\*\*5.- Is the story credible?\*\*

\*\*5\*\*

\*\*6.- Does the text require your participation or cooperation to complete its form and meaning?\*\*

\*\*4\*\*

\*\*7.- Does it propose a new perspective on reality?\*\*

\*\*4\*\*

\*\*8.- Does it propose a new vision of the genre it uses?\*\*

\*\*3\*\*

\*\*9.- Does it give an original way of using the language?\*\*

\*\*4\*\*

---

\*\*Evaluation:\*\*

Murakami-esque in tone and subtle melancholy, this story is both quietly realistic and metaphorically rich. The framing device of the failed kingdom echoes its central theme: the erosion of youthful idealism, integrity, and personal connection—as embodied in the seemingly flawless Q. The fish don’t care, nature is indifferent, and the narrator, too, is swept along in adult compromises, emotional passivity, and introspective self-erasure. The title evokes greater meaning retrospectively and signals a loss not just of status, but of spirit. Quietly devastating, the story rewards those who read below the surface and recognize its soft critique of systems, success, and sweetness fading.