

Dialogical Analysis of the Chronology of Revelation of the Qur'an from the Perspective of Classical Theory and Modern Theory

Abdul Aziz¹, Kusnadi², Pathur Rahman³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Indonesia

Email: abdulaziz_25052250017@radenfatah.ac.id¹, kusnadi_uin@radenfatah.ac.id²,

pathurrahman_uin@radenfatah.ac.id³,

Received: 04 Juni 2026

Revised: 18 Juni 2026

Accepted: 02 Juli 2026

Abstract:

This article aims to present a dialogical analysis between the classical and modern perspectives on the chronology of revelation, by examining the epistemological foundations of each theory, the operational methods used, and the hermeneutical implications that arise. Through a library research approach with a descriptive-comparative analysis method, this study finds that epistemologically, the classical perspective relies on the authority of narrations, whereas the modern perspective depends on textual analysis and historical context as sources of knowledge. In terms of operational methods, the classical perspective employs *naskh*, *asbāb al-nuzūl*, and the classification of Makki-Madani as main tools, while the modern perspective develops stylistic, historical, and more detailed periodization analyses in reconstructing the chronology of revelation. From the hermeneutical implications side, the classical perspective tends to produce readings that are normative and tradition-oriented, whereas the modern perspective encourages readings that are more historical and contextual. Therefore, the dialogue between the two shows that integrating historical accounts and critical analysis is the most productive approach to comprehensively understanding the chronology of revelation without neglecting the theological or historical dimensions of the Qur'an.

Keywords: *Chronology of the Qur'anic Revelation, Classical Perspective, Modern Perspective, Dialogical Analysis.*

Abstrak:

Artikel ini bertujuan menyajikan analisis dialogis antara teori kronologi wahyu perspektif klasik dan modern, dengan menelaah landasan epistemologis masing-masing teori, metode operasional yang digunakan, serta implikasi hermeneutis yang ditimbulkan. Melalui pendekatan kepustakaan (*library research*) dengan metode analisis deskriptif-komparatif, kajian ini menemukan bahwa dari sisi epistemologis, perspektif klasik bertumpu pada otoritas riwayat, sedangkan perspektif modern mengandalkan analisis teks dan konteks historis sebagai sumber pengetahuan. Dari sisi metode operasional, perspektif klasik menggunakan *naskh*, *asbāb al-nuzūl*, serta klasifikasi *makki-madani* sebagai

perangkat utama, sementara perspektif modern mengembangkan analisis stilistika, historis, dan periodisasi yang lebih rinci dalam merekonstruksi kronologi wahyu. Adapun dari sisi implikasi hermeneutis, perspektif klasik cenderung menghasilkan pembacaan yang normatif dan berorientasi pada tradisi, sedangkan perspektif modern mendorong pembacaan yang lebih historis dan kontekstual. Oleh karena itu, dialog antara keduanya menunjukkan bahwa integrasi riwayat dan analisis kritis merupakan pendekatan yang paling produktif untuk memahami kronologi wahyu secara komprehensif tanpa mengabaikan dimensi teologis maupun historis al-Qur'ān.

Kata Kunci: Kronologi Wahyu Al-Qur'ān, Perspektif Klasik, Perspektif Modern, Analisis Dialogis.

INTRODUCTION

The Qur'an is the word of Allah SWT revealed to the Prophet Muhammad SAW through the intermediary of Angel Jibril as guidance for all of humanity. Its presence is not merely an ordinary religious phenomenon, but a monumental cosmic event full of profound wisdom. One of the most astonishing aspects of the Qur'an is the way it was revealed, which did not occur all at once, but gradually (munajjaman) over a period of more than twenty years. (Maulana Dwi Kurniasih et al., 2020) This long process of revelation holds a richness of historical, sociological, and theological dimensions that cannot be ignored by anyone who wants to understand the Qur'an comprehensively. Classical scholars paid serious attention to this issue long before modern science developed. Among them is Imam al-Suyūṭī, who in his monumental work *Al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān* compiled a list of the order of the revelation of Qur'anic verses and chapters based on available reports, making it one of the most important foundations in the study of the chronology of revelation. (Setiawan & Putri, 2026)

Among the branches of Qur'anic sciences, the most fundamental in understanding the chronology of revelation is the science of Makkiyyah and Madaniyyah. Makkiyyah and Madaniyyah are concepts of categorizing Qur'anic verses based on the periodization of Qur'anic revelation. (Mahmudah, 2021) This knowledge classifies the verses and chapters of the Qur'an based on the period of their revelation, namely the Meccan period (before the Hijrah) and the Medinan period (after the Hijrah). The importance of understanding the chronology of revelation is not merely academic. Practically, this knowledge has a very significant impact on the methodology of interpretation (manhaj al-tafsīr), the derivation of Islamic law (istinbāṭ al-aḥkām), understanding of nāsikh-mansūkh, as well as the reconstruction of the history of Prophet Muhammad's (peace be upon him) mission. A mufasssīr who does not understand when a verse was revealed is very likely to produce a mistaken interpretation, regardless of their language proficiency. (Karimah, 2024)

Another equally important theoretical issue is about how to determine the Makkiyyah or Madaniyyah status of a verse. Scholars have formulated at least three main theories: the geographical theory (based on the place of revelation), the subjective theory (based on the object that is called upon), and the historical theory (based on the time of revelation relative to the event of Hijrah). Each theory has its own advantages and disadvantages, so none can be applied absolutely and

comprehensively to all Qur'anic verses. (Hardillah, Muh. Khumaidi Ali, 2026)

The issues in the study of the chronology of revelation are actually quite complex. On one hand, there is the tradition of narrations passed down from generation to generation by the companions and the tabi'in regarding the order of revelation. On the other hand, in the modern era, orientalist such as Theodor Nöldeke in his work *Geschichte des Qorans* offered an alternative chronological approach based on linguistic and historical-critical analysis that often contradicts traditional narrations. The dynamics between these two approaches, classical-traditional versus modern-academic, have become one of the discourses that continues to develop into the contemporary era.

In addition to those three classical theories, modern Muslim thinkers also offer new approaches that are more contextual. Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwazah, Muḥammad 'Ābid al-Jābirī, and Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd strive to integrate the dimensions of text, historical context, and contemporary relevance. Such efforts signify that the study of the chronology of revelation is a field that continues to live and develop, not merely stopping in the classical period. Based on the above description, the author assesses that a systematic study of the chronology of revelation or a dialogical analysis between classical and modern chronological theories is a highly relevant academic necessity. A comprehensive understanding of this topic will not only enrich the reader's knowledge but also provide a stronger foundation for studying and interpreting the Qur'an.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a library research approach, which is a method that relies on written sources as the main data. Primary data were obtained from classical works such as *Al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān* by Al-Suyuti, orientalist works such as *Geschichte des Qorans* by Theodor Nöldeke, as well as articles by Munirul Ikhwan entitled *Drama Ilahi: An Attempt in Reading the Chronology of Quranic Revelation*. Secondary data were obtained from scientific journals relevant to the discussion in this study.

The method used is descriptive-comparative. The first step is a systematic description of each theory, both classical and modern, based on the available sources. The second step is an analytical comparison to identify points of convergence, points of difference, as well as the methodological strengths and weaknesses of each perspective. The third step is a dialogical synthesis that attempts to formulate the potential integration between the two traditions. The analysis focuses on three main aspects: (1) the epistemological foundations of each theory, (2) the operational methods used, and (3) the hermeneutical implications that arise.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chronology of Revelation Theory from a Classical Perspective

1. *The Theory of Naskh*

The initial attention of Muslim scholars to the chronology of revelation arose from a practical need, namely to understand the sequence of Islamic laws in the Qur'anic verses. The scholars developed the theory of naskh (abrogation of

law), which is identifying new verses (Nāsikh) that replace the laws of old verses (Mansūkh). This theory is rooted in the opinions of the scholars of the tabi'in generation such as Muslim bin Yasar (d. 101/719), Mujahid bin Jabr (d. 104/722), al-Hasan al-Basri (d. 110/728), and others. (Ikhwan, 2020)

Nāsikh, in its definition, is interpreted in various ways by scholars; among them, some interpret it as al-Izālah wa al-Ibtāl (removal and annulment), while others interpret it as al-Naql wa al-Taḥwīl (transfer and conversion). The difference in definitions will show its implications, such that if Nāsikh is understood as al-Izālah wa al-Ibtāl, it will result in the existence of a legal text whose ruling is removed and annulled. Conversely, if Nāsikh is understood as al-Naql wa al-Taḥwīl, the consequence is that the ruling contained in a legal text is transferred to another medium. (Nasution, 2022) However, this theory only provides a limited chronological picture because it only concerns certain legal verses. The number of verses discussed within the framework of abrogation is very small compared to the entire Qur'ānic verses, so it cannot present a complete picture of the chronology of all revelations.

2. Literature of Asbāb al-nuzūl

The literature of asbāb al-nuzūl (the reasons for the revelation of the Quranic verses) is a further development of chronological efforts. 'Ali bin Ahmad al-Wahidi (d. 468/1076) is known as a pioneer who wrote this genre of literature systematically. This literature collects reports that connect the revelation of certain verses to specific events during the Prophet's time, based on the accounts of companions and tabi'in who were regarded as having witnessed or heard the revelation directly. (Ikhwan, 2020)

In general, asbāb al-nuzūl (the reasons for revelation) includes three things: 1) events; 2) the actors; and 3) the time. Without the actors, the depiction of events would not be possible. However, regarding asbāb al-nuzūl, it only emphasizes the aspect of events and sometimes ignores the time it occurred and the actors. (Ilman, 2024) Although useful as a key for the initial mapping of the context of the revelation of verses, asbāb al-nuzūl literature has weaknesses, namely that the number is small, it often contains contradictory reports, and does not indicate a clear time. Its main purpose is more to present the narrative of the text's context rather than to build a theory of the chronology of revelation comprehensively.

3. Makki and Madani Classification

Another important development is the classification of surahs and verses into Makki (revealed before the migration) and Madani (revealed after the migration to Medina) categories. The main sources are the memorization and opinions of the companions and the tabi'in. (Julaiha et al., 2023) Scholars such as al-Suyuti in al-Itqān fī 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān record a number of surahs whose status is disputed, including al-Fātiḥah, al-Ikhlāṣ, al-Kawṣar, and dozens of other surahs. (Ikhwan 2020)

To determine whether a surah is Makkiyyah or Madaniyyah, scholars use guidelines from two fundamental methods, namely the al-Manhaj al-Simā'i al-Naqlī method and the al-Manhaj al-Qiyāsī al-Ijtihādī method. The al-Manhaj al-Simā'i al-Naqlī is a method based on hearing and narration. It involves studying various authentic narrations from the companions of the Prophet who were alive when the revelation was revealed, and from the tabi'in who knew and transmitted

it. The al-Manhaj al-Qiyāsī al-Ijtihādī is a method based on the characteristic features of the surahs in the Qur'an, including the style of language in the surah, the model of exhortative sentences in the surah, certain specific sentences in the surah, and the content of the surah related to the customs of the people of Mecca and Medina.(Fitri Setia Putri et al., 2022)

The Chronology of Revelation Theory from a Modern Perspective

1. Nöldeke's Chronology Theory (Based on Internal Text Analysis)

Theodor Nöldeke was a pioneer in modern chronological studies that went beyond the limitations of traditional accounts. He criticized the validity of reports concerning the Makkan surahs because the Prophet during the Meccan period had not yet become a major figure in history. Nöldeke accepted the Medinan reports that linked the surahs to major events (the Battle of Badr, the Trench, the Treaty of Hudaibiyyah) because they could be more historically verified. (Ikhwan 2020) Nöldeke introduced the theory of chronology based on stylistic analysis with the premise that shorter verses, with strong rhyme and high intonation, are older than longer, prosaic verses with extensive explanations. He divided the Meccan period into three phases and one Medinan period. However, Nöldeke acknowledged that this analysis still leaves parts of the Qur'an difficult to identify chronologically, especially because he still relied on surahs rather than verses as the unit of chronology.(Ikhwan 2020)

In detail, the characteristics of each period according to Nöldeke are:

- a. First Meccan: short surahs, strong rhymes, high intonation, frequently using oaths with natural objects, displaying a burning spirit.
- b. Second Mecca: transition period, beginning to use the name al-Raḥmān, stories of previous prophets appear.
- c. The Third Mecca: very prosaic, full of formulaic repetition, using the call yā ayyuhā al-nās.
- d. Madinah: focus on the Prophet's followers, social rules, conflict with Jews and hypocrites, as well as community legal matters. (Ikhwan 2020)

2. Weil's Chronology Theory (Based on Topic Changes and Language Style)

Gustav Weil introduced an early chronological theory that divided the Qur'an into four periods: three Meccan periods and one Medinan period. His three classification foundations were: (1) references to historical events that can be verified from other sources, (2) changes in topics before and after the Hijra, and (3) changes in language style from poetic-rhymed narration to prose. Weil set the time limit for the first Meccan period as 610-615 AD. (Ikhwan 2020)

The second Meccan period (615-620 CE) featured a more reflective and artistic Qur'an. The depictions of heaven and hell became more detailed, and the stories of earlier prophets were increasingly mentioned. The third Meccan period (620-622 CE) was characterized by a style that was sometimes prosaic, although the oratorical quality was still felt. Meanwhile, the Medinan period is easier to reconstruct because of its connection to clear historical events. (Ikhwan 2020)

3. Hirschfeld Theory (Verse-Based Chronology)

Hartwig Hirschfeld went further by constructing a chronology based on collections of verses rather than entire surahs. For the Meccan period, he classified the verses into categories: proclamation, confirmation, declamation, stories,

description, and legislation. For the Medinan period, he divided them according to historical events: before the Battle of Badr, the Prophet's political speeches, the Prophet's domestic matters, and from after the Treaty of Hudaibiyyah until the Prophet's death. (Ikhwan 2020)

4. Modern Muslim Scholar

Among modern Muslim scholars, Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwazah (1888-1984) initiated the exegesis of the Qur'an based on the chronology of revelation. He used the chronology of the surahs from the manuscript of the Turkish calligrapher, Kadirgali Mustafa Nazif Efendi, but made several modifications based on reports that he deemed valid. For example, Surah al-Fāṭihah is the fifth surah in the chronology of the Kadirgali manuscript, but Darwazah placed it as the first surah after he considered the reports to which it is attributed. (Ikhwan 2020) Thus, history remains the foundation of its innovation.

Muḥammad'Ābid al-Jābirī (1935-2010), a Moroccan philosopher, reconstructed chronology by aligning the reports with the sīrah and the phases of the Prophet's mission. He divided the Makkan surahs into six groups based on the phase of the mission: (1) the planting of the doctrine of prophethood and divinity, (2) the introduction of the Day of Judgment, (3) confrontation with polytheism, (4) resistance to the mission, (5) the boycott of Banu Hashim, and (6) after the death of Abu Talib and Khadijah. The Madinan surahs are treated as a major category closely tied to concrete events. (Ikhwan 2020)

Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd proposed an approach that combines the analysis of the context of events underlying the text and the analysis of the text itself. According to him, the transformation from *indhār* (warning) to *risālah* (mission) is reflected in the change of the Qur'ān's language style from short phrases with strong rhyme to long phrases that prioritize the conveyance of information. (Ikhwan 2020) Furthermore, according to Abu Zayd, the accommodation between narratives is reflected in: 1) the fact that a verse or surah is revealed repeatedly, first as Makki and then as Madani, and 2) that certain verses were indeed revealed before the Hijra (Makki), but their legal consequences only applied after the Hijra (Madani). (Ikhwan, 2020) According to him, there are still many sanad Makkiyyah Madaniyyah notes from classical scholars that are contradictory. (Ananda Salma Khoerunnisa et al., 2025)

Dialogical Analysis of the Chronology of Revelation Theory from Classical and Modern Perspectives

1. Epistemological Foundation (History and Text Analysis)

The most fundamental difference between the classical and modern perspectives in the study of the chronology of revelation lies in the epistemological foundation adopted. The classical perspective relies on the supremacy of *riwāyah* (transmission of reports) as the only valid method. (Ikhwan 2020) Narratives based on this information from the companions and the *tabi'in*, because these two generations are considered to have authoritative strength in terms of the validity of Makkiyyah and Madaniyyah. This often results in problems in categorizing them, which still require *ijtihād*, both *sam'ī* and *qiyāsī*. (Ananda Salma Khoerunnisa et al., 2025)

On the other hand, the modern perspective places internal textual analysis

as an epistemological foundation. Theodor Nöldeke, who is considered a pioneer of modern chronology, criticized the validity of the accounts concerning the Meccan period, because the Prophet at that time had not yet become a significant historical figure, making it difficult to independently verify the accounts related to him. He instead trusted the Madinan accounts more because of their connection to major events such as the Battle of Badr, the Battle of Khandaq, and the Treaty of Hudaibiyyah, which have a more solid historical record. (Ikhwan, 2020) The dialogue between these two epistemological foundations is not an absolute contradiction. Modern Muslim scholars like Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwazah continue to regard reports as a foundation, yet they do not hesitate to make modifications based on contextual considerations. This shows that the boundary between these two epistemological poles is actually more gradual than dichotomous.

2. Operational Method

a. Unit of Analysis (Surah and Verse)

Another important difference that emerges in this dialogue is about the unit of analysis. The classical perspective, including the makkī-madanī classification in *Al-Itqān* by Al-Suyūṭī, generally uses the surah as the basic unit of categorization, although it does not rule out the possibility of madanī verses in a makkī surah and vice versa. This approach is macro and pragmatic in nature. Nöldeke also still uses the surah as a unit of chronology, and he himself acknowledges this as a methodological weakness because it leaves parts of the Qur'ān that are difficult to identify. Hartwig Hirschfeld went further by building a chronology based on collections of verses, rather than entire surahs, which was a breakthrough that shifted the unit of analysis to a more micro and contextual level. (Ikhwan, 2020)

This modern perspective actually intersects with the classical tradition, which also recognizes the concept of *istithnā'* (exception), namely the acknowledgment that a number of verses in certain surahs have a different status from the entire surah. Thus, the dialogue between the two can actually produce a model of analysis that is more precise and methodologically responsible.

b. Periodization Criteria (Language Style and Socio-Historical Context)

The modern perspective, particularly Nöldeke's theory, relies on stylistic analysis (stylistics) as a criterion for periodization, meaning that short, strongly rhymed, and highly intonated verses are considered older than long, prosaic verses with extensive explanations. This criterion is indeed objectively measurable, but it contains a problematic assumption that linguistic style develops linearly from simple to complex. (Ikhwan, 2020) The classical perspective does not explicitly use stylistics as a criterion for periodization. Instead, it relies on the content and context of the events that triggered the revelation (*asbāb al-nuzūl*). Al-Wahidī, who systematically compiled this literary genre, emphasized that understanding the context of events is key to correctly interpreting the verses. (Ikhwan, 2020)

Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, among modern Muslim scholars, tried to bridge these two approaches. He combined the analysis of the context of events underlying the text (classical approach) with the analysis of the text itself (modern approach), and found that the transformation from *indhār* (warning) to *risālah* (mission) reflected in the change of the Qur'ān's linguistic style actually strengthens, rather than weakens, the argument for the contextuality of revelation. (Ikhwan, 2020)

c. Periodization and Phases (Classical Bipartition and Meccan Tripartition)

Classical tradition generally uses a bipartition, namely Makkan and Madinan, as the main chronological framework. Although there is an awareness that the Meccan period had internal developments, there is no adequate systematization regarding the phases within the Meccan period itself in classical literature. It is rather the modern perspective that fills this gap. Nöldeke used a tripartition of Mecca, meaning he divided the Meccan period into three phases with distinct characteristics, namely (a) First Mecca: short surahs, strong rhymes, many oaths with natural objects, (b) Second Mecca: transition period, starting to use the name *al-Raḥmān*, stories of previous prophets appear, (c) Third Mecca: very prosaic, using the address *yā ayyuhā al-nās*. Gustav Weil also proposed a similar tripartition of Mecca, adding more operational time boundaries (610–615 CE for First Mecca, 615–620 CE for Second Mecca, 620–622 CE for Third Mecca). (Ikhwan, 2020)

Muḥammad 'Ābid al-Jābirī, from the perspective of a modern Muslim scholar, divides the Makkan surahs into six groups based on the phases of the Prophet's mission, ranging from the establishment of prophetic doctrine to the period after the death of Abū Ṭālib and Khadījah. Al-Jābirī's approach is actually richer than the mere tripartite division of Nöldeke and Weil because he integrates the dimension of *sīrah* (the Prophet's biography) as a framework for interpretation. (Ikhwan, 2020)

Based on the above explanation, it can be understood that the difference in operational methods between the classical and modern perspectives in the study of the chronology of revelation is reflected in three main aspects, namely the unit of analysis, the criteria for periodization, and the model for dividing the phases of revelation. The classical perspective tends to use the surah as the unit of analysis, relies on hadith and the context of the revelation as the basis for periodization, and maintains the Makki-Madani bipartite framework. In contrast, the modern perspective develops a more detailed approach by using the verse as the unit of analysis, stylistic and historical analysis as criteria for periodization, and a more complex division of the phases of revelation such as the Makkan tripartite and periodization based on the development of the Prophet's mission. Although different in their methodological tools, both perspectives share the same goal, which is to reconstruct the chronology of revelation more accurately. Therefore, the dialogue between the two shows that the historical method and the analytical method do not have to be positioned dichotomously, but can complement each other in producing a more comprehensive and academically responsible understanding of the chronology

of revelation.

Hermeneutic Implications

1. Meeting Point (*Consensus Behind Differences*)

Behind the apparently contrasting differences, there are several significant points of convergence between classical and modern perspectives. First, both acknowledge that the Qur'an was revealed gradually (*munajjaman*) over a period of more than twenty years, and that historical periodization is relevant for understanding the content of the revelation. Second, both agree that the Medinan period is easier to reconstruct compared to the Meccan period, the classical perspective because more traditions are available, the modern perspective (particularly Nöldeke) because the events of Medina are more historically verified. Third, neither claims to be able to construct a perfect chronology without leaving any problems. Classical literature notes several surahs whose status is disputed (*mukhtalaf fiḥā*), while Nöldeke himself admits that his stylistic analysis still leaves parts of the Qur'an whose chronology is difficult to identify.

2. Points of Difference and Methodological Tension

The first and most fundamental point of difference is the matter of authority. The classical perspective places traditions as the final authority, something that cannot be surpassed by rational analysis. The modern perspective, on the other hand, places reason and empirical-historical analysis as the judge of the validity of the tradition itself. This tension is not merely a methodological difference, but a difference in fundamental epistemological orientation.

The second point of difference is the assumption about revelation. The classical perspective views the Qur'an as the Divine word that is transcendent and cannot be fully subjected to historical laws. The modern orientalist perspective tends to approach the Qur'an as a historical document born from a particular socio-political context, a position that is considered problematic by the majority of Muslim scholars because it has the potential to reduce the divine dimension of revelation.

The third difference point relates to the criteria of theoretical innovation. The classical tradition limits the space for innovation to the existing framework, meaning that if the tradition has already established the status of a surah, theoretical innovations that contradict it are not accepted. The modern perspective, on the other hand, actually uses problems and inconsistencies in the tradition of narration as a starting point to propose new theories.

3. Dialogical Synthesis

A dialogical analysis between these two perspectives does not necessarily have to end in an impasse. Modern Muslim scholars such as Muḥammad 'Izzat Darwazah, Muḥammad 'Ābid al-Jābirī, and Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd have shown that synthesis is possible. The key to this synthesis lies in the recognition that narration and textual analysis are not two mutually exclusive things, but rather complement each other within a

broader framework. Darwazah uses narration as a foundation but does not reject modification based on contextual considerations. Al-Jābirī integrates sīrah and the phases of the prophetic mission as a master map for reading the chronology of revelation, which is an approach that respects tradition while also offering a new systematization. Abū Zayd combines contextual analysis (asbāb al-nuzūl) with textual analysis to show that changes in the Qur'ān's linguistic style reflect the organic development of the prophetic mission.

The most productive synthesis appears to be an integrative model that places history as the primary data and textual/historical analysis as a tool for verification and enrichment. In this model, robust history remains the main determinant, while stylistic and historical analysis serves to fill in gaps where history is unavailable, as well as to reinforce existing patterns within the tradition. The development of Islamic studies also shows the dynamics of this dialogue. Several academic studies indicate that Nöldeke's ideas have had an indirect influence on Qur'anic studies, particularly in Indonesia, but within a framework adapted to an epistemological perspective that respects the authority of Islamic tradition.

Based on the description above, the hermeneutical implications of the dialogue between classical and modern perspectives show that the chronology of revelation is not merely a matter of determining the order in which verses were revealed, but also relates to the way of understanding the meaning and development of the Qur'ān's message. The meeting point between the two, such as the acknowledgment of revelation occurring gradually and the importance of historical context, provides a basis for a more contextual reading of the text of revelation. However, differences in the authority of reports, assumptions about the nature of revelation, and the scope of methodological innovation give rise to different hermeneutical orientations: the classical perspective tends to produce a normative reading centered on the authority of tradition, whereas the modern perspective encourages a historical-contextual reading that places the development of da'wah and social dynamics as important elements in understanding the Qur'ān. In this context, the dialogical synthesis offered by Darwazah, al-Jābirī, and Abū Zayd shows that narrative and historical analysis do not have to be in opposition. Both can be integrated to produce a more comprehensive hermeneutic approach, namely a reading that still respects the authority of Islamic tradition while being able to explain the relevance and development of the meaning of revelation in its historical context.

CONCLUSION

A dialogical analysis between the theory of revelation chronology from classical and modern perspectives shows that both have differences in epistemological foundations, methods, and hermeneutical implications. The classical perspective emphasizes the authority of narratives, whereas the modern perspective prioritizes textual and historical context analysis. Nevertheless, the two approaches do not have to be seen as opposing, but rather can complement each other. The integration of narratives as the main source and historical-critical analysis as a means

of verification and enrichment allows for the emergence of a more comprehensive, balanced, and relevant understanding of the chronology of revelation for contemporary Qur'anic studies.

REFERENCES

- Ananda Salma Khoerunnisa, Anisa Fitriany Sholehah, K. (2025). Konsep Makkiyah Dan Madaniyyah: Analisis Makna, Ciri, Klasifikasi, Urgensi, Pandanganulama Klasik dan kontemporer. *Pendas : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 10(1), 118–137.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v10i01.21643>
- Fitri Setia Putri, Fatya Zahriyani Fitri, Ika Rahmadiningsih, M. Z., & Nafi' Hasbi, S.E.IF., M. . (2022). Makkiyah dan Madaniyah. *Al-Mubarak: Jurnal Kajian Al-Qur'ān dan Tafsir*, 7(1), 43–58.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47435/al-mubarak.v7i1.1023>
- Hardillah, Muh. Khumaidi Ali, A. M. (2026). Konsep Makkiyah dan Madaniyah dalam Al- Qur'an : Analisis Konseptual, Linguistik, dan Relevansinya bagi Kehidupan Kontemporer. *Al-Ilmiya: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 1(4), 1831–1836.
- Ikhwan, M. (2020). Drama Ilahi: Sebuah Upaya dalam Membaca Kronologi Wahyu Alquran. *Mutawatir: Jurnal Keilmuan Tafsir Hadith*, 10(2), 202–238.
- Ilman, A. M. (2024). Peran Asbab al-Nuzul dalam Kontekstualisasi Ayat al-Qur'an. *Jurnal Ushuluddin*, 26(1), 103–115.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24252/jumdpi.v26i1.43912>
- Julaiha, J., Farhaini, N., Hasibuan, R. F., & Sitorus, N. A. (2023). Makkiyah dan Madaniyah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Konseling*, 5(1), 3267–3272.
- Karimah, R. (2024). *Konsep Kronologi Al-Qur'an Menurut Hartwig Hirschfeld (1854-1934) Dalam New Researches Into The Composition And Exegesis Of The Qoran*. Program Studi Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Tafsir Fakultas Ushuluddin Dan Pemikiran Islam Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta.
- Mahmudah, M. (2021). *Konstruksi Makkiyah Madaniyah Pada Penafsiran Ayat-Ayat Khamr*.
- Maulana Dwi Kurniasih, Dyah Ayu Lestari, A. F. (2020). Hikmah Penurunan Al-Qur'an Secara Berangsur. *Mimbar Agama Budaya*, 38(2), 75–85.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15408/mimbar.v37i2.18914>
- Nasution, K. B. (2022). Nasikh-Mansukh Dalam Al-Qur'an (Diskursus Penentuan Jumlah Ayat Yang Dinasakh). *Al-Kauniyah*, 3(2), 57–80.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.56874/alkauniyah.v3i2.950>
- Setiawan, W., & Putri, F. N. (2026). Analisis Ayat Pertama Dan Terakhir Diturunkan Dalam Perspektif Kitab Al- Itqan Fi ' Ulumil Qur ' an Karya Imam As -Suyuti. *Naafi: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa*, 2(2), 298–308.
<https://doi.org/10.62387/naafi.v1i6.390>