

THE HERMAN HESCHELES HOUSE OF THE POOR ISRAELITES IN LVOV. HISTORY OF THE FACILITY UNTIL 1939

Anna Jakimyszyn-Gadocha
(Jagiellonian University in Kraków)

Key words: Jews, Lvov, House of the Poor, Herman Heschel

Abstract: Hirsch Herman Heschel, a Jew born in Lvov, was the owner of private companies in Vienna and a philanthropist. As his life was associated with two cities – Lvov and Vienna – it was there that he decided to organize his philanthropic activities. The article is devoted to the history of the Herman Heschel House of the Poor Israelites in Lvov, which was opened in 1896. In this house poor Jewish people of different ages and various states of health, lived over the decades, having been guaranteed accommodation. This was the only foundation of its type to operate in Lvov before World War II.

Charity, which is one of the *mitzvot*, is an integral element in the life of each member of the Jewish community. The welfare activities undertaken vary in nature and are addressed to different groups. This was also the case in Lvov's Jewish community, where a number of foundations were active.¹ One of them was the Herman Heschel Foundation.

Hirsch Heschel, who would later use the name Herman, was born in Lvov in 1827, the son of Isch [...] Ya [...] Mayer and Rivka vel Rebeca.² In 1856, he married Taube Toni Blumenthal (b. 1832), who used the name Antonie (Antonina), daughter of Liepe.³ The Heschel family moved to Vienna, where Herman developed his business activities.⁴ He was the owner of private companies, but his fortune came from money lending. It was as a result of such activities that he was accused of fraudulent actions in the 1880s.⁵ As the case became known throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Heschel attempted to clear his name until the end of his life (he died on 9 December 1889).⁶ One of the activities in which he engaged was philanthropy.

¹ More about Jewish charity in Lvov: Wierzbieniec 2012, 367-375.

² He was born on 12 February 1827: TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701 op. 1, spr. 110, p. 42, record number 22. Cf. *Wiener Abendpost* 1887, no. 149, 7-8; *Neue Freie Presse* 1889, no. 9087, 16.

³ TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701, op. 1, spr. 134, p. 16, record number 92/46.

⁴ *Die Presse* 1887, no. 183, 10.

⁵ *Ibid.*; *Vorarlberger Volksblatt* 1887, no. 152, 1-2; (*Neuigkeits*) *Welt Blatt* 1887, no. 151, 7-8; *Die Presse* 1887, no. 183, 10-12; *Neue Freie Presse* 1887, no. 8208, 4-5; *Volksblatt für Stadt und Land* 1887, no. 80, 4; *Badener Bezirks-Blatt* 1887, no. 82, 1-2.

⁶ *Neue Freie Presse* 1889, no. 9087, 16.

As his life was associated with two cities, Lvov and Vienna, it was there that he decided to organize his philanthropic activities. His actions in this regard were supported by and continued, after his death, by his spouse.⁷ By Herman Heschel's last will, an assistance fund for Jewish girls from Vienna was established in 1893 and named after him.⁸ In fact, the priority for use of these resources was to go to poor girls from the founder's or his wife's family.⁹ The Heschel's attempted to support poorer members of their families. However, they did not spare funds for other purposes, for instance offering donations to the community, by financing the activities of the Vienna synagogue.

The second Heschel's foundation operated in Lvov, providing funds for a home for the poor residents of the town.¹⁰ In his last will and testament, Herman Heschel donated 20,000 florins for the purchase or construction of a foundation house in which free housing would be offered to the poor Jewish families in Lvov. Priority in terms of occupancy was, as in the case of the Vienna foundation, granted to relatives of the founders.¹¹ The house was to be purchased or constructed by the Jewish community with the involvement of Heschel's eldest son, Max,¹² and in the case of his death, of the founder's son-in-law, Viktor Silberstein.¹³ The two were also to manage the foundation house with the *kehilla* administration.¹⁴

This article attempts to reconstruct the history and the mode of operation of the foundation house, and to determine by whom and under what conditions it was inhabited. It is the first attempt to examine this subject, which is made all the more interesting by the fact that the house for the poor was the only foundation of the type to operate in Lvov before World War II. The information presented here is based on source documents from the Central State Archives of Ukraine in Lvov (TsDIAL of Ukraine), the State Archives of Lviv Oblast (DALO) and information published in the press during that period.

Property

The lot for the construction of the foundation house, measuring 337 square fathoms, was acquired by the Jewish community under a contract dated 1 October 1893 from Samuel and Drezla Fischer, for the amount of 2,190 zlotys 50 cents.¹⁵ However, it was not immediately transferred to the new owner. The issue was only cleared after the death

⁷ Antonie (Antonina) Heschel, née Blumenthal, died 14 April 1906; *Wiener Sonn- und Montags-Zeitung* 1906, no. 16, 5-6.

⁸ *Die Neuzeit* 1894, no. 15, 154; *Prager Abendblatt* 1887, no. 149, 5; *Die Neuzeit* 1898, no. 18, 198; *Die Neuzeit* 1896, no. 19, 203; *Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung* 1918, no. 244, 1.

⁹ *Neue Freie Presse* 1889, no. 9087, 16.

¹⁰ TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 2 V 1892, p. 30; *ibid.*, 4 IV 1893, p. 32.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, 1-8, 15 VII 1890, 13-14; *ibid.*, New Statute "The Herman Heschel's House of the Poor Israelites in Lvov," 8-10.

¹² The Heschel's had four children: Max, Leopold, Anna and Adele: *Neue Freie Presse* 1889, no. 9087, 16.

¹³ Victor was Anna's husband; *ibid.*

¹⁴ TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849; New Statute "The Herman Heschel's House of the Poor Israelites in Lvov," 8.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, 1 X 1893, 17.

of the Fischers,¹⁶ when a new mortgage entity was created, and the property rights were transferred.¹⁷

The purchased lot was located on Panieńska Street in Lvov. In 1895, plans were drafted to build a foundation house and work was started. Herman Heschels's plans concerning the involvement of the male members of the family in the construction of the house were not fulfilled. All the work was coordinated by the representatives of the Jewish community. The house consisted of two parts: a two-story building facing the street and an adjacent one-story outbuilding.¹⁸ The higher part of the building consisted of 10 cellars, a staircase, a latrine, 11 two-room apartments including a room and a kitchen, and four one-room apartments.¹⁹ The rooms were distributed as follows: five rooms and kitchens were located on the ground floor, and four kitchens, five rooms, the latrine and the staircase on the first and second floors.²⁰ In the outbuilding, the caretaker's room was located.²¹ Behind the house, a garden was situated.²²

The foundation house was ceremonially opened on 2 October 1896.²³ At the expense of the Jewish community, a plaque was made and placed on the gate of the building, bearing the following inscription: "To commemorate forever the memory of the founder of this establishment, Herman Heschels, this plaque has been made by the representation of the Jewish religious community in Lvov."²⁴

Legal basis for the operation of the foundation house

The activities of the foundation house were based on the provisions contained in the foundation act and the rules for the beneficiaries of the home for the poor of the Herman Heschels Foundation for Poor Israelite Families, drafted by the religious council of the Israelite congregation in Lvov at the annual meeting on 27 May 1902 and approved by the rescript of 10 October 1903, confirmed by the KK Vice-regency.²⁵

Under the foundation act, the Herman Heschels Foundation's funds consisted of the property at Panieńska Street and mortgage bonds (§ II). The aim of the foundation was to provide free housing to poor Israelite families (§ III, IV), which were selected through a competition. However, it was emphasized that priority rights were to be granted to the relatives of the founder and his wife (§ V). The curator of the Foundation's activities was to be the founder's son-in-law or another male descendant. If these were to disappear,

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1 II 1898, 28-29.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 1895, pp. 3-4; 18 I 1895, 5.

¹⁸ Cf. <http://www.lvivcenter.org/en/lia/posts/metropolis-and-pidzamche/>.

¹⁹ TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, 8.

²⁰ Another room layout is also cited: five bedrooms and three kitchens on the ground floor, five rooms and four kitchens on the first floor, and three kitchens and six rooms on the second floor: *ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, bd., 64.

²¹ DALO, f. 2 op. 1 spr. 3863, 4 IX 1896; Architectural plan, 14 X 1895, 12-15.

²² TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, bd., 64.

²³ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 1 X 1896, 7-8.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 2 IX 1896, 11.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

the authority was to be taken over by the authorities of the *kehilla* (§ VI, VII, VIII).²⁶ This happened when Herscheles's son-in-law died childless.²⁷ However, for the proper functioning of the Foundation, two inspectors were appointed at that time to supervise its activities.²⁸

People applying for admission to the house were selected in a competition. Apart from their relationship with the founders, financial and health status, age, and moral stature were also taken into account. The winners of the competition had to respect the provisions of the house regulations, which defined their rights and obligations, as well as the rules for the use of the assigned premises, in great detail.

The residents of the foundation house were referred to as beneficiaries, because they obtained the right to free-of-charge use of premises financed by the foundation. At the same time, they were obliged to pay a certain amount for building maintenance. They were allocated housing quarters, which could not be used for other activities, e.g. trade. However, with the consent of the *kehilla* authorities, they could carry out in their homes such commercial work which did not disturb the peace of other residents, which gave them the opportunity to improve their material status.²⁹

As the premises were assigned on an individual basis, beneficiaries were not entitled to transfer the apartments to a third party or offer overnight accommodation to anyone. They could use the apartments with their closest relatives, but these first had to be proposed and accepted by the *kehilla*.³⁰ When a beneficiary died, his heirs lost the rights to the apartment. However, if they wished to remain in the apartment, and their financial situation justified a claim for seeking a place in the house for the poor, they were required to apply for the right to continue using the apartment within 14 days from the date of the beneficiary's death. If they failed to do so, or their request was refused, they had to leave the premises.³¹

The rights to the apartments could also be lost as a result of criminal activities, changes in property relations, mental or incurable illness which required specialized care, immoral conduct, using the premises for purposes other than residential ones, and delays in the payment of building maintenance costs.³² If any of these offenses was committed by the beneficiary, other residents, if they occupied smaller premises, could apply for transfer to the vacated apartment.³³ However, if the situation concerned a family member, he lost the right to reside in the premises.³⁴

Each beneficiary was obliged to take care of the premises assigned. The rules contained a provision requiring that the floor be cleaned twice a month and the windows once a month. The residents were also obliged to care for the shared space. It was forbidden to litter the courtyards, stairs and corridors, as well as porches. They were also required to take care of security considerations. As a result, it was not allowed to keep

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1 and others.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 24 IV 1898, 1.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, § 1, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, § 2, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³¹ *Ibid.*, § 3, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³² *Ibid.*, § 4, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³³ *Ibid.*, § 5, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, § 6, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

flammable objects and those harmful to health in apartments, basements, and the attic.³⁵ It was also prohibited to make any changes to the standard of the apartments, by which alterations such as demolishing walls and changing floors, woodwork, and window frames were understood.³⁶

Appropriate behavior in the building was also required. It was forbidden to disturb the peace of other tenants with quarrels. Running in the hallways and on the porches was also prohibited.³⁷ Furthermore, residents had to comply with rules regarding curfew. At 10 pm, the caretaker locked the main gate, after which time no one could enter the building without his consent, because the residents did not have their own keys. Rules for the use of the garden, located at the rear of the building, were also set out. It could be used by all residents, but they were obliged to respect the greenery: it was forbidden to destroy the lawn, break trees and shrubs and pick fruit.³⁸

Each of the residents was required to abide by these provisions.³⁹ To ensure that nobody could claim ignorance, it was required that the house rules be placed on the bulletin board located in the hallway of the building.⁴⁰ As a result, all knew that breaking the established rules could result in a verbal warning, a written reprimand, or even the loss of the lodgings.⁴¹ In addition, upon taking possession of the apartment, each beneficiary signed a written statement confirming the acceptance of the rules.⁴²

The rules contained another important provision concerning the administrative supplement. It was to be paid by each beneficiary if funds for the maintenance of the house provided from the mortgage bonds were insufficient. The supplement was initially between 10 and 20 crowns, depending on the size of premises occupied.⁴³ In the interwar period, when funds were devaluated, and the sums provided by the inhabitants proved too low to cover the expenses, it was decided that each beneficiary inhabiting one room was to pay 2 zlotys per month, and those occupying two-room apartments, 4 zlotys.⁴⁴ This provision was introduced in the new, 12-point, Foundation Statute, approved by the Ministry of Social Welfare in 1935.⁴⁵

The Statute duplicated the existing provisions, and maintained the name of the foundation: "Herman Hescheles House of the Poor Israelites in Lvov."⁴⁶ It remained in force until World War II, but in 1939, an additional provision was introduced, changing the amount due for occupying the premises. The charge was increased to 10 and 20 zlotys respectively for one- and two-room apartments.⁴⁷ These amounts were used to finance fixed fees for the maintenance of the house, including the caretaker's salary and the tools

³⁵ *Ibid.*, § 7, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, § 8, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, § 9, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, § 10, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, § 12, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32; CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, bd., 55.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 22 III 1922, 69.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, § 14, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

⁴² *Ibid.*, § 9, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, § 10, 15-17, 20-22, 30-32.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 8-10, 35-37, point VIII.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 8-10, 35-37.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 31 V 1939, 46.

needed (brooms, brushes, cloths), charges for water, electricity and waste collection, cleaning latrines and chimneys, building maintenance, and other unforeseen repairs.⁴⁸

In addition, by a 1902 decision, the National Revenue Directorate excused the foundation house from payment of tax, starting on 1 November 1896, as the date of the actual commencement of the building use.⁴⁹ In 1923, the property was exempted from resident tax as a facility rented by a charity (in accordance with Art. 22 paragraph C of the Act of 17 December 1921, Journal of Laws RP No. 2/922).⁵⁰

The technical condition of the building

When the foundation house was opened, it was decided that one of its inhabitants would always act as the facility's caretaker,⁵¹ responsible to the building manager and inspectors appointed by the *kehilla*. These, in turn, were charged with supervising the state of the property, and solving problems if any were found. For this reason, inspectors were obliged to visit the foundation house regularly. Records of such visits testify to the overall good sanitary condition of the apartments, thereby confirming the fulfilment of the provisions of the House Rules.⁵² Not all tenants, however, were willing to submit to the rules in force. In 1922, the *kehilla* board was notified by the other inhabitants of the inappropriate behavior of one of the tenants, Regina Heschel, who was accused of damaging the common property, doing laundry in the hallway, ironing and cooking on coals (which constituted a fire hazard), flooding the ceiling of the neighbor residing on a lower floor, breaking trees in the house garden, ruining the aqueduct, quarrels with tenants, beating children and disturbance during curfew.⁵³

At the same time, due to the caretaker's negligence, the public space was not always maintained in good order.⁵⁴ In the winter of 1921/1922, the caretaker was fined for failing to provide lighting for the building staircase, which was required to be lighted in winter between the hours of 4 and 10 pm. On the evening in question, someone put out the lamp in the stairwell to steal glass from the lampshade. As this happened after 7 o'clock, when the shops were closed, the caretaker could not buy the missing item (and did not have another one in stock). The failure was spotted and reported, as a result of which a fine was charged.⁵⁵

In the interwar period, it proved necessary to perform many running repairs, including cementing basement walls, repairing or completing outflow pipes, and renovating the facade. The Foundation did not have the necessary funds to carry out repairs or cover a part of the charges resulting from them, and applied to the *kehilla* for funds.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, bd., 11; *ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 6 VII 1923, 56.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 21 III 1924, 44.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 13 XI 1924, 43.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 2 IX 1896, 11.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 6 VIII 1922, 54

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 8 I 1922, 94, 9 VII 1922, 91.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 8 I 1922, 94-95, 14 I 1922, 97-99.

In addition, it was summoned to carry out maintenance work by municipal authorities.⁵⁶ In the 1930s, given the increasingly urging letters from the municipal authorities concerning repair work,⁵⁷ a request was even made for the right to use the resources of another organization, the David Goldberg Foundation,⁵⁸ which was to lend an amount of 1500 zlotys for the renovation.⁵⁹

Tenants

In accordance with the adopted regulations, the priority to apply for accommodation in the foundation house was granted to members of the Hescheles family. This was the case during the first two decades of the facility's operation, when the house was mainly inhabited by the relatives of the founder and his wife. Each of them described their relationship to the family in their applications, and, to make sure that their case was fully understood, even drew the family tree. Over the decades, the number of relatives declined in favor of poor members of the *kehilla*.⁶⁰ Sometimes, cases of people with similar names applying for a place in the foundation house were recorded, but they were quickly verified and discarded.

In accordance with the provisions of the Statute, a person applying for a place in the foundation house had to enter a competition.⁶¹ These were largely popular. For example, in 1919, nine people applied for one apartment.⁶² Each of the candidates for the free lodgings described their situation in detail. Samuel Hescheles pointed out that he was a war invalid, with a wife who had been bedridden for several months and four dependent children,⁶³ Zygmunt Schnapik (grandson of Samuel Bera, son of Drejza – residents of the house) justified his request by the fact that his house had burnt down and he was deprived of all his belongings.⁶⁴ Relations with Hescheles family were cited by Czypa Goldstaub, whose mother Ella already lived in the house, and she had no means to support the family, because her husband, a turner, had been unable to find employment since the end of the war.⁶⁵

The criteria for the selection of the person assigned an apartment were not made public. In fact, it is difficult to determine what considerations the committee took into account, given, for instance, the situation of the above-mentioned group of candidates, and how it was able to determine in an objective manner which of those unfortunate souls were the most hard-hit, and, as such, should be granted the lodgings. In fact, the provisions of the Foundation Statute did not specify any principles in this regard. Unde-

⁵⁶ DALO, f. 2, op. 1, spr. 3863, 2 VIII 1928, 11 V 1929.

⁵⁷ TsDIAL of Ukraine, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, 5 VII 1939, 48.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 30 IX 1938, 41; 17 IV 1939, 42.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, *passim*.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 20 IV 1907, p. 53; 20 IV 1907, 28; 51.

⁶² CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 27 VII 1919, 29.

⁶³ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 1 VII 1919, 31.

⁶⁴ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 29 V 1919, 38; 15 VII 1919, 34.

⁶⁵ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 2 III 1919, 39.

nably, however, those selected were those with the lowest material status, in many cases unemployed or with low-paid jobs (the list of tenants of 1921 specifies 15 beneficiaries, of whom six were entered as unemployed, the others being a tinsmith, two shoers, three shop assistants, a patient caretaker, an upholstery journeyman, and a second-hand goods salesman).⁶⁶

Once the results of the contest were announced, further administrative actions were taken; the winner signed a protocol, declaring that he/she would respect the regulations in force.⁶⁷ Sometimes, however, those chosen in the competition decided not to occupy the lodgings. This was the case, for example, in 1920, when the *kehilla* called upon Leib Sunik, a municipal officer,⁶⁸ to immediately take over the premises. Sunik, in accordance with the regulations in force, signed the protocol of reception of the certificate of granting the premises on 16 November 1919, and also accepted the amount of the administrative fee and agreed to assume the position of caretaker in the building, but all contact with him was later lost.⁶⁹

Sometimes the *kehilla* assigned an additional tenant to an apartment which was already occupied. However, this happened with the consent and knowledge of existing residents; for example, in 1919, it was decided to assign Drezla and Zygmunt Schnapik to the apartment of Jonasz Goldsand, as they declared that they would care for the ailing, elderly widower living there.

Following the provisions of the House Rules, when an apartment was vacated, the existing tenants applied to be transferred to it. In fact, each of the 15 beneficiaries aspired to move to a larger apartment.⁷⁰ The limited number of units, as well as the relatively small turnover, led to considerable overcrowding of the lodgings, as a result of large or multi-generational families being placed in these.⁷¹ One resident described the conditions prevailing in the house in 1924 as follows: "six people in one room, which at the same time serves as a bedroom, a kitchen and a laundry room, just a few square meters."⁷²

Although the statute of the foundation, the house regulations and documents signed by beneficiaries clearly stated that their families did not have any rights to the apartment and could apply for premises only after their death, claims were sometimes made during the life of the person concerned. This was the case of Aaron Schwadron, who, having been granted lodgings, left the country and did not make use of it. Given that such conduct was a basis for the removal of the tenant, the management made appropriate arrangements; the apartment was opened by an official committee, an inventory of the stock was made, and then the door was sealed. Later that same day, the Schwadron

⁶⁶ Schnapik Dreyza, Schnajsek Zygmund, Uberall Chaim, Stark Ryfka, Schnapik Ruben, Diamond Jakob, Heschel Samuel, Schreifer Nina, Bicz Hersz, Goldstaub Izak, Malka Goldstaub, Brek Mojżesz, Schonbach Feiweł, Schnapik Józef, Steinberg Markus: CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 1921, 20, 21.

⁶⁷ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 2 XI 1896, 105, 115-116; *ibid.*, 22 IX 1919, 58; *ibid.*, 10 VI 1920, 91-92.

⁶⁸ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 12 III 1920, 27.

⁶⁹ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 16 XI 1919, 23-25.

⁷⁰ For example, Józef Sznepik occupied a one-room apartment with his wife and three children, and when a two-room flat was vacated, he applied to be granted it.

⁷¹ Feiweł Schonbach occupied one room with his wife and three children, Wolf Heschel and Hirsh Bicz lived with their wives and four children, and Markus Wolf Steinberg, with his father, wife and four children.

⁷² CDIAL, 701/3/568, 26 XII 1924.

family opened the door without authorization, to then secure it with a padlock, which, in their understanding, protected their property from an intervention by the *kehilla*.⁷³

Other cases were also recorded. In 1923, Mina Schreifler, the second wife of Meir Leib, reported that her husband's son had returned to Lvov after several years and expressed his desire to live with the family. There would be nothing unusual about this, were it not for the fact that the stepson had a bad reputation and, as a result, the family was concerned. To guarantee peace and security, the *kehilla* forbid the man to occupy the lodgings in the foundation house.⁷⁴

Tenants were also evicted for behavior violating the provisions of the House Rules. In 1919, Jonasz Goldsand was stripped of his apartment for criminal activities.⁷⁵ Deriving benefits from renting apartments to third parties in violation of the rules was punished. Guilty of such conduct was Rubin Schnapik, who rented a two-room apartment for a large fee.⁷⁶ In fact, the case of Schnapik, who should have been punished by having the apartment taken away, dragged on for over two years.⁷⁷

Conclusion

The establishment of a house for the poor was undoubtedly a success of the family of the founder, although the family was in fact guided not only by moral and charitable concern for the entire community of Lvov, but also by their own relatives, who could count on obtaining living quarters if their material status deteriorated. On the other hand, the maintenance of the house would not have been possible without the involvement of the authorities of the Jewish community. It was also thanks to the *kehilla* that the house continued to exist until the Second World War. Inhabited by people of different ages, and different states of health, over the decades, it was home to many families who, having been guaranteed accommodation, could work to improve their material situation or live their last years in peace.

However, due to the fact that the Herman Hescheles house for the poor was the only facility of the kind in Lvov, providing the poor Jewish population with living quarters, it could not meet the needs of all impoverished Lvov citizens applying for admission. Therefore, it can only be presumed that the vague criteria for admission to the house and problems with the expulsion of tenants who did not make use of the apartments, or utilized them in violation of applicable regulations, could have resulted from a lack of proper control and abuse of power, or even bribery among officials, who turned a blind eye to such irregularities.

⁷³ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 22 X 1919, 81.

⁷⁴ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 22 IV 1923, 85.

⁷⁵ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 998, 13 VII 1919, 87.

⁷⁶ Residents reported that the fee constituted an amount of 500 crowns. In other testimonies, a charge of 15 dollars is mentioned (in addition to rent); CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 20 IX 1921, 53, 24 IV 1923, 109; CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 22 IV 1923, 51.

⁷⁷ CDIAL, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 929, 24 IV 1923, 52-53.

ABBREVIATIONS

TsDIAL of Ukraine – Central State Archives of Ukraine in Lvov

DALO – State Archives of Lviv Oblast

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary sources

A) TsDIAL of Ukraine:

Lwów (Lviv) Jewish Birth Records (1823-1828), f. 701, op. 1, spr. 110.

Lwów (Lviv) Jewish Marriage Records (1854-1860), fond 701, op. 1, spr. 134.

Jewish community in Lvov, f. 701, op. 2, spr. 849, 929, 998.

B) DALO:

Panieńska St. no. 36, f. 2, op. 1, spr. 3863.

2. Secondary literature:

Wierzbieniec, W. (2012), Gmina żydowska we Lwowie wobec problemu dobroczynności i pomocy społecznej w latach 1918-1939. Wybrane aspekty, in: P. Švorc, H. Heppner (eds), *Veľká doba v maľom priestore: Zlomové zmeny v mestách stredoeurópskeho priestoru a ich dôsledky (1918-1929)*, Prešov: 367-375.

3. Internet:

<http://www.lvivcenter.org/en/lia/posts/metropolis-and-pidzamche/>

4. Press:

Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung (22 October 1918), no. 224.

Badener Bezirks-Blatt (9 July 1887), no. 82.

Die Neuzeit (13 April 1894), no. 15; (8 Mai 1896), no. 19; (6 Mai 1898), no. 18.

Die Presse (5 July 1887), no. 183.

Neue Freie Presse (4 July 1887), no. 8208; (10 December 1889), no. 9087.

(Neuigkeits) Welt Blatt (6 July 1887), no. 151.

Prager Abendblatt (5 July 1887), no. 149.

Volksblatt für Stadt und Land (6 July 1887), no. 80.

Vorarlberger Volksblatt (8 July 1887), no. 152.

Wiener Sonn- und Montags-Zeitung (16 April 1906), no. 16.

Wiener Abendpost (4 July 1887), no. 149.