case-possible scenario), always be necessary *in order to live our lives as God Wills us to*.

Finally, the sentence selected for quotation by the KBD here neglects the important context given in that message in the *immediately* preceding sentence, which reads:

"...churches are few and many will be destroyed. Many times I do not find Priests to consecrate Me; other times they allow unworthy souls to receive Me, and worthy souls not to receive Me; other souls are unable to receive Me, therefore my Love finds Itself hindered. This is why I want to make the Sanctity of living in my Will... [what immediately follows is what the KBD quotes above]..." (November 27, 1917)

Clearly, this passage is not presented as a disparagement or rejection of the act of receiving Communion. Rather, it consists in a lamentation from Our Lord that often times Communion cannot be received when it should be received, or even is received when it ought not be received, whereas those difficulties do not exist with the Gift of Living in the Divine Will. This passage is simply noting that, since Jesus can give the Gift of His Will to whomever He pleases, whenever He

pleases, it is not subject to these same limitations. This is a very inspiring and consoling message, and there is nothing unorthodox or even problematic about it.

### **The Divine Will is Not an “8<sup>th</sup> Sacrament”**

The second passage from Luisa’s volumes noted above is similarly straightforward to understand correctly. We have already noted how Catholic orthodoxy itself demands conceding a certain supremacy to the Will of God; above even the Sacraments themselves. As for the line, “my will is Sacrament,” this is certainly not a literal declaration of an 8<sup>th</sup> Sacrament. First, this would be in contradiction to the claim that the Divine Will is *above* the Sacraments (it cannot simultaneously be a Sacrament and be superior to the Sacraments). Second, Jesus is clearly speaking allegorically in referring to the Divine Will as “Sacrament.” He even speaks in similar ways about the Cross, referring to it in the same analogous manner as “Sacrament,” in the following message:

“My daughter, the Cross is Sacrament. Each one of the Sacraments contains Its special effects – one removes sin, another confers grace, another unites one with God, another gives strength, and many other effects. But the Cross alone unites all these effects together, producing them in the soul with such effectiveness as to render her, in a very short time, similar to the original from which she came.” (April 25, 1902)

Rightfully, no one accuses Luisa’s writings of exalting the Cross to the status of a literal 8<sup>th</sup> Sacrament. Similarly, no one should issue the same accusation with respect to the Divine Will. It is clear that neither case is literal. Note that even the Magisterium uses similar language. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches:

The Church's first purpose is to be the sacrament of the inner union of men with God. Because men's communion with one another is rooted in that union with God, the Church is also the sacrament of the unity of the human race... As sacrament, the Church is Christ's instrument. (775-776)

Does this mean that the Church is literally an 8<sup>th</sup> Sacrament? Of course not. There are, and always have been, exactly 7 Sacraments. Every time Jesus refers to them in Luisa’s volumes, He lists only those seven.



## Still More on The Importance of the Sacraments for Those Living in the Divine Will

It would also heretical to claim (as perhaps a few misguided devotees of Luisa do) that Living in the Divine Will dispenses us from the Sacraments. This interpretation is easy to dispute in numerous ways even beyond those we have already discussed. First, one can simply look at Luisa's own life; from the day of her birth (the same day she was baptized) to the day of her death, it was completely centered on the Sacraments of the Catholic Church.

Second, even if it were certain that someone is living in the Divine Will, he is not yet confirmed in grace (ontologically incapable of sin) so long as he is on this earth. Jesus affirms this to Luisa, saying:

**"In fact, for as long as the soul is a pilgrim one, the doors do not close behind the gift, but remain open, so that, freely, not being forced, she may live in Our gift..."** (September 29, 1931)

Because sin is always possible on earth – including during the Reign of the Divine Will – remaining anchored in the Sacraments will always be important.

Third, and perhaps most significantly, living in the Divine Will entails an *amplified* call to frequent the Sacraments, not a diminished call to do so. With the Gift, the Sacraments unleash dramatically more grace into our lives. They are, as Jesus tells Luisa, received more like "food for the healthy" than merely "medicine for the sick."

And although it is true that this Gift consists in the holiness of Heaven, and in Heaven there are no more Sacraments, it is only thanks to the Beatific Vision of Heaven that we no longer will have Sacraments there. Moreover, the Gift of Living in the Divine Will does *not* confer (nor will it confer, even during the Era) the Beatific Vision. So, while it opens the doors to Heaven's *holiness*, it does not thereby cause the *enjoyment* of Heaven to be fully appreciated on earth. Practically speaking, this means that, because Faith remains, so too must the Sacraments. Only in Heaven will both pass away, as their goal is fully attained.

This theme is so important that, as noted earlier, Jesus tells Luisa that the Kingdom of the Divine Will entails the full flourishing of the Sacraments, not their abrogation. He tells Luisa:

"The Eucharistic Sacrament that I left as food in order to give them perfect health-many eat It over and over again, but they appear always sick. Poor food of My very Life, hidden under the veils of the accidents of the bread... This is why I long so much

for the coming of the Kingdom of the Supreme Fiat—because, then, everything I did in coming upon earth will serve as food for those who enjoy perfect health. What is not the difference between a sick person who takes the same food, and someone else who enjoys perfect health? The infirm one takes it without appetite, without taste, and it serves him in order to sustain himself and not die. The healthy one takes it with appetite, and because he enjoys it, he takes more, and preserves himself strong and healthy. So, what will not be My contentment in seeing that, in the Kingdom of My Will, everything I did will serve no longer as food for the sick, but as food for the children of My Kingdom, who will be all full of vigor and in perfect health?” (November 2, 1926)

As we can see from the quote above and many others like it, the Kingdom of the Divine Will means *more* emphasis being placed on the Sacraments (particularly the Eucharist); not less—just as human society even now places (or, should place) more value on food than on medicine.

\*\*\*\*

Returning to the KBD’s claims within the present section, we can now clearly see that its insistence that Luisa’s writings “deny the efficacy of the sacrament,” or “say that people who live in the ‘Fiat’ no longer need the sacraments,” is simply false. Luisa’s volumes do no such thing. They greatly exalt the efficacy of the Sacraments and emphasize their importance for everyone, including those who live in the Divine Will.

As for the KBD’s puzzling claim that “Piccarreta is depicted as someone who makes the Eucharist on behalf of Jesus,” no such teaching exists anywhere in Luisa’s volumes. Additionally, the KBD presents no quotations from Luisa’s volumes that allegedly contain it. In fact, Luisa’s writings make it very clear that the Sacraments are from Jesus. Finally, the KBD presents the following quote from Luisa’s writings as a problematic one:

“...without It [my Will], the Sacraments themselves may be a poison for her, which may lead her to eternal death.” (17.1.21–June 10, 1924)

This passage, however, is entirely in accordance with Catholic orthodoxy. Church teaching holds that to receive the Eucharist in a state of mortal sin is sacrilegious. So too is an abuse of Confession. In both such cases, one’s rejection of the Will of God turns even the Sacraments themselves into what can fairly be called “poison *for him*.”

## 11. “Eucharist is Misunderstood as a Repetition of Jesus’ Sacrifice”?

Section 3.2 of the KBD states:

The Eucharist is a sacramental reenactment (actualization, making present) (without the shedding of blood) of Christ's sacrifice in remembrance and commemoration. It is not a repetition of sacrifice.

The quotes from Luisa’s volumes that it presents as running afoul of Catholic teaching on this point are as follows:

“In the Sacrament of Love, the Eucharist, which I instituted for you, I continue to do and suffer all that I did and all that I suffered during my thirty-three years on earth.” (1.14.26)

“It[the Mass] also manifests to us His immense love, for He was not content with dying on the Cross, but He wanted to continue His state of victim in the Most Holy Eucharist.” (1.36.4)

It is certainly true that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is the “unbloody” Sacrifice. But it does not follow, from this premise, that it is erroneous or even problematic to refer to Jesus *mystically* continuing His suffering in the Eucharist. Luisa’s writings are far from alone in insisting upon this continued suffering of Jesus (in one sense). Jesus revealed to St. Margaret Mary Alacoque:

"Behold this Heart which has so loved men that It spared nothing, even going so far as to exhaust and consume Itself, to prove to them Its love. And in return I receive from the greater part of men nothing but ingratitude, by the contempt, irreverence, sacrileges and coldness with which they treat Me in this Sacrament of Love. **But what is still more painful** to Me is that even souls consecrated to Me are acting in this way."<sup>15</sup>

St. John Vianney taught:

“Whoever communicates unworthily crucifies Jesus Christ in his heart. He submits him to a death more ignominious and humiliating than that of the Cross.”<sup>16</sup>

Bishop Athanasius Schneider wrote:

"To say that the Lord is not suffering because of the outrages committed against Him in the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist can lead to a minimizing of the great atrocities committed. Some people say: God is offended by the abuse of the Blessed Sacrament, but the Lord does not personally suffer. This is, however, theologically and spiritually too narrow a view. Although Christ

is now in His glorious state and hence no more subject to suffering in a human way, He nevertheless is affected and touched in His Sacred Heart by the abuses and outrages against the Divine majesty and the immensity of His Love in the Blessed Sacrament....Jesus Christ continues in a mysterious way his Passion in Gethsemane throughout the ages in the mystery of His Church and also in the Eucharistic mystery, the mystery of His immense Love. " ("Sins Against the Blessed Sacrament and the Need of a Crusade of Eucharistic Reparation." July, 2020.)

The young seers of Fatima, Sts. Francisco and Jacinta, were told by an angel:

"Take and drink the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, horribly outraged by ungrateful men. Repair their crimes and console your God."

St. Peter Julian Eymard wrote:

By instituting His Sacrament, Jesus perpetuated the sacrifices of His Passion... He is wrapped in the Sacred Species as in a shroud and laid in the tabernacle as in a tomb. (The Real Presence, 29. The Most Blessed Sacrament is not Loved!, III)

As we can see, Luisa's writings are in good company in their teaching that Jesus still can suffer — *in a certain mystical sense* — through His Eucharist presence. But Jesus does not tell Luisa that the Mass, or the Eucharist, is a "repetition" of what He suffered on Calvary, as the KBD implies her writings claim.

In fact, Jesus says the very opposite to Luisa. And although Luisa's writings are clear on the senses in which Jesus can still mystically suffer, they are equally clear that in His glorified humanity in Heaven, He cannot directly suffer. This careful balance of orthodoxy could not have proceeded from Luisa's own (uneducated) mind. Jesus tells Luisa:

"...in souls who use Me as Living Species, our Life develops together, we beat with one single heartbeat, and if I see her disposed, I communicate to her My Pains and I continue My Passion in her. I can say that from the Sacramental Species, I pass to the Living Species in order to continue My Life on earth, not alone, but together with her. **You must know that pains are no longer in My Power,** and I go asking for Love from these Living Species of souls, who make up for what is lacking to Me." (January 18, 1933)

## 12. The “Status of the Virgin Mary”

Section 4 of the KBD states:

The Virgin Mary is deified, and Piccarreta takes precedence over the Virgin Mary in the history of salvation. (KBD 4.)

This statement is not only entirely false, but also self-contradictory. If “the Virgin Mary is *deified*” (i.e., considered to be God) in Luisa’s writings, then, by definition, no one (including Luisa) can simultaneously be given precedence over her.

In fact, Luisa’s writings are clear that the Virgin Mary is *not* Divine. But they go far beyond merely acknowledging this truth. Jesus tells Luisa:

And since my Humanity possessed not only the fullness of my Will as Its own virtue, but the Word Himself, as well as the Father and the Holy Spirit as a consequence of Our inseparability, It surpassed in a more perfect way both innocent Adam and my very Mother. In fact, in them it was grace, in Me it was nature; they had to draw light, grace, power, beauty from God; in Me there was the springing fount of light, beauty, grace ... **So, the difference between Me, as nature, and my very Mother, as grace, was so great, that She remained eclipsed before my Humanity.**  
(May 21, 1926)

Two facts immediately emerge from this teaching in Luisa’s volumes. First, Jesus is not merely teaching that His *Divinity* is superior to the Blessed Virgin. That much is obviously true (although the KBD falsely claims that Luisa’s writings violate *even this* truth). He is going much further, and saying even His *humanity* far surpasses Our Lady. Second, this surpassing glory of Christ’s human nature above Mary is not merely acknowledged as true; it is stated to be “*so great*” that the Virgin Mary remained “eclipsed” before the humanity of Jesus Christ.

Moreover, these volumes are equally clear that Luisa is not only lacking precedence to Our Lady (or equality with Our Lady), but is *vastly* beneath her. We reviewed, in earlier sections, some teachings from Jesus in Luisa’s volumes that highlight this immense inferiority of Luisa, therefore there is no need to present them again here. Instead, we will now focus on the KBD’s depiction of the Marian teachings in Luisa’s volumes, which are as follows:

It not only expresses Mary as a ‘co-redemptrix’ but also gives her divinity. It asserts a kind of ‘pre-existing idea’ that the Virgin Mary was already conceived within the single divinity (eternity) of the Holy Trinity before she was born on earth. The Virgin Mary is called

the 'Heavenly Child,' 'the One who received the seed of Fiat Voluntas Tua,' and the 'deified One.' She is also depicted as being exempt from natural diseases. (KBD 4.1)

Any references in Luisa's writings to the Virgin Mary appearing, *as it were*, "Godlike," are always joined with qualifications indicating that this is *not* literally the case. (Again, the passage quoted above from May 21, 1926 gives the clear teaching.) It is, therefore, dishonest to present such depictions without these direly important qualifications.

As for the KBD's noting—as allegedly problematic—the volumes' description of Our Lady as a "pre-existing idea," it would be entirely wrongheaded for a Catholic to take issue with this. Catholic Sacred Tradition has always held that the Virgin Mary is indeed "the woman" spoken of in Genesis 3:15. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* notes:

"...many Fathers and Doctors of the Church have seen the woman announced in the Protoevangelium [Genesis 3:15] as Mary, the mother of Christ, the "new Eve." (¶411)

Of course, this event transpired thousands of years before the Blessed Virgin was born. Here, however, the KBD implies that it is wrong to claim that the Virgin Mary was in the mind of God before her conception in time. This claim implicitly ascribes error to the traditional Catholic understanding of Genesis 3:15, which is of course unacceptable.

As for Our Lady being exempt from natural diseases, this is not a doctrinally erroneous or problematic view. It is confirmed by other mystical revelations, such as those given to Venerable Mary of Agreda and Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich.

"Mary's spotlessness consists in this that she had in her no sin, no passion; her sacred body never endured sickness." — *The Revelations of Bl. Anne Catherine Emmerich*

## **The Virgin Mary as a "Pre-Existing Idea" in the Mind of God is Not Unorthodox**

Finally, we should address more thoroughly the notion that Our Lady was and is indeed an eternal, or as KBD says, "pre-existing idea" in the Mind of God. Far from hereby asserting something unorthodox, Luisa's writings have only proven prophetic. Without knowing anything of, for example, the great developments in Mariology imparted to the Church by St. Maximilian Kolbe (Luisa wrote before this saint did), Luisa's volumes nevertheless confirm what this

preeminent Mariologist taught. Speaking about the Virgin Mary, St. Maximilian wrote:

“... God, as St. Bonaventure says – can create a greater and more perfect world, but cannot elevate any other creature to a dignity higher than the one to which He elevated Mary. The Immaculata is the ultimate limit between God and creation. She is the most faithful image of God’s perfection, of His sanctity...

...Among the countless number of possible beings that reflect His diverse perfections, **God also saw, from all eternity, a Being perfect in all respects, unsullied by stain of sin, who reflected His divine attributes in the most faithful way possible in a created being. He rejoiced at this prospect and decided, from eternity, to call such a Being into existence at a given time.**” (*The Writings of St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe*. Volume 1. Letters. 2a. “Model of Holiness.” Nihil Obstat, 2015)

Indeed, St. Maximilian spoke of the Holy Spirit as the “Uncreated Immaculate Conception,” and the Virgin Mary as the “Created Immaculate Conception.” This teaching – whose orthodoxy the Church has confirmed, not least by canonizing this saint – is as bold a claim regarding Our Lady as anything contained in Luisa’s volumes.

Further explaining St. Maximilian’s Mariology, theologian Fr. Fehlner writes:

... for St. Maximilian the title Spouse of the Holy Spirit also connotes: not only a functional relation to one aspect of the mission of the Holy Spirit, but to the very person of the Holy Spirit... This he does in a general way describing the Immaculate as a “quasi-part” of the Trinity...[he] refers to the Immaculate as the Holy Spirit “quasi-incarnate”: not to explain the grace of the Immaculate Conception as a second grace of “hypostatic union”, but to indicate how this grace is related to and differs from the “grace of union” in her Son...This relation he explains in precise, dogmatic detail, as an intimate union or communion of two persons and two natures, the persons and natures remaining really distinct, yet so intimate that the whole being and person of the Immaculate is permeated through and through by that characteristic of the ... [so] **as to be herself “transubstantiated” into the Holy Spirit and to share his name**’. In turn, this “transubstantiation” into the Spirit makes possible not only the Incarnation of the Word, but also the incorporation of the baptized into His body, the Church.<sup>17</sup>

Again, one will not find any teaching about Our Lady in Luisa's volumes that goes beyond what this canonized saint – and others – have already taught.

The KBD presents several quotations from Luisa's volumes that exalt and glorify the Blessed Virgin Mary above all creatures. (Ironically, these quotations deftly refute any accusation that these private revelations place Luisa herself equal to or surpassing the Immaculate Virgin.) There is no need to examine each one here, as what has already been discussed demonstrates there is nothing unorthodox within these claims.

We should briefly note that the KBD quotes multiple passages from Luisa's volumes referring to the Virgin Mary as the "Co-Redemptrix," implying that such a label is problematic. Multiple Popes, however, have already referred to the Virgin Mary as Co-Redemptrix, therefore it is illicit to accuse Luisa's writings of unorthodoxy by saying the same thing. In his encyclical entitled *Iucunda Semper Expectatione*, Pope Leo XIII taught:

The recourse we have to Mary in prayer follows upon the office she continuously fills **by the side of the throne of God as Mediatrix of Divine grace**; being by worthiness and by merit most acceptable to Him, and, therefore, surpassing in power all the angels and saints in Heaven. Now, this merciful office of hers, perhaps, appears in no other form of prayer so manifestly as it does in the Rosary. **For in the Rosary all the part that Mary took as our co-Redemptrix comes to us...** (§2)

In his encyclical, *Ad Diem Illum*, Pope St. Pius X taught:

...from this community of will and suffering between Christ and Mary she merited to become most worthily **the Reparatrix of the lost world ... and Dispensatrix of all the gifts that Our Savior purchased for us by His Death and by His Blood.** (§12)

Thus seeing what even the Magisterium itself has already taught, it is certain that no grounds exist for ascribing error to Luisa's writings simply because they make similar claims.

## **Luisa's Writings Repeatedly Affirm the Inferiority of Luisa to the Virgin Mary**

Section 4 of the KBD concludes by reiterating the claim that Luisa's writings describe Luisa herself as equal, or even superior, to the Virgin Mary. We have already discussed how false this accusation is, therefore only a few additional points need to be made here.



Most of the passages the KBD here quotes from Luisa's volumes can easily be understood as fully orthodox in light of what is contained immediately above. One quote, however, merits further evaluation. The KBD quotes the following line:

“You must know that I am doing more with you than with my very Celestial Mama...” (19.12.16–April 16, 1926)

Here as elsewhere in the KBD, vital context from the very same message of Luisa's volumes is left out. Earlier in the same entry of the volumes, we read the following words of Jesus:

Such was the life of my Divine Mother. She was the true image of the living in my Will. Her living in It was so perfect, that She did nothing but receive from God, continuously, all that She was to do in order to live in the Supreme Volition.... So, my Mother took everything from Us, to be able to diffuse Herself in everything and to place Herself at the top of every act of creature ... this gave Her the right of Queen of all and of everything; and **She surpassed, in sanctity, in love, in grace, all the Saints who have been and will be, as well as all Angels united together.** The Creator poured Himself upon Her, giving Her so much love that She possessed enough love to be able to love Him for all. He communicated to Her the highest concord and the One Will of the Three Divine Persons, in such a way that She was able to adore for all in a divine manner, and to make up for all the duties of creatures....**the Celestial Mother surpassed everyone in sanctity and in love.** She alone lived perfectly and fully in the Supreme Volition, therefore She can be your guide and act as your teacher. (April 16, 1926)

As we can see, this *very* passage relays Jesus telling Luisa—*explicitly and repeatedly*—that the Virgin Mary far surpasses every other saint *who will ever exist* (and every angel), *combined*. This obviously includes Luisa. It is, on that account, radically unjust to use anything from this passage to attempt to bolster the accusation that Luisa's writings place Luisa herself equal to or above the Virgin Mary.

Still more unjust than leaving out the earlier context, however, is the KBD excluding what *immediately* follows the brief selection it presented. Here are the sentences immediately following:

You must know that I am doing more with you than with my very Celestial Mother, **because She did not have your needs, nor any tendencies or passions which might, even slightly, prevent the course of my Will in Her.** With greatest ease the Creator

would pour into Her, and She into Him; my Will was always triumphant in Her, therefore She had no need of either spurs or admonitions. **With you [Luisa], on the other hand, I must use more attentions. ... I must admonish you.** (Ibid.)

What Jesus here says to Luisa could just as accurately be said to anyone who aspires to live in the Divine Will. Jesus clarifies that, in one sense, such a soul (other than the Virgin Mary) receiving the Gift is a "greater accomplishment," simply inasmuch as such souls are sinful, not Immaculate! In other words, for a sinner like Luisa to receive this Gift is even more *magnanimous and merciful* an act of God than for Him to give His Will to the Immaculate Virgin; for she deserved it much more than Luisa or anyone else does.

Therefore, the very same (out of context) quote here presented in the KBD explicitly contradicts the very same accusation the KBD is levying by presenting it.

\*\*\*

I conclude by noting that the very final paragraph of the very last entry in Luisa's thousands of pages of private revelations is dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Here is the teaching with which Jesus concludes His revelations to Luisa:

"...the whole of Heaven prays and anxiously awaits the Divine Will to be known and to reign. Then will the Great Queen do to the children of my Will what She did for Her Jesus, and Her Maternity will have life in Her children. I will surrender my own place in Her Maternal Heart to those who live in my Will. She will raise them for Me, She will guide their steps, She will hide them within Her Maternity and Sanctity... Oh! how I would love for everyone to know that if they want to live in my Will, they have a powerful Queen and Mother who will make up for whatever they lack. She will raise them on Her maternal lap, and in everything they do She will be together with them, to shape their acts after Her own; so much so, that they will be known as the children raised, kept and instructed by the Love of the Maternity of my Mother. And these will be the children who will make Her happy, and will be Her glory and Her honor." (December 28, 1938)

## 13. “Human Will and Free Will”

Section 5 of the KBD begins by stating:

- Free will is denied and human will is considered sinful. – There is a great risk of falling into quietism by focusing only on the Will of God and viewing free will and human will as completely passive. The ‘Book of Heaven’ excessively contrasts God’s Will with human will and always regards human will as sinful. Free will is denied, and human will is viewed as completely passive, saying that if one possesses only God’s Will, one will no longer fall into sin. Before God’s Will or providence, human volition and will are of no importance.

Quietism is certainly a heresy, however Luisa’s revelations in no way endorse any of its tenets.\* (Moreover, Monothelitism, the related heresy which holds that Jesus had only one will (the Divine Will) is expressly contradicted by Luisa’s revelations: Jesus tells Luisa that He *did* have a human will (cf. July 19, 1928).) Contradicting Quietism, Jesus tells Luisa that He wants our wills *little* (just as St. Thérèse of Lisieux taught), but not annihilated; *active* (with His very own activity), not passive.

Not only do Luisa’s writings neither teach nor imply any of the 43 propositions that the Church has condemned as constituting the heresy of Quietism (cf. *Coelestis Pastor*, Pope Innocent XI, 1687 A.D.), but also throughout them we see the *opposite* of Quietism being relentlessly taught. In fact, these writings present moral effort as being paramount, implore working in order to attain salvation and avoid Purgatory as extremely important, demand interceding for others and for diverse intentions, lament the loss of souls (and other evils), insist firmly on all the virtues traditionally upheld in Catholic thought, exhort us to sacrifice for the mitigation of chastisements, and on the list goes. One of the encouragements Luisa was most fond of issuing in her letters were precisely those words one would never find on the lips of any Quietist, namely, “*make yourself a saint!*”

Indeed, there is scarcely a page among the thousands comprising Luisa’s volumes that fails to refute Quietism. Any allegations of Quietism could – more easily than against Luisa and her volumes – be levied against innumerable works of unassailable orthodoxy given to us by the many saints, Doctors of the Church, and other mystics.

Much content in Jesus’ revelations to Luisa do indeed speak of how repugnant the human *self*-will is, but all such exhortations are

---

\* Note: the following paragraphs are adapted from *Thy Will Be Done* (2021), Appendices.

given with the foundational understanding, specifically conveyed in the volumes, that the human will is the *most beautiful thing God made*, and that only *on its own* (that is, lacking union with the Divine Will) does it appear degraded (1/31/1928). Jesus also tells Luisa that the Divine Will does not destroy the human will's operations, but rather does the opposite: it *embellishes* and *animates* them! (9/16/1931) This is entirely opposite to Quietism, whose main tenet is the annihilation of the human will's operation.

Finally, the "evil" of *not* Living in the Divine Will only applies to one who affirmatively rejects this grace of graces – not to one who, through no fault of his own, is unaware of it – and even less to one who only lacked it due to not living in its time! (1/10/1930) On the contrary, Luisa's revelations exalt the "ordinary" holiness (that is, the holiness of the "pre-Gift days") in the highest terms. Jesus even told Luisa that St. Aloysius Gonzaga (who died in 1591, long before the Gift was available) had such an astounding degree of holiness that *everything* in him was love; and Luisa herself, commenting on what Jesus showed her in Aloysius' soul, said that his love was so great as to be capable of reducing the world to ashes (6/20/1899). Even in Luisa's own words contained in the volumes, wherein she sought to summarize Jesus' teachings, Luisa affirmed that Jesus only desires our wills *small* – not destroyed – *alive and operative* – not dead (3/26/1933).

**"As for self-will, we are forbidden to do our own will."** -The Rule of St. Benedict. Chapter 7

**Mortification, meditation, receiving Holy Communion, acts of fraternal charity are all certainly pleasing to God – but only when they are in accordance with his will. When they do not accord with God's will, he not only finds no pleasure in them, but he even rejects them utterly and punishes them.** (St. Alphonsus Liguori, Doctor of the Church. *Uniformity With God's Will*. Ch. 1)

## **Luisa's Writings Affirm the Goodness of the Human Will and Reject Quietism**

As noted above, any and all references in Luisa's volumes to the "evil" of the human will are only intended to refer to the will's operation *apart from God*. From the following passages in Luisa's volumes, this understanding becomes clear:

My daughter, the human will on its own is nauseating, but united with Mine is the most beautiful thing I created. More so, since the Divinity could never issue anything created by Us that would be nauseating ... Another image is the human nature. United with the soul, it is beautiful... [but] separated from the soul, it becomes putrid, it stinks in a horrible way, it is disgusting to look at; it can be said that it can no longer be recognized. Who caused such remarkable change from a body that is alive to a dead body? The lack of the murmuring of the soul, of its continuous motion that had primacy in the human nature...So, one who does not stay united with My Will, loses the life of his soul, therefore he can do nothing good, and everything he does is without life. (January 31, 1928)

[Luisa writes] Oh! how I would love to destroy this littleness of mine, that I may feel nothing but Divine Will alone; but I comprehend that I cannot, nor does Jesus want it to be completely destroyed. He wants it yet small, but alive, so as to be able to operate inside a living will, not a dead one, to be able to have His small little field of action within my littleness, which, being small, incapable, weak, with reason must lend itself to receive the great operating of the Divine Fiat. (March 26, 1933)

Now, my daughter, in my likeness, I made the soul free in her will and in her love. ... **I Myself wanted her to be free in this, so that, freely, not being forced, this will and this love might run toward Me; and immersing herself in Me, she might offer Me the noblest and purest acts which a creature can give Me; and since I am free, and so is she, we might pour ourselves into each other and run - run toward Heaven to love and glorify the Father,** and to dwell together with the Sacrosanct Trinity; run toward the earth to do good to all; run into the hearts of all to strike them with our love, to chain them with our will, and make of them conquests. Greater dowry I could not give to the creature. (December 30, 1916)

You are in the condition which is almost similar to that of the Blessed in Heaven. They have not lost their free will; this is a gift which I gave man, and what I give once, I never take back. Slavery has never entered Heaven; I am the God of sons and daughters, not of slaves; I am the King who makes everyone reign – there is no division between Me and them. May 30, 1925

I will never take free willing away from the human will – a great gift, given to man in creating him, which makes creatures distinguishable as to whether they want to be my true children, or not. But, rather, with the light of the knowledges about my

Will, I will form more than solar rays, and whoever wants to know them and look at them, will be invested by this light; in such a way that, eclipsed, the human will will take delight and love in looking at this light, and will feel fortunate that the action of the light takes the place of its own.... Look at the sky - it is an image of this. If you look at it at night, you see it studded with stars; but if you look at it during the day, the stars no longer exist for the human eye. However, they are still at their place in the sky, just as at nighttime. Who had this strength to make the stars disappear, though they are present in the full daylight? The sun. With the strength of its light, it eclipsed them, but did not destroy them... (October 13, 1926)

My daughter, a will that does not love Me freely, but by force, means distance between creature and Creator; it means slavery and servitude; it means dissimilarity. On the other hand, **a free will that does Mine and loves Me, means union between the soul and God; it means sonship**; it means that what belongs to God belongs to her; it means likeness of sanctity, of love, of manners; so much so, that whatever one does, the other does as well - wherever one is, the other is also. **This is why I created man with a free will – to receive this great honor that befits a God.** I would not know what to do with a will that loves Me and sacrifices itself by force; even more, I do not even recognize it, nor does it deserve any reward. So, this is why all my aims are upon the soul who, of her own free will, lives in Mine. A forced love is of men, not of God, because men are content with appearances, and do not go deep inside, into the gold of the will, in order to have a sincere and loyal love.  
(April 3, 1927)

After observing these passages (many similar ones could also be presented), we should again contrast them with the claims contained in the KBD; namely, that in Luisa's writings, "*free will is denied and human will is considered sinful... [the Book of Heaven] always regards human will as sinful.*" Of course, in Luisa's writings, free will is *not* denied, it is *glorified*. The human will is *not* "always" considered sinful, it is only considered thus if separated from the Divine Will.

"The human will, **without My Will**, is the source of all evils" – Jesus to Luisa. May 19, 1938.

It would be superfluous to here examine each quote from Luisa's volumes that the KBD presents undergirding the claims it makes in this section. Each one can (and must) be understood in light of this distinction.

## Catholic Teaching Holds that the Human Will is Indeed the Source of All Evil

A more general note is in order clarifying that it is clearly true – from simple Catholic orthodoxy – that all evil *does* indeed flow from the human will. All death, all suffering, all decay, all sadness, etc., derives *only and ultimately* from *sin*. Had the Original Sin never taken place, none of these evils would have been capable of entering the material universe. (Not even the Devil would have been able to touch it had Adam not invited him in by eating the forbidden fruit – i.e., by *willfully* disobeying God.) Sin, moreover, results only from the human will choosing to contradict the Will of God; as the Catechism says, it is “a revolt against God *through the will* to become ‘like gods’” (§1850). Quoting St. Thomas Aquinas, the Catechism then teaches:

“When the will sets itself upon something that is of its nature incompatible with the charity that orients man toward his ultimate end, then the sin is mortal by its very object ... But when the sinner's will is set upon something that of its nature involves a disorder, but is not opposed to the love of God and neighbor, such as thoughtless chatter or immoderate laughter and the like, such sins are venial” (§1856)

As we can see, the common theme among all sins – mortal or venial – is that they are *acts of the will*. If the human will is not involved in some act, it cannot be a sin. From all this it follows that all evil is indeed the result of the human will.

This fact of course does not imply that all evils (such as even *physical* sufferings) are the *immediate* result of someone's sin. Jesus rebuffed that notion in the Gospels (cf. John 9:3). Nevertheless, all evils can certainly be traced back to some sin – which can only ever consist in an instance of the human will operating apart from the Divine Will – at some point, even if one must go back so far as the Fall itself. Most evils, however, can certainly be traced back to some sin committed at a far more proximate time than that.

Therefore, far from being doctrinally erroneous or problematic, it is in fact almost a truism to assert that the human will is the source of all evil; or, as Luisa's volumes notes, it is that which “produces all evils.” Aquinas teaches:

“Nothing prevents a thing being good in itself, and yet becoming a source of evil to one who makes use thereof unbecomingly: thus to receive the Eucharist is good, and yet he that receives it “unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself” (1 Cor. 11:29).” “...the sin of our first parent is the cause of death and all

such like defects in human nature, in so far as by the sin of our first parent original justice was taken away, whereby not only were the lower powers of the soul held together under the control of reason, without any disorder whatever, but also the whole body was held together in subjection to the soul, without any defect..." — St. Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*.



## 14. "Other Issues"

The sixth and final section of the KBD contains several subsections addressing an assortment of additional concerns. We will treat each one, below, in the order they are there presented.

### **Luisa's Writings Never Assert "Three Gods"**

Section 6.1 of the KBD states:

The understanding and expression of the Trinity is arbitrary and discretionary. When talking about the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, it describes as if three Gods exist separately.

In fact, in each instance wherein one finds Trinitarian theology expressed in Luisa's writings, there is found not only impeccable Catholic orthodoxy, but also a depth of understanding of this dogma—the highest and most mysterious of our Faith—that is far beyond what any uneducated lay woman like Luisa could have possibly humanly known.

At no point do Luisa's volumes assert or imply (as the KBD here claims) that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are "three Gods [who] exist separately." Indeed, none of the three selections from Luisa's volumes that the KBD presents here contain such an assertion or implication. While it is true that sometimes Luisa describes mystical encounters wherein she would separately experience some action *appropriated* to this or that Person of the Trinity, these mystical experiences never amount to the blasphemous claim that "three Gods exist separately."

The same standard the KBD here applies to Luisa's writings would also ascribe Polytheism to Scripture itself, not to mention innumerable saints throughout Church History. Experiencing each Divine Person of the Trinity in distinct ways is clearly not tantamount to asserting "three Gods." By this logic, the Feast of Pentecost is polytheistic, as are Jesus' own teachings in the Gospel:

"But I tell you the truth, it is better for you that I go. For if I do not go, the Advocate will not come to you. But if I go, I will send him to you. And when he comes he will convict the world in regard to sin and righteousness and condemnation..." (John 16:7-8)  
 "Therefore, I say to you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven people, but blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven; but whoever speaks against the holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come. (Matthew

12:31-32)

At no point do Luisa's writings ever imply a greater distinction between the Persons of the Trinity than is already contained within these (and similar) verses of Scripture. As the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches:

The divine persons are really distinct from one another. "God is one but not solitary." "Father," "Son," "Holy Spirit" are not simply names designating modalities of the divine being, for they are really distinct from one another: "He is not the Father who is the Son, nor is the Son he who is the Father, nor is the Holy Spirit he who is the Father or the Son." They are distinct from one another in their relations of origin: "It is the Father who generates, the Son who is begotten, and the Holy Spirit who proceeds." (§254)

The KBD seems to presuppose that any text which acknowledges and draws from these real distinctions (deriving from Catholic dogma) is thereby guilty of asserting "three Gods."

Here as with the earlier concerns, we need only look to Luisa's writings themselves to find, refuted, the very error ascribed to them by the KBD. Jesus tells Luisa:

These three Suns are the three powers: intellect, memory and will. While being distinct among them, they hold hands and arrive at forming one single power, symbol of Our adorable Trinity, since while being **three distinct Persons, We form one single Power, one single Intellect, and one single Will.** (June 7, 1928)

My blessed daughter, my love was so much in incarnating myself in the bosom of my Celestial Mother that Heavens and earth could not contain it ... [the Father] looked at his Son, and I found myself in the same flames of love and I commanded myself that I might incarnate myself, I wanted this, and in an impetus of love, without my Father leaving, nor the Holy Spirit, the great portent of the incarnation happened. **I remained with my Father, and at the same time descended in the bosom of my Mother. The three Divine persons we were inseparable, nor subject to separate ourselves.** Therefore I can say: I remained in Heaven, and descended in earth, and the Father and the Holy Spirit, they descended with me in earth and they remained in Heaven. (March 1, 1926)

[Luisa writes:] *Whence I stopped [doing the Rounds] in the descent of the Word upon the earth and I was sorry for him in seeing him alone. And my sweet Jesus with an indescribable tenderness surprising me said to me: "My dearest daughter, you are wrong, the solitude*

was part of human ingratitude; but from the divine part and of our works, all accompanied me nor did they ever leave me alone. Rather, **you should know that together with me descended the Father and the Holy Spirit while I remained with them in heaven, they descended with me on earth. We are inseparable; we ourselves if we wanted we could not separate ourselves;** at the most we bilocate; and while we hold our throne in heaven, we form our throne on earth, but to separate ourselves not ever; at the most the Word took the operative part, however the Father and the Holy Spirit (are) always concurrent." (December 25, 1938)

Many other passages from Luisa's volumes about the Trinity could be presented here. Each one affirms Catholic dogma: namely, that there is One God in Three Divine Persons; each distinct from the others, while also consubstantial.

## Luisa's Writings Affirm Christological Orthodoxy

Section 6.2 of the KBD states:

The explanation of Christ's humanity and divinity does not conform to dogma and is arbitrary. It depicts humanity and divinity as if they exist separately. It is said that the resurrected Jesus can no longer suffer through His humanity, so He is made to suffer through Piccarreta. It depicts Jesus' humanity as if it were separate from His divinity and could be implanted in Piccarreta.

The KBD immediately proceeds to the presentation of fifteen separate selections from Luisa's volumes, but it does not at any point explain what within them allegedly violates Catholic dogma, nor does it present any teachings from Catholic dogma that are supposedly contradicted.

Indeed, Jesus Christ is fully God and fully man. In the hypostatic union, the *one Divine person* that is Jesus Christ subsists perfectly in *two natures* (Divine and human). But this does not change the fact that there is a real distinction between Christ's humanity and Divinity. Unlike the Persons of the Trinity – Who are *absolutely* inseparable and can only even be said to be distinct on the basis of *relation* – the Humanity of Christ began to exist in time (upon the Incarnation). Therefore, from this fact alone, it follows that *some manner of concrete* distinction (i.e., not merely "relational") can be said to exist. Catholic thought has long held that the hypostatic union is the *second* greatest union that exists, after the oneness of the Persons of the Trinity. While this is obviously an extraordinary exaltation, it nevertheless leaves

room for some mention of real distinction. Indeed, rendering coherent even the most basic Catholic dogmas on the Incarnation and Passion of Christ requires this acknowledgment.

Yet, the KBD implies that any such acknowledgement (which Catholic teaching affirms) constitutes a "lack of conformity to dogma." In contradiction to this implication, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches another way in which a distinction exists:

"This human soul that the Son of God assumed is endowed with a true human knowledge. As such, this knowledge could not in itself be unlimited: it was exercised in the historical conditions of his existence in space and time. This is why the Son of God could, when he became man, "increase in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man," and would even have to inquire for himself about what one in the human condition can learn only from experience. This corresponded to the reality of his voluntary emptying of himself, taking "the form of a slave.'" (§472)

\*\*\*

Luisa's writings, however, affirm the unity of the Divine and human natures of Christ in His One Divine Person. Even several of the supposedly problematic quotes from her volumes that the KBD here cites directly affirm this orthodox understanding! For example, the KBD quotes the following passages:

"It [my Humanity] was identified with the Divinity—even more, They were one single thing; and while They were one, I felt the torment of the separation, of the abyss of the Divinity..." (12.133.6–June 2, 1920)

In this passage, Jesus *explicitly* contradicts any problematic ascription of separation between His humanity and Divinity; thereby flatly negating the very claim made in this section by the KBD (whereas there are no passages in Luisa's volumes which exhibit that claim). Evidently, the KBD simply takes exception to Jesus saying that He "felt the torment of the separation." Yet this is nothing other than an exposition of traditional Catholic teaching on the "kenosis" (or "emptying") of Christ.

[Jesus], though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God something to be grasped. Rather, he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, coming in human likeness; and found human in appearance, he humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even death on a cross. (Philippians 2:6-8)

"And about three o'clock Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "*Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?*" which means, "My God, my God, why have

you forsaken me?" (Matthew 27:46)

The Catholic Encyclopedia explains:

According to Catholic theology, the abasement of the Word consists in the assumption of humanity and the simultaneous occultation of the Divinity. ... His likeness, in His abasement, to the fallen nature does not compromise the actual loss of justice and sanctity, but only the pains and penalties attached to the loss.<sup>18</sup>

\*\*\*

As for the KBD's concerns here regarding Luisa suffering on behalf of Jesus, we have already settled the orthodoxy of this theme above. Regarding the claim that Jesus' humanity "*could be implanted in Piccarreta*," this is just another way of describing the Gift of Living in the Divine Will, which we have already seen displayed in the writings of canonized and beatified mystics, as also discussed earlier. Moreover, this "implanting" of His humanity is offered to all of us, not just Luisa.

St. Thérèse, in a manner more strikingly direct than Francis de Sales and John Eudes, teaches that the believer who lovingly makes herself nothing before the will of God does indeed become a continuation of the life of Christ and a daring sharer in his divine powers. The divine and prodigal excess of the Father finds a receptacle in the soul's abandon.<sup>19</sup>

**[St.] Elizabeth [of the Trinity] believed that the Holy Spirit would transform her into another humanity of Jesus.** She wrote: "O consuming fire! Spirit of love! Descend within me and reproduce within me, as it were, an incarnation of the Word that I may be to him another humanity wherein He renews his mystery! O my Christ, Whom I love, ... I beseech Thee to clothe me with Thyself..."<sup>20</sup>

Mutual indwelling [of Christ and Christian] indicates the actual continuation of Jesus' holy life in his followers. [St. John] Eudes points to several other New Testament passages (for example, Col 3:3-4; Eph 2:5; 2 Cor 4:10-11; Gal 2:20; 2 Thess 2:11-12) that insist upon this intimacy between Christ and his disciples: this scriptural witness leaves believers no choice but to conclude that "**Jesus Christ should be living in us and that we should live only in him... our life should be a continuation and expression of his life.**" In fact, we have "no right" to live any other life on earth but his. In short, **the baptized Christian should aim for nothing short of being "other Jesus Christs on earth"**. This

“basic truth” of Christianity reflects the will of Jesus, whose union to us makes such an existence possible...<sup>21</sup>

## Luisa’s Writings Properly Depict the Sufferings of Jesus

Section 6.3 of the KBD states:

It embellishes the suffering that Jesus undergoes. Piccarreta's suffering itself is depicted as having the power to dispel wrath. Piccarreta's suffering is given the same effect and value as Jesus' suffering.

No material is presented by the KBD to justify the claim that Luisa’s writings “embellish the suffering that Jesus undergoes.” Indeed, Luisa’s *Hours of the Passion* describe, in stark terms, all the details of His Passion. Yet there is nothing unorthodox in the description, and it moreover resembles the private revelations given to other mystics about the Passion; for example, *The Dolorous Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ: From the Visions of Anne Catherine Emmerich*. Unfortunately, those who have little exposure to authentic Catholic mysticism about the Passion of the Christ—and who then are introduced to Luisa’s writings—are taken aback but just how much astounding sufferings Our Lord endured, and some refuse to believe. St. Faustina explained why this is so:

“The world still has no idea of all that Jesus suffered.” –St. Faustina. *Diary*, §1054

However, Fr. Bucci—who knew Luisa when he was a child—related in his biography (with the imprimatur) of the mystic, that when these Hours of the Passion were brought to Pope St. Pius X (by St. Hannibal di Francia), the Pope said to him in reply, “**Father, this book should be read while kneeling: it is Jesus Christ who is speaking!**”<sup>22</sup>

The KBD’s suggestion that it is problematic to state that a victim souls’ suffering can “dispel wrath” had already been proffered in previous sections, wherein we have already discussed it sufficiently.

“One day Jesus told me that He would cause a chastisement to fall upon the most beautiful city in our country. This chastisement would be that with which God had punished Sodom and Gomorrah. I saw the great wrath of God and a shudder pierced my heart. I prayed in silence. After a moment, Jesus said to me, My child, unite yourself closely to Me during the Sacrifice and offer My Blood and My Wounds to My Father in expiation” –St. Faustina. *Divine Mercy in My Soul*, §39

As for the final statement in this section; i.e., that Luisa's "suffering is given the same effect and value as Jesus' suffering," this claim derives entirely from the excerpt the KBD here presents:

"And I will look upon your pains as my own; I will give them the same effects, the same value." (12.5.4–April 12, 1917)

However, the proper translation of this passage is worded differently. In it, Jesus says to Luisa, "I will look upon your pains **as if they were** my own," not "as my own." Obviously, then, Jesus is acknowledging that Luisa's pains *are not* His own! Yet, by our offering Jesus' sufferings back to Him and His Father – and by doing so *in His Will*, in and through our own pains – Jesus, in His great love, is eager to treat this offering *as if it were* His own offering.

This is also precisely what we do in praying the Divine Mercy Chaplet as revealed by Jesus to St. Faustina. We offer, to the Eternal Father, Jesus Christ's own pains in reparation for the sins of the world, and even though we are the ones offering it, He gladly accepts it as if it were again Christ's own pains being presented before Him.

This is a beautiful and inspiring teaching, not a doctrinally erroneous or problematic one.

## Luisa's Writings are Not "Gnostic"

Section 6.4 of the KBD states:

There is too much emphasis on 'the knowledge' of Divine Will. The importance of 'faith' or 'journey of faith' is reduced. It only emphasizes 'knowledge', knowing, and revelation. This attitude of placing excessive emphasis on 'knowledge' and 'revelation' is reminiscent of 'ancient Gnosticism', which considered the recognition of spiritual 'knowledge' as an inevitable condition for salvation.

This judgment issued in the KBD is entirely a subjective description of personal preference; furthermore, it cites no Magisterial teachings.

Gnosticism is assuredly a harmful deception and heresy. Yet it is also true that one often finds an empty, vague, and undefined charge of "Gnosticism" wrongly levied against many perfectly authentic private revelations and entirely valid and orthodox tomes of mysticism, when its critics are at a loss for producing valid critiques. If some text is presented as an important one, detractors quickly realize that they can simply slander it as "Gnostic" merely because of its page count.

Anyone is free to present a specific Scriptural or Magisterial teaching against Gnosticism and place it next to the passage from

Luisa's writings that supposedly violates this teaching. To date, no one has done so (the reason is simple: there is no Gnosticism in her volumes), even though a number of Luisa's critics have indeed levied the mistaken charge of "Gnosticism" against her texts.

Here as with all the other concerns we have addressed, it is precisely Luisa's writings themselves which most emphatically refute the very errors they are being accused of displaying. In stark contrast to a revelation which would, as the KBD states, "recognize spiritual 'knowledge' as an inevitable condition for salvation," Luisa's writings teach the opposite view. Jesus tells Luisa:

"Do you want that My Will Reigns and Lives in you as Life? **If you truly want it, everything is done**, because so much is Our Love and ardent Desire that the creature possess Our Will as Life in order to let her Live of It, that as her human will truly wants it, so Ours fills the human volition with Our Supreme Volition in order to form Its Life there, and Live in her as in Its own Center... Even more, if [the soul] wants the Life of Our Will in hers, wanted, commanded by Us with so many sighs, if she truly wants It, she will have the Great Good of possessing Our Will as Life. And if this could not be, the Sanctity of Living in My Volition would be a difficult and almost impossible sanctity, and I do not know how to neither teach difficult things, nor do I want impossible things. Rather it is My usual Way to make easy, for as much as it is possible for the creature, the most arduous things and hardest sacrifice. ... so much is My Love, that in order to make it all the more easy, I whisper to the ear of the heart: 'If you truly want to do this good, I will do it together with you, I will not leave you alone, I will place My Grace, My Strength, My Light, My Sanctity at your disposition; we will both do the good that you want to possess.' Therefore, not too much is needed to Live of My Will; the too much is in the volition-if this decides and strongly and perseveringly wants it, already she has conquered Mine and has made It hers... So if you truly want My Divine Will as Life, not too much is needed, even more, because united to yours there is Mine that wants it, there is a Power that can do everything, and as for you, one will see with deeds if in all things you will behave as possessor of a Divine Will. Therefore be attentive, My daughter, and let your flight always be continuous in the Supreme Fiat." (March 19, 1935)



There are many teachings like this one in Luisa's volumes, and as is evident, they display an outlook that is the polar opposite of Gnosticism. Quite the contrary, Jesus teaches Luisa that living in His Will is all about our simply wanting it!

Now, it is also true that Jesus places great importance, in His messages to Luisa, on attaining more knowledge of the Divine Will. This knowledge empowers one's journey in the Divine Will. Such emphasis on the importance of growing in knowledge of the deepest spiritual realities is entirely unproblematic.

"My people perish for lack of knowledge!" – Hosea 4:6

"...let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus..." (Philippians 2:5)

"Saint Augustine says that "he who wishes often to be with God ought to pray frequently and read pious books," and all spiritual writers after him, without exception, have insisted on the necessity of spiritual reading for all those who wish to lead a really interior and supernatural life. Holiness is the fruit of prayer, and mental prayer is extremely difficult without the reading of spiritual books. Such reading provides the foundation on which the work of meditation is to be built up" – Fr. Edward Leen, C.S.Sp.23

But, contrary to any brand of Gnosticism, attaining advanced degrees of the knowledge of the Fiat which Jesus details to Luisa is *not a prerequisite* for Living in the Divine Will. Still less is it considered a prerequisite for salvation! Jesus gives the most anti-Gnostic message about salvation that one can imagine. To give just one example of hundreds we could present, Jesus tells Luisa:

But [My Will] does not leave [a sinful soul]; Its Love binds It to live in that creature in order to give her life, and although It feels Its Divine Life being as though suffocated, and maybe not even known or loved, the Love of my Will is so great that It follows her life, regardless of any offense, to make a surprise of love and save Its child. Our Goodness and Our Love are such that We try all ways, We use all means to snatch her from sin, to place her in safety; and if We don't succeed during her life, We make the last surprise of love at the moment of her death. Now, you must know that, in that moment, We give the last sign of love to the creature, and We endow her with graces, with light, with goodness; We place such tendernesses of love as to soften and conquer the hardest hearts. And when the creature finds herself between life and death - between time that is about to end, and Eternity that is about to begin - almost in the act of her leaving the body,

I, your Jesus, make Myself seen, with a loveliness that enraptures, with a sweetness that chains and sweetens the bitternesses of life, especially in that extreme moment. Then, my gaze: I look at her, but with so much love as to snatch from her an act of contrition, one act of love, one adhesion to my Will. Now in that moment of the stripping of illusion, in seeing and in touching with their own hands how much We have loved them and do love them, the creatures feel such sorrow that they repent for not having loved Us; they recognize Our Will as the origin and completion of their lives, and, as satisfaction, they accept death, to fulfill one act of Our Will. ... How many are saved by virtue of this sign of Ours, all love, with the exception of the most perverted and obstinate ... The moment of death is Our daily catch - the finding of the lost man. ... My Goodness is such, wanting everyone to be saved, that I allow the falling of these walls when the creatures find themselves between life and death - at the moment in which the soul exits the body to enter eternity - so that they may make at least one act of contrition and of love for Me, recognizing my adorable Will over them. I can say that I give them one hour of truth, in order to rescue them. Oh! if all knew my industries of love, which I perform in the last moment of their lives, so that they might not escape from my hands, more than paternal - they would not wait for that moment, but they would love Me all their lives." (March 22, 1938)

As we can see here, the salvific action of Jesus Christ for even the most sinful of souls is absolutely not in the least bit mitigated by that soul's deficiency of any sort of knowledge, much less by a lack of "special" or "secret" knowledge. One would be hard pressed to find a more resolute refutation of Gnosticism than what we see in Luisa's volumes. Jesus even tells Luisa that He *must* love *any* soul who loves Him; that it is "impossible" for Him to do otherwise:

"My daughter, not loving one who loves Me is impossible for Me. Rather, I feel so drawn toward her, that at the littlest act of love she does for Me, I respond with triple love and I place a divine vein in her heart, which administers to her divine science, divine sanctity and virtue; and the more the soul loves Me, the more this divine vein rises, and watering all the powers of the soul, it diffuses for the good of the other creatures." (November 15, 1916)

## Luisa's Writings Presuppose and Confirm the Entirety of the Catholic "Journey of Faith"

Regarding the KBD's claim that "the importance of 'faith' or 'journey of faith' is reduced," in Luisa's volumes, this too is an entirely illegitimate critique of her writings.

First, we must consider the purpose of Luisa's volumes. They were not intended to consist in a complete presentation of Catholic teaching or even an "Introduction to the Devout Life." Instead, Luisa was commanded—*by the Church, under holy obedience*—to write down what Jesus revealed to her. (This was the only reason she began writing.) She was not instructed to present a comprehensive summary of, or introduction to, the Faith. Indeed, Luisa's private revelations everywhere presuppose (as absolutely necessary) that whoever wishes to follow them is already a devout Catholic, following—now and always—all the teachings of the Church.

Although it is of course true that no private revelation may contradict Scripture or Magisterium, it is also true that determining precisely what proportion of content, detailing certain themes, one believes should exist within a given private revelation is not a legitimate, Church-sanctioned norm of discernment. It is certainly found nowhere in the CDF's 1978 document<sup>24</sup> outlining how such discernment must take place: *Norms Regarding The Manner Of Proceeding In The Discernment Of Presumed Apparitions Or Revelations*. God chooses different souls for different purposes. It is His right to determine what themes He will focus on in His revelations to the innumerable mystics with which the Church has been blessed.

Even, however, if we leave aside all of these considerations, we are still confronted with the fact that Luisa's writings *do in fact*—beautifully and repeatedly—emphasize the importance of the Catholic Journey of Faith.

The KBD provides no citations from Luisa's volumes to bolster its claim that her writings detract from the importance of the journey of Faith. Therefore, we will here simply consider what is contained in Luisa's volumes on this topic. For example, within them, we read:

Now, while seeing Jesus or the priest celebrating the Divine Sacrifice, Jesus would make me understand that in the Mass there is all the depth of our sacrosanct religion. Ah! yes, the Mass tells us everything and speaks to us about everything. The Mass reminds us of our redemption; It speaks to us, step by step, about the pains that Jesus suffered for us; It also manifests to us His immense love, for He was not content with dying on the Cross, but

He wanted to continue His state of victim in the Most Holy Eucharist. The Mass also tells us that our bodies, decayed, reduced to ashes by death, will rise again on the day of the judgment, together with Christ, to immortal and glorious life. Jesus made me comprehend that the most consoling thing for a Christian, and the highest and most sublime mysteries of our holy religion are: Jesus in the Sacrament [the Eucharist] and the resurrection of our bodies to glory. These are profound mysteries, which we will comprehend only beyond the stars; but Jesus in the Sacrament makes us almost touch them with our own hands, in different ways. ... Can there be anything more consoling for a human heart than the fact that not only the soul, but also the body will be beati-fied in the eternal contentments? ... Oh! how many things Jesus in the Sacrament tells us; but who can tell them all? (Volume 1 [Undated])

The first step is to know who those are who belong to Her, and these you can know by establishing one day a reunion, to which you will invite them, so that those who are Catholic should convene to the appointed place for such reunion; and there, with the help of lay Catholics, they should decide what is suitable to do. **The second step is to oblige to confession those Catholics who convene, which is the most important thing that renews man and forms the true Catholics.** And this, not only for those who are present, but they should oblige the leaders to oblige their subjects to confession; and if they do not succeed with gentle manners, they should even dismiss them from their service. Once each priest has formed the body of his Catholics, then will they be able to move forward to superior steps. (March 14, 1900)

“In order to obtain, one must believe. Just as for the head without the sight of the eyes, everything is darkness, everything is confusion, so much so, that if one wanted to walk, he would stumble now at one point, now at another, and would end up falling completely, the same for the soul without Faith—she does nothing but go from precipice to precipice. But Faith serves as the sight of the soul, and as the light which guides her to eternal life. Now, what is this light of Faith nourished by? By Hope. Now, what is the substance of this light of Faith, and of this nourishment of Hope? It is Charity. All of these three virtues are grafted to one another, in such a way that one cannot be without the other. In fact, what good comes to man from believing in the immense riches of Faith, if he does not hope for them, for himself? He will look at them, yes, but with indifferent eye, because he knows that they do not belong to him. But Hope provides the light of Faith

with wings, and by hoping in the merits of Jesus Christ, he looks at them as his own, and he comes to love them.” (Volume 1. [Undated])

[Jesus] made me see the Church, telling me these exact words: **"All Heaven is veiled in my Church. Just as in Heaven one is the head, which is God, and many are the saints, of different conditions, orders and merits, so in my Church, in which all Heaven is veiled, one is the head, which is the Pope, and the Sacrosanct Trinity is veiled even in the triple tiara that covers his head;** and many are the members that depend on this head - that is, different dignities, various orders, superior and inferior, from the littlest to the greatest, they all serve to embellish my Church. Each one, according to its degree, has the office entrusted to it, and by the exact fulfillment of the virtues it comes to give from itself a splendor so very fragrant to my Church, that the earth and Heaven are perfumed and illuminated, and the people are so drawn by this light and by this fragrance, that it is almost impossible for them not to surrender to the truth.” (May 2, 1899)

As with all the other matters we have discussed, this is only a very small selection of passages from Luisa’s volumes. Many others convey the same teachings. Jesus’ words to Luisa always presuppose the absolute necessity of the Catholic Journey of Faith, and often explicitly confirm and emphasize this.

## Luisa’s Writings Reject a “Fear-Based” Eschatology

The KBD’s final subsection of Section 6 states:

6.5. It has the color of a time-limited eschatology, and the end is portrayed as something to be feared. It foreshadows a bleak future for humanity. It incites fear, and sends messages of infernal pain and threats.

This is a particularly strange critique to read, as it is widely understood—even by those with only cursory knowledge of Luisa’s writings—that these private revelations provide the most hopeful and encouraging message about the future that one could possibly imagine while abiding within the boundaries of Catholic orthodoxy. (Luisa’s critics are even known to take issue with the optimism of these writings.)

To justify the present critique, the KBD provides five brief selections from Luisa’s volumes that speak of chastisements. There is nothing doctrinally erroneous or even problematic in these selections.

Moreover, even if we leave Luisa aside, there remains an immense corpus of approved apparitions and private revelations which give identical (or even more severe) messages detailing impending chastisements which will fall upon the world. Let us review a small selection of them here.

In the approved apparitions of Our Lady of Fatima, the Virgin Mary said:

The war is going to end: but if people do not cease offending God, a worse one will break out during the Pontificate of Pius XI. When you see a night illumined by an unknown light, know that **this is the great sign given you by God that he is about to punish the world for its crimes, by means of war, famine, and persecutions** of the Church and of the Holy Father. To prevent this, I shall come to ask for the consecration of Russia to my Immaculate Heart, and the Communion of reparation on the First Saturdays. If my requests are heeded, Russia will be converted, and there will be peace; if not, she will spread her errors throughout the world, causing wars and persecutions of the Church. The good will be martyred; the Holy Father will have much to suffer; **various nations will be annihilated.** In the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph. The Holy Father will consecrate Russia to me, and she shall be converted, and a period of peace will be granted to the world. (Vatican.va)<sup>25</sup>

In the approved apparitions of Our Lady of Akita, the Virgin Mary said:

"As I told you, if men do not repent and better themselves, the Father will inflict a terrible punishment on all humanity. It will be a punishment greater than the deluge, such as one will never seen before. **Fire will fall from the sky and will wipe out a great part of humanity, the good as well as the bad, sparing neither priests nor faithful. The survivors will find themselves so desolate that they will envy the dead.** The only arms which will remain for you will be the Rosary and the Sign left by My Son. Each day recite the prayers of the Rosary. With the Rosary, pray for the Pope, the bishops and priests." ... "The work of the devil will infiltrate even into the Church in such a way that one will see cardinals opposing cardinals, bishops against bishops. The priests who venerate me will be scorned and opposed by their confreres...churches and altars sacked; the Church will be full of those who accept compromises and the demon will press many priests and consecrated souls to leave the service of the Lord.

"The demon will be especially implacable against souls consecrated to God. The thought of the loss of so many souls is the cause of my sadness. If sins increase in number and gravity, there will be no longer pardon for them"<sup>26</sup>

In the approved apparitions of Our Lady of Kibeho, the Virgin Mary showed the seers an impending "river of blood" due to mankind's sinfulness. (Several years later, the Rwandan Genocide took place, resulting in the murder of a million innocent people.) She also told the seers:

"The world is on the edge of catastrophe. Cleanse your hearts through prayer. The only way is through God. If you do not take refuge in God, where will you hide when the fire has spread everywhere?"

In the approved apparitions of Our Lady of La Salette, the Virgin Mary said:

"If my people will not submit, I shall be forced to let fall the arm of my Son. It is so strong, so heavy, that I can no longer withhold it. ... France has corrupted the universe, one day it will be punished."

Furthermore, in His revelations to St. Faustina, Jesus said:

"Souls perish in spite of my bitter Passion. I am giving them the last hope of salvation: that is the Feast of my Mercy. If they do not adore my mercy, they will perish for all eternity. Secretary of my mercy, write, tell souls about this great mercy of mine, because **the awful day, the day of my justice, is near.**" (Diary, §965)

There are countless other fully approved – and certainly authentic – private revelations (not to mention prophecies issued directly by canonized saints) that speak of chastisements in terms just as dire as anything found in Luisa's volumes. Clearly, there are no grounds for criticizing Luisa's writings on this count.

Here we should note that many of the prophecies in Luisa's revelations about chastisements have *already* been fulfilled. As St. Haniel di Francia himself noted:

In the course of these publications which we are beginning, there are chapters which foresee divine scourges of earthquakes, wars, fire, cloudbursts, devastation of lands, epidemics, famines and the like. **Everything, everything has been predicted several years before, and everything has come about, and much yet is left to come about.** (Hours of the Passion. Preface)

For example, long before World War II started, Jesus told Luisa:

Ah! it is **the second general turmoil that the nations are preparing...**I have done everything to dissuade them...But everything has been in vain; the more they united together, the more discords, hatreds and injustices they fomented, to the point of forcing the oppressed to take up arms to defend themselves. And when it comes to defending the oppressed and justice, also natural, I must concur; more so, since the nations which appear to be victorious, succeeded on the basis of the most perfidious injustice. **They should have understood this by themselves, and been meeker toward the oppressed; on the contrary, they are more inexorable, wanting not only their humiliation, but also their destruction. What perfidy!** What perfidy, more than diabolical! They are not yet satiated with blood. How many poor peoples will perish! I grieve, but the earth wants to be purged – more cities will be destroyed... (January 16, 1923)

They have so blinded themselves, that they are preparing fierce wars and revolutions. **This time it will not be just Europe, but other races will unite together. The circle will be more extensive; other parts of the world will participate. ... the chastisements that have occurred are nothing other than the preludes of those that will come.** How many more cities will be destroyed; how many peoples buried under the ruins; how many places buried and plunged into the abyss. The elements will take the part of their Creator. My Justice can bear no more; my Will wants to triumph, and would want to triumph by means of Love in order to establish Its Kingdom. But man does not want to come to meet this Love, therefore it is necessary to use Justice... (November 16, 1926)

This century can be called the century of the most awful pretenses – and among all classes; and this is why **they never come to an agreement among themselves, and while apparently it seems that they want to agree, in reality they are plotting new wars.** ... **they are converting that peace, so praised with words, but not with deeds, into preparations for war. ... another war, much more extensive than the last one...** You, pray and offer everything, so that the Kingdom of my Fiat may come soon (March 31, 1927)

**What wickedness – after so many evils of a war they have gone through, they are preparing another one, more terrible, and they are trying to move almost the entire world, as if it were one single man.** (August 12, 1927)



Obviously, these messages have already been proven entirely true by the facts of history. And it would be absurd to malign a *fulfilled* prophecy.

\*\*\*

Even more significantly, however, Jesus repeatedly encourages Luisa (and, by extension, all of us) to have no fear whatsoever of the Chastisements, but rather to remain in absolute peace and trust amidst them; for they too—though He does not affirmatively want them even when His *permissive* Will allows them—are truly nothing but veiled acts of love. For example, He tells her:

“My daughter, **man has forgotten Heaven for the earth. It is justice that what is earth be taken away from him, and that he go wandering, unable to find a place in which to take refuge, so that he may remember that Heaven exists.** Man has forgotten the soul for the body. So, everything is for the body: pleasures, comforts, sumptuousness, luxury and the like. The soul is starving, deprived of everything, and in many it is dead, as if they did not have it. Now, it is justice that their bodies be deprived, so that they may remember that they have a soul. But—oh! how hard man is. His hardness forces Me to strike him more—who knows, he might soften under the blows.” (April 6, 1922)

“My daughter, courage, everything will serve for the Triumph of My Will. **If I strike, it is because I want to heal.** My Love is so much, that when I cannot conquer by way of Love and of Graces, I seek to conquer by way of terror and fright. The human weakness is so much that many times he does not care about My Graces, he is deaf to My Voice, he laughs at My Love. But it is enough to touch his skin, to remove the things necessary to natural life, that it abases his haughtiness. He feels so humiliated that he makes himself a rag, and I do what I want with him. Especially if they do not have a perfidious and obstinate will, **one chastisement is enough-to see himself at the brink of the grave-that he returns to Me into My arms. You must know that I always love my children, my beloved creatures, I would turn Myself inside out so as not to see them struck; so much so, that in the gloomy times that are coming, I have placed them all in the hands of my Celestial Mother**—to Her have I entrusted them, that She may keep them for Me under Her safe mantle. I will give Her all those whom She will want; even death will have no power over those who will be in the custody of my Mother.” Now, while He was saying this, my dear Jesus showed me, with facts, how the Sovereign Queen descended from Heaven with an unspeakable majesty, and a tenderness fully maternal; and She went

around in the midst of creatures, throughout all nations, and She marked Her dear children and those who were not to be touched by the scourges. Whomever my Celestial Mother touched, the scourges had no power to touch those creatures. Sweet Jesus gave to His Mother the right to bring to safety whomever She pleased." (June 6, 1935)

What is perhaps most important to emphasize for the present section, however, is that the prophecies about the future in the world provided by Jesus to Luisa are *not* primarily about chastisements. The foretold chastisements are merely the prelude to the prophecies of triumph, peace, and glory that are to follow them.

Jesus tells Luisa that earth will become a veritable saint-making factory for Heaven (which, of course, is its original purpose!):

This is the reason why We insist so much that Our Will be always done, that It be known, because We want to populate Heaven with Our beloved children. (June 6, 1935)

He tells her that the Sacraments will triumph on earth, finally bearing the complete fruit in souls that they were always intended to:

The Kingdom of my Will will be the true echo of the Celestial Fatherland, in which, while the Blessed possess their God as their own life, they receive Him into themselves also from the outside. So, inside and outside of themselves, Divine Life they possess, and Divine Life they receive. **What will not be my happiness in giving Myself sacramentally to the children of the Eternal Fiat, and in finding my own Life in them? Then will my Sacramental Life have Its complete fruit; and as the species are consumed, I will no longer have the sorrow of leaving my children without the food of my continuous Life, because my Will, more than sacramental accidents, will maintain Its Divine Life always with Its full possession. In the Kingdom of my Will there will be neither foods nor communions that are interrupted – but perennial; and everything I did in Redemption will serve no longer as remedy, but as delight, as joy, as happiness, and as beauty ever growing. So, the triumph of the Supreme Fiat will give complete fruit to the Kingdom of Redemption.** (November 2, 1926)

These are the most inspiring and consoling words about the future that one will find in Catholic prophecy, and hundreds of similar teachings can be found in Luisa's volumes.

## 15. "Conclusion"

At this point, the KBD proceeds to its conclusion. We will not address again here in detail those claims which the conclusion merely reiterates, as they are treated adequately above. It will suffice to simply repeat the following facts, which are all supported with extensive evidence in earlier pages, and which stand in contrast to what the KBD's conclusion states:

- Within Luisa's writings, God's "absolute initiative in the work of salvation" is *not* in the least ignored. It is repeatedly emphasized.
- There is not a single instance in Luisa's volumes in which it is stated or implied that "salvation [is attained] through private revelation given to Luisa." In fact, the volumes repeatedly state the opposite. These private revelations are *never* presented as necessary for salvation.
- Luisa is *never* "deified" in these private revelations. On the contrary, her sinfulness, lowliness, unworthiness, and radical dependency upon Christ (and Mary, the Sacraments, priests, the Church, etc.) is constantly emphasized.
- Luisa is never said to have existed before her own conception, much less before Adam and Eve.
- Christ's salvation is *not* "subordinated to the work of the 'Fiat'" in these writings; rather, the *Fiat is itself one of Christ's salvific works*. The Fiat is *not* from Luisa. She is simply the first contemporary soul to receive the Gift of Living in the Divine Will, and she was chosen by Jesus as the one *through whom it will be made known*. Accordingly, it is obvious that Luisa is vastly less important than Jesus (and Mary).
- Luisa's volumes never violate the proper relationship between private revelation and Public Revelation. Although they indeed contain teachings of an enormous magnitude (which is not illicit for private revelation), they do not contradict any Scriptural or Magisterial teachings (as the Church has already affirmed through the many nihil obstats and imprimaturs her volumes received). Much more than merely not contradicting Scripture, Tradition, or Magisterium, however, Luisa's private revelations beautifully complement them and constitute a perfectly organic development of Sacred Tradition.

## “Three Ages” Theory and Luisa’s Writings

The KBD’s conclusion then proceeds to introduce yet another concern it had not brought up within the corpus of its earlier pages. It states:

This argument is consistent with the ‘Three Ages’ theory advocated by new religious leaders in Korea. The Three Ages theory asserts that there are three ages in the history of salvation, and that the salvation that was not achieved in the previous two ages will be completed in the third age (they refer to this third age as the ‘Age of the Holy Spirit,’ ‘Age of the Testament,’ etc.). The most serious error in this argument is that it ignores or denigrates the salvation achieved through Christ, excludes God’s initiative in salvation, and emphasizes only the role of the third person.

While I am not acquainted with the advocacy of the “new religious leaders” in Korea, I am acquainted with the “three ages” teaching of writers like Joachim of Fiore in the Middle Ages. And what is certain is that Luisa’s writings specifically reject the “Three Ages” view of history alluded to here. They reject the dispensationalist, Joachimite, and Millenarian error which holds that the “Age of the Church” will soon pass away for the sake of an “Age of the Spirit” to replace it. Luisa’s writings describe the Era to come as the “*triumph*” of the Church, *not* its passing away. Jesus tells Luisa that the three ages of history are not those of pre-Catholic, Catholic, and post-Catholic—but rather, He says: “**the three ages of the world [are] that of the law of nature, that of written law, and that of the law of Grace.**” (October 29, 1921)

The age of the “law of nature” consists in those times which preceded God’s revelation to the Old Testament Israelites. The age of the “Written Law” consists in what is depicted among God’s chosen people within the Old Testament. The “Law of Grace” (which the Incarnation of Christ and the Birth of the Church instituted) is precisely the final age of history. We have been in it for 2,000 years already, and we will be in it until the End of Time. The Reign of the Divine Will is just a continuation of the Age of Grace. Jesus even tells Luisa, about the coming of the Kingdom of the Divine Will:

"You will see this great good from Heaven, when the Church will receive this celestial food [the writings on the Divine Will], which will strengthen her and make **her rise again to her full triumph.**" (February 10, 1924)

Clearly, Jesus’ teaching through Luisa that the times to come will entail the “full triumph” of the Church are diametrically opposed to that

“three ages” theory which anticipates the passing away of the age of the Church for the sake of an “Age of the Holy Spirit” to replace it. Therefore, it is false for the KBD to claim that Luisa’s writings are “consistent with” the very theory they affirmatively dispute.

## Private and Public Revelation, Revisited

Next, the KBD’s conclusion yet again repeats its concerns about the respective roles of public and private revelation, along with reiterating its allegation that Luisa’s writings violate the proper relationship between the two. We have already addressed this concern, but since it is treated at length again in the conclusion, some additional words are here called for.\*

Although—I propose—Luisa’s writings do indeed contain the most magnanimous private revelations that Heaven has yet graced the Church with, nowhere within their thousands of pages is there any hint of dispensationalism, a claim to a new Public Revelation, or a claim to an improvement, completion,<sup>†</sup> surpassing, or correcting of Public Revelation. In each page, Luisa’s writings present themselves as only a *private* revelation entirely subservient to—fitting within the framework of and resting upon the foundation of—Public Revelation in Christ (the Deposit of Faith), and unquestionably under the dominion of the Magisterium and hierarchical authority of the Catholic Church.

Nowhere has the Church placed limits on how grand or glorious of a claim private revelation may make—the Church only teaches that a private revelation cannot claim to *itself* improve, complete, surpass, or correct Public Revelation (cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, §67). Nowhere do Luisa’s private revelations assert anything resembling the latter. Anyone will easily see this if he opens their pages and read; but for now, a few comparisons will suffice. A clear picture emerges from even this brief consideration, below, of some essentials of both the Definitive Public Revelation we have been given *in* Christ, and the private revelations on the Divine Will we have been given *through* Luisa: they are entirely and un-confusedly distinct in nature.

---

\* Note: the following paragraphs are adapted from *Thy Will Be Done* (2021)

† It is true that the Gift is the “crown and *completion*” of sanctity, but this “completion” is none other than what the Our Father prayer *already* reveals. Luisa’s revelations do not propose to themselves “complete” Public Revelation in this sense. They only *render explicit* (as the Catechism says private revelation is indispensable for!) the completion *already* embryonic in Public Revelation and developed by two thousand years of Sacred Tradition. This dynamic is carefully demonstrated throughout Parts One and Two of the book *Thy Will Be Done* (2021)

The revelations given to Luisa fit squarely within the boundaries, given by the Church, which restrict the scope of authentic private revelation, as we see summarized in the following table:

<b>Public Revelation in Jesus Christ</b>	<b>Private revelation through Luisa</b>
God is revealed as Three Persons, not One.	No new revelation of God's essence. These Three Persons simply now wish to share Their life even more fully with us.
Jesus reveals Himself as Divine.	Luisa insists she is a sinner and the lowliest of all creatures.
A new, permanent Church is established on earth that is necessary for salvation.	A new <i>spirituality</i> is introduced, yet obedient to and fitting perfectly within this same Church.
Seven Sacraments are instituted.	<i>No Sacraments are instituted</i> ; the same Seven Sacraments remain the necessary path to holiness.
A new Priesthood is established.	No new priesthood is formed: these very same (Catholic) priests are called to be the primary heralds of these revelations.
Laws are altered.*	Laws are entirely unchanged.
Entirely new Liturgy is instituted.	The Liturgy is identical.
There is a total change in leadership away from the Levitical Priesthood and to the Petrine Ministry.	All authority remains with the Successor of Peter, all his Magisterium, and the entire Catholic hierarchy.

\*\*\*

The KBD also here alleges that Luisa's writings "assert that they are infallible." This is false. No such assertion is made within them. (The KBD provides no quotations from Luisa's volumes that supposedly make this claim.) This is moreover contradicted by the volumes themselves, wherein Luisa would often speak erroneously, and Jesus would correct her.† In one entry within the volumes, we even read the following exchange between Jesus and Luisa:

---

\* E.g., Divorce made impermissible, juridical Mosaic precepts dispensed from, all foods declared clean, circumcision abolished.

† Even if someone asserts that a given private revelation contains no errors, this does not mean he is thereby ascribing "infallibility" to it. Infallibility describes some power held by the instrument itself which produces some effect – not the objective content of the effect itself. If, for example, I wrote a book containing only the

[Luisa writes:] I was thinking to myself: 'Who knows how much nonsense, how many errors are contained in these things I write!' At that moment, I felt I was losing consciousness, and blessed Jesus came and said to me: "My daughter, errors too will do good; and this, in order to make known that there is no artifice on your part, and that you are not some doctor, because if you were so, you yourself would realize where you were mistaken..." (January 8, 1900)

Next, the KBD moves on to provide a litany of subjective or unsupported critiques of Luisa's volumes that seem futile to address here. For example, within that paragraph, the author of the KBD claims that, in Luisa's writings, "the narratives are largely sentimental." Needless to say, however, one man (*whether he be a layman, priest, or Bishop*) deciding he would personally prefer messages that are "less sentimental" does not constitute valid grounds for issuing a judgment against a private revelation, nor is it a legitimate Church-sanctioned norm of discernment. In the same paragraph, the KBD repeatedly issues unsupported claims that Luisa's writings contradict Public Revelation or Catholic orthodoxy, while giving no specifics. As we have already addressed all the specifics, we will now move on to the next major claim of the KBD's conclusion.

\*\*\*

The KBD's penultimate concern is stated as follows:

There is a great risk that excessive focus on Piccarreta's role in salvation history and the private revelations she received will essentially reduce or render the role of the Church worthless, which continues Christ's work in the Holy Spirit. This leads to misunderstanding the effectiveness of the Eucharist and the dangerous idea that all the sacraments of the Church can be replaced by the spirituality of Divine Will. Rather than deepening communion with Jesus Christ and growing one's character and sense of community in faith through deep participation in the life of the Church, excessive emphasis is placed on 'possession' of Divine Will, and there is a great risk of promoting gnostic elitism that emphasizes "only those who possess the Will of God, Fiat," or falling into the ideology of exclusive chosen people. For those who follow Piccarreta, 'Fiat' replaces the sacraments and all church activities. It's as if God's Will is followed, there is no need for priests or churches, and there is no place for church

---

assertion "2+2=4," then this book would certainly be free of all error. This does not mean I am infallible. Similarly, even if it is said that Jesus' words to Luisa contain no doctrinal errors [an affirmation I support], this does not mean that he who makes this claim is declaring the private revelations to be "infallible."

teachings other than Piccarreta's private revelations. Then the sacraments established by Christ himself, the Church system, and the life of the Church community become meaningless...

We have already seen, in the preceding sections, how these accusations are without merit, and are repeatedly and explicitly contradicted by Luisa's private revelations.

Luisa's writings constantly emphasize the importance of the Church, of priests, and of frequenting the Sacraments. They especially glorify and exalt the Eucharist in the most beautiful and powerful manner. Such claims, contained in the KBD, that these private revelations "render the role of the Church worthless," or "indicate there is no need for priests or churches," or "leave no place for church teachings," etc., are simply outlandish and slanderous.

### **"Developing into an Anti-Church Group"?**

The final concern in the KBD's conclusion states:

...this individualistic spirituality, which ignores the authority and teachings of the Church and centers on 'self,' has a very large possibility of developing into an anti-Church group, and it is expected to cause serious pastoral problems.

This paragraph consists of a remarkably exaggerated and baseless fear. The very recipient of these private revelations lived in perfect and complete obedience to the Church for the entirety of her 82-year-long life, and always exhorted all others to the same posture. The Church and the Sacraments were her life. Luisa's writings have been devoutly read by the Faithful for more than a hundred years. They have nourished the faith of innumerable pious Catholics across the world. Approved religious orders are dedicated to them. Canonized saints promoted them. Abundant fruits have already been borne from them: conversions, works of charity, increased prayer, and even priestly and religious vocations. And let us not forget that Luisa is a Servant of God.

*At no point has this spirituality ever "developed into an anti-Church group."* The very suggestion that this is a serious risk or a "very large possibility" is preposterous.

**"...a tree is known by its fruit."** Matthew 12:33



## 16. “Pastoral Recommendations”

The final paragraph of the KBD states:

Therefore, it is judged necessary for the good of the Church to prevent the spread of this Servant of God’s writings and to stop the Divine Will spiritual gatherings. In addition, it is considered desirable to revoke the permission for publishing previously given by the Archdiocese of Seoul.

As a layman, it is obviously not within my competence to render a judgment on what pastoral recommendations the Korean bishops should promulgate for their flock.

Nevertheless, it has been made clear in the preceding pages that each one of the concerns expressed regarding Luisa’s volumes (and each accusation levied against them) contained in the KBD is either entirely without merit or is at least easily resolved in accordance with Catholic orthodoxy.

It would, therefore, be appropriate for the Korean Bishops to revise their pastoral recommendations accordingly.

## APPENDICES

### 17. On the Valid Concerns About Luisa's Writings

While my purpose in writing this response to the KBD was to address its concerns in order to demonstrate the orthodoxy of Luisa's writings, I should also note that it is certainly true that there are, unfortunately, a small portion of followers of Divine Will spirituality who *do* succumb to unorthodoxy. They do this because of their own deeply erroneous interpretations of Luisa's volumes, and their failure to interpret private revelation through the lens of Scripture and Magisterium. I am certainly not intending to take exception to the Korean Bishops merely having *concerns*. Valid concerns do exist, and these concerns must be taken seriously in ensuring that proper interpretations prevail.

Even St. Hannibal himself – who did not hesitate to bestow his own *nihil obstat* to Luisa's volumes and even dedicate his life to their promotion; insisting they “must be made known to the world” – acknowledged that some passages presented difficulties which were very important to interpret correctly in order to avert heretical understandings thereof that were, moreover, unfaithful to what Jesus intended to relay through Luisa. He wrote:

...in several places, it is necessary to make some changes in order to obtain the correct meaning of the word...There are some points which, inasmuch as they are true and holy if seen in the right spirit and with holy simplicity, still are not fit for publication...<sup>27</sup>

Luisa emphatically agreed with Fr. Hannibal and encouraged him to make any modifications he saw fit and delay the publication of any individual points that merited further care. Now, St. Hannibal unfortunately did not leave us with a list of which “points” he had in mind that should not be published without first ensuring the “right spirit” is applied to them.

Therefore, respecting this saint's insistence that the revelations nevertheless “must” be made known to the world in order to hasten the “triumph of the Divine Will” (*which, recall, are his own words, even quoted in the Vatican's official biography of Luisa*), I and many others have sought with great zeal to promote the proper understanding of the difficult passages (for example, this has been done by the theologian Stephen Patton [note that his book on Luisa's writings, quoted

above, also bears the *imprimatur*]; theologian and professor Fr. Edward O'Connor; the Benedictines of the Divine Will; the many priests and Bishops involved with Luisa's cause in Trani, Italy; and numerous others). While I have done so in the preceding chapters of this document (as well as my four books thus far published on the Divine Will), I will continue to do so in the sections ahead with points not necessarily included within the KBD.

Nevertheless, before relaying such concerns and emphasizing proper interpretations, I will first add that in my own travels I have found that unorthodox devotees constitute only a tiny fraction of the overall Divine Will movement (I have attended and spoken at Divine Will conferences across North America for 10 years, and I have met thousands of Divine Will followers). Instead, I have always found devotees of Luisa's writings to be the most faithful, pious, charitable, and orthodox-minded Catholics anywhere. (I admit, however, that I have no experience with the movement in Korea.)

In this appendix, therefore, I will address some of these issues and admonish those followers of the Divine Will who promote erroneous interpretations of Luisa's writings.\*

## **An Admonishment to the Unorthodox Divine Will Followers**

The Magisterium—especially helpful here is the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*—must give us the lens through which Luisa's revelations are to be understood. *Not vice versa*.

One must absolutely commit to believe and obey 100% of the Church's Teachings, and to regard these teachings and these teachings *alone* as the filter through which he approaches everything else—including any and all private revelations (such as those of Jesus to Luisa). Whoever has not made this commitment is *not* prepared to read Luisa's revelations.

Any Catholic should already know that this approach is always necessary. Yet it is worth noting that this is exactly the approach that Luisa herself insists upon, even with respect to her own revelations from Jesus! As Luisa wrote, immediately after *certain editions* (of only three out of dozens of her works) were placed on the Index (where they were soon joined by St. Faustina's revelations):

---

\* Note: Many of the following paragraphs are adapted from my article, "Divine Will Orthodoxy," which can be found here: <https://dsdoconnor.com/divine-will-orthodoxy/>

**“With humility, I spontaneously and promptly fulfill my duty as a Christian soul, of offering my unconditional, unhesitating, full and absolute submission to the judgment of the Holy Roman Church.** And so, without any restrictions, I disapprove and condemn everything that the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office disapproves and condemns in the said books, in the same sense and with the same intention as the Sacred Congregation.” — Servant of God Luisa Piccarreta’s personal, written, unconditional submission to the Church’s judgment on her writings (*A Guide to the Book of Heaven*. Stephen Patton. 2013. *Imprimatur*.)

This written affirmation, however, was just a reiteration of Luisa’s entire, lifelong approach. She repeatedly insisted that anything and everything she wrote down—including both her own thoughts *and* her recording of Jesus’ own words—be entirely subject to the Church’s teaching, and, if necessary, be freely modified accordingly. (St. Hannibal di Francia, whom Jesus chose as the first and primary apostle of the Divine Will, took the exact same approach; although he too was entirely convicted of the authenticity of the revelations). It would obviously be absurd for any mere follower of Luisa’s writings to insist upon a degree of exaltation being given to them that Luisa herself affirmatively rejected! And no one would be more offended by this than Luisa.

Now, it so happens that nothing in Luisa’s revelations needed to be discarded in order to maintain Catholic orthodoxy. (Though some interpretations of her revelations do indeed need to be rejected.) But the point is that Luisa was prepared to do even this, because she modeled the approach to Jesus’ revelations to her that we must all take; namely: *Catholic First, Catholic Always: Until the End of Time*.

## Sources of Unorthodox Interpretations of Luisa

Several overarching themes must be constantly remembered when reading Luisa’s writings so as to ensure improper perspectives on them do not arise. Some sources of unorthodox interpretations of Luisa’s writings may flow from:

- Failing to approach these revelations through the lens of the Catholic Teaching (especially the Catechism);
- Erroneously regarding these revelations as a new Public Revelation (Jesus makes it clear to Luisa that they are not);

- Taking individual teachings from Jesus to Luisa in isolation or out of context;
- Taking the liberty to interpret these teachings in accordance with one's own speculations or preferences;
- Failing to remember that each existing translation is quite imperfect and contains translation errors;
- Failing to read all of the context of certain often-quoted teachings from Luisa's revelations and thus failing to have sufficient knowledge of the various counterbalancing themes therein;
- Failing to understand how certain repeated terms are *meant* within the volumes (*not only is each available translation quite imperfect; there is also the fact that the original Italian was written in the early 1900s, in a particular dialect, by a particular person – the same word in Luisa's revelations might not mean the exact same thing generally intended today*).
- Forgetting Jesus' own words to Luisa in which He indicates that He often speaks to her in similes and metaphors, and accordingly approaching the revelations with the disposition of assuming everything said therein is literal, **when in fact much is analogical or symbolic.**

The same issues arise with any mystical text written throughout Church History; each – including those of canonized saints and Doctors of the Church – is full of statements which, if looked at in isolation and promoted without the proper interpretation, context, and Catechesis, would lead to doctrinal problems.

## 18. Several Truths (Confirmed in Luisa's Writings) That Divine Will Followers Must be Sure to Remember in Preserving Orthodoxy

### **Heaven alone is our ultimate destiny.**

Jesus tells Luisa bluntly that “**The end of man is Heaven...**” (April 4, 1931). The word “end” here, of course, means “purpose,” not “cessation.” Heaven is what *everything* on earth is about. Assuredly, in Heaven alone is found our definitive perfection and the definitive perfection of the Church as a whole. Indeed, God’s Will *shall* be done on earth as in Heaven. This is the essence of Luisa’s writings and of the Gospel itself, as contained in the climax of the Our Father prayer.

But God has *even more* in store for the Church’s perfection and our own beatitude than accomplishing His Will: He also has in store for us, to definitively complete our perfection, the enjoyment of His Unveiled Presence (the Beatific Vision). *That* is for Heaven alone, and it will constitute the delight of the blessed for all eternity. Jesus’ revelations to Luisa are the most Heaven-centered writings one will ever come across. (Recall that their very title is “The Book of Heaven.”) No one should ever succumb, on their account, to letting his focus be distracted one iota from Heaven. Nothing could be further from what these revelations recommend.

### **Upon the death of the Apostle John, Public Revelation was rendered complete.**

This Deposit of Faith is, and always will be, our foundation; not Jesus’ revelations to Luisa. Since St. John, there has not been, and there will not ever be, any new Public Revelation until the end of time. Every private revelation that will ever be given—including Jesus’ to Luisa—must always be considered subordinate to Public Revelation’s Deposit of Faith and to the Magisterium of the Catholic Church, which alone authoritatively interprets it.

No private revelation—including Luisa’s—is now, or ever will be, a universal objective necessity for salvation. Private revelation, moreover, is not the proper object of Supernatural (Divine) Faith, except perhaps for the recipient himself or herself.

Nowhere within her thousands of pages of revelations does Jesus tell Luisa that His words to her are to be regarded as a new Public

Revelation. Indeed, Jesus (for example) says to Luisa that “*one can call* [these writings] the Gospel of the Kingdom of the Divine Will.” (January 18th, 1928) However, the language used (“*one can call*”) makes it clear that these volumes are *not* intended to literally be a Fifth Gospel. Instead, the language is merely relaying an expression; intended in the same way, for example, that Pope St. John Paul II spoke of “The Gospel of the Dignity of the Person.” (*Evangelium Vitae* §2) “Gospel” simply means “Good News,” and Luisa’s writings are indeed the primary way we have been given the wonderful news about Living in the Divine Will. But they are not a new Bible, *nor are they an addition to the Bible.*

## **Jesus will never within history reign visibly on earth.**

Christ will triumph on earth. This is prophesied by more Scriptural passages, approved revelations, and documents of papal Magisterium than one can count (for more detail, see Part Five of the 2021 book, *Thy Will Be Done*). But He will reign *by virtue of His Divine Will*—and He will do so invisibly and *Eucharistically*. He will never reign visibly until He comes again at the very end of time to commence the General Resurrection and Last Judgment. Millenarianism and “modified Millenarianism,” both of which the Church has defined as the teaching that Christ will reign *visibly* on earth (Cf. 7/21/1944 Holy Office Declaration, AAS Vol XI P. 212), are errors. Though many Evangelicals succumb to this error, no Catholic may be a Millenarian.

Jesus’ sensible reign—along with any and all benefits which flow solely from the Beatific Vision (e.g. ontological confirmation of grace, eradication of any need for faith/hope, impossibility of death/suffering, etc.)—will only be enjoyed in Heaven. Accordingly, Jesus will never come again in the flesh until the end of time. When we pray “Come, Lord Jesus!” we pray for His coming *in grace*—especially His coming through the ministry of priests, above all in His Eucharistic Reign.

## **Jesus had a human will, not only the Divine Will.**

This is absolutely settled dogma, and contradicting it is called the Heresy of Monothelitism. Unfortunately, a few followers of Luisa seem to have succumbed to it, even though it is a heresy and Jesus explicitly rejects it in His own words to Luisa. He told her:

“My daughter, and what about Me—do you want to put Me

aside? Don't you know that I had a human will...?" — Jesus to Luisa. July 19th, 1928.

It is true that Jesus always kept His human will perfectly sacrificed to the Divine Will. Thus, He models for us all — especially in the Garden of Gethsemane — how we are to keep our wills under the dominion of the Divine Will. But the fact remains that He had a human will, and this dogma is extremely important.

### **The Catholic Church — in her entire essential nature; doctrines, hierarchy, Sacraments, etc. — will exist until the end of time.**

Contrary to the errors of Joachim of Fiore, discussed earlier, and a number of Protestant Dispensationalists, neither the Catholic Church nor anything essential to her Divine Constitution will ever pass away for the sake of a new dispensation, nor will it ever be replaced by an "Age of the Spirit."

Indeed, the Era of Peace can validly be considered an age of an outpouring of the Holy Spirit — but not one that will *replace* the Age of the Church; rather, it will be the opposite: the *triumph* of the Church! Jesus describes to Luisa the Reign of the Divine Will as the time in which the Church acquires her full vigor (cf. September 2, 1901), with Catholic priests as the Divine Will's primary protagonists (cf. January 13, 1929), and the Sacraments flourishing more than ever before (cf. November 2, 1926) — certainly not passing away.

### **St. Joseph is the greatest saint after the Blessed Virgin Mary.**

Pope Leo XIII taught, in his encyclical *Quamquam Pluries*:

"In truth, the dignity of the Mother of God is so lofty that naught created can rank above it. But as Joseph has been united to the Blessed Virgin by the ties of marriage, it may not be doubted that he approached nearer than any to the eminent dignity by which the Mother of God surpasses so nobly all created natures." (§3)

As we can see here, Catholic orthodoxy requires holding that St. Joseph is the greatest saint after his spouse. Whether or not Joseph himself had the Gift of Living in the Divine Will is irrelevant to ascertaining *his* greatness. Equally irrelevant to this assessment is the fact that he never received the Eucharist, yet he still towers above all



of us post-33 A.D. Christians (except the Blessed Virgin) who *have* received the Eucharist—a greater gift than Joseph (or Moses, or Abraham, or St. John the Baptist) ever received. Receiving a greater Gift does not make a person *himself* greater than another who has not received it.

No Catholic, and certainly no child of the Divine Will, should ever be caught dead replacing the final “J” in “JMJ” with anything other than Joseph. Luisa herself certainly did not do this. Rather, she invoked Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, in *every* Volume. Moreover, Jesus tells Luisa that Joseph is the *Prime Minister* of the Kingdom of the Divine Will—a sovereign dignity not even given to Luisa. (cf. July 7, 1928).

### **The Blessed Virgin Mary is the greatest saint. She is *vastly* above Luisa.**

The Magisterium teaches that Our Lady’s holiness is “entirely unique.” Jesus repeatedly reaffirms this to Luisa, exalting the Blessed Virgin as by far the greatest creature who ever has lived or ever will live. Although the Gift of Living in the Divine Will brings us into her same realms, the Virgin herself nevertheless remains absolutely and unquestionably supreme (among *created* persons) within this realm. Luisa is no exception to this. She was a sinner just like any of us.

Indeed, the Blessed Virgin was the primary creature through whom Redemption (the “Second Fiat”) was accomplished, and Luisa is the secretary of the Divine Will. Moreover, with His Divine Will, Jesus will accomplish the “Third Fiat” — Sanctification (the Gift and its Reign). And Luisa is the soul who will, as Jesus says, “make it known.”

Naturally, therefore, comparisons would be drawn between the Virgin Mary and Luisa; and they are indeed drawn in the volumes. There is nothing unorthodox about those comparisons themselves. However, we must always ponder these comparisons while remaining cognizant of the enormous difference between the Virgin Mary and Luisa. A few followers of the Divine Will have an unhealthy degree of fixation upon or even obsession with the *person* of Luisa (instead of the *mission* that Jesus was accomplishing with her). This would surely scandalize Luisa, and it indeed understandably scandalizes other Catholics.

Upon reading the volumes, one stumbles upon frequent references to Luisa being wrong about things, and doing/saying/thinking things for which Jesus needed to lovingly scold her. One will find

nothing of the sort in the relationship between Jesus and Mary, either in Scripture or in any authentic private revelation that gives details on their lives. Their union is and was always absolutely perfect and supreme.

### **Absolutely nothing is greater or possibly could be greater than the Eucharist itself.**

This matter is a rather straightforward one, and the confusion and debate sometimes surrounding it is unwarranted. According to Catholic Dogma, the Eucharist is God. It is the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity, of Jesus Christ. But Jesus Christ is fully God. Therefore, the substance of the Eucharist itself is, simply, God. Nothing can possibly be greater than God, therefore nothing can possibly be greater than the Eucharist itself.

Various other things, however, can be considered “greater” than the Eucharist *subjectively* (that is, in consideration of the benefit we incur from it). For example, 1) the “transforming union” or “mystical marriage” which is itself the pinnacle of the 3rd stage (the “Unitive Way”) of the spiritual life—itsself the product of, among other things, *many* receptions of Communion!, 2) The Sacrament of Confession for someone who is in mortal sin (absolution would restore him to God’s friendship, whereas receiving Communion in such a state would only increase his guilt), and 3) Heaven.

A passage prone to misinterpretation would be, for example, the one from March 23, 1910, wherein Jesus speaks of His Divine Will as surpassing the Sacraments in some senses. As He explains, each Sacrament (including Communion), is subject to many difficulties and circumstances that often hinder their full subjective effects being appropriated by the recipient. His Divine Will, on the other hand, is always available, can overcome any obstacle, and living in it is always just one heartfelt “Fiat” away.

Not once in that passage (or anywhere else in the thousands of pages of Luisa’s volumes), however, does Jesus say that the Gift of His Will is greater *than the Eucharist itself*, but only that His Will can surpass the act of *receiving Communion*.

When we refer to “Communion,” we are usually referring not directly to the substance of the Eucharist, but rather to *the act of our receiving* the Eucharist, and accordingly we are—with this word “Communion”—emphasizing the graces we subjectively appropriate from such reception. Paragraph 1325 of the Catechism refers to the “**Eucharist**” as the “**cause**” of the “**communion**.” Indeed, the different

words are sometimes used interchangeably, but they are not always merely repetitive: we employ both of them because each *can* have a different connotation.

Jesus tells Luisa that in **“the Sacrament of the Eucharist ... my love overabounded in all possible and imaginable ways.”** (June 12, 1928) In and of itself, therefore—since love itself is supreme in God, and since, in accordance with Jesus’ own words to Luisa, the love on display in the Eucharist cannot be surpassed—it is also thereby clear that in and of itself, the Eucharist is the greatest possible reality. The only question that remains is *what is the ultimate way of appropriating this reality within our own souls?*

Receiving Communion, certainly. But there are many different levels of *appropriation of grace from* receiving Communion. The ultimate answer to that question, therefore, is this: *to Live in His Will.*

### **Baptism is needed and will always be needed to wash away original sin.**

Jesus tells Luisa that His Will is like “cement on the woodworm of original sin” (March 19th, 1926); that is, it prevents original sin from doing additional damage, through its effects, on the soul. But He never says it can replace Baptism by removing original sin *itself*—that is, the *guilt* of original sin. Only Baptism can, or ever will be able to, accomplish that.

Moreover, Our Lady is the only creature who ever has been or ever will be conceived without original sin.

### **The human will is a very good thing. We are never called to Quietistically seek to extinguish it or render its operations entirely passive.**

Jesus says this explicitly to Luisa. He tells her:

“My daughter, the human will on its own is nauseating, but united with Mine is the most beautiful thing I created.”  
(January 31st, 1928)

Any and all descriptions of the “evil” of the human will, no matter how frequently one finds these within Luisa’s Volumes, are only in reference to the human will’s *operation* opposed to/apart from the Divine Will.

Our task in striving to Live in the Divine Will is never to quietistically seek to annihilate the human will as if it were a disease, but

only to hand it over entirely to God, which in fact renders the will *more* active, not less so.

“Jesus wants our will alive, so that it may feel all the good, as His operating Will lays Its acts in it. The human will becomes the residence of the Divine, and gives It all the freedom to dominate and to do whatever It wants.” (Luisa’s Letter to Mrs. Antonietta Savorani.)

In fact, it is precisely because our rational free will is our greatest possession that our greatest dignity lies in handing it over, *completely*, to God. **“The best thing that one can do with the best of things is to sacrifice it.”** – Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange

### Never neglect “ordinary” piety.

The supreme height of the grace that is the Gift of Living in the Divine Will does not detract from the importance of the traditional graces of Christian, Catholic life. Most importantly – and as we have already discussed extensively – the Sacraments remain vital and necessary. Anyone who aspires to live in the Divine Will (and anyone who *does* live in the Divine Will!) must live a life centered on the Eucharist (daily, if possible) and Confession (ideally, at least monthly). If anyone were to say something to the effect of, “*I live in the Divine Will, so I don’t need Confession!*”, he has only thereby demonstrated that he is utterly delusional.

St. Hannibal, the greatest apostle of the Divine Will, chosen for this role by Jesus Himself, insisted upon this foundation, writing:

“With [the Gift of Living in the Divine Will,] in order to form Saints who surpass the ones of the past, it is important that the new Saints **possess all the virtues to a heroic degree, just as did the Saints of old.**”

More broadly speaking; Sacraments, moral virtues, theological virtues, gifts of the holy Spirit, fruits of the Holy Spirit, almsgiving, works of mercy, examinations of conscience, other private revelations, mortifications, prayers, repentance, devotions, pious practices, etc., all remain just as important for a child of the Divine Will as for any Catholic. No follower of the Divine Will should ever in any way minimize the importance of any of these things. Luisa’s volumes certainly do not, even though they do frequently discuss the supremacy of the grace of Living in God’s Will. (Recall that speaking of this Gift is the *purpose* of Luisa’s private revelations; no one can fairly fault them for focusing on the very purpose for their coming to light.)

Did the Psalms become unimportant merely because the Gospel is greater still? Certainly not; only the opposite. Did the 10 Commandments become unimportant merely because the Beatitudes perfected them? Far from it. Did the Sacred Heart devotion become unimportant upon the promulgation of St. Faustina's Divine Mercy revelations? No. (And this list could be extended for many pages.)

Luisa's revelations contain the greatest exaltations of the virtues, the Sacraments, traditional Catholic teachings, etc., that one will ever read. This is true not only in the earlier volumes; but all the way to the very end of Volume 36. Whoever would minimize or ignore these things, on account of the fact that Living in the Divine Will is the greatest grace, does grave injustice to Jesus' revelations to Luisa, and scandalizes the faithful.

The "pre-Gift of Living in the Divine Will" prayers, devotions, traditions, sacraments and sacramentals, exhortations, saint's examples, pious practices, etc., presented to us by the Church remain every bit as important now as they ever were. To consider just one example, we should note that Luisa herself admonished us to "**never neglect the Rosary**" (Letter to Vincenzo Messina), and her revelations describe "**the beads of [Our Lady's] Rosary**" bringing about the Era of Peace. (October 7, 1928) Fr. Bucci, who himself knew Luisa and whose family was close to hers (recall that he authored an approved biography of Luisa we quoted earlier) relayed that Luisa constantly had Rosary beads in her hands. Any follower of Luisa's writings who supposes they dispense us from the Rosary has, of course, only gravely misunderstood what Jesus tells Luisa.

### **The Gift of Living in the Divine Will entails an "accidental," not ontological, change in the human person.**

The Gift of Living in the Divine Will is a *grace*. It is the grace of graces, indeed. Jesus repeatedly tells Luisa, concerning the Gift, "**Greater Grace I could not give.**" But even this statement, of course, indicates that the Gift *is still a grace*. All graces, however, are by nature "accidents." That is, they are qualities that inhere in a substance (in this case, the human soul).

On the other hand, each human person will only ever undergo three *ontological* changes: conception (and the simultaneous miraculous, supernatural infusion of a spiritual soul into the embryonic matter of the body), death, and the re-uniting of soul and body at the General Resurrection. Even if you somehow knew that you had the

Gift, you would still be just as much yourself as you were before receiving it.

The Eucharistic Host does literally undergo an ontological change upon the Transubstantiation. It is no longer bread, but God. That is why we worship it. Obviously, however, (for many reasons) we would never worship a person with the Gift of Living in the Divine Will, even if we somehow knew he or she enjoyed the Gift (we will consider this point more in the following section on Divinization). That is also precisely why we can never refer to the "Transubstantiation of the Soul" with the Gift (what St. Maximilian Kolbe called the "Transubstantiation of the Self into the Immaculata") in the same way we refer to the Transubstantiation of the Eucharist. Thus, I prefer to use St. Faustina's terms: the "*Transconsecration* of the self into a *Living Host*."

Moreover, while Jesus gives many indications within the volumes of what the soul can expect to "see" in itself as it receives the Gift, we should never speak (in relation to ourselves or other living people) of enjoying the Gift with certainty. On the other hand, we *can* have certainty in—for example—the validity of the Sacraments properly administered. But recall that the Gift is not literally a sacrament. It is not administered by a priest *ex opere operato* ("by the very fact of the action's being performed"). There is no formula which, if said by a priest over a person, bestows upon him the Gift.

Receiving the Gift of Living in the Divine Will requires—as one bare minimum prerequisite—that one be in a State of Grace. But the Church teaches that even this is not something we can be *absolutely certain* of in our own souls. Therefore, if we cannot be certain of a *prerequisite* for the Gift, we should not claim certainty in having the Gift itself. Like St. Joan of Arc famously responded when asked if she was in God's grace, one should also respond—if anyone is silly enough to ask if he lives in the Divine Will—"Please pray that I may do so!"

It is extremely important that all children of the Divine Will be utterly steeped in profound, self-forgetting humility; ever recalling that Luisa herself never departed from this humility, and never presented herself as anyone special or important. Even in her private letters, she would beseech the recipients for prayers, insisting that she needed them.

## In some senses, “ordinary” Christian holiness, even aside from the Gift of Living in the Divine Will, is already superior to Original Holiness.

The Gift of Living in the Divine Will can be described as the type of holiness that Adam enjoyed before the Fall. One may then wonder: does this imply that Adam’s holiness was greater than the holiness of the Catholic saints of the first 1,900 years of the Church’s history?

This is a delicate and nuanced theological matter. It is dealt with in detail on page 286 of *Thy Will Be Done*. There is Magisterium that testifies to the superiority of Original Holiness (e.g., the Preface of Virgins in the Roman Missal, “**you call human nature back to its original holiness,**” whereas all “calls” imply seeking what is above, and this particular call is issued to those who *already have* Christian holiness). There is also Magisterium that appears to testify to the superiority of Christian Holiness (e.g., Catechism §374, “[Adam] was ... established in friendship with his Creator...in a state that would be surpassed only by the glory of the new creation in Christ.”).

We are, therefore, dealing with one of the multitude of questions in our Faith wherein “it depends” is the only fair answer to the question of, “which is better?”. St. Thomas Aquinas, in the *Summa Theologica*, likewise teaches on the subtle distinctions at work here:

“Nevertheless he [Adam] knew God with a more perfect knowledge than we do now. Thus in a sense his knowledge was midway between our knowledge in the present state, and the knowledge we shall have in heaven ... In the state of innocence [Original Holiness] man’s works were more meritorious than after sin was committed, if we consider the degree of merit on the part of grace, which would have been more copious as meeting with no obstacle in human nature: and in like manner, if we consider the absolute degree of the work done; because, as man would have had greater virtue, he would have performed greater works. But if we consider the proportionate degree, a greater reason for merit exists after sin, on account of man’s weakness; because a small deed is more beyond the capacity of one who works with difficulty than a great deed is beyond one who performs it easily.” (Summa Theologica. I. Q95. A4.)

Some Fathers of the Church also clearly teach that Adam’s holiness exceeded Christian Holiness, as they insist that the Holy Spirit was

the veritable “vital principle” of his soul (which—though these Fathers of course did not realize at the time!—is a precisely identical way of saying that Adam Lived in the Divine Will). As Fr. John Hardon teaches,

“The Fathers explicitly teach that the first man possessed [deification]... which Adam lost by the fall ... some of the Greek Fathers, like Basil and Cyril of Alexandria, believed that the supernatural sanctification of Adam is indicated in Genesis 2:7 ... the grace of the Holy Spirit as [Adam’s] supernatural vital principle... the Fathers’ common belief that Adam received both natural and supernatural life is a witness to Christian tradition.”<sup>28</sup>

Nevertheless, it is important for all followers of the Divine Will to understand that it is not licit for a Christian to regard his task of sanctification as *entirely* consisting in a *mere return* to the holiness enjoyed by Adam and Eve before the Fall. As we have seen, there are ways in which his holiness was superior to ours, and there are ways in which the holiness available even upon the very birth of Christianity is and was superior to his. What God offers us in the Gift of Living in the Divine Will is the value of *both* of these types of holiness together.

God never merely turns back the clock. He always increases His graces and favors. What He offers us now is even greater than what Adam enjoyed before the Fall. This is triply true with the Gift of Living in the Divine Will within the context of Christian, Catholic sanctification, but it was even true before the era of the Gift, in the “ordinary” context of Catholic tradition. As usual, it is precisely Luisa’s writings themselves that give the perfectly balanced and orthodox Catholic understanding of these themes in light of the Gift of Living in the Divine Will. Jesus tells her:

“My daughter, I created the creature beautiful, noble, with eternal and divine origin, full of happiness and worthy of Me. Sin ruined him from top to bottom, it made him decay from his nobility, it deformed him, and rendered him the most unhappy creature, unable to grow, because sin stopped his growth and covered him with wounds, such as to be repugnant to the mere sight. Now, **my Redemption ransomed the creature from sin, and my Humanity acted just like a tender mother with her newborn... With my wounds I covered their deformities, rendering them more beautiful than before. And if, in creating them, I made them like clearest and noble heavens, in Redemption I adorned them, studding them with the most refulgent stars of**



my wounds so as to cover their ugliness and make them more beautiful. To their wounds and deformities I attached the diamonds, the pearls, the jewels of my pains in order to hide all their evils and clothe them with such magnificence as to surpass their state of origin. **Therefore, it is with reason that the Church says, 'Happy fault', because with sin came Redemption; and my Humanity not only nourished them with Its Blood, but clothed them with Its own Person, and adorned them with Its own beauty.**" – Jesus to the Servant of God Luisa Piccarreta. February 26, 1922

### **Man's Divinization will never be literal and complete. The Gift only operates "as much as is possible for the creature."**

Not with the Gift of Living in the Divine Will, not in the Era, and *not even in Heaven*, will the *difference* between Creator and creature be eliminated; rather, it is only that the *distance* will be closed.

We will *always* be intrinsically finite beings, and the finite can never *completely* contain the infinite. Moreover, the difference between the creature and the Creator will always be infinite. All eternity will not succeed in exhausting what God is; each "day" in eternity will be entirely new for us!

While it is true that, with the Gift, we are given the greatest graces possible, that last word ("possible"), which qualifies what we receive, is extremely important. Jesus regularly reiterates this theme to Luisa; He frequently tells her that the Gift actualizes certain graces in the soul *only*:

**"...as much as is possible for the creature..."**

For example, Jesus says this to Luisa on July 24th, 1932, on August 6th, 1933, on September 4th, 1905, on October 6th, 1922, and on other occasions.

**"How much nonsense-I did not say that you [Luisa] are like the Celestial Queen, but that I want you similar to Her, just as I have said to many other souls dear to Me that I wanted them similar to Me; but with this they would not become God like Me."** Jesus to Luisa. May 19, 1931

With these and many other similar qualifications (extremely important, though sometimes brief enough that the careless reader will miss them), Jesus is reminding us that His revelations to Luisa, like

all mysticism, *is not intended as a theology textbook*; and that, accordingly, we are to consult orthodox Catholic theology for the proper understanding of these themes.

While Jesus often does provide the necessary distinctions for the proper orthodox Catholic understanding of His revelations to Luisa within the revelations themselves, He does not *always* do this.

Instead, He simply entrusts these revelations to the authority and competence of the Catholic Church and submits them to the domain of her Magisterium.

Being faithful to Jesus' revelations to Luisa, therefore, absolutely requires that we always and everywhere filter their contents through the lens of the Magisterium.

## 19. Discerning Private Revelation

While I have addressed each one of the concerns detailed by the KBD in this book, I would be remiss to fail to note what appears to be absent from the KBD; namely, inclusion of the Vatican's norms for discernment of private revelations.\*

In 1978, the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith promulgated a document entitled "*Norms regarding the manner of proceeding in the discernment of presumed apparitions or revelations.*" The document itself is short and worth reading, but the essence of its criteria is summed up as follows.

**Criteria in support of validity:** psychological equilibrium, honesty, rectitude of moral life, docility towards Ecclesiastical Authority, normal regimen of faith continued following the apparition, theology and spirituality free of error, and spiritual fruit (e.g., conversion, charity). The last item—the document instructs—is to be given "special regard."

**Criteria against validity:** Doctrinal errors attributed to (that is, allegedly said by) God or a saint, evidence of a search for profit connected to the revelation, grave sins associated with the events of the revelation on the part of the seer or followers, and psychological disorder or psychopathic tendencies.

This discernment must be undertaken with care and diligence, but the direction that it leads us in must not be indefinitely put in doubt by epistemological scrupulosity. In other words, we must not forever come up with rationalizations to pretend that we do not know what we do in fact know full well.

When an alleged private revelation has been scrutinized by the Church, and—as is the case with Luisa—1) The messages have been found to be orthodox, 2) The seer has been found to be spiritually, morally, and psychologically stable, 3) The seer has been found to be sincere, pure, and obedient, and 4) The fruits of the messages are good and enduring, then we must simply unclench the fist, bend the knee, and acknowledge the finger of God in what is transpiring.

This duty becomes even more imperative when—as is also the case with Luisa—clear evidence of miracles and other supernatural verifications of authenticity exist, and it becomes extreme when decades have passed since the seer's death with all these verifications only growing in their testimony to the seer's authenticity.

---

\* Note: Several of the following paragraphs are adapted from *Thy Will Be Done* (2021)

Luisa and her writings pass all the criteria above with flying colors; thus, they warrant no incredulity. Assuredly, it is not licit to now treat them as if they were “just any” text produced by a Catholic author, to be evaluated as a professor would evaluate his student’s term paper. Unfortunately, this seems to be the approach taken by certain critics of Luisa’s writings. Such an approach is not in keeping with the Church’s norms for these situations.

## A Closing Question

In conclusion, we should recall to mind the approvals already enjoyed by Luisa’s volumes—specifically, by the very ones the KBD is here addressing. Namely, nineteen *nihil obstat*s from a canonized saint (who was also appointed to be her Spiritual Director, and who dedicated his life to the promotion of her private revelations), and nineteen *imprimatur*s from Luisa’s Archbishop (*not to mention her diocese confirming the orthodoxy of her writings by transferring her cause to the Vatican in 2005, the Vatican’s 2016 official biography of Luisa, and countless other verifications of authenticity and orthodoxy*). Even though not strictly “infallible,” these approbations nevertheless constitute ecclesiastical assurances that the contents of Luisa’s writings to which they are affixed are free of doctrinal error.

Yet, these are precisely the volumes which the KBD does not merely have “concerns” with; rather, these are the volumes that the KBD accuses of *being filled with the most outlandish heresies one could propose*. The KBD charges these approved volumes with flagrant polytheism, with overturning Scripture, with “deifying” Luisa and the Virgin Mary, with “rendering the Church worthless,” with reintroducing ancient Gnosticism, with “re-writing salvation history,” with “replacing Jesus with Luisa,” and on the list goes. (We have already seen that all such charges are not merely unwarranted, but are the total *opposite* of what Luisa’s volumes teach.)

It is, frankly, outrageous for anyone to accuse teachings bearing *imprimatur*s,\* and strongly endorsed and promoted by a canonized

---

\* Considering that *imprimatur*s are indeed forms of approval, we should consider the following words of one of the foremost Mariologists in the Church today: “... **while the freedom remains for a member of the Church to reject a private revelation which has received official ecclesiastical approval, it would at the same time be reprehensible to speak publicly against it.**” —Dr. Mark Miravalle, Theologian. Bearing the *Imprimatur* of Cardinal Raymond Burke; Prefect of the Apostolic Signatura under Pope Benedict XVI. (*Mariology; A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians, and Consecrated Persons*. Page 830.)

saint, of such a litany of outright blasphemies and shameless heresies. For it is inconceivable that a text permeated by such explicit rebellion against the most basic dogmas of the Faith would receive *any* formal ecclesial approvals or endorsements, much less so many of them, along with such resounding additional verifications of authenticity.

Therefore, while the preceding pages have already put to rest each one of those accusations levied by the KBD—demonstrating just how baseless they are, and in some cases even downright slanderous—I conclude this document of my own by simply asking, more generally, what could motivate any Catholic to issue such egregiously unjust accusations against a Servant of God’s approved writings?

**"My daughter, the Will of God that the writings of My Divine Will come to light is absolute, and as many incidents as may occur, It will triumph over everything. And even if it should take years and years, It will know how to dispose everything so that Its absolute Will is fulfilled. The time in which they will come to light is relative and conditional upon when creatures dispose themselves to receive a good so great, and upon those who must occupy themselves with being its criers, and make the sacrifice so as to bring the new era of peace, the new Sun that will dispel all the clouds of evils. If [only] you knew how many graces and lights I keep prepared for those whom I see disposed to occupy themselves with them... But I must also say to you: 'Woe to those who are opposed or might place obstacles.'"**

—JESUS TO THE SERVANT OF GOD LUISA PICCARRETA.  
AUGUST 2, 1928

"In union with Christ take your stand as suppliants before the Heavenly Father and allow that prayer to rise to Him from your lips again and again... *Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven!*

Only then shall we be influenced solely by the honor of God and by zeal to give Him greater glory, when we earnestly desire the restoration of His Kingdom—the Kingdom of justice, of love, and of peace—throughout all the world."

-Pope Pius XII. Encyclical, *Fidei Donum*. Easter, 1957

**"Thy Will be done on earth as It is in Heaven."**

—Matthew 6:10

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Bernardino Giuseppe Bucci, OFM: *Luisa Piccarreta, A Collection of Memories* (Roma 52, San Ferdinando Di Puglia: Tipolitographia Miulli, 2000), Ch. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Ch. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Address of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to the Rogationist Fathers. Paragraph 6. 16 May 1997.

<sup>4</sup> <https://danieloconnor.files.wordpress.com/2017/04/official-letter-from-archbishop-pichierr1.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Pastoral Letter by His Excellency Paul Tchang-Ryeol Kim, Bishop of the Cheju Diocese, Korea. Easter Sunday. 1999

<sup>6</sup> Quoted by Fr. John Arintero in *The Mystical Evolution in the Development and Vitality of the Church*. TAN Publishing. Footnote 88.

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Marie Michel Philipon. *Conchita: A Mother's Spiritual Diary*. Conclusion

<sup>8</sup> Fr. Philipon. *CONCHITA: A Mother's Spiritual Diary*. Pages 57-58.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in *Listen to My Prophets*. Fr. Edward O'Connor. P. 134.

<sup>10</sup> *The Autobiography of Dina Bélanger*, translated by Mary St. Stephen, R.J.M. (Sillery: Religious of Jesus and Mary, 3rd edition, 1997), P. 219. (February 22, 1925). Cited in *New and Divine* by Hugh Owen.

<sup>11</sup> "A Sister of Mary." *I will think of Everything. You, think only of loving Me: The Ceaseless Act of Love*. 2016. Chapter 9.

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.stgemmagalvani.com/2009/07/co-redeemers-with-christ-victim-souls.html>

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04276a.htm>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.thedivinemercy.org/articles/st-margaret-mary-and-sacred-heart>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2016/04/st-john-vianneys-preaching-on-unworthy.html>

<sup>17</sup> Fr. Peter Fehlner. *St. Maximilian Kolbe: Martyr of Charity – Pneumatologist: His Theology of the Holy Spirit*. P. 37-9.

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08617a.htm>

<sup>19</sup> *Called to be the Children of God*. Chapter 8.

<sup>20</sup> Hugh Owen. *New and Divine*. P. 74-77. Misc. excerpts.

<sup>21</sup> *Called to be the Children of God*. Chapter 8.

<sup>22</sup> Bernardino Giuseppe Bucci, OFM: *Luisa Piccarreta, A Collection of Memories* (Roma 52, San Ferdinando Di Puglia: Tipolitographia Miulli, 2000), Ch. 4.

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.catholiceducation.org/en/religion-and-philosophy/spiritual-life/spiritual-reading.html>

<sup>24</sup> [https://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_19780225\\_norme-apparizioni\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19780225_norme-apparizioni_en.html)

<sup>25</sup> [https://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_20000626\\_message-fatima\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html)

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/message-from-our-lady--akita-japan-5167>

<sup>27</sup> Stephen Patton. *A Guide to the Book of Heaven*. Luisa Piccarreta's writings evaluated in light of Catholic doctrine. Page 21

<sup>28</sup> [https://www.therealpresence.org/archives/God/God\\_013.htm](https://www.therealpresence.org/archives/God/God_013.htm)