

# The Light Side of the Moon: A Lucretian Acrostic by Leah Kronenberg

Post by "Cassius" of March 16, 2022 at 1:22 PM

I think you're right Godfrey and that even in fun this is a good example of the issue.

My first inclination is to say that we consider the evidence from "all of the above" sources that you suggest be possibilities.

## [Quote from Godfrey](#)

posit that there are two different prolepseis on display here as to what constitutes a poem

I am not sure what you mean there, however (?) I have a feeling that you are using the word "prolepsis" in that sentence as if it is interchangeable with "concept." I am still not ready to embrace that "anticipations" = "concepts." Are you?

## [Quote from Godfrey](#)

One approach to the current evidence is to blindly accept the statements of classical scholars, one of which we have among us in the person of Joshua.

This would be an example of the "rely on the experts" method. No doubt we do in many situations rely on experts. That's an issue in itself as to how we do that, because sometimes experts do make mistakes, and there are differences of opinion as to who constitutes an expert. Someone wanting to write up a paper on that would find some good material in US Federal litigation case law, as there is an extensive line of cases that discusses issues revolving around the admissibility of expert testimony in court. No doubt there are significant differences in context but there is this important analogy: In court issues for fact determination, we think generally that the most fair result comes from a panel of impartial jurors; we want the jurors to make the decision in disputed issues to get the most "fair" result. What happens when jurors don't have the experience or training to be able to judge the issue? We let "experts" testify, and the task of the jurors switches to judging the credibility and persuasiveness of the experts, not of the ultimate facts directly. There is lots of interesting discussion about these issues in the legal system.

## [Quote from Godfrey](#)

Yet another approach is to examine the odds of a given acrostic occurring and to make inferences from that.

This would be a statistics-based approach. That too can be helpful, but there too we have some helpful rules of thumb about how to separate statistics from "damned lies."

#### [Quote from Godfrey](#)

One could also say that we need to understand the motivations of each person making assertions

This kind of analysis of "bias and prejudice" is definitely a part of the legal frame of analysis.

So in short we could take your examples and generalize them into a series of bullet points on how generally to approach "methods of inference" in making judgments about the unknown.