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Introduction

The Sabba Vagga (the chapter on the all) (the 3rd chapter of the Saḷāyatana Saṁyutta) closes with these three discourses, whose common theme is the non-conceiving of the senses, treated in different ways:

(1) Samugghāta Sāruppa Sutta (S 35.30/4:21-23) non-conceiving the senses;
(2) Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 1 (S 35.31/4:23 f) non-conceiving of the senses with refrain;
(3) Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 2 (S 35.32/4:24-26) the sense characteristic formula.

The Samugghāta Sāruppa Sutta (S 35.30) is almost identical to both the Ejā Sutta 1 (S 35.90) and the Ejā Sutta 2 (S 35.91). One difference is their opening themes: while the Samugghāta Sāruppa Sutta opens by stating “the way that is appropriate for the uprooting of all conceiving” (sabba,maññita,samugghāta,sāruppa), the two Ejā Suttas declare that “the dart” (salla) should be removed, and this is done by abandoning all conceiving.¹

¹ Ejā S 1 (S 35.90/4:64-66) = SD 29.10 & Ejā S 2 (S 35.91/4:66 f) = SD 29.11
The Discourse on
What is Appropriate for Uprooting
(S 35.30/4:21-23)

2  Bhikshus, I will teach you the way that is appropriate for the uprooting of all conceivings. [22]
Listen, pay careful attention, I will speak.
3  And what, bhikshus, is that way that is appropriate for the uprooting of all conceivings?²

No eye-based conceivings

4a  Here, bhikshus, a monk does not conceive the eye;¹
    he does not conceive in the eye;
    he does not conceive from the eye;
    he does not conceive, “The eye is mine.”

4b  he does not conceive form;
    he does not conceive in form;
    he does not conceive from form;
    he does not conceive, “Form is mine.”

4c  he does not conceive eye-consciousness;
    he does not conceive in eye-consciousness;
    he does not conceive from eye-consciousness;
    he does not conceive, “Eye-consciousness is mine.”

4d  he does not conceive eye-contact;
    he does not conceive in eye-contact;
    he does not conceive from eye-contact;
    he does not conceive, “Eye-contact is mine.”

4e  And as to whatever that here arises dependent on eye-contact, whether it is felt as pleasant, or painful, or neither pleasant nor painful, that, too,
    he does not conceive it;
    he does not conceive in it;
    he does not conceive from it;
    he does not conceive, “It is mine.”

No ear-based conceivings

5a  He does not conceive the ear;
    he would not conceive in the ear;
    he would not conceive from the ear;
    he would not conceive, “The ear is mine.”

5b  he would not conceive sound;
    he would not conceive in sound;
    he would not conceive from sound;
    “Sound is mine.”

5c  he would not conceive ear-consciousness;
    he would not conceive in ear-consciousness;
    he would not conceive from ear-consciousness;
    “Ear-consciousness is mine.”

² On the nature of “conceiving” (maññanā), see Ejā S 1 (S 35.90) = Intro 29.10 (3).
³ On the meaning of these 4 patterns of conceiving, see Ejā S 1 (S 35.90) = Intro 29.10 (3).
he would not conceive, “Ear-contact is mine.”

5e And as to whatever that here arises dependent on ear-contact, whether it is felt as pleasant, or painful, or neither pleasant nor painful,
he would not conceive it;
he would not conceive in it;
he would not conceive from it;
he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

No nose-based conceivings

6a He would not conceive the nose;
he would not conceive in the nose;
he would not conceive from the nose;
he would not conceive, “The nose is mine.”
6b he would not conceive smell;
he would not conceive in smell;
he would not conceive from smell;
he would not conceive, “Smell is mine.”
6c he would not conceive nose-consciousness;
he would not conceive in nose-consciousness;
he would not conceive from nose-consciousness;
he would not conceive, “Nose-consciousness is mine.”
6d he would not conceive nose-contact;
he would not conceive in nose-contact;
he would not conceive from nose-contact;
he would not conceive, “Nose-contact is mine.”
6e And as to whatever that here arises dependent on nose-contact, whether it is felt as pleasant, or painful, or neither pleasant nor painful,
he would not conceive it;
he would not conceive in it;
he would not conceive from it;
he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

No tongue-based conceivings

7a He would not conceive the tongue;
he would not conceive in the tongue;
he would not conceive from the tongue;
he would not conceive, “The tongue is mine.”
7b he would not conceive taste;
he would not conceive in taste;
he would not conceive from taste;
he would not conceive, “Taste is mine.”
7c he would not conceive tongue-consciousness;
he would not conceive in tongue-consciousness;
he would not conceive from tongue-consciousness;
he would not conceive, “Tongue-consciousness is mine.”
7d he would not conceive tongue-contact;
he would not conceive in tongue-contact;
he would not conceive from tongue-contact;
he would not conceive,  “Tongue-contact is mine.”

7e And as to whatever that here arises dependent on tongue-contact, whether it is felt as pleasant, or painful, or neither pleasant nor painful,
he would not conceive it;
he would not conceive in it;
he would not conceive from it;
he would not conceive,  “It is mine.”

No body-based conceivings

8a He would not conceive the body;
he would not conceive in the body;
he would not conceive from the body;
he would not conceive,  “The body is mine.”

8b he would not conceive touch;
he would not conceive in touch;
he would not conceive from touch;
he would not conceive,  “Touch is mine.”

8c he would not conceive body-consciousness;
he would not conceive in body-consciousness;
he would not conceive from body-consciousness;
he would not conceive,  “Body-consciousness is mine.”

8d he would not conceive body-contact;
he would not conceive in body-contact;
he would not conceive from body-contact;
he would not conceive,  “Body-contact is mine.”

8e And as to whatever that here arises dependent on body-contact, whether it is felt as pleasant, or painful, or neither pleasant nor painful,
he would not conceive it;
he would not conceive in it;
he would not conceive from it;
he would not conceive,  “It is mine.”

No mind-based conceivings

9a He would not conceive the mind;
he would not conceive in the mind;
he would not conceive from the mind;
he would not conceive,  “The mind is mine.”

9b he would not conceive mind-object;
he would not conceive in mind-object;
he would not conceive from mind-object;
he would not conceive,  “Mind-object is mine.”

9c he would not conceive mind-consciousness;
he would not conceive in mind-consciousness;
he would not conceive from mind-consciousness;
he would not conceive,  “Mind-consciousness is mine.”

9d he would not conceive mind-contact;
he would not conceive in mind-contact;
he would not conceive from mind-contact;
he would not conceive,  “Mind-contact is mine.”

9e And as to whatever that here arises dependent on mind-contact, whether it is felt as pleasant, or painful, or neither pleasant nor painful,
he would not conceive it;
he would not conceive in it;
he would not conceive from it;
he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

Not conceiving “the all”
10 He would not conceive “every thing” [the all] (sabba);\(^4\)
he would not conceive in every thing;
he would not conceive from every thing;
he would not conceive, “Every thing is mine.”

11 And thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.
Not clinging, he is not agitated.\(^5\)
Not agitated, he himself personally attains nirvana.
He understands, “Destroyed is birth. The holy life has been lived. What needs to be done has been done. There is no more of this state of being.”\(^6\)
12 This, bhikshus, is that way that is appropriate for the uprooting of all conceivings.”

— evaṁ —

\(^{4}\) See *Sabba* S (S 35.23/4:15) = SD 7.1. *Sabba* here is usu tr as “the all,” but sound semi-technical. Here, the practice is not to conceive *all* the senses as a set, as it were. If you are comfortable with the tr “the all,” and knows it senses well, you may use it. If you are not sure, then, it is better to stick to “every thing.” Note that there is a difference a significant difference btw “every thing” (*sabbe saṅkhāra*) and “everything” (*sabbe dhammā*): see *Dhamma-niyāma* S (A 3.134/1:285) = SD 26.8.

\(^{5}\) “Not agitated,” *paritassati*, Skt *paritṛṣyati*. ‘to crave, to thirst for,’ and is connected etymologically with *taṇhā*. Comy on *Pariyānāsana* S (S 12.51) explains that such a one is not agitated with the agitation of craving (*taṇhā,paritassanā*) nor with the agitation of fear (*bhaya,paritassanā*); meaning that he neither craves nor fears (SA 2:78). See *Pariyānāsana* S (S 12.51.14/2:82) = SD 11.5.

\(^{6}\) Comy on *Samugghāta Sāruppa* S (S 35.30), which applies here, says that here, insight culminating in arhat-hood is discussed in 40 cases (SA 2:363), which Sub-comy explains as follows: 7 in the eye-door: eye, forms, eye-consciousness, eye-contact, and pleasant, painful, and neutral feeling; so too the other 5 doors, making 42; n the passage regarding “self-identity,” thus, “he conceives not the all, etc,” makes 43, and the phrase “he clings not to anything in the world,” totals 44 (SAṬ:VRI 2:9). For details on the arhat-hood pericope, see *Brahma,deva* S (S 6.3) = SD 12.4 Intro (5).