



FROM VADA TO EVIDENCE: REINTERPRETING AYURVEDIC REASONING FOR CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH

Dr. Vikas Bhardwaj^{*1}, Dr. Pankaj Sharma², Dr. Sahana C.³

¹Professor & HOD, Department of Ayurveda Samhita Evum Siddhanta, Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College and Hospital, Chandigarh, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Kaya Chikitsa, Government Ayurvedic College and Hospital, Patiala, Punjab, India.

³Professor, Department of Ayurveda Samhita Siddhanta, Sushruta Ayurvedic College and Hospital, Bengaluru, India.



***Corresponding Author: Dr. Vikas Bhardwaj**

Professor & HOD, Department of Ayurveda Samhita Evum Siddhanta, Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College and Hospital, Chandigarh, India. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23117095>



How to cite this Article: Dr. Vikas Bhardwaj^{*1}, Dr. Pankaj Sharma², Dr. Sahana C.³ (2026). From Vada To Evidence: Reinterpreting Ayurvedic Reasoning For Contemporary Research. European Journal of Biomedical and Pharmaceutical Sciences, 13(10), 332-336.

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

Article Received on 01/09/2026

Article Revised on 22/09/2026

Article Published on 01/10/2026

ABSTRACT

Background: Ayurveda possesses a well-developed intellectual tradition of systematic inquiry, reasoning, debate, and establishment of knowledge. Among these, Vada provides a structured framework for examining propositions through doubt, purpose, reasoning, evidence, questioning, counter-argument, and conclusion. Contemporary research methodology similarly emphasizes systematic formulation of research questions, hypothesis development, evidence generation, critical appraisal, analysis, and reasoned interpretation. However, the classical Vada framework and modern research methodology arise from distinct epistemological traditions and should not be regarded as identical. **Objective:** The present conceptual study aims to examine the utility of Vada as a classical framework of logical inquiry in relation to contemporary research methodology, with particular emphasis on its potential contribution to scientific reasoning, critical examination, and systematic knowledge generation. **Methodology:** A qualitative, textual, and conceptual analysis was undertaken using relevant classical Ayurvedic literature and authoritative commentaries describing Vada and its constituent concepts. The identified concepts were first analyzed within their original textual and philosophical context. Subsequently, their functions were compared with corresponding stages of contemporary research methodology, including identification of research problems, formulation of objectives and propositions, evidence generation, critical questioning, analysis, interpretation, and conclusion. The comparison was based on functional similarity while maintaining distinctions between the classical and contemporary epistemological frameworks.

KEYWORDS: Vada, Ayurveda, Research Methodology, Ayurvedic Epistemology, Logical Reasoning, Pramana.

INTRODUCTION

In Ayurveda, Vada refers to a systematic method of intellectual discussion, debate, and examination of knowledge.^[1] Classical Ayurvedic literature provides a well-defined framework for conducting a rational discourse, including the subject of discussion, means of expression, methods of establishing a proposition, valid means of knowledge, and factors responsible for success or defeat. These principles demonstrate the importance given to logical reasoning, critical analysis, and systematic communication in the development and validation of knowledge. Contemporary research

discourse exhibits several methodological features that are functionally comparable to the structured patterns of inquiry and critical reasoning described in the classical Samhitas.

The principal components associated with Vaada may be organized as follows.

1. Medium of Expression- शब्द^[2] (Shabda)

Shabda refers to sound, words, or verbal testimony used for the communication and expression of ideas. It serves as the fundamental medium through which propositions,

arguments, explanations, and conclusions are conveyed during intellectual discourse.

Relation to Contemporary Research

In contemporary research, effective communication of scientific knowledge through written and oral scientific discourse is fundamental to the formulation of research questions, presentation of methodology, reporting of findings, and dissemination of conclusions. Thus, Shabda may be considered conceptually comparable to the role of structured scientific communication and scholarly documentation in research.

2. Reasons for Vada (Debate/Discussion)- संशय^[3], प्रयोजन^[4], जिज्ञासा^[5] (Samshaya, Prayojana, Jignasa)

The principal factors initiating intellectual discussion include.

- **Samshaya** – Doubt or uncertainty regarding a subject.
- **Prayojana** – Purpose, objective, or intended outcome.
- **Jignasa** – Desire to acquire knowledge or investigate a subject.

These factors provide the intellectual motivation for investigation and discussion.

Relation to Contemporary Research

These concepts have functional parallels with the identification of a research problem, definition of research objectives, and formulation of research questions. A knowledge gap or uncertainty may stimulate investigation, while the intended purpose determines the direction and scope of the research. Jignasa represents the broader intellectual motivation underlying systematic inquiry.

3. Topics for Vada- द्रव्य, गुण, कर्म, सामान्य, विशेष (Dravya, Guna, Karma, Samanya, Vishesha)^[6]

The principal subjects considered in Vada include.

- **Dravya** – Substance or entity.
- **Guna** – Quality or attribute.
- **Karma** – Action or activity.
- **Samanya** – Generality or similarity.
- **Vishesha** – Specificity or differentiation.

These categories provide a conceptual basis for examining the nature, properties, actions, similarities, and distinguishing characteristics of the subject under investigation. They are also together known as Kaarana (cause), may it be health-diseases or research.^[7]

Relation to Contemporary Research

In contemporary research, a research subject is examined through its identity, characteristics, functions, common attributes, and distinguishing features. This may be functionally related to defining study variables, characteristics, outcomes, similarities, and differences among study objects or groups. However, the Ayurvedic

categories should be interpreted within their classical philosophical framework rather than treated as direct equivalents of modern research variables.

4. Methods of Presentation- प्रतिज्ञा^[8], स्थापना^[9], प्रतिष्ठापना^[10], हेतु^[11], दृष्टान्त^[12], उपनय^[13], निगमन^[14], उत्तर^[15]

(Pratigna, Sthapana, Pratisthapana, Hetu, Drustanta, Upanaya, Nigamana, Uttara)

These represent sequential components involved in presenting and examining an argument.

1. **Pratigna** – Proposition or statement to be established.
2. **Sthapana** – Establishment or presentation of the proposed statement.
3. **Pratisthapana** – Counter-statement or opposing proposition.
4. **Hetu** – Reason or supporting evidence.
5. **Drustanta** – Example or illustration.
6. **Upanaya** – Application of the example to the proposition.
7. **Nigamana** – Conclusion or final inference.
8. **Uttara** – Reply, response, or rebuttal.

Together, these components provide a structured framework for presenting, examining, and defending an argument.

Relation to Contemporary Research

This structure demonstrates functional parallels with the logical progression of scientific inquiry, in which a research proposition or hypothesis is formulated, supported through evidence and reasoning, examined against alternative explanations, and followed by interpretation and conclusion. Elements such as Hetu and Drustanta may correspond functionally to justification and supporting evidence, while Nigamana parallels the formulation of a conclusion based on the available evidence.

5. Tools Used for Proving a Statement- सिद्धान्त^[16], प्रत्यक्ष^[17], अनुमान^[18], ऐतिह्य^[19], औपम्य^[20]

(Siddhanta, Pratyaksha, Anumana, Atiheyta, Aupamy)

The following are employed as means for establishing and supporting a statement:

- **Siddhanta** – Established doctrine or accepted conclusion.
- **Pratyaksha** – Direct perception.
- **Anumana** – Inference based on reasoning.
- **Atiheyta** – Traditional or authoritative testimony.
- **Aupamy** – Analogy or comparison.

These represent different epistemological bases for establishing and supporting an argument.

Relation to Contemporary Research

Contemporary research similarly employs empirical observation, inference, established theoretical knowledge, documentary evidence, and comparative approaches to substantiate scientific claims. Pratyaksha may therefore show a functional relationship with empirical observation, while Anumana may relate to inferential reasoning. Aupamya has parallels with comparative analysis. These relationships should be regarded as methodological parallels rather than direct epistemological equivalences.

6. Supplementary Means of Knowledge- अर्थप्राप्ति^[21], सम्भव^[22] (Arthaprapti, Sambhava)

- **Arthaprapti**– Presumption, postulation, or explanatory implication.
- **Sambhava** – Possibility or knowledge derived from inclusion or logical possibility.

These supplementary methods may assist in arriving at or supporting a conclusion when direct means are insufficient.

Relation to Contemporary Research

In contemporary research, indirect reasoning may contribute to hypothesis generation, explanatory model development, interpretation of observations, and consideration of plausible relationships. Arthaprapti can therefore be viewed as having a conceptual parallel with explanatory postulation, whereas Sambhava may relate to consideration of logical or theoretically possible explanations. Such parallels remain interpretive and should not be considered direct methodological equivalences.

7. Definite Conclusion- व्यवसाय^[23] (Vyavyasaya)

Vyavyasaya denotes decisive determination, firm ascertainment, or definite conclusion following appropriate examination and reasoning.

Relation to Contemporary Research

In contemporary research, conclusions are reached through systematic analysis and interpretation of evidence. The functional relevance of Vyavyasaya may therefore be observed in the process of arriving at a reasoned determination after evaluating the available evidence. Importantly, scientific conclusions remain dependent on the quality, limitations, and statistical or methodological strength of the evidence.

8. Indefinite or Inconclusive Reasoning- सव्यभिचार^[24] (Savyabhichara)

Savyabhichara refers to erratic or inconclusive reasoning in which the proposed reason does not invariably establish the intended conclusion and may lead to different or contradictory outcomes. It consequently weakens the validity of an argument.

Relation to Contemporary Research

This concept has a functional parallel with inconsistent evidence, inadequate causal reasoning, confounding, weak associations, or inappropriate inference in contemporary research. Recognition of such problems is important for assessing the internal validity and robustness of scientific conclusions.

9. Questions and Responses in Presentation- अनुयोग^[25], प्रत्यानुयोग^[26], छल^[27], परिहार^[28], उपालम्भ^[29] (Anuyoga, Pratyanyuyoga, Chala, Parihara, Upalambha)

These represent different forms of questioning, counter-questioning, and responses during intellectual discourse:

- **Anuyoga** – Inquiry or questioning.
- **Pratyanyuyoga** – Counter-inquiry or reciprocal questioning.
- **Chala** – Quibbling, misinterpretation, or use of a pretext.
- **Parihara** – Avoidance, resolution, or appropriate response.
- **Upalambha** – Pointing out a fault, objection, or censure.

These mechanisms facilitate critical examination of arguments.

Relation to Contemporary Research

Comparable functions occur in peer review, scientific criticism, methodological questioning, replication, response to reviewer comments, and academic discussion. Anuyoga and Pratyanyuyoga particularly illustrate the importance of critical questioning, while Upalambha may be viewed in relation to identification of methodological or logical shortcomings. Chala highlights the potential for ambiguity or misinterpretation, which contemporary research attempts to minimize through precise definitions and transparent reporting.

10. Reasons for Failure or Defeat- अनुयोज्य^[30], वाक्यदोष^[31], अहेतु^[32], अतीतकाल^[33], प्रतिज्ञाहानि^[34], हेत्वन्तर^[35], अर्थान्तर^[36] (Anuojya, Vakyadosha, Ahetu, Atitkaala, Pratigayahani, Hetvantara, Arthantara)

Certain errors or deficiencies may result in failure during debate.

- **Anuojya** – A statement or response that cannot appropriately be subjected to questioning.
- **Vakyadosha** – Fault or defect in verbal expression.
- **Ahetu** – Absence of a valid reason or fallacious reason.
- **Atitkaala** – Presentation of an argument after the appropriate time.
- **Pratigayahani** – Abandonment or loss of the original proposition.
- **Hetvantara** – Substitution or alteration of the original reason.
- **Arthantara** – Shifting to an irrelevant or different subject.

Such errors compromise the logical continuity and validity of discourse.

Relation to Contemporary Research

These concepts can be related functionally to methodological problems such as inadequate justification, unclear scientific language, invalid reasoning, inappropriate timing or procedural deviations, alteration of hypotheses or endpoints, changing the rationale during analysis, and deviation from the original research question. They highlight the importance of methodological consistency, transparency, and adherence to a predefined research protocol.

11. Factors Associated with Successful Discourse-

अनुयोज्य^[37], वाक्यप्रशंसा^[38], अभ्यनुज्ञा^[39]

(Anuyojya, Vakyaprasansa, Abhyanujna)

- **Anuyojya** – Appropriate questioning or a statement that can properly be examined.
- **Vakyaprasansa** – Appreciation or approval of an appropriately expressed statement.
- **Abhyanujna** – Acceptance or acknowledgment of a valid point.

These facilitate constructive dialogue and maintain clarity and logical progression.

Relation to Contemporary Research

In contemporary research, constructive scholarly discourse depends upon clear research questions, logically structured scientific communication, acknowledgement of valid evidence, and reasoned engagement with alternative interpretations. These features contribute to transparent academic discussion and facilitate the progressive refinement of scientific knowledge.

12. Failure or Defeat in Debate- निग्रहस्थान^[40] (Nigrahasthana)

Nigrahasthana refers to the grounds or points of defeat in debate. It encompasses errors, inconsistencies, omissions, or inappropriate responses through which a participant fails to adequately establish or defend the proposition under discussion.

Relation to Contemporary Research

In contemporary research, comparable functions are observed in the critical identification of methodological, logical, evidentiary, or interpretative deficiencies. During peer review and scientific scrutiny, such deficiencies may lead to requests for clarification, methodological revision, rejection of an unsupported inference, or the need for further investigation. Thus, Nigrahasthana may be understood as a classical framework for identifying weaknesses that compromise the defensibility of an argument.

Overall Conceptual Relationship

Taken collectively, these elements demonstrate that Vada provides a structured classical framework encompassing problem identification, inquiry, proposition, reasoning,

evidence, counter-argument, critical examination, error detection, and conclusion. Contemporary research methodology incorporates several processes serving comparable functions. However, these should be described as functional or conceptual parallels rather than direct equivalences, since their epistemological foundations, terminology, and methodological contexts differ.

RESULTS

The analysis indicates several functional parallels between Vada and contemporary research methodology. Samshaya provides a conceptual basis for recognizing uncertainty or a knowledge gap, while Prayojana and Jignasa relate broadly to the purpose and motivation of inquiry. Pratigna represents a proposition requiring establishment, whereas Hetu, Drustanta, Upanaya, and Nigamana demonstrate structured reasoning from justification and illustration to application and conclusion. Pratyaksha and Anumana provide classical approaches to observation and inference, while Anuyoga and Pratyanyoga encourage questioning and critical examination. Concepts such as Savyabhichara and Nigrahasthana draw attention to defective reasoning and weaknesses in argumentation. These features have potential utility in promoting clarity of research questions, logical coherence, critical appraisal, transparent argumentation, and reasoned interpretation.

CONCLUSION

Vada may be viewed as a valuable conceptual and epistemological resource for understanding systematic Inquiry and critical reasoning in Ayurveda. Its principles can complement contemporary research methodology by encouraging structured argumentation, examination of evidence, recognition of logical fallacies, and critical dialogue. Nevertheless, classical Vada concepts should be interpreted within their original context and treated as functional parallels rather than direct equivalents of modern scientific methods. Further methodological research may explore how selected principles of Vada can be appropriately incorporated into contemporary Ayurvedic research without compromising either their classical meaning or the requirements of modern scientific rigor. Thus, the framework of Vada illustrates the classical Ayurvedic emphasis on logical reasoning, critical examination, evidence-based discussion, and systematic establishment of knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya YT, Charaka Samhita of Agnivesa, Vimana Sthana. Reprint, ch. 8 Ver. 28. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Prakashan, 2011; 266
2. Acharya YT, Charaka Samhita of Agnivesa, Vimana Sthana. Reprint, ch. 8 Ver. 38. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Prakashan, 2011; 268
3. Acharya YT, Charaka Samhita of Agnivesa, Vimana Sthana. Reprint, ch. 8 Ver. 43. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Prakashan, 2011; 269

- www.ejbps.com