

好段摘抄三则与反面病例：好段为什么好，堆砌为什么砸

好段一：那条溪清得过分。夏天蹚水过去，膝盖以下全看得见，水底的沙子一格一格的，像谁用耙子梳过。脚一踩，沙子腾起一团白雾，等它落下去，脚趾头已经陷进去半个。好处点评：全段没有一个好词，清得过分、白雾、陷进去半个，全是自己的话，但清澈见底的意思一个字没丢。摘抄这种段比摘抄成语有用，因为它示范的是怎么把成语拆成现象。

好段二：傍晚最好看。夕阳压到山尖上，整条溪变成橘红色，连我们几个泥猴子的胳膊都照成铜色。谁也不喊了，都看着水里。太阳往下掉一寸，溪面的光就窄一条，像有人慢慢收一条毯子。好处点评：波光粼粼四个字没出现，但橘红色、铜色、收毯子三个东西把光写完了。不喊了三个字最妙，前面段段都是欢声笑语，这里一安静，傍晚的分量就出来了。

好段三：走的时候，阿公还在溪里洗澡，搓得胳膊吱吱响。我们喊阿公回家，阿公头也不抬，说你们先走，水还没凉。后来很多年，我一听见扑通声就想到那个抬都不抬一下的头。好处点评：这段写人，欢声笑语不在我们身上，在阿公身上。好段不一定写景，写一个蹲在溪里的人，溪就在你心里了。

病例一：溪水清澈见底，波光粼粼，美丽极了，像一幅美丽的画。病因：三个好词挤在一句里，画这个比喻谁都用过。修改：拆成三句，每句只留一个信息，清就写清的证据，亮就写亮的时刻，删掉美丽极了和像一幅画。

病例二：我们欢声笑语地捉鱼，欢声笑语地戏水，欢声笑语地回家。病因：欢声笑语复读三遍，一个具体动作都没有。修改：把三个欢声笑语换成三件具体的事，捉鱼写鱼跑了，戏水写谁呛了水，回家写影子先进村。

病例三：阳光、溪水、蝉鸣、花草，构成了一幅生动和谐的夏日画卷。病因：名词排队加总结词，没有动词，没有我。修改：从名单里只留两样，阳光和蝉鸣，加一个我的动作：我躺在樟树下，阳光从叶子缝里一下一下戳我，蝉在很远的地方叫。画卷两个字永远删掉。

Three Model Paragraphs and Their Sick Counterparts: Why Good Works, Why Piling Fails

Model 1: that creek was unreasonably clear. Wading across in summer, everything below the knees stayed visible; the sand on the bottom lay ridge by ridge, as if someone raked it. One step and a white cloud of sand rose; by the time it settled, the toes had sunk half in. Why it works: not one stock idiom in the paragraph – unreasonably clear, white cloud, sunk half in are all the writer's own words, yet crystal clear loses nothing. Copying such a paragraph beats copying idioms, because it shows how to unpack an idiom into phenomena.

Model 2: dusk was the best hour. The sun pressed on the hilltop, the whole stream turned orange, even our mud-caked arms glowed bronze. Nobody shouted anymore; everyone watched the water. As the sun dropped an inch, the light on the stream

narrowed by a strip, like someone slowly gathering in a blanket. Why it works: the idiom glittering never appears, yet orange, bronze, and the gathered blanket finish the light. Nobody shouted is the gem: after paragraphs of laughter, one silence weighs out the evening.

Model 3: when we left, grandfather was still bathing in the stream, scrubbing his arms squeaking loud. We shouted for him to come home; without looking up he said go ahead, the water is not cold yet. For years afterward, any plop would bring back that head too stubborn to lift. Why it works: this paragraph writes a person; the laughter lives on grandfather, not on us. A good paragraph need not describe scenery – one man squatting in the stream, and the stream is inside the reader.

Case 1: the stream was crystal clear, glittering, extremely beautiful, like a beautiful painting. Diagnosis: three stock phrases crammed in one sentence, and painting is everyone's simile. Prescription: split into three sentences, one piece of information each – prove the clarity, name the moment of brightness, delete extremely beautiful and like a painting.

Case 2: we caught fish with laughter, played in the water with laughter, went home with laughter. Diagnosis: laughter everywhere repeated three times, not one concrete action. Prescription: replace the three laughs with three events – the fish escaped, someone choked on water, the shadows entered the village first.

Case 3: sunlight, stream, cicadas, flowers and grass formed a vivid and harmonious summer scroll. Diagnosis: nouns queuing up plus a summary word, no verb, no I. Prescription: keep only two items from the list, sunlight and cicadas, and add one action of mine: lying under the camphor tree, sunlight poking me through the leaves again and again, cicadas calling far away. The word scroll gets deleted, always.