Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi
Sayı 18 (2012-2) 17-34

A CROSS-LINGUISTIC EXPLORATION OF TENSE AND MODALITY IN TWO DIFFERENT NARRATIONS OF THE HERCULES MYTH

HERKÜL MİTİNİN İKİ FARKLI ANLATIMINDA ZAMAN VE KİPSELLİĞİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI DİLBİLİMSEL İNCELEMESİ

Devrim GÜNAY[1]

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to conduct a cross-linguistic exploration of tense and modality across two distinct accounts of the same mythological tale (of Hercules's 12 Labors) as retold by Edith Hamilton (in English) and Azra Erhat (in Turkish) and to investigate how the variation in the use of these elements in narration has influenced the construction and positioning of the 'hero' with regard to factuality/ counter-factuality of the subject as well as the other emergent features of it. Regarded among the main semantic-grammatical categories of language, tense and modality mark the event reconstructed in narration in terms of its time and propositional status, respectively. Despite a lack of consensus on the definitions of related terminology, a commonly agreed view on the functions of modality emphasizes that modality expresses the author's subjective commitment to the event, carrying the event to the realms of irrealis. Growing interest and extended debates on the subject has aroused a need for further evidence on how these categories work in narrations across different languages and how they may be valued in language teaching. To this end, the current study undertakes a contrastive linguistic analysis of tense and modality in two texts identifying the sets of verbs and adverbs used by two different authors to depict the same labors of Hercules. The results indicate to a divergence in the emergent images of the hero, one being a flawless and unmatchable subjectivity located within the borders of factuality and the other a humanized person in counter-factuality. From this, suggestions on how to utilize such contrastive linguistic studies to raise the awareness of language learners towards the functions of tense and modality is also addressed.

Keywords: *Cross-linguistic analysis, Narrative analysis, Modality, Language Teaching*

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, aynı mitolojik öykünün (Herakles'in 12 işi) Edith Hamilton ve Azra Erhat tarafından İngilizce ve Türkçe olarak anlatılan iki farklı versiyonunda zaman ve kipselliği diller arası bir odaktan araştırmak ve bu iki unsurun kullanımındaki farklılıkların, kahramanın gerçeklik/ gerçek-dışılık ve ortaya çıkan diğer özellikleri bakımından oluşturulup konumlandırılmasında hangi etkileri olduğunu

[1] Istanbul University, Hasan Ali Yucel Faculty of Education English Language Teaching Department, Research Assistant, devgunay@istanbul.edu.tr

incelemektir. Dilin ana anlamsal-dilbilgisel kategorileri arasında yer alan zaman ve kipsellik, öykülemede yeniden oluşturulan olayı, sırasıyla zaman ve önerme durumları açılarından niteler. İlgili terimler dizgesinde bir uzlaşı olmamasına rağmen kipselliğin işlevleri üzerine genel olarak kabul gören anlayışa göre kipsellik anlatıcının olaya öznel bağlanımını ifade ederken aynı zamanda olayı gerçek dışılığa da taşımaktadır. Yapılan diller arası araştırmalar gerçekdışılığın, pek çok dilde kipselliğin yanı sıra çeşitli zaman-görünüş bileşimleriyle de ifade edildiğine işaret etmektedir. Konuya ilişkin artan ilgi ve süregelen tartışmalar, bu kategorilerin farklı dillerdeki anlatılarda nasıl işleyiş gösterdiğine dair daha fazla bulguya ve karşılaştırmalı çalışmaların dil öğretiminde nasıl kullanılabileceğine ilişkin görüşe ihtiyaç duyulduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu ihtiyaç doğrultusunda bu çalışmada söz konusu iki metinde aynı işleri betimlemek için kullanılan eylemler ve belirteçler saptanarak karşılaştırmalı dilsel bir odaktan incelenmektedir. Sonuçlar, aynı öykünün farklı anlatışlarında biri gerçeklik sınırları içinde oluşturulmuş kusursuz ve kıyas kabul etmez diğeri gerçeklik sınırları dışına taşınmış insansı iki farklı kahraman imgesinin ortaya çıktığına işaret etmektedir. Buradan hareketle, benzer karşılaştırmalı dilsel çalışmaların yabancı dil öğrenenlerin dil işlevlerine olan farkındalığını arttırmak için nasıl kullanılabileceği konusunda önerilerde bulunulmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: *Karşılaştırmalı dilsel inceleme, Öykü incelemesi, Kipsellik, Yabancı Dil Öğretimi*

1. Introduction

Tense, aspect and modality have been assigned major roles in the text production and interpretation processes due to their direct relation to the ways the event is described in a given piece of text. This has marked them as both the subjects and the preferred tools of linguistic and narrative analyses across a variety of languages. The most commonly referred classifications in the fields of semantics and pragmatics tend to view tense in charge of the temporal depiction of the event while recognizing aspect as responsible for the nature of the event with regard to its "internal temporal constituency" (Comrie,1976:3),(Palmer,2001:1). Among these classifications, modality receives particular attention as it is viewed to be implying the authors' attitude towards or commitment to the event described in terms of semantic notions such as "jussive, desiderative, intentive, hypothetical, potential, obligative," etc. (Bybee & Fleischman,1995:2). More recent work on modality focuses on the correlation between the element of counter-factuality and the extent to which an utterance is expressed with modals (Van Linden & Verstraete, 2008: 1865), (Van Linden, 2011:150). In brief, tense, aspect and modality perform their roles in the realization of a text in the readers' minds through activating their socio-culturally constructed cognitive frames of perception and engaging them in the culturally marked semantic sequence of events. They interpenetrate and form a nexus to construct the social action, the social actor and the temporal as well as the spatial context of the event. In this sense, they profoundly impact on the re-contextualization of the story by the reader favoring certain ways of narrating while excluding others.

Taking modality and tense -the two main categories of language that are profoundly influential in the construction of texts- as a starting point, this study explores the effects of these two elements on the construction of factuality in narration through a contrastive

analysis of two different accounts of "Hercules" myth retold by Azra Erhat and Edith Hamilton. While doing so, the study can be viewed to be running after the following research questions:

- What specific influence do the selections of tense, aspect and modality have on the construction of factuality in the texts selected?
- How does the resulting image of the hero show variety depending on tense, aspect or modality across the two accounts of the same events?
- What relevance may such contrastive linguistic studies have for language teaching?

The rationale for undertaking such a study stems from the need to further and expand the point made in Kaplan's (1997) article on "Contrastive Rhetoric" which emphasizes the cross-language differences in the retelling of the same sequence of events. In his work, Kaplan (ibid.) highlights that "the resources available to speakers of different languages prompt somewhat different presentations of the event", relying on the previous studies that focus on the differences in the narrations of the same story by children of diverse languages. He notes that the English and German accounts of the "frog" story make use of adverbial particles and prepositional phrases while the Spanish and Hebrew versions of the same story recounts the event in a series of episodes (Kaplan, 1997:21).

In this study, however, this general notion on the variation of narrative patterns across languages will be applied to more specific elements of textuality, namely the text type, tense and modality with regard to the role they play in the factual realization of the "Hercules" myth.

1.1. Text Selection and Text Type

The texts chosen for exploring the effects of modality and tense on the construction of factuality are taken from two different books on mythology by Edith Hamilton and Azra Erhat. Hamilton's "Myhology" and Erhat's "Mitoloji Sözlüğü" (Dictionary of Mythology) are both meant to give comprehensive accounts of a selection of mythological tales, although with divergent aims. The below mentioned differences in their stated purposes, mark the books and the texts as belonging to different text type traditions, placing them in varying proximity to the element of factuality. This macro scale variation of aims, in turn, may be influential on the voice adopted by the authors in narrating the same series of events and may contribute to the factuality/ counterfactuality of the stories or the particular elements in the stories.

In "Mythology", Edith Hamilton clarifies her aim in undertaking a book on mythology as "to make the reader see some difference between writers who were so different" and emphasizes that her purpose is not the retelling of the stories for the sake of entertainment but bringing the reader as close as possible to the original tale (Hamilton, 1999:V). Taking this statement of the writer as an indicator for the function of the text, it can be considered that the text is intended to informative type text or more traditionally a descriptive text that focuses on knowledge enrichment (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981:184). Although the design and the semantic partition of the book offer stories in the form of narrations, before the story in each chapter, an introductory part giving information about the source and the style of the story is provided, pointing to the informative nature of the text. Therefore, looking at the intended text type, the narration undertaken Hamilton is assumed to be

carrying characteristics of factual description.

Azra Erhat's account of mythology, on the other hand, displays properties which make it more difficult to categorize under a certain text type. The name of the book- "Dictionary of Mythology" suggests that the reader will encounter alphabetically sequenced information which could result in the identification of the text as informative or descriptive regarding the form. However, in the foreword to the book Azra Erhat describes the aim of the book through an argumentative part also discussing the tendency of the Western world to see Greek works and Greece as the only source of human values and fine arts and justifying the universal quality of a nationless mythology. She states the aim of the book as walking in this universal path and giving their rights to the writers while doing so. Without a comprehensive consideration of the intrinsic qualities of the text, the book as a dictionary may be regarded as an example of the informative text type. However, upon a closer look on the text, it implies a divergence from Edith Hamilton's informative style by both adopting the mentioned attitudinal position towards the stories narrated and by enacting a more personalized voice emergent in the text.

The rationale behind the current selection of text for this contrastive study goes under two points of consideration. First of all, '12 Labors of Hercules', which forms the main field of investigation within the aims of this study, is a universally recognized Greek myth describing the tasks accomplished by Hercules and therefore, it is to the advantage of the study that whichever author undertakes the narrating of these tasks, the content will be fixed, giving the chance to observe the variation across the narrations of the same series of events. The second point that is taken into consideration in the selection of the texts is that they are equitable in terms of the content they focus on yet, they are, by no means translated works either from each other or from some other source. With these properties and for the stated reasons, the two texts form a fruitful area of research for observing the construction of factuality.

1.2. *A scope for Tense, Modality and Aspect in the Expression of Factuality*

As influential as the intended text type in the re-framing of the events narrated, are the elements of tense, aspect and modality that are realized by various linguistic means in the text. In order to specify these elements to account for specific tools of investigation, it is necessary to visit the domains of modality and tense and reveal their relation to factuality.

Modality is described as the "function of language which concerns the speaker's or writer's attitude to, and commitment to the content of what he says" (Carter& Simpson,1989:94) emphasizing the focus on the description of the event in terms of its propositional status (Palmer,2001). Similarly, Mschane and Nirenburg (2003:57) describe mood and modality as related to "the linguistic expression of other speaker's attitude toward an utterance".

In an attempt to distinguish between the distinct roles tense, aspect and modality play in the re-construction of the event in a text, Palmer (200:1) views tense as concerned with the time of the event, aspect with the nature of the event and modality with the propositional status of the event. In this distinction, however, modality receives particular attention in formulating the relation between factuality and counter-factuality. According to Palmer (ibid.):

"Modality differs from tense and aspect in that it does not refer directly to any characteristic of the event,

but simply to the status of the proposition. One possible approach to its analysis is to make a binary distinction between 'non-modal' and 'modal' or 'declarative' and 'non-declarative', and to associate this distinction with the notional contrast of 'factual' and 'non-factual' or 'real and unreal".

The distinction between types of modality goes way beyond this basic specification and distinguishes between propositional and event modality specifying further categories of epistemic and evidential under propositional modals and deontic- dynamic distinction under the category of event modals. These commonly referred categories of modality in the literature can be explicated as follows depending on Palmer's (2001:8) notions:

- Propositional modality denotes the subjective attitude of the speaker to "truth-value or factual status of the proposition" (valid for entire proposition).
- Epistemic modality expresses speaker's belief or opinion on the possibility or necessity of a proposition. (plausibility)
- Evidential modality expresses evidenced judgement of the speaker on the factual value of a proposition
- Event modality focuses on the subjective attitude of the speaker about potential performances that are not actualized (limited to the event, action, state depicted).
- Deontic modality expresses the judgment of possibility through permissibility (may) or necessity (must) of an action, state, or event by a speaker.
- Dynamic modality is concerned with the ability (can) or volition (will) of the subject of the sentence.

Across all these categories of modality, however, a form of deviation from the factuality of the proposition or a close relation to potentiality retains. This tension between what is realized and what could be realized is also expressed in the deictic opposition of *realis* and *irrealis*. According to Mithun (1999:173),

"The realis portrays situations as actualized, as having occurred or actually occurring, knowable through direct perception. The irrealis portrays situations as purely within the realm of thought, knowable only through imagination'.

Therefore, realis and irrealis (factuality and counter-factuality) come out as the opposite ends of a dichotomy expressed by the non-modal or modal status of a proposition or event in the utterance. The modal use in an utterance inevitably marks the subjective attitude of the speaker or narrator and decreases the objectivity of the proposition. The proposition, then, is viewed as a potential act and not an actualized proposition. As indicated by the variation in the factuality values of the sentences "he may be going home" and "he is going home", modality marks the first sentence as the speaker's belief and the second sentence as the objective truth. In a way, "he is going home" declares a piece of factual information while the other indicates to an attitudinal position by including the personal stance or perspective of the author. Many other elements, therefore, can be found to be contributing to this binary opposition between factuality and counter factuality. The following table has been provided to draw an outline of this relation with a focus on an extended list of elements referred in the literature on both sides of the dichotomy:

Table 1: An outline of elements in factuality / counter-factuality relationship

Factuality	Counter-factuality
Realis	*Irrealis*
Non-modal	*Modal*
Actual	*Potential*
Objective	*Subjective*
Declarative	*Non-declarative*
Conceptual meaning	*Illocutionary meaning*
Weak adjectival constructions	*Strong adjectival constructions*
Weak adverbs	*Evaluative adverbs*

The variety of elements found to be contributing to the opposition between counter- factuality and factuality implies that, there may be a variety of ways modality can be marked. In a cross linguistic study involving as many as 43 languages, Van Linden and Verstraete (2008) attempted to identify the most common linguistic markers of counter-factuality and came across with the results that(ibid.:1865):

"Contrary to popular belief, neither past tense nor imperfective aspect is a universal feature in the combinations of markers used to signal counterfactuality: the only type of element that is found in every combination is a modal element marking some kind of potentiality, which can be combined (i) with past tense markers, (ii) with a combination of past tense and aspectual (perfect or perfective) markers, or, (iii) just with aspectual markers".

This shows that, factuality or counter factuality is not signaled in a single, predefined way in the text, but rather, should be sought in the multiple semantic layers of narration such as the combinations of tense and aspect, various forms of modality, etc. This, naturally calls for a broader understanding of the related terminology that does not only depend on auxiliaries and pure linguistic notions but also makes use of dynamic and emergent elements of text that are semantically realized through a combination of multiple means of discourse.

Such a broader conception of modality goes beyond a strictly grammatical view that limits modality to the use of modals. This results from the fact that the writer's attitude towards what s/he writes does not only depend on the inclusion of an auxiliary prior to the verb; on the contrary a wide variety of linguistic choices can be included in a piece of writing to describe the speaker's commitment. This broader view of modality as irreducible to a single dedicated marker of auxiliary is cited by Weber (1989:95) in Fowler (1977:13) and addresses a huge domain to be interacted upon for modality. The broad sense of modality, as it is cited;

"...covers all those features of discourse which concern a speaker's or writer's attitude to, or commitment to, the value of applicability of the propositional content of an utterance, and concomitantly, his relationship with whoever he directs the speech act to."

Acting within this broad definition of modality but still attempting to concretize it within the limits of linguistically and textually observable data, a further specification for the indicators of modality in a text needs to be made. The following list of modality indicators which forms the reference point for the analysis of modality in this study is suggested by Weber (1989:96).

- *Modal auxiliaries* (may, might, should, would, etc.)

- *Modal and sentence adverbs* (certainly, possibly, perhaps, probably)
- *Evaluative adjectives and adverbs* (luckily, fortunate, regrettably, awfully)
- *Verbs of knowledge, prediction, evaluation* (believe, guess, approve, dislike, etc.)
- Generic sentences (generalized sentences which pro-claim universal truths)

Taking such kind of an extended notion of modality as a starting point, Van Linden (2011) explores the role of adjectival constructions in marking counter-factuality and reaches evidenced results on how these elements may contribute to modality and counter-factuality. Strong adjectives with evaluative value are considered indicative of modal or potential meaning while weak adjectives mark a non-modal and factual representation of the event/ proposition. This points to the fact that, a broader perspective on modality is apt to employ various tools of investigation to reveal the patterns of factuality/ counter- factuality that may be working concomitantly throughout the narration in a given piece of text.

2. Methodology

The aim of the present study is to explore how tense and modality work across two different narrations of the same series of events- one in English and one in Turkish- for expressing factuality and counter-factuality and to reveal recurring patterns employed to this end, if there are any. The texts chosen for this aim are the Turkish and English accounts of the same mythological tale named "12 Labors of Hercules", which were undertaken by Azra Erhat and Edith Hamilton, respectively. Within the specified limits of the study, the specific parts used to describe the mentioned labors in the two texts were analyzed with respect to the commonly accepted indicators of counter- factuality which can be listed as:

- Tense and aspect of the verbs used to describe Hercules' accomplishments
- Modal auxiliaries that signify the attitudinal stance of the author
- Modal and sentence adverbs that bear evaluative remarks about the accomplishments

The data reached as a result of the linguistic analysis with particular focus on the specified areas of concern has been summarized in a contrastive table and resulting interpretations have been made in line with these points of consideration. In classifying the data gathered as a result of the analysis, Weber's (1989:96) list of modality indicators and Van Linden and Verstraete's (2011:155) conceptual map of modal evaluative domain has been employed.

3. A Cross-linguistic Analysis of Modality and Tense in Two Accounts of the Myth

Mschane and Nirenburg (2004:57) highlights the difficulty of describing language with regard to mood and modality considering the reasons that "*the inventory of modal meanings is not stable across languages, moods do not map neatly from one language to another, modality may be realized morphologically or by free standing words, and modality interacts in complex ways with other modules of the grammar, like tense and aspect*". Despite the stated complexity and difficulty of undertaking such an analysis, the present study attempts to describe how elements of tense and modality may be found to be contributing to the factuality/ counter factuality of the narration, marking the attitude of the author to the main character.

In terms of tense and aspect, the introduction parts of the twelve labors of Hercules seems to be following different paths in the two accounts, informing about further differ-

entiations in the textual and stylistic organization of the two narrations. Edith Hamilton's "Mythology" makes the following descriptive introduction before the listing of the 12 labors in a narrative mood:

The tasks Eurystheus gave him to do are called "The Labors of Hercules". There were twelve of them and each one was all but impossible.

The first sentence to be found in the introduction part takes on the function of a generic sentence introducing the general inclination of earlier descriptive studies to nominate the events as "the Labors of Hercules". In the second sentence the tense shifts to narrative past without losing the sense of factuality implied by the generic beginning. The use of "were" can be considered as a high degree of certainty that supports the generic sentence at the beginning. The turning point, however, is the use of the adjectival construction "all but impossible" at the end of the sentence. This, clearly reveals the attitude of the writer towards the achievements of Hercules, and thus, points to a move away from objectivity, marking an increased modality.

Azra Erhat's account, on the other hand, can be considered to be following a somewhat different path in introducing the labors of Hercules. The sentence to be found before the narration of "The Labors of Hercules" is as follows:

(4) HERAKLES'İN ONİKİ İŞİ. Aşağıda sayacağımız işleri Herakles yalnız kollarının gücü ve silah olarak elinden hiç ayırmadığı topuzuyla başarmıştır.

Formally organized as a dictionary entry, this account addresses "The Twelve Labors of Hercules" not with a generic or informative tone but with a personalized voice that takes "we" as the reference group. The use of "sayacağımız" indicates more of a personal knowledge sharing rather than a formal transfer of information. However, a high degree of factuality is implied by the enactment of "başarmıştır" at the end of the sentence, as this tense and aspect combination in Turkish indicates to a declarative notion, carrying the proposition to the degree of certainty. On the other hand, the evaluative character of the verb "başar-" and the use of the adverb "yalnız kollarının gücüyle" is also used in the same sentence and this clearly announces Hercules as a powerful, and successful "hero", pointing to a counter-factual element which can be associated with a high degree of modality.

In terms of modality, the analysis of verbs and adverbs used to depict Hercules' accomplishments have revealed that they are extensively employed in marking the stance of the two authors towards the hero giving way to a re-framing of the character in distinct ways, either within the domain of factuality or counter-factuality. Significant differences in the narrations of some of the labors have been encountered, leading to a positioning of the hero in contradicting stances. Of all the 12 labors analyzed, the most outstanding examples to the varied positionings of the hero caused by the varying degree and kind of modality employed, have been labors 1,5,9 and 12.

In the first labor- killing the lion of Nemea (See Appendix)- Hamilton's use of adverbs and verbs accounts for a hero with absolute superiority over the enemies. Hercules' fight against the lion of Nemea is depicted with the verbs "solved", "heaved", "carried into",

"gave orders" and with the adverb "by chocking life out of him". However, in Erhat's account, the use of adverbs "alt edemeyince" and "bin zorla yüzdüğü" for Hercules' actions views the hero with certain incapabilities.

Likewise in the narration of the 5th labor -cleaning the Augean stables- Hamilton's account is found to be making use of expressive adverbs such as "in a single day", "in no time at all", still emphasizing the perfect nature Hercules undertakes his tasks. In contrast, Erhat's account of the same labor depicts his deed with weaker adverbs that only gives specific details on the events like "yataklarını değiştirerek", "sularını ordan geçirip", "oğullarıyla birlikte". This, in turn, points to a decreased subjectivity on the author's side, marking an increased factuality of narration.

In the 9th Labor- bringing back the girdle of Hyppolita- Hamilton's depiction of the event and Erhat's account are observed to be drawing two distinct images of the hero partly due to the variation in the extent of modality they consult to in narration. In the part that depicts Hercules' killing the queen of the Amazons, Hamilton chooses to describe the action of killing with the adverbs "without a thought of how kind Hyppolita had been, without any thought at all", emphasizing the merciless character of the hero without any observable human characteristics. On the other hand, the very same action of Hercules is expressed as "Amazonlar kraliçesini öldürmek zorunda kalır" in Erhat's account, where the hero comes out as an emotional being carrying humanized virtues rather than a flawless character.

In order to search for further tense and modality effects on the "factuality" of the two texts, a comparative table including the verbs used in narration and the adverbs used to depict the actions of Hercules has been provided. The table is intended to give a comparative account of how each labor is narrated by the two authors with emphasis on which specified indicators of factuality and counter- factuality are employed. In the first column of the table The Labors of Hercules are listed. In the second column the verbs used in the narration of the events in Hamilton's and Erhat's accounts take place and in the third column the adverbs used to describe only Hercules's actions are provided to have an access to the differences in narration that stem from narrators attitude towards the character.

Table 2: A comparative account of "Twelve labors" with respect to tense and modality differences in Edith Hamilton and Azra Erhat

	The Labors of Hercules	**Verbs used in narration**	**Adverbs used to depict Hercules' actions**
1	Killing the lion of Nemea	Was to kill, could wound, solved, heaved, carried into, gave orders	Solved *by chocking life out of him*
		Kasıp kavuruyormuş, kolları arasına almış, elleriyle boğmuş, zırh etmiş	Alt edemeyince, bin zorla yüzdüğü
2	Killing the Dragon of Lerna	Was to go, kill, chopped off, was helped, seared, cut off, disposed of.	Was *exceedingly hard* to do , burying it securely.
		koparmış, gömmüş	*Bir bir* koparmış

3	Bringing the deer of Cerynitia	Was to bring back, could have killed, hunted, succeded	Could have killed it *easily*, hunted it *a whole year*
		kovalamış, yakalamış,götürmüş,vermiş	*Tam bir yıl kovalamış, sonunda okla yaralayarak yakalamış, omuzlarına yüklenerek götürmüş.*
4	Capturing the Boar of Erymanthus	was to capture, chased, was exhausted, drove into, trapped	Chased *from one place to another*
		izlemiş, konuğu olmuş, öldürmüş, yakalamış.	Aylarca izlemiş, tartışmaya girip birçoklarını öldürmüş, peşine düşüp yakalamış
5	Cleaning the Augean Stables	Was to clean, diverted, made them flow.	In a single day, in no time at all
		Temizlemiş ortalığı, öldürmüş.	Yataklarını değiştirerek sularını ordan geçirip temizlemiş, oğullarıyla birlikte öldürmüş
6	Driving away the Stymphalian birds	Was to drive away, was helped to drive them out, shot.	N.a.
		öldürmeyi başarmış	N.a.
7	Fetching the Cretan savage bull	Was to go, mastered him, put in a boat, brought	N.a.
		başarmış	Boynuzlarından yakalayıp götürmeyi başarmış
8	Getting the man eating horses of Diomedes	Was to get, slew, drove off	unopposed
		çarpışır, yedirir, getirir, parçalatır	Öldürüp ölüsünü atlarına yedirir
9	Bringing back the girdle of Hippolyta	Was to bring back, arrived, killed, was able to fight off, get away with	Without any thought at all, instantly.
		öldürmek zorunda kalır, uğrar,kurtarır, ayrılır	öç alacağını söyleyerek ayrılır
10	Bringing back the cettle of Geryon	Was to bring back, reached, set up, got, took them to	N.a.
		gelir, geçer, sütun diker, güçlük çeker, tehdit eder, verir, öldürür,alıp götürür, döner, verir	Anı olarak diker, tanrıyı oklarıyla tehdit eder,
11	Bringing back the golden apples of Hesperides	Was to bring back, did not know, went, asked, offered, agreed, had wits to trust, had to give, was successful, agreed to, asked him to, could put, picked up, went off.	N.a.
		bulur, kurtarır, gönderir, getirir, kaçar,adar	Bir süre kurtarır, aldatarak kaçar
12	Bringing Cerberus up from Hades	Took down to, gave permission, used, could use, forced to submit, lifted, carried,	all the way up
		iner,kurtarır, kaçırır, bırakır	Hermes ve Athena'nın yardımıyla iner, alıp kaçırır, geri götürüp bırakır

Total number of references to adverbs as forms of modality (Edith Hamilton)	***10***
Total number of references to adverbs as forms of modality (Azra Erhat)	***22***

Relying on the above listed elements of modality employed throughout the two accounts of the Hercules myth, some interpretations concerning the overall view of factuality and counter factuality of the narrations can be made.

4. Interpretations

The sequences of the verbs used to realize the same events linguistically in two different texts display the variation in the authors' styles of narration as well as their distinct ways of text organization. Azra Erhat chooses to see the "labors" as the entries in a dictionary rather than combining the pieces to form a unified body. The time progression line that is applied by the writer in the retelling of the first seven labors of Hercules, takes the past combined with a perfect aspect (unseen past) as a vehicle to narrate the events. However, in the eighth labor of Hercules a combination of the same past with the present is put into use in the sequence of the verbs varmış >çarpışır> yedirir> getirir> parçalatır. The same shift between two tenses is seen in the eleventh labor where the verbs take the sequence of korumaktaydı> bulur> kurtarır> gönderir> getirir> istemez> kaçar>adar. This tension between the indirective form of past (reported past) and the present tense in the time line of the narration points to an ambivalence in the sense of factuality, where the uses of - izlemiş, konuğu olmuş, öldürmüş, yakalamış inform an increased counter-factuality.

Edith Hamilton's account of the same series of Hercules's labors, on the other hand, seems to be following a consistent path dominantly making use of the simple past tense which may result in an increase in the sense of factuality. The exceptional uses of past perfect tense and the modals come into the fore only when a reference to the further past becomes necessary, thus, the use of these tenses does not intend to foreground a change in the narrator's attitude towards the event or a change in the sense of factuality but rather stand for shifts in the temporal sequence of the events for setting the background to an event.

As for the indicators of modality, the variation in the number and use of adverbs which are presented in table 2 indicate to a significant difference between the two accounts of narration under investigation. Hamilton's account makes use of 10 evaluative adverbs in describing Hercules' actions while Erhat's narration features 22 adverbs in the depiction of the same labors. This points to an increased element of modality on the part of Azra Erhat's account, marking the hero and his deeds as reliant on the attitudinal descriptions of the author rather than objective and factual presentation of information. With regard to the adverbs, then, Erhat's hero, makes more use of counter-factuality than that of Hamilton.

Another indicator of modality emergent in the analysis of the two texts is the use of strong elevatory adjectival constructions for the enemies Hercules fights against. In its simplest form this involves depicting a stone he lifts as a "huge stone" or describing a task he accomplishes as "the most difficult of all", and clearly marks the tendency of the authors to praise their heroes indirectly. A list of the adjectival constructions, used to depict the enemies Hercules fights against in the two texts can be listed as follows:

Table 3: Adjectival constructions used to depict the enemies of Hercules

Adjectival constructions in the narration of Edith Hamilton	Adjectival constructions in the narration of Azra Erhat
Exceedingly hard to do, a great rock, a whole year, thousands of cattle, no time at all, enormous numbers, beautiful savage bull, two great rocks, most difficult of all, the worst of all, terrible monster a	*Ekhidna canavarlarından doğma aslan, zehir saçan kafaları, kocaman bir kaya, korkunç bir yaban domuzu, sihirli bir hayvan, korkunç kartallar, dağ gibi üst üste yığılan gübre, azgın boğa, insan eti yiyen atlar, dev Gryoneus, en zor iş*
Total number: 11	**Total number: 11**

Represented in equal numbers across the two accounts of the mythological tale, these adjectival constructions reveal the subjective attitude of the two authors towards the hero, marking a high degree of modality which carries the emergent image of the Hercules to the realm of counter-factuality.

The divergent nature of modality across two texts of the same labor sometimes leads to the classification of the same character under different categories. In the retelling of the first labor for instance Azra Erhat describes Hercules's achievements with the adverbs "alt edemeyeceği" and "bin zorla yüzdüğü" which can be interpreted as an attempt to reflect the character with incapabilities like human beings. This becomes clearer in the retelling of the "Bringing back Hyppolita's girdle" labor. Hercules's killing of Hyppolite is described with such contradicting adverbs in two accounts that the image of Hercules drawn by Edith Hamilton displays characteristics of a merciless hero while in Azra Erhat's account of the same labor he is viewed with humanized feelings and hesitations. Similar contradicting images of the hero due to the entailment of attitudinal adverbs by the authors are also remarkable in the labors 1,2,5,9 and 12, which results in the divergent positioning of the texts with regard to factuality.

5. Conclusion

More comprehensive interpretations of the two different texts that take the same sequence of events as their concerns are possible through a focus on discourse aspects other than tense and modality. However, this brief study on the factuality of the texts has taken these two major areas as a starting point in line with the scope and the pre specified aims of the analysis. It can be concluded from the interpretations based on the identification of the tense aspects that are used to realize the events as narrations that; creating the element of "factuality" in the texts depends on the purpose of the narrator in constructing the text. Modality, which has been considered through an analysis of the adverbs used to depict the character's actions reveals the writer's attitude towards the character and leads to the realization of him either as an untouchable and flawless hero or a sensitive human being with feelings. On both sides of the issue, the crux of the matter seems to be the relations of the writers to the society they belong, the text traditions they adopt, and the array of worlds they create through their linguistic and non-linguistic choices.

It is possible to summarize the results reached as a result of this limited analysis under the following points of consideration:

1. The type and the intended aim of the texts have, to a large extent, influenced the construction of the hero and the element of factuality in both cases. However, there are no clear boundaries in identifying a text as a certain type as is reflected in the Turkish account of the tale which was intended as a dictionary entry yet adopted a rather narrative style instead of an informative one, making use of expressive adjectives at certain points.
2. Certain features of modality and tense (reliance on adverbs, expressive adverbs and strong adjectives in terms of modality and shifts to the perfective aspects in the tense) contribute to the construction of factuality and counter- factuality of the events in narration and give way to the emergence of the social actors depicted in the texts either in the domain of realis or irrealis. In the Turkish account of the 12 Labors of Hercules, the hero is distanced from factuality due to the increased use of modality in the depiction of his deeds and reliance on the expressive adverbs and strong adjectives. On the other hand, Edith Hamilton's account of the same myth makes use of an uninterrupted sequence of simple past tense with few interruptions of perfective aspect, employs a lower number of expressive adverbs and, thus, remains closer to realis depicting Hercules and his deeds with greater factuality when compared to the other.
3. Such cross linguistic analyses of narrations undertaken with a focus on distinct semantic and linguistic parts of language may provide valuable insights gained with joy to the language learners on the condition that they are tailored to the levels and needs of the learners and graded accordingly. They may also function in raising the awareness of the learners towards specified functions and categories of the language under focus. A simpler analysis of a similar fashion may well be undertaken in the language focus part of a task based lesson paradigm with simplified notions of grammar represented in manageable parts. Moreover, an integration of literary texts and linguistic analysis may enable the learners to notice how certain elements of language operate in their natural contexts- the construction of texts and grasp a deeper understanding of the target language by giving the learners the chance to make use of their L1 repertoires through comparison of certain patterns across different languages.

References:

Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W.U. (1983). Introduction to Text Linguistics, Harlow: Longman

Bybee, J. and Fleischman S. (1995). Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carter, R. & Simpson (1989). Language, Discourse and Linguistics, London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.

Erhat, A., (1972), (2004). Mitoloji Sözlüğü, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi

Fowler, R. (1977). Linguistics and the Novel, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd..

Hamilton, E., (1942), (1999). Mythology, New York: Warner Books.

Kaplan, R., (1997), "Contrastive Rhetoric", Functional Approaches to Written Text: Class-

room Applications, Washington D.C., English Language Programs

Kiefer, F. (1994). Modality. In R. E. Asher (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics ,2515-2520. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Mithun, M. (1999). The Languages of Native North America, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mschane& Nirenburg, (2004). "Mood and Modality: out of theory and into the fray", Natural Language Engineering,Vol.10/ 1: 57-89.

Palmer, F. R. (2001). Mood and modality (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics), 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Linden & Verstraete, (2008). The nature and origins of counterfactuality in simple clauses Cross-linguistic evidence, Journal of Pragmatics, Vol. 40, pp/1865-1895.

Van Linden & Verstraete, (2011). Revisiting deontic modality and related categories: A conceptual map based on the study of English modal adjectives, Journal of Pragmatics, Vol. 43, pp.150-163.

Weber, J. (1989). "Dickens's Social Semiotic: The Modal Analysis of Ideological Structure," in Carter, R. and P. Simpson eds, pp.94-11.

Appendix

HERAKLES

(2) SOYU. Herakles'in annesi Alkmene ile, ölümlü babası Amphitryon da Perseus'la Andromeda soyundandırlar (Tab. 13). Zeus, Alkmene'nin eşi Amphitryon ile birleştiği gibi, Alkmene'yi de aldatarak dünyaya getirir. Aynı gece Alkmene Herakles ve İphikles'e gebe kalır (*Alkmene, Amphitryon*).

(3) HAYATI. Alkmene gebe kalır kalmaz tanrıça Hera onu karşı konulmaz bir kıskançlıkla beslemeye başlar. Zeus'a söz verdirir ki Perseus soyundan ilk doğacak çocuk, insanlar üzerinde büyük bir egemenlik kuracaktır. O sırada Sthenelos'un karısı yedi aylık gebeydi, Hera kızı *ebe* tanrıça Eileithyia'ya onu yedi aylıkken hemen doğurtur ve Alkmene'nin doğumunu geciktirir. Böylece Perseus soyundan ilk doğan erkek Herakles değil, Eurystheus olur (*Eurystheus*).

Hera Herakles'in elinden bakılarını alırsakla kalmaz, sekiz aylık olup ölen İphikles'le birlikte beşiğinde yatmış bir gün iki koca yılan göndererek çocukları boğmak için. İphikles avaz avaz bağırdığı halde, Herakles yılanlara sarılır ve her elinde bir yılanı boğazından sıkıp boğar.

Herakles iratkar bir eğitim görür: Amphitryon onu arabacılığa, Eurytos ok atmaya, Linos da güzel saz çalmasını öğretirler.

Delikanlılık çağına gelince boyu boyu ve gücü olağanüstüdür. On sekiz yaşında Amphitryon'un sürülerini beklerken, babasının ve kral Thespios'un ülkesinde korku salan Kithairon aslanını öldürür. Thespios da karşılık olarak elli kızıyla yatmasına izin verir. Bu kızlardan elli tane oğlu olmuş (*Thespios*).

Bundan sonra Thebai'liler haraca kesen Orkhomenos kralı Ergînos'la *Minyalar* savaşını öldürmüş. Thebai kralı Kreon ödül olarak kızı Megara'yla evlenmiş yiğide. Bu kadından da epey çocuğu olmuş Herakles'in, ama gönlü birinde Hera yiğidin cinnet getirmesini sağlamış, kendi çocuklarına bir bir öldürmüş. Yiğit kendine gelince, Thespios'un yanına sığınmış ve kendini bu suçlardan aramış, ama Hera bununla da yetinmemiş, Apollon kâhini Pythia aracılığıyla yiğidin gidip Eurystheus'un hizmetine girmesini bildirmiş. Suçlarının kefaretini olacak bu on iki yıllık hizmeti başarıyla sona erdirince, ölümsüzlüğe kavuşacakmış.

(4) HERAKLES'İN ON İKİ İŞİ. Aşağıda sayacağımız işleri Herakles yalnız kullanılan güç ve ülkü olarak elinden hiç ayırmadığı topuzuyla başarmıştır:

Nemea aslanı. Typhoeus'la Ekhidna canavarlarından doğmuş bu aslan Yunanistan'da Nemea bölgesini kasıp kavuruyormuş; yiğit onu oklan ve topuzuyla alt edemeyince, kılı kırk yarmış ve yiğitlerle boğmuş. Bu zorlu yürüdüğü postunu da kendine zırh etmiş.

Lerna ejderi. Dokuz kafalı bir yılan olan "hydra" adlı ejderi Hera Argos bölgesindeki Lerna batakhğına salmış. Herakles atlılar saçan kafalarını bir bir koparmış ve ölümsüz olan kafasını da kocaman bir kayanın altına gömmüş.

Erymanthos yaban domuzu. Arkadia'nın Erymanthos dağında korkunç bir yaban domuzu varmış, Eurystheus bu hayvanı kendisine dirî olarak getirilmesini buyurmuş. Herakles de aylarca izlemiş, canavarı, o sırada da dağlakt at adamı Pholos'un konuğu olmuş. Bir gün at adamlarla tartışmaya girip birçoklarını öldürmüş. Sonra yaban domuzunu peşine düşüp onu bir ağ içinde yakalamış. Eurystheus hayvanı görünce korkusundan bir fıçının içine saklanmış.

Kiyrneia geyiği. Altın boynuzlu, tunç ayaklı bu geyiği Apollon'la Artemis'in kovalığını sürdü bir hayvanmış. Herakles onu tam bir yıl kovalamış, sonunda okla yaralayarak onu yakalamış ve omuzlarına yüklenerek götürmüş, Eurystheus'a vermiş.

Stymphalos gölünün kuşları. Gene Arkadia'da Stymphalos gölünün üstünde gagalarıyla pençeleri tunçtan, insanı etiyle beslenen korkunç kartallar varmış; Athena tanrıça Herakles'e bu kuşları ürkütmek için ziller vermiş, Herakles de zilleriyle canavarları öldürmeyi başarmış.

Augeias'ın ahırları. Elis kralı Augeias'ın ahırları öyle bir süre önce yağılara gübrelere kullanılmaz olmuş ve gübresiz kalan toprağı da bir hevesletmiş yetmiyiği. Eurystheus yiğidi büyük düşünmek için bu ağılları temizlemesini buyurmuş. Herakles de Alpheios'la Peneios ırmaklarının yataklarını değiştirerek sularını ahırları geçirip temizlemiş ortalığı. Ama bu iş için sürülerinin onda birini vermeyeceğini söylemiş Augeias sözünde durmamış, Herakles de kralı oğullarıyla birlikte öldürmüş.

Girit boğası. Girit kralı Minos bir beyaz boğa gönderen Poseidon'a kurban etmek istememişti, tanrı da üç akrak için boğaya kudurtmuştu. Hayvan Girit ekinlerini yok ediyor, ülkeye açlık kıtlık kurtuya boğuyordu. Herakles bu azgın boğayı boynuzlarından yakalayıp Yunanistan'a götürmeyi başarmış. Oradan boğa serbest bırakıldıktan sonra Marathon kapılarında Theseus'un eline geçmiş.

Diomedes'in atları. Trakya kralı Diomedes'in insan eti yiyen atları varmış. Herakles Diomedes'le çarpışır, onu öldürüp ölüsünü atlarına yedirir. Sonra da ehlileşen hayvanları Mykenai'ye getirir, ya da kapıkı bir anlatıma göre Olympos dağında vahşi hayvanlara parçalatır.

Amazon'lar kraliçesi Hippolyte. Eurystheus'un kızı Admete, yiğitten Amazon'lar kraliçesi Hippolyte'nin büyülü kemerini ister. Ares'in Hippolyte'ye armağanı olan bu kemeri almak için Herakles Amazon'lar kraliçesini öldürmek zorunda kalır. Dönüşte yiğit Troya'ya uğrar, Laomedon'un kızı Hesione'yi deniz canavarının elinden kurtarır, ama Laomedon söz verdiği atları teslim etmeyince, yiğit üç akrağını söyleyerek Troya'dan ayrılır (*Laomedon, Hesione*).

Geryoneus'un sürüleri. Dünyanın batı ucunda, Okeanos ırmağının bir adasında Geryoneus büyük sığır sürülerini otlatmaktaymış. Herakles oralara kadar gelir, Çanakkale boğazını geçer ve ana olarak geçit yerine iki sütun diker (Cebelitarık boğazına Yunanlılar Herakles sütunları derlerdi). Herakles Okeanos ırmağını geçmekte güçlük çeker, Libya çöllerini geçerken Helios'a karşı sıcaktan ötürü kızdığı için tanrıya oklarıyla tehdit eder, Güneş de ona Okeanos'u geçmek için altın sandalını verir. Yiğit böylece dev Geryoneus'u, sürülerini bekçilerini öldürür ve sığırları alıp götürür. Galya, İtalya ve Trakya yoluyla Tunus'tan'a döner ve sürüleri Eurystheus'a verir (*Geryoneus*).

HERAKLES

Batı kızlarının altın elmaları. Hera'nın Zeus'la evlenirken düğün hediyesi olarak aldığı bu büyülü meyveleri Batı kızlarının bahçesinde nymphe'ler ve bir ejder korumaktaydı. Herakles Nemea'nın izlenimi gereğince yola öğrendikten sonra, Batı kızlarının bahçesini bulur, orada dünyaya omuzlarında taşıyan Atlas'ı bir süre bu yükünden kurtarır ve elmaları almaya gönderir. Dev altın elmaları getirir, ama dönşünü yükünü bir daha omuzlarına almaya istemez. Herakles onu aldatarak kaçar ve elmaları Athena'ya adar.

Kerberos'un dişler üzerinden kaçırılması. Herakles'in başardığı en zor iş budur. Hermes ve Athena'nın yardımıyla, hiçbir ölümlünün geri gelmediği yeraltı ülkesine iner, orada başlı bekçisi Theseus'la kurtarır ve Kerberos köpeğini alıp yeryüzüne kaçırır. Eurystheus bu azmanı görünce öyle korkar, yiğit de köpeği Hades'e geri götürüp bırakır.

Burdan Herakles'in başlıca on iki işidir, ama başardan bununla bitmez, çilesi de tükenmez. Thebai'ye dönüşünde Sarıncı karısı Megara'yı arkadaşı Iolaüs'a verir, sonra kral Eurytos'un düzenlediği bir ok yarışmasını kazanır, ama kral'ın yarışmanın ödülü olan kızı Iole'yi ona vermez. Herakles öfkeye kapılarak Eurytos'un oğlu İphitos'u öldürür. Bu suçtan arınmak için Lydia kralı Omphale'nin hizmetine girer. Bu kadın Herakles'i kölle hallice getirir, kadın kılığına sokup yün eğirmesini sağlar. Ne var ki bu sırada yiğit Kalydon annesi ve Argonautlar seferine de katılabilir. Omphale'den kurtulunca Troya'ya gidip Laomedon'u öldürür. Olympos tanrılarının devlere karşı savaşlarına katılır, Augeias'tan ödünü alır, onu arındırmak istemeyen kral Neleus'a karşı savaşır, Sparta'ya karşı bir saldırıya girişir vb. Sonra Kalydon'a gidip Deianeira ile evlenir, ama önce tüllü annak tanrı Alkyoneus'la dövüşmek zorunda kalır. Kayınatası Oineus'un yarışı sonucunu Eurytos'u kızın ile öldürdükten sonra, geme sürgüne gitmek durumunda diğer, gölerken kanlı Deianeira ile adam Nessos'un saldırısına uğrar. Yiğit oklarıyla ona yaralayınca Nessos ölmeden Deianeira'ya büyülü bir ilaç verir. Trakhis'e yerleşen Herakles Eurytos ve oğullarını öldürmekle sözünde durmayan kralı cez-

from sharing all with you. Evil I share with you is not evil to me. And hear me. Men great of soul can bear the blows of heaven and not flinch."

Hercules said, "Do you know what I have done?"

"I know this," Theseus answered. "Your sorrows reach from earth to heaven."

"So I will die," said Hercules.

"No hero spoke those words," Theseus said.

"What can I do but die?" Hercules cried. "Live? A branded man, for all to say, 'Look. There is he who killed his wife and sons'! Everywhere my jailers, the sharp scorpions of the tongue!"

"Even so, suffer and be strong," Theseus answered. "You shall come to Athens with me, share my home and all things with me. And you will give to me and to the city a great return, the glory of having helped you."

A long silence followed. At last Hercules spoke, slow, heavy words. "So let it be," he said. "I will be strong and wait for death."

The two went to Athens, but Hercules did not stay there long. Theseus, the thinker, rejected the idea that a man could be guilty of murder when he had not known what he was doing and that those who helped such a one could be reckoned defiled. The Athenians agreed and welcomed the poor hero. But he himself could not understand such ideas. He could not think the thing out at all; he could only feel. He had killed his family. Therefore he was defiled and a defiler of others. He deserved that all should turn from him with loathing. At Delphi where he went to consult the oracle, the priestess looked at the matter just as he did. He needed to be purified, she told him, and only a terrible penance could do that. She bade him go to his cousin Eurystheus, King of

Mycenae (of Tiryns in some stories) and submit to whatever he demanded of him. He went willingly, ready to do anything that could make him clean again. It is plain from the rest of the story that the priestess knew what Eurystheus was like and that he would beyond question purge Hercules thoroughly.

Eurystheus was by no means stupid, but of a very ingenious turn of mind, and when the strongest man on earth came to him humbly prepared to be his slave, he devised a series of penances which from the point of view of difficulty and danger could not have been improved upon. It must be said, however, that he was helped and urged on by Hera. To the end of Hercules' life she never forgave him for being Zeus's son. The tasks Eurystheus gave him to do are called "the Labors of Hercules." There were twelve of them and each one was all but impossible.

The first was to kill the lion of Nemea, a beast no weapons could wound. That difficulty Hercules solved by choking the life out of him. Then he heaved the huge carcass up on his back and carried it into Mycenae. After that, Eurystheus, a cautious man, would not let him inside the city. He gave him his orders from afar.

The second labor was to go to Lerna and kill a creature with nine heads called the Hydra which lived in a swamp there. This was exceedingly hard to do, because one of the heads was immortal and the others almost as bad, inasmuch as when Hercules chopped off one, two grew up instead. However, he was helped by his nephew Iolaus who brought him a burning brand with which he seared the neck as he cut each head off so that it could not sprout again. When all had been chopped off he disposed of the one that was immortal by burying it securely under a great rock.

The third labor was to bring back alive a stag with horns of gold, sacred to Artemis, which lived in the forests of Cerynitia. He could have killed it easily, but to take it alive was another matter and he hunted it a whole year before he succeeded.

The fourth labor was to capture a great boar which had its lair on Mount Erymanthus. He chased the beast from one place to another until it was exhausted; then he drove it into deep snow and trapped it.

The fifth labor was to clean the Augean stables in a single day. Augeas had thousands of cattle and their stalls had not been cleared out for years. Hercules diverted the courses of two rivers and made them flow through the stables in a great flood that washed out the filth in no time at all.

The sixth labor was to drive away the Stymphalian birds, which were a plague to the people of Stymphalus because of their enormous numbers. He was helped by Athena to drive them out of their coverts, and as they flew up he shot them.

The seventh labor was to go to Crete and fetch from there the beautiful savage bull that Poseidon had given Minos. Hercules mastered him, put him in a boat and brought him to Eurystheus.

The eighth labor was to get the man-eating mares of King Diomedes of Thrace. Hercules slew Diomedes first and then drove off the mares unopposed.

The ninth labor was to bring back the girdle of Hippolyta, the Queen of the Amazons. When Hercules arrived she met him kindly and told him she would give him the girdle, but Hera stirred up trouble. She made the Amazons think that Hercules was going to carry off their queen, and they charged down on his ship. Hercules, without a thought of

how kind Hippolyta had been, without any thought at all, instantly killed her, taking it for granted that she was responsible for the attack. He was able to fight off the others and get away with the girdle.

The tenth labor was to bring back the cattle of Geryon, who was a monster with three bodies living on Erythia, a western island. On his way there Hercules reached the land at the end of the Mediterranean and he set up as a memorial of his journey two great rocks, called the Pillars of Hercules (now Gibraltar and Ceuta). Then he got the oxen and took them to Mycenae.

The eleventh labor was the most difficult of all so far. It was to bring back the Golden Apples of the Hesperides, and he did not know where they were to be found. Atlas, who bore the vault of heaven upon his shoulders, was the father of the Hesperides, so Hercules went to him and asked him to get the apples for him. He offered to take upon himself the burden of the sky while Atlas was away. Atlas, seeing a chance of being relieved forever from his heavy task, gladly agreed. He came back with the apples, but he did not give them to Hercules. He told Hercules he could keep on holding up the sky, for Atlas himself would take the apples to Eurystheus. On this occasion Hercules had only his wits to trust to; he had to give all his strength to supporting that mighty load. He was successful, but because of Atlas' stupidity rather than his own cleverness. He agreed to Atlas' plan, but asked him to take the sky back for just a moment so that Hercules could put a pad on his shoulders to ease the pressure. Atlas did so, and Hercules picked up the apples and went off.

The twelfth labor was the worst of all. It took him down to the lower world, and it was then that he freed Theseus

from the Chair of Forgetfulness. His task was to bring Cerberus, the three-headed dog, up from Hades. Pluto gave his permission provided Hercules used no weapons to overcome him. He could use his hands only. Even so, he forced the terrible monster to submit to him. He lifted him and carried him all the way up to the earth and on to Mycenae. Eurystheus very sensibly did not want to keep him and made Hercules carry him back. This was his last labor.

When all were completed and full expiation made for the death of his wife and children, he would seem to have earned ease and tranquillity for the rest of his life. But it was not so. He was never tranquil and at ease. An exploit quite as difficult as most of the labors was the conquest of Antaeus, a Giant and a mighty wrestler who forced strangers to wrestle with him on condition that if he was victor he should kill them. He was roofing a temple with the skulls of his victims. As long as he could touch the earth he was invincible. If thrown to the ground, he sprang up with renewed strength from the contact. Hercules lifted him up and holding him in the air strangled him.

Story after story is told of his adventures. He fought the river-god Achelous because Achelous was in love with the girl Hercules now wanted to marry. Like everyone else by this time, Achelous had no desire to fight him and he tried to reason with him. But that never worked with Hercules. It only made him more angry. He said, "My hand is better than my tongue. Let me win fighting and you may win talking." Achelous took the form of a bull and attacked him fiercely, but Hercules was used to subduing bulls. He conquered him and broke off one of his horns. The cause of the contest, a young princess named Deianira, became his wife.

He traveled to many lands and did many other great deeds.