

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY EVIDENCE FOR THE BURNING OF THE PERSEPOLIS PALACE

1. THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Recent excavations in Macedonia have provided an analogy to the pillaging of the Palace at Persepolis. In plundered tombs at Aiani the excavators found a number of small gold discs with impressed rosettes and of gilded silver ivy leaves;¹ at Katerini some thirty-five gold discs with impressed rosettes, a gold double pin, a gold ring from a sword-hilt, a bit of a gilded pectoral, gilded silver fittings once attached to a leather cuirass, many buttons and other fragments;² and at Palatitsia (near Vergina) bits of a gilded bronze wreath and of a gold necklace, and an ivory fitting.³ It was suggested that some of these objects had been dropped when ornamental facings were being torn away from a wooden funerary couch and from clothing by the robbers, who were probably working at speed and dared not return. In the antechamber of the tomb at Katerini many of the objects I have mentioned were found inside a burnt layer, and M. Andronikos has provided the explanation that they had been burnt on the pyre outside the tomb and then brought inside with the debris of the pyre itself.⁴ Nothing else was associated with burnt material.

At Persepolis, where the Palace complex consisted of the Apadana, the Throne Room and the Treasury, the excavators found very similar objects of gold which were believed to have been facings on wooden furniture and on clothing. The plundering seems to have been done in haste; for in Room 16 of the Apadana, for instance, 'pieces of gold foil and gold tacks were scattered all over the floor'.⁵ The plunderers were violent; for instance, 'a piece of heavy gold band... must have been torn from a curved piece of wood to which it had been attached by means of gold tacks'.⁶ They were rapacious in that 'not a single vessel of silver or gold escaped' them,⁷ and they were vandals, in that they 'shattered most (of the fine stone tableware) which they left behind'.⁸ The excavators expressed surprise at the 'frequency of specimens (of small precious ornaments) lost or discarded during the pillage'.⁹ This was particularly so in

* The following abbreviations are employed:

AG² = N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (New Jersey, 1980; second ed., Bristol, 1989).

Berve = H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich, 1926).

Borza = E. N. Borza, 'Fire from Heaven: Alexander at Persepolis', *CPh* 67 (1972), 233f.

Bosworth C = A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, i (Oxford, 1980).

Bosworth CE = idem, *Conquest and Empire: the Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1988).

Goukowsky = P. Goukowsky, *Diodore de Sicile Livre 17* (Paris, 1976).

Hamilton C = J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander: a Commentary* (Oxford, 1969).

Schmidt = E. F. Schmidt, *Persepolis* i–iii (Chicago, 1953–70).

THA = N. G. L. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: the So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge, 1983).

¹ G. Karamitrou-Mentessidi, *Aiani of Kozani* (Thessaloniki, 1989), especially p. 56 and Fig. 23.

² A. Despini in *AAA* 13 (1980), 206; illustrated in *Ancient Macedonia* (Athens, 1988), Figs. 226–9.

³ *Ergon* 1984 [1985], 32 and 1985 [1986], 19f.

⁴ M. Andronikos in *BSA* 82 (1987), 11.

⁵ Schmidt i.75.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Schmidt i.179.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Schmidt i.76

two courtyards, where the excavators supposed that the plunderers had sorted out the spoils, and in the process had lost or discarded such objects as two buttons of gold, bits of lead and bronze, a gold rosette, a silver nail and beads of semi-precious stone.¹⁰

The greatest difference between the pillaging in Macedonia and the pillaging at Persepolis was in what was left on the floors of the buildings at Persepolis – not hidden but there for anyone to see. We have already mentioned individual items of gold and other metals. The excavators gave the total of objects connected only with clothing as fifty-three of gold and twenty-one of bronze. In addition to what we have mentioned heads of lances, javelins and arrows numbered 3,862 in bronze and 834 in iron,¹¹ and there were lumps of lead and a lump of unworked amethyst, fine pieces of royal tableware in stone and glass, and bits of onyx, lapis lazuli, carnelian, amethyst, agate and amber.¹² All this material, amounting to a large sum in value, lay there for the taking but untaken.

This difference has sometimes been overlooked entirely, for instance in such remarks as 'even before the fire the palace had been picked clean'.¹³ There is only one explanation for the failure of the pillagers to return and make a clean sweep of the residue. The pillaging itself was done not only at speed, as the excavators noted, but also during a short time, so that the pillagers were able to collect and remove only what was most valuable and easily carried off. Thereafter, no one was able to return and collect the less valuable objects. Why was this so? The obvious answer is that the great conflagration which consumed the Apadana, the Throne Room and the Treasury¹⁴ followed immediately after the pillaging. Certainly the effect of the fire is undisputed. In the words of the excavators 'the debris of collapsing roofs and walls sealed off the objects rejected or lost during the pillage of the site'.¹⁵ The debris formed a thick deposit, since the walls of the massive buildings were mainly of mud-brick. Moreover, this debris lay undisturbed; for there was no sign of any reoccupation or redevelopment of the site. The question to which we shall seek an answer in the literary evidence is whether there was a substantial interval between the pillaging and the burning or a very brief one.

2. THE LITERARY EVIDENCE

Within the lifetime of the contemporaries of Alexander two versions of the burning of the Palace were current. One was attributed by Athenaeus to Cleitarchus in the following passage. 'Did not Alexander the Great keep with him the Athenian prostitute Thaïs? Of her Cleitarchus speaks as being responsible for the palace at Persepolis being burnt. After the death of Alexander this Thaïs was married to Ptolemy, the first to rule as king over Egypt' (576d–e). The other version was derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, whom Arrian was following for his narrative (*Arr. Preface* 1), and it was summarised by Arrian as follows. 'He [Alexander] burnt the Persian palace although Parmenio was advising him to preserve it' (*Arr.* 3.18.11). The reasons of Parmenio and of Alexander followed; we shall consider them later. For the moment the point is that there existed early in the Hellenistic period two incompatible versions of the origin of the conflagration.

Both versions were still current at the end of the Roman Republic. The first version was retold at great length by Diodorus, and the second was stated in a simple form by Strabo: 'Alexander burnt the palace at Persepolis as an act of revenge for the

¹⁰ Schmidt i.188.

¹¹ Schmidt ii.99; cf. ii.97.

¹² Schmidt i.81, 131, 179 and 185. Also, of course, much furniture and fine cloth.

¹³ Bosworth C, p. 332.

¹⁴ Schmidt ii.3.

¹⁵ Ibid.

Greeks, because the Persians sacked temples and cities of the Greeks with fire and sword' (729/730). Curtius, writing probably during the principate of Vespasian,¹⁶ gave an even longer account of the first version than Diodorus had done. Moreover, it is clear that Diodorus and Curtius drew on a common source, namely the account of Cleitarchus.¹⁷ This is particularly apparent from the timetable of events, which is relevant to the question of the interval between the pillaging and the conflagration. I begin with that of the Cleitarchan version.

After the victory at 'the Susian Rocks' Tiridates wrote offering to surrender Persepolis, and Alexander marching at speed bridged the river Araxes (Diod. 17.69.1–2; Curt. 5.5.2–4). On the other side of the river he met a group of mutilated Greeks and dealt kindly with them (17.69.2–9; 5.5.5–24). On reaching Persepolis in January 330 B.C.¹⁸ Alexander said – at a council of his Commanders according to Curt. 5.6.1 – that the city was more at enmity with them than any other city in Asia, and he sent the Macedonian soldiers (Diod 17.70.1–2 *τοῖς Μακεδόσιν... τοῖς στρατιώταις... οἱ Μακεδόνες*) of the phalanx¹⁹ (Curt 5.6.2 'rex phalangem nihil cunctatus inducit') to loot and plunder the city.²⁰ After the looting Alexander 'went on to the acropolis and took over the treasure there' (Diod. 17.71.1 *εἰς τὴν ἄκραν*). This led Diodorus to digress²¹ about the buildings on the acropolis (17.71.1 and 3–8, *τῆς ἄκρας*; they included the Apadana, the Throne Room and the Treasury). Diodorus resumed his narrative with Alexander at Persepolis being engaged in games and sacrifices and the entertaining of his Friends, which culminated in the drunkenness and the mad folly of the Macedonians and in the burning of the Palace at the instigation of Thaïs. Curtius, without any digression, described arrangements at Perspolis and then a campaign by Alexander in the wilds of Persis, which began at the start of spring and lasted thirty days²² (Curt. 5.6.12 and 19). Thereafter Alexander came back to Persepolis and gave presents to his Friends (5.6.19–20). This corresponded with the entertainment of his Friends in Diodorus' account, and it was followed at once by the burning of the Palace at the instigation

¹⁶ At any rate before Arrian wrote; for I am not persuaded by the arguments of K. Buraselis in favour of a later date in *Ariadne* 4 (1988), 244f.

¹⁷ So Goukowsky, p. 98 n. 3, Bosworth *CE*, p. 93 and *THA*, pp. 56f. and 131f.; Borza 234 expressed doubts.

¹⁸ I am following my chronology in *AG*², p. 313. This date is usually accepted; see Borza 237.

¹⁹ They had borne the brunt of the heavy fighting at the Persian Gates. Alexander had rewarded good service after the battle of Issus by sending the Thessalian cavalry under Parmenio's command to capture the booty at Damascus (Curt. 3.12.27; Arr. 2.11.10; Polyae. 4.5).

²⁰ Goukowsky claimed that the plundering was to be not of the city itself but of the 'ville royale...y compris les Palais et la Trésorerie' (p. 100 n. 2). That is not what was described by Diodorus and Curtius. Diodorus called Persepolis the capital city of the Persian kingdom (17.70.1, *μητρόπολιν... τῆς Περσῶν βασιλείας*) and a city surpassing the other cities in misery when it was sacked (17.70.6 *τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων*), and Curtius wrote similarly of Persepolis as 'urbs' and 'oppidum' (5.6.1–2). In their accounts it was the city which was plundered. Diodorus commented on the wealth of the private houses (*τῶν ἰδιωτικῶν οἰκῶν*) even of the masses (*τοῖς πλεθροῖς*), which were of course not on the acropolis but in the city. Both authors described the massacre of the men, the suicides of entire families and the outrages committed on the women by the troops in the sack of the city. Whether their accounts included a looting of the acropolis area will be considered later.

²¹ The digression was derived probably from the work of Deinon, perhaps via his son Cleitarchus; see Goukowsky, p. 222 on Diod. 17.71.7 and *THA*, p. 57.

²² This campaign corresponded at least in part with that which Diodorus appended to the Thaïs episode at 17.73.1 and with the campaign in Paraetacene which Arrian mentioned at 3.19.2. The Mardi whom Curtius mentioned at 5.6.17 were a different tribe from the Mardi of Hyrcania.

of Thaïs (5.7.1–7). Alexander then left Persepolis and marched towards Media. It was now April or May 330 B.C.²³

Thus the interval between the plundering of the city of Persepolis and the burning of the Palace was a matter of some four months (Plut. *Alex.* 37.6). At the time of the plundering of the city (or just after it, if one takes Diod. 17.71.1 literally) Alexander removed from the Treasury (adjoining the Apadana) bullion amounting to 120,000 talents, and he arranged for the transportation thereof by draught-animals and by camels (Diod. 17.71.1–2; Curt. 5.6.9–10). Diodorus did not state clearly whether the plundering of the city included a plundering of 'the Palace', which lay within the city but on the acropolis (sometimes called 'The Terrace'). For he wrote at first that Alexander let the soldiers loose on the city 'except for the Palace' (17.70.1 *χωρὶς τῶν βασιλείων*), but he included in the looting 'the outrageous and utter ruination of the great and world-famous Palace' (17.70.3), an expression which can only mean the Apadana, founded by Darius and improved by Xerxes. Yet he reported after the looting that Alexander took over 'the treasure on the acropolis' (17.71.1). Curtius made no exception. He wrote of plunderers fighting over 'the royal robes' (which were in the Palace); and when he said that 'the wealth of all Persis was concentrated in this city' he was certainly thinking of the Palace as well as of the houses of the city. Yet he too mentioned the handing over of the treasure by Tiridates to Alexander (5.6.11 *gazam tradiderat*).

The excavation has demonstrated that this timetable is incorrect. It is inconceivable that some four months intervened between the hasty and incomplete plundering of the Palace and the burning of the Palace.²⁴ For throughout that period valuable objects were lying on the floors for anyone to see. If the site was being guarded by Macedonian troops, there was nothing to prevent them pocketing small gold objects, for instance; and, if it was unguarded, any robber could have helped himself. We must therefore reject the Cleitarchan version of what happened.²⁵

The account of Arrian which was derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus provided a different timetable of events. After the victory at 'the Persian Gates' Alexander marched at speed to the Araxes, which had been bridged in advance by a separate force (3.18.6 and 10), and 'again at speed' reached Persepolis, arriving

²³ See Hamilton C, p. 98 for a discussion of the months involved; Borza 241 had Alexander leave Persepolis in mid-May.

²⁴ The usual view has been that the city was looted in January, the acropolis was exempted then (despite Diod. 17.70.3 and Curt. 5.6.5), and the acropolis building – 'the Palace' in the texts – was burnt in mid-May. So Bosworth *CE*, p. 94 'Alexander turned over the city to his troops...only the palace complex was exempted...the fate of the palace must have been discussed during the months of occupation...the question was resolved dramatically' by the Thaïs episode. With this scenario the Palace was never looted at all: its store of valuables must have been involved in the conflagration started suddenly by Thaïs. This lack of looting is directly contrary to the archaeological evidence and is therefore unacceptable. Borza 243 had given a different sequence: looting of the city but not the palace complex; 'Alexander ordered the systematic looting of the royal monuments' (I suppose he meant the Palace, the Throne Room and the Treasury); and then in mid-May the burning of the Palace à la Thaïs. Here he invented the intermediate stage; it is not in the Cleitarchan version at all, and the archaeological evidence does not support a 'systematic' form of looting.

²⁵ Before the excavation of Persepolis Berve ii.175 accepted the Thaïs episode as historical, U. Wilcken, *Alexander the Great* (London, 1932), p. 145 called the Thaïs episode 'one of the fables of Cleitarchus', and W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, ii (Cambridge, 1948 and 1979), p. 48 'I need hardly say that there is not a word of truth in the Thaïs story'. Since Schmidt's publication most scholars have accepted the Thaïs episode without argument and reproduced the sensational description of brutalities and atrocities and then the drunken revel in the Cleitarchan manner, e.g. R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London, 1973), pp. 259–64 and Bosworth *CE*, pp. 92f.

before the Persian garrison could rob the Treasury. He captured the treasure at Pasargadae also (it was some forty kilometres beyond Persepolis), appointed a Persian as satrap of the Persians, and 'burned the Palace'. After that Alexander went on 'towards Media', subdued the Paraetacae and appointed a satrap over them. During his march he learnt that Darius was preparing to resist. He therefore pressed on without his baggage-train and entered Media on the twelfth day. There was no mention of a return to Persepolis in this narrative.²⁶

In this account the burning of the Palace followed upon a discussion between Alexander and Parmenio when they first came to Persepolis. That discussion had been reported, no doubt at greater length, by Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus, and it was comparable to the discussions, for instance, before the battle of the Granicus River, the battle of Issus, the siege of Tyre, and the battle of Gaugamela (Arr. 1.13.2-7; 2.7.3-7; 2.16.8-17.4; 3.9.3-4). It was presumably a discussion which Alexander held with his Commanders (as indeed Curtius had reported at 5.6.1 on the arrival of Alexander at Persepolis).²⁷ Parmenio argued that, apart from destroying what was now Alexander's own property (the Palace), 'the peoples of Asia would not come over to him in the same way on the grounds that (in destroying the Palace) he had decided not to hold the rule of Asia but to engage only in victorious conquest' (3.18.11). When he put this argument about the Persian attitude to Alexander, there was clearly no question of sacking the city of Persepolis; for that would have alienated Persian opinion immensely more than the firing of the Palace. Alexander replied, putting the Greek point of view (as Strabo had reported at 729/30), that the burning of the Palace would be an act of revenge for the Persian destruction of Athens, the burning of the Greek temples and all the other crimes against the Greeks.

This argument was particularly cogent in January 330, when Agis III was in control of the Peloponnese, and it was only the loyalty of Athens and other central Greek states to the Common Peace which prevented Agis from going north and endangering Macedonia itself.²⁸ News from Persepolis will have reached Athens well before the start of the campaigning season in Greece. To the Athenians the burning of the Palace at Persepolis was a striking demonstration that the Greeks of the Common Peace in collaboration with Macedonia had triumphed in their war against Persia.

That the version of Cleitarchus was fictional should not surprise us. Cicero and Quintilian, who knew his work *in toto* whereas we have only a few fragments, regarded him as an able sensational writer who took the liberty of lying outright (*FGrHist* 137 T 6 and T 7 *ementiri*, and *fides infamatur*) in order to produce a more brilliant account (*argutius*).²⁹ The marks of fiction in the description of the sack of the

²⁶ It is of course possible that he did return to Persepolis, because Arrian was abbreviating the account of his sources drastically. But if Alexander did return, Arrian's silence indicates that nothing spectacular or important happened at Persepolis.

²⁷ Attempts to import Thais into the account given by Arrian, as in Borza 235, are misplaced; for the discussion between Alexander and Parmenio was a sober consideration of policy and not part of a drunken revel with prostitutes and fun and games. Strabo 729/730 also gave Alexander's reasons.

²⁸ I am following the chronology of *AG*², pp. 159f. The dating of the war of Agis is disputed (see P. A. Brunt in the Loeb edition of Arrian, *Anabasis*, i [London, 1976], pp. 480-5); but even an earlier dating is compatible with 'the possibility that the news of the rebel collapse could have greeted Alexander almost any time after mid-December 331 B.C.' (Borza 242), and so after the burning of the Palace in January.

²⁹ Such lies were the visit of the Amazon Queen to bed down with Alexander (Plut. *Alex.* 46.1; cf. Diod. 17.77.1-3 and Curt. 6.5.24-32) and the participation of Ptolemy in saving the life of Alexander at the city of the Malli (Curt. 9.5.21). For his fictional battle-narratives see *THA*, pp. 13-27.

city are clear. For at Persepolis, which had not resisted, the Macedonians were said in the Cleitarchan version to have killed all the men and abused the women until Alexander called a halt and tried to protect them from further violation (Curt. 5.6.8). In Asia the policy of Alexander was to win over the Asian peoples. To that end he had forbidden the army to ravage Asia (Just. 11.6.1). After the battle of Gaugamela he appointed Persians as satraps, took Persians into his entourage, and within a year formed a Persian Royal Guard of cavalry. With this policy in mind he would have been mad to let his army sack the city; for, if he had done so and atrocities had inevitably been committed, he would have wrecked his hopes of ever winning Persian support.

We have to bear in mind the standpoint of Cleitarchus. A young Greek writer who did not participate in this part of the Asian campaign (or probably later), he had to rely for information mainly on Greek soldiers who returned after service and told him what they thought had happened.³⁰ There were no Greek troops at all with Alexander when he broke through the Persian Gates and marched posthaste to Persepolis, and there was not much to interest Greeks in the looting of the Palace by the Macedonians. Cleitarchus, writing for the Greeks at home on both sides of the Aegean Sea, wanted to provide a proud moment for the Greeks and to belittle the part of the Macedonians. His theme was revenge for the atrocities committed by Persians in Greek cities, as related by Herodotus (8.33 including outrages on women). Such revenge was the sack of the city (not just the acropolis) in the Greek manner, that is with a massacre of all males and a selling of the rest as slaves; for in 353 B.C. Athens had treated Sestus in that way (Diod. 16.34.3 *τοὺς μὲν ἡβώντας κατέσφαξεν κτλ.*), and in 335 B.C. some Greeks of the Council of the Common Peace had proposed 'the direst penalties' for Thebes (Diod. 17.14.2), which had killed all males and enslaved the rest of the population of Orchomenus in 363 B.C. (Diod. 15.79.6). Cleitarchus therefore provided a brilliantly rhetorical sack and at the same time a mocking of the Macedonians' greed in pillaging, which led to some men cutting off the hands of others. But more was desired. A banquet was described not of the Macedonian type with men only but of the Greek type with prostitutes, and the marvellous tale of an Athenian prostitute leading the drink-sodden king and his drink-sodden Friends to burn down the Palace as a demonstration of Greek victory and Greek revenge. This was just what Greeks at home longed to hear.

On the other hand Ptolemy and Aristobulus were on the campaign,³¹ they knew what happened at Persepolis, and they had no reason to falsify it, especially as their writings were primarily for Macedonians who had also been on the campaign. Although so little of their account has been preserved by Arrian, we can use it as a basis for the following interpretation.³²

³⁰ It is likely that the work published by Callisthenes did not extend beyond the battle of Gaugamela, and that in any case it did not cover the burning of the Palace; for Alexander's official version of what he did at Persepolis would surely have been cited by the surviving Alexander-historians. The river Araxes which Callisthenes mentioned (Strabo 531) was not the river of that name near Persepolis.

³¹ Arrian described 'Ptolemy' as holding a command during the action at the Persian Gates (3.18.9). He is probably our Ptolemy, the son of Lagus; for he was mentioned with his patronymic in command of a much larger force which captured Bessus a year later (3.29.7). Aristobulus may have been in the party which went ahead to Pasargadae; for his description of the contents of the Tomb of Cyrus before it was robbed was surely that of an eye-witness (6.29.4-6).

³² I am including as historical the action by Tiridates and the mention of one day of looting, which figured in Diodorus and Curtius because such details might well have been reported accurately to Cleitarchus.

3. AN INTERPRETATION

When the Macedonian force, consisting originally of the phalanx infantry, the Companion Cavalry, the Scouts, Agrianians and Archers (Arr. 3.18.2), approached Persepolis, Alexander consulted a meeting of his Commanders, at which Parmenio opposed the idea of burning the Palace and Alexander supported it as a symbol of revenge for the Greeks (3.18.11–12). Having decided what he would do, Alexander received from Tiridates³³ the surrender of the Treasury and removed the bullion from it to a safe place. He then rewarded the Macedonian infantrymen for their hard fighting at Gaugamela and at the Persian Gates by sending them in to pillage the Apadana, the Throne Room and the Treasury. It is possible that they were allowed only a single day in which to remove all they could; for in Diodorus' account it was said that 'the Macedonians spent the day in looting and yet could not satisfy their insatiable lust for more' (17.70.4 *ἐνημερεύσαντες ταῖς ἀρπαγαῖς*). On the following day Alexander had the Palace, the Throne Room and the Treasury burnt completely. The site was effectively sealed by masses of debris, and it remained so until the excavators dug into the debris and found the evidence of a hasty pillaging and of valuable objects still not taken but preserved under the deposit.

This interpretation fits the personality of Alexander. He was a man who acted quickly in breaking through the Persian Gates, having the bridge prepared in advance, marching at speed to Persepolis, taking over the treasure from Tiridates and sending a force at once to Pasargadae to capture the treasure there. It was typical that he decided quickly after the consultation with his commanders on a course of action and carried it out forthwith: the looting of the acropolis and the burning of the Palace. He had the war in Greece much in mind, since he knew that Antipater had not sufficient forces to take the offensive, and that everything depended on the states of central Greece remaining loyal to the Common Peace and maintaining the alliance with Macedonia. Parmenio advised against the burning of the Palace, presumably because he knew and supported Alexander's policy of winning over the Asians and particularly the Persians. Alexander judged that the encouragement of the loyal states in Greece was more important at that time than any discouragement in the policy towards the Asians. For he needed the cooperation both of the loyal states in Greece and the support of the troops of the Greek allies, in order to safeguard Macedonia and complete the war against Darius. He was wise to act as he did. In the process he rewarded the Macedonian phalanx-men, on whom he relied for the victory in that war. The city of Persepolis was not damaged. It was there that the army rested for some four months.³⁴ and the city continued to be the capital of Persis within Alexander's Kingdom of Asia.³⁵

Clare College, Cambridge

N. G. L. HAMMOND

³³ He was named in Diod. 17.69.1 and Curt. 5.5.2 and 5.6.11; see Berve ii.374f.

³⁴ The fact that the army stayed there so long shows that the city of Persepolis was not the desolation which Diodorus and Curtius had depicted, with the males slaughtered, the women and children enslaved, and some buildings burnt according to Curt. 5.6.7 (cf. 5.7.4–5 *urbem*, and 5.7.10 *urbem...deletam*).

³⁵ I have not included in this article the account of Alexander's Persepolis in Plutarch. *Alexander* 37–8. As regards the Thais episode Plutarch added little to what Diodorus and Curtius had already written, and his other stories concerning the statue of Xerxes and the tears of Demaratus are not relevant here. I have discussed them in a book which is forthcoming on the *Sources of Plutarch's Alexander and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandrou*. Justin 11.14.10 is too brief to be of significance.