

**CORRUPTION OF THE OTTOMAN INHERITANCE SYSTEM AND
REFORM STUDIES CARRIED OUT IN THE 17th CENTURY***Zabit ACER****Abstract:**

The Turkish nation is one of the nations who have founded many States in the history and ever continued its names. Today 45 countries have been founded in the lands under the sovereignty of the Ottoman State, 31 countries under its authority and influence. The Ottoman State, being parallel to its continuously growing and following active policies in the world politics, continuously renovated itself. Contemporary and modern historians starts the stagnation of the Ottoman State from late 16th century. Long lasting wars brought the corruption of economy along and the regression became inevitable when also added incompetence of the Statesmen. The most important factor in the stagnation of the Ottoman State became the change in the inheritance procedure. The corruption in the inheritance system became effective in the corruption of the army and navy. That there were great problems in Timarli Sipahis, taxes increased more and villagers fell into the hands of usurers churned agricultural system deeply and the people escaped leaving their villages. As a result, the State started the struggle to make reforms as of 17th century to eliminate emerging disorders. 17th century reforms made based on the power and violence couldn't find much development opportunity. The most characteristic speciality of this term reforms is that they were made depending on persons. There wasn't the effect of Europe in renovations made and studies to bring the Ottoman State back to its previous powerful terms were made.

119

Key Words: Reform, Ottoman State, Economy, Corruption.

Introduction:

The Turkish nation is one of the nations who have founded many States in the history and ever continued its names. The Ottoman, Mameluke, Safavid and Babur States, who have shown themselves as the most powerful States especially in the beginning of the 16th century, have been founded by Turks. (Turan vd., 1999: 1) This situation clearly shows Turks' fondness for their independence.

Today 45 countries have been founded in the lands under the sovereignty of the Ottoman State, 31 countries under its authority and influence. That the proportion of the population living in these regions to the world population is 40.1 % is an important indicator showing the magnitude of the dominance of the Ottoman. (Hayta ve Ünal, 2003: 1) In the dominance of the Ottoman State over such a large geography, juridical, civil and military organizations' legacy from Seljuks, the effect of Ilkhanate and Mamelukes in the organization field and great

* Lecturer, Dumlupinar University Vocational School of Kütahya – Kutahya/Turkey. acer@dumlupinar.edu.tr

organizational characteristics of the foundation age sultans have become effective. (Köprülü, 1988: 110) The Ottomans intervened in important issues concerning the world politics especially in the second half of the 16th century. The Ottomans well used Protestantism's dividing Europe into two and provoked this separation in their struggles in the Middle Europe and Mediterranean and also undertook the protection of Protestants and France. This situation made the Ottoman an equipoise by European States and provided it to be effective first factor in European politics.

The Ottoman State, being parallel to its continuously growing and following active policies in the world politics, continuously renovated itself. The Ottoman State, who had not any regular military system in the beginning, gained power thanks to the foundation of the Janissary Corps in the term of Murad I.

First, about a thousand janissaries were taken into the corps but this number reached ten thousands in the middle of 15th century. (Halaçoğlu, 1993: 342-344) That the State continuously grew in the Rumelia part and so needed soldiers became effective in this. (Hayta, 2003: 2)

The Ottoman State was able to solve disorders occurring in the running of the State order until the end of the 16th century through its absolute centralist structure. However in the next terms even though the width of the boundaries of the State became effective in the continuity of its outside appearance speciality and magnificence, it couldn't prevent the revelation of very significant disorders.

120

The Kanuni term called classical term in which military, cultural and administrative institutionalization reached to the peak ended (Fleischer, 1999: 149) and the State entered the stagnation age gradually as of the second half of the 16th century and this situation continued during the 17th century. (Köksal, 1999: 162) The Ottoman Classical Age is started by historians generally as of the middle of the 15th century and continued until the end of the 16th century. The term's Ottoman intelligentsia became aware of that the structure of the State and society changed from the 'classical' order as of the second half of the 16th century.

The Ottoman Statesmen and ulama determined that the State and society orders started to corrupt especially after the last quarter of the 16th century and said with their own expressions "nizâm-o âleme ihtilâl ve reaya ve berayaya infial geldi". They tried to explain these developments they came across with the Ottoman society understanding based on basic principles such as "dâire-i adliye ve erkân-ı erbaa". (Öz, 2001: 12-13)

Contemporary and modern historians starts the stagnation of the Otoman State from late 16th century. Long lasting wars brought the corruption of economy along and the regression became inevitable when also added incompetence of the Statesmen. Value loss in money, that chairs were not delivered to competent ones but bought and sold with bribe, often changed sultans and that money lost value in accessions caused the events to occur and the army to rebel. (Hayta, 2003: 2) Problems occurring in political and military structure of the State were identified

also by scientists and intellectuals of the term and the solution ways were looked for and it was provided the Governance to deal with this subject. (Köksal, 1999: 163)

The most important factor in the stagnation of the Ottoman State became the change in the inheritance procedure. Not the principle that sultanate passes from the father to the son but the principle that it passes to the oldest – called “ekberiyet”- and the most intelligent one inside the Ottoman dynasty was adopted. After the confirmation of this system, the princes’ stepping up to the sanjak procedure was abolished and the cage procedure was brought and so the princes were confined to the palace and then they became sultans without gaining experience about administration. (Turan vd., 1999: 12-13)

The corruption in the inheritance system became effective in the corruption of the army and navy. The first corruptions in the janissary corps were seen in Murad III term. The circumcision feasts of princes were performed in extraordinary way in the Ottoman history (Demir ve Kafkas, 1995: 215) and they continued for 2 months night and day and the group entertaining the people was taken into the corps as ‘ağa çırağı (apprentice of agha) after the feast ended. Therefore the first corruption in the corps occurred. (Danışman, 1993: 30) With the corruption of the devsirme system, people not concerned military entered the corps and the discipline of the corps corrupted. So this military organization became effective in changing sultans and Statesmen by intervening directly in politics.

Happiness of people in a State depends on unconditional loyalty of soldiers connected to the existing order and the chain of command. (Müteferrika, 1990: 59) Since the soldiers having *dirlık* (subsistence) are more than *Kapıkulu* soldiers, their territorial and military record books were formed very well. “Rüstem Paşa havass-ı hümayunu iltizama vermek gibi bir bidat icat ederek”, the number of *timars* (benefices) decreased also in the next terms and *dirlıks* passed to the hand of incompetent people. (Demir ve Şen, 1995: 223-225) The Ottoman economy consisted of agricultural economy based on food supply enough for the public and the collection of taxes as money and goods. The State had given its lands to its soldiers and other workers, instead of money, as compensation for their services. However the land tenure system occurred by the end of the 18th century and money entered the cash box of the State with this system meaning that the taxes which would be collected for certain time in a place determined through the public auction would be sold to the ‘leaseholders’. (Zürcher, 1996: 34) It was started to be given from the capital unjustly to those wanting *zeamet* (feud) or *timar*. One making this is the grand vizier in Istanbul. Since the competent claim position did an injustice in this way, the public became helpless. (Danışman, 1993: 24-26) Lütüfi Pasha reduced this problem to the term of *Kanuni* and said that the people started to migrate from villages to towns. That there were great problems in *Timarli Sipahis*, taxes increased more and villagers fell into the hands of usurers churned

agricultural system deeply and the people escaped leaving their villages. (Lewis, 1993: 33)

The situation in the wars of Lepanto, Mohac and 1593-1606 Austria showed that the timar system came to a halt. Breakdowns seen in military order showed themselves in politics and economy. New taxes were laid and inflation increased. High rank Statesmen coveted to timar lands to increase their incomes. Therefore the difference between people living in the village and in the city quite increased. When the land system corrupted, the villagers attached to the land owners absolutely and so serious decreases were seen in products as well. Corruptions in agricultural system caused economy to collapse. Our classical historians separated these into three as commotions of sipahis, janissaries and tradesmen, Celali commotions and commotions of governors. Corruptions in military, land and economical system brought along corruptions in moral values as well. When money lost value, the people spent much money and this caused those working in the State positions to use their opportunities in the direction of their interests. So bribe and favour became widespread. (M.E.B, İ.A, 12/2: 318)

Economy came into inextricable state since gold brought to America by Spaniels caused big inflation in Europe and Ottoman, tax became uncollectible due to the corruption of the dirlik system, the bribe and favour increased, The Ottoman lost economic advantages it possessed before in consequence of geographic discoveries, it remained far from the level the West arrived with Industrial Revolution (Hayta, 2003: 17-18), karat of money reduced, the price of gold whose price wasn't changing arised (Demir ve Kafkas, 1990: 249), expenditures, luxuries and dissipation increased.

Due to the loss in agriculture and animal stocking, thousands of aimless people became appear in Anatolian and Rumelian lands, the people suffered big losses because of occurring Celali Rebellions, life became unbearable in the regions where rebellions occurred and the trust between people and the State joggled due to methods in quelling revolutions. Moral, cultural and economic disorders increasingly became prevalent.

Madrasahs forming the basis of educational mechanism of the Ottoman State couldn't renovate themselves in historic period and exhibited a preventive attitude against reforms. (Alperen, 1999: 212) Only religious sciences were started to be taught in madrasahs, sciences such as physics, chemistry, algebra were abolished and an ilmiye (ulama) class deprived of science occurred. (M.E.B. İ.A, 12/2: 318)

In addition to all these, in the 15th and 16th centuries that Europeans moved valuable metals in the places they discovered to Europe and started colonialism and then became rich and got necessary capital for the industry became effective in the stagnation of the Ottoman State. With the discovery of new trade ways, The Ottoman became deprived of customs incomes it took from Europeans and its economy got weaker.

Europeans removed factors preventing development through Renaissance and Reform movements and showed important improvements in science and technique. They performed big changes in intellectual life and improved in marine. They established big armies militarily and made new weapons. In contrary to this, the Ottoman State organization corrupted and the power of the army vanished and any important improvement in science and technique couldn't be exhibited. As a result, the State started the struggle to make reforms as of 17th century to eliminate emerging disorders.

1. Last Terms of Osman II (Young Osman, 1618-1622):

When the eighteenth Ottoman Sultan Osman II was enthroned, he knew Arabic, Persian, Latin, Greek and Italian very well. He was being known as 'Young Osman' by people. Although he acceded to the throne in small age, he comprehended the State works in short time since he took very good education. (Koçu, 1981: 191) Sultan Osman II did some changes in the management and appointed some of the palace jobholders to the State official duties. (Hammer, 1990: 530) Although he attempted the first serious reform movements, that there weren't people advising to young and inexperienced Sultan for effective management prevented him from arriving his aim. (Sertoğlu, 1998: 1814)

The most important reform which Young Osman thought doing in his last term is the abrogation of the Janissary Corps. Osman II, during 1620 Hotin War Voyage, due to the fail of Janissaries, decided to make reforms in the army. However that there wasn't enough preparation of him, that he was young and inexperienced prevented him from abolishing Janissary Corps and establishing a new army. In addition to these, Sultan's thought of going on the pilgrimage was perceived by Janissaries as that Sultan would collect soldiers from Egypt and Syria after the pilgrimage and abrogate it. The event which made Janissaries and Sipahis worried first and then induced them to take revenge was sultan's persistent wish for going on the pilgrimage. (İlgürel, 1993: 439) Janissaries and Sipahis rose in revolt and demanded Osman II not to go on the pilgrimage and those encouraging about pilgrimage to be punished. Sultan Osman II had an interesting dream one night. Hz. Mohammed came while he was reading Koran in his throne took Koran from his hands and his cloak from his back and slapped in the face of him and sent him sprawling from his throne to the ground. He couldn't accomplish to kiss feet of the prophet although he wanted to do. His scholar Ömer Efendi and *kızlar ağası* Süleyman Agha interpreted this dream Young Osman had as that "you must go on the pilgrimage immediately". However Sheikh-ul-Islam Esat Efendi and in Uskudar Sheikh Aziz Mahmud Hüdai Efendi stated that his going on the pilgrimage was not necessary and even had drawbacks. (Koçu, 1981: 191-197, Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 136) Osman II, who felt offence against the Statesmen, ulama, the corps men and all institutions of the State due to sensibility sourced from youth, came across disastrous end called "haile-i Osmaniyye" due to the fomentation of his scholar as well. (Koçu, 1981: 39)

He, not being lavish person, behaved hard to Statesmen. He restarted the brother killing, which had been given up from the term of Ahmed I up to this moment, by having his brother Mehmed killed. He wandered by disguising and had those making banditry among Janissaries killed. Rumours that he would want to go on the pilgrimage and thanks to this he would come to Istanbul together with military forces in Egypt and Syria and would abolish the Janissary Corps revealed. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 585) Although Osman II, who saw reactions were big, gave up going on the pilgrimage, mutineers took him and brought to the Yedikule Dungeon. With the order of Davut Pasha, Sultan Osman was martyred in May 20, 1622 when he was 18 years old yet and the following day he was buried near Ahmed I in Sultan Ahmed Mosque. (Hayta ve Ünal, 2003: 12) This event caused big reactions to occur first in Istanbul later in the provinces. Janissaries, so to speak, crashed under occurring spiritual pressure since they were regarded as killers of the Sultan. (Emecen vd., 1999: 50)

Osman II was the first killed Sultan in the Ottoman history and his youth and inexperience caused him not to be able to predict the disastrous final. (İlgürel, 1993: 442)

2. Murad 4 (1623-1640):

Murad 4, who became sultan in small age yet, acceded to the throne as the seventeenth Ottoman Sultan and carried out the state works under the effect of his mother Kösem Sultan. (Danışman, 1993: 10) However he concerned the State matters and works more closely and controlled the Governance completely. (Öztuna, 1977: 205)

Murad 4 had all protagonists urging Janissaries killed. He did not want to leave authorities to anyone other than himself. He had Recep Pasha, who spoilt the State authority, was the source of commotions and despotisms and led to the anarchy to occur, killed. Insurgents quailed when they saw the corpse of Recep Pasha in the palace gate. (Öztuna, 1977: 217) He filled the treasure being empty and didn't do unnecessary expenses. He put out the soldier-officer employment redundant, paid the State debt in time and wages were paid on time and with correct carat money. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 334-337)

After that, Murad 4 called the council and ulama to an extraordinary meeting and provided an absolute dominance over the Janissary and Sipahi aghas and finished his mother's viceroyalty. He closed coffee houses most of which were being operated by Janissaries since they caused fires. He banned smoking even in houses. He supervised bans in their places by disguising and had many addicts executed. He had İznik Cadi executed due to his passiveness about repairing roads and also had Sheikh-ul-Islam protesting this executed. Therefore a Sheikh-ul-Islam was executed first. With this event, an absolute dominance was provided over ilmiye class. He closed bars by putting alcohol ban in the return from Lehistan war voyage and started intensive monitoring. He even had the poet Nef'i, who satirized

himself with horrible allegations, executed. While doing all these, advisory of Murad 4 is Göreceli Koçi Bey. (Öztuna, 1977: 218-225) Koçi Bey is one of Turkish history's rarely raised intellectual men. He presented his first treatise to Murad 4 in 1631 and the second one to Sultan Ibrahim in 1640. In his treatise he presented to Murad 4, he presented it with a high style; taking attention to that Sultan took a good education. The treatise in which he stated about disorders in the State organization became quite effective on Murad 4. The treatise he presented to Sultan Ibrahim is simpler and purer. We see that he paid attention to the spiritual state of Sultan Ibrahim. Many topics from how the Sultan should act in various situations to how type of orders he would give to viziers, commanders were stated meticulously. (Danişman, 1993: XII-XIV)

The essential reason of the corruption of the Ottoman State was the corruption of the dirlik system. In the situations in which the governance was troublous, Anatolian Sekbans and Kapikulu despots often attempted to take over the governance. Murad 4, since he sat on the throne in small age, he spent the first years of his sovereignty by watching these chaoses. Only when he became a young man, he wanted reports from Statesmen, being Koçi Bey primarily, to preclude this riot. Koçi Bey, in his treatise, focused on increasing Kapikulus and the corruption of timars. Since the battle order changed in Europe front, Koçi bey critiques couldn't bring a practical solution. But his suggestions of controlling the Governance tightly and keeping the order in one hand became effective on the Sultan. Murad 4 destroyed mutineer protagonists and viziers helping to them, to remove riots. He tidied up Anatolia before moving to Safevids. He accomplished to amend the State institutions and to take Baghdad back within the term he controlled the Governance. (Kunt vd., 1997: 30)

The number of Janissaries became nearly fifty thousand in the term of Murad 4. Although the Grand Vizier Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Pasha reduced the number to 'seventeen thousand', later this number exceeded 'seventy thousand' and paying wages even got difficult. Murad 4 regarding the number of Janissaries quite much prohibited soldiers to be taken into this institution. In this way he disciplined the corps and took the revenge of Young Osman. Many times high rank State officers used Janissaries in infightings. Recruiting of soldiers randomly from numerous sections corrupted the order of Janissaries. That tradesmen and porters were taken into this educated group with bribe, they were staying in the barrack and going their homes and works corrupted the order of the corps. Also with the corruption of the devsirme system, the impact became big. Murad 4 wandered among people by disguising and threw Janissaries not conforming to rules from the corps. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 275-281)

In the term of Murad 4, one of the most valuable Ottoman Sultans in the 17th century, the State was in a very bad situation inside and outside. He precluded taking men through bribe into the Janissary Corps. He put the Kapikulu Corps into an order and threw those making vagabond movements. He applied to every

method to better impairing order and had those doing despotism in Anatolia killed. In the mean time many innocent ones got lost. He was the conqueror of Baghdad and left a State the order of which was provided and a filled treasure. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 586-587)

3. Tarhuncu Ahmed Pasha:

The Ottoman State, which often lived grand vizierate changes in the 17th century, lived economic and political stresses and by the aim of solving this, in the term of Mehmed 4, in 1652, Tarhuncu Ahmed Pasha, who had carried out financial works in Egypt, was appointed as grand vizier. The fame of Ahmed Pasha was heard as preventing bribe, trimming expenses and closing the treasure deficit and preparing the first budget pleading. (Hayta ve Ünal, 2003: 16) He had revenues and expenses determined. He trimmed excessive expenses, the palace primarily. He prepared a budget called 'Tarhuncu Budget'. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 405-406) When Tarhuncu saw that revenue was less than expense, he trimmed expenses to provide balance. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 334-337)

Although Tarhuncu Ahmed Pasha wanted to do many things, he couldn't get a visible success. Except the budgets of provinces, he made the central budget calculation and revealed the budget deficit. Bribe and malversation were abolished and he did not move by the effect of the palace, by not conforming to advices of it. Ahmed Pasha known with his truthfulness and fairness took hard measures to balance the budget without paying attention to pleasing and making up. So he gained lots of enemies and the bureaucracy started to work against him. (Hayta ve Ünal, 2003: 17) Therefore he was killed by circles whose interests were being damaged. (Öztuna, 1977: 359)

4. Koprulus Term:

In the term of Mehmed 4, Koprulu, who was appointed to the grand vizierate in 1656, became quite effective in acquiring the reputation of the Ottoman State in the 17th century. (Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, 79)

When Koprulu Mehmed Pasha took control as 'sahib-üs seyf (owner of the sword)' Katip Chelebi suggested, the crisis greatly intensified. Between the Janissary Corps and the palace people the struggle of providing superiority served Koprulu. Venetians closing the Dardanelles and taking Limni and Tenedos moved upon him. When Venetian blockade was broken and Limni and Tenedos were taken back, Istanbul got through a dangerous situation successfully. That an operation started in the Danube Principates against the Ottoman superiority left Koprulu' plans of collapsing the Crete defence and taking Kandiye undone. Due to Erdel-Sweden approach and Erdel's attempts of acting on its own, Koprulu Mehmed Pasha went to Erdel. However when Anatolian governors coming together around Abaza Hasan Pasha wanted to establish their own authorities, Koprulu declared that this movement was "Celali" and returned headfirst from Erdel war voyage and quelled this movement. Those attending to Abaza Hasan

Pasha movement were punished and thousands of rifles were collected from Anatolia to prevent the rebellion to occur again. Koprulu Mehmed PaSha couldn't solve the Erdel Rebellion and nevertheless the Crete war voyage was continuing still, he established the State authority in Istanbul and provinces, limited expenses and provided a harmonious function between political institutions. While in the first 8 years term of Mehmed 4 often viziers were changed, during the 5 years in the end of which Koprulu died a natural death, political life caught an order. Koprulu Mehmed Pasha changed Kapikulu commanders –it was a complicated issue-, and brought people he trusted. Since Kapikulu soldiers were disciplined, Abaza Hasan Pasha Rebellion was quelled and the State gained some success in the Dardanelles and Erdel war voyages. (Kunt, 1997: 35-37)

Koprulu Mehmed Pasha well established the revenue-expenditure balance put new taxes due to long lasting wars and even sold valuable goods in the palace and coined, laid taxes to the rich, sold headquarters in cash and so classes like rich senators emerged. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 334-337) Koprulu-zade Fazıl Ahmed Pasha, being the son of Koprulu Mehmed Pasha, well comprehended the State and army works. He conquered Crete and Kandiye. (Öztuna, 1977: 359)

5. An Overview of 17th Century Reforms:

Intellectuals such as Âlî, Selânikî, Koçi Bey and Akhisârî explained the reasons of disorders seen in the Ottoman State in that way: 1. The Sultan's authority churned and relatives of the sultan started to be more effective instead of the grand vizier. Sultans after Kanuni Sultan Süleyman didn't concern the State works much and disinterest towards the central authority started in the provinces. 2. Turkish agriculturalists started to concern soldiery and most of them gave up the farm labour and attended to the mutineers group since devsirme system corrupted and Muslim people also were taken there. The circles being close to the sultan took the income sources in the hands of Timarlı Sipahis and led to them to weaken economically. An increase in the number of Janissaries was seen in Istanbul. This situation rendered Janissaries stronger in provinces and centers against Timarlı Sipahis who became powerless. To fill the treasure which was unfilled, new taxes were laid and the villagers left their villages and escaped from there since they crashed under heavy load. Even this situation was stated that "Kitab-ı Mustetâb'a göre Üsküdar'dan Bağdad'a ve Revan'a varınca kurâ ve mezâriden ancak dörtte biri kalmıştır". Indeed as stated by these authors, with the infringement of laws and rules, the corruption process of the State started. They even accept that the corruption started in the term of Murad III. Well, what was the effect of developments in Europe on the downfall of the Ottoman State and what kinds of changes were available in the State's economic and bureaucratic life? It is necessary to anyhow evaluate these. They think that it can be returned to the past powerful terms with a strong and authoritarian Sultan.

As of the end of the 16th century, some changes were observed in the Ottoman Empire. These also give cues to us in the subjects in which some reforms are

necessary to be made: 1. The population increasing rate in cities is more than villages. The village people becoming far from farming either will run to the State doors or engage in banditry by attending to Celalis. 2. The Ottoman State entered economic imbalance called 'revolution of prices'. Large amount of silver came from abroad and the market double-folded suddenly and the State continuously reduced the silver ratio in money and foreign money entered the market and interests rose. Due to the sudden rise in prices, employees having the fixed income stranded and this became effective in the rebelling of Janissaries and Kapikulu soldiers. For money lost in value, the budget showed a deficit and the State tried to compensate this by putting new taxes. The taxes of 'avârız-ı divâniye', which were being collected in extraordinary times, started to be collected continuously. 3. As a result of changes made in military system for keeping in step with modern European army, making the manufacture of weapons within the country widespread was permitted and the costs were reduced. 'Sekban soldiers', who became moneyless after the war ended, engaged in banditry by forcing the residence places to pay money named 'salma'. These soldiers formed mutineers we knew as Celali mutineers. During the war, Sekban soldiers wanted to be salaried soldiers like Janissaries when they fought like them by sacrificing their lives. This situation made Janissaries in Istanbul and Sekban soldiers in provinces the opposite sides in the 17th century. 4. The Ottoman became a market for one directional Europe since Europeans discovered new trade ways and thanks to the concessions the Ottoman gave. (Uzunçarşılı, 1982: 591-592)

Result:

A regression and idleness was seen in the 17th century Ottoman Sultans. Those princes were taken from sanjak seigniories, sons of Ahmed I that acceded to the throne after him were inexperienced in sultanate, and the palace women intervened in the management caused this situation. As a result, the respect the people showed towards the sultan decreased. That Mustafa I was sultan in spite of his amok state increased this situation much. Although the authority of Murad 4 bettered the State works again, attitudes of Avcı Mehmed reversed this. Although that Mehmed 4 run to hunting by leaving works to Koprulus for twenty eight years formed an order in the beginning, this resulted in Venice Defeat and the loss of many Ottoman lands. Indifference Mehmed 4 showed against the loss of many Ottoman lands resulted in rebellions against his sons Mustafa and Ahmed.

In consequence of that timar and zeamet system weakened in the Ottoman Empire in the 17th century, Timarli Sipahis lost their previous importance since rifles were being used in wars and Janissaries together with Kapikulu and devsirmes became dominant over the Capital, it was seen that the dominance superiority of the Turkish power reduced to the second line. Madrasahs, due to seen opinion change, were making pressure over the State in religious areas. (Parmaksızoğlu, M.E.B. İ.A, 12/2: 317)

The Ottoman Empire gave up its rights and claims over Azerbaijan, Dagestan, Cibal, even Gilan in the end of the century in consequence of military, political, economic and social changes occurring when it had wide boundaries in the 17th century, and had to withdraw to the front of Danube in the west and so started to lose its superiority in the world politics. In the east, it left its contemplations concerning Kipchak Turks and had to leave Turkish cities from Bucak up to Astirhan to Slavs. (İnalçık, M.E.B. İ.A., 12/2: 308)

17th century reforms made based on the power and violence couldn't find much development opportunity. There wasn't the effect of Europe in renovations made and studies to bring the Ottoman State back to its previous powerful terms were made. The most characteristic speciality of this term reforms is that they were made depending on persons. So after reformers were taken from their duties, everything disordered again. These reforms not bringing solution to the stagnation of the Ottoman State caused the circles whose interests were removed to react through intrigues and rebellions. This caused the reform studies to result in unsuccessfulness. That reforms were made only in military and economic areas and renovation studies were not made in political, social and cultural areas caused the State to live a big tremor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akgündüz, Ahmet ve Said Öztürk. (1999). *Bilinmeyen Osmanlı*. İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayınları.
- Alperen, Abdullah. (1999) Osmanlı Devletinde Modernleşme ve Din, *Osmanlı*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları,
- Armaoğlu, Fahir. (1993). *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarih.*, Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Ayverdi, Samiha. (1993). *Türk Tarihinde Osmanlı Asırları*. İstanbul: Damla Yayınları.
- Berkes, Niyazi. (1988). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları.
- Danışman, Zuhuri. (1993). *Koçi Bey Risalesi*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Fleischer, Cornell H. (1999) Mehdi ve Binyıl: Osmanlı Emperyal İdeolojisinin Gelişimi, *Osmanlı*. Ankara.:Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.
- Halaçoğlu, Yusuf. (1993) Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatı, *Doğuştan Günümüze Büyük İslam Tarihi*. İstanbul: Çağ Yayınları.
- Hammer. (1990). *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat.
- Hayta, Necdet ve Refik Turan. (1999). *Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi*. Ankara: Siyasal Yayınları.
- Hayta, Necdet ve Uğur Ünal. (2003). *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yenileşme Hareketleri (XVIII.yüzyıl başlarından yıkılışa kadar)*. Ankara: Gazi Yayınları.
- İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin ve Feridun Emecen. (1999). *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi*, İstanbul: Feza Yayınları.
- İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin ve Nuri Yüce. (1999). *Osmanlı Medeniyeti Tarihi*. İstanbul: Feza Yayınları.
- İlgürel, Mücteba. (1993). II. Osman, *Doğuştan Günümüze Büyük İslam Tarihi*. İstanbul: Çağ Yayınları.
- Karal, Enver Ziya. (1988). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. (1981). *Osmanlı Padişahları*. İstanbul: Ana Yayınları.

- Köksal, Osman. (1999). XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Devletinde Islahat İhtiyacının Algılanışı ve Islahat Temayülleri, *Osmanlı*, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.
- Köprülü, Fuad. (1988). *Osmanlı Devletinin Kuruluşu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Kunt, Metin ve Sina Akşin. (1997). *Türkiye Tarihi, Osmanlı Devleti 1600-1908*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınları.
- Lewis, Bernard. (1993). *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Mantran, Robert. (1999). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*. çev: Server Tanilli. İstanbul:Adam Yayınları.
- Müteferrika, İbrahim. (1990). *Milletlerin Düzeninde İlmi Usuller*. sad: Ömer Okutan. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Öz, Mehmet. *Osmanlı'da Çözülme ve Gelenekçi Yorumları*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Öztuna, Yılmaz. (1977). *Büyük Türkiye Tarihi*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Sertoğlu, Mithat. (1998). *Resimli Haritalı Mufassal Osmanlı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Güven Yayınları.
- Şeref Efendi, Abdurrahman. (1995). *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi 1*. Yayına Hazırlayanlar: Ahmet Demir, Mehmet Kafkas. İzmir.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. (1982). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. C. II. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. (1982). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. C. III., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Zürcher, Eric Jan. (2008). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.