

THE
INTERNATIONAL STANDARD
BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

JAMES ORR, M.A., D.D., GENERAL EDITOR

JOHN L. NUELSEN, D.D., LL.D.

EDGAR Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.

ASSISTANT EDITORS

MORRIS O. EVANS, D.D., PH.D., MANAGING EDITOR

VOLUME III
HERESY—NAARAH

CHICAGO
THE HOWARD-SEVERANCE COMPANY

1915

3

A difficulty attaches to the dates of this period. The Pul of 2 K 15 19 and 1 Ch 5 26 is now identified with Tiglath-pileser III, who took this title on ascending the throne of Assyria in 745 BC. In an inscription of Tiglath-pileser, Menahem appears as *Minehimmu Samarina* (Menahem the Samaritan), together with *Razunnu* (Rezin) of Damascus and *Hirumu* (Hiram) of Tyre. The date given to this inscription is 738 BC, whereas the last year we can give to Menahem is 749, or 10 years earlier.

The chronological difficulty which thus arises may be met in one of two ways. Either the inscription, like that on the black obelisk of Kurkh (see JEHU), was written some years after the events to which it refers and contains records of operations in which Tiglath-pileser took part before he became king; or Pekah—who was on the throne of Israel in 738 (?)—is spoken of under the dynastic name Menahem, though he was not of his family. The former of these hypotheses is that which the present writer is inclined to adopt. (By others the dates of Menahem are lowered in conformity with the inscription; see CHRONOLOGY OF THE OT.)

Menahem attempted no reformation in the national religion, but, like all his predecessors, adhered to the worship of the golden calves. On this account, like them, he incurs the heavy censure of the historian.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

MENAN, mē'nan. See MENNA.

MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN, mē'nē, mē'nē, tē'kel, ū-fār'sin, men'ā, men'ā, tek'el, ō-fār'sin (מֵנֵי מֵנֵי תְּקֵל וּפְרָשִׁין, *mē'nē' mē'nē' tē'kel ūpharšîn*; Theod., *Μανή, θεκέλ, φαρές, Μανή, θεκέλ, φαρές*): These are the words that, according to Daniel's reading, were inscribed on the walls of Belshazzar's palace and that caused the great commotion on the occasion of his last feast (Dnl 5 25). As the only authority that we have for the reading is that of Daniel, it seems but fair that the interpretation of the terms be left to the person who gave us the text. According to his interpretation, there is a double sense to be found in the three different words of the inscription (Dnl 5 26-28).

Mē'nē', which, however it is pointed, must be taken from the verb *m'nāh* (Heb *mānāh*; Bab *manu*), is said to have indicated that God had numbered (the days of) Belshazzar's kingdom and finished it (or delivered it up). Both of these meanings can be shown to be proper to the *√ m'nāh*.

Tē'kel, on the contrary, is interpreted as coming from two roots: the first, *tē'kal*, "to weigh," and the second, *kal*, "to be light or wanting" (Heb *kālal*; Bab *kālālu*).

Pērēs (or *paršîn*) also is interpreted as coming from two roots: first, *pēraš*, "to divide" (Heb *pāras* or *pārash*; Bab *pārasu*), and the second as denoting the proper name *Pāras*, "Persia." Thus interpreted, the whole story hangs together, makes good sense, and is fully justified by the context and by the language employed. If the original text was in Bab, the signs were ambiguous; if they were in Aram., the consonants alone were written, and hence the reading would be doubtful. In either case, the inscription was apparent but not readable, except by Daniel with the aid of God, through whom also the seer was enabled to give the proper interpretation. That Daniel's interpretation was accepted by Belshazzar and the rest shows that the interpretation of the signs was reasonable and convincing when once it had been made. We see, therefore,

no good reason for departing from the interpretation that the Book of Dnl gives as the true one.

As to the interpretation of the inscription, it makes no difference whether the signs represented a mina, a shekel, and two perases, as has been recently suggested by M. Clermont-Ganneau. In this case the meaning was not so apparent, but the puns, the play upon the sounds, were even better. We doubt, however, if it can be shown that *tē'kel* means *shekel*. On the old Aram. documents of Egypt and Assyria, it is with one exception spelled *shekel*. In the Tg of Onkelos, *shekel* is always rendered by *šela'*; in the Pesh and Arab. VSS, by *mathkal*; in the Samaritan Tg, by *mathkal* (except only perhaps in Gen 23 16, where we have *ethkel*). In the Tg of Onkelos, wherever *tiklā'* occurs, it translates the Heb *bēka'* (Gen 24 22 and Ex 38 26 only). *Mē'nē'*, to be sure, may have meant the mina, and *pērēs*, the half-mina. The *pārāsh* is mentioned in the inscription of Panammu and in an Aram. inscription on an Assyrian weight. Besides this, it is found in the New Heb of the Mish. It is not found, however, in the Tg of Onkelos, nor in Syr, nor in the OT Heb; nor in the sense of half-shekel in the Aram. papyri. While, then, it may be admitted that Daniel may have read, "A mina, a mina, a shekel, and two half-minas," it is altogether unlikely, and there is certainly no proof that he did. Yet, if he did, his punning interpretations were justified by the usage of ancient oracles and interpreters of signs, and also by the event.

R. DICK WILSON

MENELAUS, men-ē-lā'us (Μενέλαος, *Menēlaos*): According to the less likely account of Jos (*Ant*, XII, v, 1; XV, iii, 1; XX, x, 3), Menelaus was a brother of Jason and Onias III, and his name was really Onias. But it is very unlikely that there should be two brothers of the same name. The account of 2 Macc is more credible—that Menelaus was the brother of the notorious Simon who suggested to the Syrians the plundering of the temple; he was thus of the tribe of Benjamin (2 Macc 4 23; cf with 3 4) and not properly eligible to the high-priesthood. He was intrusted by Jason (171 BC), who had supplanted Onias, with contributions to the king of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes, and by outbidding Jason in presents he secured the office of high priest for himself (4 23 f), 171 BC. Menelaus returned with "the passion of a cruel tyrant" to Jerus, and Jason fled. But as Menelaus failed to pay the promised amount, both he and Sostratus, the governor, were summoned to appear before the king. Lysimachus, the brother of Menelaus, was left at Jerus in the meantime as deputy high priest. The king was called from his capital to suppress an insurrection of Tarsus and Mallus. Menelaus took advantage of his absence to win over Andronicus, the king's deputy, by rich presents stolen from the temple. For this sacrilege Onias III sharply reproved him and fled to a sanctuary, Daphne, near Antioch. Andronicus was then further persuaded by Menelaus to entice Onias from his retreat and murder him (4 34 f)—an act against which both Jews and Greeks protested to the king on his return, and secured deserved punishment for Andronicus. Meanwhile, the oppression of Lysimachus, abetted by Menelaus, caused a bloody insurrection in Jerus, in connection with which a Jewish deputation brought an accusation against Menelaus on the occasion of Antiochus' visit to Tyre. Menelaus bribed Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, to win over the king to acquit himself and secure the execution of "those hapless men, who, if they had pleaded even before Scythians, would have been discharged uncondemned" (4 39 ff). Menelaus returned in triumph to his office. But Jason, taking advantage of Epiphanes' absence in