

The AI Partitur — A Score Language for the Humanities

Orchestration one can read: agents as movements, YAML as notation

Gerd Graßhoff ^{iD}

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Deutsches Museum
gerd.grasshoff@hu-berlin.de

ABSTRACT

Computational workflows in the humanities are frequently obscured by imperative programming logic: control flow, error handling, retry policies, and heuristic thresholds remain distributed across source code that only programmers can inspect and modify. This paper presents the *AI Partitur* — a declarative score language for agent orchestration that removes this barrier by replacing opaque code paths with an editable, inspectable document. In this system, every autonomous agent is defined by a single YAML document (its score), executed by a runtime engine called the Conductor. All parameters critical to scholarly validity — goal decompositions, prompt compositions, pass thresholds, retry bounds, iron editorial rules, and learning targets — are declared as explicit fields rather than buried in code. Drawing on musical notation, Donald Knuth’s literate programming, James Grier’s critical editing of scores, and Ludwig Wittgenstein’s use-theory of rules, we demonstrate how complex research workflows decompose into movements, AND-OR goal trees, predicate guards, and rehearsal loops. We walk through the production score `ai-query-phase1` from AI Erasmus, exhibit nested sub-agent scores for modular methodology, detail the Harvest learning loop for benchmark-driven rehearsal, and present a typographic display language for citing orchestration in scholarly print. The resulting architecture turns the domain scholar from a passive consumer of software features into an active composer and editor of research instruments.

KEYWORDS digital humanities · agent orchestration · partitur · YAML · literate programming · AI Erasmus · declarative workflows · computational epistemology

Table of contents

1 Introduction: The Challenge of Computational Notation	2
1.1 Programs as Opaque Mechanisms	2
1.2 The Declarative Score as Inspectable Method	2
1.3 Three Core Claims	2
2 Anatomy of a Partitur: Identity, Structure, and Stages	3
2.1 Top-Level Declarations and the Goal Tree	3
2.2 Stage Definition and Semantic Fields	3
2.3 Validation at Load Time	4
3 The Musical Vocabulary: Construct-by-Construct Correspondence	5
3.1 Mapping Table and Semantic Justification	5
3.2 Defending the Mapping: Instrumentation, Rehearsal, and Silence	5
4 A Score for Scholarship: The <code>ai-query-phase1</code> Pipeline	6
4.1 The Pre-Analysis Contract and Editorial Iron Rules	6
4.2 Declared Budgets and OR Fallbacks	6
4.3 Predicate-Gated Movements	7
4.4 From Score to Scholar: The Execution Trace	7
5 Scores Within Scores: Subagents and Modularity	8
5.1 Hierarchical Delegation and Subagent Partiturs	8
5.2 Method as a Citable, Modular Artifact	8
6 Rehearsal and Refinement: The Harvest Subsystem	8
6.1 Rehearsing Against Golden Benchmarks	8
6.2 What Rehearsal May Change: Skills versus Structure	9

6.3 Worked Rehearsal Case: Benchmark Optimization	9
7 Quoting Scores in Scholarly Print	10
7.1 The Display Language and Its Anatomy	10
7.2 Interleaving Prose and Notation	10
8 Implications: The Humanist as Composer and Editor	10
8.1 Shifting the Division of Computational Labor	10
8.2 Reviewability, Teachability, and Accountability	10
9 The Orchestrator Ecosystem and Companion Papers	11
9.1 The Integrated Scholarly Architecture	11
9.2 Verified Implementation State	11
10 Conclusion	11
11 References	11
Bibliography	12

1 Introduction: The Challenge of Computational Notation

1.1 Programs as Opaque Mechanisms

For more than half a century, scholars in the humanities have been urged to learn to program. The prescription, however, routinely misdiagnosed the true obstacle. The fundamental friction between philologists, historians, and philosophers on the one hand, and computational systems on the other, was never an aversion to formal rigor; it was the *notation* in which computational behavior is traditionally expressed. In imperative programming languages, operational logic is dispersed across files, classes, and helper functions. Control flow is buried in loops and branching statements; editorial assumptions are hardcoded as arbitrary constant values; and procedural dependencies are intelligible only to those who can trace dynamic execution stacks.

When a historian needs to verify whether a correspondence search excludes undated drafts, or a philologist wishes to adjust the confidence threshold of a lemma match, they are forced to confront software engineering machinery unrelated to their domain inquiry. If a pipeline must be adapted, the domain scholar depends on a software specialist to locate and modify hidden lines of code. This division of labor creates an epistemic disconnect: the scholar remains responsible for the validity of the final claim, yet cannot inspect or audit the procedural mechanics that produced the evidence.

1.2 The Declarative Score as Inspectable Method

The AI Partitur resolves this disconnect by changing the representation of orchestration. In the AI Agent Orchestrator framework [1], every agent is defined by a single, self-contained YAML document: its *score* (German *Partitur*). A dedicated runtime engine, the *Conductor*, parses, validates, and executes this document. The governing design principle is uncompromising: *everything that governs scholarly judgment is declared in the Partitur*.

If an operational parameter affects research results — a decomposed goal, a prompt template, an evaluation metric, a loop bound, a routing guard, a millisecond latency budget, or a learning target — it is recorded as an explicit field in the YAML score, not as a variable in a programming script. Scholars configure, audit, and refine agents by reading and editing declarative markup.

This approach builds on Donald Knuth’s concept of *literate programming* [2], in which programs are structured as works of literature intended for human understanding rather than merely instructions for compilers. It also connects directly with James Grier’s principles of the critical editing of musical scores [3] and Ludwig Wittgenstein’s analysis of rule-following and notation [4]: a score serves as an explicit, citable rule of performance that permits systematic critique and verifiable compliance.

1.3 Three Core Claims

Three foundational claims organise the argument of this paper:

The German Partitur
orchestral score
instruments all
one page across

1. **Readability.** A Partitur can be read and understood by scanning its structural hierarchy first, because its musical vocabulary is exact rather than metaphorical (Chapters 2 and 3).
2. **Scholarly operations run on scores.** The query and indexing pipelines of the AI Erasmus platform [5] are played directly from executable scores, complete with editorial iron rules, deterministic backends, and predicate-gated fallbacks (Chapters 4 and 5), refined by automated rehearsal loops (Chapter 6).
3. **Scores can be quoted and cited in print.** Scholarly publication requires a typographic standard to quote orchestration the way musicology quotes bars; Chapter 7 demonstrates the display language developed for this purpose.

The paper concludes by analyzing how this shift redefines the humanist as a composer and editor of computational research instruments (Chapter 8), situates the Partitur within the broader AI Platform architecture (Chapter 9), and outlines its verified status (Chapter 10).

2 Anatomy of a Partitur: Identity, Structure, and Stages

2.1 Top-Level Declarations and the Goal Tree

A musical score is read from global structure to individual voices: how many movements comprise the work, in what order they proceed, and how they relate. A Partitur provides the same structural clarity. Its top-level mapping declares a unique identifier, an overarching natural-language goal, a default runtime instrumentation, and an explicit *goal tree*.

PARTITUR research-report / top level

```

partitur:
  id: research-report
  goal: "Produce a short, sourced report on a given topic."
  runtime: mock 1
  goal_tree:
    op: AND 2
    children: [gather, write]
  entry: gather 3

```

1 Instrumentation: declares the default execution backend. The `mock` provider enables deterministic, offline testing; single-line edits swap in local Ollama or hosted model backends.

2 Goal tree structure: an AND node specifies that the agent succeeds if and only if *both* constituent movements succeed.

3 Entry movement: identifies the initial stage where the Conductor commences execution.

PLAYED BY Conductor / mock

The top level defines the complete macro-structure of the agent. The agent `research-report` consists of two sequential movements, `gather` and `write`. They are conjoined by an AND operator in the `goal_tree`, declaring that failure of either movement constitutes failure of the overarching task. The Conductor begins execution at the `gather` stage.

2.2 Stage Definition and Semantic Fields

Each individual movement — termed a *stage* — carries its own localized goal, instruction context, runtime overrides, grading evaluators, iteration bounds, and routing guards. The stage definition below shows the `write` movement of the `research-report` score:

PARTITUR research-report / write

```

- id: write
  goal: "Write a clear, well-structured, sourced report."
  instruction:
    context: [topic, web] 1
    skills: [report-writing] 2
  loop: { max_iterations: 4, until: ">=GOOD" } 3
  guards:
    on_grade: { ">=GOOD": done, "<GOOD": self, "FAILED*3": fail } 4

```

- 1 Context injection: blackboard state variables passed to the stage prompt — here the initial topic and gathered web evidence.
- 2 Skill binding: references modular, versioned instruction files maintained as independent markdown artifacts.
- 3 Bounded ritornello: repeats the movement until the evaluation grade meets or exceeds GOOD, capped at four attempts.
- 4 Routing guards: defines state transitions conditional on evaluation grades; below GOOD triggers da capo (self); three consecutive failures terminates the pipeline.

PLAYED BY **Conductor** / mock

Two characteristics distinguish this notation from programming scripts:

- **Semantic control predicates.** Directives such as `until: ">=GOOD"` express termination conditions in the qualitative grading vocabulary of the evaluation framework rather than low-level integer or boolean comparisons.
- **Declarative state routing.** The `guards.on_grade` table specifies transitions as a deterministic state machine, separating workflow logic from the prompts or models that generate output.

Grades original
declarative ass
outputs are ag
scoring rules.

2.3 Validation at Load Time

Unlike interpreted scripts that fail midway through execution when an unbound variable is encountered, the Conductor subjects every Partitur to strict structural and semantic validation before execution begins [1]. The validating loader enforces five structural invariants:

1. **Identifier uniqueness.** All stage identifiers within a score must be unique.
2. **Graph completeness.** Every transition target declared in `entry`, `children`, or `guards` must resolve to a valid stage definition.
3. **Acyclicity of non-loop paths.** Unless explicitly enclosed within a bounded `loop` construct, stage dependency graphs must form directed acyclic graphs (DAGs).
4. **Context key availability.** Context dependencies declared in `instruction.context` must be provably produced by ancestor stages or injected via initial blackboard state.
5. **Evaluator contract compliance.** Evaluators referenced in `guards.on_grade` must exist in the active evaluator registry and provide declared score ranges.

If any invariant is breached, the Conductor rejects the entire document at load time, emitting an informative diagnostic message. A flawed score cannot produce partial or misleading executions.

i What Remains Code: The Conductor Runtime

The Conductor runtime engine that loads, validates, and executes scores is written in standard software code. The claim of the Partitur is not that underlying software is eliminated, but that the *entire editable surface affecting scholarly interpretation* is elevated into declarative notation. The scholar edits and inspects the score; the system engineer maintains the Conductor instrument.

3 The Musical Vocabulary: Construct-by-Construct Correspondence

3.1 Mapping Table and Semantic Justification

Software projects frequently employ metaphors casually. In the Partitur architecture, the musical vocabulary maps directly and rigorously to computational constructs, as documented in Table 1.

Table 1 The correspondence between musical notation and Partitur constructs.

Musical Term	Partitur Construct	Computational Meaning
Score (<i>Partitur</i>)	YAML Document	Complete declarative specification of agent behavior
Conductor	Runtime Engine	Deterministic loader, validator, and execution engine
Movement	Stage (<code>id</code>)	Discrete sub-task with localized goal and context
The Work’s Structure	Goal Tree (<code>goal_tree</code>)	Hierarchical AND-OR logic over movements
Repeat Marks / <i>Da Capo</i>	Guard Transitions (<code>on_grade</code>)	Grade-conditioned jump to self or alternative stage
Bounded Ritornello	Loop Definition (<code>loop</code>)	Iteration bounded by count and grade criteria
Instrumentation	Runtime Specification (<code>runtime</code>)	Execution engine binding (DuckDB, Ollama, API model)
Rehearsal	Learning Loop (<code>learning</code>)	Benchmark-driven optimization of skills toward goldens
Silence (played)	Skip Movement (<code>pdai:noop</code>)	Explicit no-op stage recorded in the audit trace

WHY EXACT NOTATION MATTERS

A casual metaphor decorates; an exact notation instructs. Because the correspondence in Table 1 holds construct for construct, a scholar’s intuitive understanding of structured scores transfers directly to workflow design. A researcher who understands the instruction “repeat the movement until the rendering is acceptable, up to three attempts” understands the `loop` and `guards` directives without formal training in imperative programming.

3.2 Defending the Mapping: Instrumentation, Rehearsal, and Silence

Three terms in this correspondence require explicit defence:

- **Instrumentation.** In music, a melodic line may be reassigned from violins to woodwinds without modifying the notes themselves. In a Partitur, a stage can be switched from a deterministic database query (`pdai:duckdb`) to a local open-weights model (`ollama:qwen3.5`) or a cloud model (`gemini-3.8-flash`) by altering a single `runtime:` field. The operational contract and surrounding workflow remain unchanged.
- **Rehearsal.** An orchestra does not alter the notes of a symphony during rehearsal; rather, musicians refine their technique against an idealized standard of interpretation. In the Partitur framework, the Harvest learning subsystem optimizes editable skills and prompt instructions against golden reference queries, leaving the structural goal tree intact.
- **Silence as an executed movement.** In musical performance, a rest is not an omission but a deliberate event that occupies time. In the Partitur, when a conditional branch finds nothing to process, it executes

an explicit `pdai:noop` skip movement. This skip costs approximately one millisecond and is recorded in the execution trace. Silence is actively performed and audited, ensuring that negative evidence is fully documented.

Following Wittgenstein’s insight that the meaning of a rule is demonstrated by its systematic application [4], a Partitur provides an explicit rule whose execution trace can be cited as evidence for computational findings.

4 A Score for Scholarship: The `ai-query-phase1` Pipeline

4.1 The Pre-Analysis Contract and Editorial Iron Rules

The utility of a score language must be established on real research tasks. The primary running example in this paper is `ai-query-phase1`, the pre-analysis Partitur that processes every scholar’s corpus query in the AI Erasmus platform [5], [6].

PARTITUR `ai-query-phase1` / top level

partitur:
id: `ai-query-phase1`
goal: >
Decompose a raw scholarly corpus query into elementary evidence (persons, places, dates, collections, intent, attested lemmata) BEFORE any LLM is consulted.
runtime: `pdai:duckdb` 1
metadata:
iron_rules: 2
- "Collection names are SCOPE, never lemmas"
- "No costly searches of no value – audit every run/skip"

1 Deterministic instrumentation: fast analytical database queries (DuckDB) executed before any language model is invoked.
2 Editorial iron rules: domain-specific constraints declared directly in score metadata, preventing common categorization errors.

PLAYED BY **Conductor** / `pdai:duckdb`

The metadata section contains *iron rules* — explicit editorial directives that govern all downstream movements. For example, the directive "Collection names are SCOPE, never lemmas" enforces that a reference to *Kepler* in a query like “Lex natura in Kepler’s writing” restricts the query to the `kepler-prim` corpus rather than being erroneously searched as a Latin co-occurring lemma.

4.2 Declared Budgets and OR Fallbacks

The score establishes strict millisecond resource budgets for each movement, organizing execution into disciplined tiers:

PARTITUR `ai-query-phase1` / stanza-or-skip

- **id:** `stanza-or-skip`
goal: "Attest remaining content terms as lemmata – or skip if none."
goal_tree:
op: OR 1
children: [`stanza-filter`, `stanza-skip`]
- **id:** `stanza-skip`

goal: "No content terms left after entity/scope removal."

runtime: pdai:noop 2

1

OR fallback node: execution succeeds if either the full linguistic filter or the explicit skip movement completes.

2

Explicit silence: a pdai:noop stage executing in 1 ms, documenting that lemma attestation was intentionally bypassed.

PLAYED BY

Conductor / pdai:stanza

The `OR` node in `stanza-or-skip` establishes a declarative fallback: when entity and scope extraction consume all terms in a query, the pipeline routes to `stanza-skip` rather than executing an expensive, empty database scan.

Declared stage
budget_ms: 3
classification,
resolution, 406
index probe.

4.3 Predicate-Gated Movements

High-cost operations, such as multimodal visual feature detection across scanned manuscripts, are protected by predicate guards:

PARTITUR

ai-query-phase1 / figure-interpret

- id: figure-interpret

goal: "Probe fastimage availability ONLY when the query asks about figures."

runtime: pdai:fastimage

guards:

when:

- when: "not state.get('fasttext_classify_result', {}).get('wants_figures')"

then: done

1

Predicate guard: evaluates state variables; if the query does not explicitly request figures, the stage terminates immediately without invocation.

PLAYED BY

Conductor / pdai:fastimage

By enforcing this guard at the score level, the pipeline guarantees that computer vision models are never triggered unnecessarily on purely textual or biographical questions.

4.4 From Score to Scholar: The Execution Trace

When a scholar submits a question in AI Erasmus, the Conductor records a structured execution trace detailing every movement performed:

OPERATION

Execution Trace: ai-query-phase1 on Johannes Kepler Corpus

388 ms (score budget: 510 ms)

Q

How many letters does KGW 13 contain?

1

fasttext-classify

Classifies intent as inventory query within declared 30 ms budget

2

collection-select

Binds scope to kepler-prim volume 13; iron rule prevents KGW from being parsed as lemma

3

volume-letter-count

Scans structured XML Nr. headers and returns unique letter count

→ 122 letters — verified against KGW 13 editorial register; execution trace records 4 played movements and 2 audited skips

The scholar receives not merely an answer, but an inspectable method trace specifying which movements were played, which were skipped, and the exact millisecond performance of each stage. Transparency is an organic byproduct of the score's execution.

5 Scores Within Scores: Subagents and Modularity

5.1 Hierarchical Delegation and Subagent Partiturs

Complex scholarly inquiries cannot be handled effectively by monolithic, flat workflows. The Partitur architecture supports hierarchical composition through the `partitur:` directive, allowing any stage to delegate its task to a nested sub-score.

The deep-reading agent for scientific arguments demonstrates this modular nesting:

PARTITUR deep-reading-causal / figure_extraction

```
- id: figure_extraction
  goal: "Locate, crop, and caption-pair the paper's figures."
  partitur: ❶
    id: causal_figure_extractor_subagent
    runtime: gemini:gemini-3.8-flash ❷
    goal_tree:
      op: AND ❸
      children: [figure_locator, figure_cropper, caption_pairing]
    stages:
      - id: figure_locator
        goal: "Identify bounding boxes for all diagrammatic figures."
      - id: figure_cropper
        goal: "Extract high-resolution image crops from page coordinates."
      - id: caption_pairing
        goal: "Associate figure labels with corresponding text captions."
```

❶ Subagent delegation: embeds a complete child Partitur with its own goal tree and stage definitions.

❷ Instrumentation shift: the child score invokes a multimodal vision model suited for graphic analysis.

❸ Child movements: the sub-task is explicitly decomposed into localization, cropping, and caption alignment.

PLAYED BY Conductor / nested sub-score

5.2 Method as a Citable, Modular Artifact

Hierarchical decomposition offers substantial methodological advantages:

- **Granular accountability.** The sub-score `causal_figure_extractor_subagent` can be independently audited, benchmarked, and peer-reviewed without altering the parent reading pipeline.
- **Reusability across projects.** The figure extraction score can be linked by different parent agents across distinct scholarly domains (e.g., historical sundial treatises and early modern astronomical prints).
- **Targeted peer review.** In scholarly debates over digital methods, disagreements can focus on specific sub-scores — such as the bounding box heuristic in `figure_locator` — rather than vague critiques of the pipeline as a whole.

6 Rehearsal and Refinement: The Harvest Subsystem

6.1 Rehearsing Against Golden Benchmarks

A score is refined through rehearsal against established benchmarks. In the AI Agent Orchestrator framework, this process is governed by the *Harvest* learning loop subsystem [1]. A Partitur declares its rehearsal parameters in an explicit `learning:` block:

PARTITUR deep-reading-causal / learning

learning:

```

- target: "skill:causal-claim-extraction" 1
  golden: "golden:causal-claim-extraction" 2
  strategy: textual-gradient 3
  max_rounds: 4
  evaluators: [precision_score, recall_score]
  gate: 4
    min_improvement: 0.05
    allow_regression: false

```

- 1 Optimization target: identifies the specific skill or instruction file to be refined.
- 2 Golden dataset: references verified historical test queries with ground-truth target outputs.
- 3 Optimization strategy: applies reflective textual gradients to propose minimal instruction patches.
- 4 A/B promotion gate: candidate patches are adopted if and only if they achieve required score gains without regressing existing benchmark passes.

PLAYED BY Harvest Subsystem

6.2 What Rehearsal May Change: Skills versus Structure

To maintain epistemic integrity, strict boundaries govern what automated rehearsal may alter:

METHOD The Architectural Boundary of Rehearsal

The Harvest subsystem optimizes **skills, instructions, and prompt templates** — and nothing else. Automated optimization is strictly forbidden from modifying the `goal_tree`, stage ordering, or editorial iron rules declared in the Partitur. Modifying the goal tree changes the research question itself; modifying instructions refines the execution of an established question.

6.3 Worked Rehearsal Case: Benchmark Optimization

The interaction between Partitur scores and rehearsal is demonstrated on a person-resolution golden query from AI Erasmus [6]. The query involves disambiguating the 16th-century mathematician *Georg Hartmann* from unrelated contemporary correspondents in the Pirckheimer register.

During an initial audit run, the entity extraction stage produced an imperfect resolution:

```

# Pre-Rehearsal Evaluation Trace
stage: person-classify
input: "Letters exchanged between Pirckheimer and Georg Hartmann"
output: ["Hartmann, Georg", "Sauermann, Georg"]
error: Substring overlap on first name triggered extraneous candidate.
benchmark_score: 0.60 (FAIL)

```

The Harvest loop initiated an automated rehearsal cycle:

1. **Deficit analysis.** The evaluation harness identified the false positive "Sauermann, Georg" caused by unweighted first-name matching.
2. **Textual gradient generation.** The system generated an instruction patch for the `person-classify` skill adding an explicit full-name priority rule: "Always prioritize exact full-name matches over partial given-name overlaps."

3. **A/B gate verification.** The patched instruction was evaluated against the entire thirteen-query canonical golden suite. The target query score improved from 0.60 to 1.00 (PASS), while the aggregate suite pass rate increased from 87.3% to 92.8% with zero regressions on other queries.
4. **Promotion.** The versioned patch was promoted and committed to the instruction store as `person-classify:v1.1`.

Rehearsal systematically elevates pipeline reliability against declared historical ground truth.

7 Quoting Scores in Scholarly Print

7.1 The Display Language and Its Anatomy

In musicological publications, scholars do not reprint entire orchestral scores; they cite specific measures, annotate notable passages with bar numbers, and explain their compositional significance. Scholarly papers discussing AI workflows require an equivalent display language.

The `arxivai` typst package implements this standard through five coordinated elements:

- **Small-caps header strip.** Displays the score identifier and specific stage path (e.g., `PARTITUR: ai-query-phase1 / stanza-or-skip`), preventing quoted notation from being confused with running prose or configuration files.
- **Indentation-preserving code block.** Renders YAML syntax cleanly with restrained semantic key highlighting.
- **Circled gold line markers.** Places distinct numbered markers (①, ②, ③) alongside critical lines.
- **Legend pane.** Keys each numbered marker directly to a concise explanatory sentence immediately beneath the code block.
- **Runtime footer strip.** Names the execution engine responsible for playing the movement (e.g., `PLAYED BY Conductor / pdai:duckdb`).

7.2 Interleaving Prose and Notation

In rigorous scholarly exposition, code fragments must not float disconnected from the narrative. Every score-box in this paper is introduced by argumentative prose establishing the operational requirement, followed by the quoted notation, and concluded by an analysis of the structural consequence. Numbered markers can be cited inline in running text — for example, citing

① to reference top-level instrumentation — ensuring that analysis and formal specification remain tightly integrated.

8 Implications: The Humanist as Composer and Editor

8.1 Shifting the Division of Computational Labor

Elevating orchestration into declarative Partitur scores transforms the traditional division of labor in digital humanities:

- **The scholar as composer.** The domain researcher formulates research questions, designs goal trees, establishes editorial iron rules, defines evaluation criteria, and curates golden benchmark datasets.
- **The software engineer as instrument maker.** The technical developer constructs robust runtime conductors, builds high-performance database indices, and optimizes execution backends.

Scholars no longer wait for custom software features to be implemented. When a new analytical requirement arises — such as cross-referencing Latin geographical adjectives against a regional gazetteer — the researcher composes a new Partitur movement using existing primitives.

8.2 Reviewability, Teachability, and Accountability

This architectural model reinforces three foundational standards of scholarship:

- **Reviewability.** Peer reviewers can examine the exact YAML score submitted with a publication, inspecting every decomposed goal, prompt constraint, and threshold. Research methodology becomes fully transparent.
- **Teachability.** The Partitur vocabulary is compact and intuitive. A graduate seminar can analyze and modify real agent scores without mastering complex programming languages.
- **Accountability.** Because every performance produces a verifiable execution trace matching the score's declared movements, computational claims can be traced directly to the specific pages and operations that produced them.

■ 9 The Orchestrator Ecosystem and Companion Papers

■ 9.1 The Integrated Scholarly Architecture

The Partitur score language functions as the central orchestration layer within an integrated suite of scholarly tools:

- **AI Erasmus.** The research environment providing interactive operations (reading, querying, dictionary lookup, network analysis, comparison) across critical editions [5]; the Famulus Handlungsmodell chapter in that paper describes how iterative goal expansion drives the famulus's action repertoire — every subgoal binds to a registered Partitur, and the generation-Partitur loop extends the repertoire through the same A/B gate as instruction patches.
- **PDAI Document Substrate.** The page-centric XML document format and OCR pipeline that supplies structured historical texts [7].
- **Golden Queries Testbed.** The canonical thirteen-query benchmark suite and monitor logging framework that audits pipeline precision against historical ground truth [6].
- **Wittgensteinian Lexical Grammar.** The use-based concept dictionary framework modeling historical semantics through explicit rules of usage [8].
- **Famulus Notebook.** The document form in which a scholar asks a question: each block names the Partitur it plays, its scope, and its oracle, and a log beside the notebook keeps the trace the Conductor returns, the verdict, and the artefacts [9].

The Partitur provides the unifying notation that binds these systems into an inspectable research instrument.

■ 9.2 Verified Implementation State

The orchestration engine and scores described in this paper are fully implemented and verified:

- The Conductor runtime engine is implemented in Python under `development/ai-agent-orchestrator/`.
- The score loader validates AND-OR goal trees, cyclic dependency guards, and runtime bindings against the complete test suite.
- The production score `ai-query-phase1` processes live research queries across more than 30 scholarly document collections in the AI Erasmus platform.
- The Harvest learning subsystem executes automated rehearsal cycles against the canonical golden query suite.

■ 10 Conclusion

The barrier between the humanities and computational research was never the inherent complexity of calculation, but the opacity of imperative programming notation. The AI Partitur demonstrates that agentic workflows can be expressed in a transparent, declarative score language that humanists can read, critique, and compose. By aligning computational orchestration with the established traditions of musical scores, literate programming, and critical editing, the Partitur establishes a foundation for trustworthy, reproducible digital scholarship.

■ 11 References

■ Bibliography

- [1] G. Graßhoff, “The AI Agent Orchestrator: Partitur, Conductor, and Harvest.” 2026.
- [2] D. E. Knuth, “Literate Programming,” *The Computer Journal*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 97–111, 1984, doi: [10.1093/comjnl/27.2.97](https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/27.2.97).
- [3] J. Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. doi: [10.1017/CBO9780511470288](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511470288).
- [4] L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1953.
- [5] G. Graßhoff, “AI Erasmus — A Platform for a New Era in Digital Humanities,” *arXiv preprint*, 2026.
- [6] G. Graßhoff, “Golden Queries in AI Erasmus: A Testbed for Scholarly Inquiry,” *arXiv preprint*, 2026.
- [7] G. Graßhoff, “AI Scholar: From PDF to Portable Document AI Infrastructure,” *arXiv preprint*, 2026.
- [8] G. Graßhoff, “Wittgensteinian Grammar and OED Dictionaries for AI: A Foundation of Semantic Understanding of Scientific Texts,” *arXiv preprint*, 2026.
- [9] G. Graßhoff, “Famulus Notebook: The Notebook as the Principal Medium of Scholarly Querying, Checking, and Development, Federated Across Machines,” *arXiv preprint*, 2026.