

# 3. Pyrrhus

---

Tess Lambert, 25.09.2018

## Youtube Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AXUSjxGmKwY>

### [00:00:16.450] - Tess

Amen. To recap on what we did yesterday. We finished looking at Fatima. Then we left the study of the counterfeit and we moved on to Acts 27. We picked up the symbols of Midnight Cry and Sunday Law which we line up with shipwreck. Then we saw that in between those Luke chooses to tell us about the number on board of the ship, which was 276.

### [00:00:52.420] - Tess

We'd already made application of three of that number. As being representative of the priests. And the support of Aristarchus and Luke. His companions during that journey as Christ and the Holy Spirit. That left us with 273 Levites. One thing I like about that line is you do have the three groups. And we took the 273. The symbol of the Levites. And brought that to Numbers 3. Where you have the calling out of the Levites as they replace the work of the firstborn. That's the only time I can locate the number 273 in inspiration. It's with the calling out of the Levites when there was 273 too few. And they had to pay some type of ransom money.

### [00:01:56.810] - Tess

We took that 273 of the Levites between Midnight Cry and the Sunday Law. And we looked at 273 BC and we saw that day on that date. It was the first diplomatic contact between Egypt and Rome. It's the first time that the world really took attention of Rome. When Rome enters the world scene. The reason that the world stepped up and started paying attention to Rome was the fact that they just fought the Pyrrhic War.

### [00:02:32.380] - Tess

This was three battles against Pyrrhus of Epirus. Leading southern Rome against northern Rome. And this was a battle between the king of the north and the king of the south. Pyrrhus against Rome. And it's that battle that not only gave Rome control of the entire Peninsula, allowing it to branch elsewhere. But also Greece, Egypt, all those countries, Macedonia, they stepped up and started paying attention to Rome. And sending ambassadors. Going into alliances. Et cetera. I just want to go back and add a couple of things to thoughts that we've already covered. You always remember things you didn't say.

### [00:03:24.890] - Tess

I mentioned off the cuff 2004 as being the year that at least the United States and the papacy should have perhaps noticed that Russia was about to be a very big problem. I don't like to say things without a little bit of evidence to back that up. 2004 was the Beslan school siege. And I'm just going to read you a couple of quotes from the Washington Post. September 14, 2004.

**[00:03:56.190] - Tess**

The Beslan siege ended about ten days before this publication. They say: Moscow, September 13. *"President Vladimir Putin announced plans on Monday for a radically restructured political system that would bolster his power by ending the popular election of governors and independent lawmakers. Moves he portrayed as a response to this month's deadly seizure of a Russian school."* What Putin did was he radically restructured the political system inside Russia. *"Under his plan, Putin would be the only one to appoint governors and he would create a single chain of commands."* There would be no more general elections. *"The Russian people would no longer vote for specific candidates. They could only vote for political parties in parliamentary elections. He characterized the changes as efforts to enhance national cohesion in the face of a terrorist threat. While critics called to them another step towards restoring the tyranny of the state. 13 years after the fall of the Soviet Union."*

**[00:05:09.810] - Tess**

This is quoting Putin. *"Under current conditions, the system of executive power in the country should not just be adapted to operating in crisis situations, but should be radically restructured in order to strengthen the unity of the country and prevent further crises. Those who inspire, organize, and carry out terrorist attacks seek to bring about a disintegration of the country, to break up the state, to ruin Russia."*

**[00:05:39.730] - Tess**

Sergei Mitrokin, a former parliamentary leader from the Liberal Yabloko party, said, *"it's the beginning of a constitutional coup. It's a step toward" dictatorship.*

**[00:05:54.410] - Tess**

Putin used the Beslan school siege as an excuse to radically restructure Russia's political system.

**[00:06:02.930] - Tess**

And this is five years after he becomes President. What I wanted to suggest with that history. By the time that Lucia dies, 16 years after the fall of the Berlin wall, they should have known that Russia was back up on the ascendancy. But she never has a new message. And what I wanted to suggest was that Satan didn't know either.

**[00:06:29.990] - Tess**

In that context, why didn't we know? Why did God hold his hand over that? For me, it gives, I think a little bit of a clearer picture of the great controversy that God doesn't purposefully make information hard to

find. He doesn't purposefully withhold information from us. He wants to be able to tell us. But this is a proxy war and you don't send all your plans to the enemy. I'd like to suggest that's why it was also withheld from us. Russia would never have been able to come back.

### **[00:07:11.430] - Tess**

The one other thing I didn't mention that I would like to. I was the number 273. And this is just a curiosity. I'm not trying to make any profound application, but it's a fascinating number when you come to mathematics and astronomy. I love science. It's my favorite subject. But I don't necessarily have a solid grasp of it. But have looked into absolute zero. And it's that temperature at which all atoms cease to move. This table is held up by moving atoms, everything's bouncing against each other. That friction causes a solid structure. At absolute zero, those atoms cease to move. And it's a complicated argument about what happens when atoms cease to move. That's what gives everything form. I have read that at least gasses would cease to exist, which is why they say we can't actually get to absolute zero. And absolute zero is -273 degrees Celsius. All movement stops.

### **[00:08:29.000] - Tess**

At -273 degrees Celsius, you cannot get a degree colder because you cannot have something more than stop. Once it's stopped, that's it. This is the point of all stopping. What Kelvin did was he saw that -273 degrees Celsius equals zero. And he thought it was a little silly to not just call it zero. For the Kelvin scale of temperature, what he did was he just made -273 zero degrees. And then -272 one degrees. There's always a difference of 273 between the Celsius and the Kelvin scale.

### **[00:09:19.710] - Tess**

Some studies suggest that it is the period of human gestation, 273 days long. And then when you get into the moon cycles 27.3 days around the earth, and that's where a lot of spiritualism begins to come into this number. But I do think it has some interesting qualities. And that's all I wanted to say about that.

### **[00:09:47.390] - Tess**

Yesterday we looked at 273 BC and it really gave us the story of Pyrrhus and the Pyrrhic War. What I suggested is that Pyrrhus represents the king of the south. He leads the south against Rome in the north, and that we could be benefited by looking at his whole life. Initially, when I did this study, it took me to 273 BC and then it seemed natural to work backwards. 272, 271. But you can't teach backwards. What I want to do this morning and tomorrow morning as well, is just cover history. Just so we can know what's going on in the world during the life of Pyrrhus, and the role he plays in world affairs. I don't want to make any application until we've laid out the history. And then we'll go back and make application of those events.

### **[00:10:57.770] - Tess**

I've given you a print out. It's four pages long of some of the quotes that we have read and will read. We're not going to really work through it and I won't read all of this. I would prefer to pick up highlights. But I wanted you to be able to see some sources and also go back in your own time and have a look, if

you so choose. AT Jones has been invaluable, but there are periods of history that he skips or gives little detail. There have been some other books I've used. Some of the ancient historians with a great degree of caution, such as Plutarch, et cetera. I found them to be heavily biased towards Rome. And some things they suggested, particularly when they wrote poetically in a style that they did back then. I found it to not be very accurate. But I do find when they're discussing battles, historical events, that it did tend to agree with AT Jones. I have included some of them.

### **[00:12:12.080] - Tess**

We looked at the history that was occurring around the birth of Pyrrhus. Four years before he was born, Alexander the Great died in 323 BC. And Daniel eight jumps from 323 to 301 BC. It skips 22 years of history to give us these four generals, also known as the Diadochi, or the successors. And it was by these four Diadochi wars that we ended up with these four successes of Alexander. I said yesterday that there was four for a period of three years. That was inaccurate. They had control of Alexander the Great kingdom for four years. It was four years between the Battle of Ipsus and the death of Cassander. Through this history, what I particularly like is you just have the number four. Four years after the death of Alexander. Pyrrhus is born. Four Diadochi Wars, giving you four generals for four years.

### **[00:13:22.570] - Tess**

Just a background story. The third Diadochi War ended with a peace treaty in 311. This peace treaty was between Antigonus and Demetrius his son, and their opponents, Cassander, Lysimachus and Ptolemy. Antigonus, never signed the peace treaty with Seleucus. Because his purpose was after that peace treaty to undertake the Babylonian War. Where Antigonus and Seleucus fought for the control of Babylon. It's when Seleucus defeated Antigonus that they mark the beginning of the Seleucid Empire. And that occurred in 309, ending the Babylonian war. And Seleucus then undertakes his campaign east, where he heads all the way to India, brings back his elephants, et cetera.

### **[00:14:15.230] - Tess**

The fourth Diadochi War we marked over here also is 317. Before, in 317, Cassander placed the dictator in Athens in the peace treaty is broken when Demetrius Freddie's Athens from that dictator and in Demetrius and Pyrrhus go into an alliance.

### **[00:15:23.970] - Tess**

And this fourth Diadochi War ends at the Battle of Ipsus in 301. Where you had Cassander, Lysimachus and Seleucus versus Antigonus, Demetrius, who is backed in this battle by a young Pyrrhus.

### **[00:15:57.890] - Tess**

Pyrrhus, only in his late teens, is undefeated in this battle. Demetrius, while the battle is lost and his father dies, this essentially also makes him king. Because his father, who was really called the shots himself, didn't allow his son a whole lot to say. When he dies, Dimitri still has his own territory and his own navy.

He has all of that to fall back on and he remains a king. These three, Cassander, Lysimachus and Seleucus are known as the allies.

**[00:16:47.490] - Tess**

On your page, the first half of these quotes deal with 273 BC. I just wanted to include them in there. So that you can read that history. About halfway down, he presented Demetrius to the army and declared him his successor. That's back in this history, 301 BC, the day before the Battle of Ipsus.

**[00:17:18.830] - Tess**

It says: "briefly before battle was joined unexpectedly, Seleucus appeared on the scene and joined Lysimachus and Cassander. This changed the entire situation. Plutarch offers some numbers, but they appear to be inflated. Still, it seems reasonably certain that after Seleucus arrival, the armies were near equality in size. That is the extent of Antigonus's power at this stage, his army and his Empire. It was equal to the other three at this stage combined. Ptolemy didn't show up to this battle.

**[00:17:55.370] - Tess**

What happens in this battle is Demetrius is cut off from his father. Antigonus fights to the death, expecting any moment to be saved by the arrival of his son. But Seleucus drives his elephants between the two in that battle, and Demetrius is not able to get to his father in time. And Antigonus is killed.

**[00:18:30.510] - Tess**

Is that history clear? There's no questions?

**[00:18:36.670] - Tess**

Okay. After this battle we have four years before Cassander dies. And that occurs in 297 BC. And this is AT Jones page two at the top of your sheet.

**[00:19:06.310] - Tess**

Cassander died in 298. Cassander died in 298 BC and was succeeded by his son Philip, who himself soon died. Leaving two brothers, Antipater and Alexander, to contend for the kingdom. Cassander dies. He leaves his eldest son in charge. That eldest son soon after dies. And there's two younger brothers now fighting it out. Antipater the elder, murdered his mother because she favored his brother for the Crown. Alexander called to his aide, Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, and Demetrius.

**[00:19:46.930] - Tess**

This was really his fundamental mistake. Antipater killing his mother, taking control of the kingdom. The younger brother fleeing, and he calls two kings to come to his aid, offering a reward if they will defeat his

brother and give him the throne of Macedonia. This is a fight over Macedonia, this territory here, which was the area that Cassander had.

### **[00:20:15.190] - Tess**

Pyrrhus gets there first. He defeats the elder brother, Antipater. And places Alexander on the throne. Into the next paragraph. And this is a separate source. It describes what Pyrrhus got for that as a reward for his services, a list of territory around Epirus. He was given some territory in here.

### **[00:20:51.030] - Tess**

Demetrius, though, saw an opportunity and he didn't want to lose the opportunity of intervening in the fairs of Macedonia. Even though Alexander has been placed on the throne, Demetrius comes up anyway, even though all this work is done, Pyrrhus has placed him on the throne, headed back to Epirus, and now Demetrius comes up, visits with Alexander, promptly kills him and takes the throne for himself. Demetrius gets a pretty rough account in history as an awful character. And some of it I find an exaggeration. Some of it I find pretty plausible. And this is one of the places where I find it plausible.

### **[00:21:40.930] - Tess**

He just killed Alexander, who was supposed to be an ally and took the throne of Macedonia. What occurred here really was a division of territory. Due to these Affairs, Pyrrhus gained some of Macedonia and Demetrius gained the kingship. What we're really focusing on in this history is the relationship between Pyrrhus and Demetrius. I'm not going to go into detail about what is happening with these other generals. We see in this history of dividing up of territory, although both kings desire the whole. And this affair over Macedonia really strained the alliance between Pyrrhus and Demetrius. By this stage, Pyrrhus' sister, who married Demetrius in 303, has died. This alliance is under heavy strain.

### **[00:22:56.020] - Tess**

I've included an extremely rough map of Italy and Greece here. Greece being this area down the bottom. Please don't judge me too harshly. I cannot draw. We have Italy over here. This is the location of Epirus, just below the heel of Italy. Up above Epirus and to the east is Macedonia. And down south you have Greece with Thebes, Athens, Sparta, these Greek nation states. What is happening in this history. Demetrius has conquered much of the territory down here, while also being king of Macedonia. Demetrius' Empire really clings around Epirus, again straining their relationship.

### **[00:23:58.690] - Tess**

In 291 BC, this strain breaks out into the open for the first time. And this is really Pyrrhus instigation. Demetrius is down here besieging Thebes. He's known as the besieger of cities. It was his title, Demetrius the besieger. And he built huge siege weapons. Battering ramp that required 400 men to haul against the walls. Huge structures that he would build and bring against cities. And it was primarily the way he liked to fight was besieging cities. And he's down here besieging Thebes. And Pyrrhus for reasons we don't really know, decides to create a diversionary campaign. And what he does is he invades this

area here. He comes out of Epirus with his army and invades. He's cutting off Demetrius, who is down stuck by Thebes from his kingdom of Macedonia. He's actually cutting through Demetrius Empire. And diverting him from Thebes. It doesn't appear that he actually ever wanted a battle. Because when Demetrius abandons the siege temporarily and marches up to face him, he he runs back to Epirus. It really didn't do Pyrrhus much good. This area he invaded is known as Thessaly.

### **[00:25:59.750] - Tess**

This, as you can understand, did not go over well with Demetrius. He was pretty furious at Pyrrhus, his former ally, for making trouble for him in this way. He goes back down, finishes the siege of Thebes. He's victorious. As he usually was. And then when that siege is over, he's up for a fight. And what he does is he marches his army up from Thebes all the way up through Epirus and pretty much just ravages Epirus. And this is in 289 - 288, when he's finished with the siege. Pyrrhus tries to come against him and he marches down through his country to face him. I don't know how this happened, but what happened was the armies missed each other. One took one road, one went down another road. And Pyrrhus just found himself down in the middle of nowhere, not even in his country as Demetrius is. Ravaging it. Pyrrhus is down here outside of his country with all of his army, while Demetrius is up here, ravaging Epirus. Pyrrhus does encounter a separate army. A general and his army that was fighting for Demetrius. There is an army that Demetrius had left here with one of his generals and Pyrrhus does fight him. And Pyrrhus takes him on one on one combat. They say, don't let our armies fight. Why don't you and I fight? Which was something Pyrrhus liked to do. He's an incredible warrior. The two of them went at it. Pyrrhus nearly killed him and the general was dragged away before Pyrrhus could finish the job. He does have a small victory here, but it doesn't save his country.

### **[00:28:22.110] - Tess**

After this invasion, Pyrrhus also then attempts to come across here and fight Demetrius. Demetrius was sick with some type of illness. It was life threatening, but it didn't last. He recovered fully. But while he was sick, Pyrrhus tried to continue this. A very sick Demetrius drags himself from his bed and again chases Pyrrhus back to Epirus. And they go into a peace treaty. And this lasts only till 287.

### **[00:29:23.290] - Tess**

It's a very short piece treaty. What Demetrius is doing during this time is creating an immense army, a huge military build up. By this stage he's created an Empire that is virtually as powerful as his father's ever was. And that's described in a couple of these quotes. Page two, it's the paragraph down the bottom with all the underlining.

### **[00:30:08.330] - Tess**

It says, *"Demetrius, characteristically already had his eyes elsewhere and was busy building up a large army and navy for a campaign in Asia Minor. Evidently in the hope of restoring the Antigonid Empire in the east."* His father's Empire. *"With this in mind, he had already assembled 98,000 infantry, 12,000 cavalry, and laid down the keels for 500 ships in Pareus Chalses Impala. This vast military and naval program is reflected in the increasingly large issues of coinage by various Macedonian and Greek mints*

*under Demetrius control throughout these years. These various coinages reveal very clearly the size of the military and naval effort Demetrius was making at this time. The threat which it must have presented to his enemies, and the burden of taxation which it will have laid on the inhabitants of his empires. News of what was afoot soon reached the other kings and spread general alarm. Recalling his father's ambitions. They were apprehensive at the menace which Demetrius in his turn represented. Now that he controlled Macedonia and at least part of Greece, sometime in 288. Therefore, Seleucus, Ptolemy and Lysimachus made an alliance against him and sent a joint embassy to Pyrrhus, urging him to ignore his agreement with Demetrius and to attack Macedonia."*

### **[00:31:41.440] - Tess**

This military build up is seen as a massive threat the three surviving generals, Lysimachus, Seleucus and Ptolemy. They send ambassadors to Pyrrhus, asking him to join them in this alliance against Demetrius. This alliance is organized in this history of 288. And in 287, they come against Demetrius. Pyrrhus joins the allies, and Demetrius is defeated. This is why we say that Lysimachus took over the kingdom of Cassander. He never defeated Cassander or any of Cassander's children. Who he defeated to take over that area of Cassander, was to defeat Demetrius. This is where Demetrius was stationed in Macedonia. And Pyrrhus came from the west, Lysimachus from the east. And coming from both sides they cornered Demetrius.

### **[00:33:16.130] - Tess**

Demetrius is defeated. Even though this alliance also included Seleucus and Ptolemy, neither of them showed up. They gave their support. But it was Lysimachus and Pyrrhus who came against Demetrius who fought. But they never actually fought. And that's what I find interesting about this account. Demetrius appears to be someone who was generally hated, even by his own people. He was homosexual. There was quite stories of abuse. And I think he tried to attack one young man who promptly killed himself to save himself from Demetrius. I can't remember which one of these Greek cities, but they deified that young man who fled Demetrius. He was generally hated. When Pyrrhus particularly marched against Demetrius from the west, and Lysimachus from the east. Demetrius army was so disillusioned with this king, they didn't really want, that they joined Pyrrhus and Lysimachus. His entire army deserted him. They never had to fight and Demetrius had to flee.

### **[00:34:45.370] - Tess**

Much of Demetrius territory landed without any battle into the hands of mostly Pyrrhus. Purely by the fact that all these cities decided to join. They just gave themselves to Pyrrhus. This means the end of Demetrius. He fled. And soon after, he was taken by Seleucus. He lived the rest of his life out under house arrest by Seleucus. And this area of Macedonia was divided into east and west between Lysimachus and Pyrrhus. You have an east and west division. And that was in 287.

### **[00:35:44.050] - Tess**

AT Jones, Great Empires of Bible Prophecy. The second last paragraph on your page says, "*In those seven years, Demetrius built up an army of 100,000 men and a fleet of 500 galleys. At this, Ptolemy,*



*Lysimachus and Seleucus became alarmed and set about to check his further progress. They secured the alliance of Pyrrhus, whose dominions bordered Macedonia on the west. And who, of course, could not consider himself safe in the presence of Demetrius in possession of such an army as that. Lysimachus invaded Macedonia from the east and Pyrrhus from the west. The troops of Demetrius all deserted him and joined Pyrrhus. Demetrius made his escape in disguise, and Lysimachus and Pyrrhus divided between them the Dominion of Macedonia, 287 BC."*

**[00:36:48.450] - Tess**

The next quote is by the legacy of Alexander A. B. Bosworth. I won't read it for time, but it gives just more of a description about this battle, or lack of a battle.

**[00:37:13.550] - Tess**

Instead of tension between Pyrrhus and Demetrius, now there is this tension between Pyrrhus and Lysimachus. Because particularly Lysimachus is not content with just the east. He's jealous of Pyrrhus and how much Pyrrhus has gained through taking the western half of Macedonia. Lysimachus desires all of it. What you have, beginning in 287 BC is this struggle between Pyrrhus and Lysimachus for total control of Macedonia. This is essentially a cold war.

**[00:37:59.210] - Tess**

The following quote on your last page says "*Lysimachus soon succeeded in sowing such distrust among the soldiers who had lately gone over from Demetrius to Pyrrhus that they now went over from Pyrrhus to Lysimachus. This so weakened Pyrrhus that rather than to contend against the power of Lysimachus, he, with his own epirotes and original allies, returned to his own country of Epirus. This left the whole of Macedonia to Lysimachus, who formally took possession of it and added it to his dominions. This is the process by which Lysimachus gains the territory originally ruled by Cassander."*

**[00:38:45.430] - Tess**

What Lysimachus did to defeat Pyrrhus in the west was he sent covert spies into the cities, and they pretty much just fomented unrest. As I said yesterday, Epirus was seen as that relative that they didn't really want. That they were embarrassed by. Because Greece had always ruled Epirus. Epirus had always come under their authority. And now you have a king of Epirus ruling over Macedonia in this territory. And these people, these spies he would send in would ridicule the people. What are you doing, letting a king of Epirus rule over you? Aren't you a little humiliated? Even though as general and leader, Pyrrhus has always been loved by his subjects, they rose up against him.

**[00:39:41.030] - Tess**

Another thing that he allegedly did was cut off Pyrrhus' supply lines. As Pyrrhus would send supplies to support his own army in this area, Lysimachus made that very difficult for him. I would describe that as sanctions and subterfuge. Pretty much the two elements that you find in a cold war. That process ends in

285. Pyrrhus has lost everything, all of his territory that he gained over this whole history, except Epirus itself. And he who was stationed in the west he goes back home. Lysimachus keeps all of it.

**[00:40:49.110] - Tess**

Let's see if there's something I've missed. Do we have any questions about this history?

**[00:41:11.830] - Tess**

Lysimachus tactics to gain the kingdom include covert operations. He undermined Pyrrhus and essentially economic sanctions and cutting off his supply lines. These attempts are successful. And Pyrrhus is forced to surrender and return to his own kingdom. Losing all that he had gained to the hand of Lysimachus. We can see that in 285 BC. Pyrrhus has lost all, but his original nation state of Epirus. And at that same time, Demetrius downfall is complete. This marks the end of Pyrrhus' time in Macedonia. Up till here, this is Pyrrhus in Macedonia, which was essentially a failure.

**[00:42:02.870] - Tess**

Now I want to move on to Pyrrhus time in Italy. It's in 285 BC. This same year, the war in Italy essentially begins. Or the beginning stages of that war. If it's okay, I'm going to need this half of the board. I will rub this map out. If you can try and keep this in your mind, because we're about to go into the history of Italy. Actually, I will just describe it quickly.

**[00:42:51.330] - Tess**

So back to the front page. We'll read these quotes again on your front page. Those first four quotes.

**[00:43:06.010] - Tess**

*"In 273 BC, Ptolemy II of Egypt established diplomatic relations and friendship with Rome. The reputation of the Romans beginning now to spread through foreign nations by the war they had maintained for six years against Pyrrhus, whom at length they compelled to retire from Italy and return ignominiously to Epirus. Ptolemy Philadelphus sent ambassadors to desire their friendship and the Romans were charmed to find it solicited by so great a king. The following year, the Romans sent to Egypt four ambassadors in return for this courtesy from Philadelphus. Rome's defeat of Pyrrhus was a clear declaration to the rest of the ancient Mediterranean world that the Romans had arrived on the world scene of warfare, and power politics. A recognition of this fact was no long time in coming."*

**[00:43:59.770] - Tess**

I'll leave those quotes there. What I want to look at now is how this war began. How did Pyrrhus become involved in the affairs of Italy? We briefly touched on it yesterday. We will review. We understand that by 285 BC Rome has essentially gained control of all of the northern half of Italy, pretty much down to the ankle of the boot. But scattered around this southern portion are Greek city states. And these are all Greek. And there's quite a lot of them. And Greece has always been seen to have authority over this

region. And the chief city state is Tarentum. Who had a sphere of influence over all the other city states. There's also this other city on the other side of the Gulf of Tarentum called Thurii. And it's Thurii that allied themselves with Rome.

### **[00:45:22.380] - Tess**

Going into a history prior, around 334 BC. The Romans had gone into a treaty with Tarentum. This treaty indicated that they wouldn't interfere with the politics of this region, and also very specifically, they would never sail ships into the Gulf of Tarentum. They would never sail their navy down into this sensitive region in the Gulf. And they would also not interfere with the affairs of southern Italy.

### **[00:46:00.010] - Tess**

This being an old treaty and also made with a king who was long since dead. Rome didn't see it as legally binding, but Tarentum sure did. *"For the Tarantines, there was good reason to fear the growing power of Rome and to claim that a treaty limiting Rome's authority was still valid in that region."* In 285 BC, the same date where Pyrrhus is driven back to Epirus. Thurii, which is the southwestern corner of the Gulf of Tarentum, *"was under attack by the Lucanian tribes. Thurii appealed to Rome for help rather than to its strong but rival neighbor Tarentum."* And this was the aristocratic leaders. As I said, there were these two divisions, and it was the aristocrats who preferred to go into alliance with Rome, as they saw that would have more financial benefit, than being generally the wealthy. Thurii, to protect them from these invading Lucanians, send ambassadors up to Rome and ask for some type of alliance of protection. And Rome loved to work that way. They agreed. We don't have much knowledge of the history at this point in time, but we know Thurii asked for it in 285, and in 283 Rome descended on Thurii, stationed a garrison, and drove off the Lucanians.

### **[00:47:42.670] - Tess**

There was also a political reason for this. Thurii also was not happy with the balance of power in the region. Tarentum was seen as a arrival. They didn't like the authority Tarentum would try and hold over these other city states. What they were hoping to change was the balance of power as well. There was also politics against Thurii and Tarentum. And that's why Thurii choose to ally themselves with Rome.

### **[00:48:31.970] - Tess**

The two rival factions I mentioned. Aristocrats and the Democrats. The Democrats wishing to stay aligned with Tarentum and Greece, the aristocrats to align with Rome. And those two factions existed in many of the city states. The aristocratic faction took power in Thurii, and in 285 appealed to Rome for protection. The history is scarce, but in 282 BC, Thurii makes another appeal to Rome for protection, and Rome response.

### **[00:49:13.230] - Tess**

Thurii's appeal to the Barbarian city on the Tiber, to Rome, is a clear indication that Rome had now emerged as acknowledged hegemonic power of the entire Peninsula. And that Roman fights could be

counted on to provide security against external attacks. Rome accepted Thurii's plea for assistance. And the consul Fabricius led an army against the Lucanians, and Brutians, defeated them in battle, and left a Garrison in Thurii. Fabricius military operations on land were apparently backed up by a small fleet of Roman warships. And these vessels sailed into the Gulf of Tarentum. So Rome broke their ancient treaty with Tarentum. And this was a strategic move.

#### **[00:50:00.360] - Tess**

This is where I start to doubt those ancient historians who paint Rome as a good guy, just trying to keep the region in peace. Help out a friend, not really looking for war. That's how a lot of the historians describe Rome. And I really don't buy it. This was strategic. By having Thurii under their control. First of all, they're right in the center of the south, but as Thurii is a city on the Gulf, it also gives them power within the Gulf of Tarentum. While they had a treaty with Tarentum that they would never enter. Tarentum, as you can imagine, is not pleased.

#### **[00:51:18.610] - Tess**

In 282, Tarentum response. What I want to mark here is a change. We're changing from the history of Macedonia to the history of Italy. I'll just mark it by another color. 285, Thurii appeals to Rome. Changes their alliance, and the balance of power in Italy. And in 282. I'm going to have to keep this really tight, if you don't mind. Hopefully it's still clear. 282, Tarentum responds.

#### **[00:52:17.250] - Tess**

To summarize, there's two spheres of influence in Italy. Thurii chooses Rome over Tarentum. It's really a case of pick your dictator. And some of these other city states are also increasingly looking to Rome for protection. Overlooking Tarentum. The very southern and strategically placed Thurii does this in 282. Which provokes Tarentum. 282, Tarentum attacks the fleet of ships stationed in the Gulf. It's a fleet of ten ships. They sink four, capture one, and the other five ships flee. They then invade Thurii, expel the Garrison and sack the city. You have Tarentum come against Thurii and expel that Garrison. It forces Thurii back under its own sphere of influence.

#### **[00:53:07.430] - Tess**

Thurii significantly weakened. Pretty much sunk into the condition of a dependent ally of Rome. And was after this state protected by Roman Garrison. No record of it is found in future battles. 282, Tarentum attacks.

#### **[00:53:44.530] - Tess**

What happened after this? You could go into detail about the back and forth. Ambassadors were sent from Rome to Tarentum to say, Why did you do this? The historians who I don't put a lot of faith in said Tarentum insulted them and instigated this war. But really the net result is that Rome declared war on Tarentum.

**[00:54:14.690] - Tess**

And this is AT Jones, Great Empires of Bible Prophecy 218.1. Talking of Pyrrhus. *"Shortly after he had returned thus to his own country in 281 BC, there came to him ambassadors from Tarentum and from all the Greeks in Italy, bearing to him the invitation to become their general and lead them in war against the Romans. They promised that the Tarantines, the Lucadians, the Sabnites and the Messapians would bring into the field 370,000 troops."* Toronto isn't strong enough to take Rome on directly. They sailed ambassadors over to Epirus.

**[00:54:54.360] - Tess**

And this was something that those city states had done before. What they tended to do was to look to their more powerful Greek neighbors for assistance in fighting their battles. And they asked Pyrrhus to take on this war on their behalf. They also promised him that these other city states and tribes would join him in fighting Rome.

**[00:55:18.110] - Tess**

And in 280 BC, Pyrrhus arrives in Tarentum. He immediately prepares the city for war. He begins his military preparation. He was hoping to have time to gather all those tribes that had promised assistance to fortify the city, to train the men of the city to fight with his army. But all of that is cut short. Rome is already marching on Tarentum, and there is no time for preparation.

**[00:56:05.370] - Tess**

He sends out ambassadors, sends them up to the Roman army. He tries to act as a mediator. Why do we need to fight? Maybe I can mediate. Tarentum and you can sort this out without fighting. And Rome rejects all efforts. They just want to fight this war. Really, what Rome has to gain from fighting this war is all of Italy. And that's one of the reasons, I believe, they were never trying to avoid it in the first place. What follows is three battles.

**[00:56:47.230] - Tess**

This first battle is fought by a very unprepared Pyrrhus. Soon after he arrives on the shores. And it's known as the Battle of Heraclea, due to its location. According to AT Jones, *"before the promised troops of Pyrrhus's allies had come to him, he learnt that a powerful army of the Romans was marching against him. Pyrrhus sent a heralds to ask the Romans whether they would accept him as arbiter between them and the Greeks in Italy. They replied, The Romans neither take Pyrrhus as an arbiter nor fear him as an enemy. A battle was fought in 280 BC near Heraclea in Italy, in which the Romans were defeated with a loss of 15,000 men. Pyrrhus himself losing 13,000."*

**[00:57:47.590] - Tess**

This first Battle of Heraclea is won by Pyrrhus. You might have heard the phrase a Pyrrhic war. Or a Pyrrhic battle. It's become one of those phrases that you use in different situations. To describe a battle or a war where the party that wins wins at such great loss that it's not really a victory.

#### **[00:58:29.840] - Tess**

For example, you won a court case, but really you had to pay a lot of money. It didn't give you much benefit. You could say it was a Pyrrhic victory. You might have won something, but at such a great loss to yourself that it was virtually not worth fighting in the first place. And that's where this phrase comes from. From the Pyrrhic War, where Pyrrhus wins these battles, but at such great loss to himself. He says, after the second battle, if I have one more victory like this, I'm ruined. I'm paraphrasing.

#### **[00:59:03.270] - Tess**

So first Battle of Heraclea in 280 BC, and this is in the autumn. Pyrrhus tries to, after this battle to March on Rome, thinking that after such a victory, it might be a good opportunity. He comes into a distance of 300 furlongs of the city of Rome. But due to the time of year coming into winter, he retires his troops and they wait out the winter without another battle. That's the Battle of Heraclea.

#### **[01:00:01.490] - Tess**

How did Pyrrhus win this battle? In a previous war, he had been able to barter for some elephants. And he sailed to Tarentum with 20 elephants. Rome had never seen elephants before, for then this was a completely new mode of warfare. And when Pyrrhus turned up at the field of battle with 20 war elephants, the Roman soldiers, for all their training, were terrified. And that is what won Pyrrhus the Battle of Heraclea. Elephant. For Rome, a completely new mode of warfare.

#### **[01:00:44.630] - Tess**

Before this battle, all of those meant to be allies of those Greek city states are holding off a little just to see what would happen. Not wanting to get involved in a war that might lose to Rome. After Pyrrhus wins his first battle, they all join him, all those neutral parties. It's interesting, this battle, while we talk about Panium, this battle is fought between Heraclea and Pandosia. I just find that interesting. You could also call it the Battle of Pandosia.

#### **[01:01:25.770] - Tess**

The next battle, is a Battle of Asculum, in 279 BC. And for this battle, Pyrrhus is prepared. Both armies are now fully ready. AT Jones says, *"in 279, a second battle was fought near Asculum in which Pyrrhus was again victorious. But with such great loss that when one of his officers congratulated him on the victory, Pyrrhus, with grim humor replied, if we gain such another, we are inevitably ruined. In 279 BC, Pyrrhus fought the second major battle at the War of Asculum. This was one of a much greater scale than that of Heraclea, and it was fought for two days in the Hills of Apulia. The Roman general Publius Mus managed to use the terrain to reduce the effectiveness of the Greek cavalry and elephants. Thus, the first day ended with a stalemate. The second day, Pyrrhus made another attack with war elephants supported*

by infantry, which finally overwhelmed Mus's position. The Romans lost about 6000 men, while Pyrrhus' army suffered 3,500 thousand casualties." I want to note that this battle is on a much larger scale, and it's over two days.

### **[01:02:55.540] - Tess**

During this winter period, Rome afraid of these elephants, trying to counteract them. They build these anti-elephant carts. And they built 300 anti-elephant, carts. And they're essentially just carts on wheels with spikes, flame throwers, anything that they thought could either kill or make an elephant afraid. And these carts fail. They're just broken up. And again, it's the elephants that win the Battle of Asculum.

### **[01:03:58.470] - Tess**

This account is Pyrrhus by Jacob Abbott. He said, *"the Romans stood most in awe of the elephants and they resorted to some peculiar and extraordinary means of resisting them. They prepared a great number of chariots. Each of which was armed with a long pointed spear projecting forward in such a manner that when the chariots should be driven on towards the elephants, these spears or beaks should pierce the bodies of the beasts and destroy them. The chariots, too, were filled with men who were all provided with fire brands, which they were to throw at the elephants and frighten them as they came on. These chariots were all carefully posted in front of that part of Pyrrhus's army where the elephants were stationed. And the charioteers were strictly ordered not to move until they should see the elephants advancing."*

### **[01:04:51.450] - Tess**

They're much more prepared for this Battle of Asculum, than they are for the Battle of Heraclea. Both parties. But again, they fail. What happens after the Battle of Asculum is a very tentative armistice. Between Pyrrhus and Rome. One of the reasons Pyrrhus wanted this armistice is Rome is just rebuilding their army so quickly with so many people to call on. Whereas Pyrrhus far from his country, Epirus, he can't rebuild and recover so quickly. And he knows that he's been weakened, even in his own victories. He goes into this armistice with Rome. The other reason being is that just below that toe of Italy, you have the island of Sicily. Sicily, which is down here, they are pretty much ruled by the Carthaginians. Carthage has taken over this area of Sicily, and the Carthaginians are acting as tyrants. What the people of Sicily do is they send ambassadors up to Epirus and they say, come and fight for us and clear our island of Carthage.

### **[01:06:52.630] - Tess**

*"Pyrrhus was determined on carrying into effect his design of a descent upon the coast of Africa."* What Pyrrhus wanted really to rebuild the Empire of Alexander the Great. The vision that he could see was that in taking Sicily, defeating Carthage, he then has a perfect strategic location to build a strong navy. Once he has a strong navy in Sicily, he can go down and defeat Carthage. Once he has Carthage, he can rebuild, come up underneath Greece and take Greece.

### **[01:07:24.320] - Tess**

Once he has Greece, he can go over take Macedonia. Once he has all of that area, he can just come back and defeat Rome. He's got big plans. It's not just taking Sicily, it's a strategic plan by which he's going to come full circle. And he wants everything. That was very much his nature.

**[01:07:47.980] - Tess**

He goes into this tentative armistice with Rome. To free him up to sail down to Sicily. And in Sicily he shows himself as a tyrant. Sicily, expects this king to come and free them from Carthage, but they get something much worse than Carthage. Pyrrhus shows his bad side of nature down in Sicily. In trying to build this navy and this huge army, he pretty much turns himself into a dictator. I'll read some of this description from the Roman Antiquities by Dionysus.

**[01:08:45.080] - Tess**

He says, "Pyrrhus down here, he took away the estates of many of the powerful people. Distributing them to his own friends and allies. He assigned the chief Magistrates in the cities to be his own shield bearers and captains. He pretty much disregarded all local laws and customs. He was settling lawsuits and controversies and all kinds of civil matters. He took over the control of the entire island. And this is not what they had asked for.

**[01:09:17.310] - Tess**

He began taxing them to build this navy that he would need to take on Carthage. Many people were becoming hostile to his presence in Sicily. He introduced garrisons into the cities, taking as an excuse for war threatening from the Carthaginians. He arrested the most prominent men in the city and put them to death. Alleging plots and treasonable acts.

**[01:09:46.750] - Tess**

What he did in this history and what he considered to be his undoing for the rest of his life in that running short of funds, he took the sacred treasures of Persephone. What he did is he went into a pagan temple and desecrated it. In this time period, he shows himself as a dictator, and he desecrated a temple. This temple was supposed to hold vast amounts of wealth. And finding himself lacking funds to build this navy for this enterprise, he went in and took everything from the temple. He set it on ships and attempted to sail it back to Tarentum.

**[01:10:50.630] - Tess**

The Roman Antiquities continues to state that, *"the ships, upon putting out from the harbor in Sicily, found a land breeze and made progress. But an adverse wind sprang up and holding through the entire night, sank some of them, drove others into the Sicilian Strait. And in the case of those in which the offerings and the gold yielded by the offerings was being transported, drove them ashore on the beaches of Locrese. The men on board the ships were submerged and perished in the backwash of the waves. And the sacred monies, when the ships broke up, were cast ashore on the sand banks nearest Delocrey. The king restored all the ornaments and treasures to the goddess, hoping thereby to appease her wrath."* You



find this story in quite a few different accounts, in different details. They don't necessarily agree, but they agree on the core subject. That he desecrated a temple, that he tried to send that to Tarentum, that those ships were wrecked, and that Pyrrhus for the rest of his life, believed that by angering this goddess was the reason for all of his future ruin.

### **[01:12:09.380] - Tess**

I'm going to read the period of this history by AT Jones, *"Pyrrhus accepted the offer of the Sicilians and at once embarked his army and sailed to Sicily. These Sicilians delivered to him the promised cities as soon as he landed. And he soon so gained the hearts of the people and made himself so powerful that the Carthaginians asked for peace upon the condition that they might be allowed to retain only one city of Lilybaeum. Pyrrhus felt himself so secure that he not only refused to grant this request for peace, but even proposed to make an expedition against Carthage. He had a sufficient fleet to do this, but not enough sailors. To secure the necessary sailors, he levied a draft of men on all the cities of Sicily and punished the cities that would not furnish their quota. This caused great dissatisfaction to the people of Sicily. And as Pyrrhus pushed his exactions, he finally drove the Sicilians into a League with the Carthaginians and the Mamertines against him."* What the Sicilians do is they decide that Carthage was a better master than Pyrrhus, and they go back to Carthage and say, Will you come back and drive off Pyrrhus?

### **[01:13:26.490] - Tess**

*"Just at this juncture, the Tarantines and the Sabnites sent word to Pyrrhus that they were shut up in their cities and were surely lost unless he came to the rescue. He started immediately."* Rome has broken this armistice and they're marching on Tarentum. They have come also against the Tarantines and the Sabnates, who send word of this to Pyrrhus. He heads back to Italy to again confront Rome. And the third battle is fought in 275 BC. This is the Battle of Beneventum, the third and final battle. Also in this time period, Rome was going into an alliance with Carthage against Pyrrhus as well. The Battle of Beneventum was fought in 275 BC. Coming to Tarentum, bringing 20,000 foot and 3000 horse. He took on the best troops of the Tarantines and led them against the Romans.

### **[01:14:47.190] - Tess**

He found a lot less support for himself in southern Italy at this time. Many of those city states resenting him, leaving and sailing to Sicily. Not as many allies were willing to come to his aid at this third battle than they had been for the second. He is significantly weakened by the abandonment of many of his former allies. What happens? Do you find a couple of different accounts of this battle? What we do know is Pyrrhus is defeated by Rome.

### **[01:15:28.270] - Tess**

How is he defeated? I'll give you one account, and that is that there was a young elephant among Pyrrhus, elephants. And that younger elephant was badly injured. Its cries reached the ears of its mother, and its mother, in her desperation, turned around from heading into the Roman army and led all the

elephants back in a charge over Pyrrhus himself. This is what the historians do agree on. Pyrrhus was defeated by his own elephants.

### **[01:16:11.690] - Tess**

Again, elephants decide this battle, even though Pyrrhus is defeated. The other accounts of this battle just say that the elephants turned and charged Pyrrhus. I don't find other accounts of that particular story of why they did that, but I do agree that the elephants turned. Pyrrhus, flees back to Tarentum, gets in a ship and sails back to Epirus. He's given up that war. 275 BC, that Battle of Beneventum is what launches Rome onto the world stage. This defeat of Pyrrhus. Pyrrhus is very well known general across Egypt. He actually was raised partly in the court of Ptolemy. He married Ptolemy's Stepdaughter. He was closely known among those generals, and they knew him to be a fantastic general. The way that Rome fought this war really gained the attention of the rest of the world. Macedonia, Greece, of all of their generals. In 275 BC, the Pyrrhic war ends when Pyrrhus flees Tarentum.

### **[01:17:37.490] - Tess**

I just want to know if some interesting characteristics of the name Beneventum. It was originally and over the period where this battle was fought, in 275, it was not know as Beneventum. Rome later changed the name. In 275 it was known as Maleventum. Maleventum means bad event or bad omen. And then after winning a couple of battles at Maleventum, Rome finding the name superstitious, changed it to Beneventum, which means good event.

### **[01:18:38.190] - Tess**

It sits at a fork of the Apian Ray, where two Rivers, the Sabato and the Color, come together. And Benevento is known as the city of witches, or the Italian Salem. It's to consider the place where witches from all over the world would gather to celebrate their Sabbath under a centuries old Walnut tree. And it began long before the Emperor Dimitian established the temple of Isis. Here, Isis, the God that controls serpents.

### **[01:19:06.300] - Tess**

This, combined with tree worship brought by the Lombards, merged itself into a cult that worshipped the serpent in the tree, also combining the worship of the goat God. All the witches of the world were said to gather at Benevento to worship this tree serpent in a gathering that they would refer to as the trigenda. A word believed to have derived as a plural form of tresanto, meaning the 300. It's pretty much the Italian Salem. And the witches would gather there in the trigenda, meaning the 300. "*And they would chant the call, Carry me to the Walnut tree of Benevento, above the water and above the wind and above all other bad weather.*"

### **[01:19:52.290] - Tess**

It is said that among their rights, the witches had the custom to meet in the nights between Saturday and Sunday around a big Walnut tree to give birth to their demoniac Sabbath.

**[01:20:06.790] - Tess**

Benevento featured many of the famous witch trials of the Dark Ages. And when that persecution ceased, some of Europe's most famous witches pretty much descended and chose to live in Beneventum.

**[01:20:26.810] - Tess**

They were known as locally. In Benevento, they were known as the Janara, possibly from Dianara, a priestess of Diana. That's the context of the city of Benevento. What I find particularly is that meeting that would take place on a Saturday night to welcome in their false Sabbath. The reason I particularly find that interesting is if we're going to make this, as we said before, 275 - 273 - 272. Benevento lines up with Panium.

**[01:20:59.870] - Tess**

And we already know that the studies that have been done on Panium and the word pan. 273, Egypt sends ambassadors to Rome, which is pretty much the quotes you find on the front of that page. 272 BC, running out of room. But in 272 BC, Rome sends ambassadors back to Egypt. And that was headed, as we said, by Fabius Maximus. Meaning maximum, Gurges, meaning flood. Maximum flood.

**[01:21:40.770] - Tess**

Pyrrhus while defeated in 275 BC. Torenum held out against Rome all the way until 272. In 272 BC, Torenum surrenders to Rome. Even though Rome has control over the whole of Italy, the city of Torenum itself was still under siege from 275 to 272. Torenum falls in 272.

**[01:22:13.810] - Tess**

The other thing that happens in 2072 is Pyrrhus, who has fled back to Epirus. He's engaging in a different war in Greece. And in 272, he's killed. Pyrrhus was fighting a battle in the streets of Argos. He'd been fighting, I believe it was Sparta. And in that battle, his first born son had died. Pyrrhus didn't handle that so well. When he rushes into battle the next time, he's not thinking clearly, he doesn't make very good decisions. And he finds himself fighting against Argos. And what was meant to be an invasion of the city, he ends up inside the city walls, fighting street to street, hand to hand combat. And in fighting a soldier, it was a tight street battle with a Spartan soldier. And this soldier's mother was watching the battle from a window and she throws a tile down, connects with Pyrrhus, knocks him off his horse, and the Spartan soldier cuts off his head. I find that account interesting, the way he's defeated by a woman, essentially. But Pyrrhus is killed in 272, Rome sends ambassadors to Egypt and Torenum falls. The other thing I want to note is Pyrrhus is 46 years old. That's in the streets of Argos, the name Argos. Argos means glistening bright or white. It's described as the reason they named it white is the visual impression given by the Argolic plain.

**[01:24:26.060] - Tess**

The plains of Argos is where they grew all of their wheat. And they say that it was named Argos, meaning white, because of the visual impression given by the Argolic plain during harvest time. You can also connect Argos to harvest time. And they say the history of Rome by Theodore Mumpson, "*for the first time, Italy was now United into one state under the sovereignty of the Roman community.*"

### **[01:25:00.910] - Tess**

We've begun the life of Pyrrhus or his interaction in world affairs with this fourth Diadochi War, this alliance with Demetrius, which he really exhibits at the Battle of Ipsus. Fighting alongside Demetrius against the allied forces. We see the division of Macedonia after this battle between Demetrius and Pyrrhus. Then we see, first of all a strain on their relationship in 291, which descends really into war in 289 / 288, when Demetrius comes against Epirus. You see a peace treaty. And then as Demetrius conducts this huge military build up, Pyrrhus joins the allies from back here. Who he originally began by fighting with. Lysimachus comes from the East, Pyrrhus comes from the west. And Demetrius is defeated. His empire is divided into east and west. This begins the Cold war, which lasts from 287 to 285. Lysimachus defeats Pyrrhus in this cold war with sanctions and subterfuge. At the same time 285, we also begin to change scene. From the history of Macedonia to the history of Italy. 285, Thurii appeals to Rome. It changes the balance of power in those southern states. 282, Rome responds and they attack Thurii and expel the Garrison.

### **[01:26:42.630] - Tess**

And this begins a war with Rome. They asked Pyrrhus to fight on their behalf. He arrives in southern Italy in 280. And very soon after, before he's really ready, he fights a battle at Heraclea against Rome. He wins, but at a great loss. This battle is won by elephants. Both of them prepare properly for war. 279 is the second battle. Rome has built 300 anti-elephant carts and this battle takes place over two days. Pyrrhus wins again and again. It was because of his elephants. He sails down to Sicily. After creating a tentative armistice with Rome. He turns into a dictator. He desecrates a temple which ends badly for him.

### **[01:27:35.370] - Tess**

Then he's called back to Rome in 275 as they're breaking this peace treaty they had gone into. He meets Rome at Beneventum, and he is defeated when his own elephants turn on him. This ends the Pyrrhic War. At the same time the war has ended. Pyrrhus is not dead. Tarentum has not fallen. Even though everyone knows that Rome has won that war. Egypt recognizes Rome in 273 by sending ambassadors. Rome responds in 272 by sending ambassadors back to Egypt at that same time Tarentum fall, they surrender. And Pyrrhus dies in the streets of Argos. What we've covered essentially is the life of Pyrrhus.

### **[01:28:26.030] - Tess**

Do we have any questions? We're over time. If we don't have any questions. Tomorrow, we'll just quickly review this history and then move on from Pyrrhus.

### **[01:28:43.890] - Tess**

Please kneal with me. Dear Father in heaven, thank you, Lord, for our blessings. Thank you for this new day, and the ability to come together and to study. Lord, we know that your voice is as many waters. And as someone said recently, those waters are histories and nations and kingdoms. You wish to teach us through these histories. I pray, Lord, that you'll guide us in our studies, direct us to what we need to know for this time. That we might be prepared both mentally in heart and mind. And also that we can do our duty. What you have raised up this movement to do in both the churches and the world around us. I pray you'll be with each head bowed as they go through the day. You know the individual battles, the individual studies and work being undertaken by each person here. And I pray that you will bless that and guide. I pray this in Jesus name, Amen.