

范文点评：这段作文好在哪、毛病在哪

假设我拿到一篇六年级范文，开头是这样写的：《西游记》是我国古典四大名著之一，作者吴承恩，书里讲了唐僧师徒四人西天取经的故事，我读了以后有很多感想。这段毛病很明显：绕了两句背景，自己的观点还没露面。如果开头先介绍作者和书的评价，老师会认为你在抄资料，不是在写观点。改法是把背景全删，第一句直接亮出论点：取经路上谁最重要？我的答案是四个人缺一不可。

再看它的论据段。原文写：孙悟空三打白骨精，他火眼金睛，一下子就认出妖怪变的村姑、老妇人、老公公，举起金箍棒就打。这段只讲了故事，没有分析。论据不是复述情节，而是要回答这个情节怎么证明我的观点。修改示范：悟空三打白骨精，哪怕被师父念紧箍咒、被赶回花果山，他也要先把妖怪打死。这说明开路不光要有本领，还要有挨了误解也要做对的事的担当。加上后一句，故事才变成论据。

接着看论据的分工。这篇范文三个论据各管一件事：唐僧的坚持管方向，孙悟空的本领管开路，八戒沙僧的辅助管保障。沙僧看守行李、八戒请回悟空，这些细节说明队伍的日常运转靠的是他们。如果两个论据都在夸悟空能打，论据重复，论点就塌了一半。

最后是结尾。范文原文：我们一定要学习他们坚持不懈的精神。这是喊口号，跟谁最重要没有关系。修改后的结尾：火焰山一难，唐僧坚持要过，悟空借扇灭火，八戒沙僧斗牛魔王，四人少一环都过不去——取经路上，方向、开路、保障，缺一不可。班级活动也一样，每个人都有自己的位置。

检查一篇议论文，就问三个问题：论点能不能一句话说清？每个论据是不是讲完故事又回到观点？结尾有没有回扣开头？三问都过关，文章就立得住。

Reviewing a Model Essay: What Works and What Needs Fixing

Suppose I receive a sixth-grade model essay whose opening reads: Journey to the West is one of the four great classical novels of China, written by Wu Cheng'en, telling the story of the monk and his three disciples traveling west for scriptures, and after reading it I have many thoughts. The flaw is obvious: two sentences of background pass by before the writer's own view shows up. If an opening starts with the author and the book's reputation, the teacher will think you are copying reference material instead of writing an opinion. The fix is to delete all the background and state the thesis in the first sentence: who matters most on the journey? My answer is that all four are indispensable.

Next, look at its evidence paragraph. The original reads: Sun Wukong struck the White Bone Demon three times; with his fiery golden eyes he instantly recognized the demon disguised as a village girl, an old woman, and an old man, and raised his

golden cudgel to strike. This paragraph only retells the story; it analyzes nothing. Evidence is not plot summary—it must answer how this episode proves my point. A revised version: Wukong struck the White Bone Demon three times, and even as his master chanted the tightening headband spell and drove him back to Flower Fruit Mountain, he insisted on killing the demon first. This shows that clearing the road takes not only skill but the courage to do the right thing even when misunderstood. With that second sentence, the story becomes evidence.

Then check how the evidence divides its labor. This model essay gives each of its three points a separate job: Tang Seng's perseverance covers direction, Sun Wukong's skill covers road-clearing, Bajie and Sha Seng's support covers logistics. Sha Seng guarding the luggage and Bajie winning Wukong back show that the team's daily routine runs on them. If two points both praise Wukong's fighting, the evidence repeats itself and half the thesis collapses.

Finally, the ending. The original reads: we must learn their spirit of perseverance. That is a slogan, unrelated to who matters most. A revised ending: at Flaming Mountain, Tang Seng insisted on crossing, Wukong borrowed the fan and quenched the fire, Bajie and Sha Seng fought the Bull Demon King—miss one link and the four could not pass. On the scripture journey, direction, road-clearing, and support are all indispensable; class activities are the same, with a place for everyone.

To check an argumentative essay, ask three questions: Can the thesis be stated in one sentence? Does each piece of evidence return to the point after telling the story? Does the ending echo the opening? Pass all three, and the essay stands.