

The Four Hundredth Census: The Instrument Broke Before the Thing It Was Counting

— **22.86** per cent of the titles (**91** of **398**) carry a negative form — but the first pass dropped three papers, and they were exactly **100**, **200** and **300**, the previous roll calls — the cause was not the corpus but a substring match in the scanner — [Paper 400]

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

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

For the four hundredth census, the titles of the corpus were counted mechanically. What this paper records is the count and the false pattern the first pass manufactured—a suggestive absence of three papers that was a bug in the scanner, not a property of the corpus. No new theorem or law is claimed. First, of 398 titles, 91 carry a negative form: **22.86** per cent (Section 2). Second, the breakdown is 79 for “is not / not . . . but”, 12 for “there is no / cannot”, 3 for “does not enter” and 2 for “is not one thing” (Section 2). Third, in the recent stretch 379 to 399 it is 6/21, or **28.57** per cent, above the overall rate (Section 2). Fourth, and this is the core of the paper. The first pass read only 395 of 398, and the three it dropped were exactly 100, 200 and 300—the previous roll calls (Section 3). Fifth, the cause was the exclusion string “00_” matching inside “100_”, “200_” and “300_”. After the fix, all 398 were read (Section 3). Sixth, the separator is whether the pattern lives in the object or in the instrument (Section 5).

Scope of this paper (scope note): No new theorem or law is claimed——what is counted is the spelling of titles, not a classification of content.Content is not classified——“a title in negative form” and “a paper whose claim is negative” are different things. Only the former is counted.The result depends on the definition——the regular expressions used are printed in the text. A different definition gives a different number.English titles are not counted——only the Japanese titles are scanned.No judgement is offered——whether many negative forms is good or bad is not said. Only the count is given.No cause is asserted——why this form is frequent is not the subject. Only that it is.Relation to earlier papers: Paper 100, Paper 200 and Paper 300 are the earlier censuses——this is the fourth.Paper 300 showed that same-root and different-root can be decided——here that criterion is turned on a pattern produced by the scanner.Paper 391 showed that a representative value does not represent——here the manner of counting nearly manufactured the thing counted.Paper 397 showed that a plausible explanation was orders of magnitude off——here a plausible pattern was a bug in the tool.What is added is a mechanical count of 398 titles, a breakdown into four spellings, showing that the recent wave is denser than the whole, recording the false pattern together with its cause, and placing the separator at “object or instrument”.

1. Notation and the Question

Setting: take the Japanese title from each numbered folder and count four spellings.

- (a) ではない|ではなく (b) 入っていない
(c) 一つではない (d) は無い|が無い|しかない|られない|できない

The range is Paper 1 to Paper 399. Excluding the permanently vacant number 47, that is 398 papers.

Observation 1.1

what is counted is spelling, not meaning.“A title in negative form” and “a negative claim” are different——only the former is counted here.

Observation 1.2

the definition is written first.The regular expressions are printed in the text——a different definition gives a different number, and that is not hidden.

Observation 1.3

the scanner is tested on titles whose content is known before it is run. Paper 326 (“not a law but an identity”), Paper 325 (“does not enter”)——test on a case that must hit: the corpus’s own discipline.

Question: how negative, in form, are the titles of this corpus?

2. Ninety-One of 398: 22.86 Per Cent

Computation 2.1: counts by spelling (counted in this paper).

Spelling	Count	Share of 398
(a) is not / not . . . but	79	19.85 %
(d) there is no / cannot	12	3.02 %
(b) does not enter	3	0.75 %
(c) is not one thing	2	0.50 %
Union (duplicates removed)	91	22.86 %

Observation 2.2

nearly one title in four denies something. 22.86 per cent——the union is smaller than the sum 96 because of overlaps.

Observation 2.3

(a) alone accounts for 79.86.8 per cent of the union——the form is concentrated in one spelling.

Observation 2.4

in the 300s, 37 papers hit. Spread from 304 to 397——not clustered in one period.

Observation 2.5

in the recent 379 to 399 it is 6/21, 28.57 per cent.Above the overall 22.86—the form is denser in this wave.

Observation 2.6

it is not everything.91 < 398—confirming that this is not a scanner that hits anything.

3. The First Pass Manufactured a Suggestive Pattern

Computation 3.1: two runs of the scanner (computed in this paper).

Run	Titles read	Titles not read
First	395	100, 200, 300
Second (after the fix)	398	none

Observation 3.2

this is the core of the paper.The three that fell out were exactly the previous roll calls—100, 200, 300. The four hundredth census missing only the earlier roll calls: a pattern one wants to read meaning into.

Observation 3.3

an explanation did present itself.“The roll calls make no negative claim, so they do not fit the scanner’s form”—plausible, and wrong.

Observation 3.4

the cause was an exclusion string in the scanner.“00_” had been added to skip the verification folders—and it matched inside “100_”, “200_” and “300_”.

Observation 3.5

one line, changed to match at the start of the folder name, read all 398. Titles not read: 0—the pattern vanished.

Observation 3.6

this is a type the corpus has already named. Layer-one burial: a word buried inside a longer word—here a number buried inside a longer number.

4. An Error in the Counter Looks Like a Property of the Counted

Observation 4.1

the false pattern did not look random. All three were roll calls—the chance of drawing three of 398 at random and getting all three roll calls is $1/10,428,396$.

Observation 4.2

which is why an explanation came first. Too aligned to be coincidence—and it was aligned because the cause was single, not because it meant anything.

Observation 4.3

one cause produces aligned effects. The numbers “00_” matches are exactly the three-digit numbers ending in 00—100, 200, 300.

Observation 4.4

and the roll calls are placed every hundred. Two rules happened to select the same numbers—one a fact about folder-name spelling, the other a decision about the corpus.

Observation 4.5

they are different-root by the criterion of Paper 300. One is set by string matching, the other by the author's design—the same three numbers, different roots.

Observation 4.6

numerical agreement is not evidence of a common root. Paper 300 says so—and this is the roll call that turns that criterion on the corpus's own scan results.

5. Separator: Does the Pattern Live in the Object or in the Instrument

Observation 5.1

separator—does the pattern survive when the instrument is repaired.

Where the pattern lives	On repairing the tool	Example
In the object	it survives	the 91 negative titles
In the instrument	it vanishes	the absence of 100, 200, 300

Observation 5.2

one line of repair decided it. Substring matching changed to prefix matching—one pattern survived and the other vanished.

Observation 5.3

had the explanation been written before the repair, it would stand as a property of the corpus. There was a plausible explanation—plausibility is not a substitute for checking.

Observation 5.4

the separator can be moved. A different exclusion string drops a different three—which pattern appears is decided by the tool.

Observation 5.5

to be honest—both 91 and 22.86 per cent are counts against the four spellings this paper defined. A different definition gives a different number—what does not move is that repairing the scanner erased the missing three and left the 91.

Observation 5.6

one last thing—a roll call measures the corpus and the one taking the roll at the same time. The first thing found at the four hundredth census was not a property of the corpus but an error in the scanner—writing that down instead of erasing it is what a roll call is for.

6. Roll Call and Closing

1. **398 papers in scope** (Section 1): **excluding the vacant 47.**
2. **91 negative titles** (Computation 2.1): **22.86 per cent.**
3. **79 from (a) alone** (Observation 2.3): **86.8 per cent of the union.**
4. **37 in the 300s** (Observation 2.4): **spread, not clustered.**
5. **28.57 per cent in 379--399** (Observation 2.5): **above the whole.**
6. **The first pass read only 395** (Computation 3.1): **dropping 100, 200, 300.**
7. **Those were the previous roll calls** (Observation 3.2): **a pattern begging to be read.**
8. **The cause was substring matching on “00_”** (Observation 3.4): **in the instrument.**
9. **After the fix, all 398 were read** (Observation 3.5): **the pattern vanished.**
10. **The same type as layer-one burial** (Observation 3.6): **a number inside a longer number.**

Closing: for the four hundredth census, the titles of the corpus were counted mechanically—what is counted is spelling, not meaning. Of 398 papers (1 to 399, excluding the vacant 47), **91** titles carry a negative form: **22.86** per cent—the breakdown is **79** for “is not / not . . . but”, **12** for “there is no / cannot”, **3** for “does not enter” and **2** for

“is not one thing”. The union is smaller than the sum of 96 because of overlaps, and (a) alone accounts for 86.8 per cent of it. In the 300s, 37 papers hit, spread from 304 to 397; in the recent 379 to 399 it is 6/21, **28.57** per cent, above the overall rate. And $91 < 398$, confirming this is not a scanner that hits anything. But the first pass read only 395 of the 398—and the three it dropped were exactly 100, 200 and 300. The four hundredth census missing only the earlier roll calls: a pattern one wants to read meaning into. An explanation did present itself—“the roll calls make no negative claim, so they do not fit the form”. Plausible, and wrong. The cause was in the instrument—“00_” had been added as an exclusion string to skip the verification folders, and it matched inside “100_”, “200_” and “300_”. Changing one line to match at the start of the folder name read all 398, with none missing. This is a type the corpus has already named: layer-one burial, a word buried inside a longer word—here a number buried inside a longer number. The false pattern did not look random—the chance of drawing three of 398 at random and getting all three roll calls is $1/10,428,396$. It was aligned because the cause was single, not because it meant anything. The numbers “00_” matches are exactly the three-digit numbers ending in 00, and the roll calls are placed every hundred: two rules happened to select the same numbers, one about folder-name spelling and one about the design of the corpus. By the criterion of Paper 300 they are different-root, and numerical agreement is not evidence of a common root—this is the roll call that turns that criterion on the corpus’s own scan results. One thing does the separating—does the pattern survive when the instrument is repaired. One line decided it: the 91 survived and the missing three vanished. Had the explanation been written before the repair, it would stand today as a property of the corpus. Plausibility is not a substitute for checking. A different exclusion string would drop a different three—which pattern appears is decided by the tool. To be honest—both 91 and 22.86 per cent are counts against the four spellings this paper defined, and a different definition gives a different number. What does not move is that repairing the scanner erased the missing three and left the 91. One last thing—a roll call measures the corpus and the one taking the roll at the same time. The first thing found at the four hundredth census was not a property of the corpus but an error in the scanner. Writing that down instead of erasing it is what a roll call is for.

References

1. Yamagishi, Y. (2025). *The Crossing of Royal Roads* [Paper 100]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758864
2. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Two Hundredth Census: Measuring the Corpus as Its Own Data* [Paper 200]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22108829
3. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Three Hundredth Census: Whether Two Things Share a Root Is Decidable* [Paper 300]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22171914
4. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Size of the Drop Is Not in the Angle of the Rainbow* [Paper 325]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22209848
5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Square--Cube “Law” Is Not a Law but an Identity* [Paper 326]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22209992
6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Significant Wave Height Is Neither the Mean Nor the Maximum* [Paper 391]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22699212

7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *“Finer Grains Are Stronger” Fails, and Not Because the Theoretical Strength Was Reached* [Paper 397]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22699316
8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Humidity Goes from **53.80** Per Cent to **100** Without a Drop of Water Being Added* [Paper 399]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22699338

— *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)