

Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 1

The First Discourse on What is Conducive to Uprooting

[Non-conceiving the senses]
(Saṃyutta Nikāya 35.31/4:23 f)
Translated by Piya Tan ©2009

Introduction

There are the two **Samugghāta Sappāya Suttas** (S 35.31-32). **The Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 1** (S 35.31) is identical to **the Ejā Sutta 1** (S 35.90),¹ except that the former uses the word “conducive” (*sappāya*), that is, it refers to the spiritual exercise as being “the way that is conducive for the uprooting of all conceiving” (*sabba,maññita,samugghāta,sappāya paṭipadā*).²

Furthermore, while the Ejā Sutta 1’s teachings are given in the conditional mood, that of the Samugghāta Sutta 1 is in the present tense, as in **the Samugghāta Sārappa Sutta** (S 35.30).³ Moreover, as in **the Ejā Sutta 2** (S 35.91),⁴ the Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 1 also has the “non-conceiving” refrain [§4g etc].

The Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 2 (S 35.32) works on the same theme as the Samugghāta Sappāya Sutta 1, that of “the way that is conducive for the uprooting of all conceiving,” but it applies the “aggregate characteristics formula,” like the one found in **the Āditta,pariyāya Sutta** (S 22.59),⁵ followed by the *nibbidā* (“revulsion”) formula⁶ applied to the six senses.⁷

— — —

¹ S 35.90/4:64-66 = SD 29.10.

² S 35.31/4:23 f = SD 19.20.

³ S 35.30/4:21-23 = SD 29.19.

⁴ S 35.91/4:66 6 = SD 29.11.

⁵ On the “aggregate characteristics formula,” see S 22.59.12+17/3:67 f = SD 1.2 nn (see notes at §§12 & 17).

⁶ Cf S 22.59.22/3:68.

⁷ S 35.32/4:24-26 = SD 29.21.

The First Discourse on What is Conducive to Uprooting

(S 35.310/4:23 f)

- 2 Bhikshus, I will teach you the way that conduces to the uprooting of all conceiving.⁸
Listen, pay careful attention, I will speak.
- 3 And what, bhikshus, is that way that conduces to the uprooting of all conceivings?

No eye-based conceivings

- 4 Here, bhikshus, a monk
does not conceive the eye;⁹
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,
he would not conceive it;
he would not conceive in it;
he would not conceive from it;
he would not conceive, “It is mine.”
- 4f For, bhikshus, whatever he conceives, whatever he conceives in, whatever he conceives from, whatever he conceives as “Mine,” it turns out to be otherwise.¹⁰
The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.¹¹

THE NON-CONCEIVING REFRAIN

- 4g Bhikshus, whatever is the extent of any of the aggregates, the elements and the sense-bases,

⁸ *Sabba,maññita,samugghāta,sappāyaṃ vo, bhikkhave, paṭipadam desessāmi.*

⁹ On the meaning of these 4 patterns of conceiving, see **Ejā S 1** (S 35.90) = Intro 29.10 (3).

¹⁰ *Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmim maññati, yato maññati, yaṃ meti maññati, tato taṃ hoti aññathā.*

¹¹ *Aññathā,bhāvī bhava,satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati:* as at **Ejā S 1** (S 35.9/4:66 f). There seems to be a word-play here on “existence” (*bhava*) and “becoming otherwise” (*aññathā,bhāvī*). Comy on **Samugghāta Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (*aññen ākārena hoti*) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAṬ:VRI 2:8]. In the second sentence, *aññathā,bhāvī* means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (*aññathā,bhāvam vipariṇāmam upagamanena aññathā,bhāvī hutvā*) (SA 2:363). In the word **bhava,satto, satto** is the pp of *sajjati* (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as *laggo, laggito, paḷibuddho* (id).

he would not conceive it, he would not conceive in it, he would not conceive from it, he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

4h Thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.

Not clinging, he is not agitated.

Not agitated, he himself personally attained 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.”

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;
he would not conceive, “Sound is mine.”

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

5d he would not conceive ear-contact;
he would not conceive in ear-contact;
he would not conceive from ear-contact;
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.”

5f For, bhikkhus, whatever he conceives, whatever he conceives in, whatever he conceives from, whatever he conceives as “Mine,” it turns out to be otherwise.¹²

The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.¹³

THE NON-CONCEIVING REFRAIN

5g Bhikkhus, whatever is the extent of any of the aggregates, the elements and the sense-bases, he would not conceive it, he would not conceive in it, he would not conceive from it, he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

5h Thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.

Not clinging, he is not agitated.

¹² *Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmim maññati, yato maññati, yañ meti maññati, tato tañ hoti aññathā.*

¹³ *Aññathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati:* as at **Ejā S 1** (S 35.9/4:66 f). There seems to be a word-play here on “existence” (*bhava*) and “becoming otherwise” (*aññathā, bhāvī*). Comy on **Samuggahāta Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (*aññen ākārena hoti*) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAT:VRI 2:8]. In the second sentence, *aññathā, bhāvī* means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (*aññathā, bhāvam vipariñāmam upagamanena aññathā, bhāvī hutvā*) (SA 2:363). In the word *bhava, satto, satto* is the pp of *sajjati* (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as *laggo, laggito, paḷibuddho* (id).

Not agitated, he himself personally attained 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.”

No nose-based conceivings

6a He would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive,
the nose;
in the nose;
from the nose;
“The nose is mine.”

6b he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive,
smell;
in smell;
from smell;
“Smell is mine.”

6c he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive,
nose-consciousness;
in nose-consciousness;
from nose-consciousness;
“Nose-consciousness is mine.”

6d he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive
he would not conceive,
nose-contact;
in nose-contact;
from nose-contact;
“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.”

6f For, bhikkhus, whatever he conceives, whatever he conceives in, whatever he conceives from, whatever he conceives as “Mine,” it turns out to be otherwise.¹⁴

The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.¹⁵

THE NON-CONCEIVING REFRAIN

6g Bhikkhus, whatever is the extent of any of the aggregates, the elements and the sense-bases, he would not conceive it, he would not conceive in it, he would not conceive from it, he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

6h Thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.

Not clinging, he is not agitated.

Not agitated, he himself personally attained 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.”

¹⁴ *Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmim maññati, yato maññati, yañ meti maññati, tato tañ hoti aññathā.*

¹⁵ *Aññathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati:* as at **Ejā S 1** (S 35.9/4:66 f). There seems to be a word-play here on “existence” (*bhava*) and “becoming otherwise” (*aññathā, bhāvī*). Comy on **Samugghāta Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (*aññen ākārena hoti*) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAṬ:VRI 2:8]. In the second sentence, *aññathā, bhāvī* means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (*aññathā, bhāvī vi pariñāmañ upagamanena aññathā, bhāvī hutvā*) (SA 2:363). In the word *bhava, satto, satto* is the pp of *sajjati* (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as *laggo, laggito, paḷibuddho* (id).

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.”
- 7f** For, bhikshus, whatever he conceives , whatever he conceives in, whatever he conceives from, whatever he conceives as “Mine,” it turns out to be otherwise.¹⁶
 The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.¹⁷

THE NON-CONCEIVING REFRAIN

- 7g** Bhikshus, whatever is the extent of any of the aggregates, the elements and the sense-bases, he would not conceive it, he would not conceive in it, he would not conceive from it, he would not conceive, “It is mine.”
- 7h** Thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.
 Not clinging, he is not agitated.
 Not agitated, he himself personally attained 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.”

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;

¹⁶ *Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmim maññati, yato maññati, yañ meti maññati, tato tañ hoti aññathā.*

¹⁷ *Aññathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati:* as at **Ejā S 1** (S 35.9/4:66 f). There seems to be a word-play here on “existence” (*bhava*) and “becoming otherwise” (*aññathā, bhāvī*). Comy on **Samugghāta Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (*aññen ākārena hoti*) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAṬ:VRI 2:8]. In the second sentence, *aññathā, bhāvī* means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (*aññathā, bhāvāñ vipariñāmañ upagamanena aññathā, bhāvī hutvā*) (SA 2:363). In the word *bhava, satto, satto* is the pp of *sajjati* (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as *laggo, laggito, paḷibuddho* (id).

- 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.”
- 8f** For, bhikshus, whatever he conceives , whatever he conceives in, whatever he conceives from, whatever he conceives as “Mine,” it turns out to be otherwise.¹⁸
The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.¹⁹

THE NON-CONCEIVING REFRAIN

- 8g** Bhikshus, whatever is the extent of any of the aggregates, the elements and the sense-bases, he would not conceive it, he would not conceive in it, he would not conceive from it, he would not conceive, “It is mine.”
- 8h** Thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.
Not clinging, he is not agitated.
Not agitated, he himself personally attained 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.”

No mind-based conceivings

- 97a** 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 touch;
he would not conceive from mind-object;

¹⁸ *Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmim maññati, yato maññati, yañ meti maññati, tato tañ hoti aññathā.*

¹⁹ *Aññathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati:* as at **Ejā S 1** (S 35.9/4:66 f). There seems to be a word-play here on “existence” (*bhava*) and “becoming otherwise” (*aññathā, bhāvī*). Comy on **Samuggahāta Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (*aññen’ ākārena hoti*) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAT:VRI 2:8]. In the second sentence, *aññathā, bhāvī* means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (*aññathā, bhāvāñ vipariñāmañ upagamanena aññathā, bhāvī hutvā*) (SA 2:363). In the word *bhava, satto, satto* is the pp of *sajjati* (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as *laggo, laggito, paḷibuddho* (id).

- 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.”
- 9f** For, bhikshus, whatever he conceives, whatever he conceives in, whatever he conceives from, whatever he conceives as “Mine,” it turns out to be otherwise.²⁰
 The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.²¹

THE NON-CONCEIVING REFRAIN

10a Bhikshus, whatever is the extent of any of the aggregates, the elements and the sense-bases, he would not conceive it, he would not conceive in it, he would not conceive from it, he would not conceive, “It is mine.”

10b And thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.

Not clinging, he is not agitated.²²

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.”²³

11 This, bhikshus, is that way that conduces to the uprooting of all conceivings.”

— evaṃ — 090806

²⁰ *Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmim maññati, yato maññati, yaṃ meti maññati, tato taṃ hoti aññathā.*

²¹ *Aññathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati:* as at **Ejā S 1** (S 35.9/4:66 f). There seems to be a word-play here on “existence” (*bhava*) and “becoming otherwise” (*aññathā, bhāvī*). Comy on **Samugghāta Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (*aññen’ākārena hoti*) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAṬ:VRI 2:8]. In the second sentence, *aññathā, bhāvī* means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (*aññathā, bhāvāṃ vipariṇāmaṃ upagamanena aññathā, bhāvī hutvā*) (SA 2:363). In the word *bhava, satto*, *satto* is the pp of *sajjati* (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as *laggo, laggitto, paḷibuddho* (id).

²² “Not agitated,” *paritassati*, Skt *paritṛṣyati*. ‘to crave, to thirst for,’ and is connected etymologically with *taṇhā*. Comy on **Pari, vīmaṃsana 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 **Pari, vīmaṃsana S** (S 12.51.14/2:82) = SD 11.5.

²³ Comy on **Samugghāta Sārūpa 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).