

Dr. Yasmin El Shazly

Let's move to Neferneferuaten, who is believed to have succeeded Akhenaten. Who may have been preceded by Semenkhekare, what do we know about this female ruler?

Dr. Jacquelyn Williamson

Almost nothing, almost nothing at all. I mean, that's the problem. And that's another great example of where we rush in to make a story with because we have almost no evidence at all. So, who we don't even know who exactly Neferneferuaten was, during the last couple of years of Akhenaten's life, we have this individual called Semenkhekare, who appears very, very suddenly and then disappears just as suddenly. And we don't really know who this individual was, there's a lot of discussion was he Akhenaten's brother was he, you know, a person who is married to Akhenaten's kid Meritaten. And so therefore was raised to sort of a co-regency towards the end of Akhenaten's reign. But we do know that Semenkhekare dies before Akhenaten dies himself. And so Semenkhekare is literally just a splash in history that then immediately disappears. Then this individual called King Neferneferuaten, appears equally just as suddenly. And so a lot of people said, Oh, well, maybe, maybe that's the throne name of Semenkhekare. Or maybe that was an addition because we all know that kings had multiple different regnal names. But the thing that's quite interesting is that Marc Gabolde especially really demonstrated that a lot of the inscriptions of Neferneferuaten pretty much prove that King Neferneferuaten was indeed female. And so therefore, since we're there's no question that Semenkhekare was male that takes Semenkhekare out of the running that so it seems like Neferneferuaten was an individual. But then who is it? Right? And so people are said, Well, is it, maybe Meritaten right, Akhenaten's daughter, maybe she took that name and succeeded her father to the throne as a female ruler. However, there's a more simple explanation. Nefertiti herself around when she comes to the throne around you know, when she marries Akhenaten and comes to throne around year five calls herself Neferneferuaten Nefertiti. So that name already exists, and it's attached to somebody already. And so it would make a degree of sense, if King Neferneferuaten is indeed King Neferneferuaten Nefertiti, because that name

was already attached to Nefertiti anyway. Um, we have no definitive proof at all. The thing that's been one of the so one of the reasons that we have been hesitant about saying whether or not that's Nefertiti is that previously, around year twelve, we thought that Nefertiti disappeared. She stopped appearing in all the records, whereas what happened to Nefertiti. And so of course, again, we rushed to fill this gap saying, oh, maybe she angered Akhenaten and he discarded her or maybe she died or whatever but because of the amazing work of Athena Vander Perre, she found a wonderful inscription and a quarry about, gosh, almost 10 years ago, I guess now wow, how fast time flies. That proves that Nefertiti was still alive and calling herself Queen Nefertiti in Akhenaten's year 16. So, she was still alive, and still calling herself Queen, which means that she wasn't in a co-regency she hadn't yet identified as King. All of this, indicating that if there is indeed a King Neferneferuaten that King Neferneferuaten if it was Nefertiti came to the throne after Akhenaten's death, and identified herself as King later on, right so, but then again, she also only rules for about three seconds, because she disappears as soon as they relocate to Thebes; we actually do have an inscription from TT 139, of Pairi, who a brief inscription of King Neferneferuaten there. So, it's clear that she relocated to Thebes along with, or Luxor along with the rest of the Royal Court. But then she disappears. So, you know what, what happens? We have no idea but so we have this brief, Amarna King, just this flash in the pan and possibly Nefertiti. But again, we just we just don't know, we can't say too much more about that we and we really, we really can't say it's it, there's so many maybes around it, that there's no way to pin that identity, you know, like, whereas with Tutankhamun on the other hand, there is enough evidence that pretty much that I would feel confident about labeling him as Akhenaten's son, because there is enough kind of conclusive evidence that indicates that but there's so much conflicting evidence about the identity of King Neferneferuaten that I feel reluctant to attach it definitively to Nefertiti but due to Athena Van Der Perre's amazing discovery, it makes it far more likely.

EI Shazly

Okay, I'm glad you mentioned Tutankhamun because that leads us to our next question. What evidence do we have for the reuse of some of Neferneferuaten's burial goods by Tutankhamun? And why do you believe these objects were you reused?

Williamson

Yeah. Well, that's it's a great question. So, I think that there are a number of different objects from Tutankhamun's tomb that are clearly Amarna, right. So, there's that his throne, of course, the famous throne that actually has the Aten and you know, all day anyway. So, it's, it's very clear that this is an Amarna period King. And it's obviously been altered. You know, so the names have been altered, some of the members of the throne have been altered all of this. And so, it's clear that a lot of these have been specially modified to go into Tutankhamun's tomb, which makes a lot of sense, since he died sort of unexpectedly and quite young. And in order to be able to adequately equip a tomb like that, you would want to be able to, you know, again, you need kind of a lot of stuff very, very quickly. And the idea, as we see, with Tutankhamun, abandoning his birth name of Tutankhaten, then there may have been a press to say, wait a minute, we've got all of these Amarna period Atenist burial materials, let's just finagle them and reuse them. And because that way, it's sort of nobody, I don't think anybody wanted them for one thing, you know, and so he's kind of reusing and reuse and recycle, right? Using and recycling these objects in order to sort of fill out his burial material. So, it's an interesting, it is a really interesting question.

El Shazly

Okay, Mariam, I want to ask you a few questions now about the gods wives of Amun. The position of Gods wife of Amun was another very powerful position held by some women in ancient Egypt. Can you please talk to us about this position and why it was so powerful?

Dr. Mariam Ayad

Well, gladly, thank you. Well, I think, let me start at the very beginning, again, back to the early 18th. dynasty. The title first appears in its complete form, at the very first earliest reign of the 18th dynasty when Ahmose, the person responsible for reifying, Egypt for explaining the Hyksos, gives it to his wife, Chief royal wife, Ahmose-Nefertari. And with the title, he also announced the office with a vast estate, enormous estate at the end of the decree for establishing that estate, he says very clearly, that no future king shall be able ever to take away the property of the gods wives. So, it's a special endowment, independent of the royal household that is established for his chief royal wife. Now people can speculate why he did that, whether it's a religious move, to show his devotion to god Amun, whether it's a political move as part of a larger policy, through which he placed key family members and key positions. So now the chief royal wife is well embedded in the Amun hierarchy. At the same time, he invents a position called the King's Son of Kush, King son, by the way is just a way of saying Prince so the prince of Kush, is actually given to his son and he's placed in charge of Nubia similar to like the Prince of Wales. In later parts of the of the new kingdom, that position seems to be held by an actual Prince, or, you know, we don't know but other officials may have held it. And the same goes for the God's wife of Amun It started as a royal household position. We discussed how Hatshepsut may have used it as possibly a springboard from which to gain power. But again, I hesitate to say that because as the assumption is very important, she's assuming something she should not have assumed. But what we do know is that Hatshepsut as King, with the epithet Xnmt Imn, the one who's united with Amun she acquires when she becomes King. And when that epithet is enclosed in her royal cartouche, we have several examples where that royal cartouche is preceded by the title God's wife. A good example is a kohl jar from the Metropolitan Museum. So even after becoming the chief for royal wife, or in other words, the Queen after becoming a regent after becoming a nsw-bity, or king of Upper Egypt, she would still use the title of God's wife of Amun, and that's very intriguing, and deserves more study. My own work in fast forward about four or five hundred years, and a time another intermediate period of time when Egypt was politically fragmented, and that office is resurrected and dusted off. And instead of a chief royal wife holding it now it's being given to a daughter of the king. Now, Hatshepsut was a

daughter of the king too, but I think it's not quite clear when she became God's wife, but the assumption is, she became a God's wife after as part of her being a chief royal wife, as was the custom in the early 18th dynasty. So, in the Third Intermediate Period, Osorkon III, who was a ruler of the 23rd dynasty gives it to his daughter, Shepenwepet, they are Libyan, we assumed that they had a residence somewhere in the Delta, possibly Tanis and he sends this daughter to Thebes. Now, in the 90s, there was this idea that the 23rd dynasty is actually a Theban dynasty and that theory was based on one monument only, and it's the chapel of Osiris Heka-Djet at Karnak. And it's that chapel that actually shows the most number of iconographic scenes of Shepenwepet I, leading the person who excavated the chapel, Redford, to write in 1973 that the chapel itself was constructed as a monument to celebrate Shepenwepet being placed into the office of God's Wife. In that chapel Osorkon appears with his co-regent, Takelot, who had been the high priest of Amun but had just been elevated to become co-ruler with his father. So, the two kings are presented each eight to twelve times in that chapel and Shepenwepet is represented fifteen different times. So, if anything, the one monument for the so-called Theban 23rd Dynasty is a monument for the gods wife celebrating commemorating her investiture into that office. And what we see here is the investiture scenes that we discussed earlier in conjunction with Hatshepsut, so she's being suckled by a goddess and the milk of a goddess, according to Pyramid Texts and other inscriptions seem to have imbued the king with His Divine aspects. So, she's presented three times being suckled with a goddess including twice on the side of that Libyan chapel. And then she's been crowned by Amun twice on the facade as well. But of course, again, when people describe those scenes, Amun is not crowning her, he's adjusting her headgear. Yes, that's another way of saying crown, right? No, not even tiara, but they're actually very elaborate crowns that she wears. In one scene when she's being suckled in that first room by a goddess who's probably Hathor, but the headgear is lost, we're not sure of the identity of the goddess. She's wearing actually two double crowns the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, but they're in miniature and they're placed such that they're flipped to face one another. She has such elaborate headgear, that it's a problem for the iconographers working there to actually make sure that they are facing the correct lines. But all of these

scenes are scenes of legitimation or investiture with power that is, that seems on the surface of it to be equal to the kings. These specific scenes are associated with coronation, but some of them are also associated with the sed festival. Through my work on the gods wives of Amun I have come to view the sed festival not as a Jubilee celebration, as is commonly said, not as a 30 year celebration, to use the Greek term which is erroneous, but rather as an investiture celebration through which the king became a priest. And that idea was proposed in 66-68, by Bleaker, but again, it didn't gain traction in Egyptological circles and people have gone back to this idea of the Sed festival as just a royal festival, but I think it's mainly investing the king with his priestly powers.

Now, Shepenwepet was still alive when the Nubians invaded Egypt. The Nubians, for some reason immediately recognized the value of these scenes. So instead of erasing these scenes and placing the name of their own appointee to office in her stead, they didn't do that and instead when they constructed an additional room in that Chapel of Osiris Heka-Djet, ruler of eternity, they incorporated new scenes that depict Shepenwepet I as alive, so as a living God's Wife while she's presenting Amun with maat, she is receiving the menat necklace from Isis. And immediately underneath in the lower register of that eastern wall of the birth room, Aminirdis I, the Nubian God's wife, receives lives or receives three keys of life in her hand and life to her nose, from Amun and behind him his consort Mut standing and presents her with the Sed festival symbols, followed by the word for numerous, aSA. So, it's as if one God's Wife sows and the other reaps, one gives and the other takes, because usually in the presentation of maat, it's a tit for tat between the king and the gods. So, the king is presenting maat and, in the same scene, he is receiving life with these two God's wives, the sequence the ritual sequences, divided one gives and the other receives. So, I think that the Nubians intentionally kept Shepenwepet there because they understood the value of the scenes showing her investiture and instead built on her legitimacy to legitimate their own appointee to office as God's Wife. And from that point on, the office really takes off, and the second woman to become a God's Wife also Shepenwepet. So she is the namesake of the Nubian woman, assumes as so many different iconographic scenes that are formerly associated with the king, including actually celebrating the sed festival in a monument that

was dismantled in antiquity, and whose blocks were used as filler in a ramp leading into the temple of Montu. But these blocks were recovered during the French excavations of the early 50s and published and again, you know, a lot of the information is out there, but people are not looking at what's and everything that's out there. So, the God's wives were great. I think in terms of religious power vis-à-vis the gods, they seem to be equal to the king in the chapel of Amenirdis at Medinet Habu, again, we see Shepenwepet II performing various funerary rites for her deceased predecessor, including the driving of the four calves, including the consecration of the marriage chests, which at that point were royal prerogatives, they occur maybe a one or two coffins in the 21st dynasty belonging to priests, at a time when the priests and the Kings shared a lot of things, including the throne at times. But again, in that instance, with a driving four calves, when Hatshepsut performs it at Deir el-Bahari, she's represented in a male royal kilt as if she is a masculine King. Whereas with the god's wife is performing it she's feminine, curvaceous wearing a long dress, wearing the vulture headdress. So there's no denying of femininity in this case, probably because there's no need to deny it. She's not a Horus, she is just a very high-status priestess, as high in her status, in her priestly status, as a king. And under the Nubians that kind of makes sense a little bit because I think of the Nubians as being very much into power sharing. So, you have a brother of the king leading the armies who eventually becomes King, like Taharqa. And then you have the god's wife taking care of the temple ritual. And you have to wonder, so what does the king do under the Nubians because they were really very much into delegation. At least that's how I understand the time.

El Shazly

Fascinating. And now we're going to move on to a very exciting figure. Cleopatra. So, Jackie, do you consider Cleopatra to have been Greek or Egyptian and why?

Williamson

Oh, it's a can of worms, isn't it right? So um, Cleopatra, of course, is the last ruler of Egypt and she's Cleopatra, the seventh. You know, one of a long line. And she's a member of the Ptolemaic dynasty. So, Alexander the Great, of course, from Hellenistic Greece conquered pretty much the majority of the kind of part of the Mediterranean in the known world up to sort of Pakistan, India and etc. And when he died, he divided his gigantic Empire amongst his generals and his general Ptolemy is the one who got Egypt, thus creating a Greek foundation for an Egyptian ruler. Now the thing is, of course, is we were just talking about in order to be a legitimate ruler of Egypt, you have to be Horus. And so, they would not really have accepted a ruler who claimed power over them unless he ruled according to Egyptian religious and social norms. And so, he became a crowned and invested as Mariam points out King, divine king of Egypt, just thus creating this really interesting hybrid of Egyptian culture with Greek ideas and concepts as well. And so, it's this very interesting synthesis of cultures. Um, so, I mean, I guess it depends on again, I think that our tendency is to want to see a black and white identity, you know, are they then Egyptian? Or are they then Greek? And I think they're both, you know, I think that they would have themselves identified as both. However, that being said, most of them didn't speak ancient Egyptian, most of them couldn't read it, they didn't really interact with their people in the same way a traditional Egyptian King would have done. And that's one of the things that stands out about Cleopatra, is that she really does go out of her way to embrace Egyptian religion. And she does indeed learn the native language of the people that she rules. And she was known to be quite a remarkable linguist, actually, she could speak apparently, you know, many, many languages and could converse easily in all of them. If there's a text that says that she didn't require a diplomatic interpreter when she received foreigners from other lands, because she could easily converse with them in any language. So, she was obviously a great intellect. She certainly seems to have embraced being Egyptian in many ways, she identified very strongly as both Isis as well as Hathor particularly Isis. And, you know, so she herself may have self-identified as Egyptian, even if according to sort of our traditional understanding of what makes an ancient Egyptian and ancient Egyptian, she wouldn't quite coincide with that. But it also had been hundreds of years, since a traditional Egyptian had been on the throne. So she is, again, this

sort of she's the synthesis of what culture was at that moment. So, it's an interesting, it's a really, really interesting question. And I, you know, again, it's, you know, we need to, you know, defer, of course, to Sally-Ann Ashton and etc, for doing such great work on her and her reign, the Ptolemies as well, in order to really understand them in particular.

El Shazly

How did Cleopatra ascend the throne?

Williamson

This is a question that we really have to put in a much broader historic context. So, she's Cleopatra the seventh, and the last ruler of Egypt as an independent nation. And of course, so we have to really sort of think about what was the identity of the time period that she grew up in. She's a Ptolemy. The Ptolemaic Empire was created by Alexander the Great, Alexander the Great, of course of Hellenistic Greece, who conquered the majority of the eastern Mediterranean world. And when he died, he broke his empire up and gave Egypt to his general Ptolemy. And so, Ptolemy comes to the throne. He is a he marries both Greek as well as Egyptian ideas in order to become a valid crowned religious ruler of Egypt. The ptolemies themselves were in many ways, very much like Game of Thrones, they were assassinating each other, and there was some incestuous interactions. And so, it was a very tumultuous time period. They were, so she is in no way dissimilar from everyone who came before her. And so, she actually came to the throne, ruling in tandem with her brothers. And one of her brothers actually assassinated a general who had been defeated by Julius Caesar, and then came to Egypt and so her brother assassinates this general whose name is Pompey, as a means to gain the favor of Julius Caesar, and he's hoping that Julius Caesar will place, will smile upon this act of assassination and go on to Cleopatra's brother's side and squeeze Cleopatra out of power and you know sort of support her brother, not Cleopatra. But the brother really miscalculates, because although Julius Caesar needed to

defeat Pompey, he didn't hate him. And so, the idea of this general being assassinated actually made him very, very sad. And so, Cleopatra meets with Julius Caesar to politically kind of negotiate with him about not only the rulership of Egypt, but the status of Egypt itself. And he decides to kind of throw his lot in with Cleopatra. And one of the things I think that we again as moderns, whenever we see a woman in power, we automatically assume that there must be a sexual component going on here. But we also need to remember that she was a person in power, it's an entirely legitimate thing for a person in power to approach another person in power to negotiate the political status of their country. This is a completely legit action. And Julius Caesar as a as a foreign dignitary in her country, of course, he interacted with Cleopatra, it would be strange if he didn't. And so, Cleopatra demonstrated her ability to rule in a way that eclipsed her brother. And so, because of again, her brother's sort of, you know, betrayal of Pompey, and his execution of that ended up making Julius Caesar throw his power and his support behind Cleopatra. And this is the thing that really elevates her to singular rule in Egypt.

El Shazly

So, do you think Cleopatra's romantic life affected the position of Egypt as a sovereign state?

You know, that there are so many stories woven around Cleopatra?

Williamson

Absolutely. Yeah, it's a great question. So, I think that, again, so much of our modern understanding of Cleopatra is, we have to remember that it's actually based on things that were written about Cleopatra, over 100 years after she died. So, what we're looking at in order to understand her are a series of Roman historians, who were not writing at the same time as she and Anthony. And they had a political agenda. And in fact, that particular Roman writer talks about how he doesn't care about historic facts, what he cares about, is rumor, because he says he thinks that illustrates the identity of people better. So, in other words, what we're literally looking at when we look at the Roman histories of Cleopatra,

we're looking at fake news. Like, it's absolutely fake news. And it's also seen through this very different social eye, Rome, was a very, very patriarchal society, it was absolutely frowned upon for women to be in power. You know, there were issues of sexuality tied with ideas of morality and status, in a way that just simply didn't exist in Egypt. It's not that you know, it again, it's that's that that triggers us makes us think that therefore the Egyptians had no morals, it's just they had a different type of morality, when it came to sex and sexuality. And so, what they're doing is they're judging her by their own standards. And they need to delegitimize her, they need to cast her in negative in the most negative light possible. And so that, as the since the Egyptian language died out, Latin survives is the language of Christian worship. And so that's the only voice that we had in history until, you know, we really started to be able to understand and translate ancient Egyptian in a more sophisticated way. And so, it's really only just now that we're starting to kind of put together our understanding of Cleopatra. And this is a very long way to get to answering your actual question, which is, did these relate romantic relationships have any relationship to her rule? Yes and No, right? They're both because the idea of what we think of as any woman who has a romantic or sexual relationship with a man if they are in power, we automatically judge them because of that. And so, we have an assumption that she must have been manipulated, manipulative, or something like this, but we must also remember that Cleopatra probably died some time in her 40s. And according to all sources, she only had two romantic relationships in her life. One was Julius Caesar, and the other was Marc Anthony. And she only got together with Marc Anthony after Julius Caesar died, there's no indication that she ever had any other relationships at all. And Cleopatra understood those relationships with both of those men as marriages. She didn't think of them as extramarital affairs. And so she didn't think of herself as being, you know, cheating on anyone, so to speak, you know, because, again, in dynastic marriages, the Ptolemies, married everyone, you know, and it was very normal for rulers to have multiple wives, so her from her perspective being with these men did not delegitimize or offend their other wives, it was a very different situation from her perspective. And so, although yes, she did have these relationships with these men, the political relationship with the men existed before those romantic relationships. So, she established this situation

and the rulership of the establishment, of her singular power with Julius Caesar before they got together as a romantic couple. And the same thing with Mark Antony, when Julius Caesar dies, Anthony comes to Egypt in order to try to track down Julius Caesar's assassins, but they had already known each other. And Anthony was very similar to Julius Caesar in that he sort of supported and appreciated Egypt, you know, he didn't want to completely subject it to Roman control. And so politically, she and he were very much on the same, the same kind of thought patterns. And so politically, they already had this political alliance and understanding, and their personal relationship developed after that. So again, for each of these situations, what we're seeing is a sophisticated, intelligent, remarkable woman, meeting equally sophisticated, remarkable men who form a political relationship first, and then that ends up leading into a romantic relationship. And of course, I'm sure that many of the people who are listening to this will understand this, that obviously, somebody who shares your social and political views is a good partner. And, you know, it's not only that, but if you're that smart, you want to have somebody who's just as smart as you are, because otherwise they're boring, you know. So, you know, and so you want to have that kind of relationship with someone. And so, one of the things we're constantly told is the Cleopatra is apparently an incredibly exciting conversationalist. Everyone loved talking to her. And so, we could imagine that with Mark Antony, and Julius Caesar, they're coming from this Roman environment where women are not educated. They're not as you know, they're not as sophisticated, they're actually sort of encouraged to not have that level of engagement in the world. And suddenly, they meet this remarkable woman who has multiple languages and can speak on their political level and is an incredible political active power Insider. That must have been incredibly exciting.

EI Shazly

You know it was probably her character, not that she looked like Elizabeth Taylor.

Williamson

Exactly, exactly. One. In fact, we actually have a lot of indications that she probably wasn't, you know, that she wasn't Elizabeth Taylor, you know, that she was a normal looking person. And I'm sure that everyone in this, I've had this happen to you, I'm sure that everyone has where you've, you know, you meet somebody and you think, wow, you know, what, a good-looking person and then they open their mouths and you're like....right?

EI Shazly

Very true

Williamson

Or the other will happen, where you meet somebody who maybe they're, you know, maybe not so whatever, and then you get to talk to them and you're like, you're the most exciting person I've ever met in my life right then. So yeah, yeah. Looks aren't everything you know.

EI Shazly

Exactly. Very true. Okay, so my last question to both of you, Nefertiti and Cleopatra, were very iconic. And Hatshepsut is famous, but you she never became as iconic as Nefertiti and Cleopatra. Why do you think that is it?

Williamson

I'll just jump in really quickly. So, for Cleopatra, the reason that she stayed famous is because Shakespeare used those Roman histories to create his play. And Shakespeare's Cleopatra play was incredibly popular at the time, and of course it lasted. And so, this is what created the sort of modern understanding of what of who and what Cleopatra is. And so, this idea of this seductive exotic temptress, you know, kind of played into a lot have sort of Western, you know, overheated imaginations. And so that's why she's survived. And of course, Nefertiti, it's a very similar thing it plays

into these Western ideas because she exploded on the scene with that beautiful bust. Right? And so, we moderns, well, human beings in general, we love beauty, you know, it's the, it's the thing that and our, in our modern day we associate the value of a woman with that with the beauty of her face. If her face is beautiful, then therefore she has value. And so not only is she, was this iconic bust beautiful, but then you know, she seems and I want to emphasize seems to have such significance in Akhenaten's reign that suddenly we kind of start, our imagination explodes. Whereas for Hatshepsut, a lot of her material was kind of fragmented and in pieces and it's really only just now that we've started to really understand her. And so, since she presented herself as a male, again, if we're looking to value women for being sexual and pretty, and you know, and you know, a femme fatale, Hatshepsut does not fit that category, you know, because she showed herself as a man. And she's, you know, she's very she very much downplays that part of herself, right. And so, as a result, she is fit with our modern Hollywood understanding of what an exciting woman should be. And I think I think I could be wrong, but that's why she doesn't trigger that kind of modern fascination. But I'd love to hear what Mariam thinks there.

Ayad

I totally agree with you, Jackie. Absolutely. on both counts, you know, the Shakespearean connection and also the beautiful bust of Nefertiti. But on that last point, I think it's not just that her bust was discovered but all the intrigue surrounding getting the bust out of Egypt and how now it's in Berlin and the makeover that was given her making her into another version of Joan Crawford or something, you know...

Williamson

You're right. I totally forgot about that.

El Shazly

And Hitler's fascination with her.

Ayad

And you know, with Hatshepsut, who is so beautiful, I think in my eyes, she has an intriguing smile on the face of hers from one of those Osirian statues, which is enormous is in Cairo Museum, it was never taken out. It was never sensationalized. And also, don't forget with Nefertiti the connection with Tutankhamun that came from the discovery of his tomb around the same time, like it all happened in the late 20s. Right. Right. So, there's there was just a lot of publicity associated with that. And never underestimate the power of the media. With Hatshepsut it was more low key, it was mostly the Polish expedition, not the German expedition. So there's, you know, factors that, you know...

Williamson

Because I think, you know, and in taking off of that, so like, we have that moment of intense Egyptomania, right? In the 20s and 30s, in the center that like, you know, it was people were having earrings made, and, you know...

Ayad

All of the Art Deco stuff, you know, to, you know...

Williamson

But we as sort of modern scholars, shy away from that most of us shy away from that kind of sensationalism of our field, you know, um, you know, like, Mariam and I are, we're just, we're just, you know, cautioning everyone to not, you know, read into gaps in evidence, and see, to try to be a little bit more cautious about stuff like this. But that's not exciting to people, you know, like, that's not the kind of element that you know, makes people dream and get excited. I'm sure that if, you know, maybe if the Polish had, like been like, oh, here's this, you know, like, you know, if they had trumpeted Hatshepsut you know, in that more kind of publicity type of, you know, 1920s and etc, that it would have been different.

Ayad

Yeah, but there's a reason why they haven't and why in particular, Nefertiti received so much attention, don't forget the power of capitalism and commercialization and advertising all these findings, and the objects. So, I think we're veering off into socio-political modern history. Yeah, on that note, we should stop.

EI Shazly

Yeah. Well, that was absolutely fascinating. Thank you very much for sharing your time and knowledge with us today.

Ayad

Thank you for having us.

Williamson

Thank you very much Yasmin for having us. We really appreciate it was great to have an opportunity to talk to both of you. I really appreciate it.

EI Shazly

My pleasure. Thank you.