Journal of Mathematics Instruction, Social Research and Opinion
Vol. 5, No. 3, September 2026, pp. 2551 – 2563, https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v5i3.2063
ISSN 2962-7842

From Specialized Knowledge to Public Conversation: Aristotelian Rhetoric in the Digital Popularization of Philosophy: A Case Study of Fahruddin Faiz's Ngaji Filsafat on the MJS Channel, YouTube

Violita Noor Haliza[1*], Anang Sujoko[2], Reza Safitri[3]
[1,2,3]Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Brawijaya

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-08-28
Revised 2026-09-28
Accepted 2026-09-30

Keywords:

Digital knowledge communication
Knowledge popularization
Neo-Aristotelian
Public engagement
Rhetorical Criticism
YouTube

ABSTRACT

As philosophy migrates from lecture halls to comment sections, a pressing question emerges: how does specialized knowledge survive and thrive outside its native institutional habitat? This study addresses this question by examining Fahruddin Faiz's Ngaji Filsafat, a YouTube-based philosophy discussion program with substantial digital audience visibility in Indonesia. Rather than treating popularization as mere simplification, this study foregrounds rhetoric as an active mechanism through which specialized philosophical discourse is reconstructed for public communication. Employing a qualitative descriptive-interpretive approach grounded in Neo-Aristotelian Rhetorical Criticism, the study analyzes how ethos, pathos, and logos are constructed in Fahruddin Faiz's verbal discourse across ten Ngaji Filsafat episodes broadcast in 2025. Episodes were purposively selected based on broadcast period, viewership, thematic diversity, data completeness, and the availability of audience comments for contextual triangulation. The analysis examines how rhetorical appeals emerge through argumentation, narrative framing, diction, analogical reasoning, and audience-oriented address. The findings demonstrate how philosophical knowledge is rearticulated rather than merely simplified as it enters digital public discourse, with rhetorical appeals connecting specialized concepts to audiences' everyday experiences and concerns. The study concludes that Aristotelian rhetoric provides a useful lens for understanding how specialized knowledge negotiates accessibility, credibility, and audience resonance in participatory digital spaces, contributing to scholarship on digital knowledge communication and public engagement.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Corresponding Author:

Violita Noor Haliza
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Brawijaya
Email: violitanhaliza@student.ub.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Philosophy has traditionally been guarded by institutional gatekeepers, universities, peer-reviewed journals, and credentialed experts, who determine what counts as legitimate

philosophical discourse and who is authorized to produce it. Digital platforms have destabilized this arrangement. On YouTube, philosophical content no longer requires a lecture hall, a peer-reviewed publication, or institutional affiliation to reach an audience; it requires only a camera, a compelling delivery, and a willingness to speak philosophy in terms a non-specialist audience can follow. This shift raises a question that is at once old and newly urgent: what happens to specialized knowledge when it is no longer addressed to specialists?

A common answer treats this transformation as simplification, the assumption that popularization necessarily entails a loss, a thinning of complexity in exchange for accessibility. This framing, however, underestimates what is actually happening rhetorically when specialized knowledge is reconstructed for public audiences. Simplification implies subtraction; popularization, this study argues, is better understood as rearticulation, a process in which philosophical content is not merely reduced but actively rebuilt using rhetorical resources suited to a new audience, a new medium, and a new set of expectations about what counts as credible, engaging, and worth attending to. Understanding this process requires attention not to what is said, but to how it is made persuasive, relatable, and legitimate in a space where authority can no longer be assumed from credentials alone.

The need for this kind of mediating strategy is increasingly urgent in digital public spaces, where the boundary between communicator and audience has grown porous [1], [2]. Among various platforms, YouTube stands out for combining audiovisual content, narrative, and mass user participation, with active users in Indonesia reaching 139–143 million [3]. Beyond serving as a distribution medium, YouTube fosters a distinctive creator culture in which content producers and audiences actively shape and negotiate discourse together through comment features and sustained interaction [4], functioning as a space for informal learning that allows audiences to construct critical understanding independently [5].

Academic philosophy itself tends to remain isolated from the public due to technical language and a scholarly orientation geared toward fellow experts [6], [7], a disconnect confirmed even at the level of beginning students, who tend to view philosophy as impractical and insufficiently inclusive [8]. Education research, however, suggests that this barrier is constructed rather than inherent: philosophy packaged as participatory inquiry has been shown to increase public engagement significantly [9], consistent with the growing public philosophy movement, which positions philosophers as facilitators of reflective dialogue rather than academic authorities dictating understanding [10]. This point matters: if accessibility barriers can be overcome through appropriate communicative design, the more fundamental scholarly question is no longer why philosophy is difficult to understand, but how such communicative design mechanistically operates.

Ngaji Filsafat, hosted by Fahruddin Faiz and broadcast through the MJS Channel on YouTube, offers a productive site for examining this question. With 357 thousand subscribers as of October 2025 and more than 480 episodes, the channel consistently presents reflective discussions of philosophical themes without reducing them to concise slogans. Fahruddin Faiz walks audiences through genuinely complex ideas through a

discursive oral style that distinguishes him from the rigid, elitist image of philosophy, he opens each session with a religious greeting, interspersed with light humor, everyday language, and concrete examples drawn from his audience's social reality. The significance of this case is further confirmed by Humaidi et al. [11], who found that Ngaji Filsafat had a significant effect on Islamic philosophy students' understanding, while also identifying inconsistencies in definitions and historical exposition compared to established academic references. This duality, effective in popularity, yet problematic in academic precision, is precisely why Ngaji Filsafat merits examination: not to confirm its success, but to dissect how Fahruddin Faiz's rhetorical strategies operate to popularize philosophical ideas so widely.

Although the phenomenon of philosophy popularization through digital media continues to grow, a fundamental explanatory gap remains regarding the communicative mechanisms that make this process possible. Studies on philosophy popularization generally stop at discussing the material or ideas conveyed, without explaining how philosophical knowledge is translated into discourse comprehensible to a non-academic public [6], [9]. Meanwhile, digital rhetoric studies employing the Aristotelian framework have largely focused on political communication and public opinion persuasion [12]–[15], leaving rhetoric under-theorized as a mechanism of reflective knowledge communication. Bartsch et al. [16] show that educational communicators in digital spaces function as intermediaries of epistemic empathy, bridging knowledge to make it comprehensible to non-academic audiences, yet the rhetorical mechanisms that enable this mediating process to work, particularly in the context of philosophy popularization, have not been systematically explained.

By analyzing ethos, pathos, and logos as they operate within this specific digital-philosophical context, this study advances an argument that departs from the simplification paradigm dominant in existing popularization research: rhetoric is not incidental to the popularization of philosophy but constitutive of it. The construction of credibility, emotional resonance, and argumentative coherence is what allows specialized knowledge to be rearticulated as public conversation, rather than merely broadcast to a wider but passive audience. In doing so, this study contributes to the growing body of research on digital knowledge communication by demonstrating that classical rhetorical theory, often treated as a historical artifact of oratory, offers a robust analytical lens for understanding how specialized disciplines negotiate visibility, credibility, and resonance under the conditions of contemporary participatory media.

2. METHOD

2.1 Approach and Research Design

This study employs a qualitative descriptive-interpretive approach, a methodological orientation that emphasizes depth and contextual richness in understanding social phenomena, aiming to uncover the what, why, and how behind communicative practice rather than merely quantifying occurrences [17]. This approach follows directly from the nature of the research questions: how are ethos, pathos, and logos constructed, and how does this construction function as a mechanism of philosophy popularization in

digital space, both are "how" questions, not "how many" or "how often" questions. This study does not aim to measure the frequency of ethos, pathos, or logos in Fahruddin Faiz's discourse, but to understand how these rhetorical constructions operate in rearticulating philosophical knowledge for a digital public.

Paradigmatically, this study is grounded in the interpretivist tradition, which proceeds from the assumption that social reality is subjective and constructed through meaning attributed by social actors within their context [18]. The method employed is rhetorical criticism, specifically the Neo-Aristotelian Rhetorical Criticism approach, chosen because it directly operationalizes the construction of ethos, pathos, and logos in public communication, while being specifically designed to dissect the persuasive strategies of a single rhetor within a coherent rhetorical artifact, distinct from other variants of rhetorical criticism such as narrative or feminist criticism, which emphasize story structure or gendered power relations [19]. The researcher is positioned as a critic who actively interprets the communicative strategies a communicator uses to achieve a particular effect on an audience.

2.2 Object and Unit of Analysis

The object of this study is Fahruddin Faiz's verbal discourse in the Ngaji Filsafat program on the MJS Channel, YouTube. To provide a sharp and manageable analytical focus, this study limits its unit of study to ten episodes purposively selected based on a combination of five criteria: (1) broadcast during 2025, representing the mature phase of Fahruddin Faiz's communicative style after more than a decade on air; (2) among the ten highest-viewed episodes as of the data collection date; (3) covering diverse philosophical themes, so that the rhetorical analysis is not confined to a single topic; (4) of full duration and fully available for transcription; and (5) containing a sufficient number of audience comments for contextual triangulation. This combination of criteria was used because viewership alone was considered insufficient as the sole basis for data selection, given that view counts can be shaped by platform algorithms [20] as well as transient viral spikes [21]. View count data was retrieved on April 20, 2026, and treated as snapshot data rather than a fixed figure.

Table 1. Ten highest-viewed ngaji filsafat episodes of 2025

Ep.	Episode Title	Broadcast Date	Views
468	The True Teacher in Javanese Philosophy	May 28, 2025	110,468
471	Morgan Housel — The Psychology of Money	June 18, 2025	92,663
485	Establishing Meaning and Purpose in Life	September 24, 2025	56,967
496	Human Uncertainty in Javanese Philosophy — Janma Tan Kena Kinira	December 10, 2025	49,298
482	Building Personal Resilience in the Face of Uncertainty	September 3, 2025	39,168
472	Alain de Botton — Status Anxiety	June 25, 2025	38,173
487	Identity Crisis and Existential Crisis	October 8, 2025	37,881
477	Buya Hamka — Modern Sufism	July 30, 2025	35,621
476	Bediuzzaman Said Nursi — Between Light and Reason	July 23, 2025	35,053
495	Ngunu yo Ngunu Ning Aja Ngunu	December 3, 2025	35,003

The unit of analysis is distinguished at two levels: the sampling unit consists of the ten episodes listed in Table I, while the coding unit consists of speech segments containing a single complete idea or rhetorical function, with segment boundaries determined by shifts in idea, changes in tone, or explicit transition markers within the discourse (e.g., "now, let's look at…," "consider this…"). The analysis focuses on the verbal dimension rather than multimodal analysis because the program's visual format is dominated by presentation slides containing bullet-point material, without consistently showing the speaker's face, such that the available audiovisual elements are insufficient to support systematic multimodal analysis.

2.3 Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

Data collection was conducted through three complementary techniques: nonparticipant observation (systematically watching each episode at least twice to understand the flow of discourse while recording rhetorical patterns in detail), documentation (downloading recordings, producing verbatim transcripts as primary data, and selectively documenting audience comments that explicitly responded to particular speech segments as triangulation data), and a literature review conducted iteratively throughout the research process to sharpen analytical categories and resolve borderline cases when a segment showed indications of overlap between rhetorical dimensions.

Data analysis was carried out through nine sequential steps: verbatim transcription, an initial reading to gain an overall sense of the communicative style, segmentation of the transcript into coding units, initial annotation of salient rhetorical elements, formal categorization of each segment into the dimensions of ethos, pathos, and/or logos (including the application of disambiguation notes to segments showing indications of overlap), the writing of analytic memos documenting the rationale for categorization, analysis of how ethos, pathos, and logos are constructed in the delivery of philosophical ideas, analysis of the role of this rhetorical construction in the popularization of philosophy in digital public space, and finally cross-episode comparison to identify consistency and variation in Fahruddin Faiz's communicative style, so that findings are not based on a single, isolated episode.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. FINDINGS

The analysis of 262 speech segments across ten *Ngaji Filsafat* episodes indicates that ethos, pathos, and logos rarely operate as isolated rhetorical appeals. Instead, the appeals frequently overlap within individual segments, producing a layered rhetorical structure through which philosophical concepts are introduced, contextualized, and connected to everyday experience. The findings below first examine the dominant construction of each rhetorical appeal and then consider how the three appeals interact across episodes.

3.1.1. Constructing Ethos: Credibility through Humility and Textual Reference

Ethos in Fahruddin Faiz's discourse is consistently constructed through two complementary strategies: the acknowledgment of his own epistemic limitations and the

accumulation of textual references across philosophical, religious, and cultural traditions. In Episode 468, for instance, while discussing the concept of the true teacher in Javanese philosophy, Faiz draws on *Serat Wulangreh* to explain the characteristics of a person considered worthy of being a teacher, and subsequently qualifies his own position by acknowledging that he has not attained the level of *topo*: "I haven't arrived there myself, so please don't assume I have…"

This juxtaposition is rhetorically significant. The textual reference establishes an external basis for the philosophical claim, while the subsequent acknowledgment of limitation prevents Faiz from positioning himself as the ultimate authority on the subject. The same pattern recurs when he states that he has not reached the level of *topo* and asks the audience not to regard him as a *mursyid* or expert. Rather than presenting philosophical knowledge as a possession that authorizes the speaker to speak from an unquestionable position, Faiz positions himself as a mediator who is also situated within an ongoing process of learning. In this sense, epistemic humility functions as a form of ethos through self-positioning: credibility is constructed by making the boundaries of the speaker's own authority visible within the discourse.

A second dimension of ethos emerges through the accumulation of textual references. In Episode 468, the concept of the true teacher is grounded in several Javanese texts, including *Suluk Wujil*, *Serat Kalatidha*, *Serat Centhini*, and *Serat Darmogandul*. Similar intertextual strategies appear in Episode 495, where the principle of the middle path is related to Aristotle, Al-Ghazali, and Ibn Miskawayh, and in Episode 487, where the discussion of human dimensions draws on Ibn Miskawayh's framework.

These references do more than increase the number of authorities cited. They place a single proposition within multiple intellectual traditions and thereby demonstrate the breadth of the knowledge base from which Faiz constructs his explanation. Ethos is therefore not primarily established through explicit claims to academic credentials, but through an intellectual performance observable within the discourse itself: the speaker demonstrates familiarity with sources while simultaneously acknowledging the limits of his own position. The resulting credibility is consequently **performative and relational**, constructed through how knowledge and authority are presented rather than simply asserted.

3.1.2. Constructing Pathos: Personal Anecdote and Experiential Connection

Pathos is most consistently constructed through personal anecdote, everyday analogy, humor, and references to situations that audiences can recognize within their own experience. These devices do not merely decorate philosophical explanations; they create an experiential point of entry through which abstract questions can be approached from familiar situations.

In Episode 495, for example, Faiz introduces the principle of limits through a childhood anecdote about being reprimanded by his grandmother for reading too much. He subsequently connects the experience to his father's advice to "go out into the street" when experiencing overthinking and to recognize that other people also carry their own problems. The anecdote establishes a personal and emotionally recognizable starting point

before the discussion moves toward the more abstract philosophical principle of moderation. Rhetorically, the strategy positions the speaker not only as someone explaining a philosophical concept but also as someone who has encountered the problem being discussed. Pathos thus emerges through experiential recognition, allowing the philosophical proposition to be approached through an ordinary human experience.

Everyday analogy provides another important mechanism. In Episode 468, conscience is explained through the metaphors of a compass and a mirror reflecting light, while the relationship between the true teacher and inner awareness is explained through a radio and its signal. These analogies primarily perform a logical function by making abstract concepts intelligible, but they also carry a pathos function because they relocate metaphysical ideas into familiar sensory and experiential frames. This overlap is important: the same rhetorical device does not necessarily belong exclusively to one Aristotelian appeal. Its rhetorical classification depends on the function it performs within a particular segment.

A similar pattern appears in Episode 482, where philosophical ideas about change and uncertainty are connected to contemporary "viral" culture, the Javanese expression *ojo ngumunan*, *ojo kagetan*, and the experience of information overload. Rather than framing the digital information environment simply as a lack of knowledge, Faiz presents it as an excess of information that makes it difficult to distinguish truth from falsehood. The contemporary framing gives an otherwise abstract philosophical problem a recognizable emotional context: audiences are invited to encounter philosophical reflection through a condition already present in their digital lives.

The convergence of anecdote, analogy, humor, and contemporary reference therefore produces a form of experiential anchoring. Philosophical concepts become connected to situations, emotions, and concerns that audiences can recognize without requiring them to first enter the discourse through specialized philosophical terminology. Importantly, this does not mean that the concepts are reduced to personal experience. Rather, experience functions as the rhetorical entry point through which philosophical reflection becomes more immediate and relatable.

3.1.3. Constructing Logos: Layered Classification and Contextual Application

Logos in Faiz's discourse is most prominently realized through layered classification, conceptual differentiation, analogy, and the application of philosophical principles to contemporary situations. These strategies allow complex ideas to retain an identifiable argumentative structure while being presented in a form that can be followed by non-specialist audiences.

In Episode 468, for example, the levels of Javanese knowledge are explained by mapping them onto recognizable domains such as schooling, skills, career, social life, and spirituality. The four types of teacher, *guru rupo, guru wicoro/sabdo, guru laku,* and *guru sejati*, are likewise organized into a tiered conceptual structure. The classification provides audiences with a sequence through which an otherwise complex knowledge system can be differentiated and followed.

A comparable strategy appears in Episode 495 through the six principles associated with Ki Ageng Suryomentaram: *sak butuhe, sak perlune, sak cukupe, sak benere, sak mestine,* and *sak penake*. Rather than presenting the principles as an undifferentiated philosophical exposition, Faiz explains them individually and attaches concrete examples to each. The result is a structured presentation in which philosophical principles can be remembered and related to everyday circumstances.

Logos also operates through the explicit contextual application of philosophical principles. In Episode 495, the principle of ethical limits is tested against political, educational, and technological situations. Faiz explains that a person may pursue wealth but not through corruption and may seek academic achievement but not through cheating or complete dependence on ChatGPT. The philosophical principle therefore remains recognizable while being relocated into contemporary problems that are immediately relevant to a digital audience.

Similarly, in Episode 476, Bediuzzaman Said Nursi's principle of goodness is organized into stages that can function as a practical framework for facing hardship rather than being presented merely as biographical or historical information. Across these examples, logos does not depend on formal academic exposition alone. Instead, argumentative coherence is maintained through classification, differentiation, sequencing, analogy, and contextual application.

These patterns indicate that accessible language does not necessarily entail the disappearance of logical structure. On the contrary, Faiz frequently makes conceptual relationships more explicit by organizing them into layers, categories, and practical cases. In this sense, rhetorical popularization operates through making complexity navigable rather than simply removing complexity.

3.1.4. The Interaction of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos: Cross-Episode Patterns

The most consistent finding across the ten episodes is that ethos, pathos, and logos rarely operate separately within a single speech segment. Instead, the three appeals are frequently layered, with one rhetorical device performing multiple functions or several devices converging to support a single philosophical proposition. This pattern is particularly important because it indicates that the popularization of philosophy is not produced by three independent rhetorical strategies, but through their interaction.

In Episode 476, for example, a single segment combines a reflective question associated with pathos, introspection associated with ethos, and direct advice associated with logos to guide audiences toward using inner experience as an indicator of spiritual limits. In Episode 495, the concepts of *sedeng* and *ngemong* are introduced through conceptual definition, which provides a logos-based structure, and then developed through an analogy of parenting that adds experiential and emotional resonance. The discussion closes with a poetic metaphor in which the heart is compared to the wind but warned not to become a storm that harms others, combining conceptual coherence with emotional resonance.

A recurring pattern can also be observed in the broader organization of the episodes. Opening segments frequently establish or delimit a concept through logos while

simultaneously establishing Faiz's stance toward the material through ethos. The middle portions commonly introduce anecdote, analogy, humor, or contemporary examples that provide pathos and experiential connection. Conclusions then frequently bring the three appeals together by combining conceptual synthesis, personal reflection, and persuasive orientation.

This recurring layering is significant because it changes how the rhetorical process of popularization can be understood. The appeals do not simply operate sequentially, first logos, then pathos, then ethos. Rather, they are dynamically combined within the same discourse. A philosophical concept can therefore be simultaneously structured through logos, made relevant through pathos, and rendered credible through ethos.

Taken together, the findings indicate that rhetoric is constitutive of digital philosophy popularization because the accessibility of specialized knowledge is produced through the layered coordination of credibility, emotional resonance, and argumentative structure. The transformation from specialized knowledge to public conversation therefore does not depend on stripping philosophical discourse of its complexity. Instead, complexity is rhetorically reorganized so that it can remain conceptually structured while becoming understandable, relatable, and usable within the experiential world of a digital public.

3.2. Discussion: Rearticulation as A Mechanism of Philosophy Popularization

3.2.1. Rearticulation Rather Than Simplification

The main finding of this study shows that the popularization of philosophy in *Ngaji Filsafat* is more accurately understood as rearticulation rather than simplification. This finding matters because knowledge popularization is often associated with a reduction in complexity to render it acceptable to a non-specialist audience. However, analysis of the ten episodes reveals a different pattern. Argumentative structure does not disappear when philosophical concepts move into digital space; on the contrary, that structure is often made more explicit through layered classification, analogy, definition, and application to contemporary cases.

This is evident, for instance, in the use of layered classification in Episode 468 and in the organization of Ki Ageng Suryomentaram's six principles in Episode 495. Concepts drawn from complex philosophical traditions are not merely shortened, but reorganized into a form the audience can follow linearly. Likewise, the analogies in Episodes 468 and 482 connect abstract ideas to more familiar experiences without erasing the proposition being explained.

This finding broadens our understanding of knowledge popularization. What changes is not merely the level of knowledge's complexity, but the way that complexity is communicatively organized. Popularization, accordingly, can be understood as a process of transforming the representational form of knowledge so that it becomes negotiable within a public communication context. In the case of *Ngaji Filsafat*, rhetoric functions as the mechanism that allows philosophical concepts to retain argumentative structure while simultaneously acquiring a form more navigable for a digital audience.

3.2.2. Rhetorical Layering as Epistemic Mediation

A second, more specific finding is that this process of rearticulation occurs through a layering of ethos, pathos, and logos. The three Aristotelian appeals do not operate as separate devices, but continually reinforce one another within a single discursive sequence.

In this context, ethos supplies a foundation of credibility through command of sources and epistemic humility; logos sustains conceptual structure through classification, differentiation, and application; while pathos connects that structure to the audience's experience and concerns. Importantly, these functions do not always follow a fixed order. A single analogy, for instance, can simultaneously help the audience grasp a conceptual relationship and create experiential closeness. Likewise, an acknowledgment of the limits of one's own knowledge can function as self-positioning while also building a more egalitarian relationship with the audience.

This pattern helps clarify the concept of epistemic empathy discussed in the literature on knowledge intermediaries. Within that framework, the communicator serves as a mediator who helps bridge the gap between expert knowledge and the audience's capacity or experience. This study's findings show further that this mediating function can be observed concretely through the rhetorical choices made within discourse. In other words, epistemic mediation does not operate only at the level of what is communicated, but also at the level of how that knowledge is rhetorically shaped.

We can therefore read *Ngaji Filsafat* as a form of rhetorical epistemic mediation: philosophical knowledge is preserved as knowledge possessing structure and sourcing, while simultaneously being reorganized so that it can be understood and experienced within the audience's own horizon of life [22].

3.2.3. Extending Aristotelian Rhetoric to Reflective Knowledge Communication

A third finding concerns the position of Aristotelian rhetoric within digital communication scholarship. Contemporary Aristotelian rhetoric literature largely addresses persuasion in public, political, and digital media communication. This study shows that the framework of ethos, pathos, and logos is equally productive when the object of communication is not political appeal or opinion formation, but reflective knowledge.

In *Ngaji Filsafat*, the rhetorical aim is not primarily persuasion toward a particular political choice or decision. Rather, rhetoric is used to help the audience understand, weigh, and reflect on philosophical questions. The persuasive function, then, does not disappear, but its orientation shifts: from persuasion toward decision to persuasion toward meaning-making and reflective engagement [23].

This extends the application of Aristotelian rhetoric within digital communication studies. Ethos, pathos, and logos are relevant not only when a communicator seeks to make an audience accept a given position, but also when a communicator seeks to make a particular body of knowledge worth attending to, trustworthy, comprehensible, and relevant to the audience's life.

In this sense, *Ngaji Filsafat* shows that rhetoric can operate as an epistemic infrastructure for digital knowledge communication. Rhetoric becomes an epistemic infrastructure because, through it, knowledge is not merely transferred from communicator

to audience, but restructured so that it can function within a digital public communication environment.

This finding also extends the concept of intermediaries of epistemic empathy proposed by Bartsch et al. [24]. Where that concept explains the role of educational communicators as knowledge intermediaries in general terms, this study shows how that intermediary role is concretely carried out through the operationalization of ethos, pathos, and logos, layered upon one another, not operating in parallel or in sequence, but fused within the same speech segment. Epistemic empathy, on this reading, is not merely a communicator's disposition, but an effect of rhetorical design that can be analyzed and replicated: humility paired with textual reference (ethos), anecdote and analogy that bridge experiential distance (pathos), and layered classification that keeps philosophical argument structure intact while remaining followable (logos).

At a broader level, this finding challenges the assumption that digital rhetoric is relevant only to public opinion persuasion and political communication, which has thus far dominated contemporary Aristotelian rhetoric scholarship [25], [15]. *Ngaji Filsafat* shows that the same framework, ethos, pathos, logos, can and should be applied to the domain of reflective knowledge communication, not merely persuasion in the political sense. The difference lies in rhetorical purpose: rather than moving an audience toward a decision or a particular stance, rhetoric in digital philosophy popularization aims to move an audience toward deeper understanding of existential questions, a form of persuasion oriented toward meaning-making rather than toward action. This difference in purpose opens space for extending the Aristotelian rhetorical framework to other domains of knowledge communication beyond philosophy, popular science, law, and health communication, which face similar accessibility challenges.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined how Aristotelian rhetoric operates in the digital popularization of philosophy through Fahruddin Faiz's *Ngaji Filsafat* on MJS Channel. Based on the analysis of 262 speech segments across ten episodes broadcast in 2025, the study finds that philosophical knowledge is not merely simplified when communicated to a non-specialist digital audience. Instead, it is rhetorically rearticulated through the layered construction of ethos, pathos, and logos.

Ethos is constructed through epistemic humility and the accumulation of textual references, establishing credibility through both acknowledged limitations and demonstrated engagement with philosophical, religious, and cultural sources. Pathos is constructed through personal anecdotes, everyday analogies, humor, and contemporary experiences that connect philosophical concepts with the audience's lived realities. Logos is realized through layered classification, conceptual differentiation, and the contextual application of philosophical principles to contemporary situations. Most importantly, these appeals rarely operate independently. Their interaction creates a rhetorical layering through which philosophical concepts can remain conceptually structured while becoming more understandable, relatable, and applicable within digital public discourse.

The study therefore contributes to research on digital knowledge communication by conceptualizing rhetorical rearticulation as a mechanism of knowledge popularization. Rather than treating accessibility as the result of reducing conceptual complexity, the findings suggest that accessibility can be produced by reorganizing complexity through coordinated rhetorical appeals. In this process, rhetoric functions not merely as a persuasive technique but as a form of epistemic mediation through which specialized philosophical knowledge becomes available for public understanding and reflection.

Future research may examine whether similar rhetorical patterns emerge among other philosophy communicators, platforms, and forms of specialized knowledge, as well as how audience responses participate in shaping rhetorical strategies over time.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Bruns, "From 'the' public sphere to a network of publics: Towards an empirically founded model of contemporary public communication spaces," *Communication Theory*, vol. 33, no. 2–3, pp. 70–81, 2023, doi: 10.1093/ct/qtad007.

[2] P. Staab and T. Thiel, "Social media and the digital structural transformation of the public sphere," *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 129–143, 2022, doi: 10.1177/02632764221103527.

[3] D. Tewu, D. Destine, and I. Gunawan, "Analysis of social media user growth and its implications for digital marketing strategies in Indonesia 2024," *Int. J. Manage. Stud. Social Sci. Res.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 236–245, 2025, doi: 10.56293/ijmsssr.2025.5623.

[4] D. Craig and S. Cunningham, *Creator Culture: An Introduction to Global Social Media Entertainment*. New York, NY, USA: New York Univ. Press, 2021.

[5] F. Pires, M. J. Masanet, J. M. Tomasena, and C. A. Scolari, "Learning with YouTube: Beyond formal and informal through new actors, strategies and affordances," *convergence*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 838–853, 2022, doi: 10.1177/13548565211020545.

[6] S. Conix, O. Lemeire, and P. S. Chi, "The public relevance of philosophy," *Synthese*, vol. 200, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11229-022-03546-9.

[7] D. Bourget and D. Chalmers, "Philosophers on philosophy: The 2020 PhilPapers survey," *Philosophers' Imprint*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2020, doi: 10.3998/phimp.2109.

[8] B. Peterson, D. Agboola, and K. Lundberg, "What do beginning students think about philosophy before their first college course?," *J. Am. Philos. Assoc.*, 2023, doi: 10.1017/apa.2023.12.

[9] L. Leng, "The role of philosophical inquiry in helping students engage in learning," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 11, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00449.

[10] F. Albersmeier and A. Christian, "Introduction to the special issue 'Popularizing Philosophy'," *Kriterion (Austria)*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 283–285, 2022, doi: 10.1515/KRT-2022-0004.

[11] H. Humaidi, M. Sairi, and F. Husaeni, "Critical analysis of Islamic philosophy on social media," *Kanz Philosophia: J. Islamic Philos. Mysticism*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 105–130, 2025, doi: 10.20871/kpjipm.v11i1.400.

[12] M. Aisyah, "Ethos, pathos, logos dan komunikasi publik: A systematic literature review," *Jurnal Darma Agung*, vol. 3, 2022.

[13] G. C. Feng, Y. Luo, Z. Yu, and J. Wen, "Effects of rhetorical devices on audience responses with online videos: An augmented elaboration likelihood model," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 18, no. 3, 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0282663.

[14] A. Finlayson, "YouTube and political ideologies: Technology, populism and rhetorical form," *Political Studies*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 62–80, 2022, doi: 10.1177/0032321720934630.

[15] A. Sujoko, M. Haboddin, and L. O. M. Afala, "Anies Baswedan's rhetoric amid political polarization for COVID-19 handling in Jakarta, Indonesia," *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian J. Commun.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 54–69, 2022, doi: 10.17576/JKMJC-2022-3803-04.

[16] A. Bartsch *et al.*, "Epistemic authority in the digital public sphere: An integrative conceptual framework and research agenda," *Communication Theory*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 37–50, 2025, doi: 10.1093/ct/qtae020.

[17] W. M. Lim, "What is qualitative research? An overview and guidelines," *Australas. Marketing J.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 199–229, 2025, doi: 10.1177/14413582241264619.

[18] N. Pervin and M. Mokhtar, "The interpretivist research paradigm: A subjective notion of a social

context," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Prog. Educ. Dev.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 419–428, 2022, doi: 10.6007/ijarped/v11-i2/12938.

[19] S. K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*, 5th ed. Long Grove, IL, USA: Waveland Press, 2017.

[20] H. Hosseinmardi, A. Ghasemian, M. Rivera-Lanas, M. H. Ribeiro, R. West, and D. J. Watts, "Causally estimating the effect of YouTube's recommender system using counterfactual bots," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 121, no. 8, pp. 1–8, 2024, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2313377121.

[21] E. Sangiorgio, N. Di Marco, G. Etta, M. Cinelli, R. Cerqueti, and W. Quattrociocchi, "Evaluating the effect of viral posts on social media engagement," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2025, doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-84960-6.

[22] C. Ritzi, "The hidden structures of the digital public sphere," *Constellations*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 55–60, 2023, doi: 10.1111/1467-8675.12664.

[23] T. N. Friemel and C. Neuberger, "The public sphere as a dynamic network," *Communication Theory*, vol. 33, nos. 2–3, pp. 92–101, 2023, doi: 10.1093/ct/qtad003.

[24] E. Luhtakallio and T. Meriluoto, "Fame democracy? Social media and visuality-based transformation of the public sphere," *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 318–342, 2024, doi: 10.1080/1600910X.2023.2263818.

[25] E. Plaut, "Strategic illiteracies: The long game of technology refusal and disconnection," *Communication Theory*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 21–31, 2023, doi: 10.1093/ct/qtac014.