

# Good writing in literature vs BLUNT writing in VGIRs

The concise, accurate, and nimble writing style of good literature is impossible to match in BLUNT VGIRs; yet in return, the unambiguous BLUNT style of VGIRs facilitates automatic and correct translation into the negotiated and controlled vocabularies of other (human BEST) VGIR languages. This greatly simplifies internationalization as the manifold challenges of translating good literature are reduced to translating the controlled lists of BEST Names used in VGIRs.

Thus, to represent real biological data electronically requires the challenge of negotiating BEST names and the effort it takes to use them; the resulting loss of accuracy and elegance may shake the in disappoint some bust some bubbles, but is unavoidable if machines are to process biodata – all other claims result in irresponsible epistemology. Consider this description of good literature to illustrate this:

"... philological clarity in literary texts can quickly turn into too much of a good thing. Literature in general ... cultivates certain profound and haunting enigmas, delights in leaving its audiences guessing about motives and connections, and, above all, loves to set ambiguities of word choice and image against one another in an endless interplay that resists neat resolution. In polar contrast, the impulse of the philologist – here a barbarous term nicely catches the tenor of the activity – "to disambiguate" the terms of the text. The general result when applied to translation is to reduce, simplify, and denature ... " (Robert Alter (2019) on page XV "... the Heresy of Explanation", in vol. 1 "... Translation with Commentary", Norton & Co, New York).

Similar problems arise, when translating reality or large complex literature reviews into data sets for bioreasoned VGIRs: implied ambiguities, references, paradoxes, etc. have to be spelled to make a VBIR useful for computers, and hence BLUNT – at the expense of literary elegance.