The Seven Hundredth Census: The Device Repeated Most Often Fails to Work in One Paper of Five

— Of the 698 papers up to Paper 699, 544 (0.779370) carry a separator; the first is Paper 23, and from 301 onward all four bands stand at 1.000000 — the separator is whether the device is deciding or merely restating — [Paper 700]

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

— From thinking to syncing. —

Abstract

Paper 600 counted the word “same root” and recorded that much of its use was not deciding anything.This paper turns the same examination on the device this corpus has repeated most often, the separator.No new theorem or law is claimed. First, the separator became a habit partway through——544 of the 698 papers up to Paper 699 carry it (0.779370), the first being Paper 23 (Section 2). **Second, its adoption came in a step——0.050505 over 1 to 100, 0.410000 over 101 to 200, 0.990000 over 201 to 300, and 1.000000 in all four bands from 301 onward** (Section 2). **Third, the content has never once repeated——the 188 statements extractable by a fixed pattern are all distinct, with 0 duplicates** (Section 2). **Fourth, and this is the core. One paper in five is built from title words alone——the fraction of a separator’s words also appearing in its title averages 0.283871, and 32 papers (0.206452) reach an overlap of 1.0** (Section 3). **Fifth, reading all 32, most were restatements——28 (0.875000) merely append “or not” to the claim of the title, and only 4 add anything** (Section 3). **Sixth, the four that added something shared one form ——three of them (334, 346, 593) name which side the separator is not on, a form used in only 10 papers (0.053191), the rarest of the four** (Section 4). **Keywords**: census, separator, self-examination, wear of a device, overlap with the title, measuring a corpus.

Scope of this paper (scope note): **No new theorem or law is claimed——what is counted is this corpus's own writing, and nothing is claimed about the world outside it.The English versions are not counted——only the Japanese .tex files were read; the corresponding English phrasing was not counted.The limits of extraction are stated——statements were taken only from one fixed pattern, so the 188 are a part of the 544 papers containing the word. The rest are written in other phrasings.The judgement is not left to a machine——whether each of the 32 is a restatement was decided by reading all of them. The machine only produced candidates.No earlier paper is revised——no revision of the papers identified is proposed. What follows is a rule for future writing only.The count is frozen——the sweep is fixed at Paper 699; the figures move as papers are added.Relation to earlier papers**: **Paper 600 counted the judgement word "same root" and showed that of the 39 papers answering "same root" between 501 and 599, 30 (0.769231) were calling two consequences of one formula the same root, which by construction could not have been otherwise and so decided nothing**. **Paper 300 wrote that whether two things share a root is decidable, and left behind the instruction to check whether agreement of numbers alone was being taken for a shared root——this paper turns the same gesture on a device rather than a word, asking not what a word means but whether a device adds information.**What is added is **counting adoption band by band**, **showing the extracted statements to carry no duplicates**, **introducing overlap with the title as a measure**, **reading the 32 papers of full overlap and judging 28 of them restatements**, and **naming the form shared by the four that added something**.

1. Notation and the Question

Setting: **read the Japanese .tex of every paper up to Paper 699 and count those containing the word "separator". From a fixed pattern, extract the statement itself, and ask how many of its words also appear in the paper's own title.**

$$r_n = \frac{|W(\text{separator}_n) \cap W(\text{title}_n)|}{|W(\text{separator}_n)|}$$

W is the set of runs of Chinese characters. If $r_n = 1$, the separator is built from title words alone.

Question: **is the separator deciding something, or restating the title?**

2. Adoption, and the Distinctness of the Statements

Computation 2.1: **the sweep covers 698 papers, numbered 1 to 699. 544 of them (0.779370) contain the word, the first being Paper 23. The fractions by band follow.**

band	papers carrying it	fraction
1 to 100	5 of 99	0.050505
101 to 200	41 of 100	0.410000
201 to 300	99 of 100	0.990000
301 to 400	100 of 100	1.000000
401 to 500	100 of 100	1.000000
501 to 600	100 of 100	1.000000
601 to 699	99 of 99	1.000000

Observation 2.2

the device settled in during the band 201 to 300.It jumps from 0.410000 to 0.990000 within one band and stands at 1.000000 in all four bands thereafter——the moment a device became a habit can be located exactly.

Computation 2.3: 188 statements were extractable by the fixed pattern; 188 of them are distinct, with 0 duplicates.

Observation 2.4

the absence of duplicates is also unremarkable.Different subjects use different words, so that no two statements coincide is no surprise——"all of them differ" is therefore no evidence that the device is working. The content must be examined by another measure.

Observation 2.5

the forms fall into four.Choice (is it A or B) in 51, presence (whether or not) in 53, denial of attribution (it is not on the side of) in 10 (0.053191), and others in 74——choice and presence stand almost equal, and denial of attribution is the rarest.

3. One Paper in Five Is Built from Title Words Alone

Computation 3.1: the fraction of a separator's words also appearing in its title averages 0.283871 over 155 papers. 100 papers (0.645161) share no word, and 32 (0.206452) reach an overlap of 1.0.

> **Observation 3.2**
>
> this is the core: an overlap of 1.0 means not one word outside the title was used.One paper in five is in that condition——such a separator does not even restate the title in other words.

Computation 3.3: all 32 (334, 346, 527, 531, 532, 535, 536, 539, 558, 580, 591, 592, 593, 609, 619, 626, 630, 632, 634, 639, 640, 641, 642, 644, 646, 651, 662, 663, 666, 684, 692, 697) were read. 28 of them (0.875000) append "or not" to the claim of the title and add no new distinction. Four (334, 346, 593, 640) add something.

> **Observation 3.4**
>
> a restatement is not an error. Neither is it work.When the title says "it is X" and the separator says "whether it is X", the reader has read one thing twice——what a separator should answer is what one must move to make it a different thing, not confirm the title.

> **Observation 3.5**
>
> this is the same shape Paper 600 found.Paper 600 counted at 0.769231 the papers in which the judgement word decided nothing——there the meaning of a word had thinned; here the information of a device has. The more a thing is repeated, the more the repeating becomes the point.

4. The Four That Added Something, and the Rule Hereafter

> **Observation 4.1**
>
> the four that added something shared one form.Three of them (334, "it is not on the side of the sensor's accuracy"; 346, "it is not on the side of the substance"; 593, "whether friction along and across is added arithmetically or treated as a directed quantity") name what is not doing the work——once the title has said what governs, a separator that says what does not govern is new.

Observation 4.2

that form is the least used.Denial of attribution appears in only 10 (0.053191), the rarest of the four forms——the form that works hardest is the one used least.

Observation 4.3

the separator is whether the device is deciding or merely restating.A separator using not one word outside the title is under suspicion of not deciding anything——a machine can carry it that far, and whether it actually works must be settled by reading.

Observation 4.4

the rule hereafter.A separator shall contain at least one word not in the title; where that is impossible, it shall name which side the separator is not on——no earlier paper is revised. This is a rule for future writing.

Observation 4.5

what is not said.The English versions were not counted, and only 188 statements of one fixed pattern were extracted, a part of the 544——the rest are written in other phrasings, and their rate of restatement was not measured.

5. Roll Call and Closing

1. **544 papers (0.779370)** (Computation 2.1): **the first is Paper 23.**
2. **0.050505 over 1 to 100** (Computation 2.1): **not yet present.**
3. **0.990000 over 201 to 300** (Computation 2.1): **it settles here.**
4. **1.000000 in all four later bands** (Computation 2.1): **a habit.**
5. **188 statements, all distinct** (Computation 2.3): **but unremarkable.**
6. **denial of attribution in 10 (0.053191)** (Observation 2.5): **the rarest form.**
7. **overlap averages 0.283871** (Computation 3.1): **the measure.**
8. **32 papers at overlap 1.0 (0.206452)** (Computation 3.1): **the core.**

9. **reading them, 28 (0.875000) restate** (Computation 3.3): **four add something.**

10. **deciding or restating** (Observation 4.3): **the separator; Papers 600 and 300.**

Closing: **The device this corpus has repeated most often fails to work in one paper of five.Of the 698 papers up to Paper 699, 544 (0.779370) carry a separator; adoption jumps from 0.410000 to 0.990000 within the band 201 to 300 and stands at 1.000000 in all four bands thereafter——the moment a device became a habit can be located exactly.The 188 extractable statements are all distinct, but different subjects use different words, so that is no evidence the device is working.The fraction of a separator's words also appearing in its title averages 0.283871, and 32 papers (0.206452) are built from title words alone——reading all 32, 28 (0.875000) merely append "or not" to the claim of the title.Three of the four that added something name which side the separator is not on, a form used in only 10 papers (0.053191)——the form that works hardest is the one used least.The separator is whether the device is deciding or merely restating.The rule hereafter——a separator shall contain at least one word not in the title; where that is impossible, it shall name which side the separator is not on. No earlier paper is revised.Placed among the earlier papers——Paper 300 wrote that it is decidable and Paper 600 counted a judgement word that decided nothing; here a device that adds no information is counted.To be honest——the English versions were not counted, and the 188 are a part of the 544, the rest unmeasured.**

References

1. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Three Hundredth Census: Whether Two Things Share a Root Is Decidable* [Paper 300]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22171914

2. 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

— *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)