The present commentary originated in a National Endowment for the Humanities sponsored project (1976-78) entitled: Philo of Alexandria, An Interdisciplinary Study in the Fusion and Diffusion of Cultural Traditions. The principal investigators were the undersigned, and the purpose was to attain, by means of an interdisciplinary team approach, new and more detailed insights into the immediate sources and true nature of Philo's work. The pair of treatises De Gigantibus—Quod Deus were chosen for the production of a detailed commentary on a representative section of the Philonic corpus to serve as a paradigm for the type of commentary which we felt was needed. The Greek text was divided into a series of segments, and each of us wrote a commentary on those segments assigned to him. The commentary consisted of two parts: (a) general comments on the segment as a whole, and (b) detailed line-by-line commentary. We then read and revised each other's work. Each segment upon completion was mailed out to a team of scholars who reviewed it in the light of their respective specialties. The following are the members of the team: D. Gooding, J. Leopold, and V. Nikiprowetzky. B. Bokser and R. T. Wallis also commented on a number of segments. As it turned out, Nikiprowetzky wrote a detailed commentary on our commentary, which required us to make a thorough revision of the whole. In the light of this, we have deemed it appropriate to include his name as one of the authors of the commentary. The introduction is a composite containing components contributed by Thomas Conley, John Dillon, David Gooding, John Leopold, Valentin Nikiprowetzky, Richard Wallis, and David Winston. Each author is responsible for his own contribution to the introduction, and no attempt has been made by the editors to harmonize the various views expressed. The enormous diversity of Philo's learning and the intricate problems involved in the comprehension of his thought cannot properly be appreciated except by the sort of close work on at least a segment of his text represented by the present commentary.
While the treatment of anything like his whole *oeuvre* with the detailed care which we have devoted to this portion of it would be beyond the resources of all but a large team, the present work, we feel, points the way to such an enterprise. We are extremely grateful to the National Endowment for the Humanities for making it possible through their research grant. The findings and conclusions presented here do not necessarily represent the view of the Endowment. We are also very grateful to Irene and Dani Winston and Professor John Leopold for helping in the preparation of the indices.

David Winston
John Dillon
INTRODUCTION