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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), 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 patipadā).

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 Sāruppa Sutta (S 35.30). Moreover, as in the Ejā Sutta 2 (S 35.91), 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, pariyyāya Sutta (S 22.59), followed by the nibbidā (“revulsion”) formula applied to the six senses.

---

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

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, sappāyaṁ vo, bhikkhave, paṭipadaṁ 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, yasmiṁ maññati, yato maññati, yam meti maññati, tato tam hoti aṇṇathā.
11 Aṇṇathā, 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” (aṇṇathā, bhāvī). Comy on Samugghāta Sappāya S 1 (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (aṇṇen ‘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, aṇṇathā, bhāvī means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (aṇṇathā, bhāvānam viparanānam upagamanena aṇṇathā, bhāvī hutvā) (SA 2:363). In the word bhava, satto, satto is the pp of sajajī (“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, bhikshus, 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 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.”

5h Thus not conceiving anything, he clings not to anything in the world.
Not clinging, he is not agitated.

---

12 Yaṁ hi, bhikkhave, maṁhaṁ, yasmin maṁhaṁ, yato maṁhaṁ, yaṁ meti maṁhaṁ, tato taṁ hoti aṁnaṁbhāṁ.
13 Aṁnaṁbhāṁ bhavaṁ, saṁta 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” (aṁnaṁbhāṁ, bhāvāṁ). Comy on Samugghāta Sappāya S 1 (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (aṁnaṁ 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, aṁnaṁbhāṁ, bhāvāṁ means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (aṁnaṁbhāṁ, bhāvāṁ viparināmaṁ upagamanena aṁnaṁbhāṁ, bhāvāṁ huvā) (SA 2:363). In the word bhava, satto, satto is the pp of sajjaṁ (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as laggo, laggito, palibuddho (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 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.”

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, yasmiṁ maññati, yato maññati, yaṁ meti maññati, tato taṁ hoti aṁṇathā.

¹⁵ Aṁṇathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavan 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” (aṁṇathā, bhāvī). Comy on Samugghāta Sappāya S 1 (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (aṁṇen ‘ākārena hoti) from that in which it is conceived [what is conceived as permanent actually is impermanent, SAT-VR 2:8]. In the second sentence, aṁṇathā, bhāvī means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (aṁṇathā, bhāvam viparināmaṁ upagamanena aṁṇathā, bhāvī huvā) (SA 2:363). In the word bhava, satto is the pp of sajāti (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as laggo, laggito, palibuddho (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. The world, becoming otherwise, is attached to existence, delights only in existence.


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, yasmiṁ maññati, yato maññati, yaṁ meti maññati, tato taṁ hoti aṁṇathā.

17 Aṁṇathā,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” (aṁṇathā,bhāvī). Comy on Samugghāta Sappāya S 1 (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (aṁṇen ’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, aṁṇathā,bhāvī means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (aṁṇathā,bhāvāṁ viparīṇāmaṁ upagamanena aṁṇathā,bhāvī hūtā) (SA 2:363). In the word bhava, satto is the pp of sajīti (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as lago, laggito, paḷibuddho (id).
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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, bhikkhus, 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 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."

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 mind-object;
he would not conceive from mind-object;
he would not conceive, "Mind-object is mine."

---

18 Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmiṁ maññati, yato maññati, yaṁ meti maññati, tato taṁ hoti aṇñathā.
19 Aṇñathā, 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” (aṇñathā, bhāvī). Comy on Samughṭā Sappāya S 1 (S 35.31) says that the first sentence asserts that the object exists in a different mode (aṇñen '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, aṇñathā, bhāvī means “becoming otherwise,” which Comy explains as “It becomes otherwise by arriving at change, a state of alteration” (aṇñathā, bhāvam viparītānāmaṁ upagamanam aṇñathā, bhāvī hutfā) (SA 2:363). In the word bhava,satto, satto is the pp of sajati (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as lago, 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.”

— evairi — 090806

20 Yañ hi, bhikkhave, maññati, yasmiñ maññati, yato maññati, yañ meti maññati, tato tam hoti aññathā.

21 Aññathā, bhāvī bhava, satto loko bhavam eva abhinandati: as at Ējā 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, bhāvān viparināmāṁ upagamanena aññathā, bhāvī hutvā) (SA 2:363). In the word bhava, satto, satto is the pp of sajajati (“to cling to, be attached to”), glossed as laggō, laggito, paḷiḥuddho (id).

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

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

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

25 Comy on Samugghāta Sāruppā 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).