

General Topics :: Sadhu Sundar Singh and The New Church

Sadhu Sundar Singh and The New Church - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/6/6 23:52

Looks like I'm not the only one who thinks something is strange about the connection between Sadhu and Jakob Boehme/Swedenborg. I thought someone else on this forum would know but not so. So eventually i found this article and it answered most of my questions.

Here is are a few excerpts from the article:

"In Sweden, there were others who were prepared to compare the two visionaries. While the Sadhu was still in Sweden, on May 8, 1922, Major Oswald Kuylenskierna a friend, though apparently not a member of the New Church -- published a short article in a leading Stockholm newspaper, Svenska Dagbladet, pointing out that although Sundar Singh was in many ways Swedenborg's diametrical opposite, having no scholarship and no interest in theology, nevertheless on the visionary level, there was a "striking resemblance" between the two."16

"I regret that I have not found any independent corroboration of this statement concerning Sundar Singh's earlier acquaintance with Heaven and Hell. But it could very well be true. If true, it would help to explain at least some of the resemblances between the Sadhu's visions and those of Swedenborg."

"...Alden went on to state bluntly that "here is a man (Sadhu)who never heard of Swedenborg," and yet '... he devotes himself to the promulgation of the same message as that proclaimed to the Christian world of the West by Swedenborg.' How can such things be?"

"Is it possible that Sadhu Sundar Singh has been reading Swedenborg; and then has had visions which reflected the ideas derived from Swedenborg? Or did he really receive direct information from heaven? The close resemblance of his ideas to those taught in Swedenborg, the divisions of the spiritual world, expressed in the same terms, seem as though he had first gained his information from Swedenborg, and then the spirits had confirmed him in it. It would be interesting to know more of this case, including the previous knowledge which Sadhu Sundar Singh had, and especially whether he had previously read Swedenborg."

FYI: this is all in the name of truth. I'm all about the truth. I'll die for the truth. I live for truth. I have found truth in Jesus Christ, NO even more i have found the absolute truth which is Jesus Christ and i must contend for the truth. I'm am not out to hurt someone's image, I'm on a mission to expose lies if need be and proclaim the truth. Remember we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities, powers and wicked rulers in the heavenly places. I have nothing against Sadhu but i do have a problem with the father of lies and that old serpent twisting truth and i must investigate when i come across something that i am confounded about but have a right away feeling that something's not right.

Take a look at this website. It explains more deeply about what i was trying to say in the last thread concerning Sadhu Sundar Singh.

<http://www.baysidechurch.org/studia/studia.cfm?ArticleID=113&detail=1&VolumeID=18&AuthorID=41>

By the way it is a lengthy article so be prepared to read or come back another time.

In conclusion, i haven't come up with the answer concerning Sadhu Sundar Singh and his connections with Swedenborg but this article gave me more information to form my opinion and it is not important to devote your whole life to something like this for i am not but its good to be armed and aware whenever presented with something appealing in christendom so that you are not lead astray by any figure, movement, denomination or wind of doctrine whether it be from the catholics or from the pentecostals or from the other side of the world in a different society. No denomination is exempt from the possibility of false teachers arising up. So what really matters is to watch out for each other while watching out for yourself by standing upon the pure unadulterated Word of God. For the bible cannot be added to or taken away and make Christ the focus in all life not rumors, myths, and fables.

Be Blessed

I encourage you as i encourage myself keep the Lord at the center of your life.

Re: Sadhu Sundar Singh and The New Church - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/6/7 1:49

I read most all of the article and researched amongst some others sources on the internet. As well, I read concerning the "New Church" and it's doctrines, which were directly influenced by Swedenborg. Almost all of it was in agreement, though coming from various parties.

Altogether I must say that many, many of his views were plainly heretical to my understanding of scripture. Further, his insistence on speaking with the saints is frightening, given how little he seemed to regard speaking to Christ if such a communication was readily available.

*Note, some of those apparent heresies to which the Sadhu seems to have subscribed were:

- The ability of the dead to receive Christ **after** death.
- The ability to regularly consult the deceased for wisdom and guidance. This included speaking not only with both those who had accepted Christ, but also them who "had not yet accepted" Him. The Sadhu claims to have done this frequently .
- A well noted indifference towards doctrinal divisions. This hardly aligns with Jude, who exhorts us to "contend earnestly" for the faith **once delivered**. Sundar had gushing praise for Swedenborg who openly added **new revelation** to the scriptures (search his book "Arcana Coelestia" ~ "Angelic Wisdom", which reinterprets Genesis and Exodus with this new light .)
- The belief that all angels and demons were once men.
- Unitarianism; Jesus IS completely Jehovah, and beside him no God is. (Swedenborg taught this doctrine emphatically and Sundar taught that Swedenborg was "a highly trained" angelic leader in heaven.)

Everett, I'm with you going, "whoa, what is this?!" I'm fearful of anyone preaching a gospel given by a man, or an angel, and especially a dead man transformed into an angel.

Perhaps some others could look into this and add scriptural light to this?

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/6/7 7:06

Thanks for replying to my thread. It's relieving to know that someone else has the same conviction as I do.

To be honest, I was all set to buy one of Sadhu's books but i just don't buy anything without first reading a little about the person. The little bit that i read seemed too good to be true (because I always pray that God would raise up men and women of God) so i read more on the web and found some of his writings online and his book "The Sadhu, the Wisdom of Sadhu Sundar Singh" on ebook at plough. In that book there were several things that i didnt agree with like how he said that "christianity was the fulfillment of hinduism". I knew what he meant by that but my bible taught me that Christ is the fulfillment of the law and the prophet and such religions as hinduism could not be fulfilled because they were false anyway, why fulfill them? Rather Christianity is the better way. So subtle statements like this made me investigate even more and i came across in his book that he read some of Jakob Boehme's writings and i wanted to see, you know how he influenced him if some or little and when i looked at Jakob Boehme's writings such as heaven and hell and others they were strikingly too similar for comfort.

So now as much as i wanted to embrace him as a special apostle or prophet that God had raised up to reach the hindus and muslims i just couldnt any more. The evidence was too clear even before i came across this article. The article simply confirmed my convictions.

The purpose and motive of this thread was not to start up controversy because as i found out this is nothing new but to inform anybody to be careful not to accept everybody even if they seem like they cant be wrong. There are counterfeits out there and false signs you know? Our mission is not to fight against people but the power and force behind it. So let's contend for the truth from this day forth and forever more.

Have A Great Day

Re: - posted by enid, on: 2007/6/7 7:22

Some years ago, I bought a book about Sundar Singh, and I read a few chapters and put it down.

I read about him being in trances for up to 8 hours. His friends, who were waiting for him in a boat, could not continue the journey until he came out of the trance.

Fair enough, the Bible tells us that Peter was in a trance, Acts 10v10, but for 8 hours?

I don't know, maybe I should have read the book to the end, it might have cleared up some misgivings that I have about him.

Just feel uneasy about it.

God bless.

8 Hours. - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/6/7 16:00

Eight hours?

I wonder how long John was receiving the revelation, or Ezekiel, his visions?

Nevertheless, eight hours is pretty striking in ways that can be both good and alarming. Don't know how I feel about that.

I've experienced one clear vision in my life. It felt like five seconds but the clock said fifteen minutes had passed. It was in the days when I had repented of sins, before repenting of Sin. You know what I mean? So it wasn't a happy vision of angels.

Thanks Everett and Eind for your thoughts and watchfulness.

Re: Singh - posted by heartablaze (), on: 2007/6/9 0:14

This is why I do not like rewrites of so-called saints by those who want to put them in that light- one of those simple books led me to believe that the man had very different doctrine. I guess it was too good to be true, but I will also look for myself.

I also picked up a book of his writings from the library(I did not finish it though, perhaps it was the same book) - and they seemed fine and correct, but it is true that a little bit of untruth can spoil the whole well- or a little bit of leaven(sin) can leaven the whole bread. Hopefully, though, the truth that is there will lead people to the Truth...anyway, I have some researching to do.

Thank you, brothers.

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/6/9 1:58

You know, I haven't lost respect for this man neither do I consider him a deceiver, who knows someone could have tainted with his writings or mistranslated sayings. It could be a rare possibility, probably not likely but that doesn't matter. What matters is what we can learn from people. If we can't learn from someone concerning their doctrine b/c of error then we can look at their life and possibly learn something if anything beneficial from it. It's like a love song that was supposed to be written for Jesus but was captivated by worldly fame to be popular and instead was turned into a secular love song but here you come along and rewrite it for its original purpose to reach the heart of God.

Here's another example: What can we learn from Judas Iscariot's betrayal of Jesus? Certainly we shouldn't follow in his footsteps of greed and theft but we can learn not to do what he did. We can learn that no matter how close a man may LOOK like he is to Jesus he can still have a secret life that will eventually be exposed if not aborted from.

Likewise we see their wasn't everything accurate in Sadhu's life concerning the close comparison with Swendendorf writings that were purposely mixed into his visions and teachings, we can somehow, somewhere learn from him. Take

out bits and pieces from his life that were right and positive. Don't we intensely desire revival? Shouldn't we be about our Father's business? Sadhu had some attributes that characterize this but I'm not saying to get into all that spiritualism and mysticism stuff. Everything that leads us closer to God and is according to the Word of God can be used to advance and grow. Everything that leads us away from God and is not according to the Word of God will gradually destroy us and must be avoided.

All of us have different convictions. We have different preferences and interests but without the truth we would have nothing to stand on. The truth points us to the right direction.

So do your research about him if you're still not sure and learn from him what can be beneficial to you. Things not grounded upon the truth are not beneficial but by this God will teach you the difference between truth and error.

By the way is anyone perfect? Although Sadhu had reasons to be positively - examined or negatively - criticized, are we exempt? Preachers and prophets whether they be true or not have it hard. Their under the spot light. We examine everything to the bone until we finally find something wrong in a person. As if anyone's perfect. Why do we do this? It's because we want someone totally perfect in word and in deed that we can rely on so that life will be easier. We want some superhuman that knows all and does all at the snap of our fingers. There's no more need to look here and there in personalities and denominational figures. Jesus is perfect. Depend on him. This is why we all need each other. **Together we are one, united we stand tall, divided we are none, separated we fall.**

God Bless you all

Re: Sadhu Sundar Singh and The New Church - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/6/9 9:01

Everett,

This is the first time I have ever heard anyone say anything negative about Sadhu Sundar Singh. Everything I have heard before is that he was an exemplary godly man who loved the LORD and followed him.

As I checked out the link you shared I noticed the church who posted it and to me that is a red flag in itself. The red flag is the cult itself: It can not be depended on to be truthful in its interpretation of God's people or their writings.

Now, this means for me, I will need to look at other sources, like Sadhu's own writings, to see what did he say and what did he mean. On the other hand, this will require a lot of time which I do not have. The fact remains, Jesus is the one who died for me and it is Him I must follow and answer to, and what Sadhu believed is between him and God.

The bottom line is that it is always dangerous to take another man's writings, word as the final authority in matters of life, faith. Other people can and do help us. They also can and do destroy. Deception occurs when most of the info shared is correct and it gets you hooked where you will be blinded to the truth, to what is false in this teaching.

My opinion and thanks for sharing. I will be more alert about this man from now on.

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/6/9 14:34

Your right, I just looked and I didn't notice it was posted by the BAYSIDE SWEDENBORGIAN CHURCH but the author who wrote it was Eric J. Sharpe. He was "Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia. He was a major scholar in the phenomenology of religion, the history of modern Christian mission, and inter-religious dialogue. "He was a specialist in the history of modern day Christian missions to India and wrote biographical studies on influential missionary-scholars such as A.G. Hogg and John Nicol Farquhar." In fact he wrote a book on the biographical study of the famous Indian Christian, Sadhu Sundar Singh explaining the various biographical views that the west and other churches had about him. So on that part I don't think he is an Swedenborgian neither a part of a cult but I will do research regarding him and his opinion concerning Sadhu whether its accurate or not.

When I first brought up this thread I was looking for more understanding regarding this issue and I was open for disagreement because it's not about getting people on your side but it's about finding the truth. So thank you for replying and I hope that you would shed light on why Sadhu's writings, more specifically his visions are so similar to Emanuel Swedenborg and Jakob Boehme's writings and work. Please if you will compare the two by the source themselves so you can get y

our own personal opinion regarding the matter and share it with me please.

God Bless you

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/6/9 19:00

This man had a great impact on Corrie ten Boom. He helped her go deeper in the Lord and she really thought a lot of him.

Jordan

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/6/11 0:47

Everette,

I did just a tiny bit of more research on Sadhu Sundar Singh and what I found seemed to line up with your original post. I am surprised - never heard this idea floated by anyone before.

From the search I have done and what my memory reminds me of is that Singh travelled extensively during his lifetime, including the USA. When he was here in the states, were there any preachers who sensed anything amiss and warned people about him? Reckon, I am a tad bit surprised that it has only been in recent years we are reading anything negative about him.

Everette, I do not want to disprove what you have said; it is just that this info has taken me completely by surprise because I thought he was a wonderful Christian.

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/6/11 22:39

Here's some information to answer your question (although its not the best) concerning when he visited America (the west) if there were any pastors who sensed something wrong about him.

<http://www.mergingcurrents.com/ssss.php>

"...He was invited to the West and made a number of tours there in the following years. Western Christianity was also desperate for Asian heroes, and Sundar fit the bill.

But a controversy broke out that was never really resolved, and **most likely never will be**. Sundar came under severe attack from critics who suggested that he was a sham, one who fabricated stories to make himself famous. There were some difficult issues raised by these critics, particularly stories about visits to and ministry in Tibet, but the critics were manifestly bent on trouble and not just seeking after truth. The friends of Sundar Singh reacted in his defense, counseling him to ignore his attackers."

Now, I don't know what they were criticizing him about but from this passage it shows that some people in the west had a second thought about him. Some of those people may have been the typical haters and those people with bad motives who always spring up to find something bad about a person's life in which they seek to hurt a person's image and fame instead of seeking the truth.

From the passage below some Evangelical Christians weren't comfortable with his visions.

"Up to this time, the western world had had to judge the content and the character of Sundar Singh's visions almost entirely from what had been recorded in Streeter and Appasamy. In his tours and other preaching engagements, he had avoided the subject of visions, probably because he recognized that the Evangelical Christians with whom he chiefly associated would be unwilling to take them seriously, and might perhaps even have been hostile, had they known of the nature and character of his visionary experience. To the extent that visions were acceptable in Evangelical circles, they had to conform to the record and terminology of the Bible. This some of the Sadhu's visions perhaps did; but not all. At least it was not permissible for Evangelicals to converse with the spirits of the departed on "the other side," a circumstance which

inevitably suggested the error of spiritualism. And there the matter rested for the next four years. Sundar Singh's visions presumably (indeed certainly) continued, though he refrained from speaking of them in public. But in 1926 he broke his silence." (from the article by Eric J. Sharpe called Sadhu Sundar Singh and the new church)

I was much impressed and excited once coming across this legendary figure but because of my growing desire to know more about his life I came across the name Jakob Boehme in one of his (Sadhu) books called "Wisdom of the Sadhu; The teachings of Sadhu Sundar Singh" (which you can read online) and I looked him (Boehme) up and his writings were remarkably similar not identical but similar to that of Sadhu's pertaining to his visions and mystic beliefs. So this and this alone do I have against him because his life was truly exemplary.

I will surely not mark him off of my list but I will try to learn from his life because he went far beyond the boundaries of common western Christianity but I couldn't help to notice the similar relationship his visions have with other mystic's writings like Jakob Boehme and Swendenborg.

BE BLESSED

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/6/11 23:35

Everette,

Thanks for sharing. I am alarmed at the idea that he may have been communicating with the spirits of the dead. If this is true, he definitely is a false prophet. Now a true prophet can have dreams and visions, that I can believe - if they line up with the scriptures, but there again, they must be 100% accurate and come to pass exactly like they prophesied: no room for errors.

Now I will have to be more alert about anything that is attributed to him.

Blessings,
ginnyrose

PS; (EDIT) Come to think about it, I do not recall ever hearing Ravi Zacharias mention him and he is an Indian from India.....wonder why?

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2008/1/18 16:56

I know it has been a long time since the last post but your question has stuck in my mind and has resurfaced and just surprisingly after searching the internet not thinking about this subject concerning whether Ravi Zacharias spoke of Sadhu Sundar Singh I came across it and here it is:

Quote:
-----"Dr. Ravi Zacharias grew up in India in the midst of all the major religions of the world. At the age of seventeen, while recovering from an attempt to take his own life because of the meaninglessness of it, someone read to him John 14:6 where Jesus said, I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through Me. He committed his life to Christ that day and today is one of the world's most renowned Christian apologists.

Quote:
-----In THE CASE FOR FAITH Lee Strobel asked Ravi, "What about people who live in places where the Gospel isn't routinely discussed or where its dissemination is actually outlawed?" This is how Dr. Zacharias responded:

Quote:
-----"I have spoken in many Islamic countries, like Syria, which are tough countries to speak in. Virtually every Muslim who's come to know Christ has either come to know Christ, number one, because of the love of Christ expressed through another Christian or because of a vision or a dream or a supernatural intervention.

Quote:
-----"One of India's greatest converts was a Sikh, Sundar Singh. Sundar Singh came to know Christ through an appearance of Christ in his room in a dream one night and had a tremendous impact on his life, and he became a Christian and so on. So I say that there are ways that God reveals and speaks that are far beyond our own understanding.

Quote:

-----"Now if God is able to give the word of Christ in various settings within ways which are beyond what you and I can understand, if he can speak through general revelation, speak through the conscience, then we have to accept the fact that He tells us that we are without excuse. Every human being, I understand, will know enough truth so that if they respond to that known truth, God reveals more to them. Does that mean they have to have as much of a volume of truth as anyone in another setting? I do not believe that to be so."-----

I really can't come to an absolute conclusion on him concerning the whole mysterious connections he has with Swedenborg and Jakob Boehme that are seen in his visions and his writings, his belief in universalism, his great interest in the spirit world and angels and his many controversial stories just doesn't sit well with me but one thing I do know is that if he were a truth apostle or prophet I wouldn't have started this topic. Only God can judge righteously and I leave this up to him and the last day where everyone's works will be revealed.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/1/20 19:21

Everett,

Ravi is right about this thing of how God reveals himself to people who are remote physically from the Gospel. In recent years I have read numerous testimonies of people who came to the LORD in dependant of any human testimony. This happens a lot in Muslims countries at this present time. I personally know an Indian lady who was visited by the LORD Jesus. Her father was an atheist and her mother a snake worshipper - a highly unlikely situation for a child of six to learn about the LORD Jesus.

I experience a sense of shame when I am in the presence of a person like this. She has a quality of spiritually I can only dream about; she shames me with her sense of trust and faith -the like of which I can only aspire to. The difference is because I have had life too comfortable where I never was so totally destitute that I was TOTALLY DEPENDANT on God. Hey, I am healthy, have a good husband to care for me....

In the meantime, I pray the LORD would teach me to recognize his voice whenever He speaks so I may be obedient to Him in everything. My closeness to the LORD is up to me, this I know. I am never content with this life but do aspire to be always where God wants me and therein I meet an enemy and he is deceptive...so God help me to recognize it where ever I encounter it.

Got on a rabbit trail did I not?

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: Sadhu Sundar Singh and The New Church - posted by AllanJ, on: 2008/1/25 0:52

I have been following this discussion (on and off) for a while now and feel that it is time to add my few cents worth. A trivial point first, but the story about Sadhu Sundar Singh being in a trance for 8 hours is not correct. The incident is mentioned on pp. 68 Å– 69 of Heiler's "The Gospel of Sadhu Sundar Singh" but the person who experienced the trance (and held up the boat!) was Devendranath Tagore NOT Sundar Singh! Nevertheless, prolonged trances are not unknown in Christian history; Quaker founder, George Fox, was said to have experienced a trance lasting 14 days (!) at his conversion. Secondly, the criticism directed toward the Sadhu by many Western clergy was mentioned. No doubt, some of this would have been by certain evangelicals, but that is not surprising. I have seen a Web page (allegedly by evangelicals) arguing that Billy Graham is a servant of the Devil! But the most vigorous criticism of the Sadhu came from some Roman Catholic (mainly Jesuit) priests and liberal Protestants. Some of the former figured that he must be an impostor on the grounds that nobody outside the (Roman Catholic) church could live such a saintly life! As far as the liberal Protestant clergy were concerned, the Sadhu's insistence on the Bible as inspired and his belief in miracles (both in the Bible and Å– though rarely Å– during the present day) went against their belief in the rationalistic approach of higher biblical criticism. German Protestants, in particular, were especially hostile to Sadhu on these grounds. As far as Sadhu's beliefs are concerned, he is not always easy to pin down, but I find no evidence that he ever accepted the "Unitarian" Swedenborgian idea that the Trinity is present in Jesus. On the contrary, he explained the Trinity in the (admittedly imperfect) model of the Sun's light and heat (the light is not the heat and vice versa, but both reveal the Sun) used by some of the Church Fathers. Clearly, Sadhu saw Jesus as one Person of the Trinity, although he did stress

s that God the Father could never be known except as revealed through the Divine Manhood of Jesus. (Man can never comprehend God in His full essence, but we can relate to Him in so far as He reveals Himself as Man).

In one or two places, Sadhu writes as if the Redeemed in Heaven can act as 'angels' but there are also passages where he makes a clear distinction between angels and humans. In one place, for instance, he writes that man can know more of God's love than angels can, because man is a fallen being in need of redemption, whereas angels have always been in the presence of God and know nothing of sin. Unlike Swedenborg, Sadhu believed in a personal Satan, who was himself a rebellious angel. If Satan was an angel and if it was through him that man fell (as Sadhu also believed) then it stands to reason that angels must have existed prior to the creation of humanity and cannot be simply redeemed human spirits!

Sadhu's relation with the Swedenborgians is complex. Some of them saw his visions as confirmation of Swedenborg's but others accused him of being a spiritualist (Sadhu defends himself against this charge – possibly made by Swedenborgians – in his book "The Spiritual World"). One of the criticisms that the Swedenborgians had against him was that his theology remained too evangelical. They argued that if he had really experienced the realm that Swedenborg had, his theology would have become more Swedenborgian! Therefore he must be deluded. (There also seemed a reluctance, in some Swedenborgian quarters, to believe that anyone other than Swedenborg could have had visions of Heaven). What are we to say then?

Did Sadhu hold some false theological ideas? No doubt!

Do you and I hold some false theological ideas? No doubt! (Let he who is without theological error cast the first stone!)

To be sure, Paul and the other epistle writers stress the importance of sound doctrine, but it is probably an oversimplification to equate "sound doctrine" simply with "correct theology". Paul was most anxious that his audience held firm to the belief that salvation is by grace through faith in Jesus Christ alone, and not a reward for good works. That seems to have been the core of "sound doctrine". That, and the style of life flowing from it. "Sound doctrine" was closer to "right living" than to "right theology".

In a similar vein, Jesus gave us two criteria for distinguishing His true followers;

They are to be known by their fruit, and,

They hear His voice and follow Him.

Jesus did NOT say that His followers would be known by the accuracy of their theology. I bet that Satan knows more theology than anyone on this site, but he is no Christian! On the other hand, the dying thief probably knew next to nothing (he most probably did not even know that Jesus was divine), yet was with the Lord in Paradise that very day!

The fruit of Sadhu's life is represented in part by his willingness to spread the Gospel at grave risk to his personal safety and the thousands of people who found Christ (and, no doubt, continue to find Him) through his parables and writings. The Layman's Evangelical Fellowship International is just one indirect fruit of the Sadhu... it was founded by an evangelist who travelled with Sadhu for a time, eventually parting company on the understanding that Sadhu would evangelize the north of India whereas Daniel (the disciple evangelist) would evangelize the south. LEFI continues its work of evangelism in India and beyond.

As for hearing Jesus voice and following Him, that is what Sadhu did from the age of 15. Because of this, his own family tried to kill him and he became an outcast to his own community. He gave his life TO Christ and ended up by giving his life FOR Christ. We don't know whether he was murdered or died of natural causes on his way to Tibet, but had he not been trying to reach the unreached, he would not have died at that time. When I look at his life and then back at mine, the experience is certainly humbling and leaves little room to doubt the godliness of this man.

Blessings

AlanJ

Re: - posted by enid, on: 2008/1/25 10:18

AllanJ,

Thanks for pointing out who the real person was who was in the trance for 8 hours.

Fact is, I lost the book and have only recently found it.

Still, it says on page 68 in a paragraph above the one you quoted that, '...he reckons that he experiences this gift of God from eight to ten times a month. The ecstasy usually lasts an hour or two'.

If this is not talking about Sundar Singh then please let me know.

The thing is I have never finished the book, so maybe I need to.

God bless.