

# Modern Neuroscience And The Katastematic / Kinetic Debate

Post by "Don" of June 30, 2023 at 9:07 PM

[Quote from Little Rocker](#)

This is a minefield

😄 LOL! Well, that hasn't stopped us before! 😄

Pleasure appears to be a "feeling," since it is canonically defined as one of the two feelings of the canon.

Is "feeling" a sensation? I would have to say yes, in the sense that every feeling is a sensation in the sense of PD2, but interestingly, Saint-Andre doesn't use sensation but awareness there:

*[Death is nothing to us; for what has disintegrated lacks awareness, and what lacks awareness is nothing to us.](#)*

We are \*aware\* when we are \*feeling\* pleasure...therefore, it seems to be that feelings = sensations.

Or we may just be splitting hairs to no purpose:

αἴσθησις (aísthēsis)

- Perception from the senses, feeling, hearing, seeing
- Perception by the intellect as well as the senses
- That which is perceived: scent
- Ability to perceive: discernment
- Cognition or discernment of moral discernment in ethical matters

[Quote from Little Rocker](#)

So for what it's worth, I'm inclined to think the difference is that katestematic pleasure is always there, always available to perception. I can call it to mind and experience it wherever I am. 'Kinetic' pleasure comes and goes.

Now, \*THAT\* I agree 100%! To continue on my soapbox/hobby horse: That's why we can be more confident in katastematic pleasures: *They are always available to us.* We can enjoy kinetic pleasures, but they are dependent on circumstances external to ourselves.

I realize I still need to again read G&T (Why do I read that "gin & tonic"??) but then I think... do I? I need to back and read Epicurus and what's left of the Epicureans first, I think.