

FROM *TAWHĪD* TO *FADĀ'IL*: THE EPISTEMIC CONSTRUCTION OF Q.S. AL-IKHLĀS IN DIGITAL QUR'ANIC PREACHING

Moh. Nadhif,^{1*} Moh. Subthi Buchori,² Muh Zamroni,³ Luthfi Hakim,⁴ Mamluatu Solihah⁵

¹ STAI Ma'had Aly Al-Hikam Malang, Indonesia; buya.nadhif@gmail.com

² Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia; mohsubthi@uin-malang.ac.id

³ Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia; muhzamroni2@uin-malang.ac.id

⁴ Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari Tebu Ireng Jombang, Indonesia; luthfihakim@unhasy.ac.id

⁵ Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia; luluksholeh.ls@uinmalang.ac.id

Article History:

Received: 12 August 2026

Revised: 29 September 2026

Accepted: 3 October 2026



© 2026 by Authors. Submitted for possible open-access publication under the terms and conditions of the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20871/tjsq.v9i1.717>

Abstract: Digital Qur'anic preaching often places Qur'anic wording, *ḥadīth* reports, exegetical explanation, and motivational language within one short audiovisual sequence. This study examines how a 10-minute 31-second preaching video transforms Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] from a compact declaration of *tawḥīd* into a sequence of *fadā'il* claims and supplication, while asking how source differences remain visible or become compressed. The study uses an artifact-centered qualitative case design that integrates audiovisual content analysis, thematic *tafsīr*, *ḥadīth* source criticism, and multimodal framing analysis. The video is reconstructed claim by claim before comparison with Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112]: 1–4, Q.S. Al-A'raf [7]: 156, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Musnad Aḥmad*, *Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī*, and classical *tafsīr*. The findings show four recurrent operations: doctrinal condensation, devotional expansion, source-label equalization, and motivational reframing. The report that Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] equals one-third of the Qur'an has strong canonical support, whereas the ten-recitation reward report has a debated transmission history and wording variation; the *al-Aḥad/al-Ṣamad* supplication is comparatively well supported. Close reading of Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] further indicates a theological progression from an identification of the oneness of God toward absolute independence, then to the negation of genealogy and equivalence, so later reward claims belong to a reception layer rather than the *sūrah's* semantic content. As its main contribution, the article proposes an Epistemic Faḍā'il Mediation Model (EFMM) linking provenance, authentication, communicative function, and media framing without claiming empirical audience reception.

Keywords: Digital Qur'anic Preaching, Epistemic Authority, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān*, Q.S. Al-Ikhlās, *Tawḥīd*.

* Corresponding Author

Abstrak: Dakwah Al-Qur'an digital sering menempatkan redaksi ayat, riwayat hadis, penjelasan tafsir, dan bahasa motivasional dalam satu rangkaian audiovisual yang singkat. Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana sebuah video dakwah berdurasi 10 menit 31 detik mentransformasikan Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] dari deklarasi padat tentang *tawhīd* menjadi rangkaian klaim *faḍā'il* dan doa, sekaligus menelaah apakah perbedaan sumber tetap terlihat atau justru terkompresi. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain studi kasus kualitatif yang berpusat pada artefak, dengan mengintegrasikan analisis isi audiovisual, tafsir tematik, kritik sumber hadis, dan analisis pembingkai multimodal. Isi video direkonstruksi per klaim sebelum dibandingkan dengan Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112]: 1–4, Q.S. Al-A'raf [7]: 156, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Musnad Aḥmad*, *Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī*, dan tafsir klasik. Temuan menunjukkan empat operasi utama, yaitu pemadatan doktrin, perluasan devosional, penyertaan label sumber, dan pembingkai motivasional. Riwayat bahwa Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] setara dengan sepertiga Al-Qur'an memiliki dukungan kanonik yang kuat, sedangkan riwayat pahala membaca sepuluh kali memiliki sejarah transmisi yang diperdebatkan dan variasi redaksi; doa yang menggunakan *al-Aḥad* dan *al-Samad* relatif lebih kuat. Pembacaan dekat terhadap Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] juga menunjukkan urutan teologis dari identifikasi positif tentang keesaan Allah menuju kemandirian absolut, kemudian penolakan genealogi dan kesetaraan. Oleh karena itu, klaim pahala merupakan lapisan penerimaan di luar kandungan semantik surah. Kontribusi utama artikel ialah Epistemic Faḍā'il Mediation Model (EFMM) yang menghubungkan asal sumber, autentikasi, fungsi komunikatif, dan pembingkai media tanpa mengklaim adanya data resepsi audiens empiris.

Kata-kata Kunci: Dakwah Al-Qur'an Digital, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān*, Otoritas Epistemik, Q.S. Al-Ikhlās, *Tawhīd*.

Introduction

Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] is one of the shortest Qur'anic chapters, yet its four verses articulate a dense theology of divine identity, self-sufficiency, non-generation, and incomparability. In contemporary digital preaching, the *sūrah* is rarely presented only as a creed-like statement. It is recited for protection, linked to quantified rewards, inserted into supplication, and reframed as motivational advice. These practices do not make *faḍā'il* discourse illegitimate. The epistemic problem arises when Qur'anic wording, authenticated prophetic reports, debated virtue traditions, later exegetical explanation, and preacher synthesis appear in the same visual register. A source name can then function as if it were an authenticity grade, while the theological sequence of Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] itself recedes behind a sequence of memorable rewards.

The research corpus is a 10-minute 31-second preaching video supplied to the researchers as an audiovisual file. The video begins by displaying Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] and then organizes the message around three stated secrets. The first links the *sūrah* to a report attributed to al-Bukhārī that it equals one-third of the Qur'an. The second attributes to Aḥmad a promise that ten recitations produce a house or palace in Paradise. The third presents a supplication attributed to al-Tirmidhī that invokes God as *al-Aḥad* and *al-Samad* and repeats the *sūrah*'s language of non-generation and incomparability. The video also displays Q.S. Al-A'raf [7]: 156, *wa-rahmatī wasī'at kulla shay'*, as a supplementary mercy motif. The supplied artifact does not contain verifiable creator, channel, platform, or upload-date metadata, so this article does not reconstruct those facts from inference. Its validity as a research

object rests instead on the internal stability of the audiovisual file: duration, spoken narration, on-screen wording, source labels, and sequential organization can be repeatedly checked within the same corpus.

Research on the digital Qur'an has shown that platform mediation changes not only access but also the form in which scripture is interpreted. Short-video environments reorder reading, teaching, sound, typography, music, and visual emphasis, while digital editions and websites create new relations among text, commentary, and circulation (Ghozali et al. 2022, 1263–82; Ali and Isnaini 2024, 1–23; Rosyid and Anoraga 2023, 419–39; Yuningsih and Ghany 2024, 187–204). Tanzil's recent discussions similarly show that online *ruqyah* can make Qur'anic reception simultaneously informative and performative, that pragmatic contextualization can detach verses from established interpretive frames, and that audiovisual aesthetics can relocate a verse within motivational culture (Nabila 2024, 1–24; Lufaei and Fahriana 2025, 251–70; Putri et al. 2025, 79–98). Barir's reconstruction of contextual hermeneutics further underscores the need to keep stages of interpretation visible rather than collapse them into an apparently self-evident conclusion (Barir 2026, 203–32).

Related literature explains how digital religion reorganizes piety and authority. Qur'an-centered movements such as One Day One Juz show how online media can support semi-virtual devotional communities. In contrast, studies of Facebook, Instagram, websites, and online celebrity preachers document new negotiations among institutional learning, visual persuasion, accessibility, and platform visibility (Nisa 2018, 24–43; Muslim 2017, 33–51; Halim 2018, 44–60; Hew 2018, 61–79; Husein and Slama 2018, 80–93; Fauzi 2023, 304–29). Recent work has extended this concern to the fading or redistribution of traditional exegetical authority, the movement from *sanad* to algorithm, and the ethical problem of interpretation in social media (Ichwan et al. 2024, 320–45; Asriadi et al. 2025, 405–19; Abay 2025, 70–84; Armita 2025, 154–64).

Living Qur'an studies likewise show that mediated scripture is received through practice, performance, affect, and social use, not textual semantics alone (Rafiq 2021, 469–84; A'yun 2020, 319–37; Nurmansyah et al. 2022, 277–300; Nurmansyah and Oktaviana 2022, 104–13; Pratiwi and Isnaini 2023, 185–202; Qudsy and Muzakky 2021, 1–19; Mubarak and Romdhoni 2021, 110–14). Hadith mediatization studies add that source material can be reformatted into compact infographic or audiovisual units whose persuasive force is partly produced by design (Mundzir et al. 2023, 55–79).

The literature on *faḍā'il al-Qur'ān* asks a different question: how should virtue reports be authenticated and interpreted? A report may be widely circulated yet require *isnād* criticism; conversely, a strong report may still be semantically overextended. Qomariyah shows that the one-third report concerning Q.S. Al-Iklāṣ [112] supports several interpretive possibilities rather than one mechanical

equivalence (Qomariyah 2020, 130–45). Al-Ghouri warns that popular reward formulas can become detached from their transmission histories (Ghouri 2025, 97–124), while Khousrof and Khaled emphasize that literature on Qur’anic virtues also serves pedagogical and devotional functions (Khousrof and Khaled 2022, 81–115). These literatures remain partly separated. Digital Qur’anic studies explain mediation, hadith studies evaluate transmission, and living Qur’an research explains practice. What remains underdeveloped is a claim-level method that keeps the Qur’anic semantic baseline, the transmission status of later reports, and the media framing of those reports analytically distinct.

This article therefore asks three connected questions. First, how does the audiovisual sequence transform the *tawḥīd* structure of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] into a *faḍā’il*-centered devotional itinerary? Second, how do Qur’anic text, strong *ḥadīth*, debated virtue reports, cross-*sūrah* thematic linkage, and preacher synthesis carry different levels of epistemic authority inside the same clip? Third, what analytic model can preserve those differences without reducing digital preaching either to a binary of authentic versus false or to a purely media-centered account? The article contributes an Epistemic Faḍā’il Mediation Model (EFMM). The term mediation is deliberate. This study does not possess audience comments, interviews, or platform analytics and therefore does not claim to measure empirical reception. EFMM analyzes the reception pathway designed by the artifact, that is, how claims are positioned for viewers before any audience response is measured.

Methodologically, this is an artifact-centered qualitative case study. The video was selected purposively as an information-rich critical case because one short sequence juxtaposes five analytically different claim types: Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]: 1–4, a strongly authenticated one-third report; Q.S. Al-A‘rāf [7]: 156, a cross-textual mercy motif; a debated ten-recitation reward report; and a supported supplication built from *al-Aḥad* and *al-Ṣamad*. The case is not treated as statistically representative of digital preaching. Its value is analytical: maximum source heterogeneity is compressed into one bounded artifact, allowing the internal logic of epistemic equalization to be observed closely. The article first reconstructs the audiovisual sequence, exact wording, source labels, and communicative function. It then performs a thematic and close exegetical reading of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112], with attention to *al-Aḥad*, *al-Ṣamad*, the two negations of generation, and the final denial of equivalence.

Table 1. Literature and Conceptual Gap Matrix.

Research Stream	Established Contribution	Unresolved Issue	This Article’s Response
-----------------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------------------

Digital Qur'anic Studies	Explains mediation, platform form, interpretation, and circulation.	Often leaves claim-level source grading implicit.	Adds provenance and authentication auditing.
<i>Faḍā'il</i> and <i>Ḥadīth</i> Criticism	Tests transmission, wording, and authenticity of virtue reports.	Often stops before media framing and communicative function.	Connects transmission status with digital presentation.
Living Qur'an and Digital Authority	Explains practice, piety, and negotiated credibility.	Audience methods cannot be inferred from artifact data alone.	Use literature contextually while limiting claims to artifact-level mediation.
This Study	Integrates close tafsīr, <i>ḥadīth</i> criticism, and audiovisual analysis.	One bounded, information-rich case.	Develops the Epistemic Faḍā'il Mediation Model (EFMM) as a testable heuristic.

The second analytic stage conducts *ḥadīth* source criticism by tracing collection, wording, transmission route, narrator evaluation, and later grading where relevant. The study triangulates the video with *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhari*, *Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad Ibn Hanbal*, *Jāmi' al-Tirmidhi*, and classical *tafsīr*, especially *Jāmi' al-Bayān fī Ta'wīl Āy al-Qur'ān* and *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Aẓīm*. The final stage compares textual provenance and authentication with multimodal framing, including quotation, paraphrase, headline form, source labeling, and sequence. Thematic *tafsīr* establishes what the Qur'anic text says and how its internal theology is structured; *ḥadīth* criticism evaluates later prophetic claims attached to that text; multimodal analysis explains how these heterogeneous sources are made continuous on screen. Living Qur'an scholarship functions here as a contextual lens for the movement from text to devotional practice, not as a substitute for ethnography. Audience negotiation and daily practice are reserved for a future empirical phase rather than inferred from unavailable data.

Digital Transformation in Qur'anic Studies

The analysis begins with the Qur'anic text rather than the reward claims attached to it. Because Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] is the primary object of study, its Arabic wording must remain visible before later transmitted materials are introduced:

قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ اللَّهُ الصَّمَدُ لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يُولَدْ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ

"He is Allah, one; Allah, the Self-Sufficient; He neither begets nor is begotten; and none is comparable to Him (Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]: 1–4)."

The theological movement of the *sūrah* is more structured than a simple list

of divine attributes. Verse 1 begins with a command of proclamation, *qul*, then identifies the referent as *Allāh* and qualifies God with *aḥad*. In this position, *aḥad* is not merely a numeral. It marks singularity that cannot be decomposed into members of a class. Verse 2 repeats the divine name and adds *al-Ṣamad*, shifting from identity to relation: God is not dependent, while creatures direct need toward God. Verses 3 and 4 then protect those positive affirmations through negation. *Lam yalid wa-lam yūlad* excludes genealogy in both directions, while *wa-lam yakun lahu kufuwan aḥad* excludes any comparable counterpart. The sequence therefore moves from identification to absolute self-sufficiency, to the negation of lineage, and finally to the negation of equivalence.

Recent stylistic analysis supports reading this sequence as an integrated theological design rather than four isolated propositions. Hijaz and colleagues identify the predominance of nominal construction, the lexical precision of *aḥad* and *ṣamad*, and layered negation as mechanisms that progressively close alternative theological readings (Hijaz et al. 2026, 208–22). This linguistic pattern is important for the present study because the digital clip later changes the organizing principle. The *sūrah* itself culminates in incomparability; the clip subsequently reorganizes attention around merit, numerical reward, and usable prayer. The digital movement is therefore not merely explanation. It is a shift in genre from theological declaration to devotional application.

Classical *tafsīr* deepens the semantic field of *al-Ṣamad*. Ibn Kathīr similarly treats *aḥad* as uniqueness without peer, likeness, or equal and reads the chapter as a concentrated rejection of claims that attribute offspring, derivation, or equivalence to God (Kathīr 1999, 528–29). These interpretations differ in detail, but they converge on a theological relation of asymmetry: God is not one object among comparable objects, and divine sufficiency is not one degree within a scale of creaturely sufficiency.

That asymmetry matters for *faḍā'il*. None of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]: 1–4 specifies a numerical reward, a fixed number of recitations, a house in Paradise, or a rule that three recitations mechanically replace the complete Qur'an. Such claims can possess authority from *ḥadīth* or later devotional transmission, but their authority is external to the lexical and propositional content of the *sūrah*. This distinction does not isolate *tafsīr* from devotional life. It separates semantic explanation from merit narration so that each can be evaluated according to its own source.

The same principle applies to Q.S. Al-A'raf [7]: 156. The phrase *wa-rahmatī wasi'at kulla shay'* (My mercy encompasses all things) is direct Qur'anic wording, but it belongs to another *sūrah* and another immediate textual context. Its appearance beside Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] can form a legitimate thematic association between divine uniqueness and divine mercy. Yet the association is a cross-textual act of interpretation. It should not be made to look as if universal mercy were a fifth verse or an intrinsic lexical element of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]. EFMM therefore

distinguishes the authority of a source from the authority of the link that a preacher constructs between sources.

This Qur'anic baseline also changes the article's center of gravity. Digital media remain analytically important, but the primary question is what happens to the theology of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] when it enters a compressed devotional sequence. The chapter's architecture supplies the benchmark against which later claims are classified. Once the baseline is established, the one-third report, the ten-recitation promise, the supplication, and the mercy motif can be examined as differentiated extensions rather than as equivalent components of one undivided message.

Faḍā'il and the Problem of Source Differentiation

The first secret is the least problematic in terms of authentication and the most revealing in terms of interpretation. The video displays a statement attributed to the Prophet that Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] equals one-third of the Qur'an and labels it al-Bukhārī in *Sahih al-Bukhārī* number 5013, which contains the report from Abu Sa'id al-Khudri. The core wording is:

وَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ إِنَّهَا لَتَعْدِلُ ثُلُثُ الْقُرْآنِ

By Him in Whose hand is my life, it is equal to one-third of the Qur'an (Bukhārī 2002, 5013).

This is not a case in which a digital preacher has attached a famous collector's name to an unattested statement. The report has strong canonical standing in Sunni hadith tradition, and al-Bukhārī also transmits another version in which the Prophet explicitly says that Allah, the One, *al-Ṣamad*, is one-third of the Qur'an (Bukhārī 2002, 5015). EFMM therefore places the merit claim in a high-authentication hadith category, distinct from, but strongly adjacent to, the Qur'anic baseline.

Authentication does not end the interpretive question. What does one-third mean? Qomariyah's hadith study is important because it documents several interpretive possibilities: the equivalence may concern the concentration of *tawhīd* as one major Qur'anic domain; it may concern the reward for recitation; or it may be linked to a particular devotional setting (Qomariyah 2020, 130–45). The video chooses a compressed explanation. It links the report primarily to the *sūrah's* intense theology of divine unity. That explanation is plausible and has a long exegetical pedigree. The problem would arise only if the equivalence were converted into a claim that reciting Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ three times always substitutes for reading the entire Qur'an in every legal, pedagogical, and devotional sense.

This case therefore exposes a distinction between hadith authenticity and semantic scope. A sound report can still be overextended. Digital media encourage overextension because memorable equivalences are easily converted into formulas. The phrase equal to one-third is algorithmically and rhetorically attractive: it promises a clear ratio, efficient practice, and an instantly shareable religious fact.

Yet a ratio in a hadith does not explain its own domain of equivalence. Responsible preaching must preserve the difference between the authenticity of the report and the interpretation of what its equivalence entails.

The video's framing is relatively restrained on this point. It does not explicitly tell viewers to abandon longer Qur'anic reading. Instead, it emphasizes the density of *tawhīd*. This is significant because a claim can be epistemically sound even when its digital packaging is popular. The aim of EFMM is not to treat persuasion as contamination. Nabila's analysis of online *ruqyah* demonstrates that digital Qur'anic reception can be both informative and performative without becoming analytically illegitimate (Nabila 2024, 1–24). Rafiq's broader formulation of living Qur'an likewise makes room for scripture functioning through practice, not only interpretation (Rafiq 2021, 469–84). The critical question is whether the performance use remains proportionate to its textual and transmitted warrant.

The second secret is the article's clearest test case because it looks, on screen, almost identical in authority to the first. The video displays the statement, "Whoever recites *Qul huwa Allāhu aḥad* ten times, Allah will build for him a house in Paradise, followed by the source label Aḥmad. A viewer receives a simple structure: practice, number, reward, collector. Yet the transmission history is more complicated than the visual economy suggests.

مَنْ جَاءَ فِي رِصْدَةِ اللَّهِ إِلَى تِلْكَ رِسْعَةِ لِهَمِّهِ نَبِيَّ حَدْ حَ اللَّهُ وَهُوَ أَفْ أَرْقَ نَمَ

Whoever recites *Qul huwa Allāhu aḥad* until completing it ten times, Allah builds for him a palace in Paradise (Ḥanbal 2001, 376).

The report requires a more differentiated *isnād* discussion than a single modern grading. In *Musnad Aḥmad*, the route from Mu'ādh ibn Anas includes Zabbān ibn Fā'id. The critical issue is not that every transmitter in the chain is rejected, but that Zabbān received mixed and generally weak evaluations. Ibn Ḥajar summarizes him as weak in *ḥadīth* while acknowledging his piety and devotion (ʿAsqalānī 1986, 213). The critical apparatus of the modern *Musnad* edition likewise treats the principal route as weak, while noting supporting routes with their own limitations (Ḥanbal 2001, 376). This makes the report qualitatively different from the one-third tradition transmitted in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.

Later scholars have nevertheless considered whether corroboration raises the report above isolated weakness. Al-Albānī classifies the tradition as *ḥasan li-ghayrihi* after considering supporting evidence rather than treating the principal route as independently sound (Albānī 1995, 589). That formulation matters. *Ḥasan li-ghayrihi* describes a cumulative judgment produced by mutually supporting routes; it should not be paraphrased as if the *Musnad Aḥmad* chain were itself free of criticism. The article therefore records both levels: the main route contains a criticized transmitter, while some later evaluators judge the wider set of

attestations sufficient for devotional use.

A second issue is wording. The Aḥmad route cited above uses *qasran*—a palace, whereas circulating formulations often say *baytan*—a house. This variation does not by itself prove fabrication. It shows why digital subtitles should not be treated as a transparent copy of a stable original. The source label Aḥmad identifies a collection in which a related report occurs, but it does not communicate the wording history or the degree of confidence attached to the transmission.

Two epistemic observations follow. First, Aḥmad identifies where a version is transmitted; it does not tell the viewer how the chain has been assessed. Second, the video's displayed wording uses *baytan*—a house, whereas the Aḥmad route retrieved for number 15610 uses *qasran*—a palace. Allied transmissions of virtue circulate with small wording variations. The variation does not automatically invalidate the devotional meaning, but it matters for source fidelity. A digital caption can create the impression of verbatim quotation even when it is actually a harmonized paraphrase across related reports.

This is precisely the type of problem that studies of *faḍā'il al-Qur'ān* warn against. Al-Ghouri shows that reports on the virtues of individual *sūrah*s have historically attracted fabrication, amplification, and weak transmission, which makes methodological detection essential even when the devotional content appears harmless (Ghouri 2025, 97–124). Khourof and Khaled similarly treat knowledge of Qur'anic virtues as a field that requires careful differentiation of evidentiary bases rather than indiscriminate accumulation (Khourof and Khaled 2022, 81–115). The present case does not justify dismissing the ten-recitation report. It shows why its digital presentation should include a modest qualifier such as reported by Aḥmad; graded differently by hadith scholars if the preacher intends to present it as a precise prophetic promise.

The contrast with the first secret is analytically powerful. Both clips can be edited with the same font, the same voice, the same black background, and the same label structure. One rests on a report in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*; the other rests on a report whose chain has been debated and whose wording varies across routes. The screen equalizes them before the viewer has any opportunity to distinguish them. This is what the article calls source-label equalization: bibliographic naming substitutes for visible epistemic grading.

This finding also qualifies the common language of distortion. Lufaei and Fahriana usefully warn that online Qur'anic contextualization can distort a verse when selective use abandons established interpretive context (Lufaei and Fahriana 2025, 251–70). Putri, Amni, and Poipesi show that digital aesthetics can shift a verse into a new motivational register (Putri et al. 2025, 79–98). In the present video, the ten-recitation claim is not necessarily a distortion of the Qur'an because it is not presented as a Qur'anic verse. The more precise problem is epistemic leveling. The report has a real transmission history, but the video does not expose

the difference between transmission existence and transmission strength.

EFMM consequently requires two labels for this type of claim. The provenance label identifies the report, for example, *ḥadīth* number 15610 in *Musnad Aḥmad*. The confidence label indicates its assessment, for example, reported with a disputed chain; strengthened by some later scholars. This two-label practice is more informative than extreme. It avoids the maximalist claim that every narrated virtue is certain, and it avoids the minimalist claim that any debated virtue must disappear from preaching.

The third secret moves in a different direction. Instead of assigning a quantified reward, it turns the vocabulary of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] into the language of supplication. The video displays a prayer attributed to al-Tirmidhī:

اللَّهُمَّ إِنِّي أَسْأَلُكَ بِأَنِّي أَشْهَدُ أَنَّكَ أَنْتَ اللَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنْتَ الْأَحَدُ الصَّمَدُ الَّذِي لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يُولَدْ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ
كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ

O Allah, I ask You by my testimony that You are Allah; there is no deity except You, al-Aḥad, al-Ṣamad, who neither begets nor is begotten, and none is comparable to Him (Tirmidhī 1998, 3475).

Ḥadīth number 3475 in *Jami' al-Tirmidhī* transmits this supplication from Buraydah through his son 'Abd Allah. Al-Tirmidhī explicitly describes the report as *ḥasan gharīb*, and later editions also grade it positively. The *ḥadīth* continues by stating that the supplicant has asked God by His greatest name, by which He answers when called and gives when asked (Tirmidhī 1998, 3475). Compared with the ten-recitation report, the source status is more straightforward.

Theologically, this is the video's most elegant movement from *tawḥīd* to practice. The prayer does not add a foreign reward to the *sūrah*. It revoices its predicates as direct address. The declarative Allah is *al-Aḥad*, *al-Ṣamad* becomes I ask You by my testimony that You are Allah, there is no deity but You, *al-Aḥad*, *al-Ṣamad*. Doctrinal language becomes performative theology. The believer does not merely learn what God is not; the believer prays through what the revelation teaches about God.

This movement deserves attention because digital Qur'anic research often separates interpretation from practice too sharply. Living Qur'an scholarship has shown that Qur'anic reception frequently operates through recitation, healing, prayer, ritual, memory, and affect rather than through proposition alone (Rafiq 2021, 469–84; Nurmansyah et al. 2022, 277–300; Nurmansyah and Oktaviana 2022, 104–13). Nabila's Tanzil article similarly demonstrates that a digitally mediated Qur'anic practice can remain recognizably scriptural while acquiring new performative conditions (Nabila 2024, 1–24). In the present case, the supplication does not dilute Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ. It demonstrates how a theological *sūrah* becomes a devotional vocabulary.

The analytical caution is different here. Because the prayer closely echoes the *sūrah*, viewers may assume that the whole supplication is Qur'anic wording. The video partly protects against that confusion by displaying the label al-Tirmidhī. EFMM nevertheless recommends that digital preachers distinguish quotation levels explicitly: “*The Qur'an says...*” should be reserved for the verse; “*the Prophet was reported to hear a man supplicate...*” should introduce the hadith. Verbal precision is an epistemic service to the audience.

The Q.S. Al-A'rāf [7]: 156 fragment on divine mercy illustrates another kind of devotional synthesis. The phrase *wa-rahmati wasi'at kulla shay'* is Qur'anic, but it does not belong to Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]. Its insertion connects divine incomparability with divine mercy. Such thematic cross-reference is a normal exegetical technique, but the cross-reference should be recognized as a preacher's thematic construction, not as part of the *sūrah*'s immediate literary unit. Barir's emphasis on preserving stages of contextual reasoning is relevant here: an interpretation becomes more accountable when the path from text to application is visible (Barir 2026, 203–32).

This section therefore complicates any assumption that digital compression only degrades interpretation. Compression can also reveal a genuine theological relation. The four verses of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ can be memorized, recited, and used to structure prayer precisely because of their semantic compactness. The task of scholarship is not to resist devotional condensation, but to distinguish transparent condensation from unmarked supplementation.

The comparison also exposes a genre problem that digital presentation tends to conceal. *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān* is not identical with lexical *tafsīr*, creed, law, or historical reporting. It is a devotional genre concerned with the merits of recitation, remembrance, and attachment to scripture. Qomariyah's study of the one-third report is instructive precisely because a strongly authenticated narration still requires interpretation before its merit is translated into practice: equivalence can refer to thematic concentration, reward, or a particular devotional circumstance rather than a mechanical replacement of the whole Qur'an (Qomariyah 2020, 130–45). The genre therefore contains two questions at once: whether a report is responsibly transmitted and what kind of religious action its wording is meant to encourage.

This dual structure helps explain why an authenticity label cannot do all the analytical work. A sound report may be preached irresponsibly if its scope is exaggerated, while a disputed *faḍā'il* report may be transmitted responsibly if its status is disclosed and no binding doctrine is built upon it. Al-Ghouri's recent study of fabricated and weak *faḍā'il* traditions emphasizes the need to distinguish popular circulation from evidentiary reliability (Ghouri 2025, 97–124). Khourof and Khaled likewise show that *faḍā'il* material belongs to a long pedagogical history in which exhortation, recitation, and spiritual formation interact with questions

of hadith criticism (Khourof and Khaled 2022, 81–115). EFMM therefore does not reduce the genre to a traffic-light system of authentic, weak, and false. It asks how the transmission grade, devotional function, and presentational force relate to one another.

Digital media intensify the genre shift because they often remove the textual surroundings that once signaled what kind of claim was being read. A classical reader might encounter a virtue report under a chapter heading, within an isnad, or beside other reports whose differences were visible. A viewer of a short clip sees a headline, a collector’s name, and a promised outcome. Nabila’s distinction between informative and performative Qur’anic reception is useful here: a digital practice can teach something about scripture while simultaneously inviting an embodied act such as recitation or healing (Nabila 2024, 1–24). The Q.S. Al-Ikhlās video does exactly this. Its first claim teaches merit, its second converts merit into a repeatable action, and its third folds doctrine into supplication. What changes at each step is not only content but genre.

Table 2. Claim-Level Source Audit of the Video.

Video Claim	Displayed Source	Source Audit	EFMM status	Primary Epistemic Risk
Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112]: 1–4: divine uniqueness, al-Šamad, non-generation, incomparability.	Qur’an	Direct Qur’anic text	P1; direct scriptural.	Importing later rewards into the verses’ semantic content.
Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] equals one-third of the Qur’an.	Al-Bukhārī	<i>Ḥadīth</i> numbers 5013 and 5015 in <i>Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī</i> .	P2; strongly supported <i>ḥadīth</i> .	Overextending the domain of equivalence.
Ten recitations yield a house/palace in Paradise	Aḥmad	<i>Ḥadīth</i> number 15610 in <i>Musnad Aḥmad</i> ; principal route weak; supporting routes used by some later scholars.	P3; debated <i>fadā’il</i> report.	Treating a collection label as an unqualified authenticity grade; wording drift.
My mercy encompasses all things.	Q.S. Al-A‘rāf [7]: 156	Direct Qur’anic wording outside Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112].	P1 text + P4 thematic link.	Making a thematic association look intrinsic to Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112].

Supplication using al-Aḥad and al-Ṣamad	Al-Tirmidhī	<i>Ḥadīth</i> number 3475 in <i>Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī</i> ; al-Tirmidhī describes it as <i>ḥasan gharīb</i> .	P2; supported <i>ḥadīth</i> .	Blurring Qur’anic wording and <i>ḥadīth</i> wording.
---	-------------	---	-------------------------------	--

Recognizing genre also sharpens the article’s pushback against two easy conclusions. The first says that any disputed reward report makes the entire preaching artifact unreliable. That is too broad because the clip’s Qur’anic theology, the one-third report, and the al-Tirmidhī supplication have distinct and stronger warrants. The second says that a devotional context excuses loose sourcing because the content is only motivational. That is also inadequate. Motivation is precisely where numerical rewards, repetition counts, and promises of Paradise can become memorable and portable. The more actionable a claim becomes, the more important it is to preserve the conditions of its authority. A genre-sensitive epistemology therefore asks preachers to maintain devotional warmth while signaling where exhortation begins to depend on evidence of a different quality.

Digital Framing and Source-Label Equalization

The most distinctive feature of the video is not any individual *ḥadīth*. It is architecture that turns heterogeneous claims into three parallel secrets. The phrase “*What is the first secret we want to know today? establishes a discovery frame.*” The second and third sections are explicitly labeled *al-sirr al-thānī* and *al-sirr al-thālith*. Each unit offers a compact religious payoff. The frame is pedagogically efficient: viewers can remember three items. It also shifts the mode of authority from exposition to revelation-like disclosure. What was available in well-known *ḥadīth* collections is experienced as something newly uncovered.

This is a common logic of attention economies, but its religious effect deserves precise description. Digital *da‘wah* depends on selection. Hew’s analysis of visual persuasion shows that social media preaching operates through an interaction of aesthetics, persona, entertainment, and doctrinal communication (Hew 2018, 61–79). Ghozali, Mursyid, and Fitriana show that TikTok’s short-form logic encourages selected *sūrah*s, visual mediators, and concise interpretive functions (Ghozali et al. 2022, 1263–82). Faldiansyah argues that social media *da‘wah* must adapt form while retaining correct interpretive principles (Faldiansyah 2024, 505–24). The three secrets structure is therefore not an accidental decoration. It is a media technique that orders knowledge.

Four operations can be identified. The first is doctrinal condensation: a complex theological discourse is concentrated in the four verses of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ and explained through *al-Aḥad* and *al-Ṣamad*. The second is devotional expansion: the *sūrah* is linked to merit, repeated recitation, and supplication. The third is source-label equalization: collector names appear as compact signs of authority without

equal visibility of grading differences. The fourth is motivational reframing: the material is organized as secrets, shifting the audience from textual study toward discovery and action.

These operations explain why the article prefers epistemic construction to misinformation as its central concept. The video contains substantial authentic material. To describe the whole clip as misinformation would be inaccurate and analytically crude. The issue is how the viewer is invited to distribute confidence. A strong hadith and a debated virtue report receive similar presentational certainty. A Qur'anic phrase from another *sūrah* is inserted into a thematic discussion without a visible marker of the interpretive bridge. A prayer that echoes Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ is correctly attributed to al-Tirmidhī, but its relation to the *sūrah* can be mistaken for direct textual identity. The problem is the architecture of certainty.

Putri, Amni, and Poipesi provide a useful comparison. Their study of an Instagram post on Q.S. Al-Baqarah [2]: 195 shows that visual, audio, and narrative aesthetics can move a Qur'anic fragment from its established interpretive setting into the register of personal motivation (Putri et al. 2025, 79–98). The present video is less radical in its semantic shift, but the mechanism is comparable: platform-friendly narrative form redistributes emphasis. Lufaei and Fahriana likewise show that online contextualization must be tested against interpretive accountability rather than accepted simply because its social purpose is constructive (Lufaei and Fahriana 2025, 251–70).

Digital authority scholarship helps explain why this redistribution matters. Rosyid and Anoraga show that websites produce convergence and contestation among Qur'anic interpretations, making *tafsīr* available in a field where traditional gatekeeping is weakened (Rosyid and Anoraga 2023, 419–39). Rifai describes digital *tafsīr* as contributing to the democratization of religious sources (Rifai 2020, 152–70). Mubarak and Romdhoni observe a similar migration of *tafsīr* into social-media environments (Mubarak and Romdhoni 2021, 110–14). Accessibility is a genuine gain, but democratization increases the burden on source transparency because users encounter claims outside the pedagogical settings that once explained chains, genres, and levels of evidence.

The three secrets frame also creates a subtle shift in readerly posture. Classical *fadā'il* material often appears within a chapter, isnaḍ, legal discussion, or exegetical commentary. The reader encounters the report as part of a textual archive. In video, the viewer encounters it as a complete unit of actionable knowledge. The transition from archive to actionable unit can delete uncertainty markers that were once visible in the surrounding literature. The medium therefore does not merely shorten the text; it can shorten the epistemic context.

A comparison with earlier forms of digital religious pedagogy makes this point clearer. Halim's study of young As'adiyah preachers on Facebook shows that religious institutions do not simply lose authority when they adopt social media;

they reorganize networks, reputations, and pedagogical relationships through the new medium (Halim 2018, 44–60). Muslim's study of the One Day One Juz community similarly demonstrates that digital architecture can discipline Qur'anic practice by turning a daily portion of recitation into a technologically coordinated routine (Muslim 2017, 33–51). In both cases, the medium shapes practice without necessarily determining doctrine. The Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ clip reveals a parallel process at the micro level: the medium does not create the hadith reports, but it creates the order, equivalence, and confidence with which the reports are encountered.

Hadith mediatization research offers an especially close comparison. Mundzir and colleagues show that hadith circulated through online infographics undergo a process in which textual authority, visual design, ideological emphasis, and *da'wah* purpose become mutually reinforcing (Mundzir et al. 2023, 55–79). A hadith card or subtitle is therefore not a transparent window onto a collection. It is a designed interpretive object. The present video goes one step further by placing several different source types inside a single designed sequence. The problem is not only the mediatization of one hadith, but the intermediation of Qur'an, hadith, *tafsīr*, and devotional inference within the same attention structure.

This helps explain why a simple bibliography at the end of a video would not fully solve the problem. Bibliographic completeness tells the viewer where materials came from; epistemic calibration tells the viewer how they should be held. A list containing al-Bukhārī, Aḥmad, and al-Tirmidhī may be technically accurate and still leave the impression that every displayed sentence has the same degree of hadith support. Conversely, a brief on-screen qualifier can sometimes do more epistemic work than a long description box. The design problem is therefore not maximum information but minimum sufficient differentiation.

This observation supports, but also revises, concerns about the loss of religious authority online. The central issue is not simply that ulama lose authority to influencers. A trained scholar can also produce compressed content, and a non-celebrity account can cite accurately. The deeper issue is the transformation of authority from layered reasoning into source tokens. Bukhārī, Aḥmad, and Tirmidhi become clickable-like signs of trust. EFMM responds by asking digital preaching to restore one layer of context without abandoning brevity: source plus confidence plus function.

The social significance of this framing can be discussed without claiming to know how any particular viewer responded. Studies of Indonesian digital Islam show that authority is increasingly performed through availability, visual competence, circulation, and the capacity to translate specialized knowledge into accessible formats (Fauzi 2023, 304–29; Ichwan et al. 2024, 320–45; Asriadi et al. 2025, 405–19). In that environment, an on-screen source label is not a neutral footnote. It participates in a credibility performance. The collector's name, the Arabic script, the reciter's voice, and the reward formula jointly construct a scene

in which heterogeneous sources can feel equally immediate even when their transmission histories differ.

This point also connects the case to studies of modern Muslim piety. Online piety involves negotiation between aspiration, anxiety, convenience, and public display (Husein and Slama 2018, 80–93). Qur'an-centered digital movements show that media can organize repeated devotional practice rather than merely communicate information (Nisa 2018, 24–43; Muslim 2017, 33–51). The video's movement from *tawhīd* to merit, repetition, and prayer is therefore sociologically meaningful as a designed devotional pathway. Yet the present data reveal only the pathway offered by the artifact. They do not reveal whether viewers accept the ten-recitation promise, repeat the *sūrah* because of it, challenge the *isnād* in comments, or integrate the practice into daily worship.

A digital-ethnographic extension would be an important next step, but it requires a dataset that cannot be retroactively invented. A genuine ethnography of this phenomenon would require traceable platform metadata, comment-section sampling, observation of interaction over time, interviews or other evidence of practice, and ethical procedures for studying users. None of those materials are contained in the submitted video file. The revised article therefore narrows its empirical claim while expanding its theoretical preparation for such work. It analyzes how authority and practice are invited by the artifact, not how an audience actually negotiates them.

Within this narrower claim, source-label equalization remains observable. The clip places al-Bukhārī, Aḥmad, and al-Tirmidhī in parallel positions even though the three reports have different evidentiary profiles. The media form does not falsify the collection names. It compresses the interpretive labor that ordinarily surrounds them. That is why the relevant contrast is not digital versus classical or viral versus authentic. The key issue is whether the transition from one source type to another is marked with enough information to prevent the stronger claim from lending unearned certainty to the weaker tone.

Epistemic Faḍā'il Mediation Model (EFMM)

The comparison among the five claim clusters suggests that neither *ḥadīth* grading nor reception theory alone can explain the artifact. Grading can identify transmission strength but does not show how a report is transformed by typography, sequencing, paraphrase, or reward headlines. Reception theory can illuminate performative use but, without audience data, should not be used to infer actual response. EFMM therefore treats the digital claim as the unit of analysis and asks four questions in sequence: where does the claim come from, how strongly is it supported, what is it doing communicatively, and how is it mediated?

The first axis is provenance. P1 denotes explicit Qur'anic wording. P2 denotes a prophetic report with strong or comparatively strong authentication. P3 denotes a

transmitted *faḍā'il* report whose chain or wording is debated. P4 denotes exegetical or thematic synthesis, such as linking Q.S. Al-A'rāf [7]: 156 to Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]. P5 denotes preacher framing, including labels such as secret, motivational summaries, or practical extrapolations. Provenance is not a hierarchy of spiritual worth. It identifies the textual location from which a claim derives.

The second axis is authentication. Direct Qur'anic wording is marked as scriptural text; a strong *ḥadīth* is marked as strongly supported; a report with disputed routes is marked as contested or corroboratively strengthened; and an interpretive link is marked as derivative rather than transmitted. The third axis is communicative function: doctrinal, exegetical, devotional, supplicatory, or motivational. The fourth axis is mediation: exact quotation, paraphrase, source label, confidence label, reward headline, and visual sequence. The axes prevent one property from substituting for another. A moving devotional function does not authenticate a chain, and an authentic chain does not authorize every possible paraphrase of its meaning.

The model is proposed from one bounded case as an analytic heuristic, not as a population-level law. A short video is sufficient for model generation here because it contains maximum internal contrast within a stable sequence: direct revelation, a strong *ḥadīth*, a debated *faḍā'il* report, a second Qur'anic verse used thematically, and a supported supplication. The model formalizes distinctions already required to describe those data coherently. Its broader validity remains an empirical question. Replication across a larger corpus can test whether the same axes are sufficient, require modification, or fail under other genres of digital Qur'anic preaching.

Table 3. Epistemic Faḍā'il Mediation Model (EFMM).

EFMM Axis	Question	Categories	Required Output
Provenance	Where does the claim originate?	P1 Qur'an; P2 strong <i>ḥadīth</i> ; P3 debated <i>faḍā'il</i> report; P4 tafsīr/thematic synthesis; P5 preacher framing.	Provenance Label
Authentication	How strongly is it supported?	Direct scriptural; strong; contested/corroborated; derivative.	Confidence Statement
Function	What is the claim doing?	Doctrinal; exegetical; devotional; supplicatory; motivational.	Function Tag
Mediation	How is it presented?	Exact quotation; paraphrase; source label; confidence label; reward headline; sequence.	Fidelity/Framing Note

Applied to the video, the model produces a differentiated assessment. Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] itself is P1 and direct scriptural text. The one-third report is P2 with strong support, while its exact meaning remains interpretive. The ten-recitation promise is P3 because the report exists, but its chain has been debated, and the on-screen wording does not exactly match the Aḥmad wording retrieved in the audit. The Tirmidhi supplication is P2 in practical terms, with al-Tirmidhī's own *ḥasan gharīb* assessment and positive later grading. The use of Q.S. Al-A'rāf [7]: 156 is P1 as a verse but P4 in its relation to Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ, because the thematic bridge is constructed by the preacher. The title of the three secrets is P5.

The model changes academic language. Instead of writing, Islam promises a house in Paradise for anyone who reads Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ ten times, a source-sensitive sentence would say, A report transmitted in *Musnad Aḥmad* promises a palace in Paradise for completing Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ ten times; its chain has been evaluated differently by later hadith scholars. Instead of saying, Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] is one-third of the Qur'an, so three recitations equal the whole Qur'an, the writer can say, Sound hadith describes the *sūrah* as equivalent to one-third of the Qur'an, while scholars have differed over the domain of that equivalence. Small changes in verbs preserve large differences in authority.

This linguistic discipline is especially important in algorithmic environments. Short clips are copied, transcribed, clipped again, and detached from the original speaker. Once the phrase Aḥmad is removed, a debated report can circulate as anonymous religious fact. Once the source is retained but the grading dispute is forgotten, the collector's name can become a permanent authenticity proxy. Research on contemporary digital authority suggests that such transformations are not marginal. They are part of a wider reconfiguration of who can circulate, explain, and stabilize religious knowledge (Ichwan et al. 2024, 320–45; Fauzi, 2023, 304–29).

EFMM also offers a way to avoid elitist gatekeeping. Digital Qur'anic preaching does not need to reproduce a hadith monograph in every caption. A three-second qualifier can be meaningful: reported by Aḥmad, disputed in grading, or sound report in al-Bukhārī, or thematic reflection, not the wording of the *sūrah*. Such labels do not weaken *da'wah*. They teach audiences how Islamic knowledge is structured. In that sense, epistemic transparency is itself a form of religious education.

The model further helps distinguish responsible adaptation from distortion. A preacher may paraphrase if the paraphrase preserves the claim's scope. A visual metaphor may be used if it is not presented as revelation. A *faḍā'il* report may motivate practice if its transmission status is not exaggerated. A thematic verse may illuminate another passage if the interpretive connection is stated as a connection. Digital creativity becomes problematic not because it is creative, but when creativity becomes invisible as interpretation.

The model also clarifies the classical idea that *faḍā'il* discourse can tolerate a different evidentiary threshold from doctrine and law without becoming epistemically unregulated. A devotional report may be used with greater cautionary latitude when it encourages an already established good act and does not create a new obligation, creed, or prohibition. Yet the digital environment can erase the conditions attached to that latitude. A phrase such as this is a reported merit can become the Prophet guaranteed' after repeated reposting. EFMM therefore treats leniency not as permission to omit source status, but as a reason to state function more carefully. The more a report is used to promise a precise supernatural outcome, the more valuable a confidence label becomes.

The ten-recitation case illustrates this distinction. Repeating Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] is unquestionably a permissible devotional act, and the report's moral direction does not conflict with the *sūrah*. What remains debated is the precision of the prophetic attribution and the exact reward formulation. A preacher can preserve the motivational value without converting scholarly disagreement into certainty. The sentence Among the reported virtues is a promise of a palace in Paradise for ten recitations; scholars have differed over the strength of its chain' is still devotional language. It is simply devotional language that teaches the audience to distinguish practice from proof.

This approach also makes room for epistemic asymmetry inside one digital artifact. The video need not carry one global label such as authentic or unreliable. Its first merit claim can be strong, its second contested, its prayer report strong, and its thematic synthesis interpretive. A claim-level method prevents the common mistake of judging a whole sermon by its weakest report or, conversely, allowing its strongest report to authenticate everything around it. This is a methodological advantage over video-level evaluation and a central reason the individual claim is the analytical unit of this study.

In practical terms, EFMM can be converted into a production checklist. Before publication, an editor can ask five questions for every religious statement: Is this the wording of the Qur'an? If it is a hadith, which collection and identifier? Is its grading materially disputed? Is the speaker offering *tafsīr* or paraphrase rather than quotation? Does the headline state more certainty than the underlying source? Such a checklist can be used by mosques, *pesantren*, university *da'wah* units, and independent creators. It is intentionally simple because an ethics of digital attribution will fail if it requires every creator to reproduce the full apparatus of a hadith critical edition.

This approach has implications for Tanzil's growing body of digital Qur'anic studies. Nabila's informative/performative distinction can be enriched by an epistemic question: what sources support the function being performed? Putri, Amni, and Poipesi's analysis of digital representation can be extended from semantic shift to evidentiary shift. Lufaei and Fahriana's warning about

distortion can be refined by distinguishing distortion of meaning from leveling of source authority. Barir’s mapping of epistemological stages can be transferred from contextual hermeneutics to mediated devotional discourse. These are not corrections of the earlier studies; they show how a claim-level audit can connect interpretive epistemology with digital reception.

EFMM also clarifies the boundary between artifact analysis and audience research. The present study has no comment data, viewer interviews, or platform analytics, so it does not claim to know how actual viewers interpret or practice the three secrets. The model instead records how the artifact positions its claim for reception. A second-stage study can combine EFMM coding with digital ethnography, comment analysis, interviews, and platform traces to compare designed mediation with observed reception.

Table 4. Epistemically Calibrated Language for Digital Qur’anic Preaching.

Avoid	Prefer	Reason
The Qur’an promises a house for ten recitations.	A report in <i>Musnad Ahmad</i> promises a palace for ten recitations; its transmission has been debated and strengthened by some later scholars.	Separates revelation from transmitted <i>ḥadīth</i> .
Three readings equal the whole Qur’an.	A strongly transmitted <i>ḥadīth</i> states that Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] equals one-third of the Qur’an; scholars differ on the domain of equivalence.	Prevents semantic overextension.
This prayer is Q.S. Al-Ikhlās.	A <i>ḥadīth</i> in al-Tirmidhī records a supplication that reuses the <i>sūrah</i> ’s divine names and predicates.	Distinguishes Qur’anic wording from <i>ḥadīth</i> wording.
Aḥmad as the only source marker.	<i>Hadīth</i> number 15610 in <i>Musnad Ahmad</i> ; principal route weak, with later corroborative strengthening noted.	Adds confidence information to provenance.

For Qur’anic studies, EFMM makes a specific contribution. It keeps the semantic architecture of the *sūrah* primary while showing how later devotional materials accumulate around it. This avoids treating digital media as the research object in isolation. The model asks first what Q.S. Al-Ikhlās [112] says, then what later reports claim, then how the artifact makes those levels interact. In this respect, the model complements studies of digital *tafsīr* that emphasize changing media forms (Sihabussalam et al. 2024, 87–114; Faldiansyah 2024, 505–24; Rifai 2020, 152–70).

For *ḥadīth* studies, the implication is reciprocal. A chain evaluation should travel with the report when the report is converted into a short digital claim. The ten-recitation case is especially instructive because the devotional act of reciting Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112] is not itself problematic, yet the attached quantified reward carries a different evidentiary burden. A calibrated presentation can preserve encouragement while identifying the report as debated. This is more accurate than either suppressing all contested *faḍā'il* or presenting every source label as an equal guarantee.

For preachers and editors, the model can be translated into a compact production routine. Qur'anic text should be visually distinguished from explanation; *ḥadīth* should include collection and a stable locator such as a number, plus a brief confidence cue when grading is contested; paraphrase should preserve the scope of the source; and thematic links should be marked as interpretation. These practices do not require turning a short video into a technical monograph. A short phrase such as reported in *Musnad Aḥmad*; grading debated can materially improve epistemic transparency.

The study has four limitations. First, it examines one bounded video and cannot estimate the prevalence of source-label equalization across platforms. Second, the supplied file lacks verifiable creator, channel, upload-date, and platform metadata, so no claim is made about a specific producer or algorithmic environment. Third, the study analyzes designed mediation, not empirical audience reception. Fourth, the *ḥadīth* audit is directed to the claims used in this artifact rather than a complete *takhrīj* of every historical route. These limits define the next research phase: a larger corpus of *faḍā'il* videos, traceable platform metadata, systematic comment sampling, interviews or digital ethnography, and comparative transmission mapping. Such research can test whether EFMM predicts where viewers notice, ignore, accept, contest, or ritualize epistemically different claims.

Conclusion

This study finds that the central epistemic issue in the analyzed preaching video is not the presence of *faḍā'il* as such, but the way heterogeneous sources are synchronized around Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ. A close reading of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ [112]: 1–4 shows a coherent theological sequence: divine uniqueness is proclaimed through *aḥad*, self-sufficiency through *al-Ṣamad*, genealogy is denied in both directions, and any comparable counterpart is finally excluded. The latter promise of reward is therefore not part of the *sūrah*'s lexical-semantic content, even when it is supported by prophetic or devotional transmission. The source audit confirms a differentiated picture. The one-third report has strong canonical support; the ten-recitation promise rests on a debated principal route, wording variation, and later corroborative strengthening; the *al-Aḥad/al-Ṣamad* supplication is comparatively well supported; and Q.S. Al-A'rāf [7]: 156 is direct Qur'anic wording used through a cross-textual thematic link.

The article's main contribution is the Epistemic Faḍā'il Mediation Model (EFMM), which integrates provenance, authentication, communicative function, and media framing at the level of the individual claim. The model explains why a correct source label is not yet a complete epistemic description and why an authentic report can still be overextended by paraphrase or framing. It also keeps the study within Qur'anic Studies by making the theology of Q.S. Al-Ikhlāṣ the interpretive baseline, while media analysis explains the transition from that baseline to devotional practice. EFMM is offered as a heuristic generated from an information-rich case, not as a universal theory established by one video.

The absence of creator metadata and audience data is therefore treated as a methodological boundary rather than filled by speculation. Future studies should test EFMM across larger, traceable corpora and combine artifact coding with comment analysis, platform analytics, interviews, and digital ethnography. Such work can determine whether the designed hierarchy of claims is recognized by audiences and how *tawḥīd*-based preaching becomes embedded in everyday devotional practice. For current digital Qur'anic preaching, the practical implication is immediate: accessibility and motivation can be retained while provenance, confidence, and interpretive transitions are made visible.

REFERENCES

- Abay, Asykhari Gustama. 2025. "The Qur'an on Social Media: Questioning Authenticity and Negotiating the Authority of Interpretation." *Al-Afkar* 8 (3): 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.31943/afkarjournal.v8i3.2273>.
- Albānī, Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-. 1995. *Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣaḥīḥa wa-Shay' min Fiqhībā wa-Fawā'idihā*. Maktabat al-Ma'ārif.
- Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-. 2002. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Dār Ibn Kathīr.
- Ali, Rijal, and Subi Nur Isnaini. 2024. "Digitising Interpretation: Transforming Tafsir Al-Mishbah in the Context of the Living Quran." *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Hadis* 25 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.v25i1.5186>.
- Armita, Pipin. 2025. "Digital Da'wah and Quranic Interpretation: Opportunities, Distortions, and Ethics in the Age of Social Media." *International Journal of Islamic Thought and Humanities* 4 (1): 154–64. <https://doi.org/10.54298/ijith.v4i1.421>.
- Asriadi, Muh., Edi Komarudin, and Jajang A. Rohmana. 2025. "From Sanad to Algorithm: Religious Authority and Digital Islamic Knowledge." *Al Furqan* 8 (2): 405–19. <https://doi.org/10.58518/alfurqan.v8i2.4452>.
- ʿAsqalānī, Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-. 1986. *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAwwāma. Dār al-Rashīd.
- A'yun, Qurrata. 2020. "Resepsi Al-Qur'an di Media Sosial: Studi Kasus Film Animasi Nussa Episode 'Hiii Serem!!!'" *Living Islam: Journal of Islamic Discourses* 3 (2): 319–37. <https://doi.org/10.14421/lijid.v3i2.2296>.
- Barir, M. 2026. "Abdullah Saeed's Contextual Approach to Qur'anic Interpretation: Epistemology and the Reconstruction of Conceptual Mapping." Preprint. <https://doi.org/10.20871/tjsq.v8i2.561>.
- Faldiansyah, Iqrom. 2024. "Strategi Tafsir Ayat Dalam Dakwah di Era Digital: Mengoptimalkan Media Sosial sebagai Makna Dakwah." *Jurnal Bimas Islam* 17 (2): 505–24. <https://doi.org/10.37302/jbi.v17i2.1323>.
- Fauzi, Niki Alma Febriana. 2023. "Zulkarnain EL Madury and the Micro-Celebrity Ustaz Phenomenon: Tracing Muhammadiyah's Struggle in Maintaining Religious Authority in Cyberspace." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 51 (151): 304–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2023.2274708>.
- Ghourī, Syed Abdul Majid Al-. 2025. "Motivations and Methods of Detection of Fabricated Aḥādīth on the Virtues of Qur'anic Surahs." *Journal of Islamic and Religious Studies* 10 (1): 97–124. <https://doi.org/10.36476/>

jirs.10:1.06.2025.08.

- Ghozali, Mahbub, Achmad Yafik Mursyid, and Nita Fitriana. 2022. "Al-Qur'an (Re)Presentation in the Short Video App Tik Tok: Reading, Teaching, and Interpretive." *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 30 (3): 1263–82. <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.30.3.18>.
- Halim, Wahyuddin. 2018. "Young Islamic Preachers on Facebook: Pesantren As'adiyah and Its Engagement with Social Media." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 46 (134): 44–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2018.1416796>.
- Ḥanbal, Aḥmad Ibn. 2001. *Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal*. Edited by Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūṭ et al. Mu'assasat al-Risālah.
- Hew, Wai Weng. 2018. "The Art of Dakwah: Social Media, Visual Persuasion and the Islamist Propagation of Felix Siau." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 46 (134): 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2018.1416757>.
- Hijaz, Muammar, Abdul Ghany, Ahmad Mujahid, Yuzhril, and Arya Dekhan. 2026. "A Stylistic Analysis of Surah Al-Ikhlās (A Study of Ma'āni al-Qur'an)." *Kasyful Murad: Jurnal Studi Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir* 3 (2): 208–22. <https://doi.org/10.24252/kmjst.v3i2.67575>.
- Husein, Fatimah, and Martin Slama. 2018. "Online Piety and Its Discontent: Revisiting Islamic Anxieties on Indonesian Social Media." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 46 (134): 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2018.1415056>.
- Ichwan, Moh. Nor, Mustaqim Pabbajah, and Faizal Amin. 2024. "Digitization of Religious Tafsir: The Fading of Indonesian Ulama Authority in Post-Truth Era." *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Hadis* 25 (2): 320–45. <https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.v25i2.5545>.
- Kathīr, Isma'īl ibn 'Umar Ibn. 1999. *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Aẓīm*. Edited by Sami ibn Muhammad Salamah. Dār Ṭaybah.
- Khousrof, M. M. Ali, and N. Abdo Khaled. 2022. "Knowledge of the Virtues of Noble Qur'an and Aspects of Care for It." *Al-Hikmah* 5 (5): 81–115. <https://doi.org/10.46722/hikmah.v5i5.303>.
- Lufaei, and Lukita Fahriana. 2025. "Between Contextualization and Distortion: Interpretation of Qur'anic Verses on Nationalism in Detik.Com and NU Online." *Tanzil: Jurnal Studi Al-Quran* 7 (2): 251–70. <https://doi.org/10.20871/tjsq.v7i2.412>.
- Mubarok, and Romdhoni. 2021. "Digitalisasi Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir Sosial Media di Indonesia." *Jurnal Iman dan Spiritualitas* 1 (1): 110–14. <https://doi.org/10.20871/tjsq.v7i2.412>.

org/10.15575/jis.v1i1.11552.

- Mundzir, Muhammad, Doli Witro, Moh. Nailul Muna, Asa'ari, and Muhamad Yusuf. 2023. "Mediatization of Hadith and the Spirit of Da'wah Moderation in Infographic Content of Online Media." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 22 (64): 55–79.
- Muslim, Acep. 2017. "Digital Religion and Religious Life in Southeast Asia: The One Day One Juz (ODOJ) Community in Indonesia." *Asiascape: Digital Asia* 4 (1–2): 33–51. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22142312-12340067>.
- Nabila, Ida Fitri. 2024. "Reception of the Qur'an in the Digital Age: Social Media Online Ruqyah on Muhammad Faizar's YouTube Videos." *Tanzil: Jurnal Studi Al-Quran* 7 (1): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.20871/tjsq.v7i1.341>.
- Nisa, Eva F. 2018. "Social Media and the Birth of an Islamic Social Movement: ODOJ (One Day One Juz) in Contemporary Indonesia." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 46 (134): 24–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2017.1416758>.
- Nurmansyah, Ihsan, Luqman Abdul Jabbar, and Sulaiman. 2022. "Resepsi Estetis dan Fungsional atas Adegan Ruqyah dalam Film Roh Fasik." *Living Islam: The Journal of Islamic Discourses* 5 (2): 277–300. <https://doi.org/10.14421/lijid.v5i2.4021>.
- Nurmansyah, Ihsan, and Sherli Kurnia Oktaviana. 2022. "Islam and Social Media in Indonesia: A Study of the Living Qur'an and Hadith in the Film 'Ruqyah: The Exorcism.'" *Al Qalam* 39 (2): 104–13. <https://doi.org/10.32678/alqalam.v39i2.6995>.
- Pratiwi, Hanief Ayunafa, and Subi Nur Isnaini. 2023. "Fenomena Konten Video Quotes Islami di Media Sosial dalam Akun Instagram @Kulometer_ (Kajian Living Qur'an)." *At-Tahfidz: Jurnal Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir* 4 (2): 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.53649/at-tahfidz.v4i2.282>.
- Putri, Desy Amelia, Alin Zata Amni, and Sahrul A. Poipesi. 2025. "Representation of Q.S. Al-Baqarah [2]:195 on Instagram Account @almuhajirinwalanshar: A Perspective of Jean Baudrillard's Consumerism Theory." *Tanzil: Jurnal Studi Al-Quran* 8 (1): 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.20871/tjsq.v8i1.474>.
- Qomariyah, Siti Lailatul. 2020. "Keutamaan Surat Al-Ikhlās: Studi atas Hadis dalam Sunan Abu Dawud Nomor 1461." *Journal of Islamic Studies and Humanities* 5 (2): 130–45. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jish.v5i2.6292>.
- Qudsy, Saifuddin Zuhri, and Althaf Husein Muzakky. 2021. "Dinamika Ngaji Online dalam Tagar Gus Baha: Studi Living Qur'an di Media Sosial." *Poros Onim: Jurnal Sosial Keagamaan* 2 (1): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.53491/>

porosonim.v2i1.48.

- Rafiq, Ahmad. 2021. "The Living Qur'an: Its Text and Practice in the Function of the Scripture." *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Hadis* 22 (2): 469–84. <https://doi.org/10.14421/qh.2021.2202-10>.
- Rifai, Achmad. 2020. "Tafsirweb: Digitalization of Qur'anic Interpretation and Democratization of Religious Sources in Indonesia." *Jurnal At-Tibyan* 5 (2): 152–70. <https://doi.org/10.32505/at-tibyan.v5i2.1640>.
- Rosyid, Muhammad, and Bhirawa Anoraga. 2023. "More Than a Tafsir: Convergence, Contestation, and Deradicalization of Quranic Interpretations on Website." *SUHUF* 16 (2): 419–39. <https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v16i2.868>.
- Sihabussalam, Sa'adatul Lailah, and Roma Wijaya. 2024. "Digital Era Qur'anic Interpretation in Indonesia: Influence and Development on Contemporary Tafsir." *SUHUF* 17 (1): 87–114. <https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v17i1.998>.
- Tirmidhī, Muḥammad Ibn 'Isa al-. 1998. *Jami' al-Tirmidhī*. Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabi.
- Yuningsih, Hartati, and Abdul Ghany. 2024. "Transformasi Tafsir Al-Qur'an di Era Media Digital: Analisis Metodologi Tafsir dalam Channel Youtube Kajian Tafsir Al-Ma'rifah." *Al-Qudwah* 2 (2): 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.24014/alqudwah.v2i2.29123>.