

E-18

It does say that it will not return thither until it has given bread to the one has been eating. It does not say that it will not return thither to give bread to the man who is eating. Then it would mean that those people who are eating bread alone will ~~g~~ be given bread, not the people who are hungry. For they have nothing to eat. It is true if you are eating, you will not be hungry for a while. ^{It is the} People who are going to, to the one who wants to eat. It gives seed to the man who is going to sow. It gives bread to the man who is going to eat. So, in each case, it is participle expressing ^a future idea. It gives each of them what he needs in order that he may do this. So, seed to the one who is going to sow, and bread to the one who is going to eat. In English we hve this particular kind of noun which expresses the agent, which is all right to be translated from the participle here... seed to the sower, and ~~to~~ bread to the eater. But it is not an exact translation. If you do not ~~have~~ any common word, eater. That is not a common word. This sower went out to sow. It is rather uncommon now. But many years ago, the word sower was common, it is one who went ~~you~~ to sow. Sower was a farmer who went out to sow his crops... that was part of the farmer's function. You hire a sower. You hire a thresholder... ~~but~~ that is an occupation. A sower would be an occupation, but eater would not be an occupation. Unless the universal... occupation... having a good designation. It is a ~~la~~ participle ... but certainly eat~~ing~~... it is a participle expressing a future continuous action. .. so that you can eat... (Q) Yes, sure, but the trouble is this. The sower would be in the infinitive... it would give seed for sowing. ' It would give bread for eating. That would be an infinitive. Seed to be ~~de~~ sown, bread to be eaten. That would ~~an~~ infinitive. The seed to be sown, and then bread to be eaten. That would be an ~~infinitive~~. Seed to be sown, and bread to be