



means: “A constantly changing pattern or sequence of elements.”

Dynamic, variable and plural, subject to interactions, the kaleidoscope can be compared to the effects of the work: in other words, the artist’s intention, concretized, realized in its implementation, with a view to perception(s). It is the plurality of effects, or more precisely, the maintenance of the potentiality of multiple effects, that manifests the vitality of a work. Our use of metaphor thus joins that of Eco, and that of Brandi, who had a controversy with the semiotician in the wake of the Milan Triennial (Brandi 1989, 133; Verbeeck 2021).

The metaphor used here is not a game of the mind. It is an image, which invites us to take a different look at things – or at least to look at them from a different angle. To look at the work through the prism of intention is to diffract the artist’s thought, to continue to see the work as “his thing.” But once the work is created, it escapes him. It only becomes a work of art in the relationship it establishes with the viewer. To be interested in the kaleidoscope of effects is to consider aesthetic functionality, not from the angle where it is intended, but as it is perceived. It is to ensure that the work is open to the prolixity of perceptions.

### Acknowledgments

The author thanks The Samuel Kress Foundation and the True Vue Foundation who supported the presentation of this paper at the AIC conference, Uncasville, and Olivier Steib for the exchanges on nomenclature and examples cited in the presentation at AIC. Finally, my gratitude goes to Isabelle Brajer (once again) for her careful proofreading and alternative translation proposals. My warmest thanks go to Bonnie Naugle, whose patient proofreading has overcome my discouragement.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

### Funding

This work was supported Foundation for Advancement in Conservation (FAIC) and Tru Vue [grant number 2019]; Samuel H. Kress Foundation [grant number 2019].

### Notes on contributor

**Muriel Verbeeck** is a Doctor in Philosophy and Letters (History), member of the Scientific Council of IRPA and researcher at AAP and DIVA research unit of the University of Liège, she teaches ethics, history and conservation theories. She is also a visiting professor at the Institut National du Patrimoine in Paris. She is particularly interested in the theorization and conceptualization of conservation-restoration (COTOCOCO Project, Connectheo Center), as well as in the relations between conservation and minorities in Western urban areas (CHIC Project). Address: Unité de Recherche Art, Archéologie, et Patrimoine (AAP), Université de Liège, Quai Roosevelt, 1B (Bât. A4), 4000 Liège, Belgium. Email: [muriel.verbeeck@uliege.be](mailto:muriel.verbeeck@uliege.be); [muriel.verbeeck@ceroart.org](mailto:muriel.verbeeck@ceroart.org).

### References

- Brandi, Cesare. 1966. *Le due vie*. Bari: Laterza.
- Brandi, Cesare. 1989. *Les Deux Voies de La Critique*. Bruxelles: Marc Vokar Editeur.
- Breuil, Marie-Hélène, Cécile Dazord, M. Lavandier, X. Guchet, N. Heinich, V. Sorano-Stedman, P. Laurensen, et al. 2013. “Conserver l’art contemporain à l’ère de l’obsolescence technologique.” *Technè*, no. 37. Paris: RMN.
- “Centre national de ressources textuelles et lexicales.” 2019. <https://www.cnrtl.fr/>.
- Cometti, Jean-Pierre. 2008. “Analyse et ontologie : remarques sur l’identité des oeuvres d’art.” *Rivista di estetica*, no. 38 (June): 47–54.
- Cometti, Jean-Pierre. 2009. *La force d’un malentendu: essais sur l’art et la philosophie de l’art, preface Olivier Quintyn*. Collection Saggio Casino. Paris: Questions théoriques. <http://tocs.kubikat.org/rco/b00/356/b00356505m-toc.pdf>.
- D’haenens, Manon, and Muriel Verbeeck. 2018. Autour de Nicolas Schöffer, conserver/restaurer des œuvres à caractère technologique – Four Study Days in Conservation. *CeROArt*, HS.