The Eight Hundredth Census: Whether a Seat Citation Took the Seat Is Known Unread Only When It Says So

— all **32** that say “seat” or “sit” did sit (**1.000000**), while **19** of the **69** that do not (**0.275362**) placed themselves beside the seat or cited something that was not set aside — the separator is whether a seat citation says if it sat or stood beside — [Paper 800]

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

— From thinking to syncing. —

Abstract

Paper 700 counted the separator and Paper 600 the judgement word “same root”, each recording the part that stopped working through repetition.This paper counts a practice the earlier censuses did not: later papers citing, as a “seat”, what an earlier scope note set aside.No new theorem or law is claimed. First, the stock of what has been set aside is large——685 papers carry a scope note containing 2979 clauses of the form “does not —”, and every band from 201 onward stands at 1.000000 (Section 2). **Second, seat citations grew in later bands——reading all 156 candidates gives 101 seat citations, 53 of them in the band from 701, the first that sat being Paper 218** (Section 3). **Third, read one by one, most did sit——82 sat (0.811881), 17 stood beside, and 2 cited something that was not set aside** (Section 3). **Fourth, and this is the core. Every citation that says it sits did sit——all 32 that say “seat” or “sit” sat (1.000000), while among the 69 that do not, 19 (0.275362) did not sit** (Section 4). **Fifth, from Paper 723 to 797, saying “seat” had disappeared——none of the 49 seat citations in that span names the seat, and on reading, 9 (0.183673) did not sit** (Section 4). **Sixth, in all three cases where the same seat was taken twice, the later paper cited the earlier occupant——stall (458 and 650), contact angle (722 and 764), internal temperature distribution (589 and 798)** (Section 5). **Keywords**: census, scope note, reserved seat, relation to earlier papers, naming the seat, 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 form of scope note is taken narrowly——only the form written inside a quote environment with "本稿の射程" (scope of this paper) counts as a scope note. Paper 526 counted a broader form, and the per-band numbers here are not compared with 526's.The limits of extraction are stated——candidates were restricted to sentences of a scope note, cut at full stops, that contain an earlier paper number and one of the words for "scope note", "stated", "seat", "did not" or "left open". Sentences citing a seat in body observations or closings were not counted.Judgement is not left to the machine——all 156 candidates were read and sorted into four. Judgements were made by reading the scope-note sentence and the sentence following it, not the whole of each paper. The machine only proposed candidates and recounted the table of judgements.Citations that did not sit are not called errors——standing beside also marks a boundary with earlier work.Earlier papers are not revised——revising the papers concerned is not proposed; this is stated only as a convention for future writing.The time point is fixed——the scan was fixed at Paper 799 (including Papers 798 and 799). The numbers move as papers are added.Relation to earlier papers**: **Paper 700 counted separators, showed that of the 32 built from title words alone, 28 (0.875000) merely restated the title, and set the convention of adding a word not in the title——this paper applies the same approach to the practice linking earlier papers, and sets one convention of the same form.Paper 600 counted the judgement word "same root"——there the meaning of the word had thinned. Here the word itself had disappeared.Paper 526 asked whether writing "this paper does not" evades refutation or aims it, counting set-aside declarations and dividing them into three word families——there the setting aside was counted. Here it is counted how later papers cited what was set aside.**What is added is **reading all 156 seat-citation candidates and sorting 101 into four**, **showing that all 32 that say "sit" did sit**, **counting that naming disappeared from Paper 723 to 797**, **confirming that all three twice-taken seats cite their earlier occupant**, and **setting one convention for future writing**.

1. Notation and the Question

Setting: **the Japanese .tex files up to Paper 799 were read, and the part of the body written inside a quote environment with "本稿の射程" is taken as the scope note. Statements within a scope note that say something is not treated, not included, not entered, restricted or fixed are called set-aside statements. A sentence in a later scope note citing an earlier paper's scope note, or what it set aside, is called a seat citation.**

judgement	meaning
sat	the later paper took up what the earlier paper set aside
did not sit	cited what was set aside but stood beside it, drew the same line, or placed it as a different thing under the same word
not set aside	the content cited is not a set-aside statement
not touching	does not touch the earlier paper's scope note (a miss of the machine's candidates)

A seat citation is said to name the seat when it, or the next sentence, contains a word for "seat" or "sit".

Question: **do seat citations say whether they sat, in a form that can be known without reading further?**

2. The Stock

Computation 2.1: **the scan covers 798 papers (numbers 1 to 799). Papers with a scope note, by band, are as follows.**

band	papers with a scope note	fraction
1--100	8 / 99	0.080808
101--200	78 / 100	0.780000
201--300	100 / 100	1.000000
301--400	100 / 100	1.000000
401--500	100 / 100	1.000000
501--600	100 / 100	1.000000
601--700	100 / 100	1.000000
701--799	99 / 99	1.000000

> **Observation 2.2**
>
> **the stock of what has been set aside is large.The scope notes of 685 papers contain 960 occurrences of “does not treat” and 2979 clauses of the form “does not —”. The 0.080808 of the earliest band shows only that this form of scope note did not yet exist, and is separate from the adoption counted in a broader form by Paper 526——the seats later papers could take number in the thousands.**

3. Reading the Seat Citations

Computation 3.1: **among the sentences of scope notes cut at full stops, 156 candidates (143 papers) contain an earlier paper number and one of the words for “scope note”, “stated”, “seat”, “did not” or “left open”. All were read and sorted.**

judgement	count	examples
sat	82	**334←322** (fusion with external observations), **722←309** (contact angle)
did not sit	17	**490←337** (stands beside), **571←274** (a different thing under the same word)
not set aside	2	**580←470**, **761←294**
not touching	55	the pattern “Paper N showed ... — there too ...”

There are 101 seat citations (95 papers); 82 sat (0.811881), and did-not-sit and not-set-aside together make 19 (0.188119).

Computation 3.2: **seat citations were divided by the band of the citing paper.**

band	seat citations	sat	did not sit	not set aside
201--300	4	2	2	0
301--400	2	2	0	0
401--500	5	4	1	0
501--600	20	16	3	1
601--700	17	16	1	0
701--799	53	42	10	1

Observation 3.3

seat citations grew in later bands.The first to sit is Paper 218, the word “reserved seat” is used by three papers, 458, 469 and 484, and 53 gather in the band from 701——the practice of later papers picking up what earlier ones set aside grew along the way.

Observation 3.4

citations that did not sit are not errors.Standing beside, drawing the same line, or saying it is a different thing under the same word all mark a boundary with earlier work——the question is whether the sentence shows if it sat or stood beside.

4. Citations That Say “Sit”

Computation 4.1: **the 101 seat citations were divided by whether they name the seat.**

	count	sat	did not sit	not set aside
naming (writes “seat” or “sit”)	32	32	0	0
not naming	69	50	17	2

Observation 4.2

this is the core: every citation that says it sits did sit.All 32 naming citations sat (1.000000), while among the 69 not naming, 19 (0.275362) did not sit——the naming word was used truthfully, but for citations without it, whether they sat is not known until one reads on.

Computation 4.3: **naming citations are in Papers 334, 458, 469, 484, 489, 513, 523, 526, 532, 564, 574, 582, 584, 589, 591, 594, 595, 596, 597, 631, 651, 654, 658, 659, 662, 663, 666, 668, 672, 674, 722 and 798. From Paper 723 to 797 there are 49 seat citations, of which 0 name the seat, 40 sat, and did-not-sit and not-set-aside together make 9 (0.183673). Up to Paper 722 there are 19 non-naming citations, of which 9 (0.473684) did not sit.**

Observation 4.4

from Paper 723 to 797, saying “seat” had disappeared.Citations in that span were written in the fixed pattern “its scope note stated ...”, and although it is the band with the most seat citations, not one names the seat——the practice continued but its name vanished, so which of the 49 sat and which stood beside is not known until the following sentence is read.

Observation 4.5

the regular expression for naming did not miss.The same expression hits 32 citations in other bands, hits a known case (722←309, “the seat was open”), and misses a known case (764←309)——the 0 from 723 to 797 is not a hole in the counting.

5. Seats Taken Twice, and a Convention for Future Writing

Computation 5.1: **citations that sat more than once for the same earlier paper were listed, with what was sat in written after reading.**

earlier paper	papers that sat (what they sat in)
Paper 309	722 (contact angle), 764 (contact angle), 794 (whether the cohesion theory holds)
Paper 390	458 (stall), 650 (stall of an underwater wing), 651 (planing)
Paper 414	596 (equation of time), 670 (atmospheric refraction)
Paper 465	589 (internal temperature distribution), 798 (internal temperature distribution)
Paper 562	658 (martensitic transformation), 756 (heat input control)
Paper 702	759 (memory hierarchy), 760 (parallelization)
Paper 733	743 (the assumed form of variance), 744 (regularization)

Observation 5.2

in all three cases where the same seat was taken twice, the later paper cited the earlier occupant.For stall, 650 cites 458 four times; for contact angle, 764 cites 722 four times; for internal temperature distribution, 798 cites 589 three times. In the remaining four earlier papers, what was sat in differed——a second sitting was written not as a duplicate but as a continuation naming the earlier occupant.

Observation 5.3

the separator is whether a seat citation says if it sat or stood beside.When it says so, all 32 sat as written; when it does not, 19 of 69 did not sit——when one fixed pattern is used both for sentences that sit and for sentences that stand beside, the pattern does not help judge.

Observation 5.4

a convention for future writing.When citing an earlier scope note, say in one word whether one sits (“sits in that seat”) or stands beside (“stands beside”). If the seat already has an occupant, cite that occupant——earlier papers are not revised. This is a convention for future writing.

Observation 5.5

what is not said.English versions were not counted; candidates were only sentences within scope notes containing fixed words, and sentences citing seats in body observations or closings were not counted. Judgements were made by reading the scope-note sentence and the one following, not the whole of each paper——reading the whole body might shift some judgements between sitting and standing beside; that fraction was not measured.

6. Roll Call and Closing

1. **685 papers with a scope note** (Computation 2.1): **1.000000 from 201 onward.**
2. **2979 clauses of "does not —"** (Observation 2.2): **the stock.**
3. **156 candidates, 101 seat citations** (Computation 3.1): **all read.**
4. **82 sat (0.811881)** (Computation 3.1): **most did sit.**
5. **all 32 naming citations sat (1.000000)** (Observation 4.2): **the core.**
6. **19 of 69 non-naming (0.275362)** (Observation 4.2): **not known until read.**
7. **49 from Paper 723 to 797, 0 naming** (Computation 4.3): **the name vanished.**
8. **9 of them did not sit (0.183673)** (Computation 4.3): **mixed into the pattern.**
9. **all three twice-taken seats cite the earlier occupant** (Observation 5.2): **the second is a continuation.**
10. **whether it says sat or stood beside** (Observation 5.3): **the separator; Papers 700, 600, 526.**

Closing: **Whether a citation of a vacant seat took the seat is known without reading only when it says so.Up to Paper 799, 685 papers carry a scope note containing 2979 clauses of "does not —". Reading all 156 candidate sentences in which later papers cite them gives 101 seat citations, of which 82 (0.811881) sat——the practice of picking up what earlier papers set aside grew along the way and works well.All 32 that say "seat" or "sit" did sit, but 19 of the 69 that do not (0.275362) stood beside or cited something not set aside, and none of the 49 from Paper 723 to 797 names the seat——the practice continued but its name vanished, and whether a citation sat became unknowable without reading.In all three cases where the same seat was taken twice, the later paper cited the earlier occupant.The separator is whether a seat citation says if it sat or stood beside.A convention for future writing——when citing an earlier scope note, say in one word whether one sits or stands beside, and cite any earlier occupant. Earlier papers are not revised.Placed among the earlier papers——Paper 700 counted a device that adds no information, Paper 600 a judgement word whose meaning thinned, and Paper 526 the set-aside declarations themselves. Here it was counted that the name of the practice vanished from the sentences citing what was set aside.To be honest——neither English**

versions nor citations in body observations were counted, and judgements were made by reading scope-note sentences, not the whole body of each paper.

References

1. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Does Writing "This Paper Does Not" Evade Refutation, or Aim It?* [Paper 526]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22867648
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
3. 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

— 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)