

两篇草稿的故事：为什么抄来的感悟一眼就被看穿

假设班里布置读《小溪边的夏天》写读后感，小舟交了两篇草稿，第一篇开头引用了溪水和落叶，结尾写：时光如溪水般流逝，我们要珍惜身边的每一刻。老师在旁边批了四个字：这是谁的话。小舟答不上来，这句话是他从好词好句书上抄的，书上的句子放在溪水、落叶、旧照片后面都通顺，正因为放哪儿都通顺，它不属于哪一篇。

第二篇草稿换了写法。小舟写自己家老院子，搬走那年他上四年级，院子里有棵枣树。他引用文章里落叶漂过拐弯那段，然后写自己放假回去过一次，院墙还在，枣树没了，空地上晾着别人的被子。他站在门口没进去，钥匙早就没了。结尾写：枣树被谁砍的，我到现在也没问。

老师把第二篇读了两遍，只问了他三个问题：你什么时候回去的，为什么没进去，没问是因为忘了还是不敢。小舟每个都答得上来，答完老师就在作文本上写了合格。三个问题其实是在查三样东西：时间地点查经历是不是真的，为什么没进去查细节里有没有他自己的选择，没问是因为忘了还是不敢查结尾那句是不是从他心里长出来的。抄来的感悟经不起这三个问题，因为写它的人没答过。

这个故事里小舟用的办法可以直接搬走：动笔前先替老师问自己三问，我写的这件事发生在什么时候什么地方，我在那件事里做了什么选择，我结尾那句话是回答哪个问题的。三问有一问答不上来，就换素材或者补细节，别急着往下写。第二篇草稿里没进去、没问出口，都是选择，选择写出来，文章就有了人。第一篇草稿的问题不在文笔，引用和结尾都顺，问题是整篇没有一样东西只有小舟能写出来。

好词好句不是不能用，用在小舟第一篇那种地方就废了，它替你把感悟说完，你就没话可说了。自己没答过三问的句子，写的时候顺，读的人一眼看出是借来的。借来的句子用一次，读者记住的是书；自己的句子写一次，读者记住的是你那条溪、那棵枣树。

The Story of Two Drafts: Why Borrowed Insights Are Spotted at Once

Suppose the class is assigned a reading response to *Summer by the Stream*, and a student named Zhou turns in two drafts. The first quotes the stream and the fallen leaf, then ends with: time slips away like a stream, we should cherish every moment around us. The teacher writes four characters beside it: whose words are these. Zhou cannot answer. He copied the line from a book of good sentences. That line works after a stream, a leaf, or an old photograph, and precisely because it works everywhere, it belongs to no single essay.

The second draft changes method. Zhou writes about his family old yard. They moved the year he was in fourth grade, and the yard had a jujube tree. He quotes the passage where the leaf floats around the bend, then writes that he visited once during a school break: the wall still stood, the tree was gone, someone else bedding

was drying in the empty space. He stood at the gate and did not go in; the key was long gone. The ending reads: who cut down the jujube tree, I never asked, even now.

The teacher read the second draft twice and asked only three questions: when did you go back, why did you not go in, and did you not ask because you forgot or because you were afraid. Zhou could answer every one. After his answers the teacher wrote pass in the notebook. The three questions were checking three things: time and place check whether the experience is real; why you did not go in checks whether the detail contains a choice you made; forgot or afraid checks whether the closing sentence grew from your own mind. A borrowed insight cannot survive these questions, because the person who wrote it never answered them.

Zhou method can be taken directly: before writing, ask yourself the teacher three questions. When and where did this event happen, what choice did I make inside it, and which question does my closing sentence answer. If one question has no answer, swap the material or add the detail before writing on. In the second draft, not going in and never asking are both choices; once choices appear on the page, a person appears in the essay. The problem with the first draft was not the writing itself; the quote and the ending both read smoothly. The problem is that nothing in the whole piece is something only Zhou could write.

Good sentences from books are not forbidden. They fail in the way Zhou used them in draft one: they finish the insight for you, and then you have nothing left to say. A sentence you never answered the three questions for feels smooth while writing it, and readers see at once that it was borrowed. Borrow a sentence once and readers remember the book; write your own once and readers remember your stream and your jujube tree.