The Nine Hundredth Census: What Told Whether There Was a Seat Was Not “Placed Beside” but the Word “Scope Note”

— reading all **114** candidate sentences citing earlier papers in the scope notes of Papers **801** to **899**, **79** do not touch the earlier scope note — the separator is whether a naming word cites an earlier paper’s result or a statement it set aside — [Paper 900]

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

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

Paper 800 counted that whether a seat citation sat is known without reading only when it says “sit”, and set the convention that later papers say in one word whether they sit or are placed beside.This paper counts the same judgement again in the 99 papers written after that convention.No new theorem or law is claimed. First, the convention’s words were used widely——reading all 114 candidate sentences citing earlier papers in scope notes gives 35 seat citations, of which 31 (0.885714) carry a naming word (Section 2). **Second, “sit” kept working——all 10 that say “sit in the seat” cited a scope note (1.000000), 9 (0.900000) sat in what had been set aside, and the remaining one took up something placed as “standard”** (Section 3). **Third, and this is the core. “Placed beside” stopped telling whether there was a seat——of the 97 containing “placed beside”, 76 (0.783505) did not touch the earlier scope note, and 72 of those (0.947368) took the form “showed —; this paper is placed beside it”** (Section 3). **Fourth, what told it instead was the single word “scope note”——among the 30 candidates with that word none fails to touch a scope note, among the 84 without it 79 (0.940476) do not, and 30 of the 35 seat citations (0.857143) carry the word** (Section 4). **Fifth, the spread of “placed beside” advanced as the numbers rose——the share of papers with a non-touching “placed beside” is 0.142857 for 801 to 807, 0.700000 for 808 to 837 and for 838 to 867, and 0.906250 for 868 to 899** (Section 4). **Sixth, the separator is whether a naming word cites an earlier paper’s result or a statement it set aside——the 7 sentences saying “no earlier occupant” were all correct at the level of what was sat in. From now on, naming words are used only in sentences citing a scope note, and those sentences say “scope note”** (Section 5). **Keywords**: census, scope note, relation to earlier papers, naming the seat, convention, 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.Scope notes are taken as in Paper 800——only the part of the body written inside a quote environment with "本稿の射程" (scope of this paper) counts as a scope note, and sentences citing earlier papers in body observations or closings are not counted.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 either the same candidate words as Paper 800 or one of the naming forms listed in the table of Section 1. Naming forms were also sought in the next sentence when it contains no paper number.Judgement is not left to the machine——all 114 candidates were read and sorted into the same four classes as Paper 800. Judgements were made by reading the scope-note sentence and the sentence following it, not the whole of each paper. Two borderline cases were decided by reading the scope notes of both the earlier and the later paper. The machine only proposed candidates, sorted the naming forms, and recounted the table of judgements.A non-touching "placed beside" is not called an error——Paper 800's convention decided how to write when citing a scope note, and said nothing about sentences citing results.Papers already written are not revised——revising the papers concerned is not proposed; this is stated only as a convention for future writing.Mentioning a word is kept apart from naming a seat——when this paper writes "sit", "placed beside" or "seat", it is mentioning the words being counted, not naming a seat in an earlier scope note.The time point is fixed——the scan was fixed at Papers 801 to 899. The numbers move as papers are added.Relation to earlier papers**: **Paper 800 read 101 seat citations, showed that all 32 that say "seat" or "sit" did sit, and set the convention of saying in one word whether a seat citation sat——this paper recounts the same judgement in the papers written after that convention, and measures that its two words went separate ways.Paper 600 counted the judgement word "same root" and showed that its meaning had thinned——in Paper 800 the word itself had disappeared. Here the word spread outside scope notes and lost its power to distinguish.Paper 700 counted separators and set the convention of adding a word not in the title——this paper sets one convention of the same form.**What is added is **reading all 114 candidates and sorting them into four**, **laying out judgements by naming form and showing that "sit" and "placed beside" went separate ways**, **counting that the presence of the word "scope note" separated the judgements**, **checking sentences saying "no earlier occupant" against Paper 800's table**, and **setting one convention for future writing**.

1. Notation and the Question

Setting: **the Japanese .tex files of Papers 801 to 899 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. Among the sentences of a scope note cut at full stops, those containing an earlier paper number are called sentences citing earlier papers.The words that Paper 800's convention uses for naming were sorted into five forms.**

naming form	form in the sentence
sit	“sit in the seat” (その席に座る)
not sit, beside	“not sit in the seat, placed beside” (その席には座らず、隣に置く)
beside the seat	“placed beside the seat” (その席の隣に置く)
beside	“placed beside it”, “placed beside it too” (その隣に置く・隣にも置く)
no naming	none of the above

The judgements are the same four as in Paper 800.

judgement	meaning
sat	the later paper took up what the earlier scope note set aside
did not sit	cited what was set aside but did not take it up
not set aside	cited a scope note, but the content was “placed as known”, “standard” and the like
not touching	did not touch the earlier scope note, citing only a result

As in Paper 800, the first three are called seat citations.

Question: **after the convention was set, do its words still tell, without reading, whether a citation is a seat citation?**

2. Candidates and Judgements

Computation 2.1: **all 99 papers carry a scope note. Sentences citing earlier papers in scope notes number 191, of which 114 (in 98 papers) are candidates. All were read and sorted.**

judgement	count	examples
sat	10	895←728 (evacuation), 850←333 (biological membranes)
did not sit	15	801←672 (auditory models), 854←456 (sound insulation)
not set aside	10	835←256, 861←719
not touching	79	the type “showed —; this paper is placed beside it”

There are 35 seat citations (in 32 papers); 31 (0.885714) carry a naming word, and the 4 without are 814←805, 834←346, 856←488 and 862←519.

> **Observation 2.2**
>
> **two holes in the counting were closed by self-tests.Paper 800’s candidate word “did not” also hit two sentences through “was not decided” and “was not enough”, and Paper 800’s naming pattern also hit “squatting” (居座る, 816) and “good seats decreased” (822, binding sites of receptors)——this paper’s sorting of naming forms does not take “squatting” as “sit” (the sentence of 816 falls under “beside” through its “placed beside”), and does not take “good seats decreased” as naming. The two sentences that became candidates only through “did not” were both read as not touching.**

> **Observation 2.3**
>
> **the two borderline cases were decided by reading both scope notes.For 854←456, 456 set aside “the sound insulation performance of buildings” and 854 states that it does not treat floor vibration or radiation into the room below, so it did not sit. For 857←466, 466 set aside “tuning practice, inharmonicity and adaptive temperaments” and 857 does not treat the shift of overtones, so it did not sit——both agree with the naming each paper wrote for itself.**

3. The Separate Ways of Two Words

Computation 3.1: **the 114 candidates were sorted by naming form and judgement.**

naming form	count	sat	did not sit	not set aside	not touching
sit	10	9	0	1	0
not sit, beside	11	0	1	4	6
beside the seat	14	0	8	3	3
beside	72	0	4	1	67
no naming	7	1	2	1	3

Observation 3.2

“sit” kept working.All 10 saying “sit in the seat” cited a scope note (1.000000), and 9 (0.900000) sat in what had been set aside——the remaining one (835←256) took up what 256’s scope note placed as “Kleiber’s law is standard”, sitting in something that was not a set-aside statement. None of the ten failed to sit, and none failed to touch a scope note.

Observation 3.3

this is the core. “Placed beside” stopped telling whether there was a seat.The three forms containing “placed beside” total 97: against 13 that did not sit and 8 not set aside, 76 (0.783505) did not touch the earlier scope note——of those 76, 72 (0.947368) take the form “showed —; this paper is placed beside it”, and no seat citation takes that form. Even among the 25 in the two forms using the word “seat”, 9 (0.360000) cite no seat.

4. The Word That Told Instead, and How the Spread Went

Computation 4.1: **candidates were split by whether the sentence (and the next) contains the word “scope note”.**

word “scope note”	count	sat	did not sit	not set aside	not touching
present	30	9	15	6	0
absent	84	1	0	4	79

Observation 4.2

what told it instead was the single word “scope note”.Among the 30 with the word, none fails to touch a scope note; among the 84 without it, 79 (0.940476) do not touch one——30 of the 35 seat citations (0.857143) carry the word, and the 5 without it are 4 citing something placed as known (or stated as a known result) and 1 (856←488) saying within the sentence that the topic was “left open”.

Computation 4.3: **counts were made for each range of numbers.**

range	candidates	seat citations	“placed beside” forms (not touching)	papers with non-touching beside
801–807 (7 papers)	10	7	8 (2)	1 (0.142857)
808–837 (30 papers)	33	11	28 (21)	21 (0.700000)
838–867 (30 papers)	35	12	28 (22)	21 (0.700000)
868–899 (32 papers)	36	5	33 (31)	29 (0.906250)

Observation 4.4

the spread of “placed beside” advanced as the numbers rose.The first non-touching “placed beside” is in Paper 806, and from 868 to 899, 29 of 32 papers (0.906250) have one; only 873, 876 and 898 do not——in the same range, seat citations fell to 5.

5. Earlier Occupants and the Convention from Now On

Computation 5.1: **the 10 citations that sat were laid out by what they sat in and by the papers that, in Paper 800’s table, had sat earlier in the same earlier paper. Paper 800’s table was read from its verification script itself.**

citation that sat	what it sat in	earlier occupant of the same paper
807←334	bias (systematic error)	none
830←342	weaves	none
850←333	biological membranes	594 (boiling-point rise and vapour-pressure lowering)
853←451	condensation measures	none
856←396	escapements	none
856←488	escapements	none
867←581	thinning	none
873←387	exploration and exploitation	none
875←348	approximation ratios	770 (connecting only the given points)
895←728	evacuation	none

Observation 5.2

sentences saying “no earlier occupant” were all correct at the level of what was sat in.Candidates saying there was no earlier occupant number 7 (6 that sat, plus 835←256), and only two earlier papers, 333 and 348, had an earlier occupant——in both, the earlier occupant sat in a different item of the same paper. Within 801 to 899, no earlier paper was sat in twice.

Observation 5.3

the separator is whether a naming word cites an earlier paper’s result or a statement it set aside.A sentence citing a set-aside statement writes “in its scope note it stated —”, and there the naming word tells whether the citation sat——when the same words are used in sentences citing results, they no longer tell whether there is a seat, and what tells it is only whether “scope note” was written.

Observation 5.4

the convention from now on.Naming words (sit, placed beside, seat) are used only in sentences citing an earlier scope note, and those sentences say “scope note”. Sentences citing only an earlier result do not use naming words——papers already written are not revised. This is a convention for future writing. This paper’s own scope note uses no naming word in the sentences citing the results of Papers 800, 600 and 700.

Observation 5.5

what is not said.The English versions are not counted, nor sentences citing earlier papers in body observations. Judgements were made by reading scope-note sentences and the sentences following them, not the whole of each paper——reading the whole bodies might reveal that some citations judged as not touching did in fact cite something written in a scope note. That share was not measured.

6. Census and Closing

1. **191 sentences citing earlier papers, 114 candidates** (Computation 2.1): **all read.**
2. **35 seat citations, 31 naming (0.885714)** (Computation 2.1): **the words were used widely.**
3. **all 10 “sit in the seat” cite a scope note (1.000000)** (Observation 3.2): **9 sat (0.900000).**
4. **76 of 97 “placed beside” not touching (0.783505)** (Observation 3.3): **the core.**
5. **72 of them (0.947368) in the form “showed —; placed beside it”** (Observation 3.3): **0 among seat citations.**
6. **9 of 25 using “seat” (0.360000)** (Observation 3.3): **citing no seat.**
7. **79 of 84 without “scope note” (0.940476)** (Observation 4.2): **the word that told instead.**
8. **0.906250 for 868 to 899** (Computation 4.3): **the spread advanced with the numbers.**
9. **all 7 “no earlier occupant” correct by item** (Observation 5.2): **333 and 348 were different items.**
10. **a result, or a set-aside statement** (Observation 5.3): **the separator; Papers 800, 600, 700.**

Closing: **“Placed beside” stopped telling whether there was a seat, and what told it instead was the single word “scope note”.Reading all 114 candidates citing earlier papers in the scope notes of Papers 801 to 899 gave 35 seat citations; all 10 saying “sit in the seat” cited a scope note, and 9 sat——of the convention set by Paper 800, “sit” kept working.But of the 97 containing “placed beside”, 76 (0.783505) did not touch the earlier scope note, 72 of them in the form “showed —; this paper is placed beside it”, and from 868 to 899, 29 of 32 papers carried such a citation ——the word spread outside scope notes and lost its power to distinguish. Yet among the 30 that wrote “scope note”**

none failed to touch one; it was this single word that separated the judgements.The separator is whether a naming word cites an earlier paper's result or a statement it set aside.The convention from now on——naming words are used only in sentences citing a scope note, and those sentences say "scope note". Papers already written are not revised.Placed among the earlier papers——Paper 600 counted that a judgement word's meaning thinned, Paper 700 that a device added no information, and Paper 800 that the name of a practice disappeared. Here it was counted that a name, once set, spread beyond its convention and lost its power to distinguish.To be honest——neither the English versions nor citations in body observations were counted, judgements were made by reading scope-note sentences rather than whole papers, and the papers counted and this census belong to the same stream of writing, so there is no guarantee that this paper is free of the habit measured here.

References

1. 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
2. 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
3. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Eight Hundredth Census: Whether a Seat Citation Took the Seat Is Known Unread Only When It Says So* [Paper 800]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.22805383

— *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)