There have been several opinions among scholars as to the exact meaning of the term 'Maharastrakatraya'. The opinions of two schools may be summarised here. One school is of the opinion that 'Maharastrakatraya' comprising 99,000 villages as mentioned in the Aihole inscription do not represent the dominions of Pulakesi II and that the term should be the name of a division along with those of other divisions like Lata, Malava, Gurjara and few others. This school is of the view that the division referred to 'Maharastrakatraya' should be to the west of Kalinga and Kosala. However, the Aihole inscription and the account of Mien-Tsang mention that Pulakesi became the Lord of Maharastra comprising of 99,000 villages.

The other school points out that no record of Pulakesi speaks of 'Maharastrakatraya', as a division of the dominions of Pulakesi II. If the term is taken to mean the Maharastra country as it was being called in those days, and if Pulakesi's empire confined only to this region, the extent of the empire of Pulakesi would be a small one. This is against historical evidence which indicate the empire to have been a large one. The supporters of the second school, say that Maharastrakatraya was the division shared by the sons of Namanka of...
the early Rastrakuta family and that Hiuen-Tsang who wrote
his account of the Chalukya empire camped at 'Mohalaacha',
gathered information from persons there and came to the
conclusion that the area where Pulakesi and his army
camped must be 'Maharastra'; and that this conclusion
is wrong. Further, this school believes that Maharastra
was the same as 'Maharatta' which was quite a different
region from that of Kuntala; so Maharastra was also a
country quite distinct from Karnataka and therefore such
a small country would not represent the extensive
dominions of Pulakesi II. Hence the term Maharastra
should be the name of one of the political divisions
formed in the time of Pulakesi II. This division included
Konkan and the region upto the river Varada and was one
of the three big divisions of the Chalukya dominions
along with the other two regions, namely, Karnataka and
present Maharastra. Pulakesi retained that part of
Karnataka round the capital city of Vatapi for being
directly administered by him and entrusted the other two
to relatives of the royal family.

A probable explanation of the meaning of the term
'Maharastrakatraya' may be attempted on the information
afforded by the account of Hiuen-Tsang and that of the
Aihole inscriptions. In the words of Yuan-Chwang the
Mohalaacha country is described as one having a circuit of
6000 li and that its capital had a large river on its west.
Naturally the entire dominion of Pulakesi II could not have comprised only 6000 li. The Chinese pilgrim must have had in his mind the country of Maharashtra. Its capital in those days must have been Nasik surrounded by a large river on its west viz., the Varada river.

Taking into consideration the reference to Maharashtra-katraya in the Aihole inscription, we may say that the Poet Raviśkriti, who composed the inscription by about the year A.D. 634-35, speaks emphatically in verse 25 that Pulakesi II "acquired the sovereignty over three Maharashtrakas with their nine and ninety thousand villages". By the time of the composition of the inscription, Pulakesi II had defeated Harsha and had not merely acquired the northern territories but became the overlord of the entire country upto the river Harmada. Hence Pulakesi II may be said to have become the lord of three Great countries namely present Maharashtra, Konkan, Karnataka or Kuntala. These three divisions extending from Gujarat to southern part of Mysore could have easily comprised 99,000 villages. The vastness of the empire of Pulakesi II is an indisputable point.