

# Growing More Than Vegetables: A Case Study in the Use of CCAR Responsa in Planting the Tri-Faith Community Garden

*Deana Sussman Berezin*

Mr. Rogers may have famously coined the phrase, “won’t you be my neighbor?” but in Omaha, Nebraska, we at Temple Israel live that phrase every day as members of the groundbreaking Tri-Faith Initiative. The Tri-Faith Initiative began over a decade ago when members of the three Abrahamic faiths came together to begin conversations about a bold vision “to be in relationship together as neighbors on one campus, committed to practicing respect, acceptance, and trust.”<sup>1</sup> Today, that bold vision has become our reality as we find ourselves situated on one beautiful thirty-eight-acre campus with our Christian and Islamic partners, Countryside Community Church (UCC) and The American Muslim Institute.

Our mission is simple: “The Tri-Faith Initiative fosters empathy, invites understanding, and advances common action between people of diverse faiths through the shared efforts of intentionally co-located congregations.”<sup>2</sup> Our shared vision is to “imagine and work for a world in which religious differences are seen as an asset and strength to be celebrated, where people realize the ability to overcome fear and stereotypes and embrace one another.”<sup>3</sup>

A synagogue, a church, and a mosque, all on one campus known as the Tri-Faith Commons. To many, it sounded like a pipe dream, a vision of a utopia beyond our grasp; and yet, here we sit, encountering

---

RABBI DEANA SUSSMAN BEREZIN (LA14) is the associate rabbi at Temple Israel in Omaha, Nebraska. She received her MAJE from the Rhea Hirsch School of Education in 2012.

each other as neighbors and friends each and every day. Our communities strive to break down the barriers that have historically divided us by creating opportunities for authentic relationship building: our clergy teach and preach at each other's congregations; our children gather monthly to learn about faith traditions other than their own while creating real and lasting friendships; and our congregants sit on committees together to create joint programming where meaningful relationships can flourish.

And yet, though the Tri-Faith Initiative is more than a decade old, it was just this past year, in the spring of 2019, that the building process was completed and the vision of our founders was realized as all three partner congregations finally find themselves co-located on the Tri-Faith Commons.<sup>4</sup> And so, we find ourselves in brand new territory, discovering what it means to live together as neighbors.

Oftentimes, this manifests itself in the realm of the mundane—utilizing one another's parking lots or drawing up joint contracts for lawn care and snow removal. But sometimes it becomes more than maintenance, and sometimes, the maintenance becomes more than mundane, and every so often, the mundane becomes holy—as was the case of the Tri-Faith Community Garden.

The Tri-Faith Community Garden was originally envisaged by the Temple Israel Social Justice Committee as part of our work on issues of hunger and food insecurity, which brought it to the Tri-Faith Initiative as an opportunity for collaboration, education, and communal engagement. As expected, the response from the three partner congregations and the Tri-Faith Initiative staff was overwhelmingly supportive, and our work began.

Temple Israel provided the land for the Community Garden and plans were soon drawn up for eight beds to be constructed during our inaugural planting season. Congregants from each of the partner congregations worked with Tri-Faith Initiative staff to determine what should be planted and how it should be maintained. How would we ensure that the garden was watered regularly? That it was weeded and maintained throughout the hot summer months? When would we harvest the fruits and vegetables, and where would they be donated? The Gardening Committee worked diligently, thoughtfully considering how to best work together to achieve our desired goals. As planting season drew nearer, we began making firmer plans for the construction of the beds and the

planting of the garden—and suddenly our amicable relationship became fraught with tension and emotion.

Was the tension over who would be responsible for engaging volunteers? No. Was it over who would pay for this garden? No. Was it over what we would be planting? No. It was over *when* we would be planting it. Yes, the question at hand was whether we could plant our Tri-Faith Community Garden on Shabbat.

In commanding us to observe Shabbat, the Torah states: “Six days you shall work, but on the seventh day you shall rest; in plowing time and in harvest time you shall rest.”<sup>5</sup> The Torah categorically prohibits any type of *m’lachah* (מלאכה, work) on Shabbat but leaves the definition of “work” vague. And yet, that ambiguity does not extend to plowing and harvesting—these activities are expressly prohibited in the Torah itself. Furthermore, the Rabbis of the Talmud outline thirty-nine categories of proscribed labor on Shabbat. Included in the categories of labor are building, sowing, plowing, and reaping.

The question of whether we should engage in the construction and planting of a Tri-Faith Community Garden on Shabbat from a halachic perspective has a clear answer. The types of transformative, creative labor that would be necessary to construct the beds, haul the soil and fertilizer, dig the holes, plant the seeds, and water the beds are obvious violations of the command to abstain from *m’lachah* on Shabbat.

And yet, for us, as Reform Jews in an interfaith setting, the answer was somewhat less clear. When the Tri-Faith Gardening Committee approached us with this question, it was evident that both parties believed that this would be a simple decision with little fanfare. The committee, which included members of all three congregations, believed that, as Reform Jews, we would be amenable. When we, the clergy, discussed the issue, we believed our response—that we did not feel that it was an appropriate activity for a synagogue on Shabbat—would be met with perhaps some disappointment, but ultimately accepted without resentment. We were all sorely mistaken.

As the controversy gained momentum, we realized that the issue at hand manifested itself in two discrete dimensions: (1) the desire of Temple Israel’s Reform Jews to do gardening work on Shabbat and (2) the desire of the Tri-Faith Initiative’s non-Jewish partners to do gardening work on Shabbat—and to do so, moreover, *on synagogue property with the sanction of the synagogue*.

### The Question of Jews Doing Gardening Work on Shabbat

To tackle the first dimension, we first considered what Reform Judaism has to say about *m'lachah* on Shabbat, particularly since a strong argument could be made for allowing congregants to exercise personal autonomy (the hallmark of Reform Judaism) in their decision to garden. As a movement with a mandate of personal choice, we encourage our congregants to find what is spiritually nourishing and to make it an ongoing part of their lives. With regard to Shabbat, we urge our constituents to wrestle with the texts and the traditions in order to determine how to elevate and sanctify their Jewish experiences, and, in turn, their Jewish identities. Striking a balance between *m'lachah* and *m'nuchah* (מנוחה, rest) is up to each of us as individuals. It is therefore no surprise that many in our Temple Israel community find gardening—working with their hands, basking in the beautiful sunlight that illuminates the natural world, feeling the cool, damp soil as they pick, prune, and water—to be the very definition of Shabbat *m'nuchah*.

Our first task was to ask ourselves if we were, in fact, limiting personal autonomy by denying Temple Israel congregants the ability to work in the Tri-Faith Community Garden on Shabbat. We turned to CCAR Responsa for guidance and found the following statement to be helpful to us in articulating our Movement's aim in achieving our ideal Shabbat observance:

It is our goal to “balance creativity in practice with the desire to conserve and adapt what speaks to us from the past.” This conception implies that we are not neutral and dispassionate in our attitude toward traditional standards of practice . . . As liberal Jews who seek to affirm our connection to our people in all lands and all ages, we should maintain the traditional practice in the absence of a compelling reason to abandon or alter it. The Responsa Committee has long followed this approach with respect to questions on the observance of Shabbat. We have stressed time and again that Shabbat is a mitzvah in its own right, one that makes its own legitimate demands upon us, demands that often take precedence over worthy causes.<sup>6</sup>

While we cannot deny that engaging in the work of the Tri-Faith Community Garden is a worthy cause, we could find no compelling

reason to abandon or alter our observance to allow for its work to be done on Shabbat.

We then had to determine if the Tri-Faith Community Garden's position as a congregational interfaith social justice project would grant it special status in the Reform Movement. Fortunately, the same responsum, dealing with social action projects on Shabbat, provides a directive for this, too—one that seemed to speak to the very heart of our issue:

We have also urged that social action and *tzedakah* projects involving traditionally prohibited labor not be held on Shabbat. *Tzedakah* is indeed a mitzvah, but then, so is the observance of Shabbat; and generally, "we do not perform a true mitzvah if it is done by transgressing another command." In light of our movement's increasing efforts during recent decades to strengthen Shabbat observance among our people, we must acknowledge that while a social action project may be scheduled on a weekday, "the seventh day is the Sabbath; it belongs to *Adonai* your God" (Exod. 20:10; Deut. 5:14). Shabbat is not simply a day on which we do good deeds. It is *Shabbat kodesh*, a holy day, **a refuge from many of the activities associated with the weekday world of building and planting, sowing and reaping**, getting and spending [emphasis mine]. We do not trespass upon Shabbat, even for the sake of mitzvot, unless those mitzvot must be performed on that very day.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, another responsum specifically addressing communal interfaith social justice work on Shabbat notes that there is a distinct but significant difference between personal Shabbat observance and institutional Shabbat observance:

We are certain that those who are ready to participate think that they are doing the right and religious thing, and we suspect none of them observes Shabbat as a day of rest in the accepted way. But as partners in this activity they perform the labor not as private persons; they act under the auspices of the synagogue. Jews may eat pork privately and find it both delectable and religiously acceptable, but the synagogue will refuse to serve it.<sup>8</sup>

While we respect our congregants whose personal theology permits them to do gardening work on Shabbat, we could not, in good conscience, sanction the activity on an institutional level.

Given that these responsa provided us clear reasoning for our decision, our clergy team felt comfortable maintaining our position that it would not be permissible to do the work of gardening on Shabbat. And yet, even as the clergy team came to a well-thought-out conclusion (much to the dismay of our congregants), I began to question if there was more than deference to the responsa influencing our decision.

Our Movement had indeed provided immense clarity on this issue, and yet a small part of me wondered if we used the responsa to validate the “gut response” that felt appropriate in this situation. So much of our observance of *halachah*—and specifically our observance of the traditional *halachot* of Shabbat—is lenient, so why did we feel that this particular case crossed the line? Why was gardening on Shabbat the boundary that we could not transgress?

Perhaps the key to understanding our apparent certainty is the sociological significance of the decision. In his work *Tradition in Transition*, Rabbi David Ellenson suggests that boundaries are often determined by a community’s (conscious or unconscious) need to identify deviant behavior, which is socially defined:

The group, by assigning a label of deviance to a particular form of behavior or belief is able to establish and clarify its own norms and mores regarding acceptable forms of practice and belief. The range of activities open to persons in the group is thereby limited and the group is able to state precisely where the boundaries of permissible behavior or belief for its members are located. Deviance, from this sociological perspective, helps to establish limits for the community. It contributes directly to the social task of boundary maintenance and identity formation.<sup>9</sup>

According to Ellenson, deviance theory helps to explain some of the phenomena at work in the development of Orthodoxy as Reform Judaism advanced and enmeshed itself in Jewish communities in nineteenth-century Europe. To help define themselves, Orthodox Jews established guidelines to help followers determine which reforms crossed the bounds of Orthodoxy. Such boundaries included a ban against hearing a sermon delivered in a non-Jewish language, entering a synagogue where the bimah was not in the center, erecting a synagogue with a tower, and the donning of clerical robes by the clergy. But the most controversial symbol of all was the organ. As Ellenson points out: “It was forbidden to enter

a synagogue where an organ was played on the Sabbath or holidays, and [some Orthodox authorities] stated that no rabbi who allowed an organ in the synagogue could be called 'Orthodox.'"<sup>10</sup> It is important to note, however, that this stringent ban on organs in the synagogue was geographically limited: while the organ became a boundary issue in Hungary and Germany, its introduction in French and Italian synagogues did not cause widespread controversy, thus affirming the principle that deviance is socially defined. As Ellenson notes: "What is permissible in one context may not be in another. The organ represents one such issue and . . . became the major practical dividing line between Orthodox and Liberal varieties of Judaism in Germany around the turn of the twentieth century."<sup>11</sup>

In seeking to understand why gardening on Shabbat had become a boundary issue for us, I had to consider the issues raised by deviance theory as possible contributing factors. Could this be Omaha's "organ moment?" As the sole Reform congregation in Omaha, Nebraska, we are often defined by our halachic leniency in comparison to the Conservative and Orthodox congregations. And yet, one of the strengths of the Omaha Jewish Community is the strong relationship the three congregations have with one another. It would not be implausible that we subconsciously recognized that synagogue-sanctioned gardening on Shabbat, an activity plainly visible to anyone near our building (including those walking to and from the Orthodox synagogue located just down the street from Temple Israel), would be too far outside the bounds of acceptable religious practice. Even as we maintain our identity as a Reform congregation committed to the core principles of Reform ideology (e.g., egalitarianism, LGBTQ inclusivity, radical hospitality), it is still important to us not to put ourselves so far outside the bounds of Jewish practice that we become unrecognizable to our counterparts.

Furthermore, it seems to me that while much of our practice is open to interpretation, the fact that our Movement has issued several *t'shuvot* that deal explicitly with this issue cannot be ignored. While I do believe certain concerns highlighted by deviance theory were subconsciously present, I am equally certain that it was the determinative nature of the CCAR responsa we studied that provided us with the confidence we needed to maintain our position that gardening was not permissible on Shabbat.

## The Question of the Synagogue Allowing Our Non-Jewish Partners to Do Gardening Work on Shabbat on Synagogue Property

These *t'shuvot*, however, address only one dimension of the issue at hand. Though we had made our decision, I felt it necessary to delve deeper into the second dimension: the desire of the Tri-Faith Initiative's non-Jewish partners to do gardening work on synagogue property on Shabbat. Up to this point, the responsa indicated that the desire of our congregants to engage in interfaith social justice work mirrored the experience of other Reform congregations. But on the issue of whether we were unfairly limiting our Tri-Faith partners, the responsa were far less conclusive. I soon recognized that our intentional co-locating in the Tri-Faith Initiative placed us in a league of our own.

Suddenly, the realization that this decision was not just about us—the Jewish partner in this three-pronged relationship—compelled me to grasp the enormity of this moment in the life of the Tri-Faith Initiative. What was already a difficult decision to justify to our own congregants became compounded with the additional dynamic of our Tri-Faith partners' needs. Did we owe it to our Muslim and Christian neighbors to allow gardening to take place on Shabbat? Would restricting access be anathema to our pluralistic vision? Does being a “good neighbor” mean that we should compromise our own religious beliefs and practices to protect the vision of interfaith partnership and cooperation that we know as the Tri-Faith Initiative?

An examination of CCAR responsa led me to two *t'shuvot*, one which addresses the question of whether a non-Jewish contractor is permitted to build a synagogue on Shabbat, and another which considers whether an off-premises synagogue thrift store may be operated by non-Jews on Shabbat. While not directly related to my specific question, elements of these responsa helped to define the questions we should be asking at this critical juncture.

The first of these *t'shuvot* notes that Jewish law expressly prohibits Jews from hiring laborers to do work for them on Shabbat:

[A Jew] may, however, let out work to a non-Jew and need not concern himself whether the non-Jew does it on Sabbath or not, provided that the non-Jew has the time and could do the work

on the weekdays. Since the Jew does not profit by the work being done on the Sabbath, he is not responsible for the non-Jew's choosing to do the work on the Sabbath. For the Jew is not commanded to try in any way to make the non-Jew observe the Jewish Sabbath. In any case, then, where the non-Jew is not a hired laborer (i.e., paid wages by the day or week or month), but receives payment for the finished job or contracts to do the whole work and receives payment for the delivered product (*bekablanut* or *bekibolet*) and not for the hours of labor put in the Jew may let him do on the Sabbath the labor contracted for.<sup>12</sup>

A similar construct whereby the non-Jew would not be an employee or agent of the synagogue might allow for them to work in a synagogue owned thrift-store on Shabbat. Indeed, the responsa points out that "Jews have for centuries resorted to such legal devices in order to engage in a variety of business relationships with Gentiles and yet observe the letter of Shabbat law."<sup>13</sup>

And yet, both *t'shuvot* point out the importance of the concept of *mar'it ayin* (מַרְאִית עַיִן, appearance of impropriety) and how these situations might be perceived by the public. Although both scenarios might be acceptable within the framework of Jewish law, it is important to determine whether the practice in question is so pedestrian within the community that it would not arouse concern that the laws of Shabbat were being violated. The responsum explains that

even though the formal *halakhah* (Torah law; *dina de'oraita*) permits a Jew to lease a business to a Gentile for operation on Shabbat, the rabbis forbade this arrangement under the following circumstances: 1) when it is widely known that the business is Jewishly-owned, and 2) where it is not the common local practice to lease such a business. The rabbis feared that people seeing the business in operation on Shabbat would suspect that the Gentile was in fact the employee of the Jewish owner, working for that owner and not for himself.<sup>14</sup>

For many liberal Jews, refraining from various activities for the purposes of *mar'it ayin* (for the sake of appearances) lacks the power it holds in other denominations. The responsum acknowledges this, and yet advocates that, in certain cases, it should be given due consideration. To accede that something should not be done for the sake of *mar'it ayin*

suggests, at a certain level, appearances are more important than substance, and that is a sentiment we most definitely do not accept. Yet in another respect, *mar'it ayin* retains its ethical power for us, as the age-old expression of the maxim that one's actions must not only be proper but appear to be proper as well. Our religious institutions are charged with the sacred task of teaching Torah, and we accomplish this task in the example we set no less—and perhaps more—than in the words we preach.<sup>15</sup>

The responsum on doing synagogue construction on Shabbat is more amenable to work being done on Shabbat because of the highly conventional nature of construction contracts and the likelihood that the general public would be aware of said conventions. The second responsum, however, counsels explicitly against operating a synagogue thrift store on Shabbat. So, while the Tri-Faith Community Garden is certainly not renting out land, nor is it hiring laborers, the issues to which the responsum is speaking are similar. It might be possible halachically to have non-Jews engaged in doing Tri-Faith gardening work on synagogue premises on Shabbat, but only if such a situation were so commonplace that passersby would not suspect the people working in the garden were Jews, which, of course, would not be the case.

The responsum cites the *Magen Avraham* commentary to the *Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayim* 244:8, which states that some authorities refused to allow work to be done, even by contract. In the *Magen Avraham's* words:

Since the non-Jews do not let any person do any public work on their Holiday or Sunday, it would be a disgrace, a sort of *Chilul Hashem* if we would permit work on our buildings to be done on our Sabbath . . . This is a poor argument, and Rabbi Akiva Eiger in his notes on the *Shulchan Aruch*, ad loc., rightly remarks that he cannot see any disgrace in our not imitating other people by forcing our Sabbath upon others.<sup>16</sup>

The responsum further notes that, “And we today who strongly object to other people’s seeking to force Sunday laws upon us, certainly do not consider it disgraceful to refrain from forcing other people to observe our Sabbath.”<sup>17</sup> In light of this, denying our Tri-Faith partners access to working in the garden on Shabbat may be considered unfair and potentially interpreted as Temple Israel

foisting the Jewish observance of the Sabbath upon our interfaith neighbors.

The primary difference between these responsa and the case of the Tri-Faith Community Garden is the involvement of Jews in the work. It would be impossible to limit the work of the Tri-Faith Initiative to two-thirds of the partner faith traditions; the work, by definition, involves Jews, Muslims, and Christians. Even if we were able to achieve widespread communal understanding that ours was a Tri-Faith garden rather than a Temple Israel garden, permitting gardening on Shabbat would inevitably compromise our institutional religious values by giving what would essentially amount to a *hechsher* (הכשר, approval) to Jews doing the work of gardening on Shabbat.

Moreover, in the same responsum that discusses communal social justice work on Shabbat, we are reminded that upholding our own traditions and commitments is imperative as we interact with the religious other.<sup>18</sup> To engage in work that is a clear violation of Shabbat in order to participate in interfaith efforts would be to diminish Judaism in our own eyes as well as in the eyes of our neighbors. How can we expect our neighbors to value and uphold the sanctity of our religious traditions if we devalue them?

Ultimately, CCAR responsa seem to be silent on how to approach interfaith social justice work when this work takes place on a communal campus with shared resources. Though the Tri-Faith Community Garden sits on Temple Israel's property, it is paid for and maintained jointly by partners from all three congregations and the Tri-Faith Initiative itself. As we move into a new era when, God willing, interfaith collaboration and intentional co-locating are becoming more commonplace, understanding where halachah orients itself on such issues will be vital to communities engaged in this kind of sacred work.

### **Choosing a Planting Day Acceptable to Jews, Christians, and Muslims**

Though we had concluded that it was impermissible to plant the garden on Shabbat, the question of when we *could* plant the garden remained. I began to contemplate other days and times that gardening might be permissible for all three of our traditions. Could we garden on Friday afternoon before Shabbat begins? No—Friday

afternoons are the time of the Muslim *Jum'ah* prayer, the most important weekly service. What about Sunday either during or after religious school? No—Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, the holiest day of their week. If Friday, Saturday, and Sunday are *all* holy days for the Tri-Faith partner congregations, what were we to do? How would this garden ever get planted?

Of course, halachah is only concerned with Jews doing work on Shabbat, meaning that refraining from work on both Friday and Sunday is obviously not a halachic necessity. However, the unique arrangement of the Tri-Faith Initiative means that the religious traditions of all three partner faith traditions carry equal weight, an understanding that is unfathomable in halachic literature as well as in our Reform responsa. Indeed, in our paradigm, the requirement to refrain from violating Muslim and Christian holy days provides its own sort of quasi-halachic force to which we hold ourselves accountable.

We consulted with our clergy partners from Countryside Community Church and the American Muslim Institute. They wholeheartedly supported our decision to abstain from gardening on Shabbat. Our clergy partners taught us that though Friday and Sunday are holy days in the Muslim and Christian calendars respectively, they do not carry with them the same prohibitions against transformative labor that Shabbat in the Jewish tradition does. Together, we concluded that Sunday afternoon after Countryside Community Church's worship services finished would be an ideal time to plant the garden.

### Conclusion

Reaching this conclusion together was, itself, a holy process, and felt, to some degree, as if I were sitting in a *beit din* (בֵּית דִּין, rabbinic court) of sorts. The rabbis and cantor, the imam, and the ministers of the Tri-Faith Initiative are responsible for what my dear friend and Tri-Faith clergy partner, Rev. Dr. Eric Elnes, calls “the soul of Tri-Faith.” While a great many people look out for the “body” of Tri-Faith (the physical grounds, the buildings, etc.), it is our responsibility, as its clergy, to maintain the health and well-being of its soul. Ensuring that we are upholding our religious traditions and the values that make our faiths sacred enlivens the soul of the Tri-Faith Initiative.

Though our constituents did not all agree with our collective decision, they abided by it and made it work. We were all reminded that being part of this grand experiment we call the Tri-Faith Initiative means that sometimes we have to sit in the tension and navigate around boundaries and barriers that would simply not be present in any other situation. But our commitment to being neighbors means that, sometimes, we are inconvenienced, and that part of learning the lessons of how to live together means respecting and upholding the sanctity of the religious other.

The Tri-Faith Community Garden controversy reminded me of an important lesson that I have the honor of learning and re-learning daily: encountering the religious other does not dilute my own beliefs. Rather, meaningful encounters with members of other faith traditions strengthens me in my own faith. I am a stronger, more faithful Jew because of my experience in the Tri-Faith Initiative, a sentiment that I am confident is shared by all those who are touched by our efforts.

Restricting gardening on Shabbat does not make us “bad neighbors.” In fact, I believe it makes us better neighbors. We model our commitment to our faith by maintaining our religious integrity. We create opportunities to teach our neighbors about our laws and traditions by not compromising them. We demonstrate our commitment to pluralism as we hold fast to the values that make our faith tradition different from those of our neighbors.

Serving as a rabbi in a partner congregation of the Tri-Faith Initiative is a rare privilege. Being part of this neighborhood means having the opportunity to go to work each day knowing that my office sits squarely upon holy ground. It means knowing that every decision we make, every conversation we have, every interaction that we experience is part of our unfolding story. Being part of the Tri-Faith Initiative means that our work is always sacred, even when we might be tempted to dismiss it as mundane. Each and every decision, whether it be utilization of one another’s parking lots, joint contracts for lawn care and snow removal, and yes, even planting a community garden, has the capacity for greatness when you consider where you are making these decisions. And when you get to go to work every day bearing that in mind, it is *always* a beautiful day in the Tri-Faith Neighborhood.

Despite its tense beginnings, the Tri-Faith Community Garden has been an unqualified success, yielding over five hundred

pounds of produce, which was donated to local food pantries. This summer, we have plans to more than double the size of our garden, proving that in working together, we really do grow more than vegetables.

### Notes

1. Tri-Faith Initiative, "About," <https://trifaith.org/about/> (accessed October 30, 2019).
2. Tri-Faith Initiative, "Our Mission," <https://trifaith.org/about/> (accessed October 30, 2019).
3. Ibid.
4. Note: A shared Tri-Faith Center on the Tri-Faith Commons is still under construction, anticipated to open in early 2020. The Center will serve as a hub of collaboration for social events, educational activities, and conference facilities.
5. Exod. 34:21.
6. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "CCAR Responsa: Presenting a Check for Tzedakah at Shabbat Services," <https://www.ccarnet.org/ccar-responsa/nyp-no-5756-4/> (accessed December 6, 2019).
7. Ibid.
8. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "CCAR Responsa, Communal Work on Shabbat," <https://www.ccarnet.org/ccar-responsa/tfn-no-5753-22-169-170/> (accessed October 25, 2019).
9. David Ellenson, *Tradition in Transition: Orthodoxy, Halakhah, and the Boundaries of Modern Jewish Identity* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989), 35.
10. Ibid., 45.
11. Ibid., 46.
12. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "CCAR Responsa: Work on a Synagogue on Sabbath by Non-Jews," <https://www.ccarnet.org/ccar-responsa/arr-71-75/> (accessed December 10, 2019).
13. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "CCAR Responsa: The Synagogue Thrift Shop and Shabbat," <https://www.ccarnet.org/ccar-responsa/nyp-no-5757-7/> (accessed December 10, 2019).
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "Work on a Synagogue."
17. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "Work on a Synagogue."
18. Central Conference of American Rabbis, "Communal Work on Shabbat."