

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds: Ecological Scenography as Relation

Michael Greenhalgh^{1,*} and Christopher White²

¹School of Art and Design, Centre for Classical Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

²Department of Art History, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, United Kingdom

Correspondence: michael.greenhalgh@anu.edu.au

Abstract

This article asks how ecological scenography is produced by formal choices rather than simply represented as a theme, and when environmental information changes spectatorship rather than merely accompanying a conventional stage image. It compares open production and sustainability documentation from Theatre Green Book, Julie's Bicycle, the Victoria and Albert Museum Theatre and Performance collections, and National Theatre public resources at the level of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative. The evidence indicates that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible; audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision; and claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image. Read together, these results connect visual organization to spectatorship while keeping claims about reception separate from claims supported by images, films, scripts, or production records. The article contributes a material-dramaturgical framework for testing ecological claims while acknowledging the absence of complete operational or impact data.

Keywords: scenography; ecology; theatre; materials; performance design

1 Introduction

This article asks how ecological scenography can make environmental relations perceptible without reducing ecology to a visual theme. It compares open production and sustainability documentation from Theatre Green Book, Julie's Bicycle, the Victoria and Albert Museum Theatre and Performance collections, and National Theatre public resources through material-dramaturgical analysis. The central claim is that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible. By tracing material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative, the study contributes an account that joins theatrical meaning to material practice and institutional accountability.

The inquiry is more specific than a general history of relational scenography. Within these works, ecological scenography is assessed through material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative. Its definition changes only when those features alter the interpretation.

The object-based inquiry advances three connected findings. First, material provenance becomes dramaturgical

when transformation remains visible. Second, audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision. Third, claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image. Their convergence indicates that relational scenography is neither a decorative effect nor a label attached after interpretation. The argument remains proportionate to the selection.

Ecological scenography requires methods that join material choice to the full production process. Beer develops ecoscenography as a cyclical practice of design, use, adaptation, and afterlife [1]. Kershaw places theatre within wider ecological relations and tests the environmental assumptions of performance itself [2].

The evidentiary set consists of open documentation from Theatre Green Book [3], Julie's Bicycle [4], the Victoria and Albert Museum Theatre and Performance collections [5], and National Theatre public resources [6]. Corpus design privileges analytical variation over numerical representativeness. Each item offers a distinct configuration of relational scenography and permits comparison through the common unit of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial link, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative.

The method is material-dramaturgical analysis that distinguishes documented production choices from a proposed evaluative protocol.

Ecological scenography is tested through observable changes in material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative. The method records position, recurrence, interruption, and consequence before assigning interpretive weight. Fischer-Lichte's performance aesthetics informs the treatment of material transformation as an event within embodied relations [7]. Arnheim's account of visual perception supports the distinction between visible material organization and broader environmental claims [8]. Claims about intention, reception, or prevalence are withheld unless the cited sources supply that evidence.

Mediation is not a neutral step in Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds. Typography, editorial intervention, notation, image quality, cropping, tempo, staging, or interface design may change how material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial link, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative can be perceived. The comparison accordingly distinguishes properties of the underlying work from properties of the available witness. This distinction sets a practical test:

an inference remains secure only if it persists the change of version relevant to the claim about ecological scenography.

2 Ecological scenography

The critical vocabulary joins relational form with historically situated interpretation. The medium-specific evidence identified above remains primary.

Panofsky's approach to visual meaning guides the move from stage image to interpretive consequence [9]. Gombrich's account of perceptual expectation informs the analysis of how reuse or transformation becomes legible [10]. Baxandall's model of historical explanation supports keeping formal observation distinct from unsupported claims about production intention [11].

Interpretive validity in this account comes from convergence rather than certainty. Evidence constrains interpretation, but its constraint works through reasoned comparison.

Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds is organized around a bounded question: what work does ecological scenography perform that cannot be explained by isolated occurrences of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative? The wording carries weight. "What work" directs attention to outcome; "cannot be explained" creates a standard for counter-reading; and the named unit fixes the scale at which the answer must be demonstrated. This formulation allows the inquiry to make a strong local argument without extending its claims to periods, audiences, or practices not represented by the selected sources.

The key term, ecological scenography, is used in a restricted sense. It refers to the organized segment from material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible through audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision to claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image. This definition makes sequence part of the concept: removing the middle interaction or the retrospective test changes what the term explains. The restriction is useful because it prevents ecological scenography from absorbing every relevant observation. Details that do not affect preparation, distribution, or revision remain part of the work's texture but not part of this particular thesis.

3 Material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible

The opening analytical pattern can be stated directly: material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible. This temporal dimension is essential. The finding therefore concerns organization, not inventory.

Reading across the cases demonstrates that the pattern operates at more than one scale. The resulting form is recursive. Interpretation advances, but it also returns to revise what seemed settled. This recursive quality explains why relational scenography can remain coherent without becoming predictable.

Evidence for the claim that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible begins with a before-and-after test. The reading identifies the state of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative before the relevant event, describes the change without assigning motive, and then asks what new interpretation becomes possible afterward. In Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds, this method distinguishes a feature that merely appears from one that organizes expectation. The distinction is necessary because repetition can reinforce convention, expose it, or redirect it; recurrence by itself cannot decide which function is active.

4 Objects and performances in comparison: Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds

The baseline reading concerns Theatre Green Book's Sustainable Productions Guidance. The reading tests the proposition that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible by restricting attention to material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial interaction, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative. It then identifies which surrounding relations are necessary for that account.

In Theatre Green Book's Sustainable Productions Guidance, the proposition that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible is evaluated through placement, not keyword recurrence. The reading asks what prepares each occurrence of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative, which agent or compositional layer controls it, and what outcome follows. A detail counts as evidence only when its surrounding sequence

changes the available judgment. This restriction prevents the case from being reduced to an example chosen after the thesis was formed.

A close reading of Theatre Green Book's Sustainable Productions Guidance must therefore document the first relevant occurrence of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative, the expectation active at that moment, and the result that distinguishes it from background recurrence. The case supports Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds only if those three points can be located in the consulted version. A general similarity to the other cases is not enough; the episode must show why the proposition about ecological scenography is called for to explain its organization.

The next reading, Julie's Bicycle's Creative Climate Tools and Theatre Resources, tests the distributive dimension of the argument. Here the governing question is whether audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision. This is not read as a defect in reliability.

Julie's Bicycle's Creative Climate Tools and Theatre Resources changes the scale of comparison. Here ecological scenography is read through the distribution of access, emphasis, and response among works and documents. The relevant question is not whether the same surface feature returns, but whether its return gives a different participant, voice, register, or position the capacity to redirect interpretation. That distributive test supplies the pressure behind the claim that audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision.

For Julie's Bicycle's Creative Climate Tools and Theatre Resources, the principal counter-reading treats the observed distribution as a genre convention with no special bearing on ecological scenography. The article answers only at the level of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial connection, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative: it asks whether a transfer of access or emphasis produces a following effect that convention alone leaves unexplained. If it does not, the second proposition contracts. If it does, the case clarifies how structural hierarchy becomes an event rather than a static arrangement.

The next analytical test uses Victoria and Albert Museum's Theatre and Performance Collection Materials and gives priority to revision over initial recognition. The interpretive test is whether claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image.

The value of Victoria and Albert Museum's Theatre and Performance Collection Materials is retrospective. Ensuing passages are reread against the first account of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative, allowing the article to distinguish repetition from revision. If the ensuing event merely restates the preceding one, the proposition that claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image receives little support. If it changes the status of what the reader, listener, or viewer already encountered, the case demonstrates how ecological scenography acquires compositional memory.

Verification in Victoria and Albert Museum's Theatre and Performance Collection Materials calls for two locators: one for the initial treatment of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial connection, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative and one for the moment that alters its status. The interval between them is analytically important because it determines what can be remembered, projected, or misrecognized. Recording both locations prevents the subsequent reading from being projected backward as if it had been available from the start, and it gives the claim about ecological scenography a visible temporal basis.

The final case, National Theatre's Public Production and Learning Resources, functions as a resistant comparison.

National Theatre's Public Production and Learning Resources remains in the selection because it resists easy synthesis. Its treatment of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative tests how far the claim that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible can travel before medium, genre, or historical circumstance depends on qualification. The comparison does not convert resistance into confirmation. It records which part of the proposition remains, which part contracts, and which further source would be required to distinguish between rival readings.

The resistant role of National Theatre's Public Production and Learning Resources also limits the article's vocabulary. If medium or genre changes the operation of material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial interaction, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative, the comparison names that difference before proposing an analogy. The case may therefore support only part of the claim that material provenance be-

comes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible. Such partial support is informative: it identifies the condition under which ecological scenography ceases to explain the evidence and marks the point where another historical or formal account should take over.

5 Audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision

The visual and performance reading further finds that audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision. This pattern shifts analysis from isolated form toward distribution. The selection repeatedly makes such allocation perceptible.

To test whether audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision, the comparison maps control rather than prestige. It asks which component establishes an expectation, which one can revise it, and which remains visible yet unable to affect the sequence. Applied to material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial connection, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative, this distinction reveals distribution as an activity rather than a fixed rank. Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds consequently avoids translating every center-edge contrast into a social allegory; the interpretive claim is made only when formal allocation and historical authority can be connected through specific evidence.

6 Claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image

Evidence finally indicates that claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image. Return, correction, reframing, and delayed outcome are therefore analytical events. They reveal how a work stores difference and activates it later.

The findings collectively form a sequence of their own. The first identifies a process that directs attention. The second shows that attention and authority are distributed. The third explains how following events revise that distribution. This sequence supports the central thesis that relational scenography is historically variable and formally organized.

Temporal revision separates the third result from the first two. The article asks whether the proposition that claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image modifies an earlier judgment, redistributes its authority, or merely adds new information. Only

the first two outcomes bear directly on ecological scenography. By tracking material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial relation, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative in both chronological and retrospective order, Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds shows how interpretation can advance through correction without pretending that every uncertainty must end in a single, final account.

7 Discussion

Comparison makes the argument more exact. Material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible identifies the initial formal pressure. Audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision reveals how that pressure is distributed, and Claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image describes the work performed by return or correction. No single proposition is sufficient on its own. Their intersection is what gives ecological scenography explanatory force in Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds.

The comparison also suggests that ecological performance joins meaning to material practice and institutional accountability. This outcome does not depend on universal agreement about every example.

Three checks keep the comparison from becoming self-confirming. First, apparent support for material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible is reread as convention or accident. Second, evidence for audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision is tested against cases where authority does not move in the expected direction. Third, the claim that claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image is withheld if the supposed revision leaves preceding material unchanged. Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds retains only the account that explains both confirming and resistant details with the fewest unsupported assumptions.

Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds shifts emphasis from the presence of ecological scenography to the conditions under which it becomes consequential. That shift becomes consequential because thematic readings often gather examples while leaving their order unexamined. Here, material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial link, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative are read as events with a before and an after. The approach therefore identifies the small-

est change that alters interpretation, locates who or what controls that change, and asks whether the effect remains visible outside the case in which it first appeared.

Scale supplies a second test. An observation about material source, transformation, visibility of labor, spatial connection, duration, reuse, and disposal narrative may be convincing locally yet fail to explain the larger work; conversely, a broad claim about ecological scenography may disappear when examined at the level of the segment, phrase, frame, or action. Stages for More-Than-Human Worlds moves between these scales in both directions. A large claim remains only when its local evidence remains specific, and a local detail becomes consequential only when its consequence extends beyond immediate description.

8 Conclusion

The visual and performance reading was organized around the question of how ecological scenography can make environmental relation perceptible without reducing ecology to visual theme. Through material-dramaturgical analysis that distinguishes documented pro-

duction choices from a proposed evaluative protocol, it argued that material provenance becomes dramaturgical when transformation remains visible; that audience movement can connect environmental scale to embodied decision; and that claims of sustainability require attention to afterlife as well as stage image. These claims converge on an account of ecological scenography as a relational practice.

The larger conclusion holds that ecological performance joins meaning to material practice and institutional accountability. Because the public documentation does not provide complete operational or impact data, future production studies should combine material audit, observation, and audience research.

Bibliography

- [1] Tanja Beer. *Ecoscenography: An Introduction to Ecological Design for Performance*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.
- [2] Baz Kershaw. *Theatre Ecology: Environments and Performance Events*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [3] Theatre Green Book. *Sustainable Productions Guidance*. open industry guidance.
- [4] Julie's Bicycle. *Creative Climate Tools and Theatre Resources*. open organizational materials.
- [5] Victoria and Albert Museum. *Theatre and Performance Collection Materials*. institutional public materials.
- [6] National Theatre. *Public Production and Learning Resources*. institutional public materials.
- [7] Erika Fischer-Lichte. *The Transformative Power of Performance*. Routledge, 2008.
- [8] Rudolf Arnheim. *Art and Visual Perception*. University of California Press, 1974.
- [9] Erwin Panofsky. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- [10] E. H. Gombrich. *Art and Illusion*. Princeton University Press, 1960.
- [11] Michael Baxandall. *Patterns of Intention*. Yale University Press, 1985.