

To the question as to what is to be known through the aforesaid Knowledge, the Bhagavān says, 'I shall speak of that which is to be known,' etc.

Objection: Do not humility etc. constitute *yama* and *niyama* (96)? The Knowable is not known through them. For humility etc. are not seen to determine the nature of anything. Moreover, everywhere it is observed that whatever knowledge reveals its own object, that itself ascertains the nature of that *object of knowledge* (the knowable). Indeed, nothing else is known through a knowledge concerning some other object. As for instance, fire is not known through the knowledge of a pot.

Reply: This is not a defect, for we have said that they are called 'Knowledge' because they lead one to Knowledge, and because they are auxiliary causes of Knowledge.

ज्ञेयं यत्तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्ज्ञात्वाऽमृतमश्नुते ।
अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते ॥ १२ ॥

12. I shall speak of that which is to be known, by realizing which one attains Immortality. The supreme Brahman is without any beginning. That is called neither being nor non-being.

Pravaksyāmi, I shall speak of, fully describe just as it is; *tat*, that; *yat*, which; is *jñeyam*, to be known. In order to interest the hearer through inducement, the Bhagavān speaks of what its result is: *Jñātvā*, by realizing; *yat*, which Knowable; *aśnute*, one attains; *amrtam*, Immortality, that is; he does not die again. *Anādimat*, without beginning—one having a beginning (*ādi*) is *ādimat*; one not having a beginning is *anādimat*. What is that? The *param*, supreme, unsurpassable; *brahma*, Brahman, which is under discussion as the Knowable.

Here, some split up the phrase *anādimatparam* as *anādi* and *matparam* because, if the word *anādimat* is taken as a Bahuvrīhi compound, (97) then the suffix *mat* (*matup*) becomes redundant, which is undesirable. And they show a distinctive meaning: