

*La validità del condizionale crisippeo
in Sesto Empirico e in Boezio (Parte II)*

Mauro Nasti De Vincentis

In the first part of this article, an unnoticed passage in Sextus Empiricus's Outlines of Pyrrhonism is pointed out, namely: «it is impossible for a sound conditional to be constituted from conflicting propositions» (P II 189, esp. frag. 961, 1228, 9-11 Hülser). As is argued at length, and chiefly owing to this passage, the Chrysippean implication, far from being an ancestor of strict or relevant implication, has as its modern relative the so-called analytic consequential implication. Moreover, as is shown in the second part, Sextus's unnoticed passage has two closely related counterparts in the fourth book (349, 40-42 Orelli and 359, 19-21 Orelli) of Boethius's Commentary in Ciceronis Topica, which are almost a paraphrasis of 1228, 9-11 Hülser. This is only the starting point towards a principal aim of this article, namely to show that all the unexplained features of the so-called Boethian logic, and notably the strict equivalence between 'if P, then Q' and 'not-(if P, then not-Q)', become nothing more than simple and provably sound corollaries of the Chrysippean theory of conflict and connectedness. Therefore, the Stoic logic of Chrysippean implication becomes, by means of a late peripatetic restatement, a fundamental (although far and indirect) source of Boethius's doctrine of valid or repugnant conditionals, whence Boethius also becomes a fundamental source for (a real understanding of) Stoic logic.

È abbastanza interessante notare che la chiave risolutiva, non solo di alcune questioni più specifiche ma anche del problema generale (già menzionato a conclusione della prima parte di questo lavoro) del rapporto fra impossibilità e repugnanza nella cosiddetta logica boeziana venga, come ora si vedrà, proprio da una sorta di ricostruzione e giustificazione peripatetica di elementi stoici che serve a Boezio per giustificare l'unicità di un *locus* che includa, da un lato, gli antecedenti e i conseguenti di un condizionale valido (e dunque, dato il contesto, la loro *conexio*, cioè, in