This thesis has proved thatulk Raj Anand is primarily a protest novelist. It has further proved that his protest is primarily social though it does take on psychological dimensions too. It has also proved that it draws upon the twin emotions of compassion and anger for animating his protest theme.

It is now relevant to evaluate him first in the larger frame of his contemporaries, namely, Raja Rao and R.K. Narayan because three of them as far as English novel is concerned have established three distinct traditions which they have stamped with their own idiom. R.K. Narayan affirms essentially the traditional India as exemplified in his depiction of family life, social relationships, friendships and he pokes fun at the aberrations creeping into the traditional body politic from the encounter with the West or what is loosely called modernity. Lot of research papers have been written on the dialectics of modernity and tradition in Narayan's writings but that is not our subject as the evaluation only endeavours to pinpointulk Raj Anand's special contribution to the Indian novel vis-à-vis the special contribution of Narayan and Raja Rao. The vis-à-vis is essential to highlight Anand's achievements. Raja Rao is intensely involved with India like Anand is
but his involvement is more mythopoetic and also philosophical. He is representing Indian culture in its depth and ideality. R.K. Narayan is also interested in Indian mythology as evidenced in his later works such as *The Man Eater of Malgudi*, etc., but he uses myth more allegorically with moral thrust. In contrast with them, Mulk Raj Anand is concerned with India as it is with the economic, social and political issues. He is keen to point out how these problems have to be resolved. He is interested in ameliorating the conditions of the sunken and depressed, the repressed and the ignored, be they untouchables, coolies, bonded labourers, children of the poor, rural women and restoring them to human dignity. So alongwith Anand, alongwith Narayan and Raja Rao, he leaves behind for the prospective novelist a third way and it seems that it is well nigh impossible for the writers coming in the wake of the three giants of Indian novels to step outside the frame of the three.

Now for a recap of Anand's social protest with a view to making a final statement on its range, depth, timbre, and tone. Our investigation of the five novels, *Untouchable, Two Leaves and a Bud, The Sword and the Sickle, Seven Summers*, and *Gauri* has demonstrated in depth and detail that Anand has a fantastic range which takes him from the rural locales to metropoles like Bombay as in *Coolie*.
reeking with greed and corruption. In his range he is *picareseque* in the sense that he gives us the portrayal of practically all classes and conditions of existence. Though *picareseque* in range, he has depth also which is missing in *picareseque* fiction. It is true as conceded at places in the course of the analyses of the texts that at times to subserve the protest theme he tends to present his characters in somewhat simplified categories of good and evil. Good and evil is not seen by him ontologically as principles as Milton would do or Sri Aurobindo would do in his philosophical and occult envisionings. The good characters are victims because of their poverty and bad characters are oppressors because they are deeply entrenched in their positions, in the vested interests. They can mess lives up and get away with it. But the redeeming feature though in this encounter between the victims and the oppressors is that Anand throws up characters who challenge the oppressors and champion the victims, infusing into the latter courage. These saviour characters, however, are not melodramatic heroes like in Hindi Masala films; they are not Deus Ex Machina beings, but intellectuals endowed with clarity and emotional sensitivity, sometimes ordinary humans who fight systemic changes in society, socio-economic arrangements, in the Indian culture and religion ridden with ritualism,
obscurationism, casteism. Anand sees good and evil as stemming not from above, but as resulting from a bad system. In placing his social protest in the frame of history, culture, institutions, he emerges as a clear-eyed humanist for whom proper study of man is man in society. Anand's humanist perspective on protest, of course, is heavily coloured with leftist ideology with Marxist flavour which, ideology, at the present time is in such disarray in the world. But one can subtract this ideology which is a component or a colour in the theme from his protest, the protest still retains its range and depth. The depth comes from his engagement, from his Sorge, and from his identification with the hurt of the sunken and his anger against the propped up and the elevated.

It must, however, be pointed out that his identification with the deprived, the injured and maimed is emotional, but not emotional from the depth psychic. For that kind of identification one has to go to Prem Chand of Go Dan, to cite only one novel, to Maxim Gorky, to Tolstoi and Dostoevsky. He is just not of their rank, though he does place himself in the tradition of Prem Chand, Gorky, Tolstoi. Why the emotional-psychic depth co-efficient is missing in his identification is a subject
for a psychoanalytic investigation. In the absence thereof one can hazard a guess.

Anand comes into anger psychodynamically speaking too early before getting fully into the hurt side of the psyche. Furthermore, his intellectual side which is not that fine despite his being a student of philosophy in England comes into a rough and ready play, albeit ideologically cutting him off from the sorrow of the sorrow that sorrow is. The emotional does not go inward deeply to the point where it can rend the heart asunder — something one finds in Prem Chand, Gorky, Tolstoi, even in the stories of Raja Rao. This idea has been conveyed a few times in the course of the analysis, but it naturally stayed in the background because of the textual analysis which necessarily is extensive. This idea, therefore, is now being high-lighted. To conclude this issue, Anand has range in the thematics of protest, but the matching depth he misses.

Now for timbre and tone side of Anand's semantic universe of protest. Both timbre and tone are very important to consider because Anand is not writing reports, essays or communiques on protest, but is converting the latter into art as a novelist. So powerful emotions are being associated with the theme through characters, large and small, through their interactions, through their passage and growth, through
a whole complex of circumstances and a medley of situations. As a result his protest theme emits a certain timbre. This aspect of his protest theme was brought out in the text of the analysis, invoking ideas from alchemy and ideas from psychology. It was pointed out that Anand invests his theme with anger and imbues it with compassion. The timbre tallies with the range and depth. Without timbre, no amount of range and depth can carry conviction. Timbre is the special voice of the writer, in fact, one can say that Anand's timbre is meant for the protest. He must trumpet. Anand is rigorous and strident. This timbre is not meant for subtle philosophical formulations, the plunge and lyricism of romantic love, nor for light-hearted raillery which is the metier of R.K. Narayan. In this context it is interesting to note that Anand as a public personage is very fond of expounding causes, chastising abuses and aberrations, knaves and villains, whipping capitalists, America in particular, and despite his age of 86 years he can get worked up with holy smoke and go red in his face.

If the timbre is related to the theme on one hand, it is related to the personality of the author on the other. It is believed in Indian esthetics that certain Bhavas are stronger than other Bhavas. To make it more explicit, some writers excel in compassion, some in Eros or what is called Sringar Bhava or Rasa, some in Vira Bhava, some in the Bhava of
peace, tranquility or disgust. In Indian esthetics this predominance of certain Bhava/Bhavas and the abeyance or absence of others is linked with one's Sanskaras from previous lives and the shaping of these Sanskaras in this life because of parentage, upbringing, early influences, and also one's own experience and endeavours and aspirations. This view of the matrices of Bhavas can be put in Jungian terms. Sanskaras pertain to the archetypal side of the personality. To speak simplistically, in some the Father archetype may be active, in some the mother, in some the hero archetype may be active. The archetypal side gets mixed up with the personal side. So what is important is not merely the active essence of a given archetype, but also how it is cultured and secured. It was pointed out in the course of texts analysis that the hero archetype is active in Anand. Perhaps, it should be pointed out here now that the hero archetype is mixed up with the Father archetype which functions in a compensatory way. The father is a critic, a censor, his love and caring is conditional. The hero is concerned with the life of group, society, culture, times. He wants to improve society. Naturally he goes hammer and tong against those people and forces which stand in the way. Despite Anand's idealization of
of the mother and compassion for women and conscious
denigration of the father/father's, he has always looked
upto Father figures, be it Gandhi, Tagore, Iqbal and
he identifies with hero figures like Lenin, Nehru. In
the analysis of the texts, therefore, a few biographic-
psychic flares were evoked which are now being heightened
in the conclusion definitively. The Bhavas of this hero
son father constellation are anger, courage, a certain
relentlessness resulting therefrom. These Bhavas are in the Service of
just society, an ideal world. These considerations have
to be kept in mind in deciphering the force and intensity
of the timbre in his protest voice.

The timbre of the protest voice is loud and
clear like that of a drum, trumpet, or a bugle. The
timbre resonates in the solar plexus of the reader.

The timbre and tone are spoken of synonymously
in the dictionary, but the tone has to be separated from
the voice, it being the expression of the meaning of a work.
In Sanskrit esthetics the tone is the special auditory
emanation resulting from the Rasas - the conversion
of the Bhava cycle through Vibhava, vibhava, sanchari
Rasa. Regarded from this perspective tone is a total thing
Tone is what is called jñwani in Sanskrit. It is the
mantric or Varna medium through the Rasas are realized and conveyed to the reader. The tone can be literal and denotative in which words convey, but lack rich communication. The tone can be connotative rich in image, symbol, texture. It becomes suggestive and begins to reverberate not merely in the head register, but in the heart, in the Antakarna, in the field of personal, cultural, archetypal network of reader’s associations. This side of the tone cannot be captured by the formalists despite their concern with image, symbol, irony, paradox which they try to figure out within the confines of the text, cutting off the reverberation in the "Poetics of Space" or in the Vyoma of the reader. The tone can be incantatory, magical or 'mantric' in the Aurobindonian sense. That tone is beyond scholars, exegetes; it is for Sahridayas.

Before coming to Anand’s tone accompanying his protest theme to which passing references have been made in the body of the thesis, some general statements of an evaluative kind are in order. Anand as a novelist does not have that finished, realized rich tone of Raja Rao who is beyond comparison. No Indian novelist is his match. R.K. Narayan does not have Raja Rao’s style. He does not tangle symbology, rush of Rasas, profusion of images. His tone, however, is adequate, matches his subject, has
stretches of eloquence. In any case, it is blemished. Anand’s tone unfortunately is that of a polemicist, propagandist, an advocate, and not that of an esthetician, who distils the rasas. This lack is because he does not process his emotions properly into objective correlates or into esthetic sentiments or Rasas.

Another way of putting across what has been said above more schematically is that style or tone can be i) adequate, (ii) persuasive or rhetorical, (iii) illuminating, (iv) intuitive, (v) revelatory. Starting from the last item, in the revelatory tone, tenor and vehicle, in the language of Alan Tate are in accord. Needless to say revelatory tone/style/tone is the hallmark of the great writers. In the language of Bhavabhuti in the revelatory style, meaning runs after the words, after the sound they emit. Intuitive tone can be simple, even bare, but the words, collocations thereof are vertical and impinge on truth registers, setting up ripples and repercussions in the whole of consciousness. Illuminating style, third in the list stems from a wrought imagination which is so soaked in the material of theme, plot, character, situation, etc that Atma Satkaran, appropriation has taken place so deeply in the psyche that the meaning exists prior to its expression. Persuasive writing is essentially rhetorical. It tries to convince the reader to its viewpoint.
Adequate style is self-explanatory. It is informative, not evocative at all.

When we apply the above scheme on tone to Milnk Raj Anand in general and to his protest thesatics in specific, he falls in the second category of the persuasive/rhetorical tone with occasional upsurge into the illuminating. He also has fnt stretches of the adequate. This idea has been conveyed in the text chapters in a diffuse way from time to time. The anger part of the protest does not explode in the primordium like it explodes in Swift, Juvenal, to give only two examples. The fact that it does not have solemn tone or that of the other European novelists is because anger, the driving force, or charge behind protest does not stem from the inner vital like it does, say, in Elizabethan tragedy. Furthermore, it is whipped up from the mental side. It is not the anger of Jewish prophets like Amos. It is there, sure it issues out from compassion, but the latter is not deeply interiorized, identification is not Blakean, it is not even Pyrnic. To be very precise, the identification with the poor is emotional, but not psychic. Because of anger being strident and compassion not being Buddhistic in feeling terms, how can one expect the great
Anyway, leaving aside some reservations regarding depth, a lot of reservations regarding timbre, and real ones regarding tone, Anand is a great protest : thematist whose protest, though primarily social, takes in its ambit psychological thrusts and feminist perspectives. He is primarily a protester who wants to unveil a new India, more equalitarian, and free from ignorance, caste shackles, class barriers, religious obscurantism, the excrecent rot of a moribund tradition. Unlike a Raja Rao who goes into the depth of tradition, a long religious-spiritual heritage, both philosophical and mytho-poetic, to revitalize us and to free ourselves from the tinsel of fake modernity, unlike a Narayan who wants to espouse and salvage tradition as it informs the life of people, Anand like a hero forges forward and wants to give to his readers secularism, revisionism of the old myths and archetypes, humanism, socialism. His protest is in the service of modernism or modernity. And surely, like his contemporaries Rao and Narayan he gives us a version of India made real. It is for the reader to decide who has more truth because all three have some special versions. Anand of course sells his truth as a public personage, as an advocate through the press,
through crusade, through affiliation with the progressive writers while Rao and Narayan stay strictly as artists. The truth they offer has a more satisfying esthesis. Anyway, leaving these comparisons aside whose thrust is discriminatory, not deflating Anand, protest will always remain as his signal, sovereign achievement.