

PLSJ

Persian Literary Studies Journal (PLSJ)

Vol. 6, No. 9, 2017

ISSN: 2322-2557

DOI:10.22099/jps.2017.26133.1070, pp. 1-22

Putnam's Theory of Social Capital: A Critical
Analysis of Beyhaqi's "Busahl Zuzani's Plot
against Khwārazm Shah Altuntāsh"

Amir Pourrastegar

Ph.D. Candidate

Shiraz University

amirpourrastegar@yahoo.com

Bahee Hadaegh*

Assistant Professor

Shiraz University

bhadaegh@rose.shirazu.ac.ir

Marjan Daraee

M.A. Graduate

Shiraz University

marjandaraee@yahoo.com

Abstract

The topic in question deals with the sociological aspect of literature referring to Iran's literary and historical experiences. The basis of sociological criticism has been built upon the premise that literary works are the products of social life and that a comprehensive understanding of a work without considering its social aspects is impractical. To reach a more precise understanding of Abul Fazl Beyhaqi's social circumstances, the Social Capital theory has been employed by the authors of this article. The highlighted features of Mas'ud Ghaznavi's age are revenge, demotion, and distrust. The present study applies Putnum's theory of Social Capital from the point of view of its three major parameters: social trust, social interaction, and social support. Within this framework, it specifically reads the story of "Busahl Zuzani's plot against Khwārazm Shah Altuntāsh". As a result, it appeared that by creating mistrust, negative interaction, and demotion, safety and social capital dramatically declined.

Keywords: Social Capital Theory-Robert Putnam-Distrust- Social Support-Khwārazm Shah Altuntāsh- Busahl Zuzani

* Corresponding Author

Received: 20/07/2017

Accepted: 26/12/2017

Introduction

Of the basic assumptions of the sociology of art and literature is that scrutinizing the mind and character of the artist reveals social issues reflected in his works. This scrutiny, then, leads to the recognition of the social evolutions of a specific group and the prevailed worldview among its members. Creative authors have chosen specific approaches applying to human nature, mood, love, or aversion. Additionally, they pay focal attention to the mindset of the people described and reflected in their works. The above mentioned approach of literary authors in the light of sociology may not initially appear to be remarkable, but is actually considered as an original source concerning the effects of social atmosphere –or the external context of life on the most private, internal realm of life. Some knowledgeable people, are indeed most aware of the aspirations, goals, demands, values and social norms of their own class. These outstanding individuals go beyond routine information and try to illustrate particular issues and categories in specific ways. Lowenthal believes that if documentary historical analysis (regarding social aspects of the images authors render about themselves and the society) is tangled with sociologists' recent discussions, it will lend itself to a more concrete and comprehensible presentation. (Wellek, 110)

In a social criticism, mutual effects of both the society and the artistic work are studied.

That's why literature expresses the condition of a society and reflects the statuesque in each of the eras; also, some believe that literature is a representation of a version of life. Some consider it as a social document and hypothetical image of social realities. They assert that general social history can be extracted from literature as a social document. (Wellek, 110)

The reciprocal effects of these two categories will not lead to a thorough recognition of them, unless we investigate a realm where literature and society overlap. Based on this point, the sociological aspect of literature can be studied and the recognition of literary texts in terms of psychological and social origin of the authors can be evaluated.

Since studies normally include interpretation of social phenomena. They can render an accurate picture of history and sociology as well. According to Goldman, in studying great works, it is possible to acquire an appropriate recognition of social classes, their place in bigger social structure and also their interconnection with this structure. Although, the real awareness of the classes is seldom united with their possible awareness, this unity is highlighted in great works highlighting cultural values. Goldman asserts that “an author is the first or at least is the first who delineates this worldview in a coherent, progressive way. Actually the authors’ delineation is done through their making an imaginative world full of characters, issues and their common relations to the real world”. (66)

The question of the text’s relation to its author’s biography, psychology, class and cultural conditions dominating his creativity has been always important and valid. Today, those who are in search of the secret relations of a work with the historical and economic conditions of its author’s era are not considered to be the enemy of such studies. Those who are also in search of the structure, form and context do not deny such studies in a similar vein. Both groups are well aware of the fact that each of these methods can be an accurate investigation of literature. As a result, those who could relate the form to the historical and economic conditions have really done significant investigations regarding the social study of literary works and, in some cases, sociological aspect of literature ... (Shafi ‘i Kadkani, 17)

Considering the facts that a great artist is in fact a person fully informed of the state of a social group and that an artistic work, which is one of the indicators of this awareness as the product of the artist’s creativity which is itself a comprehensive representation of an era, a class, and a stratum, the researchers of the present study aim to investigate social capital which is one of the many crucial factors of social life. Beyhaqi’s narrative in Persian literature is a clear depiction of the social atmosphere of Ghaznavi era.

Social Capital

In university courses, social capital has been mostly developed since the early 1990s. During those years, there appeared abundant works about social capital in the forms of academic research and fields of study such as sociology, political science, economics, social welfare and educational science. In recent years, this scientific concept has entered into everyday language and life. It is significantly developed in political-social journals and lectures held in almost every country. Reflectively, it is universally acknowledged that this phenomenon can solve most of a society's problems. Despite recent reputations, the core idea of social capital is not only far from novelty, but also rooted in traditional communities.

In fact, the term capital means possession and wealth; in other words, it has the capacity to take possession or be in the possession of someone or something. However, the social capital outside the realm of an actor and far from his reach does not possess this feature. Authors who apply the term social capital, more or less, believe that capital is made through the relations of the actors and may be hidden in that relationship. Thus, this kind of capital does not include the capacity to take possessions. Through the formation and accumulation of this capital, the actor feels safer and expresses his targeted actions encouragingly.

Social capital is formed in partially stable relations while it helps the actors reach the goals in an improved way. A set of contacts, relations, acquaintances and friendships renders the actor a heavier social weight and a higher power of actions and reactions. Thus, the durable dense links seem so important because the measurement of social capital is dependent on a number of relationships and also the rate of the capital acquired by each relationship.

Parallel to all other kinds of capitals, social capital can be accumulated and used when necessary. As a society confronts a problem or a crisis, it may acquire benefits from the power of social capital because it is able to provide a setting for correlations and promote society's status by creating social networks, a facilitating trust and cooperation among communities.

Basically, social capital consists of a set of valuable sources hidden and inherent in the social relations among traditional and modern groups, social organizations of the society, formal and informal institutes. Some of these valuable resources which are sometimes called social values include honesty, good will, healthy esteem, sympathy, friendship, correlation, sacrifice, etc.

Through these sources, social capital ensures the actors' actions in three social levels of micro, meso and macro easily, quickly and safely. As a result, it helps the actors gain their common social goals. Fukuyama asserts that

Social capital can be defined simply as the existence of a certain set of informal values or norms shared among the members of a group that permits cooperation among them. Sharing values and norms does not in itself produce social capital because the values may be the wrong ones. The norms which produce social capital must substantively include virtues like truth telling, meeting of obligations and reciprocity". (11)

Social capital and networks of relationships can be studied in the light of both traditional and modern communities. Collective actions and common social norms are not particular to modern societies. In past, communities experienced a stable traditional order and governmental system, beliefs, religious thoughts and lifestyle that were seldom exposed to change or even doubt. Thus, the administrators could simply establish order by several instruments and provide people with their subsistence and social needs. But it's worth mentioning that the function of this concept is different in each community. Nevertheless, it's obvious that the communities including stronger civil societies have more out-group social capital. Social capital in classic communities had existed before modern era possessed in-group features and especial limited trust. Today, it is called old social capital. Modern communities mostly deal with inter-group social capital accompanied by public trust which is called new social capital.

An accumulation of social capital, besides the altruistic and voluntary citizenship behavior in Iran, caused by chaotic and tyrannical history did not have the opportunity to practice democracy and to expand public domain and confront excessive problems. In fact, there were chances in different parts of

Iran to establish and activate this behavior that due to the temporary outbreak, the continuous accumulation of this capital leading to an effective, durable process of development is hard to be recognized.

Literature Review

Only one article has been written from the point of view of social capital in Beyhaqi's narration. In a general evaluation and through the lens of political approach, Mohsen Khalili asserts that social capital is considered as a kind of unintentional investment without any individual possessions. It is inherited and has its root hidden in the past. Based on this notion, he tries to reflect a pathological study of successive, historical decadence in Iran. That's why he has chosen *Beyhaqi History*. The significance of the present study though lies in its focal point of reflecting the sociological aspect of literature and in order to show this, applies Putnam's theory of social capital clinging to its major parameters which have been never addressed to in similar studies done before like that of Khalili. What he shows in his research instead, is the political dimension of social capital and its declining course. The study is more concerned with the variables related to the elites and the commoners while this issue is of no importance in Putnam's theory.

Theoretical Framework

The concept of Social Capital was first proposed by L. Hanifan in the early 20th century and then it was developed by Glenn Loury (1997). He believes that social origin can affect the amount of resources which at last will be invested in the service of their progression. The core elements of theoretical approaches about social capital are as follow: (Lin, 29)

Researcher's name	Definition of social capital	Level of analysis	Goal
Bourdieu	It is the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrues from a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of stable relationships accessible to individuals and facilitates mutual recognition.	collective	Economic capital

Researcher's name	Definition of social capital	Level of analysis	Goal
Coleman	It consists of some aspects of social structure that facilitate actions.	Individual/ collective	Human capital
Putnam	Trust, norms and networks that permits cooperation for the meeting of reciprocity.	collective	Political and democracy development
Fukuyama	An existence of informal values and norms shared among members of a group.	collective	Economic development
Paxton	Concrete relations among people on one hand and mental linkage of those people on the other.	Individual/ collective	
Network analysis(Bari Velleman)	Investment in social relations by individuals and attainment of different social linkage that provide access to various supportive and instrumental resources.	individual	Various instrumental and supportive resources

In the history of the concept of social capital, three main currents of thoughts can be recognized. At first, Bourdieu, under the influence of Marxism, questions the origin of social injustice and then to social capital. The starting point for Coleman is that individuals take action wisely in order to reach their goals. Putnam is both the inheritor and the developer of the idea of cooperation and civil society which is considered as the basis of solidarity and welfare. In other words, Bourdieu considers social capital as the agent of social differentiation. Mostly, Coleman and Putnam evaluate it as an instrument for constructing social links.

Pear Bourdieu differentiates social capital from economic, cultural and symbolic capitals and considers its structural and interactive feature. He believes that social capital is a partially durable network including institutionalized relations, with any recognition and commitments including mutual trust facilitating both individual and collective actions. Thus, according to Bourdieu, the creation and effectiveness of social capital depend on the membership in a social group whose members establish the group's borders through exchanging things and institutions. These relations are

guaranteed by applying a common name (family, nation, association, party, religion) and also a complete set of actions to establish material and organizational exchanges. Coleman defines social capital as hidden energies in a society that activate relations among people. He asserts that these resources are trust, sympathy, mutual understanding and common values which connect human resources to those of social ones. He points out the elements of social capital: trust, freewill, commitment, expectations and norms. (20)

According to Coleman, social capital is defined as a set of rules, norms, commitment obligations, reciprocity and an established trust in social relations whose members are able to gain both collective and individual goals. (63)

Similar to Coleman and Bourdieu, Robert Putnam separates social capital from all other kinds of capitals and considers it as a social organization including networks of relations, awareness-based interactions and social trust. It also facilitates the organization's functions and economic developments. In contrast to Bourdieu, Putnam believes that social capital is not a source whose accessibility to a group limits other group's accessibility to it. However, he points out that social capital is a resource enforcing individuals' actions. As a result, his approach is positive. According to Putnam, in any organizations or group, people produce a sense of trustworthiness, sympathy and social capital by their collective political cooperation and by establishing cohesion in formal and informal groups. This produced capital affects other aspects of work and social life. These groups and networks make connections between different experienced people and thus facilitate exchanging of skills and information. (56)

A network carrying social capital is created through reciprocal human relations. Horizontal networks (egalitarian), unlike vertical ones (monopolist), enforce trust and cooperative norms because a vertical link reduces collective actions' capacity and cause distrust. Horizontal network is shaped within civil cooperation; because of rendering an appropriate framework for cooperation, it establishes cooperative norms.

In Putnam's view, vertical networks are less advantageous than horizontal networks. This network is like invisible webs, playing role within human relations. If reciprocal human relation is built upon trust, it will enforce social capital both in the family and the organizations. (Putnam, 80)

Putnam differentiates between two primary forms of social capital: bridging social capital (comprehensive) and linking social capital (monopolistic). He believes that bridging social capital creates strong ties among individuals who cross different social divisions while linking social capital, reinforces particularized identities and maintains solidarity. He asserts that social capital is the basis of a society's credit which, by establishing trust, encourages people to make social interactions and belongings in order to reach their perceived goals. Furthermore, Putnam differentiates the basic elements of social capital from commitment, reciprocal trust, common values and norms, social cooperation in implementing, supporting and establishing social interactions.

Theoretical and Operational Definitions

Social Trustworthiness

Trust is a vital element that promotes cooperation. It is enforced in a small society through maintaining a close relationship among people; but larger and more complex societies necessitate more impersonal or indirect trust. Trust can be defined as having optimism toward individuals who do not belong to any ethnic or tribal groups. In other words, trust is considered to be the level of trust acquired in relation to acquaintances (family members, relatives, friends, colleagues and neighbors), strangers, different organizations and governmental representatives.

Social Cooperation, Relations and Individual Links

UN Research Institute defines cooperation as "The organized attempts to increase control on disciplinary resources and organizations in a specified social condition through some groups and movements that have been deprived of such a control." (Azkiā and Ghaffāri, 291)

Social cooperation is a kind of targeted, collective, voluntary action. In other words, it is a collective attempt within an organizational framework through which the participants are to reach the collective or individual goals by merging their ability, facility and resources. Cooperation satisfies the individuals and shapes useful relations besides potential supportive networks (visiting friends and relatives, participating in celebration, ceremonies and funerals in neighborhoods, etc.).

Social Support and Cooperative Norms

Another category in social capital is social support which means to acquire the attention, love and companionship of family members, friends and others. Indeed, social support is distributed in a number of instruments to render services, help, and provide material and spiritual support.

In the following discussion, the researchers are to extract social capital concepts from *Beyhaqi History* by means of social capital's elements based on Robert Putnam approach (social trust, social cooperation and social support).

Discussion

Beyhaqi History, written by Abul-Fazl Beyhaqi, has been considered as the most valuable Persian prose. Its significance lies not only in the light of being a historical and a documentary work, but also in its literary excellence. The method used for reconciling history and literature leads to the work's uniqueness, especially among all other pure literary works. "Beyhaqi, alongside its important historical events, reports social issues and specific elements of the community of that era such as the court, kingship creeds, authorities, positions, divisions, obstruction, enmity, regulations, traditions, beliefs and customs." (Dabirsiāqi, 1)

In order to gain common values in Mas'ud Ghaznavi's age, social relations and group functions lent themselves to anomaly and fragmentation. The said circumstances helped the emergence of too many spies who even counted his breaths. Furthermore, social cooperation and interaction were not mainly dependent on the individuals' capacity and ability. Also, the

administrators tried to gain their own benefit which was not what the community required. The unpleasant consequences of that restless era related to Iran's culture and history are proved to be the prevailing decadence, dishonesty, a sense of fear from tyranny and baseless thinking. "The Conflict, covert and overt rancor between *Pedariyān* and *Pesariyān* who are called *No khāstegān*, changed Mas 'ud's court into a center of conspiracy, irritation and spying which concluded in insecurity, chaos and distrust." (Eslāmi Nodushan, 34)

Here, the concept of tyranny, ingratitude, keeping the wolf from the door and dishonesty are clearly come to fore. Motivating a useful action and expecting a satisfying reciprocal social action considered as the basis of a society possessing social capital had been indeed inversed in *Beyhaqi History* (Busahl's plot against Altuntāsh); so, within that state of uproar the community was embedded with "Villains, seditious, those who are careless to the consequences, and the naïve who have done mischief." (Beyhaqi, 413)

Totally, the hypocrisy and the sympathizers' disappointment of reformation, created a procedure disturbing the function of the community and the government by facilitating any opposite, conflicting actions. What blurred there, were the basic concepts of trust, sympathy, effective social cooperation, material and spiritual support, group correlation and also cooperation in solving people's problems which are the foundations of social capital. What were dominated instead could be named as the sense of tyranny, indiscretion and intrigue.

An Analysis of Busahl Zuzani's Plot Against Altuntāsh Based on Putnam's Theory of Social Capital

A Synopsis of the Story and a Brief Note of Khwārazm Shah Altuntāsh's Background

Having attacked Khwārazm and taken over it in 408 AH, Mahmud of Ghazni made Khwārazm Shah as one of his wisest commanders, the agent and finally the governor of Khwārazm. This important region (pagans' frontier) was the border of Torkan Saljuqi and had always been enforced by struggle and conflict. A partial stability dominated this period because

Mahmud and Altuntāsh had been involved in an honest, trustworthy friendship. After Mahmud's dismissal, Sultan Mas 'ud praised Altuntāsh for his honesty, piety and sincerity as well. He knew him as his own father and one of the leaders of the government. In addition, Mas 'ud called Altuntāsh "Hājeb-e Fazl" and "a'm". However, when Mas 'ud had been in Herat, Khwārazm Shah visited him so as to found a reciprocal trust and conclude a treaty with the new king, but Mas 'ud had been tempted to arrest him. In that special occasion, Mas 'ud rejected the temptation because he believed that Altuntāsh could protect Khwārazm. As a result, he sent out Altuntāsh to Khwārazm. Just then, Altuntash with his gentlefolks departed "overnight" since "he realized the ill condition" and found out that some conspirators who had become ministers surrounded Mas 'ud. Emir did what he heard. Without playing a drum, Altuntāsh departed secretly and hastily overnight. Thus, he was afraid of the forthcoming collapse and enemy penetration. He made Qepchāqiān and Ghazzān's threat as an excuse to return to Khwārazm hastily. Altuntāsh was not deceived by this fallacious friendship." (Bosworth, 239)

Interestingly, that night, they tempted Emir Mas 'ud to arrest, detain or even stop Altuntāsh but "the wise Turk" had been far away. There was no use in sending out 'A 'bdus to make him return because of Altuntāsh's deep sense of astuteness and his convincing response. The attempt to expel Khwārazm Shah, similar to driving out other leaders, was not ended. Another seduction begun by Busahl Zuzani who seduced Sultan Mas 'ud and assured him that Altuntāsh was not single-hearted or honest; so he had to be overturned. In addition, his utility and assets had to be sent to the treasury. In order to arrest Khwārazm Shah, they appointed the commander Malanjuq who was Mas 'ud's military agent in Khwārazm. However, this mystic, bad intention could not have been remained undercover because Mas 'adi, Khwārazm Shah's gatekeeper, informed Altuntāsh of this plot so the commander and his child were killed. Thus, this event caused Altuntāsh to get a sense of distrust and abjection for the court located in his important governmental region called Khwārazm. Then, Mas 'ud decided to amend his mistake by the help of the minister Khaje Ahmad Hassan Meymandi. He eventually decided to

resolve the mistake by arresting Busahl though he did not confide in Mas 'ud and his associates. Finally, in his battle with Ali Tagin, Altuntāsh "was failed" and died. Hārūn, succeeding Altuntāsh, along with his child was caught by talebearers and intriguers, thus, finally Altuntāsh with all his dignity and rank were annihilated.

In this part of Beyhaqi's report, the decline of social capital with all its elements is more clarified. In other words, actions and behaviors of all the agents who were in opposite sides, established a stable set of social instability, distrust and negative in-group cooperation. Robert Putnam considers the vertical relation of the agents as the foundation of the negative actions, pessimism, and deviation embedded in the societies which lack social capital. This lack has been clearly depicted in the mentioned adventure.

In this incident, reported by Abul Fazl Beyhaqi, Busahl Zuzani is the founder of the most of these senses of distrust and norm breaking regarding Khwārazm Shah Altuntāsh. He "Excited sedition, created mischief and blandishment." (Beyhaqi, 403)

Even king of Ghazni attempts to avoid this corruption but Beyhaqi's astute report proves that Mas 'ud Ghazni was himself the main agent of this political social corruption. His mistake caused Khwārazm Shah and his leader, Ahmad Abdul Samad, along with his abundant agents to build a sense of mere distrust in the frontier region of Khwārazm. "Decadence, moral failure, impiety of the courtiers had them make only their own benefits, so they paid attention neither to the nation's destiny nor to the country's future" (Eslāmi Nodushan, 37). Mas 'ud was a king whom Busahl deceived. Altuntāsh's army tempted him to stir distrust and disappointment in his agents working in enemy's frontier. Nevertheless, he eventually tried to amend his big mistake. "He has always been aware that Emir's blessings and favors for him are like a trap and sooner or later he will be caught." (Matini, 240)

The clear image of a decline of the social capital is depicted in this adventure. In other words, this is an illustration of those who tried to disturb the society by spying, authorizing and arresting. Here, we see that having been informed of the secret letters of Busahl and Mas 'ud regarding overthrowing

Khwārazm Shah, Khaje Ahmad Hassan tells Bu Nasr Moshkān, “Do you see what they are doing? (Beyhaqi, 404)

Discussion of the Three Theoretical Items in *Beyhaqi History*

1. Trust and Establishing Social Trust

Obviously, reciprocal interactions and in-group relations in this adventure led to the decline of trust. An effective trust embedded in group causes optimism among the members and as a result, it provides a satisfying cooperation. In the case study, social cooperation has gone toward the state of conflict and decadence because the trusting links are torn. The following paragraphs include the explanation of the signs of distrust and its agents.

First sign: Mostly Busahl Zuzani is the important founder of distrust; as ‘Abdus tells Bul Fath regarding the advancement of Mas ‘ud’s and Busahl’s intrigue, “and Busahl will not stop the corruption.” (Beyhaqi, 406) Because of mental and personal reasons, Busahl induced the whimsical, irresolute, tyrant Sultan of Ghazni that Khwārazm Shah Altuntāsh is not honest; so he has to be arrested and his pomp, wealth and army should be sequestered and sent to the treasury.

In addition to the existing conflict between Pedariyān and Pesariyān, their sharpening vengeance, appointing spies, and even the presence of distrusting characters like Busahl Zuzani, the root of all the distrust in Mas ‘ud’s period was his own extremely materialistic view and his greed in amassing great riches. This very characteristics of him was one of the reasons for his pessimism toward the minister, the army chief, the juris consult, the scientist and the messenger so that he could saturate his greed. So, he himself paved the way for being arrested, overthrown and prisoned. Altuntash was aware of this fact and when he received Mas ‘adi’s secret letter, he told his headman Ahmad Abdul Samad, “Shame on these mischievous people! They ousted and deposed those who were not in line with them, for instance, Ali Qarib, who was unique, Ghazi and Aryāroq as well”. (Beyhaqi, 423)

Within this context, greedy Mas ‘ud longed for Altuntāsh’s wealth that Busahl figured out for him. Among the important signs of a negative cooperation for destroying trust, were writing a letter to the commander

Malanjuq (who is thirsty for Khwārazm Shah's blood), ordering to kill Altuntōsh and grasping his property by the signed letter of the king. This was not only useless, but also weakened the roots of empathy and trust in line with strengthening revenge in the court. Thus, Ahmad 'Abdul Samad, Khwārazm Shah's headman reacted to this situation and said, "But we should scare them so that they recognize our pomp and that Khwārazm Shah is not stupid...those whose heads are filled with pride by Mas'ud have to be cut." (Beyhaqi, 424)

Second sign: It is about the secret actions of Busahl and Mas'ud enforcing their unsuccessful plot. Following Busahl's suggestion for arresting Khwārazm Shah, Mas'ud was hesitant and thus informed Busahl, "In order to implement our plot we need an army and a great leader. Busahl says, "It is too easy to perform this plot if it is done in secret...it is not easy to turn him down because the whole nation will revolt." (Beyhaqi, 402)

In response to Mas'ud's doubts and to ensure him in activating the plot, Mas'ud said, "And if the letter is signed by the king, all will trust it and no writer will be aware of this fact." (Beyhaqi, 403)

When Busahl himself wrote the letter, signed it and assigned the whole actions to Mas'ud, Beyhaqi said, "Busahl did not think that this plot will not remain undercover." (Beyhaqi, 403)

In order to hide the plot, Busahl, who was himself the army vizier, had closed the exit ways to Khwārazm, so that no news could be released and the king of Khwārazm would not be informed of this plot, "They took the letters and were careful." (Beyhaqi, 403)

Although this precaution of Mas'ud was effective, Mas'adi's (Khwārazm Shah's gatekeeper) letter to Khwārazm Shah, regarding the plot, was discovered and banned. But it was late. Thus, this situation increased chaos and fear in the court because this was the second letter of Mas'adi to Khwārazm, "He wrote two secret letters in this respect." (Beyhaqi, 405) In the first letter, "written immediately", all the precautions were observed but Khwarazm Shah was informed of the plot. Even the actions were done in a

high sense of secrecy and tyranny that the vizier, who was not in a good and appropriate relationship with Altuntāsh, was not aware of it. “And I don’t know why they have concealed it from me. I could guide them in what is correct or incorrect.” (Beyhaqi, 409)

In Nozari’s view, one of the major reasons of Ghazni's extinction is that, “Bureaucrats and agents, unlike landholders and the rich, were not allowed to enter the Ghaznavid’s governmental system and were deprived of independency. As a result, they became the salaried of the government.” (172)

The vizier sent out Bunasr to Emir so that he could be aware of the details of the king’s mistakes and could solve the issues. Mas ‘ud claimed that he was innocent and he accused ‘Abdus. Khaje Ahmad Hassan knew that this claim of Mas ‘ud was only a deception and so he told Busahl, “He went in the company of Bunasr secretly and they concealed it. This did lead to chaos.” (Beyhaqi, 406)

Third sign: The jealousy and enmity between ‘Abdus and Busahl caused ‘Abdus to intentionally and distrustfully tell the secret to Bul Fath Hātami. Thus, Ahmad ‘Abdul Samad, Altuntāsh’s headman, became aware of this news through Bu Mohammad Mas ‘adi.

Indeed, king of Ghazni’s unwise mindset and destructive trust did not let the viziers and also the others accuse the king or in other words, blame him. Due to this fact, “Instead of reprimanding and blaming the king, Khaje Ahmad says, “but he has to be punished because he lied”. But in fact, Bul Fath did not lie and he just quoted the king.

Mas ‘ud lied in order to hide his role and his mistake. This point is clarified in the following two events:

1. “It should be said that: Bul Fath Hātami lied and Busahl and Abdus are in a bad relationship with each other. This dog told tales and lied in such a way.” (Beyhaqi, 406)
2. With his words containing distrust and timidity, Mas ‘ud told his vizier Ahmad Hasan, “Busahl told us that Altuntāsh was arrested and captivated in Shāburqān. I yelled at him. Abdus said to Hātami.” (Beyhaqi, 406)

Fourth sign: It is about forcing Mas 'adi to write a letter to Altuntāsh once more. This letter was completely different from the previous one. This letter was not only useless but also caused doubt and distrust.

On the other hand, Bu 'Abdollāh Hātami, Khwārazm's messenger, sent two different letters out of the same situation (how to arrest the commander Malanjuq), which is in itself doubtful.

The next sense of distrust embedded in Ghazni's governmental system that Khaje himself expressed is the conflict between Altuntāsh and the vizier. "Altuntāsh and I did not have a good relationship. Nevertheless, he knows what happens to me." (*Beyhaqi*, 409)

The other sign which Mas 'ud himself revealed was "Bul Fath's spying for Mas 'ud in the time of Mahmud Ghazni." (*Beyhaqi*, 410)

Another piece of evidence is Mas 'ud's quarrelsome behavior toward Busahl. "For how long will you be planning your wrong policies? From now on, if you dare to talk imprudently to me, I will order your head to be cut... You the tyrants will receive what you are deserved of." (*Beyhaqi*, 410)

Finally, it is evident from the vizier's words addressed to the king, the vizier planned a strategy, that there is significant political, social chaos, "The king should know that these experienced old men who remained in the court, are much better than the thousands of naïve young men. The glorious God kept them alive to confirm the king's prosperity. We should not lose them." (*Beyhaqi*, 417)

2. Social Cooperation (Relations and Individuals' Link in Society)

In this chaotic situation, Khaje Ahmad Hassan secretly told Bunasr Moshkān that a (you mean a great number of dissenters or literally a world?) revolt was certain and because of Ahmad 'Abdul Samad's concomitance with Khwārazm Shah, he was not to be failed easily. Of course, this old man had concerns for his own reputation, otherwise with knowing these open intrigues against him, he would have ruined us and "as you know, I'm wondering that I do avoid these actions but Altuntash lays the faults on me." (*Beyhaqi*, 406)

An example of inverse, negative social cooperation in order to arrest someone is the commander Malanjuq's mandatory cooperation so as to

destroy and cause the downfall of Altuntash. Moreover, he caused to destroy Khwārazm Shah “And in fact, that day the commander who was killed the next day invited the heads of the seditious army of kajāt and Joghrāt...” (Beyhaqi, 411) Of course, the commander was destroyed by Amad ‘Abdul Samad’s plot.

The other evidence of the mandatory cooperation is that of Khaje Ahmad Hassan and Bunasr to improve the chaotic situation made by Busahl Zuzani and the king. Hastily and anxiously, Mas ‘ud asked for a remedy from Bunasr. His fear was not for the murdered commander but for his own handwriting and signature. Bunasr suggested that the remedy had been acquired by the cooperation of the vizier who was not aware of the event. “I said: the great Khaje can solve this; nothing is accomplished in his absence.” (Beyhaqi, 408) Eventually, they found the remedy to dismiss and arrest Busahl Zuzani in order to amend the mistakes.

Because of the court’s overall pessimistic and conspiratorial atmosphere, the reformers improved the situation fearfully and may have presented their comments in an unsafe conditions. Having improved the situation, Khaje tells the king, “You may not think that I talk dogmatically or I hate to see the court’s agents.” (Beyhaqi, 413)

In such an atmosphere, the sympathetic wise and the supportive reformers are rejected out of their role playing scenes gradually one after another. “Meanwhile, after Dandanqān’s battle, Sultan was becoming pessimistic to the sympathetic wise day by day. In such a condition, he displaced the wise and the servants like Eqbāl Zarrin who played influential roles.” (Foruzāni, 249)

The vizier, being in a higher position, was also doubtful of his own effective mediation and cooperation. He told Emir, “However, all is deception and all the smart, experienced, wise men are aware of these tricks; we must behave courteously so that the Turk will not be disappointed.” (Beyhaqi, 416) The other point reported in this adventure is that even cooperation of the individuals to reform and repair was accompanied by lies and deceptions. The vizier was committed to tell another lie to prove the king’s innocence. “I tell him secretly to write a secret letter regarding the fact that Sultan did all this

for his sake. And Busahl found an opportunity to prepare a version of that letter. When the king was drunk, he wrote a letter in the king's handwriting and sent it to Khwārazm immediately." (Beyhaqi, 416)

3. Cooperation Norms and Social Support

Norms, interactions and reciprocal support are the generators of social capital. Those groups and societies which follow these norms, will effectively overcome the problems of collective actions. These norms are connected to the mass networks of social exchange and reinforce one another. In this adventure there is an evidence of cooperation and support to improve the situation but this collective support is only to improve the past abnormalities and negative cooperation. Thus, we receive a false sensation of social support in this adventure, though there is an evidence of a kind of collective support.

In this adventure, Altuntāsh's son (Seti) who was pawned in the court, was supported and awarded and finally was appointed as a gatekeeper so that his father would be tranquilized. Regarding this action Emir says, "Immediately we appeased Altuntāsh's son, Seti, who is as a true son and a reliable man to us and we appointed him as a gatekeeper. He is endeared to us as our child is." (Beyhaqi, 421)

Basically, this action was done to keep secrecy and amend the mistakes, not to make an effective social support. According to Beyhaqi, "To eliminate all the hatred and pessimism done by this seditious." (Beyhaqi, 421)

Another immediate, compensating support to improve this chaotic situation caused by the king, was the support of Mas'adi, Khwārazm Shah's gatekeeper, to write a fake letter unlike the first real one, "And Khaje encouraged Mas'adi and I (Bunasr) to write two secret letters regarding that was all a tale bearing." (Beyhaqi, 405)

The most significant part is that in the beginning of the adventure, he explicitly supported Busahl through his words and actions to fulfill the plot of arresting Altuntāsh. With respect to his suggestion of arresting Khwārazm Shah, he confirmed and supported him and said, "It is highly correct. You are the leader. Write each name (the retinue who perform the order to kill Altuntāsh)." (Beyhaqi, 403)

Another example is Mas 'ud's letter to Altuntāsh. He asserts in the letter that he made a mistake in appointing Busahl as a leader and also in supporting him. This led to the negative consequences. "And we gave Busahl a military job so that he could keep his position and consequently the court could be relieved of his boldness but he didn't figure his way out and he kept up his pride." (Beyhaqi, 420)

Conclusion

By analyzing Robert Putnam's Social Capital theory and applying it to one of the most important part of *Beyhaqi History*, "Busahl's plot against Altuntāsh" as a good example, the authors of this article have made evident that the three major parameters of this theory as social cooperation (individuals' link and relations), cooperative norms, and social trust are clarified in a reversed negative way. The researchers have concluded that the society is in a chaotic state along with its prevailing self-interest sensation. Because of the existence of the above mentioned evidences, the society was destroyed and declined. The cooperation which Putnam introduced as the principle of the theory is responsible for exalting a society and producing a social capital. However, this cooperation is clarified only as a counter-social capital in this adventure. The cooperation of the intriguer Busahl Zuzani and the king himself was to confine the agents and plunder their properties. As a result, it was shown that this atmosphere caused the fall and the killing of Emir of Ghazni.

Bibliography

- A. A. Dastgheyb, *Dar āyene-ye naghd*, Tehran: Art domain of Islamic Propagation Organization, 1387/2008.
- Abul Fazl Mohammad Ibn Hossein. *Beyhaqi, Tārikh-e Beyhaqi*, ed. A. A. Fayyāz, Mashhad: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 1375/1996.
- A. H. Zarrinkub, *Ashnāi ba naghd-e adabi*, Tehran: Sokhan, 1380/2001.
- A. Q. Foruzāni, *Ghaznavian az peydāyesh tā forupāshi*, Tehran: Samt, 1384/2005.

- C. E. Bosworth, *Ghaznavid History*, tr. H. Anusheh as *Tārikh-e Ghaznaviān*, Tehran: Amir Kabir, 1378/1999.
- E. Nozari, *Tārikh-e ejtemā'i-ye Iran az āghāz tā Mashrutiyat*, Tehran: Khojaste, 1388/2009.
- F. Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, New York: Free Press, 1995.
- F. Vahidā, S. Kalāntari and A. Fātehi, "Rōbete-ye sarmāye-ye ejtemā'i bā hoviyyat-e ejtemā'i-ye dāneshjuyān", *Research Magazine of Isfahan University*, (1383/2004).
- H. Sotudeh, *Jāme'e shenāsi dar adabiyāte-e fārsi*, Tehran: Ava-ye nur, 1378/1999.
- J. Coleman, *Foundations of Social Theory*. tr. Manuchehr Saburi as *Bonyād hā-ye nazariye-e ejtemā'i*, Tehran: Nashr-e Ney, 1377/1998.
- J. Field, *Social Capital*, tr. Jalal Mottaqi as *Sarmāye-ye ejtemā'i*, Tehran: M'oassese-ye āli-ye pazhuheshi-ye tamin-e ejtemā'i, 1385/2006.
- J. Matini, "Simā-ye Mas'ud Ghaznavi dar tārīkh-e Beyhaqi", *Yād nāme-ye Abul Fazl Beyhaqi*, Mashhad: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, (1386/2007), pp. 530-607.
- L. Goldman, *an Introduction to Sociology of Literature*, (A collection of essays). tr. Mohammad Ja'far Puyandeh as *Darāmad-i bar jāme'e shenāsi-e adabiyāt*, Tehran: Cheshmeh Press, 1381/2002.
- L. Goldman, *Society, Culture, Literature*, tr. and Compiled by Mohammad Ja'far Puyande as *Jāme'e, farhang, adabiyāt*, Tehran: Cheshmeh Press, 1376/1997.
- L. Lowenthal, "Jāme'e shenāsi-e adabiyāt", *Iran Sociology Magazine* 1 (1948), pp. 117-136.
- M. A. Eslami Nodushan, "Jahān bini-e Abul Fazl-e Beyhaqi", *Yād nāme-ye Abul Fazl-e Beyhaqi*, (1386/2007), pp. 303-345.
- M. Azkiā, and Gh. Ghaffāri, "Barresi-ye ertebāt-e e'temād va moshārekate-e ejtemā'i dar navāhi-ye rustāee-ye shahr-e kāshān", *Nāme-ye 'olum-e ejtemā'i* 17 (1380/2001), pp. 3-31.
- M. Dabirsiāqi, *Gozide-ye tārīkh-e Beyhaqi*, Tehran: Join-stock Company of pocket books, 1369/1990.

- M. Khalili, "Sarmāye- ye ejtemā'i dar tārikh-e Beyhaqi", Magazine of Mashhad Faculty of Literature and Human Science 41, no.1 (1387/2008), pp. 152-171.
- M. Kosari, *Ta'āmollāt-i dar jāme'e shenāsi-ye adabiyāt*, Tehran: Bāz, 1379/2000.
- M. R. Shafi'i Kadkani, *Moosiqi-e sh'er*, Tehran: Nashr-e Agāh, 1370/1991.
- N. Lin, *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- R. D. Putnam, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital". *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1995), pp. 65-78.
- R. Escarpit, *The Sociology of Literature*. tr. Morteza Katbi, Tehran: Samt, 1374/1995.
- R. Sa'ādat, "Takhmin-e sath va tozi 'e sarmāye-ye ejtemā'i-e ostān hā", *Fasl nāme-ye refāh-e ejtemā'i*, Sixth year, (1385/2006), pp. 173-195.
- R. Wellek, *Theory of Literature*, tr. Parviz Mohajer and Zia Movahhed as *Nazariye-ye adabiyat*, Tehran: Academic and Cultural, 1373/1994.