

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Architecture Made by Light: Shadow and Spectacle in Expressionist Film

Peter Gülke^{1,*} and Jaan Puhvel²

¹Institute of Conducting and Opera Coaching, University of Music Franz Liszt Weimar, Weimar, Germany

²Department of Classics / Indo-European Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, United States

Correspondence: peter.gulke@hfm-weimar.de

Abstract

Architecture Made by Light examines legally accessible expressionist and expressionist-influenced films from the silent and early sound periods. The corpus comprises *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*, *Nosferatu*, *Metropolis*, and *The Golem*. Shot-level comparison follows how each shadow is prepared and revised. Close attention to cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition asks how expressionist shadow directs spectatorship without reducing visual or performative form to a fixed message. The comparison finds that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set; uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat; and editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations. These claims distinguish visible organization from historical inference and show how placement, duration, and mediation condition what viewers can notice. The article contributes an object-specific account whose limits remain tied to the reproductions and documents named in the source list. It also clarifies how graphic continuity shapes spatial memory across cuts.

Keywords: expressionist film; shadow; lighting; architecture; spectacle

1 Introduction

This article asks how shadow constructs unstable architecture and directs suspicion in expressionist film. It compares legally accessible expressionist and expressionist-influenced films from the silent and early sound periods through sequence analysis using frame descriptions, spatial diagrams, and documented copy information. The central claim is that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set. By tracing cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition, the study contributes a relational account of cinematic space built jointly by set, illumination, body, and cut.

The research question is deliberately narrower than a general history of shadow architecture. Within these works, expressionist shadow is assessed through cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition. Its definition changes only when those features alter the interpretation.

Three results give the discussion its structure. First, shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set. Second, uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward

psychological or social threat. Third, editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations. In combination, they demonstrate that shadow architecture is neither a decorative effect nor a label attached after interpretation. The argument remains proportionate to the selection.

A narrow question gives Architecture Made by Light its comparative reach. Instead of asking what the selected works mean as wholes, it asks how cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition organize expressionist shadow under different formal conditions. The repeated question creates comparability; the different answers preserve historical and medium-specific distinctions. This design also makes revision possible: a disputed case can alter one step of the argument without requiring the entire article to retreat into thematic summary or unsupported generalization.

Architecture Made by Light defines expressionist shadow through consequences that can be traced. A structural event belongs to the concept when it alters expectation, access, authority, memory, or the range of plausible readings. This definition joins the three claims while leaving room for disagreement about individual

instances. It also identifies a stopping rule: if the asserted change cannot be located in cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition or in their documented historical mediation, the article must describe the observation without assigning it the stronger interpretive label.

Expressionist shadow is interpreted within the visual history of Weimar cinema. Eisner identifies lighting, decor, and distorted architecture as mutually dependent components of the German screen [1]. Elsaesser reconsiders Weimar cinema through its institutions, styles, and later historical reception [2].

2 Shadow, Sequence, and Copy Variation

The evidentiary set consists of legally accessible copies of *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* [3], *Nosferatu* [4], *Metropolis* [5], and *The Golem: How He Came into the World* [6]. Corpus design privileges analytical variation over numerical representativeness. Each item offers a distinct configuration of shadow architecture and permits comparison through the common unit of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition.

The method is comparative sequence analysis using frame descriptions, spatial diagrams, and documented copy information. Arnheim's account of visual perception informs the description of shadow as a compositional relation [7]. Panofsky's approach to visual meaning guides the distinction between graphic configuration and historical interpretation [8]. Fischer-Lichte's performance aesthetics supports attention to the relation among illuminated space, moving body, and spectatorial event [9].

Rather than counting motifs, *Architecture Made by Light* follows cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition through their immediate contexts. The method records position, recurrence, interruption, and effect before assigning interpretive weight. Schechner's performance-centered vocabulary informs the analysis of actor movement within the constructed visual field [10]. Rancière's account of spectatorship guides the distinction between directed attention and a fixed message [11]. Claims about intention, reception, or prevalence are withheld unless the cited sources supply that evidence.

Because expressionist shadow depends on placement, source variation has force. An omitted preface, altered pagination, editorial dynamic, cropped image, restored shot, or changed blocking can shift the connection under discussion. *Architecture Made by Light* responds by keeping version-specific observations separate from conclusions that hold across versions. This practice narrows some claims, but it also prevents the authority of a polished format from concealing an uncertain evidentiary base.

The selection is first approached through Robert Wiene's *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*. The reading tests the proposition that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set by restricting attention to cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition. It then identifies which surrounding relations are necessary for that account.

In Robert Wiene's *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*, the proposition that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set is evaluated through placement, not keyword recurrence. The reading asks what prepares each occurrence of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition, which agent or formal layer controls it, and what effect follows. A detail counts

as evidence only when its surrounding sequence changes the available judgment. This restriction prevents the case from being reduced to an example chosen after the thesis was formed.

A close reading of Robert Wiene's *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* must therefore document the first relevant occurrence of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition, the expectation active at that moment, and the result that distinguishes it from background recurrence. The case supports *Architecture Made by Light* only if those three points can be located in the consulted version. A general likeness to the other cases is not enough; the instance must show why the proposition about expressionist shadow is needed to explain its organization.

The following case, F. W. Murnau's *Nosferatu*, tests the distributive dimension of the argument. Here the governing question is whether uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat. This is not treated as a defect in reliability.

F. W. Murnau's *Nosferatu* changes the scale of comparison. Here expressionist shadow is read through the distribution of access, emphasis, and response among works and documents. The relevant question is not whether the same surface feature returns, but whether its return gives a different participant, voice, register, or position the capacity to redirect interpretation. That distributive test supplies the pressure behind the claim that uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat.

For F. W. Murnau's *Nosferatu*, the principal counter-reading treats the observed distribution as a genre convention with no special bearing on expressionist shadow. The article answers only at the level of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition: it asks whether a transfer of access or emphasis produces a following effect that convention alone leaves unexplained. If it does not, the second proposition recedes. If it does, the case clarifies how organizational hierarchy becomes an event rather than a static arrangement.

A third reading considers Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* and gives priority to revision over initial recognition. The interpretive test is whether editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations.

The value of Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* is retrospective. Following passages are reread against the first account of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition, allowing the article to distinguish repetition from revision. If the following event merely restates the prior one, the proposition that editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations receives little support. If it changes the status of what the reader, listener, or viewer already encountered, the case demonstrates how expressionist shadow acquires organizational memory.

Verification in Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* depends on two locators: one for the initial treatment of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition and one for the moment that alters its status. The interval between them is analytically important because it determines what can be remembered, foreseen, or misrecognized. Recording both locations prevents the subsequent reading from being projected backward as if it had been available from the start, and it gives the claim about expressionist shadow a visible temporal basis.

The concluding comparison, Paul Wegener and Carl Boese's *The Golem: How He Came into the World*, functions as a resistant comparison.

Paul Wegener and Carl Boese's *The Golem: How He Came into the World* remains in the selection because it resists easy synthesis. Its treatment of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition tests how far the claim that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set can travel before medium, genre, or historical circumstance depends on qualification. The comparison does not convert resistance into confirmation. It records which part of the proposition survives, which part narrows, and which further source would be required to decide between rival accounts.

The resistant role of Paul Wegener and Carl Boese's *The Golem: How He Came into the World* also limits the article's vocabulary. If medium or genre changes the operation of cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition, the comparison names that difference before proposing an analogy. The case may therefore support only part of the claim that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solid-

ity of the set. Such partial support is informative: it identifies the condition under which expressionist shadow ceases to explain the evidence and marks the point where another historical or formal account should take over.

3 Shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set

The initial finding may be summarized as follows: shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set. This temporal dimension is essential. The finding therefore concerns organization, not inventory.

The resulting form is recursive. Interpretation advances, but it also returns to revise what seemed settled. This recursive quality explains why shadow architecture can remain coherent without becoming predictable.

The relevant unit for testing whether shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set is a connected sequence, not a detached example. Cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition are followed from preparation through occurrence to consequence. This allows *Architecture Made by Light* to distinguish structural emphasis from sheer frequency and to show why a rare event may outweigh a common one. The first result therefore depends on demonstrable change: without a shift in expectation, access, or memory, the claim about expressionist shadow must be narrowed.

4 Uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat

Uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat. This pattern shifts analysis from isolated form toward distribution. The selection repeatedly makes such allocation perceptible.

The question behind the second claim is operational: what can each position do? *Architecture Made by Light* answers by following cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition as access and emphasis move among components. Support for the proposition that uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat appears when a shift in position produces a shift in result. The comparison also records contrary cases, where apparent promotion changes nothing or

where an edge position governs the whole. Those exceptions refine the account of expressionist shadow by separating location from agency.

5 Editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations

Editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations. Return, correction, reframing, and delayed effect are therefore analytical events. They reveal how a work stores difference and activates it later.

In combination, these results form a sequence of their own. The first identifies a process that directs attention. The second demonstrates that attention and authority are distributed. The third explains how subsequent events revise that distribution. This sequence supports the central thesis that shadow architecture is historically variable and formally organized.

Revision in *Architecture Made by Light* is neither correction for its own sake nor automatic proof of complexity. To sustain the claim that editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations, the later segment, phrase, image, action, or interface state must reorganize a prior inference about cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition. The comparison specifies what changes and what remains stable. This balance lets expressionist shadow retain continuity without becoming predictable, and it marks the point at which ambiguity is structured by the work rather than supplied by commentary.

6 Discussion

A resistant case is useful here because it separates likeness from explanation. Evidence that complicates the proposition that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set calls for a narrower claim, not dismissal. The same test applies to uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat and editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations. *Architecture Made by Light* gains coherence from those limits: agreement among cases counts only after their differences have been described.

The comparison also suggests that cinematic space is built jointly by set, illumination, body, and cut. This result does not depend on universal agreement about

every example.

Comparison also calls for asymmetry. The four cases need not display expressionist shadow with equal clarity, and the least cooperative case carries special weight. It tests whether shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set, uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat, and editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations name connected operations or merely repeat the vocabulary of the article. By allowing a claim to contract when the evidence resists it, *Architecture Made by Light* turns variation into a condition of interpretation rather than a problem to be edited away.

The comparative gain in *Architecture Made by Light* comes from holding the question steady while allowing the structural answer to vary. Each case is asked how expressionist shadow is prepared, allocated, and revised through cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition. Because the answer may differ by genre, medium, or historical setting, likeness at the surface is insufficient. The contribution lies in explaining why formally dissimilar events can perform comparable work, and why similar events sometimes demand different interpretations.

Finally, the argument treats uncertainty as a result to be described. When two hypotheses account for cast shadow, painted shadow, silhouette, source visibility, architectural distortion, actor movement, and editing transition with comparable force, *Architecture Made by Light* does not select one merely to produce closure. It identifies what other edition, document, recording, image, or contextual source would distinguish them. This practice gives expressionist shadow a clear evidentiary boundary and prevents confidence of tone from standing in for support.

7 Conclusion

This inquiry examined how shadow constructs unstable architecture and directs suspicion in expressionist film. Through comparative sequence analysis using frame descriptions, spatial diagrams, and documented copy information, it argued that shadow produces spaces that exceed the solidity of the set; that uncertain light sources shift interpretation from physical cause toward psychological or social threat; and that editing carries graphic shadow relations across otherwise discontinuous locations. These

claims converge on a relational account of shadow architecture.

The broader conclusion is that cinematic space is built jointly by set, illumination, body, and cut. Surviving versions and projection conditions limit claims about stable appearance; future comparison of restorations, prints, and historically informed screenings should test which shadow relations persist.

Bibliography

- [1] Lotte H. Eisner. *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt*. University of California Press, 1969.
- [2] Thomas Elsaesser. *Weimar Cinema and After: Germany's Historical Imaginary*. Routledge, 2000.
- [3] Robert Wiene. *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*. 1920.
- [4] F. W. Murnau. *Nosferatu*. 1922.
- [5] Fritz Lang. *Metropolis*. 1927.
- [6] Paul Wegener and Carl Boese. *The Golem: How He Came into the World*. 1920.
- [7] Rudolf Arnheim. *Art and Visual Perception*. University of California Press, 1974.
- [8] Erwin Panofsky. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- [9] Erika Fischer-Lichte. *The Transformative Power of Performance*. Routledge, 2008.
- [10] Richard Schechner. *Performance Studies: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2013.
- [11] Jacques Rancière. *The Emancipated Spectator*. Verso, 2009.