

14.30-17.00 — Panel 6: The Aesthetic "Spirit of Netting" and Theoretical Aspects of Art (Chair: Alessandra Delfino)

14.30-15.00 — José María Nadal (University of the Basque Country, Lejona-Bilbao, Spain): Antagonism Versus Unity as a "Metaphor of Europe": Guided by the Spirit of Relationships, Revolution, and Aesthetic "Netting"

15.00-15.30 — Dace Vasilā (Art Therapist, International Biocentric Research Academy, Riga, Latvia): Transcultural Symbolism of Colors and a Health-Related Approach

15.30-16.00 — Edna Akmane (Riga Stradiņš University, Riga, Latvia) & Eda Skozdina (Certified Art Therapist, Riga Stradiņš University, Riga, Latvia): Dialectics of Becoming: Rethinking Professional Identity Through the Hero's Journey in Times of Global Transformation

16.00-16.30 — Sarit Zeltzer (Art Psychotherapist, Tel-Aviv, Israel): The Art of Feeling at Home: A Transcultural Weaving of Mindfulness, Creativity, and Healing

18.00 — Social Dinner: Rooftop of Hotel Gutentags (Gutentags Terrace)
Doma laukums 1, Centra rajons, 1050 Riga, Latvia (entrance via Māksla iela)

Give and Take: Transdisciplinary Spaces of "Cohesive Netting"

From History to Augmented Realities and AI-Techniques

Congress Directors:
Dagmar Reichardt (Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia)
Raffaele Tumino (Università degli Studi di Macerata, Italy)
Constantino Maeder (Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium)

Venues:
Latvian Academy of Culture, LAC Theatre House "Zirgu Pasts", Ozimaru iela 46, 1010 Riga
Radisson Blu Latvija Conference Hotel, Elizabetes iela 55, 1010 Riga

Riga/Latvia
June 30th - July 2nd, 2026



Abstracts, Title Research, "Abstract", 2019, digital print on art albumen, 100 x 100 cm

PROGRAM 1/3

Tuesday 30.6.2026 15.00-17.00 (Riga time)

Latvian Academy of Culture, LAC Theatre House "Zirgu Pasts", Ozimaru iela 46, 1010 Riga, Latvia

15.00-15.30 — Opening Remarks & Greetings

— Welcome and opening: Prof. Dāvis Simanins, Rector of the Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia
— Greeting from the Rector of the co-organizing University of Macerata, Italy: Prof. John F. McCourt
— Official statements and conference appointments by Dagmar Reichardt and Raffaele Tumino

15.30-16.45 — Panel 1: "Cohesive Netting" Between Transculturality, Digitality, and the Arts
Til Novak (Concept Artist, Los Angeles, USA) in conversation with Claus Friebe (University of Music and Theatre Hamburg, Germany): "The Joy of Losing Perspective" — Using Digital Multiplicity to Find Shared Viewpoints
Conversation on stage & Discussion

16.45-18.00 — Wolfgang Welisch (University of Jena, Germany): Netting as a Universal Paradigm
Keynote & Discussion

18.00-19.00 — Buffet & refreshments, Ozimaru iela 46, 1010 Riga

Wednesday 1.7.2026 9.30-17.00

Radisson Blu Latvija Conference Hotel (Elizabetes iela 55, 1010 Riga)

9.30-13.00 — Panel 2: Transcultural Theory and "Realpolitik" (Chair: Loreta De Stasio & José María Nadal)

9.30-10.00 — Ian Chambers (University of Naples "L'Orientale", Italy): Torn Maps, Critical Nets and Theoretical Shipwrecks

10.00-10.30 — Christine Landfried (University of Hamburg, Germany): Transcultural Participation in the European Union: The Conference on the Future of Europe

10.30-11.00 — Andreas Koch (University of Salzburg, Austria): A Social-Geographical Perspective on the Power and Limits of Transcultural Spaces

11.00-11.30 — Coffee break

PROGRAM 2/3

15.00-15.30 — Rīta Muktupvels (Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia) & Vaidis Muktupvels (University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia): (Re-)Netting Human and Nature Through Music: An Ecomusicological Approach to Transcultural Sustainability

15.30-16.00 — Iara Onheux (University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia): The Destiny of a Certain Feminine Character at the Intersection of Cultural Traditions — An Examination of Aspects of this Theme in the Novel "Die Walsche" (1782) by South Tyrolean Author Joseph Zoderer and in the Film of the Same Title (1986)

16.00-16.30 — Loreta De Stasio (University of the Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain): Narrating Belonging Across Cultural Thresholds: Identity, Memory and Relational Becoming in Samaya Abdel Gader's "In cerca di me"

18.00 — Skyline Bar, 26th floor
Radisson Blu Latvija Conference Hotel, Elizabetes iela 55, 1010 Riga

Thursday 2.7.2026 9.30-17.00

Radisson Blu Latvija Conference Hotel (Elizabetes iela 55, 1010 Riga)

9.30-13.00 — Panel 3: Dialectics, Pedagogical Interventions, and Cosmopolitical "Third Spaces" (Chair: Marc Röt)

9.30-10.00 — Stefania Aisaghiene & Julija Grigorovič (both Vilniaus Magnus University Kaunas, Lithuania): Transforming Teaching, Personalized Learning in Online Diversity

10.00-10.30 — Danka Marčova, Dragana Kuzmanović, Ana Ringeleva Vladova & Biljana Ivanova (all Goce Delčev University, Skopje, North Macedonia): Identifying Ambiguity (Using AI) Insights from German, English and Macedonian Language Students at the Faculty of Philology, Goce Delčev University, Skopje

10.30-11.00 — Monica Martinelli (University of Connecticut, USA) / Liana Mafioletti (Bologna, Italy): Is it Possible to Achieve Global Citizenship through Literature? Findings from the Implementation of a Curriculum Promoting (Tele)phone Literature with a Migratory Background

11.00-11.30 — Coffee break



11:30–12:00 — Joseph Farrell (University of Strathclyde, UK): “Icarus” by Lauro de Bosis: Antifascist Myth?	11:30–12:00 — Elena L. Torres and “Being”: Global Citizenship Education and Cohesive Learning Techniques (Chair: Monica Makris)
12:00–12:30 — Jovana Kranicki Josimovska & Darinka Marolova (both: Goce Delcev University, Stip, North Macedonia): The Cartography of Self: Location Categories in African-Italian Post-Migrant Narratives	11:30–12:00 — Jacqueline van Marwijk-Koessen (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands): Learning With and For the World: Global Citizenship Education in Higher Education and World-Oriented Didactics alongside Mixed Classrooms
12:30–13:00 — Marc Hill (University of Innsbruck, Austria): “Response”able Storytelling” on Urban Stage: Postmigration Perspectives	12:00–12:30 — Snežana Stamenko Veselinovska, Desislava Simevska & Sanja Petrovska (all: Goce Delcev University, Stip, North Macedonia): Transcultural Pedagogical Approaches for a Sustainable Future: From Theory to Practice
13:00–14:30 — Lunch break	12:30–13:00 — Signe Behlkeina (Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia): Cities as a Transcultural Ecosystem: Hybrid Journeys of a Performing Art
14:30–17:00 — Panel 3: Transmedial Crossovers: From Aesthetical and Symbolic Logic to “New Identity”-Based Music, Literature, and Film (Chair: Christine Landstred)	13:00–14:30 — Lunch break
14:30–15:00 — Stefano Palenta (University of Macerata, Italy): The Aesthetic Space as a Site of Hybridization and the Emergence of New Identities	

Identifying Ambiguity Using AI: Insights from German, English, and Macedonian Language Students at the Faculty of Philology, Goce Delcev University, Stip

Darinka Marolova, Faculty of Philology, Goce Delcev University, Stip, North Macedonia
Dragana Kuzmanovska, Faculty of Philology, Goce Delcev University, Stip, North Macedonia
Ana Ringacheva Vitanova, Faculty of Philology, Goce Delcev University, Stip, North Macedonia
Biljana Ivanova, Faculty of Philology, Goce Delcev University, Stip, North Macedonia

Abstract

This study investigates the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in identifying linguistic ambiguity, with a focus on German-, English-, and Macedonian-language tasks. Ambiguity—lexical, syntactic, referential, and pragmatic—represents a key challenge to linguistic clarity and may lead to misinterpretation in both everyday and academic communication. The research examines how AI-based language tools, particularly ChatGPT, can support students in detecting ambiguous expressions and exploring alternative interpretations.

The study involved 30 students from the Faculty of Philology at Goce Delcev University, Stip, including students of German Language and Literature, English Language and Literature, Macedonian Language, as well as students studying German and English as elective foreign languages. The participants completed tasks in their target languages or in their mother tongue containing ambiguous expressions and were asked to identify and analyze them independently and with the support of AI tools.

The findings indicate that AI significantly expands the range of detected meanings compared to students’ initial interpretations. Students typically identify dominant and prototypical meanings, whereas AI generates a broader set of interpretations, including less frequent and highly context-dependent ones. However, students demonstrate greater accuracy in evaluating contextual appropriateness, particularly in cases involving pragmatic and culturally bound meanings.

The study highlights the pedagogical potential of AI language models such as ChatGPT, not only as tools for ambiguity identification but also as instruments for developing linguistic awareness, critical thinking, and advanced academic writing skills in multilingual contexts.

Keywords: Ambiguity, Artificial intelligence, ChatGPT, German language, English language, Macedonian language

Introduction

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly influenced the acquisition of various skills in language learning. AI tools such as ChatGPT are increasingly used by students and educators for text generation, language correction, translation, linguistic analysis, and a wide range of other language-related tasks. One area in which AI may provide particularly valuable support is the identification of ambiguity, a phenomenon that frequently affects communication across languages and cultures.

Ambiguity is a natural feature of human language and occurs when a linguistic expression can be interpreted in more than one way. Although ambiguity can sometimes serve stylistic and rhetorical purposes in literary and creative discourse, it often poses a challenge in academic communication, where clarity and precision are essential, and, to a lesser extent, in everyday communication.

The identification of ambiguity is particularly relevant in multilingual contexts. Learners of foreign languages frequently encounter expressions with multiple possible interpretations, while native speakers may overlook ambiguity because they automatically select the most familiar meaning. Raising awareness of ambiguous language therefore plays an important role in language education.

Recent advances in AI have created new opportunities to support this process. Unlike human readers, who typically rely on contextual expectations and world knowledge to select a single interpretation, AI systems can generate multiple possible meanings simultaneously. This makes AI particularly suitable as a pedagogical tool for helping students recognize alternative interpretations and reflect critically on language use.

The present study investigates the use of ChatGPT in identifying ambiguity in German, English, and Macedonian. It examines how students interact with AI-generated outputs, how their interpretations compare with those produced by AI, and the extent to which AI can contribute to the development of linguistic awareness and critical thinking.

The main objective of this paper is to examine how AI tools can support students in recognizing ambiguous structures, exploring alternative interpretations, and becoming aware of the need to disambiguate ambiguous utterances.

This paper is organized as follows. First, we present the methodology and research design. Next, we provide a theoretical overview of lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic ambiguity, as well as the context-driven process of disambiguation. The following section presents the empirical tasks and results. Finally, we discuss the findings in relation to AI-supported language learning and conclude the study.

Methodology

As previously stated, this research focuses on the identification of ambiguous expressions and the exploration of how AI can support the recognition of alternative interpretations. The participants in the research were students who frequently used ChatGPT for various academic tasks, both during classes and at home, including translation, text generation, proofreading, grammatical transformations, coursework preparation, and other forms of language practice. This familiarity with AI tools provided a solid basis for evaluating the role of AI in tasks related to ambiguity within the given tasks.

The study involved 30 students from the Faculty of Philology at Goce Delcev University, Stip, including students of German Language and Literature, English Language and Literature, Macedonian Language, as well as students studying German or English as elective subjects. The research was conducted over two semesters during the 2025/2026 academic year.

Participants completed tasks containing ambiguous expressions in their target languages or in Macedonian, i.e., their mother tongue. They were asked to identify ambiguous elements, explain possible interpretations, compare their analyses with AI-generated outputs, and evaluate the effectiveness of AI in supporting the identification and interpretation of ambiguity.

Understanding Ambiguity in Language

Linguistic expressions often allow more than one interpretation. Lexical ambiguity occurs when a single word has multiple meanings. For instance, the English adjective *hard* carries both physical and abstract meanings. Ambiguity may also arise from grammatical category flexibility. The English word *light*, for example, can function as a noun, adjective, or verb, each with own meanings. Function words also contribute significantly to ambiguity, as prepositions such as *on*, *at*, or *to* can express various relations depending on the context.

Syntactic ambiguity arises when sentence structure allows multiple interpretations. For example, in the sentence *The girl saw the boy with binoculars*, the prepositional phrase *with binoculars* may attach either to the verb *saw* or to the noun phrase *the boy*, producing two valid interpretations.

In this regard, Agricola (1968: 62) distinguishes three main types of syntactic ambiguity.

The first type involves dependency relations within a sentence, where a sentence element can be linked to more than one constituent. An example is *While reading the letter, John called his mother*. Here, the participial phrase *while reading the letter* may be interpreted as modifying either *John* or *his mother*, leading to two possible readings: either John was reading the letter when he made the call, or his mother was reading the letter at the time of the call. Since both attachments are grammatically plausible, the sentence remains structurally ambiguous.

The second type arises when the relationship between sentence elements permits different interpretations. For instance, *Sarah follows Maria* illustrates a case in which the semantic roles of the participants may be interpreted differently depending on the context. However, in English, as in most languages, word order typically assigns the first noun phrase the role of subject and the second the role of object, thereby reducing potential ambiguity.

The third type combines features of the two previous categories. A classic example is *Watching children can be exhausting*, which may refer either to the activity of supervising children or to children who are engaged in watching something. In this case, there is more than one possible dependency relation, and the nature of the relationships involved may also differ.

Pragmatic ambiguity arises from context and communicative intention rather than from linguistic form. For example, *Can you open the window?* may function either as a question about ability or as an indirect request, depending on the situation.

The interpretation of ambiguous expressions depends strongly on context, background knowledge, and communicative expectations (Kaplan, 1950; Bar-Hillel, 1964; Wilks, 1975). In most cases, ambiguity is resolved automatically during language processing through the interaction between linguistic input and stored knowledge (Nikodinovska, 2009).

Task-Based Study of Students' Use of AI in Identifying Linguistic Ambiguity

The empirical part of the study is based on a set of structured tasks designed to examine how students identify and interpret different types of linguistic ambiguity, both independently and with the support of AI tools. The tasks cover lexical and syntactic ambiguity in German, English, and Macedonian, presented either with or without contextual information. Some tasks

required students to provide their own interpretations of ambiguous expressions, while others involved comparing their interpretations with AI-generated outputs and evaluating differences in scope, accuracy, and interpretative depth. Additional tasks included translation activities and related exercises. The following section presents the tasks and discusses the corresponding results.

Task 1: Identifying Lexical Ambiguity and Comparing Results with AI

Students were asked to identify possible meanings of words with homonymous¹ characteristics and compare their responses with AI-generated outputs.

German: *Kiefer, Bank, Leiter, Band, Schloss*

English: *spring, run, draft, light, bat*

Macedonian: *лист, јазик, лак, град, коса*

Results

The comparison revealed a clear difference between the semantic range identified by students and that generated by AI. Students generally provided the most frequent and prototypical meanings of the lexical items, whereas AI consistently generated a broader range of interpretations, including less frequent, specialized, and highly context-dependent senses.

For example, for the German lexeme *Schloss*, students typically identified the most common meanings such as, *castle* and *lock*, whereas AI additionally generated another uses and compound-based interpretations (*locking mechanism / fastening device, latch or fastening component* etc.) A similar pattern was observed with the English lexeme *spring*, where students mainly listed familiar meanings such as *one of the seasons* and *a water source*, while AI further expanded the semantic range to include *coil/spiral, jump/hop*, and other technical uses. Likewise, for the Macedonian lexeme *лист*, students generally focused on the most frequent meanings such as *leaf* and *sheet of paper*, whereas AI additionally generated meanings such as *newspaper page, blade, and sheet (of metal)*.

On average, students identified around 45-48% of all AI-generated meanings of homonymous lexical items. In contrast, AI generated a significantly broader semantic range, covering around 90% of dictionary-attested meanings. However, around 6.5% of AI-generated interpretations were contextually overgeneralized or lexically imprecise, indicating the need for explication.

Task 2: Identifying Sentence Ambiguity Using AI

Students were asked to identify syntactic ambiguity in German, English, and Macedonian, then to compare their outputs with those generated by AI.

German:

- *Die Journalistin interviewte die Wissenschaftlerin, nachdem sie den Bericht gelesen hatte.* (The journalist interviewed the scientist after she had read the report.)
- *Der Trainer beobachtete den Spieler, bevor der Schiedsrichter ihn ansprach.* (The coach observed the player before the referee spoke to him.)
- *Die Mutter begrüßte die Nachbarin, als sie aus dem Haus kam.* (The mother greeted the neighbor as she came out of the house.)

English:

- *The journalist interviewed the scientist after she had read the report.*
- *The coach watched the player before the referee spoke to him.*

¹ some of which are not strictly homonymous but display elements of polysemy

- *The mother greeted the neighbor as she came out of the house.*

Macedonian:

- *Професорката ја праша студентката кога влезе во училиницата. (The professor asked the student when she entered the classroom.)*
- *Мајката ја повика ќерката додека трчаеше во парком. (The mother called the daughter while she was running in the park.)*
- *Судијата му се обрати на играчот додека беше на терен. (The referee addressed the player while he was on the field.)*

Results

The analysis revealed that most students were able to identify syntactic ambiguity when explicitly guided by the task instructions. A total of 86.7% of students successfully recognized multiple possible interpretations, whereas 13.3% focused on a single dominant reading, based on what appeared to them to be more logical. In doing so, they relied on their own experience or on the sequence of sentence elements.

In contrast, AI-generated outputs consistently provided all logically possible interpretations and clearly distinguished between alternative readings.

Overall, students demonstrated solid performance in recognizing sentence-level ambiguity; however, AI showed greater exhaustiveness in generating interpretative alternatives.

Task 3: Identifying Ambiguity in Translation Using AI

This task examined how ambiguity can be identified in translation processes using AI. Students translated Macedonian (as it is their mother tongue) sentences into German and English and compared their interpretations with AI-generated outputs in order to identify possible alternative readings.

Macedonian:

Машината ја обработи датотекаата со грешка.

(The machine processed the file with an error.)

This sentence allows two interpretations:

1. The error refers to the processing:
 - **German:** *Die Maschine verarbeitete die Datei fehlerhaft.*
 - **English:** *The system processed the file incorrectly.*
2. The file itself contains an error:
 - **German:** *Die Maschine verarbeitete die fehlerhafte Datei.*
 - **English:** *The system processed the corrupted file.*

Additional **Macedonian** examples:

Полицеаецот го запре возачот на мостот.

(The police officer stopped the driver on the bridge.)

Наставникот ја пофали ученичката со насмевка.

(The teacher praised the student with a smile.)

Results

The results indicate that students frequently focused on a single interpretation when translating ambiguous sentences. In 80% of cases, only one possible reading was identified, typically corresponding to the most salient interpretation. 20% of responses explicitly recognized the existence of multiple possible readings.

For example, in the sentence *Машината ја обработи датотекаата со грешка*, most students identified only one interpretation, usually assuming that the processing was incorrect. The

alternative possibility, namely that the file itself contained an error, was less frequently recognized. Similar tendencies were observed in the additional examples, where one interpretation tended to dominate students' responses.

In contrast, AI-generated outputs more consistently highlighted the existence of multiple possible interpretations and made the underlying structural ambiguity more visible.

Overall, the findings suggest that ambiguity in translation often remains unnoticed unless learners are explicitly encouraged to search for alternative interpretations. AI proved useful in drawing attention to possible ambiguity, although students were still required to critically evaluate the relevance of the interpretations generated.

Task 4: Identifying AI Errors Caused by Literal Interpretation

In this task, students evaluated AI-generated translations of Macedonian sentences into German and English that contained errors resulting from overly literal interpretation. Students were asked to identify cases in which the AI failed to recognize the intended meaning because it relied primarily on lexical correspondences rather than contextual, pragmatic, or world knowledge.

Macedonian:

Падна системот за време на презентацијата.
(The system crashed during the presentation.)

AI translation:

- **German:** *Das System ist während der Präsentation gefallen.*
- **English:** *The system fell during the presentation.*

AI incorrectly interpreted the verb *падна* literally as *ist gefallen/fell*. However, in technological contexts, the expression *падна системот* is an established expression meaning that the system crashed or stopped functioning. Students were able to correctly identify the intended meaning based on their familiarity with computer-related terminology and contextual usage, which takes precedence over the literal lexical interpretation.

Correct interpretation:

- **German:** *Das System ist während der Präsentation abgestürzt.*
- **English:** *The system crashed during the presentation.*

Additional examples:

- *Тој ја крена фирмата за само две години.*
- *Министерот го замрзна проектот до следната година.*
- *Компанијата ги пресече трошоците.*

Results

The same pattern was observed across all examples. AI-generated translations were generally grammatically correct but occasionally relied on literal interpretations of lexical items and expressions, overlooking meanings that are conventionally established within specific contexts or domains. The results showed that students were highly successful in identifying such cases. Approximately 96.7% of participants recognized that the AI-generated translations were contextually inappropriate despite being linguistically well-formed.

Students consistently relied on contextual information, world knowledge, and familiarity with conventional expressions to identify the intended meaning.

Overall, the findings suggest that human interpretation remains superior when identifying context-dependent and conventionalized meanings. While AI systems can generate structurally accurate translations, they may still fail to recognize meanings that depend on experiential, cultural, or domain-specific knowledge.

Conclusion

This study examined the role of AI in supporting the identification of linguistic ambiguity among students of German, English, and Macedonian at the Faculty of Philology, Goce Delcev University, Stip. Through a series of task-based activities, students identified lexical and syntactic ambiguities and compared their interpretations with AI-generated outputs.

The results of the four tasks revealed complementary strengths of AI and human interpretation. In the *lexical ambiguity task*, AI generated a substantially broader range of meanings than students, who primarily identified the most frequent senses of ambiguous words. In the *sentence ambiguity task*, both students and AI successfully recognized alternative interpretations, although AI consistently provided more exhaustive analyses. In the *translation task*, students often focused on a single interpretation, whereas AI more consistently highlighted multiple possible readings and sources of ambiguity. Finally, in the task involving *AI errors* caused by literal interpretation, students demonstrated superior contextual awareness and were highly successful in identifying cases where AI failed to capture the intended meaning. Overall, AI proved particularly effective in generating interpretative alternatives, while students showed greater competence in evaluating contextual appropriateness and selecting the most plausible interpretation.

These findings indicate that AI and human interpretation possess complementary strengths rather than competing capabilities. While AI excels at generating a wide range of possible meanings and revealing alternative readings that may otherwise remain unnoticed, students demonstrate greater sensitivity to contextual, pragmatic, and culturally embedded aspects of meaning. The study therefore confirms that effective ambiguity identification benefits from the combination of AI-generated outputs and human critical evaluation.

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings highlight the considerable potential of AI tools such as ChatGPT in language education. By encouraging students to explore multiple interpretations, compare alternative readings, and critically assess AI-generated outputs, such tools can contribute to the development of linguistic awareness, analytical thinking, translation competence, and academic writing skills. At the same time, the results underscore the importance of teaching students to evaluate AI-generated information critically, since not all suggested interpretations are equally relevant or contextually appropriate.

References

- Agricola, E. (1968). *Syntaktische Mehrdeutigkeit (Polysyntaktizität) bei der Analyse des Deutschen und des Englischen*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. (1964). On syntactic categories. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 15, 1–16. (Reprinted in Bar-Hillel, 1964a, pp. 19–37).
- Fries, N. (1980). *Ambiguität und Vagheit*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jäger, G. (1975). *Translation und Translationslinguistik*. Halle (Saale).

Kaplan, A. (1950). An experimental study of ambiguity and context. *Mechanical Translation*, 2(2), 39–46. (Original work published 1950 in mimeographed form, November).

Nikodinovska, R. (2009). *Didakmuka i evaluacija na prevoduvanjeto od italijanski na makedonski jazik i obratno*. Skopje: Filološki fakultet „Blaze Koneski“.

Wilks, Y. (1975). A preferential pattern-seeking semantics for natural language inference. *Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 53–74.