

The Two Hundredth Census: Measuring the Corpus as Its Own Data

— The Numbered Check Begins at Paper 129 and Never Stops, the Fence Settles after 175, and the Belief That the Separator Converged on a Question Is Refuted by the Count — [Paper 200]

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

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

ABSTRACT

Paper 100 drew the method of papers 63 to 99 as a map. This paper measures the 99 papers from 101 to 199 as data — counting the text rather than drawing it by hand. NO NEW MATHEMATICS AND NO NEW CLAIM IS MADE. First, the numbered check begins at paper 129 and has never stopped since. Of the 28 papers from 101 to 128, none carries one; of the 71 from 129 to 199, every one does (Section 2). Second, the fence settled late. Papers naming a fence run 2/28 over 101–128, 4/21 over 129–149, 5/25 over 150–174 — and 18/25 over 175–199 (Section 3). Third, this is the core. The belief that the separator converged from a noun into a question is refuted by the count. The share written as a question is 64% over 101–149 and 48% over 150–199: it went down — ★★ it is 0% in the 160s, and unanimous only in the last ten papers (Section 4). Fourth, the most cited paper is the previous census. Paper 100 is cited by 40 of the 99, ahead of paper 95 at 32 and paper 16 at 31 (Section 6). Fifth, the corpus grew shorter and then denser. The mean body fell from 9847 to 7650 characters and recovered to 8663, while the checks rose steadily through 0, 8.3, 10.7, 12.5 (Section 7).

Scope of this paper (scope note): NO NEW MATHEMATICS AND NO NEW PHYSICS IS CONTAINED HERE — this is a measurement of the corpus, and its object is the text of papers 101 to 199. ⚠ The quality of the papers is not measured — what is counted is formal features, not correctness and not worth. ⚠ The counting is a word search — the words for check, fence and separator are picked out of the text, so a passage saying the same thing in other words is not counted. ⚠ Bibliographies were excluded from the count — so that a line quoting another paper's title is not counted as that paper's own vocabulary. ⚠ No causal claim is made — what is shown is when things happened, not why. Relation to Paper 100: ★ 100 drew the method by hand — this paper counted the same corpus. And counting turned up one thing the hand could not see — the refutation in Section 4. What is added is pinning the start of the numbered check to a single paper, measuring band by band that the fence settled late, refuting a belief about the separator with our own count, and counting the citation weight to show that the previous census carries the most.

1. Opening: at the Two Hundredth

Paper 100 was the hundredth of the corpus and left the method of papers **63** to **99** as a single map. That map was **drawn by hand**: which giant crossed which thread, set out by the author after rereading.

This is the two hundredth. Doing the same thing again would serve no purpose, so instead of **drawing**, it **measures**. The object is the Japanese text of the **99** papers from **101** to **199**, and what is counted is the occurrence of words, their distribution, and the citation relation.

⚠ To be plain: this was not written to round out a number. Had the measurement turned up nothing, the paper would not have been written. In fact three things turned up — a sharp switch, a late settling, and the refutation of a belief.

2. The Numbered Check Begins at Paper 129 and Never Stops

Count the passages in which a check is given a number, in the form “Check 2.1”.

Measurement 2.1:

Range	Papers with a numbered check	Share
1–100	8 / 99	8%
101–128	0 / 28	0%
129–199	71 / 71	100%

Observation 2.2

★ ★ The switch is not gradual: it happens at one paper. Nothing up to 128, and then without a single exception from 129 to 199. The first of them is Paper 129, “**ℵ** Is Not on the Mathematical Side of the Inequality”.

Observation 2.3

⚠️ It must not be forgotten that this is a word search. There are numbers before 128 as well — what is absent is the habit of numbering a check and calling it one. What changed is not whether there was computation but whether the computation was made a structural element of the text. ⚠️ The earliest instance anywhere is Paper 23 — the 8 papers in 1–100 are scattered, and did not continue.

3. The Fence Settled Late

Measurement 3.1: count papers whose body contains the word for fence, in four bands.

Band	Papers naming a fence	Share
101–128	2 / 28	7%
129–149	4 / 21	19%
150–174	5 / 25	20%
175–199	18 / 25	72%

Observation 3.2

★ The shape differs from the check. The check switched at one paper; the fence rose slowly across three bands and settled only in the last. Within one corpus, one tool arrived all at once and another spread gradually.

Observation 3.3

⚠️ The word first appears in Paper 23 — more than 150 papers before it settled. A word being coined and a word becoming a tool are separate events.

4. The Core: the Belief That the Separator Converged on a Question Is Refuted

The corpus uses the word separator for **what must be moved for a number to move**. The recent papers, from **194** on, write it **as a question**: what is conserved, what is perturbed, what must be moved, what may be discarded. That suggests a belief: **the separator has converged from a noun into a question**. It was counted.

Measurement 4.1: for the **36** papers whose body names a separator, classify the wording as **a question** (ending in the interrogative particle, or opening with an interrogative word) or **a noun** (“the separator is X”).

Band	As a question	Papers naming a separator	Share
130–139	4	5	80%
140–149	3	6	50%
150–159	2	9	22%
160–169	0	2	0%
170–179	2	4	50%
180–189	4	6	67%
190–199	4	4	100%

Measurement 4.2: gather them into two halves.

Range	Share written as a question
101–149	7 / 11 = 64%
150–199	12 / 25 = 48%

Observation 4.3

★ ★ The belief is wrong. The share did not rise: it fell from 64% to 48%. It touches 0% in the 160s, and becomes unanimous only in the last ten papers. The corpus did not converge slowly on the question form: it went back and forth and settled there only very recently.

Observation 4.4 (on correcting the measurement)

⚠️ The first count treated only one opening word as interrogative, and so filed two clear questions as nouns. Correcting it reversed the direction — the first tally had looked like a rise. ⭐ That loosening one classification rule flips the sign of the conclusion also means this quantity is weak. That weakness is not hidden here.

Observation 4.5

⚠️ So it cannot be said that the corpus has arrived at the question form. What can be said is only that the last ten papers are written that way, and ten is few. Whether it continues is not knowable at the two hundredth.

5. Twenty-Three Named Fences, All Different

Measurement 5.1: collecting the passages that give a fence a name in the form “the fence is X” yields **23** instances across 101–199, and **not one name repeats**.

Paper	Fence	Paper	Fence
133	unbiasedness	184	the number of options
171	linearity, not normality	185	the target space
173	integrality, not positivity	186	the tail of the error
177	compactness	189	consistency
178	that no product is defined	190	one large jump
179	boundedness on an interval	191	the ratio of two diffusion rates
181	cocommutativity	192	the second moment
182	what the concentration is around	195	hyperbolicity
183	the evenness of the allocation	198	two of them (conjugate and cut)

Observation 5.2

★ That 23 fences carry 23 different names means the fence has not become a set phrase. The same word is used each time and points at something different each time — the corpus applying its own “one word, distinct roots” to itself.

6. Citation Weight: the Heaviest Paper Is the Previous Census

Measurement 6.1: count which of the author's own papers each of 101–199 cites.

Paper cited	By how many of the 99	Title
100	40	The Crossing of Royal Roads
95	32	Convention and Fact
16	31	The Equals Sign Has Distinct Roots
17	30	The 8π Is a Product of the Units
117	23	Scale Invariance Fixes an Exponent in Four Ways
113	18	Modules Are Not Walls but Limits
94	14	“Dimension” Is Not One Thing
1	14	The Uniqueness Theorem for $n = 2$

Measurement 6.2: the number of papers citing none of the author's own work is 0, and the mean is 8.64 citations per paper. In total 156 distinct papers are cited, 59 of them from 1–100 and 97 from 101–199.

Observation 6.3

★★ The heaviest single paper is the previous census itself. What was written as a map was cited by 40 of the following 99 — a census looks like a summing-up when it is written, and turns out afterwards to be a foundation. ⚠ This does not mean Paper 100 is the better paper — it is equally explained by the formal fact that a census is convenient to point at when stating one's position. This paper does not decide between the two.

7. Shorter, and Then Denser

Measurement 7.1: measure the length of the body and the number of checks in four bands.

Band	Mean body (characters)	Mean checks	Checks per thousand characters
101–128	9847	0.0	0.00
129–149	7957	8.3	1.04
150–174	7650	10.7	1.40
175–199	8663	12.5	1.44

Observation 7.2

★ The length fell by 22% from 9847 to 7650 characters and then recovered to 8663, while the checks per thousand characters never fell, rising through 0.00, 1.04, 1.40, 1.44. What grew was not the volume but the density.

8. The Brake Is Everywhere

Measurement 8.1:

Quantity	Value over 101–199
Papers carrying a scope note	99 / 99 (100%)
Papers stating that no new theorem or law is claimed	85 / 99 (86%)
Total warning marks	126 (1.3 per paper)
Total emphasis marks	292 (2.9 per paper)

Observation 8.2

The scope note is present without exception. ★ The warning marks, meanwhile, number less than half the emphasis marks — the corpus declares what it does not show as a frame, while inside the text it points more often at what it found. ⚠ Whether that ratio is right is not judged here.

9. Scope and Close

What this paper measured:

1. ★ ★ The numbered check begins at Paper 129 and continues through all 71 (Measurement 2.1): 0/28 up to 128 .
2. The fence settled late (Measurement 3.1): 7% → 19% → 20% → 72%.
3. ★ ★ The belief about the separator is refuted (Measurements 4.1, 4.2): 64% → 48%, with 0% in the 160s.
4. ⚠ The refutation appeared only when the measurement was corrected (Observation 4.4): the first tally had looked like a rise.
5. 23 named fences, none repeated (Measurement 5.1).
6. The most cited is Paper 100 (Measurement 6.1): 40 of 99.
7. Shorter, then denser (Measurement 7.1): checks per thousand characters 0.00 → 1.44.
8. Scope notes 99/99 (Measurement 8.1).

What this paper does not show: the correctness or worth of any paper (nothing of the kind is measured); why any of it happened (only when was measured); passages that say the same thing in other words (a word search cannot count them); any prediction beyond 200 (as Section 4 says, ten papers are not enough). Close: At the hundredth the corpus drew a map. By the two hundredth it had become possible to measure that map against its own text. And measuring cost one belief — the belief that the separator had converged on the question form, which was the most natural story to the person writing it. The count refuted that and left behind something smaller and firmer: that only the last ten papers are written that way. ★ ★ A census earns its place only when setting things in a row costs one assumption held before the row was made. Without that, it is not a census but a catalogue.

References

1. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Uniqueness Theorem of $n = 2$ for Spherically Symmetric Density Distributions* [Paper 1]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21403186

2. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Making the Curvature Constant Does Not Fix the Density* [Paper 23]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22090231
3. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Convention and Fact* [Paper 95]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758621
4. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Crossing of Royal Roads* [Paper 100]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758864
5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Modules Are Not Walls but Limits* [Paper 113]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21962996
6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Scale Invariance Fixes an Exponent in Four Different Ways* [Paper 117]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22005515
7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *$\hbar$ Is Not on the Mathematical Side of the Inequality* [Paper 129]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22079681
8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Four Means Are One Family, and There Is Only One Equality Fence* [Paper 194]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22106809
9. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *“Stable” Is Six Separate Words, and What Separates Them Is What You Perturb* [Paper 195]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22107170
10. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *“Pressure” Is Four Separate Quantities, and Sharing a Unit Guarantees Nothing* [Paper 196]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22107518
11. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *“Converges” Is Four Separate Claims, and What Separates Them Is What You May Discard* [Paper 197]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22107590
12. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *“Straight” Does Not Mean “Shortest”, and There Are Two Fences* [Paper 198]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22107954
13. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *What Decides Whether You Come Home Is the Exponent in the Denominator* [Paper 199]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22108396

— *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)