

写普通人诚信随笔的四个坑：评语腔、素材平均用力、议论成段、细节失真

随笔要求语言自然亲切、夹叙夹议，听起来简单，实际最容易写歪。四个坑有一个共同根源：作者忘了随笔是说话，不是表态。四个常见坑，逐个拆。

坑一，评语腔。症状：摊主真是个好心人、同学的精神值得学习、邻居太可贵了。每段末尾都贴一句评语，全文像广播稿。改法：把评语换成观察。好心人换成她先蹭手再递钱，值得学习换成抠掉名字比留下名字难。评语是给别人贴标签，观察是替人物留证据，随笔要证据。

坑二，三个素材平均用力。症状：摊主200字、同学200字、邻居200字，三件事一样长一样淡，读完只记得有仨人。改法：给三个素材分主次。挑一个最有反常点的当重头，比如同学抠名字那段，多给40字；其余两段收紧。随笔的随不是平均，是各有轻重。

坑三，议论成段。症状：三个素材讲完，单起一段写诚信是中华民族的传统美德，我们应当从身边小事做起。这一段一出现，前面积累的亲切全部作废。改法：议论打散，每个素材后面只跟一句，全文议论不超过三句。美德、传统、应当这类词一个不用，道理让细点自己长出来。

坑四，细节失真。症状：摊主追出二百米还钱、邻居每次都带着利息还、同学捡到钱包里有三千块。夸张的细节一出来，读者立刻不信，随笔的亲切建立在真上。改法：把细节缩到可信的范围。多找的是两块钱不是五十，还钱不带利息只带新信封，水壶不是钱包。小的真胜过大的假，写普通人就写普通数目。

交稿前四问。一问：把全文的评语句全删掉，文章还立得住吗？立得住说明证据够。二问：三个素材里有没有一个让你想多写40字的？没有说明还没找到反常点。三问：议论有没有哪处超过一句？超了就拆。四问：每个细节报个数，两块钱、一百块、十四个月，数字是不是都小得可信？四问全过，再把全文轻声读一遍，读到哪句觉得像在念社论，就改哪句。随笔写普通人，可信就是亲切的地基。

Four Traps in Essays About Ordinary Honest People: Verdict Tone, Even Effort, Paragraph-long Commentary, Fake Details

The essay asks for natural, intimate language and commentary woven into narration. It sounds simple and is easy to warp. All four traps share one root: the author forgets that an essay is talking, not making a statement. Four common traps, taken apart one by one.

Trap one, the verdict tone. Symptom: the vendor is such a kind person, my classmate's spirit deserves imitation, the neighbor is truly praiseworthy. A verdict pasted at every paragraph's end turns the piece into a broadcast script. The fix: trade verdicts for observations. Kind person becomes she wiped her hands before

passing the money; deserves imitation becomes scratching off the name is harder than leaving it. A verdict labels a person; an observation keeps evidence for them. Essays want evidence.

Trap two, even effort across three materials. Symptom: vendor 200 words, classmate 200, neighbor 200, three stories equally long and equally pale, leaving readers remembering only that there were three people. The fix: grade the materials. Pick the one with the strangest point, say the classmate scratching off the name, and give it 40 extra words; tighten the other two. Ease in an essay does not mean sameness; it means each part carries its own weight.

Trap three, commentary in whole paragraphs. Symptom: after the three stories, a standalone paragraph declares that integrity is a traditional virtue and we should start from small things nearby. The moment that paragraph appears, all the warmth built before it is void. The fix: scatter the commentary, one sentence after each material, no more than three sentences in total. Never use words like virtue, tradition, ought; let the moral grow out of the details on its own.

Trap four, details that ring false. Symptom: the vendor chased two hundred meters to return money, the neighbor always repaid with interest, the classmate found a wallet with three thousand yuan. Once details inflate, readers stop believing, and an essay's warmth rests on truth. The fix: shrink details to a believable range. The overpayment is two yuan not fifty; repayment comes with no interest, only a new envelope; the item is a water bottle, not a wallet. Small truth beats large fiction; to write ordinary people, use ordinary numbers.

Four questions before submitting. One: delete every verdict sentence, does the piece still stand? If yes, the evidence is enough. Two: is there one material you wanted to write 40 words longer on? If not, you have not found the strange point yet. Three: does any commentary run past one sentence? If so, break it up. Four: read out every number, two yuan, a hundred yuan, fourteen months, are they all small enough to believe? Pass all four, then read the whole piece aloud, and rewrite any line that sounds like an editorial. When an essay writes ordinary people, believability is the foundation of warmth.