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ABSTRACT Changing 19th-century socio-economic identities have been a major topic of debate among European historians. Obviously, there are disagreements over the scientific analysis and objectivity of identities research in Lithuanian and Western historical narratives. This is especially relevant when discussing the specific characteristics of urban society. In this article, the author analyses the social identities of the Kaunas burgher elite, and the factors which affected the group in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The theoretical approach of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu is used to describe the phenomenon. The habitus concept is used to analyse the facts, as it helps to reveal representations of the identification of elites with the city and estate structures (the early Kaunas urban tradition and the new Imperial Russian classes).
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Introduction

The collective identity and expressions of it have always been of interest to historians studying change in social structures, the mentality of society and other cultural phenomena. The search for identities from the past has been given more relevance through the selection of topics for analytical research. For example, there are discussions about the suitability of the normative divide between ‘us’ and ‘them’ in more complicated and complex identity

---

1 This article was written with the support of the Research Council of Lithuania as part of project “Identities and the Sociopolitical Transformations of the Townsmen’s Elite in Second Half of 18th- First Half of 19th Centuries: the Case of Kaunas” (No.: LIP-094/2016).
At the same time, historians create alternative constructs, adapting the concepts and interpretative approaches used by sociologists and anthropologists.

When we analyse historiography, it becomes evident that there are disagreements in Lithuanian and Western historical narratives over the scientific analytical value and objectivity of identity studies. It is as if answering the question which theoretical (and to a degree, methodological) approach and identity construct should be selected for the analysis of specific historical phenomena summarises the issue behind this discussion. The issue under consideration here is relevant to researchers of 18th to 20th-century history studying the content of complicated (overlapping or different) collective identities and their processes of change. Obviously, the challenges dictated by the material from the specific periods are not the only ones that researchers face. Historians also encounter other fundamental theoretical problems. For example, the relationship between collective social and individual identities is often unclear. They also try to reveal the extent to which self-representation in its various forms echoes a deeper self-awareness. This means that historians analysing this topic must unavoidably focus their attention on the conceptual approach to be used in their research (although, of course, to varying degrees).

Several 19th-century historians have tried to go beyond merely descriptive typologies in recording expressions of collective identities. Tamara Bairašauskaitė noted this in an article in which she presented a synthesis and a critical assessment of existing historical studies. The author stated accurately that the application of the identity construct in 19th-century Lithuanian social identity studies has left many questions unanswered, while the interpretations were rather too ‘eclectic’ and could not always be justified. At the same time, she voiced clearly her doubts about the suitability of collective interpretative provisions when analysing social identity (such as the identification of social groups with the traditional classes, or the new derivatives that were ‘handed down’ by Russia). Bairašauskaitė does not limit herself to just an analysis of historiography, criticising identities research and presenting a synthesis. She has created an

---

2 Cf. T. Bairašauskaitė, ‘Tapatybė ir identifikacija XIX amžiaus istorijos tyrimuose: teorinis aspektas’, in: Lietuvos istorijos metraštis, 2012 metai.1 (2012), pp. 51–53; B. Lewis, The Newest Social History: Crisis and Renewal. The SAGE Handbook of Historical Theory (London, 2012), p. 232.

3 R. Baudry, J.P. Juchs, ‘Définir l’identité’, in: Hypothèses, t. 10 (2007), pp. 166–168.

4 T. Bairašauskaitė, ‘Tapatybė ir identifikacija’, p. 51.
analytical construct for social identities research, taking a multilateral approach to studying identities (overlapping and/or opposing). Clearly, due to its specific nature, this kind of approach can be applied first of all to the research of 19th-century Lithuanian society.

The historian Aelita Ambrulevičiūtė has systematically analysed identification with the legal categories of merchants of the Russian Empire (sub-estates among the urban population). The author devotes most attention to the impact of the Russian political and legal regimes on the changing identifications felt among the merchants of Vilnius. This echoes both traditional historiographical questions and the conceptual approach. In terms of this analysis, she pays too little attention to the change in identities (especially in the early 19th century). On the other hand, she does include social identity research themes when analysing attitudes towards charity, social recognition and education. The historian states that the merchants of Vilnius did not have collective social identities.5

Note that multilateral identity constructs dominate in sociological and social psychology identity theories.6 This kind of integrated approach deals with the problem itself, the complexity of theoretical provisions, and their compatibility with factual analysis. Nevertheless, new collective identity research themes and integrated analytical constructs are limited in their scope for interpretation. They often do not encompass aspects of identity fluidity (in the field of social relations) and change over time. In addition, identity research of the ‘large’ social groups (the nobility, the bourgeoisie, etc) often does not take into account specific features of local historical societies (what distinguishes a particular parish, region, city, etc). When constructing social identity research, it is difficult to coordinate the levels of group and individual identity. The individual often remains on the margins of historical narratives. There are more theoretical problems, and rather than improving social identity research constructs, they can be solved by employing sociologists’ theories.

5 A. Ambrulevičiūtė, Vilniaus pirkliai XIX amžiuje: statusas, veikla, galimybės (Vilnius, 2016), p. 395; eadem, ‘Pirklių teisinis apibrėžimas ir socialinė taštybė Rusijos imperijoje XIX a. pabaigoje–XX a. pradžioje’, in: Teisė, t. 84 (2012), pp. 68–69.
6 S.J. Schwartz, V.L. Vignoles, K. Luyckx, ‘Epilogue: What’s next for identity theory and research’, in: Handbook of identity theory and research, eds. S.J. Schwartz, V.L. Vignoles, K. Luyckx (New York, 2011), pp. 933–934; H.W. Schäfer, Identität als Netzwerk: Habitus, Sozialstruktur und religiöse Mobilisierung (Wiesbaden, 2015), pp. 18–19.
This is not the only problem. A historical narrative can be corrected not only by a conceptual approach, but also by methodology and empirical material. Historical research into the identity of European and regional social classes and estates reveals the prevailing strands. Nonetheless, an analysis based on local and micro-historical research is more rounded. This kind of narrative object and methodology allows us to relate the individual and the group, the causality of social practices, and the actions taken by actors, which are of great significance in conducting more comprehensive identity research.7

In this article, I analyse the social identities of the Kaunas urban elite, and the factors that influenced it in the early 19th century. The description of this phenomenon is based on the theoretical approach of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. *Habitus* and other concepts are employed for the factual analysis, which helps to reveal representations of the identification of the elite group with city and estate structures (the old Kaunas burgher tradition and the new Imperial estates). The *habitus* concept allows us not only to identify and thoroughly describe specific features of these identities, but also to reveal their components: the expression of emotion, the content of life concepts, etc. In addition, the *habitus* research approach is not normative, and is significantly more integrated compared to the social identity category. Of course, in this case, identity becomes a representation of *habitus*. When designing current research, Bairāšauskaitė’s 19th-century identity constructs were employed, which distinguished the dimensions of identities that were government-constructed (legalised), resistance-oriented, or under creation.8 A review of the historiography reveals that the self-awareness of separate groups in the cities, or the subjectivity of self-awareness, increased the integration of identities.9 We can therefore say that several levels of self-awareness existed in the cities, which formed dispositional networks. Only by describing them as part of a micro-history study, and by analysing the unique society of the actors involved, can we arrive at a clear definition of these levels.

---

7 C. Charle, ‘Comparative and Transnational History and the Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu: Theory and Practice’, in: *Bourdieu and historical analysis*, ed. P.S. Gorski (Durham, 2013), pp. 75–84.
8 T. Bairāšauskaitė, ‘Tapatybė ir identifikacija’, pp. 60–65.
9 At the same time, the identification ofburghers with a particular estate, or class, and the related interaction, is revealed in conceptual empirical studies and empirical research: G. Benadusi, ‘The complex case of Tuscan Urban Identities’, in: *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, vol. 5 (2000), pp. 81–86; H. Vasudevan, ‘Identity and Politics in Provincial Russia: Tver, 1889–1905’, in: *Social identities in revolutionary Russia*, ed. P. Madhavan (New York, 2001), p. 58.
The burgher’s *habitus* and social activity in the early 19th-century city

The concept of collective identification with the social structure is multilateral in terms of its content. The factual justification of identities and the oft-repeated descriptive analysis only make scientific explanations more difficult. By solving the problem of choosing the right conceptual approach, historians create more accurate identity constructs.

The problem of identifying collective identities could be solved by applying the *habitus* concept. Two circumstances make it difficult to describe the *habitus* of a 19th-century burgher: 1) application problems; this concept is not coherent or unifying; conversely, it is associated more with a dynamic, multilateral construct.\(^{10}\) In addition, the content of this concept can be disclosed only by applying a broader theoretical model (Bourdieu’s field theory);\(^{11}\) 2) answering the hypotheses raised can be difficult, due to the limited historical sources and the specific focus of the research object. It should be noted that these problems do not pose a fundamental obstacle to the research in general.

Bourdieu conceptualised the *habitus* concept, gradually improving his theory. According to the theorist, *habitus* consists of ‘a set of historical relations “deposited” within individual bodies in the form of mental and corporeal schemata of perception, appreciation and action […] *Habitus* is the strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations […] a system of lasting, transposable dispositions, which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions, and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks.’\(^{12}\) With this holistic concept, the French sociologist sought to relate individual actions (of the individual, group or institution) and their structuration (‘a structured and structuring structure’).\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{10}\) L. Wacquant, ‘A concise genealogy and anatomy of habitus’, in: *The Sociological Review*, vol. 64 (2016), pp. 67–68; P. Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations* (Stanford, 2000), p. 124; R. Baudry, J.P. Juchs, ‘Définir l’identité’, pp. 161–162.

\(^{11}\) L. Wacquant, ‘Putting habitus in its place: Rejoinder to the symposium’, in: *Body & Society*, vol. 20 (2014), p. 124; C. Costa, M. Murphy, ‘Bourdieu and the application of habitus across the social sciences’, in: *Bourdieu, Habitus and Social Research*, eds. C. Costa, M. Murphy (London, 2015), pp. 6–8.

\(^{12}\) P. Bourdieu, L. Wacquant, *Įvadas į refleksyviąją sociologiją* (Vilnius, 2003), p. 40.

\(^{13}\) P. Bourdieu, *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 170.
The employment of this analytical tool makes it possible to explain how the experience of historical figures ‘structured’ the surroundings of the family, guild, workshop or religious community (a set of certain ‘collected’ historical relations). This ‘structure’ of awareness in Bourdieu’s theory consists of a so-called system of predispositions (or tendencies). It encompasses thinking, emotions, imagination, unarticulated needs, acknowledgement, awareness of one’s body, etc. Note that a *habitus* historical study would not be related to the genesis of social or class-based structures. This concept is ‘more’ than just categories of mentality or emotions. On the other hand, the *habitus* theory was criticised for sounding ‘mystifying’, and for a certain lack of definition.

In addition, it is important to note that the concept discussed here must be associated with a particular interactional space, field or arena. Bourdieu calls the interaction arena the field category. This means that politics in class-based ruling institutions, the city economy, local politics, the movement of burghers and other social interaction spaces, can be understood as fields of social action. The actor’s situation in one field or another can depend on the *habitus*, or on its amassed political, social or symbolic capital. The limits of a specific social field also block the *habitus*: a *habitus* which operates in the economic field of the city is not effective, for example, in the political field of class-based institutions. At the same time, there is mutual interaction between the *habitus* and the economic field, or duality, that is, the city’s economic field and the *habitus* can stand in for one another. This internal dualism in social life allows us to understand identification with certain social structures and their symbolic representations.

The *habitus* theory is a suitable tool for a ‘genetic’ study of past thinking and emotions. Nevertheless, we should pay attention to one additional detail. As the sociologist Loic Wacquant noted, ‘the

---

14 L. Maton, ‘Habitus’, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, ed. M. Grenfell (Routledge, 2008), pp. 61–65; A. Lenger, C. Schneickert, F. Schumacher, ‘Pierre Bourdieus Konzeption des Habitus’, in: *Pierre Bourdieus Konzeption des Habitus*, eds. Lenger, C. Schneickert, F. Schumacher (Wiesbaden, 2013), p. 14.

15 Bourdieu defines the field as a space for social interaction, agreement and events, usually one that is historically defined and dependant on the interests of the associated actors. P. Bourdieu, *The Social Structures of the Economy* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 145.
theoretical *habitus* pudding should suit its empirical degustation.’\(^{16}\) So, it is important to answer the question of whether the analytical tool corresponds with the historical material and method. Any doubts can be dissipated by *habitus* research in historiography. Historians harnessing the field theory and *habitus* concept face numerous problems. For example, the concept’s analytical meaning is often overemphasised,\(^ {17}\) they face the so-called ‘scholastic fallacy phenomenon’,\(^ {18}\) or *habitus* is understood as an awareness structure continuing over time.\(^ {19}\) Yet this problem can be solved by uniquely applying the analytical tool being discussed in historical research. For example, the history of emotions can be examined based on the *habitus* concept (emotions are understood as the actions of a historical figure, group or institution),\(^ {20}\) expressions of self-awareness (note that in French historiography, *habitus* has been replaced by the mentalities paradigm of the Annales historiographical school),\(^ {21}\) the intellectual elite’s actions in the fields of literature, science, art and the liberal professions,\(^ {22}\) in state governance,\(^ {23}\) and so on. Ultimately, the *habitus* concept was used

---

\(^{16}\) L. Wacquant, ‘A concise genealogy’ p. 70.

\(^{17}\) P. S. Gorski, ‘Bourdieu as a theorist of change’, in: *Bourdieu and historical analysis*, p. 6.

\(^{18}\) Researchers often think that the actions of people (their historical figures) echo the pre-prepared theoretical models for the actions of rational people. The *habitus* category, meanwhile, is more practical, demanding of researchers of the past a degree of analytical sensitivity and reflection. D. Swartz, ‘Metaprinciples for sociological research in a Bourdieusian perspective’, in: *Bourdieu and historical analysis*, p. 24.

\(^{19}\) P. Bourdieu, R. Chartier, *The sociologist and the historian* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 60–62.

\(^{20}\) M. Scheer, ‘Are emotions a kind of practice (and is that what makes them have a history)? A Bourdieuan approach to understanding emotion’, in: *History and Theory*, vol. 51 (2012), p. 194.

\(^{21}\) J. Vincent, ‘The sociologist and the republic: Pierre Bourdieu and the virtues of social history’, in: *History Workshop Journal*, 58 (2004) pp. 137–139; J. Jovicic, ‘L’Habitus touristique: le cas des lettres d’Orient (1850–1900)’, in: *French Cultural Studies*, vol. 11 (2000), pp. 101–110.

\(^{22}\) C. Charle, *Birth of the Intellectuals: 1880–1900* (New York, 2015), p. 71; M. Lyons, ‘La culture littéraire des travailleurs autobiographies ouvrières dans l’Europe du XIXe siècle’, in: *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, t. 56 (2001), p. 933; C. Charle, ‘Frontières contestées’, in: *La Vie intellectuelle en France, Des lendemains de la Révolution à 1914*, eds. C. Charle, L. Jeanpierre (Paris, 2016), p. 11; R.M. Berdahl, *The Politics of the Prussian Nobility: The Development of a Conservative Ideology*, 1770–1848 (Princeton, 2014), pp. 52–53, 72.

\(^{23}\) A. Lüdtke, *Police and State in Prussia, 1815–1850* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 7–25.
in identity analysis in the past, constructing specific research designs. In this case, the identities themselves were analysed by historians as representations of *habitus*. For example, the historian Christophe Charle, when analysing the Parisian cultural elite’s collective identification with the city, defined it as a ‘representational *habitus*’ (*d’habitus en représentation*). The historian Longina Jakubowska analysed the dispositional system of the nobility (*habitus*, etiquette, understood as moral discipline, cosmopolitanism, aesthetic standards, assessment of past traditions) in its identification with this estate. The identification of the elite (including the merchant group) with the city as representations of *habitus* have been widely analysed in studies by Jesus Cruz. He describes a specific *habitus* found in Madrid (of the merchants and nobility), based on the wealthy rural family tradition (*señoritismo*), political loyalties, or a certain inertia of social practices (of separate groups).

In his research, Cruz shows how to suitably combine historical material and methods (the prosopographic, statistical and qualitative research methods were applied) with an analytical construct. On the other hand, a historical narrative is created based on the dimension of change (not the modernisation approach, which is conceptually narrow).

Several major studies which analyse the *habitus* of urban elite groups in the 18th and 19th centuries are worth mentioning here. The work of Morten Reitmayer, a researcher of financial and economic elite groups, stands out most, in which he thoroughly examines the *habitus* of the 19th-century bankers and other economic groups. In his research, he defines the major bankers’ collective *habitus*

---

24 R. Gagnon, ‘Capital culturel et identité sociale: les fonctions sociales du discours sur l’encombrement des professions libérales au XIXe siècle’, in: *Sociologie et sociétés*, vol. 212 (1989), pp. 134–145; D. Damamme, ‘Grandes illusions et récits de vie’, in: *Politix*, vol. 7 (1994), p. 188.

25 C. Charle, ‘Introduction’, *Le temps des capitales culturelles XVIIIe-XXe siècles*, ed. C. Charle (Paris, 2009), pp. 18–19.

26 L. Jakubowska, *Patrons of History: Nobility, Capital and Political Transitions in Poland* (London, 2012), p. 59; V.S. Dubina, ‘The „distinction“: Russian nobility and Russian elites in the European context (the 18th–19th century)’, in: *Social Evolution & History*, vol. 7 (2008), p. 84.

27 J. Cruz, *Gentlemen, bourgeois, and revolutionaries: Political change and cultural persistence among the Spanish dominant groups, 1750–1850* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 169–172.

28 M. Reitmayer, *Bankiers im Kaiserreich: Sozialprofil und Habitus der deutschen Hochfinanz* (Göttingen, 2000), pp. 195–206.
as ‘established’ (*Habitus der Etablierten*). He states that a specific result-oriented work ethic was important to bankers, or a ‘pseudo-aristocratic’ lifestyle and aristocratisation of civilian status.\(^{29}\) Reitmayer’s study is special in that it is dedicated to the socio-economic powers and social capital of the elite groups (he makes separate analyses of the main groups, Jews, those who did not work in Berlin, etc), and also analyses their *habitus*. He does not relate his research directly with Bourdieu’s fundamental conceptual *habitus* and field. The French historian Boris Deschanel analyses the change in *habitus* of merchants from the Dauphiné region (mostly those from the city of Grenoble) in the 18th century.\(^ {30}\) In his study, he reveals how the collective *habitus* of merchants and their positions in the field changed, how that change was reflected in the regulation of the old regime and class restrictions. The historian states that a paternalistic, family-based *habitus* was replaced by a model of trust in one’s assignees (commercial representatives). These studies reveal how the *habitus* of merchants and financiers could be analysed in economic fields.

In summary, it is important to answer the question why it is worth using the *habitus* approach to examine the identities of the urban elite. There might be two answers. First, *habitus* can encompass the collective life of burghers (a certain kind of biographical experience), and facts important to their self-awareness. In this case, it is important to note that the concept not only covers the tradition of Kaunas burghers (their relationship with estate-based institutions, the city, etc), or historical memory as the practice of acting, but also ensures a certain continuous research. Second, by analysing the impact of *habitus* on the representation of identities, we can examine the image of burghers, their awareness and emotional configurations associated with the situation ‘here and now’, that is, with attitudes towards the Russian government (newly ‘handed-down’ Imperial estate derivatives, forms of control and domination, the reduced authorisation of popularly elected officials in the city’s governance, etc) and the changed economic situation. Also, local research based on micro-historical cases allows us to combine analyses of elite groups and individual identity.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., pp. 223–224.

\(^{30}\) B. Deschanel, ‘Champ et habitus économiques dans le Dauphiné préindustriel au XVIIIe siècle’, in: *Revue française de socio-économie*, no. 1 (2014), pp. 49–65.
The transformation of Kaunas into an Imperial Russian city: the bureaucratic field and new estate structures

As has already been mentioned, in order to understand the *habitus* of the Kaunas urban elite and its representations, we need to discuss how the space (field) of social relations operated. The Russian bureaucratic field (we could call it this in terms of the aspect of implementation of decisions) became an important space for social relations for the city’s inhabitants. The domination of the power of the Imperial Russian government in this field was very clear, being realised via military, police and administrative institutions. The main aim of these institutions was to ensure the management and control of the city, an administrative, and in part economic, unit (it was important for the city to carry out military provisions, postal and other duties attributed to it), and they also implemented other aims of Imperial integrational state policy.

Obviously, in this field, the Imperial Russian government created a monopoly of power firstly through military institutions (the military garrisons established in 1794–1796), and later through police and administrative institutions. Virgilijus Pugačiauskas gives a consistent account of the domination of state institutions in the cities (towns) in his analysis of the status and activities of the Vilnius town council in 1795–1808. He states that the Vilnius council ceased operating as a self-governing institution, and could only perform certain court functions autonomously, even though it was actually carrying out the decrees and orders of local Russian officials and bureaucrats.

31 Research into the tsarist government’s policies on cities reveals that Russian city and burgher estate policy was rarely uniform, consistent or effective in terms of realising the set goals. This was in effect due to the nature of the system of government, the inefficient bureaucracy, and the fragmented laws (that in actual fact did not apply to all cities). We can discuss historians’ claims of a partly functioning self-government among the burgher estate, however. B. Mironov, ‘Bureaucratic-or self-government: the early nineteenth century Russian city’, in: *Slavic Review*, vol. 52 (1993), pp. 254–255; J.M. Hartley, *Provincial and local government* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 450–453.

32 *Lietuvos istorija*, VIII t., I dalis: T. Bairašauskaitė, Z. Medišauskienė, R. Miknys eds. Devynioliktas amžius: visuomenė ir valdžia (Vilnius, 2011), pp. 203, 355–362; L. Žytkowicz, Rządy Repnina na Litwie w latach 1794–7 (Wilno, 1938); R. Civinskas, *Lietuvos miestiečių luomas ir jo struktūros nuo 1795 m. iki XIX a. vidurio*. PhD dissertation (Kaunas, 2001), pp. 42–52.

33 V. Pugačiauskas, ‘Magistrat Wileński w pierwszych latach pod zaborem rosyjskim (1794–1808)’, in: *Biuletyn historii pogranicza* (Bialystok, 2001), pp. 20–29.
The bureaucratic field established in Kaunas for the supervision and control of the city, as an economic and social unit, functioned in a similar way. At the end of the 18th century, the tsarist government introduced policies to integrate burghers into either the imperial merchant guild (there were three guilds of *kuptsy*, rus. *купцы*) or the townsmen (*meshchanie*, rus. *мещане*) estates.

Nevertheless, there are several important details that reveal the specifics of this field in its first stage of creation. It is common for the entrenchment of state power in the theoretical aspect to be expressed as the entrenchment of physical or symbolic forms of coercion. Authority entrenched as state coercion was usually actualised in symbolic forms, thereby gradually constructing a government monopoly. These kinds of outcomes are revealed in the events that took place in Kaunas at the end of the 18th century.

As the council’s correspondence with other institutions demonstrates, as early as the autumn of 1794, the Kaunas urban elite had come to terms with the inevitability of a Russian government. The city’s most important officials could only seek to minimise the possibility of physical violence. The protocols of the Kaunas council’s meetings and other documents reveal that the city’s elite, carrying out their newly allocated duties, sought to ensure that the government did not resort to violence. In seeking this goal, the burghers carefully carried out the resolutions of officials and, most importantly, the army commanders. They also tried to defend themselves within the norms of the law, or by appealing to higher authorities. Nevertheless, they did not always manage to avoid violence, and sometimes members of the council were

---

34 P. Bourdieu, P.S. Farage, ‘Rethinking the state: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field’, in: *Sociological theory*, vol. 12 (1994), p. 4.

35 In the period analysed, estate-based self-government functioned as a partly autonomous system. The council was elected by burghers, and consisted of councillors, the burgomaster, and judges of the benchers’ court. In this article, the council is understood as an institution (which functioned until 1808), and as the group of officials (existing or former) elected by the elites of the burgher estate. Members of the council made up some of the city’s elites. Besides them, this estate also included merchants and sworn-in members of the city council. On the other hand, in historiography, the council is also understood as a social group, identified with the ruling elite.

36 These kinds of appeals were constantly repeated in 1795–1798. They were often accompanied by special requests. Kaunas Regional State Archives (KAA), f. I-31, ap. 1; b. 617; l. 110, 118.
victims themselves. For example, the nature of this violence is illustrated by the lawlessness exhibited by General Zapolski of the Yekaterinburg Regiment during the fire of 1 April 1801. The officer whipped burghers, beat them, and broke one person’s arm. That was not enough: the same officer ordered two burghers he did not like to be beaten (one received 100 lashes, the other 200). 37 That same year, Captain Zegarov of the Russian army assaulted the member of the Kaunas council Samuehl Rohd. 38 This violence continued in the hands of the officers heading the Kaunas city police (the police-masters). They often exerted physical and psychological violence against members of the city community. 39 The violence was illegal, but widely entrenched. Even members of the city elite experienced violence in one form or another when carrying out army substation duty, providing accommodation and meals to Russian army officers and soldiers. 40 However, the extent of this violence gradually decreased once the burghers came to understand how this field operated.

On the other hand, Russian government institutions (officials) also resorted to symbolic coercion (which sometimes developed into actual violence), entrenched in rituals of state celebration or special decrees. The symbolic projection of the new government began in late 1794. At the start of December, the magistrate received an order from General Sergei Golitsin indicating that the entrance to the Town Hall and all the windows should be lit up in honour of the empress (or, as she was called in the decree, the ‘great patron-ness of the city’). On 5 December, as indicated by the drummer, all other inhabitants of the city had to put lighted candles in the windows of their homes as well. 41 Those who failed to comply with the war commandant’s decree would have to appear before the Russian authorities. Archival data does not reveal any signs of disobedience. Soldiers in Russian regiments undoubtedly genuinely

37 KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 28, l. 71, 105.
38 KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 28, l. 71, 102.
39 K. Statkutė, ‘Policijos įkūrimas Kaune ir jos veikla. XIX a. pirmajame ketvirtyje’, in: Kauno istorijos metraštis, t. 2 (2003), pp. 295–297.
40 Such cases of violence were quite frequent. For example, in 1809 the police pristavas abused several city merchants and a councillor. Lithuanian State Historical Archives (LVIA), f. 378, ap. 1809, BS, b. 110, l. 32–33.
41 KAA, f. I-31, ap. 1; b. 617, l. 124.
celebrated this day. The city’s residents would have been aware of this fact, as they had to provide accommodation for up to several dozen soldiers or officers.

Some weeks later, symbolic coercion was used again. On 27 December, the Kaunas council received a decree from General Sergei Golitsin and Nikolai Repnin. It indicated that all residents of the city, according to their class, had to swear an oath of allegiance at the Town Hall and sign a special book.\(^{42}\) Not all residents complied. Paradoxically, some Kaunas burghers, mostly members of the elite, swore allegiance to the ruler of Prussia Friedrich Wilhelm II at a similar time, and became his subjects.\(^{43}\)

Of course, the sworn-in burghers continued to live in Kaunas. The chance to put one’s loyalty to one or another ruler on record was made possible through the partitioning of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It ‘distributed’ the property of the burghers and the city along the River Nemunas (the lands of a suburb Freda\(^ {44}\) that belonged to the burghers community), and also made it possible for some to become subjects of the Prussian monarch.\(^ {45}\) We could say that historical circumstances and state coercion reflected power dispositions. The magistrate (as well as the urban elite) found

\(^{42}\) Of course, people also swore allegiance to the empress following prayers in a Catholic parish church. The council and certain individuals also had to hand over any documents from the revolutionary period they might have had. KAA, f. I-31, ap. 1; b. 617, l. 129–130.

\(^{43}\) It appears that some people swore allegiance to both Russian and Prussian rulers. For example, the sons of Henrik Essen were included in the revisionary lists of burghers; however, following the empress’ death, Kristina Esenova (Essen) swore allegiance to the Prussian monarch. Later, she (like some members of the Kaunas council) proved their noble status. Some members of this family began military careers in the Russian army, others settled in lands in Užnemunė. We could suppose that their choices were driven firstly by economic interests, and also by their particular elite *habitus* in the bureaucratic field. LVIA, f. SA, b. 13877, l. 207, 215, 216; J. Macianskis, ‘Kauno miestas’, in: *Kauno istorijos metraštis*, t. 2 (1998), p. 194.

\(^{44}\) In the 17th century Kaunas acquired the manor called Freda, where the local burgher elite bought private land. The Nemunas divided territories of the landed property and urban area: Freda was on the left and Kaunas was on the right bank of the river.

\(^{45}\) The Prussian government started taking care of owners in seeking to collect taxes and perform state duties at the beginning of 1795. Burghers had to inventorise the property at their disposal, and provide grounds for the taxes they had to pay. KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 8, l. 3; KAA, f. I-31, ap. 1; b. 617, l. 130.
themselves on the fringes of this field. Nevertheless, the genesis of the actions of the state bureaucratic field should be associated with identifying with the burghers’ *habitus*.

Representations of Kaunas urban elite identities as their unique *habitus* are best reflected in their actions and attitudes in response to the introduction of Imperial structures in Russian cities. In implementing unifying policies in the cities, the Russian government integrated Lithuania’s burghers into class structures. This policy was rather complex and multifaceted in Lithuania, and, somewhat more even and consistent concerning merchants and burghers. Meanwhile, the policy aimed at incorporating Jews into the urban estate was much more dynamic and fragmented. This policy was implemented gradually, abolishing urban class-based communities that were uniform, in terms of their legal status, and dividing burghers into the legal categories distinguished in the Charter to the Towns of Catherine II from 1785 (based on social-property status and economic activity). We can notice several things without going deeper into the topic of the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy. First, it was the burghers of Vilnius and Kaunas who found themselves at the epicentre of the implementation of this unifying policy in 1795–1801, whereas other cities in Lithuania were nowhere near as important. Second, the process of the policy’s implementation did not have one single direction, it was complex, and also encompassed the level of construction of self-awareness. Conceptualising a possible research approach, Bairašauskaitė notes quite accurately that in unifying social-legal structures, the government created a unique collective identity. She calls it a formal, legitimised Imperial identity. In other words, the implementation of this policy expressed the Russian government’s goal to convert the

---

46 Separate topics on the implementation of Russian policy in the early 19th century have been examined thoroughly in Lithuanian historiography: T. Bairašauskaitė, ‘Vilniaus pirkliai XVIII a. pabaigoje – XIX a. ketvirtajo dešimtmečio viduryje: judėjų ir krikščionių padėties palyginimas’, in: *Žydai Lietuvos ekonominėje-socialinėje struktūroje*, eds. V. Sirutavičius, D. Staliūnas (Vilnius, 2006), pp. 28–29, 37–39; *Lietuvos istorija*, VIII t. I dalis, pp. 369–365; R. Civinskas, ‘Rusijos politikos įtaka žydų miestiečių ekonominei veiklai’, in: *Žydai Lietuvos ekonominėje-socialinėje struktūroje*, pp. 53–73; V. Pugacjusius, in: ‘Vilniaus amatinių cechų “biurokratija” XIX a.: struktūra, funkcijos, tradicijos’, in: *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis. 2014/1* (2015), pp. 48–49; R. Civinskas, ‘Kauno žydų integracija į miestiečių luomą’, in: *Darbai ir dienos*, t. 28 (2001), pp. 53–59.

47 T. Bairašauskaitė, ‘Tapatybė ir identifikacija’, pp. 59–60.
newly created social orders (based on unequal legal definitions) into mental structures as well. The question arises, how was this done? The Russian government made use of bureaucratic classifications as measures for identity creation. One such classification was the division of burghers into a multi-level, partly hierarchalised class structure. Estate classifications were considered to be symbolic capital that was used in order to legitimise authority and thus entrench domination.

The creation of new mental structures started in Kaunas (as in other Lithuanian cities) in 1795, and gradually continued. Russian government institutions and separate officials had a number of measures to hand, which can be divided into three different groups: 1) censuses (revisions, ревизские сказки), the compilation of urban population books, reacting to burghers’ complaints (these depended on mutual conflicts where the question of status was raised); 2) the division of merchants into guilds, the formation of Jewish ethno-confessional groups, the attribution of migrating Old Believers to the estate of burghers; 3) the election of council officials and its reorganisation into the Duma in 1808. In time, the third-level estate community in Kaunas was to become an Imperial burgher estate.

In applying these measures, the Russian government sought to construct a collective identification of the residents of Kaunas with the Imperial estate and its categories. In an analysis of the process of implementing this transformation, we notice that it was not consistent, but quite random and fragmented. This was an inherent feature of the bureaucratic field. The main interests in this field of the Imperial Russian government (including institutions in

48 More about this: Б.Н. Миронов. Социальная история России периода империи (XVIII–начало XX в.). Генезис личности, демографической семьи, гражданского общества и правового государства, т. 1 (С. Петербург, 1999), p. 111.

49 P. Bourdieu, The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power (Stanford, 1998), p. 166.

50 The merchants’ estate, which had certain privileges, was at the top of this hierarchy. A separate sub-group of burghers were the workshop craftsmen. Another less important estate sub-group of foreigners was also distinguished. Burghers who owned property in the city but did not belong to any craftsmen’s workshops or merchants’ guilds had practically the same status. There was also the group of honorary citizens. Ethno-confessional communities that lived in the city had a unique estate-based status as well.

51 According to the Charter to the Towns of Catherine II of 1785, burghers had to be entered in the city book.
St Petersburg and in the Vilnius province) were aimed at ensuring control over the duties carried out by burghers and tax collectors.

It is important to note that the administration of Imperial Russian estate classifications involved separate members of the Kaunas council. In carrying out the ‘administration of the estates’, the actual discretionary powers of burgomasters, councillors and city clerks would increase when the police officers who carried out the lowest functions of supervision of the city gorodnitchi (городничий), later, from 1803, police-masters), or higher Russian government institutions, did not interfere in decision-making. On the other hand, Kaunas police officers and public servants often abided by the principle of Чиновники кормятся от дел (‘public servants live [literally eat] off cases’) which applied to the Russian government as well. This is revealed in a study of the management of the Vilnius province in 1824, indicating violations that took place in the Kaunas police for several decades: the incorrect entry (not according to the right category) or non-entry of burghers into revisionary lists (the so-called revision books), the forgery of travel passports, etc. 52 Interestingly, one of the public servants responsible for these violations, the police station secretary Mikhał Pacanowski, belonged to the city elite, and was a burgher until 1811. 53 This means that this public servant’s motivation for supporting the interests of the burghers when checking the compilation of the revision books, for example, was quite obvious.

The symbolic structuring of estate structures in the Kaunas bureaucratic field

As has already been mentioned, we can analyse records about burghers (the compilation of inspection lists, their entry in burgher and merchant books) not only as the implementation of a policy of unification, but also as the creation of legitimised Imperial identities. Before starting to examine the transformation of the identity of the Kaunas urban elite, it is important to discuss the census process, and focus more on the individuals who carried it out. In the late 18th and

52 LVIA, f. 378, ap. 1809, BS, b. 110, l.15; KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 28, l. 43; Statkutė, ‘Policijos įkūrimas’, p. 297.

53 He and his father Mikhaļ Pacanowski were included in the revisionary lists of burghers in 1811, and were attributed to the ‘old burghers’ category. The revisionary lists indicated that in 1805 both these people received the rank of provincial secretary. KAA, f. I-61, ap.1, b. 65, l. 3.
early 19th centuries, the census of Kaunas burghers was supervised by police officers (the gorodnitchi later by the police-masters) and indirectly by the Vilnius province treasury chambers. In addition, the commission would also usually include members of the council.\textsuperscript{54} The control and supervision of officers (gorodnitchi, police-masters) carrying out Russian government instructions was most likely only formal. These officers did not know specific people.\textsuperscript{55} Much like the council members, they were not very familiar with the Russian Charter to the Towns of 1786, and the multi-level hierarchical classification outlined in the document. In addition, this classification did not need to be followed to the letter when making records about the population based on categories. It also appears that the document was ignored when writing up the City Book in 1789, which is practically a register of all the burghers.\textsuperscript{56} The organisation of revisionary censuses most likely followed the generalised instructions coming from the Vilnius province government (orders were checked by the accountable body for this matter, the Vilnius province treasury chambers). In fact, this means that city dwellers (who made up part of the commission, and it was also they who were appointed as police councillors) could correct the classifications to a degree, rank groups not according to the order outlined in the law, and so on. While this unique division and identification were not important from an administrative point of view, they did represent the identities of the urban elites.

Owners of immovable property (a house or other building) identified as natives (Polish starożytni, Russian зажилые)\textsuperscript{57} (Table 1).

\textsuperscript{54} LVIA, f. 381, ap. 26, b. 1, l. 12.

\textsuperscript{55} Kaunas had a population of around 2,400 to 2,800 in 1795–1800. Yet demographical data from different sources varies somewhat and may be inaccurate. For example, one commission did not make a record of Jews living in Kaunas, and later it did not share any knowledge about their numbers. At the time in question, the burgher estate could have had around 850 to 920 males. The merchants’ estate had seven or eight males. At the same time, there were 28 Tartars in Kaunas. Итоговые материалы подводных переписей и ревизий населения России (1646–1858), т. 6 (1972), с. 107; KAA, f. I-61, ap.3, b.8, l. 1–49.

\textsuperscript{56} The importance of these registers to the administration of the burgher estate was much greater. For example, new burghers, newly arrived foreign craftsmen, etc, were entered in the book in accordance with the government decrees.

\textsuperscript{57} In 1795, the natives category had 82 males. In 1811 there were only 23 mentioned; however, this list is less accurate, as other data suggests there could have been around 20 men. By 1816, there were nine men and ten women. Note that in the revision of 1816 (known as the seventh), unlike in 1811 (or the sixth), women were also included in the lists. Eight people were included in this category in 1833. KAA, I-61, b. 289, l. 1–12; KAA, f. I-61, ap. 3, b. 8, l. 1–49.
This formal identification survived until the seventh (1816) and eighth (1833) revisions.\textsuperscript{58} When we look at the content of this category, we notice that, based on their economic power, the first to be entered were the wealthiest merchants, followed by certain other burghers owning larger or smaller properties, or engaging in various economic activities.\textsuperscript{59}

Table 1. Categories of burgher (officially – meshchanie), based on data from the 1795 and 1811 revisionary censuses

| Vilnius                                      | Kaunas                                      | Hierarchy from the Charter to the Towns, 1785 |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Burghers/meshchanie, property owners (possessors) | Native burghers/ meshchanie                 | True burghers (настоящие городовые обыватели); those who had immovable property in the city at their disposal and had established social links within the city. Book I. |
| Native burghers/ meshchanie                  |                                             |                                             |
| Burghers/meshchanie who could prove their noble origins | Merchants. Book II                          |                                             |
| craftsmen who belonged to a workshop         | Craftsman who belonged to a workshop        | Craftsman who belonged to a workshop. Book III |
| Independent craftsmen                        |                                             |                                             |
| Foreign burghers/ meshchanie                 | Foreign burghers/ meshchanie                | Foreigners and burghers/ meshchanie from other cities. Book IV |
| Foreign craftsmen                            |                                             | Famous citizens. Book V                     |
| Peasants from Riga                          | ‘Factory-workers’ (labourers)               | Individuals of other status (the posadin\textsuperscript{59} who did not belong to the above-mentioned groups. Book VI |
| Russian ‘arrivals’                           | Peasants from Riga                         |                                             |
| Russian ‘arrivals’                           |                                             |                                             |

Table based on: LVIA, f. 515, ap. 1, b. 183l, l. 1–137; KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 1–34.

\textsuperscript{58} KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 289, l. 1–15; KAA, f. I-61, ap. 2, b. 117, l. 1–10, 24.

\textsuperscript{59} The 1795 list also features people who were not considered part of the urban elite. Nonetheless, as the revisions from 1811 show, a significant number moved out of Kaunas, some were transferred to the nobility estate’s revisionary lists, died, or commenced military or public service. KAA, f. I-61, ap.1, b. 65, l. 1–34.

\textsuperscript{60} Posadskie (посадские) was the lowest category of townsmen estate structure in the Catherine II’s Charter of 1785 to Towns. This category often included labourers, servants, sometimes beggars and other townsmen with an unclear legal status.
It is also important to note that the identification of these categories differed somewhat in the cities. For example, in Vilnius there were three sub-categories of burghers (owners of immovable property) (see Table 1). This could have been because of the greater differentiation in the wealth status (distribution of economic capital) among residents of a larger city, or larger legal clauses, or the opinions of individuals who made up these categories. We can also note that in the Kaunas census, the category of foreign burghers was specially distinguished. It included some members of the Kaunas elite. In the census, these people would have belonged to the second category. This attribution differed from the hierarchical order of categories outlined in Russian law (Table 1).

Another document, a letter from the council to the Supreme Court of the Vilnius province from 1805, confirms the importance of classifications. In the letter, distinctions were made between merchants (of the first and second guilds), council public servants (former and existing), former council public servants (only those who once held a council position), natives (Rodovici starożytni), foreign burghers, and other categories. 61 This document confirms that the division into categories in the city during the revisionary census was not random. The same people were attributed to the mentioned categories.

In summary, we notice that the category of native burghers distinguished in the 1795 city census was a kind of oriented identity. Its emergence could have depended on several factors. First, the urban elite sought to demonstrate their group’s authority. Merchants and members of the council used symbolic capital left over from the times of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL), whose importance on positions in the Kaunas bureaucratic field was not great. 62 That means the representation of the native burgher identity with the Imperial ‘label’ attached could have encouraged respect and certain behavioural templates. Second, the status of native was an indication of collective exclusivity. This was important for understanding mental orders, which rested on category-based divisions. 63 These classifications and hierarchical rankings were especially important to the hierarchical field.

61 This list mentions burghers, burghers belonging to workshops, foreign craftsmen and Tartars living in Kaunas. KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 47, l. 150–152.
62 KAA, f. I-61, ap.1, b. 65, l. 4–5.
63 In other words, symbolic capital is recognised and understood only when applying attribution based on categories.
The native burgher status explained some of the elite’s association with the self-governing city tradition (the importance to the city), and indirectly with the symbolic legalisation of the council. The distinction of this group also demonstrated and legitimised native burghers among other participants in the field, for example, craftsmen who belonged to workshops, foreigners, etc. The historian Zigmas Kiaupa noted that in Kaunas in the late 18th century, the practically formally uniform burghers’ estate was made up of three groups: council members, a council that had sworn allegiance to the city (Polish gmini, pospolstwo, Latin communitas iurata, plebs communitas), and craftsmen. This structure functioned for as long as Magdeburg Law and privileges applied in the city. This meant several things, most importantly though, the functioning, traditional and judicially legal estate structures applied. On the other hand, structures based on Magdeburg Law and privileges were not clearly defined or established. Besides, they were important to the proper governance of the city, and yet were not automatically converted or used in the bureaucratic field. The nomination configurations and placement of positions here were somewhat different. For example, most of the council members who had sworn allegiance were entered in the category of foreign burghers. The burgher categories distinguished during the revisionary censuses were unimportant. They can be viewed as representations of the tradition and self-protection of the Kaunas elite, a kind of expression of symbolic identification. In summary, it can be said that two dispositions, the legacy of the city tradition and beneficial adaptation to the new structures, affected the experiences of members of the elite, and formed their unique kind of habitus.

64 Z. Kiaupa, ‘Kauno miesto metinio burmistro rinkimai XVIII a. antroje pusėje’, in: Ministri Historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose, eds. Z. Kiaupa, J. Sarcevičienė (Vilnius, 2013), p. 483.
65 The legal ambiguity is demonstrated in the arguments of the Vilnius burghers, merchants and council officials, as well as arguments between burghers in Kaunas regarding election procedures. A. Ragauskas, ‘Vilniaus miesto valdžios elito nobilitacinės privilegijos (1568 m.) likimas Rusijos imperijoje. (XIX a. pirmasis–trečiasis dešimtmeciai)’, in: Vilniaus istorijos metraštis, t. 1 (2007), pp. 84–87.
66 KAA, f. I-61, ap.1, b. 65, l. 3–4.
Symbolic nominations as representations of a conformation *habitus*

The impact of the *habitus* of the Kaunas elite on their decisions is revealed in another phenomenon related to the structuration of the bureaucratic field in the first years of the Imperial Russian government. Members of the city magistrate (under the influence of their *habitus*) presented themselves not just through their status as officials within the burgher estate, but also by trying to associate with the category of para-officials. This was a kind of identification which reflected not just the interests of part of the elite (they can be understood as the goal of retaining positions of authority), but was also an example of the use of the exclusive *habitus* of the burghers. It could be that this *habitus* changed the field itself as well. This is revealed in the context analysis of individuals not attributed to the burgher estate in the census of 1811.

At the end of 1811, the Vilnius province treasury chambers ordered a commission to make a record of all the nobles, officials and reserve officers living in Kaunas. A record was also made of individuals from other groups, that is, categories for Tartars, teachers, monks, the disabled and beggars (the documents went under the general heading of the manor list). This unexpectedly diverse list also featured officials from the Duma and the council, that is, the Kaunas burgomaster (Piotr von Reyss), the president of the Duma, all four of his councillors, the council clerk, and clerks from the benchers’ court. We notice that several city dwellers and their children who did not hold official positions also appeared on this list, for example, the former long-serving Kaunas burgomaster Daniel Kalow (Kalof), and the clerk Maciej Pożerski. Some of

---

67 LVIA, f. 515, ap. 15, b. 252, l. 1.
68 Note that the Reyss merchants did not always use the participle von indicating their noble status; however, in this document, von already appears in the surname of the father and his sons. This could be a reflection of the merchant’s aspirations for the future. On the other hand, in the list being analysed, this person was not attributed to the nobles or lesser nobles category. LVIA, f. 515, ap. 15, b. 252, l. 5.
69 From 1800, these men were accused by some of the burghers and certain government officials of improper management of the city’s finances. Special commissions investigated the activities of the burgomaster and his clerk on numerous occasions. They tried to defend themselves in the Vilnius provincial courts. In 1809, Pożerski was dismissed. In this list, it says that Pożerski was a lawyer. LVIA, f. 378, ap. 1800, BS, b.50, l. 1, 25, 66.
the former council officials now served as councillors with the city police, or were post office officials (Jan Essen, the son of Henrik Essen). In effect, almost all the council members were included in this category.\textsuperscript{70} This nomination and collective aspiration of the council’s members would come as no surprise if it were not for the year 1811. Note that all these individuals were included in the city books in 1798. This indicated the judicial confirmation of their belonging to a given estate. On the other hand, these individuals were not included in the revisionary census of the burghers. We could say that this was due to the poorly defined Russian law applying to cities and the burgher estate.\textsuperscript{71}

Most of the urban elite sought to become officials in 1811, that is, to rise to a higher position in the bureaucratic field.\textsuperscript{72} This is especially evident since it was several burgher officials who compiled the list, confirmed by the specifying entries and signatures on the margins of the list made by these people.\textsuperscript{73} Note also that the officials mentioned do not appear in the revisionary censuses made in 1811 and 1816.\textsuperscript{74} As we know, the council members were not included in the revisionary census of burghers (as is indicated by the revisionary census of 1816). On the other hand, these people had been entered into the Book of Burghers of 1798, which functioned as an official register of the estates, and was considered more important.

So, this list reveals part of the urban elite’s goal to position themselves in the field, and also to represent their higher status. We may ask, when creating these lists, if some of the Kaunas elite expect

\textsuperscript{70} According to Magdeburg Law and tradition, council members comprised a separate category or estate of burghers. In Kaunas they were known as council members or officials (\textit{Polish urzędnikami}).

\textsuperscript{71} R. Civinskas, ‘\textit{Lietuvos miestiečių}’, pp. 52–59.

\textsuperscript{72} The Imperial Russian law the Charter to the Towns of 1785 foresaw that famous citizens could be entered in city books: council officials, scientists, etc. This category of individuals was not distinguished in 1811, and it appears this moment was overlooked. Nonetheless, the Duma official’s status probably changed the situation. We should also remember that the census was held after the reorganisation of the Kaunas city council into the Duma in 1808. The officials mentioned had formally become members of an estate-based self-government institution.

\textsuperscript{73} For example, Maciej Pożerski signed on the eighth page. LVIA, f. 515, ap. 15, b. 252, l. 1.

\textsuperscript{74} Some individuals attributed to the category of officials could have been included in the census of burghers in 1811. The first page of this census was torn out. It could be that some people did this to ‘hide’ certain entries.
to receive individual and collective nobilitations, like the members of the Vilnius council who actively pursued it.\(^{75}\) This question is difficult to answer. One thing is certain: the Kaunas council members did know about this possibility, as they visited Vilnius regularly to handle their trade and business matters. On the other hand, facts testifying that individual attempts were made to prove one’s noble origins were not found.\(^{76}\)

Nevertheless, based on the compilation of the revisionary lists, it can be said that over the course of several dozen years, some of the urban elite worked out the logic of how to function in the bureaucratic field. They managed to exploit the unclearly defined orders from the Imperial Russian government, the burgher estate law that itself raised many questions, and the upheavals of the transition period.

But most importantly in the case examined here, the entry of the Kaunas council members in the diverse list of nobles and officials represents their new identification with the unclearly defined category of Imperial para-officials. Being a para-official, at least symbolically, meant having a higher status. This most likely excused them from having to pay the demeaning pillow tax, and perhaps conscript duty as well.

On the other hand, this case reveals how effectively the positioned nomenklatura could be exploited as symbolic capital, entrenching the positions of the elite. Ultimately, the nomination of para-officials in this list also reflects the impact of the conforming \textit{habitus} in the bureaucratic field. The \textit{habitus} of this elite group did not form over a few years, but over the course of several decades. Its foundation was the historic tradition of the nobility (\textit{szlachetnych}).\(^{77}\) Incidentally, the \textit{habitus} of benchers (existing or former) formed

\(^{75}\) For more, see: Ragainauskas, ‘Vilniaus miesto’, pp. 81–84.

\(^{76}\) In 1798, the Kaunas \textit{voigt} Jozef Chrapički refused to be entered in the burgher and merchants books. Some of the elites used his belonging to the estate of nobles as an argument for his dismissal. The burghers did not allow the \textit{voigt} to serve in his position from 1800. They explained to the provincial government that Chrapički was not entered in the burgher or merchants books, or the revisionary census, and so, according to Russian law, could not serve in this position. Interestingly, in 1798–1800, the council noted that he still held his position, and was performing his duties in line with the old Kaunas laws. The changed position of the council was determined by internal conflicts and arguments among the elite. LVIA, f. 380, ap. 26, b. 1, l 5; LVIA, f. 378, ap. 1800, BS, b. 58, l. 1, 2.

\(^{77}\) The \textit{szlachetnych} title was applied to councillors and benchers. The term was actually still in widespread use in the correspondence of the council from the late 18th to 19th centuries and tax lists, and less commonly in protocols, etc. This title explained their symbolic social exclusivity and belonging to a sub-estate group.
the collective biography of officials as the practice of acting whilst holding a position and being in an institution. Based on research into elite groups from other cities, we can presume that being a council member alone created a unique habitus. It consisted of many small variables, the ethos of professionalism, the importance of being educated, the goal of improving, the historic tradition of a self-governing city, etc.

**In search of a collective habitus for merchants**

The Kaunas city elites not only chose a strategy of becoming para-officials or uniquely conformed to the Imperial urban estate category to entrench their status, but also seized the opportunity to rise up a notch in the stratification of Imperial estates. In the Russian Empire, merchants were probably the only category of people who could pay for their estate status and the privileges it afforded. This status also meant greater influence and higher positions in the bureaucracy and city government. On the other hand, historiography suggests that at the beginning of the 19th century, the positions of merchants in Lithuania’s city structures were quite strong. There are doubts whether this was actually the case, however. Formally, one became a merchant (usually rising from the burgher estate) when one paid taxes to the state which would issue a receipt in their name. Also, merchants who belonged to one of the three guilds (kinds of corporate organisations) were ensured privileges and a prestigious status.

Until 1795 (before merchants were attributed to guilds), the status of merchants in Kaunas was based on the commercial activities

---

78 This is comparable to the economic urban elites of Germany or France. M. Reitmayer, ‘Bürgerlichkeit als Habitus Zur Lebensweise deutscher Großbankiers im Kaiserreich’, in: Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Heft. 1 (1999), pp. 66–87; M. Maurer, Die Biographie des Bürgers. Lebensformen und Denkweisen in der formativen Phase des deutschen Bürgertums (1680–1815) (Göttingen, 1996), pp. 434–435.

79 Most researchers note that the Imperial Russian government supported merchants from the first guild, as it suited its estate and economic policy goals. M. Hildermeier, Bürgertum und Stadt in Russland 1760–1870: rechtliche Lage und soziale Struktur (Köln, 1986), pp. 124–126.

80 A. Ambrulevičiūtė, ‘Pirklių teisinis apibrėžimas’, p. 69; A. Ambrulevičiūtė, Vilniaus pirkliai, pp. 332–341; T. Bairasauskaitė, Vilniaus pirkliai XVIII a. pabaigoje–XIX a. 4-ojo dešimtmečio viduryje, p. 34; G. Hausmann, Gesellschaft als lokale Veranstaltung: Selbstverwaltung, Assozierung und Geselligkeit in den Städten des ausgehenden Zarenreiches (Göttingen, 2002), pp. 15–25; A. J. Rieber, Merchants and entrepreneurs in imperial Russia (Chapel Hill, 1982), pp. 8–16.

81 A. Ambrulevičiūtė, Vilniaus pirkliai, pp. 31–32.
they undertook and the valid laws of the time. Historic research into the city’s society revealed that the Kaunas city elite consisted of merchants.\textsuperscript{82} Their legal status in the 18th century in Kaunas was somewhat different, it usually depended on the legal-political regime of the time. Some documents offer indirect evidence that merchants formed a separate community (in Latin \textit{honorata Communitas Mercatoria}, in Polish \textit{Konfraternia Kupiecka, Izba Kupiecka}). Liudas Glemža indicates in his research that the Kaunas craftsmen blamed the merchants for the election results in 1794, and referring to the new laws proclaimed the equality of all the city’s citizens (the Hrodno parliament reforms were to guarantee the right of all city residents who owned immovable property to vote).\textsuperscript{83} This and other facts testify to the group identity of the merchants. There are too few historical studies to suggest a strong corporate identity among the Kaunas merchants.

Several changes took place at the end of the 18th century. We learn from the council’s responses to the government, election protocols and other documents that from 1795 a separate merchants book was kept.\textsuperscript{84} It is likely that it was compiled on the day of the revisionary census, with a merchants’ meeting being held especially for the occasion. Unlike before, this bureaucratic register had a record of the formal estate status of individuals. Jews were attributed to the Kaunas merchants’ community from the very first years of Russian governance.\textsuperscript{85} From 1798, merchants were placed in guilds. From the response of the Kaunas council to the burghers of Raseiniai, we learn that the Kaunas merchants and the council soon gained a good understanding of Russian law. From 1785, burghers did have the Charter to the Towns of Catherine II (the Kaunas burgomaster suggested officials in Raseiniai have the document sent from Vilnius).\textsuperscript{86} Imperial decrees regulating merchants’ dues were

\textsuperscript{82} Z. Kiaupa, ‘Kauno miesto’, p. 483; L. Glemža, \textit{Savivaldos darbas Kauno rotušėje}, online: <http://kaunosenamiestis.autc.lt/lt/paieska/objektas/1717/savivaldos-darbas-kauno-rotuseje> (accessed: 2017-09-19); R. Urbaitytė, ‘Kauno miesto valdžia ir cechai XVIII a. antrojo pusėje’, in: \textit{Kauno istorijos metraštis}, t. 9 (2008), pp. 46–49.

\textsuperscript{83} L. Glemža, ‘\textit{Savivaldos darbas}’.

\textsuperscript{84} In 1798, on the demands of the Kaunas gorodnitchi (городничий) Weyss, the council appointed a councillor and a clerk to compile the new book. KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 8, l. 3; KAA, f. I-31, ap. 1; b. 167, l. 194.

\textsuperscript{85} In 1795–1805, the number of merchants in Kaunas varied between 11 and 19. Most were locals, three had arrived from Riga. Three merchants were also Prussian subjects. KAA, f. I-31, ap. 1; b.167, l. 140, 194; KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1; b. 47, l. 150.

\textsuperscript{86} KAA, f. I-61, ap. 1, b. 8, l. 37.
also known. From 1798–1800, the Kaunas council carried out all the functions associated with overseeing the merchants and defending their rights in Russian government institutions.

The closer unification among Christian merchants in Kaunas in the 19th century was also encouraged by the unfavourable trading conditions with Prussia, and the great fire, which damaged some of their homes. Merchants often appealed to the Russian government to try to defend their economic interests. In these letters (they were mostly submitted by the council member and merchant of the first guild Piotr Reyss), the Kaunas merchants’ community (целого общества ковенских купцов) featured as a collective representative.\(^87\) The word ‘visa’ meant that both Christian and Jewish merchants were represented. Note that the famous Kaunas merchant wrote from Moscow to the governor-general of Vilnius Levin von Bennigsen, after the coronation of Alexander I. In his long request he wrote on behalf of the Lithuanian merchants (about equating guild taxes with those paid by merchants from the Russian Empire) and the Kaunas merchants (requesting trade concessions with Prussia). In addition, the merchant asked the provincial government on behalf of the citizens of Kaunas to allocate timber construction materials. An analysis of Reyss’ appeal indicates that he based merchants’ trade on the privileges issued by the rulers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.\(^88\) On the other hand, this more likely served the personal position and interests of the merchant himself. The new merchants’ corporations lacked strong social capital (they had not formed a network, there were no institutionalised forms of activity), but they all related to the city’s governance and participated in the activities of the estate’s institutions. This is proven by the merchants’ belonging to different political groups within the city government, and the competition for positions.\(^89\) There is nothing to indicate that there was a collective *habitus* of merchants within the bureaucracy, as they shared no emotional or mental bonds. Decisions by merchants most likely depended on their individual provisions.

For example, Fridrich Hechel, who had arrived from Riga (he appears on the first guild or merchants list from 1798), positioned himself in the bureaucratic field, identifying with the Imperial es-

\(^87\) LVIA, f. 378, ap. 1801, BS, b.29, l. 1–5.
\(^88\) Ibid.
\(^89\) R. Civinskas, L. Glemža, ‘Kauno magistrato politinės kultūros bruožai XVIII–XIX a. sandūroje’, in: *Kauno istorijos metraštis*, t. 3 (2002), pp. 67–81.
tate and the associated exclusive estate-based laws. This merchant referred to them constantly when lodging appeals about violations in council elections and accusing other councillors. These sorts of demands made by a merchant of the first guild, submitted to Imperial government institutions based on Imperial merchants’ law, were often successful. For example, he was allowed to participate as a merchant in the 1803 elections, despite not owning any property in the city. In response to the merchant’s complaints, the Vilnius governor-general Bennigsen sought an explanation from the Russian minister of internal affairs. In his response, the minister indicated that elections in the city had to be held according to the procedures outlined in the Charter to the Towns of 1785. Note also that this merchant never based his appeals on Magdeburg Law or the old privileges that still applied in government institutions in Kaunas. Nor did he ever mention the city’s tradition. Merchants played a prominent role in his rhetoric, that is, higher-ranking burghers, etc. This former Riga merchant’s habitus could have been formed through his activities in Riga. The traditional Kaunas merchant identity did not function in Hechel’s bureaucratic field of city governance (unlike the cases discussed earlier). Quite the opposite, he invested his social capital (his status as a merchant in the first guild) and judicial capital (Russian city laws, awareness of how the complaints procedure functioned in his decision-making) in order to ensure higher positions in the bureaucratic field. In addition, the merchant had a sense of how to play the bureaucratic field, formed through practices that were in part successfully employed.

An analysis of elections to the Kaunas council (1802–1804) shows that Hechel had the support of the long-serving Kaunas burgomaster Kalow, and some other councillors. Reyss was among them, despite having lost the elections in 1802. They seemed to cower behind

---

90 He appealed by writing to the governor-general that the other candidates had not paid their guild taxes, and as such could not be allowed to participate in the elections. Hechel also doubted the legitimacy of the elections (in three complaints), because the other candidates were not merchants. He stated indirectly that burgomasters should only be merchants. In his third complaint about election violations, he mentioned that he was representing the merchants himself, i.e., the merchants’ faction, even though formally only a few merchants of the several dozen that belonged to this faction had actually signed the complaints. Mention of this has been encountered in only one document. LVIA, f. 378, ap. 1802, BS, b. 72, l. 9, 31, 41.

91 Ibid., l. 91.
Hechel’s aggressive stance during the elections (during the election meeting there were both harsh debates and physical confrontations, as well as incidents of violent behaviour). It is believed that they were the result of political interests, and the realisation that the status of merchant of the first guild was better capital for functioning in the bureaucracy than having formerly held the position of burgomaster, especially since Kalow was involved in proceedings in the provincial court over abuse of his position. On the other hand, it appears that Kalow and Reyss must have been affected by the collective *habitus* of the city officials, where conformation and upholding the city tradition were more important than any election battles.

**Conclusions**

1. In conceptualising historical research on identities, we notice that they can be effectively researched by adopting the *habitus* concept normally used by sociologists and historians (based on Bourdieu’s ‘field’ theory). It is suitable for examining urban elite identities for two reasons. First, *habitus* encompasses the collective lives of city-dwellers (a certain biographical experience) and facts that are important to their self-awareness. In this case, it is important to note that the concept not only covers the Kaunas burghers and council tradition (relations with estate-based institutions, the city, etc) and the historical memory as a means of acting, but also ensures a kind of continuity to the research. Second, when examining the impact of *habitus* on presentations of identity, we can also study burghers’ image, their understanding and emotional configurations associated with the ‘here and now’ situation at the time, that is, with their attitude to the Russian government (the new Imperial estate derivatives ‘handed-down’ from above, forms of control and domination, the reduced authority of the council in the city’s governance, etc), and the changed economic situation. In addition, a study based on local, micro-historical cases allows us to combine an analysis of group and individual elite identities.

2. The Imperial Russian government sought to construct collective identities for the Kaunas burghers (as well as for other Lithuanian cities) in line with the Imperial estate and its categories that were neither legally nor factually uniform. An analysis of the process of

---

92 R. Civinskas, L. Glemža, ‘Kauno magistrato’, pp. 75–81.
93 LVIA, f. 381, ap. 24, b.44, l. 214.
implementation of this goal in Kaunas points to the fact that it was inconsistent, rather random in its nature, and fragmented. This was natural to the bureaucratic field that formed in the city of Kaunas as well. The main interest of the Imperial Russian government in this field was ensuring the control of tax collection and duties carried out by the burghers. On the other hand, the construction of newly created Imperial estates was not completely shunted off to the fringes of policy implementation either. We should note that the administration of the classification of Imperial estates also involved individual members of the Kaunas elite. Council burgomasters, counsellors and clerks, conforming with the new order, often relied on the phenomenon of information asymmetry, widespread corruption in Imperial office, etc. Nevertheless, Russian government institutions and individual officers totally dominated the bureaucracy that functioned in Kaunas.

3. The beneficial conformation to the Imperial order’s collective habitus is evident among members of the Kaunas urban elite in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Several phenomena reveal this. First, the category of native burghers distinguished in the city census of 1795 (it remained in later censuses as well) was a kind of orientation of their unique identity. The emergence of the category could have been determined by several factors. First, the urban elite sought to display their group’s authority. The status of being native to the city was an indication of collective exclusivity. This was important for the understanding of mental orders, based on a division according to categories. These classifications and hierarchical rankings were especially significant in the hierarchical field. In addition, the status of a native burgher explained some of the elite’s association with the tradition of a self-governing city (their importance to the city), and indirectly to the symbolic legitimisation of the council. The categories of burgher distinguished during revisionary censuses were practically insignificant. They can be viewed as presentations of the tradition and self-protection of the Kaunas elite, that is, as a certain kind of expression of symbolic identity. In summary, we can say that two dispositions, the legacy of the city tradition and the beneficial conformation to the new structures, affected the experiences of members of the elite, and formed a unique kind of habitus. The conformation habitus not only covers identification with the Imperial estates, but can also be related to symbolic feelings, reflections on tradition, and the sensation and experience of everyday threats from
the government as the political regime changed in the 18th century, and possible economic benefits.

4. The *habitus* of beneficial conformation to the Imperial order was presented in the association of members of the Kaunas council (some of the elite) with the category of para-officials. These collective *habitus* representations were revealed in the list of males compiled at the end of 1811 in Kaunas, where they were attributed to the categories of nobles, officials, reserve officers, scientists, and others. The remarkably diverse list featured existing and former council officials (formally, from 1808, the council became the Kaunas Duma). In effect, in 1811, the majority of the urban elite sought to become officials, that is, to rise to a higher position in the bureaucratic field. The story behind the compilation of this list reveals the goal of the urban elites to position themselves in the field, thereby representing their higher status. The inclusion of members of the Kaunas council in the diverse list of nobles and officials also represented their new identity, and the ambiguously defined Imperial para-official category. Being a para-official, at least symbolically, indicated a higher status. It most likely meant that such individuals could be excused from paying the demeaning pillow tax, and perhaps even conscript duty. On the other hand, this case reveals how effectively the positioned nomenklatura could be employed as symbolic capital, entrenching the positions of an elite group. The Kaunas elite had a clear sense of the ‘game’ in the bureaucracy, which it successfully put to good use. This group (like the majority of the city elite) also had a collective orientation to the *habitus* of the city tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

5. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the Kaunas merchant elite (in terms of Imperial estate-based law, they comprised a separate category among the other elites) seized the opportunity to rise a stage in the Imperial estate-based stratification. They employed the beneficial conformation *habitus*. The beneficial conformation *habitus* encouraged some of the members of the elite to pay taxes and join guilds to become ‘legitimate’ merchants, that is, to meet the formal requirements set out in Imperial law. This guaranteed a number of privileges, and a higher status. On the other hand, historical research does not determine a unique collective *habitus* for this group in the bureaucratic field, due to the differing economic interests of merchants and their amassed social capital. (Some merchants were Jews. In addition, merchants
from Riga settled in Kaunas towards the end of the 19th century. Some of them became active figures in the bureaucratic field. Of course, Christian city dwellers also engaged in trade.) The conformation habitus was expressed individually. For example, Fridrich Hechel, who had arrived from Riga (he appears on the list of first guild merchants from 1798), positioned himself in the bureaucratic field by identifying with the Imperial estate and the exclusive estate-based laws afforded to this group. This merchant never relied on Magdeburg Law which applied in the city, or the old privileges, nor did he speak about the city’s tradition; that is, he was not affected by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania’s city tradition habitus. Quite the opposite, social capital (first guild merchant status) and judicial capital (knowledge of Russian city law and the impact of complaints in decision-making) were invested in order to secure higher positions in the bureaucratic field. The Kaunas, that is, Grand Duchy of Lithuania’s city, tradition habitus affected other Christian merchants, just as it did the majority of the urban elite.
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BESIKEIČIANT MIESTO, LUOMO IR CARO POLITIKOS PEIZAŽAMS: KAUNO MIESTIEČIŲ ELITO HABITUS IR SIMBOLINĖS REPREZENTACIJOS XIX A. PRADŽIOJE

Santrauka

REMIGIJUS CIVINSKAS

XIX a. socialinių-ekonominiių tapatumų kaitos tema sulaukia itin daug Europos istorikų aptarimo. Akivaizdu, kad Lietuvos ir Vakarų Europos istoriniuose pasakojimuose yra nesutarimų dėl tapatumų tyrimų mokslojo analitiškumo, objektyvumo. Ypač tai aktualu nesutarimų miesto visuomenė. Šiame straipsnyje, remiantis sociologo Pierre Bourdieu teorine prieiga, analizuojamos Kauno miestiečių luomo elito socialinės tapatybės ir jas lemintantys veiksnių XVIII a. pabaigoje – XIX a. pradžioje. Ėmėse nėščių pasitelkiai habitus sąvoka, padedanti atskleisti elito grupės tapatumų su miestu, luominėmis struktūromis (senojo Kauno miestiečių luomo tradicija ir naujaisiais Rusijos imperiniai luomai) reprezentacijas. Išanalizuotas miesto elitos nustatyta:

1) caro valdžia siekė „sukonstruoti“ Kauno (kaip ir kitų Lietuvos miestų) miestiečių kolektyvinius tapatumus su teisiškai ir faktiškai nevieniu imperiniu luomu ir jo kategorijomis. Nagrinėjant šio sumanymo įgyvendinimo procesą Kaune galima pastebėti, kad jis buvo nenuoseklys, atsitiktinis, fragmentiškas. Tai buvo natūralu Kauno mieste susiformavusiam biurokratiniam laukui. Pagrindinis caro valdžios interesas buvo nukreptas į miestiečių vykdomų prievolių kontrolės užtikrinimą ir mokestių surinkimą. Kita vertus, naujai kuriamų imperiniai luomų konstravimas nebuvo nustumtas į visiškus politikos įgyvendinimo užribius. Reikia pažymėti, kad į imperinių luominių klasifikacijų administravimą buvo įtraukti ir atskiri Kauno elito nariai;

2) naudingas prisitaikymo prie imperinės tvarkos kolektyvinis habitus yra ryškus tarp Kauno miestiečių elito XVIII a. pabaigoje – XIX a. pradžioje. Tai atskleidžia neįtikėtinai vyriškų narių kategorijos. Pirmo, 1795 m. miestų gyventojų surašyme išskirta senbuvių miestiečių kategorija, kuri išliko ir vėlesniuose surašymuose) buvo savito tapatumo orientacija. Galima pastebėti, kad dvi dispozicijos – miesto tradicijos paveldas ir naudingas prisitaikymas prie naujų struktūrų – veikė elito narių patyrimus ir formavą savitą habitus. Prisitaikymo habitus apima ne tik tapatumus su imperiniai luomai, bet gali būti siejamas su simbolinėmis jausnomis, refleksijomis, su tradicija, kasdieninės grėsmės iš valdžios jausnomis, patirtimis, atsiradusiomis besikeičiant politiniams režimams XVIII a., ir galima ekonominė nauda.