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Abstract
The present paper examines the coinage of King Arslān Argū – brother to Sultan Malik Šāh – the Saljūq who ruled over Khorasan in (485 – 490 AH. / 1092 – 1096 AD.) and struck coins which reflected the prevailing political conditions at the time. Arslān Argū inscribed on his coins the name of the Abbasid Caliph, Al Muqtadi, to win his favour and guarantee that his coinage would be considered legitimate in circulation while some of his coins show that he omitted the name of Barkiyarq, Sultan Malik Šāh’s son and successor, to announce that he is the sole ruler of Khorasan and that he does not consider Barkiyarq the legitimate ruler of the great Saljūq lands. However, on other coins Arslān Argū inscribed the name of Barkiyarq together with his own name to proclaim himself ruler of Khorasan and, at the same time, to avoid annoying Barkiyarq or enraging him, especially because Barkiyarq was able to defeat all his enemies and have independent rule over Saljūq lands. In this way, Arslān Argū’s coinage reflects the political conditions of the great Saljūq reign at the time when he was ruler of Khorasan.
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1. Introduction
The weakness and decline of the power of the rule of the Saljūqs and the division of their unity was the result of the death of Sultan Malik Šāh, (1072-1092 AD. / 485-465 AH.) -who is considered one of the great Saljūq rulers of Iran and Persia and during whose reign the lands ruled by Saljūqs had reached their widest expansion- in Baghdad in the middle of Shawwal, the tenth month of the Muslim year, (485 AH / 18th November 1092 AD.) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. On the death of Malik Šāh, a struggle over power and rule started between Barkiyarq, Malik Šāh’s eldest son and successor, his stepmother, Turkan Khatun, and his two uncles Toutoche and Arslān Argū ben Alp Arslān Muhammad ben Ğaqri Bak ben Dā’ud ben Mikael ben Saljūq ben Duqmaq who was mentioned for the first time in historical sources in 485 H. / 1065, when Sultan Alp Arslān (455-465 AH / 1063-1072 AD.) promised kingship to his son Malik Šāh and named him successor while on the same occasion he granted princes lands whereby Khwarazm was given to his brother Arslān Argū who owned the greatest part of Khorasan during Malik Šāh’s reign [6, 7]. When Malik Šāh died in Baghdad, Arslān Argūwas accompanying him; consequently he aspired to
get power and rule over Khorasan. He seized Hamadan, Marw, Balkh, Terméz, Nisâbûr, and the majority of the countries in the region of Khorasan [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8]. The increase of Arslân Arğû’s power led him to demand from Barkiyarq in 485 AH. / 1092 AD. to give him rule over Khorasan, which had been ruled before by his grandfather Dâ’ud, brother to Sultan Tughrîl Bak (429-455 AH. / 1038-1063 AD.), in exchange for any amount of money that Barkiyarq demands in order not to struggle over power or rule [8, 9, 10]. Although Barkiyarq refused Arslân Arğû’s demand, he did not take any action against his uncle Arslân Arğû, for he was then busy facing his stepmother, Turkan Khatun and his uncle Toutoch, both of whom had ambitions to seize power and rule over his lands as previously mentioned. Turkan Khatun had succeeded in seizing power and bestowing rule on her four-year old son, Mahmud (485-487 AH. / 1092-1094 AD.) by bribing into allegiance princes, soldiers and the Abbasid Caliph, Al-Muqtadî (467-487 AH. / 1075-1094 AD.) who ordered the mention of his name in the Khutba, or the Speech preceding Friday Prayers, in Baghdad as well as in the Two Holy Places, Mecca and Medina [1, 11, 6, 12, 8]. Moreover, Turkan Khatun, to ensure that her son will remain in power, ordered the rulers of Esfahan to arrest Barkiyarq, which they did in the same year, namely 1092 AD / 485 AH. [1, 11, 6, 3, 7, 8]. Consequently, Mahmud was proclaimed ruler in Iraq and Western Persia [13]. However, on getting news of Sultan Malik Şâh’s death and Barkiyarq’s detention, the regular Mam-elukes (El-Nedameyya) revolted in Iṣbahân, set Barkiyarq free and proclaimed him ruler. Hence, two Sultans ruled at the same time: Mahmud in Baghdad and Barkiyarq in Iṣbahân, [14], which led to a battle between the armies of Barkiyarq and Turkan Khatun at the end of Zu’l-hijjah, in the same year. The battle ended with the defeat of the armies of Tukan Khatun and her retreat to Iṣbahân where she was followed and besieged by Barkiyarq [1, 11, 6, 3, 7, 10]. Meanwhile, on the death of Malik Şâh, Barkiyarq’s uncle, Toutoch -bin Alp Arslân- who was ruler of Damascus and the nearby lands of the Levant, demanded from the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muqtadî in 486 AH / 1093 AD. to proclaim him ruler but the Caliph refused on grounds that since Toutoch was not ruler of the East or Khorasan, he had no right to seek power. Toutoch prepared an army and was able to seize Aleppo, Nâṣûbîn, Al-Mawsil, Mayyâfârîqin, all Diyarbakir and went to Azerbâjîân where Barkiyarq followed to fight him. Toutoch, who was abandoned by some army leaders, realized that he would not be able to confront Barkiyarq and withdrew. He went back to the Levant and thus Barkiyarq could reign as Sultan [1, 11, 6, 3, 4, 10, 14]. In Shaban 486 AH., August 1093 AD., a fight erupted between Barkiyarq and his maternal uncle, ruler of Azerbâjîân, who was tempted into marrying Turkan Khatun by her inscribing his name on the coins struck in the name of her son Mahmud, and was allied to her in pursuit of gaining rule and becoming Sultan. However, in the same year he was defeated and killed by the princes loyal to Barkiyarq [11, 6, 8, 14, 15].

2. Political Significance of the Coinage Inscriptions

The turbulent political conditions, the unrest and the presence of numerous power seekers who wanted to seize Sultan Barkiyarq’s lands gave his uncle Arslân Arğû the opportunity to strike coins carrying his name, thereby announcing his independent rule of Khorasan. On these coins, Arslân Arğû inscribed the name of the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muqtadî but did not add the name of Barkiyarq, which meant that he rose against Barkiyarq’s rule and did not want to accept its legitimacy. The coins are illustrated as follows:
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2.1. The inscriptions of Arslân Arğû’s dinars and their significance

2.1.1. Arslân Arğû’s dinar, Nîsâbûr mint, date 486 (H), (W. 4.43 gr.), private collection, first published.

The general shape and inscriptions content of the coins of Arslân Arğû, subject of the present study, were similar to the Saljûq coins of the time when Sultan Tughril Bak reigned. As for the general shape and inscriptions content, the center of the obverse and reverse fields had horizontal inscriptions surrounded by double overlapping circles that were followed by marginal inscriptions extending in a counter-clockwise direction then a circle followed by the edge of the coin. As for the inscriptions content on the coins of Arslân Arğû, the obverse had on the center inscriptions of the First Kalima and the name of Abbasid Caliph ruling at the time, the name and titles of Arslân Arğû in addition to two margins that extended in a counter-clockwise direction; the first margins carried incomp-le-
mention of Basmala, mint and date while the second had quotes from the Holy Koran, namely Sura Al-rum – verse 4 and 5. On the center of the reverse, God’s name was inscribed (Allah) then the Second Kalima and the name, title and ancestry of the Saljuq ruler who ordered the striking of the coin, followed by a margin of inscriptions that extended in a counter-clockwise direction to record quotes from the Holy Koran, namely Sura At-tawba – verse 33 [16]. Arslan Argu, most probably, struck this type of dinars (numbers 1 & 2) after seizing the cities of Khorasan, of which Nisabur was one in 486 AH / 1093 AD to announce that he did not consider Barkiyarq’s rule legitimate. This is emphasized in his not inscribing his name on the dinars [16], he only had the name of the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muqtadil below the inscriptions of the center of the obverse in order to announce his loyalty to the Abbasid Caliph and add legitimacy to his coins. What is also noticed is that Arslan Argu, unlike all Saljuq rulers, had not inscribed the title “Sultan” on his coins [16, 17, 18, 19, 20], maybe in order not to provoke Barkiyarq into fighting him and depriving him of the countries he ruled. The title he used was “Al Malik Al Muza’affar”, the same title inscribed on Barkiyarq’s coins [13,16, 15], perhaps to show Barkiyarq his rivalry. On the fifth and sixth lines of the center of the reverse, Arslan Argu had his name and ancestry inscribed, referring to Sultan Alp Arslan, and added the title “Moez el Islam” on the fourth line of the center of the reverse, which—to my knowledge—is shown for the first time in the inscriptions on the coins of the great Saljuq rulers of Persia and Iran; by doing so, he may have meant to show that his rule of Khorasan, which Barkiyarq refused to allow him to possess, implies the glory of the Islamic nation and the Saljuq rule.

2.1.3. Arslan Argu’s dinar, Nisabur mint, date 486 (H), (W. 3.560 gr., D. 21 mm) [16].

This dinar resembles the two previous dinars both in the general shape and the inscriptions. The difference between them is that it has on the center of the obverse the inscription “Rukn al-donia w al-din”, a title, which, as one researcher notes, refers to the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muqtadi; and that was the first time to get this title inscribed on Arslan Argu’s coins [16]. The researcher’s above conclusion corresponds to the conclusion reached in the present research, particularly because Arslan Argu had such titles inscribed on the third dinar to win the favor of the Abbasid Caliph and to guarantee the Caliph’s acceptance of his rule of Khasan. The same researcher mentioned that the title “Al Malik al Mu’azzam” was inscribed on the
third line of the center of the reverse to refer to Arslân Arğû who had his name inscribed on the fifth line of the center, which was the first time to have that title inscribed on the gold coins of the Saljûqs Struck in Nisâbûr [16]. However, the present study reached the conclusion that the reading of the third-line inscriptions on center of the reverse of the previous dinar, namely dinar number three, as “Al-Malik Al-Mu’azzam” is an inappropriate reading, for the correct reading is “Al-Malik Al-Muzaffar”. The conclusion reached in the present study is made clear and valid on comparing the letters of the title inscribed to similar dinars Struck in the same year and published for the first time in this study as well as on comparing them to similar coins published in world catalogues, which testifies the correctness of the reading mentioned in the present study [21]. The previous study [16] also mentioned that the fourth line of the center of the reverse of the dinar had the title “Rukn al-Islam” inscribed on it whereas the present study emphasizes that the correct, appropriate reading is “Muaz el Islam”. The conclusion that is reached in the present study is based on the comparison made with the dinars that are struck in the same year -486 AH.- with the same title inscribed on them and are published for the first time in the present study. Towards the end of the year 486 AH. / 1093 AD., Sultan Barkiyarq went to Baghdad and demanded from the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muqtadi that his name be pronounced in the Khutba (Friday Speech at the mosques), a demand which Al-Muqtadi accepted and Barkiyarq’s name was, consequently, pronounced in the mosques of Baghdad on the 14th of Muharram 487 AH. / the 3rd of February 1094 AD .and had the title “Rukn al –Din” [1, 6, 7, 4, 12]. In the same year, the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muqtadi died and was succeeded by his son Al-Mustażhir (487 -512 AH. / 1094- 1118 AD.) who Called in the mosques of Baghdad to Sultan Barkiyarq and stressed his acceptance of Barkiyarq’s rule of Persia and Iraq. Sultan Barkiyarq stayed in Baghdad till Rabia al –awal, March 1093, and then he went to Al-Mawṣil [1, 22, 6, 3, 7, 12, 10]. In 487 AH. / May 1094 AD. Tag el Dawla Totouch could seize Roha, Harrān, Al-Diyar al-Gaziryâ, Diyar-akir, Khat, Azerbâijân and Hamaḏân [1, 6, 3, 4, 8]. In Shawwal 487 AH., October 1094 AD. a fight took place between Barkiyarq and his uncle, Toutoch, where Barkiyarq was defeated. Barkiyarq went to Iṣbahān and surrendered to his brother Mahmud who put him in prison. However, Mahmud was attacked by small pox and died of the disease at the beginning of Shawwal 487AH. / 14th October 1094 AD. Consequently, the princes ruling at the time set Barkiyarq free and proclaimed him Sultan [11, 6, 3, 7, 4]. The present study did not find any coins struck by Arslân Arğû in 487 AH.; however, future excavations may lead to the discovery of samples of such coins. As for the coins struck by Barkiyarq in that year, they had inscriptions that indicate the increase of Barkiyarq’s power, for he gave himself the title “Addad el dawla el Qahera” on the reverse center of a dinar struck in Madinat Al - Salâm in 487 AH. [23]. The following dinar dated by 488 H., which is an example of the dinars struck by Barkiyarq in the same year, reveals the increase of his Barkiyarq’s power.

2.2. Barkiyarq’s dinars and the significance of its inscriptions
2.2.1. Barkiyarq’s dinar, Nisâbûr mint, date 487 (H), (W. 3.55 gr.), Private collection, first published.
On becoming Sultan, Barkiyarq suffered from small pox in 488 AH / 1094 AD., whereupon Toutoch, on getting news of Barkiyarq’s illness, demanded from the Abbasid Caliph Al-Mustaẓhir in Baghdad to have his name pronounced in the mosques of Baghdad. The Abbasid Caliph Al-Mustaẓhir accepted Toutoch’s demand when he knew that he won victory over Barkiyarq [1, 6, 3, 4]. However, in the same year, Toutoch went to fight Barkiyarq and get hold of the Sultanate but was defeated and killed near Al Rayy on 17th Safar 488 AH / 26th February 1095 AD. [1, 22, 11, 6, 3, 7, 4]. Barkiyarq got a strong hold over power and removed his vizier Moayed al Malik from power and demanded support from his brother Fakhr al Molik [11, 6, 7, 4, 8], then from Magd al Molik Abul Fadl al Blansy who had the authority to manage all state of affairs. Al Blansy attempted to start negotiations with Arslān Arğû to make him give up Khorāsān but Arslān Arğû announced disobedience and rebellion against Barkiyarq and stopped correspondence with him claiming that he did not want to deal with al Blansy and did not intend to give up. Consequently, Barkiyarq sent his uncle Bury Bress to fight Arslān Arğû but their fight in Khorāsān ended in the defeat of Bury Bress in 488 AH / 1094 AD. A year later, Bury Bress was murdered at the order of his brother Arslān Arğû who remained ruler of Khorāsān [11, 22, 6, 8]. In spite of Arslān Arğû’s rebellion against Sultan Barkiyarq and his attempt to keep hold of Khorāsān, the inscriptions on the coins he struck in that year indicate that his power was limited where Barkiyarq’s power had increased. Following is an example of these coins:

2.3. Dinars and dirhams of Arslān Arğû and Barkiyarq and their inscriptions Significance

2.3.1. Dinar in the name of Arslān Arğû and Barkiyarq, Nīsābūr mint, date 488 H. (W. 3.87 gr.), private collection, first published [21].
The inscriptions of this dinar demonstrate the weakness of Arslân Arğû’s political position in comparison with the increasing power of Sultan Barkiyarq, which is emphasized in Arslân Arğû’s omission of the title “Moez al Islam” which was inscribed on the dinars he struck in 486 AH. and which were previously referred to (numbers 1-3) in this study. He only had the title “Al-Malik Al-Muzaffar” inscribed on the right and left of the obverse center inscriptions on dinar (number 5) while he inscribed on the reverse center the titles and ancestry of Sultan Barkiyarq as “Al Sultan al Muazzam / Malik al Islam / Abul Muzaffar Barkiyarq / bin Malik Shâh”. If Arslân Arğû’s disobedience and rebellion against Barkiyarq had been based on his being powerful enough, he would have omitted Barkiyarq’s name from the inscriptions on his coins as he had done in the dinars struck in 486 AH and previously referred to in this study. Arslân Arğû had also struck dirhams that reflected the political condition at the time and had the following inscriptions:

2.3.2. Dirham in the name of Arslân Arğû and Barkiyarq, Nîsâbûr mint, date 488 H. [16].

The inscriptions on this dinar emphasize that Barkiyarq’s power had been increasing and he was one of the most powerful Saljûq rulers where Arslân Arğû had limited power and that was why he did not have any titles on this dirham. He only had his name and ancestry inscribed whereas Sultan Barkiyarq had an additional title inscribed, namely “Rukn al- Donia wal- Din”, the same title that Sultan Tughril Bak previously gave to himself and inscribed on his coins, a title that distinguish the person that has it as more superior to the rest of the rulers [24]. Arslân Arğû may have meant to win the favor of Sultan Barkiyarq and prevent a war with him. Although historical sources do not mention the nature of the relations between Arslân Arğû and Sultan Barkiyarq in 489 AH. / 1095 AD., their relations are seen in the inscription of the coins that were struck by Arslân Arğû in the same year, for the coins reflect the continuity of Sultan Barkiyarq’s power and strong hold over the lands under the rule of the Saljûqs as well as the limited power of Arslân Arğû. This is emphasized in the fact that Arslân Arğû kept inscribing the same phrases and titles that he inscribed on the coins struck in 488 AH. Examples of these coins are.

2.3.3. Dinar in the name of Arslân Arğû and Barkiyarq, Nîsâbûr mint, date 489 H. (W. 3.85 gr.), Private collection, first published.
2.3.4. Dinar in the name of Arslān Arḡū and Barkiyarq, Nīsābūr mint, date 489 H. (W. 3.90 gr.), Private collection, first published.

In 490 AH. / 1096 AD., Barkiyarq, after getting rid of those who struggled to seize power and deprive him of it, decided to fight his uncle Arslān Arḡū who remained ruler of Khorāsān and had his name inscribed on the coins against Barkiyarq’s will. Barkiyarq went to fight Arslān Arḡū only to find that the latter had been killed by one of his boys before Barkiyarq’s arrival in the month of Muharram, in 490 AH. / 1096 AD. It was Arslān Arḡū’s ill-treatment of his boys that led the boy to kill him. Consequently, Barkiyarq seized Khorāsān and his name was pronounced in the Khutba (Friday speech) in Transoxiana [6, 3, 7, 4, 12, 10].

2.3.5. Dinar in the name of Arslān Arḡū and Barkiyarq, Nīsābūr mint, date 490 H. (W. 4.00 gr., D. 22 mm) [25].
The inscriptions on this dinar resembled those on the previously mentioned dirham, dirham number 6, and reflected the power of Sultan Barkiyarq as well as Arslân Arğü’s attempts to prove that he is entitled to rule Khorâsân by inscribing his name on the coins struck there. This also reflected that Arslân Arğü tried to win Sultan Barkiyarq’s favour by inscribing his titles and ancestry on the coins while Arslân Arğü only referred to himself using the title “Al-Malik Al-Muzaffar”, which is made clear in the following coin:

2.4. Fals in the name of Arslân Arğü and Barkiyarq, no mint name, no date. (W. 3.66 gr.) [21].

3. Discussion & Conclusion

From the above, the importance of coinage in showing the political role played by the coins of Arslân Arğü is clearly demonstrated. As shown in the inscriptions on the coins struck by Arslân Arğü and examined in the present study, the coins of Arslân Arğü shed light on the use of coins in political propaganda and show how he struck coins to express his disobedience and rebellion against his nephew, Barkiyarq, as well as to announce his seizure of Khorâsân in 489 AH. / 1092 AD. The inscriptions on the coins of Arslân Arğü that are published for the first time in the present study as well as those on the coins that are published in world catalogues revealed many historical facts that relate to the political history as well as coinage of Arslân Arğü. The present study provided evidence that Arslân Arğü had given himself the title “Muaz al Islam”, a title which had not been used before on the coins struck by the great Saljuq rulers, a fact which had not been referred to in historical sources. Similarly, the present study provided evidence that Arslân Arğü had given himself the title “Al-Malik Al-
Muzaffar” not “Al-Malik Al- Mu’azzam”, a conclusion which refutes what had been mentioned in some of the previous studies. A third conclusion reached in the present study is that the coins Arslân Arğû struck in 489 AH., which are published for the first time in this study, revealed the nature of the relations between Arslân Arğû and his nephew, Sultan Barkiyarq, which had not been mentioned in historical sources. To sum up, it is obvious that the basic conclusions which had not been referred to in other studies and can be considered the contribution of the present study are that the coins of Arslân Arğû examined in the present study shed light not only on his political history but on the history of his coinage as well.
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