

31. The Murders in the Rue Morgue (part 3 of 4) – by Edgar Allen Poe

【三十一】墨街謀殺案（四之三） -- 愛倫坡著

“That the voices heard in contention,” he said, “by the party upon the stairs, were not the voices of the women themselves, was fully proved by the evidence. This relieves us of all doubt upon the question whether the old lady could have first destroyed the daughter and afterward have committed suicide. I speak of this point chiefly for the sake of method; for the strength of Madame L’Espanaye would have been utterly unequal to the task of thrusting her daughter’s corpse up the chimney as it was found; and the nature of the wounds upon her own person entirely preclude the idea of self-destruction. Murder, then, has been committed by some third party; and the voices of this third party were those heard in contention. Let me now advert – not to the whole testimony respecting these voices – but to what was peculiar in that testimony. Did you observe anything peculiar about it?”

“爭吵的聲音，”他說，“根據在樓梯上的那些人所述，不是兩位女人的聲音，這一點由證據證完全証明了。我們就不必再懷疑是不是老女士先把女兒毀掉然後自殺的可能性。我提起這點，完全只是爲了周全我的推理方法；反正我們知道利西班牙女士根本不可能把她女兒的屍體推擠到烟囪裏面，就像他們發現的時候一樣；再說，她自己身上所受的傷害，也完全證明不可能是她加害於自己的。也就是說，這個謀殺是由第三者做出來的；這第三者的聲音就是證人所聽到爭吵的聲音。讓我現在提醒你 – 並非有關聲音的所有證言 – 而是有關證言裏面有什麼特別引人注意的地方。你查覺到了嗎？”

I remarked that, while all the witnesses agreed in supposing the gruff voice to be that of a Frenchman, there was much disagreement in regard to the shrill, or, as one individual termed it, the harsh voice.

我說，所有證人同意粗糙的聲音是法國人的聲音，有關那個尖銳的聲音，或者證人之一稱之爲刺耳的聲音，則見仁見智，說法不一。

“That was the evidence itself,” said Dupin, ‘but it was not the peculiarity of the evidence. You have observed nothing distinctive. Yet there was something to be observed. The witnesses, as you remark, agreed about the gruff voice; they were here unanimous. But in regard to the shrill voice, the peculiarity is – not that they disagreed – but that, while an Italian, an Englishman, a Spaniard, a Hollander, and a Frenchman attempted to describe it, each one spoke of it as that of a foreigner: Each is sure that it was not the voice of one of his own countrymen. Each likens it – not to the voice of an individual of any nation with whose language he is conversant – but the converse. The Frenchman supposes it the voice of a Spaniard, and ‘might have distinguished some words had he been acquainted with Spanish.’ The Dutchman maintains it to have been that of a Frenchman; but we find it stated that ‘not understanding French this witness was examined through an interpreter.’ The Englishman thinks it the voice of a German, and ‘does not understand German.’ The Spaniard ‘is sure’ that it was that of an Englishman, but ‘judges by the intonation’ altogether, ‘as he has no knowledge of the English.’ The Italian believes it the voice of a Russian, but ‘has never conversed with a native of Russia.’ A second Frenchman differs, moreover, with the first, and is positive that the voice was that of an Italian; but, not being cognizant of that tongue, is, like the Spaniard, ‘convinced by the intonation.’ Now, how strangely unusual must that voice have really been, about which such testimony as this could have been elicited! – in whose tones, even, denizens of the five great divisions of Europe could recognize nothing familiar! You will say that it might have been the voice of an Asiatic – of an African. Neither Asiatics nor Africans abound in Paris;

but, without denying the inference, I will now merely call your attention to three points. The voice is termed by one witness 'harsh rather than shrill.' It is represented by two others to have been 'quick and unequal.' No words – no sounds resembling words – were by any witness mentioned as distinguishable.

“那個本身就是證據，”老杜說，“但又不是證據裏面凸顯的地方。你並沒有觀察出籠統的證據裏頭凸顯之處。我們必須仔細看看。證人們，就如同你所說的，對於那粗糙的聲音意見都相同；在這一點上，可以說是異口同聲。至於那個尖聲，最凸顯的一點 – 我不是說他們不同意這點 – 而是說他們是見仁見智的，一個意大利人這麼說，一個英國人這麼說，一個西班牙人這麼說，一個荷蘭人這麼說，一個法國人這麼說，他們都說是個外國人：每個人都確信不是自己國家的人講的話。每個人都把它比成 – 不是各自講的語言 – 恰恰適得其反。法國人認為是西班牙人，又加上‘假如他懂得西班牙文的話，有可能聽出來幾個字。’那個荷蘭人認為是法國人；我們偏又知道他‘不懂法文，證詞是經由翻譯做出來的。’那個英國人認為是德國人的聲音，又偏偏‘不懂德文。’那個西班牙人‘確定’是英國人的聲音，但是完全由‘聲音的抑揚頓挫’臆測出來的，原因是他對英文狗屁不通。‘那個意大利人認為是俄國人的聲音，卻‘從來沒有和俄國人交談過。’第二位法國人又再和第一位法國人看法不同，確定聲音是意大利人的聲音；然而，因為不懂意大利文，就像那個西班牙人一樣，是由‘說話者的抑揚頓挫’肯定出來的。你想想證詞是這麼著，那個說話聲必定比外星人講的話還奇特了！ -- 我們光是說講話的聲調而已，歐洲五個元老文化的庶民都聽不出半點熟悉之處！你可能要說那聲音是屬於亞洲語系 -- 或者非洲語系。巴黎卻很少亞洲人或者非洲人；然而，暫且不否定這推理，我只請你注意三點。有個證人說這聲音‘粗糙而非尖銳。’另外兩位證人說是‘快而不均勻。’沒有任何一個語詞 – 沒有任何聲音是類似某個語詞的 – 而被證人聽出來拿來作證的。

“I know not,” continued Dupin, “what impression I may have made, so far, upon your own understanding; but I do not hesitate to say that legitimate deductions even from this portion of the testimony – the portion respecting the gruff and shrill voices – are in themselves sufficient to engender a suspicion which should give direction to all farther progress in the investigation of the mystery. I said ‘legitimate deductions’; but my meaning is not thus fully expressed. I designed to imply that the deductions are the sole proper ones, and that the suspicion arises inevitably from them as the single result. What the suspicion is, however, I will not say just yet. I merely wish you to bear in mind that, with myself, it was sufficiently forcible to give a definite form – a certain tendency – to my inquiries in the chamber.

“我不知道，”老杜繼續說，“到目前為止我跟你說的在你心裏的瞭解上做成了什麼印象；但是呢，我敢拍胸脯跟你這麼說，這部分證言的合理推斷 – 有關於粗糙聲和尖銳聲這部分 – 就形成了一個能夠指引進一步調查這起懸疑案件的疑點。我說‘合理推斷’；光是這幾個字又不能完全表白我的意思。我必須這麼說，這麼的推斷是唯一適合的途徑，懷疑這些講話聲是唯一的解決這件懸疑案件的途徑。但是疑點到底是什麼，我暫且不說。我只期望你心裏有準備，在我呢已經是胸有成竹 – 生米已成熟飯 – 我在那個房間裏的調查已經水落石出。

“Let us now transport ourselves, in fancy, to this chamber. What shall we first seek here? The means of egress employed by the murderers. It is not too much to say that neither of us believe in preternatural events. Madame and Mademoiselle L’Espanaye were not destroyed by spirits. The doer of deed were material, and escaped materially. Then how? Fortunately, there is but one mode of reasoning upon the point, and that mode must lead us to a definite decision. Let us examine, each by each, the possible

means of egress. It is clear that the assassins were in the room where Mademoiselle L'Españaye was found, or at least in the room adjoining, when the party ascended the stairs. It is then only from these two apartments that we have to seek issues. The police have laid bare the floors, the ceilings, and the masonry of the walls, in every direction. No secret issues could have escaped their vigilance. But not trusting to their eyes, I examined with my own. There were, then, no secret issues. Both doors leading from the rooms into the passage were securely locked, with the keys inside. Let us turn to the chimneys. These, although of ordinary width for some eight or ten feet above the hearth, will not admit, throughout their extent, the body of a large cat. The impossibility of egress, by means already stated, being thus absolute, we are reduced to the windows. Through those of the front room no one could have escaped without notice from the crowd in the street. The murderers must have passed, then, through those of the back room. Now, brought to this conclusion in so unequivocal a manner as we are, it is not our part, as reasoners, to reject it on account of apparent 'impossibilities'. It is only left for us to prove that these apparent 'impossibilities' are, in reality, not such.

“讓我們假想現在就在那個房間裏面。我們首先該尋找什麼呢？那應該是謀殺者的出路。用不着說我們兩個都不相信超自然的力量。里斯班女士和她女兒都不是神鬼驅使的人。做謀殺這件事的人是實質上存在的，逃走也是實質上逃走的。這麼說，如何逃走呢？幸好，有關這一點只有一個推理的模式，而且這個模式會引導我們做確定的決定。現在，我們來檢討一下逃出去的方法。由證人的證詞所指出，衆人上樓梯的時候，謀殺者在里斯班小姐屍體被發現的那個房間，或者在隔壁的那個房間。於是乎，我們只須從這兩個房間來著手進行調查。警方已經把地板，天花板，和所有牆壁都打開搜查。看不到半點兒蛛絲馬蹟。我呢，偏偏不相信他們的眼睛，自己搜查了一下。事實上也是，沒有什麼奧秘的發現。兩個房間通向走道的門都鎖著，鑰匙都在裏面。接下去，讓我們看煙囪。大約由壁爐往上六到八呎是一般的寬度，再往上根本容不下一隻大大的貓。煙囪這個出路就這麼確定為不可能了。我們現在來看窗子。假如從前面那個房間的窗子出去，一定會引起街上的人注意。於是乎，謀殺者必定是由後面那個房間的窗子出去的。我們的思路毫無選擇就被這麼論定了，看起來‘根本不可能’不是我們應該持有的態度。相反地，我們唯一的方法是來證明這個‘不可能’事實上是可能的。

“There are two windows in the chamber. One of them is unobstructed by furniture, and is wholly visible. The lower portion of the other is hidden from view by the head of the unwieldy bedstead which is thrust close up against it. The former was found securely fastened from within. It resisted the utmost force of those who endeavoured to raise it. A large gimlet-hole had been pierced in its frame to the left, and a very stout nail was found fitted therein, nearly to the head. Upon examining the other window, a similar nail was seen similarly fitted in it; and a vigorous attempt to raise this sash, failed also. The police were now entirely satisfied that egress had not been in these directions. And, therefore, it was thought a matter of supererogation to withdraw the nails and open the windows.

“這房間有兩個窗子。其中之一沒有被家具擋住，而且整個都可以看到。另外一面窗子的下半部被一張緊靠著它的床遮住了。第一扇窗子他們發現是由裏面牢牢鎖住的。想要把它打開的人用盡吃奶的力量也沒辦法打開。窗子左邊有一個大大有螺紋的洞，洞裏面裏面有一支結實的釘子牢牢釘著，幾乎釘到釘子的頭部都釘進去了。另外一扇窗子呢，觀察之後發現也有類似的釘子釘著；他們用力開這扇窗子，但是打不開。警察於是完全把握謀殺者不是由窗子逃走的。於是乎呢，他們認為把釘子拔起來打開窗子是吃得太飽閑得沒事幹的人才會去做的。

“My own examination was somewhat more particular and was so for the reason I have just given – because here it was, I knew, that all apparent impossibilities must be proved to be not such in reality.

“我自己的調查則比較特別，原因就如剛才所述 – 所有看起來不可能的事都要被證明為恰恰適得其反。

“I proceeded to think thus – a posteriori. The murderers did escape from one of these windows. This being so, they could not have refastened the sashes from the inside, as they were found fastened. They must, then, have the power of fastening themselves. There was no escape from this conclusion. I stepped to the unobstructed casement, withdrew the nail with some difficulty and attempted to raise the sash. It resisted all my efforts, as I had anticipated. A concealed spring must, I now know, exist; and this corroboration of my idea convinced me that my premises at least, were correct, however mysterious still appeared the circumstances attending the nails. A careful search soon brought to light the hidden spring. I pressed it, and, satisfied with the discovery, forbore to upraise the sash.

“我於是這麼想 – 一個反推。謀殺者一定從這窗子之一逃走。這麼說，他們沒法由裏面把釘子就像他們發現的一樣釘住。這麼說，這兩扇窗子的釘子必定能自己釘上。唯有此路一條，別無他法。我走到那扇沒有被擋住的窗框那裏，用了些力氣試圖把釘子拿起來把窗框提起來。完全無能為力，就像我所預期的。於是，我推想必定有一個隱藏的彈簧機關藏在哪裏；我的推理如此合理，至少讓我相信我這麼想是對的，不論事實上有關這釘子的神奇行為是這麼奇妙。於是我仔細找了一下，找到了隱藏的彈簧機關。我一按，自己就滿足已經發現到如此地步，剋制住自己的興奮而沒有把窗子推上去。

“I now replaced the nail and regarded it attentively. A person passing out through this window might have reclosed it, and the spring would have caught – but the nail could not have been replaced. The conclusion was plain, and again narrowed in the field of my investigations. The assassins must have escaped through the other window. Supposing, then, the springs upon each sash to be the same, as was probable, there must be found a difference between the nails, or at least between the modes of their fixture. Getting upon the sacking of the bedstead, I looked over the head-board minutely at the second casement. Passing my hand down behind the board, I readily discovered and pressed the spring, which was, as I had supposed, identical in character with its neighbour. I now looked at the nail. It was as stout as the other, and apparently fitted in the same manner – driven in nearly up to the head.

“我把釘子放回去，然後仔細觀察。一個人從窗子出去，可能再把窗子關上，可是不可能把釘子放回去。於是結論非常明白，再次把我偵察範圍又縮小了。殺人者必定是由另一扇窗子出去的。這麼說來，假如兩扇窗子的彈簧如同想象的都是一樣的話，那麼，必定是釘子不一樣了，或者說釘子固定方式不一樣。我爬上那張床去，到床墊上，仔細從靠頭那邊的直立板子上方觀察。我把手仔細在床板後方摸索，我馬上找到了彈簧，而且按下去，結果就如我預期的一樣，跟另一張床的彈簧裝置完全一樣。我於是看了一下釘子。釘子也如同另一張窗子的釘子一樣堅牢，裝置法也完全一樣 – 幾乎釘到釘子的頭那麼深。

“You will say that I was puzzled; but, if you think so, you must have misunderstood the nature of the inductions. To use a sporting phrase, I had not been once ‘at fault.’ The secret had never for an instant been lost. There was no flaw in any link of the chain. I had traced the secret to its ultimate result – and that result was the nail. It had, I say, in every respect, the appearance of its fellow in the other window;

but this fact was an absolute nullity (conclusive as it might seem to be) when compared with the consideration that here, at this point, terminated the clew. 'There must be something wrong,' I said, 'about the nail.' I touched it; and the head, with about a quarter of an inch of the shank, came off in my fingers. The rest of the shank was in the gimlet-hole where it had been broken off. The fracture was an old one (for its edges were encrusted with rust), and has apparently been accomplished by the blow of a hammer, which had partially embedded, in the top of the bottom sash, the head portion of the nail. I now carefully replaced this head portion in the indentation whence I had taken it, and the resemblance to a perfect nail was complete – the fissure was invisible. Pressing the spring, I gently raised the sash for a few inches; the head went up with it, remaining firm in its bed. I closed the window, and the semblance of the whole nail was again perfect.

“你要說我這下可迷糊了；假如是如此，你就誤會了我的推論性質。我們就拿運動比賽時的用語把，我從沒‘犯規’過。我要追蹤的氣味從未遺失。推論的任何一個環節都沒遺失。我已經找到了秘密的起源 – 這個起源就是這個釘子。我說過，任何一個角度來看，這支釘子和另外那扇窗子的那一支釘子看起來一摸一樣；這個事實的價值卻完全是個零（雖然推論起來有條有理），因為我就不要這樣子，假如真的是完全一樣的話，就沒什麼戲可唱了。‘一定有什麼不對的地方，’我這麼說，‘這隻釘子必定隱藏了什麼機竅。’我摸了摸這支釘子，嘿，釘子的頭加上大約釘子四分之一的長度的釘子本身就被我的手指頭拈斷了。其餘的下大半截則乖乖地釘在那個洞裏，動都沒動。已經斷了一段時日（因為邊沿有鐵鏽，）而且看起來是錘子打斷的，那上半部藏在窗框底部上方。我這時候把這頭半部仔細地放回我從那裏拿起來的那個洞裏，果然不錯，看起來就是一支好端端的釘子 – 斷的地方完全看不出來。我一壓彈簧，斯斯文文地把窗框開起來幾英寸；釘子的頭那一半也跟著提起來了，下一半則乖乖坐在洞裏面。我把窗子關上，釘子看起來完完整整的。

“The riddle, so far, was now unriddled. The assassin had escaped through the window which looked upon the bed. Dropping of its own accord upon his exit (or perhaps purposely closed), it had become fastened by the spring; and it was the retention of this spring which had been mistaken by the police for that of the nail – farther inquiry being thus considered unnecessary.

“謎，到這裏，就真相大白了。殺人者是從靠床的這張窗子逃出去的。他出去之後，窗子自動掉下來（或者蓄意地關窗子也好），窗子被彈簧鎖住了；就是這彈簧拉住的力量被警方認為是釘子釘牢的 – 於是警方認為沒有必要再偵察什麼了。

“The next question is that of the mode of descent. Upon this point I had been satisfied in my walk with you around the building. About five feet and a half from the casement in question there runs a lightning-rod. From this rod it would have been impossible for any one to reach the window itself, to say nothing of entering it. I observed, however, that the shutters of the fourth story were of the peculiar kind called by Parisian carpenters ferrades – a kind rarely employed at the present day, but frequently seen upon very old mansions at Lyons and Bourdeaux. They are in the form of an ordinary door (a single, not a folding door), except that the upper half is latticed or worked in open trellis – thus affording an excellent hold for the hands. In the present instance these shutters are fully three feet and a half broad. When we saw them from the rear of the house, they were both about half open – that is to say, they stood off at right angles from the wall. It is probable that the police, as well as myself, examined the back of the tenement; but, if so, in looking at these ferrades in the like of their breadth (as they must have done), they did not perceive this great breadth itself, or, at all events, failed to take it into due consideration. In fact, having once satisfied themselves that no egress could have been made in this quarter, they would

naturally bestow here a very cursory examination. It was clear to me, however, that the shutter belonging to the window at the head of the bed, would, if swung fully back to the wall, reach to within two feet of the lightning-rod. It was also evident that, by exertion of a very unusual degree of activity and courage, an entrance into the window, from the rod, might have been thus effected. – By reaching to the distance of two feet and a half (we now suppose the shutter open to its whole extent) a robber might have taken a firm grasp upon the trellis-work. Letting go, then, his hold upon the rod, placing his feet securely against the wall, and springing boldly from it, he might have swung the shutter so as to close it, and, if we imagine the window open at the time, might even have swung himself into the room.

“下一個問題是怎麼下去的。有關這一點，我在和你繞著房子走一圈的時候找到了滿意的答案。我們質疑的那個窗子的窗框距離大約五呎半有根避雷針。從避雷針沒有任何人能夠到達這窗子，更不用提要怎麼進去了。然而，我仔細觀察，四樓的窗簾是一種巴黎木匠們稱之為‘非拉對’的窗簾 – 這種窗簾今日已經不常用了，但是在里昂和伯迪歐的老式房子還是常常可以看見。他們的形式是個普通的門的樣子（單扇的門而非雙扇的），唯一不同的是上半部是做成格子狀的，或者就是一個開放的架子 – 這麼一來，就成爲一個手能握住的好地方。這個窗子的窗簾上半部的空架子有三呎半寬。我們從房子後面看的時候，這些窗簾都是半開著的 – 換句話說，它們都跟房子的牆壁成直角。警察很可能跟我一樣巡視了一下房子後頭；假如是如此，他們含含糊糊地看了一下這種非拉對窗簾的寬度（他們必定有這麼做），並沒有真正去理解實際的寬度有多大，又有可能的，理解是理解了，在下判斷的時候，卻又沒有真正把它們考慮進去。說真的，他們已經認爲不可能是從這裏逃走的，於是就匆匆走過，潦潦草草，走馬看花地就過去了。在我看來，床頭這扇窗子的窗簾假如完全打開的話，能夠接近到避雷針兩呎遠近的地方。假如夠靈巧又夠大膽的話，從避雷針進到窗子裏面就可能了。一個竊盜把手伸出去兩呎半，（我們假設窗簾是全開的）能夠穩穩地抓住窗簾上部的空架子。把抓住避雷針的手放開，把兩隻腳穩穩踩在牆上，然後大膽地一跳，他能把窗簾旋轉過來，回到關閉的位置，再加上，假如窗子是開著的話，就把自己甩進屋子裏面了。

“I wish you to bear especially in mind that I have spoken of a very unusual degree of activity as requisite to success in so hazardous and so difficult a feat. It is my design to show you, first, that the thing might possibly have been accomplished: -- but, secondly and chiefly, I wish to impress upon your understanding the very extraordinary – the almost preternatural character of that agility which could have accomplished it.

“我希望你特別注意到假如要做出我剛才所描述的那麼危險又那麼困難的動作，一個人的動作是必須極端靈巧的。我是這麼計劃的，首先，先跟你表明這件事是可能做成的：-- 然而，其次，也就是最重要的，是要把這個觀念加在你心裏頭，是完成這個動作的極其奇特之處 – 奇特到幾乎必須有超人的能力才能可能做成。

“You will say, no doubt, using the language of the law, that ‘to make out my case’ I should rather undervalue, than insist upon a full estimation of the activity required in this matter. This may be the practice in law, but it is not the usage of reason. My ultimate object is only the truth. My immediate purpose is to lead you to place in juxtaposition, that very unusual activity of which I have just spoken with very peculiar shrill (or harsh and unequal voice, about whose nationality no two persons could be found to agree, and in whose utterance no syllabification could be detected.”

“你要說，無疑的，引用法律用語，爲了‘證實我的論點’我必須把所述的敏捷程度降低才對，爲什麼我反而把這個敏捷性提高到最高的程度呢。法律是這麼做的，但是在論理的時候是不管用的。我的最終目標是真理。我當前之急是把你放在兩根平衡杆之上，讓你去放開你的心思，以便能夠包容我所述極端困難的行動，和那個尖叫声聯想起來（或說粗糙聲，而到底是什麼國家的人發出的聲音，沒有兩個人能夠同意，而且所發出的說話聲，卻也沒有讓他們聽出任何一個音節。

At these words a vague and half-formed conception of the meaning of Dupin flitted over my mind. I seemed to be upon the verge of comprehension without power to comprehend – as men, at times, find themselves upon the brink of remembrance without being able, in the end, to remember. My friend went on with his discourse.

聽到此處，我的心思突然間閃過了老杜所說這一切的意義端倪。還不如這麼說，我在那個似了解又不了解的境界 – 好比人們有時候會這麼做：似乎記起某件事，又不真正記得，於是記憶停留在那個過度階段。我的朋友繼續說下去。

“You will see,” he said, “that I have shifted the question from the mode of egress to that of ingress. It was my design to convey the idea that both were effected in the same manner, at the same point. Let us now revert to the interior of the room. Let us survey the appearances here. The drawers of the bureau, it is said, had been rifled, although many articles of apparel still remained within them. The conclusion here is absurd. It is a mere guess – a very silly one – and no more. How are we to know that the articles found in the drawers were not all these drawers had originally contained? Madame L’Espanaye and her daughter lived in exceedingly retired life – saw no company – seldom went out – had little use for numerous changes of habiliment. Those found were at least of as good quality as any likely to be possessed by these ladies. If a thief had taken any, why did he not take the best – why did he not take all? In a word, why did he abandon four thousand francs in gold to encumber himself with a bundle of linen? The gold was abandoned. Nearly the whole sum mentioned by Monsieur Mignaud, the banker, was discovered, in bags, upon the floor. I wish you, therefore, to discard from your thoughts the blundering idea of motive, engendered in the brains of the police by that portion of the evidence which speaks of money delivered at the door of the house. Coincidences ten times as remarkable as this (the delivery of the money, and murder committed within three days upon the party receiving it), happen to all of us every hour of our lives, without attracting even momentary notice. Coincidences, in general, are great stumbling-blocks in the way of that class of thinkers who have been educated to know nothing of the theory of probabilities – that theory to which the most glorious objects of human research are indebted for the most glorious of illustration. In the present instance, had the gold been gone, the fact of its delivery three days before would have formed something more than a coincidence. It would have been corroborative of this idea of motive. But, under the real circumstance of the case, if we are to suppose gold the motive of this outrage, we must also imagine the perpetrator so vacillating an idiot as to have abandoned his gold and his motive together.

“你將會看到，”他說，“我已經把話題從如何從那屋子出來，轉移到如何進去。我的用意是要讓你知道兩個動作都是相同的方法做出來的，而且都發生在同一個地方。現在嘛，讓我們看一看房間裏面。我們觀察一下。櫥櫃的抽屜，據他們說，被翻過，但是呢，很多東西又幾乎原封不動的。這個結論是荒唐的。他們只是隨便猜猜而已 – 而且猜的很笨 – 不多不少。我們怎麼知道留在抽屜裏的不就全是原先就在那裏的。利斯班女士和她女兒生活極其隱蔽 – 她們沒有訪客 – 很少外出 – 沒有必要很多外出衣服來更換。他們發現的至少也有這兩位女士所擁有的衣服那麼好。假如竊盜

要拿，爲什麼不拿最好的呢 – 爲什麼不全拿呢？換句話說，他爲什麼放棄四千法郎的金子而去偷一包衣服呢？金子被丟棄在那裏。銀行老闆彌老所提到的錢幾乎全部都在一個袋子裏，放在地板上。所以，我希望你放棄這個念頭，也就是說，假如認爲金錢是動機的話，那就會把你引導到錯誤的推斷。警察只是因爲有證據說銀行把錢送到門口，就判斷錢是動機。比這個巧妙十倍的事情天天在我們生活中發生，根本沒有人把它們當一回事。（這個送錢來之後，三天內發生謀殺案又算得什麼。）巧合是一個沒有受過機遇率教育的思想者最大的障礙 – 機遇率這門學問是人類最冠冕堂皇的研究工作所能達到最冠冕堂皇的傑出境界的功臣。回到我們目前這檔案件，假如金子不見了，那麼三天之前送金子來這件事就不單是巧合。事實是如此，金子留在屋裏，假如金子是這竊盜所要的，這個人必定是個白癡裏的白癡，把金子也不要了，把自己要的也不要了。那不是白癡又是什麼。

“Keeping now steadily in mind the points to which I have drawn your attention – that peculiar voice, that unusual agility, and that startling absence of motive in a murder so singularly atrocious as this – let us glance at the butchery itself. Here is a woman strangled to death by manual strength, and thrust up a chimney, head downward. Ordinary assassins employ no such modes of murder as this. Least of all, do they thus dispose of the murdered. In the manner of thrusting the corpse up the chimney, you will admit that there was something excessively outre – something altogether irreconcilable with our common notions of human action, even when we suppose the actors the most depraved of men. Think, too, how great must have been that strength which could have thrust the body up such an aperture so forcibly that the united vigor of several persons was found barely sufficient to drag it down!

“牢牢記住我跟你加強注意的幾點 – 奇特的聲音，超人的敏捷性，以及完全出人意表的沒有動機，這三點卻偏偏指向一場這麼殘忍的謀殺案件 – 就讓我們看看怎麼殺的好了。一個女人被手的力量活活掐死，頭下脚上塞進烟囪。一般謀殺者不這麼做。更不這麼處理死尸。這個把死尸塞進烟囪的做法如此極端不同，是和我們所謂的人的行爲配合不起來的，即使殺人者是個最最沒人性的人也好。再說，要多大的力氣才可能把一個尸體塞進烟囪裏面，使得後來他們要把它拉下來的時候，必須的好幾個人一起用力才拉得下來！