In the Ipur set II, Mādhavavarman III is endowed with the title \textit{Trikūṭa-Malay-ādhipati} meaning "the lord of the Trikūṭa and Malaya (mountains)." It is a unique title in the epigraphs of the Viśnukumāris and scholars differ from each other in identifying the Trikūṭa and Malaya and in explaining the significance of the title. Regarding this question the following theories are in the field:

1) The first scholar who noticed the above record, i.e., Sri N. Krishna Sastri, identified the Trikūṭa with its namesake mentioned in the Vākāṭaka records and on that ground concluded that the Viśnukumāris must have been distinctly a north Indian family (ARE, 1920, p. 99). But we have already seen the untenability of the theory of the north Indian origin of the Viśnukumāris.

2) On the other hand, Dr. Hultzsch, who edited this record, found it difficult to explain the epithet as the Trikūṭa is a mountain on the Bombay side and the Malaya, the Western Ghats (i.e., its southernmost part) both of which were at a safe distance from the dominions of Mādhavavarman II (EI, XVII, p. 338).

3) Some later scholars like Dr. D.C. Sircar viewed the epithet as indicative of the chief's hostile relationship with the above Trikūṭa and the Malaya. Consequently it is
believed that Madhavavarman might have joined the armies of some powerful king who invaded those regions (SS, p. 488).

4) Another set of scholars like Prof. V.V. Mirashi, who identified the issuer of the Khanapur plates with Madhavavarman II, conjectured that that ruler must have annexed the Maharashtra region also to his kingdom. In view of these scholars, the epithet of Madhavavarman III under question supports the above conjecture. They further suggested that the epithet under question indicates that on the death of Madhavavarman the elder his extensive empire was divided. The western portion including Maharashtra and Karnatka (i.e. the regions of the Trikuta and Malaya) came to be ruled by his grandson Madhavavarman the younger, while the eastern portion comprising Kosala, Kalinga and Andhra went to the former's another grandson Indrabhatarkavarman (BI, XXVII, 315-16). But, it has already been concluded that the Khanapur record was issued not by Madhavavarman the Vishnukundi, but by some other ruler who was probably a Rasnikuta of Manapura (Ch. IV, Sect. 1). Moreover, other explanations of the title are possible (see below). Therefore to establish the theory of such a vast empire of Madhavavarman the elder, and of its division on his death, one needs some evidence stronger than the mere title of Madhavavarman, the younger, now under discussion.

5) A fifth school of scholars like B.V. Krishna Rao
pointed out that the Kotappakonda (Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur District) inscriptions refer to a temple of Śiva there under the name of Trikuṭēśvara or Trikōṭīśvara (ED, pp. 339, 427). Therefore they identified the Trikuṭa with Kotappakonda itself, situated about eight miles south-west of Narasaraopet. Again, as an Ānanda king also is found bearing the title Trikūṭaparvatapati in the Chezerla inscription (Inscr. XVIII), it is believed that the above Trikuṭa or Kotappakonda was originally within the territory of the Ānandas. Consequently it is concluded that the title of the Vishnu kuṇḍi Mādhava-varman III, under examination, signifies his conquest of the area from the Ānandas. Coming to the question of identification of Malaya it is pointed out that many hills in the eastern districts of Andhradēsa (i.e. old Ganjam, Vizagapatnam, Godavari and Guntur Districts) go by the Sanskrit name Malaya though they are known locally by different names (ED, p. 428). So it is ascertained that both the Trikuṭa and Malaya were within the Vishnu kuṇḍi dominions. This theory has drawn much support of other scholars also in general (SS, p. 401; JAHRS, XI, p. 45; CA, p. 209; etc.).

However, a group of scholars though underline the above Trikuṭa-Kōṭappakonda identification, hold that the word malaya is the Sanskritized form of the Dravidian malai 'hill'. So they conclude that the epithets Trikuṭamalayādhipati of Mādhava-varman III and Trikūṭaparvatapati of the Ānanda king are synonyms (JAHRS, XI, p. 45; SG, p. 189). Thus these scholars do not feel the necessity of searching for the Malaya mountain
in explaining the epithet.

But it may be doubted whether a chief can be referred to as the āra of the Trikūṭa, if a god was to be called Tri-kūṭēśvara in the Kotappakonda inscriptions. Further, it may be noted that the inscriptions from Kōṭappakonda referred to above (SII, IV, Nos. 915-16, 918-21) spell the word as Tri-kūṭīśvara and that they are not earlier than the eleventh century. Therefore one is naturally led to doubt whether those inscriptions can be of any help to us in understanding the significance of the title of a king of the sixth century A.D.

Moreover Trikūṭa and Trikūṭēśvara are not the monopolies of the Kotappakonda inscriptions alone. For, we have got a long list of inscriptions from different parts of Andhra and Karnataka that speak of Trikūṭēśvara. That list consists of an inscription from Magala (Hadagalli Taluk, Bellary District) of the Hoysala Vira Ballāla II and of Śaka 1131 (No. 123 ARE, 1913); and inscription from the Trikūṭēśvara shrine at Pushpagiri (Cuddapah Taluk and District) of Śaka 1176 (No. 304, ARE, 1905); an inscription from Hāvipāḍu (Narasarasopet Taluk, Guntur District) belonging to the time of the Kākatīya Rudra and Śaka 1199 (No. 333, ARE, 1918); about ten inscriptions from the Trikūṭēśvara temple at Gadag (Dharwar District), bearing dates Śaka 984 onwards, and belonging to the later Chālukyas, Yādavas etc. (IA, II, pp. 296 ff; EI, III, pp. 217 ff; XIX, pp. 217); and many more inscriptions from other places in Karnāṭaka (QJMS, LV, pp. 55-56). Therefore
Dr. Fleet seems to be perfectly right when he affirmed that Trikuṭēśvara, as a name of Śiva can have no allusion to any mountain; and that trikūṭa in this compound symbolises probably the well-known triad of Brahmā, Višnu and Śiva (IA, II, 299). The terms Trayīpūrṇa and Tripūrṇa are also used as synonyms of Trikuṭēśvara in the inscriptions of the 10th-11th centuries etc. (QJMS, LV, pp. 53 ff). Besides, Shri K.R. Srinivasan, Special Officer of Archaeological Survey, Temple Survey Project (Southern Region) was kind enough to write to me (letter dated 9.6.1969) that trikūṭa may also be a technical term in temple architecture, having an allusion to a temple complex with three shrines; that a temple complex with five shrines goes by the name pāṇchakūṭa; and that instances like this can also be multiplied. Therefore, it is certain that the Kotappakonda inscriptions cannot decide the issue, we are at present concerned with.

True, the Ānanda king Kandara II also bears a title claiming to be the lord of the Trikuṭa. But, that title may indicate that within his territory there was a hill called Trikuṭa, though it may not be easy to identify that hill. If so, Mādhavaśvarman’s title may indicate that he conquered the Ānandas and brought their territory under him. However, it must not be forgotten that none of the early rulers of the Ānanda family bore such a title; and that Kandara II, who was perhaps the first Ānanda ruler to have that title, is to be assigned to the later half of the sixth century, i.e., slightly
later than Mādhavavarman III (See Ch. VI, Sect. ii; Ch. IX, Sect. iii). If so, the latter would be probably the first of the two rulers, known so far to claim the lordship over the Trikūṭa. Therefore it is more probable that the title was originally of Mādhavavarman III and the title of Kandara II may indicate that he defeated the Vishnukūṇḍī, drove him out of his territory and assumed partly the title of the vanquished. It has already been suggested how the Vishnukūṇḍī came to claim to be the lord of the Trikūṭa by taking part in one or the other expedition against the Traikūṭakas or the rulers of the Trikūṭa in the Aparānta region on behalf of, or along with, the Vakaṭakas (See Ch. IV, Sect. ii, Ch. VI, Sect. ii). This alternative, if accepted, may relieve us of the trouble of searching for a Trikūṭa as different from the famous one of that name.

Coming to the question of identification of Malaya, one important point to be borne in mind is this: Maybe, the Sanskrit malava, in general, has something to do with, or has come from the Dravidian "malai" (see Brown, Tel. Eng. Dict. s.v. malaya; Burrow and Emeneau, A Dravidian Etymological Dict. s.v. malai). Even accepting this, it is beyond one's reasoning to believe that the word malaya in Mādhavavarman's title had anything to do with the Dravidian malai. For, it is preceded by the proper noun Trikūṭa and one is yet to find an example where a name of a mountain is followed by malaya (just as the words parvata, giri etc.) and both the words form a madhvama-pada-lāpi-karmadhāraya compound
(like Vindhyā-nēmakah parvatah or girih = Vindya-parvatah or Gīrīh). Otherwise, one may be equally right in taking *malaya* to be a Dravidian *malai* even in the compound *Machay-Siritana-Malaya-Mahida* etc. which gives the list of mountains over which Gautamiputra Śrī Satakarni claims to be the lord (EI, VIII, p. 60, line 2). Therefore *Trikūṭa-Malaya* of Madhavavarman's title is only a *dvandva* compound and the word *Malaya* here is a proper noun. On the other hand, in Kandara's title the expression *Trikūṭaparvata* can be a *karmadhāraya* compound of the said type, as the word *parvata* is a common noun. Thus the titles of Madhavavarman III and of Kandara II may not be completely synonymous. Therefore the Malaya over which Madhavavarman III could have claimed to be the lord still remains to be located.

Before one enters the question of its identification it is worthwhile to bear in mind that Madhavavarman III was not the only king to claim to be the lord of the Malaya. Another Andhra king of an earlier period viz., Gautamiputra Śrī Satakarni too claims to be the lord of the Malaya besides many other mountains, as we just saw. As the famous Malaya (i.e. the Travancore Hills) was far away from the Andhra empire, one may naturally conclude that the claim of Gautamiputra was a vague one (See SS, p. 218; S. Ins. p. 203, f.n. 4).

It is interesting to observe that a question, more or less of the same nature now stares at us while explaining the claim of Madhavavarman III. Luckily, a solution to this problem seems to come from two well known poets, viz., Rāja-
In his Kavyamimamsa (pp. 92-93) Rajasekhara speaks of four Malayas. One of them he locates in Lanka or Ceylon and the other he describes as the abode of Kumbhasambhava (Agastya) and as the birth-place of the Tamraparni river. No doubt the second Malaya is nothing but the Travancore hills. The other two Malayas the poet neither locates nor describes in clear terms. One of them is described as the place of a certain sage (gaumunipangavasya) and the other as the birth place of chandana and jati trees. Rajasekhara concludes that the Southern Wind blows from all the above four Malayas (pravartate + + + tebhbvas-ehrntnbhvo-Pi va santa-mitraitF udan-mukfo daksipa-matariya). But while illustrating a description of that Southern Wind, the poet quotes a verse that endows it with the following four actions: (1) shaking the gardens of Lanka; (2) causing the curly hairs of the Keralis (i.e. women of the Travancore region) to dance; (3) untying the hairlocks of the Andhra ladies; and (4) tossing the piper betels. The verse under question runs:

Dhunyan Lanka-van-alir-muhur-alaka-lata lasavan Kera-
linam, Andhr-dhammilla-bandhan saradi kithilayan val-
layan nacavallip I uddamam daksipatrah + + + praatrah
+ + + sanitrah II (Ibid., p. 100).

It is significant that after enumerating and describing the four Malayas, and characterising the winds as being born from all the four, the author quotes the above verse that
connects it with four places, out of which the first two are the two Malayas enumerated previously. This seems to suggest strongly that the poetic tradition locates the third Malaya in the Andhra region, though the location of the fourth Malaya still remains to be decided. If this suggestion is accepted, then one may identify the Malaya of the title of Madhavavarman III with the above third Malaya of the Andhra region.

In this connection it may be pointed out that there was a family of chiefs who were feudatories of the Eastern Chalukyas and who styled themselves as Malayadhivatias. Their inscriptions bear dates starting from the beginning of the 11th century down to the end of the 13th century (C.P. No. 1 of ARE, 1922; see JAERS, XX, pp. 130). Their principality, called as Malayavani and described as being watered by the Gantami Godavari is believed to have comprised the modern Kovur, Nidadavolu and Ellor Taluks in the West Godavari District (ibid. p. 131). We have already seen how Madhavavarman III made successful incursion into the Vengi country and occupied some parts of the coastal area (Ch. VI, Sect. ii). May be, his title indicates his success in vanquishing the chief of the area or in capturing the territory full or partly. If this is accepted then it may also probably explain why his victorious rival Ananda ruler Kandara II is found in the Chezerla inscription of Mahendravarman Pallava, to have appropriated for himself the title of the vanquished Vishpukunjii, only partly and not fully. For, we have seen earlier a probability of a friendly tie between the Vishnu-
kunđi and the Pallava during the time of Mahendravarman (Ch. VII, Sect. i; Ch. IX, Sect. iii). Therefore the Pallava vassal’s claim of victory over the Malaya territory of Vengi at that time might be tantamount to a claim of his victory over the Vishnu kundī himself and might consequently go against the political current of the period.

At any rate, the above suggestion of locating a Malaya in Andhra itself may solve the problem of explaining not only the claim of Madhavavarman III but also that of Gautami-putra’s similar claim of lordship over the Malayas.

The second alternative that may be suggested in this connection is this. In the Kishkindhākāṇḍa of the Rāmāvata (canto ii, verse 14; canto v, verse 5. See also the Critical Ed. - Baroda, pp. 18-19, star passages Nos. 73, 79, 81) the poet Vālmīki mentions a Malaya along with the Rśyamūka Mountain where the monkey leader Sugrīva was hiding from his brother Vālin. According to the Tilaka commentary (NSP Ed. canto ii, under verse 14), Malaya was another name of the Rśyamūka itself. However it is more likely that the Malaya and Rśyamūka were two peaks of one mountain range, and this point is made clear by the grammarian poet Bhāṭṭi of c. 600 A.D. (See the Bhāṭṭikāvya, canto. 6, verses 85, 87, 90, 103; see also Rāma, Kishkindhākāṇḍa, Critical Ed., op. cit., p. 456, Critical Notes). Pargiter too had located the said Malaya near by the Rśyamūka (JRAS, 1894, p. 255). The same scholar had also identified the latter with the range of hills that stretches from Ahmadnagar via. Naldurg to Kalyāṇī
and divides the Mānjira and the Bhīma rivers (The Markandeya-
purāṇa, Trans. Note under Ch. LVII, verse 14). Already we
saw that according to Rājaśekhara one of the four Malayas,
viz., the third one, is the place of a sage. This sage must
be different from Agastya whose abode is stated to be the
second Malaya as pointed out earlier. It may be noted that
the Malaya-Risyamūka area is well known in the
Kishkindhakāndā (cantoes ii and xi) as the Āśrama or abode of the famous sage
Mataṅga. It is very likely that the writers of the inscrip-
tions of the Andhra and Vishṇukūḍa chiefs followed the
tradition of the Rāmāyana in referring to as the Malaya a
particular hill in the mountain range mentioned above. If
this is approved then one may locate a Malaya in the territory
which was certainly within the dominions of Gautamiputra
that extended as far as Malwa. It is also likely that the
raid on this Malaya by Mādhavavarman III was perhaps closely
connected with that of him on the Trīkūṭa in the Aparaṁta
country. Other Vishṇukūḍa kings did not bear the title
under question because they had not taken part in the Trīkūṭa-
Malaya expedition.

However, N. Dey (See Gen. Dict., s.v. Risyamūka)
identifies the Risyamūka of the Rāmāyana with the Ānegundi
hill near Koppal on the banks of the Tungabhadrā river in the
Raichur District. If that is correct, then one may have to
locate a Malaya near Ānegundi. In that case Mādhavavarman's
epithet may have to be viewed as an indication of his success
in subjugating the area which is only 70 miles south west of the Mahbubnagar District that lay within the Vishṇukūṇḍi kingdom. Or, it is also likely that he undertook an expedition to this area not for himself, but for the sake of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief of Mānapura who was related to him on the distaff side (See Ch. IV, Sect. ii) and who might have continued the policy of enmity towards his southern neighbours viz., the Kuntala kings, originally started by Māṇāṅka of that family in the middle of the 5th century A.D. (see CA, p. 20; SG. pp. 163 ff. For the other view, see EI, XXXVII, p. 16). Any way, both the suggestions of locating the Malaya may help one in explaining the claims of both the Andhra ruler Gautamiputra Sātakarnī and the Vishṇukūṇḍi prince Mādhavavarman III to be the lords of the Malaya.