

Mateusz Matuszczyk

(Translated into English by Andrew Rajcher)

Jewish Communities in the Kalisz Province in the First Half of the 19th Century

Jewish Communities – Their Structures and Functions

The centre of Jewish religious and communal life was the synagogue which acted not only as a house of prayer, but also as a place where people gathered and which housed the religious court. It therefore played a role in connecting Jews as a community, not just in religious terms¹.

The Jewish community functioned under the purview of a Jewish community council. Over the centuries, Different Hebrew words have been used to define it. Politically, it has been called *Chever Ir*, meaning a “Municipal Union”. However, Hasmonean coins referred to *Chever ha-Yehudim*, meaning “Jewish Community”. In turn, the Jewish religious community was referred to as *Eda*², *Kehilla*, *Tzibur* and *Knesset*. Members of the religious community were referred to as *B’nei ha-Knesset*³.

The concept of a *Kehilla*, in the Hellenic epoch, corresponded to a *Jewish City*, also understood as a ghetto, isolated from an environment which, through various historical periods, was pagan, Christian and Muslim. That name referred to two social phenomena. The first of these was the existence of a local Jewish community, while the second is directly linked to the first, as it relates to the internal organisation of this community within a specific structure. This structure made it possible to maintain bonds between members of the community and to maintain contacts with the political institutions within a given area⁴.

Encyclopaedia Judaica defines the *Gmina Żydowska* also referring to the abovementioned Hebrew words *Eda*, *Kehilla*, *Kahal*. A “Gmina” is nothing more than a *Holy Community* (*Kehilla Kadisha*), which is a centre connecting the local Jewish community, as well as being the centre for that community’s administration in cities and in smaller settlements. From the Middle Ages, the “Gmina” was a *Jewish City*, which functioned simultaneously within Christian and Muslim cities⁵.

The existence of a community results from the obligation of prayer. Prayers can be recited by Jews either individually or as a community. Personal devotions and spontaneity are more difficult to achieve within public prayer. However, the possibility of common prayer is an

¹ J.H. Schoeps (ed.), *Nowy leksykon judaistyczny*, Warszawa 2007, p. 284.

² According to an Ephedra papyrus, it was the oldest name used relating to a religious community; Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ J. Tomaszewski, A. Żbikowski (ed.), *Żydzi w Polsce. Dzieje i kultura. Leksykon*, Warszawa 2001, p. 108.

⁵ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol. 5, Detroit–New York–San Francisco–New Haven, Conn–Waterville, Maine–London 2007, p. 101.

expression of a group identity, the manifestation of which is one of the natural needs of a religious community⁶. This is why common prayer is more important as, in this way, a spiritual bond is created within the Jewish population dispersed around the world. It is also a symbol of a community of people, united before God, a people who are faithful and obedient to Him. The essence of a community is a sense of shared responsibility and the ability to help other members of that community⁷.

The functioning of the community is connected with religious obligations. It is therefore subject to God and His judgment. Members of that community, as a whole, must therefore act according to His will. Apart from the mutual support arising from the existence of a community, there exists the possibility of self-fulfillment and of working together with other community members who, together, can achieve more than if working independently. For these reasons, the communal dimension of human life is extremely important within the Jewish religion⁸. Within the community, if prayer is to be public, the presence of at least ten men (adult Jewish men), namely a *minyan*⁹, is required. One of the men in the Kalisz Province Gmina was designated the *Shaliach Tzibur*¹⁰. The synagogue is a very important place for the followers of Judaism and prayers recited within it have a completely different meaning than those recited elsewhere. Therefore, it is also important for everyone to have the possibility of praying in the synagogue together with all those assembled¹¹.

The religious obligations of Jews emanate from the Torah and the Talmud. The Talmud commands Jews to participate in synagogue prayers, because “a person’s prayer can only be heard by God when it is recited in a synagogue” (Ber. 6 a)¹². Synagogue prayers are not simply read, but they are recited. This also applies to the reading of the Torah, which takes place in an established pattern. Jewish liturgy is rich in melody which is performed by a trained cantor (*Chazan*). Jews have always attached great importance to the diligence with which these melodies are performed and have ensured that their cantors are well-trained – that they are able, in an appropriate manner, to convey the content of the words sung and also the spiritual message of those words¹³.

In order for a community to fulfill all its ritual and liturgical obligations, it is required to employ full-time staff. Smaller communities employ just one person to perform several functions. In the first instance, a rabbi needs to be appointed. Above all, the rabbi needs to be an expert on the Torah and on religious law. However, he is not a clergyman in the same sense as a priest in Christian religions (especially in Catholicism). In the past, many Jewish communities performed their obligations without even employing a rabbi¹⁴.

⁶ N. de Lange, *Judaism*, Oxford–New York 1986, p. 37.

⁷ L. Trepp, *Żydzi. Naród, historia, religia*, Warsaw 2009, p. 347.

⁸ D.J. Goldberg, J.D. Rayner, *The Jewish People. Their History and Their Religion*, Middlesex 1987, p. 304.

⁹ The obligation for a *minyan* emanates from biblical times; see L. Trepp, op. cit., p. 347; por. Lb 13,1–14, 27.

¹⁰ Z. Greenwald, *Bramy Halachy. Religijne prawo żydowskie. Kicur Szulchan Aruch dla współczesności*, Kraków 2005, p. 50.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 51–52.

¹² A. Cohen, *Talmud*, Warsaw 2002, p. 106.

¹³ L. Trepp, op. cit., p. 345.

¹⁴ A. Unterman, op. cit., pp. 246–248.

The rabbi, the aforementioned cantor (Hebr. *Chazan*) and the *shochet* (ritual slaughterer), perform the most important functions within a Jewish community. In addition, there are a number of less important positions. Among these would be a caretaker of synagogue attendant (Hebr. *Shamas*), also known in Polish as a *szkolnik* or *szuklaper* (from the Yiddish *szul* - synagogue, *klaper* - a knocker)¹⁵. The cantor would have an assistant (Hebr. *Chazan Shayeni*). There would be a *mohel* to perform circumcisions, while in the *cheder*, the religious school attached to the synagogue and a teacher (a *melamed*). The *kehilla* could also employ a scribe (Hebr. *sofer*), whose job it was to rewrite the Torah scrolls¹⁶. A Jewish community could own various properties including, above all, a synagogue, plus a cemetery, a ritual bathhouse, a school and a hospital. There were also charitable institutions and a court¹⁷.

The Jewish Community Council made it possible for the religious duties, imposed upon Jews by Jewish law, to be fulfilled. Apart from recognising its existence, its operations were not always established by the right of an appropriate state law. The mode of operation of such a community council was determined, by its members, based on religious law and custom. A Jewish community council was not limited to religious activities. It could also deal with other areas of life, including economic, social and administrative.

The *Polish Judaica Dictionary* defines a Jewish community council (a *kehilla*) as the basic link to a Jewish self-government, which included all Jews living within a defined area and which usually encompassed a city and its surrounding villages¹⁸. *Kehillas* regulated religious and communal issues. They also had a certain independence in economic, tax and legal matters¹⁹. However, attention should be drawn to the ambiguity of the term *kehilla*. The first meaning refers to a “community” – a community of Jews, mentioned at the beginning of this paper. The second meaning, cited above, relates to the community’s board or council.

The first legal regulations concerning Jewish communities in Poland already came about by the 13th century. Bolesław Pobożny’s (Bolesław the Pius) Kalisz Statute, dated 1264, ensured that Jews were free to organise community councils and gave them the right to have matters adjudicated by a *Kehilla* (with the existing possibility of appealing to the Royal Court). This was the foundation which allowed the further development of the organisation of Jewish communities in Poland²⁰. During the period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the organisation of communities was based on Torah and Talmud, as well as on Western European communities. At the head of a community was a Jewish community council, comprising the community’s elite. It was these elite that comprised the supreme authority, with the chairmanship changing on a rotational system. Their number ranged from three to five - however they quite often directed committees and fraternities. Elections to Jewish community councils would be held each year. These consisted of electorates which each elected members of the council²¹. At that time, Jewish community councils carried out administrative-treasury, judicial, educational and, of course,

¹⁵ See *Polski słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, Vol. 2, by Z. Borzymińska and R. Żebrowski, Warsaw 2003, pp. 615–616, 633, 661.

¹⁶ A. Unterman, op. cit., pp. 248–250.

¹⁷ *Żydzi w Polsce...*, op. cit., p. 108.

¹⁸ *Polski słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, Vol. 1, op. cit., p. 491.

¹⁹ *Nowy leksykon judaistyczny*, op. cit., p. 285.

²⁰ *Polski słownik judaistyczny...*, Vol. 1, op. cit., p. 491.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 491–492.

religious activities. They also helped on economic matters. The council's committees dealt with regulatory and treasury matters, as well as the granting to membership to that particular Jewish community. Jewish community councils in the Kalisz Province dealt with moral supervision, the observance of religious regulations and proper customs, the reciting of Psalms, synagogues, schools, charitable issues, issues relating to women, control of weights and measures, trade fairs and the observance of ritual cleanliness. Apart from that, there were guilds and burial societies²². In order for the community council to be able to function effectively, it was necessary to employ the already mentioned personnel. Three types of courts dealt with judicial matters – spiritual, secular and a mixture of the two²³.

It can therefore be said that Jewish community councils regulated every aspect of their community members' lives. That situation began to change from the end of the 18th century, when modern, centralised, absolute monarchies sought to restrict the rights of Jewish community councils, attempting to transform them into Jewish religious communities, limiting them to only religious matters with a legal structure recognised by state law. Religious community councils had become the norm in modern European countries. The reason behind the establishment of such structures were the activities of the state authorities connected with, among other things, the certification obligation which was regarded as less important by religious bodies²⁴. In the Congress Kingdom of Poland, Jewish community councils were done away with in 1821, converting them into synagogue supervisory bodies, subordinate to municipal authorities²⁵. These were appointed on 20th March 1821 by a decision of the Governor of the Congress Kingdom. Special attention, at the time, was paid to the fact that no provisions had as yet been made to regulate the financing of Jewish religious ceremonies. That issue was regulated by the elders and religious fees were often enforced, which was a particular burden on the poorest²⁶.

An order by the Governor obliged the Governmental Commission for Religious and Public Enlightenment to extend its activities to supervising religious contributions and fees. In accordance with this order, each year, a Jewish community was required to submit a budget for the maintenance of its synagogue, school, rabbi and the poor. The authority from this regulation lay with the synagogue supervisory body. Funding for the abovementioned needs came from fees collected, to that point, for religious services (e.g. funerals, use of the ritual baths, etc.). However, if these funds proved to be insufficient, the shortfall could be covered by contributions, assessed on the basis of their wealth, from members of the Jewish community. The synagogue supervisory body was obliged to maintain a record of all contributions and fees and to submit this data to the Provincial Commission. The statements of income and expenditure were to be recorded in the Polish language²⁷.

It should be noted that the order dated 20th March 1821 uses the terms *parafja żydowska* (Jewish parish) as well as *parafianie* (parishioners). The *Polish Judaica Dictionary* defines *parafia żydowska* as an organised, independent community, encompassing Jews living in a given

²² Ibid..

²³ Ibid., p. 492.

²⁴ J. Spyra, *Żydowskie gminy wyznaniowe na Śląsku Austriackim (1741–1918)*, Katowice 2009, pp. 11–14.

²⁵ *Polski słownik judaistyczny...*, Vol. 1, op. cit., p. 492.

²⁶ *Postanowienie Namiestnika Królewskiego z dnia 20 marca 1821 r. o ustaleniu funduszków na utrzymanie bóżnic i służby bóżniczej* (Provisions relating to the activities of the government and the District Governors, Warsaw 1886, pp. 148–149), art. 1.

²⁷ Ibid., art. 1–4.

city and surrounding villages. That community remained dependent upon its “mother” community, ranked as a *przykahalka* (an overseeing community). The Jewish parish or village parish was also defined as a village, with a concentration of Jews, which was not self-governing and was subordinate to a “mother” community²⁸. The *przykahalek*, in turn, was a branch of the “mother” *kehilla* and was linked to it at an organisational level, utilising its religious properties, while gradually striving to achieve independence²⁹. However, the above definition of a *Jewish parish* and a *przykahalka* does not fully reflect the meaning of these concepts. As the state understood it, a “parish” was identical to a “gmina” and, even more precisely, with a parish registry district, which can be deduced from the analysis, presented further in this paper, of documents prepared at the request of the authorities.

On 24th April 1821, the Governmental Commission for Religious and Public Enlightenment decided to regulate the issue of elections to synagogue supervisory bodies and the accounting for synagogue funds. In this manner, the rules for the management of a Jewish community were defined. Each currently existing community selected three supervisors who were to be approved by the Provincial Commission. The supervisors, along with the rabbi, set a budget for the maintenance of the synagogue, the rabbi, the cemetery and also for a hospital for the poor (which was maintained for religious reasons). In working out those expenses, the supervisors and rabbi were to follow the wishes of the majority of the members of the community. In accordance with expenditure needs, they also set up a schedule of income to be derived from fees paid for religious rites and from contributions from community members. Payment of smaller fees (from circumcisions, marriages) were paid to the rabbi. They were not included in the statement of income and were dealt with separately. However, higher fees (from funerals, use of ritual baths) were adjusted into four classes, assessed by the supervisors according to payers’ wealth.³⁰ Income and expenditure statements, plus a register of payers, was prepared prior to 1st December each year and were to be approved by the district commissioners³¹. Eventually, on 1st January 1822 (20th December 1821 according to the old style), Aleksander I abolished kehillas in Jewish communities. The distribution and collection of treasury taxes from Jewish residents were handed over to the provincial authorities and to the municipal administration in Warsaw. They were to be helped in this task, on a temporary basis, by the synagogue supervisors. The aim of this was to prevent the Jews from constantly complaining about pressuring and oppression of the poor by the *kehilla*³².

Specific legal regulations were introduced by the Administrative Board on 7th January 1830. The parishes were converted into synagogue supervisory districts, which were designated by the Governmental Commission for Religious and Public Enlightenment, in consultation with the Governmental Commission for Internal Affairs and Police. Rabbis were ordered to maintain

²⁸ *Polski słownik judaistyczny...*, Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 290.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 370–371.

³⁰ The poor were enrolled in a separate fifth category and were protected against paying contributions.

³¹ *Postanowienie Komisji Rządowej Wyznań Religijnych i Oświecenia Publicznego z dnia 24 kwietnia 1821 r. o wyborze nadzorców bóżniczych i o rachunkowości funduszy bóżniczych* (Provisions relating to the activities of the government, pp. 150–153).

³² *Ukaz Najwyższy z dnia 20 grudnia 1821 r. / 1 stycznia 1822 r. o zniesieniu kahałów, zaprowadzeniu dozorów bóżniczych i życiu tychże do pomocy w rozkładzie podatków skarbowych* (*Dziennik Praw Królestwa Polskiego*, Vol. 7, No. 31, pp. 275–278), art. 1–3.

records of births, deaths and marriages. Clerks were to keep watch over these registers and maintain Civil Registry Records for the Jews and the synagogue supervisory bodies³³.

During the first half of the 19th century, a comprehensive legal solution was established for the organisation of Jewish communities. The former *kehillas* (as community councils) were abolished. In reality, they were only replaced by supervisors. What has been described above is the manner by which these supervisors were chosen and the period of their administration. Consideration was also given to the issue of financing Jewish communities, both in terms of religious practices and charitable activities. Overall control was maintained by the state authorities.

Jewish Community Councils in the Kalisz Province

The Kalisz Province was one of the eight provinces (*województwa*) of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, even though it was established in 1807 as the Kalisz Department under Article 64 of the Constitution of the Duchy of Warsaw³⁴. In the initial period of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, the administrative division was taken over from the Duchy of Warsaw. By a decision of the Governor of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, dated 16th January 1816, the departments were replaced by provinces, the areas of which largely covered the same areas as those of the former departments which they had replaced. The provinces (*województwa*) were divided into circuits (*obwody*) which, in turn, were divided into counties (*powiaty*)³⁵.

The Kalisz Province was divided into five circuits, each containing two counties (except for the Wieluński Circuit, which consisted of three counties). The circuits were:

- Kaliski (counties: Kaliski and Warcki)
- Koniński (counties: Koniński and Pyzdrowski)
- Sieradzki (counties: Sieradzki and Szadkowski)
- Wieluński (counties: Ostrzeszowski, Wieluński and Częstochowski)
- Piotrkowski (counties: Piotrkowski and Radomszczański).

Each name derived from the city which served as the capital of the specific circuit³⁶. The Kalisz Province also contained Pyzdry which, during the Duchy of Warsaw period, belonged to the Poznań Department. In 1815, the town was occupied by the Prussians, an act which triggered a border conflict³⁷. This administrative division continued until 7th March (23rd February in the old style) 1837 when, by a decree (*ukase*) of Tsar Nicholas I, the provinces were replaced by governates (the change was only one of nomenclature)³⁸. This division into governates operated

³³ *Postanowienie Rady Administracyjnej z dnia 7 września 1830 r. o ustanowieniu okręgów bóżniczych, o powinnościach rabinów i o utrzymywanych przez nich księgach zapisowych* (Dziennik Praw Królestwa Polskiego, Vol. 13, No. 52, pp. 147–160), art. 1, 2, 4, 6.

³⁴ *Ustawa Konstytucyjna Księstwa[Xięstwa] Warszawskiego z dnia 22 lipca 1807 r.* (Dziennik Praw Księstwa Warszawskiego, Vol. 1, pp. II–XLVII), art. 64.

³⁵ *Postanowienie Namiestnika Królestwa Polskiego z dnia 16 stycznia 1816 r. o podziale Królestwa Polskiego na Województwa, Obwody i Powiaty* (Dziennik Praw Królestwa Polskiego, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 115–120), art. 1, 5.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, art. 5. *Wartski*, a Radomszczański as *Radomski*. In the text of decree, the Warcki County is recorded as “Wartski” and the Radamczański as “Radomski”

³⁷ J. Zdrada, *Historia Polski 1795–1914*, Warsaw 2015, p. 268.

³⁸ *Ukaz Najwyższy z dnia 23 lutego / 7 marca 1837 r. zmieniający nazwanie dotychczasowych województw na gubernie* (Dziennik Praw Królestwa Polskiego, Vol. 20, No.2, pp. 412–417), art. 1.

until 1918, being the end of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, during which the number of governates changed, as did the areas covered by them individually.

By 1845, the changes had already taken place. A decree by Nicholas I, dated 9th/21st August 1844, reduced the number of governates from eight to five. The Kalisz Governate was abolished and its territory was incorporated into the Warsaw Governate³⁹. In 1867, in accordance with an Act dated 19th/31st December 1866, regarding the administration of governates and counties within the Congress Kingdom of Poland, the number of governates was increased to ten. The governates were divided into counties (growing in number from 39 to 85), and the counties were divided into councils/communities (*gminy*). The Kalisz Governate was restored, but with different borders. Some of the territory which had belonged to the Kalisz Governate before 1845 and which included, among others, Częstochowa, Łask, Piotrków Trybunalski and Radomsko, was included within the newly-created Piotrków Governate⁴⁰.

One of the interests of the authorities, established after 1807, was the issue of organising community life, in a manner different to that prior to 1795, and in a way which would meet the demands of a modern state. To that end, they had to understand how a community functioned and what its constituent groups were. That information would be obtained from general censuses. The first general census in Polish history was ordered by the Great Sejm (also known as the “Four Year Sejm”) on 22nd June 1789. The census contained relevant descriptions of the populations of villages, towns, and Jews⁴¹. During the period of the Duchy of Warsaw, three general censuses were undertaken - in 1808, 1810 and 1812. The first two were completed and the majority of their records have been preserved. The 1812 census was interrupted due to the war with Russia, and only a fraction of its results have been preserved⁴².

The following data shows that Jews constituted a significant part of the residents of the Duchy of Warsaw as well as of the Congress Kingdom of Poland. In some locations, they even represented a majority of the residents. They formed dense clusters and lived within organised structures which sustained almost all of aspects of life. From this, the state authorities also became interested in those structures, carrying out censuses, as well as registering, within their official documentation, existing communities. They also enacted legal provisions under which they could operate.

The 1808 census had many shortcomings. Inasmuch as the population’s division into Christians and Jews was taken into account, this only applied to cities and towns. When it came to villages, only the total number of residents is provided. At that time, the Duchy of Warsaw had a population of 2,099,512 individuals. Whilst 1,560,053 people lived in villages, 539,459 lived in cities and towns, among them being 138,115 Jews - thereby constituting one-quarter of

³⁹ *Ukaz Najwyższy z dnia 9/21 sierpnia 1844 r. ustanawiający w miejsce dotychczasowych ośmiu guberni w Królestwie Polskim, pięć guberni* (Law Journal of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, Vol. 34, No.109, pp. 452–459), art. 1, 2.

⁴⁰ *Ustawa z dnia 19/31 grudnia 1866 r. o zarządzie gubernialnym i powiatowym w guberniach Królestwa Polskiego* (Law Journal of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, Vol. 66, No. 219, pp. 118–193), art. 1, 2, annex to art. 2; J. Zdrada, op. cit., p. 527.

⁴¹ H. Grossman, *Struktura społeczna i gospodarcza Księstwa Warszawskiego. Na podstawie spisów ludności 1808–1810*, Warszawa 1925, s. 3. The 1789 census of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is mentioned on the website of the Central Statistical Office: “(...) druk pn. *Okazanie proporcji między województwami, miast, wsiów, dymów i podatków...*, będący wynikami spisu ludności”; <http://stat.gov.pl/spisy-powszechne/narodowe-spisy-powszechne/historia-spisow/> (accessed: 12/05/2017).

⁴² H. Grossman, op. cit., pp. 10–11.

the urban population. Also, at that time, the Kalisz Department had a population of 460,703. Of that number, 368,937 lived in villages, while 91,766 lived in cities and towns, amongst whom were 18,659 Jews – 20.33% of the urban population⁴³.

The 1810 census divided the entire population according to religion, designating Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Greco-Catholics as well as Jews. By then, the Duchy of Warsaw had a population of 4,334,306, more than double the figure contained in the 1808 data. The entire state contained 300,285 Jews, being 6.93% of the total population. At the time, the Kalisz Department had 512,750 people, around 52,000 more than two years previously. According to that census, the number of Jews totalled 24,716. That was about 6,000 more than in the 1808 census but, this time, the residents of villages were taken into account, the result of which was that the proportion of Jews within the Department's population stood at around 4.82 %⁴⁴.

Following the coming into existence of the Congress Kingdom of Poland, the state authorities began collecting information on the state of the structures which organised the lives of its Jewish subjects. In *Wykazie Gmin Wyznania Mojżeszowego w Województwie Kaliskim (A List of Jewish Communities in the Kalisz Province)*, drawn up on 19th November 1816, twenty nine Jewish communities were specified. However, the information contained in this document does not include which towns were included within a given community and the number of residents. The list provided the names of rabbis and community elders, their duties within their community, as well as the sources and extent of the income achieved through these individuals⁴⁵. Table 1 shows the towns in which there were Jewish communities in 1816.

Table 1. Jewish Communities and Rabbis in the Kalisz Province in 1816.

COUNTY	JEWISH COMMUNITY	RABBI	RABBI'S NAME
Kaliski	Kalisz	Assistant Rabbi	Izrael Markus Weingodt
	Iwanowice	Assistant Rabbi	Hirsz Gulberk
Warcki	Warta	Rabbi	Szymon Wolf Paczanowski
	Błaszki	Rabbi	Jozef Zaydel
	Dobra	Assistant Rabbi	Rafał [brak nazwiska]
	Uniejów	<i>Shammes</i>	Aaron Łęczycki
Koniński	Konin	Rabbi	Sendor Wolff Joppe
	Koło	Rabbi	Efraim Beor
	Kleczew i Kazimierz Biskupi	Rabbi	Leyzer Hersz
	Golina	Rabbi	Markus Salomon
	Władysławów	None	-
	Śleszyn	None	-
	Skulsk	None	-
Sieradzki	Sieradz	None	-
	Widawa	None	-
	Złoczew	Rabbi	Mosiek Berkowicz
Szadkowski	Lutomiersk	Assistant Rabbi	Chananol [brak nazwiska]
	Łask	Rabbi	Majer Cylich

⁴³ Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 47.

⁴⁵ AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the establishment of synagogue supervision and the regulating of Jewish community contributions and payments. Overall, 1810–1817, Ref. 1429, pp. 233–251.

Wieluński	Działoszyn	Assistant Rabbi	Jozef Moyzesz
	Praszka	Rabbi	Jochym [brak nazwiska]
Częstochowski	Mstów i Częstochowa	None	-
	Nowe Krzepice	Assistant Rabbi	Herszlik Abraham
Ostrzeszowski	Wieruszów	None	-
	Bolesławiec	None	-
Piotrkowski	Piotrków Trybunalski	Rabbi	Izrael Leyzer Pacanowski
	Tuszyn	Rabbi	Lewin Harkel Rozenblut
	Bełchatów	None	-
	Rozprza	Rabbi	Illut Pinkus
Radomszczański	Konieczpol	Rabbi	Lewek Kachnita

Źródło: AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the establishment of synagogue supervision and the regulating of Jewish community contributions and payments. Overall, 1810–1817, Ref. 1429, pp. 233–251.

Based upon the above list, certain issues regarding these towns and their Jewish populations should be noted. The community of Koło includes Brudzew (Brudzewo), where “the few families who live there cannot be called a congregation (*kehilla*)”. Also included within the Koło community was the Władysławów (Władysławowo) *kehilla*. The document lists it separately but, at the same time, within the Koło community. In the table, under the section of *kehilla* officials, is the annotation, “The Władysławów Congregation belongs here, even though no congregation officials exist”⁴⁶. There was no rabbi in Skulsk as the town had only twelve Jewish homes, whose occupants could not support one⁴⁷. Also, the Bełchatów *kehilla* was unable to support a rabbi, since it did not constitute a separate “parish”⁴⁸. So, it can be supposed that Bełchatów could only have the status of a *przykahalka*, but that is not explicitly stated in the source. There are certainly those places, where Jewish congregations or large groupings of Jews had existed earlier, which had aspired to such a status. However, as the result of demographic changes, they had become too small in order to maintain that position. In response to that situation, the state authorities had to react. This is confirmed by further documentation.

In 1816, nine of the above-mentioned communities had no rabbi. Seven communities had other individuals – three had an assistant rabbi, another three had an under-rabbi, while one had a Jewish scholar (*shammes*). The remaining thirteen communities had officially appointed rabbis. In each community which had a rabbi or a replacement for a rabbi, certain funds were allocated for that person’s support. In some places, it was a specific salary. This income was usually derived from the community’s residents’ contributions, from taxes on kosher meat, as well as from payments for religious ceremonies (e.g. marriages). In many communities, payments were set according to past customs⁴⁹.

The 1816 list of Jewish communities did not take into account their size. However, what is provided is the number of congregation (*kahal*) officials within a given county (*gmina*), which varied from county to county. So, it is possible to suppose that that diversity related directly to the size of the communities. Amongst the bigger communities, there were those which had four (Lutomiersk, Mstów and Częstochowa, Piotrków Trybunalski, Warta), five (Łask) or six officials

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 238–239.

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 240–241.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 248–249.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 233–251.

(Kalisz). However, the vast majority of Jewish communities within the Kalisz Province had two (Bełchatów, Bolesławiec, Iwanowice, Koniecpol, Konin, Praszka, Ślesin, Tuszyn, Uniejów, Widawa, Wieruszów, Władysławów) or three officials (Błaszki, Dobra, Działoszyn, Golina, Kleczew and Kazimierz Biskupi, Nowe Krzepice, Rozprza, Sieradz, Złoczew). Skulsk was the only one which had just one individual (who was, at the same time, the kosher butcher). However, Koło appointed no congregation official. The most developed, in the spirit of Jewish tradition, was the provincial “capital” of Kalisz. That community had six older synagogues, as well as six congregations, served by officials who acted as, among others, *chazans*, teachers and kosher butchers⁵⁰.

It was broadly understood that their duties included maintaining order within the community, as well as representing the community in contacts with state authorities at various levels. In almost all the communities within the Kalisz Province, congregation officials did not take payments for performing their functions. They usually supported themselves through other activities and performed their duties as volunteers. With regard to payment for their services, two communities within the Kalisz Province stand out as exceptions. The first was Kalisz itself, where congregation officials received a determined annual income which varied according to the person (from 34 to 180 old Polish zł). Unlike the *kahals*, the elders of the Kalisz synagogues took no payment. The other exception was Bolesławiec. There, congregation officials also received remuneration for their service, which was derived from two sources. The first was from payment for ritual slaughter (17 zł), while the second was a voluntary contribution (27 zł). However, apart from mentioning the level of payments, the listing does not state the periods of time to which they applied⁵¹.

In the 1820's, changes took place to the structure of Jewish communities within the Congress Kingdom of Poland. The 27th January 1824 is provided as the date of the *Projekt zaokrąglenia Parafii Żydowskich w Województwie Kaliskim (A Plan for the Rationalisation of Jewish Parishes in the Kalisz Province)*, prepared by the Kalisz Provincial Commission. This plan contains detailed data relating to the area included within each community and the number of residents they comprised. By comparison to 1816, new communities appear, however some have been amalgamated with their neighbour. Their overall number rose from 29 to 37. New communities arose in Koźminek, Stawiszyn, Pyzdry, Przyrów, Wieluń, Kamieńsk, Widawa (Radomszczański County)⁵², Radomsk, Pławno, Nowa Brzeźnica, Pajęczno and Sulmierzyce. Stand-alone communities ceased to exist in Iwanowice (amalgamated with the Błaszki community), Władysławów (linked with the Koniń community), as well as Ślesin and Skulsk (both linked with the community in Kleczew)⁵³. Information regarding the number of communities in this plan allows for a comparison with data, from 1827, collected and published by Franciszek Rodecki in *Obrazie jeograficzno-statystycznym Królestwa Polskiego (A*

⁵⁰ Ibid.; see A. Michałowska, *Gminy żydowskie w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. Wybór tekstów źródłowych*, Warsaw 2003.

⁵¹ AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the establishment of synagogue supervision and the regulating of Jewish community contributions and payments. Overall, 1810–1817, Ref. 1429, pp. 233–251.

⁵² The question of identifying the town of Widawa remains problematic as, in the Radomsko county, there was no place with such a name. However, there is Widawka, which belonged to the Radomsko community. However, the document identifies a community in Widawa and the list of towns accompanying it lists “Widawa Miasto”. AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the regulating of Jewish communities. Overall, 1821–1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 328–333.

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 159–350.

Geographical-Statistical Picture of the Congress Kingdom of Poland). That comparison is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: The number of residents in Jewish communities in the Kalisz Province.
A comparative view between 1824 and 1827. Part 1 – communities according to size.**

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITY	POPULATION	
		According to 1824 Plan	According to Franciszek Rodecki
Kaliski	1. Błaski	940	1,041 ⁵⁴
	2. Dbora	1,111	1,058
	3. Kalisz	3,461	3,465 ⁵⁵
	4. Kozminek	192	147
	5. Stawiszyn	356	297 ⁵⁶
	6. Uniejów	539	363 ⁵⁷
	7. Warta	991	928
	Totals:	7,590	7,299
Koniński	1. Konin	992	1,253 ⁵⁸
	2. Koło	1,087	1,215 ⁵⁹
	3. Kleczew	1,143	1,359 ⁶⁰
	4. Golina	421	481 ⁶¹
	5. Pyzdry	1,216	1,187 ⁶²
		Totals:	4,859
Sieradzki	1. Sieradz	688	1,063 ⁶³
	2. Lutomiersk	1,558	1,310 ⁶⁴
	3. Łask	1,275	1,360 ⁶⁵
	4. Widawa	937	818 ⁶⁶
	5. Złoczew	529	130 ⁶⁷
		Totals:	4 987

⁵⁴ Błaski included the towns of Iwanowice and Staw – the number also includes those towns.

⁵⁵ Częstochowie included the town of Mstów – the number also includes that town.

⁵⁶ Stawiszyn included the town of Chocz – the number also includes that town.

⁵⁷ Uniejów included the town of Turek – the number also includes that town.

⁵⁸ Koniń included the towns of Rychwał, Tuliszków and Władysławów – the number also includes those towns.

⁵⁹ Koło included the town of Brudzew – the number also includes that town.

⁶⁰ Kleczewie included the towns of Kazimierz Biskupi, Skulsk, Ślesin and Wilczyn – the number also includes those towns.

⁶¹ Golina included the town of Łądek – the number also includes that town.

⁶² Pyzdry included the towns of Zagórów and Słupca – the number also includes those towns.

⁶³ Sieradz included the town of Zduńska Wola – the number also includes that town.

⁶⁴ Lutomiersk included the town of Szadek - the number also includes that town.

⁶⁵ Łask included the town of Pabianice – the number also includes that town.

⁶⁶ Widawa included the town of Szczerców – the number also includes that town.

⁶⁷ Złoczew included the town of Burzenin – the given number of includes only Burzenina, as F. Rodecki did not include Złoczew in his calculation.

**Table 2: The number of residents in Jewish communities in the Kalisz Province.
A comparative view between 1824 and 1827. Part 1 – communities according to size.**

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITY	POPULATION	
		According to 1824 Plan	According to Franciszek Rodecki
Wieluński	1. Bolesławiec	465	157
	2. Krzepice	1,242	816
	3. Częstochowa	1 440	1,251 ⁶⁸
	4. Praszka	650	541
	5. Przyrów	537	552
	6. Wieruszów	433	519
	7. Działoszyn	2,094	2,054 ⁶⁹
	8. Wieluń	467	335
	Totals:	7,328	6,225
Piotrkowski	1. Bełchatów	432	323 ⁷⁰
	2. Tuszyn	486	370 ⁷¹
	3. Piotrków Trybunalski	2,349	2,600 ⁷²
	4. Rozprza	601	213
	5. Kamieńsk	312	268
	6. Widawa	388	-
	7. Radomsko	483	369
	8. Pławno	487	273
	9. Koniecpol	582	444
	10. Brzeźnica	318	172
	11. Pajęczno	341	173
	12. Sulmierzyce	366	-
	Razem	7,145	5,205
	CIRCUIT	POPULATION	
		According to 1824 Plan	According to Franciszek Rodecki
	1. Kaliski	7,590	7,299
	2. Koniński	4,859	5,495
	3. Sierdzki	4,987	4,681
	4. Wieluński	7,328	6,225
	5. Piotrkowski	7,145	5,205
	Totals:	31,909	28,905

Source: the author's own work based on: AGAD, CWW, Ref. 1438
(Records relating to the regulating of Jewish communities. Overall, 1821–1829), pp. 159–350.

⁶⁸ Kalisz also included the town of Opatówek – the number also included that town.

⁶⁹ Działoszyn included the town of Kłobuck – the number also included that town.

⁷⁰ Bełchatów included the town of Grocholice – the number also included that town.

⁷¹ Tuszyn included the town of Rzgów – the number also included that town.

⁷² Piotrków Trybunalski included the towns of Wolbórz and Sulejów – the number also includes those towns.

As can be seen, both lists show certain differences and reflect the changes in the communities over consecutive years. Some towns' communities grew, while others diminished. Apart from that, F. Rodecki's list included only towns within the Congress Kingdom of Poland, while the 1824 plan included all towns belonging to a given Jewish community, along with the number of their residents.

There appears to be a significant discrepancy in the case of the community in Sieradz. According to the 1824 plan, it included Zduńska Wola, a town where no Jews lived. However, F. Rodecki states that, in 1827, 468 Jews lived there⁷³. There is a similar situation with regard to Złoczew (Sieradzki Circuit). The town was not totally taken into account in F. Rodecki's list while, according to the 1824 plan, 477 Jews lived there. Burzenin belonged to the Złoczew community and, in 1824, had no Jews. However, in 1827, according to F. Rodecki, 130 Jews lived there⁷⁴.

In the Wieluński Circuit, considerable differences appear in the cases of Bolesławiec and Krzepice. F. Rodecki states that the number of Jews in Bolesławiec was 157 and that was the only town which he took into account with respect to that community. However, the 1824 plan also lists Lututów (157 Jews) and Ulica Podzamcza (125 Jews), as well as a few other towns which also held small numbers of Jews. These totalled 465 individuals⁷⁵. Next, the 1824 plan lists Krzepice, where 234 Jews lived, Nowokrzepice with 666 Jews and Starokrzepice with 22 Jews. Also the village of Truskolasy should not be forgotten with its 159 Jews. (The remaining villages, belonging to the Krzepice community, had significantly smaller numbers of Jews.) F. Rodecki includes only Krzepice, inhabited by 816 Jews, which would certainly have included those living in Starokrzepice and Nowokrzepice⁷⁶.

The situation of the Działoszyn community is also worth noting as the difference in the numbers provided is minimal. Here, F. Rodecki provides data relating to this town - Działoszyn has 1,799 Jews, while Kłobuck has 255. The 1824 plan states that 1,125 Jews were Działoszyn and 209 in Kłobuck. The plan also includes villages amongst which two belonged to the Działoszyn community and were inhabited by more than 200 Jews (Osjaków and Kamyk). However, the remaining villages only had a few, or a dozen or so, Jews⁷⁷.

In communities within the Piotrkowski Circuit, the differences result from the fact that F. Rodecki only took towns into account, while the majority of that community was comprised of only one town, being the seat of the community plus its surrounding villages. However, the difference here is not as great as in the case of the other parts of the Kalisz Province. It should also be noted that F. Rodecki does not provide a count of residents of any towns which were included within the Widawa and Sulmierzyce communities. This results from the fact that they

⁷³ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 243-250; F. Rodecki, *Obraz jeograficzno-statystyczny Królestwa Polskiego*, Warsaw 1830, p. 6..

⁷⁴ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 275-278; F. Rodecki, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁷⁵ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 279-282; F. Rodecki, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁷⁶ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 281-286; F. Rodecki, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁷⁷ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 295-300; F. Rodecki, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

were wholly comprised of villages. However, the town of Widawa, listed in the 1984 plan, caused some problems associated with its identification and location⁷⁸.

The above difference between both sets of data caused discrepancies in the overall count of the Jewish population in the individual circuits and in the Kalisz Province as a whole. The 1824 plan provides a count of 31,909 Jews in the Province, while F. Rodecki's list from 1827 totals 28,905. And so the difference is a little over 3,000 individuals. Despite that, with regard to the whole Kalisz Province, the data sets are comparable, fluctuating as they do, around a count of 30,000.

The plan, produced by the Kalisz Province Commission, was approved on 13th March 1827 by the Governmental Commission of Religious Affairs and Public Enlightenment. The document, confirming the plan, again listed the towns in which the centres of each community were located. The Governmental Commission pointed out that, in Kłobuck and Szczerców, there were no plans to create official communities, despite the fact that, earlier, both had had synagogue supervisory bodies. Also, the Governmental Commission withheld any decision and gave the Provincial Commission a free hand regarding the creation of an official community Zduńska Wola, where "the wish of the new Squire is to establish a rabbinate"⁷⁹. Once again, an issue arises with respect to the number of Jews in Zduńska Wola. The Province Commission's plan states that no Jews lived there. However, the list drawn up three years later by F. Rodecki, shows a totally different situation, which has been shown above. It is possible that the aforementioned "Squire", namely the feudal owner, had decided to reactivate the town and rapidly drew Jews into Zduńska Wola. The town received its city charter in 1825⁸⁰.

In 1827, the Kalisz Provincial Commission also drew up a *Lista imienna rabinów i zastępców znajdujących się w Województwie Kaliskim (A List of Rabbis and Assistant Rabbis in the Kalisz Province)*. The names of the rabbis are listed in Table 3, which enables us to compare these rabbis with those rabbis listed in 1816.

Table 3. Rabbis in Jewish Communities in the Kalisz Province in 1816 and 1827.
Part 1 –Kaliszki, Koniński and Sieradzki Circuits.

OBWÓD	JEWISH COMMUNITY	RABBIS	
		IN 1816	IN 1827
Kaliszki	Błaszki	Jozef Zaydel	Jozef Seydel
	Dobra	Assistant Rabbi Rafał (no surname)	Icek Urbach
	Kalisz	Deputy Rabbi Izrael Markus Weingodt	Efraim Jakubowicz
	Koźminek	No community	No community
	Stawiszyn	No community	No community
	Uniejów	<i>Shammes</i> Aaron Łęczycki	Salomon Goldhammer
	Warta	Szymon Wolf Paczanowski	Szymon Wołow Pacanowski
	Iwanowice	Deputy Rabbi Hirsz Gulberk	No community

⁷⁸ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 305-309; F. Rodecki, op. cit., p. 6.

⁷⁹ AGAD, CWW, Records regarding the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438 pp. 128-129.

⁸⁰ *Encyklopedia powszechna*, Vol. 8, Kraków 2002, p. 391.

Koniński	Konin	Sendor Wolff Joppe	Hersz Nachmann
	Koło	Efraim Beor	Efraim Bär
	Kleczew	Leyzer Hersz	Deputy Rabbi Jozef Lissner
	Golina	Markus Salomon	Markus Zückermann
	Pyzdry	No community	Rafał Działdowski
	Rychwał	No community	Markus Buke
Sieradzki	Sieradz	No rabbi	Aron Mozes Lewin
	Lutomiersk	Assistant Rabbi Chananol (no surname)	Natan Mozes Baryer
	Łask	Majer Cylich	No rabbi
	Widawa	No rabbi	Deputy Rabbi Jankel Sikier
	Złoczew	Mosiek Berkowicz	No rabbi

Table 3. Rabbis in Jewish Communities in the Kalisz Province in 1816 and 1827.

Part 2 – Wieluński and Piotrkowski Circuits.

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITY	RABBIS	
		IN 1816	IN 1827
Wieluński	Bolesławiec	No rabbi	No rabbi
	Krzepice	Assistant Rabbi Herszlik Abraham	Deputy Rabbi Icyk Kempner
	Częstochowa	No rabbi	No rabbi
	Praszka	Jochym (no surname)	No rabbi
	Przyrów	No community	Deputy Rabbi Josek Ruchter
	Wieruszów	No rabbi	Deputy Rabbi Fabisz Abraham
	Działoszyn	Deputy Rabbi Jozef Moyzesz	Deputy Rabbi Nochem Abram
	Wieluń	No community	No rabbi
Piotrkowski	Bełchatów	No rabbi	Deputy Rabbi Jakub Abramowicz Lieberman
	Tuszyn	Lewin Harkel Rozenblat	Lewek Rosenblatt
	Piotrków Trybunalski	Izrael Leyzer Pacanowski	Deputy Rabbi Dawid Bucher
	Rozprza	Illut Pinkus	Deputy Rabbi Michał Łęczycki
	Kamieńsk	No community	Heim Stern
	Widawa	No community	No rabbi
	Radomsko	No community	Deputy Rabbi Joachim Herszlikowicz Klugermann
	Pławno	No community	Deputy Rabbi Samuel Gutermann
	Konieczpol	Lewek Kachnita	Deputy Rabbi Samuel Staal
	Brzeźnica	No community	No rabbi
	Pajęczno	No community	No rabbi
	Sulmierzyce	No community	No rabbi

Source: the author's own work based on: AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the regulating synagogue supervisory boards and Jewish community finances. Overall, 1810–1817, Ref. 1429, pp. 234-251; AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the appointment of rabbis and rabbinical schools. Overall, 1823–1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 48-54;

In 1827, only four communities had the same rabbis as in 1816, even though the spelling of their names differs between the two lists. These were the communities in Błaszki, Warta, Koło and Tuszyn. In 1827, there was no rabbi in Iwanowice due to the linking of that community with that in Błaszki. The 1827 list of rabbis names a rabbi in Rychwał, whereas the earlier document states that there was no community in that town. According to the 1824 list, Rychwał was included within the Koniń community, having earlier belonged to the Kalisz synagogue.

Another issue concerns the rabbis in Uniejów, Konin, Lutomiersk and Piotrków Trybunalski. Both lists provide contradictory information. In each of those places where different rabbis are listed in 1827 from those listed in 1816, their periods of employment overlap. Also, there is the situation in Golina. The documents show only that both first names of the rabbi are the same. It is possible that this rabbi changed his surname. Then there is the issue of juxtaposition. The 1816 document states that Markus Salomon had already been the rabbi for eleven years. However, according to the 1827 list, he was only appointed to that position on 16th August 1806, which is less than eleven years.

A similar issue arises in Radomsko where, according to official documents, it had no stand-alone community in 1816. However, the 1827 list of rabbis contains information that the Deputy Rabbi took up his position in 1811. This probably indicates a common custom in a community where there were several individuals with rabbinic qualifications from amongst whom one was employed as the community's rabbi. However, in some communities, there were disputes as to who should be appointed rabbi.

An excellent example of this is Częstochowa where, according to the above documents, there was no rabbi in either 1816 or in 1827. But, according to *Listy Duchownych Starozakonnych wykonywających te obowiązki w Okręgach Bóżniczych Powiatu Wieluńskiego* (original spelling) (*A List of Orthodox Jewish Clergy Performing Duties in Circuit Synagogues in the Wieluń District*), Rabbi Zachariasz Weingott (Wajngott) occupied that position from 1822⁸¹. Twelve communities had no rabbi, although some did have one in 1816. The following twelve communities, instead of a rabbi, appointed a deputy (or substitute)⁸².

Table 4. Rabbis in Jewish Communities in the Kalisz Province in the 1820's.
Part 1 –Kaliszki and Koniński Circuits.

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITIES		RABBI			
	Town	No.of Jews	First Name and Surname	Age	Annual Salary	Knowledge of Languages
Kaliszki	Kalisz	3, 461	Efraim Jakubowicz	84	2,100 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Błaszki	940	Jozef Seydel	51	1,500 zł	Speakes and writes German, a little Polish
	Dobra	1,111	Icek Urbach	46	900 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish

⁸¹ AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the appointment of rabbis and rabbinical schools. Overall, 1823–1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 331–331b. See J. Spyra, *Miejsce rabina w gminie żydowskiej w Królestwie Polskim w I połowie XIX wieku. Spór o Zachariasza Weingotta w Częstochowie*, “Studia Judaica” 19, 2016, No.1 (37), pp. 157–186.

⁸² AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the regulating synagogue supervisory boards and Jewish community finances. Overall, 1810–1817, Ref. 1429, pp. 234–251; AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the appointment of rabbis and rabbinical schools. Overall, 1823–1853, Ref. 1444, pp.48–54.

	Uniejów	539	Salomon Goldhammer	61	700 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, a little Polish
	Warta	991	Szymon Wołow Pacanowski	85	600 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
Koniński	Konin ⁸³	863	Hersz Nachmann	52	1,600 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, German
	Pyzdry	1,216	Rafał Działdowski	66	1,430 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, German, Polish
	Koło	1,087	Efraim Bär	69	1,584 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Kleczew	1,143	Jozef Lissner, Deputy	49	300 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Rychwał ⁸⁴	129	Markus Buke	44	450 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, German, Polish
	Golina	421	Markus Zückermann	60	600 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish

**Table 4. Rabbis in Jewish Communities in the Kalisz Province in the 1820's.
Part 2 – Piotrkowski, Sieradzki and Wieluński Circuits.**

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITIES		RABBI			
	Town	No. of Jews	First Name and Surname	Age	Annual Salary	Knowledge of Languages
Piotrkowski	Bełchatów	432	Jakub Abramowicz Lieberman, Deputy	48	140 zł	Yiddish
	Piotrków Trybunalski	2 349	Dawid Bucher	52	600 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish
	Pławno	487	Samuel Gutermann	47	300 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish
	Kamięnsk	312	Heim Stern	40	300 zł	Yiddish
	Konieczpol	582	Samuel Staal, Deputy	48	300 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Radomsko	483	Joachim Herszlikowicz Klugermann, Deputy	55	300 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Rozprza	601	Michał Łęczycki, Deputy	44	400 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, German, Polish
	Tuszyn	486	Lewek Rosenblatt	60	400 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
Sieradzki	Sieradz	688	Aron Mozes Lewin	47	1,800 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, German
	Widawa	937	Jankel Sikier, Deputy	46	600 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Lutomiersk	1 558	Natan Mozes Baryer	54	800 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, German, Polish
Wieluński	Działoszyn	2 094	Nochem Abram, Deputy	60	1,000 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Krzepice	1 242	Icyk Kempner, Deputy	38	672 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish
	Przyrów	537	Josek Ruchter, Deputy	?	482 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, a little Polish
	Wieruszów	433	Fabisz Abraham Deputy	28	336 zł	Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish – reads and writes

Source: the author's own work based on: AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the regulating the organising of Jewish communities. Overall, 1821–1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 159-350-251; AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the appointment of rabbis and rabbinical schools. Overall, 1823–1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 48-54⁸⁵.

⁸³ The Koniń community included Rychwał. The overall number of Jews was 992.

⁸⁴ The Koniń Jewish community included Rychwał

⁸⁵ Data concerning Jewish population numbers of individual communities is from 1924, whereas information about rabbis is from 1827.

The majority of the rabbis listed in Table 4 did not have a concession from the authorities, meaning that their appointment had not been approved. Such approval had been given only for the rabbis in Kalisz, Golina and Rozprza. The vast majority of the rabbis were aged between 40 and 69 (21 rabbis). One was 38 years old (in Krzepice), while the youngest was 28 years old (Wieruszów). Two rabbis were over the age of 80 – in Kalisz (84) and in Warta (85 – the oldest). Information and the age of the rabbi in Przyrów are not provided. The average age of the remaining twenty five rabbis is 53.36 years.⁸⁶

Each community granted its rabbi an annual salary. However, the amounts paid were quite varied. The least, 140 złotych of the time, was paid to the rabbi in Bełchatów, while the Kalisz rabbi received the most – 2,100 złotych. It is necessary, however, to take note of the size of the population in individual communities where the rabbi would obtain his salary from the contributions of community members. The Bełchatów community was comprised of only 432 Jews, while Kalisz had 3,461 – a difference of over 3,000 people. As can be seen from the above table, the highest salaries were paid to rabbis in communities comprised of a thousand or more Jews. This would amount to a thousand złotych or more. However, this was not rule because, in the large community in Kleczew, with its 1,143 Jews, the rabbi received barely 300 złotych annually. On the other hand, in the Sieradz community which numbered only 688 Jews, the rabbi received 1,800 złotych annually. By comparison, in Bełchatów, a salary paid of 1,660 złotych from a community of just 256 more people, represents a huge difference.

This data allows us to conclude that the amount paid to a rabbi depended not only on the size of the community, but also upon the affluence of its residents. It is also possible that a rabbi received only a small remuneration for the reason that he would mainly be earning his living from his own business activity or that the community provided him with a livelihood. The average annual salary for a rabbi in the entire Kalisz Province amounted to 776.69 złotych. Seventeen communities paid their rabbi below that average. Within seven communities, the rabbi earned 1,000 złotych or more (Kalisz, Błaszki, Konin, Pyzdry, Koło, Sieradz and Działoszyn) and, in two, the salary was only slightly more than average (Lutomiersk and Dobra)⁸⁷.

It is worth noting the languages known by rabbis in the Kalisz Province. Almost all used Hebrew and Yiddish. Twelve of those rabbis were fluent only in those two languages. Two rabbis were fluent only in Yiddish (in Bełchatów and Kamieński), while the rabbi in Błaszki spoke and wrote only in German or “a little in Polish”. As well as Hebrew and Yiddish, five rabbis (in Uniejów, Piotrków Trybunalski, Pławno, Przyrów and Wieruszów), knew the Polish language at varying degrees of fluency. Apart from Hebrew and Yiddish, the rabbis in Koniń and Sieradz also spoke German. However, four rabbis (in Pyzdr, Rychwał, Rozprza and Lutomiersk) knew four languages – Hebrew, Yiddish, German and Polish⁸⁸.

The 1827 list of rabbis contains a “Comments” column. Under that heading is the concept of *dążenia do cywilizacji* (*aspiration towards civilisation*), which should be clarified here. The idea of *civilising* began developing in the 18th century. *Cywilizować* is understood as to *develop*

⁸⁶ AGAD, CWW, Records concerning the appointment of rabbis and rabbinic schools. Main, 1823-1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 48-54.

⁸⁷ , CWW, records concerning the organisation of Jewish communities. Main, 1821-1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 159-350; AGAD, CWW, Records concerning the appointment of rabbis and rabbinic schools. Main, 1823-1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 48-54.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

or to *level out*. The concept of *cywilizacji* was also understood as being associated with *culture* – even as a replacement for it. “Civilising” meant going from a primitive, barbaric culture to a higher, better and modern culture - this notion involved a hierarchy of *civilisation*. At the top of this hierarchy was the enlightened Western Europe, often described as *Christian civilisation* – and this was precisely the type of civilisation which was to be imitated. In the 19th century, *civilising* was not aimed exclusively at the Jews, but mainly at Poles. It was understood as “educating and raising the cultural, professional and social qualifications of the broad mass of the peasantry, especially the village populations”⁸⁹.

So the idea of civilising the Jews was part of the concept of civilising all the residents of the time who were on Polish territory. However, in the case of the Jews, the consequences were much more serious. Civilised Poles were intended to remain Poles as a part of the same Christian Europe, but at a higher cultural level. Poles were a part of civilised Western Europe despite their “civilised backwardness”, while Jews were considered outside that area.

At the beginning of the 19th century, in the Congress Kingdom of Poland, there were aspirations to reform the Jews, defined as determining the principles under which that populace was to function, as well as what policy the state authorities were to formulate towards this numerous community. Debate on this issue took place even during the period of the Four Year Sejm. However, the concept of *civilisation*, with respect to the Jews as Marcin Wodziński writes, was most probably introduced by Stanisław Staszic and, after 1795, was further developed by many Polish reformers. Their main demands concerned “supplanting the Hebrew and Yiddish languages, a ban on the printing and distribution of books propagating traditional, rabbinic culture, supporting Polish language publications which promoted Polish culture, supporting secular education and propagating norms of behaviour characteristic of the Christian majority”. Among other measures towards this goal, the Congress Kingdom of Poland authorities established the *Komitet Starozakonnych (Committee of Orthodox Jews)*, which operated from 1825 to 1837 and prepared a most comprehensive plan of reforms⁹⁰.

However, returning to the aforementioned list of rabbis, the Kalisz Provincial Commission determined which rabbis, in their view, “aspired to civilising the Jews” and which did not. As many as fourteen of the twenty six rabbis were considered as “not aspiring to civilisation”. Some were described as “superstitious” or as “lacking in learning”⁹¹. According to that list, nine rabbis “aspired to civilisation”, with their conduct determined as bring moral. These rabbis were from Uniejów, Piotrków Trybunalski, Pławno, Rozprza, Tuszyn, Sieradz, Lutomiernik, Krzepice and Przyrów. A notation can be seen beside the name of the Golina rabbi which stated that he had long-acted according to old customs and that the Talmud was the basis for his learning. However, the Koniecpol rabbi “did not stand out from the others”, which probably meant that he stood out neither within the Jewish population as a whole nor from other rabbis. With regard to these two rabbis, there is no mention as to whether they had a desire to “civilise” the Jews or whether they lacked that desire⁹².

⁸⁹ M. Wodziński, *Władze Królestwa Polskiego wobec chasydyzmu. Z dziejów stosunków politycznych*, Wrocław 2008, pp. 38–39.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 39–41.

⁹¹ These were the rabbis in the following places: Kalisz, Błaszki, Dobra, Warta, Konin, Pyzdry, Koło, Kleczew, Rychwał, Belchatów, Kamieńsk, Widawa, Działoszyn and Wieruszów. It is surprising that a rabbi, Jozef Seydel of Błaszki, being fluent only in German and only knowing a little of the Polish language, could be expected to support reformist tendencies.

⁹² AGAD, CWW, Records concerning the appointment of rabbis and rabbinic schools. Main, 1823-1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 48-54.

The situation of the Radomsk rabbi (actually the Deputy Rabbi), Joachim Herszlikowicz Klugermann, deserves a separate explanation. Similarly to the fourteen other rabbis, he was also considered as “not aspiring to civilising” Jews but, at the same time, it was mentioned that he belonged to the *Kitajowcy*⁹³. This was another name for Hassidim and, at the beginning of the 19th century, was used by the Hassidim themselves as well as by the governing authorities. In 1818, Abraham Stern, of the *Komisja Rządowa Wyznań Religijnych (Government Commission on Religious Faiths)*, regarded the term as coming from the *kitaj* – the thin silk or cotton fabric which was used by Hassidim for their attire, but he provides no explanation as to why that name was adopted⁹⁴. It turns out that there was a Hassidic group in Radomsk and, perhaps, this could be the explanation of the issue mentioned when comparing the 1816 list of rabbis with that of the 1827 listing. According to 1816 data, there was no Jewish community in Radomsk. However, Joachim Herszlikowicz Klugermann took up his post in 1811. It could be that the authorities did not recognise that group as a community. A confirmation of the presence of Hassidim in Radomsk is the conflict which took place regarding the place of worship. This took place in 1831 and is mentioned by M. Wodziński⁹⁵.

Tą samą datą, co opisana powyżej lista rabinów, opatrzona jest *Lista imienna szkolników starozakonnych znajdujących się w Województwie Kaliskim*, także przygotowana przez Komisję Województwa Kaliskiego (zob. Aneks). Trzeba przy tym zwrócić uwagę, że w niektórych z wymienionych w Aneksie miejscowościach nie było gmin żydowskich. Rychwał i Władysławów należały do gminy w Koninie, Zagorów należał do gminy w Pyzdrach, Ślesin i Wilczyn należały do gminy w Kleczewie, a Szadek należał do gminy w Lutomiersku. Niektóre gminy żydowskie nie zostały wymienione na tej liście, w związku z tym prawdopodobnie nie zatrudniano w nich szkolników. Były to gminy w Tuszynie, Kamieńsku i Widawie (wspomniany już problem z lokalizacją miejscowości) z obwodu piotrkowskiego oraz w Bolesławcu i Wieluniu z obwodu wieluńskiego.

That same date, which is described in the above list of rabbis, is provided in the *Lista imienna szkolników starozakonnych znajdujących się w Województwie Kaliskim (The List of Orthodox Scholars in the Kalisz Province)* also prepared by the Kalisz Provincial Commission (see: Annex). In addition, it should be noted that in some of the places mentioned in the Annex, there was no Jewish community. Rychwał and Władysławów belonged to the community in Koniń, Zagórów belonged to the community in Pyzdracy, Ślesin and Wilczyn belonged to the community in Kleczew, while Szadek belonged to the Lutomiersk community. Some Jewish communities were not mentioned in that list, probably because there was no one learned employed there. There were communities in Tuszyn, Kamieńsk and in Widawa (the issue of the town location has already been mentioned) of the Piotrków Trybunalski Circuit, as well as Bolesławiec and Wieluń in the Wieluń Circuit⁹⁶.

In a decided majority, 21 out of 38 localities each employed a lone *shammes* (sexton), while 11 employed two. Three communities employed three (Widawa, Krzepice and

⁹³ Ibid., pp. 51–52.

⁹⁴ M. Wodziński, op. cit., ps. 63.

⁹⁵ Ibid., s. 61.

⁹⁶ AGAD, CWW, Records concerning the management of Jewish Communities. Main, 1821–1829, Ref. 1438, pp. 159–350.

Wieruszów), while in Częstochowa there were four. The most – twelve - were employed in Łask and in Kalisz, certainly because they were large communities. Two or three sextons were employed, mainly, in large communities although, for example in Sulmierzyce, there were also two even though the community comprised only 366 individuals. Wieruszów had three despite it being a community of 433. However, in Kleczew and Pызdry, communities numbering over a thousand, each only had one sexton⁹⁷.

The age difference amongst the sextons was significantly greater than in the case of rabbis. The most, in twenty three instances, fell into the 40-49 category. The smallest number was aged between 50 and 59 (18 sextons). There were 14 sextons aged between 60 and 69 and 12 between 30 and 39 years of age. Another large number were aged between 70 and 79 – there were nine. Two sextons were aged under thirty - Simon Halisz in Golina (the youngest at 24) and Michał Hersz Max in Rychwał (26 years old). The two oldest sextons were Simsie Broda in Widawa (aged 80) and Mosiek Szmul in Praszka (aged 86). The average age was 52.2 years old. The longest serving sexton was 75-year-old Icik Kupfermann in Błaszki (1774 to 1827), while the shortest serving was 43-year-old Natan Schweriner in Stawiszyn (one year, in 1826). None of the eighty sextons held a concession, namely a confirmation of their position by the state authorities⁹⁸.

There was a large difference, amongst the sextons, with respect to the salary each received. In fact, twenty three of them received no salary at all. The least amount was paid to Joachim Lewkowicz in Bełchatów and to Manele Pukacz in Łask, who received 20 złoty each. The highest amount was paid to Fiszel Boms in Kalisz – 1,144 złoty. He was the only one whose pay exceeded 1,000 złoty. The average salary paid to sextons throughout the Kalisz Province was 212.47 złoty, with the majority (38 sextons) earning less than that amount. However, 19 sextons earned more than the average amount. Fifteen sextons were paid less than 100 złoty. In the majority of cases, earnings ranged between 100 and 700 złoty. Abram Łaski in Złoczew (210 złoty) earned closest to the average. As in the case of the rabbis, the amount of the salary was dependent upon the size of the community, but not always⁹⁹.

All the sextons named in the list could speak Yiddish – for 43 of them, it was their only language. Apart from Yiddish, 25 sextons spoke another language – among them, 13 spoke Hebrew, 9 Polish (three of these could read and write in Polish) and 3 spoke German. 11 sextons had a third language. For 7 of them, apart from Yiddish, they had Hebrew and Polish. For 4, apart from Yiddish, it was German and Polish. Dawid Holewicz in Kleczew was the only one who spoke four languages – Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish and German. In total, 21 sextons spoke Hebrew, 8 German and 21 Polish¹⁰⁰.

In a manner comparable to that of the rabbis, the idea of “aspiring to civilisation” appears. 37 sextons were regarded as “not aspiring to civilisation” and as “not possessing an education”, while 12 were acknowledged as “superstitious”. It should be added here that, beside the names of Markus Sądowski and Berek Mędel of Warta, there was a note that, using the rabbi

⁹⁷ AGAD, CWW, Records concerning the appointment of rabbis and rabbinic schools. Main, 1823–1853, Ref. 1444, pp. 55–63.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

as their example, they were instilling superstitions into the Jews. In all, 49 sextons received a negative assessment from the Kalisz Province Commission. Next to Mortek Mittmann in Koźminek and Dawid Schmiedebricki in Uniejów, there appears a notation stating that “he neither aids nor hinders civilisation, because he himself knows nothing” - so that these two have also attracted a negative opinion. Four sextons in Częstochowa were described as not distinguishing themselves in any way, while with regard to the twelve in Kalisz, “the Municipal Office could say nothing special”. So, either they did not stand out in any way from the rest of the Jewish community or the municipal authorities were unfamiliar with their activities. Only Jochym Rubin in Przyrów was regarded as moral and a suited to his vocation. Also, only Natan Schweriner of Stawiszyn was described as “as yet unknown”. This would certainly have been as the result of the fact that he had served as sexton for only a short time. No remarks were made against the names of the eleven sextons of Jewish communities within the Koniń Circuit, so that we cannot determine their attitude towards “civilising” the Jews¹⁰¹.

Concluding the analysis of the 1927 list of sextons, it is still worthwhile examining some of them. Next to name of Lewek Lipczyn of Koło is written the word “cantor”, which probably also a function which he performed for the community¹⁰². In the 1816 list of communities in Kalisz, sextons Szabs Mansfeld and Izrael (no surname) are mentioned. It is quite possible that this is Izrael Schwartz (who held this position from 1790). In turn, Berek Stein (also from Kalisz) is also mentioned in the 1816 list as a butcher (his surname being spelt as “Sztain”). In the case of Krzepice, it is possible that, in 1816, sexton Icik Heynitz held the position as *kehilla* official. Among the Krzepice community officials in the 1816 list is Icik Hanizel (his surname is not completely legible), however an analysis of the source documents showed that data from various years recorded surnames with varied spelling. Thus, the sextons, in various ways, performed various other functions across the communities¹⁰³.

The next compilation of Jewish communities in the Kalisz Province was undertaken in 1834. It was entitled *Wykaz zakreślonych okręgów żydowskich, w których rabini lub ich zastępcy obrządki religijne wykonywać są obowiązani* (*A Listing of Highlighted Jewish Communities in Which Rabbis or Their Deputies Are Responsible for Performing Religious Rites*). The listing encompassed the Kalisz, Kraków, Mazowiecki and Podlaski Provinces. By comparison with the Province Commission’s 1824 listing, as well as that of 1827, this listing confirmed that, within the network of Jewish communities in the Kalisz Province, there were no changes and that the centres of the communities were all located in the same thirty seven localities as they had been ten years previously. The 1834 listing, however, does not list specific communities or their numbers of residents. What it does confirm is the fact that, for some period of time, the number of Jewish communities in the Kalisz Province had stabilised¹⁰⁴.

An analysis of the documents drafted on the orders of the Congress Kingdom of Poland allows for confirmation of the fact that the structure of Jewish communities in the Kalisz Province, at the beginning of 19th century, underwent changes. The most significant change was

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.; AGAD, CWW, Records relating to the establishment of synagogue supervision and the regulating of Jewish community contributions and payments. Overall, 1810–1817, Ref. 1429, pp. 234–235, 246–247.

¹⁰⁴ AGAD, CWW, Records concerning the management of Jewish Communities. Main, 1821–1829, Ref. 1439, pp. 306–309.

the regulation of the network of communities in the 1820's – from the preparation, in 1824, of the Province Commission's project concerning the division of the Province into *gminy* (Jewish "parishes"), to confirmation of that project by the Government Commission of Religion and Public Enlightenment in 1827. By the end of the 1820's, the structure of the communities had stabilised. The documents concerning rabbis and sextons provides interesting information on the manner by which these communities functioned. The data shows that the income of the communities' employees could be dependent upon the wealth of the community, as well as of specific Jewish families. (A community's finances were dependent upon the material status of its members.) However, knowledge of languages allows us to determine the education level of a rabbi or sexton, which can also reflect their background. The statistical data is also interesting, informing us of the Jewish residents in particular localities. On that basis, it can be stated that the size of Jewish communities was greatly diverse – from very small (around 200-300 individuals) to the large (more than 1,000). At the same time, the state authorities received information on the distribution of Jews, who constituted a significant part of the population of the Congress Kingdom of Poland.

ANNEX

Sextons in Kalisz Province Jewish Communities in the 1820's.

Part 1 – Kaliski Circuit.

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITY		SEXTON (<i>SHAMMES</i>)			
	Town	No. of Jews	First Name and Surname	Age	Annual Salary	Knowledge of Languages
Kaliski	Kalisz	3,461	Lewi Kanter	44	684 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Fiszel Boms	54	1,144 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
			Izrael Schwartz	70	384 zł	Yiddish
			Szabs Mansfeld	72	342 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Lewek Gutfreund	36	525 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Natan Gabryel Klopper	45	530 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Berek Stein	53	175 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Baruch Balcz	48	250 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Syne Szlumper	68	50 zł	Yiddish
			Dawid Baruch	56	225 zł	Yiddish
			Markus Natt	54	75 zł	Yiddish
			Ester Baumwolle	61	110 zł	Yiddish
	Błaszki	940	Icik Kupfermann	75	300 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
			Abram Schnurmann	65	-	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
	Dobra	1,111	Hersz Wollstein	60	600 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
			Michał Kubel	60	50 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
	Koźminek	192	Mortke Mittmann	38	-	Yiddish, Hebrew
	Stawiszyn	356	Natan Schweriner	43	312 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
	Uniejów	539	Dawid Schmiedebrick	36	312 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish
	Warta	991	Markus Sądowski	41	360 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Berek Mędel	70	200 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew

Part 2 – Koniński and Piotrowski Circuits.

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITY		SEXTON (<i>SHAMMES</i>)			
	Town	No. of Jews		Town	No. of Jews	
Koniński	Konin ¹⁰⁵	690	Leib Herrman	67	160 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
	Pyzdry ¹⁰⁶	1,060	Izrael Jakob Lisner	65	364 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
	Koło	1,087	Lewek Lipczyn ? kantor	49	60 zł	Yiddish, Hebrew
			Hersz Fordoński	61	300 zł ?	Yiddish, Hebrew
	Kleczew ¹⁰⁷	792	Dawid Holewicz	50	-	Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish, German
	Rychwał ¹⁰⁸	129	Michał Hersz Max	26	96 zł	Yiddish, little Polish and German
	Zagórow ¹⁰⁹	156	Alexander Grünberg	33	100 zł	Yiddish, read and write Polish
	Władysławów ¹¹⁰	173	Izaak Frölich	36	288 zł	Yiddish, German
	Ślesin ¹¹¹	198	Abram Rydz	42	200 zł	Yiddish
	Wilczyn ¹¹²	153	Izaak Gotliebowicz	42	-	Yiddish, read and write Polish
Golina	421	Simon Halisz	24	200 zł	Yiddish, read and write Polish	
Piotrkowski	Bełchatów	432	Joachim Lewkowicz	59	20 zł	Yiddish
	Brzeźnica	318	Lewek Gottheiner	40	40 zł	Yiddish, German, Polish
	Piotrków Trybunalski	2,349	Kiwe Berkowicz	37	-	Yiddish
			Icik Laskowski	56	-	Yiddish
	Pławno	487	Hercyk Samuel	52	150 zł	Yiddish
			Mozes Magnetstein	72	72 zł	Yiddish
	Pajęczno	341	Michał Kluger	65	-	Yiddish, German, Polish
	Konieczpol	582	Berek Wruk	46	75 zł	Yiddish
	Radomsko	483	Leyzer Palmann	48	150 zł	Yiddish
	Rozprza	601	Bączen Wolrauch	55	50 zł	Yiddish
	Sulmierzyce (wieś)	366	Feyrus Margrlis	48	-	Yiddish
Abram Szlamowicz			52	-	Yiddish	

¹⁰⁵ Rychwał and Władysławów belonged to the Koniń community. The total community population was 992.

¹⁰⁶ Zagórow belonged to the Pyzdry community. The total community population was 1,216.

¹⁰⁷ Do Ślesin and Wilczyn belonged to the Kleczew community. The total community population was 1,143.

¹⁰⁸ Rychwał belonged to the Koniń community.

¹⁰⁹ Zagórow belonged to the Pyzdry community.

¹¹⁰ Władysławów belonged to the Koniń community.

¹¹¹ Ślesin belonged to the Kleczew community.

¹¹² Wilczyn belonged to the Kleczew community

Part 3 – Sieradzki and Wieluński Circuits.

CIRCUIT	JEWISH COMMUNITY		SEXTON (<i>SHAMMES</i>)			
	Town	No. of Jews		Town	No. of Jews	
Sieradzki	Sieradz	688	Szafir Noe (?)	44	300 zł	Yiddish, German
			Samuel Wapersatz	36	100 zł	Yiddish, German
	Złoczew	539	Abram Łaski	42	210 zł	Yiddish
			Icik Lewkowicz	63	65 zł	Yiddish
	Widawa	937	Simsie Broda	80	30 zł	Yiddish
			Joachim Harlstein	43	200 zł	Yiddish
			Eliasz Friedemann	68	108 zł	Yiddish
	Szadek ¹¹³	258	Fiszel Grano	39	25 zł	Yiddish
	Łask	1,275	Aron Moskowicz	46	208 zł	Yiddish
			Aron Abram Weinrebe	73	-	Yiddish
			Leyzer Moskowicz Łęczycycki	63	-	Yiddish
			Smul Cylich	34	-	Yiddish
			Nochem Zaydfel	36	-	Yiddish
			Izrael Rapaport	41	-	Yiddish
			Jakob Zaysel Kluk	52	-	Yiddish
			Icik Baruch	65	260 zł	Yiddish, German, Polish
			Efraim Spiren	70	208 zł	Yiddish
			Wolek Eyzik	53	260 zł	Yiddish
	Lutomiersk ¹¹⁴	1,300	Szye Mozes Bauer	53	-	Yiddish
			Manele Pukacz	73	20 zł	Yiddish
Wieluński	Częstochowa	1,440	Megir Bresler	56	100 zł	Yiddish
			Szye Szymkiewicz	66	100 zł	Yiddish
			Michał Hirschfeld	57	-	Yiddish
			Nathan Rutke	41	-	Yiddish
	Działoszyn	2,094	Markus Schiff	52	-	Yiddish
			Szymon Lustberg	70	-	Yiddish
	Krzepice	1,242	Icik Samsonowicz	47	200 zł	Yiddish, Polish
			Jozef Berkowicz	46	200 zł	Yiddish, Polish
			Icik Heynitz	58	100 zł	Yiddish, Polish
	Praszka	650	Samuel Guttkin	49	100 zł	Yiddish, Polish
			Wolff Schipper	40	100 zł	Yiddish, Polish
	Przyrów	537	Mosiek Szmul	86	194 zł	Yiddish
	Wieruszów	433	Jochym Rubin	55	70 zł	Yiddish, Polish
			Herszlik Fibel	32	-	Yiddish
Kananie Szymisie			33	-	Yiddish	
			Icik Elkan	40	-	Yiddish

¹¹³ Szadek belonged to the Lutomiersk community.

¹¹⁴ Szadek belonged to the Lutomiersk community. The total community population was 1,558