MARQUISEMUSEUM
ERC-20 WHITE PAPER

Art-Backed Token Genesis, Market Architecture and Provenance, 2017-2026

Marquise Museum Archive | B1 evidence-lock layout v0.2 | 12 September 2026

Contract: 0xA4daaE9552Cd2390Ee1DcdD1a76BC8D0eeA22609

This document is a historical and technical white paper. It is not an investment memorandum, a current valuation, a promise of liquidity, an offer of equity, or a representation that historical redemption mechanics remain available in 2026.

ABSTRACT

MARQUISEMUSEUM is a fungible ERC-20 token associated with the Marquise Museum / Pimp Fashion project and issued in November 2017. The surviving record places the token after the creation of the underlying art corpus and shortly after publication of the Pimp Fashion artbook. A public project announcement dated 9 November 2017 connected the token initiative to an exhibition line that included the artbook and framed prints, using purchase and authenticity language. The historical significance of the ERC-20 is therefore best understood as an early blockchain layer attached to an already-existing art project, not as a 2017 NFT collection.

The contract address is 0xA4daaE9552Cd2390Ee1DcdD1a76BC8D0eeA22609. Surviving project and explorer records describe a 66,000-unit supply; a current secondary token registry reports 18 decimals and a total/max supply of 66,000. The exact technical role of the November 2017 contract must remain narrower than later project descriptions. Explicit book redemption is documented in a January 2018 Counterparty record, while the more developed M-I/M-II redemption-and-authenticity architecture appears across the 2018-2020 Waves and patent record. Those later mechanics are not back-projected into the original Ethereum contract.

By 2021, identifiable Pimp Fashion works were being represented as NFTs on OpenSea. That later migration creates a chronology in which art and publication came first, a fungible blockchain asset followed, redemption/authentication architecture matured across later implementations, and NFTs arrived several years afterward. In 2026 the ERC-20 remains a live transferable historical token with decentralized-market access where liquidity exists, but this paper makes no representation of present fair value, guaranteed execution, or an active redemption entitlement.

1. Object First: Pimp Fashion Before the Token

The strongest way to understand MARQUISEMUSEUM is to begin with the cultural object rather than with the token. Pimp Fashion was not created by an NFT mint. The surviving project chronology places works such as Wotan, The Morning Star and Unholy Trinity in 2015 and the principal Pimp Fashion image cycle in 2016. More importantly for independent dating, the Pimp Fashion artbook was catalogued under ISBN 978-91-983694-0-3 and published on 30 October 2017 as a 50-page English-language art publication.

That order matters. The book and exhibition products existed before the Ethereum token became part of the public record. A surviving 9 November 2017 Bitcointalk announcement connects the Marquise Museum token initiative to the Pimp Fashion exhibition line, including the artbook and framed prints, and describes purchase and authenticity functions. The token was therefore presented as an economic and provenance layer around a named cultural product rather than as an anonymous coin whose art narrative was invented later.

The Archive uses an object-first evidence hierarchy. Blockchain records are used to establish the existence and state of the token. Institutional records establish publication and formal filings. Contemporaneous forum and project records establish what the project publicly claimed or intended at a given date. Later promotional language is not allowed to migrate backward into earlier technical generations.

This evidence discipline produces a narrower but stronger historical proposition: in late 2017 a pre-existing art project acquired an Ethereum fungible-token layer with publicly described purchase/authenticity functions. It does not require the 2017 token to be called an NFT, and it does not require the later M-I/M-II state transition to have been encoded in the Ethereum contract.

1.1 Chronology boundary

The minimum defensible sequence is:

2015-2016 art corpus -> 30 Oct 2017 publication -> 9 Nov 2017 Ethereum token/public linkage -> Jan 2018 explicit book-redemption record -> 2018-2020 dual-state architecture -> 2021 NFT migration.

The ERC-20 occupies one precise place in that sequence: it is the earliest identified Ethereum blockchain asset of the project.

1.2 Why this framing is important

Calling the 2017 token an NFT would collapse fungible and non-fungible categories. Conversely, treating the token as unrelated to the art would ignore the contemporaneous public linkage to the Pimp Fashion artbook and framed prints. The historically useful classification is therefore an **art-linked fungible token / early art-backed token experiment**, with later technical generations documented separately.

2. Contract Profile and Token State

2.1 Core identifiers

Field	Evidence-locked working value	Status
Network	Ethereum	Established
Standard	ERC-20 / fungible token	Established
Contract	0xA4daaE9552Cd2390Ee1DcdD1a76BC8D0eeA22609	Established
Public issue period	November 2017	Established
Public project date	9 November 2017	Established
Supply	66,000 units	Strongly supported
Decimals	18	Current secondary-registry metadata; direct RPC recheck pending
Project-linked issuer/genesis wallet	0xC742BcE0c13E31F2BBEC650D3A26058b64038832	Project-authored record; chain relationship to be rechecked before final v1.0
Current market access	Decentralized-market route through Matcha/underlying liquidity where available	Current route exists; liquidity not guaranteed

The contract address is independently preserved in the current Marquise Museum research record and in public token registries. The supply is consistently described as 66,000 in the historical project record and current secondary metadata. The Archive does not treat a displayed AMM price as a valuation of the underlying art project.

2.2 Fixed-supply language

Later project records describe the Ethereum edition as non-reissuable and repeatedly characterize the original 66,000-token batch as intact. B1 does not elevate those later statements to a direct smart-contract audit. The current evidence lock therefore distinguishes between **supply observed/reported** and **administrative capability independently verified from contract source or RPC**.

At evidence-lock v0.1 (carried unchanged into layout v0.2), the paper can safely state that public records describe a 66,000-unit supply. It does not yet claim that no callable mint, owner, pause or administrative function can exist, because contract-source verification has not been independently completed in this batch.

2.3 Fungibility and divisibility

The ERC-20 is a fungible asset. A current secondary registry reports 18 decimals, consistent with divisibility at the token layer. This is one reason the Archive explicitly rejects the label "2017 NFT" for the contract. A fungible token can still carry historical provenance, redemption utility, economic exposure or cultural significance, but those properties do not make each unit non-fungible.

2.4 What the contract proves - and what it does not

The contract proves the existence of an Ethereum token layer in the project chronology. In combination with the 9 November 2017 public announcement, it supports a contemporaneous relationship between the token initiative and Pimp Fashion products.

It does **not** by itself prove:

- one token = one artwork;
- the later M-I/M-II lifecycle existed in the contract;
- a current legal claim on a specific artwork;
- a current redemption entitlement;
- a present fair-market valuation;
- direct technical lineage to later NFT-vault protocols.

Those distinctions are not disclaimers added after the fact; they are part of the Archive's method for keeping successive technical generations separate.

3. What "Art-Backed" Means in This Historical Record

The phrase "art-backed" requires precision because it can be read in several different ways. In the Marquise Museum record, the strongest early meaning is that the token initiative was attached to a proprietary art publication and exhibition-product line rather than to fiat currency, gold or another conventional reserve asset.

The 9 November 2017 project announcement linked the token to the Pimp Fashion artbook and framed prints through purchase and authenticity functions. On 11 January 2018, an archived Counterparty forum record made the functional relationship more concrete by describing redemption of the limited-edition Pimp Fashion artbook and preserving the historical PDF link. This is stronger evidence than a generic slogan that a coin was "backed by art," but it still does not mean that the November ERC-20 smart contract autonomously enforced every later redemption step.

3.1 Backing as product linkage, not stablecoin collateral

The project emerged during the 2017-2018 asset-backed-token boom, when many projects described backing in terms of monetary or commodity collateral. Marquise Museum used a different underlying object class: its own art publication and exhibition products. The cultural product already existed and could be independently identified.

The Archive therefore uses "art-backed" in a **historical product/provenance sense** unless a specific contractual or technical right is separately evidenced. It should not be read as a representation that a custodian currently holds a one-to-one reserve of artworks redeemable by any token holder on demand.

3.2 Purchase and authenticity

Two functions recur early in the record:

1. **Purchase/redemption:** tokens could participate in acquiring a Pimp Fashion product.
2. **Authenticity/provenance:** blockchain records were presented as part of the mechanism for validating the relationship between holder, product and project.

The later Waves M-I/M-II architecture separated those functions more explicitly into a liquid circulation layer and a persistent authenticity state. That later separation helps explain the trajectory of the project, but it should not be treated as proof that the November 2017 ERC-20 itself already contained the mature two-state mechanism.

3.3 Economic interpretation

A fungible token attached to a scarce cultural project can provide a market layer even where the token is not itself the artwork. This is the historically relevant distinction. MARQUISEMUSEUM was not a one-token-per-image NFT collection; it was a fungible economic instrument attached to an art project. Later versions experimented with redemption, retirement and persistent authenticity, and later still the artworks themselves were represented as NFTs.

4. From Ethereum Genesis to Explicit Redemption Architecture

The January 2018 Counterparty record is a key bridge because it names the Pimp Fashion artbook and describes redemption. The next major shift occurs in February 2018 when project materials begin presenting a Waves-based token system to exchanges. A surviving Binance listing application dated 18 February and a TokenMarket email dated 20 February describe a Waves-era design combining ownership authentication, digital currency and digital-asset functions.

This is evidence of **iteration**, not evidence that the November ERC-20 silently contained the same design.

4.1 Why the generations must remain separate

The 2018 Swedish patent application later formalized a state transition in which M-II was accumulated and returned to redeem a product; the liquid claim was retired, while an M-I certificate remained to support authenticity in later resale or dispute. By 2019 the M-I/M-II distinction was public on the Waves forum. By 2020 project documentation added an explicit anti-double-redemption rationale and a fractional burn formulation.

These later records show how the project attempted to solve a problem that was already visible in the 2017 purchase/authenticity language: how to combine a transferable market instrument with a persistent provenance state around a cultural object.

4.2 ERC-20 as genesis, not container

For the ERC-20 white paper, the technical conclusion is deliberately restrained:

> The November 2017 contract is the project's Ethereum genesis asset. It establishes early blockchain integration and contemporaneous art-product linkage. The mature redemption/provenance state machine belongs to later documented generations unless a direct earlier implementation can be proven.

That distinction protects both the historical value of the early token and the technical accuracy of the Archive.

4.3 Patent boundary

The Swedish filing is relevant as a later formal disclosure, but it was not granted as a patent. PRV's 2019 examination found claims 1-3 novel and industrially applicable but not inventive, with BitCar identified as closest prior art. The application was later dismissed after procedural deadlines were not met. The ERC-20 paper therefore uses the filing to document architectural evolution, not to claim a monopoly right or granted patent.

5. 2021 NFT Migration and Provenance Continuity

The later NFT collections change the object model. In 2017 the blockchain layer was fungible and attached to an art publication/exhibition line. In 2021 identifiable Pimp Fashion works began appearing in OpenSea collections as NFTs. The Archive therefore treats 2021 as the NFT boundary rather than retroactively labeling the ERC-20 as non-fungible.

5.1 Four dates, four different facts

For any individual work, the following dates must remain distinct:

- **artwork creation date** - when the image/work was made;
- **publication date** - when Pimp Fashion was issued as a book/object;
- **fungible-token date** - when the project entered token markets;
- **NFT mint date** - when an identifiable work received a later non-fungible blockchain representation.

This separation is central to provenance. It allows the later NFT to inherit contextual history from the earlier art corpus without claiming that the NFT itself existed in 2017.

5.2 Genesis-wallet continuity

Later project records identify 0xC742BcE0c13E31F2BBEC650D3A26058b64038832 as the Ethereum project/genesis wallet and describe continuity between that wallet, the original ERC-20 supply and later NFT minting. This is relevant evidence of project continuity, but B1 treats it as a project-authored chain hypothesis pending a dedicated wallet-level audit before final v1.0.

5.3 Relationship to NFT-vault logic

The mature Marquise architecture and later NFT-vault protocols share an abstract topology: a scarce cultural object, a fungible liquidity claim and a redemption/retirement event. The substrates differ. NFTX v1 began with NFTs deposited into a vault and minted fungible claims against them. Marquise began with art products and fungible tokens before the Pimp Fashion works themselves became NFTs.

The defensible language is **precursor analogue** or **independent anticipation of part of the later economic topology**, not direct invention of NFTX and not causal influence.

6. Current 2026 Status and Market Access

The ERC-20 remains a live Ethereum token at the original contract address. The current Archive plan is to expose a direct decentralized-market route through Matcha for visitors who want to buy or sell where liquidity is available. Matcha is an execution/aggregation venue; it is not the issuer and it does not convert the Archive into a custodian.

The paper deliberately separates **market access** from **market quality**. A route can exist even when depth is thin, spreads are wide or there is no executable quote at a particular size. Nothing in this white paper guarantees liquidity, price continuity or execution.

6.1 Current product status

A 2025 project update stated that the older fungible swap system was no longer an active component of the Museum's product line after OpenSea integration. In 2026 the Archive's planned ERC-20 page is therefore best understood as **historical-token market access and provenance display**, not as a revival of every historical redemption promise.

Unless a separate current redemption policy is published, this white paper should be read as documenting the token's history and present transferability only.

6.2 No valuation inference

The Archive does not treat any of the following as evidence of present fair market value:

- an AMM spot quote;
- a self-posted asking price;
- a thin-liquidity implied market capitalization;
- the 2021 appraisal;
- historical OTC proposals;
- later promotional price targets.

Those materials may be preserved as historical evidence, but they are not valuation conclusions in this paper.

6.3 Market-risk statement

Trading an old, thinly traded token can involve severe slippage, inability to exit, stale quotes, smart-contract risk, venue risk and total capital loss. Visitors must independently verify the contract address before trading. The Marquise Museum Archive is a provenance and technical-history site; it is not a broker, exchange, custodian or investment adviser.

7. Claim-Control Ledger and Evidence Status

7.1 Claims accepted for this white paper

Claim	Status
Pimp Fashion existed as an art/publication object before NFT minting	Established
MARQUISEMUSEUM ERC-20 belongs to November 2017	Established
Contract address is 0xA4...2609	Established
66,000-unit supply is part of the surviving/current record	Strongly supported
9 Nov 2017 public material links the token initiative to Pimp Fashion artbook/prints and purchase/authenticity	Established as contemporaneous project statement
Explicit Pimp Fashion book redemption is public by 11 Jan 2018	Established
The mature M-I/M-II architecture belongs to later 2018-2020 evidence	Established
Identifiable Pimp Fashion NFT migration begins in 2021	Established
Current decentralized trading route exists where liquidity is available	Supported; execution not guaranteed

7.2 Claims excluded or unresolved

Claim	Status / reason
The 2017 ERC-20 was an NFT	Rejected - fungible/divisible token
The 2017 ERC-20 already encoded the mature M-I/M-II state machine	Unresolved - do not back-project
Each ERC-20 unit represented one discrete artwork	Unsupported
Current token purchase confers equity in Marquise Museum	Not claimed
Current token purchase guarantees redemption of art/NFTs	Not claimed without a separate current policy
The Swedish filing was a granted patent	Rejected
Marquise invented NFTs or art tokenization	Rejected; prior art exists
Marquise directly influenced NFTX	Unsupported
2021 appraisal proves present value	Rejected
Current holder concentration / 100% LP allocation	Not locked in B1 - requires direct chain snapshot
Contract admin/mint/owner capabilities	Not independently locked in B1 v0.1

7.3 B1 evidence-lock conclusion

B1 supports a publication-grade historical white paper without requiring speculative claims. The strongest proposition is the chronological one: **a pre-existing art corpus and publication acquired an Ethereum fungible-token layer in 2017; explicit redemption appeared by early 2018; a more formal dual-state redemption/authenticity architecture followed; and identifiable NFT representations arrived in 2021.**

That sequence is historically substantive precisely because the paper does not collapse the generations.

References

[1] Boktugg, *Pimp Fashion*, ISBN 9789198369403, publication record dated 30 Oct 2017. https://www.boktugg.se/bok/9789198369403/

[2] MarquiseMuseum, Bitcointalk, *The Marquise Museum of Contemporary Art [MARQUISEMUSEUM ECR-20 Limited Edition]*, surviving 9 Nov 2017 post linking the token initiative to Pimp Fashion artbook/prints and purchase/authenticity functions. https://bitcointalk.org/index.php?topic=2377841.msg24268536

[3] Etherscan, MARQUISEMUSEUM token record, contract 0xA4daaE9552Cd2390Ee1DcdD1a76BC8D0eeA22609. https://etherscan.io/token/0xa4daae9552cd2390ee1dcdd1a76bc8d0eea22609

[4] Official Counterparty Forum (archived), *Ticker: MARQUIMUSEUM now in float on Counterparty platform pegged to XCP 1:1*, 11 Jan 2018; token-to-Pimp Fashion redemption procedure and historical PDF link. https://forums.counterparty.io/t/ticker-marquimuseum-now-in-float-on-counterparty-platform-pegged-to-xcp-1-1/4396

[5] Marquise Museum Archive, *Before NFT Vaults / Marquise Museum - Curatorial Research Note v1.5b*, 2026. Primary internal synthesis for evidence hierarchy, claim controls and generation boundaries.

[6] Blockspot, *Marquise Museum (MARQUISEMUSEUM)*, current secondary token metadata; contract, 66,000 supply and 18 decimals. https://blockspot.io/coin/marquise-museum/

[7] Matcha, MARQUISEMUSEUM Ethereum token route. https://matcha.xyz/tokens/ethereum/0xa4daae9552cd2390ee1dcdd1a76bc8d0eea22609

[8] Swedish Patent and Registration Office (PRV), application 1800140-4 / SE 1800140 A1, *Dualchain business method*. https://tc.prv.se/aktinsyn/servlet/singlepdf/?ansnr=18001404&lang=en&ordnr=31&sort=date

[9] PRV examination notice, 14 Mar 2019, application 1800140-4; claims 1-3 assessed novel and industrially applicable but not inventive. https://tc.prv.se/aktinsyn/servlet/singlepdf/?ansnr=18001404&lang=sv&ordnr=27&sort=

[10] PRV dismissal decision, 13 Jul 2020, application 1800140-4. https://tc.prv.se/aktinsyn/servlet/singlepdf/?ansnr=18001404&lang=sv&ordnr=34&sort=

[11] OpenSea, *Marquise $Museum's Pimp Fashion*, 2021 collection record. https://opensea.io/collection/marquise-museum-s-pimp-fashion

[12] MarquiseMuseum, Bitcointalk project thread, later public project updates including current Matcha/WX links and the 2025 statement that the fungible swap system was no longer the active product layer after OpenSea integration. https://bitcointalk.org/index.php?topic=2970288.0

Version note

v0.2 / layout-only revision of B1 evidence-lock draft. Evidence content is unchanged from v0.1. Final v1.0 should recheck the ERC-20 contract directly at RPC/source level for decimals, total supply and callable administrative/mint functions; capture a current holder/liquidity snapshot; and confirm whether any 2026 redemption policy is intentionally active. Until those checks are complete, the white paper deliberately avoids those stronger claims.