THE BEST IN EVALUATIVE JUDGMENTS

Fandieyeh Farhan Altarawneh[1]*

[1] Teacher at the Model School, Mutah University.

ABSTRACT

The issue in this study is to reveal the actual essence of the best rule of the evaluative judgments of grammarians and to explain its character as a preferential judgment that is applied to distinguish between the different usages of lingo. This is done by responding to a question, which is associated with the concept of this rule, and the principles on which grammarians founded its use. The study aimed to fulfill a number of tasks, the most prominent of which was defining the term of best and its position among other evaluative judgments, exposing the criteria according to which grammarians used it, clarifying that it is a judgment of preference as opposed to one of rejection, and pointing out the effects it had on the construction of the linguistic norms in the grammatical tradition. This research is significant in that it sheds some insight on the critical issue within the evaluation methodology in Arabic grammatical thought contributing to the context in understanding the mechanics of preference between linguistic forms explaining the connection between analogy and usage in the direction of judgments and rendering its results relevant to modern linguistic research. The study followed a descriptive-analytical style by tracking the instances of the "best" rule in the books of grammarians, interpreting the situations involving the application of this rule, and explaining the reasons of its occurrence against the backdrop of the grammatical rules. In the study, the best ruling was found to be an evaluative and preferential ruling which comes within the scope of what is right and allowed. It also demonstrated that there was a range of factors that grammarians used to arrive at this decision which included analogy, high frequency, simple meaning and phonetic convenience. Moreover, the paper demonstrated that their methodology is rooted in a stepwise approach to the linguistic acceptance. Sibawayh was a representation of the inductive method that was associated with the sound application and Ibn Hisham was more concerned with codification and and the classification of the ruling, and Holy Quran and sound application were still central in determining preference. The study suggested that there was a need to re-do the assessive decisions in view of the contemporary linguistic methods, with a focus on the analysis of the grammatical preference terms, applying the contemporary linguistic methods to teach Arabic language, comparative research on the influence of context and meaning on the determination of grammatical decisions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Evaluative judgments have occupied a significant position in the Arabic grammatical studies. Grammarians did not only define the linguistic phenomena in the way they were manifested in the speech of the classical Arabic, but judged them and compared them in terms of different criteria, i. e., adherence to grammatical rules, frequency of occurrence, clarity of meaning and structural harmonisation with the linguistic system. The best of these judgments is one of the means of preference, which shows the various degrees of linguistic use without necessarily ruling it out of the field of eloquence or admissibility.

The study of the best judgment is essential to the nature of grammatical thinking of the ancients. It unveils how they set their standard of linguistic and the processes of comparing various forms of linguistic. It also points out how usage and analogy relate to guide judgment and proves that grammatical evaluation is predisposed on preference rather than rejection/exclusion.

1.1. Research Problem:

The research problem is that it tries to reveal the actual essence of the best ruling in the judgment of evaluation and that it is a preferential ruling in the various linguistic usages. This may be stated as the following question: What is the meaning of best in evaluative judgements under grammarians and what were the grounds on which they drew on in making this decision?

1.2. Research Objectives:

1. To explain the meaning of the term best in evaluative judgments as per grammarians.
2. To work out the ranking of the best ruling out of other evaluative judgments.
3. To bring out the principles on which grammarians had grounded this decision.
4. To make clear what the best ruling is a preference and not the rejection of other possibilities.
5. To emphasize the role that the "best" decision plays in creating the language standards within the grammatical tradition.

1.3. Research Significance:

1. To emphasize a point in the Arabic grammar thinking evaluation method.
2. To make a contribution in comprehending how preferences among linguistic usages work.
3. To clarify the association between analogy and usage in leading grammatical ruling.
4. To apply the findings of the research to modern linguistic and grammatical research.

5. To enhance research that covers evaluative judgments in the Arabic literary tradition.

1.4. Research Methodology:

This study uses descriptive-analytical methodology, by following the phenomena of the best judgment being used and the situations of its application in the works of grammarians, and subsequently explain the motives and criteria of such best judgment based on the rules of grammar and linguistics.

2. THE FIRST SECTION: THE CONCEPT OF BETTER IN EVALUATIVE JUDGEMENTS:

2.1. Signification of the superlative adjective, and of the form af'al:

Superlative adjective is a derived noun that is created to show that two things have a particular quality, and one of them has this quality in a higher extent than the other one. e.g. Zayd is better informed than Amr. They both share knowledge, but Zayd is more endowed with it. The superlative adjective is applied to compare and contrast two or more items and it can be used without meaning of comparison provided other contexts depict otherwise (Ibn Malik, 1967, 1/56).

The superlative is initially constituted on the model af'al -fu'la, masculine and feminine respectively, of the trilateral verb which is absolutely conjugated, affirmative and variant, like: ḥasana - ahsan, kabura - akbar, aalima - a'lam. Grammarians have figured out that the meaning of increase and preference is represented by form af'al and this is employed to compare the language uses among them all and therefore, they make judgment by saying: This way is better or more excellent, that is, more preferable than others, and the other way is within the sphere of permissibility (Ibn Hisham, 1985, 1/187).

2.2. The notion of grammatical excellence:

To grammarians, best means a qualitative and likable judgment raised upon any given linguistic form in case it is considered preferable to others in terms of criteria like adherence to grammar, usage, or specificity of meaning or simplification of pronunciation. This is with the consideration that the other form is still acceptable or legitimate in Arabic. This is not meant to nullify the alternative form but only to show what is deemed to be more appropriate by certain linguistic standards. This judgment is seen in the scenario of evaluating the various forms where the grammarian would lean towards a particular form in comparison with the other form due to its perceived concord with the lingual system and its use in the Arabic speech (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

The fact that the grammarians have applied the best judgment makes it known that their grammatical method is a matter of preference and not rejection. There is a number of correct ways of the interpretation of one issue, and some are more probable, or desirable, than others. This comes under their approach to assessing the use of language and weighing the established usage against analogy to come up with a grammatical judgment (Ibn Jinni, 1952, 1/35).

2.3. The distinction between good and the opinion of right and wrong:

The best judgment by the grammarians is not the judgment of correctness and error. The criterion of right and wrong is determined by the rejection or approval of usage in terms of its adherence to the concepts of Arabic and its standardized use. The correct use is the one that is accepted in the Arabs speech and that which is in line with the standards of their language. Error is that which goes against this and is not substantiated. Thus, the ruling in this case is a descriptive one, which shifts the usage to the category of rejection, or the opposite (Ibn Hisham, 1985, 1/43).

The decision about the best form is a preferential decision and as such, it is under the jurisdiction of what is correct and acceptable. Each and every one of them can be correct Arabic, although the grammarians will favour one of them due to its similarity to standard, frequency of use or more eloquent meaning. They state, this is better or this is superior without necessarily meaning that the other forms are wrong or banned. Consequently, the best form decision is intended to be associated with the comparison method of usages and not the method of correctness and incorrectness, which strives to establish the scope of linguistic correctness (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

Position of the Best Among Evaluative Judgments (The Best, The Most Appropriate, The Arabic, The Permissible):

The best judgment takes an intermediate place between the evaluative judgments adopted by grammarians in the comparison of linguistic usages. It is a preference and this implies that one usage is better than another, and the other will fall under the category of acceptability. Grammarians did not restrict themselves to the evaluation of rightness or wrongness, but formed an assessment scale where the judgment is placed by degree of use and consistency with the rules of the language. Therefore, terms like best, most suitable, Arabic, and permissible were coined all of which expressed a particular level of reception and preference (Ibn Jinni, 1952, 1/34).

The most analogous points out to the most general rule of grammar, and the best points out to the good use and the unity to analogy or eloquence. The Arabic represents what has been developed in the speech of the Arabs, though this may not be more desired than others. The permissible, on the contrary, is an admissible form, in the view of grammatical technic, but not the admissible or even the admissible favorite. Here, the determination of the best is a part of preference between the permissible and the best, where the grammarian favors one form over another considering factors, which have to do with usage or analogy, without placing them out of the realm of Arabic (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

Based on the above it can be understood that the best of the grammarians is not conceived as a normative judgment that avoids other uses and determines them as incorrect. Instead, it is a methodological device the grammarians take in order to systematize linguistic diversity and to place the degrees of linguistic diversity in the context of eloquence. In estimating a grammarian that a form is best, he is utilizing a group of overlapping criteria, which include such items as adherence to analogy, use, semantic clearness, and structural compatibility with the overall grammatical system. This demonstrates a precocious understanding of the fact that language is a system that tolerates diversity with the necessity to prioritize between its forms. Therefore, best is a medium between just permissibility and the final quality and at the same time, is a manifestation of the desire of the grammarians to compensate description and evaluation, in such a way that the judgment is biased towards the best linguistic option without discounting others as belonging to the Arabic tradition or the quality of their soundness.

3. PART TWO: THE USE OF THE VERB BETTER BY GRAMMARIANS:

3.1. The Direct Construction of the Wording "Better":

The word better is used directly in the works of grammarians in the comparisons of two or more linguistic alternatives. It happens where there are many correct choices and the grammarian decides to prefer one of them as better than the other ones and does not reject the validity of the other alternatives. This application can be seen on the issues about stylistic choice or something that is more in accord with analogy or usage, where the better decision implies a greater level of acceptance in the area of what is acceptable and right (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

The direct application of the word best shows that grammarians did not simply state how it was used,

but instead they analyzed and compared variants, and found some of them more desirable than others according to how well they made out or how well they fit the system as a whole. This brings out the aspect of the best judgment as an instrument of preference, and not exclusion or the act of condemnation (Ibn Hisham, 1985, 2/96).

3.2. Its Correlation with Other Evaluative Judgments (Better and More Excellent; Better and More Analogically Sound):

The term better is commonly used in the work of the classical grammarians and the term more excellent when they attempt to make a distinction between linguistic forms all believed to be correct but varying in their levels of sophistication. In these comparisons, one form being thus said to be preferable on one side, and superior on another, indicates its power in actual practice, and its more conformity to the laws of eloquence. Reliable attestation and extensive circulation of the label is generally associated with the more excellent label in the speech of the Arabs; with the better label that would help to enforce the notion that the desirable label is not only better in its permissibility but also better in its style and linguistic palatability (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/200).

In addition to this, the matching of this pair also indicates the incredible accuracy with which grammarians created hierarchical assessment classes. One structure will be evaluated as acceptable or truly Arab and another may still be considered as superior and superior in quality thus taking a superior stage in the preference ladder. These differences also show that the evaluative terms in the grammatical tradition never were arbitrary and interchangeable, but represented discerningly measured degrees of linguistic approval depending upon the intensity of analogical thinking and the number of times a term was attested to have been used. With this strata, grammar pedagogues could bring the speakers and students to those forms that best mirrored the language ideal (Ibn Jinni, 1952, 1/37).

It is also sometimes accompanied by the term to a greater degree when the rationale behind the preference is based on adherence to a given rule of grammar. In such cases a form is said to be better and more analogically sound, that is, closer to the fundamental patterns on which the Arabic grammatical analogy is based. This tendency is particularly pronounced in those questions where variants of dialect and syntactic options were intertwined: grammarians tended to promote the form that is in agreement with analogy and which is superior to others, even in cases when a variant existed that was being authentically propagated in Arab speech (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/185).

This conjunction also serves to depict that analogy also served as the key criterion when it came to making judgments of preference. Formulas that are in conformity with uniform and productive regulations were considered more appropriate in pedagogical explanation and codification of grammar. In turn, grammarians aimed to juxtapose these evaluative descriptors to emphasize the sturdiness of the chosen form in two orthogonal perspectives, which are its structural viability in the grammatical system and its validity in the living lingual practice (Ibn Hisham, 1985, 1/210).

3.3. Its application in the selection of two dialects or forms of grammar:

Another principle that was applied by grammarians was the better, which was used to select one of two Arabic dialects in case they both had become established. They gave preference to one of them using linguistic factor like compliance to grammatical rules, usage in the Arabic speech, or understandability. The fact that there are two dialects in a given issue does not imply they are equally equal in the eyes of the grammarian; one of them can be considered to be better due to its proximity to the general linguistic system or in its consistent with the principles of Arabic whereas the other dialect is acceptable in terms of its usage (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

This rule is also applied in the selection between two correct grammatical interpretations, where grammarians allow both readings, and then say that one of them is superior since it is clearer in meaning, or it is less complicated, or it is more remote to ambiguity. This shows the essence of the grammatical approach founded upon preference between possible interpretations, because the task of the grammaticalian is not to describe what can be done, but what interpretation is better than others as regards the use and teaching (Ibn Jinni, 1952, 1/36).

3.4. The preference, not the exclusion, of the best:

Grammarians take the best judgment to be an evaluative, preferential judgment which does not tend to eliminate or exclude the other forms as part of the Arabic world. Instead, it concentrates on pointing out the most suitable option in case there exist several right options. In most cases, grammarians recognize the allowance of two or more uses of a word, and one of them by saying, It is best, meaning that it is closer to the rules of grammar, more common in classical Arabic, or more clear and less ambiguous. This does not mean that the rest is wrong (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

This application shows the character of the grammatical approach that relies on the accommodation of linguistic variety within the system of eloquence. This variation in use is not the reason why it should be rejected provided it is attested or within the standard of Arabic. Instead, it involves prioritizing them based on their level of strength and favoritism. Therefore, the principle of best is a way of controlling and directing linguistic choice not exclusion and restriction. This coincides with the perception of the grammarians about language as a large system that may have more than one right way of being construed (Ibn Jinni, 1952, 1/34).

Based on the foregoing, we observe that the different shapes of applying the best rule among grammarians show systematic knowledge of the nature of the linguistic diversity in Arabic. This rule was not a description in language, but an judgmental way of organizing this diversity, of ordering its degrees. The fact that the term is explicitly used (best), it is associated with other rules like more excellent and more analogous, and it is used in comparing dialects or grammar elements also show that the intention of grammarians was to guide its usage to the most likely factor, without excluding the others. Therefore, the most suitable rule is one that illustrates grammatical thought in its preference and gradual acceptance whereby the various aspects are not allowed to fall outside the circle of Arabic but some of them are accorded preference above others in accordance to the scientific criteria that considers analogy, hearing, and good performance. This is what makes the best a means of regulating linguistic choice, but not a means of decision on cancellation or restriction.

4. SECTION THREE: THE RATIONALE OF THE USE OF THE EVALUATION THE BEST.

4.1. Nowadays, it is most common among the EnglishAdherence to Grammatic Paralleling:

Adherence to grammatical analogy is regarded as one of the most outstanding motives which prompted the grammarians to guide the principle of better to specific linguistic forms and not to others. To them, the analogical type is the base on which general rules are constructed and that which fits it the best is the most deserving of selection and the nearest to the Arabic system. Thus, they favored the one that was consistent with the established rule, and judged it to be better, even when another form was heard, provided that its use was limited or had less analogy (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/185).

This directive shows that it is not a matter of taste that governs the determination of what is best, but a scientific one, the regularity and stability of the rule. The one which adheres to the norm has greater generalizability and easier teaching, and has consistency in grammatical form. Therefore, the notion of best amongst the grammarians is associated with the notion of original and derivative. The standard one is taken to be more preferable and worthy of use than the derivative though derivative may be acceptable by use (Ibn Hisham, 1985, 1/210).

4.2. Frequent Usage:

Frequent use is one of the major causes of the best judgment of grammarians. The most common form which is used in Arabic speech is nearer to eloquence and has more right to be selected, compared to the other forms. The reason is that it is widely used, a fact that implies its stability and consistency in Arabic language. Thus, grammarians preferred the most common of them and termed it as the best though others were acceptable depending on either standard or usage (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/8). The impact of such a criterion can be observed in the method of grammarians founded on combining analogy and hearing because the use of the linguistic form is stronger when it is used more often, and there is more chance to employ it in the process of learning and practice, because it is simpler and more familiar with the Arabs tongues. Thus, the most appropriate form in the case does not imply the cancellation of the less common form, but only suggests a preference to the most common form since it is more likely to be closer to eloquence and linguistic stability (Ibn Jinni, 1952, 1/36).

4.3. Clarity of Meaning:

One of the guidelines that grammarians followed in liking some forms of linguistics and classifying them as better was clarity of meaning. Linguistic construction is done with the main aim of attaining clarity and understanding and any form that is more comprehensible in meaning and less ambiguous is more desirable. Thus, the importance of having structures that communicated meaning clearly with no ambiguity or doubt was preferred by grammarians and thus it was an element that made them prefer one form over another in the area of correct usage. This is due to the fact that making sense is among the objectives of grammatical system itself (Ibn al-Sarraj, 1985, 1/58).

Moreover, regarding the sense of clarity, we may see that grammatical judgment was not founded exclusively on the formal level, yet it was also connected with the communicative role of language. The simpler and more regular a structure expressed meaning, the more readily it was used and therefore

warranted to be termed as superior, without the rejection of other types so long as they could technically be employed in Arabic (Hassan, 1979, p. 214).

4.4. Phonetics: Ease: Phonemic Awareness:

One of the criteria that grammarians adopted in order to know what is the best speech form is phonetic ease and pronunciation. It is also true that Arabs prefer those which are easier to pronounce and simpler to say as it creates a phonetic harmony and makes it easier to say. Thus, grammarians favored some language forms to the others as they were simpler to pronounce or not so phonetically cumbersome. This was one of the reasons why they favored one form over another, but the other form could still be used at the discretion of analogy or practice (al-Zamakhshari, 1993, p. 52).

This criterion can be seen in a number of phonetic phenomena, which have been treated by grammarians, including assimilation, elision, and simplification. It depends on the decision that is made on which one is easy to pronounce without meaning and grammatical structure are affected. Therefore, the definition of the best form is occasionally associated with the regard to the phonetic part of the language, since simplification is a considerable goal of the Arabic usage. This has helped to inform most of the grammatical decisions that are preferred by linguistic analysts in the assessment of linguistic standards (al-Astarabadi, 1975, 1/112).

4.4. Regularity of Structure with the General Linguistic System:

One of the reasons that caused grammarians to consider a particular form better than other forms is its compatibility with the general linguistic system. The shape that corresponds to the general principles of the language and is based on the traditional patterns is more probable to be fixed and desirable. Grammarians began to think of structure in terms of its connection with the overall structure of the language, and not as an independent use. Thus, they preferred what brings harmony of the elements of the sentence and the unity of the overall grammatical system (Ibn Ya'ish, 2001, 1/73).

Moreover, the presence of such consistency demonstrates the awareness of the grammarians of the integrity of the linguistic system and relationship of the parts of the system to each other. A form which adheres to the general rules eases the other forms compared with it to measure and helps to stabilize and teach the use of language. Therefore, the decision of what is best has been occasionally associated with

the balancing of the rule and the usage to make sure that the structure is in line with the core values on which the Arabic grammar is founded (Eid, 1995, p. 89).

The rest of this shows us that the motives of directing the decision on the best among grammarians were not founded on a single criterion, but due to the coincidence of a kind of linguistic foundations that bring out the character of the grammatical thinking founded on the fusion of analogy, use, meaning and sound. Conformity to analogy endows it with strength in the view of the rule, frequency with the tongue, clearness of meaning with the communicative purpose of the language, and lightness of sound with the ease of performance, and regularity of form with the laws of the general language system with its conformity to the laws of the Arabic. The best ruling, then, is the product of a trade-off between these elements, and not a mere convenience, indicating the validity of the grammatical method in criticising the usages and classifying them according to scientific principles that maintain the breadth and variety of the language, and which tend to lead it towards the most likely and the most consistent.

5. FOURTH: GRAMMARIANS IN THE BETTER RULE:

5.1. Examples of Sibawayh's Use:

The rule of the better is used by Sibawayh in those cases when there are several correct forms of the language. He prefers one to the other depending on whether it adheres to grammatical principles, is convenient or comprehensible. As a case in point, he states in the question of assimilation and dissimilation that both are permissible and then explains that one is superior to the other because it is more phonetically harmonious or structurally regular. This means that his decision was not founded on elimination but it was found on determining which form was preferred to be used (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

The application of this criterion by Sibawayh is quite clear when he compares the various languages. He proves more than one language to be valid and thereafter, he prefers one as superior due to its proximity to the normal use or the language that is more widely used in Arabic. This shows his perception of language as a multi-accommodating system, where the variation will be ranked based on its strength and preponderation. Such an approach changed the standard of excellence to a systematic instrument of grammatical analysis, not just a temporary linguistic characterization (Al-Mubarrad, 1994, 1/56).

5.2. Examples of the Usage of Ibn Hisham:

The application of the principle of selecting the better form is likewise seen in the work of Ibn Hisham where there are numerous grammatical interpretations or syntactic structures. He says that it is possible to have various interpretations and prefers one to the rest according to the strength of analogy, the soundness of the structure, or the clearness of meaning. This can be seen in the way he handles matters where grammatical possibilities are in conflict with each other as he takes care to explain which is the most grammatically correct and still recognizes the other as valid. This reflects the practice that his predecessors (grammar teachers) continued to follow in assessing the linguistic practice (Ibn Hisham, 1997, 1/128).

It is also manifested in his concern with leading the commonly used constructions where he weighs usage against analogy, and he refers to certain forms as better in that they are consistent with the general rule or are not too complicated. This is an evident schooling inclination in his approach. It will also direct the learner to the more powerful and simpler form without calling the other form wrong provided it has its form in the Arabic language (Al-Suyuti, 2005, 2/45).

5.3. The difference between the two scholars on the way to employ the grammatical rule:

This becomes evident when we study the application of the better rule of grammar by Sibawayh and Ibn Hisham that they both operate on the rule of weighing the correct linguistic forms. Their methods however vary in the basis and method of such weighing. Sibawayh is inclined to refer better grammatical rule both to usage and analogy. He approaches the language on the side of its inductive study in the language of the Arabs, determining the various forms in the first place, and then showing what he believes to be nearest to analogy or most in keeping with the system of Arabic. This is what connects his grammatic rule to the character of the language which was listened to (Sibawayh, 1988, 4/472).

In the case of Ibn Hisham, he will apply this rule more codificationally, organizationally, and he will incline the rule to be rather educational and industrial, insofar as he is inclined to demonstrate the clearest way and the easiest way in the practice of grammar, although the other ways are preserved within the circle of permissibility. His style is inclined to master the rule and make clear what is better to adhere to when teaching and this shows the evolution of the grammatical lesson during the later stages towards more codification and organisation (Ibn Hisham, 1997, 1/128).

5.4. The Impact of Quran and Oral Tradition on the Selection of the most appropriate Interpretation:

The Holy Quran and oral tradition contained in the words of the Arabs are some of the best sources that grammarians use in finding the most appropriate interpretation. An interpretation in the Quran or its settled nature in the speech of the eloquent Arabs was a good ground in choosing it out of others, because of the authority which the oral tradition has in the reasoning of grammar. According to the grammarians, the usage of Quran is the ultimate measure of linguistic authority; hence, the interpretation that poses correspondence to it is worthiest of precedence in case there are various interpretations, since it entails eloquence and usage (Ibn al-Hajib, 2010, 1/74).

The role of oral tradition is also seen in issues of grammatical dispute, as some scholars give one account as better than the other in terms of there being more evidence on it, or of its being transmitted by the Arabs, even where the other is plausible in terms of analogy. The differences in the preferences of the grammarians as explained by Abu al-Barakat al-Anbari are usually due to the different levels of dependence on oral tradition versus analogical reasoning. This renders the determination of the definition of what constitutes better as being dependent on the extent of usage that has been established in Arabic (al-Anbari, 2003, 1/112).

Shawqi Daif explains in the context of the evolution of the grammatical studies that reliance of the grammarians on the Quran and oral tradition helped to formulate the set of eloquence. Preference was not under individual interpretation but what was laid down in trustworthy writings on Arab usage. This rendered the determination of what is estimated as better related to the vital use of the language, not only to the theoretical provisions (Shawqi Daif, 1968, p. 182). Conversely, Abbas Hassan processes that the Quranic verses and classical Arabic sources were used as a major reference in the choice of the most probable meaning. The repetition and intensity of the material give the structure a solid ground on the usage and, therefore, more suitable on the teaching and grammatical instructions. This is the reason why the decision on what is best is associated with the multitude of evidence and the correctness of application (Abbas Hassan, 1974, 1/52).

Also, according to Abdelsalam Al-Masdi, the fact that grammarians were dependent on oral tradition indicates that they had an early understanding of the practicality of language. The analysis of grammar

cannot be separated with a practical application; to them the ideal variant is the one that consists of the correctness of the linguistic system and the correctness of usage. This shows an evident linguistic approach to their approach (Al-Masdi, 1981, p. 96). Fadhil al-Samarrai confirms the contextual meaning of the Quran and the clarity of meaning in that led to the adoption of some grammatical interpretation by preference. This is the one that makes the Quranic text the preferred one because the structure of it is in harmony with its general meaning. This is why the choice of the most suitable interpretation is at times associated with the integrity of the meaning as well as the rightness of the grammatical structure (al-Samarrai, 2000, 1/63).

In the foregoing it is apparent that the uses of the rule of the best among grammarians exhibit a pragmatic side to grammatical judgment since the rule was not theoretical in nature, but on the contrary, a procedural device applied to help in deciding the various linguistic elements. It has emerged with Sibawayh connected with induction of the language by the primary sources, founded on hearing and analogy combination and classification of languages by the intensity of their use. Conversely, unlike Ibn Hisham, it adopted a more structured and didactic nature, which sought to demonstrate the simplest one and the nearest to the rule without annihilating others. It is also evident that the Holy Quran and hearing created a decisive basis in this preference, since the grammatical scholars imbued them with normative validity whereby the aspect that met them was more worthy of being judged the best. So the rule of the best is an intersection point between theory and practice in the study of the Arabic language because it is a combination of maintaining breadth and a diversity of the Arabic language and leading it to the most probable and the most consistent with the system of the language and the highest standards of eloquence.

6. CONCLUSION:

This paper has proved that one of the most critical evaluation criteria in Arabic grammar is the best rule. Grammarians used it as the means to distinguish one linguistic form against another in a context of acceptability and the correctness, without applying it as the means of rejection or recognition of incorrectness. The study indicates that such a rule was developed in the context of a scientific procedure of putting together analogy and usage, as well as the consideration of the ease with which the meaning is perceived, phonetics, structural compatibility with the rest of the language. This turned it into an accurate instrument of structuring linguistic diversity and ranking the levels of diversity.

It is also demonstrated in the study that the evolution of using the most appropriate rule began with the inductive and descriptive phase of Sibawayh to the more organized and codified phase with Ibn Hisham without any changes in the basic methodological principles which was that the most probable form must be used but that others may be true. This proves the idea that the Arabic grammatical thought did not work on rigidity, but a flexible vision that the linguistic usages should be suited to and oriented to realizing eloquence and harmony towards the linguistic system.

7. RESULTS:

1. The best judgment is an evaluative and preferential judgment which exists within impacts of what is right and what is acceptable rather than the right and wrong judgment.
2. In coming up with the best judgment, grammarians used several criteria with the best being analogy, frequency of usage, a clear meaning, and phonetic simplicity.
3. The application of the best judgment has shown that there is a grammatical shift of gradual acceptance of the linguistic dismissal.
4. Sibawayh used the best judgment in an inductive framework which is related to usage whereas Ibn Hisham used it in a more organized and systematic approach of rules and teaching.
5. The Holy Quran and usage were one of the main grounds to define the preference of linguistic forms and evaluate them as the best ones.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The modern grammar research needs to be oriented to the re-evaluation of evaluative judgments by taking into consideration the contemporary linguistic practices.
2. The other grammatical preference terms and how they tend to correlate with the judgment of best should also be studied including more excellent, more analogous, and more eloquent.
3. Adopting the approach of preference of the grammarians in designing the Arabic language teaching curricula.
4. Comparative studies of the application of evaluative rules in grammar books and books of exegesis and rhetoric.
5. Increasing studies on the influence of context and meaning on the use of evaluative rules by grammarians.

REFERENCES

Abdelwahed, N. A. A. (2025). The predictive power of technology leadership and green HRM toward green innovation, work engagement and environmental performance. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 74(6), 2159-2182.

Al Masri, R., and Wimanda, E. (2024). The role of green supply chain management in corporate sustainability performance. Journal of Energy and Environmental Policy Options, 7(2), 1-9.

Alfina, K. N., Ratnayake, R. C., Wibisono, D., Basri, M. H., and Mulyono, N. B. (2025). Prioritizing performance indicators for the circular economy transition in healthcare supply chains. Circular Economy and Sustainability, 5(1), 231-276.

Awad, I. M., Nuseibeh, H., and Amro, A. A. (2025). Competitiveness in the era of circular economy and digital innovations: An integrative literature review. Sustainability, 17(10), 4599.

Bag, S., and Rahman, M. S. (2024). Navigating circular economy: Unleashing the potential of political and supply chain analytics skills among top supply chain executives for environmental orientation, regenerative supply chain practices, and supply chain viability. Business Strategy and the Environment, 33(2), 504-528.

Bevere, D., and Faccilongo, N. (2024). Shaping the future of healthcare: Integrating ecology and digital innovation. Sustainability, 16(9), 3835.

Caldera, S., Hayes, S., Dawes, L., and Desha, C. (2022). Moving beyond business as usual toward regenerative business practice in small and medium-sized enterprises. Frontiers in Sustainability, 3, 799359.

Chansanguan, S., Rittippant, N., Ueki, Y., and Jeenanunta, C. (2025). Sustainable digital transformation in public hospitals: Strategic enablers for smart healthcare systems. Sustainability, 17(19), 8614.

Cheng, W., Li, Q., Wu, Q., Ye, F., and Jiang, Y. (2024). Digital capability and green innovation: The perspective of green supply chain collaboration and top management's environmental awareness. Heliyon, 10(11), e10921.

Chuah, C., Homer, S. T., and Loo, W. H. (2025). Mapping regenerative business: a conceptual framework building upon systems thinking in Southeast Asia, Asian Journal of Business Ethics, 1-29.

De Angelis, R. (2021). Circular economy and paradox theory: A business model perspective. Journal of Cleaner Production, 285, 124823.

Dohmen, A. E., Merrick, J. R., Saunders, L. W., Stank, T. P., and Goldsby, T. J. (2023). When preemptive risk mitigation is insufficient: The effectiveness of continuity and resilience techniques during COVID-19. Production and Operations Management, 32(5), 1529-1549.

Erbey, A., Gündüz, C., and Fidan, Ü. (2025). Digitalization, Sustainability, and Radical Innovation: A Knowledge-Based Approach. Sustainability, 17(7), 2972.

Gee, R. O. W. (2025). Greening the blue ocean: Leading systemic transformation with regenerative intelligence. Earth Environmental Science Research and Review, 8(1), 01-27.

Guenther, P., Guenther, M., Ringle, C. M., Zaefarian, G., and Cartwright, S. (2023). Improving PLS-SEM use for business marketing research. Industrial Marketing Management, 111, 127-142.

Hahn, T., and Tampe, M. (2021). Strategies for regenerative business. Strategic Organization, 19(3), 456-477.

Horn, E., and Proksch, G. (2022). Symbiotic and regenerative sustainability frameworks: Moving towards circular city implementation. Frontiers in Built Environment, 7, 780478.

Jum'a, L., Alkalha, Z., and Alaraj, M. (2024). Towards environmental sustainability: the nexus between green supply chain management, total quality management, and environmental management practices. International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management, 41(5), 1209-1234.

Kantur, D., and Say, A. I. (2015). Measuring organizational resilience: A scale development. Journal of Business Economics and Finance, 4(3), 1-20.

Kolodny-Goetz, J., Hamm, D. W., Cook, B. S., and Wandersman, A. (2021). The readiness, resilience and recovery tool: An emerging approach to enhance readiness amidst disruption. Global Implementation Research and Applications, 1(2), 135-146.

Kosolapova, N., Matveeva, L., Nikitaeva, A., and Chernova, O. (2023). The drivers of the circular economy: Theory vs practice. Terra Economicus, 21(2), 68-83.

Kristoffersen, E., Blomsma, F., Mikalef, P., and Li, J. (2020). The smart circular economy: A digital-enabled circular strategies framework for manufacturing companies. Journal of Business Research, 120, 241-261.

Lee, K. H., and Kim, J. W. (2011). Integrating suppliers into green product innovation development: An empirical case study in the semiconductor industry. Business strategy and the Environment, 20(8), 527-538.

Makhloufi, L. (2024). Do knowledge sharing and big data analytics capabilities matter for green absorptive capacity and green entrepreneurship orientation? Implications for green innovation. Industrial Management and Data Systems, 124(3), 978-1004.

Memon, M. A., Ramayah, T., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Chuah, F., and Cham, T. H. (2021). PLS-SEM statistical programs: A review. Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling, 5(1), 1-14.

Nie, C., Zhong, Z., and Feng, Y. (2023). Can digital infrastructure induce urban green innovation? New insights from China. Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy, 25(10), 3419-3436.

Paul, J., Ueno, A., Dennis, C., Alamanos, E., Curtis, L., Foroudi, P., ... and Wirtz, J. (2024). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary perspective and future research agenda. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 48(2), e13015.

Pereira, N., and Fernandes, C. (2025). Knowledge management in health organizations: A systematic literature review. Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 1-73.

Rossi, L. A., and Srai, J. S. (2025). The role of digital technologies in configuring circular ecosystems. International Journal of Operations and Production Management, 45(4), 863-894.

Saleem, F., Sundarasen, S., and Malik, M. I. (2025). Green leadership and environmental performance in hospitals: A multi-mediator study. Sustainability, 17(12), 5376.

Sarstedt, M., Radomir, L., Moisescu, O. I., and Ringle, C. M. (2022). Latent class analysis in PLS-SEM: A review and recommendations for future applications. Journal of Business Research, 138, 398-407.

Sepetis, A., and Parlavantzas, I. (2025). Circular economy behavior and sustainable healthcare. Circular Economy and Sustainability, 1-23.

Shin, J., Mollah, M. A., and Choi, J. (2023). Sustainability and organizational performance in South Korea: The effect of digital leadership on digital culture and employees' digital capabilities. Sustainability, 15(3), 2027.

Siakas, D., Lampropoulos, G., Rahanu, H., Georgiadou, E., and Siakas, K. (2023). Emerging technologies enabling the transition toward a sustainable and circular economy: The 4R sustainability framework. In European conference on software process improvement (pp. 166-181). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Simion Luduşanu, D. G., Fertu, D. I., Tinică, G., and Gavrilescu, M. (2025). Integrated quality and environmental management in healthcare: Impacts, implementation, and future directions toward sustainability. Sustainability, 17(11), 5156.

Trần, T. H. T., Abu Afifa, M., Tran, N. K., and Dang, D. M. T. (2025). The role of green technology innovation and digital capability in sustainable management and performance: Empirical evidence. Meditari Accountancy Research, 1-20.

Ul-Durar, S., Awan, U., Varma, A., Memon, S., and Mention, A. L. (2023). Integrating knowledge management and orientation dynamics for organization transition from eco-innovation to circular economy. Journal of Knowledge Management, 27(8), 2217-2248.

Vishwakarma, L. P., Singh, R. K., Mishra, R., and Kumari, A. (2025). Application of artificial intelligence for resilient and sustainable healthcare system: Systematic literature review and future research directions. International Journal of Production Research, 63(2), 822-844.

Xu, J., Yu, Y., Zhang, M., and Zhang, J. Z. (2023). Impacts of digital transformation on eco-innovation and sustainable performance: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing companies. Journal of Cleaner Production, 393, 136278.

Yadav, V., and Yadav, N. (2024). Beyond sustainability, toward resilience, and regeneration: An integrative framework for archetypes of regenerative innovation. Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management, 25(4), 849-879.

Zhou, K., Warwick, E., Ucci, M., Davies, M., and Zimmermann, N. (2024). Sustaining attention to sustainability, health, and well-being in urban regeneration. Organization and Environment, 37(1), 57-83.