
Frontier gentlemen's club: Felix Kanitz and Balkan archaeology

Vladimir V. Mihajlović

Histories of archaeology show that our disciplinary knowledge has immensely diverse origins, in terms of its interactions not just with other fields of scholarly inquiry, but within the field of archaeology itself. Routes of communication exist outside 'regular' academic channels and have a great influence on the production and transmission of disciplinary knowledge. Knowledge that is now perceived as canonical has often been conceived through contacts made outside institutional circles and their strict rules. Archaeological knowledge, as well as scientific knowledge in general, like any other form of knowledge, is 'a cultural formation, embedded in wider networks of social relations and political power, and shaped by the local environments in which practitioners carry out their tasks' (Livingstone, 2002: 236; on the social nature of knowledge see Latour, 1996, 2005; Law, 1992). The socio-/geopolitical nature of knowledge that David Livingstone writes about can be clearly seen in the life and work of Felix Kanitz (1829–1904), one of the greatest researchers of the Balkans (and their past) in the nineteenth century. Géza Fehér, the author of the first and still the most comprehensive biography of Kanitz (1932), gave him the flattering nickname 'Columbus of the Balkans'. Kanitz was once perceived as the discoverer of the lands south of the Sava-Danube river boundary, and his books are still 'a veritable mine of rich and scholarly information' on the Balkans – and Serbia and Bulgaria in particular – hence, 'no attempt at summarizing this achievement can do it credit' (Todorova, 2009 [1997]: 71). Kanitz's work on the Balkan lands brought him a great deal of recognition: he was decorated by the Austrian emperor and the Serbian king, and named an honorary member of several learned societies,

including the Serbian Learned Society, the Serbian Royal Academy and the Royal Saxon Academy. His publications cover numerous fields of academic inquiry: geography, ethnography, demography, linguistics, folklore, art and, of course, archaeology. Kanitz is celebrated as the author of 'some of the most important early works on archaeology in Serbia' (Novaković, 2011: 387). His enquiries were followed by modern researchers. Petar Petrović and Miloje Vasić, who took part in the large-scale rescue excavations conducted in the Iron Gates gorge, write that 'the validity of documents left by Kanitz could be evaluated best [*sic*]' (Petrović and Vasić, 1996: 15). Kanitz collaborated with the leading scholars and stakeholders of his time, and thus he – at the very least – laid the foundations of Serbian archaeology. Moreover, his influence can still be found in the everyday practice of today's archaeologists: for instance, his site reports are usually a starting point for research, and his writings have been used in the construction of contemporary identities (Babić, 2001: 173; 2002; Cvjetićanin, 2011: 151). Having in mind the important role of Felix Kanitz in Serbian archaeology, the aim of this chapter is to shed light on the context of his research in the field. In order to complete this task, I shall use theoretical insights from geography of knowledge (Naylor, 2002, 2005; Livingstone, 2007; Livingstone and Withers, 2011). Contrary to the widespread belief that science is placeless, authors working in this field have shown that, like 'temporality and embodiment', geography is also a *conditio sine qua non* for scientific endeavour of any kind, since 'spaces both enable and constrain discourse', as Livingstone (2003: 7) nicely puts it. The concept of space in this particular case takes us to the topics of inclusion and/or exclusion, validity, veracity, partiality, etc. Accordingly, this chapter questions the role of geography in both the nurturing and the hindering of Kanitz's scientific understanding and activities, as well as the reception of his endeavours. Finally, having in mind the social origin of knowledge in general, special attention in this chapter is given to the network of contacts Kanitz created; that is, the informal group of people who influenced Kanitz's political, cultural and scholarly views, and consequently left a strong mark on Serbian archaeology as well.

Kanitz's discovery of the Balkans

Felix Philipp Kanitz was born on 2 August 1829 to a 'rich and notable' Jewish family in Obuda, now part of Hungary's capital Budapest (Fehér, 1932; Horel, 2011: 16–17; Teichner, 2015: 7). At the age of 14 he started training as an illustrator at the studio of the famous illustrator Vincenz Grimm (1800–72) in Pest. Grimm was a very important figure in Hungarian artistic circles of the time – he was the founder of the

Pest Art Society (*Pesti műegylet*) – and, likewise, close friend to numerous politicians and scholars in the Habsburg Empire (Horel, 2011: 17; Timotijević, 2011: 94). As a result, while in his youth, Kanitz was presented to Hungarian higher society. For example, Grimm's circle included the Hungarian palatine, as well as the famous topographer, ethnographer and historian József Vincenz Häufler (1810–52), and the archaeologist Ferenc Kiss (1791–1859), who would later become a professor at Pest University. This stimulating learning environment taught Kanitz a wide spectrum of skills: besides artistic illustration, he learned technical drawing, which was and remains one of the basic tools in the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology. Likewise, during his formative years Kanitz became acquainted with the teachings of J.G. Herder (1744–1803) and his Romantic followers. These ideas would become the theoretical framework of Kanitz's writings (Horel, 2011: 17–18; Timotijević, 2011: 92, 100–101).

In 1847 Kanitz moved to Vienna, where he enrolled in the prestigious Academy of Fine Arts. However, just a year later, he left the Academy, though he stayed in the capital, training in lithography at Eduard Singer's workshop (Horel, 2011: 17; Timotijević, 2011: 92). Towards the end of 1848, Kanitz became a correspondent for the *Illustrierte Zeitung* (*Illustrated Newspaper*) in Leipzig, a job he would keep almost until the end of his life (Babić, 2001: 173; Timotijević, 2011: 92). *Illustrierte Zeitung* was the first German illustrated magazine; when Kanitz became its correspondent, it was one of the most prestigious (as well as expensive) illustrated magazines in the German language (Timotijević, 2011: 93).

Even after leaving the Viennese academy, Kanitz continued to expand his intellectual horizons, broadening his knowledge about art and related topics in Munich, Dresden and Nuremberg over the next few years (Timotijević, 2011: 93). Finally, in 1856, after several years of extensive travel throughout Europe (Germany, France, Belgium and Italy), he settled in Central Europe's unofficial centre – Vienna. Symbolically, Vienna was also considered to be at the edge of the Balkans: 'Asien beginnt auf der Landstraße' said Prince Metternich (1773–1859), the German-born Chancellor of the Austrian Empire, in 1820 (Davies, 1996: 55; Sowards, 2004: 42). That is to say, according to the chancellor, Asia, including the Balkan Peninsula, begins on the Landstrasse, the road which leads south and east from the city of Vienna.

His career as a newspaper illustrator brought Kanitz to south-east Europe for the first time in 1858, so he could report on the political upheaval in 'European' Turkey. The uprisings of the Balkan Christians that had started at the beginning of the 1850s in Montenegro and Herzegovina peaked at the end of 1857 and, the next year, spread to

parts of nearby Bosnia. The possibility that several peasant rebellions might turn into a fight for national liberation sparked the interest of Europe's Great Powers, as well as its general public (Stolberg, 2008: 68; Todorova, 2009 [1997]: 62). Over the course of his first Balkan excursion, Kanitz visited Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia. After that trip, he became more and more interested in the nuances of the emerging Eastern Question, until he became completely devoted to the study of south-east Europe, and Serbia and Bulgaria in particular. In short, Kanitz went to the Balkans as a newspaper correspondent but returned to his home in Vienna determined to dedicate himself to a more extensive study of the region.

One year after visiting the western Balkans, Kanitz visited centrally positioned Serbia for the first time; he returned to the country in 1860 and 1861. His first papers on Serbian themes were published in the *Illustrierte Zeitung*, and Kanitz's first major publication – *Die römischen Funde in Serbien* (*The Roman Finds in Serbia*) – was printed in Vienna in 1861 under the aegis of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. The following year he published another, *Serbiens byzantinische Monumente* (*The Byzantine Monuments of Serbia*). Kanitz recapitulated his decade-long impressions and inquiries of Serbia when he published his 1868 scholarly travelogue, *Serbien. Historisch-ethnographische Reisestudien* (*Serbia. Ethnographic and Historical Travel Studies*). While *Die römischen Funde* was published under the auspices of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, this last work was supported by the Serbian government to the extent of 300 ducats (Timotijević, 2011: 99, footnote 14). That is to say, in less than a decade Kanitz positioned himself as the crucial author in the field of Balkan studies – he managed to interest both Serbian and Austro-Hungarian governments and their institutions in his work.

Kanitz dedicated the next decade and a half to the study of Bulgarian lands and population. He returned to Serbia again in three consecutive years – 1887, 1888 and 1889 – to continue his previous studies. During these visits, Kanitz also noted the great changes that had occurred in almost every aspect of Serbian society. The country was quickly going through modernisation processes: organisation of public institutions on European lines, urbanisation, industrialisation, railway building, even a change of fashion on the streets of Serbian towns where western hats replaced Turkish fezzes. Over the following fifteen years, that is, until the very end of his life in 1904, Kanitz turned his research into several publications. Firstly, he published a comprehensive work about the Roman heritage of Serbia titled *Römische Studien in Serbien* (*Roman Studies in Serbia* [1892]). This book offers evidence of the magnitude of the changes in Roman archaeology in Serbia. In his first book on the topic, published shortly after his first visit to the country (in 1861),

Kanitz had mentioned around 40 sites, while his later study contains around 300 more. Clearly, though, Kanitz was not solely responsible for this increase/growth, but his discoveries, and the enthusiasm for research that he spread to others, were unquestionably an integral part of the process.

Kanitz's last and the most extensive book on Serbia was published in 1904, in Leipzig – where his first papers on Serbia had been printed – just a few months after his death. *Das Königreich Serbien und das Serbenvolk von der Römerzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (*The Kingdom of Serbia and the Serbian People from Roman Times until the Present*) is the pinnacle of Kanitz's studies of Serbia and covers a time span of more than thirty years. It is also a kind of memoir since it contains, along with his scholarly observations, numerous personal or even intimate moments. Thus, this publication is a collection of diverse data on Serbia as well as a description of the way Kanitz obtained those data.

Finally, it should also be said that throughout this time Kanitz was highly valued as an illustrator – his visual works even found their way into the publications of other authors. For instance, his illustrations adorn Georgina Mackenzie (1833–74) and Adelina Irby's (1831–1911) popular and influential book *Travels in the Slavonic Province of Turkey-in-Europe* (1877), as well as Auguste Viquesnel's (1803–67) *Voyage dans la Turquie d'Europe* (1868); Kanitz's work can also be found in illustrated magazines of the time, including several articles published by A. Leist in the *Globus – illustrierte Zeitschrift für Länder und Völkerkunde* (Timotijević, 2011: 98).

Nineteenth-century Serbia: between Orient and Occident

Between Kanitz's first visit to Serbia in 1859 and his last, which occurred in 1889, Serbia underwent large-scale political changes. Kanitz's first visit was to a principality officially under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire, and his last was to an internationally recognised kingdom. That is, when Kanitz arrived in Serbia for the first time, Serbia was a semi-independent principality but still a part of the Ottoman Empire. By 1867, the country had become *de facto* independent, though formal recognition had to wait until the Congress of Berlin, in 1878. Lastly, in 1882 Serbia became a kingdom. These changes in the formal status of the country were followed by a complete transformation upon a Western and Central European model: the abolition of feudalism, adoption of several constitutions, construction of roads and railways, reorganisation of administration and so forth (Petrovich, 1976; Pavlowitch, 1999; Luković, 2011). First and foremost, the winds of change blew

from Serbia's northern neighbour – the Austrian, that is – from 1867 – Austro-Hungarian Empire.

At the same time, the ruling circles of the great Habsburg Empire were also dealing with the Eastern Question posed by the 'sick man of Europe': the Sublime Porte's problems maintaining political control over the Balkans (Anderson, 1966; Bridge, 2002; Sowards, 2004, 209–29). From the end of the eighteenth century onwards, Europe's Great Powers (Britain, Prussia, Russia and Austria) were trying to solve numerous issues connected with the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire, in order to maintain the fragile balance-of-power system on the continent. Being the Ottoman Empire's closest neighbour among the Great Powers, Austria (from 1867 Austria-Hungary) was particularly interested in the possibility of seizing power over the Balkan lands hitherto under Ottoman control. Thus, the foreign politics of Austria-Hungary in this part of Europe could be labelled 'frontier colonialism'. The Dual Monarchy's colonial efforts were directed towards its own frontiers, as in the case of the occupation and subsequent annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Donia, 2008; Ruthner, 2008). These lands were surrounded by Austro-Hungarian territory on two out of three sides, in contrast with the more prominent colonial experiences of the British or Spanish Empires. The term 'frontier' here also stresses the fact that Austro-Hungarian colonialism was not, so to speak, colonialism in its full right. However, this colonialism was not particularly unique. Frontier colonialism is just one form of the 'informal imperialism' or 'informal colonialism' practised around the world during the second half of the nineteenth century. Thus, Serbia could be located among those countries in which 'there was an acknowledgement of a need for modernization following western-dominated models', so 'they all had the European presence in their lands' and some of these 'Europeans were trusted to provide advice on political and cultural matters, or even were appointed to Westernise their countries' (Díaz-Andreu, 2007: 99–100).

To sum up, during the second half of the nineteenth century Serbia was politically independent, first as a principality, then, from the 1878 Congress of Berlin, as a kingdom, but under the political, economic and cultural influence of its powerful northern neighbour. Furthermore, all of this accords with the perception of the Balkans as somewhere 'in the middle' that Maria Todorova, a Bulgarian-born US historian, has termed 'Balkanism'. The central idea of her book *Imagining the Balkans* (2009 [1997]) is 'that there is a discourse... that creates a stereotype of the Balkans, and politics is significantly and organically intertwined with this discourse' (Todorova, quoted in Halpern, 2014: 15). The status of the Balkans, according to Todorova, is 'semicolonial, quasi-colonial, but clearly not purely colonial', and thus, their liminal

character – which ‘invokes labels such as semideveloped, semicivilized, semioriental’ (Todorova, 2009 [1997]: 16) – ‘could have made them simply an incomplete other; instead they are constructed not as the other but as an incomplete self’ (Todorova, 2009 [1997]: 18). The Balkans were/are not perceived as the Other (like the Orient in Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1978)), or even as an incomplete other, but as an ‘insufficiently European Europe’ (Goldsworthy, 2006: 32); albeit peripheral, the Balkans were still thought of as within European space.

Having in mind the Austro-Hungarian semi-colonial relationship with Serbia it could be said that Kanitz’s position was also somewhat liminal. He was an intermediary between the two states, i.e. between two distinct political, economic and socio-cultural entities. Kanitz was a protégé of both the Serbian and Austro-Hungarian governments; his endeavours were in line with the foreign policies of both countries. More specifically, Kanitz received financial support for publishing his works from the small, newly established Principality and the great, old Empire. His information was important to the Habsburg court for its planned expansion *nach Osten* – first economic and cultural and, then, potentially, military. At the same time, Serbia saw a chance to promote itself through Kanitz’s writings. The Serbian authorities accepted, helped and honoured Kanitz, and his works were considered one of the cornerstones of the country’s representation abroad (Vasić, 1929: 594; Cvjetičanin, 2011: 147; Timotijević, 2011: 108). In fact, Kanitz’s publications were an element of Serbia’s foreign policy in the second half of the nineteenth century (Teichner, 2015: 11–12).

Kanitz’s specific position could be the reason why he, unlike many other observers of those times, restrains himself from either lobbying for or demonising Balkan populations – even though his writings do contain traces of what Todorova elegantly calls ‘the specific admixture of nineteenth century romanticism and *Realpolitik*’ (2009 [1997]: 62). Despite the fact that Kanitz refused to take sides, his insights and actions, network of contacts and finally the knowledge he produced as well as the reception of that knowledge were all influenced by ‘geography’, or, more precisely, the geopolitical situation in which he found himself.

Felix Kanitz’s Balkan network

The roots of Kanitz’s world view, and hence the foundations of the knowledge he created, could be found in the period when he was still learning the craft of engraving and illustration in Vincenz Grimm’s studio in Pest. From then on, Kanitz continued to constantly broaden it in the following decades. Before going into details about Felix Kanitz’s informal network, his specific position ‘in-between’ should be stressed

once again. Kanitz's liminality cannot be reduced to the realm(s) of foreign policy; it was also social (he was, at the same time, an insider and an outsider in both Austro-Hungarian and Serbian society) as well as disciplinary (his research into the Balkan past could be placed somewhere between amateur antiquarianism and disciplinary archaeology). Therefore, in discussing Felix Kanitz and his network we cannot talk about a 'thought collective' in the narrowest sense: more likely, his position could be placed between those theoretical esoteric and exoteric circles (Fleck, 1979). For instance, while in Nuremberg, Kanitz had the chance to meet Carl Alexander von Heildeloff (1789–1865), a professor of architecture at the Polytechnic School and the City Architect, who specialised in the restoration of medieval buildings. Heildeloff's work inspired Kanitz, paving the way for his studies of medieval art in the Balkans, crowned by his publication on Byzantine monuments (Kanitz, 1862). Likewise, after Kanitz settled in Vienna, he and the archaeologist Francesco Carrara (1812–54) became friends. Their friendship immensely deepened Kanitz's knowledge of archaeology (Timotijević, 2011: 93). The roots of Kanitz's interest in Roman archaeology could also be found in the general *Zeitgeist*. During the nineteenth century, states presented themselves as inheritors of ancient Greece and Rome using the symbolic capital (*sensu* Bourdieu, 1984) of the past to expand their cultural and political influence in the present (Diáz-Andreu, 2007: 101). In this particular case, the ruling elites of the Habsburg Empire sought to use the prestige of the ancient world in order to expand the Empire's cultural and political influence in the Balkans. At the same time, Roman heritage served as a proof of Serbia's European-ness (Babić, 2001: 176).

Kanitz's last book on Serbia, *Das Königreich Serbien*, offers crucial insight into this elaborate network of contacts. This three-volume work, as indicated above, essentially contains *Erinnerungen*, or memoirs, of Kanitz's Serbian years. Unlike his previous books, which are more or less scholarly in their essence, *Das Königreich Serbien* is a travelogue, and in accordance with the rules of the genre its narrative is unbounded, sometimes even intimate. This gives us an insight into Kanitz's network, his personal relations with the people who helped him during the decades he spent in the Balkans.

The list includes people whom Kanitz met in Vienna while still preparing for his journeys, as well as those he met in the course of his travels. Ami Boué (1794–1881), a Hamburg-born geologist of French descent, has a prominent place in the first group. Boué is famous for his ground-breaking study *La Turquie d'Europe* (*European Turkey* [1840]), published in Paris just a year before its author moved to Vienna. *La Turquie d'Europe* covers the geography, geology and natural history

of the Balkan Peninsula and, hence, it is no great surprise that, among Boué's numerous works, Kanitz found this particular one the most useful (von Hauer, 1882; Kostić, 2011: 6). Kanitz's Viennese circle also included Guillaume Lejean (1828–71), another pioneer researcher of the Balkan lands (Lory, 2011), as well as Heinrich Kiepert (1818–99), one of the most prominent historical cartographers of his time. Kiepert and Kanitz's voluminous correspondence testifies to their contributions to one another's work (Timotijević, 2011: 95).

Finally, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787–1864), one of Vienna's most prominent South Slavs, had a major role in Kanitz's preparations for his Balkan travels. This philologist and linguist, a major reformer of the Serbian language, was highly influential in his homeland, as well as in the German-speaking lands (Duncan, 1970). Karadžić recommended Kanitz to the political and cultural elites of Serbia. He also gave him some highly practical advice: for example, that Kanitz should not reveal his Jewish descent when talking to locals (whether Christian or Muslim) (Lory, 2011: 70). Accordingly, before heading to Serbia Kanitz got in touch with some of the greatest authorities in the emerging academic field of Balkan studies. Contacts that started as Kanitz searched for help and advice in the comfort of Viennese salons sometimes turned into sincere and lasting friendships – especially in the cases of Boué and Kiepert – and more or less frequent written correspondence.

When he finally arrived in Serbia for the first time Kanitz had already been introduced to higher society. Furthermore, Kanitz's interests coincided with those of the elite at that particular moment, as can be seen from an 'announcement' issued by the Serbian Ministry of Education: 'Показатељ овог г. Каниц, молер, путује по Србији да снима и молује знатније манастире, развалине старе, пределе итд., у намери да све то после у збирке изда на свет које ће наше отечество изближе упознати са изображеним народима.' ('The bearer of this [announcement], Mr Kanitz, a painter, is travelling through Serbia to draw and paint notable monasteries, ancient ruins, landscapes, and further on, in order to compile everything and publish it, which shall shortly introduce our homeland to enlightened nations'; my translation) (cited after Kostić, 2011: 3). So that Kanitz might easily finish his task, the Ministry of Education adds that government officials, priests, teachers and 'everyone else' should be at his disposal (cited after Kostić, 2011: 3). As a result, his hosts and guides through bureaucratic labyrinths, as well as through the landscape of Serbia, were numerous government officials: from ministers and mayors to engineers, physicians and priests – everyone indeed.

Of particular importance for Kanitz's archaeological work were people like Janko Šafarik (1814–76) or Jovan Gavrilović (1796–1877), both ethnic Slavs born in Habsburg dominions, who were invited to the

newly liberated Principality of Serbia in order to establish state institutions upon Central European models. Šafarik, an ethnic Slovak born in the Hungarian town of Kiskőrös, was educated in Bratislava, Vienna and Prague before coming to Belgrade, where he took up the post of Professor of Physics at the Lyceum of the Principality of Serbia. Šafarik undertook the first archaeological survey in Serbia – in 1868, he went on an archaeological journey to western Serbia, where he conducted small-scale excavations (Milinković, 1998: 427). In 1861 Šafarik left his post at the Lyceum, becoming the director of the National Museum and, then, of the National Library as well (Nikolić, 1979; Milinković, 1985; Novaković, 2011: 387). Together with Jovan Sterija Popović (1806–56), who was also born in the Austrian Empire, Šafarik is the person most 'responsible for the first legal acts to protect the historical heritage' (Babić, 2001: 171). Gavrilović, on the other hand, was a Serb born in the Croatian town of Vukovar (then also in the Habsburg Empire). He took up several important political positions in the establishment of the Principality of Serbia – minister of finance, member of the council of regency after the assassination of Prince Mihailo, member of the State Council, head of the Prince's Chancery. Gavrilović was also the chair of the Serbian Learned Society and had a lively interest in Serbian history (Nikić et al., 2007). Kanitz refers to Šafarik and Gavrilović as friends with whom he shared the same scientific interests as well as the (German) language and social norms. These two very important persons in nineteenth-century Serbian politics, just like the members of his 'Viennese circle', were Kanitz's 'gatekeepers' in a literal as well as metaphorical sense: opening doors for him, both of particular official institutions and of Serbian society in general.

Beside those who, to a degree, were professionally connected to archaeology, many 'laymen' were also of great help to Kanitz's work. Especially important were the county engineers who took Kanitz to archaeological sites and helped him with drawing and mapping (Kostić, 2011: 7–8). Kanitz often praises the intelligence and hospitality of the city and county engineers and does not forget to mention their names: Hesse, Sandtner, Zermann, Valenta, Novak, Riener, Deuster and so forth. In fact, Kanitz's collaborators in Serbia perceived themselves as a distinct group; they thought themselves to be enlightened agents of 'culture' and 'civilisation'. Like Šafarik, Gavrilović, and the engineers mentioned, they were either economic migrants from the Austro-Hungarian Empire or Serbs educated in the Central and Western European universities. Thus, Kanitz's network in Serbia was practically a gentlemen's club. It consisted of people who shared the same language – German – and the same cultural values – from etiquette and customs to fashion and cuisine. In Kanitz's own words (1868: 88): 'Mann und Frau, wie beinahe alle

Ingenieurfamilien Serbiens, eingewanderte Oesterreicher, suchten mit Eifer mich die lange Trennung von deutscher Art und Sitte weniger empfinden zu lassen' ('man and woman, almost everyone from the families of the Serbian or Austrian engineers sought zealously to make me feel as little as possible the effects of my long separation from German manners and customs'; my translation). Moreover, they were also perceived as a distinct group by the natives of Serbia. Kanitz mentions several times in his publications that these engineers were generally called 'Swabians' by the local population, no matter what their ethnic identity really was (e.g. Kanitz, 1868: 268 and 1904: 280).

To summarise, as a focal point of this informal group Kanitz was an intermediary (or when in Central Europe the intermediary) who was presenting the newly resurrected Serbian state to a wider European audience. He was a semi-colonial 'discoverer' of those, to some extent geographically, but even more culturally, distant lands. This 'Columbus of the Balkans' was the provider of new and hitherto unknown information to European scholars; recall Kiepert's work on ancient cartography mentioned above (Timotijević, 2011: 97).

Accordingly, the reception of Kanitz's work also had a double nature. During his lifetime, Kanitz's work was not promoted, translated or printed in Serbia, even though it was financially supported from public funds. Furthermore, his archaeological insights were often ignored or even criticised by the first generation of Serbian archaeologists, such as Mihailo Valtrović (1839–1915) and Miloje M. Vasić (1869–1956) (Mihajlović, 2016: 128–32; Kostić, 2011: 12–13, with references). For instance, the first translation of Kanitz's works in Serbia came only in the 1980s, after his data proved useful during the large-scale excavations in the Iron Gates gorge. Conversely, Kanitz's works were immensely popular in Western Europe and had near-canonical status in Central Europe. They were the first works consulted by basically anyone interested in Serbia, Bulgaria or their respective pasts. Again, as with everything connected with Kanitz, there is also a middle ground in the reception of his work – the Serbs living in the Dual Monarchy. Kanitz's writings were translated into Serbian before the 1980s, but not in Serbia itself – rather, in the parts of Austria-Hungary inhabited by Serbs, that is, more or less, the present-day Vojvodina region.

Conclusion

Kanitz's travels between Vienna and Belgrade were at the same time metaphorical journeys between Austro(-Hungarian) *Realpolitik* and his personal, Romantic ideas about Serbia. The position of Felix Kanitz 'in between' is mirrored in his notion of Serbia. He did not hide his

excitement over 'günstigen Umschwung... in opferfreudigster Förderung des Heer- und Schulwesens, im Fortschritt von Wissenschaft, Kunst, Industrie, Land- und Bergbau' (Kanitz, 1904: xii), 'an astonishing vigour... in the development of science, arts, industry, agriculture and mining' (Babić, 2001: 175) among 'das Volk blieb im Kern gesund' (Kanitz, 1904: xii), 'the people [who] remained sane in their core' (Babić, 2001: 175). However, from time to time, Kanitz reminds his readers that this is not-quite-Europe. For example, lamenting the destruction of archaeological sites by looting locals, he notes that 'denn nirgends steht das *Schätzesuchten*, mit und ohne *Zauberformeln*, so stark im Schwunge, wie in Serbien' (Kanitz, 1904: 156) ('nowhere did the quest for treasure, with or without the aid of magical formulas, gain such momentum as in Serbia'; my translation and emphasis). Hence, in spite of his overall sympathies for the country and its people, Kanitz's works on the Roman past picture Serbia 'in terms of a pleasant semi-exotic landscape over which the Roman past is scattered' (Babić, 2001: 175).

The 'semi-exotic' landscape of Serbia is the key to understanding Felix Kanitz's informal network. During the second half of the nineteenth century there was a great demand for knowledge about the Balkans among the newly established Balkan states as well as the old European powers. In this particular case, Serbia searched for a means to present itself to the European audience, in order to eventually take its place in that (imaginary) community of nations. On the other hand, to pursue its semi-colonial politics the Habsburg Empire needed information about the Balkans for its political, economic and (potentially) military aspirations. Meanwhile, both countries searched for relevant, reliable and systematised knowledge – and Kanitz saw his unique opportunity. However, he could not complete this complex and voluminous task on his own, so he was spurred to create a ramified *cum* informal network. This network enabled him to feel at home in these – as it seemed to his Western contemporaries – distant and unknown lands, and members of diasporas – in a way travellers themselves – had an instrumental role in it; people like Vuk Karadžić, one of the champions of the Serbian community in Vienna, on one hand, and Janko Šafarik and county engineers – emigrants from Habsburg dominions – on the other, enabled Kanitz to be simultaneously an insider and an outsider in both Serbian and Austro-Hungarian society.

Helped by the members of the informal network he created, Kanitz reported on the changes that transformed 'Turkey in Europe' to 'European Serbia'. However, he was not just reporting socio-political changes in Serbia – rather, Kanitz took an active role in those changes, especially in the field of Roman archaeology. Faced with the task of creating a knowledge that is simultaneously universal and provincial,

it is no great surprise that Kanitz dedicated most of his time to Roman *limes* – a topic which is universal yet provincial in its essence. For that matter, he presented himself as an ‘enlightened’ and ‘civilised’ foreigner who was there to patronise the locals. In summary, Kanitz tried to dispel ‘magical formulas’, consequently transforming the ‘quest for treasure’ into an academic discipline. This patronising attitude is the reason why he was criticised. He was perceived to be a biased outsider – both ethnically and in a professional/disciplinary sense – while his works were usually neglected by the first generation of Serbian archaeologists.

Nevertheless, after they proved useful during the 1960s, Kanitz’s publications have been consulted in excavations of Roman sites ever since. At the same time, they have been used for constructions of contemporary identities. Present-day Serbian archaeologists often refer to Kanitz in their constant effort to prove that Serbia has a claim to European heritage that is, if not greater than that of Western Europe – as signified by the current, state-supported project purporting to show Serbia to be the ‘homeland of Roman emperors’ (Kuzmanović and Mihajlović, 2015) – certainly equal to it. The irony lies in the fact that in order to cast away the (semi-)colonial image of the state, academic authorities in Serbia turned to Kanitz’s publications, which are semi-colonial in their essence (Babić, 2001 and 2002).

Kanitz’s travels to and from the Balkans put him in numerous liminal positions: he stood on the narrow line that, at the same time, connected and divided Balkan and ‘European’ realms. He also stood on the border of the discipline of archaeology itself: an amateur in the field, who created an elaborate Europe-wide network that produced and, following that, transmitted knowledge about the Roman past of Serbia. Through their work, Kanitz and his collaborators tucked their own liminality deep into the fold of Serbian archaeology. Thus, besides being the ‘veritable mine of rich and scholarly information’ the validity of which is beyond question, the work of Felix Kanitz has brought much more to Serbian archaeology: its theoretical and epistemological foundations.¹

Note

- 1 In the course of writing this chapter Thea De Armond, Staša Babić and Monika Milosavljević provided valuable comments and suggestions. V.V. Mihajlović is participating in project no. 177006 of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Republic of Serbia.