SINESTESIEONLINE

SUPPLEMENTO DELLA RIVISTA «SINESTESIE»
ISSN 2280-6849
a. XII, n. 40, 2023

RUBRICA «IL PARLAGGIO»

Remaking Horror to Avoid Repeating History: Werner Herzog and 'Nosferatu'

MEAD BRYAN

ABSTRACT

To address cultural and political issues facing Germany in the late 1970s filmmaker Werner Herzog decided to remake F.W. Murnau's Nosferatu, one of the most famous German films from the early 1920s. In doing so Herzog was able to connect the country's past issues with those of his present day, challenging his audience to recognize contemporary shortcomings not as new problems but instead as problems which, like Count Dracula himself, continually resurrect themselves. Herzog's ability to connect his film with both the German artistic past and the historical past makes his version of Nosferatu an important artifact within New German Cinema.

KEYWORDS*: Werner Herzog, German Cinema, Nosferatu, Vampire Movies*

AUTORE

Bryan Mead, Ph.D. is Assistant Professor of English at East Texas Baptist University (Texas, USA). He has taught literature, writing, and film courses for over a decade and has published numerous articles on film in academic journals and book collections.
bmead@etbu.edu

Nosferatu: Phantom der Nacht (Herzog, 1979) was made, according to director Werner Herzog, "in order to close the gap in German film history between the great filmmakers of the Weimar Republic and those of the postwar generation" (Prager 16). For Herzog, and for many other German filmmakers of the 1960s and 70s, a German cinema devoid of any substance, truth, or meaning filled this lengthy gap, initially caused by a Nazi-controlled film industry's increasing anti-Semitic policies that both banned pre-Nazi regime films made by "degenerate artists" such as Fritz Lang and removed enough creative control and experimentation from filmmaking to cause others, such as Douglas Sirk, Ernst Lubitsch, and Billy Wilder, to leave for Hollywood (Cook 351). After the fall of Nazi Germany the gap continued to grow in the late 1940s and through the 1950s for various reasons, including the influx of American films following the war, and the belief, whether factual or merely perceived, that "denazification of the film industry workforce was virtually impossible" since most of the "directors, writers, actors, cameramen and technicians had been members of the Nazi Party, but were nevertheless re-employed after the war" (Knight 10). For these reasons few films attempted to deal with the social and political ramifications of a post-Nazi Germany, opting instead for non-critical, escapist entertainment.

This nearly two-decade-long gap in politically relevant and artistic filmmaking caused many who considered cinema a legitimate art-form to call for significant changes by the early 1960s. The most famous statement of discontent with German filmmaking practices became known as the "Oberhausen Manifesto," which both decried "Papa's Kino" as dead and called for something new. Scholars call what eventually emerged from this initial declaration "New German Cinema," of which Werner Herzog is an integral part. As opposed to the cinema of the 1950s, Sabine Hake points out that many films from New German Cinema directors such as Herzog, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Wim Wenders, and Helena Sanders-Brahms attempted to uncover "the institutional and ideological legacies of the Third Reich" while directly connecting the social situation of the 60s and 70s with the Nazi regime (Hake 154). One of the most prominent political events to take place during this time pe-

riod was the so-called "Great Coalition" of 1966 which "institutionalized the historical compromise between stability and reform that guaranteed continuous economic growth", yet which also brought along with it a capitalistic society that many, including the burgeoning film movements, offered a "fundamental critique" (Hake 154).

These creative artists felt the official policies of the government, along with the mainstream cinematic output, ignored many of the social issues still prevalent in West Germany caused by the not-so-distant past. This apparent cultural and historical ignorance led New German Cinema filmmakers to root themselves within "the romantic/philosophical" tradition of the more distant past as a form of opposition to "the fascist tradition against which it is seen to struggle" (Davidson 45). New German Cinema's rooting within this "romantic/philosophical" tradition sees its clearest outpouring in the films of Werner Herzog, and gives aesthetic credence to Herzog's wish to close the gap between the cinema of the Weimar period and his own. Brad Prager notes that Herzog's desire was to fill more than a gap based on "historical narrative" but also on "aesthetic choice" which was "more concerned with 'showing' powerful images than with relaying narratives", affording the spectator "the opportunity to see something not yet absorbed by an over-determined form" (17).

By choosing to remake *Nosferatu* (Murnau, 1922), one of the most famous films of the Weimar period, Herzog directly connects his own post-war environment with that of F.W. Murnau's original film. Herzog also attempts to issue a warning about the state of his modern Germany by remaking Murnau's *Nosferatu*, a film critic often see as a sign of warning to a troubled society. Judith Mayne points out that Herzog, in a "Kracauer-like reading of his project," stated Murnau's original film "prophesied the rise of Nazism by showing the invasion of Germany by Dracula and his plague-bearing rats," while also giving "a legitimacy to German cinema that was lost in the Hitler era" (Mayne 120). This decision to make a film so deeply connected with the artistic traditions of Germany and the country's historical past reveals Herzog's desire to illumine what he saw as a social crisis. Murnau's original audience

was a country torn by war, divided by political parties, and struggling to find a solution to economic peril, and the decisions made to solve those problems resulted in another war, more division, and an even deeper guilt associated with poor choices. Germany of the 1920s began to question what it meant to be "German" and retain a strong heritage of "German-ness" in the wake of war, fueled in part by an increase in American films and culture. These struggles of identity ultimately led down a dangerous path of racism, hate, and death under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. Herzog's audience in the 1970s was also a country torn by war and divided by political parties, symbolized most obviously in the Berlin Wall. Even though more than two decades had passed since WWII, struggles related to guilt and rebuilding of an economy fractured by the war remained strong. This was a generation, like that of Murnau's, also searching for a distinct "German-ness" and dealing with an increasingly Americanized culture. Herzog harkens back to earlier, distinctly German art-forms as a way of calling attention to the pivotal historical period of which he was a part and to provide guidance and caution to a generation traversing down a dangerous and familiar path.

Herzog's cinematic call to acknowledge a buried history is nowhere more clearly visualized than in the opening sequences of *Nosferatu*. The film's first images are of children's corpses, long dead, stored away in a crypt-like place. Making the images even more jarring is the fact that these corpses, though rotting, retain clothes, as if the bodies were thrown away together and left abandoned. Herzog films these corpses with a hand-held camera, compounding the unsettling nature of what is being shown. There are a few cuts to close-ups of individual corpses, mouths gaping as if they died in the midst of suffering and pain, before the first prolonged analysis of a single corpse. This analysis begins with a close-up of the face, this time of an adult victim, mouth again gaping, before the camera slowly tilts downward to view the entire body in segments. The chest area is emaciated, ribs sticking far further out from the skin than they should, while the hands are held close to the stomach region as if they were grasping for something that is no longer there. Next the fingers are shown, which are bent in odd ways, apparently having been broken at

some point, before the camera makes its way past the fully exposed pelvic region, shriveled upper legs, boney knees, and nonexistent calves.

Up to this point the slow tilting camera has represented a meditation on life-lessness and suffering, framing within its field of vision a body completely void of clothing or comfort. Yet, as the camera ceases its motion at the bottom of the body, it is revealed that this corpse has footwear. The presence of shoes makes the viewing of this dead body all the more bewildering and the cause of this mass graveyard even more perplexing. Just as the shoes on the corpse are utterly useless, these visuals convey a sizable disaster without meaning or apparent purpose. Within these first images Herzog's connection with the past as an agent of foreshadowing future events is made known. It is as though the memory of these victims and the circum-stances surrounding their demise should be remembered, yet has been forgotten.

Numerous other corpses line the walls of the crypt before another apparently non-diegetic image appears on-screen. This new image is of a bat descending in slow motion from the sky. As the bat draws nearer to the ground the film cuts to Lucy (Isabelle Adjani) quickly rising in her bed, waking from a dream. Whether these im-ages were part of the "nightmare" that Jonathan (Bruno Ganz) calls Lucy's vision is not made clear. Lucy and Jonathan's initial exchange in this opening sequence does, however, set up one of the major contrasts in the film between those that believe in the signs of evil and those that ignore the signs. This bat-image is used throughout the film as a leitmotif for impending doom that all but Lucy fail to see. Count Dracula and the death that he brings will continually draw closer to the town of Wismar, and all except Lucy will ignore the signs of assured destruction.

The first character to conflict with Lucy's vision of disaster is her husband Jon-athan. Whereas Lucy senses something amiss in Jonathan's dealings with his com-pany and the carnage that eventually overtakes the town, Jonathan can only focus on the business deal he is assigned to. Jonathan and Lucy's conflict further connects the thematic tendencies of *Nosferatu* with "the legacy of Romanticism" in that it ex-hibits conflicts between "the individual and the society, love and death, sanity and

insanity, [and] dream and reality" (Lüke 153). Lucy's penchant for trusting her instincts and her dreams puts her at odds with the highly rational and scientific-minded populace surrounding her, and this conflict is highlighted early in the film as Jonathan decides to undertake a four week voyage to Transylvania to sell a house near his own in Wismar to Count Dracula (Klaus Kinski) even though his wife is against the trip.

Jonathan's complacency and disregard for his own welfare and his wife's emotional well-being connect to his single-minded obsession with work. This is clearly articulated in the first post-credits scene in the film as Jonathan and Lucy sit down to breakfast. What at first appears to be a pictorial and leisurely meal quickly reveals a deep emotional divide between the married couple. Moments into the scene, Jonathan rises from his seat, quickly eats his remaining food, finishes the rest of his beverage, and begins readying himself for the day by grabbing his hat and jacket. Lucy remains seated for the first part of Jonathan's actions, actually being removed from view as the camera pans with Jonathan to retrieve his coat. Her attempts to pass cream to Jonathan for his coffee having gone unnoticed, Lucy returns to Jonathan's side in an effort to tell him that he is working too hard and that she is "worried about him." Yet, just as with her nightmare that opened the narrative portion of the film, Jonathan does not heed her warnings or acknowledge the truth inherent in them. Instead, without showing a verbal response to Lucy's words, the film cuts to an exterior shot outside the Harker house as Jonathan exits and goes about his day. The long-shot showing Jonathan's exit of the house contrasts sharply with the medium-shot that captured Lucy's words. What began as an attempt at intimacy and care quickly turns into further isolation and distance. Even though Jonathan is shown kissing Lucy as he ventures out from the house, the distance of the shot betrays any notion of romance. Within the first moments of the film Herzog has, both visually and verbally, set up a dichotomy between the work-focused, capitalistically-minded Jonathan and his cautious, deeply unsettled wife.

Herzog further emphasizes Jonathan's mindless, capitalistic pursuits with direct references to Germany's national artistic past. The film repeatedly uses music from German composer Richard Wagner's *Das Rheingold*, "linking the vampire to

Albrecht", who, in Wagner's opera, was able to control numerous Nibelung dwarfs with the power of a ring, forcing them into continuous labor for his profit (Day 85). Dracula's ability to control the minds of his minions, including Jonathan's boss Renfield (Roland Topor), so that they work without ceasing for his purposes furthers the film's commentary on society's mindless pursuit of capitalistic ideals. There is a lack of discernment, shown in Jonathan's quick acceptance of Renfield's direction, present in the followers of those who seek economic stability without moral guidance. While Renfield's jerky movements, obsessive speech patterns, shifty eyes, and unkempt appearance are clear signs of mental instability, Jonathan does not hesitate to follow his boss' instructions.

In fact, the scene in which Renfield asks Jonathan to visit the Count is shot in a much more intimate manner than the preceding breakfast scene with husband and wife. The two men are always within the same frame and their voices are kept low. Yet this intimacy comes with a price. Jonathan's walk from his house to the office marks the beginning of his decent into darkness, moving away from the sun-filled rooms of his home and into the darkness of his workplace. As Jonathan enters the office he is lit from the exterior sunlight slightly coming in through the window near the door. However, almost immediately Renfield calls for Jonathan to meet him upstairs. The film cuts from a medium shot of Jonathan at the fairly well-lit door to a medium shot of Renfield in the dimly-lit and windowless upper portion of the office. Another cut moves the camera to a high-angle long shot of Jonathan from atop the stairs and pans with him as he moves from the lit doorway, up the stairs, and into the darkness with Renfield.

From this point forward the scene keeps the two characters within the frame while also keeping Jonathan from fully re-engaging with the exterior light. After Renfield asks Jonathan to take the journey to Transylvania, the two characters move back downstairs and sit next to the window. Renfield does not take any notice of the outside world, focusing all of his attention to the map of Jonathan's journey on his desk instead. This action accentuates Renfield's single-minded focus on bringing Count Dracula to Wismar and foreshadows the type of vigor Jonathan adopts during

his trek to Transylvania. With Renfield's attention on the map, Jonathan speaks about how "great" it will be to get out of the city, and as he does this, he stares longingly out the window. As Jonathan does this, though, his head is nearly removed from view as the camera tilts slightly downward to capture the map. Reminiscent of Jonathan's movements away from Lucy at breakfast, when Lucy re-entered the frame attempting intimacy with Jonathan, Jonathan actually re-enters the frame here and leans over Renfield, again emphasizing their shared passion to sell Count Dracula a house in town.

At the conclusion of Jonathan's conversation with Renfield, the film accentuates the sharp contrast between the office and the house with an abrupt cut to the Harker dining area as Jonathan tells Lucy he is leaving for Transylvania immediately. In an almost identical conversation to the ones they have had previously, Jonathan dismisses Lucy's fears as those of superstition and fantasy. He condescendingly refers to his journey as being filled with "wolves and people who see ghosts" when Lucy "forbids" him to go. Jonathan, of course, does not listen to his wife, and instead packs his belongings for his trip. The staging of the scene reiterates the distance between the two characters as Jonathan again consistently moves away from Lucy. Also, just as the film utilized a cut from a medium close-up of the couple inside the house to a long shot of the couple kissing with Jonathan's first exit from the house, this second dining room scene makes the same cut from a medium close-up of Jonathan holding Lucy after she pleads with him to go to the beach "where they fell in love" to a long shot of the couple walking arm in arm on the beach. Far from being a romantic image the beach scene is aesthetically cold and harsh. Wind pounds against the couple as they walk, waving their hair and clothes and making it hard for them to talk to each other. By the time Lucy tells Jonathan that she feels a "dark force" and a "nameless deadly fear," it has become clear that her words and thoughts are meaningless to her husband. He responds to her concern with silence, staring off into the vastness of the sea.

Jonathan's journey toward Transylvania brings his rational and scientific mindset into conflict with others who feel and talk as Lucy does. These characters live beyond the city and hold on to ancient myths and legends. His first encounter

with this group of people occurs when he enters an inn for supper. Once inside, his goal of reaching Count Dracula's castle is met with astonishment and horror. Herzog frames Jonathan from behind and at a slightly high angle as the traveler awaits service. A reverse shot captures the innkeeper's wife dropping a glass as she hears of Jonathan's quest, then, as if to accentuate the contrast between Jonathan and these characters further, the film cuts back to the angle behind Jonathan for a reaction shot of his fellow diners. Every head in the room turns toward Jonathan and conversation ceases. Jonathan is then given a lecture from the innkeeper, similar to the one he received from Lucy, on the perils of making such a journey. Since the lecture is full of talk about "evil spirits" and, as Jonathan terms it, "superstition", the characters in the tavern are, to Jonathan, preoccupied with myths and legends rather than facts and rationality.

What makes this scene so interesting, though, is the fact that the apparently uneducated non-city dwellers are the ones with whom the audience is meant to identify. Not only does the title and premise of the film give away the secret that the movie is about vampires (and any familiarity with Stoker's original story, Murnau's film, or any Dracula tale would make Jonathan's decision seem oblivious and stupid), but the two prominent angles used in filming the scene convey points of view shot from the perspectives of the other characters in the tavern. The higher-angle shot from behind Jonathan correlates to the positioning of the innkeeper and his wife while the reverse shot corresponds to the other diners' perspective. An inner drive to fulfill his mission as a businessman and to earn enough compensation to, as he tells Renfield, "buy Lucy a bigger house" that she "deserves" actually leads Jonathan into danger and, ultimately, brings danger upon his entire town. Viewers of Herzog's *Nosferatu* cannot help but see the error of Jonathan's ways and take note of the many times he is warned of the obvious only to ignore it and pursue danger more passionately. More examples of this warning/ignoring cycle occur when characters outside the inn lecture Jonathan, telling him not to travel any further; when the innkeeper's wife passes along a book about vampires to Jonathan; and when a coachman pretends not to have horses or a coach when Jonathan wants a ride even though the

horses and the coach are clearly visible. The further Jonathan goes on his journey the more his actions resemble those of Renfield in carrying out a single-minded objective.

After Jonathan refuses to heed the numerous warnings provided for him he begins his solo journey, on foot, to Dracula's castle. In this sequence Herzog overwhelmingly emphasizes Jonathan's inability to control his surroundings, positioning the natural environment as more powerful and more mysterious than Jonathan has previously acknowledged. The long, meditative takes of Jonathan traversing over rocks, past waterfalls, and through caves accentuate his small size in comparison to the Carpathian Mountains that he is attempting to cross. His flippant acceptance of Renfield's earlier seemingly mundane request contrasts with the weightiness of the journey. It is also important to note the size difference between the mountains in Jonathan's actual journey and the size of the map Renfield and Jonathan studied in the office a few scenes before. These "vast expanses of landscape" make Jonathan appear as a "fragile, tiny figure" rather than the in-control businessman who casually disregards all warnings of imminent danger (Mayne 123).

This journey also emphasizes Jonathan's movement away from civilization into an untamed wilderness, which marks a move from a place of perceived stability and control into a place of instability and disorder. For the first time in the film, Jonathan's refusal to acknowledge unseen powers and evils brings him into apparently insurmountable conflict with his surroundings. The sequence ends with the clearest visual example of this as a mysterious carriage arrives to take Jonathan to the castle. Backlit as he walks through a tunnel next to a flowing stream, Jonathan's journey through the mountains begins to look more like a dream than reality. Most interestingly, the carriage's arrival is never explained. Whereas in Murnau's film the carriage is actually driven by the vampire character, offering some explanation for its mysterious arrival and frantic driving speed, in Herzog's film the driver is unnamed and is never shown again. This choice deepens the mystery surrounding Jonathan's journey and introduces mystical forces beyond those of just Dracula. Herzog depicts a universe that makes the "lines between dream and waking, between passion and

reason, [and] between mysticism and materialism" absolute (Mayne 123). Once Jonathan crosses this divide he is unable to return.

Jonathan's arrival at the Count's castle makes several visual connections to the German Expressionist cinema of Murnau's time. Herzog continually uses high and low angle shots to distort perspective and size while also filling the frame with shadows. For example, Jonathan's ascent up the staircase to the main door is shot from a low angle, making the size of the doors seem relatively normal. However, as the doors swing open to reveal Dracula, the doors become clearly oversized. Dracula also dresses in all black and is lit from behind, making his entire figure that of a shadow in the doorway. Once inside the house the film cuts to a high angle shot of the two figures in the dining room. This dining room contrasts sharply with the dining room of Jonathan's home. The overwhelming light of the breakfast shared by Jonathan and Lucy that casts no shadows at all is replaced by a room barely lit by candles and containing numerous shadows on the high, white walls. Both angled shots in this second dining area further present Jonathan within an overwhelming environment. The high archways, large furniture, and giant shadows dwarf both Jonathan and Dracula as they prepare to sit at the table while also heightening the visual dichotomy between Jonathan's status within the city and his current situation outside city limits. By the time Jonathan attempts to talk business with Dracula at the dinner table his efforts seem futile. It is a foregone conclusion Dracula will sign the papers, and Jonathan's locket, containing a picture of Lucy, and Jonathan's blood interest the vampire much more than the lease agreement.

The film uses this dining room scene in Dracula's house as another example of interpersonal intimacy, again showing Jonathan's connection to another figure. Unlike his connection with Lucy, and similar to his scene with Renfield, Jonathan continually moves closer to Dracula. Herzog refrains from cutting for much of the scene and maintains both characters within the frame at all times, ultimately connecting them physically when Dracula cannot help but suck the blood from Jonathan's freshly cut hand. Even though Renfield and Dracula inhabit dark places, speak as if they were possessed, and move with a lack of fluidity and grace, they still draw in

Jonathan. His unwarranted acceptance of both Renfield and Dracula continually contrast with his flippantly dismissive reactions to Lucy and the other characters who warned him of this journey.

Once Dracula overtakes Jonathan and leaves his castle for Wismar, the narrative focus shifts from Jonathan's story to Lucy's. A major event highlights this shift which Herzog's film shares with Murnau's: the race to Wismar between the boat carrying Dracula and the ground voyage of Jonathan. However, this race in Herzog's version of the film is much less climactic than Murnau's version since it is always a certainty that Dracula will arrive first. Jonathan's attempts to outrun the ship are continually thwarted – first by falling from his window and being knocked unconscious, then by his increased sickness due to Dracula's bite, and finally by his complete mental breakdown that leaves him with no memory. Dracula, in contrast, succeeds in his efforts at nearly every point along his journey. Just as in Murnau's film, Dracula's boat ride becomes a floating ship of death with the members of the crew either disappearing completely or dying aboard the floating vessel. The images of the ship act both as a reminder of past iniquity and the inevitability of future evil. Jonathan's inability to recognize the evils of his journey brought to his attention both by his wife and by those he encountered along the way have led not only to his own personal demise but also the inevitable demise of his home town.

Due to Jonathan's incapacitation, Lucy's conflict shifts from one with her husband to one with the entire town, embodied most clearly in the character of Dr. Van Helsing (Walter Ladengast). The new "plague" that begins to kill the town is only explained through scientific means rather than through otherworldly or spiritual means, and the film showcases Van Helsing's inability to comprehend the obvious signs of vampirism soon after the ship arrives in the Wismar harbor. After observing the bite marks on the ship captain's neck, Van Helsing remarks that the captain's death is "truly a mystery." The doctor is soon hearing similar lectures from Lucy that she previously gave to Jonathan, which Van Helsing likewise does not heed. None except Lucy notice the infiltration of Wismar by something much more sinister than the rats and "the plague."

The film also represents the obliviousness of the town in another scene when Lucy, who wanders through a group of people reveling in their destiny of death, is asked by another group to dine with them. Herzog uses camera placement to emphasize the madness that has overtaken the town. He uses high angle crane shots to offer an aerial view of townspeople dancing amidst dead bodies and fires and contrasts them with handheld shots behind Lucy as she traverses the streets amidst the chaos. Men jump on top of large pigs and cheer as fire surrounds them and as coffins rest on the outskirts of the square.

With the town completely taken over by Dracula's powers, the vampire finally attempts to convert Lucy. However, Lucy is able to reject him. Lucy's small victory, though, is not enough to save her husband or the town. In fact, Dracula's offer to revitalize Jonathan if Lucy agrees to "show him the same love that she shows her husband" is, of course, not sufficient enough for Lucy who feels that she can win her husband back through the power of love. It is Lucy's stubbornness, and her ultimately less powerful nature, that allows Dracula to have "his revenge by forcing his alter ego Jonathan into the same futile and destructive mode of being he had himself sought to escape" (Prawer 59). Ultimately, Lucy's final decision to offer herself as a sacrifice to save Jonathan and the town backfires, leaving her dead and Jonathan forever a vampire. During Lucy's sacrificial scene, Herzog intercuts the image of the descending bat again, as if Lucy's giving of herself to Dracula completes her original dream and assures her visions as actual prophecies rather than merely nightmares.

Thus, Lucy's apparently heroic actions are quickly reversed. The medium shot of her lying on the bed as Dracula crumples to the ground begins as a positive image with sun coming in from the windows and a smile on her face, but ends with her gasping for breath and dying. Even Van Helsing's apparent transformation into vampire killer at film's end is short-lived since Jonathan, finally arriving in town, calls for assistance and has the doctor arrested. As William Patrick Day points out, the absurdity of the dialogue surrounding Van Helsing's arrest and the confusion of how to handle the situation conveys the "sense of complete moral failure and social dis-

order" at the "center of this movie" (Day 85). Jonathan's initial ignorance of the danger he was getting himself into brought the same ignorance to the entire town and destroyed everything that was good and innocent within its limits, most fully embodied in the character of Lucy. By ending the film with Jonathan as a vampire riding off into the distance, the film ends with an unvanquished and perpetual evil.

Ultimately, Herzog's *Nosferatu* succeeds in delivering a message of caution about a culture ignorant of its own past and overly concerned with its economic status. The capitalistic tendencies of Jonathan Harker result in the destruction of his town and the desolation of his own soul. He becomes an embodiment of what was thought to be dead – resuscitating that which appeared to be beyond resuscitating. In this way *Nosferatu* is part of the "recreation of the past undertaken by filmmakers" of the New German Cinema "to remind Germans of the realities of the Third Reich" and challenge them to understand the warning signs of a potential rebirth (Day 85). These films emphasize that sins of the past are not simply "part of the past but a state of mind, an attitude that is always there, waiting to return" (Day 85). Herzog's ability to connect his film with both the German artistic past and the historical past makes his version of *Nosferatu* an important artifact within New German Cinema. Herzog provides cinematic expression to Lucy's, and hopefully the audience's, ability to "recognize vampirism" and "not deny what she sees" even in the "typeface and blinding flash of public opinion" (Day 85). Thus, acknowledging the German past for what it was is imperative, and denying the lingering effects or possible connections with future trajectories is dangerous and should consciously be avoided. This is a strong message that the New German Cinema continually visualized, and one that Herzog fully captures in *Nosferatu*.

Works Cited

Cook, David A. *A History of Narrative Film*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996. Print.

Davidson, John E. *Deterritorializing the New German Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1999. Print.

Day, William Patrick. *Vampire Legends in Contemporary American Culture: What Becomes a Legend Most*. Lexington: University of Kentucky, 2002. Print.

Hake, Sabine. *German National Cinema*. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Kracauer, Siegfried. *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2004. Print.

Lüke, Martina G. "Nosferatu the Vampire (1979) as a Legacy of Romanticism." *Draculas, Vampires, and Other Undead Forms: Essays on Gender, Race, and Culture*. Ed. John Edgar. Browning and Caroline Joan Picart. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2009. 153-64. Print.

Mayne, Judith. "Herzog, Murnau, and the Vampire." *The Films of Werner Herzog: Between Mirage and History*. Ed. Timothy Corrigan. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.

Prager, Brad. "Introduction." *A Companion to Werner Herzog*. Ed. Brad Prager. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. 101-26. Print.

Prawer, S. S. *Nosferatu--Phantom Der Nacht*. London: BFI Pub., 2004. Print.