

The Ghaznavid Marble Architectural Decoration: An Overview.¹

MARTINA RUGIADI
“Sapienza” University of Rome

Writing just a decade or so after its construction, the historian al-‘Utbī, who lived in Ghazni between the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century, has left us a vivid description of the *‘Arūs al-Falak* (Bride of Heaven), the congregational mosque built by order of Mahmūd b. Sebūktigin at Ghazni in c. 1018 and that he must have seen in person:

“Its surface was covered with marble carried from every deep cavity and long way, squared, more polished than the palm of a hand of a maiden and the face of a mirror.

[...] As for the colors, look at a garden in spring, with smiling mouths and crying eyes! They [the colors] keep the eye and bound who watches them. As for the gold gilding, it suffice [to say] that Rusāfa’s masters would not have had enough melting pots and could not have accomplished the job. Not only golden leaves were melted, but red gold bars, melted from the broken idols and the Buddhas removed.

[...] The Sultan reserved for his court a raised room in the mosque, cubic, wide, proportioned in the corners and in the sides. The pavement and the dado were of esteemed marble: the backs had toiled to carry it from the land of Nīšāpūr. A reddish-gold *miḥrāb* has been traced on each square marble slab, decorated with lapis lazuli and with arabesques with the colors of the violet and the rose.”

(al-‘Utbī, *al-Ta’rīḥ al-Yamīnī*; from the translation of Bombaci 1964: 25, 31-2)

Al-‘Utbī’s description of the *‘Arūs al-Falak* is one of the few descriptive passages found in historical accounts and poems on the splendors of the city of Ghazni at the time it was the capital of the Ghaznavids – a local dynasty whose founder, the *amir* Sebūktegin, a former slave of Central Asian origin then general of the Samanids, had asserted his independence there in 977. The dynasty’s possessions stretched from Ghazni to Iran and to the regions of North West India, which were repeatedly sacked, and the rulers obtained legitimacy and honorific titles from the caliph in Baghdad, mainly thanks to their commitment in contrasting the heterodox factions hostile to the Abbasid caliphate; the dynasty reached its peak under Maḥmūd b. Sebūktegin (998-1030). With the booties of the military campaigns and the silver mines of its territories, Ghazni became one of the richest cities of Central Asia, while it was also a centre of culture and learning for the literates and scientists (among which al-Bīrūnī) whom the rulers had drawn together in their capital. Maḥmūd and his successors

¹ The three months I spent in 2009 at AKPIA at MIT have been a very helpful experience for my research. I would like to thank especially Nasser Rabbat and Jim Waiscot for the stimulating discussions and advises, as well as Gülru Necipoğlu at AKPIA at Harvard. This article is a brief overview of the marble architectural decoration from Ghazni, including some of the iconographic topics I researched during my stay at AKPIA. I am currently working on a monograph on this material, where all these topics are more widely discussed.

carried on an extensive building activity in Ghazni, concerning palaces and gardens, mosques, *madrastas*, funerary monuments, minarets, and bridges, which are mentioned in the historical sources and whose archaeological remains have been investigated in the last century.² The archaeological researches have concerned in particular the excavation of a Sultanal palace that was attributed to the Ghaznavid Mas‘ūd III (1099-1115), where marble slabs belonging to two different dadoes (of which one was partially still *in situ*) and to other panelings were found; this evidences, and the record of hundreds of artifacts, mainly marbles, reemployed in cemeteries and recent buildings, have highlighted that, along with the more common ornaments in carved brick and stucco, wood, and few examples of carved alabaster, the distinctive feature of the architectural decoration, as well as of the funerary architecture, was marble – carved in flat bas-relief with vegetal, geometrical, architectural and figurative motifs and with epigraphic texts, polychrome and gilded.³

The *corpus* of marble artifacts of architectural decoration known to us numbers about one thousand artifacts; its comprehensive functional-morphological typology includes: elements of wall and floor facings (dado panels, panels, frames, and floor slabs), other architectural decorative elements (transennas, arches, merlons), bases of columns and capitals, elements of the water system (basins, well curbs, tanks and manhole covers), as well as functional elements in the building (hinges and hinge washers).⁴ Wall paneling, and especially dadoes, were the most common marble architectural features. The large number of artifacts and of the decorative variations of the functional-morphological types (for a total of 159 decorative sub-types) are indicative of the importance of marble as decorative material in Ghazni. The lack of analogous finds in other coeval archaeological sites – and especially the absence of any marble finds from the large and important Ghaznavid site of Lashkari Bazar, extensively investigated –,⁵ stress the peculiarity of the Ghazni production, whose development was occasioned as a result of more factors, above all the existence of a local source of marble (a quarry only three miles from Ghazni) and the persistence of a local stoneworking tradition – in particular the Hindu-Shahi marble statuary, whose tools and surface finishing techniques are the same as in the Ghaznavid period (despite differences in the volume and in the function of the objects).⁶ At the same

² In the years between 1957 and 1966 the Italian archaeological mission on behalf of IsMEO (today IsIAO) carried on excavations and surveys; these were followed by restoration activities both of the excavated sites and of several standing monuments. For a detailed overview of the studies on the Islamic period in Ghazni see Giunta (2003a, in particular pp. 8-10); on more recent works see Giunta 2009.

³ The marble funerary elements are published in Giunta 2003; the other elements of architectural decoration in marble are catalogued along functional-morphological-decorative types in Rugiadi 2007; see also Rugiadi *in press A* for a tentative reconstruction of the marble decoration of the palace of Mas‘ūd III in Ghazni; Rugiadi *in press B* for the polychrome facet of the marbles (with analyses and critical analysis of al-‘Utbi’s text); Rugiadi 2009 for the recent history of the marble artefacts. For a comprehensive typology of the architectural decoration in backed brick see Artusi 2009.

⁴ Rugiadi 2007, pp. 1071-1276.

⁵ For more a more detailed inquiry on this and other Islamic sites see Rugiadi *in press A*.

⁶ On the tools employed in Ghazni see Rugiadi *in press A*. On the parallels of tool and techniques with the Hindu-Shahi statuary see *ead. in preparation*. The legacy of local traditions in the Ghazni marble

time, most probably, the high costs of transportation would have prevented the expansion in large scale of marble decoration outside the province of Ghazni.

The marbles are carved with vegetal motifs and epigraphic texts, as well as geometrical motifs, architectural motifs, and figurative representations – although the geometrical rules of composition along which motifs are usually arranged, and the adaptability of some of these motifs to different contexts can make such a categorization somehow improper.⁷ The motifs are seldom employed alone; more often different elements are found on the same slab, both on different panels or interlaced one to the other. With the exception of inscriptions, most frequently carved within separate panels, and of figurative scenes, full ornaments are developed arranging the motifs along standard geometrical rules of composition, of which three main types can be identified: vertical independent units developed along a central axis (Fig. 1); vertical units connected one to the other in horizontal sequences (Fig. 2); modular units repeated along a geometrical grid (a square or radial grid, following which the unit can be developed in either direction: Fig. 3). The study of the composition rules, besides the advantages in the classification when dealing with patterns created by the combination of different motifs (e.g arches and vegetal motifs), outlines the strict connection between pattern construction, motifs and morphology of the carved marbles, stressing both the functionality of certain decorative choices (and the practical techniques followed by the craftsmen), and the theoretical structure which was behind the compositions (connecting them to the coeval developments in the fields of mathematical sciences).⁸ Geometry and order, which are underneath the decoration of the Ghazni marbles, might have had, for cultured viewers, an intellectual connotation, as the visual counterpart of the coeval theological and philosophical notion of God as “a wise Ordainer and a preventing Framer” of the created world – expressed, for example, by the historian al-‘Utbī, who lived at the court in Ghazni in the 11th century, in the introduction of his *Kitāb al-Yāminī*.⁹ Moreover, with the original polychromy, the marble panelling would have looked like “a brocaded surface”, which is one of the common literary definition for the created world, employed in al-‘Utbī to express the beauty of the coloured world created by God.¹⁰

The predominant decorative element on the Ghazni marbles is the trefoil motif (a geometrical composition with rounded profiles made of a continuous band; Figs 2, 4),

production is also testified by the use of location marks on the slabs, not known to be employed in Islamic stonework, but well attested in the Gandharan stone basreliefs (see Rugiadi 2007, pp. 1063-1064).

⁷ Some of these definition are problematic (see *infra* for the trefoil motif); they are not meant to imply an iconographic interpretation of the motifs which in many cases has to be further investigated – they are employed here only for the sake of the simplest presentation.

⁸ This taxonomical approach is not unconnected to Grabar’s suggestion that “it is necessary to separate, at least analytically, the making of an object or a motif from its perception” (1989, p. 43), while acknowledging the exigency of contextualizing the object to understand how it was perceived at the time of its production.

⁹ Rugiadi *in print B*, with references.

¹⁰ See fn. 9.

which is found in interlaced sequences on hundreds among dadoes and tombs, and whose only occurrence as a single motif is in the still venerated tomb of Maḥmūd, the greatest of the Ghaznavid sovereigns, as the frame of his epitaph.¹¹ This motif is only sparsely encountered elsewhere in this period (in this form it will become a common decorative pattern in Islamic art only from the 13th century onwards), and even the Ghaznavid site of Lashkari Bazar did not yield any such representations, with the exception of few later funerary slabs from Bust, of the Ghurid period.¹² It would be thus tempting to assign to the trefoil motif a special and possibly meaningful place in Ghaznavid visual culture, but no evidences have been found yet to prove it. The problematic interpretation of the trefoil as an architectural motif – the depiction of an arch, as it is often described by scholars –, rather than a mere geometrical motif, might be important for the understanding of its reception in the Ghaznavid period, also as regards a possible link with the *miḥrāb* (whose established representation is that of an arch); the term “*miḥrāb*”, whose reception in Ghaznavid times needs further research, is employed, for example, in the quoted passage of al-‘Utbī to describe the motifs traced in sequences on the marble (or alabaster?) dado in the *bayt* of Maḥmūd’s mosque. A direct link with the architectural trefoil-shaped arch can be nonetheless ruled out, not only for the geometrical composition of its form, which is attested by preparatory sketches found during the excavation of the palace of Mas‘ūd III¹³ and which is exemplified by the continuous interlacing, but also because the absence of this form among the structural arches from Ghazni gives no evidence of the employ of trefoil-shaped arches in the city.¹⁴ The hypothesis that its reproduction as decorative motif comes directly from the local pre-Islamic architectural and decorative traditions, where it is frequent (trefoil niches or motifs were employed, for example, in Bamiyan, 7th century, in some Turko-Shahi monuments in Pakistan, as well as in Tepe Sardar near Ghazni, 8th century), can be also excluded, because its geometrical composition seems very far from those traditions, where the shape of the trefoil is rather approximated and where it is always associated with the architectural element of the niche (but see *infra*). The architectural link seems to be a weaker explanation for the trefoil motif in Ghazni and its use must be referred to other visual models, of which we have sparse evidences. These fall within a tendency of Islamic art since the 9th century, which modifies vegetal elements into stylized and repeatable trefoil forms (for example: on an Iranian glass attributed to the 9-10th century at the British Museum, inv. OA 1966.4-18.1; on a fragment of a pre-Seljuq wall painting from Isfahan, where the trefoil ends in a vertical vegetal element; on a stucco panel

¹¹ This is the only tomb from Ghazni made in alabaster instead of marble. For its debated dating see Giunta 2003, no.1; see also Flood 2009, fn. 1 p. 286.

¹² These are also the only marble artefacts found in the area; their iconography resembles that of the Ghurid funerary architecture in Ghazni and its inspiration has been recently discussed in Flood 2009, pp. 196-199.

¹³ Preparatory sketches painted on a floor in the excavated palace of Mas‘ūd III attest that its reproduction needed a precise geometrical draft.

¹⁴ The structural arches attested from the Ghaznavid period in the city, all in marble, are the Persian arch (quadricentric pointed arch), and the Persian horseshoe arch with polylobed inner frame.

framing the *mihrāb* in the great mosque in Cordoba, dated 965),¹⁵ sometimes in sequences (as in some stone moldings of the minaret of the al-Hakim mosque in Cairo, dated 990-1014). A major shift in this tendency is discernible in the uninterrupted and interlaced trefoil patterns on stucco panels of the style C from Samarra (of at least 15 types), which might retain an explicit link to the vegetal element (with the trefoils departing from a bead [or bud?] and ending in a semi-palmette) but are mostly full geometric interlaced patterns;¹⁶ a carved wooden column from the area of Termez (Kurut), attributed to the 10th century, attests of the diffusion of these geometrically interlaced trefoil patterns before their occurrence in Ghazni.¹⁷ Besides these recognizable antecedents in Islamic art, a feeble residue of the local iconographic traditions – which did not survive directly but possibly helped the diffusion of the Islamic patterns – is suggested by the earliest dated tomb from Ghazni whose date is not questioned (dated: 447/1055; see fn. 11 for Maḥmūd’s tomb), where an irregular trefoil motif, closer to Buddhist trefoil niches rather than to the Ghaznavid trefoils, frames the epitaph of the defunct.¹⁸ As for the reception of the trefoil motif in Ghazni, the occurrence on the opposite side of this same funerary element of a Persian horseshoe arch framing a second inscription (Koran 21:35), might be meaningful.¹⁹

Anthropomorphic representations on the marbles from Ghazni essentially follow the Iranian-Central Asian traditions, both in the depiction of the somatic features of the personages and their clothes, and in the choice of the scenes (Fig. 5). On those slabs which had been spared by later iconoclastic obliteration of the faces, the somatic characteristics – rounded face with prominent cheek-bones – descend from the Central-Asian visual traditions (as for example in the paintings in Miran, 5-6th century); the apparent approximated execution of the faces might have been completed with the painted decoration.²⁰ The clothes of the personages are mainly those of Central Asiatic origin usually referred to as Turkic, as the *qabā*,²¹ whose attestation in Islamic art goes back already in the Omayyad period (for example in the floor painting in Qasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi). Gestures and scenes draw on the Iranian heritage and culture, as is discernible in the hands of a standing personage (presumably a court attendant) in the *dast bar sīna* “conventional attitude of respectful

¹⁵ These representations differ from those, unequivocally architectural, also attested in Islamic art from the Omayyad period onwards, where trefoil arches are supported by small columns, as at Qasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi and in a stucco balustrade from Khirbat al-Mafjar, or as in the five-lobed and interlaced motifs in the Noh Gonbad mosque in Balkh (9th century). For the Isfahan painting see Jung 2010, n. 2132.

¹⁶ Herzfeld 1923: patterns nos 95, 96, 97, 106-7, 134-35 (no. 135 is on marble, from the Throne Hall of the Jawsaq al-Khaqani palace), 136a-b, 137, 138, 140, 150, 155, 162.

¹⁷ Deniké 1935, fig. 3 (photo), p. 70; Chuvin *et al.* 1999, fig. 709 (drawing).

¹⁸ Giunta 2001, p. 112, figs 2, 4; *ead.* 2003, no. 2.

¹⁹ Giunta calls it a *mihrāb* (Giunta 2001, p. 112, figs 3, 5; *ead.* 2003, no. 2).

²⁰ The execution of the faces makes it difficult to recognize all the ethnic connotations of the Mongolian type, as the “flat nose”, and the “slanted eyes”, envisaged by Bombaci (1959: 10). Nevertheless the kind of relief employed for the faces shows a certain degree of skill in the rendering of a slightly rounded surfaces for the cheeks and the mouth of the personages (instead of a totally flat bas-relief).

²¹ Bombaci 1959, Esin 1970; the ethnical connotation of the personages should be questioned (Flood 2009, p. 66 with earlier references).

attention”,²² and in the scenes of knights in combat, dancers, guards, and of a rider hunting a lion. The visual language employed in these scenes depicts the traditional attributes of the sovereign as fighter and pleasure-seeker, as transmitted by the Iranian tradition – the well known concept of *bazm-o-razm* (fight and fête); their iconography originates in pre-Islamic traditions early merged into Islamic art (for example a silver plate attributed to 8th-9th century Iran in the Hermitage Museum with a rider hunting a lion).²³

The iconographic details which reveal a different ascendance are relatively few. The dancer with the scarf, carved on a dado in the David Samlings in Copenhagen,²⁴ is a depiction recurring in Islamic art (for example in Fatimid Egypt and in the Cappella Palatina in Sicily), with deep roots in the Sasanid²⁵ and Central Asian²⁶ iconographic traditions, but also not alien to the Indian iconography;²⁷ it reveals an Indian ascendance as far as regards the nude breast (not paralleled as such in Islamic art),²⁸ the necklaces, the hairstyle,²⁹ and the transparent cloth which drapes around the legs of the dancer;³⁰ a more precise interpretation, especially as regards the employ of “alien” details, could have been proposed if the face of the dancer was not chiseled off by an iconoclastic act, canceling her somatic characteristics. The three female dancers on a transenna once in the Kabul Museum (Fig. 5)³¹ are only apparently a conventional representation of group dance in Islamic art, in which dance scenes are always associated to the courtly sphere as entertainment of the prince: if the somatic characteristics of the personages, their clothes and the beaded head ornaments, as well as the movement of the legs are all conventional elements,³² yet

²² Kabul Museum Inv. 58.2.1 (now probably destroyed); Bombaci 1959, p. 10; Rugiadi 2007, cat. no. 809.

²³ Piotrovsky and Rogers 2004, no. 28.

²⁴ Inv. 73.1979; Rugiadi 2007, cat. no. 682.

²⁵ For the reproductions of several gilded silvers with the image of a dancer with the scarf, see *Splendeurs des Sassanides* 1986, nos 75, 85-88.

²⁶ In Central Asian iconography, however, and especially in the T’ang period, the scarf is much longer and winding, and almost frames the figure (Kefen 1985), unlike the Ghazni example, which has instead more parallels in coeval Islamic representations.

²⁷ The scarf put on the shoulders and long until the waist is widespread and known since the Gupta period (Gaston, 1982, p. 178; for the period between 550 and 800: *ibid.* pl. 97 Nord region, pl. 98 Deccan region, pls 103, 105 East region).

²⁸ Even if representations of female dancers with nude torso are often attested in the Omayyad period: for example three stucco sculptures in the entrance area of the *ḥammām* in Khirbat al-Mafjar, today in the Rockefeller Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem (Hamilton 1959, tavv. LV-LVI); a completely nude female dancer painted in the audience hall of the *ḥammām* of Qusayr ‘Amra (Almagro *et al.* 1975, fig. XXVIIc). The sources suggest that in the Ghaznavid period representations of nude human figures might have been more frequent, depending on the patron: the wall paintings of a pavilion of Mas‘ūd I in Balkh included scenes with naked dancers, men and women (Bosworth 1963, p. 140).

²⁹ A large plaited knot falling down on one shoulder, depicted on terracottas and paintings of the Gupta period (Chandra 1940, no. 37, fig. 131, p. 144).

³⁰ Gaston 1982, pl. 105: male dancers on a relief in the temple of Parasuramesvara at Bhubaneswar (period 550-800 East region).

³¹ Inv. 58.2.1; Rugiadi 2007, cat. no. 809.

³² For the head ornaments, typical of female dancers/attendants, cfr. the painting of the Samarra dancers, with the two dancing coup-bearers (Herzfeld 1927, pls I, II). The dance movement of the risen leg and bent knee is, according to Grube, the Islamic version of a Central Asian dance imported by

two of them are engaged in an unconventional dance movement with their hands (the third dancer holds a bowl). Not only this gesture does not have parallels in Islamic art – hands are usually put around the companion’s shoulder in representation of group dances –, but is evocative of a specific position in Indian dance. This position, not often depicted in the otherwise rich Indian iconography related to the dance, is described in the historical texts (as the *Natyashastra*, dated between the 2nd b.C. and the 2nd A.D.): it is the *mutra anjali*, one of the symbolic positions of the two hands together (*hasta samyukta*), and the greeting gesture both in the Buddhist and Hindu traditions.³³ In the slab from Ghazni this gesture might go back to local traditions of the pre-Islamic period: Ghazni had been the capital of the Buddhist reign of Zābul until the 9th century, and the local Buddhist site of Tepe Sardar testifies of a syncretic Buddhist-Hindu culture which goes back in time. Otherwise, more probably, it might be the attempt of a local artisan to depict Indian dancers who possibly performed (at the court?) in Ghazni:³⁴ lacking of a pre-existent iconography of this subject, which was probably also unfamiliar to him (?), the artisan based his work on known iconographies (as the somatic characteristics of the personages) and combined them with a new form, that of the hand gesture – an attempt of realism which reveals a taste for exoticism. An exotic scene has been identified in the famous slab with the depiction of a monkey in the Linden Museum,³⁵ the only narrative scene known on the Ghazni marbles, and one of the earliest attested in Islamic art (beside miniatures);³⁶ the origin of this image lies in several stories telling about monkeys employed by humans for the cropping of fruits that grow on inaccessible trees. These stories, frequent in the *ajā’ib* literature (the literature of the wonders), are set in fabulous islands, located in India or the far East. Maria Vittoria Fontana sees in the architecture within which the scene is depicted – evoking a Kashmiri or northwest Indian temple – an attempt to place the scene in an “Indian” context.³⁷

The style and the composition of non-figurative motifs, as well as the style and the repertoire of the scenes of figurative representations place the marble production of the 11th and 12th centuries from Ghazni in the wide horizon of Islamic art of the post-Samaritan period, within the strong Iranian-Central Asian tradition, identifying it as the immediate forerunner of Saljuq art; it presumably reflects what were the artistic trends in the caliphal capital of Baghdad. At the same time, some iconographic details alien to Islamic art help to contextualize the production in the peculiar cultural horizon of Ghazni, especially as far as concerns links and/or echoes of non-Islamic

Turkic elements as soon as the Abbasid period (Grube 1995, pp. 28-29); see the painting found in the so-called *harām* of the Jawsaq al-Khaqani palace in Samarra (9th century).

³³ Rebling 1981, p. 41, fig. 82; pl. 9b. In Hindu iconography the depiction of the same gesture is explained as representing cult and prayer (Rao 1971, p. 16).

³⁴ The presence of Hindu women at the court in Ghazni is deducible, for example, from the *Adāb al-mulūk* (tr. Shafī 1938, p. 197). Important sources for the evidence of the presence of a Hindu quarter in Ghazni are brought up by Flood (2009, pp. 78-79, fn. 111).

³⁵ Inv. A35 165L; Fontana 2005; Rugiadi 2007, cat. no. 683.

³⁶ See Pancaroğlu 2000, p. 25 ff, and p. 26 fn. 23 for a survey of the occurrences of narrative scenes, including miniatures, in Islamic art.

³⁷ Fontana 2005, especially pp. 441, 443-448, fns 2-3.

cultures, both for possible resilient elements of the pre-Islamic period in Ghazni (the Islamic conquest of the city was realized only in the 9th century) and for the coeval connections with the Indian subcontinent and its artistic and architectural productions.³⁸ The figurative repertoire on the marbles was meant to depict the idealized image of the sovereign and his court; it can be understood as the visual counterpart of the image of the prince in coeval poetry, as in the *Shahnāme* and in the poems of Farrukhi e Manuchihri, where it is represented as “life warrior, hunter, elephant-rider, lion-slayer, and lover”;³⁹ exotic features had probably a realistic implication, evoking the life at the Ghaznavid court, increasing, at the same time, the prestige of the patron.

- Almagro *et al.* (1975) Almagro, Martin, Caballero, Luis, Zozaya, Juan and Almagro, Antonio, *Qusayr Amra: Residencia y baños omeyas en el desierto de Jordania*, Instituto Hispano-Arabe de Cultura, Madrid, 1975.
- Artusi (2009) Artusi, Simona *La decorazione architettonica in cotto e in cotto e stucco proveniente dal palazzo di Mas‘ūd III (1099-1115) a Ghazni (Afghanistan)*, PhD thesis, Università degli Studi di Udine, Udine, 2009.
- Bayhaqī (1324/1945) Bayhaqī, Abū’l Fadl, *Ta‘rīkh-i Mas‘ūdī*, in Q. Ġanī and CA.A. Fayyāz (eds), Tehran, 1324/1945.
- Bombaci (1959) Bombaci, Alessio, “Introduction to the Excavations at Ghazni. Summary Report on the Italian Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan”, *East and West* 10.1-2, 1959, pp. 3-22.
- Bombaci (1964) Bombaci, Alessio, “La Sposa del Cielo”, in *A Francesco Gabrieli. Studi orientalistici offerti nel sessantesimo compleanno dai suoi colleghi e discepoli (Studi orientali 5)*, Università di Roma, Roma, 1964, pp. 21-34.
- Bosworth (1963) Bosworth, Clifford Edmund, *The Ghaznavids: their Empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran 944-1044*, Edinburgh, 1963.
- Chandra (1940) Chandra, Moti “Cosmetic and coiffure in ancient India” *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art* 8, 1940, pp. 62-145.
- Chuvin *et al.* (1999), Chuvin, Pierre, Bernus-Taylor, Marthe, Bittar, Thérèse and Golombek, Lisa, *Les arts de l’Asie Centrale*, Paris, 1999.
- Deniké (1935) Deniké, Boris, “Quelques monuments de bois sculpté au Turkestan Occidental”, *Ars Islamica* 2, 1935, pp. 69-83.
- Flood (2009) Flood, Finbarr Barry, *Objects of Translation. Material Culture and Medieval “Hindu-Muslim” Encounter*, Princeton and Oxford, 2009.

³⁸ The iconography of the marbles from Ghazni suggests that the multi-directional processes of appropriation and reproduction of exotic features that Barry Flood has illustrated in the Ghurid artistic productions (occurred when the expansions into the Indian subcontinent put into contact a new class of “bourgeoisies” with the Indian visual culture, i.e. in the short period between 1190 and 1210, and probably encouraged by the mobility of Indian artisans, especially masons), already occurred in the Ghaznavid period (also envisaged in Flood 2009, pp. 199, 203, 219). For the discussion, with previous references, of the use and meaning of exoticism in Islamic art, see *ibid.* p. 219.

³⁹ Tetley 2009, p. 6.

- Fontana (2005) Fontana, Maria Vittoria, “La fortuna di un ‘ajā‘ib?” in Michele Bernardini e Natalia L. Tornesello (eds), *Studi in onore di Giovanni M. D’Erme*, Università di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici (Series Minor 68), Napoli, 2005, vol. 1, pp. 441-456.
- Gaston (1982) Gaston, Anne-Marie, *Śiva in Dance, Myth and Iconography*, Bombay Calcutta Madras, 1982.
- Giunta (2001) Giunta, Roberta, “The Tomb of Muḥammad al-Ḥarawī (447/1055) at Ġaznī (Afghanistan) and Some New Observation on the Tomb of Mahmūd the Ġaznavid”, *East and West* 51, pp. 109-126.
- Giunta (2003a) Giunta, Roberta, *Les inscriptions funéraires de Ġaznī (IVe-IXe/Xe-XVe siècles)*, Università di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Is.I.A.O., Fondation Max van Berchem (Series Maior 8), Napoli, 2003.
- Giunta (2005) Giunta, Roberta, “«Islamic Ghazni – an IsIAO Archaeological Project in Afghanistan». A Preliminary Report (July 2004 - June 2005)”, in Pierfrancesco Callieri e Anna Filigenzi *To Maurizio Taddei (East and West, 55.1-4)*, Rome, 2005, pp. 473-484.
- Giunta (2009) Giunta, Roberta, “Islamic Ghazni: Excavations, Surveys and New Research Objectives”, in Anna Filigenzi and Roberta Giunta (eds), *The IsIAO Italian Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan 1057-2007. Fifty Years of Research in the Heart of Eurasia* (Proceedings of the symposium held in the Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente, Rome, January 8th 2008), Roma, 2009, pp. 89-104.
- Grabar (1989) Grabar, Oleg, *The Mediation of Ornament*, Princeton, 1989.
- Grube (1995) Grube, Ernst J., *Studies in Islamic Painting*, London, 1995.
- Hamilton (1959) Hamilton, Robert W., *Khirbat al-Maffar: an Arabian Mansion in the Jordan Valley*, Oxford, 1959.
- Herzfeld (1923) Herzfeld, Ernst *Der Wandschmuck der Bauten von Samarra und seine Ornamentik*, Berlin, 1923.
- Herzfeld, Ernst, *Die Malereien von Samarra*, Berlin, 1927
- Jung (2010) Jung, Michael, “Pre-selġūq wall-paintings of the Masġid-i Jom‘e at Isfahan excavated by the Italian Archaeological Mission, ADAMJI Project, in P. Matthiae *et al.* (eds), 6ICAANE *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East. May, 5th-10th 2009. “Sapienza”- Università di Roma*, Wiesbaden, 2010, vol. 3, pp. 111-127.
- Kefen (1985) Kefen, Wang, *The History of Chinese Dance*, Beijing, 1985.
- Pancaroglu (2000) Pancaroglu, Oya, “*A World Unto Himself*”: *The Rise of a New Human Image in Late Seljuq Period (1150-1250)*, PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2000.
- Piotrovsky and Rogers (2004) Piotrovsky, M.B. and Rogers, J.M. *Heaven on Earth. Art from Islamic Lands. Works from the State Hermitage Museum and the Khalili Collection*, Munich – Berlin – London – New York, 2004.
- Rao (1971), Rao, Gopinath, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Delhi, reprinted 1971.
- Rebling (1981) Rebling, Eberhard, *Die Tanzkunst Indiens*, Berlin, 1981.

- Rugiadi (2007) Rugiadi, Martina, *Decorazione architettonica in marmo da Ghazni / Marble architectural decoration from Ghazni*, PhD thesis, Università degli Studi di Napoli 'L'Orientale', Napoli, 2007.
- Rugiadi (2009) Rugiadi, Martina, "Documenting marbles of the Islamic period from the area of Ghazni. The Italian contribution (1957-2007)", in Anna Filigenzi and Roberta Giunta (eds), *The IsIAO Italian Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan 1957-2007. Fifty years of research in the Heart of Eurasia* (Proceedings of the symposium held in the Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, Rome, January 8th 2008), Rome 2009, pp. 105-115.
- Rugiadi (*in press A*) Rugiadi, Martina, "Marble from the palace of Mas'ud III in Ghazni", in *Proceedings of the XIX International Conference on South Asian Archaeology, Ravenna, 2th-6th July 2007*.
- Rugiadi (*in press B*) Rugiadi, Martina, "As for the colours, look at a garden in spring'. Polychrome marble in the Ghaznavid architectural decoration", in *7ICAANE Proceedings of the 7th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East. April, 12th-16th 2010. British Museum*.
- Rugiadi (*in preparation*) Rugiadi, Martina, *Marble architectural decoration from Ghazni*.
- Shafi (1938) Shafi, M. "Fresh lights on the Ghaznavids", *Islamic Culture* 12, 1938, pp. 189-234.
- Splendeur des Sassanides* (1993) *Splendeur des Sassanides. L'empire perse entre Rome et la Chine [224-642]*, Bruxelles, 1993.
- Tetley (2009) Tetley, G.E., *The Ghaznavid and Seljuk Turks. Poetry as a source for Iranian history*, *Routledge Studies in the History of Iran and Turkey*, Abingdon, 2009.



Fig. 1 Panel (seat?) from the Ziyāra Pīr-i Fālīzvān in Ghazni. Ghazni store-rooms (Isiao inv. PF2). Photo Isiao Archive (digital photo, 2003).



Fig. 2 Dado panel from the excavation of the palace of Mas'ūd III. Museo Nazionale di Arte Orientale "G. Tucci", Rome (Isiao inv. C2924). Photo Isiao Archive (Dep. Neg. 1221/5).



Fig. 3 Panel from the excavation of the palace of Mas'ūd II, throne room (Isiao inv. C2792). Photo Isiao Archive (Dep. Neg. 636/1).



Fig. 4 Dado panel from the excavation of the palace of Mas'ūd III. Museo Nazionale di Arte Orientale "G. Tucci", Rome (Isiao inv. C2890). Photo Isiao Archive (Dep. Neg. 635/1).



Fig. 5 Transenna from Ghazni. Once in the Kabul Museum (inv. 58.2.1; now probably destroyed). Photo Isiao Archive (Dep. Neg. D187).

