

exist . I don't understand it, but I know it's there.. And I can't understand how light can be corpuscular, ~~but~~ there are so many things that don't fit with that , but at least there is light . And what little I know about light is probably a tiny fraction of ~~x~~ what the Lord actually knows when he put into the structure ^{of it} when He made it. (And in that sense I sort of feel that bears out the thinking that I have ~~xxx~~ that everybody agrees that there are ~~some~~ ^{certain} things with each of these theories would hold to and certain things with each of these theories that make them incompatible , and so they are not closing the book on either, but looking for additional ^{information} light) (Is it possible to hold to such a view that you actually don't accept either one of them.) Not really. (Glasses illustration). (I don't think that's quite the same, though) But it's somewhat in the same direction. (Yes, it's in the same direction, the difference being in the one case, in fact, we admit lack of knowledge and complete understanding. There is no scientist ~~or~~ ^{of} any good ~~repute~~ ^{repute} that will come out and say that wave light is a particle. Do you know of anyone, I don't think that I ~~xxx~~ know of anyone, who is ^{acts} a learned man who will say that even though ~~xxxx~~ it/likes an particle sometimes. ^{nor is there one who will say light is a wave} Now, in this other case the analogy is not the same as here . We ~~have~~ have a case if we try to be like scientists and say , and we have something to carry through the analogy, says light is ~~x~~ like a particle and another passage ~~xx~~ where light is light is like a wave ~~xxx~~ phenomenon). Well, you don't say ~~xxxx~~ light is ^{a particle or a wave but light is} like a particle or light is like a wave ,but you will say that it is like a ~~x~~ wave and you will say that light is like a particle . (That's fine, then when you say that to carry ~~x~~ through the analogy , you deal with these in a similar fashion. I was ~~going to~~ was going to say well, something like predestination exists and something like ~~xx~~ free will exists . Obviously , it is not dogmatically free will and not dogmatically predestination both, ^{even though} The Bible looks like it clearly teaches this, or it looks like it clearly teaches this. We won't say