

# Famulus Reasoning

*Evidence, reasoning chains and validation for questions to scholarly collections*

Gerd Graßhoff <sup>ID</sup>

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

2026-10-02

## ABSTRACT

A question put to a scholarly collection is usually answered by retrieving text and letting a language model write the answer. This paper describes a different answer: the conclusion of an argument. In Famulus, the platform of the PDAI collections, a question is read as a propositional form with an open place and assigned to one of 56 declared query forms. The form's database query proposes an answer and names its witnesses; for every witness the addressed facts of the collection's DuckDB are read, the rules of the form's argument scheme are grounded over them, and a resolution prover decides whether the instance follows. Critical questions, which are the collection's error model written as queries, search the same database for defeaters: unresolved parties and undated letters that make a count a lower bound, two register entries for one person, duplicate letters, readings whose measured precision is too low, period boundaries that are only proposed. A conclusion is validated when it follows from instances whose weakest premise reaches the acceptance grade and no critical question refutes it. Validation is a justification status, not a truth predicate: it certifies that the conclusion follows from premises of a declared strength; whether those premises are true is a question the system exposes for checking, address by address, rather than one it settles. The answer is written from the validated argument; a sentence that carries a number of its own is dropped. The complete argument is stored with the notebook, shown in an expandable view with three reference modes (page, document, citation), and open to annotation. An annotated objection starts a learning episode, which diagnoses the error, writes a general lesson as a patch to the declarative argument schemes, gates it against the case, the affected regression cases and a mutation test, and promotes or rejects it. We report the method applied to 74 catalog questions on two pilot collections, the Kármán papers and the Euler–Goldbach correspondence, the measured quality of the data layers, a retrieval baseline on the same questions, and a first learning campaign.

**KEYWORDS** computational epistemology · argumentation schemes · critical questions · justified answers · DuckDB · scholarly correspondence · learning from annotation

## 1 A question and two answers

The question is: *With whom did Theodore von Kármán correspond between 1930 and 1940?* The Kármán papers at Caltech are registered as 15,976 letters and documents; the query form for this question (C1, *partners of a person*) is one SQL statement over the register. It returns 491 rows, one for each counterpart, and 1,503 letters.

A retrieval system answers differently. It searches the regests and the letter texts for the words of the question, passes the best passages to a language model and lets the model write. In our baseline (Section 10) the model answered this question from twenty passages: *only a few correspondents of Kármán for 1930–1940 can be established from the passages*, followed by five names with citations. The answer is honest about its passages and says nothing about the collection: neither how many correspondents the register records nor that any count over it is a lower bound.

Famulus treats the 491 rows as a proposal. Every one of the 1,503 letters is a witness; for each, the register facts are read (sender, recipient, year, pages) and a prover decides whether it follows from them and the rules of the scheme *counting correspondence partners* that the letter connects Kármán with the row's counterpart. Then Famulus searches for objections. It finds 153 pairs of letters with the same parties and the same day,

copies or drafts that may count only once: 1,390 letters carry the count, not 1,503. It finds 126 letters of Kármán in the period without a resolved counterpart, 298 letters in the period with no resolved party at all, and 928 undated letters of Kármán. Each finding has the same consequence: the register is not closed for this range, so what follows is a lower bound. A lesson learned from an annotation (Section 11) adds that register entries with the same surname and compatible initials are, for a lower bound, one person; 65 such pairs are found. The justified conclusion is:

Theodore von Kármán corresponded between 1930 and 1940 with **at least** 443 persons (1,390 letters).

*Exactly* 443 does not follow, and the answer says why. Each of its premises can be opened down to the register entry and the facsimile page that carries it (Figure 1).

The screenshot shows the 'Famulus Notebook' interface. On the left is a sidebar with search filters like 'Neue Frage', 'Lernen', and 'Notebook suchen'. The main area displays a question: 'Mit wem korrespondierte Kármán zwischen 1930 und 1940?'. Below it is an answer: 'Theodore von Kármán korrespondierte 1930–1940 mit mindestens 443 Personen (1390 Briefe)'. The answer is marked as 'validiert'. Below the answer is a 'BEGRÜNDUNG' (Justification) section. It includes a summary: '443 mindestens 1.390 Briefe'. The justification is structured into three parts: 'ZEICHEN' (Signs), 'IDENTIFIKATION' (Identification), and 'BELEG' (Evidence). The 'ZEICHEN' part lists three points: 1. The register lists 1390 letters with Kármán as a party from 1930-1940. 2. The identity 'Theodore von Kármán' is linked to 14 register entries. 3. 5 rules of the schema support the derivation. The 'IDENTIFIKATION' part lists three points: 1. 126 letters have no resolved counterpart. 2. 298 letters have no resolved party. 3. 928 letters are undated. The 'BELEG' part lists three points: 1. 65 pairs of letters have the same name and date. 2. 153 letter pairs have the same name and date. 3. The register lists more entries with the same name as the identified person. The 'BELEG' section also includes a reference to a specific entry: 'Herzfeld, H. 1930. Turbine Blades General Correspondence. Kármán, Theodore von an Herzfeld, H. 17.5.1930.'

**Figure 1** The expanded view of a request block in the notebook: the answer with its seal, the justification with premises, the inference, the critical questions that fired or passed, and the first evidence item in the reference mode *page*.

The difference between the two answers is not one of accuracy alone. The retrieval answer is a text whose support is looked for afterwards. The Famulus answer is the conclusion of an argument whose premises, rules and defeaters were determined before the text was written. The argument does not make its conclusion true — no argument does that unless its premises are true — but it makes the justification of the conclusion exact: every premise is an addressed fact of the collection that can be checked at its source, and every conclusion that rests on a false premise can be enumerated and its justification withdrawn. The rest of this paper describes how such arguments are built, validated, displayed and improved, and what they show about two collections.

## 2 Why matching an answer is not justifying it

A natural design lets the model write the answer and then checks whether its numbers agree with the rows of the query. This is the order of retrieval-augmented generation [1]: first the text, then the search for support. It compares two strings. It does not establish that the proposition the answer expresses follows from anything. The number 491 can be copied correctly and the proposition *Kármán corresponded with 491 persons* still be false, because two register entries name one person, or because letters are missing from the register. Justification is argument-shaped: evidence justifies a proposition only as a premise of an argument for it [2].

Famulus reverses the order. First the proposition asked for and the kinds of evidence that can count for it are fixed by the form and its scheme. Then the evidence is read, the conclusion derived, the defeaters searched. Text comes last, and it cannot state a number the argument does not carry.

### 3 The ground

Each PDAI collection has its own databases [3]. The **stanza database** holds the sentences of the page texts with a language label, the tokens with form, lemma, part of speech, morphological features and dependency head, and the named entities; a sentence is keyed by the triple (*document, page index, sentence index*). The **register** holds the letters with their parties, dates, places and regests. The **FQL sidecar** joins both into the tables the query forms read: letters with resolved parties, letter pages and letter sentences, paragraphs, footnotes and figures, mentions linked to register entries, a topic taxonomy assigned to the regests' keywords, speech acts (requests, promises, offers, payments, recommendations, thanks, refusals) with amounts, historical periods, and, new for this work, the documents and printed page labels a citation needs.

Every layer has measured errors; the measurements are read-only queries over the collection (`scripts/fql_quality.py`) and agent-read samples with Wilson intervals (`scripts/fql_audit_sample.py`). Three findings bound what the forms can establish:

- In the Kármán papers 42 % of the letters have no resolved party at all; every count over persons is a lower bound.
- The sentence language label selects the stanza model. Of the Kármán sentences labelled Latin and decidable by a vote over function words, 4.7 % agree with the vote; most are English. These sentences were parsed with the Latin model and carry no entities.
- The full-text index uses English stop words and stems for every language. Latin function words such as *et*, *non*, *in* are removed, and *numerus*, *numeri*, *numeratorum* are three different search terms; the lemma route finds *numerus* in 1,052 Euler sentences, the string in 508.

**Table 1** Precision of the readings the arguments rest on. The samples are drawn with a fixed seed and read by the agent that built the sidecar, not by the owner. The interval for the mentions combines two samples (24 and 20 decidable items).

| Reading                                                 | Collection | n  | correct | precision | 95 % interval |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------|----|---------|-----------|---------------|
| speech act read from a sentence, with its locus         | Kármán     | 30 | 22      | 73.3 %    | 55.6–85.8 %   |
| the same acts, type and roles only                      | Kármán     | 30 | 27      | 90.0 %    | 74.4–96.5 %   |
| speech act read from the regest                         | Kármán     | 30 | 28      | 93.3 %    | 78.7–98.2 %   |
| topic assigned to a letter                              | Kármán     | 30 | 27      | 90.0 %    | 74.4–96.5 %   |
| topic assigned to a letter                              | Euler      | 30 | 26      | 86.7 %    | 70.3–94.7 %   |
| mention linked to a register person                     | Kármán     | 44 | 37      | 84.1 %    | 70.6–92.1 %   |
| imperative as a request (stanza filter)                 | Kármán     | 30 | 4       | 13.3 %    | 5.3–29.7 %    |
| <i>I will / I shall</i> as a commitment (stanza filter) | Kármán     | 30 | 12      | 40.0 %    | 24.6–57.7 %   |

The stanza filters at the bottom of Table 1 are the reason why speech acts come from a model reading with a measured precision rather than from a sentence pattern: the imperative mostly matches the expository mood of manuscripts (*Let us consider*, *Assume*), and *I shall* mostly announces what a text will do.

### 4 Questions as declared forms

The Famulus Query Language (FQL) is a catalog of 56 query forms in nine families: holdings, names and mentions, correspondence relations, subjects, speech acts, time and context, text and language, combinations, and limits. A form has a question schema, examples, typed parameters (person, topic, letter, year, place,

lemma, ...), the tables it requires and one SQL statement. A model of the harness assigns a question to a form and fills its parameters; the names are then bound to register entries, and the binding is recorded in the notebook's memory with its origin (unique in the register, chosen by the model among candidates, from memory, set by the owner). A form returns, besides its displayed columns, its **witnesses**: the letters of a row (`_belege`), the register entries of a row's person (`_keys`), the speech acts (`_acts`), or the sentence key.

The question itself is not a proposition. It is a propositional form with an open place, *Kármán corresponded 1930–1940 with  $x$  persons*; the reading that maps it to a form is a recorded interpretation, and the conclusion fills the place.

## 5 Argument schemes

Every form belongs to one of fourteen argument schemes, among them *counting letters*, *counting correspondence partners*, *correspondence of two persons*, *chronology*, *text witness of a mention*, *interpretation of a speech act*, *thematic classification*, *assignment to war and peace*, *lemma witness* and *full-text search*. A scheme states which facts can carry a conclusion of its kind and by which rules; the idea and the name follow the argumentation schemes of informal logic, each with its critical questions [4], and the warrant-and-rebuttal structure of S. E. Toulmin [5].

**Facts.** A fact is a ground atom of a small vocabulary with an address and an origin, for example `Absender(L:109-10.../015, P:8)`: the register gives entry 8 as the sender of letter 015 of folder 109.10. Facts from the register are graded *strong*. A model reading is graded by the lower bound of the Wilson interval of its measured precision: at least 0.9 strong, at least 0.7 medium, below that weak; a reading that was never measured is *open*. A boundary that is only proposed, such as the dates of a war, is *open* as well. The grade of a fact measures the strength of the justification it confers; it is not a truth value. A register entry graded *strong* can still be false — the grade records that the register, not a fallible reading, is its source.

**Rules.** Rules are Horn clauses over the vocabulary:

```
GegenparteiAls(L, X, N) :- VonPerson(L, X), EmpfaengerAls(L, N)
```

read: *if person  $X$  wrote letter  $L$  and the register gives the recipient of  $L$  as  $N$ , then  $N$  is the counterpart of  $X$  in  $L$ .* A rule may carry a grade of its own, the strength of its warrant: the words of a regist are a certain fact, the inference from them to a topic is weak.

**Instances and proofs.** For every witness the rules whose heads the form's goal reaches backwards are grounded over the witness's facts, and the shared prover `famulus_proof` decides whether the instance goal follows. The prover is ground resolution with unit propagation over two watched literals [6], which decides Horn sets in linear time [7], DPLL for a non-Horn remainder [8], and set-of-support resolution for the proof text [9]; it is the prover with which the Famulus lector checks the factual validity of sentences [2], extracted into one package for both. The proof ends in leaves, the facts and rules the instance rests on. A proof is as strong as its weakest leaf, and an instance is as strong as its strongest proof: a surname that matches only weakly may be one route to the goal, a registered full name form another. Because a prover returns whichever proof it finds first, the instance is proved again with only the clauses of a higher grade until no proof remains; the grade of the instance is then the highest grade at which the goal still follows, and it does not depend on the order in which the database returns the facts. A first implementation took the first proof and let a critical question act on only the first 200 rows it found; both made the same argument come out differently from run to run (for *Who mentions Einstein in letters to Kármán?* between 0 and 9 accepted instances). Replaying every stored argument three times now gives identical results.

**Closure.** A count is an inference too. *Exactly  $n$*  follows only with a closure premise: the register lists, in the range of the question, every letter. For neither pilot collection is closure declared. Without it, *at least  $n$*

follows, and absence does not follow at all. The lower bound is therefore not a caveat added to an answer; it is what the grounds entail.

## 6 Critical questions and validation

The critical questions of a scheme are its defeaters, written as read-only queries over the same sidecar. Their outcome has a declared effect on the argument:

**Table 2** Critical questions of the schemes and their effects. The wording of each question and its SQL are part of the learnable scheme file.

| Critical question                                                                                                        | Effect when it fires                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Are there letters of the person in range without a resolved counterpart, or without a date?                              | the conclusion is a lower bound          |
| Does the register list further entries with the bound name form?<br>Do counted partners share a name form?               | note; merge entries for the lower bound  |
| Are there duplicates among the witness letters (same parties, same day)?                                                 | merge witnesses                          |
| Is the agent of a read act another person than the letter's sender (a relayed request)?                                  | downgrade the instance                   |
| Does the evidence sentence carry the reading's words, or is it a neighbouring sentence?                                  | downgrade the instance                   |
| Is the same act read independently from sentence and regist? Does the letter's register index list the mentioned person? | upgrade the instance (two witnesses)     |
| Is the sentence language label reliable?                                                                                 | regrade the readings of a label          |
| Are the period boundaries confirmed?                                                                                     | note (the boundary facts are open)       |
| Is an empty result a finding or a gap?                                                                                   | the conclusion is about the sidecar only |

The verdict follows the rule the lector uses for sentences [2]. A conclusion is **validated** when (1) at least one instance follows from the facts and reaches the acceptance grade *medium*, (2) at least half of the witnesses carry, (3) no critical question refutes it, and (4) every earlier block it rests on is validated. Otherwise it is **not validated**. The two verdicts are justification statuses, and each is the contradictory negation of the other; neither is a truth predicate. *Not validated* does not say that the proposition is false: the registered grounds do not suffice, and the argument names its weakest premise. *Validated* does not say that the proposition is true: it says the proposition follows from premises of a declared strength, each of which can be checked at its address. If a premise turns out false, the argument is unsound and the conclusion loses this justification; from the falsity of the premise nothing follows about the conclusion, which may be true on other grounds. Instances that do not carry are not counted; the conclusion states only what the accepted instances, merged where the critical questions show identity, establish.

## 7 The answer from the argument

The first sentence of the answer is the conclusion, formed from the scheme's template. Further sentences are written by the model of the harness, but with placeholders such as `{r0.name}` and `{r0.angenommen}` for every number and every row value; the system fills them from the validated rows. A sentence with a digit of its own is dropped and recorded, as is a sentence that states a lower bound as a total (*insgesamt, in total*). Every sentence of the answer is thus bound to a node of the argument by the way it was made, not by a comparison after the fact.

## 8 Display: the justification in the notebook

A request block with a stored argument shows the answer card: the conclusion as lead sentence and a seal (*validated*, *not validated*, *gap*). In the expanded reading mode the justification follows (Figure 1): figures, numbered premises with grades and citation markers, the sentence *it follows*, the critical questions grouped as refuted, open and passed, the gaps, and the evidence. The evidence cards follow one reference mode for the whole notebook: *page* (with the facsimile of the page, Figure 2), *document* (folder or volume, letter number, date) or *citation* (the citation built from the collection bibliography or the folder sheet, with the printed page where the edition prints one). *Full tree* opens the propositional form, the reading, the rules, the critical questions with their SQL and every instance, page by page, each with its goal, leaves and, for the first ones, the resolution proof.




**Figure 2** An evidence card in the reference mode *page*: the register entry of a letter of 1930 and the facsimile of its page.

The argument is one JSON file per block version (schema `famulus-argument/1`) in an auxiliary folder of the notebook project, next to the version store of the result; result and justification are read together. A block may name earlier blocks as premises; when the argument of such a block changes, the dependent block shows that its justification has lost validity.

## 9 The method applied to the query set

The method was applied to the 74 example questions of the catalog, run against the Kármán papers and the Euler correspondence of the *Opera omnia* IV A, with the Euler–Goldbach volume IVA 4 as full text (`scripts/fql_bench.py`). The model of the harness is `deepseek-v4.1-flash:cloud`. With an empty learning store, that is, before any lesson:

**Table 3** The 74 catalog questions with their arguments, with an empty learning store.

| Measure                            | Value  |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| questions                          | 74     |
| form chosen as the catalog expects | 74     |
| validated                          | 63     |
| not validated                      | 10     |
| gap (no row)                       | 1      |
| median time of the argument        | 624 ms |
| median SQL time                    | 21 ms  |

The ten conclusions that are not validated are findings about the collections, and each names the work that would make it justifiable:

- *War and peace* (forms F1–F3, five questions): the period boundaries are conventional dates with the status *proposed*; peace is the complement of the war periods and inherits their status. Owner confirmation of the boundaries makes these conclusions validatable.
- *Speech acts read from a sentence* (E2–E4, E6, four questions): the precision of the sentence reading is too low for the acceptance grade; the learning campaign addressed this.
- *Mentions by surname* (B6 for Euler, one question): the 31 derivable instances for *Daniel Bernoulli* rest on the surname alone, which seven other entries of the Euler register share (J. Bernoulli, N. Bernoulli and others), and the Euler sidecar has no register index of the persons named in a letter that could serve as a second witness. For Kármán that index exists, and the same form is validated.

## 10 A retrieval baseline on the same questions

To see what the argument adds, the same 74 questions were answered by retrieval: the ten best regests and the ten best text paragraphs by BM25 on the question’s words, passed with their ids to the same model with the instruction to answer from them and cite them (`scripts/fql_rag_baseline.py`). The baseline answers were compared with the arguments of the same questions by the counts they state.

**Table 4** The retrieval baseline, compared with the arguments. A count is a digit run in the prose of the answer outside citation brackets, dates and years; an answer matches when any of its counts equals the figure.

| Measure                                                   | Value    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| answers stating a count                                   | 31 of 74 |
| questions whose argument establishes a count              | 62       |
| of these, answers whose count equals the justified figure | 3        |
| of these, answers whose count equals the query’s figure   | 1        |
| of these, answers stating counts that equal neither       | 24       |
| lower-bound questions answered with <i>at least</i>       | 0 of 61  |
| answers citing a passage                                  | 63 of 74 |

The comparison is lenient towards the baseline: an answer that mentions a matching number in passing counts as a match. Of the 62 questions whose argument establishes a count, the baseline answered 28 with a count; 24 of these state numbers that neither the query nor the argument establishes, and 34 give no count at all, often saying, as for Kármán’s correspondents, that the passages support only a few cases. None of the 61 lower-bound questions is answered with *at least*, while 63 of 74 answers cite passages. Citing a passage is not having a ground for a count: the passages are a sample of twenty texts, and no count over a collection

of 15,976 letters follows from twenty texts. A first version of this measurement read digits inside the citation brackets (folder numbers) as counts and overstated the baseline’s counting answers; the figures above are from the corrected measurement.

## 11 Learning from unconvincing justifications

A reader who finds a justification unconvincing marks the node (a premise, the conclusion, an instance) and says why, choosing a category: a premise is missing or false, the inference does not hold, the conclusion is stronger or weaker than its grounds, persons are confused, a defeater was not considered, the scheme or the reading of the question is wrong, the evidence locus is wrong, the wording is poor. The annotation opens an **episode**, stored with the complete argument.

A learning Partitur [10] runs five stages. *Diagnose* (gemini-3.8-flash) assigns the error to one site: a rule, a critical question, a grade, a reliability, a form, an instruction of the harness, or the data, which is not learnable and is recorded as a data issue. *Generalise* writes a lesson as one general sentence and as a patch of operations on the declarative scheme file (add or change a critical question, add a rule, set a rule’s grade, set which measured sample governs a reading, change a form or a scheme text, change the acceptance thresholds) or on an instruction. *Propose* applies and checks the patch: it must parse, its probes must only read, a reliability may only name a measured sample, it must name no instance of the case (no letter id, register id, person or row value), and it must not equal a revoked version. *Gate* measures the baseline first, then the candidate, on the annotated case, on every stored case the patch can affect (an impact analysis over schemes, rules and critical questions), and on two mutations: invented witnesses and witnesses moved between mutually exclusive rows, neither of which may be accepted more often than before; a judge model decides whether the case is resolved and whether a changed case became worse. *Promote* activates the version when every check passes. Every learned version stays revisable; an owner revocation restores the previous version, and a revoked version is never activated again. Repeated gate failures of one category, or an owner revocation, open a **meta-episode** in which the lesson writer’s own instruction is rewritten and gated by re-running the failed episodes under it. Everything is recorded in one DuckDB file: episodes, stages, diagnoses, lessons, artifact versions, gate runs, replays, promotions, meta-episodes.




**Figure 3** The review of the learning store: metrics by category, lessons with their patches and status, episodes with their diagnosis and gate reasons.

### 11.1 A first learning campaign

Seven episodes were run, from objections the agent derived from the measured audit findings; they are stored with the origin *agent-seeded*. Table 5 lists them; two re-runs follow a defect of the patch check that had refused a vocabulary word (*position*) as an instance of the case, fixed before the re-run.

**Table 5** The learning campaign. The lessons are quoted in the German of the learner model.

| Block            | Objection        | Lesson                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Outcome       |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| fql-geld         | too weak         | Die Verlässlichkeit von aus Sätzen gelesenen Handlungen bemisst sich nach dem Zutreffen von Handlungstyp und Rollen im Brief, nicht nach der punktgenauen Belegstellenabgrenzung.                                                               | learned       |
| fql-stellen      | premise wrong    | Eine Bitte um Geld, die im selben Brief wie eine Stellenbewerbung formuliert wird, ist im Zweifel als unselbständige Gehaltsvorstellung der Bewerbung und nicht als eigenständige Geldbitte zu werten.                                          | patch refused |
| fql-einstein     | too weak         | Im Argumentationsschema für Personenerwähnungen ist transparent zu machen, dass Nennungen mit vollständiger Namensform vollen Beweisgrad besitzen und lediglich isolierte Familiennamen wegen möglicher Namensgleichheit herabgestuft werden.   | gate failed   |
| fql-einstein-mit | persons confused | Eponyme Fachbegriffe, Formeln und Kennzahlen, bei denen ein Name unmittelbar Gattungsbegriffe wie Zahl, Formel, Gesetz oder Theorem bestimmt, bezeichnen wissenschaftliche Gegenstände und dürfen nicht als Personenerwähnungen erfasst werden. | gate failed   |
| fql-partner      | persons confused | Bei der Zählung von Korrespondenzpartnern für eine Untergrenze müssen Registereinträge mit identischem Familiennamen und übereinstimmenden Initialen als mutmaßliche Personenidentität zusammengeführt werden.                                  | learned       |
| fql-stellen      | premise wrong    | Eine in einem Bewerbungsschreiben genannte Gehaltsvorstellung oder Geldforderung ist Teil der Bewerbung und darf nicht als eigenständige Bitte um Geld gewertet werden.                                                                         | gate failed   |
| fql-einstein     | too weak         | Bei Mindest- und Existenzaussagen darf das Auftreten schwach gestützter Zusatzkandidaten die Validierung hinreichend gesicherter Belege nicht durch eine zu strenge globale Abdeckungsquote verhindern.                                         | gate failed   |

2 of 7 episodes produced a lesson that passed every check. The first separates the reliability of a speech-act reading (type and roles, 27 of 30) from that of its evidence sentence (22 of 30) and lets the former weigh the act; its patch is a single line that names the measured sample. The second merges, for lower bounds, register entries with the same surname and compatible initials; the lower bound for Kármán’s partners 1930–1940 drops from 491 to 443. Merging can only lower a lower bound, so the change is conservative. For Euler the same lesson takes the lower bound from 304 to 195: the register of IVA writes members of one family under one surname with compatible initials, so the Bernoullis and other families collapse into fewer partners. The figure stays a true lower bound, but it is less informative; the lesson is therefore marked for the owner’s review rather than treated as settled.

The gate rejected 5 lessons, and for reasons that matter: a lesson that only rewrote a scheme’s text left the case unchanged; a lesson that appended a rule to an instruction of the harness could not change an argument already built; and a lesson that lowered the global coverage threshold to make a weak case pass was judged to make another case worse, because it validated an argument whose witnesses mostly do not carry. Two failures in one category opened meta-episodes; both rewrote the lesson writer’s instruction, and neither candidate made a failed episode pass on replay, so neither was adopted.

The two episodes on the Einstein mentions failed for a second reason, found only afterwards: their gates ran under the prover defect described in Section 5, which let a critical question act on only the first 200 of its 1,302 rows. The objection was right, the remedy was already in the scheme, and after the correction the case is validated without a lesson. The episodes keep their verdict and carry a note in the learning store; a gate is only as good as the determinism of the replay it compares.

**Table 6** The 74 catalog questions with an empty learning store and with the learned lessons: same code, same sidecars, same questions.

|               | without lessons | with lessons |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| validated     | 63              | 66           |
| not validated | 10              | 7            |
| gap           | 1               | 1            |

The bench runs the language model again, and the model does not read every question the same way twice: it may bind a name to another set of register entries or choose other parameters. The effect of the lessons alone is therefore measured by replay (`scripts/fql_lesson_effect.py`): every argument of the bench is rebuilt on the same rows and the same bound parameters, once with the shipped schemes and once with the learned ones. Of 74 arguments, 10 change:

**Table 7** The effect of the lessons by replay: same rows, same bindings, shipped against learned schemes. The figure is the justified count of the conclusion.

| Form        | Question                                                              | without lessons   | with lessons   |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| C1 (Euler)  | <i>Mit wem korrespondierte Euler?</i>                                 | validated, 304    | validated, 195 |
| C1 (Kármán) | <i>Mit wem korrespondierte Kármán 1930–1940?</i>                      | validated, 491    | validated, 443 |
| C3 (Kármán) | <i>Wer schrieb an Kármán 1945?</i>                                    | validated, 34     | validated, 32  |
| E1 (Kármán) | <i>Wer bat Kármán um eine Stelle?</i>                                 | validated, 38     | validated, 53  |
| E2 (Kármán) | <i>Wer bat Kármán um finanzielle Unterstützung?</i>                   | not validated, 26 | validated, 73  |
| E3 (Kármán) | <i>Wie viel Geld sagte Kármán anderen zu?</i>                         | not validated, 2  | validated, 14  |
| E4 (Kármán) | <i>Wen empfahl Kármán?</i>                                            | not validated, 91 | validated, 210 |
| E5 (Kármán) | <i>Wer bat Kármán um Sonderdrucke?</i>                                | validated, 229    | validated, 429 |
| E6 (Kármán) | <i>Wie entwickelten sich die genannten Geldsummen über die Jahre?</i> | not validated, 10 | validated, 85  |
| H2 (Kármán) | <i>Wer bat Kármán um eine Stelle, und antwortete Kármán?</i>          | validated, 35     | validated, 54  |

## 12 Related work

The schemes and their critical questions take their form from informal logic [4], [5]; the treatment of defeaters as reasons that can withdraw a conclusion follows the theory of defeasible reasoning [11], and the acceptance of conclusions under attack has a formal model in abstract argumentation [12]. What is particular here is the ground: the facts are rows of a scholarly collection with addresses down to the page and the sentence, the defeaters are queries over the same rows, and the strength of a model reading is its measured precision. The relation to retrieval-augmented generation [1] is the inversion described in Section 2. The companion papers describe the platform [13], the notebook [14], the score language [10], the golden queries that test the machinery on questions with known answers [15], the lexical institution that governs the terms [16], and the epistemological account on which the verdict rule rests [2].

## 13 Limits

- Validation is justification relative to the registered ground, not a guarantee of truth. If a register entry is false, every argument that rests on it is unsound: its conclusion loses this justification, and the system can name exactly the conclusions concerned, because every premise carries its address. The conclusions are not thereby false — from the falsity of a premise nothing follows about the truth of the conclusion. Correcting the entry and re-running the argument restores or revises the verdict.
- The precisions of the model readings rest on samples of 20 to 44 items, read by the agent that built the sidecar, not by the owner. The seeded annotations of the learning campaign are the agent’s, not the owner’s.
- Closure is declared for no collection; every count is a lower bound and no absence follows.
- One learned lesson merges register entries by surname and initials for lower bounds. It is conservative for a lower bound, since merging can only lower the count, but it compares name forms by their parts; it is marked for the owner’s review.
- The grounding is per witness; arguments with more than 20,000 instances are cut, and the uncounted instances are reported as a gap.
- The link from an evidence card into the edition viewer is a gap for the Euler volume IVA 4 until the volume is registered there; the notebook shows the facsimile itself.

## 14 Conclusion

An answer of Famulus is the conclusion of an argument whose premises are addressed facts of the collection, whose rules are declared, and whose defeaters were searched in the same data before any sentence was written. The argument certifies a justification, not a truth: the conclusion follows from premises of a measured strength, and every premise can be checked at its address. The quantifier of the answer is what the grounds entail; for registers without declared closure, every count is a lower bound, and the answer says so. What cannot be justified is reported as not validated, with its weakest premise, and becomes a task: confirm a boundary, measure a reading, add a witness. An annotation of an unconvincing justification becomes a lesson for all arguments of its kind, gated against the case, the collection and invented evidence, and revocable by the owner.

## Bibliography

- [1] P. Lewis *et al.*, “Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 9459–9474, 2020.
- [2] G. Graßhoff, “Computational Epistemology: Foundations. Evidence and Its Justificatory Reach in the Sciences and the Humanities,” 2026.
- [3] M. Raasveldt and H. Mühleisen, “DuckDB: an Embeddable Analytical Database,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD ’19)*, ACM, 2019, pp. 1981–1984. doi: 10.1145/3299869.3320212.

- [4] D. Walton, *Argumentation Schemes for Presumptive Reasoning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996.
- [5] S. E. Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- [6] M. W. Moskewicz, C. F. Madigan, Y. Zhao, L. Zhang, and S. Malik, “Chaff: Engineering an Efficient SAT Solver,” in *Proceedings of the 38th Design Automation Conference*, Jun. 2001, pp. 530–535. doi: 10.1109/dac.2001.935565.
- [7] W. F. Dowling and J. H. Gallier, “Linear-Time Algorithms for Testing the Satisfiability of Propositional Horn Formulae,” *The Journal of Logic Programming*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 267–284, 1984, doi: 10.1016/0743-1066(84)90014-1.
- [8] M. Davis, G. Logemann, and D. Loveland, “A Machine Program for Theorem-Proving,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. 394–397, 1962, doi: 10.1145/368273.368557.
- [9] J. A. Robinson, “A Machine-Oriented Logic Based on the Resolution Principle,” *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 23–41, 1965, doi: 10.1145/321250.321253.
- [10] G. Graßhoff, “The AI Partitur — A Score Language for the Humanities,” 2026.
- [11] J. L. Pollock, “Defeasible Reasoning,” *Cognitive Science*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 481–518, 1987, doi: 10.1207/s15516709cog1104\_4.
- [12] P. M. Dung, “On the Acceptability of Arguments and its Fundamental Role in Nonmonotonic Reasoning, Logic Programming and n-Person Games,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 321–357, 1995, doi: 10.1016/0004-3702(94)00041-X.
- [13] G. Graßhoff, “Famulus. Eine verteilte lokale Plattform für professionelle Forschung,” 2026.
- [14] G. Graßhoff, “Famulus Notebook,” 2026.
- [15] G. Graßhoff, “Golden Queries in AI Erasmus: A Testbed for Scholarly Inquiry,” 2026.
- [16] G. Graßhoff, “Wittgensteinian Grammar and OED Dictionaries for AI: A Foundation of Semantic Understanding of Scientific Texts,” *arXiv preprint*, 2026.