DOI: 10.2478/aa-2021-0004

A postcolonial feminist dystopia: Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*

Adam Briedik

Adam Briedik is a PhD student at Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra. He is currently residing in Norway and writing his dissertation on the topic of contemporary dystopian fiction. Other topics of his interest are transgressive fiction, postcolonial criticism, utopian studies, and mental illness in literature.

Abstract:
Postcolonial criticism offers a radically new platform for the interpretation of science fiction texts. Mostly preoccupied with the themes of alien other and interstellar colonization, the genre of sci-fi breaths with colonial discourse and postcolonial tropes and imagery. Although Margaret Atwood rejects the label of science fiction writer, her dystopian novel The Handmaid's Tale *(1985) explores similar ethical concerns to the anti-conquest narratives of postcolonial authors. Atwood's identification of Canadian identity as a victim of the former British Empire is challenged by her introduction of a female character rejecting their postcolonial subjugated identity in a patriarchal society. Her variation on dystopian concerns is motivated by sexuality, and her characters are reduced to objects of colonial desire with no agency. The protagonist, Offred, endures double colonization from the feminist perspective; yet, in terms of postcolonial criticism, Attwood's character of Offred is allowed to reconstruct her subaltern identity through her fragmented narration of the past and speak in an authoritative voice. The orality of her narration only confirms the predisposition of the text to interpretation in the same terms as postcolonial fiction.*

Introduction

Postcolonial criticism (PC) has had a complex and vexed relationship with science fiction (SF). Not only are they both concerned with "other worlds", but – according to some critics – they explore the same set of themes about the alien "other" and colonization of distant places.[1] This generalization and affinity between the two modes, SF and PC, is confirmed even by the authors of the genre. Ursula Le Guin – a friend of Margaret Atwood and author of *The Dispossessed* – assumes that "Galactic Empires" of SF resemble "the British Empire 1880" and other planets and civilizations are portrayed as "warring nation-states, or as colonies to be exploited […] by the benevolent Imperium of Earth toward self-development – the White Man's Burden all over again" (1989, p. 84).

Simultaneously, the two modes look beyond the horrors of colonialism and offer a platform for utopian, eschatological and ecological dimensions of the genre. Thus, establishing a systematic definition of SF – one encompassing all the works generally considered as SF – seems impossible, and I will not attempt it. The range of literature that calls itself science fiction poses the question not whether there is an existing link but to what extent dystopian fiction engages with postcolonial discourse. I will analyse Margaret Atwood's feminist dystopia *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), a highly popular and influential novel. I argue that the novel is preoccupied by themes and modes of representation that can be best described as postcolonial and subaltern.

Margaret Atwood and postcolonial science fiction

Margaret Atwood is Canada's most prominent and prolific author of contemporary fiction who has achieved international success and acclaim. However, she is also a celebrated poet, writer of short stories, national critic of cultural politics, painter, and environmental and human rights activist, who has been also concerned with literary criticism. Her other works include novels like *Surfacing* (1972), *Cat's Eye* (1988), *Alias Grace* (1996), *Oryx and Crake* (2003), and *The Year of the Flood* (2009).

As an author, she has been vocal about and dismissive of her label as SF writer.[2] Atwood defines "science fiction" as "H.G. Wells's blood-sucking Martians shot to Earth in metal canisters – things that could not possibly happen" – whereas for her, the fiction descending from "Jules Verne's books about submarines and balloon travel and such – things that really could happen" should be called "speculative fiction." She places her books in the "no Martians" category (2012, p. 6). So Atwood has taken the side of other New Age authors who refused to be pigeonholed. While attempting to write an imaginative type of fiction, they regarded the term as a limitation.[3]

Before Margaret Atwood rejected the label of SF author, she had contributed to the theorizing of Canadian national identity in *Survival* (1972) – as a book of criticism, a manifesto, and a collection of personal and subversive remarks, her answer is twofold: survival and victims.[4] She defined Canada as a colonial (i.e., cultural) victim of the former British master (victimizer). In addition, the subordinated mentality evolved from cultural into economic and political subservience to the neocolonial hegemony of the USA. The political discourse, based on the victim/victimizer relationship, corresponds to the concept of dichotomy introduced by Edward Said in *Orientalism* (1978) between the dominant, positive colonizer ("us") and the (culturally, economically and politically) inferior and negatively described Other ("them"). The

paper argues that she wrote *The Handmaid's Tale* in the same spirit, and she introduced a character who is no longer just a passive colonial victim and failure – presenting us with the typical, reoccurring theme of Canadian postcolonial literature. She, once again, proves to the sceptics that Canadian literature has its literary tradition, and it is represented and epitomized in the expression of Canadian identity.

However, dystopian all-encompassing narratives and hegemonic fictitious worlds do not mechanistically imitate imperialist expansion patterns. *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) rejects the negative discourse patterns of male-oriented dystopian fiction. Dystopian literature – conventionally centred on positively represented male heroes – usually depicts female characters in passive secondary roles of no importance. Women are either cast as firm supporters of the system – figuring as representatives of the code of the society, or alternatively, as sexual rebels that seduce the protagonist. Male protagonists prevail even in postcolonial patriarchal novels of the third world written in the 20th century, where for the most part, the plot focuses on a male point of view.

Atwood's novel envisages a dire assessment of a totalitarian society governed by reductive religious ideology and the subjugation of otherness. Atwood's "Republic of Gilead" is set in the late 20th Century, after a cadre of militant Christians have overthrown the US government and formed a theocratic, patriarchal society. Due to an unexplained fertility crisis, the government has imprisoned unmarried women of proven fertility in a state of domestic sexual servitude derived from the Old Testament – and intertextually referring to the biblical handmaid Bilhah,[5] Atwood's protagonist Offred (a "handmaid of commander Fred") fulfils the role of a surrogate mother. Other women occupy different roles in an autarkic, inefficient command economy. Women are not allowed to read or to meet without supervision. Every sexual dissent (homosexuality, sterility, adultery, premarital sex) is dogmatically a woman's fault and is inquisitionally persecuted. The novel thus places specific emphasis on the most persistent forms of female victimization: the sexual exploitation, isolation and compelled ignorance that is accompanied by severe economic and political powerlessness in society. In conclusion, a metafictional epilogue describes the novel as a transcript of cassette tapes found two hundred years later.[6]

Unlike traditional SF, Atwood's novel is not an attack on scientific positivism and the anachronistic society of Gilead, her variation on SF concerns is concerned with gender as the established monolithic theocracy with no tolerable dissent forces the handmaids from the public sphere into a domestic and familiar space. Handmaids are untouchable, but their status is rather low, equating to that of slaves.

Handmaids as the Other

Offred represents a dramatic shift in the orientation of dystopian fiction. Not only does the novel occupy the alternative female space neglected by the authors, but the novel has subtle domestic dimensions as its abiding concern. Critical to *The Handmaid's Tale* is an awareness of the Other. In postcolonial discourse and science fiction, otherness is conceptualized "corporally" (Carducci, 2016), similarly as in the novel. The subjugation of an entire gender is complicated, and the acceptance of women's role in the hierarchy is difficult; Allan Weiss (2009) remarks in his discussion of the novel that Gilead's system is not imposed from above as "sought" from those "below" (p. 127); it emerges after the whole population allowed the establishment of a controlling organization. Gilead employs language, indoctrination and surveillance as its means in the process. This attempted subjugation and control of fertile women is based on a literal, fundamentalist interpretation of the Bible and offers a philosophical foundation of society with an almost allegorical quality. Dystopian and postcolonial fiction both represent discussions on subjugation through the authority of language – this novel is no different. According to Foucault's "power-knowledge" discourse (1990), power is derivative of knowledge and uses knowledge; on the other hand, power reproduces knowledge in accordance with its anonymous intentions. Owing to the persistence of verbal, mental and physical abuse by the class of "Aunts", a handmaid loses her identity (positive self-image) and becomes alienated from her inner self. Thus, she and other handmaids should become devoted (sacrificial) slaves of the domestic household in a sexist, patriarchal society. Since her name says nothing about her but constructs her identity as a piece of property, her real name humanizes her only in the presence of other handmaids. This describes how the government reduces women and imposes societal bounds by suppressing their identities, creating what Foucault calls "docile bodies" (1979). The power over death had lost its authority over the last centuries, requiring Gilead to find a new method to break and subjugate the population.[7] Whereas the traditional totalizing methods of control lay in the power over life and death, the deployment of sexuality – as Michel Foucault calls it – after the 17th century made the power over death inadequate. Humanity's sexuality awakened, and it came imbued with the death instinct: "[The temptation is] to exchange life in its entirety for sex itself, for the truth and the sovereignty of sex. Sex is worth dying for."[8]

In properly controlling a population, dystopian establishments will, therefore, sooner or later, attempt to repress – instead of co-opt – sexual behaviour via strict laws and taboos (Booker, 1994, p. 76). The vital variation in dystopian concerns is in their attitude towards

sexuality, which has always been a rather crucial and yet ambiguous subject in this type of fiction. It depends on the story in question, sexual desires and the behavioural quirks associated with an oppressive function. Gilead politicizes and controls fertile women's bodies based on a literal, fundamentalist interpretation of the Bible. As sexuality represents a threat to the system, as Haraway states, a woman who chooses to become sterile subverts the notion that womanhood is inherently maternal, as well as the "widespread binary notions of woman-man, nature-culture, and organism-machine" (1985, p. 109). This directly threatens the Republic of Gilead, which wants to protect this dichotomy.[9]

As mentioned, Gilead's physical subjugation of women politicizes and controls fertile bodies based on a fundamentalist, perverse interpretation of a single Bible passage. It is most evident during "the Ceremony." According to Offred, every detail is regulated and symbolic: the gathering of the household, reading of the Bible passage, placement of the Handmaid between the Wife's legs as the Commander performs his duty. "The Commander is fucking. What he is fucking is the lower part of my body. I do not say making love, because this is not what he's doing. Copulating too would be inaccurate, because it would imply two people and only one is involved. Nor does rape cover it: nothing is going on here that I haven't signed up for. There wasn't a lot of choice but there was some, and this is what I chose" (Atwood, 2010, pp. 104-105). The whole act makes them objects and sole arbiters of their reproductive functions; so, Gilead repudiates motherhood and elevates fertility, but sexuality itself becomes a more complicated issue. In the government-run brothels known as "Jezebel's", unsuitable handmaids are sterilized and used as prostitutes. They dress in sexualized costumes of the past and exist without being noticed by the general public. Offred's commander concludes: "Nature demands variety, for men. It stands to reason, it is part of the procreational strategy. It's Nature's plan." He continues, "Women know that instinctively. Why did they buy so many different clothes, in the old days? To trick the men into thinking they were several different women. A new one each day" (Atwood 2010, 249). So while the government attempts to erase their alterity, he emphasizes the difference. The quote breaks with totalizing modes of thinking and depicts the irreducible alterity of the Other. Thus, Atwood treats the theme of sex as pervaded by both images of transgressive sexuality and exoticism, which corresponds with Robert Young's term "colonial desire."[10]

Another closely related term – coined by Holst Petersen and Rutherford – "double colonization" (1985), refers to the assumption that women are subjected to the domination of both empire and patriarchy. They act as analogous in their exertion of control over female subjects, and post-colonial nationalisms do not alleviate the situation. In Atwood's novel, the

power of state and patriarchy is an inseparable unity. Sadeghi and Mizrapour (2020) conclude that "the novel depicts the subjugation of handmaids, their marginalization as well as their struggle to survive and resist the imperial/patriarchal discourses". However, I would like to oppose these claims: Offred's "double colonization" results rather from a complex matriarchal network with a feminist perversion of the traditional misogyny given to the fact that the sterile wives of commanders operate in a relatively high position in the society, the indoctrination of "handmaids" is done by "aunts", and households are run by "econowives". Thus, women are divided in their oppression, and apart from the handmaids, other women are also socially classed and follow their respective strict codes of dress and behaviour. However, unlike Young, Atwood does not see sexuality as a congruent legacy of the commercial discourse of colonialism, where the traffic of commerce is complementary and intertwined with the traffic of sexuality. Handmaids are objectified, but they are not commoditized. In contrast to the focus on sexual exploitation, isolation and absolute ignorance of human nature, the idea of the seductive but enervating foreign world that embodies the simultaneous lure and threat of the novel's other, the novel draws parallels with postcolonial fiction in the issue of agency. This premise, adjusted in Atwood's text to increasingly introduce a feminine perspective, can be partially linked to the various feminist movements that turned up in the last quarter of the 20th century.

Handmaids as subaltern

Duties outside those the handmaid must provide for her Commander's household are minimal. The novel has subtle domestic dimensions as its abiding concern, as dissent forces the handmaids from the public sphere into the domestic one. They are not granted any power in the system or independence of it, so we cannot ignore the parallels between colonialism and sexism. However, Atwood's portrayal of society mimics black slavery due to the novel's heavy focuses on exploitation and, most importantly, "orality" (Merrimen, 2009).

In Gilead, the handmaids do not have access to literacy, and only the men in charge are allowed to read and write. The protagonist's narration employs the oral mode as a vehicle for self-presentation; similarly to postcolonial fiction, she offers a voice and space to the marginalized, subjugated and exploited, leading to a dystopian exercise in massive transformative agency. As a "subaltern",[11] her agency is questioned – not only by the deprivation of control over her reproductive functions but also by the inability to recollect the past. Only at the end of the novel do we discover that we have been reading a transcription and her narrative suddenly becomes an elocutionary act.

Her fragmented narration offers a glimpse into her everyday life and how the United States segued into Gilead also comes from her memories, which seethe with vague political changes. Regarding the narrative structure, Atwood's technique is fragmented, following a stream of consciousness – more specifically – an internal monologue, which gradually recounts her life and unveils the trauma of her capture, indoctrination and subjugation in flashbacks. Her attempts to describe the past, marginally successful, establish a link with her present and direct her towards the future. According to Gulick, her journey of self-discovery is a psychological one, "[m]oving backward in time in an attempt to find some understanding of what has happened to her and what she has become in this new society" (1991, p. 69). However, she is not able to provide a coherent picture – even of current society. By remembering her past, she reconstructs her identity – a form of therapy that helps her survive. The wounded psyche of her victimized heroine heals from its psychological trauma, and she resolves herself as a human being. In the novel, she appears as a retrospective first-person, limited, unreliable narrator, while the ending of the novel is open to interpretation as it is not evident whether she was taken by members of "the Eyes" or "the Mayday". While the constant observation of the handmaids – epitomized in the secret police known simply as "the Eyes" – ensures the internalization of their discipline upon the handmaids. The disruption of totalizing efforts in Gilead is epitomized in the resistance movement known as the "Mayday" movement. When Ofglen informs Offred about its existence during their trivial yet heretical speculations about God, they refer to "the Eyes" as "them". When Ofglen reveals herself as a member of the movement and offers Offred membership, Offred immediately rejoices: "There is an *us* then, there's a *we.* I knew it" (Atwood 2010, 177). Simultaneously, Atwood constructs a reversed Saidian dichotomy between Gilead's secret Police controlling any possible dissent and the resistance movement. Thus, Atwood's variation of the dystopian shares similarities in themes and forms with the "anti-conquest narratives", which are usually produced in countries with postcolonial heritage.

Conclusions

In Atwood's novel, her female protagonist no longer appears in a secondary role, but as an active heroine who, metaphorically speaking, struggles to survive "double colonization" since she is victimized by the North American postcolonial patriarchal society of the 20th century and oppressed by the domineering classes of women, whom struggle for power in the battle between the sexes – struggles based on Foucauldian differentials of knowledge and power similarly as postcolonial fiction. Her agency is questioned – not only by depriving her of control over her reproductive functions but also by the inability to recollect the past. By remembering

her past, she reconstructs her identity, which is a form of therapy that helps her survive and maintain her sanity. Her female protagonist is still a "subaltern" victim, but – on a profoundly personal (i.e., psychological) journey of self-discovery – she seeks her female identity and the voice of an unnamed heroine. In her struggle, she becomes empowered as a human being and finds a unique way to escape the harsh patriarchal and political environment.

The societal allusions and parallels with Puritan New England, with a barely anti-religious sentiment, remove the geographically specific oppression from its broader context. However, instead of an archetypal account of female exploitation, the stand-in is the universality of Offred's experience; it explores the same issues as the postcolonial fiction of the third world. Although the book does not simply reproduce the functions of the imperial world, it is a variation on themes of the "anti-conquest narrative". It is not a colonial project; it is its dispelling that represents the postcolonial discourse of the novel. Simultaneously, this paper demonstrates the enormous potential of PC in the critique of totalizing ideologies in the literary spaces of dystopian futures and societies governed by violence and erasure of alterity.

In her decolonizing counter-discourse, Atwood rejects the negative discourse patterns of British colonial novels in the early stages of decolonization, and it offers a possible direction for further research since it corresponds with Homi K. Bhabha's concept of "mimicry".[12] Furthermore, the postcolonial theory of Mary Louis Pratt (1992) and concepts like "contact zone",[13] or her re-interpretation of the term "anti-conquest narrative",[14] may be regarded as another platform for interpretation.

Endnotes

[1]According to Jessica Langer, "the figure of the alien – extraterrestrial, technological, human hybrid or otherwise – and the figure of the far-away planet ripe for the taking" as "deep and abiding twin signifiers in science fiction…perhaps the central myths of the genre". These two signifiers are also the "twin myths" of both SF and colonialism (2011, p.11).; for John Reider, the majority of the motifs and themes of science fiction "represent ideological ways of grasping the social consequences of colonialism" (2008, p.32).; Gregory Benford proposed the concept of "the galactic empire" as a domineering trope of science-fiction mode (1980, p.55).

[2] For example Le Guin stated that *The Handmaid's Tale*, *Oryx and Crake*, and *The Year of the Flood* are examples of one of the things SF does: "to extrapolate imaginatively from current trends and events to a near-future that's half prediction, half satire" (2009).

[3] Le Guin advocates these actions as a form of protection "being relegated to a genre still shunned by hidebound readers, reviewers and prize-awarders. She doesn't want the literary bigots to shove her into the literary ghetto" (2009); however, Peter Watts assumes that Atwood has been "so terrified of sf-

cooties that she'll happily redefine the entire genre for no other reason than to exclude herself from it". Concerning the dystopian novel in question, Watts is not only critical, but downright vulgar: "Whenever Atwood makes such remarks—she trotted out the same horseshit for The Handmaid's Tale back in the eighties—I suffer mixed reactions" (2003, p.3).

[4] In her study, Atwood distinguishes four victim positions which gradually enable the oppressed victim to overcome a situation of crisis and evolve into a free individual: 1. the victim is in denial; 2. he/she acknowledges being a victim, but attributes this position to a higher power; 3. the person refuses it as unavoidable; 4. he/she no longer participates in the victim/victimizer binary and becomes a creative non-victim (1972, p.36-40).

[5] The surrogate mother of Rachel's baby in the Old Testament owing to Rachel's infertility. Bilhah's role is, thus, fulfilled by Atwood's protagonist Offred in forced sexual intercourse with the Commander, while the sterile wife Serena Joy fulfils the role of Rachel.

[6] Staines (2006), who comments on the novel's setting, states that "[s]ociety has returned to a constricted re-creation of Puritan New England … [o]nly a Canadian, a neighbor as well as an outsider to the United States, could create such an unsettling vision of the American future" (p. 21).

[7] Foucault goes on to say that for successful governments in modern times, "it is no longer a matter of bringing death into play in the field of sovereignty, but of distributing the living in the domain of value and utility. Such a power has to qualify, measure, appraise, and hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendor" (1990, 80-81).

[8] Accordingly, Freud had argued about the subversive nature of sex in his *Civilization and its Discontents*. According to him, sexual relationships are dangerous to societal structures, since they are merely concerned with two entities, "whereas civilization depends on relationships between a considerable number of individuals" (2000, 108). The strong emotions that accompany it, moreover, defy most logical reasoning and frequently prove to be unpredictable, making it harder to create a stable and manageable environment (112).

[9] The seemingly positive and fundamentally reductive term "colonial desire", employed by Robert Young (1995), indicates the magnitude to which colonialism was preoccupied by sexuality, both negative (rape, penetration, impregnation) and positive (exoticism).

[10] The term subaltern describes lower social classes and Other social groups on the margins; in postcolonialism, a subaltern is a person without human agency, as defined by social status. Gayatri Spivak elaborates this definition to refer to groups outside and denied access to both mimetic and political forms established in the structures of political representation. The criterion for claiming subalternity is thus participation in the hegemonic discourse (see Spivak 1988).

[11] The term, introduced by Said, refers to the resistance of natives to colonization (see Said 1978).

[12] Mimicry appears when the colonized subject imitates the culture of the colonizers as a form of resistance (see Bhabha 1994).

[13] According to Mary Louis Pratt (1992) a contact zone is a social space where two or more disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple, in asymmetrical relationships of dominance and subordination.
[14] A concept referring to the effects and conditions of a cultural encounter; it describes the relational injustice occurring in the contact (Pratt, 1992).

Works cited:

Atwood, M. 1972. *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

---. 2010. *The Handmaid's Tale*. London: Vintage.

---. 2012. *In Other Worlds: Science Fiction and the Human Imagination*. London: Virago.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Booker, K. 1994. *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide*. London: Greenwood Press.

Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.

---. 1990. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage.

Freud, S. 2000. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Volume XXI*. Translated by James Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Gulick, A. M. 1991. *The Handmaid's Tale by Margaret Atwood: Examining Its Utopian, dystopian, feminist and postmodernist traditions*. Iowa State University. Available at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1063&context=rtd [Google Scholar]>

Haraway, D. 1985. *A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s*. San Francisco: Center for Social Research and Education.

Langer, J. 2011. *Postcolonialism and Science Fiction*. London: Palgrave Macmillian.

Le Guin, U. K. 1989. "American SF and the other." In: Susan Wood (ed.). *The Language of the Night: Essays on Fantasy and Science Fiction.*. London: The Women's press, pp.83-85.

---. 2009. "The Year of the Flood by Margaret Atwood," In *The Guardian*, [2009-08-29]. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2009/aug/29/margaret-atwood-year-of-flood>

Merriman, B. "White-washing oppression in Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale." In *Notes on Contemporary Literature*, 39.1 (Jan 2009). Available at: <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/White-washing+oppression+in+Atwood%27s+The+Handmaid%27s+Tale.-a0206534450>

Pratt, M. L. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
Rieder, John. 2008. *Colonialism and the Emergence of Science Fiction*. Connecticut: Wesleyan UP.
Said, E. W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin.
Sadeghi Z. & N. Mirzapour. 2020. "Women of Gilead as colonized subjects in Margaret Atwood's novel: A study of postcolonial and feminist aspects of *The Handmaid's Tale"*. In: M. G. Champion (ed.). *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7:1. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311983.2020.1785177>
Spivak, G. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?." In: Nelson, C. and L. Grossberge (eds.). *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. London: Macmillan, pp. 271-313.
Staines, D. (2006). "Margaret Atwood in her Canadian Context". In: C. A. Howells (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 12-27.
Young, R. J. C. 1995. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London: Routledge.
Watts, P. 2003. "Margaret Atwood and the Hierarchy of Contempt". In: *On Spec*, summer, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 3-5.
Weiss, Allan. 2009. "Offred's Complicity and the Dystopian Tradition in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale." In: *Studies in Canadian Literature/ Études en littérature canadienne*, vol. 34, no.1, pp. 120-141.

Adam Briedik
Department of English and American Studies
Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra,
Štefánikova 67,
949 74 Nitra, Slovakia
a.briedik@centrum.sk