Chapter 3

Science, The Scientist, and Feminicide

 In this section, I will address the crime of violence against women classified as feminicide in the 21st Century. The objective of the study is to show how the Southern Cone literature from the 1860s to the 1920s paved the road to a culture that accepts gender crimes.

 The word violence comes from the Latin 'violentia' which means abuse by force and also has the meaning of 'violare,' which means transgressing respect for a person (*Dle.rae.es*). To deal more objectively with violence against the female sex, scholars coined the terms femicide and feminicide.

 The North American scholar, Diana Russell, created the term femicide in 1970. It is an alternative word to the term homicide to designate the death by acts of violence against the woman. According to the *Latin American protocol model for investigating women's deaths from gender-based violence*, Russell conceives femicide as: "Murders by men motivated by a sense of entitlement or superiority over women, for pleasure or sadistic desires towards them, or by the assumption of ownership over women "(13).

 The differences between the definitions of feminicide and femicide are that the Mexican Scholar, Marcela Lagarde, coined the term feminicide, and she makes the State complicit in the violence practiced by omission. I decided to use the Lagarde term for two reasons. The first is that Lagarde is a Latina woman and researcher, she knows well, both from her own experience as a woman in Mexico, the verbal and corporal violence suffered by women, besides her knowledge of the sociological theories for being a researcher. The second reason is that the Anthropologist makes the State complicit by omission in this type of violence.

 There are two feminicides in the story "A skeleton" by Machado de Assis, first published in *Jornal da Família* in November 1875: "There were ten or twelve boys. They talked about arts, letters, and politics. Some anecdote came from time to time to temper the seriousness of the conversation. God forgive me! It seems that even some pun intended "(n. p.)

 The story begins with a group of men talking about arts, literature, and politics. There is no woman present in the youth group. But, it should not surprise us because we are in the nineteenth century, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. In those days, we know that women did not occupy the same space as men in society. Our argument here is that narratives, like this one, have legitimized feminicide in Brazil and Latin America, which, unfortunately, is perpetuated until the present day.

 The story takes the title of "A skeleton" because it is the skeleton of Dr. Belém's first wife. He murders her and keeps her skeleton as proof of her deep love for her. Symbolically, the skeleton of the doctor's wife represents the social right of man to kill his wife in defense of his honor. The reason the protagonist decides to murder his wife was his zeal for her with a neighbor. Belém believed that his spouse was in love with their neighbor and that she would be having an extra-marital affair.

 The doctor finished a piece of cheese, drank the rest of the wine in his glass, and repeated:

–– É verdade, um crime de que fui autor. Minha mulher era muito amada de seu marido; não admira, eu sou todo coração. Um dia, porém, suspeitei que me houvesse traído; vieram dizer-me que um moço da vizinhança era seu amante. Algumas aparências me enganaram. Um dia declarei-lhe que sabia tudo, e que ia puni-la do que me havia feito. Luísa caiu-me aos pés banhada em lágrimas protestando pela sua inocência. Eu estava cego; matei-a (N.p.).

 It is interesting to note that the author does not give the short story the title "The skeleton," but prefers to use the indefinite article 'um,' which is also a numeral in Portuguese. Then, one can interpret the title as an individual skeleton or any skeleton. If we interpret it as a skeleton, when we discover that it is the skeleton of the doctor's wife, we have a sense of horror, which exemplifies the concept of family estrangement from which Freud speaks in his classic text "The Uncanny."

 Levantou-se; levantei-me também. Estávamos assentados `a porta; ele levou-me a um gabinete interior. Confesso que ia ao mesmo tempo curioso e aterrado. Conquanto eu fosse amigo dele e tivesse provas de que ele era meu amigo, tanto medo me inspirava ele ao povo, e era efetivamente tão singular, que eu não podia esquivar-me a um tal ou qual sentimento de medo.

 No fundo do gabinete havia um móvel coberto com um pano verde; o doutor tirou o pano e eu dei um grito. Era um armário de vidro, tendo dentro um esqueleto. Ainda hoje, apesar dos anos que lá vão, e da mudança que fez o meu espírito, não posso lembrar-me daquela cena sem terror (N. p.)

 In his text, Freud analyzes whatever awakens in us the feeling of horror or terror in the arts as part of Aesthetics. People usually relates this branch of Philosophy with the concepts of beauty. However, what causes us horror has its terrifying beauty: "- that the uncanny is the species of the frightening that goes back to what was well known and had long been familiar." (124)

 When the reader discovers that the skeleton is Belém’s first wife, he experiences the sensation of the sinister, for the first time, because he associates the fact with what he knows, which is familiar to him: Death and violence in Brazilian society. If feminicide is any and all violence against women, even those of which the State exempts by omission, the tale is representative of this terrible social reality that afflicts Latin American societies up to the present day.

 The reader of the twenty-first century confronts the sinister, which gives him the sense of horror as he reads the tale. The question is whether the reader of the nineteenth century also had the feeling of the sinister when he read it since feminicide was seen as a male right act by society. Another question is what kind of emotions would the reader then have when he realized that the second wife of Belem was forced to dine with the skeleton of the first, who was always sitting next to her at the table. These questions, perhaps, have no conclusive answers. I believe that the reader of the nineteenth century experiences the sinister when he learns that Belem kept the skeleton of his wife in his house instead of giving her a proper burial.

 If the sinister emerges from the familiar, the reader unconsciously acknowledges violence against women in Brazilian society. Thus, to keep the status quo, the resolution for this sense of horror is the sarcasm at the end of the story. Belém gives his blessing to his second wife, Dona Marcelina, and to his disciple, Alberto, for them to be together:

–– Em todo o caso, minha resolução está assentada, disse o doutor. Quero fazê-los felizes, e só tenho um meio: é deixa-los. Vou com a mulher que sempre me amou. Adeus!

O doutor abraçou o esqueleto e afastou-se de nós. Corri atrás dele; gritei; tudo foi inútil; ele metera-se no mato rapidamente, e demais a mulher ficara desmaiada no chão.

Vim socorrê-la; chamei gente. Daí a uma hora, a pobre moça, viúva sem o ser, lavava-se em lágrimas de aflição (ch. 5).

Alberto and Dona Marcelina thought that Dr. Belém would commit a new crime: murdering them out of jealousy. But the doctor breaks the tension created by the discovery of the mutual love of his second wife with his disciple when he announces to them that he is going away with the skeleton of his first wife. Once again, the reader experiences the uncanny. Unconsciously, the reader observes a Catholic rule: Marriage is for life and unique before God. But, the first wife was dead, which would allow him to marry again. Nevertheless, it is the memory that the reader has that Belém has never buried Gregorina after killing her. It is precisely the disrespectful act of not giving her a proper burial that makes one experience the sensation of the sinister.

In the last chapter, Chapter VI, once again, the narrator, Alberto, breaks with the logic of events, causing surprise and estrangement in the reader through the use of humor:

 Alberto acabara a história.

–– Mas é um doido esse teu Dr. Belém! exclamou um dos convivas rompendo o silêncio de terror em que ficara o auditório.

 –– Ele doido? disse Alberto. Um doido seria efetivamente se porventura esse homem tivesse existido. Mas, o Dr. Belém, não existiu nunca, eu quis apenas fazer apetite para

 É inútil dizer o efeito desta declaração (ch. 6).

 This unusual end of the story destabilizes the reader for two reasons: The first is the information that Dr. Belém was a fictional invention. The second is that the story begins with a group of boys on the beach and, in the end, Alberto announces that he created the account to pass the time until tea time as if everyone were at home. The reader ends with the feeling of the uncanny, which dissipates with cathartic humor.

 The humor and sarcasm of Machado de Assis are the keys to the understanding of the process of normalization of feminicide in Brazilian society. It is not my intention to affirm that Machado de Assis, as a writer, is responsible for violence against women. But, sarcasm often helps to legitimize violence by normalizing the act. The cathartic reader feels free from the malaise caused by the sensation of sinister through laughter. With humor, feminicide becomes a 'normal' act acceptable to society.

 The other violence observed in the text is the psychological torture to which Belém submits Doña Marcelina, the doctor's second wife. This type of feminicide is more common in society, but less publicly discussed. But, according to psychologists, it is no less harmful to women than physical violence. In fact, health professionals say that domestic violence first begins with verbal abuse escalating to physical violence and death. Passional violence in Brazil occurs in exorbitant numbers, and according to the NGO, Compromisso e Atitude, it is not a question of social class or of rich and poor. It happens at all social levels. (N.p.).

 The tale, in some way, confirms the fact that passionate violence does not have the cause in social class. Dr. Belém, Mrs. Marcelina, and Alberto belong to the privileged class. They represent the Brazilian elite. Nevertheless, Dr. Belém murdered his first wife. He perversely kept her corpse in the house until it became a skeleton. He married Doña Marcelina, who endured psychological abuse.

 Thus, we have here two types of feminicide: The first of passionate violence - the murder of Dr. Belém's first wife. Brazilian Society has looked at this type of crime as ‘the defense of the husband's honor,' and many people believe it is an actual law, but it is not. The Brazilian penal code of 1890-1940 dictated:

 ... em seu artigo 27 que se excluía a ilicitude dos atos cometidos por aquelas pessoas que “se acharem em estado de completa privação de sentidos e de inteligência no ato de cometer o crime”. Basicamente ele estava dizendo que não era considerada criminosa a pessoa que cometesse um crime quando estava em um estado emocional alterado. Era esse artigo que alguns juristas usavam para justificar a legítima defesa da honra. Mas reparem que, em nenhum momento, ele está dizendo que a pessoa pode matar o(a) parceiro(a) que está traindo. Isso era interpretação desses juristas. (“Para entender direito”)

 Therefore, the famous "Legitimate Defense of Honor" is a myth created by the jurists to defend their clients before a court. The problem is that this myth remains to this day among Brazilians for having entered popular culture. The truth is that, in the current Brazilian criminal code, according to the article quoted above, it reads:

 “Não excluem a imputabilidade penal: I - a emoção ou a paixão”. Ele diz justamente o não desejava que os magistrados absolvessem alguém que agiu movido por ciúme ou outras paixões e emoções é que ele inseriu esse inciso na lei. (“Para entender direito”)

 Thus, we observe that there is a manipulation of the interpretation of the penal code by the jurists, which already constitutes feminicide on the part of the State for not using the law for the defense of the victim. The second, as we have already discussed, is Doña Marcelina's psychological abuse, and the subject will be further elaborated in chapter six of the thesis, where I will deal with pathological narcissism and the scientist.

 Another example of feminicide is in Holmberg's "Bag of Bones" (1875). Interestingly, the bones that were inside three different bags were of men, and a woman was the assassin. In the first bag, the doctor received as a gift from his friend Alberto; there was "the skeleton of a young man who was between 23 and 24 years of age, of fine structure, about 1.75m high, healthy, magnificent teeth, harmonic skull, "(6). The doctor then makes a remarkable discovery: He was missing a bone: The bone of the fourth rib.

 The symbolic meaning of the fourth rib is deductively relevant to the discovery of the killer. The fourth rib represents the first woman created by God, as Genesis says, the first book of the Old Testament.

 Gén 2:21 Entonces Jehová Dios hizo caer sueño profundo sobre Adán, y mientras éste dormía, tomó una de sus costillas, y cerró la carne en su lugar.

 Gén 2:22 Y de la costilla que Jehová Dios tomó del hombre, hizo una mujer, y la trajo al hombre.

 Gén 2:23 Dijo entonces Adán: Esto es ahora hueso de mis huesos y carne de mi carne; ésta será llamada Varona, porque del varón fue tomada.

 Gén 2:24 Por tanto, dejará el hombre a su padre y a su madre, y se unirá a su mujer, y serán una sola carne (*Biblia Online*).

 Curiously, it is Clara, a woman, who takes the rib of her victims who are men, twisting the biblical narrative. Clara equals herself to God, just as Lucifer did when he answered the Creator: "Non-Serviam." And, like Lucifer, Clara also falls. Her crimes are discovered by Alberto, the scientist of the narrative. However, Alberto is also a criminal for instigating Clara's suicide. At the end of chapter VII, the reader is led to the conclusion that Clara drinks the poison used to kill her victims (50).

 Tomé una de sus manos, blanda y tibia, y la miré en el fondo de los ojos.

 –– ¡Antes de veinticuatro horas, la policía debe estrellarse en sus pesquisas!

 Clara se estremeció

 –– Doble dosis para usted…

 ––¡Y estoy perdida!

 –– ¡Salvada!

 The doctor commits two crimes: The first is Clara's induction to suicide, and the second is to take justice into his own hands because she decides that the woman's salvation is her death by taking the poison she used to murder their victims. The character explains his rationing:

 Pero soy yo quien hace la pesquisa, como novelista, como médico, con espíritu romántico – la mujer me interesa, y me propongo salvarla – y la salvo, es decir, la salvo de la garra policial; pero para eso es necesario que tome una dosis doble de veneno (53).

 It is clear in that fragment that, again, fiction and reality intertwine. The doctor is a scientist and novelist, as well as Eduardo Ladislao Holmberg. In previous chapters, we have seen the importance of mixing fiction with reality to be used as a didactic tool to indoctrinate readers. With this tactic, the reader believes in the truthfulness of the facts, since the author is a scientist indeed.

 The protagonist comes out as a hero at the end of the narrative, and without suffering any penalty. One could make two kinds of interpretations. The first is that, as a man, the doctor would have the right to decide the future of Clara, who should suffer punishment twice - take a double dose of the poison she used - for having equaled the Creator, and for having killed two men. Clara, as a woman, would have to pay for her two crimes, and no one better than a man like a doctor to decide her fortune.

 The central theme that interests us in this chapter is whether the doctor’s behavior that induces Clara to suicide is feminicide. If we do a reading with the eyes of the 21st century, we believe that the answer is yes, since the doctor first decides the type of punishment that the murderer should suffer without a court trial. According to article 83 of the current Argentine Penal Code, suicide is not in itself a crime, but instigation to it is ("El Suicidio: Algunas Claves Para Entender Su Regulación").

 However, the Penal Code of 1867 dictated that the act of suicide was a crime against life. That is to say that the person who tried to commit suicide and was not successful in the act, was considered a criminal. According to the Professor Carolina Piazzi of the National University of Rosario, suicide constitutes a crime that is classified as an atrocity; this term has its origin in the Old Regime:

 One of the reasons that defined the atrocity was that the crime committed had broken the natural, social and divine orders. It was done by attacking the closest and sacred links, and as such from the Roman legal corpus, homicides aggravated by bondage and suicide were falling within the category of heinous crimes. The statutory classification of atrocious was ambivalent and indeterminate, and judicial arbitration ended up defining the convictions. If a crime was considered to be monstrous, this implied legal consequences: shorter trials and safe sentences even though they did not comply with minimum procedural guarantees (95).

 The possible reading with a 19th-century reader's glance is that Clara was guilty of the crime of murder and suicide. But the doctor is not exempt of his crime since the Penal Code of this time also would have considered him a criminal; the person who instigated another to suicide. Manuel, the phrenologist, makes it clear to the reader the seriousness of his friend's behavior: "But you are guilty, you are a criminal, as an instigator of suicide." (53) However, the doctor defends himself by manipulation of the law that gives someone immunity through the use of medical confidentiality. In this way, the protagonist does not suffer any penal punishment and ends up publishing a novel about the case of the bag of bones. How sarcastic!

 The novel by the Brazilian physician Gastão Crulz presents feminicide mixed with the theme of genocide, which I will analyze in chapter IV. During the first chapters of *A Amazônia Misteriosa*, the reader observes the richness and diversity of the Brazilian Amazon. In Chapter IV; Professor Hartmann is introduced to the reader, a German scientist, who lives with the natives in the Amazonian territory, and with his wife, a younger French woman in a house where the indigenous women were the maids. But before the protagonist meets Hartmann's wife, his physical description of native women is not only erotic but animalizing, as one notes in the quote below:

 As seis raparigas eram todas jovens e formosas e, sem grande exagêro de gabos, também poderiam ser “*buenas hembras*” aos olhos do cronista Lopez de Gomara que, na sua *História Geral das Índias* assim se referia a certas índias de Guatemala (65).

 To legitimize the classification of the natives as 'hembras'; a noun usually used to refer to the female sex of animals, the narrator states that the chronicler López de Gómara used it for the first time in his own work. In fact, López de Gómara existed. His name was Francisco López de Gómara, a Spanish historian, who accompanied Hernán Córtez in his expedition, and published the work mentioned in the novel in the year 1552. The fact that a chronicler of the sixteenth century had confirmed the classification of the native woman as a female animal reaffirms and legitimizes their knowledge about the 'race' of the natives.

 The narrator follows the physical description of women, giving them an erotic and very sexual tone:

 De formas esbeltas, os seios altos e firmes, o quadril bem modelado, os membros roliços, todas elas tinham a cabeleira longa e uma carnação rija e acobreada. Creio que, entre as mais velhas, nenhuma teria mais de vinte e poucos anos, tanta era a frescura das suas feições, de grandes olhos amendoados, muito negros, vivos e inquietantes, malares ligeiramente relevados, nariz aquilino e boca de lábios finos, mais enérgicos do que sensuais (50).

 It is public knowledge that the European colonizers, in this case, the Portuguese, used the native women sexually, and later on, the black enslaved African women. For example, the work of Gilberto Freyre, *Casa Grande e Senzala* (1933), while offering us a simple look at the intimate relations between colonizers and colonized, undoubtedly documented some barbarous acts perpetrated by the Portuguese with black and indigenous women. The problem with Freyre's theory is that it transforms into glamor the relationship of slavery and colonization between the Portuguese, the black and the natives when he affirms that the Portuguese man was already predisposed to feel attraction for the women of darker skin because they were accustomed to the Arabs.

 It is this type of relationship between white men and indigenous women that Cruls describes in the novel. The description of the natives, which we have seen, paints a picture of total respect and erotic desire for these women. Meanwhile, some historical documents give us a closer view of reality, as Ronaldo Vainfas states in his essay "Moralidades Brasílicas." In this study, Vainfas states that "the multi-ethnic sexuality determined by the style of Portuguese colonization was, therefore, arm in arm with the process of acculturation." This process was two-fold: The indigenous and the colonizer suffered the same process. The Brazilian historian defines as the emblem of this multiethnic relation of acculturation the figure of the ‘mameluco,' which arises from the sexual contact of the white man with the Indian (222-273).

 The character named Pacatuba represents the ‘mameluco’ that Vainfas refers to as "connoisseurs of the language and the native modus vivendi" (Vainfas 222-273). Pacatuba is that mixture of cultures with tendencies towards the ideas of the colonizer. For example, when Pacatuba explains to the protagonist the meaning of "Dibara woman". In this scene, the doctor sees a white woman in the middle of the Indians, on the veranda of the house where Hartmann lived. Pacatuba, incongruously, exposes two visions of two different cultural worlds in his explanation:

 –– Há de ser, Seu Doutor, procurava suavizar-me o Pacatuba. O senhor vai ver que esse gringo ainda é pior do que os outros e não se contenta com a bugras daqui. Para mim, aquilo é qualquer mulher dibará, que êle arrastou até este meio de mundo.

 –– Mulher *dibará*?

 –– Sim... mulher de má vida. Seu doutor entende como é? Uma dessas mundiças que são capazes de tudo... (68).

 In this passage, we see Pacatuba speaking of the European man as a gringo. According to the *Dictionary Aurélio da Língua Portuguesa*, the word means "designation given to foreigners, mainly to North Americans". Then, we deduce that the character is identified with the native. On the other hand, Pacatuba refers to indigenous women as 'bugras,' a word used to designate 'savage Indians' (Dictionary Aurélio de Português Online Bugres). At this moment of his speech, Pacatuba is European. The normalization of acculturation is the relevance of the scene.

 The narrator continues with his detailed description of the natives:

 Cíngulos plumosos, verdes em umas, vermelhos em outras, encobriam-lhes *o* *sexo*. Também era tudo quanto ao vestuário, se não incluirmos neste os muitos recamos ligeiros, sob a forma de colares, ligas e braceletes, e ainda as aljavas a tiracolo e umas elegantes sandálias de couro, que se prolongavam em caneleiras até o alto das pernas (65).

 The description of the Amazons reminds us of a photo of magazines with the exoticism of naked natives who use colored feathers to cover up their sex, and also sensual ornaments of silver and gold. It constitutes a portrait that exposes a wrong reality to the reader, mainly, the young person. The natives are portrayed as women who are offering themselves to the white man. The fact that they lived basically naked did not mean that the European man could use them or sexually abuse them. But the generalized idea was formed that both black and indigenous women, and especially mestizos, accept their inferior social status as sexual property, created by a racist and macho patriarchal society.

 This type of cultural interpretation of the indigenous tribes of Brazil begins with the letters of Jesuits such as José de Anchieta and Father Manuel da Nóbrega. The Jesuits contributed to the creation of the Brazilian stereotype as a sexually free and libido-ridden woman. This idea is perpetuated to this day. For example, in one of the letters of Nóbrega dated 1551, the Jesuit affirmed that the conversion of the Tupinambá would be easy because they did not worship idols, but the difficulty was in "cannibalism, in killing opposites and having many women" (114).

 The idea that indigenous men had 'many women' also implied the idea that it was a society where sexuality was free, especially when in another letter, Nóbrega speaks of 'bad customs' of the tribe. He also affirms the great difficulty of catechizing them. Part of the bad habits were polygamy, instability in marriage, frequent separations, and adultery (104-58).

 But what is most relevant to this study is the mention of 'Indian' slaves, who according to Nóbrega, 'knew well to know the sins in which they lived (125). The character of Malila represents this 'Indian slave' in the house of Prof. Hartmann and his wife Rosina, the Frenchwoman who taught the Indians to speak French, and Malila spoke it, as the protagonist tells us: "After an enigmatic German, an Indian who spoke French”.

 Feminicide appears very subtly for the reader of the beginning of the 20th century. The narrative was published in 1925. That means that in Brazilian society at the time, women did not have many rights compared to men, and it was worse if they were indigenous or mestizo. Consequently, we do not believe that the treatment offered to the female characters in the story would have been a scandal to the reader. But the interpretation we have of the text is that, as a formative instrument of opinion, it is successful in affirming and legitimizing the inferiority of women and their status as the property of man in front of society.

 The appropriation of the Greek legend of the tribe of the Amazons is not by chance. The Amazons are recognized as a mythological tribe of warriors, in whose society there was no male presence. Chapter V, "As Amazonas," is the legend of the Brazilian Amazons, which gave the name of one of the Brazilian State of Amazonas. According to Patricia Pereira, the Brazilian legend is based on the indigenous tribe called Icamiabas. It was a tribe composed only of women, and that the natives did not allow the presence of men. They fought against them and tied the right breast with a ribbon so that they could use arrows as weapons.

Pereira describes them as:

 Mulheres altas, musculosas, de pele clara, cabelos compridos e negros, como descreveu o frei espanhol Gaspar de Carvajal, que fazia parte da expedição de Orellana. Ele disse tê-las visto às margens do rio Nhamundá, na divisa dos Estados do Pará e do Amazonas (Pereira, "Amazonas: Lenda Ou Realidade?")

 Professor Hartmann also mentions Orellana: "Well, that's what I'm telling you. We are among the authentic Amazons, the famous tribe of women warriors who, almost four centuries ago, were first and only seen by Orellana and his companions (78). Again, the use of reliable sources for proof of the argument legitimizes the story, and the reader believes in its truthfulness. The professor even mentions the origin of the legend of the Brazilian Amazons, as we mentioned earlier. And, continue to give the reader a lesson in folklore for the rest of the chapter.

 Apparently, the legend would show women how to be strong beings capable of living a life independent of the man like the Brazilian Amazons, whose society constituted a gynecocracy. However, with a more careful reading, we see that the use of the legend serves to legitimize the text as a reliable document based on a serious investigation so that, later, the brutal experiments that Professor Hartmann does with the natives, mainly, involving women and human reproduction are also understood as valid.

 Another type of feminicide that appears in the novel is the psychological abuse of Rosina, the Frenchwoman who was the wife of Dr. Hartmann. One day, Rosina and the protagonist talked about personal matters while visiting the tribe of the Amazons, as some had given birth. The protagonist tells him that France was at war with Germany. At this moment, Hartmann's wife becomes sad, but Mr. Hartmann approaches both, and the matter is suspended. Later, with a new opportunity, Rosina and the protagonist speak again. 'Seu doutor', as Pacatuba called him, once again observes the deep sadness of the character. Thinking that it was because of the war, he asked her what was wrong:

 Eu já estou nervosa há muito tempo. Não é brincadeira passar oito anos neste isolamento. Depois...o meu marido é tão diferente de mim! Não sei se o senhor reparou que eu não lhe disse nada a respeito da situação europeia. É que ele é alemão até a raiz dos cabelos, e isso vai ser sem dúvida motivo para novas discussões e aborrecimentos...Oito anos de mato dão para embrutecer completamente uma criatura (109).

 Implicitly, the character lets us understand that Mr. Hartmann is an aggressive man, at least verbally. Rosina also speaks of the lack of communication between her husband and her due to an incompatibility of personalities: “Depois…o meu marido é tão diferente de mim!” (109). From then on, the reader begins to distrust the suitability of Hartmann. And, that distrust will be confirmed in later chapters, when Rosina and the doctor fall in love and decide to flee the place.

 Then after the protagonist had discovered the genetic experiments that Professor Hartmann did with the natives, the doctor and Rosina decide to flee because he believed that they were all in danger with the presence of a scientist like the character of H.G. Wells, Dr. Moreau. Finally, in the last chapter, "Rio Below," the two, Rosina and her lover, flee in a canoe. But unfortunately, although Malila had advised them not to take the road by the river because they would pass near the tribe of the Apautos, they continue their journey, and an apauta arrow beats Rosina, that falls in the water: “––Ela foi ferida! Avisou-me o Pacatuba. E antes que eu me lançasse na agua, já êle nadava com afoiteza e ia em sua direção” (221). Rosina does not resist the piranhas’ attack and dies.

 Rosina's death functions as a redemption of her misconduct as a married woman. Although in Western society there are no religious laws that demand the death penalty of an unfaithful wife, fiction allows the author to realize the desire of many. Therefore, we can say that feminicide can also happen in the literary work. For many federal governments, what Rosina suffered at the hands of her husband does not constitute a crime. For example, the Government of Mexico does not recognize serial killings or rituals caused by couples' problems as a pattern, which would reclassify them as a feminicide. They then defend the argument and explanation of them as domestic violence and resulting from the fragmentation of the family (Monárrez Fragoso and Cervera Gómez 113-133).

 When the author kills Rosina, he is doing justice with his own hands. That is to say that the character deserved death as an end for her infidelity to the husband. Moreover, there is an implicit message that means ‘this is how society maintains order and social rules for the best of Humankind. The death of Hartmann's wife happens to be a redemption and a warning to all the married ladies: Watch out! Infidelity has a price, and you're not a character in a novel.

 The fourth text to be analyzed is titled "Gregorina," which was published on December 24, 1882, in the Album of the Home, and is written by the Argentine writer Raimunda Torres y Quiroga (Quiroga and Abraham 9-69). The story has two and a half pages of literary mastery.

 The story tells of a man who begins to hear a voice that tells him that his wife was betraying him: "I do not know what invisible demon, what malevolent genius slipped those cruel words to my ear. From that night of cruel revelation, the worm of jealousy began to gnaw at my heart "(73). From the beginning of the story, the reader deduces what is going to happen: Gregorina's husband is going to kill her:

 Yo sonreía ante esta idea, y un vértigo, el vértigo de la locura del malvado se apoderaba de mí, y en mis noches sin sueño la veía acercarse cómo un fantasma, envuelta en su fúnebre sudario y tendiendo hacia el asesino sus descarnados brazos (73).

 We have observed that in these texts exist a pattern of the murder of the female characters, except the death of Rosina. The pattern is the murder of the victim by poisoning. "Gregorina" follows the same pattern. Her husband gave her small doses of poison that he prepared for her every night, and gave her medicine to cure her of her 'mysterious illness' (74).

 There is no mention in the text that the character's husband was a doctor. But one can deduce that he was a doctor or apothecary. According to historians of science (Susana R. Frías, Abelardo Levaggi, and César A. Garcia Belsunge) both the apothecary and the doctor were important figures of Buenos Aires society, where there were many pharmacies in the nineteenth century ("Doctors and Apothecaries" 35-61). Second, the narrator and murderer states:

 ¡Oh! Si hubierais visto con qué salvaje alegría la veía beber el emponzoñado brebaje que todas las noches le preparaba y que le abriría las puertas de la eternidad.

 Yo contemplaba en sus lívidas mejillas las señales del veneno, y un placer infernal dilataba mi corazón (73).

 We implicitly understood that the husband knew how to prepare the poison, and he also had knowledge of the symptoms that caused the person who took it: "I looked on her livid cheeks, the signs of poison".

 If according to the law of feminicide, there is a need for a pattern as explained by Lagarde y de los Rios, in these fictional texts we observe at least two:

 Para que se dé el feminicidio concurren, de manera criminal, el silencio, la omisión, la negligencia y la colusión parcial o total de autoridades encargadas de prevenir y erradicar estos crímenes. Su ceguera de género o sus prejuicios sexistas y misóginos sobre las mujeres (Lagarde y de los Ríos 19).

 The first is the murder of women by poisoning and the second is the lack of justice of the scientist, who commits the crime and never goes through trial by a court. One could use the argument that feminicide as law is a very recent fact in the history of legislation in many countries. For example, according to the Brazilian organization, Compromisso e Atitude.org, an organization whose goal is to inform Brazilians about the Maria da Penha Law, a law created in 2006 for the protection of women; in an investigation by the World Values Survey Association, 25% of people in 41 countries in the world still believe that men have the right to strike women ("Em Muitos Países, 25% Ou Mais Acham Justificável Um Homem Bater na Esposa").

 Consequently, taking into consideration the century in which these texts were written, we can deduce that there was no law in those Latin American countries that protected woman from domestic violence. But, there were laws in their Penal Codes against homicide as we have already mentioned in this chapter.

 The protagonist and narrator follows the description of Gregorina's agonizing death:

 Una noche que estaba a su lado– yo no la dejaba un momento–, la vi llevarse las manos al pecho con desesperación.

 – Dadme agua, porque tengo aquí un fuego que me abrasa–me dijo con voz apenas perceptible.

 Yo no me moví.

 It is a premeditated and calculated crime. At the end of Chapter III, there is a surprise. The narrator informs the reader that Gregorina, already agonizing, announces that she is pregnant and that the protagonist killed her and her son as well. Then the woman said to him: “–¡Bebe!– me dijo presentándome el mortal brebaje. Yo obedecí” (74). But the same voice, who told him his wife was unfaithful, told him that Gregorina was innocent.

 The possible psychosis of the narrator could function as an instrument of redemption, as he would be claiming that his mental capacity was compromised by the disease: “Apenas había apurado el contenido del vaso, cuando sentí a mis espaldas una carcajada. Y una voz, la misma que me había dicho *ella es adultera*, me cuchicheó al oído: *ella era inocente*” (75). He also redeems himself when he drinks of the poison, although in chapter IV after the reader assumes that the murderer had died for having taken his own concoction, the narrator is reborn as Lazarus, and announces to the reader:

 No tratéis de averiguar cómo es que vivo después de aquella noche de fúnebre recuerdo.

 Yo mismo no me he atrevido a arrojar una mirada al fondo de mi negra conciencia, ni a recordar el pasado.

 ¿Y sabéis porqué? Porque tengo miedo de ver dibujarse en el horizonte de mis recuerdos la imagen de Gregorina (75).

 The protagonist and narrator of the story do not die, even if he had taken the poison that he prepared every night for his wife. It is true that the lethal concoction needed time to function, but the fact that the murderer lives and remains free is relevant because, as in the story of Machado de Assis, "A skeleton," the murder of the wife constitutes feminicide. Also, there is the suggestion that the cause of the crime was defense of honor.

 My intention in this chapter is to show how the fictional texts from the 1870s until the 1920s paved South American cultures' criminal patterns of thought about gender violence. There is nothing ordinary when we hear the news stories about domestic violence, sexual abuse, sexual traffic of children, etc. Society rejects those facts as crime, but the authorities have not done enough to stop them. Perhaps, the reason why is because we as a culture still believe that women and children are inferior despite all the present scientific proof that contradicts this perverted belief.
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