It has long been recognized, and is beyond doubt, that there is a connection between Pr. 26 and Theophrastus’ De ventis. The first scholar I know of who made explicit his awareness of this connection is the unknown ‘second hand’ writing in the margins of Bernensis gr. 402 (ca. 1480), a manuscript which includes De ventis (fols. 42r–53v). Over a dozen times he quotes the Problemata in the margins, adjacent to the passage in De ventis it parallels. What is more, he makes it clear that he accepts the ancient attribution of the Problemata to Aristotle; for in the margin next to the words τὸ δὲ μὴ πνεῖν κατὰ ταύτην τὴν Ἀἴγυπτον (the opening line of what is ch. 8, according to the modern divisions in De ventis), he writes: ταὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἀριστοτέλης ἐν προβλήμασιν (fol. 43v), a reference to Pr. 26.44. I assume he believed Pr. 26 was prior to De ventis. Now the view that these two works are related, and that Pr. 26 was written by Aristotle and thus precedes De ventis, is found in the earliest commentaries on De ventis—Bonaventura (1593) and Furlanus (1605)—and it persisted into the 19th century among scholars working on this Theophrastan treatise: see, for example, Schneider (1818–21).

In the 20th century the situation changed radically, owing to a change in how scholars viewed the Problemata, namely as a work that is not (at all or for the most part) by Aristotle, but by more than one Peripatetic, working perhaps centuries after Aristotle. From this perspective, De ventis should (likely) be considered a source for the parallel passages in Pr. 26—the latter is raising questions about the former—and not the other way around. This is the view, for example, of Forster (1921, 1927, 1933), Flashar (1962), Steinmetz (1964),

---

1 On the second hand in Bernensis gr. 402, see Burnikel (1974, 25–34). The date of the second hand is likely not long after 1480, and certainly before the publication of the Aldine edition (1497). I should note that there are twelve manuscripts of De ventis, and Vaticanus gr. 1302 (circa 1300) is the ultimate source of the other eleven (see Burnikel 1974, 90).
2 More on the connection between Pr. 26.44 and Vent. 8 shortly.
3 Barthélemy-Saint Hilaire, however, in his translation with commentary of the Problemata, is non-committal. For example, speaking of the relationship between Pr. 26.3 and Vent. 50, he writes: “Il est évident que l’un des deux passages a été emprunté à l’autre” (1891, 2: 226).
and Coutant & Eichenlaub (1975). For most of these scholars, the relationship between *De ventis* and *Pr. 26* is non-complex and obvious—that is, *De ventis* simply is prior to *Pr. 26*, and this priority can be assumed with little or no argument. For example, Steinmetz discusses the relationship between *Pr. 25–26* and *De ventis* in a section of his work entitled *Die Nachwirkung der theophrastischen Windlehre* (1964, 60–68), and there assumes the priority of *De ventis*.6

Until recently, this is how I viewed the relationship between *Pr. 26* and the *De ventis* (see Mayhew 2011, 2: 156). What I want to do in this chapter is re-examine what has become the standard view.

1 A Critical Analysis of Pierre Louis’s Thesis

Pierre Louis, in the *Notice* to Book 26 in his Budé edition of the *Problemata* (1993, 194–99),7 argues for a view of the relationship between *Pr. 26* and *De ventis* that represents a rejection of the standard modern view and a return to the older one.8 In what follows, I present his arguments in detail, and while doing so offer my criticisms of them. I do not criticize Louis simply because I think his arguments fail; more importantly, by going through his arguments and responding to them, I hope to underscore the difficulties involved in establishing with certainty the precise relationship between some section of the *Problemata* and a text with parallel passages. The results should have implications beyond the relationship between *Pr. 26* and *De ventis*.9

---

4 For example, Forster presents *Vent. 19–20* alongside a parallel passage in *Pr. 26*.48, and simply comments: “the compiler of the latter clearly copies from the former” (1921, 166). Ruelle et al. (1922), Hett (1937), and Ferrini (2002) all note parallels between the two works, but say nothing about which has priority. This is not to say that any of them is in fact non-committal.

5 Flashar (1962) is an exception, in or to the extent that he sees the relationship as complex. For although he claims that *De ventis* “ist die Hauptquelle für *Prob. xxvi,*” he adds: “Während in den meisten Fällen die Priorität Theophrasts sicher ist, scheint in einigen Fällen Theophrast von den Prob. abhängig zu sein” (673).

6 For more on Steinmetz’s view of the relationship between *Pr. 26* and *De ventis*, see note 23.

7 Unless otherwise indicated, quotes from and references to Louis are from or refer to this *Notice*, and thus bibliographical information (including pagination) is not indicated.

8 I say *represents* a rejection and return, because Louis does not in fact refer to the view he is supplanting nor to the fact that he is defending an interpretation that had once been widespread. He simply states and defends his position.

9 At the very least, this study should contribute to discussions of the relationship between *Pr. 2* and Theophrastus’ *De sudore*, and between *Pr. 5* and his *De lassitudine*. 