MUSEUM OF ONE

RESEARCH PAPER · SUPPLEMENT 2

Extended Case Studies and Methodological Demonstrations

Supplement 2 to Relational Archival Investigation

Dorian Vale

Museum of One

November 2026

Companion document

Four sustained case discussions examine naming, photographic repair, early documentary presentation, and changing exhibition arrangements. They develop research from two unpublished Museum of One manuscripts, with publication planned, and identify the institutional evidence directly.

Suggested citation

Vale, Dorian. 2026. *Extended Case Studies and Methodological Demonstrations*. Supplement 2 to *Relational Archival Investigation: Identity, Chronology, and Historical Judgment in Korean Experimental Art*. Museum of One.

© 2026 Dorian Vale · Museum of One

Scope and relation to the main paper

This supplement accompanies *Relational Archival Investigation: Identity, Chronology, and Historical Judgment in Korean Experimental Art*. The documentary source comparisons are preserved in Supplement 1. The following case studies develop arguments from two unpublished Museum of One manuscripts: *A History of Korean Art Through Changed Titles and Dates: The Archival Life of Names, Chronologies, and Reconstructed Works* and *When Documentation Becomes the Work: Photographs, Reperformance, and the Archival Lives of Korean Experimental Art*. Publication of both studies is planned. Their unpublished status identifies the present state of the scholarship; it does not make the historical sources on which they draw unpublished. The discussion cites the manuscripts for the development of the arguments and identifies the institutional records supporting their documentary premises. These are demonstrations developed within the same research programme, rather than independently published applications or external assessments of Relational Archival Investigation.

1. Kim Yong-Ik: a title's origin, adoption, and later explanation

The question changes when the witnesses are distinguished

The title history examined in *A History of Korean Art Through Changed Titles and Dates* offers a substantial example of a question altered through comparison. At first, the problem appears to concern the correct English wording of Kim Yong-Ik's *Flat Object* works. Was the intended expression "plain objet," or did "place objet" identify a different concern? That question becomes inadequate once the source of a wording is distinguished from the artist's subsequent use of it. An accidental expression can be accepted for a time without having been intended at its origin. A later explanation can establish how the artist remembered that acceptance without supplying the date of every earlier inscription (Vale 2026a, §3).

SeMA's portfolio description, online item 89408, records two pertinent kinds of evidence. Its account of images 17 and 18 reports Kim Yong-Ik's recollection that the intended "plain objet" became "place objet" through a typographical error, that he used the latter temporarily because its meaning seemed compatible, and that he subsequently returned to the intended expression. The same description transcribes the reverse of the photograph at image 18 as identifying a 1977 work,

100 × 300 cm, with the wording "平面 objet (Place object)." The artist's recollection and the attributed inscription therefore bear on different questions. One explains an origin and a subsequent choice; the other supplies evidence of a particular wording associated with a particular work description (SeMA, item 89408, images 17–18).

A separate record describes a certificate issued on 25 November 1978 by the *Hankook Ilbo*,

awarding Kim Yong-Ik a prize for a work named "平面 objet(평면 오브제)." This dated documentary occasion supplies another title form. It does not explain the origin of the English variant, but it prevents the inquiry from treating the artist's naming practice as though one English phrase exhausted it. The certificate's date belongs to the award; the year written on a photographic verso may belong to the work. Neither should silently become a date for the artist's recollection (SeMA, item 89335).

These descriptions make several distinctions necessary before interpretation. A catalogue date assigned to a work does not, on its own, date the act of writing on a photograph. An institution's transcription is evidence of what it reports the inscription to say, not a declaration that the present researcher has examined the original verso. The existence of differently worded titles does not

establish that they all designate one physical object. The unpublished study accordingly preserves the different dimensions and arrangements rather than assembling a single object history from a shared series title (Vale 2026a, §3).

Error and intention do not form an adequate opposition

The artist's reported recollection gives an affirmative answer, but to a more exact question than "Which title was correct?" According to that testimony, an unintended wording became a temporarily accepted designation. Its history contains both error and subsequent agency. To describe the entire episode as an intentional invention of "place" would obscure its reported origin. To dismiss every later use as meaningless because the origin was accidental would obscure the reported acceptance. Neither conclusion follows from the testimony as preserved.

RAI's contribution to this reading is to keep the object of each judgment stable. The first judgment concerns how the variant is said to have arisen. The second concerns what Kim Yong-Ik is reported to have done with it. A third would concern what another writer subsequently made of the term. That third question is not answered by either the inscription or the recollection. A history of reception would require an identifiable text that adopted the wording and an argument showing how its interpretation depended upon it.

The same distinction bears upon semantic analysis. "Place" invites questions of location, whereas the Korean title and the alternative English wording invite consideration of plane or flatness. Such differences can be discussed as possibilities of interpretation. They become evidence of an actual historical interpretation only when a particular use is located. The appropriate result is therefore neither a prohibition against reading the title nor a claim that the title itself proves a theory of site. It is an account of the conditions under which such a reading could become historically attributable.

There is a further question of the artist's authority. A retrospective recollection is indispensable evidence for the explanation reported by SeMA. It is not a surviving proof sheet showing exactly where an error entered print. Those sources could complement one another, but one cannot be substituted for the other. The account can accept the recollection as an attributed explanation while leaving the circumstances of production and transmission open.

The demonstration and its limits

The investigation thus moves from a choice between rival words to a history of naming: an intended expression, an accidental form, a reported period of acceptance, another dated documentary usage, and a later recollection. This is a positive historical articulation, even though some dates and material connections remain unresolved. The finding is not that SeMA misdescribed the work. SeMA preserves the crucial distinction; the methodological task is to retain it when writing a history from the record.

The case shows the method doing more than accumulating contradictory labels. Comparison changes the question from correctness alone to the relation between origin and adoption. It also identifies the evidence needed for a further argument about reception. A more complete account could add original printed materials, dated inscriptions, or an identified critical use. Those additions would answer specified questions rather than merely increase the number of sources.

A further distinction concerns formal retitling. Without securely matching the same individual work across the relevant descriptions, title variation within a series does not establish that a particular accessioned object was renamed. The result remains substantial without that claim: the naming history includes an acknowledged accident that the artist is reported to have made

temporarily usable. Preserving that history makes interpretation more exact, rather than simply more cautious.

2. Rim Dong Sik: the photograph as evidence of more than one act

From the represented action to the history of its image

The Rim Dong Sik material in *When Documentation Becomes the Work* shifts the problem from naming to the material character of evidence. A photograph can depict an earlier action while its present surface records subsequent interventions. The relevant question is not whether a photograph counts as documentation in general. It is which parts of its historical authority belong to the action represented, the making of the image, and the later treatment of the photographic object (Vale 2026b, "Rim Dong Sik: A Photograph That Was Worked On").

SeMA's record MA-03-00006485 identifies a photograph of *Tying Reeds and Beard* associated with Rim Dong Sik's work on Wonsando in 1988. Its description reports moisture damage and subsequent intervention by the artist with marker and oil paint to restore background features, including grass and rocks. The record gives a historical year for the photograph's subject while also describing a later material history. It does not provide an exact date for every subsequent intervention (SeMA, item 23414).

Another record, MA-02-00007550, describes a two-page document comprising black-and-white copies of photographs of *Thoughts Facing a Blade of Grass*, performed outside Hamburg in 1985. SeMA describes Rim Dong Sik's use of printing, copying, recopying, layering, and editing. This second object establishes that the use of photographic records as working material is itself documented within the archive. It is not another independent witness to the repair of MA-03-00006485; it concerns a related practice and a different documentary object (SeMA, item 24479).

The initial expectation might be that an archive photograph provides visual access to an earlier outdoor encounter. The account of repair changes that expectation. It gives the surviving image a history that cannot be exhausted by the date of the depicted action. Its present appearance is the appearance of an object that has been photographed, damaged, and worked upon. The significance of the record lies in the relation among these acts, not in discovering an additional number to place after 1988.

Neither transparent evidence nor discredited evidence

Two inadequate readings become possible if the acts are left undifferentiated. One treats every visible detail as an unchanged photographic trace of the original site. The other treats later intervention as sufficient reason to disregard the image. The evidence supports neither generalization. A repaired photograph may retain information about an action and also bear witness to how the artist sought to preserve or recover it. Its uses must be judged separately.

Suppose the inquiry concerns the exact appearance of the background at the moment of exposure. SeMA's account makes comparison with an earlier print or negative important: the present object cannot certify that every visible contour remains photographically untouched. Suppose instead that the inquiry concerns the artist's later treatment of his records. The same description provides affirmative evidence that the photographic object became a site of further artistic work. The image has not ceased to matter; the historical proposition for which it matters has changed.

This is also a question of attributed purpose. The museum describes the intervention as restoring content damaged over time. That explanation is attributed to the institution's account. It cannot infer from the materials alone that Rim Dong Sik intended to deceive a later viewer, that the

intervention made the object a different work, or that the artist understood every repair as a new autonomous artwork. Those propositions require their own evidence. A description of restoration does not itself determine the work's philosophical identity.

The reverse caution is equally important. Recognizing the intervention as artist-authorized does not make it contemporaneous with the event depicted. Authorship and chronology answer different questions. The artist may have good reasons for preserving the image in this way, while a historian still needs to know which features can support a claim about the earlier site. Respect for artistic authority and discrimination among historical acts need not conflict.

What changes in the historical account

The comparison produces an affirmative account of documentary activity. Rim Dong Sik did not merely leave records that an institution later transformed. In the sources considered here, the artist's own copying and intervention belong to the continuing life of the materials. This qualifies any account that places all interpretative change on the museum side of an otherwise passive archive. The surviving object can embody artistic work before it enters the historian's description.

The case demonstrates RAI's attention to the scope of identity. The represented action, the initial exposure, a surviving print, and a repaired print may remain connected under one title. Their connection does not make them one historical occurrence. A title can preserve continuity while an account of materials establishes change. The question is therefore what kind of continuity a particular claim requires: identity of the depicted action, continuity of a physical support, or the artist's recognition of an image as belonging to the work.

For present purposes, the source-grounded conclusion is limited but positive: SeMA describes later material intervention in a photograph associated with an earlier action. The argument developed from that description is that the current surface has more than one historical reference. No physical conservation examination, complete map of overpainting, or original-negative comparison is reported here. Those would permit finer judgments about particular details, but their absence does not erase the distinction already preserved by the source.

The unpublished study supplies the comparative argument; SeMA supplies the object-specific account of copying and repair. Keeping those contributions visible allows a reader to question the interpretation without losing sight of its evidence. It also permits a new source to change one part of the explanation without making the entire image either wholly reliable or wholly unusable.

3. Sung Neung Kyung: photographic presentation within the work's early history

A case that qualifies a general history of belated documentation

Sung Neung Kyung's *Reading Newspaper* supplies a different conclusion in *When Documentation Becomes the Work*. Here the principal question is when photographic presentation entered the work's public history. The surviving record can test the assumption that photographs became substitutes for live events only through much later collecting or retrospective display (Vale 2026b, "Sung Neung Kyung: The Document Was Already on Display").

MMCA's description identifies a first performance on 4 April 1976 at *Four-Person Event* and a further performance on 3 July at *Event Logical*. It then identifies a photographic panel shown at the Fourth Independents Exhibition in the same year and states that the museum holds this panel. The collection record, management number 08033, lists twelve photographic elements. The source

consequently distinguishes live occasions from a photographic presentation within the work's early exhibition history (MMCA, record 8194).

The historical conclusion is more precise than the proposition that documentation eventually became art. On the institution's account, photographic presentation already formed part of the work's circulation in 1976. That account provides a counterexample to the universal claim that exhibiting the record in place of the event was necessarily a much later museum invention. It does not establish that every Korean performance photograph had this status, or that the artist regarded every record as an autonomous work.

What the dates permit—and what the photographs do not yet establish

The dates identify different occasions under a related title. They permit the historian to distinguish performance from presentation through photographs without breaking the connection between them. The panel can belong to the work's early public history while offering an encounter different from the duration of reading and cutting a newspaper. Historical continuity does not require the forms of encounter to be identical.

Several further conclusions would outrun the record. The statement that a photographic panel was exhibited in 1976 does not identify, by itself, which performance supplied every photograph. A panel may contain images of one occasion, more than one occasion, or a separately arranged photographic session. That question requires identification of the images and their origins. Likewise, a historical date assigned to the work should not automatically certify the manufacture date of every surviving print. That would require material or documentary evidence specific to the objects.

The comparison therefore yields both a firm chronological result and a more exact subject for further inquiry. A photographic presentation is reported within the year of the live performances. The relation between individual exposures and those occasions remains a separate question. The historian can recognize the early public status of the panel without inventing a complete photographic sequence.

This distinction matters to interpretation. An account of a work that makes selection and deletion perceptible through action must also ask what a photographic arrangement preserves, abbreviates, or changes. That question is not answered by declaring the image either a transparent record or an inadequate substitute. It requires attention to the presentation actually described. The historical account gives the interpreter a more particular object: a photographic panel shown at a specified exhibition, rather than an abstract category of documentation.

Why this belongs beside the Rim Dong Sik case

These two cases should not be treated as repeated confirmation of a single process. Rim Dong Sik's photograph raises the material history of an image after an action. Sung Neung Kyung's panel raises the public status of photographic presentation within an early exhibition history. The first concerns later intervention in a photographic object; the second concerns the timing and form of its display. Their shared relevance is that the record has a history of its own, but the evidence supporting each history is different.

The comparison makes a stronger argument than either a general celebration or a general suspicion of archives. Institutional descriptions can preserve distinctions that the historian needs. The methodological obligation is to carry them into the interpretation rather than reduce them to a single title and year. A finding can therefore arise from a further comparison of publicly available

descriptions without claiming that the descriptions were erroneous or that their contents were previously unknown.

4. The same work is not necessarily the same exhibition arrangement

Kim Youngjin's *1978–2*, already included in the seven-entry acquisition comparison, gives an especially economical demonstration of the same obligation. MMCA's description states that twelve recorded bodily actions were first presented on one monitor because equipment was limited, while the 2016 Busan Biennale presentation used twelve monitors. Its present entry identifies a twelve-channel installation under the historical year 1978. The annual report also lists twelve monitors beneath that year (MMCA, record 7928; MMCA, *2016 Annual Report*, 40, entry 79).

Each element can be accurately transcribed and still support an inaccurate sentence if its reference changes. "The work dates from 1978" and "the installation uses twelve monitors" do not, without further evidence, establish "twelve monitors were used in 1978." The inference combines a historical identity with a later arrangement. Here the fuller institutional account supplies the missing distinction, rather than leaving the explanation wholly open.

The comparison shows how a conclusion can become unsound without a false title, a mistranscribed year, or an incorrectly counted component. The defect lies in making the accurate details refer to one occasion when the source assigns them to different presentations. RAI directs the examination to that conjunction.

The difference also has a reasoned consequence for exhibition history. One monitor and twelve monitors provide different possibilities for arranging recorded actions. The source establishes the reported distinction in equipment; it does not, by itself, establish the duration of each visitor's attention, the precise order of playback, or the spatial experience of every installation. Those questions can be investigated without treating the current physical arrangement as evidence that answers them for the earlier occasion.

5. How these demonstrations bear on the methodological argument

The contribution of the expanded case discussion is comparative precision, not an enlarged count of successes. Kim Yong-Ik's title history distinguishes an expression's accidental origin from its subsequent adoption. Rim Dong Sik's photographic record distinguishes a represented action from later material intervention. Sung Neung Kyung's exhibition history places photographic presentation within the work's early circulation. Kim Youngjin's work distinguishes an accepted historical identity from the arrangement of a particular display. Each comparison answers a different question about the relationship between a record and what a historian concludes through it.

The cases also show why "unresolved" cannot describe an entire investigation indiscriminately. The exact date of a repair may be unknown while the institution's account of intervention is explicit. The individual photographs in a panel may require further identification while the photographic form of a recorded exhibition is established. The full history of a title's circulation may remain open while an artist's attributed recollection supplies a particular explanation of its adoption. A methodologically exact conclusion preserves the affirmative finding and identifies the further proposition for which the evidence is insufficient.

These examples form a distinct, deliberately selected comparative discussion. They are separate from the seven consecutive MMCA acquisitions. They were sought because they develop particular historical difficulties, and that reason for selection should remain visible. Their value is the depth

and differentiation of the argument, not a claim to represent how often these difficulties occur across Korean museums.

The use of unpublished investigations here does not require the reader to await their publication. The decisive source relationships and reasoning are presented within this discussion, with direct institutional references. The unpublished manuscripts remain attributable contributions to the development of that argument. They are not additional independent witnesses to the events described by the museum records they cite.

6. Post-Interpretive Criticism and the limits of historical warrant

These cases give a particular historical form to a concern of Post-Interpretive Criticism: an interpretation should remain answerable for what it claims to settle (Vale 2025). The connection does not make factual verification an exhaustive account of aesthetic or ethical responsibility. It identifies one obligation when criticism makes historical assertions.

An unintended title can acquire meaning through later acceptance; a repaired photograph can retain artistic force; a photographic panel can offer an encounter that is not reducible to witnessing the earlier action. None of those possibilities settles the date or source of a particular historical claim. Conversely, establishing the date of a panel or the material history of a print does not determine the entirety of its meaning. RAI concerns the grounds on which the historical assertion stands; PIC addresses a wider question about the authority and consequences of interpretation.

The distinction is productive rather than restrictive. It permits a critic to discuss the significance of an image without misrepresenting it as untouched evidence, and to consider a title's possibilities without turning an attributed recollection into contemporary proof. It also gives due credit to the institutions whose descriptions make those histories available. The result is neither an unmediated archive nor a prohibition against interpretation, but an account in which evidence and interpretation remain related without becoming interchangeable.

Source note

The historical readings distinguish institutional descriptions and attributed transcriptions from inspection of physical works or original inscriptions. SeMA's account of the title variant is retrospective testimony as reported by the institution; its account of photographic repair is not a conservation examination undertaken for this paper. MMCA's narrative of early photographic exhibition is used as an attributed historical account.

The four cases are deliberately selected demonstrations. They are not additional members of the seven-entry acquisition comparison, except for the further discussion of Kim Youngjin's *1978–2*, which develops C-79. The same institutional statement cited in more than one paper remains one evidential source. The two underlying manuscripts are unpublished, with publication planned. No previously published RAI application, independent methodological trial, new interview, or public deposit is claimed.

The consulted online descriptions are identified by their institutional numbers and stable item pages. The documentary readings refer to 9 November 2026; that date identifies consultation, not an institutional alteration or independent web-archive capture. Public access is not treated as permission to reproduce source images.

References

National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea (MMCA). n.d. *2016 Annual Report*. Acquisition list, printed pages 39–40, entries 73–79. Reporting year: 2016.

MMCA. n.d. “1978–2,” Kim Youngjin (listed as KIM Youngjin b). Management number 07915; online record 7928. Collection description.

MMCA. n.d. “신문 읽기” (*Reading Newspaper*), Sung Neung Kyung. Management number 08033; online record 8194. First historical paragraph and object description.

Seoul Museum of Art Archives (SeMA). n.d. “1970년대부터 1980년대 작품 사진 포트폴리오” (Photographic Portfolio of Works from the 1970s and 1980s), Kim Yong-Ik. MA-05-00049360; online item 89408. Descriptions of images 17–18, including attributed recollection and verso transcription.

SeMA. n.d. “1978년 제5회 한국미술대상전 우수프론티어상장” (Fifth Korean Art Grand Prize: Outstanding Frontier Award Certificate). MA-05-00049287; online item 89335. Documentary date: 25 November 1978.

SeMA. n.d. “1988년 서해안 원산도에서의 〈갈대와 수염 묶기〉 사진” (Photograph of *Tying Reeds and Beard* on Wonsando, 1988), Rim Dong Sik. MA-03-00006485; online item 23414. Description of damage and later intervention.

SeMA. n.d. “1985년 〈풀잎과 마주한 생각〉 문서” (Document for *Thoughts Facing a Blade of Grass*, 1985), Rim Dong Sik. MA-02-00007550; online item 24479. Description of copied photographic records.

Vale, Dorian. 2025. *Interpretation at Risk: Post-Interpretive Criticism After the 20th Century*. Museum of One. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18104019.

Vale, Dorian. 2026a. *A History of Korean Art Through Changed Titles and Dates: The Archival Life of Names, Chronologies, and Reconstructed Works*. Museum of One. Unpublished manuscript; publication planned. Especially the section on Kim Yong-Ik.

Vale, Dorian. 2026b. *When Documentation Becomes the Work: Photographs, Reperformance, and the Archival Lives of Korean Experimental Art*. Museum of One. Unpublished manuscript; publication planned. Especially the sections on Rim Dong Sik and Sung Neung Kyung.