By grouping three personalities as Trinity, the justification will be complete only if the merits of all the three are comparative and comparable exhaustively with no room for pointing out a finger at the slightest inadequacies in the attainments of anyone or two of them. In the case of the musical Trinity there have been fundamentalists for each one of them who would shout at the top of their voice how his/her candidate is at least one shade or other superior to others. The grouping as Trinity will thus have arguments for and against the grouping. This thesis has so far gone in vast detail with arguments in favour of the grouping. Any research study should not remain satisfied with arguments in its favour alone but should also care for the opinions of the unsympathetic viewers.

Parochialism among listeners has played a big part in the name and fame of many luminaries in music. Staunch Tirunalvelians had many differences of opinion in judging the merits of musicians from Tanjore district. This parochial attitude reached great heights in the early twentieth century and the Tirunalvelians and Tanjoreans were very keen that musicians hailing from their district must be kept in higher esteem. A Tirunalvelian would thus patronize a concert of Kallidaikuruchi Vedanta Bhagavatar more avidly than even a better musician from Tanjore district. Such narrow sentiments were perhaps not so intensified during the Trinity era, but there have been staunch admirers of Muthuswamy Dikshitar who spent most of his life in Ettayapuram, Tirunalveli district, who would treat a composer from their district one shade better than Tyagaraja, a confirmed Tanjorean. There have therefore been unkind critics of both Tyagaraja and Dikshitar just because one belonged to their own district. The propagators of such feelings go to great heights in highlighting the inadequacies of even a great composer like Tyagaraja. While on the subject of inadequacies, they are present in any human being and Tirunalveli parochialists have sometimes highlighted the inadequacies in Tyagaraja kritis and praised the attainments of Dikshitar sky high. Allegations
and counter allegations at this juncture will give room for endless controversies.

Tyagaraja lived all his life in Tanjore, while his mother tongue was Telugu. The Telugu of native Andhras is chaste and rather too chaste for the Telugu spoken by Tanjoreans. Tyagaraja’s Telugu is bitterly criticized by Tirunalvelians who had time to find out the differences between the Telugu accent current in Andhra and Tanjore. Sanskrit had always been given the highest place among other languages and an expert in Sanskrit language is always kept one shade above the pundits of other languages. It is therefore not proper to class a composer of a spoken language with one who excelled in Sanskrit, the divine language. Starting at such flimsy arguments the fundamentalists of the two districts had more and more points in favour of Dikshitar and reducing the level of achievements of Tyagaraja. The number of available Syama Sastri kritis is much fewer than that of the other two compeers and there is room to raise doubts about Syama Sastri too.

All said and done, there is no second opinion about the fact that Tyagaraja, Muthuswamy Dikshitar and Syama Sastri are at a level of recognition not reached by any other composer till today. Greatness beyond a certain level defy comparison and one cannot raise convincing objection in grouping the three composers of Himalayan heights into one panel and the regard for the Trinity is sure to continue forever.