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1. The mere happening of res Extends vs the event of flesh

Descartes has used two kinds of substances including res Extensa that extends in the space and res Cogitans that is purely mental. He relied on the concepts of physics for explaining these two substances. The mental connections are not linked to does not require scientific description because they cannot be measured. The central reason behind it is that they lack physical extensions. Descartes has attempted to resolve the dilemma of distinguishing between the two substances. He claims that things that receive praise for physical appearance cannot be extended at all. He claims that a lack of physical extension does not exclude res Extensa. He has further explained that res is a substance that exists individually and it does not have a relationship with any other substance. It lacks the properties of atoms and is indistinguishable. He used the two substances ‘res cogitans' and ‘res Extensa' for presenting them as the thinking substance. This is also used for claiming that dependence is not an impossibility. This emphasize on differentiating between the physical and the external world. Descartes has provided comparison of thee primary objects by categorizing substances as res Extensa and Cogitans. This concept is used for determining if the objects exist in the world. Primary objects according to him are distinctive compared to the conceiving objects. He argues that own mind does not include the idea of imagination, sensation or the emotions. If an individual continues in the same manner he ends in an impoverished manner. Without a mind it is not possible to think or use imagination.

Descartes substance dualism explains that mind and body are completely distinct entities. He supports his claims by stating that the nature of mind is entirely different from that of the body. It means that the characteristics of both vary thus making them independent and separate. Descartes considers mind-body distinctiveness because his theory reflects that the mind is made of different matter. Gretchen thinks that even with the existence of souls the theory of personal identity is illogical. She claims, "because we have great ways of telling whether two people are the same over time. But we have no way of telling whether two souls are the same over time” (Moreira-Almeida, Araujo and Cloninger). Bodies are the same as souls because the same souls are attached to the same bodies. It also states that one body has one soul of the soul of another persona cannot enter that body. Similarly, the same souls exhibit similar personalities. It indicates that the personalities of a single body cannot be changed thus making body and souls are one entity. The souls of people never change making the argument of Descartes invalid (Moreira-Almeida, Araujo and Cloninger).

We cannot guarantee the sameness of immaterial self when we observe sameness of psychological characteristics. To understand the problem, it can be considered if mental phenomena can or cannot be reduced to physical phenomena. The sameness of the psychological characteristics can be guaranteed because the human functioning and properties of experience such as intellectualism, thinking and creativity depend on one's mind-brain relationship. People having active minds can perform thinking activities efficiently. However, we cannot find sameness of immaterial self because we are unable to identify the functions of the soul. We cannot explain the experiences of the soul or what's going on in the inner world.

Marion has less of explicitly contrasted flesh with a cartesian body that links to the term in-resistance. Res Extensa is important as it plays a vital role in identifying the role of objects. Descartes has set clear boundary for determining the primary imaginative objects and uncovering their distinction from others. According to him the distinct idea of own mind does not suggest the purposeful body movement. All above explained by the philosopher is linked to one’s own body. He also suggests that the reverse is not true because it former body cannot be considered as merely of the body. Things appear to be different when considered from the perspective of mind. This can be used for linking it with the sense of pure thought. The distinction is only possible when essential modes are providing claims for the separability of mind from the body. Disconnection between mind and body is also essential for identifying the role of soul. Cartesian internalism is used for meshing with the materialistic thinking of the current state. This claims the location for the mind-body dualism. Having a location means need for drawing line between inside and the outside boundaries. It also suggests that metaphysics is equal to the geometric points.

Marion has focused on the contemporary interpretation of Cartesian that suggests appealing location of mental states with respect to the boundaries. Descartes has struggled for adding adequate expression to his concept of union of the mind and body. The current topologists attempts to build connection for identifying the relationship between person and the physics. This also reflects the concept of organism bound individual. The scientists that are materialist minded have accepted that persons mind is inside head that also refers to internal location claim. The arguments of Descartes are provided for substance dualism and Res Extensa. Nothing outside person’s body is constitutive and he puts brain in a vat for presenting the difference between the two substances. Mental properties are normal according to him when they are embodied in subject that abides in the normal circumstances. Individuals dependent on the external or environmental factors refers to content-externalism. Cartesian intuitions used by Marion explains that anything that happens inside subject’s head or mind is capable of altering the mental states. The difference in the mental state or type also reveals what the person is thinking. There is limitations to the content externalism and possession claims. Subject’s relation to the environment is determined for understanding its exact state. This is used for uncovering the difference between subjects.

The discussion of Marion depicts that flesh needs to be understood by the sense of the meaningful event. Descartes discovered the ego explaining full consciousness. This reflects that the ego is part of individual identity. He claims that we cannot doubt the existence of our own ego. Every individual existence is capable of denying that the ego exists. This also reflects the role of consciousness. Descartes has referred to Cogito ergo sum that refers to ‘I think therefore I am’. He also explained that the discovery of ego occurred at the time of childhood and birth. The argument of Marion states that meaningful event is crucial for understanding flesh and its needs. This reflects the presentation of subjectivity and the exposed mode of giveness that rests on the outside intentionally. Counter-intentionality is also a related term used for understanding the sense of a meaningful event. This reflects that Marion has demanded experience for relating it with anticipation, control and manipulation. The interpretation of phenomenology's own aims. He has managed to discover the saturated phenomena and configured the understanding of philosophy. His analysis states that phenomena is crucial and contributes to philosophy. It is not possible to understand philosophy by neglecting the phenomena. He has attempted to reinterpret reduction and giveness that is also referred to as pure from the call. His principle of as must as reduction as giveness explains the forms of appearing. His rich phenomenal folds the meaning of giveness and is not constrained to the objects. His entire discussion has emphasized on revisiting powers and identifying thee aspects of knowing.

1. Falque on the incarnate suffering of the Christ

Falque argues that "Christ's flesh is the element or the medium of the humanity". The event of suffering explained by Falque has a theological basis. Human flesh according to this claim is identified as the instrumental medium that confirms the presence of divine life. This is used for distinguishing between the flesh and the spirit. Falque explains that the same thing is experienced by the soul and the flesh differently. this proves that human flesh was acquired through the soul.

Lieb and Korper build the argument that there are two alternatives to resurrection. It is not appropriate to trust the biblical accounts as legends replaced the factual information in the disciples. Leib lacked a semantic equivalent in modern English and explains that there is an understatement in explaining the transition. While the argument of Korper emphasize on the soul. He explains that death occurs only when the soul separates from the body. In understanding this perspective it is also important to determine if Eucharist is Korper. The Catholic analysis stresses on the distinction between substance and accident. The church's purpose is also examined for understanding the argument.

The resurrection of Leib is different from that of Korper. To deal with resurrection it is important to deal with the authenticity of the Gospel. The alteration in the facts makes it less reliable or authentic. For Christians to claim their edge over truth, they need to be certain about the religious events existing in Christianity. The Christians today rely on the knowledge presented to them by the legends, whose authenticity is doubtful. One claim regarding the unreliability of the Gospel is that it originally contained everything and the embarrassing details while the legends remove those details. The removal of the controversial information makes Bible a transformed version, lacking many details of the original book. The common example of these details is the point when Jesus referred to Peter as Satan, the cowardly nature of the disciples becoming apparent at the time of the crucifixion, also that the disciples refused initially to believe the rise of the Jesus (Sekatskaia).

Falque emphasized on the subjective, live and self-aware experience of the Christ. The reason for the exclusion of these facts may be to show the positive side of the disciples but it makes resurrection different from what was told in the Gospels (J. P. Moreland). The story of Alamo explains how the legends changed the details making it different from the original event. "Illustrations may even be used to help establish the dating and history of the Bible" (93-99). The actual event worked to change the glorified status of the legends. It altered facts such as 185 Texans taking over 5,000 Mexicans, while the story embellished over time. The contemporary historians also peeled away from the legends. Time played another role in transforming the factual information as legends lacked sufficient time to creep into Easter stories. For the establishment of New Testament documents, the legends needed time for writing the actual events of the Christ. The rime factor made it difficult to include such minute details. In recreating events, the legends failed to focus on required details, demanding time. It is thus unreliable to trust the rising of Jesus. The untruthfulness of the resurrection is also visible in the altered facts of the Synoptic Gospels that was written before the Book of Acts. The fall of Jerusalem and the death of Paul are also missing from the recorded versions of legends while the Acts were written between A.D 60 to 62. The absence of and alterations in these events do not improve the knowledge of the Christians regarding the resurrection of other religious events. The rise of Jesus also puts the followers of the Christian religion into a conflicting situation where they struggle for factual information (Caciola).

Replacing facts in telling resurrection, makes truth unexplored by the Christians. Resurrection without actual historical evidence makes Christians uncertain about how Jesus rose from the dead. The conspiracy theory explains that the legends removed the information about Christ's sufferings; his trial to crucifixion, burial, Roman seal and the empty tomb. The legends find the details of Roman guards beating and whipping as embarrassing, so they remove such information. The Christians relying on legend lacks the details of how bloody torture weakened Jesus and how the massive rock was rolled across the tomb.

1. I have my body? Or I am my body?

Falque claims “I am my body” that can be related with the theological data of Christ’s suffering. The argument of Falque states that it was Christ's body that saved humanity not his words. He has based his argument on the French phenomenologists instead of authors. The phenomenologists include Husserlians, Heideggarians and Marleau-Pontyians. The roots in different authors have less importance in determining the way of thinking. his central argument states that the word is made of flesh so it is capable of becoming the word. This is used for proving that flesh holds more significance than a word. Falque also emphasized on the power of theology and explains that the philosophers always learn from the theologians. He has thus considered theologians as more powerful and effective than the philosophers. He denies any instinct where theologians could learn from the philosophers. This reflects that Falque has based his beliefs on theology and consider it a strong foundation for explaining the concept of Christ's flesh. The body of Christ means a true body like humans that consist of limbs, hair, stomach and has connections with the contemporary phenomenology. This again leads to the same distinction explained by Leib and Korper. Leib stresses on flesh while Korper relies on the body for presenting their arguments. The Feast of Lamb is related to the spread body that builds an intermediary between the extended body and Descartes ‘lived body'. Hurssel has further revealed that philosophy and theology cannot separate both.

Falque uses ‘I am the body' for explaining the suffering of Christ. This reflects that he has used the phenology of suffering and incarnation. Christ shared his suffering by virtue by emphasizing on Goodness. In his argument, he has attempted to present the human body as a symbol of goodness. The goodness of the body is beyond the finitude and the limitations. He preserved insights and benefits by avoiding the problem of the grand narrative. He has reclaimed the centrality of the immanent material by building a connection between theology and phenomenology. Incarnation remains central to his understanding of humans. He has aimed at relating the human body with that of Christ. This reflects his emphasis on the concepts of human suffering, death, resurrection, finitude and fleshy material being. This indicates that finitude provides reasoning for the reclamation of incarnate humanity and reshaping our understanding of the term. This reveals that the human person is problematic. He maximizes his account by stating the grand narrative of theology is linked with the problems of phenomenological validity. This also indicates his emphasis on human finitude and God-given reality. The desires for the fullness of perfections remains one of the prominent viewpoints of Falque. He mentions, "the desire for fullness or for perfection remains precisely one of the masks which the Serpent bears, and thus also sin. You will be like Gods" (Genesis 3:5). This indicates that finitude is an inherent event before the transgressive journey from a sinful life. The humans that refuse to accept their limitations or imperfections are more like to commit the sin.
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