METAMORPHOSIS OF A METAPHOR: THE SHADOW IN EARLY GERMAN CINEMA

JAMES C. FRANKLIN

A given of almost any discussion of early German cinema is a mention of the unsurpassed chiaroscuro effects of artificial lighting found in these films. The silent filmmakers of the early Weimar Republic—Lang, Murnau, Lubitsch, Wiene, Dupont, Oswald, Robison—were, we read time and time again, unexcelled masters of studio-created atmosphere, of mysterious, demonic, bone-chilling mood. The majority of commentators give few specific examples of *how* lighting was used as a narrative device, preferring instead either to praise in general terms or to refer only subjectively to the evocative, atmospheric qualities of early German chiaroscuro.[1] General and subjective assessments of the role of chiaroscuro in these films are to be sure not inaccurate, but seldom does one find an elucidation of specific functions of light/dark interplay.[2] While in some early Weimar films chiaroscuro *is* little more than a decorative element or a creator of mood, in older films chiaroscuro elements in general, and specifically the shadow, assume a precise communicative function.

The employment of the shadow as a communicative metaphor is, of course, not limited to the silent cinema nor even to the twentieth century. A traditional metaphor of perception, it is found at least as early as Plato's *Republic*. At the beginning of Book VII is found the allegory of the cave: men chained within a cave can see nothing but the shadows cast on the back of the cave, cast by fire and moving figures outside the cave, and can hear nothing but the echoes of voices that resound from the walls of the cave. Plato's cave-dwellers thus erroneously perceive the shadows and echoes as reality itself. The cave-dwellers' perceptions are not totally false: they result from what is real. They are merely a weakened, diluted hint of reality. The significance of Plato's strikingly cinematic allegory is, of course, that the cave dwellers'

perception of existence represents humanity's imperfect perception of the universe, of the reality that transcends the sensible world of appearances. In Plato's logic the contemplation of the shadows leads to the contemplation of "the objects themselves": "And first he will see the shadows best, next the reflections of men and other objects in the water, and then the objects themselves."[3] For the dwellers in the cave as for the viewer of the silent film, the shadow is less a deception than it is a potential intimation of otherwise unperceived reality.

This traditional motif of the shadow as a metaphor of perception then reappears in twentieth-century popular thought as an element of Jungian psychology. Jung employed the shadow metaphor to describe the underside of the human psyche which, if acknowledged, provides vitality, creativity, and survival responses. If repressed and "undifferentiated," however, the Jungian shadow may fight for acceptance until it overwhelms the ego and brings about the collapse of the individual.

As with Plato's shadow, the Jungian key to wholeness is recognition of the psychic shadow; and the struggle to acknowledge the Jungian shadow supplies a narrative crisis in an early section of one of the most popular Weimar literary works, Hesse's *Demian*. Stimulated by Hesse's own psychoanalysis by a Jungian therapist, *Demian* (1919) is the story of Emil Sinclair's growth to maturity, a story in which personal, psychological integration is the *sine qua non* for social integration. Thus each major character is the barely disguised embodiment of a significant Jungian archetype. In *Demian* Hesse describes Emil Sinclair's perception, in his childhood, of another world just beyond the bounds of his family's clean, secure, and orderly home: "In dieser zweiten Welt gab es. . . eine bunte Flut von ungeheuren, lockenden, furchtbaren, rätselhaften Dingen. . . . Alle diese schönen und grauenhaften, wilden und grausamen Sachen gab es."[4] Emil Sinclair is at first frightened by the second world and tries to flee it, for "nichts auf der Welt ist dem Menschen mehr zuwider, als den Weg zu gehen, der ihn zu sich selber führt" (p. 142). And one of the early stages of Sinclair's maturation is the overcoming of his fear and the incorporation of the second world into his personality: "die 'dunkle Welt', die 'andere Welt' war wieder da. . . [und] stak nun in mir selber" (p. 144).

In the philosophy of Plato, in the psychology of Jung, in the literary works of Hesse, the act of recognizing and acknowledging the shadow becomes an affirmation of psychic or existential wholeness. In early German cinema, a popular medium of popular culture, the shadow signifies nothing so grandiose as Plato's "the objects themselves." The intention of the early popular filmmaker was, above all, to involve the

viewer in the film event. The traditional shadow metaphor was thus appropriated as an efficient and gripping narrative device; the philosophical and psychological significance of the shadow became subordinated to the film's fictional narrative; and the function of the shadow was sublimated into the narrative act. Sometimes the shadow was a means for the film character to assimilate realities of his or her own existence; more often it became a device by which the filmmaker communicated a simultaneous, secondary narrative to the viewer.

The prevalence of shadows produced by the non-mimetic *mise-en-scène* and by the artificial lighting of the early German studios, of course, caught the attention of the two most influential historians of early German film: Lotte Eisner and Siegfried Kracauer.[5] In *The Haunted Screen* Eisner has pointed out the most striking of shadow images in German film of the 1920's and has convincingly related these images to the earlier Romantic concept of the *Doppelgänger* or shadow side of the human soul. Essentially, however, she would only convince us that the shadow is an "image of destiny" (p. 130), thereby dismissing a clever cinematic device as little more than an unconscious effect of a Weimar "Zeitgeist." And Kracauer in his "psychological history," *From Caligari to Hitler*, invoked the overwhelming presence of shadows as evidence in his indictment of early German filmmakers for expressing the dark, instinctual side, the unconscious drives, the Nazi id—if you will—of the so-called "German soul."

Both Kracauer and Eisner see the shadow as a visual metaphor for evil or for the dark and threatening forces that allegedly lurked in the pre-Hitler German psyche or soul. In fact, it can be better argued that the shadow's significance is neither evil nor good but is instead an "other" reality that must be perceived for the sake of existential security or psychic stability. Eisner, to a certain extent, seems to have recognized this. Sensing the kindred spirits of the early cinematic shadow and the Shadow of Nietzschean philosophy, she quotes from *Also Sprach Zarathustra*: "What do I care about my shadow! Let it chase after me! I run away and I escape from it. . . ." (p. 129). But for Nietzsche the key to spiritual health and power was not to *escape* the pursuing shadow but to acknowledge and to accept it. In the last book of *Also Sprach Zarathustra*, Nietzsche comes to a conclusion which Eisner fails to mention. Zarathustra tries in vain to outrun his shadow:

> "Darf aber Zarathustra sich wohl vor einem Schatten fürchten? Auch dünkt mich zu guterletzt, dass er längere Beine hat als ich."
>
> Also sprach Zarathustra, lachend mit Augen und Eingeweiden,

> blieb stehen und drehte sich schnell herum—und siehe, fast warf er dabei seinen Nachfolger und Schatten zu Boden.[6]

By facing his shadow, Zarathustra overcomes his fear and assimilates the wisdom of the shadow.

Eisner correctly relates the shadow motif to the literary precedent of German Romanticism. Kracauer correctly relates it to the subconscious and irrational aspect of the human mind. Neither, however, moves beyond these specifics to givemore than passing notice to the way in which the cinematic shadow functions in the narrative.

On the basis of two significant and well-known early silent films, F. W. Murnau's *Nosferatu* of 1922 and Arthur Robison's *Schatten* or *Warning Shadows* of 1923, one can demonstrate that the cinematic shadow, following in and supported by a long literary, philosophical, and psychological tradition of the shadow as metaphor, was employed communicatively both as a form of denouement to characters within the film and as a means of revealing narrative intention between filmmaker and viewer. The early cinematic shadow—when foregrounded by isolation from its human source and by juxtaposition to other characters or objects within the frame—frequently enabled a simultaneity of multiple narrative, a diegetic complexity, otherwise achieved later through the use of sound, as in Fritz Lang's *M* of 1931 for example. In the decade separating *Nosferatu* and *Warning Shadows* from *M*, there is discernible first the adoption and then the rejection of the shadow as metaphor within the conventions of the cinematic code.

While the early Soviet formalists experimented with the establishment of narrative significance by juxtapositions of one shot to another, the early German filmmakers excelled in the creation of meaning and conveyance of narrative by juxtaposition *within* the shot. Chiaroscuro, in the contrast of black and white frame areas, established a visual tension which, in the viewing process, became identified with the story being told; style became narrative. As a subtle refinement of chiaroscuro, the shadow—and its complementary image, the mirror reflection—permitted a transcendence of conventional (at that time), single-stranded, one-dimensional, linear narrative. As chiaroscuro manipulated the visual sense to create emotions, the foregrounded shadow, rather than being merely an Expressionist mannerism, added narrative depth to the silent film. The early Weimar filmmakers, as exemplified by Murnau and Robison, adapted a traditional metaphor and transformed it into an effectively modernist narrative device whose communicative function was superseded by the soundtrack of the films of the 1930's.

In Murnau's *Nosferatu*, the first vampire film, the shadow alone informs the viewer of transcendent reality, of the vampire's threat to the characters in the film, while in Robison's *Warning Shadows* mirror images reinforce fundamentally the shadow's significance.[7] Nevertheless, even with little use of mirror reflections to reinforce the metaphoric weight of the shadow, Murnau created in *Nosferatu* a complex of implication and intentional ambiguity that is unsurpassed in Weimar film. Undeniably, Murnau's use of shadows in *Nosferatu* is, for the most part, decorative and manneristic, merely one characteristic of the world of the vampire, merely one element in the film's counterpoint of light and dark. Frequently, however, the shadow also becomes a device of foreboding, as in the famous shot of the vampire's shadow ascending to the heroine's room; here as well as elsewhere in the film the shadow heightens suspense both through its temporal precedence of the vampire's approach and through its increase in the vampire's (apparent) size. As the shadow increases in size, so do the vampire's proximity and threat to Nina, the heroine. Conversely at the end of the film a shot of the lowering of shadows on the buildings of Bremen at sunrise foretells the demise of the vampire.

The vampire in *Nosferatu* represents more than simply a purely evil, destructive force, however. Murnau carefully establishes the vampire as a natural power by equating it with a hyena, Venus's fly-trap, a cannibalistic polyp; and as a natural force it seems to belong to a realm lying beyond the normal, rational world of good and evil. If the film were concerned only with a counterpointing of light and dark or good and evil, it would be much more clear-cut, but infinitely less interesting. Murnau's film is invigorated by its complexity and by the essential ambiguity of its title character, and this complexity and ambiguity were underscored by Murnau's use of the shadow in at least one key sequence: the final encounter of Nina and Nosferatu. The vampire's shadow slowly ascends the stairs, crosses to the doorway of Nina's room, and the shadow hand touches the door. We then see Nina crouched horrified in her bed (not an insignificant location). The shadow of the vampire's hand crosses Nina's body and, reaching her heart, clenches into a fist. Nina collapses in an expressionistic paroxysm. While the original meaning of horror and imminent death is retained by this image, it also simultaneously gives an added dimension to the encounter of girl and vampire: a linking of death and sex. For the gesture of the vampire's shadowy hand is also seen to be an erotic stroking of the girl's breast, an image of deadly sensuality that, though stunning in its impact, has not appeared unannounced. Earlier in the film, in what today's audience reacts to as a comic *double entendre*, Nosferatu

says upon seeing a picture of Nina: "Oh, what a lovely throat!"

The voyeuristic quality of the vampire's remark is reinforced throughout *Nosferatu* by shots of the vampire silently gazing—at Nina's picture, at Jonathan Harker, at the camera—and by the famous shot of Nosferatu staring through the centermost of nine window-panes in his Bremen warehouse/home, presumably looking at the house where Jonathan and Nina live together. Here Murnau uses a visual metaphor—the enclosing of the vampire's head by the window frames—to convey Nosferatu's imprisonment by his eternal life-in-death and by his eternal desire. Recent films such as John Badham's *Dracula, A Love Story* and Werner Herzog's remake of *Nosferatu* (both 1979) have been praised for their "discovery" of the interrelatedness of death and sexual desire in the vampire tradition. Clearly, however, a relating of sex, death, and voyeurism (with fascinating implications for the cinematic viewing process) already exists in Murnau's film. Given Murnau's training as an art historian, this linking could well have been stimulated by Edvard Munch's famous *trompe-l'oeil* painting *The Vampire* in which what seems at first sight to be a consoling caress is seen at second sight to be the attack of a vampire.

Even more notably, perhaps, the eroticism of the shadow-hand on Nina's breast reverberates backward through the film, possibly altering the meaning of Nina's words "He is coming!" as her husband and Nosferatu raced toward Bremen by land and sea (just *whose* arrival was Nina really anticipating?). At the very least this image expands the significance of the film's penultimate sequence: the vampire hovers over Nina's body, apparently sucking the girl's blood from her neck as she lies on her back in bed, but his attack is now transformed into an act of sexual rapacity. Even here, however, Murnau continues to compound ambiguities, for the vampire is also seduced. His moment of blood-lust with the girl keeps him in her room until sunrise and his annihilation.

The mechanics of Murnau's use of the shadow image are fascinating. By not overtly exposing this particular theme of the film to the viewer until very near the end, Murnau forces upon us the possibility that other complexities, other truths, other levels of reality and experience also exist that we have not perceived. Instead of what had seemed to be a straightforward and relatively simple horror story, we are now faced with what might be an endless labyrinth of meaning and implication. And the shadow has been transformed from a mere mood-setting ornament or an image of evil and darkness into Murnau's device for revealing to the viewer new levels of ironic reality.

While the shadow is the primary revelatory device in *Nosferatu*, mirror images (*The Republic*: ". . . And first he will see the shadows best, next the reflections of men and other objects in the water. . . ") do infrequently occur. The film has been criticized by vampire-purists for showing Nosferatu's reflection in a mirror. At least once, however, the mirror image assumes a communicative function similar to the shadow's in this film: after his first, terrifying night in Nosferatu's castle, Jonathan Harker—in a close-up shot—lifts a hand mirror to check for the presence or absence of the vampire's mark on his throat. Subsequently by actor motion and mirror manipulation, the shot shows only Jonathan's smiling mouth framed by and reflected in the mirror. Through a simple trick of motion, an in-shot shift, Murnau moves the viewer from an objectively observing stance to a more subjective point-of-view and simultaneously aligns the viewer with the threatened protagonist.

Possibly the purest and most complex example of the shadow metaphor and of its interplay with complementary mirror imagery is found in Robison's appropriately named *Warning Shadows*. The "warning shadows" of the title are the shadows of the members of a dinner party: a young wife, her jealous older husband, and five young courtiers. Each of the three main characters—the wife, the husband, and the most ardent of the courtiers—is dominated by one aspect of his or her non-rational personality: the wife by her vanity, the husband by his jealousy, and the young man by his lechery. An illusionist, a maker of shadow-plays with his hands or paper silhouettes, arrives at the party. At first he entertains the guests and then entrances them, releasing their shadows, their irrational personalities, to act out to their ultimate end the passions and fears that have come to dominate their normal, "rational" lives. The dinner guests watch their own shadow personalities enact an irrational tragedy of seduction, betrayal, and murder, and this confrontation with their own dark drives permits a final rejection—or perhaps it is a Jungian assimilation—of these impulses in the film's happy ending of loyal friendship and marital reunion.

In this central sequence of hypnotism and psychodrama, the equation of shadow and unconscious is, if anything, too obvious. More subtle and more interesting is the metaphoric implication of shadows in the film *before* the arrival of the illusionist, as the filmmaker Robison himself becomes an illusionist for *his* audience, showing us truths that are invisible to the characters themselves and intriguingly ambiguous to us. In one of his most complex uses of the shadow motif, Robison shows us in one shot the wife characteristically inspecting her own image in a mirror. The mirror reflects the wife's own overriding interest: her own

beauty. But it also shows us both levels of her being: her external appearance and her interior reality, her vanity. Simultaneously, as the wife examines herself, we see the young dinner guests examining her figure, one of them tracing its outline in the air with his hands. In this shot Robison shows us the drives of two of his main characters. In the next shot, by means of the shadow, he combines these with that of the husband's jealousy: we see the husband as he watches, through a curtain, shadow hands stroke his wife's shadow body, creating a reality that surpasses what has actually occurred and raising the question of which is truer—the intention or the deed itself? Also, while presenting the viewer with a minor moral/ethical dilemma, the second shot effectively captures the predicament caused by the husband's jealousy. Were he not jealous, he would not be spying on his wife and thus would not misapprehend an (objectively) erroneous image. This twist in Robison's use of the shadow is reiterated in the film: each major character sees in the shadows and mirror reflections the overriding aspect of his or her own personality; one sees what one expects to see. The husband, dominated by jealousy, sees his wife's apparent infidelity; the wife, dominated by vanity, sees only herself; and the young man, desirous of the wife but fearful of discovery by the husband, turns from his lecherous inspection of the wife's body to see the husband's angry face reflected in the mirror next to him.

In *Warning Shadows* Robison's primary concern is to show us *potentials* as well as actualities; he plays with, and neatly erases the line between what *is* and what might be. Shadows communicate transcendent truths: in one shot antlers hanging on a wall are juxtaposed onto the head of the husband's shadow, creating for the viewer an image of the husband's potential, though not yet actual, cuckolding. Like Pabst's *Secrets of a Soul* (1926) and *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*, *Warning Shadows* attempts a popularized exploration of the levels of the human mind. Through the illusionist's shadows the husband, the wife, and the young man all recognize the significance and power of their own irrational drives, and the acknowledgment of the shadow world is their key to existential security. Similarly through the shadows, reflections, and illusions created by the filmmaker, the viewer is made privy to narrative secrets which remain hidden to the characters themselves until the end of the film.

The shadow as metaphor was used most effectively in early silent films. By the late 1920's the New Objectivity had brought heightened realism to German films, and more "natural" lighting had replaced the intense chiaroscuro of the early 1920's. The cinematic shadow had in fact already become a cliché, and its narrative function was taken over

by other devices: the "significant object" of the late silent films and, to an even greater extent, the soundtrack of the early sound films.

Already in Lang's first sound film, *M* from 1931, sound has for the most part supplanted the communicative function of the shadow; the film's basic counterpoint of good and evil, rationality and irrationality, appearance and reality is rendered perceptible somewhat by the shadow, more by the mirror reflection, but most of all by sound itself. Lang, as so often in his films, would have us see in *M* that nothing is as it seems on the surface: an apparent innocent is a psychotic killer; an apparently peaceful crowd can become a raging mob; apparent friends can become suspicious accusers; apparent organization (the police) is ineffective against the killer; apparent disorder (the underworld) is really more orderly and efficient than the police. Even apparently innocent children are tainted by evil: the film's opening sequence shows a group of children playing as they sing a variation of "One Potato, Two Potato," a song about another, *non*-fictional mass murderer named Haarmann who not only murdered but also cooked and sold his victims as canned meat. What we see is innocent childhood; what we *hear* refutes this appearance. The children sing: "Warte, warte nur ein Weilchen./Bald kommt Haarmann auch zu dir./Und mit dem kleinen Hackebeilchen,/Macht er Schabefleisch aus dir." In *M* appearance always deceives; true reality is perceptible only to the observant viewer—and listener.

In *M* the shadow metaphor has become secondary to the metaphors of reflection and sound. Shadows appear only infrequently, though this infrequency makes them all the more striking when they do appear. As Beckert leaves his home, he is followed by his shadow, a visible reminder that, even at his most rational, he is pursued by his irrational psychosis. Later in the film as the gangster Schränker and his band plan the capture of the murderer, Lang moves his camera from the criminals themselves to their shadows on the wall, apparently signifying their transformation from a group of individuals into a transcendent retributive force which by its ubiquity and organization is able to trap the killer.

Undoubtedly the most effective use of the shadow is the well-known shot from near the beginning of *M* in which the shadow of the child-murderer Beckert falls across the poster describing his previous crimes as his voice addresses the girl Elsie who is to be his next victim. This juxtaposing of the visual of the shadow and poster plus the audial naming of the girl is a concentrated image of plot denouement and a device for placing the viewer on a level of knowledge or awareness transcending that of any of the characters (including Beckert, the child killer, who, or so the film implies; is rationally unaware of his irrational

crimes). Since the killer appears *physically* to be the most harmless of individuals, the viewer immediately perceives through this image the relationship of the man and the girl in a way that no one within the film could. With this one juxtaposition, Lang has become a cinematic juggler who with one hand tells us what characters in the film know (little girl meets kindly man) and with the other hand moves us beyond this limited perceptual area to a more universal one in which *we* can identify the shadow as killer and the girl as victim. And, of course, in Jungian terms Beckert's *shadow* is the killer.

Intriguing in its connection of slightly but significantly different shot elements is the best-known visual image from *M*, a related shot juxtaposing the poster, the shadow, and the girl Elsie with her ball and reiterating the juxtaposition in *Nosferatu* of the bed, the vampire's shadow, and the heroine Nina. It should be noted, I think, that this shot does not actually occur in the film itself—in the film the girl is *named* rather than seen—but is rather a publicity still, again a silent medium like the silent film demanding different in-shot elements.

Generally, the role played by the shadow in *Nosferatu* and *Warning Shadows* has in *M* been supplanted in crucial scenes by mirror reflections and sound imagery. The shadow is used only for the initial establishment of Beckert's villainy. When Beckert is first seen on-screen some 20 minutes into the film, he is seen inspecting his own face in a mirror, making faces, perhaps making fun of himself, perhaps attempting to grasp the reality of his own existence.[8] While Beckert seems to perceive nothing about himself, the viewer sees, quite literally, *two* Beckerts, a concise image of the little man's predicament. In a later shot, the mirror image *does* tell Beckert his own reality as he sees the "M" on his back reflected in a shop doorway. Beckert has become now literally a "marked man." The mark signifies for Beckert, for the viewer, and for the underworld that traps him the final identification of Beckert's two personalities one with the other.

Most ingeniously in *M* Lang has reinforced the shadow and mirror images by sound. Much has been written about the early sophistication of sound in *M*. This commentary has centered, however, on the use of sound as complementing the visual image. Usually mentioned, for example, is the voiceover commentary during the scenes of the police investigation: the voice of the police commissioner giving a general explanation of the specific police actions that are seen. Sound, however, is also used at times to contradict the visual image, communicating a *real* threat to an *apparent* tranquility. In one sequence a little girl walks alone along a street, apparently safe. If *M* were a silent film, the girl's peril might well have been represented by Beckert's pursuing shadow.

Lang however has replaced the shadow with Beckert's characteristic, whistled tune, a threatening audial emblem that accompanies the figure of the little girl on the screen until she meets her waiting mother and the whistling abruptly ceases—the sudden silence now signifying the girl's *real* safety. Sound has thus been made to assume the function of narrative simultaneity and multiplicity which had earlier been supplied by the shadow, and the sound film has reattained the narrative subtlety which many observers felt had been lost with the end of the silent film.

In the New Objectivist-influenced films of the later silent period, more realistic themes, style, and lighting supplanted earlier cinematic practices. Nor could it even be said that the majority of pre-1925 films employed the shadow metaphor so consistently and profoundly as *Nosferatu* or *Warning Shadows*—not even other films by Murnau or Robison. There are nevertheless innumerable other instances in which the shadow moved beyond the ornamental or suspenseful to become an integral element of visual narrative and perceptual awareness. It can be found at least as early as *The Student of Prague* from 1913 in which, parenthetically, the narrative crux is the protagonist's loss of his own reflection. It occurs, although briefly, in Leopold Jessner's *Backstairs* (1921) and in *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*,[9] in Lang's *Nibelungen* (1924), and even in *Pandora's Box* (1928), a film by G. W. Pabst, the most realistic among the major early German directors.

Moreover, although the chiaroscuro foundation of the shadow was replaced by more realistic or by Hollywood full-lighted codes in the German cinema, the shadow never entirely disappears. In the opening sequence of Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* (1936) the shadow of Hitler's airplane sweeps across the marching parades of Nuremburg, metaphorically blessing the faithful and establishing a primal connection of *Führer* and *Volk*. And, of course, the image also moved into American cinema as an element of *film noir* where the shadow becomes an emblem of the unknown criminal or, as in the case of Lang's own *Hangmen Also Die* (1943), of the political enemy: the Gestapo torturer bearing a whip moves as a shadow into his victim's cell.

For the most part, however, the metaphoric shadow disappeared with the realistic *mise-en-scène*, its communicative function supplanted by the soundtrack: the traditional philosophical, psychological, literary metaphor appropriated, exploited, and ultimately rejected as obsolete by the popular film.

Purdue University

[1] In *The History of World Cinema* (New York: Stein and Day, 1974) David Robinson, for example, refers to ". . . the brilliance of their lighting and photography" (p. 93); in *Close-Up: A Critical Perspective on Film* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972) Marsha Kinder and Beverle Houston assert that "lighting techniques created tension between light and shadow, sometimes evoking fear" (p. 26); and in *How to Read a Film* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977) even James Monaco, certainly one of the most perceptive commentators, says only that chiaroscuro "allowed them to emphasize design over verisimilitude" (p. 162). Gerald Mast in one of the most widely read film textbooks, *A Short History of the Movies*, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1976), says only that "the German film, in an era of silence, made the aura, the mood, the tone of the shot's visual qualities speak" and "a perfect control of style and decor. . . enhances the mood of many of the best films" (pp. 160-61).

[2] As one of the few exceptions can be mentioned Lane Roth's essay on the lighting codes of Lang's *Metropolis* in *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 6 (1978), 342-46.

[3] *Republic*, trans. B. Jowett, in *The Dialoques of Plato*, 4th ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), II, 377-78.

[4] Hermann Hesse, *Demian* in *Gesammelte Dichtungen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1957), III, 104. Further page references will be given in parentheses in the text.

[5] Lotte Eisner, *The Haunted Screen*, trans. by R. Greaves (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Siegfried Kracauer, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947).

[6] Friedrich Nietzsche, "Der Schatten" in *Also Sprach Zarathustra* IV. *Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. G. Colli and M. Montinari (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), Sec. VI, Vol. I, 334-35.

[7] As a symbol of self-realization, the mirror reflection occurs more commonly in Western culture than the shadow. The symbolic reflection is found not only in Plato but also in the Bible, Thomas Aquinas, Dante, Shakespeare, *et al.* Ad deVries's *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* (Amsterdam, London: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974) lists as the first significance of the mirror reflection: "(self-)consciousness, the ego, self-realization, examination of the self as disconnected from the surrounding universe, or in the universe; introspection" (p. 323). Thus, the mirror image is an even more traditional communicative metaphor and universal image for the attainment of existential awareness, and a "literal" cinematic adaption of this image was natural for early filmmakers. In the films under consideration, and especially in *Warning Shadows* and *M*, the mirror reflection reiterates and reinforces the message borne by the shadow.

[8] A similar shot is found in Sternberg's *The Blue Angel* (1930). When Professor Rath's tragic transformation into a cabaret clown has been completed some two-thirds of the way through the film, he is shown contemplating his own image in the dressing-room mirror. A variation of this shot is then repeated ten minutes later in the film. Sternberg's reliance on the mirror

image as a narrative device is intriguing, given the almost total absence of narrative shadows in this eclectic early sound film.

[9] For the most part the shadows of *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* are painted, non-representational designs and patterns that merely establish the film's threateningly psychotic atmosphere, but the murder of Alan by Cesare is seen only as a struggling of shadows.