Acta Univ. Sapientiae, Film and Media Studies, **1** (2009) 167–180

The Official and Hidden Scenarios of Role-Playing in István Dárday's *The Prize Trap* (1974)

Elemér Szabó
Director of anthropological films and documentaries
(Hungary)
email: szaboelemail@gmail.com

Abstract. This paper analyses the film entitled *The Prize Trap* (*Jutalomutazás*) directed by István Dárday, which counts as one of the most emblematic examples of the so-called docu-features in Hungary. The The Prize Trap represents an exciting and idiosyncratic symbiosis of documentary and feature cinema, and as such, it may offer useful insights into the nature of reality and fiction as represented by cinema. The author examines the film from a new perspective. He begins with the gap filling survey about a method engaged by numerous directors belonging to the Budapest School, that is, the employment of amateur actors. With the analysis of their role playing, the role conflicts and role confusions manifested in the process of acting, the author reveals the "double consciousness" of contemporary society, the encounter between the official and hidden scenarios of that time. The theoretical frames of the analysis are the role-theories of social sciences, Jay Ruby's reflections about the anthropological film, together with Scott's idea of everyday resistance.

The Budapest School

The Prize Trap (Jutalomutazás) directed by István Dárday in 1974[1] stands as an important turning-point in Hungarian film history. It marks the beginning

[11] Györgyi Szalai has been a lifelong companion of Dárday and her role is just as central in *The Prize Trap* as in other films. She is credited with the screenplay of the film, although – unofficially – she counts to be the co-director of the film (therefore I refer to them as "the Dárdays").

of the so called *Budapesti Iskola (Budapest School),* and counts to be one of its most emblematic examples. In my essay I will also mention the documentary entitled *Study of a Specific Case* (*Egy egyedi eset természetrajza*, Györgyi Szalai, 1976) which is a kind of sequel, "background study" to *The Prize Trap* and contains conversations with the people whose story originally served as inspiration for the film and thus offers minute details about the nature of communal relationships and the reception of the film.

The Budapest School as a cinematic movement produced films that are far from being uniform. There are various attempts of definition and self-definition of the name: some wish to understand it along stylistic and thematic terms, others in relation to groups/generations of directors, yet others offer definitions based on common traits of production and distribution. The Budapest School refers to a rather flexible group of films made in the seventies by the second generation representatives of the Balázs Béla Studio who entered filmmaking in the early 1970s and made films which are sometimes referred to as docu-features and fictional documentaries. The main characteristic of these films is the marriage of documentary features and the mode of address characterizing feature film, the intermingling of these two traditional cinematic forms into a hybrid aesthetic form in which the language of fiction and documentarism mix. In this regard the Budapest School represents an exciting and idiosyncratic symbiosis of documentary and feature cinema, and as such, it may offer useful insights into the nature of reality and fiction as represented by cinema.

The values the artists involved in Budapest School shared were rejuvenation and a readiness to redefine the roles and possibilities offered by filmmaking. Participants were united by a feeling of collective dissatisfaction towards the contemporary conditions of Hungarian feature and documentary filmmaking and all hoped to renew cinema stylistically and/or thematically. Representatives of the Budapest School were ready to radically rethink and thematize contemporary socialist reality, uncover the sphere concealed by party slogans and propaganda-reality and discuss taboos using that relatively undisturbed sphere which cinema enjoyed over other forms of publicity. There has always been a strong, yet latent motivation to reveal a subsequent reality, to turn cinema into the representation of those social and political messages which were eliminated from public speech. "To dive under the surface and reveal that which is hidden" – as Dárday argues (2005, 54). "A new word dawns upon the spectators in these films, 'another' Hungary, a social condition that was meant to be silenced and disguised" – adds Zalán (2005, 17).

Some of the documentarist features in this fashion are "sociofilms" dealing with actual social issues. They rely on new insights reached by the then

relatively unknown science of sociology. Social tendencies became known as the result of sociological research projects that had started in the sixties and were published in the early seventies. One of the most remarkable features of the Budapest School was the comparatively successful cooperation between filmmakers and sociologists. As a result of this the socio-consciousness and social scientific sensibility became stronger in documentaries. There have been aspirations to gradually institutionalize the filmmaker-sociologist cooperation (see the manifesto entitled *Szociológiai Filmcsoportot!* [*For a Sociological Film Department!*] at the end of the 60s, or *Társulás Stúdió* [*Association Studio*] from the early 80s which was a partnership of filmmakers and sociologists). Due to the explicit intention to give legitimacy to cooperative filmmaking of strong social scientific consciousness, script writing was often preceded by extensive fieldwork, and films not only showed a high degree of awareness as far as the choice of topic was concerned, but also found their theoretical and empirical base in sociographies, scientific analyses and surveys. "For a certain period the high-profile artist had to give over the position of the ideal filmmaker to the analyst possessing accurate and actual knowledge" – writes Vince Zalán (2005, 15).

The documentarist representation of social issues was achieved through the method of direct portrayal of reality in many of the films of the Budapest School. The criteria of "new objectivity" put raw everydayness, "unbound concreteness" into focus. Along this path, documentarist films adopting the spirit of "new objectivity" as a filiation of the social scientific approach arrived to the direct representation of people and their gestures, mimicry and language. In sum they opened new paths towards microscopic levels of social existence. Many films with a keen eye for details are characterized by empiricism and a "close textual analysis focusing on detail" (Fekete 2005, 219). This type of bottom-view exploration, the micro-perspective approach and the "thick description" of the portrayed reality call attention to the similarities between anthropological filmmaking and the Budapest School.[2]

[2]Further inquiries in this direction would have to examine the theoretical and methodological analogies between works of visual anthropology and fiction films, furthermore investigate if the films of the Budapest School can be regarded (and if yes to what extent) as the forerunners of Hungarian anthropological filmmaking.

The Specific Case of The Prize Trap

The bottom-view perspective, peeping into the private lives of selected individuals, the introduction of selected cases reveal a reality beyond itself (according to the principle of *pars pro toto*) and models the functioning of a broader social institution or a comprehensive social mechanism. In a similar manner, *The Prize Trap* balances between presenting both an individual case study and a general situation, a singular and a comprehensive social model when it offers "the study of a specific case" – as the already mentioned documentary (intended as a background study to the film) suggests.

As far as the case is concerned, the Dárdays used an apparently insignificant yet true incident with no real "dramatic stake" as the story of their film. The tension of the film is created not by the story but by the play of the "double social consciousness" that I shall be describing in more detail later. The main conflict of the film arises after the district committee of pioneers receives the order from the national leaders to choose a child who will go on a prize trip to England for a month. After some hesitation – as there seems to be no one who would fit the description – the committee appoints Tibi Balogh, a sixteen year old teenager who plays pop songs to the girls of the village, thus fits at least the parameter of being able to play a musical instrument. The committee has the astonished parents (who are out on the fields hacking) sign the declaration of acceptance and the organization of the trip is well under way when – at the peak of the story – the parents change their mind and decide not to allow their son to go on the trip. Consequently another pioneer gets the opportunity to visit England. This banal story contains one absurd and ambiguous detail: the resistance of the parents, who do not accept this honourable prize, offered as a privilege. Their resistance at the time was met by the total incomprehension of the local political elite with the relentlessness of the parents being interpreted by the superiors as a historically inherited stubbornness characterising soil-bound, un-illuminated peasant mentality. This annoying incident would have nevertheless been long forgotten had the cinematic attention of the Dárdays not put it into the centre of public attention.

The Dárdays' choice of content, the uniqueness of Tibi's story reveals the authors' interest in the peculiar, idiosyncratic phenomenon of micro-realities. At the same time the uniqueness presented in the documentary reveals another tone and additional political meanings. "This is an unfortunate specific case, which despite all our efforts to prevent it does happen occasionally" – says the district secretary of the pioneers at the end of *The Study of a Specific*

Case. This sentence is far more important than it sounds, and suggests that in the eyes of the political elite this incident is nothing but an "isolated case," a rare disgrace in the otherwise effective and successful history of the pioneer movement: it is a deviation from the accustomed; it is a case of deviance. The question of deviance becomes especially emphatic in the political climate of the mid-seventies: within this gradually softening, yet in its fundamental logic still totalitarian system anything that breaks the norms, fractures authority and deviates from the official ideology and scenario falls into the field of isolation, punitive sanction or passive toleration. Within this field deviance will be either dropped out from publicity, left out from official statistics, narratives, its pure existence being neglected, or, if it receives some publicity, like in the case of Tibi, it will officially be labelled as deviant. As we shall see, the social reception of *The Prize Trap*, the waves of opinion generated by it also illuminate this dual technique of obliteration and blacklisting, which was put in motion when the contemporary political system encountered deviance. One of the key privileges of contemporary authority was the power to determine which forms of everyday action counted to be deviant and which were to be "overlooked". Everyday action, daily routine were deviant as long as the authorities regarded them to be such. The Dárdays' film decides to portray a "deviant case" that does not have an appropriate portrayal in terms of the official scenario, which slips away from it. This calls attention to the cracks, anomalies within the authoritative system.

Amateur Actors – Role-Playing in Culture

In the next section I describe the method engaged by numerous directors belonging to the Budapest School, that is, the employment of amateur actors. *The Prize Trap* could be a showcase of this. Naturally this was not the first time that non-professional actors starred in films, the most notable examples being Italian Neorealism and the Czech New Wave. Also there are Hungarian examples of the use of amateur players already from the sixties, and Dárday himself employed non-professional actors in his diploma film entitled *Impression (Lenyomat)*. Still it was in *The Prize Trap* that this concept became a canonized one, a method looked upon as a model by future films.

Non-professional actors are usually employed in films that reconstruct real or fictitious incidents and for the sake of authenticity people of the portrayed social status and occupation are invited to take part in the project. These participants will be allowed to shape the roles to their own personality

made possible by the widespread use of improvization. This latter is a technique of intertwining personality and role, giving rise to a new degree of directness. It resulted in instant success, documentarist filmmaking and realist representation discovered a new source of authenticity in this method. The "action in process" is seemingly indirect, yet kept under accurate control as a result of which it is capable of producing frenetic filmic experience. What we see on the screen, what happens on the screen is almost self-organizing – it makes us believe that it would have commenced exactly the same way, even if the camera had not been present. There is no enforced authorial opinion or montage" (Zalán 2005, 13).

Taking a look at the circumstances of filming of *The Prize Trap*, an unobtrusive, almost totally invisible authorial presence seems to take shape. The retreat of the author into the background is exemplified by the lack of a script and the consequent limitation of middle-class language use. "We only outline a situation and the actors add their language, thoughts, reaction to one another" – describes Szalai (Szalai 2005, 70). The screenplay also relies on real incidents, which in this context expresses the wish on the part of the filmmakers to withhold their own urban-intellectual frame of mind and not allow middle-class narrative patterns permeate the film. Editing also serves the sensitive exploration of the material. "The structuring principle is the exploratory analysis" (Grunwalsky et al. 2005, 134).

To reduce the disturbing presence of the crew the Dárdays worked with a smaller number of personnel. They used two cameras in order not to break the continuity of action within a scene, and despite the fact that they used location sound, no clapperboard was used. They did everything to ensure that the shots were recorded as if a real situation, a lifelike moment occurred in front of the camera. They filmed on natural location; the actors were not familiar with the whole screenplay, only with the subsequent scene; there were no rehearsals, there were no test-shots, sound was also recorded on the spot just as in the case of "cinema direct" and situational documentary filmmaking. The filmmakers, after discussing a scene in general terms with the actors retreated into the "fly on the wall" position of situative filming, an approach identified by the theory of visual anthropology as an attitude of non-intrusion (Heltai 2002, 96).[3]

[3]With this method of filming the Dárdays virtually followed on the footsteps of situative documentary filmmaking. The traditional interview-based, interrogative method was replaced exactly at the turn of the 60s and 70s by the so called situative documentarism, in which a dramatic situation is filmed directly and without breaking dramatic integrity (Gelencsér 2002, 251).

The actors found themselves in front of the camera in barely intentional, highly amorphous, consequently lifelike situations and started acting out roles that were hardly different from those played in their quotidian lives. Amateur actors did surprisingly well in these non-rigidified situations: social reflexes, background knowledge and the reactions arising from self-conscious acting came to life 'in situ' and actors began to behave according to the role-expectations of the given situation, as wives, husbands, colleagues, people in hierarchical relations.

Another convincing example of the employment of amateur actors is Béla Tarr's *Családi tűzfészek* (*Family Nest*, 1979), a film which starts with words that could be the motto of this method: "This is a true story, and although the people in the film act out the events, these could have happened with them." The latter momentum contains the key to the success of this method. The actors are essentially close to the roles they enact, the situations are well-known for them, these incidents "could have happened with them." This is the source of the extremely strong empathic capability characteristic of amateur actors and their familiarity with the mimicry, phrasing and behaviour necessary to authentically play the role. The employment of non-professional actors relies on the idea that authentic acting is only possible if one's social role is close to his/her cinematic role. This is why it is significant that age, sex, and occupation are all matched when selecting people for the roles. In *The Prize Trap* for example the troop leader is played by a local head of the pioneers. Due to the concurrences between the original and the enacted roles, amateur actors will have an advantage over professional ones. Dárday refers to this advantage (which on the other hand is a disadvantage) when he remarks that "there are wonderful actors and yet it is my conviction that they are more limited in their repertoire than simple civilians" (Tóth 2003, 65).

This experiment of employing amateur actors was inspired by the quite popular sociological role-theories of the time. Role-theories based on the analogies with drama (be them sociological, socio-psychological or anthropological) make the most of the similarity between social interaction and dramatic roles and respectively between contexts of interaction and the theatrical set-up. These theories regard people as agents playing roles which best fit their social statuses, agents who quasi step onto the stage during interactions and enact prescriptive scripts which are nevertheless open for dynamic modification and customization. Many cinematic situations reveal this model. According to Jay Ruby, leading theorist of visual anthropology, the anthropological filmmaker, in order to perceive culture in a visually relevant way uses a lot of theatrical analogies. In the eyes of the film making

anthropologist the visually significant elements of behaviour come together into the "scenario of culture" "in which each character has his/her own line, a corresponding costume, decoration and role [...] The socio-cultural ego of the individual is the totality of all the scenes in which one has starred as actor or participated as audience. Culture is nothing more than a stage-play performed by actors as socio-cultural beings" (Ruby 2004, 76).[4] At the same time according to Goffman a role is the assemblage of such activities that people would do when they had to act exclusively according to normative circumstances. As opposed to this, real behaviour, role-fulfilment moves away from activity regarded as ideal (Goffman 1981, 299–351). Ruby argues in similar manner: "People rarely act as they should, not even in those occasions when, as it happens, someone is aware of what would count to be rational or proper behaviour. We forget lines, invert monologues, change clothes, put on someone else's clothes, improvise or invert roles [...] The social life of a person is structured by the constant interaction between ideal and real behaviour [...] In most cases we pursue to arrive to a compromise [...] The gap between ideal and real may be conversely wide and thin" (Ruby 2004, 76–77).

If we want to understand *The Prize Trap* from the point of view of role-playing, it is clear that the above mentioned ideal behaviour is nothing more than the repertoire of roles prescribed for the socialist ideal of man. In this respect, the film points out the specific failure of the socialist ethos and the ever present gap between ideal and real behaviour on the level of everyday life. The film grasps this failure as a result of employing amateur actors whose "non-exquisite", even "rough" acting style lead either to overacting or the unsteady delivery of roles. The documentary power of the film lies largely in the accidentally framed, possibly unintentionally verbalized half-sentences, unguarded expressions, unintentional gestures, from which we learn as much about the contemporary world, as we do from the story. Most of the time while watching the film we see actors, especially the local representatives of the state administration doing everything to live up to expectations, and still their addresses are full of artificiality, blunders and slip-of-the-tongues. In this regard the film holds a mirror in front of the representatives of lower-level political administration, who are "the type of people who identify with their social role at the cost of self-deception, direct or indirect lies" (Gelencsér 2002, 255-256). Actors are in continuous conflict of roles: the local secretary of the party is also a brother-in-law, and as such he is easily pacified by Tibi's parents. Socialist role-expectations result in role confusion as seen in the scene where

[4] Translations from Hungarian texts were made by the author.

Tibi gets in a tangle while singing a pioneer song in front of the committee. He feels similarly at odds with his new role of the eminent pioneer.

The role-playing of the local political elite was not without flaws, partly because it was impossible to fulfil the idealistic expectations and party orders on local level. The national leadership of the pioneer movement was determined to send on this prize trip a child who had working class parents, could play a musical instrument well and furthermore was an eminent student and a distinguished pioneer. It is impossible to meet all these requirements, especially because the seventies were still lacking the kind of physical workers who were pursuing the otherwise middle-class and bourgeois habit of educating one's kids musically. Although the local leaders of the pioneers do everything to find a kid who fits the parameters specified by the movement headquarters, finally they offer a half-solution. The choice of Tibi only looks good on the outside: though he is of working-class origin and can play a musical instrument to a degree, he is far from being a prominent student and a distinguished pioneer. (In the end a child of middle-class parents goes on the prize trip.)

The fulfilment of non-lifelike party guidelines is especially difficult on the level of local society, where the primary frame of reference for most people is not the sphere of socialist ideals, but the still existing and very influential norms of peasant existence. An essential frame of reference is represented by religion, which is thematically present throughout the film in the form of visual representation of various religious symbols and events. In one emblematic scene the troop leader is tying his tie in front of the image of St Mary. In the first scene of the film, while portraying the All Saints' Day crowd, the camera is panning between socialist badges, blazons, religious devotional objects and the stickers of pop-stars. The freedom characterizing the camera-use calls attention to the polyphony of symbols, the interaction and parallelism of many different frames of references peculiar to the local society.

Official and Hidden Scenarios in *The Prize Trap*

The value system professed by the local society besides and instead of the official socialist one may defeat the will of the power holders. The most complex and hidden momentum of the film is the surprise decision of Tibi's parents to turn down the prize trip "assigned" to their son. The reasons given by the parents – namely the irrationally strong motherly anxiety (over any unforeseen tragedy awaiting his son during the trip) and the traditional division of labour characterizing agricultural work (as a result of which work on the

lands cannot go on without Tibi for a month) – are absurd and are met by the total incomprehension of the local authorities. It seems that the parents' gesture of refusal is according to a hidden scenario, the motives of which are incomprehensible and unavailable for the village leadership.

According to James Scott this hidden or secondary scenario belongs to the "behind the stage", to the non-public sphere which is not controlled by institutions, but which is present in the everyday life flourishing in the cracks of institutional order. As opposed to this, official or primary scenarios crystallize "on stage". These are embodied by the formal institutes and official ideologies. The two scenarios encounter each other in the communication between the dominators and the oppressed, where they take the form of some kind of deal (Scott 1996).

The hidden scenario evokes forms of everyday resistance. According to Scott this social phenomenon characterizes those symbolic practices which come alive in the relationship between the authorities and their subjects. These practices, built on the high-level implicit cooperation of the subordinate groups, discredit and undermine the non-consensual provisions and expectations of the rulers. The practice of everyday resistance does not take shape in well-articulated political action, but lurks on the level of everydayness uncontrolled and not appropriated by political authority (Scott 1996). Inscribed within the stubborn disobedience of the parents, one can recognize the refusal of the authoritative system, a specific embodiment of everyday resistance. This rejective behaviour is directed against authority hoping to infiltrate into the personal sphere of the family. The moment Tibi is appointed to go on the prize trip his family gets in the centre of the authority's attention, which through paternalist persuasion, through instructions masked as goodwill tries to push its sphere of influence to the innermost shell of the privacy (the marriage bed). The resistance of the parents reflects a basic mistrust towards power which is willing to interfere with family life and the future of children from above. The political regime in Hungary in the 1950s – as an outcome of its totalitarian logic to bring all aspects of life under control – started to besiege the border between public life and private life. Private life, which was difficult to control from "above," which hid in the cracks of institutional order, could easily escape control and supervision. According to a popular political slogan of the era, "The enemy is there where we are not." That is why the private sphere and family itself became a "dangerous assemblage," the main target of ideological appropriation and political control. The surveying and "political reorientation" of the family and other traditional communities was carried out by the centralized and institutionally controlled "communities"

that took shape in grandiose, unified social and mass institutions led by the Party like the trade unions, KISZ (Alliance of Communist Youth), Hazafias Népfront (the Patriotic Popular Front), etc. Besides the Party and labour, the ideologically formed and idealized community also started to play a central role in the socialist value system. The contemporary political regime wanted to demonstrate "communities" everywhere: in workplaces, schools, and villages. The pioneer movement itself is an exemplary socialist community. Similar to other organizations, it had the function of the "transmission gear:" it helped enhance "political reorientation," "enlightenment" in order to plant mass obedience towards the party in early childhood.

One of the scenes, in which a member of the local pioneer committee is portrayed playing with little pioneer-puppets, elucidates through irony the paternalist social politics and pedagogy inherent in the movement. In another scene where the troop leader uses the expression "our Tibi" to express that from that point on the young man will feature as the pride of pioneers, the mother reacts with the same formula "our Tibi." The mother's attitude recalls the 'I will not give you my child' type of everyday resistance, which does not allow his son to be appropriated through the pioneer movement. Everyday resistance tries to preserve Tibi for the family and the private sphere.

The bottom-view perspective of the film helps to reveal the hidden scenario of the events running parallel to the official scenario of the pioneer movement. The film discloses the contradiction of social life, the duality of the ideal and the real, the official and the hidden scenario through the handling of the camera and montage (the counterpointing of consecutive scenes and the change of planes within a scene). *The Prize Trap* expresses the social conflict which does not reach the stage of open confrontation;it captures the "development of a dual consciousness" (Gelencsér 2002, 250) characteristic of the long decades of the Kádár-era.

The Afterlife of *The Prize Trap*

In the case of *The Prize Trap* it is not just the film but its afterlife that needs to be examined. The Dárdays attribute to a special social mission documentary filmmaking, which evolves in the phase of distribution, during the afterlife of the works. Besides the traditional channels of distribution (television and cinema) and partly also independently, the authors argued for a new practice of "social distribution" taking the film back, on the one hand to the original actors, on the other hand to the narrow social stratum or institution featured in the

film. The goal of this practice is direct feedback, "escalation" (Bódy), dialogue and self-reflection. "To screen is not enough!" – argued the contemporary slogan of social distribution. As a consequence, a "new visuality" enters the scene, which "dismantles the walls between the screen and the seats" (Zalán 2005, 16) and in the deliberate meeting with the involved social actors "the circle is completed" and cinema fulfils the social function attributed to it (Zalán 2005, 18).

This new social function originated from the New Leftist beliefs of the Dárdays'. According to this belief cinema is a tool of knowing and changing reality. The starting point of this attitude is that through the method of distribution mentioned above the social system or process presented by the film can be made more effective, more rational, it can be modernized, that is, humanized. *The Prize Trap* was screened to the people who inspired the story. Their reactions and a detailed analysis of their social milieu are preserved by the documentary entitled *The Study of a Specific Case*. The filmmakers also organized a screening followed by discussion and debate in front of the national leaders of the pioneer movement in Zánka. Györgyi Szalai remembers the events as follows: "They had a great time in the darkness of the cinema; they laughed more light-heartedly than others, possibly because they were more closely affected." The darkness of the screening room is the sphere of anonymous laughter, of (self-)irony and the hidden scenario of criticizing the authoritative system and its concrete institution. After the screening, in the now well-lit room the rules of the official scenario came into effect. "The leadership sat by a long table with red table-cloth on it [...] They brought examples of what they thought was inappropriate and unreal in the film: the fat troop leader with the tie for example, who was by the way an actual troop leader. They also thought that portraying the foremen sitting by a table with red table-cloth on was also an inaccuracy – when we were actually sitting by an identical table" (Szalai 2005, 72). The outright critical edge of the film, the portrayal of a "singular case" in which the agitational activity of the pioneer movement fails miserably inspired the Pioneers Association to take concrete measures: they prosecuted the filmmakers, the studio, even the Cinema Chief Administration. The film grew to become an affair, it was screened in the party headquarters and they issued several official statements. The afterlife of *The Prize Trap* still turned out good: at some point of the contest among the representatives of power a certain kind of "deal" was made and the reception of the film turned to positive. The prosecutions had no consequences and the film that was now openly praised had more screenings. "To our luck we did not become martyrs, but filmmakers with new possibilities" – remembers

Dárday (Tóth 2003, 63). "Behind the tense interest – manifested in telephones always ringing, newspaper, television interviews – we could sense something of a clumsily imitated mechanism of a socialist star-factory; after all the regime needed young and successful people" (Tóth 2003, 63). This very specific afterlife of the film full of swings calls attention to the "muddy wrestling of making deals" (Dárday 2005, 38) which best describes the relationship of authorities and intellectuals in the consolidated Kádár-era. The different representatives of the ruling class and directors, circles of filmmakers, members of the Budapest School took part in a permanent negotiation and bargaining as a result of which the scope of films regarded compatible with the official scenario of the political elite was constantly changing.

One last remark: according to Gyöngyi Heltai the historical dimension of Hungarian filmmaking on a social scientific basis, as well as of Hungarian anthropological films at large is as yet undisclosed. I hope to have added further perspectives to the work still ahead of us. The "methodology" of *The Prize Trap* is remarkable in this regard as well, not to mention its rich anthropological material with the close insight given by the film into the workings of the bygone social system.

References

Czirják Pál. 2004. Jelenlét és elbeszélés. [Presence and Narrative]. *Metropolis* 2: 1–4.

Dárday István. 2005. Finanszírozhatatlan kép? Szubjektív jegyzetek a Budapesti Iskola természetrajzához. [Unfundable Picture? Subjective Notes about the Character of Budapest School]. In *Budapesti Iskola. Magyar dokumentum-játékfilmek 1973–1984*. [*Budapest School. Hungarian docu-features 1973–1984*], ed. Zalán Vince, 36–54. Budapest: Magyar Dokumentumfilm Rendezők Egyesülete.

Fekete Ibolya. 2005. Állapotok dinamikája. Leírási kísérletek a dokumentarizmusra. [The Dynamics of States. Attempts to Describe Documentarism]. In *Budapesti Iskola. Magyar dokumentum-játékfilmek 1973-1984*. [*Budapest School. Hungarian docu-features 1973–1984*], ed. Zalán Vince, 216–229. Budapest: Magyar Dokumentumfilm Rendezők Egyesülete

Gelencsér Gábor. 2002. *A Titanic zenekara. Stílusok és irányzatok a hetvenes évek magyar filmművészetében.* [*The Orchestra of Titanic. Styles and Trends in the Hungarian Cinema of the Seventies*]. Budapest: Osiris.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *A hétköznapi élet szociálpszichológiája* [*The Social Psychology of Everyday Life*]. Budapest: Gondolat.

Grunwalsky Ferenc et al. 2005. Szociológiai filmcsoportot! [For a Sociological Film Department!] In *Budapesti Iskola. Magyar dokumentum-játékfilmek 1973–1984.* [*Budapest School. Hungarian docu-features 1973-1984*], ed. Zalán Vince, 133–134. Budapest: Magyar Dokumentumfilm Rendezők Egyesülete.

Heltai Gyöngyi. 2002. Néhány jellemző tendencia a kortárs vizuális antropológiai gondolkodásban. [Some Characteristic Tendencies in Current Visual Anthropological Theory]. In *Dialektus Fesztivál 2002. Filmkatalógus és antropológiai írások. [Dialektus Festival 2002. Film Catalogue and Anthropological Essays]*, eds. Füredi Zoltán, Gergely István, Komlósi Orsolya, 89–112. Budapest: Palantír Film Vizuális Antropológiai Alapítvány.

Ruby, Jay. 2004. Antropológiai filmkészítés – néhány megjegyzés és a lehetséges jövő [Anthropological Filmmaking – a Few Remarks and the Possible Future]. In *A valóság filmjei. Tanulmányok az antropológiai filmről és filmkatalógus.* [*The Films of Truth. Essays about the Antrhropological Film and Film Catalogue*], ed. Füredi Zoltán, 75–82. Budapest: Palantír Film Vizuális Antropológiai Alapítvány.

Tóth Klára. 2003. "Sűrű, szimultán évek voltak". Beszélgetés Dárday Istvánnal ["They Were Busy, Simultaneous Years"]. *Filmspirál* 9. 32: 60–72.

Szalai Györgyi. 2004. Megpróbáltunk elmenni a falig. Bori Erzsébet beszélgetése Szalai Györgyivel. [We Tried to Reach the Wall. Erzsébet Bori's Interview with Györgyi Szalai]. In *Budapesti Iskola. Magyar dokumentum-játékfilmek 1973–1984.* [*Budapest School. Hungarian docu-features 1973-1984*], ed. Zalán Vince, 69–76. Budapest: Magyar Dokumentumfilm Rendezők Egyesülete.

Scott, James. 1996. Az ellenállás hétköznapi formái. [Everyday Forms of Resistance]. *Replika* 23–24: 109–130.

Zalán Vince 2005. "Reményeink lombtalanodása?" ["Defoliation of Our Hopes?"] In *Budapesti Iskola. Magyar dokumentum-játékfilmek 1973–1984.* [*Budapest School. Hungarian docu-features 1973-1984*], ed. Zalán Vince, 7–19. Budapest: Magyar Dokumentumfilm Rendezők Egyesülete.