A modest attempt has been made in the preceding chapters to give an idea of Ruyyaka's discussion on various questions relating to the poetic figures.

The worth of a work is to be judged by its novelty of treatment of the topic undertaken. It is true that Ruyyaka borrows much material from his predecessors, but he has, beyond doubt, shown his originality in his method of treatment of the poetic figures. He himself says that he is a follower of the ancients (cirantananatānusārī), but the views of the ancients do not find unqualified acceptance from him. He corrects, modifies and expands the views of his predecessors in the light of the progressive study of the subject.

In his treatment of poetic figures the author of the Alamkārasārvavasva shows a remarkable insight and independence of judgement. It is true that Ruyyaka takes his cue from Kuntaka in analysing the nature of poetic figure, but he does agree with Kuntaka on the point that figurative expression is the only poetic expression. He agrees with Ānandavardhana that the Dhvanikāvyā is the best type of poetry, but he does not go with the whole length with Ānandavardhana who relegates the importance of the expressed poetic figures. The Citrakāvyā which has been condemned by Ānandavardhana as the level of no poetry, has been established by Ruyyaka in the domain of poetry. Thus, to him, both intellectual element and emotive content can
produce aesthetic delight. But he is aware of the fact that the emotive content in poetry is more delectable.

In the analysis of poetic figures Ruyyaka achieves a measure of precision and clarity. The definitions of all the poetic figures have fairly been fixed in his Alamkārasarvasva and there is little scope for improvement on them. Therefore, he has exerted great influence on later writers who recognise Ruuyaka's views as authoritative until the appearance of the Rasagāṅgadhara of Jagannātha. Jagannātha does not agree with Ruuyaka on many points but criticises the view of the Alamkārasarvasva in his work, but his criticism levelled against Ruuyaka is not always backed by sound reasoning.

Ruuyaka discusses the problems in a direct language and his work is not burdened with arguments and counter-arguments. He is an ardent advocate of the power of reasoning and explains the questions relating to poetic figures through the power of his reasoning. Ruuyaka is practical in his approach and does not put emphasis on theoretical approach. If Mammaṭa is called dhvaniprasthānaparamācārya, Ruuyaka is rightly called Alamkārika-samājagragaṇya.