

# UCLA

## UCLA Historical Journal

### Title

*The Dreadful Day: The Battle of Manzikert.* By ALFRED FRIENDLY.  
London: Hutchinson, 1981. Pp. 256. Maps, bibliography, index, notes.  
\$17.95.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3vr778wj>

### Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 3(0)

### Author

Wojcik, Mark

### Publication Date

1982

### Copyright Information

Copyright 1982 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

the Luba state was probably centered on the control of salt and iron resources, but the actual mechanics of this control are ignored. A deeper analysis of the economic sphere would not only add more substance to the genealogies and history of state expansion, but would help guide historians toward a more holistic understanding of how these large states developed.

The second problem in Reefer's book is that he overlooks Joseph Miller's work on the Mbundu, *Kings and Kinsmen* (1976), in the areas where their work overlaps. In the process of exploring Mbundu history through the use of oral traditions, Miller examined the early Luba genesis myths which are closely related to the Mbundu and Luba myths. His discussion of the possible genesis and dissemination of the Kalala Ilunga character in central Africa may have important ramifications for piecing together the early history of central Africa. Miller suggests, for example, that the telescoping already evident in sixteenth century Luba genealogies implies greater antiquity than is generally presumed. Reefer ignores such findings.

Reefer's work is important for his analysis of Luba political history from about 1700 to 1891, when the Belgians assumed formal control of the area. His sources include the kinglist and the traditions he has gathered, corroborated with the traditions of neighboring peoples, together with archaeological, linguistic, and ethnographic evidence. *The Rainbow and the Kings* begins to clear some new ground, but it is not as satisfying as Miller's *Kings and Kinsmen* or Steven Feierman's *The Shambaa Kingdom* (1974). Both Miller and Feierman approach history through the same sources as Reefer, but have more substantive discussions of the workings of the societies concerned.

Mary Milewski  
University of California, Los Angeles

*The Dreadful Day: The Battle of Manzikert.* By ALFRED FRIENDLY. London: Hutchinson, 1981. Pp. 256. Maps, bibliography, index, notes. \$17.95.

Narrative history has its uses. For those who are new to a subject, unembroidered chronology and minimal, arcane debate prevent boredom and confusion. For the average reader, Byzantium and pre-modern Turkey require such an approach, for the subjects have no foundation in popular awareness. With such things in mind, perhaps one should welcome Alfred Friendly's *The Dreadful Day: The Battle of Manzikert*. The author does not propose to invade the academic precincts. He readily admits his dependence on the linguistic abilities and historical interpretations of several eminent Turkologists and Byzantinists. One cannot fault Friendly in this area, for he does faithfully outline some of the work of Cahen, Grousset, Vryonis, and Ostrogorsky. One wishes, however, that he had added the style and excitement which is the strongest attribute of the history popularizer. For, while the author is careful and

appropriately awed by the experts, the work remains rather pedestrian. Any scholar hoping to see a work that excites popular interest will be disappointed.

The title is a bit misleading. The work is not military history, but a social and political view of Byzantium from 1025 to 1981 as the empire fell from its position of political pre-eminence. While Friendly uses the battle of Manzikert as a symbolic moment in the decline of the Greeks and the rise of the Turks, he rightly spends most of his efforts explaining what factors brought both groups to battle. The Turkish migration from the steppes to the developed lands of the Middle East fills several introductory chapters. Friendly also provides basic descriptions of the Turks' nomadic lifestyle and warlike characteristics. Following the standard interpretation, Friendly then discusses the collapse of the Byzantine military in the years preceding Manzikert, the rise of the feudal magnates, and their internal struggles with the imperial bureaucracy. This, combined with the vagaries of the succession and the incapacity and extravagance of the emperors and empresses, provides a brief, but generally adequate explanation for the feeble response to the Turkish pressures.

If the book performs any special service, it is in reinforcing the view that the damage caused by the battle did not need to be so great. The Turks had no coherent policy of conquest, and they maintained little control over the invading Turkoman nomads. As a result, there was no reason to begin a formal conquest. Rather, Byzantium's internal weaknesses and the rivalry for the throne invited disaster with the introduction of Turkish mercenaries deep into Asia Minor after the battle. Manzikert was only the beginning of the long process of Turkification, often aided by Byzantine shortsightedness.

Insofar as the battle itself can be described from the sources, Friendly has done a satisfactory job. Unfortunately, what is available is far too general to produce a detailed or even a very exciting description of the battle. The reader is left then with a volume of reportage and a decent compendium of available information factually useful for the general reader. *The Dreadful Day* is overall an unengaging exercise which covers a great deal superficially but without the *panache* of the true popularizer. Friendly misses the sense of story and character so alien to most academic works and so welcome to the average reader. One must turn to writers like Sir Stephen Runciman to find the wit, style, and creative use of sources that might excite readers to a more in-depth look at Byzantine history. This cautious work may well serve as the one volume a person reads on the subject, but that is its greatest failure.

Mark Wojcik  
University of California, Los Angeles