The Anatomy of a Command: A Comprehensive Analysis of "Turning the Other Cheek" in Christian Thought and Practice

Part I: The Foundation: Text and Context

The command of Jesus of Nazareth to "turn the other cheek," recorded in the Gospel of Matthew, stands as one of the most recognizable, challenging, and frequently misinterpreted injunctions in the Christian ethical tradition. Its meaning has been debated for two millennia, variously invoked to support absolute pacifism, justify state-sanctioned violence, and offer strategies for nonviolent social change. A precise understanding of this command is impossible without first anchoring it in its original literary, legal, and socio-cultural milieu. To detach the phrase from its context is to risk transforming a nuanced directive for disciples into a simplistic and often dangerous platitude.

The Sermon on the Mount's Radical Ethic

The instruction to turn the other cheek appears in Matthew 5:39, situated within the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7). This discourse is not a collection of disparate moral adages but a cohesive charter for life in the "kingdom of heaven".[1] Jesus presents a series of six "antitheses," which follow the formula, "You have heard that it was said... But I say to you...".[2] These teachings address murder, adultery, divorce, oaths, retaliation, and love for enemies. In each case, Jesus does not abolish the Mosaic Law but rather intensifies it, pushing beyond mere external observance to the internal disposition of the heart.[4] The righteousness he demands must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, moving from the letter of the law to its spirit.[4]

This "ethic of the kingdom" is fundamentally counter-cultural, presenting a new set of ideals focused on love, humility, and mercy rather than force, honor, and mastery.[7] The sermon begins with the Beatitudes, blessings upon the poor in spirit, the meek, and the peacemakers, establishing a value system that inverts worldly standards.[7] Therefore, turning the other cheek must be understood not as an isolated command but as a practical expression of this broader kingdom ethic—a tangible way to live out a life of radical love and humility in a world governed by opposing principles.[10]

Re-evaluating the Lex Talionis

Jesus prefaces his command by referencing the Old Testament principle, "You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'".[2] This principle, known as the

lex talionis (the law of retaliation), is often misconstrued as a mandate for personal revenge. However, its original function within the legal codes of ancient Israel (found in Exodus 21:24, Leviticus 24:20, and Deuteronomy 19:21) was precisely the opposite. It was a principle of *proportional justice* intended for civil magistrates to apply in a court of law.[12] Its purpose was to *limit* vengeance and prevent the endless cycles of escalating violence common in tribal societies, where a minor injury could provoke a lethal response.[4] The law ensured that the punishment would be proportional to the crime, establishing equitable justice rather than sanctioning personal retribution.[13]

By the first century, however, this legal principle was apparently being co-opted by some religious teachers to justify personal retaliation in matters of honor.[6] Jesus' antithesis, therefore, functions as a crucial corrective. He is not abolishing the state's role in administering justice but is intervening in a socio-legal malpractice of his time. He commands his followers to transcend the principle of proportional justice in their *personal* lives, moving from limited, court-sanctioned retribution to a radical ethic of non-retaliation.[13] This re-establishes a critical boundary between the responsibility of the civil magistrate to punish evil and the responsibility of the disciple to absorb it with love.

The Anatomy of an Insult in an Honor-Shame Culture

The full force of Jesus' command is unlocked by its cultural specificity. He does not say, "If anyone slaps you," but rather, "if anyone slaps you on the *right* cheek".[17] In the predominantly right-handed world of the ancient Near East, striking a person's right cheek with one's right

hand requires a *backhanded slap*.[18] This was not primarily an act of violence intended to cause physical injury; it was a profound public insult, a gesture of contempt used by a social superior to humiliate and degrade an inferior—a master striking a slave, a Roman soldier striking a Jew, a man striking a woman.[20] The gravity of this gesture is reflected in Jewish law, which stipulated a fine for a backhanded slap that was double that of a regular, open-palmed slap.[17]

The context is one of public degradation within a rigid honor-shame culture, under the oppressive reality of Roman occupation.[3] A person's honor was their most valuable social commodity, and a public insult demanded a response. The conventional options were to retaliate violently to reclaim one's honor or to cower in submission, thereby accepting the shame. Jesus' command proposes a third, unexpected option. The specificity of the "right cheek" is therefore not an incidental detail; it is the hermeneutical key. To generalize the phrase, as is common in modern parlance, is to fundamentally shift its meaning from a strategic, nonviolent response to *humiliation* to a passive endurance of *violence*, thereby obscuring Jesus' primary point about subverting social degradation.[18]

Part II: Major Interpretive Paradigms Through History

The interpretation of Matthew 5:39 has not been static. It has evolved dramatically over centuries, with its meaning being refracted through the Church's changing social and political circumstances. The single most significant factor shaping its interpretation has been the Church's relationship to state power. Whether the Church saw itself as a persecuted, counter-cultural minority or as the moral guardian of a Christian empire largely determined whether Jesus' words were read as a literal command for all of life or as a spiritual ideal to be balanced with worldly responsibilities.

The Witness of the Early Church: An Ethic of Non-Retaliation

In the first three centuries of its existence, before the Edict of Milan in 313 AD, the Christian community was a politically marginalized and often persecuted minority within the Roman Empire. The writings of the early Church Fathers from this period show a near-unanimous consensus that the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount constituted an absolute prohibition against violence, retribution, and military service for believers.[24]

Justin Martyr (c. 100-165 AD) wrote, "we who formerly used to murder one another do not

only now refrain from making war upon our enemies, but also... willingly die confessing Christ".[26] Tertullian (c. 160-220 AD) was even more explicit, stating, "The Lord has abolished the sword," and asking, "Shall it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword?".[27] Origen, Cyprian, Athenagoras, and others echoed this sentiment, teaching that Christians do not repay evil with evil, do not bring lawsuits, and do not kill, even in self-defense.[24] This pacifist stance was so well-known that the pagan critic Celsus (c. 175 AD) attacked Christianity for its refusal to have believers serve in the military, arguing that if everyone behaved like Christians, the empire would be overrun by barbarians—an external corroboration of the Church's nonviolent position.[25] For the pre-Constantinian Church, non-retaliation was not a fringe opinion but a core component of Christian identity and witness.

The Pacifist Imperative: The Anabaptist "Canon within the Canon"

This early-church ethic was largely submerged after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire, but it was forcefully revived during the Protestant Reformation by the Anabaptist movement (e.g., Mennonites, Amish, Hutterites).[29] Persecuted by both Catholic and Protestant state churches, the Anabaptists rejected the "Constantinian shift" and sought to restore a believers' church separate from the coercive power of the state.[5]

For Anabaptists, the Sermon on the Mount is the supreme ethical guide for discipleship, often described as a "canon within the canon".[3] They interpret Jesus' commands, including turning the other cheek, literally and absolutely.[5] This is understood not as a call to passive inaction but to a lifestyle of "radical love" and nonresistance that actively seeks to "overcome evil with good" (Romans 12:21).[31] This commitment extends to all areas of life, leading to a principled rejection of all forms of violence, including personal self-defense, capital punishment, and warfare.[29] The paradigmatic example of this ethic is the story of Dirk Willems, a 16th-century Anabaptist martyr who, after escaping from prison, turned back to rescue his pursuing guard who had fallen through thin ice, only to be recaptured and subsequently executed.[5]

Jesus' Third Way: Walter Wink and Creative Nonviolent Resistance

In the late 20th century, theologian Walter Wink offered a highly influential re-reading of Matthew 5:39 that has reshaped modern interpretations across many denominations. Wink argued that Jesus is not presenting a choice between two options—violent retaliation ("fight") or passive submission ("flight")—but is instead articulating a "third way": creative, assertive,

nonviolent resistance.[20]

Building on the cultural analysis of the backhanded slap, Wink demonstrates that turning the other cheek is a calculated and courageous act of defiance.[8] The victim, having received the humiliating backhanded slap on the right cheek, deliberately turns and offers the left cheek. This act non-verbally tells the aggressor: "Your first blow failed to humiliate me. I deny you the power to dehumanize me. I am a human being, your equal".[20] Furthermore, it presents the aggressor with a dilemma. To strike the left cheek with his right hand, he can no longer use a backhanded slap; he must use an open palm or a fist—an act reserved for a conflict between equals.[17] The act thus seizes the initiative, subverts the power dynamic, and robs the oppressor of the power to humiliate.[21] This interpretation has been foundational for Christian social justice movements, providing a theological basis for the strategic nonviolence practiced by figures like Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr..[14] Wink's "third way" provides a powerful synthesis, satisfying the pacifist commitment to nonviolence while also satisfying the realist concern for actively and strategically resisting injustice.[8]

An Ethic of the Heart: Catholic and Mainline Protestant Views

Traditions that have historically maintained a close relationship with state power, such as the Roman Catholic Church and mainline Protestant denominations, have developed interpretations that balance the radical call of the Sermon with the perceived pragmatic necessities of governing a fallen world.

The Catholic Church generally interprets the command to turn the other cheek as a form of hyperbole, a rhetorical device Jesus used to emphasize a deeper principle.[35] The goal is not a literal, absolute rule for every situation but the cultivation of an internal disposition of patience, meekness, and forgiveness that breaks the cycle of vengeance.[35] It is a call to "active non-violence and peacemaking".[35] However, this spiritual directive does not negate what the Church teaches is the right and grave duty of legitimate self-defense (CCC 2264-2265) or the state's authority to wage a "Just War" under strict moral criteria.[38] This approach arose historically as theologians like Ambrose and Augustine, living after Christianity became the state religion, were forced to develop an ethic for a Christian empire responsible for maintaining civil order and defending its borders.[38]

Mainline Protestant denominations (e.g., Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran) often exist in a state of "responsible ambivalence".[40] Their official statements frequently declare that war is "incompatible with the teachings and example of Christ".[41] Yet, they simultaneously uphold the principles of Just War theory and provide chaplains and support for members who serve in the military.[44] For these traditions, the command is a powerful call to be peacemakers, to

prioritize diplomacy, and to always seek nonviolent alternatives, while acknowledging the tragic possibility that force may be a necessary last resort to restrain unchecked evil in a sinful world.[47]

The Two Kingdoms: Lutheran and Evangelical Distinctions

A highly influential framework, originating with Martin Luther and shaping much of Protestant and Evangelical thought, is the doctrine of the "Two Kingdoms" or "Two Realms".[7] This theology distinguishes between two spheres in which God rules: the spiritual kingdom (the Church) and the civil kingdom (the state).

In the spiritual kingdom, Christians live by the gospel and are called to the radical ethic of the Sermon on the Mount, including turning the other cheek in their personal relationships. In the civil kingdom, however, God rules through law, justice, and the sword (Romans 13:4) to restrain evil and maintain order. Therefore, a Christian can and should act differently depending on their role. As a private individual, a Christian must forgive a personal insult and not seek revenge. But that same Christian, acting in their capacity as a state agent (e.g., a judge, police officer, or soldier), has a duty to punish wrongdoing and use coercive force to protect the innocent.[13] This framework resolves the apparent contradiction by assigning different ethical norms to different spheres of life, thus separating the personal Christian duty to forgive from the government's God-ordained duty to administer justice.[13]

Part III: The Perspective of the Victim: Suffering, Dignity, and Danger

Shifting from historical paradigms to lived experience, the command to turn the other cheek carries profound implications for the person who is struck. Its meaning is transformed when viewed not as a rule imposed from the outside, but as an internal response to aggression that can reshape the victim's understanding of dignity, suffering, and power.

From Humiliation to Agency: The Power to Reclaim Dignity

The primary intent of the backhanded slap was to inflict public shame and reinforce a social hierarchy. The perpetrator's goal is to define the victim as an inferior, an object unworthy of respect. The conventional responses—retaliation or submission—both operate within this framework, either by fighting for honor on the perpetrator's terms or by accepting the assigned shame.

Turning the other cheek shatters this framework. It is an act of profound spiritual and psychological agency. By refusing to either cower or retaliate, the victim non-verbally declares that their dignity is not contingent on the perpetrator's actions or the crowd's approval.[18] This act is a public demonstration that the victim's source of worth has been re-aligned. It is no longer external, derived from the fickle honor-shame economy of the world, but internal, rooted in their identity as a person created in the image of God.[2] This transforms the victim from a passive recipient of humiliation into an active agent who seizes the moral high ground, asserts their full humanity, and redefines the terms of the encounter.[17] It is a moment of empowerment found not in overpowering the aggressor, but in refusing to be defined by their aggression.[18]

The Theology of the Cross: Kenosis, Theosis, and Redemptive Suffering

At a deeper theological level, the act of non-retaliation is an imitation of Christ and a participation in the very life of God. This can be understood through the concepts of *kenosis* and *theosis*. *Kenosis* is a Greek term from Philippians 2:7, meaning "self-emptying." It describes how Christ, though divine, "emptied himself" by taking the form of a servant and becoming obedient to death on a cross.[50] On the cross, God in Christ responded to human violence not by inflicting more violence, but by absorbing it.[52] When a follower of Jesus turns the other cheek, they are engaging in a form of *kenosis*, emptying themselves of the natural desire for vengeance and the ego's demand for honor.[53]

This self-emptying is not an end in itself. In Christian theology, it is the path to *theosis*, a term for the process of becoming more like God, or participating in the divine life.[53] By conforming to the "kenotic, cruciform character of God," the believer partakes in God's own nature of self-giving love.[52] This connects to the idea of "redemptive suffering." While Christ's suffering on the cross is uniquely salvific for humanity, Christians are called to "take up their cross" and participate in that suffering.[54] When undertaken voluntarily in the cause of justice—as exemplified by the civil rights activists who endured beatings to expose the evil of segregation—this "unearned suffering is redemptive" for the community by bringing injustice to light and creating the possibility of transformation.[55] The victim's suffering, when united

with Christ's, is thus given a new and powerful meaning.[56]

A Critical Re-examination: The Command in the Context of Abuse

It is imperative to draw a sharp distinction between the original context of the command and its dangerous misapplication in situations of ongoing abuse, such as domestic violence or child abuse. To instruct a victim of such abuse to "turn the other cheek"—meaning to passively endure continued harm—is a gross distortion of scripture and is tantamount to being an accomplice to evil.[17]

A responsible theological framework must differentiate between the voluntary, strategic suffering one might choose for a greater good (e.g., a public protest) and the "involuntary suffering" inflicted by an abuser against a victim's will, which is purely destructive.[54] The original context was a public insult, not a pattern of private, coercive violence where power dynamics are radically different.[2] In cases of abuse, the call to love and seek justice requires a different application. Here, "turning the other cheek" can be reinterpreted, in the spirit of Walter Wink, as a brave countermove: assertively naming the abuse, refusing to be silenced, setting firm boundaries, and seeking protection and justice for oneself and others.[22] This is an act of profound courage and self-respect, the very opposite of passive endurance, and is the only response that honors the dignity of the victim and truly confronts the evil of the abuser.

Part IV: The Perspective of the Perpetrator: Disruption, Shame, and Transformation

Jesus' command is not only about the victim's spiritual state; it is also a strategic action designed to have a profound effect on the perpetrator and any onlookers. The nonviolent response aims to disrupt the cycle of violence, expose the moral bankruptcy of the aggression, and create an opening for the perpetrator's own transformation.

The Psychology of "Political Jiu-Jitsu"

The act of turning the other cheek is psychologically disruptive. The perpetrator expects one

of two responses: fear and submission, which confirms their dominance, or violent retaliation, which justifies their aggression and continues the cycle. The unexpected, nonviolent response provides neither. This dynamic is what nonviolence scholar Gene Sharp termed "political jiu-jitsu": using the opponent's own force and momentum against them.[60]

By refusing to play the expected role, the victim breaks the aggressor's script and exposes the raw injustice of the situation.[61] This is particularly effective when there is an audience. The moral imbalance becomes starkly visible to third parties, who may have been neutral or even sympathetic to the aggressor. Their support can shift dramatically, leading to outrage against the perpetrator and sympathy for the victim.[60] The perpetrator, who relies on cognitive distortions like justification, blame, and minimization to excuse their actions [62], is suddenly confronted with the unvarnished reality of their own cruelty. Their violence, intended to assert power, can thus backfire, isolating them and undermining their own position.[60] This dynamic highlights the social nature of the command; its power is often magnified by the presence of a community that can witness the event and hold the perpetrator accountable.

"Heaping Burning Coals": The Goal of Redemptive Shame

The Apostle Paul, echoing a Proverb, instructs Christians to overcome evil with good, stating that by feeding a hungry enemy, "you will heap burning coals on his head" (Romans 12:20-21).[31] This is not a call for subtle revenge, but a metaphor for inducing a sharp, painful sense of shame that can lead to repentance.[19] The creative, generous responses Jesus advocates—turning the cheek, giving one's cloak, going the second mile—are all forms of "heaping burning coals." They create a powerful moral contrast that exposes the perpetrator's greed, cruelty, or arrogance.[18]

The ultimate goal, from a Christian perspective, is not merely to win a political victory or to humiliate the enemy, but to facilitate their redemption. The act is an invitation to transformation.[8] It is rooted in the subsequent command to "love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" (Matthew 5:44). By refusing to mirror the perpetrator's evil, the victim holds open the possibility of reconciliation. The loving response is intended to soften the aggressor's heart and create an opportunity for them to see their victim's humanity and repent of their actions.[2] The command, therefore, refuses to treat the perpetrator as irredeemable. It sees them not as an enemy to be destroyed, but as a person made in God's image who needs to be rescued from their own evil.[10]

Part V: Synthesis and Contemporary Application

The command to turn the other cheek, rooted in a specific first-century context, continues to pose an unsettling challenge to individuals, communities, and nations. Its application today requires careful discernment, moving from personal insults to complex issues of self-defense, domestic abuse, and international conflict. The diversity of interpretations across Christian traditions reveals a long and complex history of wrestling with how to live out this radical ethic in a violent world.

From Personal Insult to National Defense

The question of whether a personal ethic of non-retaliation can be scaled to the level of national policy is one of the most contentious points of division among Christians.

- **Pacifist traditions**, like the Anabaptists and the early Church, see no fundamental distinction. For them, the command applies to all spheres of life, and the Christian's refusal to participate in violence extends to military service. The way of Christ is fundamentally incompatible with the way of the sword, for both the individual and the state.[25]
- **Just War and Two Kingdoms traditions** draw a sharp line between the duties of the individual and the duties of the state. They argue that God has ordained the government to "bear the sword" (Romans 13:4) to protect the innocent and punish evil.[13] Therefore, while an individual must turn the other cheek in response to a personal slight, the state has a moral obligation to use force to defend its people from aggression.[37] This view separates the personal call to forgiveness from the state's call to justice.

Even within the Just War framework, however, there is a strong presumption against war. Its strict criteria—just cause, last resort, proportionality, and non-combatant immunity—are intended to severely limit the use of force.[38] Many contemporary Christian thinkers argue that the nature of modern warfare, with its massive civilian casualties, makes a truly "just" war nearly impossible.[38] Furthermore, some argue that even in international politics, a refusal to retaliate for reasons of national "honor" or prestige could prevent a significant number of conflicts.[63]

Comparative Analysis of Denominational Stances

The diverse interpretations of Matthew 5:39 can be distilled into several major approaches, each stemming from distinct theological commitments regarding the nature of the Church, its relationship to the state, and the application of scripture. The following table provides a comparative summary of these positions, clarifying the spectrum of Christian thought on this command. This framework is essential for understanding why different Christian groups arrive at such divergent conclusions from the same text. The key variable is often whether a unified ethic is seen as applying to all spheres of life, or if a distinction is made between the personal/ecclesial realm and the civil/state realm.

Christian Tradition	**Interpretation of "Turn the Other Cheek"**	**Stance on Personal Self-Defense**	**Stance on State-Sanctioned Violence (War)**
Anabaptist/Mennonite	Absolute, literal command for non-resistance as a core part of discipleship.[5]	Prohibited; response must be nonviolent, trusting God for justice.[29]	Prohibited; strict pacifism and conscientious objection to military service.[29]
Early Church (Pre-313 AD)	Overwhelmingly interpreted as an absolute command against violence and retaliation.[24]	Prohibited; emphasis on enduring wrong and not repaying evil for evil.[27]	Prohibited; widespread refusal of military service as incompatible with faith.[25]
Roman Catholic	Hyperbolic teaching on internal disposition; a call to break the cycle of vengeance, not a literal rule for all situations.[35]	Permitted as a right and a grave duty for the protection of life (CCC 2265).[35]	Permitted under the strict criteria of Just War theory.[38]
Mainline Protestant	A spectrum of views, officially holding that war is incompatible with Christ's teaching but often	Generally permitted.	Permitted under Just War criteria, but with a strong emphasis on peace, diplomacy, and nonviolent

	accommodating Just War views.[40] A call to active peacemaking.[47]		alternatives.[41]
Evangelical	Applies to personal insults and relationships; a command to forgo personal revenge, not a judicial or state policy.[13]	Permitted and seen as distinct from personal retaliation.[16]	Permitted; seen as a legitimate, God-ordained function of government (Romans 13) to restrain evil.[13]

Conclusion: The Enduring and Unsettling Call to a Different Way

The command to turn the other cheek remains a deeply unsettling and radical call. Across the spectrum of interpretation—from absolute non-resistance to creative defiance to an internal disposition of forgiveness—it consistently challenges the world's conventional wisdom. It confronts the logic of honor, which demands retaliation; the logic of power, which demands domination; and the logic of fear, which demands pre-emptive violence.

A comprehensive analysis reveals that the command is far more than a simple call to passivity. In its original context, it was a sophisticated strategy for the powerless to reclaim their God-given dignity and challenge the dehumanizing systems of oppression. Throughout Christian history, it has served as the bedrock for communities committed to peace and as a persistent challenge to those who would accommodate the ways of empire.

Ultimately, to turn the other cheek is to act in the belief that the universe is not governed by cycles of violence but by a God of restorative love. It is a decision to see every person, including one's enemy, as created in the divine image and to respond to evil not by mirroring it, but by seeking to overcome it with a creative, courageous, and transformative good.[10] Whether applied literally, strategically, or spiritually, it calls the followers of Jesus to embody a different way of being in the world—a witness to a kingdom where the final word is not violence, but peace.[8]

Works cited

1. Interpretive Approaches to the Sermon on the Mount - Joshua P. Steele, accessed October 6, 2025, https://joshuapsteele.com/interpretive-approaches-to-the-sermon-on-the-mou

nt/
2. "Why did Jesus say, 'If anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to them the other also' in Matthew 5:39?" : r/Bible - Reddit, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/Bible/comments/1iug5tt/why_did_jesus_say_if_anyone_slaps_you_on_the/
3. “The Sermon on the Mount” from the Perspective of “First-Century Culture”, accessed October 6, 2025, https://perspectivecriticism.com/2017/11/30/the-sermon-on-the-mount-from-the-perspective-of-first-century-culture-gary-yamasaki/
4. What does Matthew 5:39 mean? - BibleRef.com, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.bibleref.com/Matthew/5/Matthew-5-39.html
5. The Sermon on the Mount: What Was Jesus Thinking? - Daniels Run Peace Church, accessed October 6, 2025, https://danielsrunpeacechurch.org/the-sermon-on-the-mount-what-was-jesus-thinking/
6. An eye for an eye VS turn the other cheek : r/Christianity - Reddit, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/Christianity/comments/10g6xc5/an_eye_for_an_eye_vs_turn_the_other_cheek/
7. Sermon on the Mount - Wikipedia, accessed October 6, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sermon_on_the_Mount
8. The Sermon on the Mount: A Theology of Resistance | Sojourners, accessed October 6, 2025, https://sojo.net/articles/sermon-mount-theology-resistance
9. The Sermon on the Mount, accessed October 6, 2025, https://anabaptist.ca/pfet/sermon_on_the_mount.html
10. bibleproject.com, accessed October 6, 2025, https://bibleproject.com/articles/what-jesus-meant-turn-other-cheek-matthew-539/#:~:text=To%20turn%20the%20other%20cheek%20means%20to%20see%20and%20treat.always%20seeking%20their%20highest%20good.&text=Jesus%20teaches%20us%20to%20avoid,creativity%2C%20love%2C%20and%20generosity.
11. How to understand the Sermon on the Mount - The Simple Pastor, accessed October 6, 2025, https://thesimplepastor.co.uk/how-to-understand-the-sermon-on-the-mount/
12. Why Did God Allow for 'an Eye for an Eye' in the Old Testament? - Bible Study Tools, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.biblestudytools.com/bible-study/topical-studies/why-did-god-allow-for-eye-for-an-eye-in-the-old-testament.html
13. What does the Bible mean by "an eye for an eye"? | GotQuestions.org, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.gotquestions.org/eye-for-an-eye.html
14. Commentary on Matthew 5:38-48 - Working Preacher from Luther ..., accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.workingpreacher.org/commentaries/revised-common-lectionary/seventh-sunday-after-epiphany/commentary-on-matthew-538-48
15. "Resist Not Evil" | Religious Studies Center, accessed October 6, 2025,

https://rsc.byu.edu/sermon-mount-latter-day-scripture/resist-not-evil
16. What did Jesus mean when He instructed us to turn the other cheek? | GotQuestions.org, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.gotquestions.org/turn-other-cheek.html
17. On turning the other cheek (and how it doesn't mean what you think it means) - Corey Farr, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.coreyfarr.com/post/on-turning-the-other-cheek-and-how-it-doesn-t-mean-what-you-think-it-means
18. What Jesus Meant By "Turn the Other Cheek" in Matthew 5:39 - The Bible Project, accessed October 6, 2025, https://bibleproject.com/articles/what-jesus-meant-turn-other-cheek-matthew-539/
19. "Turning the Other Cheek": Jesus' Peaceful Plan to Challenge Injustice - Reenacting the Way, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.reenactingtheway.com/blog/turning-the-other-cheek-jesus-peaceful-plan-to-challenge-injustice
20. Walter Wink, our best teacher of Christian nonviolence | National ..., accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.ncronline.org/blogs/road-peace/walter-wink-our-best-teacher-christian-nonviolence
21. Walter Wink, Our Best Teacher of Christian Nonviolence - Father John Dear, accessed October 6, 2025, https://johndear.org/walter-wink-our-best-teacher-of-christian-nonviolence-2/
22. Should I Turn the Other Cheek? - Center for Marriage and ..., accessed October 6, 2025, https://cmr.biola.edu/blog/2020/should-i-turn-the-other-cheek
23. What Does It Really Mean to "Turn the Other Cheek"? - Bible Study Tools, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.biblestudytools.com/bible-study/topical-studies/what-does-it-really-mean-to-turn-the-other-cheek.html
24. Early Church Fathers on War, Violence, and Pacifism | Anabaptist ..., accessed October 6, 2025, https://anabaptistfaith.org/early-church-fathers-on-war-violence-and-pacifism/
25. Nonviolence in the Ancient Church and Christian Obedience - The Gospel Coalition, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/nonviolence-in-the-ancient-church-and-christian-obedience/
26. Christian pacifism - Wikipedia, accessed October 6, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_pacifism
27. 40 Early Church Quotes on Violence, Enemy Love, & Patriotism, accessed October 6, 2025, https://enemylove.com/40-early-church-quotes-on-violence-enemy-love-patriotism/
28. Was the Early Church Really Pacifist? - PCPJ, accessed October 6, 2025, https://pcpj.org/2020/09/05/was-the-early-church-really-pacifist/
29. Article 22. Peace, Justice, and Nonresistance | Mennonite Church USA, accessed

October 6, 2025, https://www.mennoniteusa.org/who-are-mennonites/what-we-believe/confession-of-faith/peace-justice-and-nonresistance/
30. How does Christian pacifism work? [Questioning faith #15], accessed October 6, 2025, https://thinkingpacifism.net/2023/01/29/how-does-christian-pacifism-work-questioning-faith-15/
31. Radical Love, War, and Nonresistance - Anabaptist Perspectives, accessed October 6, 2025, https://anabaptistperspectives.org/essays/radical-love-war-and-nonresistance/
32. Turning the other cheek and radical nonviolence - Church of the Holy Trinity, accessed October 6, 2025, https://holytrinity.to/2022/08/turning-the-other-cheek-and-radical-nonviolence/
33. Is there anything to Walter Wink's assertions? : r/AcademicBiblical - Reddit, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/AcademicBiblical/comments/9b7qx4/is_there_anything_to_walter_winks_assertions/
34. Does “turn the other cheek” mean that Christians are to be doormats?, accessed October 6, 2025, https://thoughtfulcatholic.com/does-jesus-require-total-passivity-in-response-to-evil/
35. MATTHEW 05:38-42 TEACHING ABOUT RETALIATION ..., accessed October 6, 2025, https://bibleinterpretation.org/matthew-5_38-42/
36. Turn the Other Cheek | Catholic Answers Magazine, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.catholic.com/magazine/online-edition/turn-the-other-cheek
37. Self Defense and Turning the Other Cheek | Catholic Answers Podcasts, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.catholic.com/audio/scw/year-a-seventh-sunday-of-ordinary-time
38. Just War Theory – The Episcopal Church, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.episcopalchurch.org/glossary/just-war-theory/
39. What Can Church History Tell Us about the Debate Between Just War Theory and Pacifism and What Does This Mean for the Church Today? - Scholars Crossing, accessed October 6, 2025, https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1160&context=eleu
40. On War and Peace: Methodism's Responsible Ambivalence | Political Theology Network, accessed October 6, 2025, https://politicaltheology.com/on-war-and-peace-methodisms-responsible-ambivalence/
41. The World Community: War and Peace - General Board of Church and Society, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.umcjustice.org/latest/the-world-community-war-and-peace-330
42. Peace Churches - Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.presbypeacefellowship.org/peace-churches
43. A SOCIAL STATEMENT ON PEACE AND POLITICS INTRODUCTION Peace is the

will of God. So the church confesses in every time and place,, accessed October 6, 2025, https://elcic.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/1984-A-Social-Statement-On-Peace-And-Politics.pdf
44. Methodists on War and Peace - Ethics Considered, accessed October 6, 2025, https://darrylwstephens.com/2022/04/01/methodists-on-war-and-peace/
45. Peacemaking Ministry Team - The Pittsburgh Presbytery, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.pghpresbytery.org/justice-ministries/peacemaking/
46. Peace - Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.elca.org/faith/faith-and-society/social-statements/peace
47. War and Peace | ResourceUMC, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.resourceumc.org/en/content/war-and-peace
48. Peace, Peacemaking, and War - Zion Lutheran Church, accessed October 6, 2025, https://zionhc.org/peace-peacemaking-and-war/
49. Bearing Sword in the State, Turning Cheek in the Church: A Reformed Two-Kingdoms Interpretation of Matthew 5:38–42 - The Gospel Coalition, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/bearing-sword-in-the-state-turning-cheek-in-the-church-a-reformed-two-kingd/
50. Doctrine of Kenosis | TheosU, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.theosu.ca/course/kenosis
51. What is the kenosis? What does it mean that Jesus emptied Himself? | GotQuestions.org, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.gotquestions.org/kenosis.html
52. Theosis: Union with the Kenotic, Cruciform God - Fraternized - WordPress.com, accessed October 6, 2025, https://frted.wordpress.com/2010/01/22/theosis-union-with-the-kenotic-cruciform-god/
53. Theosis and Kenosis : r/OrthodoxChristianity - Reddit, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/OrthodoxChristianity/comments/16h85cw/theosis_and_kenosis/
54. Redemptive suffering: Christ's alone | Scottish Journal of Theology | Cambridge Core, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/scottish-journal-of-theology/article/redemptive-suffering-christs-alone/C946F1F74F4DD229388BF58C42A6F9CE
55. Redemptive Suffering: The Calling of the Christian - Darrow Miller and Friends, accessed October 6, 2025, https://darrowmillerandfriends.com/2021/08/27/redemptive-suffering-the-calling-of-the-christian/
56. Learning How to Redeem Our Suffering - Westmont College, accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.westmont.edu/learning-how-redeem-our-suffering
57. Redemptive Suffering and the Phony Victim Complex - Catholic Stand, accessed October 6, 2025, https://catholicstand.com/redemptive-suffering-phony-victim-complex/
58. Turn the other cheek? Does this apply to abuse victims? | Musings on Faith and

Psychology, accessed October 6, 2025, https://philipmonroe.com/2015/01/14/turn-the-other-cheek-does-this-apply-to-abuse-victims/
59. The Problem With Turning The Other Cheek - ImagineMD, accessed October 6, 2025, https://imaginemd.com/blog/the-problem-with-turning-the-other-cheek/
60. Psychological dynamics of outrage against injustice - UOW, accessed October 6, 2025, https://documents.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/pubs/08pr.php
61. (PDF) Strategies for a Nonviolent Response to Perpetrator Actions ..., accessed October 6, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375622517_Strategies_for_a_Nonviolent_Response_to_Perpetrator_Actions_What_Can_Christianity_Offer_to_Targets_of_Workplace_Mobbing
62. Explanations of a Violent Relationship: The Male Perpetrator's Perspective - BYU ScholarsArchive, accessed October 6, 2025, https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3203&context=facpub&utm
63. A Political Non-Pacifist Reading of The Sermon on the Mount | Reformedish, accessed October 6, 2025, https://derekzrishmawy.com/2013/04/15/a-political-non-pacifist-reading-of-the-sermon-on-the-mount/
64. Your participation in the Peacemaking Offering promotes peace and justice efforts around the world., accessed October 6, 2025, http://pma.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/specialofferings/pdfs/14_-_peacemaking_/peacemaking14_leader's_guide-web.pdf