

Alban Berg's *Lulu* as a Foucauldian Heterotopia

Vanja Ljubibratić

Volume 40, numéro 2, 2020

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1105862ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1105862ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Canadian University Music Society / Société de musique des universités canadiennes

ISSN

1911-0146 (imprimé)

1918-512X (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Ljubibratić, V. (2020). Alban Berg's *Lulu* as a Foucauldian Heterotopia. *Intersections*, 40(2), 35–58. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1105862ar>

Résumé de l'article

Michel Foucault a décrit l'époque actuelle comme étant une époque de l'espace. Certaines de ses notions de l'espace se retrouvent dans ses théories sur les hétérotopies — des lieux perturbants d'altérité ségréguée — que Foucault a adaptées pour décrire les paradigmes temporels au sein d'un cadre social. Cette étude analyse la dualité des plans temporels opposés qui sont présentés comme le monde empirique et le royaume métaphysique, tels qu'ils influencent l'espace hétérotopique au sein de l'opéra *Lulu* d'Alban Berg. L'objectif est d'approfondir la signification ambiguë de l'hétérotopie et de voir l'opéra de Berg à travers la lentille fondamentale de la théorie foucauldienne.

ALBAN BERG'S *LULU* AS A FOUCAULDIAN HETEROTOPIA

Vanja Ljubibratić

The intersection of the sociology of space with human geography constituted new frontiers of abstract spatial understanding in the twentieth century. Theorists began to question the complexities of how people interacted with each other and with the spaces that they inhabited. Dualities and juxtapositions began to emerge that also considered spaces as varying planes of existence. The sociologist Anthony Giddens wrote that individuals “routinely incorporate temporal and spatial features of encounters in processes of meaning constitution” (Giddens 1986, 29). As this study will demonstrate, time and space will be seen as central tenets that inform all arguments. Likewise, the sociologist Henri Lefebvre echoed the significance of the space-time duality via two contrasting notions that he presents: *representational space*, which is a space that is “directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users,’ but also some artists and perhaps those, such as a few writers and philosophers, who *describe* and aspire to do no more than describe. This is the dominated—and hence passively experienced—space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects” (Lefebvre 1992, 39).

Conversely, *representations of space* constitute a “conceptualized space, the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers, as of a certain type of artist with a scientific bent—all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived” (Lefebvre 1992, 38). From another perspective, this latter space can be seen as a space of the mind; one of illusion; and being even in possession of transcendent metaphysical properties with which individuals may project themselves onto the space in unreal abstractions. The *representational space*, on the other hand, is real, tangible, and can be seen as constituting the empirical world that is seen and experienced. This study will seek to investigate this duality of opposing planes of time and space that are presented as the empirical world and the metaphysical realm.

The social theorist and philosopher at the centre of this study is Michel Foucault, who described real, empirical spaces in society that exist everywhere, and juxtaposed them with spaces that are somehow disturbingly “other.” Yet,

there are also intrinsic societies, cultures, and spaces that exist in works of art as fictional distortions of reality that are every bit as meaningful to the imagination and are symbolically symmetrical with Foucault's theories. Theatre is a primary example of such an art work, and within the specific category of opera, multiple modes of expression converge to express linear, non-linear, and narratively interactive tropes of space. Then, there are some operas that manipulate representations of space and time to such an extent that they become perfectly discernible abstractions, which in turn present captivating and innovative variations of Foucault's main tenets of spatial differentiation. The principal theory that Foucault constructed that will be analyzed in this study is his theory of the heterotopia—which I interpret as a space of otherness that is reserved for deviant inhabitants. Although Foucault contrived his theory in its most applicable form to relate to social paradigms, other theorists have expanded on the theory to fit interdisciplinary perspectives. My view of heterotopia as a space for deviant social outcasts is based on a plausible theoretical appropriation for the purposes of this study. As such, I will analyze both these expansions and Foucault's primary text on heterotopias when I apply them to Austrian composer Alban Berg's opera *Lulu* (which was left incomplete at the time of the composer's death in 1935), in the endeavour to exemplify how Berg crafted *Lulu* to possess what could be seen in hindsight as intrinsic heterotopic elements, and how the opera embodied congruent notions of the empirical-metaphysical duality that would later inform Foucault's theories of heterotopia.

The aim, therefore, of this study is twofold: To expand on the already divisive and nebulous meaning of heterotopia by ushering it into the realm of opera, and to view Berg's arguable masterpiece through the lens of Foucauldian theory. The juxtaposition of this framework is done with the awareness and recognition of the malleability of the heterotopic theory, and how certain elements of its imagery bear symmetry with narrative structures and implications in *Lulu*. The result will attempt to yield a dialectical discourse that informs a distinct and relevant homogeneity between theory and art in the depiction of alternate spaces in Berg's *Lulu*. Placing this opera within a heterotopic framework will not only demonstrate *Lulu's* versatility for being applicable to social theory, but will also signify how Foucauldian theory—some of the most explicit views on society and humanity of the past half-century—can be applied and made relevant to the field of musicology, which could further constitute a retroactive reconstitution of the interpretation of entire artistic epochs that symbolically predated Foucault, as *Lulu* will seek to convey. To be clear, the study is designed to expand the academic understanding of *Lulu*. However, it is also crucial to comprehend the numerous legitimate variations of heterotopias to illustrate how new interpretations must not be seen as misunderstandings or misappropriations of Foucault, but to rather view the theory as an umbrella term that can logically be modified when applied to multi-faceted and synthesizing approaches as this study seeks to embody. For this reason, it is essential not to take an orthodox position with Foucault's theory, but to instead see it as a starting point that can contrive unique pathways while still remaining referential to the original source.

Therefore, the discourse will be presented in logical divisions that first present theories of heterotopia that other researchers have adapted from the Foucauldian source material. This will be followed by a side-by-side analysis of Foucault's primary heterotopic text and the relevant heterotopic meaning in Berg's opera, as represented by examples of symbolic expressions in the narrative and the opera's libretto. To reiterate, this process is meant to facilitate my view of heterotopias as spaces of otherness for deviants and social outcasts that can also contain subsections, or heterotopias within heterotopias. This will stand as an example of how Berg frequently strove to comment on the absurd hypocrisy of deviants condemning other deviants and consigning them to even more remote states of otherness. I will incorporate Foucault's heterotopic metaphor of a mirror as bearing a synonymous function with Berg's depiction of Lulu's portrait. Concepts of permission and temporal doppelgängers will also inform my interpretation of heterotopias, as I establish connections with these phenomena between Berg and Foucault.

It is essential, though, to point out precisely where Foucault's interpretations end and my interpretation begins. Foucault was ostensibly concerned with heterotopias as physical spaces that are reserved for entities that constitute a form of otherness that does not emplace them within a utopian idealization. These are generally unpleasant entities. I adapt Foucault's broad outlook of the heterotopic theory to *Lulu* where I present Berg's heterotopia as a metaphysical illusion of temporal proportions that nevertheless can be compared to Foucault's version because they both deal with imaginary distortions of reality, albeit to varying degrees. This study will also endeavour to illustrate how these associations between Foucault's heterotopias and my interpretation of what can be seen as a heterotopia in *Lulu* through narrative and character depictions within the space of otherness are related. These are valuable appropriations of Foucault's original theory because they demonstrate a continuation of the practice of integrating the heterotopic theory into diverse research fields, which has already been done in other circles of social theory, as well as (to name a few), human geography, digital media, literature, and now also music and modern opera. The musicological benefit of such an analysis constitutes an expansion of potentiality, where a musical work is contextualized within a configuration of cultural history that is not contingent upon structural or theoretical analyses of the music itself.¹

¹ Literature that in some combination conflates Foucault, Berg, and music is scant. Arved Ashby (1998) cites Foucault's argument of the author's "voice" and purpose in regard to a broader treatment of interpreting texts by named or unnamed authors that Ashby applied to the poet Peter Altenberg when analyzing Berg's approach to textual appropriation in his *Altenberg-Lieder*. However, no direct association is made between Berg and Foucault. Foucault's relation to music, albeit not to Berg, is more explicitly traced in a chapter by Steve Potter (2020). Potter writes how the score directions in the music of John Cage denote implementations of power that the author associates with Foucault's notions of the phenomenon. In this chapter, Potter also briefly mentions Foucault's minor association with Pierre Boulez and contemporary music, which bears no impact on Berg studies. Lastly, in a book chapter, Phil Powrie (2019) argues that most filmed depictions of *Carmen*, derived from either the Bizet opera or Mérimée's novella, represent realistic depictions, except in the death scene, which is often transported into a state of non-realism. This locational juxtaposition presents the death scene as a heterotopic place of otherness. The chapter somewhat superficially lists scenic elements of *Carmen*'s

HETEROTOPIC THEORY

The theoretical implications of heterotopia have been applied in a diverse and interdisciplinary capacity, not least in relation to medicine, social theory, urbanism, and, most sparingly, to the arts. For the purposes of this study, the notion of heterotopia will be analyzed from a close reading of Foucault's notes on the subject, which was presented in an English translation as "Of Other Spaces" two years after the philosopher's death. This text became the most explicit (and controversial) insight into this concept, and following its publication, wider social and academic derivations began to be produced. However, with the intent of formulating a direct association between Foucault's heterotopia and Berg's *Lulu*, the heterotopic theories of Joanne Tompkins primarily, Kevin Hetherington secondarily, and that of a few others, will supplement the Foucauldian perspective in order to expand on the theory just enough without diluting the original, in order to establish a more favourable foundation for analyzing Berg's opera. Indeed, Foucault did not live long enough to either finish his theories on heterotopias or to de-obfuscate some of the confusion that the incomplete nature of "Of Other Spaces" instilled. Nevertheless, by focusing the heterotopic perspective to a few key theorists who apply the concept in a more compatible approach generally with the arts, the outcome will exhibit a distinctive interpretation that informs narrative and symbolic meanings in *Lulu*, demonstrating how opera can be heterotopic. As such, some narrative and figurative details in *Lulu* will be presented out of context alongside these theories in order to depict their interrelatedness beyond the Foucauldian model. These details of the opera will be clarified in the next section, where Foucault is more directly represented. It is essential to present a division between the heterotopic interpretations of scholars and a more direct analysis of source materials pertaining to Foucault and Berg, because the overarching theory of heterotopia must be internalized first from a macro spectrum view before it is focused into a micro perspective that will inform its plausible and logical reshaping when applied to *Lulu*.

To begin, the term "heterotopia"² was first applied in a medical setting, where it was used to "describe a phenomenon occurring in an unusual place, or to indicate 'a spatial displacement of normal tissue,' but which does not influence the overall functioning and development of the organism" (Sohn 2008, 41). This was likely the context of the term when Foucault initially became aware of it. His first, brief mention of heterotopias came in the preface to *The Order of Things*, where he stated that "*heterotopias* are disturbing, probably

narrative as having heterotopic potential when compared with some spaces that Foucault listed as heterotopias in his posthumously published lecture "Of Other Spaces." The theory is not taken much further, nor does it make any mention of opera in general having heterotopic possibilities.

² In virtually all theoretical contexts, heterotopia is juxtaposed with the more famous concept of utopia, for which the former is seen as a different space from the latter, where Tompkins, quoting Hetherington, describes how utopia is the "operation of the 'alternate ordering' that provides the means that 'looks to how society might be improved in the future'" (Tompkins 2014, 18). I will forgo describing utopia further in the interest of maintaining strict focus on heterotopic theory as context for Berg's opera.

because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this *and* that, because they shatter or tangle common names” (Foucault 1989, xix). The following year, Foucault discussed his theory of heterotopias in a lecture to students of architecture, and then there was no more mention of the concept until the posthumous publication of “Des espaces autres.” All of Foucault’s subsequent discussions on heterotopia will be associated with the theories presented in “Of Other Spaces.” An analysis of Foucault’s posthumous lecture will be presented in the ensuing section when it is juxtaposed with *Lulu*.

In her study of theatres as heterotopias, Joanne Tompkins discusses how a theatrical space can have heterotopic attributes. Her interpretation is important because it conflates distinctions of space, audience, and performance as an influencing interplay that ultimately has direct associations with Berg’s *Lulu*. She states that “heterotopia is a location that, when apparent in a performance, reflects or comments on a site in the actual world, a relationship that may continue when audiences leave a theatre” (Tompkins 2014, 1). This notion reflects the temporal duality in *Lulu* between the empirical world and metaphysical realm (as they exist both in the opera’s narrative and in relation to the audience), for which there is a consistent interchange, especially when Lulu’s portrait is invoked to project the traversal of the two temporal planes explicitly. Tompkins’s own working definition of heterotopia in a theatrical context states that it is “a space generated via performance that enables us to better understand the theatrical experience; it may comprise the concrete space of the theatre venue, the imagined locations depicted in that venue, and/or the social context for the performance” (16). The relationship between stage and audience is important to both Tompkins and Berg, as the former notes that heterotopia challenges the audience to evaluate the plausibility of the parameters that they perceive themselves to live by (3). The idea of drawing the audience in and compelling them to imagine an alternate reality for themselves was precisely what Berg endeavoured to do in *Lulu*,³ which Tompkins separately equates to an intricate interplay between theatre and life in regard to space (3). Importantly, she continues, the heterotopic theatre is an area where different “worlds” can be created and evaluated, establishing the opportunity for characters to exist in these areas that retain a connection with the functionality of the real world, but that are still palpably divergent from that world (3). Again, Berg takes this dichotomy of “worlds” and presents them as temporal realms of overlapping spaces that at first distinguish and then blur the dividing lines, especially from the perspective of the audience.

Kevin Hetherington defines heterotopias somewhat more succinctly yet broadly—without the theatrical implication—when he defines them as “spaces of alternate ordering. Heterotopia organize a bit of the social world in a way different to that which surrounds them. That alternate ordering marks them out as Other and allows them to be seen as an example of an alternative way of doing things” (Hetherington 1997, viii). Heidi Sohn defines the term in closer

³ Essentially, Berg has the diegetic Animal Tamer directly address and later invite the audience to come into his animal menagerie that is the opera itself, and experience it first-hand.

proximity to its socialized origins, stating that “Foucault’s heterotopias have an essentially disturbing function: they are meant to overturn established orders, to subvert language and signification, to contrast sameness, and to reflect the inverse or reverse side of society. They are spaces reserved for the abnormal, the other, the deviant. But there is a curious ‘twist’ in this: heterotopia comes to existence only when set against parameters of normalcy and correct orders” (Sohn 2008, 44).

M. Christine Boyer analyzes heterotopias from an illusory perspective, which brings her theory closer to Berg’s representation of metaphysical temporal suspensions (described below), when she states that “heterotopian spaces operate via a double logic: they are real spaces that show reality to be the illusion, or they are perfected spaces, more rational and ordered than normal spaces. By their very imaginations and illusions, heterotopias sustain the normality of everyday space and yet they negate these illusions, replacing them with other imaginary, but more static places” (Boyer 2008, 54). The interplay between what is real and imagined is akin to Berg’s temporal duality of the empirical and metaphysical, where the heterotopic projections are the illusions that ensnare Berg’s characters and erroneously make them believe that what they see constitutes reality or truth, but which is, in fact, the illusion within the blurred lines of the temporal realms—a narrative phenomenon that I call temporal suspensions. However, framing *Lulu* within a theoretical structure that bears symmetry with the ideas above, this study’s interpretation of heterotopia closely reflects Sohn’s view of the term as a space for those who are abnormal and deviant. In a general sense, Berg’s *Lulu* presents this dichotomy of double logic through its absurdist distortions that aim to expose the hypocrisy of real society for condemning certain social paradigms (for example prostitution, lesbianism, and gambling), that they helped create for their own hedonism and avarice, while ironically indulging in these very same paradigms in hypocritical ways within the operatic narrative. In other words, the social deviants who populate the heterotopic space of otherness seek to further condemn fellow deviants for being seemingly even more deviant than themselves, whom they (thinking reflexively) consider to be perfectly normal and yet are just as culpable as those whom they denigrate. It is an illusion within an illusion that becomes purposefully chaotic in its distorting ludicrousness that is meant to obscure what is real and what is the heterotopic initiative. From another perspective, this can be seen as a heterotopia within a heterotopia when one social deviant is relegated by his or her peers to an even more remote state of otherness. This fate befalls the Countess Geschwitz, who is consigned to this second heterotopia for her lesbianism. Boyer reiterates, more plainly, how Foucault uses double logic to present how spaces of conformity exist harmoniously with contrasting manners of existence, where the independent temporalities and spaces present conflicting approaches that contrive spaces of otherness (64). The same type of coexisting overlap of temporality and space is intrinsic in *Lulu*, where the coexistence is less harmonious and equally effective at creating dichotomous places of otherness.

Hetherington also expanded his own views of the term from the way in which Louis Marin and Thomas More described utopias, where the latter conflated “*eu-topia* meaning good place and *ou-topia* meaning no-place or nowhere. His Utopia was a good place that existed nowhere, except in the imagination. Marin’s aim is, however, to pull apart the nowhere from the good place. That space, which Marin calls the neutral, is where I would locate Foucault’s heterotopia” (Hetherington 1997, viii). He continues. “Heterotopia do exist, but they only exist in this space-between, in this relationship between spaces, in particular between eu-topia and ou-topia. Heterotopia are not quite spaces of transition—the chasm they represent can never be closed up—but they are spaces of deferral, spaces where ideas and practices that represent the good life can come into being, from nowhere” (ix). What Hetherington describes as the eu-topia (good place) can be equated to the empirical world in *Lulu*, and the ou-topia (nowhere) is the amorphous metaphysical realm of the opera. The heterotopia in *Lulu* is also relational between these temporal realms that are rendered simultaneous, and, in conjunction with Hetherington’s theory, emits heterotopic glimpses that are imagined and then projected from nowhere, but, conversely, do not represent a good life, but instead the quintessential Foucauldian disturbance, which is, after all, the central tenet of heterotopic theory. In a more relative explication to *Lulu*, Hetherington argues that heterotopias, as places of otherness, represent a disparate categorization of society via its association with the society that is detested (6). A theoretical pattern now emerges amongst these researchers that depicts a powerful social discord that is established from a fundamental lack of temporal coexistence between what is perceived as normal and what is other. This type of bleak, demoralizing, and essentially pessimistic assessment, which also depicts an irreconcilable rift between socio-temporal paradigms, is far more conducive to Berg’s narrative society, which is also closer to Foucault’s own view, as a space for people who, as examples of otherness, do not conform to the status quo, which alienates them and renders their insulated social construct as disturbing. As such, Hetherington reflects how people exist in spaces that constitute novel systems of categorization that are dissimilarly positioned to the unquestioned concepts of social structures (40).

Tompkins addresses the way in which her heterotopic theory extends beyond that of Foucault by describing how a heterotopia goes beyond parameters of politics or morality and can be seen as a system that investigates the space of a theatre as a “laboratory” for spaces that can create an opportunity to delve deeper into categorizations of politics or morality than the brief mention that Foucault attributed to theatres as being heterotopic (Tompkins 2014, 6). This broad view of potential is narrowed with the notion that when heterotopias are staged, they allow the audience to gain awareness of another world, whether that world is tangible or not. The aspect of performing a heterotopia creates the spatial opportunity to create places that are both seen and unseen through the power of suggestion and imagination (6). Once more, Berg’s temporal dichotomy exemplifies these notions of visible and invisible via the juxtaposition of the empirical world and metaphysical realm, which for Berg, presents the

potential for non-linear narrative views of the present and future. Another key element is distinguishing the temporal phenomenon of heterotopias as being short-lived (13). This notion has profound undertones in *Lulu*, as the opera's temporal-bending heterotopic injections are precisely fleeting moments that perpetuate the temporal interplay in the opera's narrative as well as for the audience. In the context of Berg's operas, once again, I refer to these brief moments that cut through the fabric of time and steal glimpses of the future as temporal suspensions.

In relation to Foucault's designation in *The Order of Things* where he describes heterotopias as disturbing, Tompkins emphasizes this point for its theatrical application: "This is the point about Foucault's heterotopia that is most frequently overlooked: that heterotopia is disturbing. It *unsettles* the world as we know it, a quality that will come to be key in its use in theatre" (Tompkins 2014, 22). This Foucauldian concept is also essential in comprehending the heterotopic scope of Berg's *Lulu*, which is decidedly disturbing and purposefully distorted, contributing to an altered quality of not just spatiality but also morality and rudimentary social conventions. Hetherington agrees that heterotopias can also constitute a disparate categorization of ethics (Hetherington 1997, 103). In her reading of Louis Marin and Hetherington, Tompkins appreciates their emphasis on other spaces via notions of the opposing dualities that I equate to temporal planes of the empirical and metaphysical, and expands her own theory concurrently: "Heterotopias do not simply exist in the delineation of such an alternative space: rather, their power is derived from being read *against* a context of a real or actual world" (Tompkins 2014, 25). This implies the need for a juxtaposition—one of simultaneity—where, at least theatrically, the imagined world is presented alongside the real one. *Lulu* quintessentially facilitates this phenomenon in the form of Berg's narrative design and autobiographical insertions that draw the audience from the real world into the heterotopic space, rendering spatial and temporal juxtaposition simultaneous. Hetherington separately echoes the heterotopic implications of Berg's narrative insertion of himself, where he argues that characters within the narrative can position themselves separately from the construct of their person, where the heterotopic initiative makes this phenomenon explicit, which would otherwise be an unseen suggestion (Hetherington 2011, 464). This creates an interplay between imagined spaces and tangible ones that are heterotopically juxtaposed. Such an abstraction of imagined space is important for understanding the heterotopic potential in *Lulu*, as the glimpses that Berg provides that blur the temporal planes are often induced deductions of foresight that befall the characters when they are exposed to the conduit that Berg uses throughout his opera to enable the fleeting metaphysical foreshadowings that thematically inform the entire operatic narrative, generally to disconcerting ends. The conduit for this phenomenon is Lulu's portrait. This notion of blurring the temporal planes is crucial in distinguishing the primary attribute that heterotopia is meant to be disturbing in how it contrasts temporal spaces.

One point of contention that I take with Tompkins is her assertion that "it is not possible to describe a theatrical heterotopia out of context: given that

the existence of a heterotopia depends on the intersections of an actual place and the poles of 'good place' and 'no place,' it is not an entity that will always be depicted by a list of pre-existing qualities" (Tompkins 2014, 28). I find this statement to be too reductionist. Berg's opera creates the heterotopic space by virtue of its essence (metaphysical realm-jumping, the prologue addressing the attending audience, Lulu's portrait, etc.), rather than the venue or the production. Spaces in which the opera is performed may enhance the heterotopic potential, but the essential conditions for characterizing it as a space of otherness is inherent from the opera's narrative design, which creates and manipulates the temporal traversals as a fact rather than an interpretation. The required intersections that Tompkins advocates for are already intrinsic to Berg's design and must merely be executed to his specifications rather than be contrived to conform to any semblance of a representational criterion. The crucial distinction between Tompkins and Berg is that she relegates heterotopia as conditional to the space and production, while he creates conditions in his opera that can be read as resonant with the concept of heterotopia. Tompkins also proposes that heterotopia can be implanted in narrative texts, but that its attributes can be most effectively increased by the composer and production team (31). *Lulu* once again defies this sentiment, but the distinction that heterotopia may be embedded in the narrative text is correct and validates brief inclusions later of sections in the *Lulu* libretto that prove this point. Hetherington echoes this discussion of textual heterotopia by pointing out that Foucault was cognizant that heterotopic spaces can be expressed in texts that are non-conforming and deemed to be disturbing (Hetherington 1997, 8). Opera has a unique ability, therefore, to combine these constituent parts of text, space, and act into a composite whole, which *Lulu* does explicitly in heterotopic applications that are just as disturbing textually as they are theatrically on stage.

The audience plays an essential role in *Lulu* as one half of the faction that constitutes the real, empirical world (the other being Berg himself through his autobiographical projection), and this also has significance for Tompkins, who also recognizes the role of the audience, as the disparate categorization of heterotopia places a duty on the audience to recognize the spatial divisions that a performance exemplifies, and to then interpret those distinctions. It promotes a level of involvement with their encounter that remains with them even after leaving the performance space (Tompkins 2014, 69). Berg's opera instills similar realizations in its audience, but where his propositioning of the audience is less indicative of choice and more accurately an unavoidable situation that the concertgoers are powerless to resist while ensconced within the heterotopia of the performance. Options become available to the audience only after they leave the venue. It is precisely this futility of resistance that renders *Lulu*'s heterotopic essence a product of its stylistic and narrative design rather than its venue or production, which further informs Berg's explicit desire to distort and disturb. Such representations are that much more harrowing when they are unavoidable, which is why *Lulu* has distressed and confounded audiences for nearly a century.

Tompkins appeals to my focus on temporal planes in *Lulu* when she offers that heterotopias blend time with space in a way that reflects cultural formations of temporality that represent past and present time, as it transitions from one to the other (Tompkins 2014, 69). Juxtaposing and overlapping time and space is an essential ingredient in projecting metaphysical implications, and it is a narrative ploy that Berg incorporates throughout *Lulu*. The prospect of being denied a satisfactory ending is a hallmark of Bergian opera and once again renders *Lulu* as the perfect heterotopic space. There is no satisfying catharsis at the end of the opera, which leaves a disturbing feeling that establishes relatability to the real world. Therefore, this type of an anti-resolution in *Lulu* would be more disconcerting for the audience—like a form of dramatic terrorism—due to the element of plausible relatability, which Berg’s heterotopic design facilitates and perpetuates throughout.

LULU AS HETEROTOPIA AND FOUCAULT

Following a diverse yet specific analysis of the theoretical trappings of heterotopia, particularly as it applies to abstract notions of time and space, the study will now shift focus onto a critical reading of Foucault’s lecture “Of Other Spaces” and its semblances that can be found in the narrative and libretto of Berg’s opera. Indeed, within the very first paragraph, Foucault exemplifies a central tenet that can be applied to a discussion of *Lulu* when he broadly expresses how “the present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed” (Foucault 1986, 22). Such an expression aptly epitomizes the notion of dual temporal realms as seen in *Lulu*, superimposed over one another, with the purpose of symbolically expanding the scope of the narrative via the composer’s autobiographical designs. With amusing symmetry, Foucault also notes that “space itself has a history in Western experience and it is not possible to disregard the fatal intersection of time and space” (22). Foucault perhaps did not intend the inclusion of the word “fatal” to be taken literally, but the type of intersection that he described, at least for Berg, resulted in just such an outcome for his operatic characters.

In the suggestive context that he provides before introducing the term “heterotopia,” Foucault says that “we do not live inside a void that could be colored with diverse shades of light, we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites” (Foucault 1986, 23). He writes,

One could describe, via the cluster of relations that allows them to be defined, the sites of temporary relaxation—cafes, cinemas, beaches. Likewise, one could describe, via its network of relations, the closed or semi-closed sites of rest—the house, the bedroom, the bed, et cetera. But among these sites, I am interested in certain ones that have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect. These spaces, as it were, which are linked with all the others, which however contradict all the other sites, are of two main types. (24)

The first site is the utopia, which Foucault describes as a place that does not actually exist. The next passage presents the purpose of the entire lecture:

There are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places—places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society—which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias. (Foucault 1986, 24)

Metaphysical implications in this passage abound and are in many ways synonymous with *Lulu*: Existing outside of all places implies a non-empirical realm of being, yet the prospect of being localized in reality paradoxically creates a superimposed relation with the metaphysical realm that supposes a type of realistic duality. The heterotopic function of these characteristics is highly conducive to a theatrical piece that projects one or both realms on stage and perhaps more significantly offers the same duality to the audience, thereby providing a “space of emplacement” (Foucault 1986, 22) as Foucault describes the relational depiction of existing in these types of sites.

Following the introduction of his theory, Foucault subsequently presents his most significant heterotopic analogy that will likewise represent the most important correlation in *Lulu*: the mirror:

I believe that between utopias and these quite other sites, these heterotopias, there might be a sort of mixed, joint experience, which would be the mirror. The mirror is, after all, a utopia, since it is a placeless place. In the mirror, I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent: such is the utopia of the mirror. But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy. From the standpoint of the mirror I discover my absence from the place where I am since I see myself over there. The mirror functions as a heterotopia in this respect: it makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there. (Foucault 1986, 24)

First, Foucault recognizes the duality of real and unreal phenomena that the mirror establishes from the perspective of the observer. In this sense, the mirror is empirically real, while simultaneously acting as a heterotopic conduit for allowing the viewer to pass through into the “over there,” or into a realm of the unreal, i.e., the metaphysical. Foucault acknowledges the duality of the overlapping temporal planes of existence through the varying emplacement within different spaces that the mirror’s observer experiences. And by “reconstituting

myself there where I am,” Foucault describes the kind of metaphysical projection of self that is so crucial in *Lulu*, in the scope of the fleeting temporal suspensions that the characters encounter when beholding Berg’s version of the Foucauldian mirror: Lulu’s portrait.

As M. Christine Boyer states, there is a “double logic” (Boyer 2008, 55) to Foucault’s theory of the mirror. The double logic exists because we see in the mirror only a dubious and potentially false representation because we cannot see the image of our body (or parts of it) with our own eyes. And yet we need the mirror onto which we project our idealized utopias of self. We create and believe in one illusion while rejecting another. The simultaneous condemnation and need for the mirror is an irony that can be equated to Lulu’s portrait. The portrait extracts the idealized vision that triggers the metaphysical projection, which in turn fleetingly opens the heterotopic door of the altered space in which the characters glimpse the disturbing nature of their inescapable servitude to Lulu (55). For both Foucault and Berg, the viewed image in the mirror and portrait, respectively, is an illusion, but for Berg, the deadly outcome is a by-product of the heterotopic imperative towards “overturning established orders,” as Sohn wrote earlier.

Berg’s heterotopia is a metaphysical space of the mind, with Lulu’s portrait acting as the reflective mirror that is the doorway for all beholders to enter this unique space of inevitable placelessness. Her portrait is the operatic version of the Foucauldian mirror because it reflects back a distorted idealization. The heterotopia of *Lulu* is like a giant invisible mirror between the audience and the stage, where the perceived stage narrative reflects a simultaneous sense of self and other that Berg instills in the audience, as he himself is integrally positioned on both sides of the mirror, in both temporal realms, and under one unified heterotopic canopy. In regard to Lulu’s portrait, it represents timelessness as an unchanging object of idealization that is present in every scene of the opera and grants its beholders glimpses into the metaphysical through temporal suspensions, instilling in them the realization that they are fated to succumb to Lulu’s influence.

Another perspective of heterotopia that has symmetry with Lulu’s portrait, and more generally with Berg’s application of metaphysics, is Lieven De Caeter and Michiel Dehaene’s description: “Heterotopia entails an always faltering, incomplete process, without synthesis, a dialectics at a standstill, an unstable interruption or suspension. And precisely because it is unstable, the heterotopian process of mediation requires special, different, other places, where entrance is restricted, initiation or membership required; where appearance is hidden but where the hidden appears. Between the public realm as ‘the space of appearance’ and the private realm as ‘space of the hidden,’ heterotopia indeed embodies a world of hidden appearance” (De Caeter and Dehaene 2008, 94).

De Caeter and Dehaene describe what I discern as the duality of *Lulu*’s temporal realms when they speak of the public (i.e., empirical) and private (i.e., metaphysical) realms. Furthermore, their notion of the dialectical function of mediation can be applied to Lulu’s portrait, which mediates inside Berg’s heterotopia between the real world (as inclusively observed by the audience), and

the illusory world of the narrative. The audience's inclusive observation and participation via their proxy, Alwa, will be explained in a moment. Therefore, *Lulu* has two heterotopic objects of mediation: The portrait, again, mediates between temporal realms for the characters in the opera, while Alwa mediates humanistically as the audience/Berg himself in the real world, and a character in the illusory narrative. The intimacy of this proximity between the audience and Alwa heightens the relatability between the two, rendering Alwa's fate on stage more visceral and disturbing, all of which adds potency to the heterotopic design of the opera as a truly authentic and powerful other space.

A crucial tenet of the heterotopia—explicitly for Foucault and retroactively applied to Berg—is the notion of permission. Foucault states, “To get in, one must have a certain permission and make certain gestures” (Foucault 1986, 26). Likewise, at the very start of *Lulu*, Berg has the Animal Tamer step in front of the curtain, into the empirical world, to address the audience and offer his own invitation of entry to them. The prologue constitutes real-world time in the animal menagerie that it personifies. This opening address is not located within the narrative's sphere of time, denoting a metaphysical timelessness. Dichotomously, the explicit monologue to the attending audience of the opera suggests a recognition of empirical reality, implying from the very start that the ensuing experience will traverse both temporal planes. Likewise, the request to enter are the very first words of the opera proper as well, following the Animal Tamer's prologue, symbolizing the narrative heterotopia that is about to transpire for the characters. Both temporal realms are therefore drawn into this other space, and the audience is just as present there as the characters on stage, blurring the lines of what is real and unreal, and for whom. Furthermore, as the audience has been granted permission to enter by the Animal Tamer, they become complicit as witnesses to all narrative developments, which further obscures the space and blends the temporal realms, whereby they become more actively influenced by the heterotopic events, which viscerally ties them to the characters as intrinsically as Berg tied himself to them. In an abstract way, then, the heterotopia brings the audience into the real life of the composer through the narrative, simultaneously anchoring Berg and the audience in both the real and imagined realms.

This layering of place and space is a hallmark of heterotopia and was clearly Berg's intention from the way he inserted himself into the opera via his doppelgänger Alwa, making him a composer (unlike Wedekind, who stylized Alwa as a writer after himself); and playing the opening notes of his (Berg's in reality and, by implication, Alwa's now) first opera *Wozzeck* when diegetically discussing Lulu's potential for having an opera written about her. Berg applied every means of text, music, and autobiography to cement the heterotopic traversal for the composer, the characters on stage, and the audience. It all becomes a triffecta of alternate realities that coalesce in a performance of *Lulu*. Moreover, when the audience becomes aware that Alwa is Berg himself, all of the tragic and absurd events that befall the character subsequently have an enhanced effect of discomfort for the observers. After the Animal Tamer's invitation to the audience and Alwa's first words of asking permission to enter, we as the

audience sense that he is now like us, as we are about to enter together. George Perle concurs that “it is Alwa who speaks in the Prologue, in the person of the Animal Tamer, and he speaks for the author of the drama and the composer of the opera. It is *us*, the audience, whom he invites to see the beasts of his menagerie, and it is us, as well as the characters on stage, whom his [Alwa’s] first words, ‘May I come in?’ address, when he enters in his own person at the rise of the curtain on Act I” (Perle 1989, 146). As the heterotopic convergence of real and imagined realms ensues, Alwa, as one of us, is acting as a representative of the outside, both as a guest in the stage narrative and as Berg’s doppelgänger. And as such, it draws us in even further, continuously distorting the distinction between reality and illusion. It ultimately victimizes us by proxy of the heterotopic space in which all parties are invited in, and who cannot escape as long as the realities of the dramaturgy perpetuate before us and with us.

These narrative tenets of heterotopias as stage performances relate back to Tompkins’s view of heterotopias challenging audiences to question their perceptions of themselves. This is enabled by the heterotopic design on stage that triggers a déjà vu–like realization of these false real-world projections via the different layers of the heterotopic illusion, which (perhaps paradoxically) retain a connection to the real world but are still fundamentally unreal. By drawing the audience into the narrative and emplacing them into the heterotopic design, Berg facilitates Tompkins’s theory of presenting a new world that blurs the distinction between what is real or imagined through the Animal Tamer’s invitation to the audience to enter *Lulu’s* heterotopia.

The third scene of act 1, when Alwa straddles the temporal planes, is an excellent example of the heterotopic narrative on display as Berg reaffirms the audience’s emplacement within the Foucauldian space. Alwa’s text (along with the parenthesized stage direction) in the libretto reads: “Couldn’t some clever composer take her [Lulu’s] story and make an opera from it? (Standing in front of the portrait.)” (Berg 1978, 35).⁴ The two temporal planes are evident in this line via the empirical connection to Berg himself, which is palpable when Alwa ponders whether an opera about Lulu could be composed, just when the orchestra plays the opening notes of *Wozzeck*, to imply that such an opera already exists in the real world where Alwa’s doppelgänger wrote it. A decisive feature, though, is that Alwa made these reflections to Lulu’s portrait, signifying an insight derived from a temporal suspension that once again blurs the temporal planes by creating an association between them through the doppelgängers, and the layered concept of an opera within an opera.

At the end of the opera, right before his murder, Alwa is reintroduced to Lulu’s portrait and exclaims, “With this picture before me, I feel my self-respect is recovered. I understand the fate which compels me” (Berg 1978, 105).⁵ Silvio Dos Santos notes that “Alwa’s gaze at Lulu’s portrait suggests a sort of metaphysical guilt ... and the consciousness that he had been living in a

4 Original text: “Über die ließe sich freilich eine interessante Oper schreiben. (vor dem Plakat stehend).”

5 Original text: “Diesem Bild gegenüber gewinn’ ich meine Selbstachtung wieder. Es macht mir mein Verhängnis begreiflich.”

dream world” (Dos Santos 2014, 74). The implication is that Alwa’s heterotopic representation of the empirical audience and Berg himself is at a crossroads between empirical self-awareness and the metaphysical temporal suspension that Lulu’s portrait bestows upon him, which obscures the lines of reality and illusion once again, as the real-life audience is sympathetically involved with his plight. This reinforces Berg’s heterotopic ploy, while also seemingly admitting in the operatic narrative that he is forced to fatalistically proceed, as if he knows that he is also a character in the opera, and by extension, of the heterotopic space, and that he cannot diverge from the predetermined path even if he harrowingly knows what awaits him. This idea reflects back to Hetherington’s theory that characters in the heterotopic narrative can represent themselves independently from the form of their person, as Berg and Alwa demonstrate by traversing the temporal planes.

The notion of an opera within an opera reflects the earlier supposition of an illusion within an illusion that further suggests the possibility of a heterotopia within a heterotopia, as it becomes more difficult to distinguish between what is real and what is imagined within the narrative heterotopia of *Lulu*. This was mentioned earlier as an embodiment of the Countess Geschwitz as a result of her otherness in the real world and the heterotopically disturbed world as a result of her lesbianism. Indeed, Boyer previously labelled heterotopias as spaces that reveal reality as the illusion, which Berg facilitates in his opera through his illusion of depicting real-world hypocrisy via brutal and denigrating parody. This is the foundation of *Lulu*’s heterotopia within a heterotopia. Another hypothetical heterotopia within a heterotopia is the film music interlude (FMI) that bisects the opera, essentially chronicling Lulu’s rise in the first half and fall in the second. Douglas Jarman describes this moment in the opera most effectively:

A tumultuous, flickering orchestral interlude accompanies a silent film depicting, in its first half, Lulu’s arrest, trial, sentence, and imprisonment. The second half of the film depicts the means of her escape from prison: her catching cholera from Countess Geschwitz, her transfer to the isolation hospital, and the substitution of the Countess for Lulu. Both the music and the accompanying film have a palindromic structure (the music running backwards from the middle, while the sequence of shots in the second half of the film corresponds to those in the first in reverse order) as a symbol of this crucial turning point in both Lulu’s career and in the opera itself. (Jarman 1991, 33)

Moreover, the FMI represents the chronological progression of a whole year, which is then repeated in retrograde. This signifies the dichotomy of time as simultaneously limitless and momentary through the circular depiction of Lulu not imprisoned at the beginning and end of the FMI. Her life outside of prison demonstrates temporal fleetingness and endlessness, as seen in the single year of the interlude’s circular expression. As the FMI stands so ambiguously out of time, where the characters are presented in a film on stage, this can be seen as a heterotopia unto itself, as another alternate space to the

already alternate space, with its quality of disturbing otherness perpetuating throughout. Although the film is not a real space, it functions as a retelling of real events, but outside the normal narrative chronology of unfolding time, establishing it as a heterotopic abstraction by implication of its placelessness and otherness. *Lulu's* FMI is just such an incorporating body of time with space that heterotopically informs this deeper layer of intrigue and “alternate ordering” of the alternate ordering.

In another Foucauldian layer of his heterotopic topos, the philosopher presents the notion of *crisis heterotopias*, which are “privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis” (Foucault 1986, 24). A prime example in *Lulu* is, again, the lesbian Geschwitz, who as a socially perceived sexual deviant, is a person in crisis. From a socio-political view, Geschwitz’s personal depiction as a lesbian projects a heterotopic discourse of otherness, which once more acts as its own heterotopia within the heterotopia of the opera, as she is perpetually ostracized, ironically by deviants who view her as the sole deviant. Therefore, by being the character who closes the opera, this multi-layered irony of heterotopic crisis is perpetuated to the very end. If we expand on the notion that Geschwitz is her own heterotopia, then she is what Foucault would call a heterotopia of deviation: “those in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed” (25). Therefore, *Lulu's* heterotopia is a simultaneous one of crisis and deviation, as both facilitate the other like an ouroboros, or, in a Bergian sense, as a palindrome of circular repetition.⁶ This notion further justifies my earlier opposition of Tompkins, where she stated that theatrical heterotopias cannot exist out of context. Once more, the heterotopic nature of *Lulu* is inherent in its narrative design, and from the perspective of the Countess Geschwitz, offers an even more nuanced representation through her double deviance in both the empirical world and metaphysical realm. Moreover, by specifically creating a set of parameters that he equates to deviancy, Foucault is including a layer in his heterotopic theory that is the conceptual crux of this study. If we continue to look at characters as spaces unto themselves, it can further conform with Foucault’s theory, when he associates it with theatre, noting that “the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible. Thus it is that the theater brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another” (25). In this sense, why could a person like Geschwitz not be considered a place if they are commodified as disparate elements that represent incompatibilities that are all found on a single stage?

Foucault next directs his argument to explicit discussions of time: “Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time—which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The

⁶ Berg employed the palindrome both narratively and musically to facilitate his temporal designs of having events either explicitly repeat themselves, or to fold back onto themselves as a negation of events via a reversal.

heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time. This situation shows us that the cemetery is indeed a highly heterotopic place since, for the individual, the cemetery begins with this strange heterochrony, the loss of life, and with this quasi-eternity in which her permanent lot is dissolution and disappearance” (Foucault 1986, 26).

The type of traditional break that Foucault describes occurs in the metaphysical realm of *Lulu*, which is a temporal revolving door in the opera via Lulu’s portrait. As such, visits to the metaphysical are fleeting glimpses of distress and often of catastrophe. The element of quasi-eternity is also temporally thematic in *Lulu*, as Alwa wishes to exist in a metaphysical plane beyond space and time with Lulu, and also in the form of Geschwitz’s final expression of eternal love for Lulu as she dies and closes the opera. The final text of her *Liebestod* reads: “Lulu! My angel! Appear once more for me! For I am near, I’m always near. For evermore!” (Berg 1978, 113).⁷ It is plain that Geschwitz makes this appeal to the portrait, because it is the only reminder of Lulu that is tangibly close to her in those final moments. She has been close to Lulu throughout the narrative and now, in her final metaphysical expression—to the undisclosed portrait—declares her eternal yet unreturned love. The last word of the opera, “evermore,” concludes the temporal circle and realizes the Animal Tamer’s prophecy from the prologue that foreshadows the death of almost all the participants in the metaphysical realm of the opera. As such, when we the audience are implicitly made aware of the ending at the beginning, only now when the performance has ended, are we to know that we are again a part of the real world, and that the heterotopic illusion has ended. Foucault addresses the notion of the momentary by stating that “opposite these heterotopias that are linked to the accumulation of time, there are those linked, on the contrary, to time in its most fleeting, transitory, precarious aspect, to time in the mode of the festival. These heterotopias are not oriented toward the eternal; they are rather absolutely temporal. You see, moreover, the two forms of heterotopias that come together here, the heterotopia of the festival and that of the eternity of accumulating time” (Foucault 1986, 26).

The symbolic duality of fleeting time and eternally accumulated time has an implication in *Lulu*’s temporal realms of the empirical and metaphysical, which, as Foucault states, also “presupposes a system of opening and closing that both isolates them [heterotopias] and makes them penetrable” (Foucault 1986, 26). Lulu’s portrait facilitates that system of opening and closing to the metaphysical in the form of the fleetingly experienced temporal suspensions. This is related to what Hetherington previously described as heterotopia existing between the spaces of good place and no-place, and coming from nowhere. It is akin to Berg’s construct of simultaneity between the temporal planes where the metaphysically gleaned temporal suspensions come from a timeless nowhere and disappear back into it just as quickly. The FMI also expresses the

⁷ Original text: “Lulu! Mein Engel! Laß dich noch einmal sehn! Ich bin dir nar! Bleibe dir nah, in Ewigkeit!”

paradoxical duality of being simultaneously infinite and instant in the manner in which its temporal significance is displayed as a heterotopic space of otherness outside of narrative time, which turns back on itself in the retrograde structure that brings the end to the beginning, rendering it instantaneously there, and then not.

Furthermore, as an applied relational sentiment between Foucault's mirror and Berg's FMI, M. Christine Boyer describes how the reality of otherness that the mirror establishes "shapes or molds the subject as it folds back on itself to form itself in a perceived likeness" (Boyer 2008, 63). This concept of folding back has symmetry with Berg's retrograde, as time within the FMI becomes circular and mirrors its "perceived likeness." *Lulu*, therefore, constitutes this sentiment of accumulated time as Foucault described it, yet it also fundamentally negates time via the circular constructs that Berg employs to accentuate the damning element of his heterotopic space of deviant otherness.

As we have seen in "Of Other Spaces" and in extracts from Berg's libretto, heterotopias can be quantified as imaginary spaces, as Foucault attests with his mirror, when one who beholds his or her reflection must "pass through this virtual point which is over there." *Lulu*'s portrait allows for a similar phenomenon, as it also transports its beholders from one space to another that traverses temporal planes from an empirical reality to a metaphysical placelessness of otherness that is outside of reality. As Tompkins noted earlier, the theatrical heterotopic experience allows audiences to discern another world. *Lulu* takes this further by bringing the audience into its heterotopia via the Animal Tamer's invitation and the audience relating to Alwa as simultaneously being one of them; a character in the opera; and as Berg himself through his autobiographical projection of Alwa, the composer of *Wozzeck*, and a conceived opera about *Lulu*. The audience involvement in the theatrical heterotopia is essential, to the extent that Tompkins calls it a responsibility of the audience to recognize the space of "alternate orderings," and how it is in "dialogue with 'real' locations." Berg certainly makes this recognition plausible throughout with his central placement of *Lulu*'s portrait and the temporal suspensions that consistently ensue, jumping between the two realms while marching toward the prophetic doom of all, as it was made clear by the Animal Tamer in the prologue. The audience is further implicated in the heterotopia by Hetherington, who claimed earlier that within these spaces, characters can position themselves separately from the construct of their person. In this regard, the audience is compelled to follow Berg's example and emplace themselves into the heterotopic narrative.

CONCLUSION

This study has presented heterotopic theory from multiple perspectives: from its social functions as depicted by Hetherington; from its theatrical/artistic functions depicted by Tompkins; and to the social abstraction that crossed into the realm of the philosophical for Foucault. The primary endeavour of this investigation was to exemplify how Berg's *Lulu* conflated these heterotopic applications through its temporal dualism and brutal depictions of deviant

alternate orderings of otherness in the behaviour and actions of the operatic characters. It also expanded the scope of spatial potentiality to include heterotopias within heterotopias that Berg designed as an absurdist commentary on social hypocrisy, as well as the heterotopic correspondence between Foucault's mirror and Lulu's portrait and the concept of permission. The Countess Geschwitz was also depicted as constituting a *crisis heterotopia* via the reception of her lesbianism within the heterotopic structure, relegating her to an even more remote space of otherness. It is also important to reiterate the distinction between Foucault's heterotopias as unpleasant spaces of physical otherness where entities are segregated from utopian idealizations, whereas the perceived heterotopia in *Lulu* that this study aimed to exemplify was one of a more temporal-metaphysical illusion and distortion that was associated with the opera's narrative and characters.

The theoretical framework of this study sought to first depict how a variety of scholars developed interpretations of heterotopia, thereby establishing a permissible culture of interdisciplinary appropriation that I embraced in my own adaptation of the theory. Moreover, Berg's autobiographic projection in the guise of Alwa, as well as the emplaced presence of the empirical, real-world audience inside the narrative's heterotopia, was demonstrated in this study regarding how Foucauldian theory could be retroactively applied to an opera that was composed decades earlier. Berg's symbolic devices were also comparable with Foucault's metaphors (i.e., Foucault's mirror and Lulu's portrait), to profoundly expand the heterotopic discourse in hitherto unsubstantiated correlations.

Foucault set the tone in the posthumous publication of his lecture notes, which appeared in print as "Of Other Spaces," as the foundation on which heterotopic theory of this persuasion ensued. Yet, through the Bergian lens of *Lulu*, what constitutes a heterotopic space has been expanded in this study to include multiple sites and existential planes of existence that are superimposed over one another, and more importantly, inform and influence one another, generally to chaotic and tragic ends. A heterotopia is an abnormal space for social deviants, and Berg's *Lulu* is a space that does not have a single morally upstanding narrative participant, save for perhaps the initiated audience of passive yet present observers who were permitted to enter the heterotopia for the duration of the performance. *Lulu's* heterotopia is narratively built in without requiring a supplement from the performance venue to render it so, albeit there are still productions and venues that nevertheless directly reflect the theoretical tenets of heterotopia that this study sought to explicate.

One particular production of *Lulu* deserves brief mention for its ability to complement and enhance the inherent heterotopic paradigms in the opera to compel it to deeper levels of depravity through an embodiment of these ideologies in performance. In 1996, Copenhagen held the title of European Capital of Culture. Many cultural events were organized throughout the year, but one of particular note was the Danish and Scandinavian premiere of the complete three-act version of *Lulu*, performed at the grandiose Ridehuset (riding stables) at Christiansborg Palace in Copenhagen. The American director Travis

Preston debuted his vision of *Lulu* in symbolic ways that qualify this production as an explicit example of spatial otherness, which in turn amplified the fundamental heterotopic symbolism in *Lulu*. A crucial element of this production from the audience perspective was that they sat on the same earth that comprised the stage. The characters emerged from the soil and were returned to it in death, as the staging dictated, so the audience and operatic characters virtually shared the stage, whereby the heterotopic spatial experience was even further bridged between the two constituent parties, as they were on the same plane. Indeed, the various heterotopic sites between the scenes encompassed places of real and imagined locations, as well as psychological ones. Despite depictions of modernistic technologies, and a few tangible descriptions of locations, Berg took care to emphasize in *Lulu* a nebulous quality of place and time, and general (but not complete) lack of site-specificity in the opera. Preston's Ridehuset production took these tenets that were dramatically built into the opera even further in his stylization of the psychology and humanity of the opera, which all contributed to a heterotopic placelessness and otherness. In this sense, Preston's *Lulu* was in a heterotopic dialogue with Ridehuset, allowing the audience to experience the production from the perspective of Berg's distorted and unsettling psychological design.

Foucault presented his metaphor of the mirror to emphasize his distinction between real and unreal spaces, where the real mirror allows one "to pass through the virtual point which is over there" in the unreal space. *Lulu's* heterotopia of the mind functions similarly via the temporal suspensions gleaned from observing Lulu's portrait, yielding the same kind of spatial/temporal traversal that Foucault's mirror facilitates. Notions of the empirical world and metaphysical realm abound throughout this study, and there are relevant insights that compare the tenets of heterotopia with that of the temporal duality in Berg's opera that I discussed. In his analysis of Polish filmmaker Tadeusz Kantor's philosophical theories of film, Michal Kobialka presented perceptions that bear symmetry to the present study and presents an expanded context that has value when juxtaposed to the ideas that I have presented. Koblinka writes, in discussion of a Kantor film:

"With the passing of time, one sees that everything ultimately stays in the same invisible *interior*. Everything is intertwined, one could say: everything exists simultaneously." Mirrors reflect us and allow us to see that we have an outside (the body) that separates us from other realities and that we exist in 'real' space.... Because our points of view determine what reality is to us, we assume that what we see is the "ghost" of ourselves living in an imaginary space. We are not, paradoxically, where our eyes are but over there, on the other side.... In Kantor's theatre, the Other took the form of memory that folded back on itself and thought itself; memory that transformed in space rather than in time. The mirror not only reflects her [film character's] image but also functions as a window into a different reality or dimension.... "It preserves the images of everything that has been, the reflection of past worlds, and by analogy, the sketches of worlds to come." (Kobialka 1993, 312-14)

The Foucauldian, and by extension, Bergian, implications of this passage are significant. Notions of multidimensional memory; of crossing between dimensions; past and future ceasing to exist; time existing simultaneously; mirrors that separate temporal spaces; and memory folding back on itself, all bear profound traces in *Lulu* and Berg's temporally dualistic narrative design. Even the palindrome of the FMI constitutes a folding back on itself as a negation of linear time. These abstract notions are explicit parallels, but Koblinka also directly incites heterotopias and Foucault, adding relevance to the passage above. When discussing another of Kantor's spatial contrivances in one of his films, Koblinka writes:

The heterotopic space of the room, like the *topos uchronia* from *The Dead Class*, challenged the audience to abandon logical analysis and rational thinking for the manifestations that were created by Kantor in those spaces. These commentaries [in the film] materialized in a different, second space. [The room] is a heterotopia in which the rules of real space were discarded by virtue of Kantor's rejection of traditional concepts of illusion and time. Instead, this new space was defined by repetition and its three powerful components: echo, memory, and nonlinear time.... Paradoxically for the viewer, whose gaze was positioned between Kantor and his Room of Memory, both spaces were real, even though they functioned in different dimensions. (Kobialka 1993, 336, 338–40)

It becomes clear that Kantor's reading of Foucault yielded a philosophical outcome similar to the one that Berg had applied to *Lulu*, decades before Foucault's symmetrical theories. Like Berg, Kantor's glimpses of self were clearly expressed in his films, and more importantly, the director wished to emplace his audience within the heterotopic schematic of his theatre similarly (but perhaps less explicitly) to the manner in which Berg wanted his audience to experience his operatic performance. Both clearly wanted to depict a metaphysical realm of existence, and the nebulousness of the heterotopia was the means for Kantor to achieve this and is comparable to the way that Berg sought to narratively localize his audience. However, as Berg emplaced himself on both sides of the Foucauldian mirror, or *Lulu*'s portrait, he could control the interplay of the realms, and the perceptions on both temporal planes, especially from the perspective of the audience. Koblinka's analysis of Kantor's conceptual designs depicts the way in which Foucauldian heterotopic theory can be harnessed cinematically, and how the temporal implications that Kantor derived from Foucault can be retroactively applied to Berg's *Lulu* in a way that validates such applications of the heterotopic/metaphysical theory, and how, again, much of what was imagined by Foucault and Kantor was first symbolically seen in *Lulu*. The interrelatedness of heterotopic theory and art/culture via interdisciplinary perspectives (as seen in music and now film) has facilitated the interpretation of *Lulu* specifically and the potential of opera more generally, to be seen from a new vantage point. Foucault's tenets of heterotopia were included and expanded but were nevertheless the foundation on which virtually all discussions of this theory pivot. The musicological implications of such a cross-sectional

approach are valuable in demonstrating the renewability of classical music across time, and how past cultural epochs can insightfully mirror the near-present and yield richer dimensions of social and aesthetic understanding.

In terms of the heterotopic theory's broader application to opera, one meaningful application could be the assimilation and realization of the theory as a stylistic method of spatial stage production for Expressionistic operas that already function around social and psychological distortions of reality. The *Lulu* production at Copenhagen's Ridehuset illustrated the capability of harnessing a unique venue to enhance heterotopic parameters. Furthermore, the intrinsic quality of otherness in heterotopias that establishes a disturbing spatiality could also magnify the reception and scope of understanding operas that, similarly to *Lulu*, possess a narrative framework that readily lend themselves to heterotopic implications. Most famously, these could be: Bartók's *Bluebeard's Castle*, Schoenberg's monodrama *Erwartung*, and Janáček's *From the House of the Dead*, all of which can be seen as emplaced in spaces of otherness. Likewise, less famous operas that display a similar heterotopic potential are Korngold's *Die tote Stadt*, Szymanowski's *King Roger*, and Schulhoff's *Flammen*. All of these operas could yield fascinating perspectives when viewed through a heterotopic lens, arguing for further plausible comparisons between Foucault's theory and opera studies.

REFERENCES

- Ashby, Arved. 1998. "Singing the Aphoristic Text: Berg's *Altenberg-Lieder*." In *Encrypted Messages in Alban Berg's Music*, edited by Siglind Bruhn, 191–226. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Berg, Alban. 1978. *Lulu: Opera in 3 Acts (7 Scenes), after "Erdgeist" and "Büchse der Pandora" by Frank Wedekind*, English/German libretto. Translated by Arthur Jacobs. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- Boyer, M. Christine. 2008. "The Many Mirrors of Foucault and Their Architectural Reflections." In *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, edited by Michiel Dehaene and Lieven De Cauter, 53–74. London: Routledge.
- De Cauter, Lieven, and Michiel Dehaene. 2008. "The Space of Play: Towards a General Theory of Heterotopia." In *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, edited by Michiel Dehaene and Lieven De Cauter, 87–102. London: Routledge.
- Dos Santos, Silvio J. 2014. *Narratives of Identity in Alban Berg's "Lulu"*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1986. "Of Other Spaces." Translated by Jay Miskowic. *Diacritics* 16 (1): 22–7.
- . 1989. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1986. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hetherington, Kevin. 1997. *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. London: Routledge.

- . 2011. “Foucault, the Museum and the Diagram.” *Sociological Review* 59 (3): 457–75.
- Jarman, Douglas. 1991. *Alban Berg: “Lulu,” Cambridge Opera Handbooks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kobialka, Michal, ed. and trans. 1993. *A Journey through Other Spaces: Essays and Manifestos, 1944–1990, Tadeusz Kantor*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1992. *The Production of Space*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Perle, George. 1989. *The Operas of Alban Berg*. Vol. 2, *Lulu*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Potter, Steve. 2020. “Cage and Foucault: Musical Timekeeping and the Security State.” In *Foucault’s Theatres*, edited by Tony Fisher and Kéline Gotman, 141–59. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Powrie, Phil. 2019. “From Heterotopia to Metatopia: Staging Carmen’s Death.” In *French Literature on Screen*, edited by Homer B. Pettay and R. Barton Palmer, 90–106. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sohn, Heidi. 2008. “Heterotopia: Anamnesis of a Medical Term.” In *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, edited by Michiel Dehaene and Lieven De Caeter, 41–50. London: Routledge.
- Tompkins, Joanna. 2014. *Theatre’s Heterotopias: Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

ABSTRACT

Michel Foucault described the present epoch as being one of space. Some of his notions of space are found in his theories on heterotopias—disturbing places of segregated otherness—which Foucault adapted to describe temporal paradigms within a social framework. This study analyzes the duality of opposing temporal planes that are presented as the empirical world and the metaphysical realm, as they inform the heterotopic space within Alban Berg’s opera *Lulu*. The objective is to expand on the ambiguous meaning of heterotopia and to view Berg’s opera through the seminal lens of Foucauldian theory.

Keywords: Foucault, Berg, *Lulu*, heterotopias, metaphysical realm, social frameworks, otherness

RÉSUMÉ

Michel Foucault a décrit l’époque actuelle comme étant une époque de l’espace. Certaines de ses notions de l’espace se retrouvent dans ses théories sur les hétérotopies — des lieux perturbants d’altérité ségréguée — que Foucault a adaptées pour décrire les paradigmes temporels au sein d’un cadre social. Cette étude analyse la dualité des plans temporels opposés qui sont présentés comme le monde empirique et le royaume métaphysique, tels qu’ils influencent l’espace hétérotopique au sein de l’opéra *Lulu* d’Alban Berg. L’objectif est d’approfondir la signification ambiguë de l’hétérotopie et de voir l’opéra de Berg à travers la lentille fondamentale de la théorie foucauldienne.

Mots-clés : Foucault, Berg, *Lulu*, hétérotopies, royaume métaphysique, cadres sociaux, altérité.

BIOGRAPHY

Vanja Ljubibratić specializes in the life and works of Alban Berg and Richard Wagner. He received his PhD in historical musicology from the University of Turku with his dissertation “Hans Christian Andersen and the Cultural Reception of Richard Wagner in Denmark, 1857–1875.” He is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of the Arts Helsinki where he is writing a monograph on Berg.