In the present thesis I have edited with a critical study the text of Tarkatarangini by Gunaratna Gaṇi. This text is edited for the first time on the basis of two MSS, viz one from Oriental Research Institute, Baroda and another from the British Museum London. This Text being a commentary on Prakāśika of Govardhana which itself is a commentary on Tarkabhāṣā by Kesāya Misra, throws new light on many Nyāya Vaiśeṣika problems which were not made clear in the manner which Gāni has adopted. While editing this text, I have brought to the notice such new points when Gāni adds something new. While doing so I had to point out some points of Prakāśika. For doing so I have undergone a comparative study of all the three works viz Tarkabhāṣā, Prakāśika and Tarkatarangini and have culled out the result at proper places.

Thus by the editing TT., with its critical study so many new points are brought forth in the advancement of the study of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Metaphysics in particular and of Indian Philosophy in general.

I have discussed the date of CV a fresh in the light of the colophon of Gāni and have tried to fix up the correct date that is not rightly fixed by other scholars like Pranjape and Koith. In this connection I have also shown that the writer of "Bulabheda-Sandrabha"-a commentary of Saptapādaśārthi is a different Balbheda from the father of Govardhana.

In the chapter on causation I have shown how the nature of a cause as explained by Gāni resembles Gārvakas conception of a cause.
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Regarding the Savikalpa and Nirvikalpa perception I have noted how the neo-logicians have completely changed the original interpretation of these two terms and have thus lost the force of their controversy with Baudhāyas. I have also shown Gn's unwillingness in accepting the first two varieties of six fold Sāmkarśa.

While discussing Vyāpti, I have shown Gn's deep study of the Nvya-Nyāya in applying and interpreting various definitions of Vyāpti.

I have also noted Carvaka's most pragmatic stand in rejecting the Vyāpti at all and Naiyāyika's dialectical reasoning to establish it as a logical necessity.

In the chapter on Siddhānta I have tried to give the correct interpretation of Pratītantra-Siddhānta which is not correctly interpreted and understood even by Ke. I have also shown the mistake of interpretation by the author of TPK, and corrected it by giving the right interpretation.

Similarly I have drawn attention towards all the novel points which were hitherto undiscussed by previous scholars and discussed by Gn. I have given my critical view wherever I found it.

I have enumerated such nineteen new points at the end of the introduction.

I have shown clearly that Gn has digested the Nvya-Nyāya and the value of TT lies in its most original and relishing presentation of Nvya-Nyāya epistemology.