

# The Impact of the Battle of Manzikert on the Late Byzantine Empire and Balkan Issues

XIAO CONGRONG<sup>1,2</sup>

*1 College of Art and Design, Guangdong Baiyun university, Guangzhou 510900, Guangdong, China.*

*2 Dept. of Xcultural Studies, Kookmin University, Seoul 02707, Republic of Korea.*

## Article Info

Accepted: 09 November 2024

### Keywords:

Battle of Manzikert; Byzantine Empire; East Roman Empire; Turkification; Komnenos Revival; Balkan Issues

### Corresponding Author:

XIAO CONGRONG

Copyright 2024 by author(s).  
This work is licensed under the  
Creative Commons  
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0  
International License.  
(CC BY NC 4.0).



[doi.org/10.70693/itphss.v2i1.335](https://doi.org/10.70693/itphss.v2i1.335)

## Abstract

The Battle of Manzikert was a significant turning point in the history of the Byzantine Empire, leaving a profound impact on the empire's political, military, and social structures. This paper analyzes the internal and external challenges faced by the Byzantine Empire before and after the battle, including internal power struggles, the gradual collapse of military organization, and the expansion of the Turks in Anatolia, which posed a serious threat to the security of the empire's borders. The defeat at the Battle of Manzikert not only drastically weakened Byzantine control over Anatolian territories but also accelerated the expansion of Turkish influence and internal turmoil, leading to the collapse of the Byzantine defense forces in the region. The Seljuk Turks' invasion triggered an ongoing security crisis. However, the Battle of Manzikert did not directly lead to the destruction of the Byzantine Empire. This paper examines the efforts of the Komnenos dynasty's revival, particularly Alexios I's initiatives to recover lost territories and rebuild imperial strength through military reforms and diplomatic strategies. Despite the partial alleviation of the crisis and temporary stabilization under the Komnenos dynasty, these measures were ultimately insufficient in the long term to prevent further decline, especially in the recovery of Anatolian territories. The paper also explores the process of Turkification in Anatolia after the Battle of Manzikert, where Turkish settlement and cultural infiltration in the region accelerated the loss of Byzantine control. This process not only reshaped the geopolitical landscape of Byzantium but also laid the foundation for the eventual rise of the Ottoman Empire. Finally, the article investigates the long-term impact of Turkish expansion on the former Byzantine-controlled Balkan regions. The spread of Turkish migration had a profound influence on the area of Romania (the Byzantine-controlled Balkans), where Turkish culture and the spread of Islam hastened the fragmentation and heterogenization of the European Balkans. Overall, the Battle of Manzikert was not only a critical juncture in the decline of the Byzantine Empire but also marked the beginning of Turkish dominance in the Near East, with enduring political and social effects on the Balkans.

## 1. The Political, Military, and Social Background of the Byzantine Empire before the Battle of Manzikert

### 1.1 Political Background: Power Struggles and the Decline of Centralization

Before the outbreak of the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire was already engulfed in a

deep political crisis. Since the early 11th century, the empire's central authority had gradually deteriorated, especially after the death of Basil II (r. 976–1025), which led to escalating power struggles and increasing instability in governance. During Basil II's reign, the empire relied on his strong personal leadership and policies to consolidate internal control and successfully curbed the expansion of the provincial aristocracy. However, following his death, the succeeding Byzantine emperors proved to be weak rulers, unable to effectively preserve the empire's authority and stability.

After Basil II's death, the empire descended into frequent succession disputes. The subsequent emperors, such as Michael IV and Constantine IX, all struggled with power conflicts between the imperial court and the provincial nobility. The struggle for the throne was often accompanied by fierce factional rivalries within the aristocracy, further weakening the central government. This was particularly evident during the reigns of Constantine IX (r. 1042–1055) and Michael VI (r. 1056–1057), when central power was severely diminished and the influence of the aristocracy grew significantly.

The conflict between the nobility and imperial power was not confined to the court but extended to the structure of local governance. Through marriages, land grants, and military influence, the aristocracy gradually gained actual control over provincial regions, leading to the central government's increasing loss of authority over these areas. (Roman Shliakhtin, 2024) The rise of provincial military aristocrats, particularly in the empire's eastern frontier regions, further weakened the central government's control over these critical territories. On the eve of the battle, the political landscape of the empire had become extremely complicated. The weakening of imperial power and the rise of the nobility rendered the Byzantine government incapable of effectively addressing external threats, while internal corruption and incompetence exacerbated the empire's crisis.

## **1.2 Military Background: The Collapse of the Theme System and the Rise of the Mercenary System**

The Theme System was one of the most crucial military and administrative structures of the early and middle Byzantine Empire, forming the core of its long-standing defensive capabilities and military superiority. Originating in the 7th century, the system divided the empire's territories into various "themes," each governed by a military general who was responsible for both defense and local administration. By allocating land to soldiers and farmers, the system ensured local defensive forces and, through the self-sufficiency of these theme soldiers, reduced the central government's direct military expenditures. This organizational structure not only significantly enhanced local defense but also strengthened the central government's control over the provinces, helping the Byzantine Empire maintain long-term stability and defense in the face of external threats such as the Arabs, Slavs, and other adversaries.

At its peak, the Theme System divided the empire's eastern frontier in Anatolia into several themes, each with its own military forces under direct central command. These themes were not only critical strongholds for defending against external invasions but also essential to the empire's economic foundation. The success of the system lay in its integration of military and economic functions, as it allowed soldiers to sustain themselves and their families through the land allocation system, minimizing the need for reliance on central funding.

However, from the late 10th century onwards, the Theme System began to decline. After the death of Basil II, the political situation of the Byzantine Empire rapidly deteriorated, with intense internal power struggles and the gradual rise of provincial aristocratic power. The concentration of landownership and the expansion of the aristocratic class became key factors in the disintegration of the Theme System. Local aristocrats, through purchases, annexations, marriages,

and violence, gained control over large tracts of land that once belonged to theme soldiers, leading to a significant decrease in the number of soldiers and a sharp decline in military effectiveness. The widespread phenomenon of land annexation not only weakened the military strength of the empire but also altered the social structure. Many former soldier-farmers lost their land, becoming tenants or laborers dependent on large landowners. This shift in socio-economic structure eroded the foundation of the Byzantine military, as most soldiers no longer had sufficient land to support their livelihood and fulfill their military obligations. As a result, the Theme System lost its original economic and military functions, leading to the collapse of local defensive forces. In Anatolia, this disintegration of the Theme System was especially pronounced. Facing direct threats from the Seljuk Turks, the eastern frontier, once defended by the Theme System, gradually lost its effectiveness by the mid-11th century. The number of theme soldiers dwindled, and the defense system became disorganized, allowing the Turks to easily enter and raid the region. In 1053, Constantine IX dissolved the Iberian theme, further weakening the empire's eastern defenses.

As the Theme System collapsed, the Byzantine Empire increasingly relied on mercenaries to fill the gaps in its army. The rise of the mercenary system was, to some extent, a response to the shortage of theme soldiers. From the mid-11th century onwards, the empire increasingly depended on foreign mercenaries, particularly the Varangian Guard from Scandinavia, Norman knights, and Turkish nomadic warriors, who became the backbone of the Byzantine military. The introduction of mercenaries temporarily boosted the empire's combat effectiveness, especially since many of these mercenaries came from Northern and Western Europe, regions known for their advanced tactics and equipment. However, the mercenary system also brought significant problems. Firstly, mercenaries often lacked loyalty to the Byzantine Empire, especially in unfavorable battle situations, making them prone to desertion or betrayal. A major reason for the Byzantine defeat at the Battle of Manzikert was the betrayal of mercenaries at a critical moment. (Li Yixuan, 2022)

Secondly, the high cost of maintaining a mercenary force placed a heavy financial burden on the Byzantine Empire. Mercenaries demanded high wages and extensive material support, and the heavy reliance on them forced the Byzantine government to raise taxes or cut other essential expenditures to cover these costs. This financial strain was detrimental to the long-term development of the empire, further aggravating its internal economic difficulties and fostering social discontent.

With the collapse of the Theme System and the rise of the mercenary system, the Byzantine Empire's military defense gradually crumbled. The once formidable eastern defense system proved ineffective in the face of continuous Turkish attacks. In 1064, the Seljuk Turks captured the city of Ani in Armenia, marking the further disintegration of the empire's eastern defenses. Meanwhile, internal political turmoil and military corruption further weakened the empire's defense capabilities. By the time of the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire was already in a militarily disadvantageous position. Although Emperor Romanos IV attempted to gather a large army to curb the Turkish expansion, internal factional conflicts within the Byzantine military, the lack of unified command, and the disloyalty of mercenaries led to the complete collapse of the imperial forces in the 1071 battle.

### **1.3 The Rise of the Turks and the Threat to the Empire's Eastern Front**

The rise of the Seljuk Turks was one of the greatest external threats faced by the Byzantine Empire in the 11th century. Originating as a nomadic people from Central Asia, the Seljuks rapidly ascended to power through military conquests, expanding their influence in the vacuum left by the Abbasid Caliphate. Initially, the activities of the Seljuk Turks were limited to Central

Asia and Persia, but as they gradually embraced Islam, they began expanding into surrounding regions, driven by the combination of their military prowess and religious conviction.

The Turks employed highly mobile cavalry tactics, particularly well-suited for the vast plains of Central Asia and Iran. Their cavalry forces possessed exceptional maneuverability, using swift attacks and rapid retreats to outmaneuver infantry-based opponents. This traditional nomadic military model, combined with the religious impetus brought by Islam, provided the Turks with a considerable advantage during their conquests. In the 1040s, the Seljuk Turks successfully defeated the Ghaznavid dynasty and quickly expanded into Persia, Iraq, and farther into the Middle East.

Since the Seljuk Turks' first confrontation with the Byzantine Empire at the Battle of Kapetron in 1048, their expansion into Anatolia accelerated. Although Byzantium achieved a tactical victory in this battle, the Turkish raids on the empire's eastern frontier did not cease. Over the following years, Turkish military activity became increasingly frequent, particularly during the 1050s and 1060s, as they took advantage of the political chaos within the Byzantine Empire and the collapse of its military system to launch a series of successful attacks on its eastern borders. In 1064, the Seljuk Turks achieved a major victory in Armenia by capturing the important Byzantine stronghold of Ani. This city was a key fortress in the Armenian region, and its fall marked a significant defeat for the Byzantine Empire's eastern defenses. The loss of Ani not only deprived Byzantium of crucial control over its eastern frontier but also opened the door for further Turkish expansion into Anatolia.

In 1067, the Turks advanced further into the Byzantine heartland of Anatolia, capturing key cities such as Caesarea. Although Byzantium briefly recaptured some of these territories during a counteroffensive in 1069, the overall momentum of Turkish expansion was unstoppable. During this period, the Turks not only gradually eroded Byzantine control in Anatolia through military victories but also reshaped the region's social and cultural structure through migration and settlement.

By the early 1070s, Turkish military operations in Anatolia became increasingly frequent. In 1071, the Seljuk leader Alp Arslan planned a decisive battle to shatter Byzantine control over Anatolia and expand Seljuk power in the region. Although the Byzantine Empire still nominally controlled most of Anatolia, its actual hold had been greatly weakened. Many frontier fortresses and cities had fallen to Turkish attacks, and the empire's eastern defense line had all but collapsed. Meanwhile, internal political turmoil within Byzantium further undermined the empire's military strength. In response to the Turkish threat, Emperor Romanos IV decided to personally lead his army in a decisive confrontation with the Seljuk Turks. However, after years of internal corruption, the collapse of the Theme System, and the widespread use of mercenaries, the Byzantine army was no longer the formidable force it once had been. Despite having numerical superiority, Romanos IV's army was riddled with internal divisions and organizational chaos, making the outcome of the impending battle highly uncertain.

### **1.3 Summary**

On the eve of the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire was already engulfed in a comprehensive crisis. Internal power struggles had severely undermined the authority of the central government, while the collapse of the Theme System led to the breakdown of the empire's military defense structure. The rapid rise of the Turks further intensified the security crisis along the empire's frontiers. Meanwhile, the deteriorating socio-economic conditions and growing social unrest further weakened the empire's ability to confront external threats. It can be said that the defeat at the Battle of Manzikert was not a mere accident but rather the culmination of the Byzantine Empire's long-term decline. This battle marked a crucial turning point, where the

empire began its irreversible transition from relative strength to gradual decline.

## **2. The Impact of the Battle of Manzikert on the Byzantine Empire**

The Battle of Manzikert was not only a turning point in the military history of the Byzantine Empire but also one of the most devastating events in the empire's late history. The defeat in this battle led to the rapid loss of territories in Anatolia, allowing the Turks to further expand and threaten the security of the empire's borders. At the same time, the Byzantine military system collapsed entirely, while internal power struggles and social unrest intensified, accelerating the process of the empire's decline.

### **2.1 The Fall of Anatolian Territories**

Before the Battle of Manzikert, the Anatolian Peninsula was of critical strategic and economic importance to the Byzantine Empire. As the empire's agricultural heartland and population center, Anatolia not only supplied the majority of the empire's grain and tax revenues but also served as the primary source of soldiers for the Byzantine army. Through the Theme System, the soldier-farmers of Anatolia maintained the empire's defense on its eastern frontiers, effectively resisting invasions from Persia, the Arabs, and later the Turks.

Anatolia was not only economically prosperous but also held significant geographical and strategic importance. Located on the eastern edge of the Byzantine Empire, it served as a bridge connecting Europe and Asia, controlling key routes to Syria, Iraq, and Persia. Losing control over Anatolia would not only weaken the empire's defensive capabilities but also sever crucial commercial and cultural links with the East. Additionally, Anatolia housed important cities such as Nicaea and Caesarea, which were both military strongholds and political and economic centers. After the Fourth Crusade in 1204, which resulted in the fall of Constantinople, Byzantine nobles established the exiled "Empire of Nicaea" in the western part of Anatolia. The rise of the Nicaean Empire as the center of Byzantine revival was due precisely to the strategic location and abundant resources of western Anatolia. This region was agriculturally productive and densely populated; losing it would have been equivalent to losing the economic backbone of Byzantium.

From a purely military strategic perspective, Anatolia was not only a vital barrier for defending against foreign invasions but also a key source of native soldiers for the empire. Before the Battle of Manzikert, the core of the Byzantine army consisted of theme soldiers from Anatolia, who relied on local land and resources to sustain the empire's military strength. Later, the Nicaean Empire also relied on the resources and armies of western Anatolia to counter the threats from the Latin Empire and the Turks. Between 1204 and 1261, the Nicaean Empire was able to effectively defend itself against attacks from the Latin Empire, Bulgaria, and the Sultanate of Rum, largely due to the economic and military foundation provided by Anatolia.

The loss of Anatolia also deprived the Byzantine Empire of a significant portion of its tax revenues. The cities and rural areas of Anatolia had long been the financial backbone of the empire, particularly during the reign of Basil II, when the empire's meticulous taxation system drew immense wealth from the region. However, after the Battle of Manzikert, the empire not only lost these critical sources of revenue but also faced continued Turkish incursions and the internal problem of displaced refugees.

In summary, the Battle of Manzikert was the decisive turning point in the Byzantine Empire's loss of Anatolian territories. Although Byzantium had been facing continuous Turkish raids prior to the battle, it still retained control over vast areas of Anatolia. However, the devastating defeat in 1071 swiftly dismantled the empire's actual control over the region. After the battle, the Byzantine defense in Anatolia collapsed almost completely. With Romanos IV captured, the

Byzantine army's morale plummeted, rendering it incapable of preventing the mass Turkish influx from the east. Although Byzantium managed to retain control over some coastal cities and made continuous efforts to regain control of the interior, as the empire declined, the inland regions gradually fell under Turkish settlement and military control. By the end of the 11th century, Byzantine rule in Anatolia was largely confined to a few coastal cities, while the interior had almost entirely fallen into Turkish hands.

## **2.2 The Continued Invasion by the Turks**

The defeat at the Battle of Manzikert directly led to the continued incursions of the Turks along the borders of the Byzantine Empire. Following the battle, the Turks not only expanded further into the interior of Anatolia but also posed an ongoing threat to the core regions of the empire, particularly the security of Constantinople. Utilizing their highly mobile cavalry, the Turks launched a series of raids and plundering campaigns along Byzantine frontiers. The long-standing security of the empire's eastern border was effectively shattered. The Seljuk Turks not only seized territories through military force but also altered the social and cultural fabric of Anatolia through large-scale settlement activities. The Turks, particularly the nomadic groups, began settling in the heart of Anatolia, bringing with them new agricultural practices and social structures while gradually integrating into local society. Through military and economic means, they increasingly infiltrated Byzantine social structures. (Hüseyin Erkan Bedirhanoğlu, 2017)

Turkish settlement also brought about significant changes in land ownership. As the Turks occupied and settled the lands, they gradually took over properties that had previously belonged to Byzantine farmers. Many Byzantine farmers lost their lands and livelihoods, being forced to migrate or become tenants under Turkish landlords. This shift in land ownership severely weakened the economic foundation of the Byzantine Empire, further accelerating its decline.

As the Turks settled in Anatolia, the previously Greek-Christian social structure under Byzantine rule began to disintegrate. The Turks introduced Islamic culture and engaged in complex interactions with the local Christian population. During this process, Anatolia gradually became a multi-ethnic and multi-religious fusion, and the expansion of Turkish culture in the region laid the groundwork for the eventual rise of the Ottoman Empire.

Despite the Komnenos dynasty's revival efforts, beginning in 1081 under the leadership of Alexios I, their attempts to regain control of Anatolia largely failed. Alexios I implemented fiscal and military reforms, successfully curbing the Turkish threat to the western regions of the empire and stabilizing the core Byzantine territories to some extent. However, his revival policies did not achieve lasting success in Anatolia. Although Alexios I relied on the Crusaders to reclaim some coastal cities in Anatolia and extended influence into the interior, he was ultimately unable to fully restore control over the region. The settlement and infiltration of the Turks in Anatolia became increasingly irreversible over time, and the Byzantine revival policies only temporarily delayed the Turkish expansion without reversing their control over the region. By the late 12th century, Anatolia had effectively transformed from the heartland of the Byzantine Empire into a stronghold for the Turks, who used it as a springboard to interfere in and invade the Balkans.

## **2.3 The Collapse and Reconstruction of the Imperial Military System**

The Battle of Manzikert symbolized the breakdown of the Byzantine military system. Prior to this, the empire had relied on the Theme System to maintain its military strength, but this system had essentially collapsed by the time of the battle. The defeat at Manzikert exacerbated the disintegration of the Byzantine military, as the Theme System could no longer provide sufficient manpower for the empire, and the mercenary system, plagued by high costs and unreliable loyalty, proved ineffective.

In the Byzantine army of the 11th century, mercenaries played an increasingly important role,

with soldiers from various ethnic groups from both the West and the East forming the backbone of the military. These mercenaries included Normans, Slavs, Pechenegs, Catalans, and Turks. Among them, Turkish mercenaries occupied a unique position: as the Seljuk Turks continued their incursions into Anatolia, the Byzantine Empire began to collaborate with certain Turkish tribes and mercenaries. This cooperation dates back to the early 11th century, including the presence of Turkish mercenaries during the Battle of Manzikert. By the reign of Alexios I, the empire frequently employed Turkish mercenaries to counter the invasions of other Turkish tribes. For instance, Alexios hired Turkish cavalry to help fend off the powerful Norman onslaught. However, this dual role of Turkish mercenaries posed significant risks. While they provided Byzantium with mobile and flexible cavalry, which helped counter attacks from nomadic Turkish forces, their loyalty to the empire was often shallow, driven more by payment and plunder than by allegiance. As a result, Byzantium's reliance on these mercenaries during battles came with serious issues of command and loyalty.

During the Battle of Manzikert, the structural weaknesses of the Byzantine army were fully exposed. Due to the heavy dependence on mercenaries, the army suffered from poor cohesion and low command efficiency. Many mercenaries deserted or even betrayed the emperor during the battle, leading directly to the defeat. This unstable military structure left Byzantium not only incapable of resisting the Turkish offensive on the battlefield but also unable to effectively defend its borders after the battle.

The catastrophic defeat at Manzikert was not just a military loss; it marked the complete collapse of Byzantium's traditional military system. Before the battle, the empire had already relied heavily on foreign mercenaries to compensate for the shortcomings of its native forces. The defeat exposed the fragility of the mercenary system. After the battle, Byzantium not only lost a significant portion of its elite forces but also struggled to quickly rebuild an effective military. The empire's eastern frontiers were almost entirely overrun, as the Turks swiftly advanced and occupied much of Anatolia. The collapse of the army directly led to the disintegration of Byzantine rule in the region, allowing Turkish settlement in Anatolia to accelerate.

Moreover, the capture of Emperor Romanos IV during the Battle of Manzikert severely undermined the empire's legitimacy and military command authority. As the symbolic leader of the imperial army, the emperor's capture dealt a heavy blow to morale and created a power vacuum within the Byzantine leadership. The imperial army could no longer recover its former discipline and fighting capabilities. The collapse of the Theme System, the failure of the mercenary system, and the central government's declining control over the military collectively contributed to the final disintegration of the empire's military system. In the aftermath, the army's cohesion further deteriorated, and the empire could not rapidly assemble a force strong enough to defend its territories.

Although Byzantium experienced a period of chaos and decline after the Battle of Manzikert, the Komnenos dynasty, especially under Alexios I (r. 1081–1118), attempted to rebuild the Byzantine military through reforms. Alexios implemented a series of measures aimed at strengthening the military, including centralizing authority and rebuilding the empire's financial system to support a stronger army. He also made extensive use of external allies and mercenaries, particularly Latin mercenaries, to supplement the empire's forces. However, Alexios's reforms did not completely resolve the underlying issues within the Byzantine military system. Despite successfully repelling further invasions by the Normans and Turks, the dependence on mercenaries remained a persistent problem. While the Komnenos dynasty temporarily restored some of the empire's military strength, the overall system was still overly reliant on external forces rather than self-sustaining native soldiers. The Turkish threat remained unresolved, and Byzantine territory in

Anatolia continued to be gradually eroded.

## **2.4 Intensified Internal Power Struggles and the Restructuring of the Political System**

The defeat at the Battle of Manzikert not only brought catastrophic military consequences to the Byzantine Empire but also directly triggered internal power struggles and political chaos. The capture of Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes during the battle dealt a severe blow to the stability of the Byzantine government. Before the battle, Romanos IV had attempted to revive the empire's military strength and suppress the expansion of the aristocracy through strong military measures. However, his failure caused his political base to collapse, and after the battle, the Byzantine court quickly descended into intense power struggles.

The rise of Romanos IV to power was itself a result of internal factional conflict. During his reign, tensions between aristocratic factions and struggles for imperial authority had become increasingly apparent. Romanos sought to reassert Byzantine control over Anatolia and consolidate his rule through military actions against the Turks and a reorganization of the imperial army. However, the Doukas family and other aristocratic opposition saw Romanos as a threat. Particularly after his military defeat, the aristocracy swiftly acted to diminish his influence. When news of Romanos IV's capture reached Constantinople, internal opposition forces moved quickly. The emperor's political rivals, led by court aristocrats and the Doukas family, seized the opportunity to launch a coup, deposing Romanos from the throne. Mere months after his capture, the aristocracy elevated Michael VII Doukas to the throne, allowing the Doukas family to regain control of the Byzantine political center. This power shift highlighted the fragility of the Byzantine political system, as factional struggles intensified and the central government's authority further weakened.

However, the ascension of Michael VII Doukas did not bring political stability to the empire. On the contrary, the Doukas family's rule was heavily criticized for policy failures and incompetence, particularly their inaction in addressing the empire's growing fiscal crisis and military setbacks. These failures led to continued internal unrest. Michael VII himself lacked the ability to govern effectively, and his policies were largely dictated by court officials and aristocrats, particularly the eunuch Nikephoros Bryennios. This bureaucratic rule and the expansion of aristocratic influence further eroded central authority. Romanos IV, after being released, attempted to reclaim the throne, but his efforts ended in failure. The aristocratic forces united against his return to power and launched military action to suppress him. Eventually, Romanos was captured and brutally executed. His death marked not only his personal defeat but also demonstrated the fragility of imperial authority in the face of aristocratic factional conflict.

As power struggles within the central government escalated, they quickly spread to the provinces. Local aristocrats and military warlords took advantage of the weakening central government to expand their control over their respective territories, effectively becoming regional powers. During this period, many local warlords and aristocratic factions gained increasing autonomy. While they nominally pledged allegiance to the emperor in Constantinople, in reality, they no longer followed the central government's orders. The rise of local warlords, particularly in Anatolia and the Balkans, deepened the fragmentation of Byzantine governance. Many military commanders in Anatolia and local Greek aristocrats even formed alliances with the Turks to maintain their control over certain areas. This phenomenon weakened the Byzantine central government's grip on its frontier regions and facilitated the Turks' further expansion into Anatolia. A similar situation unfolded in the Balkans, near Constantinople. Local aristocrats and warlords capitalized on the power vacuum created by the battle, gradually consolidating their power in their respective regions, challenging the authority of the central government. The trend of



regional fragmentation continued to expand during this time. Although these local powers nominally recognized the authority of the Komnenos dynasty as it rose to power, their actual independence grew stronger. This phenomenon not only further weakened Byzantine overall control but also prevented the empire from effectively mobilizing forces in time to address external threats.

Politically, the defeat at the Battle of Manzikert intensified internal power struggles and political disorder. The capture of Romanos IV and the rise of the Doukas family marked the further weakening of imperial authority, as central power crumbled amidst conflicts between aristocrats and local warlords. The spread of regional fragmentation, deepening tensions between the aristocracy and the military, and the widening gap between the rich and the poor all exacerbated the decline of the empire. Ultimately, the Battle of Manzikert not only destroyed Byzantium's primary military forces but also planted the seeds for a prolonged political crisis within the empire.

## **2.5 Summary**

One of the immediate consequences of the Battle of Manzikert was the large-scale settlement and cultural expansion of the Turks in the Anatolian region. The victory in the battle transformed the Turks from mere military invaders at the eastern borders of Byzantium into settlers who began to inhabit these areas. Through land occupation and resource control, they gradually altered the local social structure. A significant influx of nomadic Turkish tribes poured into Anatolia, where they established villages, settled, and began to engage in cultural and economic interactions with the local populations. The settlement of Turks in Anatolia not only brought about major demographic changes but also facilitated the spread of Islamic culture. The traditional Greek-Christian culture of Byzantium was gradually replaced by the Islamized Turkish culture. During this process, the Turks, through land acquisition, military control, and coexistence with the remnants of Byzantine forces, created a complex socio-cultural landscape. Anatolia gradually became the center of Turkish power, laying the foundation for the future rise of the Ottoman Empire.

In the long term, the defeat at the Battle of Manzikert had catastrophic consequences for the Byzantine Empire. The battle not only led to the rapid loss of territories in Anatolia but also created favorable conditions for the Turks' long-term settlement and expansion in the region. The continuous Turkish incursions brought a persistent security crisis, and the complete collapse of the Byzantine military system, combined with intensifying internal power struggles and social unrest, signaled an irreversible decline for the empire. This battle was not only a military failure but also a catalyst for the disintegration of the empire's political and social structures, accelerating Byzantium's collapse and eventual demise. Although the Komnenos dynasty introduced several reform measures, these efforts failed to fundamentally resolve the underlying issues of social instability, ultimately leading the Byzantine Empire further into decline under the pressure of both internal and external threats.

## **3. The Komnenos Restoration and the Reconquest Movement**

After the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire plunged into a severe military, political, and economic crisis. The empire lost control over most of Anatolia, allowing the Turks to rapidly expand across these territories and pose a direct threat to the core regions of Byzantium. In addition, internal political struggles exacerbated the chaos, as the weakening of imperial authority and the growing power of the aristocracy made it increasingly difficult for the central government to effectively respond to external threats. Against this backdrop, the Komnenos dynasty, through strong leadership and a series of reforms, managed to achieve a partial revival of the empire. (Sun Lifang, 2020)

### **3.1 The Rise of the Komnenos Dynasty**

In the decades following the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire was mired in persistent political turmoil and military threats, as the Turkish invasions and internal divisions created an unprecedented crisis for the empire. Alexios I Komnenos (r. 1081–1118), the founder of the Komnenos dynasty, was the central figure in advancing the process of Byzantine revival during this period. Born into a prominent military aristocratic family, Alexios had been involved in imperial military affairs from a young age. In 1081, amid internal strife and external pressures, he ascended to the throne by overthrowing Nikephoros III Botaneiates. At the time, the Byzantine Empire faced invasions from the Normans, Turks, and Pechenegs, prompting Alexios to initiate a series of reforms aimed at restoring the empire's strength. His reign marked the beginning of the gradual recovery from the post-Manzikert chaos, as he sought to rebuild both the lost territories and the military advantage in Anatolia.

Upon taking the throne, Alexios quickly stabilized the empire's internal situation. He secured the support of the aristocracy through strategic marriages with influential noble families and by granting them lands and titles. Recognizing that military reform was crucial to the empire's revival, Alexios embarked on a reconstruction of the imperial army. This included enhancing the empire's defense system by recruiting Western European mercenaries and strengthening central control over the military, laying the foundation for future resistance against external threats.

One of Alexios's immediate challenges upon his ascension was the Norman threat. The Normans had already captured the empire's western territories, including key strategic ports like Dyrrhachium, posing a direct threat to the empire's heartlands. Although Alexios suffered a defeat at the Battle of Dyrrhachium in 1081, he continued to resist through persistence and diplomatic efforts. This culminated in the alleviation of the Norman threat in 1085 following the death of their leader, Robert Guiscard. Simultaneously, Alexios employed diplomatic strategies to forge alliances, such as securing the support of the Cumans. This culminated in his decisive victory over the Pechenegs at the Battle of Levounion in 1091, thus neutralizing the northern threat to the empire.

### **3.2 The Military and Diplomatic Strategies of Alexios I**

While addressing external threats, Alexios I recognized that the long-term security and stability of the empire had to be based on a strong military force. However, after the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine army was on the verge of collapse. The Theme System had gradually become ineffective, with local aristocrats controlling most of the land and military resources, leaving the central government unable to effectively muster troops. Consequently, Alexios had to rely on mercenaries, particularly knights and soldiers from Western Europe.

Alexios I's reforms began with the reconstruction of the Byzantine military system. He introduced a new feudal military system known as the Pronoia System, which granted land to nobles and military commanders in exchange for providing troops when needed. This system, similar to the feudal structures in Western Europe, allowed Alexios to restore some of the empire's military strength, especially in Anatolia and the Balkans. Additionally, he reinforced control over the aristocracy, preventing the excessive expansion of local powers.

Alexios I's diplomatic acumen also played a crucial role in the revival of the empire. In 1095, Alexios requested military assistance from Pope Urban II, a move that directly sparked the First Crusade. Although Alexios initially sought a small, elite force of Western mercenaries to help recover lost territories in Anatolia, the scale of the First Crusade far exceeded his expectations. Alexios skillfully leveraged the Crusaders' presence to his advantage, successfully recapturing key cities in Anatolia, such as Nicaea in 1097, temporarily restoring Byzantine control over parts of the region. (Li Xin, 2015)

Alexios I's 37-year reign laid the foundation for the continued revival of the Komnenos dynasty. Through the rebuilding of the army, fiscal reforms, and deft diplomacy, he managed to stabilize an empire on the brink of collapse. While his reforms alleviated the Byzantine crisis in the short term, they also provided a relatively stable base for subsequent Komnenian rulers, such as John II Komnenos and Manuel I Komnenos.

Following Alexios, both John II and Manuel I continued his military and economic reforms, achieving some success in their campaigns in Anatolia and the Balkans. During this period, Byzantium once again became a significant power in the Eastern Mediterranean. Despite facing dual threats from the Crusader states in the West and the Turks in the East, the rulers of the Komnenos dynasty managed to maintain the empire's survival and influence through careful military and diplomatic strategies.

### **3.3 The Komnenos Restoration and the Reconquest of Lost Territories**

Under the rule of Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118), the Byzantine Empire began to recover and gradually reclaimed some of its lost territories, particularly with the assistance of the First Crusade. In 1097, the Byzantines, with the support of the Crusaders, successfully recaptured the critical city of Nicaea during the Battle of Nicaea.

Nicaea (modern-day Iznik, Turkey) was a strategically important city in Byzantine Anatolia and played a crucial role at several points in the empire's history. It had served as the capital for the Turks and became a focal point for Byzantium's attempt to regain influence over Anatolia. For Alexios I, regaining control of Nicaea was one of his most significant military and political achievements in his efforts to restore the empire. After the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire lost most of its economic resources in Anatolia, including its agricultural and commercial base, leading to a sharp decline in fiscal revenues. Nicaea, with its fertile farmland and rich artisanal resources, was vital for Byzantium's economic recovery.

In addition to its military and economic significance, Nicaea held immense importance in Byzantine religious and cultural life. The city was famous for hosting the First Council of Nicaea in 325, which established core Christian doctrines. Losing this region was not only a military and economic blow but also a major cultural and religious setback for Byzantium.

The successful recapture of Nicaea by Alexios I not only marked the restoration of Byzantine control over a part of Anatolia but also symbolized the empire's partial recovery of its religious and cultural authority. As a historically significant Christian site, Nicaea's return helped reinforce Byzantium's leadership in religious matters, stabilized the influence of the Orthodox Church, and restored some of the people's confidence in the empire.

As the capital of the Sultanate of Rum, Nicaea's strategic importance extended beyond its military and economic value. For Byzantium, losing Nicaea symbolized imperial decline, while its recovery was a critical victory for Alexios I's restoration efforts. The recapture of Nicaea allowed Byzantium to regain a foothold and control part of Anatolia. This victory greatly enhanced Alexios's prestige both domestically and abroad, solidifying his position within the court and the military.

Following the recovery of Nicaea, the city became not only a gateway for the Byzantines to re-enter Anatolia but also a military and political base for further reconquests. Nicaea's location made it a key outpost for future Byzantine military operations, allowing the empire to launch further offensives into Turkish-occupied territories. Although Alexios did not fully restore control over all of Anatolia during his reign, the recapture of Nicaea laid the foundation for future campaigns. Later, the Byzantine Empire, from its base in Nicaea, eventually overthrew the Latin Empire, and the restoration of Byzantium under the Palaiologos dynasty was largely rooted in the foundation established during this period.

In addition, the Battle of Philomelion in 1116 demonstrated the strategic advantage of the Byzantine army under Alexios I, who employed a series of tactical maneuvers to defeat the Turkish forces of the Sultanate of Rum. This victory was crucial in solidifying Byzantine control over the northwestern part of Anatolia.

By the time of Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143–1180), the Byzantine Empire continued this recovery process, attempting to reverse the effects of the Battle of Manzikert. Manuel I achieved notable victories, such as in the Battle of Hyelion and Leimocheir in 1177, where he successfully defeated Turkish forces, showcasing the growing tactical sophistication of the Byzantine military and their partial control over Anatolia.

However, the Battle of Myriokephalon in 1176 marked a significant military defeat for Byzantium and represented the last major attempt to recover the interior regions of Anatolia. In this battle, the Byzantine forces, on their way to the Turkish capital of Konya, were ambushed by Turkish forces, resulting in heavy losses. Although subsequent victories demonstrated that the Byzantine military still possessed some capability to launch effective counterattacks, the defeat at Myriokephalon signaled the end of large-scale Byzantine offensives in Anatolia and confirmed that Turkish control of the region would persist.

Furthermore, external powers were not always reliable allies for the Byzantine Empire. Although the Crusaders initially aided Byzantium in securing key victories that reversed many of the consequences of the Battle of Manzikert, cooperation between the Crusaders and Byzantium was often fraught with tension. The Crusaders were frequently more concerned with their own interests, leading to strained relations. For instance, during the contest for Antioch, the Crusaders refused to return the city to Byzantine control and eventually established their own Crusader state. This betrayal deprived Byzantium of a crucial ally in future military campaigns.

Overall, Byzantium's efforts to reconquer lost territories experienced numerous ups and downs. Through the military reforms of Alexios I and Manuel I, the empire managed to reclaim important cities such as Nicaea and, with the aid of the Crusaders, regained control over portions of its former territories. However, with the defeat at Myriokephalon, hopes for fully restoring the empire began to fade, as much of Anatolia remained under Turkish control. Additionally, while the initial cooperation with the Crusaders yielded some successes, conflicting interests ultimately led to the breakdown of this alliance, further limiting Byzantium's ability to expand its influence eastward. Throughout this process, Byzantium's military and diplomatic strategies displayed resilience, but the empire's long-term revival remained constrained by external invasions and internal divisions. This, in turn, set the stage for the eventual rise of the Ottoman Empire and the final fall of Byzantium.

### **3.4 Summary**

Alexios I Komnenos successfully rebuilt part of the Byzantine Empire's strength after the crisis following the Battle of Manzikert through military, diplomatic, and economic reforms. His strategies helped the empire recover some of its lost territories, particularly through the utilization of the Crusaders, which temporarily restored control over parts of Anatolia. However, the limitations of these reforms became evident in the long run. Byzantium was unable to fully regain control over Anatolia, and its reliance on mercenaries and the growing influence of Western powers introduced new challenges for the empire's future. Ultimately, although the Komnenos dynasty brought about a brief revival under Alexios I, it was insufficient to prevent the empire's gradual decline.

First, despite Alexios's successes in reclaiming some territories through the use of mercenaries and the Crusaders, Byzantine control over Anatolia remained fragile. Turkish settlements in the region had already fundamentally altered the social and cultural fabric of Anatolia, and

Byzantium was unable to fully reestablish effective governance over these areas. The successors of Alexios, such as John II Komnenos and Manuel I Komnenos, continued efforts to maintain control over Anatolia, but the expansion of Turkish influence was ultimately inevitable.

Second, Alexios's reliance on foreign mercenaries became a significant issue within the Byzantine military system. While mercenaries boosted the empire's military capabilities in the short term, they often lacked loyalty to Byzantium, and their high cost placed long-term financial strain on the empire. This reliance on external forces made it difficult for Byzantium to rebuild a self-sustaining military force in later conflicts.

Finally, although Alexios's monetary and fiscal reforms stabilized the empire's economy to some extent, they also led to a gradual loss of economic autonomy due to concessions to Western powers and dependence on external trade. The growing influence of Western maritime republics within the empire eroded Byzantine economic sovereignty, laying the groundwork for future challenges, including the establishment of the Latin Empire by the Crusaders.

In conclusion, while Alexios I's reforms provided a temporary respite and revival for the Byzantine Empire, they could not fully reverse the long-term decline that the empire was experiencing. The structural weaknesses in military reliance, economic concessions, and the inability to completely reclaim Anatolia marked the limitations of the Komnenos dynasty's efforts, ultimately leading to continued challenges that the empire would face in the following centuries.

#### **4. The Long-Term Impact of Turkish Migration on the Rumelia Region**

The Battle of Manzikert marked the weakening of the Byzantine Empire's military power in Anatolia and initiated the large-scale Turkification of the region. Following this decisive battle, the Seljuk Turks gradually infiltrated and settled in the eastern Byzantine territories, transforming Anatolia from a Byzantine heartland into a region increasingly dominated by Turkish control. This shift entailed not only a redistribution of military power but also significant cultural, religious, and demographic changes.

In this context, the Turks gradually transitioned from nomadic warriors to settled inhabitants, establishing political structures and forming new societal frameworks. Between the 11th and 14th centuries, Turkish migration facilitated the spread of Islam, the dissemination of the Turkish language, and transformations in local economic systems. These changes profoundly affected the governance structures of the Byzantine Empire, particularly in terms of the Turkification of Anatolia and its adjacent Balkan regions, historically referred to as "Romania" or "Rumelia."(Xiao Congrong, 2022) The long-term effects of this migration process reshaped the social, political, and cultural landscape of these regions, leaving an enduring legacy that influenced the balance of power in both Anatolia and the Balkans.(OKUR Mehmet, 2005)

##### **4.1 Turkish Migration and the Byzantine-Controlled Balkans**

As the Turks solidified their settlement in Anatolia, the Byzantine Empire not only suffered militarily but also witnessed significant changes in its administrative and social structures. The Byzantine Theme System was gradually replaced by Turkish military structures, especially in Anatolia, and this shift eventually had a ripple effect in the Balkans.

Following the Battle of Manzikert, the Byzantine Empire faced severe internal and external crises. Political power struggles and the rise of local military aristocrats weakened the central government's control over peripheral regions. At the same time, the Theme System decayed, and the military forces that once supported border defenses steadily declined. This internal fragility provided an opportunity for Turkish migration to penetrate not only into the Anatolian heartland but also into the Balkan region, known historically as "Romania" or the "Rumelia region,"

previously under Byzantine control. Turkish migration initially took the form of military occupation and settlement, with Turks arriving as invaders in Anatolia and gradually spreading into other Byzantine territories.

For instance, the feudal system established by the Turks blended with the existing local aristocratic structures of Byzantium, forming a new hybrid ruling class. Turkish aristocrats consolidated their power through land control and the collection of the *jizya* (a head tax imposed on non-Muslims), which would later become a key mechanism under Ottoman rule in Rumelia. Under this new order, the local Byzantine aristocracy in the Balkans was progressively marginalized, giving way to a rising class of Turkified Muslim elites. These changes had lasting effects on the social structure of the region, particularly in agriculture and the military.

The Balkans, already a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural region under Byzantine rule, operated under a relatively decentralized system that combined central authority with local autonomy. The Turks initially entered the Balkans through military invasions and gradually settled. As they established themselves, Turkish culture, Islam, and social customs began to spread across Byzantine-held territories. This was especially evident in areas such as Bosnia and Albania. The alliances between Turkish mercenaries and local aristocrats accelerated the spread of Turkish culture while simultaneously weakening Byzantine control over these regions. The Turkish incursion into Byzantine territories was not just a process of military expansion; it was also a gradual reorganization of the cultural, religious, demographic, and social order. The introduction of Islam by the Turks rapidly influenced the religious and social fabric, particularly in frontier regions where Byzantine control had always been more tenuous. This cultural infiltration took place over centuries, as the Turks solidified their presence by controlling trade routes, conquering lands, and forging alliances with local elites in the Balkans.

Turkish migration brought not only cultural and religious changes but also a reconstruction of social hierarchies and economic systems. In the broader Balkan region, Islam quickly became the dominant religion introduced by the Turks, especially in Bosnia and Albania, where it became the foundation for the legitimization of Muslim aristocrats and local rulers, further consolidating Ottoman power. Albania, in particular, was at the forefront of this expansion.

In the 14th century, the rise of the Ottoman Empire had a profound impact on the religious and social structure of Albania. Under Byzantine rule, Albania had been a multi-ethnic society, but as the Turks entered, Islam gradually supplanted the Orthodox Christian dominance. This shift also transformed Albania's social hierarchy. The land tenure system and religious policies introduced by the Turks altered the local economy, with the original local aristocracy being replaced by Turkified elites. At the same time, Ottoman administrative structures infiltrated all levels of Albanian society, reshaping its socio-political and cultural fabric. Many Albanian nobles chose to cooperate with the Ottoman Empire, and over time, Islam became the dominant religion, a legacy that persists in Albania to this day.

In Bosnia, the impact of Turkish migration was even more profound. The Kingdom of Bosnia fell to the Ottoman Empire in 1463, and Bosnia became an Ottoman province. Under Ottoman rule, Islam became the dominant religion in Bosnia, and the Muslim population eventually surpassed other religious groups, creating a society dominated by Turkish culture and Islam. Turkish migration not only altered Bosnia's religious and demographic landscape but also introduced new land tenure systems and administrative structures. The Ottoman feudal system, applied in Bosnia, distributed land to Turkish nobles and military officers, further weakening the local Christian aristocracy. This new social structure fostered the Islamization of Bosnian society and had long-lasting effects on ethnic and religious relations in the region.

In summary, the penetration of Turkish culture caused significant changes to the social structures

in the Balkans. Many local aristocrats chose to convert to Islam, gaining the support of the Ottoman Empire, while this newly emerging Muslim elite became the pillars of Ottoman control in the Balkans. Although most Balkan inhabitants remained adherents of Orthodox Christianity during the early Ottoman period, the influence of Islam rapidly grew within the elite, fundamentally transforming the region's social and political dynamics.

#### **4.2 The Roots of Long-Term Turmoil in the Balkans**

After securing their position in Anatolia, the Turks gradually expanded westward, with the rise of the Ottoman Empire providing strong support for further Turkish expansion into the Balkans. Between the late 13th and 14th centuries, the Ottoman Empire steadily entered the Balkans through a combination of military conquest and diplomatic maneuvering, exploiting the weakened state of the Byzantine Empire to extend its influence in Southeastern Europe. As the Ottomans expanded, the small states and local aristocracies of the Balkans increasingly fell under Ottoman control, either through vassalage or direct annexation.

The expansion of Turkish power into the Balkans brought not only political and military domination but also a complete transformation of the region's social, economic, and religious structures. The Ottomans introduced a new land tenure system, known as the Timar System, which redistributed land to Turkish nobles and military officers. This system allowed the Ottoman rulers to effectively control agricultural production while ensuring a stable source of military support. Economically, the Ottoman land and taxation systems reshaped local economic structures. Particularly in Bosnia and Albania, newly emerged Islamic nobles and local officials managed land and taxation, integrating the local peasantry into the Ottoman economic framework. At the same time, the introduction of Turkish culture and Islam altered local customs and lifestyles. (Ma Xipu, 1999).

On the religious front, as Turkish influence expanded, Islam became the dominant religion in many parts of the Balkans. Many local nobles in Albania and Bosnia converted to Islam under Ottoman rule, not only gaining economic benefits but also enhancing their social standing within Ottoman society. Meanwhile, the Ottoman Empire strictly regulated the Eastern Orthodox and Catholic communities. Although these Christian groups were not entirely suppressed, their influence gradually waned, and Christians became second-class citizens under Ottoman rule, subject to the payment of the jizya tax. (Han Mingxiang, 2002)

The long-term Ottoman rule had a profound impact on the ethnic and religious composition of the Balkans. The spread of Islam dramatically altered the religious landscape of the region, deepening the divisions and conflicts between Muslims, Orthodox Christians, and Catholics. For example, in Bosnia, as the Muslim population grew, Orthodox and Catholic communities were gradually marginalized, with many Christians forced to pay the jizya tax, which exacerbated tensions between religious groups. This religious and ethnic division sowed the seeds for modern-day conflicts in the Balkans. With the rise of nationalism in the 19th century, conflicts between Muslims and Christians in the Balkans became increasingly violent, and the decline of the Ottoman Empire further intensified these divisions. In Bosnia and Albania, the historical conflicts between Islam and Christianity provided a complex backdrop for later nationalist movements, and the long-term instability of the Balkans continues to shape the political and social structures of these nations today.

### **5. Conclusion**

The Battle of Manzikert was a pivotal turning point in the history of the Byzantine Empire, marking the beginning of the empire's decline. Prior to the battle, Byzantium was already embroiled in political, military, and social crises, with the collapse of central authority, the

disintegration of the Theme System, and the rapid rise of the Turks posing a significant threat to the empire's eastern frontier. The defeat at Manzikert led to the loss of Byzantine control over Anatolia, accelerating Turkish expansion in the region and severely weakening the empire's defense system and social structure. Although the Komnenos dynasty attempted to revive the empire through reforms and military efforts, they were unable to reverse the process of Turkification or recover the lost territories.

Another significant outcome of the battle was the expansion of Turkish migration, which not only accelerated cultural, religious, and social transformations in Anatolia but also had a profound impact on the Byzantine-controlled Balkans, particularly in present-day Bosnia and Albania. With the rise of the Ottoman Empire, Islam spread throughout the Balkans, reshaping the social structure as Muslim elites replaced the previous Christian nobility. The Ottoman land and taxation systems, alongside the spread of Islamic culture, facilitated the processes of Islamization and Turkification in the Balkans. These changes laid the groundwork for the religious and ethnic conflicts that have shaped the modern Balkans and contributed to the region's long-term instability. (Ma Shouxin & Wang Yuqin, 2004)

In conclusion, while the Battle of Manzikert did not directly lead to the collapse of the Byzantine Empire, it was a critical turning point in its weakening and marked the beginning of Turkish and Islamic expansion in the Near East. The battle had far-reaching consequences, not only for the Byzantine Empire but also for the political and social landscape of the modern Balkan states.

## References (Times New Roman, 12, Bold)

[1] Roman Shliakhtin. (2024). Georgios Theotokis. The campaign and battle of Manzikert, 1071. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (3). doi:10.1515/BZ-2024-1170314.

[2] Xiao Congrong. (2022). An exploration of the concept of "Rome" in the post-medieval Romanian region. *Youth Years* (12), 42-44. doi:CNKI:SUN.0.2022-12-015.

[3] Li Yixuan. (2022). Re-discussion on the historical impact of the Battle of Manzikert. *History Teaching* (06), 19-26. doi:CNKI:SUN.0.2022-06-003.

[4] Sun Lifang. (2020). Was Alexios I a "scorpion"? – The First Crusade from a Byzantine perspective. *DUSHU* (10), 136-142. doi:CNKI:SUN.0.2020-10-029.

[5] Hüseyin Erkan Bedirhanoğlu. (2017). Pre-Ottoman political situation in Anatolia after the 1071 Manzikert War. *Journal of International Scientific Researches* (7). doi:10.23834/isrjournal.362609.

[6] Li Xinhang. (2016). Preliminary discussion on the relationship between the Crusades and Byzantium (Master's thesis, Tianjin Normal University). <https://kns.cnki.net/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?dbname=CMFD201602&filename=1016108184.nh>

[7] Li Xin. (2015). A study of the foreign policy of Manuel I (Master's thesis, Zhengzhou University). <https://kns.cnki.net/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?dbname=CMFD201601&filename=1015302604.nh>

[8] McMahon Lucas. (2014). The Road to Manzikert: Byzantine and Islamic Warfare, 527–1071 (by Brian Todd Carey, Joshua B. Allfree, and John Cairns). *The Mediaeval Journal* (2). doi:10.1484/j.tmj.5.103244.



- [9] (2013). Balkan peninsula, (area of Üsküp, modern Skopje, Macedonia)?, vilayet Rumeli, c.2013. *The Numismatic Chronicle* (1966-).
- [10] Cinar Burak. (2013). "Book-review" Road to Manzikert – Byzantine and Islamic Warfare 527-1071. *Medieval Warfare* (2).
- [11] Luo Chunmei. (2012). An analysis of the impact of the first three Crusades on Byzantium. *Gansu Social Sciences* (04), 94-97. doi:10.15891/j.cnki.cn62-1093/c.2012.04.017.
- [12] Zhang Like. (2011). A preliminary analysis of the background and impact of the Battle of Manzikert. *Journal of Huzhou Vocational and Technological College* (02), 57-60+64. doi:10.13690/j.cnki.hzyxb.2011.02.008.
- [13] OKUR Mehmet. (2005). A request from the Rumeli Muslim Immigrants Society regarding the practices faced by Turks in Bulgaria. *Journal of Turkish Research Institute* (28). doi:10.14222/TURKIYAT725.
- [14] Ma Shouxin, Wang Yuqin. (2004). The origins of the Balkan issue. *History Learning* (Z1), 11-12. doi:CNKI:SUN.0.2004-Z1-005.
- [15] Svetlana Ivanova. (2003). The Empire's "own" foreigners: Armenians and Acem tüccar in Rumeli in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Oriente Moderno* (3).
- [16] Han Mingxiang. (2002). Historical exploration of the Balkan issue. *Journal of Heilongjiang Nongken Normal College* (02), 12-14. doi:CNKI:SUN.0.2002-02-004.
- [17] Ma Xipu. (1999). The origins and development of Balkan Muslims. *Journal of World Peoples Studies* (03), 28-38. doi:CNKI:SUN.0.1999-03-005.