

Philosophical ponderings presented in 유리병 속의 소녀 is presented with an innocent child-like sensibility, and, at the same time, the existence of an observant narrator makes the text quite directly polemical. That is to say that the actions of 소녀 and her state of mind do not register as importance but rather the narrator who observes the 소녀 and raises existential questions emerges to be of significance.

This narrator exists neither in the interior world of the 소녀 nor in the exterior world of the others. But strangely enough, the only world that is described in the text is that of the 소녀 which exists inside a glass bottle. This makes the narrator a sympathetic being who serves the purpose explicating the state of the 소녀. As the observer, the narrator cannot represent the 소녀, for the narrator and the 소녀 are two separate beings. Therefore, all the questions that the narrator raises are but the narrator's own inquiry based on the narrator's own perspective of the 소녀 and are not the questions of the 소녀. In short, opinions of the narrator constitute the being and perception of the 소녀.

Towards the end of the text, the narrator resorts to series of philosophical questions that are self-conscious rather than reflective. So it appears that the narrator always had those questions in mind from the very start and utilized the story of the 소녀 as an allegory to make the questions better for presentation. Interesting, and quite humorous, thing is that the narrator answered his own questions at the very end of the text.

The whole text can thus be simplified as such:

*It is our choices that determine our world and the interactions within, for we never know.*

What is fantastic about the text is that it is extremely vivid. Every image is clear and images themselves compose the story of the 소녀. Because the text is presented in the point of view of the narrator, the story of the 소녀 is never 'told' but rather 'described', which I believe is one of the most important characteristic of art. However, because the images are so well crafted, the segment with the repetition of "1 second" and "broken glass" is too direct in a sense that it assumes too much about humanity through a metaphor. For many people broken glass must be cleaned away because someone might get hurt from it rather than because the broken glass is useless.

That said, the text would be much stronger if all the metaphors (e.g. glass bottle, paintings, light, broken glass, etc.) are deleted because the text would then cease to hide behind the conventions of metaphors and reveal itself as life and art itself. Readers understand metaphors, and the fact that they 'understand' makes the text cognitive rather than affective – rendering the text to be an analytical material that is rational as opposed to intuitive (as I am doing now by writing this paper).

The first paragraph of the text is perhaps the most beautiful. The inside of the glass bottle is described in such a wonderful manner that unexplainable feelings arise. This is because those images described are not yet metaphorical but are simple reflections of life as told by the narrator. It's magnificent. Charming, lonely and lovely.

The text has great vision. What it needs now is to be written again without the unnecessary metaphors and the questions of being. It needs to be more descriptive without any logical relations between images and intentions. Forget intentions (i.e. forget what you want). The importance of logic in film and art at large is a myth. Logic is the method of calculation, so we do not need logic in art. Science and philosophy rely on logic to understand life, art is an atmosphere of feelings that need not to be explained. Everything is already in the atmosphere, and that's a good film. Tell me more about the atmosphere inside the glass bottle, and nothing else.