

# In the Margins: An Empirical Study of Ethereum Inscriptions

Xihan Xiong<sup>1</sup>, Minfeng Qi<sup>2</sup>, Shiping Chen<sup>5</sup>, Guangsheng Yu<sup>3</sup>, Zhipeng Wang<sup>4</sup>, Qin Wang<sup>3,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Imperial College London | <sup>2</sup>City University of Macau | <sup>3</sup>University of Technology Sydney

<sup>4</sup>The University of Manchester | <sup>5</sup>CSIRO Data61

**Abstract**—Ethereum Inscriptions (Ethscriptions) repurpose Ethereum calldata into a persistent inscription channel by embedding `data: URI` payloads. These transactions typically target externally owned accounts, allowing the payload to bypass EVM execution while remaining permanently replicated across full nodes. Although calldata was originally designed for compact smart-contract parameters, this repurposing enables structured data embedding with long-term storage consequences.

We present the first large-scale empirical study of Ethscriptions, treating them as a distinct *calldata-resident workload* rather than merely a subset of general calldata usage. Our analysis focuses on the *Ethscription* operational subset, which consists of payloads that decode to JSON and conform to a token-operation grammar (e.g., `p`, `op`, `tick`, `amt`). From 6.27 million Ethscription candidates ( $U_1$ ), we extract 4.75 million Ethscription operations ( $U_2$ , 75.8% of  $U_1$ ). This result shows that structured token-like activity dominates the ecosystem. Our measurements further reveal (i) a complete workload lifecycle compressed into nine months (bootstrap, expansion, saturation), (ii) proliferation of 30+ competing protocols without convergence toward a dominant standard, (iii) a lifecycle funnel exhibiting  $201\times$  deploy-to-mint amplification and a  $57.6:1$  mint-to-transfer collapse indicative of speculative minting, (iv) extreme participation inequality (Gini 0.86), and (v) a measurable permanent data footprint imposed on the Ethereum network.

**Index Terms**—Blockchain, Ethereum, Inscriptions, Ethscriptions, Calldata, Empirical measurement, JSON token protocols

## I. INTRODUCTION

Ethereum calldata was designed as an input field for smart-contract execution. It carries function selectors and ABI-encoded parameters that the EVM reads during transaction processing [1], [2]. Accordingly, the gas pricing model and execution semantics treat calldata as transient execution input intended to support computation rather than long-term data storage. In practice, however, permissionless blockchain systems allow users to repurpose protocol mechanisms beyond their original design assumptions. Ethscriptions [3], introduced in June 2023, follow this pattern by embedding `data: URI` payloads in calldata, thereby using an execution input field as an inscription channel. These transactions typically target externally-owned accounts (EOAs), so the EVM does not interpret the payload, while the data still becomes part of the permanent blockchain record. In effect, calldata is used as replicated storage, with its contents retained by all full nodes.

This practice leads to a class of transactions whose primary goal is durable data embedding rather than computation or value transfer. We call this a *payload-resident workload*.




Fig. 1: Processing pipeline and dataset hierarchy. Raw Ethereum transactions ( $U_0$ ) are filtered by `data:prefix` to yield Ethscription candidates ( $U_1 = 6.27M$ ). MIME classification establishes composition context. JSON validation and grammar parsing extract the primary analysis set ( $U_2 = 4.75M$ , 75.8% of  $U_1$ ). All core measurements are computed on  $U_2$ .

The idea is conceptually similar to Bitcoin Ordinals [4] and BRC-20 [5], which attach data to witness fields, but Ethscriptions rely on Ethereum calldata and therefore have different economic and architectural implications. Calldata fees are set to reflect execution bandwidth rather than long-term archival cost, yet inscription payloads impose permanent storage burden shared by the network. This disconnect turns an individual transaction choice into a network-wide externality, and it raises systems questions about pricing, incentives for storage, and protocol-level resource allocation.

Despite rapid adoption, Ethscriptions are not well characterized from a measurement standpoint. Public discussions are often anecdotal or market-driven, and prior measurement work typically treats calldata as a single category, mixing rollup data availability, contract inputs, and arbitrary payload embedding [1]. Without separating inscription workloads from other uses, it is difficult to analyze their dynamics, participation structure, or long-run infrastructure impact. We therefore study Ethscriptions as a distinct, measurable system phenomenon.

This paper is **not** a study of general Ethereum calldata usage. We exclude rollup data availability workloads, ABI-encoded contract inputs, and other calldata-heavy applications. Instead, we define a precise workload boundary using the `data: URI` prefix and analyze only Ethscription candidates. Within this boundary, Ethscriptions are operationally identified by structured JSON payloads that encode token-like

actions interpreted by off-chain indexers. A small fraction of `data:-`prefixed transactions contains media or free-form content; we treat these as ecosystem context rather than part of the operational workload. Accordingly, our main analysis focuses on transactions whose payloads satisfy the Ethscription operation grammar, while non-operational payloads are reported only to describe overall composition. All statistics explicitly distinguish scope:  $U_1$  denotes all `data:-`prefixed candidates, and  $U_2$  denotes the subset that conforms to the operational grammar used by indexers. This distinction reflects measurement scope rather than a different protocol category.

Beyond the workload itself, Ethscriptions highlight a broader architectural pattern. Consensus provides data availability and ordering, while semantic meaning is assigned by off-chain indexers that reconstruct state by parsing and interpreting payloads. The resulting semantic layer is software-defined: correctness depends on indexer behavior rather than protocol enforcement. This motivates a measurement-first study that begins with what is being submitted on-chain.

We pose five progressive research questions (RQs):

- **RQ0:** What is an Ethscription at the transaction/payload level, and what is the Ethscription operation grammar?
- **RQ1:** How does the Ethscription workload evolve over time (volume, phases, payload sizes)?
- **RQ2:** What protocol identifiers and operation pipelines emerge from Ethscription payloads, and what are their lifecycle conversion properties?
- **RQ3:** Who generates the Ethscription workload, and what persistent data footprint does it impose on the network?
- **RQ4:** What design lessons follow for calldata pricing, data-channel separation, and indexer-defined semantics?

**Contributions.** This paper makes four contributions:

- ▷ We construct a scope-precise Ethscription dataset with explicit boundaries, where  $U_1$  contains 6.27M `data:-`prefixed candidates and  $U_2$  contains 4.75M JSON operations. We further provide a fully documented parsing pipeline that derives  $U_2$  from  $U_1$ .
- ▷ We formalize the Ethscription operation grammar and introduce a normalized operation taxonomy covering more than 30 protocol identifiers and more than 20 operation types.
- ▷ We provide a comprehensive longitudinal measurement of the Ethscription workload, covering workload evolution, protocol growth, lifecycle conversion behavior, sender concentration, and persistent data footprint. All results are computed on  $U_2$  with explicit scope labeling.
- ▷ We analyze the system-level implications of Ethscriptions repurposing calldata into a permanent data channel. We focus on pricing incentives, data-channel separation, and the robustness limits of indexer-defined semantics.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews calldata economics and prior inscription designs across chains. Section III details the Ethscription transaction structure and JSON operation grammar. Section IV introduces the dataset hierarchy and measurement methodology. Section V presents the main measurement results on  $U_2$ . Section VI discusses system-level implications, Section VII outlines limitations, and Section VIII surveys related work.

## II. TECHNICAL FOUNDATIONS

### A. Calldata Persistence and Cost Model

Ethereum calldata [6], [7] is charged at 16 gas per non-zero byte and 4 gas per zero byte, in addition to the fixed base transaction cost of 21,000 gas [1]. This pricing scheme was designed for transmitting smart contract parameters, which are typically compact function calls consisting of a few hundred bytes. Unlike contract storage, which can be modified through `SSTORE` or partially reclaimed via mechanisms such as `SELFDESTRUCT`, calldata forms part of the immutable transaction payload. Once a transaction is confirmed, its calldata remains permanently stored across all full nodes [8].

As an illustration, a typical 75-byte JSON mint operation incurs roughly  $75 \times 16 \approx 1,200$  gas for calldata (assuming all bytes are non-zero as an upper bound), in addition to the 21,000 gas base transaction cost. At a gas price of 30 Gwei, the total cost is approximately  $22,200 \times 30 \text{ Gwei} \approx 6.66 \times 10^{-4}$  ETH (about \$1.3 assuming \$2,000/ETH). Because fiat exchange rates fluctuate substantially over time, we primarily report costs in gas and byte-level units throughout the paper to maintain consistency across measurements.

EIP-4844 [9] introduced “blob” transactions that provide temporary data availability with an approximately 18-day retention window. This design targets workloads that rely on calldata permanence, particularly rollup data availability. Ethscriptions differ in that they use calldata for permanent data embedding associated with token-like operations rather than temporary execution-related data.

### B. Cross-chain Inscription Mechanisms

The inscription paradigm first emerged in the Bitcoin ecosystem through Ordinals [10], [4], which associate serial numbers with individual satoshis and allow arbitrary data to be attached using Taproot witness fields [11], [12] (Table I). Because witness data is discounted relative to base transaction data, with fees reduced by approximately 75%, it became economically viable to embed application-level data directly on-chain. Building on this mechanism, BRC-20 [5] introduced a JSON-based token protocol in which deploy, mint, and transfer operations are encoded as structured payloads stored in witness data. Token balances and state transitions are not enforced by the Bitcoin protocol itself but reconstructed by off-chain indexers that interpret these payloads.

Ethscriptions [3] adopt a similar design philosophy on Ethereum but rely on calldata rather than witness data as the embedding channel. Although both approaches use transaction data as a carrier and depend on off-chain interpretation, the underlying economic and architectural assumptions differ substantially. Bitcoin inscriptions exploit discounted witness storage originally introduced for scalability improvements, whereas Ethereum calldata pricing reflects execution bandwidth rather than archival cost. As a result, inscription workloads on Ethereum inherit a persistence model that was not explicitly designed for large-scale data embedding, leading to different cost incentives and infrastructure impacts (Table I).

TABLE I: Ethscriptions (Ethereum) vs. BRC-20 (Bitcoin)

Property	Ethscriptions	BRC-20 [12]
Data field	Calldata	Witness (Taproot)
Fee model	16 gas/byte	1/4 weight discount
Smart contracts	Bypasses EVM	No smart contracts
State tracking	Off-chain indexer	Off-chain indexer
Protocol variants	30+ standards	BRC-20 dominant
Payload format	data: URI + JSON	JSON in witness
Data permanence	Permanent	Permanent

### III. TECHNICAL DISSECTION FOR ETHSCRIPTIONS

This section addresses **RQ0**: What is an Ethscription at the transaction/payload level, and what is the Ethscription operation grammar? We formalize the underlying structure and operational semantics that form the foundation of our analysis.

#### A. What Is an Ethscription? ( $U_1$ Definition)

**Definition.** We define  $U_1$  as the set of transactions whose calldata begins with the `data: URI` prefix defined in RFC 2397. In practice, most Ethscriptions follow a simple pattern: a zero-value transaction sent to an EOA, often the sender itself, with the payload embedded directly in the calldata field.

Listing 1: Ethscription transaction format.

```
Tx {
  to = 0xRECIPIENT // externally-owned
    account
  value = 0 // no ether transferred
  data = 0x646174613a... // hex("data:...")
}
```

**Execution semantics and gas cost.** Because these transactions target an EOA rather than a contract account, no bytecode is executed by the EVM. The gas cost therefore consists of the base transaction cost of 21,000 gas plus the calldata charge (16 gas per non-zero byte and 4 gas per zero byte) [1]. There is no additional storage or contract execution overhead.

**Empirical patterns.** The  $U_1$  dataset exhibits several consistent behavioral patterns that distinguish inscription-style activity from ordinary transaction flows. Approximately 70.7% of transactions are self-sends (`from = to`), and 97.8% carry zero ETH value, indicating that the primary purpose is payload publication rather than asset transfer. In addition, 14.4% of transactions target the null address, suggesting that the recipient field is often incidental to the data-embedding intent. These transactions are typically minimal in value-transfer semantics but non-trivial in calldata size, reflecting their focus on byte-level data embedding under the prevailing gas model. Importantly, these properties are descriptive rather than definitional: they summarize common statistical characteristics of  $U_1$  but are not required conditions for inclusion, which is determined solely by the presence of the `data: URI` prefix in calldata.

#### B. From Ethscriptions to Ethscription ( $U_2$ Definition)

The  $U_1$  set includes a wide range of payload types embedded through the `data: URI` mechanism. These payloads span

TABLE II: Content-Type of  $U_1$  (Ethscription Candidates)

Content Type	Count	Share (%)
JSON (token protocols) $\rightarrow U_2$	4,749,698	75.8
Short text ( <code>data:, ...</code> )	683,115	10.9
Facet Protocol	449,909	7.2
Images (PNG/SVG/JPEG/GIF/WebP)	274,314	4.4
Long text ( <code>text/plain</code> )	78,911	1.3
HTML	25,768	0.4
Others	7,649	0.1
<b>Total <math>U_1</math></b>	<b>6,269,364</b>	<b>100.0</b>

images (PNG, SVG, JPEG, GIF, WebP), plain text, HTML fragments, Facet Protocol operations, and structured JSON token operations. Table II summarizes the detailed content-type distribution within  $U_1$ .

Among these categories, JSON payloads form the dominant workload. The JSON subset ( $U_2$ ) accounts for 75.8% of all Ethscription transactions, indicating that most activity is associated with structured token operations rather than media-style inscriptions. For this reason, our measurement study focuses primarily on  $U_2$ . Non-JSON inscriptions ( $U_1 \setminus U_2$ ) are excluded from the main analyses and are considered only when reporting overall ecosystem composition.

JSON payloads are particularly important because they encode structured operations such as `deploy`, `mint`, and `transfer`. These operations are interpreted by off-chain indexers, which reconstruct token balances and ownership state by parsing the payload content. In contrast to media inscriptions, whose meaning is primarily representational, JSON operations define executable protocol semantics within the indexing layer. Their compact size (with a median payload length of approximately 75 bytes) also makes individual operations inexpensive, which in turn supports high transaction volumes during minting phases.

#### C. Ethscription Operation Model

To support consistent measurement, we define an *Ethscription operation model* that specifies how JSON payloads are identified, normalized, and interpreted as operational events. The goal of this model is to connect raw calldata payloads with the structured workload analyzed throughout the paper.

1) *Operation grammar*: An Ethscription operation is encoded as a JSON object that contains at least two fields. The field `p` specifies the protocol identifier (for example `erc-20`, `ierc-20`, or `reic-20`), which we observe as lowercase alphanumeric strings that may include hyphens. The field `op` specifies the operation type, typically values such as `deploy`, `mint`, or `transfer`.

Additional attributes may appear depending on the operation. These include `tick` for the token ticker, `amt` for the operation amount (encoded either as a string or an integer), `max` for the maximum supply specified during deployment, and `lim` for the per-mint limit. Some protocols introduce extra fields, such as `pow` for proof-of-work difficulty in `ierc-pow`, together with a corresponding `nonce`.

2) *Parsing and normalization*: Because Ethscription semantics are interpreted by off-chain indexers rather than enforced by the Ethereum protocol, normalization is required before measurement. Without normalization, minor syntactic differences across payloads could produce artificial protocol variants or distort operation counts. We therefore apply a deterministic normalization pipeline. Operation names are converted to lowercase and common aliases are merged (for example `Transfer` becomes `transfer`). Numeric attributes are parsed consistently regardless of encoding, so values expressed as strings (e.g., "1000") and integers (1000) are treated identically. Leading and trailing whitespace is removed, URL-encoded payloads (such as `%7B`) are decoded prior to JSON parsing, and duplicate keys follow a last-value-wins rule.

3) *Operational lifecycle model*: After normalization, operations in  $U_2$  can be organized into a four-stage lifecycle that describes how tokens are created, distributed, and exchanged. The first stage is *deploy*, which defines a new token and specifies supply parameters such as `tick`, `max`, and `lim`. The second stage is *mint*, where participants allocate or claim token units from an existing deployment using the fields `tick` and `amt`. The third stage is *transfer*, which moves tokens between addresses and includes variants such as `transfer` and `proxy_transfer`. The final stage is *trade*, which captures marketplace interactions including operations such as `freeze_sell`, `list`, `buy`, and `sell`. This lifecycle abstraction provides the analytical basis for the conversion and funnel measurements presented in Section IV.

Listing 2: Example of deploy and mint operations.

```
// Deploy: create token with 21M supply
data:,{ "p": "erc-20", "op": "deploy",
  "tick": "eths", "max": "21000000", "lim": "1000" }

// Mint: claim 1000 units
data:,{ "p": "erc-20", "op": "mint",
  "tick": "eths", "amt": "1000" }
```

#### D. Transaction Role Patterns

Our analysis of sender–receiver relationships in  $U_1$  reveals three dominant transaction role patterns, highlighting how Ethscription transactions differ from conventional value-transfer transactions on the Ethereum blockchain.

- *Self-send* (70.7% of  $U_1$ ): Sender and receiver are identical. This represents the canonical “create” behavior, where the inscriber records a data artifact to their own address. Rather than transferring value, these transactions primarily serve as on-chain publication events, highlighting the inscription-oriented nature of the workload.
- *Peer transfer* (14.9%): Sender and receiver are distinct non-null addresses, corresponding to genuine asset or ownership movement. Compared with traditional Ethereum usage, this category forms a minority, indicating that most activity is not driven by economic exchange but by data creation.
- *Null-address send* (14.4%): Transactions targeting the zero address (`0x000...000`), largely associated with Facet

Protocol operations. These transactions function as protocol-specific signaling or state-registration mechanisms rather than user-to-user interaction.

#### E. Semantic Boundary: On-chain Payload / Off-chain Indexer

An Ethscription transaction stores only the raw payload. Token balances, ownership, and validity are derived entirely by off-chain indexers that parse payloads according to protocol specifications. This creates a fundamental semantic boundary: the on-chain layer guarantees data availability and ordering, while the off-chain layer interprets meaning. This role separation leads to several practical implications:

- *Parser divergence*: Different indexers may interpret edge cases differently, leading to inconsistent state views.
- *Spec drift*: Protocol specifications can change, retroactively altering the interpretation of historical payloads.
- *No on-chain enforcement*: Invalid operations (minting beyond supply limits, transferring unknown tokens) are stored on-chain but rejected by compliant indexers.

#### F. Non-JSON Ethscriptions ( $U_1 \setminus U_2$ ) as Out-of-Scope

Non-JSON Ethscriptions - images (PNG, SVG, JPEG, GIF, WebP), plain text, HTML, and Facet Protocol operations—collectively constitute 24.2% of  $U_1$ . These payloads lack the structured operation grammar that defines  $U_2$  and serve different purposes: media inscriptions embed cultural artifacts, while Facet operations encode a distinct smart-contract-like execution model. We report their composition shares (Table II) as context for the  $U_2$  scoping decision, but exclude them from all core analyses (temporal dynamics, protocol metrics, lifecycle funnel, concentration, and footprint). This exclusion is by design: our research questions target the JSON operational workload, not the broader media inscription phenomenon.

**Takeaway:** Ethscriptions are calldata-resident payloads identified by a `data:` URI prefix ( $U_1$ ). The dominant subset (75.8%) consists of JSON-encoded token operations ( $U_2$ ) conforming to a grammar with required fields `p` and `op`. Token semantics exist solely in off-chain indexers, not on-chain consensus.

## IV. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

### A. Dataset Hierarchy and Statistical Constraints

We emphasize that our goal is to measure Ethscriptions as a *specific calldata-resident inscription workload*, rather than to characterize Ethereum calldata usage in general. To avoid conflating Ethscriptions with arbitrary calldata-heavy transactions (e.g., contract invocations, ABI parameters, or rollup data availability payloads), we define nested datasets and report all statistics with an explicit scope label. Let  $U_0$  denote the universe of all Ethereum mainnet transactions within our observation window. We extract  $U_1$  as the set of *Ethscription candidates*, defined operationally as transactions whose calldata begins with the hexadecimal encoding of the string `data:` (i.e., prefix `0x646174613a`). From  $U_1$ , we further derive  $U_2$ , the *Ethscription set*, consisting of transactions whose decoded `data:` payload is valid JSON and conforms

to an operation grammar (e.g., containing required keys such as `p` and `op`, with optional fields such as `tick` and `amt`, plus protocol-specific extensions). Unless stated otherwise, *all workload dynamics, protocol, lifecycle, participation, and footprint analyses in this paper are computed on  $U_2$* , while  $U_1$  is used only to establish the composition boundary (e.g., the share of JSON vs. non-JSON inscriptions). This design ensures that our findings describe the Etherscription ecosystem, particularly its JSON operational substrate, without making claims about general calldata behavior.

- **$U_0$ -Ethereum transaction universe.** All Ethereum mainnet transactions in our observation window (genesis through block 19,314,267, February 26, 2024). Mentioned only for high-level context.
- **$U_1$ -Etherscription candidate set.** Transactions whose calldata begins with the hexadecimal encoding of the string `data:` (i.e., prefix `0x646174613a`). This is the operational definition of Etherscriptions used in this study.  $|U_1| = 6,269,364$ .
- **$U_2$ -Etherscription set (primary analysis set).** The subset of  $U_1$  where the decoded payload: (i) is valid JSON, and (ii) matches an Etherscription operation grammar (schema constraints: required keys `p` and `op`, with optional fields `tick`, `amt`, plus protocol-specific extensions).  $|U_2| = 4,749,698$  (75.8% of  $U_1$ ).

## B. Data Collection

We query the full Ethereum mainnet transaction history from a local archive node [13], scanning all blocks from genesis through block 19,314,267 (February 26, 2024). For each transaction whose raw input data begins with `0x646174613a`, we extract the following information: transaction hash, block number, sender address (`from`), receiver address (`to`), ETH value, block timestamp, raw calldata (hex), UTF-8 decoded payload, and input data length in bytes.

**Observation Window.** Our dataset spans March 2017 to February 2024. While the Etherscriptions protocol was formally introduced in June 2023 [3], isolated `data:`-prefixed transactions appeared as early as March 2017 (11 precursor transactions). The ecosystem became active between June 2023 and February 2024 (9 months), during which 99.99% of all  $U_1$  transactions occurred.

## C. Dataset Summary

Table III and Table IV provide scope-aware summaries.

## D. Processing Pipeline

To obtain a scope-consistent Etherscription workload, we construct a deterministic multi-stage extraction pipeline that transforms raw Ethereum transactions into the analytical dataset used throughout this study. The pipeline separates identification, validation, and analysis, ensuring that inscription activity is isolated from general calldata usage.

TABLE III: Dataset Summary:  $U_1$  (Etherscription Candidates)

Metric	Value
Total $ U_1 $	6,269,364
Active period	Jun 2023 – Feb 2024
Block range	9,046,974 – 19,314,267
Unique senders	212,039
Unique receivers	176,102
Self-send ( <code>from=to</code> )	4,435,375 (70.7%)
Null-address sends	903,621 (14.4%)
Zero-value transactions	6,130,885 (97.8%)
<i>Payload size (bytes)</i>	
Median / Mean	75 / 238
P95 / P99 / Max	419 / 2,870 / 130,935

TABLE IV: Dataset Summary:  $U_2$  (Etherscription Operations)

Metric	Value
Total $ U_2 $	4,749,698
Share of $U_1$	75.8%
Unique senders	$\leq 212,039^\dagger$
Unique receivers	$\leq 176,102^\dagger$
Distinct protocol identifiers ( <code>p</code> )	30+
Distinct operation types ( <code>op</code> )	20+
Distinct token tickers ( <code>tick</code> )	1,000+
<i>Operation breakdown (<math>U_2</math>)</i>	
mint	4,461,324 (93.9%)
deploy	22,172 (0.5%)
transfer / proxy_transfer	77,508 (1.6%)
trade (freeze_sell, list, buy, sell)	76,752 (1.6%)
other (stake, claim, etc.)	111,942 (2.4%)
<i>Payload size (bytes, JSON only)</i>	
Median	$\sim 75$
P95	$\sim 120$

<sup>†</sup>Upper bound: subset of  $U_1$  addresses; exact  $U_2$  count is a subset.

1) *Pipeline Definition:* Our analysis proceeds through four sequential stages (Figure 1):

- *Stage 0: Scan  $U_0$ .* All Ethereum mainnet transactions are scanned for inputs with prefix `0x646174613a` (the hexadecimal encoding of the `data:` URI scheme).
- *Stage1: Prefix Filter  $\rightarrow U_1$ .* Transactions matching the prefix are validated for structural consistency (block range, timestamp integrity, and address format), producing the Etherscription candidate set  $U_1$ .
- *Stage2: Decode and MIME Classification.* Payloads are decoded and classified by content type to establish the composition boundary of the workload, distinguishing JSON operational inscriptions from media or free-form payloads. No analytical metrics are computed at this stage.
- *Stage3: JSON Validation and Grammar Parsing  $\rightarrow U_2$ .* JSON payloads are validated against the operation grammar defined in §III-C. Transactions satisfying required fields (`p`, `op`) form the primary analysis set  $U_2$ .
- *Stage4: Analytics (on  $U_2$ ).* All subsequent measurements, including temporal dynamics, protocol metrics, lifecycle funnel behavior, participation concentration, and persistent footprint studies, are conducted primarily on  $U_2$ .

2) *Dataset Reduction Funnel*: The staged pipeline forms a measurable filtering funnel, summarized in Table V. Starting from the candidate set  $U_1$ , we remove non-JSON payloads to isolate operational inscriptions, producing  $U_2$ , which accounts for 75.8% of all detected inscriptions.

TABLE V: Filtering funnel from  $U_1$  to  $U_2$ .

Stage	Count	% of Prior
$U_0$ (all Ethereum txs)	—	—
$U_1$ (data: prefix)	6,269,364	—
Non-JSON excluded	1,519,666	24.2%
Images	274,314	4.4%
Short text	683,115	10.9%
Facet Protocol	449,909	7.2%
Long text	78,911	1.3%
HTML	25,768	0.4%
Other	7,649	0.1%
$U_2$ (JSON + grammar)	4,749,698	75.8%

3) *Identification Validity*: False positives are expected to be negligible because the prefix `0x646174613a` is highly specific and unlikely to collide with standard ABI encoding patterns. False negatives may arise from non-standard encodings that omit the canonical prefix; however, without external ground truth, such cases cannot be reliably enumerated. Our definition therefore prioritizes alignment with the canonical Etherscription specification rather than heuristic reconstruction.

4) *Robustness and Sensitivity Analysis*: In the following, we evaluate whether the analytical results depend on parsing assumptions or grammar strictness.

**Grammar Strictness.** Relaxing the grammar from requiring both `p` and `op` to requiring only `p` increases  $U_2$  by  $<0.1\%$ , while requiring only `op` produces a  $<0.2\%$  increase. This indicates that nearly all JSON payloads already conform to the full grammar.

**Alternative Parsing.** Using strict JSON parsing (rejecting trailing commas or single-quoted strings) versus lenient parsing changes  $U_2$  by  $<0.05\%$ , suggesting that most payloads are well-formed and likely machine-generated.

**Content-Type Classification.** Our MIME classification relies on `data: URI` headers. For shorthand payloads (`data:{...}`) without an explicit media type, classification falls back to JSON parsing. Explicit `data:application/json` headers are rare ( $<1\%$  of  $U_2$ ), indicating that most JSON payloads rely on implicit interpretation rather than explicit MIME annotation.

### E. Etherscription Grammar and Normalization

We define the Etherscription grammar as follows, based on observed transaction payloads:

Listing 3: Etherscription grammar (core fields).

```
{
  "p": <string>, // REQUIRED: protocol id
  "op": <string>, // REQUIRED: operation type
  "tick": <string>, // OPTIONAL: token ticker
  "amt": <string|number>, // OPTIONAL: amount
  ... // protocol-specific extensions
}
```

**Required Fields.** `p` (protocol identifier, e.g., `erc-20`, `ierc-20`) and `op` (operation type, e.g., `deploy`, `mint`, `transfer`).

**Optional Fields.** `tick` (token ticker symbol), `amt` (amount, encoded as string or integer), plus protocol-specific extensions (e.g., `lim`, `max` for `deploy` operations; `pow` for proof-of-work parameters in `ierc-pow`).

**Normalization.** We canonicalize operation strings (e.g., merging aliases such as `Transfer/transfer`), unify numeric representations (e.g., `amt` as string vs. integer), and normalize whitespace and encoding.

### F. Metrics and Analysis Methods

Below metrics are computed on  $U_2$  unless explicitly noted.

- *Temporal Dynamics.* We measure daily and monthly transaction volumes and segment activity into bootstrap, expansion, and saturation phases using reproducible criteria derived from growth and stabilization patterns.
- *Protocol Metrics.* We track the number of distinct `p` identifiers, their entry and exit timing, and their market-share trajectories throughout the active observation period to characterize protocol-level competition and turnover.
- *Lifecycle Funnel.* Based on the lifecycle conversion pipeline (`deploy`  $\rightarrow$  `mint`  $\rightarrow$  `transfer`  $\rightarrow$  `trade`), we quantify stage transitions, including the `deploy-to-mint` amplification and `mint-to-transfer` drop-off rates, to characterize participation dynamics.
- *Concentration.* We evaluate ecosystem concentration using the Gini coefficient over sender transaction-count distributions, complemented by Lorenz curves and Top-N concentration ratios. Sender and receiver concentration are computed on  $U_1$  (all Etherscriptions) to capture structural ecosystem properties, while  $U_2$ -specific sender concentration is additionally reported where relevant.
- *Persistent Footprint.* We quantify the total calldata bytes attributable to  $U_2$  and measure its proportional footprint within the broader  $U_1$  calldata usage.

## V. MEASUREMENT RESULTS

We present our measurement results in this section. Specifically, we report only aggregate data statistics and do not link addresses to real-world identities.

All measurements in this section are computed on  $U_2$  (Etherscription,  $n = 4,749,698$ ) unless explicitly noted otherwise. Section Section V is measurement-only; interpretation and “why” analysis are deferred to Section VI.

### A. Scope Establishment: Composition and Filtering Results

We first quantify the scope of our measured workload to prevent conflating Etherscriptions with general calldata usage. Starting from the Ethereum transaction universe  $U_0$ , we extract the Etherscription candidate set  $U_1$  by identifying transactions whose calldata begins with the `data: URI` prefix. We then classify decoded `data:` payloads by content type (Table II) and observe that a substantial fraction of  $U_1$  consists of JSON-formatted payloads. Since the operational

ecosystem of interest is driven by structured operations, we further restrict to the Ethscription set  $\mathbf{U}_2$ , retaining only those  $\mathbf{U}_1$  transactions whose payload is valid JSON and matches our operation grammar (e.g., required keys  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{op}$ , with optional fields such as  $\mathfrak{tick}$  and  $\mathfrak{amt}$ ). We report (i) the composition ratio  $|\mathbf{U}_2|/|\mathbf{U}_1|$ , establishing the dominance of JSON operations within Ethscriptions, and (ii) a breakdown of exclusion reasons when constructing  $\mathbf{U}_2$  from  $\mathbf{U}_1$  (non-JSON media inscriptions; malformed or undecodable payloads; JSON that fails grammar constraints).

**Composition Ratio.**  $|\mathbf{U}_2|/|\mathbf{U}_1| = 4,749,698/6,269,364 = 75.8\%$ , confirming JSON operational dominance.

**Exclusion Breakdown ( $\mathbf{U}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_2$ ).** We exclude payloads that fail grammar constraints or are non-JSON. Non-JSON payloads dominate the exclusions (24.2% of  $\mathbf{U}_1$ ), including short text (10.9%), Facet Protocol (7.2%), images (4.4%), long text (1.3%), HTML (0.4%), and others (0.1%). Malformed/undecodable payloads and JSON missing required fields (e.g.,  $\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{op}$ ) each account for  $<0.1\%$ .

The resulting  $\mathbf{U}_2$  retains 75.8% of  $\mathbf{U}_1$ .

## B. RQ1 — Workload Dynamics of Ethscription ( $\mathbf{U}_2$ )

1) *Longitudinal Timeline ( $\mathbf{U}_2$ ):* Figure 2 shows the overall transaction volume of  $\mathbf{U}_2$ , while Figure 2(b) provides a zoomed-in view of the active period, where a clear three-phase lifecycle becomes apparent:

- *Phase-1: Bootstrap* (Jun–Jul 2023). The protocol launches on June 17, 2023. JSON operations emerge immediately with image and text inscriptions. The  $\mathbf{U}_2$  volume is moderate, primarily driven by early-adopter experimentation.
- *Phase-2: Expansion* (Aug–Oct 2023). JSON operations rapidly come to dominate the ecosystem.  $\mathbf{U}_2$  monthly volume peaks at  $\sim 434\text{K}$  in August as the `erc-20` protocol triggers large-scale minting activity, and subsequently oscillates as successive protocol variants enter and compete.
- *Phase-3: Saturation & Decline* (Nov 2023–Feb 2024). Monthly  $\mathbf{U}_2$  volume continues to escalate, exceeding 900K in November and reaching a peak in January 2024, followed by a sharp decline in February ( $<200\text{K}$  for the partial month), indicating rapid cooling and workload saturation.

2) *Payload Size Features & Temporal Evolution ( $\mathbf{U}_2$ ):* JSON payloads are compact, with a median size of 75 bytes. This distribution is tightly concentrated because the dominant operation (mint) uses a fixed-format payload ( $\mathfrak{p}$ ,  $\mathfrak{op}$ ,  $\mathfrak{tick}$ ,  $\mathfrak{amt}$ ) with minimal variation. Deploy operations are slightly larger (median  $\sim 120$  bytes) due to additional fields such as  $\mathfrak{max}$  and  $\mathfrak{lim}$ . By contrast, while  $\mathbf{U}_1$  exhibits a heavy-tailed distribution (driven by image inscriptions up to 131 KB),  $\mathbf{U}_2$  payload sizes remain highly homogeneous.

**Temporal Evolution.** Payload sizes remain stable across the active period. The median stays within 70–80 bytes throughout all three phases, reflecting the fixed structure of mint operations that dominate  $\mathbf{U}_2$ . A slight increase in mean payload size during Phase 3 (Nov 2023–Feb 2024) corresponds to the emergence of `ierc-pow`, whose proof-of-work parameters ( $\mathfrak{pow}$ ,  $\mathfrak{nonce}$ ) add  $\sim 20$ – $40$  bytes per payload. Overall, payload size is driven by operation type rather than temporal factors.

TABLE VI: Top 15 Ethscription Protocols by Volume ( $\mathbf{U}_2$ )

Protocol ( $\mathfrak{p}$ )	Txs	%	Description
<code>erc-20</code>	3,069,682	64.6	Base standard
<code>ierc-20</code>	677,814	14.3	“Improved” variant
<code>ierc-pow</code>	321,533	6.8	PoW minting
<code>rerc-20</code>	278,744	5.9	“Recursive” variant
<code>terc-20</code>	82,780	1.7	“Typed” variant
<code>esc-20</code>	69,774	1.5	Ethscriptions-native
<code>erc-cash</code>	45,892	1.0	Cash-like transfers
<code>brc-20</code>	23,416	0.5	BRC-20 naming port
<code>asc-20</code>	18,821	0.4	Arbitrum name port
<code>oft-20</code>	12,703	0.3	“Open Fair Token”
<code>ebrc-20</code>	8,128	0.2	ETH-BRC hybrid
<code>grc-20</code>	4,333	0.1	Generic variant
<code>bsc-20</code>	4,297	0.1	BSC naming port
<code>src-20</code>	4,088	0.1	Stacks naming port
<code>zrc-20</code>	3,716	0.1	zkSync naming port

**Takeaway:** The Ethscription workload compresses a full boom-bust cycle into 9 months, transitioning from bootstrap through expansion to saturation. Compact, homogeneous payloads (median 75 bytes) make individual operations negligibly cheap, enabling high-volume speculative minting that drives the rapid phase transitions.

## C. RQ2 — Protocol Landscape and Lifecycle ( $\mathbf{U}_2$ )

1) *Protocol Identifier Distribution:* We identify 30+ distinct protocol identifiers ( $\mathfrak{p}$  field values) in  $\mathbf{U}_2$ . Table VI presents the top 15 identifiers by transaction volume.


**Naming Convention.** While 30+ protocol identifiers exist on the Ethereum mainnet, we find that names such as `brc-20`, `asc-20`, `bsc-20` do *not* necessarily represent cross-chain activity; users on Ethereum created protocols borrowing names from other chain ecosystems. The dominant pattern is `X-20` where  $X$  varies by chain prefix.

2) *Protocol Dynamics:* Figure 3 shows monthly protocol adoption dynamics.


- `erc-20` remains the baseline protocol throughout the period, but its dominance is limited, never exceeding 77% of monthly share (October 2023 peak).
- New protocols can rapidly gain traction upon introduction. For instance, `ierc-20` emerges in November 2023 and immediately captures 28% of activity.
- This pattern repeats with later entrants: `ierc-pow` surges in January–February 2024, driven by PoW minting.
- Overall, these dynamics indicate a highly fluid ecosystem in which protocols can rise quickly but rarely sustain dominance, reflecting the low barrier to protocol creation.

Although a small number of protocols account for the majority of activity, the ecosystem still exhibits a long-tail structure (Appendix A-1). The long-tail distribution includes more than 15 additional protocol identifiers (each  $<4\text{K}$  transactions), reinforcing persistent fragmentation. No single protocol achieves network-effect dominance.

**Protocol Churn.** Over the 9-month active period, new protocol identifiers enter at a rate of about 3–4 per month. We define a protocol as *active* in a month if it appears in at least  $[T]$  transactions during that month (we use  $T = 100$  by default to filter



(a) Full timeline (log scale). 99.99% of  $U_1$  occurs in the 9-month active period.



(b) Active period: self-sends (minting) dominate throughout.

Fig. 2: Transaction volume of Ethscriptions. (a) Full timeline (log scale) showing that 99.99% of  $U_1$  occurs within a short active period. (b) Active-period view (Jun 2023–Feb 2024), highlighting three phases: bootstrap, expansion, and saturation/decline.

out one-off spam identifiers). Of the 30+ observed protocols, fewer than 10 sustain activity beyond their debut month. The monthly protocol churn rate (fraction of active protocols that are new entrants) ranges from 20% to 50%, confirming that protocol creation is low-cost and experimentation is persistent. No protocol that entered after `erc-20` (the founding standard) has displaced it from plurality position, yet `erc-20`'s monthly share fluctuates between 45% and 77%, indicating ongoing competitive pressure from successive entrants.

3) *Operation Type Distribution ( $U_2$ )*: Table VII reports the operation lifecycle distribution.

4) *Lifecycle Funnel and Conversion Efficiency*: The lifecycle funnel reveals dramatic drop-off:

$$\text{deploy} \xrightarrow{201\times} \text{mint} \xrightarrow{57.6:1} \text{transfer} \xrightarrow{\sim 1:1} \text{trade} \quad (1)$$

- **Deploy  $\rightarrow$  Mint amplification**: 22,172 deploys produce 4,461,324 mints ( $201\times$ ). Each token deployment triggers extensive minting.
- **Mint  $\rightarrow$  Transfer drop-off**: 57.6:1 ratio. The vast majority of minted tokens are never transferred.
- **Transfer  $\rightarrow$  Trade**:  $\sim 1:1$  ratio. Among tokens that move, roughly equal numbers enter marketplace operations.

5) *Token Ticker Surface ( $U_2$ )*: Table VIII presents the top tokens. The leading token `nodes` accounts for 22.8% of  $U_2$ . Token names span functional references (`rETH`, `powETH`, `etfDay`) and meme-culture signaling (`pepe`, `dumb`, `Troll`).

**Takeaway:** Zero-cost protocol creation leads to persistent fragmentation: over 30 competing p-identifiers emerge without convergence. The lifecycle funnel ( $201\times$  deploy-to-mint amplification; 57.6:1 mint-to-transfer drop-off) further shows that most minted tokens are never transferred or traded, indicating predominantly speculative minting.

#### D. RQ3 — Participation Structure and Footprint

1) *Sender/Receiver Concentration*: The ecosystem exhibits extreme address concentration. Figure 5 presents Lorenz curves and Top-N analysis.

**Sender Concentration ( $U_1$ )**. The Gini coefficient for sender activity across all Ethscriptions is 0.858. The top 1,000 senders (0.5% of 212,039 unique senders) account for 34.1% of all

$U_1$  transactions. In addition, the single most active sender generated 66,130 transactions (1.06%), indicating a highly concentrated participation structure.

**Receiver Concentration ( $U_1$ )**. The Gini coefficient for receiver activity is 0.900. The null address alone received 903,621 transactions (14.4% of  $U_1$ ), and the Facet Protocol contract address received 445,317 (7.1%).

**Note on Scope**. Concentration metrics are computed on  $U_1$  because address activity spans both JSON and non-JSON inscriptions, and the structural inequality characterizes participation in the broader Ethscription ecosystem. Since  $U_2$  constitutes 75.8% of  $U_1$  and JSON minting is the dominant operation, the sender concentration within  $U_2$  is expected to be comparable or higher (mint-heavy users dominate both sets). We flag this explicitly as a scope caveat (Section VII).

The power-law distribution indicates that a small fraction of addresses generates a disproportionate share of both transactions and the resulting storage externality.

2) *Concentration within  $U_2$  (JSON-only)*: To match our scope discipline, we also compute concentration on the primary analysis set  $U_2$ . Let  $c(a)$  denote the number of  $U_2$  transactions sent by address  $a$ . We compute the sender Gini coefficient over the multiset  $\{c(a)\}$  as well as Top- $N$  shares.

**Sender Concentration ( $U_2$ )**. The sender Gini coefficient within  $U_2$  is expected to be comparable to or slightly higher than the  $U_1$  value (Gini = 0.858), since JSON minting dominates activity and heavy-volume inscribers appear in both sets.

The top 1,000 senders account for 34.1% of all Ethscription transactions in  $U_1$ , and the dominance of mint-heavy activity suggests a comparable within  $U_2$ .

**Scope Note**. We retain  $U_1$ -level receiver concentration for the null address and Facet-related endpoints as a characterization

TABLE VII: Operations: Volumes and Funnel Ratios ( $U_2$ )

Stage	Operations	Count	Share
Deploy	deploy	22,172	0.5%
Mint	mint	4,461,324	93.9%
Transfer	transfer, proxy_transfer	77,508	1.6%
Trade	freeze_sell, list, buy, sell	76,752	1.6%
Other	stake, claim, pack, etc.	111,942	2.4%



responsible for an estimated  $\sim 1.8$  GB of the 5.3 GB permanent footprint. In the extreme tail, the single most active sender (66,130 transactions) contributes approximately 5 MB of permanent calldata, replicated across every full node indefinitely. This inequality of *footprint generation* (not just transaction counts) sharpens the externality argument: a small number of addresses impose disproportionate permanent storage costs on the entire network.

5) *Role Mix Over Time*: Self-send transactions (the canonical minting pattern) dominate throughout the active period, consistently comprising  $>65\%$  of monthly volume. Peer transfers remain a small fraction ( $<5\%$ ), confirming that the  $U_2$  workload is overwhelmingly *creation-oriented* rather than *transfer-oriented*.

**Takeaway:** Extreme sender concentration (Gini 0.858) means a small fraction of addresses generates a disproportionate share of both transactions and the resulting 5.3 GB permanent storage burden. Each inscriber pays a one-time gas fee that does not reflect the ongoing replication cost across every full node.

## VI. DISCUSSION: SYSTEM IMPLICATIONS

This section addresses **RQ4**: What design implications follow from the measured Etherscription workload?

### A. Persistent Footprint: What $U_2$ Adds to Chain History

The 5.3 GB of permanent calldata contributed by  $U_1$  (with  $U_2$  comprising 75.8% of transactions) represents replicated history growth borne by every full node. Each inscriber pays a one-time gas fee that does not reflect the ongoing externality of permanent storage across the global node network. This is a direct instantiation of the tragedy of the commons [14], [15]: private benefit (permanent data storage) with distributed cost (node storage burden).


### B. Pricing vs. Permanence

Calldata pricing (16 gas per non-zero byte) was calibrated for transient parameters, not permanent data embedding [1]. Etherscription workload exposes a fundamental mismatch: the pricing model treats calldata as ephemeral execution input, yet the storage model makes it permanent. Design implications:


- *Explicit transient channels*: EIP-4844 [9] blob storage (18-day expiry) addresses this for rollup DA workloads. Similar separation is needed for other data-intensive use cases.
- *Archival-burden pricing*: Pricing that reflects permanent replication cost would reduce the economic incentive for bulk calldata embedding.
- *Execution vs. embedding separation*: Protocol-level distinction between calldata for execution inputs and calldata for permanent data embedding.

### C. Indexer-Defined Semantics as a Software Layer

The Etherscription ecosystem relies on off-chain indexers to derive token state from on-chain payloads (Section III-E). This creates robustness risks:



(a) Lorenz curve for sender activity (Gini = 0.858,  $U_1$ ), zoomed to top 5%.



(b) Top-N concentration: top 1K senders (0.5%) produce 34.1% of transactions ( $U_1$ ).

Fig. 5: Address concentration in  $U_1$ . (a) Lorenz curve showing strong inequality in sender activity (Gini = 0.858). (b) Top-N concentration, illustrating that a small fraction of addresses generates a large share of transactions.

- *Parser divergence*: Multiple indexer implementations may disagree on edge cases, leading to inconsistent balances across platforms.
- *Spec drift*: Protocol specification changes can retroactively alter historical state interpretation.
- *Replay/fork handling*: Chain reorganizations require indexers to re-derive state, with no guarantee of consistency.

**Empirical Evidence: Grammar-Rejected and Ambiguous Payloads.** Although  $U_2$  enforces a minimal grammar requiring the `p` and `op` fields, inspection of JSON-decoded payloads in  $U_1$  reveals several classes of syntactically valid but semantically ambiguous submissions. These include: (i) payloads missing required operational fields, (ii) objects containing duplicated or conflicting keys (e.g., repeated `amt` or `tick`), and (iii) numeric parameters encoded inconsistently (string vs. integer representations or leading-zero formats). Such cases constitute less than 0.1% of  $U_1$ , yet they are precisely the

situations in which indexer implementations must apply local normalization or rejection policies. Representative patterns and normalization rules are summarized in Appendix A-2.

For measurement, this means observable on-chain operations ( $U_2$  payloads) may not perfectly reflect semantic truth (what indexers actually accept). Our analysis measures the *submitted* workload, not the *validated* workload.

#### D. Protocol Fragmentation Under Low Coordination Cost

The 30+ protocol identifiers (Table VI) with no convergence toward a single standard provide empirical evidence of fragmentation dynamics in permissionless environments. Unlike contract-based standards (e.g., ERC-20 [16]) where composability incentivizes convergence, inscription protocols have zero enforcement overhead: any participant can define a new  $\mathfrak{p}$  value. The result is persistent churn and non-convergence, where each new variant captures attention without bearing coordination costs.

This contrasts technically with smart contract standards, where on-chain enforcement (interface compliance, composability with DeFi protocols [17], [18]) creates network effects that reward standardization. The Ethscription ecosystem lacks these forcing functions.

#### E. Practical Takeaways

**For Protocol Designers.** The Ethscription workload demonstrates that any permanent, underpriced data field will be exploited for data embedding. Future blockchain designs should separate transient execution data from permanent storage commitments with distinct pricing models.

**For the Measurement Community.** The  $U_0/U_1/U_2$  hierarchy illustrates the importance of explicit workload identification in blockchain measurement. Conflating Ethscriptions with general calldata (or conflating JSON operations with media inscriptions) produces misleading statistics. Scope-precise reporting is essential.

**Takeaway:** The Ethscription workload reveals a pricing-permanence mismatch: calldata, priced for transient execution, is used for permanent data storage at negligible cost. Protocol designers should distinguish transient execution data from permanent history growth, and measurement studies should use scope-aware datasets to avoid mixing workloads with different cost structures.

### VII. LIMITATIONS

**Prefix-Based Identification.** Our  $U_1$  definition relies on the `data:` URI prefix as the primary identification signal. Transactions using non-standard encodings, indirect embedding methods, or payload constructions that omit this prefix are excluded. While this may undercount edge-case variants, the `data:` prefix constitutes the defining convention specified by Ethscriptions [3], making our definition aligned with the intended canonical usage rather than heuristic inference.

**JSON Grammar Scope.** Our  $U_2$  grammar requires the presence of fields  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{op}$ , thereby excluding Ethscription

variants adopting alternative or experimental schemas. This choice prioritizes semantic precision over maximal coverage. Sensitivity analysis under relaxed grammar constraints shows less than 0.1% variation in  $U_2$  size, suggesting that excluded variants represent negligible ecosystem activity and do not materially affect aggregate observations.

**On-chain Only.** Our analysis considers only on-chain calldata payloads. Off-chain indexer interpretations, validated token balances, rejected operations, and marketplace-layer dynamics are intentionally excluded. As a result, our measurements characterize inscription behavior at the protocol interaction layer rather than economic outcomes or user-visible state maintained by external infrastructure.

**Concentration on  $U_1$ .** Gini coefficients and Top-N concentration analyses are computed on  $U_1$  rather than  $U_2$  alone, thereby including non-JSON transactions in concentration measurements. We state this explicitly to avoid scope ambiguity. Because  $U_2$  accounts for 75.8% of  $U_1$  and JSON minting dominates activity across both sets, the resulting concentration patterns are expected to remain structurally comparable, though minor deviations may exist at the margins.

**Partial February 2024.** Our dataset ends on February 26, 2024 (26 of 29 days). Although a declining trend is already observable, the final monthly aggregate is incomplete and may slightly underestimate total activity for the period. Interpretations involving month-level comparisons should therefore be viewed as provisional.

**Identity and Geography.** All analysis is conducted at the address level. We do not attempt to associate addresses with real-world identities, organizations, or geographic regions. Observed temporal signatures, including hourly activity patterns and lifecycle phases, are correlational signals only and should not be interpreted as demographic or geographic attribution.

**Correlation Not Causation.** Observed temporal and structural patterns reflect statistical association rather than causal inference. Our study identifies workload characteristics and ecosystem regularities but does not claim to establish causal mechanisms driving adoption or participation.

*Comparison with Related Studies* Table IX positions our work against key related studies.

### VIII. RELATED WORK

**Inscriptions and BRC-20s.** The inscription concept [10] began with Bitcoin Ordinals [4], enabling data attachment to individual satoshis via Taproot witness fields. Wang *et al.* [12] provided the first empirical analysis of BRC-20, examining the token mechanism, market performance, and user sentiment. Bertucci [19] studied the determinants and impact of Bitcoin Ordinals on transaction fees. Li *et al.* [20] presented a study of inscription protocols as Web3 asset [23] innovation. Chen *et al.* [24] examined BRC-20's impact on Bitcoin trading dynamics. Messias *et al.* [11] analyzed inscription activity across five EVM-compatible chains during a boom period, focusing on gas fee impacts. Beyond empirical studies, existing research has investigated broader dimensions of BRC-20 and inscription systems, particularly interoperability [25] and security implications [26], [27].

TABLE IX: Comparison with related studies. ✓ = full, ○ = partial, ✗ = not addressed.

Dimension	Messias [11]	Wang [12]	Bertucci [19]	Li [20]	Victor [21]	Qi [22]	Ours
Inscription-focused	✓	✓	○	✓	✗	✗	✓
Ethereum inscription ecosystem	○	✗	✗	○	✗	✗	✓
Scope-precise dataset hierarchy	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Longitudinal (>6 months)	✗	✗	○	✗	✓	✓	✓
JSON operation grammar	✗	○	✗	○	✗	✗	✓
Protocol fragmentation analysis	✗	○	✗	○	✗	✓	✓
Lifecycle funnel metrics	✗	○	✗	○	○	✗	✓
Concentration (Gini)	○	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Persistent footprint	○	✗	✓	○	✗	✗	✓
Target chain	Multi-EVM	Bitcoin	Bitcoin	Multi	Ethereum	Ethereum	Ethereum
Core analysis set	All inscr.	BRC-20	Ordinals	Survey	ERC-20	NFT EIPs	U <sub>2</sub> JSON

Our work differs in three ways: (i) we focus exclusively on Ethereum Etherscriptions rather than Bitcoin inscription activity; (ii) we provide a *scope-precise* analysis targeting the JSON operational subset; and (iii) we measure in a broad range covering workload dynamics, lifecycle mechanics, and protocol fragmentation, rather than primarily fee impacts.

**Ethereum calldata economics and data availability.** Calldata pricing in Ethereum was designed for smart contract parameters [1], [2]. Alzoubi and Mishra [8] surveyed techniques to address blockchain bloat. EIP-4844 [9] introduced blob transactions as an architectural response to calldata overuse. EIP-1559 [28] reformed the fee market. Our work provides empirical evidence of a specific calldata overuse class (inscription workloads) and quantifies its persistent footprint.

**Blockchain measurements.** Large-scale empirical blockchain studies provide methodological precedent. Ron and Shamir [29] pioneered quantitative Bitcoin transaction analysis. Meiklejohn *et al.* [30] characterized Bitcoin payment flows. Wang *et al.* [31] studied censorship behaviours for on-chain transactions. Victor and Lüders [21] measured ERC-20 token networks, finding concentration patterns. Kim *et al.* [32] measured the Ethereum P2P network. Chen *et al.* [33] surveyed Ethereum security. Wang *et al.* [34] studied Snapshot DAO governance. Our concentration and temporal analysis methods follow this tradition.

**Contract standards vs. payload protocols.** The evolution of on-chain token standards [16] provides a technical contrast to inscription protocols. Qi *et al.* [22] analyzed NFT-related EIPs, finding poor cross-version interoperability even within formal standards. Contract-based standards enforce composability through on-chain interfaces; inscription protocols have no enforcement mechanism, producing the fragmentation we observe (Section V-C2).

## IX. CONCLUSION

We present a scope-precise empirical study of Ethereum Etherscriptions, focusing on the Etherscription operational subset (U<sub>2</sub>). From 6.27M Etherscription candidates (U<sub>1</sub>), we extract 4.75M JSON-based Etherscription operations (75.8%) and analyze their workload dynamics, protocol landscape, lifecycle mechanics, participation structure, and persistent footprint.

We deliver three design messages. First, calldata pricing that does not account for permanent replication cost creates an

incentive for bulk data embedding. Protocol designers should separate transient data availability from permanent history growth. Second, the 30+ protocol variants with zero coordination overhead demonstrate that permissionless environments without enforcement mechanisms resist standardization. Third, indexer-defined semantics constitute a distinct software layer whose robustness properties (parser consistency, spec stability, fork handling) deserve first-class attention from both designers and the measurement community.

## RESPONSIBLE MEASUREMENT NOTE

All data analyzed is publicly available on the Ethereum blockchain. We report only aggregate statistics (counts, distributions, ratios, Gini coefficients). Individual addresses are referenced only in aggregate form (“top 1,000 senders”) without linking to real-world identities, organizations, or geographic locations. Our analysis does not perform off-chain enrichment (ENS resolution, exchange attribution, IP geolocation). The pipeline is deterministic: given the same archive-node data and block range, all results are exactly reproducible.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Gavin Wood. Ethereum: A secure decentralised generalised transaction ledger. <https://ethereum.github.io/yellowpaper/paper.pdf>, 2014. Ethereum Yellow Paper.
- [2] Vitalik Buterin. A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. Ethereum Whitepaper, 2014.
- [3] Tom Lehman. Introducing Etherscriptions. <https://docs.etherscriptions.com/>, 2023. Etherscriptions protocol documentation; launched June 17, 2023.
- [4] Casey Rodarmor. Ordinal theory handbook. <https://docs.ordinals.com/>, 2023. Bitcoin Ordinals protocol documentation.
- [5] domo. BRC-20 experiment. <https://domo-2.gitbook.io/brc-20-experiment/>, 2023. BRC-20 token standard specification.
- [6] Xihan Xiong, Zhipeng Wang, et al. Toxic ink on immutable paper: Content moderation for ethereum input data messages (IDMs). In *IEEE International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*, pages 1687–1696. IEEE, 2025.
- [7] Xihan Xiong, Zhipeng Wang, et al. Talking transactions: Decentralized communication through ethereum input data messages (IDMs). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24724*, 2025.
- [8] Yehia Ibrahim Alzoubi and Alok Mishra. Techniques to alleviate blockchain bloat: Potentials, challenges, and recommendations. *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, 116:109216, 2024.
- [9] Vitalik Buterin, Dankrad Feist, Diederik Loerakker, George Kadianakis, Matt Garnett, Mofi Taiwo, and Ansgar Dietrichs. EIP-4844 shard blob transactions (shard blob transactions scale data-availability of ethereum in a simple, forwards-compatible manner). Ethereum Improvement Proposals, EIP-4844, 2022. Standards Track: Core. Created 2022-02-25.
- [10] Ningran Li, Minfeng Qi, et al. Bitcoin inscriptions: Foundations and beyond. In *IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2024.

TABLE X: Representative Etherscription edge cases that can trigger indexer divergence.

Case type	Example payload pattern & (why divergence may occur)
Duplicate keys	<code>{"p": "erc-20", "op": "mint", "tick": "x", "amt": "10", "amt": "1"}</code> JSON parsers vary: last-value-wins vs. reject; affects balance outcomes.
Mixed numeric types	<code>{"p": "erc-20", "op": "mint", "tick": "x", "amt": "001"}</code> Leading zeros may be rejected by strict JSON; string-vs-int affects canonicalization.
Whitespace / encoding	<code>data:,%7B"p": "erc-20", ...%7D</code> URL-decoding rules and normalization differ; some indexers may treat as invalid.
Unknown fields	<code>{"p": "erc-20", "op": "mint", "tick": "x", "amt": "10", "foo": "bar"}</code> Spec interpretation: ignore unknown fields vs. reject to prevent spoofing.
Case sensitivity	<code>{"p": "ERC-20", "op": "Mint", ...}</code> Whether protocol/op are case-normalized impacts matching and state updates.

- [11] Johnatan Messias, Krzysztof Gogol, Maria Inés Silva, and Benjamin Livshits. The writing is on the wall: Analyzing the boom of inscriptions and its impact on EVM-compatible blockchains. In *International Conferences on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC) Workshops*, volume 15753, pages 17–31. Springer, 2025.
- [12] Qin Wang, Guangsheng Yu, and Shiping Chen. Understanding BRC-20: Hope or hype. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems (TCSS)*, 12(6):5031–5046, 2025.
- [13] Etherscan. Etherscan: The Ethereum blockchain explorer. <https://etherscan.io/>, 2026. Accessed February 2026.
- [14] Garrett Hardin. The tragedy of the commons: the population problem has no technical solution; it requires a fundamental extension in morality. *science*, 162(3859):1243–1248, 1968.
- [15] Elinor Ostrom. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [16] Fabian Vogelsteller and Vitalik Buterin. ERC-20: Token standard. Ethereum Improvement Proposals, ERC-20, 2015. Standards Track: ERC. Created 2015-11-19.
- [17] Sam M. Werner, Daniel Perez, Lewis Gudgeon, Ariah Klages-Mundt, Dominik Harz, and William J. Knottenbelt. SoK: Decentralized finance (DeFi). In *ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies (AFT)*, pages 30–46. ACM, 2022.
- [18] Erya Jiang, Bo Qin, et al. Decentralized finance (DeFi): A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05282*, 2023.
- [19] Louis Bertucci. Bitcoin ordinals: Determinants and impact on total transaction fees. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 70(Part A):102338, 2024.
- [20] Md Monjurul Karim, Qiang Qu, Yaoyi Cai, Teddy Liu, and Xingchen Meng. Bitcoin reimaged: A comprehensive study of ordinals and inscriptions protocols for Web3 asset innovation. *Blockchain: Research and Applications (BCRA)*, page 100379, 2025. Available online 8 September 2025.
- [21] Friedhelm Victor and Bianca Katharina Lüders. Measuring Ethereum-based ERC20 token networks. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 113–129. Springer, 2019.
- [22] Minfeng Qi et al. Understanding NFTs from EIP standards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.07190*, 2025.
- [23] Qin Wang, Rujia Li, Qi Wang, Shiping Chen, Mark Ryan, and Thomas Hardjono. Exploring Web3 from the view of blockchain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08821*, 2022.
- [24] Ziwei Wang, Haijun Yang, and Zhen Li. Will technological advancement affect Bitcoin trading and pricing? Evidence from BRC-20 tokens. *Global Finance Journal*, 65:101104, 2025.
- [25] Qin Wang, Guangsheng Yu, and Shiping Chen. Bridging BRC-20 to ethereum. In *IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Cryptocurrency (ICBC)*, pages 264–272. IEEE, 2024.
- [26] Minfeng Qi et al. BRC20 pinning attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11295*, 2024.
- [27] Minfeng Qi et al. Brc20 snipping attack. In *Proceedings of the ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (AsiaCCS)*, pages 923–938, 2025.
- [28] Vitalik Buterin, Eric Conner, Rick Dudley, Matthew Slipper, Ian Norden, and Abdelhamid Bakhta. EIP-1559: Fee market change for ETH 1.0 chain. Ethereum Improvement Proposals, EIP-1559, 2019. Standards Track: Core. Created 2019-04-13.
- [29] Dorit Ron and Adi Shamir. Quantitative analysis of the full Bitcoin transaction graph. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC)*, pages 6–24. Springer, 2013.
- [30] Sarah Meiklejohn, Marjori Pomarole, Grant Jordan, Kirill Levchenko, Damon McCoy, Geoffrey M. Voelker, and Stefan Savage. A fistful of Bitcoins: Characterizing payments among men with no names. In *Proceedings of the Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, pages 127–140. ACM, 2013.
- [31] Zhipeng Wang, Xihan Xiong, and William J Knottenbelt. Blockchain transaction censorship:(in) secure and (in) efficient? In *The International Conference on Mathematical Research for Blockchain Economy (MARBLE)*, pages 78–94. Springer, 2023.
- [32] Seoung Kyun Kim, Zane Ma, Siddharth Murali, Joshua Mason, Andrew Miller, and Michael Bailey. Measuring Ethereum network peers. In *Proceedings of the Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, pages 91–104. ACM, 2018.
- [33] Huashan Chen, Marcus Pendleton, Laurent Njilla, and Shouhuai Xu. A survey on Ethereum systems security: Vulnerabilities, attacks, and defenses. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 53(3):1–43, 2020.
- [34] Qin Wang, Guangsheng Yu, Yilin Sai, Caijun Sun, Lam Duc Nguyen, and Shiping Chen. Understanding DAOs: An empirical study on governance dynamics. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems (TCSS)*, 12(5):2814–2832, 2025.

## APPENDIX A EXTENDED OPERATION DETAILS

1) *Protocol Long-Tails*: Beyond the top 15 protocols reported in Table VI, the long tail includes 15+ additional protocol identifiers with fewer than 4,000 transactions each: `layer2-20` (3,705), `fair-20` (3,162), `eths` (2,906), `prc-20` (2,691), `bm-20` (2,509), `krc-20` (2,328), `eths-20` (2,227), `frc-20` (2,138), `erc20` (2,032), `base-20` (2,031), `eorc20` (1,831), `etw-20` (1,741), `derp-20` (1,592), `xrc-20` (1,569), `irc-20` (1,379).

Also, beyond the five lifecycle categories, additional operation types include: `pack` (10,136), `refund` (7,348), `stake` (6,855), `claim` (3,716), `unstake` (2,817), `bridge-recv` (2,649), `unfreeze_sell` (2,153), `reg` (1,522), `unList` (1,400), `sellAck` (113), `split` (49), `send` (43).

2) *Indexer-Semantics Edge Cases X*: Even with a minimal grammar, indexer-defined semantics can diverge on payload edge cases. We summarize representative cases that appear in  $U_1$  JSON payloads and explain why they may yield inconsistent interpretations across indexers.

These edge cases are rare but critical: because Etherscription state is off-chain, any ambiguity in parsing or normalization can lead to inconsistent token balances across platforms. This motivates treating the indexer layer as a first-class software component with its own robustness and security properties.