The Six Hundredth Census: The Warning of the Three Hundredth Came True, but Not in the Form It Feared

— papers citing Paper 300 and answering “shared root” jumped to **39** in **501--599**, and **30** of them (**0.769231**) called two consequences of one formula “sharing a root” — not a single one rested on numerical agreement alone, the form that was feared — [Paper 600]

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

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

Paper 300 counted the corpus’s judgements of “shared root” and “different roots”, and recorded as a warning to itself that in the latest band more papers answered “shared root” while papers stating a criterion did not increase.It wrote that whether judgements resting on numerical agreement alone had crept in ought to be checked.This paper carries out that check on the 299 papers since (301--599).No new theorem or law is claimed. First, citing Paper 300 became almost a fixed custom——it is cited by 88.00 per cent of papers in 301--400, 99.00 per cent in 401--500 and 97.98 per cent in 501--599 (Section 2). **Second, answers of “shared root” rose sharply in the last band——papers answering “shared root” in a sentence citing Paper 300 number 6, 5 and 39 in the three bands; those answering “different roots” 76, 97 and 59** (Section 3). **Third, divided by the batches in which the papers were written, the rise comes in steps——papers answering “shared root” number 1 in 501--520, 6 in 521--546, 11 in 547--570, 14 in 571--590 and 7 in 591--599; in 571--590 they exceed the 5 answering “different roots”** (Section 3). **Fourth, and this is the core.Reading the 39 papers in 501--599 that answered “shared root”, 30 of them (0.769231) called two consequences of one formula “sharing a root”——written as “A and B come from the same formula and share a root”, first in 554 and last in 595, and before that only once, in 349. In this use it is obvious by construction that the two come from the same formula, and the judgement can never come out “different roots”** (Section 4). **Fifth, the form Paper 300 feared did not come——as far as reading shows, no paper answered “shared root” on numerical agreement alone. The remaining 9 judged that two things met in separate places have one source, and all 6 of 521--541 name their criterion** (Section 4). **Sixth, the separator is whether two things were met in separate places or divided within one formula——“sharing a root” in the first case is a judgement that can fail; in the second, a restatement** (Section 5). **Keywords**: corpus census, common root and distinct root, audit of judgements, consequences of one formula, structural interpretation.

Scope of this paper (scope note): **No new theorem or law is claimed——this paper only counts and reads the corpus's text.The moment is fixed——the Japanese texts of papers 1--599 are measured (598 papers without the vacant 47, references excluded); this paper itself is not counted.One counting rule is used——sentences (divided at the Japanese full stop) containing "Paper 300" were taken; those containing "shared root" were counted as "shared root", those containing "different roots" or phrases such as "not a shared root" or "not evidence of a shared root" as "different roots"; the question form "shared root or different roots" was not counted.No comparison with Paper 300's counts is made——the same rule applied to 1--299 gives 57 papers with "are different roots" and 8 with "share a root", not the 43 and 23 that Paper 300 counted by reading; 1--299 have since been revised, and Paper 300 counted by reading. Only bands under the same rule are compared.The sorting was done by reading——the sentences answering "shared root" were read one by one and sorted, not by keyword; the result was written into the verification script as sets and checked to coincide exactly with the papers picked up by the counting rule.No published paper is changed——"two consequences of one formula share a root" is not false; it is only said that it is not a judgement.Relation to earlier papers**: **Paper 300 gathered five criteria for sharing a root, took the rise of "shared root" in the latest band as a warning to itself, and recorded in Observation 5.6 that whether judgements of numerical agreement alone had crept in ought to be checked——this paper carries out that check.Paper 500 showed that the corpus's method is not one habit, each part adopted at its own time——this paper shows that the use of the word "shared root" changed from a certain time.Paper 405 showed that a numerical coincidence becomes evidence of a common root only when there is a bijection ——the use found here does not even use numerical agreement; it is closed within one formula.**What is added is **giving, band by band, the share of papers citing Paper 300 and the numbers answering "shared root" and "different roots"**, **dividing the last band by the batches of writing**, **reading every sentence answering "shared root" and sorting it into "two appearances", "one formula" or "caution"**, and **placing the separator on met in separate places versus divided within one formula**.

1. Notation and the Question

Setting: **from the Japanese texts of papers 1--599, sentences containing "Paper 300" are taken, divided at the full stop.A sentence containing "shared root" counts as "shared root"; one containing "different roots" or phrases such as "not a shared root" or "not evidence of a shared root" counts as "different roots"; the question form "shared root or different roots" is not counted.Bands are 100 papers each, the last being 501--599.**

> **Observation 1.1**
>
> **Paper 300 wrote a warning to itself.In the latest band (251--299) the ratio reversed to 7 "shared root" against 3 "different roots", and only 1 paper in that band stated a criterion. Connections were increasing while statements of criteria were not——it could not be said that judgements of numerical agreement alone had not crept in; they had not been checked one by one, and it recorded that they ought to be.**

Question: **how was "shared root" used in the 299 papers since, and did the feared judgements of numerical agreement alone creep in?**

2. Papers Citing Paper 300

Computation 2.1: **papers containing "Paper 300" in the text or listing Paper 300 in the references (bands before Paper 300 give 0).**

band	papers	citing Paper 300
301--400	100	88 (88.00 per cent)
401--500	100	99 (99.00 per cent)
501--599	99	97 (97.98 per cent)

> **Observation 2.2**
>
> **citing Paper 300 became almost a fixed custom.From 401 on, nearly every paper cites it——citing is not judging; the next section looks at what the citing sentences answer.**

3. Shared Root and Different Roots

Computation 3.1: **sentences and papers answering "shared root" or "different roots" in sentences containing Paper 300.A sentence containing both counts as "both", and its paper is counted on each side.**

band	“shared” sentences	“different” sentences	“both” sentences	papers “shared”	papers “different”
301--400	9	173	0	6	76
401--500	7	352	7	5	97
501--599	89	145	4	39	59

Dividing the last band by the batches in which it was written (501--520 on 9 September, 521--546 on the 10th, and 547--599 in three batches on the 11th),

papers	answering “shared”	answering “different”
501--520 (20 papers)	1	20
521--546 (26 papers)	6	18
547--570 (24 papers)	11	13
571--590 (20 papers)	14	5
591--599 (9 papers)	7	3

> **Observation 3.2**
>
> answers of “shared root” rose sharply in the last band, and in steps.From 1 “shared” against 20 “different” in 501--520 to 14 against 5 in 571--590——the reversal Paper 300 saw in 251--299 came back, larger.

> **Observation 3.3**
>
> these numbers cannot be compared with Paper 300’s.The same rule applied to 1--299 gives 57 papers with “are different roots” and 8 with “share a root”, not Paper 300’s 43 and 23——1--299 have since been revised, and Paper 300 counted by reading, not by words. Only bands under the same rule can be compared.

4. Sorting by Reading

Computation 4.1: the sentences of the 50 papers in 301--599 that answered “shared root” in a sentence citing Paper 300 were all read and sorted three ways.“Two appearances”: judging that two things met in separate places have one

source. “One formula”: calling two consequences (or two variables) of one formula or model “sharing a root”. “Caution”: stating method rather than judging.The result was written into the verification script as sets and checked to coincide exactly with the 50 papers picked up by the counting rule.

papers	two appearances	one formula	caution
301--400	3	1	2
401--500	4	0	1
501--520	1	0	0
521--546	6	0	0
547--570	0	11	0
571--590	0	14	0
591--599	2	5	0

Observation 4.2

this is the core.Of the 39 papers in 501--599 answering “shared root”, 30 (**0.769231**) were “one formula”, first in 554 and last in 595, and before that only once, in 349——for example, 554 called “the median is twice the mean” and “the chance of ringing by the mean is $1-1/e$” sharing a root because both come from the same geometric distribution; 584 called “inside $\sqrt{2}$ damping reduces the shaking” and “outside it increases it” sharing a root because both come from one transmissibility formula. That two things come from the same formula is obvious by construction, and such a judgement can never come out “different roots”.

Observation 4.3

the form Paper 300 feared did not come.As far as reading shows, no paper answered “shared root” on numerical agreement alone——what came was a different looseness: a “shared root” that does not even use numerical agreement, closed within one formula.

Observation 4.4

“two appearances” is the use Paper 300 originally asked about.501 judged that the waiting time for a bus and the number of citations of a paper’s neighbours in the citation graph, two different objects, have one source; 596, that the two $2e$ in the moon’s libration and in the gap between sundial and clock do; 598, that the total reflection of sound in air and of light in a stone do. All 6 of 521--541 name their criterion (the second criterion, identity-preserving correspondence, or path)——these are judgements that can fail.

Observation 4.5

keywords alone could not do this sorting.Of the 93 sentences answering “shared root” in 501--599 (89 “shared” and 4 “both”), 15 carry a keyword for “one formula” and 3 a keyword for “two appearances”; the other 75 carry neither——the sorting could only be done by reading each sentence.

5. The Separator

Observation 5.1

the separator is whether two things were met in separate places or divided within one formula.Whether two things met in separate places have one source cannot be known without looking, and may come out “different roots”. Two things divided within one formula have the same formula from the start——“sharing a root” is a judgement in the first case and a restatement in the second.

Observation 5.2

carrying out Paper 300’s check.Paper 300 warned that “shared root” was increasing and recorded that judgements of numerical agreement alone ought to be checked for——this paper’s answer: none of those had crept in, but 30 papers’ worth of “shared root” that are not judgements had.

Observation 5.3

the shape of Paper 500.Paper 500 showed that the corpus's method is not one habit, each part adopted at its own time——the use of "shared root" also changed from a certain time (554). Papers 547--599 were written on the same day, 11 September 2026.

Observation 5.4

beside Paper 405.It showed that a numerical coincidence becomes evidence of a common root only when there is a bijection——a "shared root" closed within one formula has no two independent appearances, so there is nowhere to ask for a bijection.

Observation 5.5

the corpus has already begun to return.596 and 598 use "shared root" only in the sense of two appearances, and 597 and 599 do not answer "shared root"——this paper adds one question to ask before writing "shared root": were these two met in separate places?.

Observation 5.6

what is not said.No published paper is changed, and "two consequences of one formula share a root" is not false——it is only said that it is not a judgement. The numbers were counted by one rule and the sorting decided by reading; there was one reader, and the agreement between several readers that content analysis asks for (Krippendorff 2018) was not measured. Both are fixed at 599.

6. Roll Call and Closing

1. **papers citing Paper 300: 88.00, 99.00, 97.98 per cent** (Computation 2.1): **almost a fixed custom.**
2. **papers answering "shared root": 6, 5, 39** (Computation 3.1): **a sharp rise in the last band.**
3. **571--590: 14 "shared" against 5 "different"** (Observation 3.2): **the reversal came back larger.**
4. **1--299 give 57 and 8, not Paper 300's 43 and 23** (Observation 3.3): **compare only bands under one rule.**
5. **30 of 39 (0.769231) are "one formula"** (Observation 4.2): **the core.**
6. **"one formula" runs from 554 to 595** (Observation 4.2): **before that, once, in 349.**

7. **no “shared root” on numerical agreement alone** (Observation 4.3): **the feared form did not come.**
8. **9 papers of “two appearances”** (Observation 4.4): **all of 521--541 name a criterion.**
9. **keywords sorted only 18 of 93 sentences** (Observation 4.5): **reading was the only way.**
10. **the separator is met in separate places versus divided within one formula** (Observation 5.1): **judgement or restatement.**

Closing: **Paper 300 recorded, as a warning to itself, that papers answering “shared root” were increasing while those stating a criterion were not, and left word that judgements of numerical agreement alone ought to be checked for.This paper made that check on the 299 papers since——from 401 on nearly every paper cites Paper 300 (99.00 and 97.98 per cent), and papers answering “shared root” in a sentence citing it number 6, 5 and 39 in the three bands, rising sharply in the last. Divided by the batches of writing the rise comes in steps, and in 571--590 it is 14 “shared” against 5 “different”.The warning came true, but not in the form it feared——reading the 39 papers of 501 --599 that answered “shared root”, none rested on numerical agreement alone, and 30 (0.769231) called two consequences of one formula “sharing a root”. This use began at 554 and ran to 595; since it is obvious by construction that the two come from one formula, the judgement can never come out “different roots”. The other 9 judged that two things met in separate places have one source, the use Paper 300 originally asked about.The separator is whether two things were met in separate places or divided within one formula——“sharing a root” is a judgement that can fail in the first case and a restatement in the second. The corpus has begun to return to the first from 596, and this paper adds a question to ask before writing “shared root”: were these two met in separate places?.Placed among the earlier papers——this carries out the check Paper 300 recorded in Observation 5.6 and, like Paper 500, shows in numbers the time at which a practice changed (554). The bijection Paper 405 asked for has nowhere even to be asked of a “shared root” closed within one formula.To be honest——the numbers were counted by one rule and the sorting decided by reading, so misreadings are possible, and Paper 300’s counts cannot be compared. No published paper is changed, and “two consequences of one formula share a root” is not called false. And the hand that wrote 547--599 is the same hand that wrote this census.**

References

1. Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
2. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Three Hundredth Census: Whether Two Things Share a Root Is Decidable* [Paper 300]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22171914
3. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *A Numerical Coincidence Becomes Evidence of a Common Root Only When There Is a Bijection* [Paper 405]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22699433
4. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Five Hundredth Census: The Corpus’s Method Is Not One Habit, and Each Was Adopted at Its Own Time* [Paper 500]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22760262

— 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)