



Complete Human From Hellenism, Complete State From Rome, Complete Human and Complete State From Ottoman

Ahmet Dinç

Canik Başarı University, ahmetdinc@basari.edu.tr

Zafer Çelik

Canik Başarı University, zcelik@basari.edu.tr

Bahattin Altay

Turgut Özal University, baltay@turgutozal.edu.tr

Abstract

According to dominant view in ancient Greek ideology significance was attributed to economics as much as to human notion, which was effected by religion, philosophy and ethics perspectives. When we say Ancient Greece we are talking about an era in which the bases of sciences were set, as well as an era in which humankind discovered his honor. Therefore we call it Complete Human in Hellenism. Romans, on the other hand were warriors and statesman. They bequeathed parts that set the basics of law and politics for future civilizations. Thus, we call Complete State. In Ottoman logic structure, value was added to both human and to state notion. We called both human and state in Ottoman due to their fulfilled standing positions. Our work was done within this logic structure. A vast literature review was conducted. We researched university libraries in different cities in Turkey primarily in Istanbul. We also researched works not only from Turkish economics historians but also from western scholars. Through inductive reasoning we concluded that humanism found its notion in Hellenism, state in Rome and we found that both nurtured in Ottoman.

Keywords: Hellenism, Human, Rome, State, Ottoman



Introduction

First age period handed down two very valuable legacies to the world of Western civilization. These were the notion of '*complete human*' remaining from Hellas, and '*complete state*' remaining from Rome. In other words, unity arose in some part of European community in two ways: with the unity of civilization, which was the work of Greeks; and with the unity of government and state, which was the work of Romans (Seignobos, 1939: 33). The Greeks, being the first great philosophers and scholars in Europe, tried to reach truth and wisdom. They were quite in advance in the field of science, particularly in Mathematics. The human virtues and how to develop possibilities of people were primary contributions to Europeans. Lessons of wisdom, the importance of reason and critical thinking were all inherited from Greeks.

These legacies which were inherited, popularized by Romans, their conquest of Gaul, Iberian Peninsula, Great Britain, West Germany and countries between Greece and Hungary and spreading one language in all the western part of the empire expanded this inheritance. In 212 Emperor *Caracalla* made a decision on each free person living within its borders to have status and privileges for Citizen of Rome. 'It was the first and unique example of citizenship happening upon in European territory (Goff, 1997: 24). On the other hand, the political, social and economic environment of 13th century Anatolia has remarkably led the emergence of Ottoman Empire. Rise of Ottoman dynasty, which belonged to tribe Kayı and of which foundations were laid in Battle of Manzikert in 1071, seemed to have completed the process of Turkization and Islamization by the end of 13. Century , Against Seljuks who stuck in Central Anatolia acknowledging Ilkhanids' authority, Turkmen principalities embarked on an intense activity and organized in forms of states highly benefitting from political crisis that Byzantium had been experiencing, of which central authority was on wane. (Ekmeledden, at al., 1999: 5) After Murad II's death and his son Mehmed's accession, the Ottoman Empire became an empire. Further developments would not be expressed by the word: 'state'. It is stated that the term empire gained a meaning other than its recent European definition for Ottomans. The term was used to refer to its ethnic and social structure, international policy it pursued, central government and the Sultanate system. Accordingly '*Sublime Ottoman State*', not the meaning '*imperialist*' or '*exploitative*' (Ekmeledden at al.,1999: 5).



Complete Man In Hellenism And Complete Government In Rome

Complete Human in Hellenism

Neolithic tools, which were found in various parts of Greece, reveal the fact that the Greek culture dates back to 2000 B.C. (Mansel,1971:2). While Greeks called themselves as ‘hellenes’, they counted *the others* as barbarians. Patriarchal thoughts were rooted in their family systems. In other words, a Greek male was responsible to his wife and children from her; or whom he either had bought or kidnapped. Families evolving out of the same ancestor and separated in various groups generated a lineage called ‘genos’. The greatest innovation of Greeks in social and political area was the establishment of city-states, which are called ‘polis’. The first sample of city-state was located in Lonia. Giving up nomadism, Dor tribes decided to have settled life and considered all the territory they conquered as the common property of the tribe. Instead of individual property system, people in Greece had common property system, during the first centuries of Greek’s medieval age (Mansel, 1971:2).

Each noble family used to live either in a chateau or in mansion, owned herds or vast territory, which they used to rent to villagers in order to make money. Besides the noble, some free citizens used to have farms to work for themselves and some others used to work in others’ farms. The ones working for others used to get only 1/6 of what they harvested. The rest was given to the farm owners, which prevented them from paying their debts. Solon, a Greek statesman, lawmaker living in the sixth century Athens, declared null and void all the hypotecs with the constitution he legislated (Savaş, 2000: 31). Animal raising and agriculture were quite important throughout Greek history. Agriculture took place on plains and valleys. Moreover, it was known that farms were fallowed and manured. During the medieval ages, Greek Families tried to be self-sufficient as much as possible and not pay for anything that they didn’t produce. Besides providing their own food, each family was used to try to have clothes, shoes, and furniture and agriculture tools without paying for them. All of the family members used to divide in groups and contribute to their families. To illustrate, men used to plow, plant trees, harvest, grind flour, and take care of tamed animals and milk animals, such as cow, sheep and goat. While women used to sew, spin wool, cook and take care of washing clothes. Besides, the families having a common point in social and economic aspects, developing culture life required division of labor (Mansel, 1971:100). Arif Müfid Mansel in



his history book called “Ege ve Yunanlı Tarihi” says that ‘Greeks had a vision to figure out how tools are used and they used some methods in math, astronomy and physics.

Furthermore he claims that, the Greeks pioneered in many scientific fields and had a great influence on other countries, which is clear from the Greek names given in sciences. (Mansel, 1971: 128). The ancient Greeks also contributed much to the freedom of thought as well as the development of math, literature, philosophy and economy in Europe. Almost all of the philosophers learned Greek. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, whose philosophic thoughts undisputable, affected deeply the era in which they lived. Plato supported the idea that an ideal government should provide what its civilization needs while Aristotle thought that an ideal government consisted of people whose morality and education is adequate (Küçükcalay, 2010: 43).

Complete Government in Rome

When we glance at the roman history, we see the last scene of such flawless historical era which we call ‘first age’. During the Roman history an age ended just like a new one came out. A city’s name led a government’s history (Seignobos, 1939: 41). It took the place in the history as it’s the only government whose territory expanded toward the Persian Gulf and the Hadrian wall located in south England. It is hard to say that roman history contributed much to finance, however their most valuable contribution can be seen as the Roman law. Romans created a juridical structure which revealed all the things they were going to do concretely and they completed the existing structure with the juridical structure. Colonial politics, production through slavery, being divided into social classes and conquering boundless lands allowing them to produce what they wanted were main strategies they pursued (Küçükcalay, 2010: 57). According to Jean gaudemet the most noticeable thing that Rome left was law inheritance. The liberty which Rome had, can be clearly seen from how they handled the 'site' fact. In the view of Greeks’ site was a common people community while roman Cicero took ‘site’ into consideration as a community based on law. Moreover, it is thought that this dissensus, why Rome separated from Greece. Social councils were called public council in Athens. On the other hand, age, origin, the house a person lives were the social class differences in Rome. Cicero claims that freedom only belonged to roman people and the others could deal with being a slave. The roman emperor, superior soldier and judge were the ones who were able to impose a ban and politics deal with law. However, Roman



emperor was not the one getting the empire law together, this law was written in the institutions consisting of lawyers and it was said as if it had been written by the emperor (Braudel, 1990: 171).

Greeks were not able to have a political association although they got together for the same purposes. Actually, social and political peace was brought by Italian tribe throughout Europe. The center of this tribe was Rome and their language was latin. During the VII. and VI. centuries it was a tiny tribe on the map. When it was compared with Greeks, they were living the way less civilized and they were not much interested in agriculture, texts and art. Moreover, they were not even using money in order to buy a tool. Civilization was brought by their neighboring country called 'Etrusques'. Also, building domes, observing the time of birds' migration were taught them by their neighboring countries which allowed them to predict the future (Demircioğlu, 1953). During the 7. century roman tribe mostly struggled with their enemies at the end of which they took most of them under control. They fought in order to enrich their economy, catch slaves and let a general witness a triumph. Besides they fought for the purpose of finding hidden treasures. The conquests of all tribes which were around Mediterranean Sea and oceans changed roman life style. The people of places conquered were humiliated for a long time by roman government (Güran, 1992: 12). Rome was neither an important industrial center nor a commercial place. On the contrary, they placed a high tax on people and spent the booty they had through wars. The other tribes which were around Rome were quite inactive. Romans contributed to technology, agriculture, industry and they also organized the commercial system. Romans were called the luckiest 'legatees' of all time. Even the fighting styles were invented by them.

Romans played a critical role in Europe's economical growth with their conquest of west Europe and this conquest caused the prolificacy of the place to increase just like life satisfaction levels were increased. Their conquest of east Mediterranean brought peace to hellenistic world (Seignobos, 1939: 45).

Ottoman's Socio-Economical Thoughts

Which economical model was used by the Ottoman Empire? Was it liberal system or fascist? Maybe socialist or capitalist? These questions were addressed in A. Mesud Küçükkalay's *History of Economic Thoughts*. Questions can also be elaborated. For inflation,



unemployment and gross national product, similar to today's macro economical goals or problems, which economic policies were followed? What was their economic growth or development goals? While European countries used the mercantile system, Ottoman Empire was limiting the exportation and encouraging importation, which was totally contrary -how can this action be explained? Adam Smith, who was accepted as the father of economy by some economists, was included in the classical economics school vindicating the individualism principle. According to the scope of this principle "Personal interests create social interests, state interference is unnecessary, let them make what they want, invisible hand (help) or the income distribution". So how were these opinions reflected in the Ottoman Empire? (Işık, 2009: 2).

According to Tabakoğlu (2012): "If divided into two terms, Nizam-ı Kadim and Nizam-ı Cedid the Ottoman mindset factor is one of the most important reasons which disports classical Ottoman system and the European one. The individualism principle and personal interest exc. In European countries about which I've mentioned before, turns to altruism, sympathy and not only thinking oneself and living for oneself but also thinking others and keeping them alive. Foundations are the turnouts of these thoughts. People donate their properties to foundations without expecting any profit and this is also a result of these thoughts. The reasons of the mindset, which caused people to behave like that, are that terms Ottoman citizen's mental and communal aspects, society's culture, political and social structure, religious and national thoughts. The culture of Central Asia and fondness to İslam are the basis of the foundations, which has aim of helping people without expecting any response, had created enormous marks on Ottoman society. (Sariyer, 2013). Because "The best person is the most beneficial one, the most auspicious property is the one which is spent for Allah (in other words which is devoted) and the most auspicious consecratedness is the one satisfying more necessities of people." this principles were followed.

When we pay attention to our tutor's, Ahmet Tabakoğlu, book we can realize he is pointing Ahi-Community as another indication of mindset and continues: The importance of Ahi-Community is not limited only with the traders. They had contributed to creating a unique economical subject. Moreover saying that the most important feature separating Ottoman system from the Western is originated by Ahi-Community is not wrong. Although the bourgeois system was the most important factor of capitalism and western civilization,



Ahi mindset was the most important factor which steered the Ottoman society and economy. Because of this mindset's dominance, colonial activities and class conflicts, which were the basis of western capitalism, did not appear in Ottoman Empire. Homo-economicus's, which is idealized by capitalism, basic member was personal profits and its concrete example was the bourgeois system. But in Ottoman Empire human type was idealized who gave priority to society profits and was also abstemious but entrepreneurial. The Ahi-Community, the first organizers of Anatolian economical life, stands out as the concrete example for this type. Basically Ottoman mindset was not only closed to capitalism but was also against. The limitations in trade and ceiling practice, which were observed in Ottoman economy, were resistance to let them make what they want and were also the results of seeing a social state or paternal state. Because this type of states required thinking of its public and supplying their necessities. The rational human type, which appears in Western, in other words maximizing profits, minimizing costs and solving problems with mind left its place to not sweeping others away because of the ambition of winning in short being an altruist in the Ottoman Empire.

The idea of state was formed in Ottoman people with the help of these beliefs. In the shadow of God's provision the ruler governed the empire on behalf of God. And the society was the entrusting of God to the ruler. In that case the state, such as a shepherd, had to protect its nation and provide abundance and prosperity. And so, the nation had to obey its state. Talking about the state it is worth to mention Kınalızade Ali Efendi who was an important scientist of Ottoman Empire. Kınalızade, influenced by Ibn Haldun's opinions addressed the questions and examined the idea of "The human kind is civilized from the creation." Why human kind civilized from the creation, and what was did being civilized meant? Take in case a man, desperate of satisfying his all needs, therefore has to live together with others. The obligation of being civilized is then meant *this* for Kınalızade. If everyone were rich, there would be no necessity and because of no necessity there would be no servants, either. Similarly, if everyone were poor, nobody would serve the people because they could not have afforded it. Due to this different situations have-nots became servants and the people, who made profit, were served. At the end of the day the people who were served made profit from the servants' body and the servant made profit from the properties of those people served. so everyone had served for their goals with this circulation of 'Nizam-ı Alem' viz. -the



regulation of the world- was established. Leading to people share a communal and civilized life. In this case having a communal life meant *necessity* and *obligation* for human beings. So the question arises would the prosecution appear in public life? What kind of measures were there to prevent the prosecution? Kınalızade Ali Efendi (16. Century) stated that communal life can neither always supply regulation nor could prevent defeatism in response to this questions. According to Kınalızade (1510-1571) bullying, unfairness and cruelty would appear in communal life. Since, every human liked to have their desires and make profit, therefore an authoritative ruler had to prevent cruelty and unfairness. Removing the coercion and cruelty among the people, granting them the right that they will consent mutually; both sides achieved their purpose (Okumus, 2006: 149). As mentioned before, we divided the term Ottoman Empire into - Nizam-ı Kadim and Nizam-ı Cedid - in this regard; while Western Europe had priority in economical politic – savings and growth -, social and economic balance were present in Ottomans. Mentioning Ottoman economy, significant changes occurred in the classic economic structure of Ottoman among the XVII, XVIII, and XIX centuries. It can be said that the impacts of the overconfidence of Ottoman management's elite in their established system, could not see the important change in Ottoman economy politic until the middle of XIX. century.

In other words the Ottoman approach which foresaw the conservation of established balance in the economic field primarily within the boundaries of the empire, the control over the production activity (by the way of export bans, official applications, profit limitations) prevented the occurrence of the process of capital accumulation which was evolving in the Western Europe at the same period in its own geography. Ottomans, actualizing most of the precautions about preventing the occurrence of strong capital category against the central authority, preserved this approach until the end. (Bulut, 2012: 76) According to Ö. L. Barkan, in the history of mankind after the invention of fire, the application of the steam engine into the industry was the most important matter. Western Europe countries started to get into the hands of dominance with the procurement of the essential, radical conditions. The power of steam-horse from the capital in the act of an unique armor helped to gather big capitals and the competitive advantage passed to the West (Barkan, 1980: 108). It can be said that the technics of the Ottoman Empire about preventing to occur personal capitals and in conclusion, preventing to occur capitals in the context of Western in this region continued for



a long time until the middle of XIX. century with a conscious approach. The period of Tanzimat can be interpreted as an effort to orientate with the developments in the world, in many areas. The efforts of Ottomans against the industrialization in the West: Tophane, Feshane and Çuha Factories established in 1835, İzmir Paper Factory, Beykoz Factory, Beykoz- İnceköy Porcelain Factories and the commission of reform of industrialization established in 1860s. show the weight that the government gave and the change (Bulut, 2012: 81).

Complete Human And Complete Government From Ottoman Empire

Coming up of the Ottoman Empire played an essential role in the political, social and economic environment of the Anatolia in the XII. century. Making an appearance in history of Ottoman Empire that is from Kayı Tribe's origin seemed to complete its process of being Turkized and Islamized until the last period of XIII. century. Of course, it laid the foundations in Malazgirt Victory in 1071. Turkoman Seignories organized utilizing from the situation of Byzantine whose central authority was fading in government shape against the Seljuks which accepted the Ilkhanid domination and was stuck in the middle Anatolia (Heator, 1995: 39). Community's anxiety about prosperity was militating and this was requiring dependence of an abundance economy. Government defense the determination of the economic business totally according to the values of choosing the Muslim Community against everything. It is overseeing the poor and the deprived people with economic purposes, devoting resources for the prosperity of the future generations, and trying to improve the community life (Ekmeleddin, Emecen and etc. 1999, 5). Production, profit is not an aim, it is a mean. It is basis that dividing up the profits of community among the poor and the rich. Government will supply all of these and control the prices in the markets with the civil servants that it assign. It is one of the most important responsibility of the Sultan who is the leader of the government. There was a complex and sophisticated interaction when the system was being formed. There was an importance of the past Islam governments in comprising of the mentality and foundations.

It cannot be denied that Ottoman Empire is their inheritor. We know that the foundations like fief, manor, mukata, futuwwa, akhism were taken substantially from the past Islam governments. Especially, it can be specified that the importance of the akhism in



terms of mentality. Akhis contributed in forming a free economic subject. While the burjuva mentality was the most important factor of Ottoman society and economics (Inalcık, 1983). We mentioned that the prosperity of the community overrode in Ottoman Empire. This abundance was requiring dependence on economics. As a matter of fact, the Sultans gave alm regularly (for re-dividing), slaughter sheep and divided them to the poor, distributed gifts, tips, wool fabrics to janissaries periodically and gave them service awards (Tabakoğlu, 1997: 125). Charitable institutions were the leading foundations of this re-dividing to spread it all over the layer. The endowment that was founded in Urfa was mothers and fathers of the orphans until they became teenagers, the donation in Gaziantep that gave the money to buy shoes to boarding students, the endowment in Siirt whose aim was to help blind people, the trust that was founded in Amasya protected from the damages of the floods and the bridges, the donations that establish a industrial plant in İstanbul, the endowment that prepared the marriage portions of the orphans and the donation that helped the people that was imprisoned because of debt can be counted as charitable institutions. We can summarize the aim of economic businesses of Ottoman Empire as three main principles.

The Subsistence (Provisionism) Principle: We will look at the goods and services that rise from the economic businesses in two aspects. In the lights of manufacturing, the aim of economic business is to provide cheap as much as they could, qualified and abundant goods and services. For the producer, the abundance and quality of the good and service is not important, selling in high prices and profiting is the important point. For the consumer, the abundance and the affluence are desired. Provisionism is the principle that cares economic business in terms of the consumer. According to this, the aim of economic business is to meet the needs of people. In other words, it is being abundant, qualified and cheap as much as possible in the goods and services, keeping up the offers of the goods high as much as possible.

The Traditionalism Principle: The subsistence principle that serve the aim of existing the community, protecting political and social order and caring out the government business has been the basis of the orders that shape the economic life because its objective conditions that constitute its resources and purposes that it serve, stayed in the same condition without changing for a long time and continued for a few centuries. Traditionalism can be identified as protecting the balances in social economic relations as much as their tendency allow,



preventing the changing tendency and in case of occurring a change; dominating of the decision to rule out the change so as to return the old balance.

Fiscalism: Fiscalism is trying to maximize treasury income as much as possible and blocking the decrease of income which has been reached. The actual function of treasury incomes covers the expenditures state has to do, as an indirect extension, we should mention about studies which are directed towards to reduce the expenditures. The Economics Worldview of Ottoman acquired its identity sort of in the system of triple coordinate and brought importance to the world of regulations that shape economic life (Inalcık, 2001: 81). The Ottoman Elite's three principles are the primary principles of the frame of mind which directs attitude against economic life. Ottoman state which represents the combinations that changes as to time, regions and sectors in doses were formed in a triple coordinate. Basically, disputes where we see between the various activities, which we say discrepancy, behind this there are these three principles of Ottoman State. People who did not see this can say inconsistency like we said at first. It is seen that principles locate in a strange position which accounts for different combinations, export is blocked in situations that subsistence is dominant and import is facilitated. However, in situations where the dominant is fiscalism completely opposite happens. The Ottoman State adheres to enable clear and fluent control on land, work and capital with a great insist. (Genc, 2000: 59) The Sultans who rule the Great Ottoman State were also great people. Besides knowing and representing the works of state with all the subtlety, they are sensitive in religious affairs and humanity equally. For example, Hazrat Osman Ghazi is almost a symbol with his purity and sincerity. Orhan Ghazi is close to his father in courage and heroism. As to Murat Ruler, he was both a perfect ruler and a perfect army commander. He was also one of the deepest God-friend. One day he comes to his teacher and says "How can you see the Kaaba with the first Takbir? I have been trying it for many years however I can succeed it with only the second or the third Takbir." Sultan Mehmed the Conquerer who closed an era and opened a new one learnt his lessons from Akşemseddin. As for Sultan Selim, he was a quite separate epic man. When he returned from the expedition which he went for the unity of the state and people with victory, although people wanted to welcome him enthusiastically with a great crowd, secretly, he entered the Topkapı in another way at midnight. The Great Sultans who were the servants of community for God, this situation grew and exalted both them and the state. One asks to



famous historian Braudel “Are 1516 Syria and 1517 Egypt conquests the biggest affair in the sovereignty of Ottoman than the Conquest of Istanbul? Aren’t they?” He mentions about not shooting any bullet, conquering Egypt without almost any ruin to regularity. With this expedition, Sultan Selim undertook the role of caliph which belongs to Muslims. As for Sultan Süleyman, Braudel remarks that his reign period is a period which has both victorious wars, a lot of construction and great legislation activities. Suleyman is Legal Suleyman. This means in his lands-especially in Istanbul-there are existence of an innovation in law examinations and a group of lawyers. He organized the judicial apparatus so good that, reportedly, King of England VIII. Henry sent a committee of experts for examine this operation to Istanbul (Braudel, 1990: 8).

Discussion

When we look at present-day economic books, economy is described as such “economy is called the struggle of supplying the unlimited wants with unlimited resources. Maybe this description is an imposition for us, i.e. for consumers. When we took undergraduate lessons, our teacher likened the economy to a walking bicycle and he said “When we do not pedal we fall down, just like that when we do not do consumption, this system fails. “When we look the opinion of Greek, we see Epicureans which was established by Epicurue, their main idea withstands limiting of human demands for happiness. Because it was our desires not unlimited needs. Nusiveran-ı Adil said how nice “If your wish did not happen, you would want something can probably happen .Romans ,who had gigantic lands and their life depended on acquiring to fight, direct and wealth, could not escape from collapse, unfortunately. Maybe the main cause of collapse was the lack of self-sufficient economic resource allocation. Ottoman Economic System was supply-side not demand-side, production was as in the foreground as necessity. The idea which wants abundance of goods and services in the country, people should not suffer from famine and expensiveness predominates than the idea of economic growth in modern macroeconomics, overproduction and export. Development list approach brought by the Enlightenment mentality did not place in the structure of classic Ottoman mind. Change is considered as corruption, traditionalism which determines the structure of Ottoman mind predominated. Thanks to flexible and pragmatic, humane, social administration, Ottoman Empire sustained its existence for many



years. As an indication of changes in economy politics, it has been observed that, Ottoman adopted in XVIII century western technology, also in XIX century western mentality.

Conclusion

In the historical process, humanity and understanding of state have been perceived in many different ways. It is seen that it varies with time and place. Sometimes humanity, sometimes the thought of state has predominated. In some places humanity, in some places state has become prominent.

The opinion which came up in this study, it is seen that Greeks had contributions to human civilization. But also it is true that they did discrimination. Being called races which are not Greeks barbarian is an example of this. Besides, we cannot deny the contributions that they have made to science which is important for humanity. Greek people discovered the belongings' special qualifications then they applied this to mathematics, astronomy and physics in a logical way and this shows that it is a positive result on behalf of science. In this subject, it can be referred that Greeks was a model and master of the other tribes.

When we look the history of Romans, we see colonial policy, the production style which uses slaves, social stratification and the existence of endless conquest policy. In the beginning it is expressed that Rome's heritage is legal structure. Besides Greeks did not able to provide political unity, this concept was brought to Europe by Rome. Rome could not be a great center of commerce and industry but it became conquer and received tax. The contribution that Rome has made to World civilization is using legal struction in state formation. Legal and unity has provided to become a state.

It is seen that the most important reason which separates The Ottoman Empire from the West is mentality. The ideas such as individualism, benefit etc. which exist in the West were replaced with altruism. Instead of living, there is an idea which is sustentation. Foundations and Ahi Agency have a great importance in getting used to altruism. It is seen that this idea has culture, social structure, religion and national thought of The Ottoman Empire. It was seen that in the context of the idea Akhism, in Ottoman people's mind the idea of state had been formed. A state should protect its people like a shepherd, who protects sheep, and ensure prosperity. Besides this, sheep should obey the shepherd. When Kinalızade



Ali Efendi said ‘Human has a civil nature from the beginning’, he meant the necessary of living together and the affordance system of state. It is seen that The Ottoman Empire not only values human beings but also attaches importance to the state.



References

- Braudel, F. (2008). *Akdeniz tarih, mekan, insanlar ve miras*. (Çev. Necati Erkurt). İstanbul: Metis Yayın.
- Braudel, F. (1990). *Akdeniz ve Akdeniz Dünyası*. (Çev. Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay). İstanbul: Eren Yayın,
- Bulut, M. (2012). Osmanlı Ekonomi Politigine Yeniden Bir Bakış. *Bilig*, sayı 62.
- Barkan, Ö. L. (1980). *Türkiye Tarihi Üzerine*. İstanbul: Gözlem Yayın. (Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin İktisadi Esasları).
- Demircioğlu, H. (1953). *Roma Tarihi, Türk Tarihi*. Ankara: Yayınlarından XIII Seri No.10 Dünya Tarn.
- Ekmeleddin, İ., Feridun E., Kemal B., vd. (1999). *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi*. İstanbul: cilt 1, Feza Gazetecilik A.Ş.
- Goff, J. L. (1997). *Avrupa Tarihi*, (Çev. Tümertekin, Alp). Yapı Kredi yayınları.
- Güran. T.(1997). *İktisat Tarihi*. İstanbul, Acar matbaacılık.
- Genç, M.(2000). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi*. Ötüken Yayınları.
- Heator, H. (1995). *Avrupa İktisat Tarihi*, (çev. Alikılıçbay, Mehmet). Ankara: İmge yayınları.
- İnancık, H. (2001). *Ekonomik Zihniyet İmparatorluğu Sosyal ve İktisat Tarihi*. Eren yayınları.
- Işık, H. (2009). Bir kamu hizmeti birimi olarak vakıfların Osmanlı toplum yaşamındaki rolü. *Akademik Bakış*, sayı 16.
- Küçükkalay, A. M. (2010). *İktisadi Düşünce Tarihi*. İstanbul:Beta.
- Mansel, A. M. (1971).*Ege ve Yunan Tarihi*. Ankara:Tin Kurumu Yayınları XII1.seri, No.8, Dünya Tam.
- Okumuş, E. (2006). Ibn Haldun'un Osmanlı Düşüncesine Etkisi. *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Sayı 15.



Seignobos, C. (1939). *Avrupa Kavimlerinin Mukayeseli Tarihi*, (çev. Yalçın, Hüseyi).
İstanbul:B Kanaat Kitabevi.

Savaş, V.(2000). *İktisatın Tarihi*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.

<http://sariyersancak.com/osmanli-doneminde-iktisadi-yasam.html>