

一节三打白骨精阅读指导课的点评：问题出在哪，怎么改

这篇点评我旁听过的一节阅读指导课，用它来分析名著阅读课常见的失误和改法。课题是三打白骨精，教师第一版设计分三段：先放86版电视剧片段，再让学生复述故事，最后当堂写读后感。课后我收集了四十二份习作，其中二十八份出现同一句话，夸孙悟空有一双火眼金睛，措辞几乎一样。

第一个问题在放片段这一段暴露出来：学生知道情节，但找不到课文。我问三打白骨精在书的哪一回，全班安静。原因是电视剧片段代替了阅读过程，学生以为看完视频就算读过书。改进办法是把看片段改成找不同任务：要求学生在书里找出原文和片段的三处差别，比如白骨精在原著里变化了三次，电视剧里只有两次。这个任务必须翻书才能完成。

第二个问题在复述环节：发言的总是那几个学生，其余人在走神或讲话。原因是复述是低信息量活动，只读梗概的学生复述得一样流利。改进办法是改成小组分角色读原文对话，读完后要说明为什么这样读语气。有一组读唐僧念紧箍咒那段，一个学生指出唐僧骂的是泼猴，说明他又气又怕。这种对文字的敏感，复述情节给不了。

第三个问题在当堂写作：学生写三四行就停笔。原因是读后感题目太宽，读这一回有感，读和写之间没有台阶。改进办法是给三个可选角度：写这一回里最委屈的人；写如果唐僧没有赶走悟空会怎样；或者学作者的写法，从白骨精的角度改写结尾。角度收窄后，最短的习作也超过三百字，开头没有两份重复。

这个案例说明，名著阅读课的问题通常不在学生不愿读，而在任务设计不要求他们读。每个环节都设计成不读原文就做不成，只读梗概的现象会自己消失。讨论流于表面也一样，问题太大、没有课前准备，讨论就只能停在空话上；把问题缩小到一段文字，讨论自然落到细节上。

A Case Study of a Three Beat the White Bone Demon Lesson: What Went Wrong and How It Was Fixed

This piece comments on a reading guidance lesson I observed, using it as a case to show where classic reading lessons go wrong and how to fix them. The topic was Three Beat the White Bone Demon. The teacher's first version had three parts: a clip from the 1986 TV series, students retelling the story, and an in-class essay. After class I collected forty-two papers; twenty-eight of them contained the same sentence praising Sun Wukong's sharp eye, with almost identical wording.

The first problem appeared during the clip: students knew the plot but could not find the text. When I asked which chapter the story was in, the whole class went silent. The TV clip had replaced the act of reading, and students assumed watching counted as reading. The fix: turn the clip into a find-the-differences task. Students had to locate three differences between the original and the clip, such as the White Bone Demon changing form three times in the book but only twice on screen. Completing

the task required opening the book.

The second problem was in the retelling: the same few students spoke while the rest drifted. Retelling carries little information, since a student who read only the synopsis can retell it just as smoothly. The fix: replace it with groups reading the original dialogue aloud, then explaining why they chose that tone. One group read the passage where Tang Monk chants the tightening-circlet spell, and a student noted that Tang Monk's insult shows anger mixed with fear. That kind of sensitivity to language does not come from retelling the plot.

The third problem was the in-class essay: students wrote three or four lines and stopped. The prompt was too broad, with no bridge between reading and writing. The fix: offer three narrow angles, write about the most wronged person in this chapter, write what would happen if Tang Monk had not driven Wukong away, or rewrite the ending from the White Bone Demon's side in the author's style. After the angles narrowed, even the shortest paper passed three hundred characters, and no two openings were alike.

The case shows that the problem in classic reading lessons is rarely that students refuse to read; it is that the tasks do not require reading. When every activity is designed so that it cannot be completed without the original text, reading the synopsis instead stops working. Superficial discussion follows the same logic: a question that is too large with no preparation can only float on empty phrases, while a question narrowed to one paragraph lands on details.