

VIDEO AND THEATRE OR A HYBRID SCENE: THE CASE OF THEATRICAL MISE EN SCÈNE *FANNY AND ALEXANDER*

Miloš MISTRÍK

ABSTRACT:

Today's theatrical art sometimes utilizes modern electronic technologies of visualisation that may be, especially if we use a certain amount of simplification, generally defined as "video". This kind of technology consists of a complex set of devices: shooting cameras, recording devices, trick equipment, broadcasting devices, screens. Theatrical mise en scènes once used to involve film; however, mostly before the emergence and refinement of digital video technologies. It is beyond any doubts that compared to film, video has many advantages – one of the most significant of these advantages is the fact that video technology allows to provide simultaneous online streaming of both image and sound. In case creators and producers of a theatrical mise en scène decide to use such a technology, they tend to favour it over the theatrical elements, which may lead to a shift from mimesis towards virtualisation of the performed spectacle. On the other hand, classic theatre, along with its long-term tradition and solid forms, is a strong, persistent sphere of art; even the video is rarely able to prevail and change the scenic reality into a virtual, abstract electronic world. We have decided to discuss these theoretical notions in relation to the theatrical mise en scène *Fanny and Alexander* by Ingmar Bergman, which was directed by Marián Amsler and performed at the Slovak National Theatre in 2016. Our analysis reflects on the forms of hybrid convergence merging theatrical art and video art in this particular case. However, as the conclusion suggests, video art and its technological possibilities may have influenced the mise en scène's overall setting, but the given theatrical work was able to preserve its own integrity without sacrificing any part of the true nature of theatre as such.

KEY WORDS:

Fanny and Alexander; film, Ingmar Bergman, live broadcasting on television, theatre, Slovak National Theatre, video



Prof. PhDr. Miloš Mistrík, DrSc.
Institute of Theatre and Film Research of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
Dúbravská cesta 9
841 04 Bratislava
Slovak Republic
milos.mistrík@gmail.com

Miloš Mistrík is a Head Researcher at the Institute of Theatre and Film Research of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava. He professionally focuses on the theatre research, in particular on the art of acting, new drama and French theatre, and is also interested in the media research, especially in dual media system and video art. He is the principal investigator of the grant project funded by The Slovak Research and Development Agency (APVV-15-0764) titled "Slovak Theatre and Contemporary European Theatre Culture – Continuity and Discontinuity", the author of several monographs and many scientific articles published in scholarly journals reflecting on the topics of theatre and media.

Introduction: On Theoretical Outlines of Theatre, Film, Video and Their Relations

The basic facts are well-known. A theatrical performance takes place in real time. However, spectators can see a thoroughly artful theatrical *mise en scène* only after numerous rehearsals. For purposes of this essay we will define the “*mise en scène*” as a structure of different components that is ready to become a performance, i.e. a complex work of art. A series of performances is a successive form of public presentation of a specific *mise en scène* (from *première*, through first, second and many other reprises, to *dernière*). The audience co-creates every single performance through their reactions, their emotional responses (laughter, applause, etc.). A theatrical work of art in the form of a performance exists and ‘lives’ here and now. It disappears after the last curtain falls, i.e. after its last reprise. Each unique performance, from *première* to *dernière*, exists within two basic vectors – in three-dimensional space and in real time. Performances are results of combining various elements related to time and space; these components include stage acting as well as literary, artistic and music aspects, and are organised through the director’s vision and completed by the audience and its very presence.

A film, however, is a (typically audio-visual) recording created in advance and it is thus impossible to change its form and content during the screenings attended by spectators. The audience’s opinions and emotional responses accompanying a film projection have no retrospective effect on the watched film’s features, formal aspects or on any other of its story components. Needless to say, production of a film may involve the same participating elements as any theatrical performance – the aspects of acting, literature, fine arts and music, all of them organised via directing. In other words, there is always a certain difference between a theatrical *mise en scène* and its unique live performance, but all films or video recordings produced in advance stay the same during all their projections with audience attendance. Moreover, a film image on a screen is never truly plastic; it is only two-dimensional and this distinguishes it from the plastic three-dimensionality of a theatrical work. On the other hand, cinema, video as well as theatre all include the dimension of time.

Expanding the possibilities of film art and often replacing it entirely, the emergence of video has brought significant shifts and changes. If our ambition was to reflect on this problem through the historical perspective, we would have to base our thoughts on knowledge about film and video which date back to 1960s and 1970s. However, the current situation is entirely different and we may say that video used in the context of theatrical art clearly dominates over film in terms of quality, quantity and creativity as well. Back then, in times when theatrical art’s cultural status started to be challenged by film, first theoretical notions focusing on this issue were formed and published;¹ there were also early attempts to merge theatre and film to create a new artistic form, to interconnect them despite their obvious differences related to both form and content.

It is understandable that the mentioned (and, of course, essential) differences between the theatrical art and the film art, which manifest themselves so obviously within their interconnections, created a substantial amount of resentment towards both possible combinations:

- A. theatre in film or rather **filmed theatre**;
- B. **film** (and later **video** as well) **included in theatrical performances**.

To briefly outline these situations, criticism aimed at theatre in film (which we will not discuss further) pointed out that each filmed theatrical performance became ‘conserved’; it lost its original three-dimensional plasticity and froze, ending in a film archive. However, we have to acknowledge that although we will not discuss them in detail, the problems associated with the filmed theatrical performances are not in any way an inferior topic since the ability to record a performance using an adequate medium is a very specific artistic

¹ For more information, see: KRACAUER, S.: *Teoria filmu. Wyzwolenie materialnej rzeczywistości*. Warszawa: WAI, 1975; GOURDON, A.: *Des arts et des spectacles à la télévision*. Paris: CNRS, 2000; SADOUL, G.: *Dějiny filmu – Od Lumière až do doby současné*. Praha: Orbis, 1958.

and technological issue that has been reflected on by many academic discussions.² However, as we have stated above, our aim is to focus on the active, ‘living’ relationship between film, video and theatre, and this relationship is associated with the case B., i.e. with film (and later video as well) in theatre.

Film, Video and Three Ways They Function in the Theatre

Films – later followed by videos – became a part of theatrical *mise en scènes* in three different variants:

- a. decorative and illustrative;
- b. supplementary in relation to certain elements of acting and/or art;
- c. autonomous and thus active.

Decorative and illustrative functions are fulfilled by static film screenings before, during and possibly even after a theatrical performance; walls of the auditorium, the scene itself or the curtain may all serve as projection areas. The purpose of this creative process is to build up atmosphere of the performed story or determine its localisation. Decorative and illustrative functions may also be based on screenings situated directly on the stage, i.e. on a screen placed on the stage or on a display; such screenings are able to become parts of the characters’ on-stage actions during the theatrical performances. These types of screenings are therefore exposed to the audience’s direct view. Using the ‘moving images’ as something attractive, new, began shortly after the birth of cinema; theatrical artists were still primarily ‘enchanted’ by film and thus far from overcoming the simplified juxtaposition of theatre and film. We may add that even today, in the times when video prevails over film, it would be easy to find certain examples of projections of the moving images during theatrical performances, which aim to serve as illustrations or decorations – this applies to ‘traditional’ films and ‘modern’ videos equally.

Even the earlier phases of **using films in the theatres** brought many attempts **to integrate them into acting or scenic spectacles**. Such a case is known from the history of theater – the world-famous Russian avant-garde director Sergei Mikhailovich Eisenstein used certain sequences from his own movie and projected them during his theatrical *mise en scène* *Enough Stupidity in Every Wise Man* (1923, originally written by the playwright Alexander Nikolayevich Ostrovsky). The film sequences involved an appearance of one of the characters, Glumov, who then stepped on the theatre stage live.³ In that time Eisenstein worked on his technique of film montage and the given situation allowed him to pursue the idea of using such a montage to overcome the common boundaries of film and create a theatrical-film montage. Experiments merging theatre and film have been conducted by many other artists; it is necessary to predominantly mention the theatrical directors Erwin Piscator and Vsevolod Emilevich Meyerhold. The world-renowned film director Abel Gance has also tried to use a panoramic screen to spread the moving images across the whole space of the auditorium. Other experimenters have tried to create different forms of multi-screen (Polyekran) in order to the existing possibilities of ‘inserting’ film projections into scenic actions.

A rather successful result of such experiments was presented in 1958, in Czechoslovak Pavilion at the EXPO 58 in Brussels, for which the scenographer Josef Svoboda in collaboration with the director Alfréd Radok created a Polyekran – a special performance involving non-demanding tricks and interconnecting acting on a film screen with stage acting. The performances included sketches that switched between on-screen and on-stage dancing shows; some of them duplicated entries of moderators and other allowed the audience watching folklore shows to focus on dancers’ movements in detail. Certain projections inspired the spectators to remember the faces of various historical figures, etc. The mentioned artists named this new hybrid genre

² See, for example: STADTRUCKER, I.: *Videozáznam v umění a kultúre*. Bratislava: VŠMU, 1983; PICON-VALLIN, B.: *Le film de théâtre*. Paris: CNRS, 1997.

³ PICON-VALLIN, B.: *Les écrans sur la scène*. Lausanne: L’Age d’homme, 1998, p. 13.

after the old 'magical lamp' – *Laterna Magika*. The same name was later given to the theatre in Prague where similar performances took place. Svoboda and his fellow artists also created a spatial installation named *Revue z Bedny* (in English *Revue from a Box*) for the EXPO 67 in Montreal.⁴

Besides film, video started to gain importance shortly thereafter. The 'electronisation' of audio-visual media and digitalisation of the whole communication chain – from cameras, which recorded image and sound, through signal transmissions, to projections of the recorded images and sounds attended by the audiences – led to the emergence of multimedia in the last four decades of the 20th century. Outlining many significant transformations of communication, this historically and logically determined process resulted in expanding the creative possibilities of 'traditional' film by exploring 'modern' video and, in most cases, video replaced film entirely.

Suddenly there was a new possibility of directly transmitting the image recorded in the theatre 'out' of the building. This procedure could be completed in the 1950s – via television broadcasting, although at first rather clumsily and only in black and white. Many unique, never-before-seen possibilities of artistic creation emerged; all of a sudden, artists were able to create a new, virtual audio-visual reality. For example, in 1965 the already mentioned scenographer Josef Svoboda cooperated with the avant-garde composer Luigi Nono. They worked together in Boston and connected the television broadcast of the opera *Intolleranza* into a closed circuit, in which they mixed spectacles taking place at the theatre stage with documentary shots prepared in advance; they also simultaneously 'cut' the currently shot objects and documents into the image. Moreover, this mixture of images was also being projected back onto the stage as a special element of art. This process was, once again, recorded by camera so everything spun around and a new, strange virtual world came into existence.⁵

However, the creative uses of the possibilities offered by video (not so much by film) predominantly manifest themselves within the third variant – **video as an autonomous and active element**. In these cases video integrated into theatrical performances creates both form and meaning and so its role is not supplementary, but rather crucial. Overcoming the technological specifications and, more importantly, limitations bound to film in the first half of the 20th century, video used its richer technological 'readiness' and variability to autonomously function as an important part of theatrical performance – along with acting, literature, art and music.

Traditional film – even at present – still relies on projection screens, canvas or other suitable surfaces where the rays of light from the projector are able to re-create the moving images. There must not be any obstacle blocking the rays of light between the projector and the screen. Even though the target surface does not have to be just one – it may be doubled, multiplied, expanded in terms of both height and width, panoramic or circular, i.e. encircling the whole auditorium –, these numerous possibilities of film projections are still not enough to enable experimenting with unlimited creative combinations. However, video allows us doing so.

As we do not aim to offer an enumerative overview of all variants of video as an autonomous part of a theatrical performance, we will divide these types into several categories:

1. During production, a video camera might record a true reality in front of the camera; however, digital technologies allow us to instantly use a number of trick variations to process and edit the transmitted signal and then its recording.
2. Video is autonomous towards reality; it is a space for constructing a virtual reality.
3. Unlike film, video may function in online modes, offline modes or combined modes. Film is only able to function in offline modes.
4. During transmission, video does not have to stick to the rule of unshaded visibility between the projector and the screen; the image can be imported in various ways, not only through a projection, but also via an optical cable or wirelessly.
5. Transmission of a video signal may offer the percipients not just one ray of light, but rather an atomised, huge number of rays, each with its own content and meaning.

⁴ See, for example: SVOBODA, B.: *Laterna magika*. Praha: Filmový ústav, 1968.

⁵ For more information, see: BABLET, D.: *Josef Svoboda*. Lausanne: L'Age d'homme, 2004.

Two Hypotheses

The empirical experience based on theatrical practice allows us to claim that in the 1950s it may have been rare to see a director using video as a part of his theatrical work at all, but if we take into consideration the 1960s and the following decades rushing towards the 21st century, the use of online and/or offline versions of video in terms of the theatrical art started to flourish and now it is experiencing a booming progress. We assume that contemporary artists interested in video tend to explore each possibility of the medium to the maximum. Our goal is to discuss using cameras, processing signals and their transmission onto the theatrical stage, thus in front of the audience, by using two examples related to the *mise en scène* *Fanny and Alexander*, performed in 2016 at the Slovak National Theatre. Our second assumption is that anything, which is offered to the audiences through a combination of theatre and video, may become a virtual (or a hybrid) reality but, hypothetically speaking, not in all cases.

The meaning of these two complementary questions is reflected in our ambition to use the following case study to find out whether the new technological and electronic means of communication, video and television broadcasting, both of them now embedded inside the inner circle of theatre, are able to somehow endanger the existence of the classic – and, in some respects, maybe even old-fashioned – theatrical art, or whether theatre can cope with this modernisation as it has coped with all other modernisations before.



Picture 1: Ingmar Bergman: *Fanny and Alexander*. Slovak National Theatre Bratislava, 2016. Tária Pauhofová (*Fanny*). Source: Photo by Luboš Kotlár. Archives SNT.



Picture 2: Ingmar Bergman: *Fanny and Alexander*. Slovak National Theatre Bratislava, 2016. Zuzana Kocúriková (*Blenda Vergérus*), Daniel Fischer (*Alexander*). Source: Photo by Luboš Kotlár. Archives SNT.



Picture 3: Ingmar Bergman: *Fanny and Alexander*. Slovak National Theatre Bratislava, 2016. Richard Stanke (*Eduard Vergérus*). Source: Photo by Luboš Kotlár. Archives SNT.

Video in Theatrical Mise En Scène: Fanny and Alexander in the Slovak National Theatre

The mise en scène *Fanny and Alexander* based on the literary screenplay by Ingmar Bergman premiered on 6th and 7th April 2016 at the Slovak National Theatre. The movie with the same title had been released in 1982 and it is one of the most renowned works of this Swedish director. The cinematic version of the story is 188 minutes long; there is also a television version split into four episodes (312 minutes long in total), and theatrical versions of the story are very popular as well (the play performed at the Slovak National Theatre was approximately 180 minutes long). As we have mentioned above, Bergman's original script was adapted by the director Marián Amsler and the mise en scène received a lot of praise from both critics and spectators. The most appreciated aspects involved casting (the characters were played by outstanding actors affiliated with the Slovak National Theatre) and precise directing; Ingmar Bergman's general popularity in Slovakia helped as well. However, there is one more interesting fact to note – the mise en scène's unusual conception. Marián Amsler, the director, massively used video as a part of the theatrical spectacle. The creative process – shooting with cameras, adjusting the signal via directorial processing, editing and instant parallel projection – may be defined as so-called “live-cinema”, i.e. a version of online video. Therefore we can talk about an artistically processed live broadcasting. Soňa J. Smolková, who works as a critic for the daily newspaper *Pravda*, wrote in her review: “*Watching Fanny and Alexander was a full-fledged theatrical experience even for film connoisseurs.*”⁶ However, she might have made her point by saying the opposite – it was a full-fledged film experience even for theatre connoisseurs.

The story takes place at the beginning of the 20th century and it is partially based on autobiographic facts from Bergman's personal life. The Ekdahls, a large, tolerant, light-hearted family with theatre roots, bound together by love and mutual understanding despite certain conflicts, is placed in the centre of our attention. The main characters are both children – Alexander and his younger sister Fanny. Their mother Emilia remarries shortly after her first husband Oscar, the siblings' father, suddenly dies of a stroke, becoming a wife of Edvard Vergérus, a local protestant bishop and a fellow widower. However, Emilia's new husband, soon revealed as a despotic and harsh authoritarian influenced by religious dogmas, intends to raise the helpless children by violence and starts to punish them severely.

Fanny and Alexander, once surrounded by their aunts and uncles (and their liberal values), never before criticised for their youthful sentiments and various minor ‘sins’, now have a hard time adjusting to the new situation. Their mother Emilia thus finds herself in an unsolvable situation – being a newlywed, she cannot leave her husband. On the other hand, she is not able to ignore her children's suffering. If she tried to leave the marriage, legally it would be considered desertion that would also place Fanny and Alexander in her husband's custody. Isak Jacobi, a family friend and a local merchant, eventually helps Emilia smuggle the children from the house and she runs away as well. Alexander hates his stepfather enormously, often fantasising about his death, which, in fact, happens when Edvard dies as a consequence of an unfortunate fire inside his own house. The boy has to face his future with one more trauma to process. The way the story ends – on a cheerful, life-affirming note – could be a true happy ending; however, all that suffering they have been through overshadows the rediscovered happiness.

Actors performed on the stage created by Juraj Kuchárek. The spaces within the complex of coulisses sometimes hid the action so the audience members were able to perceive certain segments of the mise en scène only thanks to the video transmission. Cameras captured not only spectacles performed on the stage, but also various situations happening in the backstage. Cameras were placed on staves or manually carried around the space; in certain cases they were placed on actors' (characters') foreheads to provide the audience with the actors'-characters' points of view. The spectator was able to choose – it was possible to watch the live theatrical performance, its video version on the screens or everything at the same time. This led to inevitable comparison

⁶ SMOLKOVÁ, J. S.: *Fanny a Alexander – divadelný zážitok aj pre znakov filmu*. Released on 10th April 2016. [online]. [2017-08-10]. Available at: <<https://kultura.pravda.sk/divadlo/clanok/389389-recenzia-fanny-a-alexander-divadelny-zazitok-aj-pre-znakov-filmu/>>.



Picture 4: Ingmar Bergman: *Fanny and Alexander*. Slovak National Theatre Bratislava, 2016. Daniel Fischer (Alexander). Source: Photo by Luboš Kottár. Archives SNT.



Picture 5: Ingmar Bergman: *Fanny and Alexander*. Slovak National Theatre Bratislava, 2016. Videoregie. Source: Photo by Luboš Kottár. Archives SNT.



Picture 6: Ingmar Bergman: *Fanny and Alexander*. Slovak National Theatre Bratislava, 2016. Milan Ondřík (Gustáv Adolf Ekdahl), Gabriela Džuríková (Alma Ekdahl).

Source: Photo by Luboš Kottár. Archives SNT.

of acting in the theatre and film acting – according to the criticism published in the daily newspaper *Hospodárske noviny*, “camera is able to miraculously point out a detail that is, at least in case of theatre, normally hidden”.⁷ This principle has been used in theatre several times since the 1980s; the most renowned directors, who are interested in this creative idea, include the British artist Katie Mitchell, the author of video installations at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, and Frank Castorf, the director of Volksbühne in Berlin who favours use of film quotations during theatrical performances.

The analysed mise en scène *Fanny and Alexander* used the framework characteristics mentioned in the previous theoretical overview. As we have defined the **decorative and illustrative function** of video in terms of theatrical performances as a basic form, it is appropriate to state that in case of *Fanny and Alexander*, it was definitely present. Most video images completed – otherwise simple and rather plain – architecture of the scene by shots that provided it with more dynamic movement, shapes and colours of costumes, with more detailed views of theatrical properties and furniture – their purpose was to illustrate the events on the scene.

However, the mise en scène by Marián Amsler primarily worked with **video as a part of acting or scenic spectacles**. For example, the last act includes a dialogue between doubting ten-year-old Alexander and a voice from the background that represents God:

THE VOICE: *I am almighty. Have you forgotten?*

ALEXANDER: *I haven't forgotten. I just don't believe it, because you just can't stop repeating that you're almighty. If you truly were almighty, you being almighty would be natural and neither you, nor the Bishop would have to prove us your almightiness on every Sunday.*⁸

The whole scene was accompanied by a video projection displayed on two side screens; the audience members were able to watch an eye in big detail – the used tricks ‘moved’ the eye abruptly and the lighting provided it with a frightening glint. The video entered the scene as a metaphor of God who was neither personified by an actor, nor portrayed in any other way. The shots recorded by an online camera, modified during the transmission via tricks and then simultaneously mediated back onto the stage, utilized a wide spectrum of mimesis and fiction – from calm, static, real shots portraying the characters and the scene, through a mobile camera and shifting between various angles of view, to colourful as well as black and white displays and shape-based processing of the reality in front of the camera (aiming to distort the image or blur it), screened either in real time or deformed by a time delay. Taking full advantage of its miniature size and highly sensitive optics, the modern video technology was able to approach the characters intimately, shoot in dark spaces, record movements in real time or as time-blurred spectacles.

The analysed mise en scène also utilizes **video as an autonomous element** that, by itself, includes everything that is necessary to create a full-valued portrayal and meaning of particular sequences. It also means that in this case video does not illustrate or complete, but rather autonomously creates a scene. Marián Amsler was very well aware of the fact that when used properly, the ‘magic of video’ could be as absorbing and compelling as the ‘magic of theatre’; that is why he placed an *expressis verbis* explanation of this idea into one of the sequences, stressing out its meaning and application. More specifically, following Áron’s monologue in the presence of young Alexander, both characters moved away from the spotlight of the scene towards a side space, a directing room, which is normally hidden from the spectator’s gaze.

ÁRON: *The reality we perceive is surrounded by numerous realities placed next to each other. Nicely, one after another. Spooks, angels, devils, demons are crawling around us. (...) Unexplainable things can scare people, and that is why it is so easy to blame the magic of theatre, trapdoors, mirrors and projections.*⁹

7 *Výstrednosť je lepšia ako fanatizmus, odkazuje nová hra SND*. Released on 16th April 2016. [online]. [2017-08-24]. Available at: <<http://style.hnonline.sk/kultura/598036-recenzia-vystrednost-je-lepsia-ako-fanatizmus-odkazuje-nova-hra-snd>>.

8 BERGMAN, I., AMSLER, M.: *Fanny and Alexander. Bulletin related to the given theatrical mise en scène performed at the Slovak National Theatre*. Bratislava : Slovak National Theatre, 2016, p. 85.

9 BERGMAN, I., AMSLER, M.: *Fanny and Alexander. Bulletin related to the given theatrical mise en scène performed at the Slovak National Theatre*. Bratislava : Slovak National Theatre, 2016, p. 86.

The monologue ended in the directing room; the pair of characters was hidden and the audience members were not physically able to see them, but the scene was still in front of their eyes thanks to a live video projection displayed on two side screens. The space representing the ‘magic of video projection’ Áron and Alexander found themselves in was equipped by a counter full of screens, colourful controllers and dimmed lighting. However, instead of spooks, theatrical equipment and the ‘magic of acting’, the curious spectator could see the most modern and fully functioning electronic equipment. This equipment was as much magical and mysterious as the background of old theatre would have been. This sci-fi room was the place where two characters – Áron and Alexander – contemplate about the existence of God. Video assumed control over the scene; the audience no longer saw the situation as a series of theatrical spectacles, but rather as videos on a television screen or on other types of larger projection screens. As one of the present critics writes, “*happiness can only be found where fantasy is*”,¹⁰ meaning the story of Fanny, Alexander and their family. This statement might as well be applied to the artistic foundations of the whole mise en scène merging theatre and video – the authors’ creativity resulted in an extraordinary hybrid work of art offering a truly joyful artistic experience.

Conclusion

The mise en scène *Fanny and Alexander* merged theatre and video; one of the most natural reasons for doing so could be the fact that the story had originally been released as a feature film back in 1982. Marián Amsler’s theatrical version of the story performed at the Slovak National Theatre utilized video that, although it shares its roots with film, currently outperforms film in terms of both artistic ideas and technological possibilities suitable for theatrical production. This powerful technological aspect was used sufficiently. As suggested in our hypotheses, the tendency to maximally use video within the analysed performance cannot be questioned since Amsler did not intend to focus on the **illustrative function of video** – it appeared somehow unwittingly – and instead of that he paid a lot of attention to using **video as a part of acting or scenic spectacles**. However, the third function, **video as an autonomous element**, was used as well, and several times. Theatre had to partially ‘retreat’ to the background; scenic acting was replaced by film (or rather video) acting. Even one of the critics attending the performance stated that the mise en scène seemed to shift between scenic acting and more detailed film acting.¹¹ This maximal use of video in theatre brought the possibility of taking the story away from the ordinary reality and carrying it towards the virtual universe.

On the other hand, we have to acknowledge that the extensive use of video in *Fanny and Alexander* did not ruin the scenic art – and did not even intend to. After all, no critiques published in the press suggest such undesirable outcome; on the contrary, the published critiques and weblogs seem to focus on the mise en scène as such, on the unusual performance at the Slovak National Theatre, pointing out the quality of acting or the scenic details such as spatial layout of buildings (the Ekdahls’ house and Bishop Vergéruš’s house as well) that excluded the possibility of looking inside otherwise than through windows and peepholes. It is quite surprising, actually, since video practically accompanied the scenic spectacles and in certain moments (such as longer sequences) it remained the only way of communication. We may therefore conclude that the mise en scène *Fanny and Alexander* performed at the Slovak National Theatre did not create a virtual world determined by abstract relationships between the characters, unreal spatial coordinates or unlikely human behaviour patterns. In the end, the theatrical art was able to preserve its dominance even despite the massive use of the video art; the ‘old’ theatre once again absorbed the electronic modernisation based on technological development spread across last five or six decades. This kind of artistic fantasy, here manifested via the combination of theatre and video, thus may be seen as a form of deconstruction, but not destruction.

10 *Výstrednosť je lepšia ako fanatizmus, odkazuje nová hra SND*. Released on 16th April 2016. [online]. [2017-08-24]. Available at: <<http://style.hnonline.sk/kultura/598036-recenzia-vystrednost-je-lepsia-ako-fanatizmus-odkazuje-nova-hra-snd>>.

11 *Výstrednosť je lepšia ako fanatizmus, odkazuje nová hra SND*. Released on 16th April 2016. [online]. [2017-08-24]. Available at: <<http://style.hnonline.sk/kultura/598036-recenzia-vystrednost-je-lepsia-ako-fanatizmus-odkazuje-nova-hra-snd>>.

Acknowledgement: The article was financially supported by the scientific project APVV-15-0764 titled "Slovak Theatre and Contemporary European Theatre Culture – Continuity and Discontinuity".

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- BABLET, D.: *Josef Svoboda*. Lausanne : L'Age d'homme, 2004.
- BERGMAN, I., AMSLER, M.: *Fanny and Alexander. Bulletin related to the given theatrical mise en scène performed at the Slovak National Theatre*. Bratislava : Slovak National Theatre, 2016.
- GOURDON, A.: *Des arts et des spectacles à la télévision*. Paris : CNRS, 2000.
- KRACAUER, S.: *Teoria filmu. Wyzwolenie materialnej rzeczywistości*. Warszawa : WAI, 1975.
- PICON-VALLIN, B.: *Les écrans sur la scène*. Lausanne : L'Age d'homme, 1998.
- PICON-VALLIN, B.: *Le film de théâtre*. Paris : CNRS, 1997.
- SADOUL, G.: *Dějiny filmu – Od Lumière až do doby současné*. Praha : Orbis, 1958.
- SMOLKOVÁ, J. S.: *Fanny a Alexander – divadelný zážitok aj pre znalcov filmu*. Released on 10th April 2016. [online]. [2017-08-10]. Available at: <<https://kultura.pravda.sk/divadlo/clanok/389389-recenzia-fanny-a-alexander-divadelny-zazitok-aj-pre-znalcov-filmu/>>.
- STADTRUCKER, I.: *Videozáznam v umení a kultúre*. Bratislava : VŠMU, 1983.
- SVOBODA, B.: *Laterna magika*. Praha : Filmový ústav, 1968.
- Výstrednosť je lepšia ako fanatizmus, odkazuje nová hra SND*. Released on 16th April 2016. [online]. [2017-08-24]. Available at: <<http://style.hnonline.sk/kultura/598036-recenzia-vystrednost-je-lepsia-ako-fanatizmus-odkazuje-nova-hra-snd>>.

