

Violence and Divine Honors in Hesiod's Theogony

Jiayi Xu

Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China

Abstract: Hesiod's *Theogony* presents Zeus as the enduring ruler of a divine world previously marked by violent succession. Yet his position cannot be explained simply as the replacement of coercion by justice, since he also confines defeated enemies and swallows Metis to prevent a successor from challenging him. Through close reading of the succession narrative, the episodes of Styx and Hecate, the Titanomachy, and the swallowing of Metis, this article examines how the poem connects military force with the distribution of divine honors. It argues that Zeus's stability depends on a distinction between powers admitted to recognized positions and threats denied independent scope for action. Promises and the preservation of privileges make cooperation possible, while confinement and incorporation restrict competing claims to sovereignty. The poem's account of order therefore combines differentiated participation with an unequal capacity to decide the terms of participation. Reading these mechanisms together clarifies both the coherence and the limits of the legitimacy attributed to Zeus, without treating divine genealogy as a direct record of Greek political institutions.

Keywords: Hesiod; *Theogony*; Zeus; Divine honors; Succession; Political authority.

1. Introduction

Hesiod's *Theogony* describes the emergence of a differentiated divine world and the establishment of Zeus's rule. Its genealogies identify the origins of powers that do not initially form a stable community. The succession stories repeatedly show that descent generates a threat to the ruler who produces it: Ouranos suppresses his children, Kronos attacks his father and swallows his own offspring, and Zeus eventually displaces Kronos. Yet succession does not continue indefinitely. The poem assigns Zeus a position from which he distributes honors and prevents another king from replacing him [1, lines 154-210, 453-506, 881-900]. What distinguishes his settlement from the arrangements that fail before it?

Zeus's victory raises a problem about the relationship between force and recognition. If Zeus succeeds only because he is stronger, the importance given to promises, rewards, and preserved privileges becomes difficult to explain. If he succeeds by abandoning the violence of his predecessors, the swallowing of Metis becomes an obvious counterexample. Both the distribution of honors and the suppression of rivals are integral to the settlement. This article argues that the poem establishes Zeus's durability through selective accommodation: some divine powers receive continuing or newly recognized honors, while others are confined or incorporated so that they cannot establish an independent claim to supremacy.

The connection between distribution and divine order is already an established scholarly concern. Rudhardt identifies the allocation of *timai* as a central expression of Greek mythical thought and draws attention to its place in the program of the *Theogony* [2]. Barker and Christensen likewise relate the poem's conflicts to leadership and the distribution of honor, emphasizing the conjunction of force and apportionment in lines 881-885 [3, chapter 4]. Building on these accounts, this article reads the distribution of honors alongside the Metis episode: the same ruler who confirms others' positions prevents the birth of a rival capable of taking his own.

Chinese-language scholarship further clarifies the stakes of

this problem. Liu Li reads cosmic origins alongside the formation of personal and social order, while also acknowledging that Zeus's settlement continues to depend on force [4, pp. 106-108]. Zhang Yang similarly concludes that divine legislation remains underwritten by strength and cunning [5, p. 24]. The question, then, is how this continuing reliance on violence shapes relations with allies, defeated enemies, and potential successors. Wu Fangrong's emphasis on the relationship between epic structure and meaning supports examining these episodes together [6, p. 109]. Wang Zhenjun examines the relationship between literary form and the separation of gods and humans [7, p. 131]. These approaches provide a basis for reading divine authority through narrative organization, without adopting a comprehensive developmental history of Greek society.

The method is a comparative close reading of episodes within the transmitted poem. References to the primary text use the standard line numbers of the *Theogony*, with H. G. Evelyn-White's English translation as the reference edition [1]. The analysis compares narrative relationships rather than proposing textual emendations or new readings of the Greek. Here, legitimacy means the grounds on which the poem presents Zeus's rule as worthy of recognition; it does not mean democratic authorization or equal rights. Similarly, honors refers to divine standing, privileges, and spheres of action, rather than to praise alone. No one-to-one correspondence between a divine episode and a historical constitution is assumed.

2. Genealogy and the Problem of Succession

2.1. The poem establishes the terms of rule

The poem announces the connection between sovereignty and distribution before recounting the succession struggles. In its opening celebration, Zeus holds the thunderbolt after overcoming Kronos and assigns portions and privileges to the immortals. Later, the invocation asks the Muses to describe both the gods' origins and their division of wealth and honors [1, lines 71-74, 104-115]. These are related questions. Birth supplies a divine power with a place in the genealogy, but

genealogy alone does not explain its acknowledged standing in the resulting order.

This opening also shapes the reader's expectations. Zeus's supremacy is announced before its emergence is narrated. The account therefore looks backward from an established order, rather than presenting an undecided contest among equally possible rulers. That perspective matters when assessing the poem's evaluation of violence. A successful act of coercion is not automatically endorsed as a general moral rule; its place in the account of Zeus's settlement helps determine how it is presented. The poem encourages readers to connect his victory with his capacity to assign positions.

Poetic authority contributes to this arrangement. The Muses authorize Hesiod's song and are themselves daughters of Zeus and Memory [1, lines 22-34, 53-79]. Their genealogy places the power to narrate divine origins within the order whose establishment the song recounts. This does not prove that the poem is a deliberate disguise for a specific political regime. It does show that the narration is not external to divine hierarchy: the account of authority is delivered through voices that belong to that hierarchy.

2.2. Suppression creates the conditions of revolt

Ouranos prevents his children from emerging into the light, causing Gaia distress. Gaia prepares the instrument and plan through which Kronos attacks him [1, lines 154-182]. Suppression brings the suffering mother and a willing son into alliance. Ouranos makes himself vulnerable by denying his offspring a place in the world that his own union with Gaia has generated. The narrative makes the rebellion intelligible through the suffering that precedes it.

Kronos repeats suppression in a different bodily form. He swallows his children because he has learned that a son will overcome him. Rhea responds by securing Zeus's concealment and substituting a stone for the infant [1, lines 453-491]. His failure to distinguish the stone from the child exposes the limits of Kronos's control. His action is directed toward maintaining the royal office, but the means he adopts provoke the cooperation that defeats him. The later release of the swallowed offspring makes that defeat a restoration of suppressed powers as well as a transfer of supremacy.

Li Yan identifies the recurrence of generational conflict as an important feature of the poem's event structure [8, p. 67]. That observation invites attention to differences within repetition: the later act of swallowing recalls Kronos, but produces a different outcome. The relevant pattern is the recurrence and modification of a specific narrative action.

These episodes explain the failures of Ouranos and Kronos through the relationships their actions disrupt. Both provoke resistance from maternal powers and leave a rival capable of acting against them. Since Zeus also uses coercion, violence alone cannot explain their defeat. The comparison with Zeus must therefore address how he handles allies, opponents, and future offspring differently. It cannot rest solely on a contrast between cruel predecessors and a benevolent successor.

3. Honors as a Means of Securing Cooperation

3.1. Styx and the credibility of promises

The Styx episode explicitly connects the recognition of honors with military support. Before the conflict with the Titans is resolved, Zeus promises that gods who join him will

retain existing privileges and that those without honors under Kronos will receive them. Styx comes first with her children, and Zeus rewards her by making her the great oath of the gods. Her children remain with him [1, lines 383-403]. The passage joins a promise about future status to a present decision about allegiance.

This is not merely a division of spoils after victory. The anticipated settlement helps constitute the victorious coalition in the first place. For a god with existing honors, joining Zeus need not entail the loss of an established position. For one without recognized standing, cooperation offers an improvement. These are different incentives, and their combination expands the basis on which Zeus can obtain support. The text then confirms that he fulfills his promises, making consistency between commitment and performance part of his characterization.

The identity of Styx's children complicates any claim that distribution replaces force. They include Kratos and Bia, Strength and Force, as well as Nike and Zelos. Their lasting proximity to Zeus connects his household to capacities essential to victory and domination [1, lines 383-388]. Honor can therefore secure the cooperation of coercive powers. Acknowledgment and force operate together: the king strengthens his position by giving powerful allies a recognized relationship to himself.

Styx's subsequent role as the divine oath extends the effects of that relationship beyond the original alliance. The poem describes penalties for a god who swears falsely by her water, including exclusion from divine councils and feasts [1, lines 775-806]. Participation in the community is thus valuable enough for its withdrawal to function as a sanction. The narrative does not formulate a modern legal system, but it does associate divine order with commitments whose breach carries consequences. The rewarded ally becomes integral to the maintenance of relations among immortals.

3.2. Hecate and the preservation of earlier claims

Hecate presents a different case. The poem stresses that Zeus does not remove the portion she held among the earlier Titan gods. Her privileges extend across earth, sea, and heaven, and the account connects them to activities such as judgment, warfare, competition, fishing, and the increase of livestock [1, lines 411-452]. Her prominence shows that the new settlement need not erase every power associated with an earlier generation. Continuity can be a means of establishing the ruler's authority.

The important point is not that Hecate becomes an equal sovereign. The poem repeatedly makes Zeus's honoring of her part of the explanation of her standing. It recognizes her effective power while presenting that recognition as compatible with his supremacy. Her situation therefore differs from both the defeated Titans and the children swallowed by Kronos. An earlier entitlement survives, but it is narrated within a world in which Zeus's acknowledgment confirms its compatibility with the prevailing arrangement.

This passage also guards against reading the divine order as a map of strictly exclusive departments. Hecate's influence spans several realms and human activities. Her honors are intelligible without being reduced to a single office. Distribution here establishes recognized but overlapping spheres of action. The analytical issue is their relationship to the sovereign, not a modern administrative division of labor.

Styx and Hecate together show two ways recognition

supports authority. Styx's honor follows a decisive act of allegiance; Hecate's continued position demonstrates respect for an existing claim. The poem does not make every relationship contractual in the same sense, nor does it give every divine figure the same route to standing. It presents a ruler capable of accommodating different claims while keeping the authority to confirm the overall settlement.

4. Military Victory and the Limits of Inclusion

The alliance with the Hundred-Handers gives recognition a material and military dimension. Zeus and his siblings bring them back into the light on Gaia's advice. After receiving nectar and ambrosia, they are asked to remember the liberation and assistance they have received. Kottos responds with an explicit commitment to support Zeus in battle [1, lines 617-663]. The exchange makes reciprocity visible. The former prisoners are neither simply commanded into action nor treated as irrelevant once released; their capacities become indispensable to the coalition.

Their participation helps resolve a war that has continued for ten years without a decisive result. The narrative gives Zeus's thunderbolts a spectacular role, but it also describes the Hundred-Handers' bombardment of the Titans with stones [1, lines 629-638, 687-720]. Victory belongs to an unequal alliance, not to an isolated agent. A reading that attributes the settlement only to Zeus's superior weapon overlooks how the poem first assembles and sustains the force through which that weapon becomes decisive.

The outcome reveals the boundary of accommodation. The defeated Titans are confined beneath the earth, while the Hundred-Handers appear as guardians associated with Zeus's security [1, lines 713-735]. Release and confinement thus coexist within the same settlement. Powers liberated from an earlier arrangement help prevent the defeated enemy from returning. The narrative distinguishes allies who receive a place from opponents whose scope for action is restricted. It does not present inclusion as an unconditional entitlement of all divine beings.

Lines 881-885 condense this relationship. The gods have settled their contest for honors with the Titans by force; they then urge Zeus to rule, following Gaia's advice, and he distributes honors among them [1]. The passage connects collective victory, recognition of a ruler, and apportionment without identifying these as separate historical stages. Its wording also limits an overly voluntarist reading: the recognition of Zeus takes place after a struggle has forcibly determined which group can make the settlement.

The confrontation with Typhoeus shows that victory over the Titans does not eliminate challenges to Zeus. The poem imagines his possible accession to rule before recounting Zeus's violent defeat of him [1, lines 820-868]. His treatment shows that military superiority remains necessary even after the Titans have been overcome. Distribution can sustain the relationships of a recognized community, but the narrative does not suggest that all potential rivals can be converted into partners by an offer of honors. The order is maintained through the capacity to distinguish between participation and an incompatible claim to supremacy.

5. Metis and the Prevention of a Successor

The Metis episode tests the distinction between Zeus and

his predecessors. In the narrative immediately following the recognition of his kingship, Zeus takes Metis as his first wife. When she is about to bear Athena, he deceives her and swallows her on the advice of Gaia and Ouranos. The reason is a predicted sequence of children: Athena is to be followed by a son who would become king of gods and humans [1, lines 886-900]. Zeus's position is threatened not only by existing opponents but by a future generated within his own family.

The parallel with Kronos is direct. Both rulers act on a warning about succession, and both use swallowing to protect the royal office. This repetition complicates an interpretation of Zeus as a ruler who establishes order simply by permitting the development of younger powers. What differs is the target and outcome of the intervention. Kronos swallows already-born children, leaving Zeus outside him through Rhea's deception. Zeus swallows the mother before the predicted male successor can emerge, while Athena subsequently appears as his own offspring [1, lines 886-900, 924-926]. The continuity of the motif allows the narrative to contrast an unsuccessful and a successful prevention of succession.

Metis is also a source of counsel. The episode ends by preserving her capacity to devise good and evil for Zeus from within his body [1, line 900]. Incorporation therefore has a double effect: it removes the independent reproductive position from which a rival could arise and retains a capacity useful to the reigning god. Zeus thus retains the benefit of her intelligence while ending her independent capacity to produce a successor. The bodily violence is central to this acquisition of counsel.

The role of Gaia and Ouranos sharpens the contrast with earlier succession. Powers associated with previous generations now advise the ruler on how to avoid displacement. Gaia's counsel had enabled resistance to suppression and had helped Zeus acquire military allies; here it supports the interruption of the succession pattern itself. This does not make Gaia a consistent embodiment of opposition to all rulers. Her changing relationships help explain why similar acts can have different results within the poem. Zeus's success includes access to guidance that his predecessors could not use to secure themselves permanently.

Read beside Hecate, Metis reveals the limits of recognized independence. Hecate retains an extensive sphere of action; Metis retains counsel but loses a separate position outside Zeus. The comparison does not require the claim that the poem articulates a universal policy toward female divinities. It shows two sharply different narrative outcomes for powerful goddesses. Honor preserves one relationship in an acknowledged external form, while swallowing absorbs another into the king's own body. Both outcomes stabilize his rule, but they do so at very different costs to the figure concerned.

The swallowing of Metis reveals a condition of the wider settlement. Zeus does not end the succession cycle by surrendering the desire to remain sovereign. He combines accommodation of existing powers with successful intervention in the production of a future rival. The stability attributed to Zeus depends on this combination, whose costs fall unequally on the gods involved.

6. Divine Legitimacy and the Scope of Justice

The genealogical connection between Zeus, Themis, and their children Eunomia, Dike, and Eirene associates his rule

with good order, justice, and peace [1, lines 901-906]. Yet that association should be read alongside the means by which his position is maintained. A divine genealogy can establish an affinity between sovereignty and justice without proving that every act of the sovereign satisfies a consistent moral principle. Its association of sovereignty with justice therefore requires attention to whose standing is protected and whose agency is restricted.

Comparing Hesiod with Plato, Bartninkas emphasizes the integration of other gods through assigned functions as a condition of cosmic stability [9, section 2.3]. The comparison helps identify what distribution accomplishes, but the *Theogony* also exposes its restrictions. The king who recognizes other powers reserves a position that is not itself open to ordinary redistribution. The difference between holding a share within the order and deciding whether that order can have another sovereign remains fundamental.

The Prometheus narrative makes the unequal distribution of agency visible from another angle. At Mekone, the division of a sacrificial animal becomes a confrontation over the relation between gods and humans. The poem explicitly attributes awareness of the deception to Zeus, complicating a simple story in which an ignorant king is tricked. Fire, its theft, and the creation of the woman subsequently mark the consequences of that confrontation [1, lines 535-612]. These events do not depict humanity entering the same process of honored military partnership as Styx or the Hundred-Handers.

Zhang reads the Prometheus story as part of Zeus's establishment of a hierarchical order rather than as a digression from it [5, pp. 22-24]. His further suggestion that Prometheus willingly participates in his own punishment remains conjectural: the narrative does not expressly establish such an agreement. Its account of punishment nevertheless supports the narrower conclusion that divine hierarchy entails unequal exposure to loss.

The episode should therefore not be reduced to a general celebration of benevolent order. The settlement regulates relationships while imposing costs on those subject to it. At the same time, the presence of suffering does not by itself establish that the poem secretly repudiates Zeus. The affirmation of Zeus's supremacy coexists with an account of the unequal consequences of his decisions. Recognizing this tension does not require attributing a concealed rejection of Zeus to the poet.

These findings concern a representation of authority in an archaic Greek poem. They cannot establish the actual distribution of power in a particular polis, the attitudes of every ancient audience, or the historical development of a single Greek doctrine of justice. Genealogy, divine personification, and narrative sequence mediate the relationship between the text and its social world. The poem is valuable for cultural history precisely because it makes certain relationships between force, recognition, and hierarchy intelligible, rather than because it supplies a transparent transcript of institutions.

7. Conclusion

Zeus's enduring rule in the *Theogony* emerges from the combined management of cooperation and succession. The Styx episode links promises to allegiance; Hecate's preserved

honors show how an earlier claim can survive within a new hierarchy; and the Hundred-Handers turn liberation and reciprocity into military support. These relationships help explain why victory cannot be attributed to strength alone. The resulting settlement contains differentiated powers with reasons to acknowledge the ruler who confirms their standing.

The same narrative nevertheless confines defeated opponents and prevents the emergence of a successor through the swallowing of Metis. Zeus's distinction from Kronos is consequently not a complete abandonment of coercion. He secures cooperation through honors while using force and counsel to prevent rival claims to his own position. The Metis episode is central to this interpretation because it demonstrates that stability includes control over the possibility of future redistribution at the highest level.

The poem's association of Zeus with justice must be understood within that unequal arrangement. Honors allow other gods a place in the order, but do not grant them an equal capacity to determine its terms. Reading distribution together with swallowing reveals a form of legitimacy sustained by acknowledgment and coercion at once. This provides a more precise account of the poem's political imagination than a linear movement from violence to justice, while leaving open the distinct historical question of how particular audiences understood and used that imagination.

References

- [1] Hesiod. (1914). *Theogony*. In Hesiod, the Homeric hymns and Homeric Hymns (H. G. Evelyn-White, Trans.). William Heinemann. <https://www.theoi.com/Text/HesiodTheogony.html>.
- [2] Rudhardt, J. (1994). Concerning the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (L. Lorch & H. P. Foley, Trans.). In H. P. Foley (Ed.), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, commentary, and interpretive essays*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400849086-022>
- [3] Barker, E. T. E., & Christensen, J. P. (2019). *Homer's Thebes: Epic rivalries and the appropriation of mythical pasts* (Hellenic Studies 84). Center for Hellenic Studies. Chapter 4.
- [4] Liu, L. (2023). From chaos to order: Origins and education in the *Theogony*. *Journal of Guangxi University (Philosophy and Social Science)*, (1), 102–108. <https://doi.org/10.13624/j.cnki.jgups.2023.01.004>
- [5] Zhang, Y. (2012). Prometheus' theft of fire and Zeus' legislation: Political and philosophical implications in Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. *Humanities and Social Sciences Journal of Hainan University*, 30(2), 20–24. <https://doi.org/10.15886/j.cnki.hnus.2012.02.013>
- [6] Wu, F. (2013). An inquiry into the epic structure of Hesiod's *Theogony*. *Journal of Yili Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, 32(4), 109–113.
- [7] Wang, Z. (2018). From myth into history: Genre and narrative in *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. *Journal of Henan Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 45(4), 131–138. <https://doi.org/10.16366/j.cnki.1000-2359.2018.04.022>
- [8] Li, Y. (2016). A study of repetition in *Theogony*. *Culture Journal*, (6), 66–67.
- [9] Bartninkas, V. (2023). *Traditional and cosmic gods in later Plato and the early Academy*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2, section 2.3. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009322638.004>