The ancient seers used the term Darśana or vision to refer the study of the universe, the nature and man in their introspection. These seers of ancient India observed every thing comprehensively. Nature, knowledge, universe, man, thought, life, sensuality, death and all other topics connected with these were closely observed. They wanted to find out the truth of the world. What is man? What is the meaning and goal of life? What is the difference between good and bad? What is the relationship between man and man, and man and nature? Is this permanent? Is it created? What is the basic cause? Is there a god? If so what is its nature? Philosophers tried to find out answers to these questions. They sought different strains of thought to reach at an
Most of their conclusions were developed through discussions and debates. From conflicts of thoughts emerged the different visions of life and universe.

During that period Dārśana was not a part of any science or art. It had a free and prominent scheme and design. Indian thought was liberal and it supported and inspired other branches of knowledge. The history of Indian thought presents an enquiry into the mind of man with its antique and present features in the primary stages of these thinking processes.

It tried to correct the mistakes of the belief of humanity with the help of rational and fruitful discussions.

The means and conclusions of ancient Indian thought are different. But they have something common in their goal. Their main purpose is the dignity and welfare of the whole humanity. The means for deliverance from misery and the common
hypothesis of emancipation are presented in these works. It is undoubtedly clear that Indian thought and philosophy have a basic urge for spirituality. But Indian philosophy is not mere spirituality. Along with spirituality, material thoughts were also relevant. From the primitive stage of Indian culture, Indian thinking and philosophy grew up and spread out the conflicts through materialism and spiritualism.

It is remarkable that spiritual as well as material visions emerged only after 7th century BC. Even then materialistic ideas were visible not only in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, but also in the ancient work viz., *Īgveda* also.

Darśanas are as old as the Vedas. In the mantras of *Īgveda* we can observe concepts emerged from monotheism, polytheism, speculation and nihilism.

*Upaniṣads* were formed from man's intense desire to seek truths and the ways to attain them. The different approaches of the *Upaniṣads* emerged from different
views on the essence of life. Some thought that the essence developed out from non-essence. But some others argued that without a subtle, there is no essence. Some were dualists and others were non-dualists. Thus we can see both materialistic and spiritual views in the Upaniṣads. The vākṣyāṇi dealt within the Upaniṣads has been grown up in the sense of a logical science through questions and their answers. Upaniṣads give evidence that there were scholars who engaged in these deliberations and made philosophical arguments through fruitful discussions.

The science of logic emerged from courts and palaces where debates and discussions on different views were held. During the epic period also we can observe the flourishing state of the Indian darśanas. In Rāmāyaṇa there is some reference about the sage Jībāli who was famous as materialist. Like wise it is said that the knowledge from Ēnvekāike may make man deviate from the moral paths. In Mahābhārata, Medhātithi Gautama is stated to be the founder of Nyāyadarsana. Similarly the topics
on logical science are enriched with the theory of Envekaika. The *Mahabharata* states that Nîrada was a person of erudite in Nyaya-Vaiṣeṣika with the unifying and consensus tones.

Prof. Anantalal Takur remarks that the hermitage of the sage Kanva in the *Mahabharata* was full of logicians. They were very learned and well versed in Nyayaśīstra and experts in the formation and combination of varied propositions. They were proficient in defining the doctrines of the establishment of one's own thesis refuting the views of opponents.

Thus Nyāyadarśana of Akñapida Goutama shows clearly the three stages of its development. They are composition of *NS*, the first systematic work as the text of independent discipline. Its commentaries and sub-commentaries, digest or prakaraṇa works on individual categories, and lakṣana works of offering exact definition of terms
used in the ājīstra. Among them lākāna works were the products of the period which
belongs to modern school or Navya Nyāya.

The age between 7th century and 2nd century B.C was an era of intellectual and
philosophical uplift. In this period, certain thoughts were unrelenting to cope with the
religious rituals, beliefs and their influences and such thoughts began to flourish.
Lokāyata, Śāmkhya, Yoga, Vaiṣeṣika Nyāya, Māṃsā, Vedānta, Baudhā, Jaina and
such other philosophical concepts emerged during this period and Lokāyata challenged
the religious rituals in true spirit. Later Cārvākas, and the four sects of Buddhist
school viz. Sautrāntikas, Vaibhāvikas, Mādhyamikas and Yogācāras showed courage to
violate the view of orthodox system and they moulded the theories which justified their
own views. Śāmkhya and Yoga could greatly influence Nyāya later. The theistic theories
presented in the NBh are seemed to be doing justice to the Yoga ājīstra. Āṅkara-ācārya,
the great engaged in debate with many teachers to establish his views of non-dualism.
The systematic study of Nyāya which probes into investigation and it could be termed as the science of science (विद्वान विद्वान). Instead of being mere logicians they sat together, discussed their views, shared their ideas and encouraged to highlight its quality. Thus logic was developed apart from the conservative side of religious rituals to the science of reasoning. As a result of this development, new thoughts emerged. They were different from the existing ritualistic mode of thinking. To bring clarity to the definition of terms related to logic the speculations of Mimamsakas on word and meaning were helpful during this time.

The art of debate and logical arguments flourished in its earlier state in the context of ancient Indian medical practices. The real propagandists of reasonable thought and observation which are indispensable in logic were the Indian physicians. It is assumed that logic and the art of debate had been flourished in the branches of traditional medical schools. Its apparent form can be visible in CS. We can
understand that in the ancient medical practices, there arose the issues of evidences
chances for debates and some times it leads to the thoughts based on hetvabhīsas also
S.N Das Gupta observes in his book, viz. A history of Indian Philosophy, that the basis of logical thoughts established in NS were the seedling forms of logic in CS.

The attempt to decode the structural development of the debate from the Vedas to the Upaniṣads leads the way for the progress of logical debates. Nyāya is the science of logic of ancient India. The word Nyāya means that it is an examination of objects through laws and rules. This vision is also known as Ēnvēkāike. The courts debates helped a lot to shape the form of Nyāyadarśana. Vāda is considered as the discussion among equal ranks. Thus Gautama has arranged these thoughts which emerged from the courts of debate. He arranged the concepts of the logical science. He gives different interpretations in separating truth from illusion with the help of discussions,
arguments and counterpoints. Nyāya thoughts also developed through the art of debate, in which the truth was examined using the right methods of logic.

Nyāya darśana deals with not only the general nature of the known objects, but the means to know about unknown objects also. With this objective, it is said that we must know the true nature of the characteristics of sixteen categories which help to get liberation mentioned by Gautama in NS. There are different steps that lead to the convictions of Nyāya. NS is the comprehensive study of the pramāṇa and prameya. The relation between pramāṇa and prameya is similar in nature with the relation between the composite with its composition.

Gautama regards philosophical knowledge about worldly objects as the means to emancipation. The real knowledge of the sixteen Nyāya categories which described in NS is called as philosophical knowledge.
When doubts arises we seek the help of the means to valid knowledge, thus we
cognize the real object. Debate originates from uncertainty. So we can call this category
'samśaya' as 'the hypothesis of a problem' Hence confutation, discussion, wrangling,
cavil, analogue, a point of defeat are used to make the surrendering of an opponent. In
this logical process one should be enriched with the knowledge of what is to be avoided,
and what is to be communicated.

There are many commentaries of \textit{NS}. All these commentaries discussed the
laws of arguments and counter arguments. At the same time, they all deal with the
common principles of a debate. \textit{Vṛṣṭyāyana}, \textit{Udyotakara}, \textit{Vścaspati Miśra},
\textit{Udayanacīrya} and \textit{Jayanta} were prominent commentators on \textit{NS}. Majority of these
commentators approached the old views with spiritual out look. But even in this period,
there were materialistic thoughts, which could challenge these spiritual interpretations.

In the \textit{NBh} of \textit{Vṛṣṭyāyana}, some sentences are written not in the bhūṭyāya style, but in the
style of vîrtika. He has not alienated Vaiśeṣika from Nyāya in his NBh. Vaiśeṣika is used in the sense of a complementary system to Nyāya. In the NBh, we can observe the claim that God is the supreme cause of everything. Here he criticises the Mādhyamika view points by stating that there is no present alienated from the past and the future. He criticises the theory of momentariness, the theories related to the nature and origin of the universe, especially Nāgārjuna’s ânyavāda. The bhâṣya presents many novel thoughts through the interpretation of sūtras. We can see that by the time of Vîtsyāyana, Nyāyastra had to complete with other systems which challenged its supremacy.

Udyotakara interprets the theory of theism as a Nyāya concept, though Sātrākâra and Vîtsyâyana have not mentioned it with much importance. Udyotakara uses the term 'Parñmarja' in the sense of commonly used. He received the terms Hetu and Śîdhya from the works of Diṅgā, the father of Buddhist Logic. Udyotakara was
the first Naiyåyika to introduce the theory of Ërambhavåda in the tenents of Nyåya
daråana. He efficiently unified the Asatkåryavåda of the Buddhist and modified it on
the basis of Nyåyåstra. Udyotakara refers Spogavåda and opposes Apovahvåda. He
has tried to establish 'time' as a free factor. He opines that PEvavat, åelavat and
åm®nyatodÀta are not the three parts of inference but they are only conditions which
real in inference should have. According to Jacobi the unification of Nyåya-Vaiåka
has got the structure of allied system (sam®natantra) from the period of Udyotakara.

Våcaspati Miåra in his MT has objected the Vedånta vision that God is the
fundamental cause of all these creations. Gautama classified perception as Avyapadeåa
and Vyavå¡tmaaka, in the same sense Våcaspati Miåra also classified them
savikalpaka and nirvikalpaka. The speciality of Nyåya is that it critically ponders over
the issues connected with spirituality. He defines that the purpose of Nyåya is to make
analysis and experiment with the help of logical rules. In Tîtparyaåeka the illustration
of Kṣryasama (balancing effect') is criticized. He approves 'the equal balancing' of

Ākāśa daśāna and Vaiśeṣika daśāna to criticize the point of defeat raised by

Dharmakṛṣṭi. He tried to revive the ancient rules and traditions of Nyāya. We can see

the flourish of philosophy in his Nyāyāsāccinibandha. In this work he bifurcates the

processing of Nyāya method into two parts, viz, the purvāga and Uttara'ga. He

declares that the application of Nyāya starts with 'doubt' and justifies the views of

Vātsyāyana. It aims that logic starts its functioning where doubt arises. It doesn't acts

in the condition where no evidences has left or where no evidence clears its position. So

doubt, purpose, instances, tenets, members of an argument, confutation and

ascertaintment are the steps to reach the fulfill state of a logical argument. These prior

state of logic leads to our own conviction. The next step is to convince other people the

knowledge that we have acquired. For this the next seven categories of Nyāya are

necessary. The conviction should be examined and established before others through
the process of deliberations. Wrangling, cavil, fallacious reasons, quibble, analogue and points of defeat are the seven categories or devices used to crystallize our ideas before the learned men. Here debate is used for enriching the knowledge. Wrangling is not admissible thing in an academic deliberation. Cavil is used to gain victory over others. We have to avoid some defects such as fallacies etc., while participating in academic discussion. Through the composition of Nyåyasauccinibandha, Vîcaspati Miñra included all these categories in the frame of logical argumentation. Thus he succeeded to some extent in shaping the logical theories in a nutshell form. He has defined the perception into determinate and indeterminate. Moreover he adopted some Buddhist theories and tried to explain them in favour of his own findings.

Udayanîçïrya composed the text *NVTT* favouring the concepts of Vîcaspati Miñra. Through this text he paved the way for the amalgamation of Nyåya and Vaiçêeáika doctrines. He tries to establish God through the composition of text, viz,
Nyåyakusumåjali. He criticises Kalyå,aråkåtå and Dharmottara in his books, viz. Atmatattvaviveka.

Again Jayantabatta gives a free interpretation of NS in his work NM. He opposes the Spñ¿a theory of the Grammarians. He denies the theories of Buddhists, viz, Apohå, Kåå,abha¿ga, árutyapramå,a, ñvarabha¿ga, criticizing the views of Dharmottara, Kalyå,aråkåtå etc. Jayanta handled these topics as an independent method. He tried to assimilate the á¡bdabodha theories of the Grammarians in the logical points of the Memìmsakas with some alterations. In this text he showed some lenience to Memìmsaka's view on áabda pramå,a.

Nyi¿a dar¿ana developed in confrontation with Baudhå and the Jaina views.

The speciality of the second stage of historical growth of Indian logical thinking, is the
considerable contributions from Buddhist scholars and Jaina Scholars which developed parallel to the Nyāya school of Akāśapāda.

Buddhism is mainly elaborated depending on logical intelligence. The Mahāyānas accepted logic as a part of their systems. In the Buddhist text of 'Lalitavistara' along with other theories, Hetuvidyā is discussed as a science of logic. In Buddhist book, viz. 'Lankāvatārasūtra' we can see the references of logical topics. There is some references of the exponent logicians in the primal texts of Buddhist philosophy. In 'Brahmajālasutta', the references about 'takki' and vimśi can be seen. The 'Anumāna sutta' in 'Majjhimanikāya' is refers to the means of inference. In 'Kathavathupprakara, a' Pattiya, Upanaya, Niggaha etc are used in their technical meaning. In the 'Milindapañha' Nyāya is used in meaning 'neti' or justice. Gradually the Bauddha Naiyāyikas concentrated on logic and they unified inference and syllogism together and made elaborate discussions on this.
Erya Nigṛjuna, the exponent of the theory of Mādhyamika was an accomplished scholar of Nyāya-jstra. He denies many theories of Gautama in his works, viz. 'Pramāṇa-āvidaḥvamsa' and 'Upyakauṭala-hūdaya-jstra'. After 4th century A.D the Buddhist scholars began to compose books dealing with Nyāya theories. S.C Vidyabhushana observes in his book HIL that the starting of logical discussion in the Buddhist circle was the necessity of that time. Diṅga and Dharmakīrti were the first glittering stars in the galaxy of Buddhist Logical thinking in India, who divided inference as the representation of relied meaning and absolute meaning. Diṅga started a new path in the discussion of logical theories to defend their own view from the attack of Naiyāyikas belong to Akāśapāda-darśana. Diṅga developed a new theory on perception which was entirely different from the school of Akāśa-pāda. Diṅga defines the perception as a knowledge which is devoid of imagination and name genus etc. He emphasizes that the indeterminate knowledge is the result of perception. Other
than this all are inferential. He defined inference with novel ideas. Following him
another remarkable personality, Dharmakirti made development on the whole phases
of logical theories. His seven works are respected even today as 'the seven celebrated
treatise' in Tibetan Monasteries. He wrote these works giving new definitions to the
whole structure of Buddhist Logic. Under his authorship this logic got complete
structural form. The Buddhist logicians developed the concept of logic as a pramāṇa
śūstra. They examined the various aspects of anumāna and established anumāna as a
fully treated pramāṇa at the centre of Indian epistemology. Venitadeva, Dharmottara
ānjāntarākāśita etc tried to defend the views of these two masters from the attack of their
opponent logicians belong to other rival schools. Through the composition of various
books Buddhists tried to defeat the views of Mīmāṃsakas, sāṁkhyās, Vaiśeṣikas,
Naiyāyikas, Grammarians etc.
Udayanacarya is the first logician who wrote with the vision of Nyaya-Vaijyanta philosophy and produced texts on both systems. He is considered as the first writer to compose prakara texts of the main stream based on both systems. His work _Atmatattvaviveka_ represents the example for the Prakara text of Vaijyanta system and _Nyayakusumajali_ represents Nyaya system. He criticised the Buddhist thoughts in _Atmatattvaviveka_ and established superiority Naiyayikas over the Bauddhas. Through the composition of _Kusumajali_ he tried to establish the existence of God. He defined the category 'Tarka' with importance and brought it into the lime light, giving it a special privilege among the sixteen padarthas. Thus Udayana started a new methodology in writing texts such as _Kusumajali_ etc., following the path of Buddhist Logicians. He tries to define the padarthas given by Naiyayikas through the composition of _Lakanamala_ and through the composition of _Lakanvali_ he followed Vaijyanta. He adopted a new style in defining Vaijyanta categories following the vision of the sage
Kaśja. Comparing the texts of both streams he succeeded to protect both systems maintaining their separate identity.

Bhūsravajña took some initial steps to make Nyāyaśtra as prāmāṇyaśtra giving importance to prāmāṇya. But he emphasised the divisions of the prāmāṇyas are three in number such as Pratyakṣa, Anumāna and āabda. He represents the second phase of Nyāya darśana. Kashmir was a separate centre for Nyāya studies, the prominent teachers of this centre were Udyotakara Jayanta Bhṛta Bhūsravajña etc..

Being the native of Kashmir Bhūsravajña also was free from the influence of Vaiśeṣika.

In Nyāyasra we can see the gist of Nyāya along with the description of prāmāṇya. He accepts sixteen categories of Nyāya were put by him under the category of prāmāṇya. He laid stress on the epistemological side denying the relation with Vaiśeṣika darśana:

but he emphasized the divisions of prāmāṇyas are three in number, viz. perception inference and āabda.
Through the composition of *NayyabhuAa*, *BhÅsra*vajña wants to establish the strength of *Naiyåyikas* without the support from *VaiÇeÅikas*. He says in *NayyabhuAa*, as such:

*Naiyåya Āstram ca vyÅkhyÅtum vayam pravÅttÅ |
TenasmÅkam vaiÇeÅika tantrena virodho na doÅiya ||

Prof. Anantalal Takur points out the remarks of some scholars that these three scholars we regarded as *ekadeÅin* by the *Naiyåyikas* of main stream all over India outside Kashmir.

Following him *VaradarÅja* gave five divisions to confutation in his work *TarkikarakÅa*. He explains how *TarkikarakÅa* acts as a solution to 'the protection for logicians'. In this text *pramÅa* is given in dominance. He declares that the existences of prameyas are always subjected to the pramÅas. *NyÅya* and *VaiÇeÅika* are joined
together with the uniform spirit of an allied system. In Tarkabhaṭṭa of Keśava Miśra we
can see the views of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika merged together. Vallābhīcīrya made some
efforts to unites the theory of matter of Vaiśeṣikas along with the pramāṇa theory of
Nyāyākas. Āśadhara’s Nyāyasiddhāntadipika gives twenty six tenets on the topics
specially mentioned in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system in his own style and presents the topics
mixedly. In ancient school of Indian Logic Prameya was given dominance but later we
can see the growth from prameya śāstra to pramāṇa śāstra. Tattvacintāmani of
Gangeśopādhyāya is the starting point of this philosophical turn.

The Nyāyadarśana which gives importance to the science of logic and the
Vaiśeṣikadarśana which gives importance to atom theory were merged together and
they came to be known under a common name, i.e. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Both these views
have tremendous similarities and therefore they are called ‘āmnānatras’. Both these
views claim that man’s ultimate aim is to reach the absolute perfection by getting
emancipation through overcoming the problem of the world. In the middle age itself
the age of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika which deals with the Prakaraṇas had been begun. Initially
the composition of Prakaraṇa texts originated in the circle of Jainism and Buddhism.

For instance Dharmakirti’s Vīdanyāya, ‘Hetubindu’ etc. Following these steps other
logicians also started to compose Prakaraṇa texts. Prakaraṇa can be defined as the
explanation of a particular topic related to some area. But these Prakaraṇa works do
not follow a common style in presenting their ideas unlike the former texts which were
written scientifically.

In the beginning of 12th century A.D a new version of Nyāya darsana is started
by Gangeśopādhyāya and thus a new era was opened. He gave importance to thought
about vyāpti and anumāna. It helped to pave the way for the new movement of Navya
Nyāya, which gave importance to deductive methods. In the beginning, the ancient
thought was a process from general to particular. They made use of the word soul in
the sense of life. But Navya Naïyikas divided the soul into āvitésma and paraṁśma.

Navya Naïya movement originated at Navadvipa in Bengal. In this school logical reasoning is given dominance. Its character is epistemological in nature. Under Gangeśa's teachership the logical method of Naïya darśana reached its acme. It began to work as a lamp to all śstras. It is named as Tarkaśtra. In this period Navya Naïya could influence all the śstras since logical science got predominance and over importance. It is certain that Indian thought and its presentation became sharper after the period of Gangeśa.

In later stage Navya Naïya focussed on the explanation of the correct descriptions of technical terms and their use in logical argumentation. The History of Naïya began from hetuvidyā during the Vedic period, developed up through centuries and reached its final stage in Navya Naïya.
During its course of development of the Nyāya in ancient India changed its attitudes on metaphysical ontological and epistemological issues. With regards to logical techniques the ancient logicians discovered a new path for the development of Nyāya. Naiyāyikas accepted a new methodology in its logical development. They accepted a new technique in defining the term through logical methods. This new system developed after Udayanācārya and reached its flowering state at the time of Gangeśopādyya, the illustrious author of Tattvacintāmani.

In southern India Navya Nyāya came into importance at a later period in about the first half of 17th century. Although there were the scholars of Nyāya system in Southern India they did not show interest in composing works in Nyāya. Tarkasamgraha of Annambhatta and Manika, a of an anonymous writer were considered as the first treatise on Nyāya topics. Annambhatta, a native of Andhra, incorporated the Vaiṣeṣika categories with pramāṇas of Naiyāyikas in a successful way.
This text is popular among the students of Navya Nyāya in Southern India. It has been acknowledged as a primer to Tarkañjastra in Southern India.

Prof. Ananta Narayana āstri observes that Tarkañjastra is a combination of the padārthas belonging to VaiśeĀikas and Prīma,īs of Naiyāyikas. Manikā,ā is a text which deals with the summarized form of Tattvacintamani and this text is translated by Dr. E.R Srikrishna āarma with the forward of H.H Rajarsi Rāmavarma and published from Adayar Library and Research Centre in 1960. Navya Nyāya teach us the details of several terms of logic such as Avacchedaka, Avacchinna, Līghava, Gaurava, Avacchedakasambandha, Pratiyogita, Nirupita etc. In the Navya Nyāya writings definition occupies an important place. Vyāyana the earliest commentator of Nyāyasūtra state that the śūtra is constituted of three components namely enumeration (uddeśa) definition (lakāana) and examination (parikāa) while defining the nature of lakāana the definition and examination of the purpose of the each term
should be noted. Each and every term has a definite stand or a concept and it should
precisely define before dealing that concept. If the definition is found to be faulty while
thinking about its ‘Dalaprayojana’, it should be remodeled till it becomes perfect or
faultless. For e.g., The definition of pramāna brings out the theory of Anyatākhyātivivāda
Ērāmbhavāda etc. Thus a new methodology is adopted by Gangeśopādhyāya, the father
of Navya Nyāya. Following these Bhūsaparicheda of Visvanātha Paucīnana which
consists of 168 verses accompanied with his own commentary called
Nyāyasiddhāntamuktāvalī, has gained very much popularity in that age.

Thus Nyāya and Vaiṣeṣika were amalgamated together. Vaiṣeṣika have
emphasized on the inductive side of reasoning with its realistic and pluralistic out looks
on substances. Nyāya theories gave importance to deductive side of reasoning on valid
knowledge.
Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sharma opines that although Nyāya system was known as Pramāṇa Āstra or the branch of learning dealing with the means of valid knowledge in earlier works, it did not lay stress on the pramāṇas, but treated them as one of several topics or one among the sixteen padṛthas. Efforts of amalgamation of, once independent systems, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika have resulted in losing their individual characteristics and it became difficult to say whether some of the Nyāya works were pramāṇa āstras or prameya āstras. Gangeṣa started to redeem the ambiguity by laying stress on the treatment of the pramāṇas. Gangeṣa tried to define some term with more accuracy. He used new expression to measure subtle thoughts. Every thoughts and expressions was subjected to careful examination. When a new topic was introduced the propriety of doing so, its relation to the topic which previously dealt and its position in the text is carefully examined. This made the language of the texts belong to Navya Nyāya system terns and it contents serious. Thus the status of Nyāya
as a pramāṇa śāstra was re-established by Gangeśopādhyāya and it underwent a considerable revolution at the hands of Raghunātha āromani. After Raghunātha āromani Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika studies spread all over India. Prakaraṇa texts like Tarkasamgrasha of Annambhatta and Bhāṣapariccheda of Viswanatha paścanana gained more popularity among the learned scholars. Its hair-splitting analyses and technicalities of language made some tedious attitudes in students belonging to colonial India for a short period. Later scholars like Indians and westerns began to take interest in Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika studies. This created some innovations in the field of this discipline.

If we took at these matters in bird’s view we should understand some points. The concept of pramāṇa is relative. There can be no pramāṇa without prameya, the object known. Similarly a pramāṇa śāstra cannot stand without dealing the prameya.
Here Naiy\text{\textja}ik\text{\textja}s accepted the concept and the division of substances of Vai\text{\textja}e\text{\textja}ik\text{\textja}s in defining prameyas with some alternations. Thus the vision of V\text{\textja}tsy\text{\textja}yana, the celebrated commentator of \text{\textja}N\text{\textja}S, reached its fully prosperous state through this revolution. His approach to Ny\text{\textja}ya is 'the science of examination of object through the means of valid knowledge' and it reached in its meaningful state. Moreover V\text{\textja}tsy\text{\textja}yana states that inference is the most significant in logical theories and the five membered syllogism are unavoidable in that process. This view of V\text{\textja}tsy\text{\textja}yana has been revived by the followers of Navya Ny\text{\textja}ya. The picture of the historical development of logical theories from early India through the hands of various celebrated writers upto the beginning of 14\textsuperscript{th} Century CE is evident from the discussions held above.