

On-Chain Systems and Registry — 2026

LivingMyth uses blockchain systems not as a cultural identity, but as an archival substrate.

The institution does not operate as a Web3 project, a tokenized community, or a marketplace-native literary environment. It uses on-chain systems only where they support permanence, inscription, provenance, and refusal of revision. The institution precedes the technology. The technology is selected only insofar as it can serve the archive.

Within LivingMyth, the blockchain does not function as the artwork itself. Nor does it function as speculative social infrastructure. It functions as record. More precisely, it functions as a registrarial layer through which custodial relations, canonical instances, and inscriptional permanence may be documented under conditions resistant to alteration, deletion, or interpretive drift. This distinction is essential. The manuscript remains the artifact. The inscription remains the artifact. The text remains the artifact. The blockchain records and stabilizes the conditions under which that artifact is held, witnessed, or formally inscribed. It does not replace authorship. It does not generate meaning. It does not constitute legitimacy on its own. It serves continuity.

There is also a quieter symbolic correspondence at work.

LivingMyth concerns itself with inscription, permanence, witness, irreversibility, and the preservation of artifacts beyond the volatility of ordinary cultural circulation. For that reason, certain on-chain systems do more than provide technical utility. They offer a medium whose structural properties remain unusually coherent with the work's own narrative and institutional logic. This is not treated as novelty or ideology. It is simply a rare instance in which medium and artifact remain in quiet alignment.

LivingMyth currently employs two primary on-chain environments for distinct archival functions.

I. Cardano

Cardano functions as the primary archive of record for LivingMyth's canonical literary artifacts.

It is used where continuity, long-form inscription, provenance, and low-spectacle permanence are required. Cardano supports a quieter and more structurally aligned environment for canonical issuance than most contemporary token ecosystems. It is selected not as a speculative preference, but as a registrarial medium appropriate to literary permanence.

- a canonical registry object
- a custodial certificate for a specific artifact instance
- a provenance-bearing literary inscription
- or a formal archival record tied to a bounded work

In some cases, these registrarial surfaces also remain publicly encounterable, allowing aligned readers and collectors to enter custodial relation directly through open issuance.

Cardano carries the authored canon.

II. Bitcoin

Bitcoin is used more sparingly and inscriptionally.

It is appropriate for secondary artifacts, side inscriptions, marginalia, sealed fragments, and stone-adjacent objects whose function is not narrative expansion but permanence through minimal inscription. Bitcoin is not used as a social or collector-facing environment within LivingMyth. It is used where the cultural and technical weight of inscription itself is symbolically appropriate.

Within LivingMyth, Bitcoin does not replace the canonical archive. It functions as stone.

III. Why Not Ethereum

Ethereum is not excluded for technical inadequacy.

It is excluded because its dominant cultural layer remains inseparable from circulation, visibility, creator profiles, collection pages, social signaling, engagement metrics, and marketplace-native behavior. Even immutable works, when placed inside those environments, remain atmospherically governed by discovery and performance.

LivingMyth is not structured to survive inside that atmosphere.

Its artifacts require conditions of refusal, silence, and non-participation that are difficult to preserve in systems optimized for visibility and market responsiveness. This is an architectural decision, not a technical one.

IV. Registry and Permanence

On-chain systems are used within LivingMyth because they provide a rare convergence of archival functions:

- immutability
- timestamped inscription
- provenance continuity
- transfer traceability
- and durable public record

These functions matter because LivingMyth is not simply issuing texts.

It is constructing a body of cultural artifacts intended to outlast platform volatility, social cycles, and authorial disappearance. The registry layer therefore serves as a continuity mechanism rather than a novelty mechanism.

This does not mean every artifact must be immediately or publicly minted.

Custodial recognition may precede registry activation where appropriate, and registry may follow once technical conditions are complete. The on-chain layer records the artifact relation; it does not determine whether the relation is real. Institutional recognition always precedes inscription.

V. What the On-Chain Layer Does Not Mean

The presence of blockchain infrastructure within LivingMyth should not be interpreted as:

- speculative invitation
- token utility signaling
- community governance
- access gamification
- market participation
- or technological ideology

LivingMyth does not use blockchain to create excitement.

It uses blockchain to preserve record.

In this sense, the on-chain layer should be understood not as a public-facing product surface, but as part of the institution's archival and registrarial architecture.

It exists to hold continuity where ordinary platforms fail.

That is its role.

LivingMyth

A registry of symbolic artifacts held under conditions of permanence.