

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component (Religious and Philosophical Questions: The problem of suffering and evil).

## Question 40

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The example of the idea of prolonged pain associated with terminal illness was awarded 1 mark, with a second mark awarded at 'as a person' for the impact of mental illness. Grieving the loss of a loved one, the impact of abuse, and loss experienced as a consequence of a natural disaster are each worth 1 mark, so the answer achieved full marks at 'in your life.'

## Question 41(a)

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The candidate didn't simply list the onmis but included a brief explanation of what each one meant, so 1 mark was awarded for each of omnipotent, omnibenevolent and omniscient. 1 mark was awarded for the idea that God is immanent, with a final mark awarded for the idea that God is beyond the universe and therefore, indescribable.

## Question 41(b)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

1 mark was awarded for the argument that permitting the existence of suffering challenges God's goodness. A second mark was awarded for the idea that God may be unable to prevent it therefore, cannot be omnipotent. The third mark was awarded for the idea that God may not be aware of suffering and evil, and cannot therefore be omniscient, and the final mark was awarded for the idea that he may not want to help, which would mean he isn't omnibenevolent.

## Question 42(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The first sentence was not awarded a mark because it wasn't clearly enough linked to the question, so the first mark was awarded at 'good reason'. 2 marks were awarded for the developed point that suffering is sent by Allah, and that this can be for two reasons: a test or a punishment. A fourth mark was awarded at

the end of the response for the belief that earthly suffering cannot compare with the reward for faithfulness.

### **Question 42(b)**

The candidate was awarded **7 marks**.

The first sentence is not correct because Buddhism has a lot to say about suffering, but does not require belief in God, so this was disregarded. The candidate was awarded 2 marks for explaining why they find the idea of karma to be a reasonable explanation because the idea of actions having consequences is like a physical law. An additional mark was awarded for showing there is a law to which it corresponds – every action has an equal and opposite reaction.

2 marks were awarded at 'regular people' for a developed point questioning why God would send suffering as a test to good people, while evil people go unchallenged. The final developed point rejecting the idea of a devil or of shaytans, and placing the blame squarely with human beings, was also awarded 2 marks.