The Thousandth Census: Seats Came Closer, and the One Missed Occupant Had Sat Before Seats Were Named

— of the 60 sitting sentences in Papers 944 to 999, 54 sit in a scope note within 100 numbers, and 71 claims of "no earlier occupant" contain 1 miss — the separator is whether the earlier occupant wrote its sitting with a naming word or only cited the scope note — [Paper 1000]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)
Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan
September 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

Paper 900 set the convention that naming words (sit, placed beside, seat) are used only in sentences citing an earlier scope note, and that those sentences say "scope note".This paper counts the sentences citing scope notes again in the 99 papers (901 to 999) written after that convention.No new theorem or law is claimed. First, the convention was kept——of 320 sentences citing earlier papers in scope notes, all 80 with a naming word carry the word "scope note", and none of the 240 without that word has a naming word (80 of 161 for 801 to 899) (Section 2). **Second, sentences citing scope notes became sentences that sit——of 80 candidates, 79 (0.987500) sat, and none failed to sit or failed to touch a scope note (10 of 114, 0.087719, for 801 to 899). Of the 240 citing results, 143 (0.595833) take the form "showed —; here —"** (Section 2). **Third, and this is the core. The seats taken came closer——for the 60 sitting sentences of 944 to 999, the median distance in numbers to the paper that opened the seat is 31.0; 54 (0.900000) are within 100, 39 (0.650000) sit in a paper that itself sat, and chains grew to 4 steps (median 466.5 and none within 100 for 801 to 899)** (Section 3). **Fourth, "no earlier occupant" missed one occupant——71 of the 79 sitting sentences (0.898734) say "no earlier occupant", and the only miss at the level of content is the one 915 wrote for the flattening seat of 404, where 787 had already sat (915 was unpublished and was corrected after this census). None of the 63 written for seats numbered 800 or later missed** (Section 4). **Fifth, the missed occupant had no naming word——the sentence in which 787 cites 404 carries "scope note" but no naming word, and 915 cited 787 as a result in the same scope note. Of the 3 occupants that sat before 900, only 672 has a naming word** (Section 4). **Sixth, the separator is whether the earlier occupant wrote its sitting with a naming word or only cited the scope note——from now on, before writing "no earlier occupant", read the earlier sentences that carry the number of the paper that opened the seat together with "scope note", and do not search by naming words** (Section 5). **Keywords**: census, scope note, earlier occupant, relation to earlier papers, convention, corpus metrics.

Scope of this paper (scope note): **No new theorem or law is claimed——what is counted is the corpus's own writing, and nothing is claimed about the outside world.The English versions are not counted——only the Japanese .tex files were read.The time point is fixed——the scope notes from 801 to 999 were copied and the copy was counted. The numbers move as papers are added or rewritten.Only the cutting of sentences is changed——scope notes are taken as in the previous two censuses, and when sentences are cut at full stops, full stops inside round brackets and corner quotation marks are not cut.Judgement is not left to the machine——all 80 candidates were read and sorted into the same four classes as the previous two censuses. Judgements were made by reading scope-note sentences, not the whole of each paper. The contents of scope notes taken up twice or more were decided by reading the scope notes of both the earlier and the later paper. The machine only proposed candidates, sorted naming forms, recounted the table of judgements, and counted distances and chains.The limits of the search for occupants are stated——occupants were sought in the tables of the previous two censuses and in this paper's table. A paper that took up the same content without citing the scope note cannot be found.Distance does not judge content——whether papers taking up nearby scope notes are thin was not measured.Published papers are not revised——revising published papers is not proposed, and this is stated as a convention for future writing. Only 915, which was unpublished, was corrected after this census.Mentioning a word is kept apart from naming a seat——when this paper writes "sit", "placed beside", "seat" or "no earlier occupant", it is mentioning the words being counted, not naming a seat in an earlier scope note.Relation to earlier papers**: **Paper 900 showed that one of the naming words spread outside scope notes and that what separated the judgements was the single word "scope note", and set a convention limiting the sentences that use naming words ——here the same judgement is recounted in the papers written after that convention, counting what changed once it was kept and what alone missed.Paper 800 set the convention of writing in one word how an earlier scope note is cited, and of citing papers that took up the same content earlier——here it is counted whether that check of earlier occupants held at the level of content.Paper 600 counted that a judgement word's meaning thinned, and Paper 700 that one separator in five does not work——here the single miss left under a kept convention, and where it came from, are counted.**What is added is **reading and sorting all 80 candidates**, **counting distances and chains over the three tables of judgements**, **reading the scope-note contents of the 23 papers taken up twice or more and checking "no earlier occupant" against them**, **counting whether the occupants' sentences carry naming words**, and **setting one convention for future writing**.

1. Notation and the Question

Setting: **the scope notes (the part of the body written inside a quote environment with "本稿の射程") of the Japanese versions of Papers 901 to 999 were copied and read. Among the sentences of a scope note cut at full stops, those containing an earlier paper number are called sentences citing earlier papers, and those among them containing the same candidate words as Paper 800 or a naming form are called candidates.When cutting at full stops, full stops inside round brackets and corner quotation marks are not cut.**

naming form	form in the sentence
sit	“sit in the seat”, “sit in that seat too” (その席に座る・その席にも座る)
beside	“placed beside it”, “placed beside it too” (その隣に置く・隣にも置く)
no naming	neither of the above

The judgements are the same four as in Papers 800 and 900.

judgement	meaning
sat	the later paper took up what the earlier scope note set aside
did not sit	cited what was set aside but did not take it up
not set aside	cited a scope note, but the content was “placed as known”, “standard” and the like
not touching	did not touch the earlier scope note, citing only a result

Distance and chains: **the number of a sitting sentence minus the number of the paper that opened the seat is called the distance (when two or more papers opened it, the larger number is used). When the paper that opened the seat itself sat, in the tables of Papers 800 and 900 or in this paper’s table, the number of steps that can be traced further is called the depth of the chain.A paper that sat earlier, with a smaller number, in the same content of the same earlier scope note is called an earlier occupant.**

Question: **after the convention of Paper 900, how did sentences citing scope notes change, and did “no earlier occupant” hold at the level of content?**

2. The Convention and the Judgements

Computation 2.1: **all 99 papers carry a scope note. Sentences citing earlier papers number 320 (330 if cut as in Paper 900), of which 80 (in 72 papers) are candidates.**

901 to 999	word “scope note” present	word “scope note” absent
naming word present	**80**	**0**
naming word absent	**0**	**240**

Counting 801 to 899 with the same cutting, of 191 sentences citing earlier papers, 161 lack the word “scope note”; of those, 80 carry a naming word and 79 (0.490683) contain “placed beside”.

Observation 2.2

the convention was kept.The sentences with a naming word and the candidates are exactly the same 80; the naming form is sit in 79 and beside in 1 (the sentence in which 910 cites the scope note of 01)——among the 240 without “scope note”, not a single sentence has a naming word.

Observation 2.3

three holes in the counting were closed.Cutting as in Paper 900 cuts at full stops inside round brackets and splits a sentence of 980 in two. Paper 900’s form “sit in the seat” misses the 6 sentences saying “sit in that seat too” (the second sentences of 949, 958, 971, 974, 976 and 977). Cutting inside corner quotation marks detaches the naming word of 672, which quotes the scope note of 466 before naming, from the sentence citing 466——this paper’s cutting and forms get all three right (self-tests).

Computation 2.4: the three tables of judgements were laid side by side. The tables of Papers 800 and 900 were read from their verification scripts themselves.

range	candidates	sat	did not sit	not set aside	not touching
213 to 799 (table of Paper 800)	156	82	17	2	55
801 to 899 (table of Paper 900)	114	10	15	10	79
901 to 999 (this paper)	80	79	0	1	0

Observation 2.5

sentences citing scope notes became sentences that sit.The share of candidates that sat is 0.525641 for 213 to 799, 0.087719 for 801 to 899, and 0.987500 for 901 to 999——the single “not set aside” is 910, citing what the scope note of 01 placed as known under the name of the singular isothermal sphere. “Does not sit in the seat” appears only once, in 991, and in the same sentence 991 sits in the lapse seat of 954.

Computation 2.6: papers with a sitting sentence number 9 of 99 (0.090909) for 801 to 899, 0 of 13 for 901 to 913, 18 of 30 (0.600000) for 914 to 943, and 53 of 56 (**0.946429**) for 944 to 999.The papers of 944 to 999 without one are 944, 945 and 946.

> **Observation 2.7**
>
> the fixed form for citing results was replaced.Among sentences citing earlier papers without the word “scope note”, for 801 to 899, 79 of 161 (**0.490683**) contain “placed beside” and 2 (**0.012422**) take the form “showed —; here —”. For 901 to 999, of 240, “placed beside” appears in 0 and “showed —; here —” in 143 (**0.595833**)——one fixed form disappeared and another appeared. The later form carries no naming word.

3. The Seats Taken Came Closer

Computation 3.1: sitting sentences were laid out by the distance in numbers to the paper that opened the seat.

range	sitting	median distance	min	max	within 100	opener also sat
213 to 799	82	212.0	1	566	24 (**0.292683**)	4 (0.048780)
801 to 899	10	466.5	167	527	0 (0.000000)	1 (0.100000)
901 to 943	19	98.0	40	597	10 (**0.526316**)	0 (0.000000)
944 to 999	60	31.0	2	591	54 (**0.900000**)	39 (**0.650000**)

> **Observation 3.2**
>
> this is the core. The seats taken came closer.For 944 to 999, 54 of the 60 sitting sentences (0.900000) sit in the scope note of a paper within 100 numbers, and in 39 (0.650000) that paper itself sat——for 801 to 899 none is within 100, and for 213 to 799 it is 24 (0.292683).

Computation 3.3: the chain depths of the sitting sentences of 944 to 999 are 1 step for 18, 2 steps for 25, 3 steps for 14, and 4 steps for 3.The three chains of 4 steps are 986←973←966←922←472, 990←977←972←961←929, and 998←980←957←938←891; within the range of the tables of Papers 800 and 900 (213 to 899), the deepest chain has 2 steps.

> **Observation 3.4**
>
> headings that open seats did not increase.The headings of the form “does not —” in scope notes average 4.383838 per paper for 801 to 899, 3.769231 for 901 to 913, 3.266667 for 914 to 943, and 2.553571 for 944 to 999——the number of items listed inside a heading was not measured.

4. “No Earlier Occupant” and Earlier Occupants

Computation 4.1: the earlier papers sat in during 901 to 999 number 64, of which 23 were sat in twice or more; 20 of those only within 901 to 999, while 358, 404 and 466 had also been sat in before 900. The contents of the seats were decided by reading the scope notes of both the earlier and the later paper.

earlier paper	papers that sat (content)
358	**757** (diffraction limit), **949** (aberration)
404	**787** (flattening), **915** (flattening)
466	**672** (hearing, beats), **942** (inharmonicity)
857	**942** (bending stiffness), **958** (wound strings)
878	**936** (model of shape change), **970** (binding rates)
879	**982** (diploidy), **983** (overlapping generations)
881	**947** (rope sag), **996** (ground-contact time)
890	**968** (bearing friction), **976** (broadband turbulent fluctuations)
891	**938** (sampling a whole stand), **963** (correlated errors)
892	**943** (star colour and surface temperature), **997** (mass loss)
926	**951** (iterative deepening and move ordering), **989** (transposition tables)
929	**961** (pressure angle), **990** (contact stress)
931	**960** (number of tanks and cost), **971** (second-order reactions)
935	**954** (forced choice with guessing), **988** (efficiency and number of trials)
936	**955** (comparison with other cooperative models), **970** (rates of binding and shape change)
938	**957** (drawing stratum boundaries), **980** (subsampling within plots)
939	**995** (massive fragments), **999** (thrown-in particles)
941	**981** (fading marks), **985** (several walkers)
942	**958** (wound strings), **974** (stretched tuning)
954	**988** (efficiency and number of trials), **991** (lapses)
961	**967** (undercutting), **972** (offset followers), **977** (flat-faced followers), **990** (contact stress)
972	**977** (flat-faced followers), **990** (contact stress)

982	984 (inbreeding), 994 (sex ratio)

Observation 4.2

only one pair sat twice in the same content.915 sat in the flattening seat of 404, where 787 had sat before. For the other 22 papers, every later paper took up a different content of the same scope note——787 counts the distance of summits from the centre, and 915 the length of a degree of latitude and the reading of the flattening, so the results do not overlap.Because 915 was unpublished, it was corrected after this census to cite 787 as the earlier occupant. The counts of this paper were made on the copy taken before the correction.

Computation 4.3: 71 of the 79 sitting sentences (0.898734) say “no earlier occupant”, and the 8 that do not are all second sentences beginning “the scope note of — also”. The only miss at the level of content is the one in 915.The 8 written for seats numbered below 800 (10 papers) contain 1 miss, and the 63 written for seats numbered 800 or later contain 0.

Observation 4.4

the missed occupant had no naming word.The sentences in which the 3 occupants that sat before 900 (757, 787, 672) cite the earlier paper all carry the word “scope note”, and only 672 carries a naming word——915 cites 787 in the same scope note as a result, in the form “787 showed —; here —”, and that sentence carries neither a naming word nor “scope note”.

Observation 4.5

the way of citing papers that sat earlier in another content appeared partway through the numbers.There are 28 pairs with an earlier occupant of the same scope note; in 24 the number of that paper appears somewhere in the scope note, and in 4 it does not (942 and 672, 949 and 757, 970 and 955, 997 and 943). Pairs named in the sitting sentence as “Paper N sat in the seat of —” number 11 (in 10 sentences), the first being 970——0 of the 5 pairs before 970 and 11 of the 23 from 970 on (0.478261); this way of writing is not yet uniform.

5. The Separator and the Convention from Now On

> **Observation 5.1**
>
> **the separator is whether the earlier occupant wrote its sitting with a naming word or only cited the scope note.All 79 sitting sentences of 901 to 999 carry the sit form, and no "no earlier occupant" failed against occupants among them——an occupant that sat at a number before naming words were set may carry only "scope note" in the sentence citing the earlier paper, and 787 was one.**

> **Observation 5.2**
>
> **the convention from now on.Before writing "no earlier occupant", read the earlier sentences that carry the number of the paper that opened the seat together with "scope note", and do not search by naming words. When an occupant is found, cite it as an occupant, not only as a result——published papers are not revised. This is a convention for future writing. This paper's own scope note uses no naming word in the sentences citing the results of Papers 600, 700, 800 and 900.**

> **Observation 5.3**
>
> **what is not said.The English versions are not counted, nor sentences citing earlier papers in body observations or closings. Judgements were made by reading scope-note sentences, not the whole of each paper——occupants were sought only in the three tables of judgements, so papers that took up the same content without citing the scope note are not found, and their number was not measured. Neither the substance of papers taking up nearby scope notes nor the procedure by which "no earlier occupant" was checked when written was measured.**

6. Census and Closing

1. **320 sentences citing earlier papers, 80 candidates** (Computation 2.1): **all read.**
2. **all 80 with a naming word carry "scope note"** (Observation 2.2): **the convention was kept.**
3. **79 sat (0.987500)** (Computation 2.4): **0.087719 for 801 to 899.**
4. **143 in the form "showed —; here —" (0.595833)** (Observation 2.7): **the fixed form was replaced.**
5. **54 within 100 for 944 to 999 (0.900000)** (Observation 3.2): **the core.**

6. **39 whose opener also sat (0.650000), chains of 4 steps** (Computation 3.3): **2 steps for 213 to 899.**
7. **71 “no earlier occupant” (0.898734), 1 miss** (Computation 4.3): **the flattening seat in 915, with 787 before it.**
8. **0 misses among 63 for seats numbered 800 or later** (Computation 4.3): **the miss is the 1 for a seat numbered below 800.**
9. **of 3 occupants, only 672 has a naming word** (Observation 4.4): **787 has none.**
10. **written with a naming word, or only citing the scope note** (Observation 5.1): **the separator; Papers 600, 700, 800, 900.**

Closing: **The seats taken came closer, and the one occupant missed by “no earlier occupant” had sat before seats were named.In the scope notes of Papers 901 to 999, all 80 sentences with a naming word carry “scope note”, and 79 of the 80 candidates sat——the convention of Paper 900 was kept, and sentences citing scope notes became sentences that sit.The 60 sitting sentences of 944 to 999 have a median distance of 31.0; 54 sit in the scope note of a paper within 100 numbers, and in 39 that paper itself sat——seats became seats opened by nearby papers, and chains grew to 4 steps.Of 71 claims of “no earlier occupant”, the one miss is in 915: in the flattening seat, 787, numbered below 800, had sat without a naming word (915 was corrected after this census)——none of the 63 written for seats numbered 800 or later missed.The separator is whether the earlier occupant wrote its sitting with a naming word or only cited the scope note.The convention from now on——before writing “no earlier occupant”, read the earlier sentences that carry the opener’s number together with “scope note”, and do not search by naming words. Published papers are not revised.Placed among the earlier papers——Paper 600 counted that a judgement word’s meaning thinned, Paper 700 that a device added no information, Paper 800 that the name of a practice disappeared, and Paper 900 that a name, once set, spread beyond its convention. Here it was counted that, once the name stayed within its convention, one occupant who sat before the name was set was missed.To be honest——neither the English versions nor citations in body observations were counted, and judgements were made by reading scope-note sentences. With only one miss, nothing can be said about where misses gather beyond what one case allows. The 99 papers counted and this census belong to the same stream of writing, so there is no guarantee that this paper is free of the ways of writing measured here.**

References

1. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Six Hundredth Census: The Warning of the Three Hundredth Came True, but Not in the Form It Feared* [Paper 600]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22805283
2. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Seven Hundredth Census: The Device Repeated Most Often Fails to Work in One Paper of Five* [Paper 700]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22805350
3. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Eight Hundredth Census: Whether a Seat Citation Took the Seat Is Known Unread Only When It Says So* [Paper 800]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22805383

4. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Nine Hundredth Census: What Told Whether There Was a Seat Was Not "Placed Beside" but the Word "Scope Note"* [Paper 900]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22805412

— From thinking to syncing. —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)