Reciting Memory, Reworking Tradition: The Historical Development of Sima'an at Two Tahfidz Institutions in Bandung, 2017–2023

Dela Arnes Septiani[1*], Mahrus[2], Dina Marlina[3]

[123] Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University Bandung

*Correspondence : delaarnes995@gmail.com

Received: April 7, 2024; Accepted: June 6, 2024; Published Online: June 15, 2024;

Abstract

This article examines the historical development of sima'an—the collective audition of Qur'anic recitation—at Ma'had Tahfidz Kampus 3 of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung and Ma'had Tahfidz Oase Qur'ani between 2017 and 2023. It treats sima'an neither as an unchanged devotional residue nor as a neutral instructional technique, but as a historical practice continually reorganized by institutional settings. The study uses the historical method of heuristics, external and internal source criticism, interpretation, and historiography. The evidence used includes research archives, institutional descriptions, and visual records available for the period, published scholarship on Qur'anic memorization and tasmi', and documented accounts of institutional routines before the temporal cut-off. The comparison identifies a common normative core: muraja'ah, accurate recitation, mutqin memorization, disciplined accountability, and the cultivation of confidence before listeners. The two institutions nevertheless developed contrasting arrangements. Kampus 3 integrated sima'an into a university residential program whose participants had to reconcile memorization with academic schedules. Its practice moved from relatively flexible bil nadzor recitation toward online continuity during the COVID-19 interruption and, after the return to campus, stronger use of bil ghaib. Oase Qur'ani, founded in 2017 as a specialist tahfidz institution, made bil ghaib and quality control central to its model from the beginning; it later intensified testing through random questioning and recitation under physically demanding conditions. The article argues that continuity was produced through controlled adaptation. Institutional time, student composition, and the distribution of authority shaped the form of audition without dissolving its ethical purpose. The comparison contributes a historical account of contemporary Islamic educational practice by showing how a recognizable tradition survives precisely through institutional reworking.

Keywords: sima'an; tasmi'; tahfidz; Qur'anic memorization; Islamic education; Bandung; historical method

Copyright © 2024. Septiani, D. A., Mahrus, & D. Marlina. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provide d the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Qur'anic memorization in Indonesia is sustained through practices that make memory publicly answerable. Among the most important is sima'an, also called tasmi', in which a reciter presents Qur'anic passages to a listener or group of listeners who attend to continuity, pronunciation, tajwid, and accuracy. The practice is devotional, pedagogical, and social at once. It protects the text through correction, trains the reciter to endure scrutiny, and creates a communal setting in which memorization becomes a shared responsibility. Its historical significance therefore lies not only in the quantity of verses retained but also in the institutional relations through which recollection is tested and transmitted.

The expansion of tahfidz education has placed this inherited practice in new organisational environments. Memorization is now cultivated not only in pesantren with long-established routines, but also in universities, residential programmes, schools, and specialist tahfidz institutions. These settings bring different calendars, admission systems, expectations of certification, and patterns of student mobility. Sima'an must consequently answer problems that earlier formulations did not necessarily anticipate: how should collective audition operate when participants are simultaneously university students; how can a public recitation continue when residential life is interrupted; and how should an institution distinguish impressive accumulation from durable, mutqin retention?

Existing studies have generally approached sima'an through its religious meaning, its influence on motivation, or its contribution to learning outcomes. Research on tasmi' has emphasised the value of repeated audition for detecting errors and strengthening memorization. Studies of Qur'anic reception have shown how recitation becomes a lived social practice, while research on pesantren pedagogy has examined halaqah, muraja'ah, and the authority of teachers. These contributions establish the normative and educational importance of sima'an, but they often treat the practice synchronically. They tell us what sima'an means or what it achieves, less often how its procedures change when institutions, students, and historical circumstances change.

This article addresses that chronological and comparative gap through two Bandung institutions whose organisational designs differ substantially. Ma'had Tahfidz Kampus 3 belongs to UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung and serves students who combine university study with residential Qur'anic formation. Ma'had Tahfidz Oase Qur'ani, established in 2017, is a specialist institution whose daily rhythm is more directly organised around tahfidz. Both institutions preserve sima'an as a means of securing memorization, yet they locate the event differently within the educational sequence. At Kampus 3, audition functions both as training and evaluation; at Oase, public performance is more strongly treated as the culmination of prior verification.

The article asks three questions. First, how did sima'an develop at the two institutions between 2017 and 2023? Second, which institutional pressures shaped the movement between bil nadzor, bil ghaib, online audition, and more demanding forms of

testing? Third, what does the comparison reveal about continuity and change in contemporary Islamic educational tradition? The central argument is that sima'an endured because institutional actors separated normative purpose from procedural form. The purpose—auditory correction, accountable memory, and mutqin retention—remained stable, while the procedures were repeatedly recalibrated in response to academic schedules, unequal preparedness, pandemic disruption, and the different degrees of control institutions exercised over students' time.

The article makes three contributions. Empirically, it reconstructs a bounded institutional history from 2017 through 2023 rather than projecting later evidence backward. Analytically, it treats institutional temporality as a historical cause: calendars and social composition do not merely surround sima'an but shape who can perform, when performance is authorised, and what counts as readiness. Historiographically, it places a contemporary religious practice within the study of continuity and change, showing that tradition is neither simple repetition nor unrestricted innovation. Its novelty lies in comparing two forms of tahfidz organisation and tracing how the same moral grammar was embodied in different institutional sequences.

Method

This study employs the historical method in four connected stages: heuristics, external source criticism, internal source criticism, interpretation, and historiography. It does not treat the two institutions as interchangeable cases or assume that present descriptions transparently reproduce the past. Instead, it reconstructs only the period for which the available evidence can be responsibly used: 2017–2023.

Heuristics consisted of identifying evidence concerning the formation of the two institutions, their routines of Qur'anic memorization, and the organisation of sima'an. The research source base encompasses research archives and their accompanying documentation, institutional profiles, and various relevant organizational regulations, photographs and publicity materials attributable to the period, published studies of tasmi' and Qur'anic memorization, and scholarly works on Islamic education and historical method. Sources that depended exclusively on interviews conducted after February 2024, administrative books dated 2024, later profiles, or later theses were excluded as evidence for the article's historical claims. They may explain how the original research was assembled, but they cannot be presented as contemporaneous proof available by the temporal cut-off.

External criticism assessed provenance, authorship, institutional origin, date, and the relationship between each source and the event it describes. Institutional materials were read according to their documentary function. A rule or programme can establish that an institution prescribed a practice; it cannot by itself prove that every participant followed it. Photographs and online materials were treated as produced representations rather than transparent windows onto social reality. Published scholarship was used to establish broader educational and historical context, while claims about the two institutions were retained only where the archive permitted a bounded reconstruction.

Internal criticism examined credibility, consistency, and perspective. The source contains retrospective material as well as editorial additions made at a later stage; therefore, its statements were separated into three categories: institutional facts that can be anchored in the 2017–2023 chronology, interpretive claims that belong to the researcher, and details that depend solely on post-cut-off testimony. The third category was removed. Numerical descriptions whose provenance could not be independently established were not converted into general statistics. The comparison consequently privileges sequences, institutional rules, and recurring procedures over unsupported precision.

Interpretation proceeded through controlled comparison. Each institution was reconstructed chronologically, then compared through five variables: institutional formation, relation between ziyadah and muraja'ah, position of sima'an within the learning sequence, role of listeners and evaluators, and response to disruption. Causality is stated modestly. The pandemic is treated as the context that prompted online adaptation at Kampus 3, not as a total explanation of every later change. The stricter Oase model is interpreted in relation to its specialist timetable and founding concern with durable retention, not as proof of theological superiority.

Historiography transformed the critically examined evidence into an argument about continuity and change. The article distinguishes evidence from interpretation, avoids claims about all Indonesian tahfidz institutions, and recognises that the UIN case has a different documentary density from the Oase case. This asymmetry is part of the source situation. A historical comparison is stronger when it makes such limits visible than when it fills them with invented detail.

Results

Institutional Formation and the University Setting

The institutional prehistory of Kampus 3 reaches back to university policies that linked Qur'anic competence with the formation of students as public religious actors. UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung developed a programme in which students were expected to memorise Qur'anic material as part of their wider academic and religious formation. The later tahfidz route formalised admission, residential support, and evaluation. Candidates entered with a prior memorization requirement and underwent tests of continuation, recitation, and religious understanding. The resulting ma'had was therefore not an isolated pesantren transplanted into a campus. It was a hybrid institution whose residents had to satisfy academic obligations while inhabiting a disciplined Qur'anic environment.

This institutional location shaped the social meaning of sima'an. The participants were not a homogeneous cohort of full-time memorizers. They arrived with different amounts of memorized text, different semesters, and different academic workloads. The residential setting created proximity and routine, but it did not abolish the university timetable. Halaqah, prayer, study, and memorization had to be coordinated with lectures and assignments. The practice of audition consequently became a mechanism for

synchronising heterogeneous learners rather than a single ceremony applied uniformly to an already-standardised group.

Before the pandemic, sima'an at Kampus 3 appears to have been relatively flexible in form. Bil nadzor—reciting while looking at the mushaf—served students whose priority was correct reading, confidence, and gradual public exposure. The arrangement did not imply that memorization was unimportant. It reflected a sequence in which accuracy and composure could precede the stronger evidentiary demand of bil ghaib. Weekly activities, smaller halaqah, and the division of passages allowed mentors to adjust the burden of performance to students' different levels of preparation.

The distinction between bil nadzor and bil ghaib is therefore historical rather than merely technical. Bil nadzor allowed the institution to protect recitation from premature failure and to make public reading a formative exercise. Bil ghaib, by contrast, made memory itself the object of scrutiny. The movement between them reveals how the institution defined readiness at different moments. It also demonstrates why a linear narrative—from reading with the mushaf to reading without it—would be inadequate. Procedures were selected in response to institutional problems, not because one method simply replaced an inferior predecessor.

Pandemic Disruption and Reassembled Audition

The COVID-19 crisis disrupted the residential ecology on which face-to-face sima'an depended. When activities moved away from campus in 2020, auditory supervision was reassembled through virtual meetings and submitted recordings. This change preserved a rhythm of recitation and maintained contact between learners and mentors, but it altered the conditions under which correction occurred. The listener could hear the voice, yet immediate intervention, shared visibility, and the ethical pressure of an assembled majlis became weaker or more uneven.

Digital continuity was consequently partial. It prevented the complete suspension of muraja'ah and allowed students to keep presenting their recitation, but it also exposed the material limits of mediated audition. Unstable connections could interrupt a passage; domestic settings could diminish concentration; and the absence of co-present peers reduced the collective atmosphere that made sima'an more than a private recording. The pandemic did not secularise the practice or dissolve its religious purpose. It revealed that the social technology of sima'an includes bodies, space, mutual attention, and the possibility of immediate correction.

When face-to-face activity resumed in 2022, the institutional problem was not simply to restore the previous format. The return created an opportunity to reconsider what should count as a convincing performance. The available account indicates a stronger emphasis on bil ghaib, through which students were required to sustain passages without visual support. This heightened the evidentiary threshold of recitation and linked public performance more directly to mutqin memorization. It also exposed a persistent difficulty: random allocation of passages could exceed the portion a student

had actually consolidated. The subsequent adjustment was therefore a process of institutional learning, not an automatic progression toward greater strictness.

Oase Qur'ani and the Institutionalisation of Difficulty

Ma'had Tahfidz Oase Qur'ani was established in 2017 with a different institutional premise. Its founding rationale centred on a concern that rapid accumulation of thirty juz could coexist with fragile retention. The criticism was directed at a quantitative model of success in which ziyadah outpaced muraja'ah. Oase's identity was consequently organised around the proposition that memorization should be demonstrably durable: it must remain available under questioning, continue through uncertainty, and withstand public audition.

The early institution developed under modest conditions before moving toward a more stable residential setting. That material trajectory mattered because institutional permanence and pedagogical ambition grew together. Oase did not define itself only by the amount of text memorized but by the procedures through which memory was verified. Halaqah, muraja'ah, public speaking, religious study, and physical activities formed an environment in which Qur'anic competence was connected to discipline, confidence, and bodily endurance.

From the beginning, Oase treated sima'an as bil ghaib verification. A student who had reached a memorization target recited before teachers and fellow students, who listened for continuity, precision, and correctness. The practice was referred to as Sima'an Mutqin. Its public character cultivated confidence, but the ceremony followed a prior claim: the student's memory should already be sufficiently stable for public testing. In this respect, Oase reversed the sequence more common at Kampus 3. Public performance was less a preliminary stage of learning than the culmination of preparation.

The institution later intensified this logic by introducing recitation while walking. The method removed the bodily stability of the seated majlis and made movement part of the test. A passage that could be sustained while the reciter moved was treated as evidence that recall was not dependent on a narrow posture or carefully controlled setting. Walking did not replace seated recitation; it added difficulty. The pedagogical principle was conservative in its objective—durable retention—but innovative in its means of verification.

A further threshold was the use of extensive random questioning before a student was permitted to perform sima'an. Questions concerning continuation, location, and accuracy tested whether memorization was distributed across the text rather than limited to rehearsed portions. If readiness was insufficient, public performance could be postponed. This procedure transformed sima'an into the visible end of a longer chain of muraja'ah. The event's legitimacy depended on the institution's claim that the reciter had survived testing before appearing before an audience.

A Comparative Sequence, 2017–2023

The two trajectories disclose a common moral grammar beneath procedural divergence. In both institutions, the reciter's memory became answerable to another person. The listener was not passive audience but guardian of textual accuracy. Correction was not an embarrassment external to the ritual; it was one of the mechanisms through which the ritual achieved its purpose. Both institutions also linked sima'an to confidence. A strong hafiz was expected not merely to retain verses in private but to recite them under observation and accept the discipline of being heard.

The difference lay in where risk was placed. Kampus 3 located risk within the process of training. Students could encounter public performance while their memorization was still developing, with bil nadzor and smaller divisions helping them progress. Oase shifted more risk into the period before performance. Testing, random questions, and walking were used to filter readiness so that the public event would carry fewer surprises. Neither model should be treated as intrinsically superior. Each translated a different institutional relation to time, authority, and student heterogeneity.

The university ma'had coordinated multiple clocks: the semester, the admission cohort, the residential schedule, and the individual pace of memorization. Its flexibility was therefore an organisational response to competing legitimate duties. Oase controlled time more densely because tahfidz constituted the centre of the institution's daily programme. It could postpone an audition, intensify testing, and require repeated muraja'ah without negotiating the same volume of academic obligations. Institutional temporality thus became a historical cause of procedural difference.

The comparison also clarifies the meaning of adaptation. Online audition during the pandemic did not represent a break with tradition; it preserved the relation between reciter and listener through altered media. The later strengthening of bil ghaib at Kampus 3 did not simply modernise the practice; it responded to the problem of proving memory after an interruption. Oase's walking recitation did not abandon inherited ideals; it sought a more demanding demonstration of them. Change occurred through recombination. The tradition survived because its custodians could modify the procedure while retaining the ethical purpose of accountable recitation.

Discussion

The historical development of sima'an at these institutions challenges two assumptions. The first is that tradition is preserved by repeating an original form. The second is that institutional innovation necessarily weakens religious continuity. The evidence supports a different proposition: tradition can remain recognisable when communities preserve its relations of authority and accountability while changing the circumstances in which those relations operate. Sima'an persisted through seated audition, digital mediation, bil ghaib testing, and walking recitation because each form continued to make memory publicly answerable.

This argument resonates with the anthropological understanding of tradition as an authoritative process of transmission rather than a frozen object. A tradition is reworked when communities confront new conditions and decide which elements are essential. At Kampus 3, the essential elements were the listener's correction, regular muraja'ah, and the cultivation of public confidence. The format could therefore move online during crisis and later become more demanding without losing its identity. At Oase, the essential principle was durable retention; new tests were legitimate because they served that older purpose.

The cases also extend educational research on tasmi'. Studies that report positive effects on motivation, discipline, or memorization are valuable, but they often leave the institutional mechanism implicit. A historical approach shows that the same educational outcome can be pursued through different sequences. Kampus 3 used repeated exposure and gradual adjustment to coordinate unequal learners. Oase used prior filtering and intensified verification to protect the quality of the public event. Method is therefore not a detachable technique. It is sedimented institutional history: a response to earlier difficulties, organisational capacities, and ideas about what failure means.

The contrast between the institutions is also a contrast between two forms of authority. At Kampus 3, authority was distributed across university policy, ma'had administrators, mentors, student organisers, and the academic calendar. The public audition helped connect the residential programme to the university's broader mission of forming students who could serve religious and social roles. At Oase, authority was concentrated more visibly in the founder's pedagogical critique and in teachers' power to delay performance until readiness had been demonstrated. The listener's role was strong in both cases, but the organisational path leading to the listener differed.

The pandemic makes the materiality of religious education especially visible. A virtual meeting can transmit sound, but it cannot reproduce every condition of a majlis. Face-to-face sima'an produces seriousness through mutual visibility, shared silence, the possibility of immediate correction, and the emotional pressure of reciting before people who know the text. Digital practice preserved continuity at the level of voice while weakening continuity at the level of embodied co-presence. The later return to campus should therefore be understood as the restoration of a social technology of attention, not merely the reopening of a room.

The comparison further cautions against measuring success solely through quantity. A target such as one or several juz may be administratively useful, but the institutions treated retention, accuracy, and readiness as distinct qualities. Oase's critique of fragile completion made this explicit. Kampus 3's later concern with bil ghaib and the adjustment of passage allocation pointed in the same direction. Both cases show that institutional memory is not secured by accumulation alone. It requires recurrent public testing and a system that can respond when formal targets exceed lived preparedness.

At the same time, the article does not romanticise institutional discipline. More demanding verification can produce anxiety, postpone recognition, and expose unequal

capacities. Flexible forms can protect learners from premature failure but may also make standards less uniform. The historical question is therefore not which institution possesses the correct method, but how each institution negotiated the tension between care and proof. Sima'an became a site where compassion for learners and responsibility to the Qur'anic text were repeatedly balanced.

The article's source limitations are analytically important. Because later interviews and post-2023 administrative records were excluded, the reconstruction cannot claim a complete year-by-year history through 2024. It also cannot generalise from two institutions to Indonesian tahfidz education as a whole. What it can establish is narrower and more defensible: by 2023, the two Bandung institutions had developed recognisable but different ways of connecting audition, memory, and authority. The absence of later evidence is not a reason to invent continuity; it marks the boundary of the article's historical knowledge.

Within that boundary, the cases support a model of institutional adaptation. A practice survives when its custodians identify a normative core and treat procedures as revisable instruments. At Kampus 3, the normative core travelled across academic scheduling, online interruption, and renewed bil ghaib. At Oase, it travelled through stricter testing and embodied difficulty. Continuity was achieved through work. It depended on mentors, students, listeners, and administrators repeatedly translating an inherited ideal into the material conditions of a changing institution.

The article consequently resists two opposite simplifications. It does not describe sima'an as an untouched inheritance immune to historical change. Nor does it describe every procedural adjustment as evidence of secularisation or decline. Historical continuity is more demanding than either claim. It requires showing how actors preserve a recognised purpose while negotiating constraints that earlier generations did not face. The two Bandung institutions make that negotiation visible in different ways: Kampus 3 through flexibility and recalibration, Oase through thresholds and intensified verification.

The period 2017–2023 is especially revealing because it includes both institutional consolidation and extraordinary disruption. Oase was founded during the period, while Kampus 3's routines were tested by a pandemic that interrupted residence and altered communication. The chronology therefore allows continuity to be observed under pressure. A tradition that survives only in stable circumstances may be habitual; a tradition that is reassembled after disruption reveals which elements its custodians consider indispensable. In these cases, the indispensable element was not a fixed seating arrangement or a single medium, but the disciplined relationship between reciter, listener, and remembered text.

From a historiographical perspective, this finding places contemporary tahfidz institutions within a longer history of Islamic educational mediation. The modern ma'had is not simply a new container for an old practice. Admission routes, residential buildings, programme schedules, digital communication, publicity, and assessment systems

reorganise how religious knowledge is embodied. Yet institutional modernity does not automatically displace inherited authority. It can provide new means for reproducing it. The historical task is to identify the precise point at which a new organisational device changes the practice and the point at which it merely gives an old obligation a different material form.

The two cases also demonstrate that listeners constitute an institutional role rather than a mere audience. A mustami' listens for textual continuity, but also represents the standards of the community. At Kampus 3, listeners included mentors and fellow students who helped create a culture of mutual participation. At Oase, listeners were part of a stricter chain of authorisation in which the right to perform depended on prior recognition of readiness. In both cases, the Qur'an was memorized socially. The reciter's achievement could not be secured by private confidence alone.

This difference affected the experience of failure. At Kampus 3, an error in public audition could become part of the learning process: the listener corrected the reciter, the passage could be repeated, and the institution could adjust the allocation of material. Failure was visible but potentially formative. At Oase, postponement before the public event protected the ceremony from avoidable error, while placing a heavier burden on preparation. Neither approach eliminated anxiety. They redistributed it—one into the event itself, the other into the period of testing that preceded it.

At Oase Qur'ani, by contrast, the event was made conspicuous precisely because it was difficult to reach. The public recitation marked an achievement that had already been examined through daily repetition and prior questioning. The distinction resembles the difference between formative and summative assessment, but the religious setting prevents the analogy from being complete. Oase's test was not merely a measurement that produced a score. It was a moral examination of whether the student had fulfilled the responsibility to guard what had been entrusted to memory. The institution's procedures therefore translated pedagogical control into an ethical vocabulary.

The institutional contrast is also visible in the relationship between routine and event. At Kampus 3, weekly sima'an formed part of an ecology of repeated small obligations: halaqah, prayer, muraja'ah, and the division of passages. Its historical force accumulated gradually. A student did not encounter accountability only at the moment of a large public ceremony; the obligation to be heard was distributed across the week. This arrangement made sima'an compatible with progressive learning, but it also meant that the quality of a particular performance depended on the uneven preparation of a mixed cohort.

The comparison therefore joins microhistory and institutional history. It attends to ordinary practices—reciting, listening, correcting, postponing, and repeating—while relating them to larger transformations in Islamic education, digital mediation, and pandemic governance. The scale is local, but the problem is broader: how do communities preserve textual and ethical authority when the spaces, schedules, and bodies through

which authority is transmitted are changing? The Bandung cases answer through adaptation rather than abandonment.

The article also has implications for how historians use institutional self-description. A profile, rule book, or programme announcement is not simply a record of what occurred; it is evidence of what an institution wished to make regular, visible, and legitimate. When read against photographs, recurring programme descriptions, and the chronology of disruption and recovery, such materials can reveal organisational intention without being mistaken for complete social reality. This distinction is crucial in religious history, where institutional ideals and participants' lived experiences may overlap but are never identical.

Its historical value lies in making institutional choices visible: the forms of recitation were shaped by decisions about readiness, accountability, time, and the social composition of learners.

Conclusion

This article has reconstructed the development of sima'an at Ma'had Tahfidz Kampus 3 UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung and Ma'had Tahfidz Oase Qur'ani between 2017 and 2023. The two institutions shared a normative commitment to muraja'ah, accuracy, mutqin memorization, correction by listeners, and confidence in public recitation. Their procedures diverged because their institutional times diverged. Kampus 3 coordinated tahfidz with university life and therefore relied on flexible scheduling, gradual exposure, and adaptation during the pandemic. Oase organised daily life more directly around specialist tahfidz and consequently made bil ghaib, prior verification, and intensified testing central to public performance.

The comparison demonstrates that sima'an was not preserved by formal invariance. It endured through controlled adaptation. Online audition preserved auditory accountability when physical assembly became impossible; the return to bil ghaib responded to the need to test durable memory; walking recitation and random questioning at Oase transformed difficulty into a pedagogical instrument. These changes did not dissolve the tradition because they continued to serve its central ethical relation: the reciter submits memory to disciplined listening.

The article's contribution is therefore historical and institutional. It shows how contemporary Islamic educational traditions are shaped by calendars, student composition, authority structures, and material disruptions. Its novelty lies in treating institutional temporality as a cause of religious form rather than as background context. The cases do not establish a universal model, but they provide a precise explanation of how continuity and change were negotiated in two Bandung tahfidz institutions before February 2024.

Notes

1. Rahmatin, "Teknik Menjaga Hafalan Al-Qur'an dengan Metode Tasmi Al-Qur'an di Pondok Pesantren Raudlatul Qur'an Al-Manshury," Jurnal Kewarganegaraan 6, no. 2 (2022): 4945–4952.

2. Rahmatin, "Teknik Menjaga Hafalan Al-Qur'an dengan Metode Tasmi Al-Qur'an di Pondok Pesantren Raudlatul Qur'an Al-Manshury," Jurnal Kewarganegaraan 6, no. 2 (2022): 4945–4952.

3. Maskur, "Tradisi Semaan Al-Quran di Pondok Pesantren," 2021.

4. Zahraini and Ibnu Hizam, "Implementasi Metode Tasmi' dalam Memperkuat Hafalan Al-Qur'an Mahasantri Rumah Tahfidz Cahaya Al-Qur'an An-Nahl 4 Mataram," 2022.

5. Ahmad Soleh, Rahendra Maya, and Muhamad Priyatna, "Metode Halaqah dalam Pembelajaran Tahfidz Al-Qur'an di Pondok Pesantren Tahfidz Al-Qur'an Darussunnah Parung Kabupaten Bogor Tahun 2018," Prosa PAI: Prosiding Al Hidayah Pendidikan Agama Islam 1, no. 2 (2018).

6. Tika Kusumastuti, Mukhlis Fatkhurrohman, and Muhammad Fatchurrohman, "Implementasi Metode Menghafal Qur'an 3T+1M dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Hafalan Santri," Al-'Ulum: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam 2, no. 2 (2022): 259–273.

7. Sa'dulloh, 9 Cara Praktis Menghafal Al-Qur'an (Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2011), 52–54.

8. Edward Shils, Tradition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

9. Sulasman, Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah (Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2004).

10. Helius Sjamsuddin, Metodologi Sejarah (Yogyakarta: Ombak, 2012).

References

Kusumastuti, Tika, Mukhlis Fatkhurrohman, and Muhammad Fatchurrohman. "Implementasi Metode Menghafal Qur'an 3T+1M dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Hafalan Santri." Al-'Ulum: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam 2, no. 2 (2022): 259–273.

Maskur. "Tradisi Semaan Al-Quran di Pondok Pesantren." 2021.

Rahmatin. "Teknik Menjaga Hafalan Al-Qur'an dengan Metode Tasmi Al-Qur'an di Pondok Pesantren Raudlatul Qur'an Al-Manshury." Jurnal Kewarganegaraan 6, no. 2 (2022): 4945–4952.

Sa'dulloh. 9 Cara Praktis Menghafal Al-Qur'an. Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2011.

Shils, Edward. Tradition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Sjamsuddin, Helius. Metodologi Sejarah. Yogyakarta: Ombak, 2012.

Soleh, Ahmad, Rahendra Maya, and Muhamad Priyatna. "Metode Halaqah dalam Pembelajaran Tahfidz Al-Qur'an di Pondok Pesantren Tahfidz Al-Qur'an Darussunnah

Parung Kabupaten Bogor Tahun 2018." Prosa PAI: Prosiding Al Hidayah Pendidikan Agama Islam 1, no. 2 (2018).

Sulasman. Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah. Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2004.

Zahraini and Ibnu Hizam. "Implementasi Metode Tasmi' dalam Memperkuat Hafalan Al-Qur'an Mahasantri Rumah Tahfidz Cahaya Al-Qur'an An-Nahl 4 Mataram." 2022.