

Introduction

Sabina Cveček and Barbara Horejs

Introduction

Renewed interest in collaborations between social anthropologists and archaeologists has been emerging for some time now in global academia. The main ideas and motivations behind the renewed interest in collaborations between social anthropologists and archaeologists also inspired the creation of this special section. Humans are not only social animals but seasonal as well. The worldwide ethnographic record provides many perspectives on seasonal human behavior, such as seasonal dwellings, seasonal use of space, and seasonal changes in the socio-political organization among non-state groups. Nevertheless, it remains challenging to identify seasonality from prehistoric assemblages. In exceptional cases, ethnographically documented practices observed among present communities may help infer seasonal practices from archaeological evidence based on direct historical analogy. In most prehistoric settings, however, a historical analogy may not be suitable due to the time lag of millennia. With continuing gaps in environmental and climate history and the impact of socio-political transformations, the difficulty of providing continuity between the archaeological and historical past and the ethnographic present represents enduring challenges. Building hypotheses based on cross-cultural anthropological research may be more suitable for some of these cases than individual cases of possible analogies.

Archaeologists continuously work towards developing new methods and sampling techniques in collaboration with experts in natural sciences. This well-established interdisciplinary approach has led to many new bioarchaeological and archaeometric methodologies in the last decades, providing new sources for analyzing past societies. Some even understand this approach as a Third Science Revolution (Kristiansen 2014). Even if the scientific impact of molecular biological analyses can only be assessed using a long-term perspective, its role might be placed alongside previous methodological innovations such as radiocarbon-dating or trace-element analyses of inorganics in the future. This development, also summarized

by a broadening of the term archaeological sciences has produced an enormous outcome of new data and models that confront researchers with the challenge of discussing and implementing the appropriate ethical (Somel et al. 2021; Ávila-Arcos et al. 2022; Kowal et al. 2023) and theoretical framework (Furholt 2021; Cveček 2024; Horejs 2024). The latter represents an ongoing process in archaeology searching for sustainable tool kits, where socio-cultural anthropology is experiencing a comeback for a renewed collaboration towards understanding past societies. In these contexts, interpretative approaches, generated through a collaboration between archaeologists and social anthropologists, remain vital to strengthening our understanding of past and present practices linked with seasonality and understanding of the (non-)human. This also promotes an improved awareness of how seasons continue to shape our research insights and/or frame our fieldwork rhythms.

Seasonal practices are spatial and time-dependent. They cannot be ignored in long-term ethnographic projects but could be easily overlooked in archaeological deposits. In the latter, seasonal practices are entangled with everyday, possibly non-seasonal objects and practices. Therefore, to discern seasonal from non-seasonal, permanent from non-permanent, and material from non-material while putting back together these puzzles, archaeologists are invited to embrace the cross-cultural variability documented in the ethnographic record. At the same time, social anthropologists may crucially benefit from extending the retrospective timelines of inquiry backward, i.e. before 1492 AD. Including the archaeological insights in their writing about the social phenomena observed in the present may, after all, challenge the apparent uniqueness of certain social phenomena. Beyond all the debates and controversy the book has initiated, “The Dawn of Everything: The New History of Humanity” (Graeber and Wengrow 2021), through its widely shared interest to readers, has, since its publication, indicated a solidly growing, renewed interest in interdisciplinary dialogues between archaeologists and socio-cultural anthropologists. Although four-field approaches in anthropology may be more common in Anglo-American academic contexts, “The Dawn of Everything,” as well as this present issue, clearly indicates that dialogues between anthropologists of the past and those of the present also continue in Central Europe, beyond the anglophone world. Readers of the *Anthropos* journal, founded in 1906 by Wilhelm Schmidt, will need no special reminder that these dialogues have a rich and productive history, especially in German-speaking academia. Despite the possible comeback of active interdisciplinary collaboration between

archaeologists and socio-cultural anthropologists, such an approach still represents a nascent minority agenda within both fields.



Fig. 1: Location of the case studies and examples mentioned in this special issue (M. Börner, S. Cveček, B. Horejs)

This special issue includes contributions dealing with seasonal practices in non-state and early state sedentary and (semi-)nomadic groups from ethnographic, historical anthropological, and archaeological perspectives (see Fig. 1). The topic of seasonality is addressed through the socio-political organization, dwellings, use of space, crafts, and farming/foraging practices, as well as gender and infrastructure. The main aim of this issue is to show how fostering a dialogue between socio-cultural anthropologists and archaeologists dealing with seasonal practices allows us to explore the entanglement of humans and non-humans in its diversity. Beyond Marcel Mauss's "Seasonal Variations of the Eskimo" (Mauss 2004 [1906]) and the vast amount of attention for "The Dawn of Everything," the present collection "The Seasonal and the Material" has also been inspired by the work of French social anthropologist Maurice Godelier. In "The Mental and the Material" (Godelier 1986), Godelier posed questions such as, "How is its [engagement of humans with nature] history to be explained? What

impact do material realities, natural and man-made, have on human beings?" These questions were initially raised in the 1980s, and Godelier tackled them through "deep" and "shallow" history, including archaeology. These questions remain actual for present-day exploration and provide examples of how they can be addressed through interdisciplinary cooperation and dialogue. Bringing both disciplines, i.e. primarily archaeology and socio-cultural anthropology, together in the combined contributions to this special issue also aims at renewing the traditional collaborative approach in the light of the recent bioarchaeological and archaeometric developments searching for new interpretative tools.

Seasonality in Anthropology

In addition to some of the famous early writings of Marcel Mauss (2004 [1906]), seasonality was also an important topic elsewhere in socio-cultural anthropology from the field's early-20th-century periods and the canonical classics they brought forth. For example, seasonality was documented in detail among the Nuer by Evans-Pritchard (1940), who documented and sketched the Nuer seasons by their seasonal rounds and explained seasonality's impact on the Nuer perception of time and socio-political organization. Nuer seasonal movements depended on the availability of pasture and drinking water necessary for their cattle (p. 59). Moreover, they made use of seasonal flooding of, and by, rivers.¹ In November and December, when the water level in the river falls, the Nuer dammed fish in the streams and lagoons that they caught with spears at night, with the help of fires lit behind the fishers.² Also, among domesticated crops and staple foods, there were seasonal fluctuations. For example, milk was a staple food among the Nuer, available year-round. However, cows produced less milk towards the end of the rainy season due to the lack of available pasture. The seasonal variation in food was also significant for the social organization of the Nuer. The Nuer routinely held important ceremonies such as weddings, initiation rites, and religious ceremonies in the rainy season after the first millet harvest. At the same time, this was the primary season for raiding

1 For seasonal patterns of flooding and how they have shaped human settlement, agriculture, and resource use in the Amazon forest, see Hecht and Cockburn (2010).

2 For the cyclical nature of salmon reproduction, the seasonal labor patterns of fish farmers, and the impact of these rhythms on the social and ecological dimensions of salmon farming among industrial farming of salmon in Norway, see Lien (2015).

the neighboring Dinka since the Nuer said they were too hungry to fight in the dry season (p. 84). The seasonal variation of activities, mapped by “EP” (Evans-Pritchard) in a seasonal chart, highlights seasonal time-reckoning. This is a well-known procedure in other ethnographic cases, too. The Nuer recognized the dry (*tot*) and the wet season (*mai*), including two transitional periods between them. They spoke of *rwil*, which is when they move from camp to village and from clearing to planting (mid-March until mid-June), and *jiom*, when they moved from village to clearing and pasture (mid-September until mid-December). Based on the importance of seasonality and ecology in the Nuer’s ways of living, EP argued that

probably, for ecological reasons, the actual political configuration remains very much the same from generation to generation. People pass through the political system without their structural position in it changing to any extent during their passage. It is the same with the lineage system. (Evans-Pritchard 1940: 256)

The last quote highlights that seasonality is not only a dynamic process that results in change but that seasonal practices may also contribute towards maintaining socio-political stability and reproduction of the same type of social organization. This argument complements the role of seasonality linked with political fluctuations among the hunter-gatherers and early farming groups in Eurasia that was recently re-emphasized (Graeber and Wengrow 2021). Therefore, it remains important to look at how seasonality affects the material consequences and changes in socio-political organization but also may pose constraints to change in kinship, politics, religion, and rituals of local and broader regional groups.

Other classical works from anthropology’s history before and after the mid-20th century also demonstrate that seasonality was intrinsic in most of them. In “The Work of the Gods in Tikopia” (1967 [1939]), Raymond Firth analyzed in detail the Polynesian seasonal ritual cycle among the Tikopia, which he described as the crucial aspect of their social life. In turn, throughout his four volumes of “Mythologiques,” Lévi-Strauss subsequently (1964; 1967; 1968; 1971) explored the cross-cultural representation of food and cooking, trickery and mythology, food sharing, and the human body and art from structuralist perspectives to address the universal structures and themes that underpin myths. Food practices and myths, however, were closely linked with seasonal cycles that related to indigenous social organization among the societies he studied in the Americas. In her different but complementary perspective, Mary Douglas (1970) explored the symbolic

meanings attributed to natural phenomena, including seasonal cycles. She argued that human societies create myths, rituals, and cultural practices – related to seasonal changes – to make sense of the natural world. At about the same time, in his radically systemic and environmentally oriented approach, Roy A. Rappaport (1968) explored the relationship between ritual, religion, and ecology among the Tsembaga of Papua New Guinea. These are just a few well-known examples from some of the major British, French, and American legacies in 20th-century anthropology before the post-modern turn. Peter Rohrbacher (this issue) discusses important counterparts in German. In all these works, seasonality was not described as a one-way road. In some cases, seasonality may denote change (Graeber and Wengrow 2021, see also Krause, see also Krause, this issue); in others, stability (see Evans-Pritchard 1940: 256; Douglas 1970).

However, it has to be said that before the publication of “The Dawn of Everything” (Graeber and Wengrow 2021), seasonality had not yet emerged as a topic *sui generis* in socio-cultural anthropology (see also Schweitzer, this issue). In contrast, archaeologists considered seasonality an important topic regarding the “agricultural revolution” (Braidwood 1960). Yet, together with the rising importance of climate change research in the past two decades (Hastrup 2009; Crate and Nuttall 2016; Stensrud and Eriksen 2019), seasonality has witnessed an important comeback in a new format. In classic ethnographic texts, seasonality was treated through adaptation to natural fluctuations and using a stark conceptual divide between nature and culture, although not in all cases (see Schweitzer, this issue). By contrast, recent scholarship has usually preferred to conceptualize seasons in terms of rhythms, emphasizing “the dynamics of social and ecological processes” that “allows us to recognize them not as fundamentally separate or opposed, but as implicated in each other” (Krause 2013: 24). Therefore, seasons, rhythms, nature, and culture cannot be neatly separated but have to be studied side-by-side. Under these reinvigorated premises, research will gain an improved understanding of local dwelling and movement codes and ensuing variations in socio-political organization.

Seasons often have a political dimension to them, as can be observed in this special issue. For example, Lisa Rail in this issue describes how seasonality shapes the infrastructure, dwellings, and property relations in the Austrian Tyrol region. Moreover, the returning seasonal rhythm of visiting the high mountain summer pastures among the Kalasha recreates and maintains strong male-to-male bonds, as described by Augusto Cacopardo in this issue for northwestern Pakistan. The political side of seasonality

can also be noticed beyond the cases addressed in this special issue. For example, during the Covid-19 pandemic, seasonal workers in agriculture were exempt from travel bans to harvest asparagus, salad, grapes, and other items requiring the employment of short-term but large workforces in central Europe. Furthermore, seasonal migration is to be observed, for that matter, for harvesting salmon in Norway (Hecht and Cockburn 2010), where the Covid-19 restrictions also did not apply to workers within the fishing industry. Therefore, we must not overlook the importance of state and local needs when thinking about seasonality, seasons, and seasonal rhythms. Both tribal, non-state societies as well as industrialized nation states, as we know them today, are incapable of ignoring, and certainly have not “overcome,” seasonality and seasonal rhythms.

Seasons also have much more obvious economic relevance. For example, seasonal trade routes rely on seasonal winds that enable seafaring from one coastal or riverine site to the other or trading across difficult terrains. On the southeast coast of Papua New Guinea, sea voyages were seasonal and could only happen at particular times. This was the only time to connect with one’s trade partner on the other side of the gulf.³ If people knew that trade would take place this year, everyone would have created and produced more: they would have produced more pots and cultivated more gardens to harvest more and create more surplus. Once the voyage was successfully concluded, a Big Man took much credit for redistributing the surplus (Munn 1992). Also, Anna Tsing, in her book “The Mushroom at the End of the World. On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins” (2015), delves into the seasonal rhythms and ecological dynamics that shape the mushroom’s growth and the ways in which it is entangled with human societies. To paraphrase Marshal Sahlins, who argued that “the elementary forms of kinship, politics, and religion are all one” (Sahlins 2008: 197), it seems that the elementary forms of politics and economics are inseparable from seasons. They – politics, economics, and seasons – are one.

Seasonality in Archaeology

The impact of seasonality and seasonal rhythm upon prehistoric societies has been well-known since the early days of archaeology as demonstrat-

3 The same applies to the Bothnian Gulf of Finland where during medieval times locals would stop trading over winter, between November and May, due to the inaccessible packed ice (Nurmi et al. 2020).

ed by seasonal cycles of hunter-gatherers related to hunting Pleistocene megafauna in Ice Age Europe as described by M. Hoernes, the founder of prehistorical studies at Vienna University (Hoernes 1892: esp. 156–218). The existential significance of seasonal-related conditions, limitations, and opportunities have been integrated since then into archaeology, leading to an enormous number of publications dealing with environmental-related seasonality around the globe. A recent study, for example, provided the microscopic evidence of eggshells from migratory birds pointing to a seasonal benefit as an additional nutrition source for the lakeshore hunter-gatherers in Schöningen (Germany) c. 300,000 years ago (Conard et al. 2015).

While the political and social dimensions of seasonal rhythm and cycles are well addressed in anthropology, the archaeological debates of prehistoric communities in deep history did not primarily focus on these aspects, not only but also *because* of the methodological difficulties in proving direct causal connections of short-term practices with their long-term socio-cultural or even political impact based on scientific data. The nature of solid archaeological data in deep history usually prevents the modeling of rapid events or abrupt changes within one human generation. Therefore, reconstructing the political effects of seasonality in archaeology was mostly restricted to such state or pre-state systems in antiquity that were related to available written sources. The rise of Pharaonic Egypt, inter alia, based on the newly invented centrally organized agriculture and water management of the repeating seasonal Nile flooding c. 3000 BCE (Kemp 2006) or the hydro-engineering technologies related to the seasonal rhythm of agriculture closely linked with the early state formation process in Mesopotamia of the 4th millennium BCE (Wilkinson 2014; Rost 2017) are examples for the political dimension in the archaeology of seasonality.

However, the nature of seasonality-linked data in archaeology offers the advantage of studying regular repeating effects beyond short-term events but through the lens of a *longue durée* perspective. Hence, seasonality-related results in the archaeology of prehistoric and pre-state societies cover a wide range of topics, like distinct agricultural or hunting-foraging practices, nutrition, and food-related activities, sourcing and procurement strategies, exchange networks and traveling modes, sedentism, mobility and pastoralism, production and applied technologies as well as their differing impact through space and time.

Seasonality and Cultural Dynamics in Archaeology

Seasonal-related challenges to past societies played a distinct role in defining specific cultural dynamics, such as the maritime networks developed between continental southeast Asia and Japan for the rising of the Jomon culture since the early Holocene based on – among others – seasonal fishing practices (Kobayashi et al. 2003; Lapteff 2006) or the cultivation of particular wild crops and the associated plant management in the early agricultural Fertile Crescent (Braidwood 1960; Asouti and Fuller 2011; Riehl 2016). The impact of seasonal cycles on early Mediterranean societies represents another illustrative example for demonstrating the wide-ranging cultural dynamics based on seasonal cycles in archaeological case studies. Since at least the upper Paleolithic, the specific environmental conditions for navigating through the Aegean Sea (including deep water) before the invention of sails required a distinct nautical knowledge of and seafaring skills covering winds, currents, fresh water sources, landing options and routes – a nautical package which is strongly interlinked with seasonality (Broodbank 2013). Specific repeated practices in the early Holocene Aegean region can be linked with this nautical package and are evident in new sourcing practices for obsidian and jadeite on the Cycladic Islands (Horejs 2019), food and ornament procurement strategies (Perlès 2016) or migration routes of Neolithic pioneers into the region (Horejs et al. 2015) – all of them representing the *longue durée* aspect of seasonality and seasonal rhythm for these societies. Recent studies, including the new analytical opportunities of stable isotopes in Mesolithic shell middens, demonstrate seasonal practices both in foraging marine shells by the populations in Iberia arguing for the intimate knowledge by the foragers of the seasonal development cycles of the mollusks and in choosing the colder months for collecting due to higher meat yield (García-Escárzaga et al. 2019).

New Challenges and Current Debates

Coming back to our main aim of fostering a new dialogue between our disciplines dealing with seasonal practices, it is worth addressing some challenges from an archaeological perspective in light of current debates. While the majority of interdisciplinary studies in archaeology focus on past societies with a traditional strong human-centric (and human-made material) perspective, it appears the right time to shift our focus towards

a wider and more inclusive perspective for future (less anthropocentric) approaches. Coevolutionary theoretical frameworks for understanding the interweaving of humans and their environments represent an established approach in archaeology, where animals and plants, as well as the environmental contexts are regularly studied. The interdependencies of co-existing species are well-known since we overcame the “man as crown of creation” concept decades ago but have received new attention since the Covid-19 pandemic. This refreshed perspective on humans as part of interconnected species is reinforced by the new bioarchaeological data of recent years. For example, the cultural transformation process of the Neolithization between southwest Asia and Europe c. 9,000 years ago was accompanied by human-adapted bacterial pathogens and viruses, such as *Salmonella enteric* or *Yersinia pestis* (Key et al. 2020; Morozova et al. 2020). Studying the development of early agricultural communities and their new way of living in house-based communities should, therefore, include not only the new human social relations but also a new level: the intensity and quality of interaction of humans and animals living closely together for the first time in history, supporting the emergence of zoonoses and new viral diseases, such as tuberculosis, plague, or hepatitis. This new perspective of a *multispecies archaeology* (Horejs 2024) not only offers a fresh look at old questions including the role of seasonality but also allows us to integrate a new methodological approach to obtaining new data.

A Case Study of Multispecies Archaeology and Seasonality

One example from ongoing studies about early farming and herding communities in southeast Europe can illustrate the new opportunities in the light of *multispecies archaeology* and the potential role of seasonality for new insights into past societies. The first agricultural communities in the Balkans are associated with the Neolithic expansion by a movement of pioneers (small-scale groups) with livestock, crops, and pulses from west Asia into southeast Europe c. 6200–6000 calBC. The subsequent centuries-long cultural transformation is summarized as Neolithization. This term refers to a complex, only vaguely understood process of adaptation and modification in aspects of cultural expression, social organization and interaction, economy, and technology (Greenfield and Jongsma Greenfield 2014; Borić et al. 2018). The very likely semi-mobile lifestyle related to pastoralism appears currently as the best model to characterize most of the

early Neolithic sites in the central Balkans, where permanent, long-term settled villages are lacking in the associated Starčevo cultural horizon for at least half a millennium after the initial Neolithic (Bánffy 2019; Horejs 2024).

Seasonal mobility of herding communities within a regularly repeating scale would explain some of the scarce archaeological data from this period and the dominating “pit-houses” in particular but are almost impossible to scientifically argue for, based on the archaeological evidence (Bailey 1999). New interdisciplinary investigations at the early-middle Neolithic site in Svinjarička Čuka (south Serbia) are aimed at analyzing the hypothesized cycles of occupation by farming and herding communities and their flocks between 6100 and 5400 calBC (Horejs et al. 2022). Our focus on the variety of scales, intensities, quantities, and qualities of settling on this river terrace is aimed at a better definition of the so far simple dichotomy of mobility/sedentism for early Neolithic communities in the Balkans. Seasonal rhythm seems the most promising frame in our current studies of aDNA, pollen, faunal, and floral remains contextualized within a micro-morphological and micro-archaeological approach. Seasonal-linked herding management, farming-associated practices like the storage of seeds for the sowing period, and temporarily occupied floors, including remains of a variety of species, hence, are important indicators for modeling the multispecies evidence at the site. This leads us to expect new insights into the cultural transformation process of the Neolithic in the near future. The case study described above and other interdisciplinary projects carried out in Vienna recently (see Cveček and Emra 2021; Cveček 2022, Cveček and Schwall 2022) were the main reasons for organizing an interdisciplinary panel at Vienna Anthropology Days (VANDA) 2022 preceding this collection.

The Seasonal and the Material

The seed for the present collection, “The Seasonal and the Material: Anthropology of Seasonal Practices,” was planted by preparing and holding a topical session for VANDA 2022.⁴ This took place between September 26–29, 2022, in Vienna as a panel organized by the editors. In line with VANDA’s mission, our panel aimed to bring together scholars from vari-

4 <https://vanda.univie.ac.at/scientific-program/>

ous fields and subfields in anthropology, social sciences, and humanities. With this special issue, we wish that seed to sprout and to continue interdisciplinary discussions on the temporality of human practices. Wherever necessary, it is hoped this will challenge our perspectives on how best to look at human and non-human beings through the lens of temporality and seasonality. Importantly, Tim Ingold (1993) initiated this process of debate and reflection three decades ago by highlighting the temporality of the landscape through the coinage of the “taskscape,” later also extended to a seasonal “taskscape”, denoting repeated rhythms of seasonal butchering practices (Cveček and Emra 2021). Contributions in this issue implicitly follow Ingold’s approach and explicitly highlight the temporality of (non-)human practices and the inability to disentangle human practices conceptually from the constantly changing environment, be that geese migration, freezing of rivers, changing of the grazing land and/or political economy.

“The Seasonal and the Material” is an experiment in translation. According to the Oxford Learner’s Dictionary, an experiment is the following: 1) “a scientific test that is done in order to study what happens and to gain new knowledge” or 2) “a new activity, idea or method that you try out to see what happens or what effect it has.”⁵ In our case, the experiment followed both definitions. Our aim was to 1) test what new knowledge can be generated when we bring scholars working in different regions and specialists in different periods to interact through a cross-cutting lens and see 2) what happens when scholars apply seasonality as that cross-cutting lens to their ethnographic and archaeological material. For our panel in Vienna, we asked participants to follow the Pecha Kucha style of presentations, in which presenters had approximately seven minutes to present their research, followed by a short question and answer round. In the final discussion round, the panel organizers, presenters, and the audience formed a circle in which participants shared their thoughts and reflections on the panel. The initial short format of presentations was also the main reason for keeping contributions to this special issue short and continuing to experiment with a new method of publishing, which was generously facilitated by *Anthropos* journal’s editor.

Quite a few new methodological insights regarding seasonality were generated by these interactive academic processes in Vienna. Panelists ascribed one of the main differences regarding seasonality to the nature of the

5 The definition taken from Oxford Learner’s Dictionary: <https://bit.ly/3M7vGAI>

material that archaeologists and socio-cultural anthropologists respectively study. For example, within the archaeological trench, hundreds of years may “collapse” within a few centimeters of anthropogenic layers. Therefore, archaeologists are challenged to “find” and identify seasonality by using already provided scientific data as well as by developing potential new state-of-the-art methods, even though archaeological fieldwork is usually seasonal (see Krause, this issue). By contrast, ethnographers may stay a few seasons in the field or return to the same place in the same season (see Schweitzer, this issue). For most of them, it becomes obvious by experience how different a place may become during each season (e.g. winter, summer, spring, or autumn as well as other locally defined seasons). Therefore, we are convinced that integrating seasonal practices into these interdisciplinary reflections can shed new light on past and present societies regarding subsistence and political economy. Seasonal practices, such as the harvesting of fruits, goose hunting, or the seasonal use of electricity, shape human dwelling in the world.

The classification of “four seasons,” which was just reiterated above, in itself requires critical reflection. Not only because, as such, it applies exclusively to the moderate zones around the globe north and south of the equator, hence this particular variety of seasonality as four equivalent if not quasi-harmonious seasons cannot claim any universality but has to be changed not only according to given regionalities within global contexts but also in relation to climatic history and its main periods and phases. Moreover, the respective “seasons,” beyond their geographic and temporal positioning, are also a challenge as soon as they require being addressed as linguistic and mental constructs. Such a move/an approach is possible for most socio-cultural anthropologists but almost impossible for most archaeologists, who will usually find it more adequate to elucidate seasons as practices rather than as concepts.

The answer to how archaeologists may better understand seasonality does not only lie in developing new methods through state-of-the-art interdisciplinary collaboration with natural sciences. Beyond that, archaeologists should also become more open to searching actively for seasonal practices within the ethnographic record. These practices may or may not be the same as those we can observe in the same place today, and therefore, ethnographic analogies with the present can be drawn only in exceptional places. Cross-cultural ethnographic literature, however, may help archaeologists understand the importance of seasonality in societies comparable

to those studied by archaeologists, which could, in turn, promote an understanding of seasonal cycles and rhythms also in deep history.

Discussion

At VANDA 2022, Thomas Hylland Eriksen delivered the opening keynote. He stated that every good conference should end with making one new friend, hearing one good paper, and learning something new. Apart from creating new friendships between the panelists and contributors to this special issue and hearing many good presentations, there are several take-home messages that our panel participants generated in Vienna. First, the panel contributed to the anthropological understanding of cultural change and the tradeoff between seasonality and monotony. Change and stability can come from both monotony and seasonality. The monotonous lives, however, that we live today (in offices) are not the norm (see Krause, this issue). Participants were convinced that there is a need for more collaboration between socio-cultural anthropology and archaeology. Social anthropologists highlighted the need to remain humble regarding timescales when compared to archaeologists. All presentations have also highlighted the need for seeing seasonal changes in economic, political, and cultural contexts simultaneously.

There was a persistent call for help raised by archaeologists to socio-cultural anthropologists. The editors, however, do not believe that socio-cultural anthropology has all the tools necessary to equip archaeologists with a better understanding of seasonality. In our view, ethnography, as a key tool, has the power to shift perceptions from monotonous to more dynamic perceptions of excavated finds. Such “added value” of ethnography as representing “varied and heterogeneous reasons or causes for a practice,” (Ucko 1969) has been recognized by some archaeologists. At VANDA, archaeologists voiced their wish that questions generated within archaeology would also hopefully become of more interest to socio-cultural anthropologists in the future by means of generating collaborative results as well as jointly tackling “hot topic research questions.” The fact that the nature of most archaeological work is seasonal, which most archaeologists are not aware of, is the final takeaway message. This could be due to a lack of discussions on positionality and situated knowledge (see Haraway 1988) in archaeology. Beyond working on seasonality, archaeologists may, therefore, also need to invest more into addressing questions of positionality, namely actively

reflecting on the question of which biases are shaping their modes of thinking and how their socio-political as well as economic backgrounds are molding their ways of seeing the world. Overall, both disciplines working together have the power to evaluate old models and to create new solid ones for discussing “The Seasonal and the Material. Anthropology of Seasonal Practices.”

Preview

Essays in this issue include case studies ranging across eight countries and span the time from prehistory until today. The opening essay by Franz Krause makes an ethnographically grounded appeal to archaeologists to prioritize seasonality in their analyses, considering that archaeological fieldwork is also a seasonal practice.⁶ Based on the case study of Kalasha in Hindu Kush-Karakorum, Augusto Cacopardo highlights the key role of seasonality in the maintenance of gendered practices and spaces between the permanent villages (mixed gender) and seasonal summer pastures (only male). Francesca Rail coins a category of “cowless shed” that includes material remains of seasonal practices intertwined with communal rights granted by the Habsburg Empire in the Austrian region of Tyrol. Clirimtare Januzaj highlights the importance of pastoralism and the seasonal harvest of wild fruits and nuts in the mountains of Isniq in Kosovo for subsistence and maintaining a connection with ancestors. Through ethnographic accounts of two villages in Iran, Wulf Frauen questions the paradox between permanent and seasonal as well as immobility and mobility by showing how pastoral history shapes villagers’ identities today.

A few archaeological case studies contain introductory essays based on ethnographic insights. Hojjat Darabi discusses the various forms of Neolithic occupation, including the evidence for seasonal and permanent settlements, in western Iran c. 10,000–6,000 BC. Laura and Oliver Dietrich speak of seasonal peaks at the early Neolithic Göbekli Tepe, which Wulf Frauen furthermore contextualizes through the concept of Resource Cultures, developed within the SFB 1070 project at the University of Tübingen. Inspired by the interactionist model of Resource Cultures, unique archaeo-

6 Even love can be seasonal. For example, an interlocutor shared with the first author of this chapter that participating in an international excavation enabled them to work with excellent international researchers, excavate a fascinating site, and find a ‘summer love’ without strings attached, between different excavation campaigns.

logical evidence for the seasonal use of open-air pottery workshops in the Iron Age (8th–5th century) in the northern Apennines in Italy, is presented by Raffaella Da Vela.

Following these archaeological cases, the last three articles are based on historical anthropology and a literature review. Andre Gingrich examines seasonality in Southwest Arabia's Late Pre-Islamic Era through a socio-cultural anthropological overview of what is known through archaeology and philology. Peter Schweitzer reflected on his own longstanding engagement with the (Alaskan) Arctic in an essay dealing with human and more-than-human cycles of engagements with seasons, seasonality, and seasonal rounds in the region. Finally, Peter Rohrbacher concludes the current collection with a historiography of interdisciplinary discourses in Vienna dating back to the early 20th century, under the umbrella of culture circle debates (*Kulturkreislehre*).

Peter Rohrbacher's article is crucial in highlighting that there is a long-standing tradition of scholarly interaction between archaeologists and socio-cultural anthropologists in Vienna. Such interactions have also been recently re-established through several PhD and postdoctoral research projects (see Cveček and Emra 2021; Cveček 2022; Cveček and Schwall 2022). They aim at bridging the gap between the two disciplines, or sub-disciplines for those among us who consider anthropology as a four-field discipline. Our subtitle "Anthropology of Seasonal Practices," aims at conveying a certain intersection, if not unity between these two (sub)disciplines. As this special issue shows, there is an enduring need to continue a close dialogue between them. This may unfold through ethnography, excavations, historiography, and various other approaches. Such dialogues will allow us to coin new categories and unpack already established ones with a shared aim of a better understanding of human diversity of dwelling in the world in both the past and the present.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the authors for their time and effort in engaging with the topic of seasonality and interdisciplinarity in socio-cultural anthropology and archaeology as crosscutting themes of this special issue. Thanks to the organizers of VANDA 2022. We were fortunate to initiate debates in person in Vienna, even though such an exchange, due to Covid-19, may have been unthinkable a year prior. Special thanks to Anna Wessman

(University of Bergen) and Andre Gingrich (Austrian Academy of Sciences) for their constructive feedback and comments on the earlier draft of our introductory chapter. Special thanks also to the *Anthropos* Editor in Chief, Darius J. Piwowarczyk, for his editorial assistance and bringing our contributions from conception to publication.

References Cited

Asouti, Eleni, and Dorian Q. Fuller

2011 From Foraging to Farming in the Southern Levant. The Development of Epipalaeolithic and Pre-pottery Neolithic Plant Management Strategies. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 14: 534–541.

Ávila-Arcos, Maria C., Constanza de la Fuente Castro C., Maria Nieves-Colón A., et al.

2022 Recommendations for Sustainable Ancient DNA Research in the Global South: Voices From a New Generation of Paleogenomicists. *Frontiers in Genetics* 13:880170. [doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2022.880170].

Bailey, W. Doug

1999: The Built Environment. Pit-Huts and Houses in the Neolithic. *Documenta Praehistorica* 26: 153–162.

Bánffy, Eszter

2019 First Farmers of the Carpathian Basin. Changing Patterns in Subsistence, Ritual and Monumental Figurines. [*Prehistoric Society Research Papers* 8]

Borić, Dušan, Thomas Higham, Emanuela Cristiani, et al.

2018 High-Resolution AMS Dating of Architecture, Boulder Artworks and the Transition to Farming at Lepenski Vir. *Scientific Reports* 8: 14221.

Braidwood, Robert J.

1960 The Agricultural Revolution. *Scientific American* 203/3: 130–152.

Broodbank, Cyprian

2013 The Making of the Middle Sea. A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World. London: Thames and Hudson.

Conard, Nicholas J., Jordi Serangeli, Utz Böhner, et al.

2015 Excavations at Schöningen and Paradigm Shifts in Human Evolution. *Journal of Human Evolution* 89: 1–17.

Crate, Susan A., and Mark Nuttall (eds.)

2016 Anthropology and Climate Change: From Encounters to Actions. London: Routledge.

Cveček, Sabina

2024 Why Kinship Still Needs Anthropologists in the 21st Century. *Anthropology Today* 40: 3–6. [doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12861]

Cveček, Sabina

2022 Çukuriçi Höyük 4. Household Economics in the Early Bronze Age Aegean. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press. [*Oriental and European Archaeology* 25] [doi.org/10.1553/978OEAW87332]

Cveček, Sabina, and Christoph Schwall

2022 Ghost Children: Delayed Personhood and Culture-specific Models of Infancy in Western Anatolia. *Præhistorische Zeitschrift* 97: 544–570. [doi.org/10.1515/pz-2022-2044]

Cveček, Sabina, and Stephanie Emra

2021 Rhythms of Seasonal “Taskscapes” at Early Bronze Age Çukuriçi Höyük. *Tijdschrift voor Mediterrane Archeologie. TMA Supplement* 2: 42–49.

Douglas, Mary

1970 *Natural Symbols. Explorations in Cosmology*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward Evan

1940 *The Nuer. A description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Firth, Raymond

1967 *The Work of the Gods in Tikopia*. New York: Routledge. [1939]

Furholt, Martin

2021 Mobility and Social Change: Understanding the European Neolithic Period after the Archaeogenetic Revolution. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 29: 481–535. [doi.org/10.1007/s10814-020-09153-x]

García-Escárzaga, Asier, Igor Gutiérrez-Zugasti, Adolfo Cobo, et al.

2019 Stable Oxygen Isotope Analysis of *Phorcus lineatus* (da Costa, 1778) as a Proxy for Foraging Seasonality during the Mesolithic in Northern Iberia. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 11/10: 5631–5644.

Godelier, Maurice

1986 *The Mental and the Material Thought, Economy, and Society*. London: Verso.

Graeber, David, and David Wengrow

2021 *The Dawn of Everything. A New History of Humanity*. London: Penguin Books.

Greenfield, Haskel J., and Tina L. Jongsma Greenfield

2014 Subsistence and Settlement in the Early Neolithic of Temperate SE Europe: a View from Blagotin, Serbia. *Archaeologia Bulgarica* 18/1: 1–33.

Haraway, Donna

1988 Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14/3: 575–599.

Hastrup, Kirsten

2009 *The Question of Resilience. Social Responses to Climate Change*. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

Hecht, Susanna, and Alexander Cockburn

2010 *The Fate of the Forest. Developers, Destroyers, and Defenders of the Amazon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hoernes, Moritz

1892 Urgeschichte des Menschen. Wien: Hartleben's Verlag

Horejs, Barbara

2019 Long and Short Revolutions towards the Neolithic in Western Anatolia and Aegean. *Documenta Praehistorica* 46: 68–83. [doi:10.4312/dp.46.5]

2024 Multispecies Mobility in the Neolithisation of Southeast Europe. Old Questions, New Methods. In: H. Piezonka, J. Schneeweiß, M. Nawroth, and H. Schwarzberg (eds.), *You Only See What You Know, You Only Know What You See. Global Historic Perspectives on Intercultural Phenomena of Mobility*; pp. 375–392. Rahden: VML. [*Berliner Archäologische Forschungen* 23]

Horejs, Barbara, Alexandar Bulatović, Jelena Bulatović, et al.

2022 New Multi-disciplinary Data from the Neolithic in Serbia. The 2019 and 2021 Excavations at Svinjarička Čuka. *Archaeologia Austriaca* 106: 255–317.

Horejs, Barbara, Bogdana Milić, Felix Ostmann, et al.

2015 The Aegean in the Early 7th Millennium BC. Maritime Networks and Colonization. *Journal of World Prehistory* 28/4 289–330. [doi:10.1007/s10963-015-9090-8]

Ingold, Tim

1993 The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25/2: 152–174.

Kemp, Barry J.

2006 Ancient Egypt. Anatomy of a Civilization. London and New York: Routledge.

Key, Felix M., Cosimo Posth, Luis R. Esquivel-Gomez, et al.

2020 Emergence of Human-adapted Salmonella Enterica is Linked to the Neolithization Process. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 4: 324–333. [doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1106-9]

Kobayashi, Tatsuo, Simon Kaner, and Nakamura Oki

2003 Jomon Reflections. Forager Life and Culture in the Prehistoric Japanese Archipelago. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Kowal, Emma, Laura Wyrich S., Juan Manuel Argüelles, et al.

2023 E Community Partnerships are Fundamental to Ethical Ancient DNA Research. *Human Genetics and Genomics Advances* 4:100161. [doi.org/10.1016/j.xhgg.2022.100161]

Krause, Franz

2013 Seasons as Rhythms on the Kemi River in Finnish Lapland. *Ethnos* 78/1: 23–46.

Kristiansen, Kristiansen

2014 Towards a New Paradigm? The Third Science Revolution and its Possible Consequences in Archaeology. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 22/1: 11–34.

Lapteff, Sergey

2006 Relationships between Jōmon Culture and the Cultures of the Yangtze, South China, and Continental Southeast Asian Areas. *Japan Review* 18: 249–86.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude

1964 Mythologiques I: Le cru et le cuit. Paris: Plon.

1967 Mythologiques II: Du miel aux cendres, Paris: Plon.

1968 Mythologiques III: L'origine des manières de table. Paris: Plon.

1971 Mythologiques IV: L'homme nu. Paris: Plon.

Lien, Marianne Elisabeth

2015 *Becoming Salmon: Aquaculture and the Domestication of a Fish*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Mauss, Marcel

2004. *Seasonal Variations of the Eskimo: A Study in Social Morphology*. New York: Routledge. [1906]

Morozova, Irina, et al.

2020 New Ancient Eastern European *Yersinia Pestis* Genomes Illuminate the Dispersal of Plague in Europe. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*.

<<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2019.0569>>[27.10.2023]

Munn, Nancy D.

1992 *The Fame of Gawa. A Symbolic Study of Value Transformation in a Massim (Papua New Guinea) Society*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Nurmi, Risto, Jari-Matti Kuusela, and Ville Hakamäki

2020 Swedenization of the North. The Early Medieval Swedish Northern Expansions and the Emergence of the Birkarls. *Acta Borealia* 37/1–2: 1–26.

Perlès, Catherine

2016 Food and Ornaments: Diachronic Changes in the Exploitation of Littoral Resources at Franchthi Cave (Argolid, Greece) during the Upper Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic (39,000–7000 cal BC). *Quaternary International* 407: 45–58.

Rappaport, Roy A.

1968 *Pigs for the Ancestors. Ritual in the Ecology of a New Guinea People*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Riehl, Simone

2016 The Role of the Local Environment in the Slow Pace of Emerging Agriculture in the Fertile Crescent. *Journal of Ethnobiology* 36: 512–534.

Rost, Stephanie

2017 Water Management in Mesopotamia from the Sixth till the First Millennium B.C. *WIREs Water*: 1–23.

Sahlins, Marshall D.

2008 The Stranger-King or, Elementary Forms of the Politics of Life. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 36/105: 177–199.

Somel, Mehmet, Ezgi Altınışık N., Füsün Özer, et al.

2021 Collaborate Equitably in Ancient DNA Research and Beyond. *Nature* 600: 37.

Stensrud, Astrid B., and Thomas Hylland Eriksen (eds.)

2019 *Climate, Capitalism and Communities*. London: Pluto.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt

2015 *The Mushroom at the End of the World. On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ucko, Peter

1969 Ethnography and Archaeological Interpretation of Funerary Remains. *World Archaeology* 1: 262–280.

Wilkinson, Toby

2014 *Tying the Threads. Trans-regional Routes and Material Flows in Transcaucasia, Eastern Anatolia and Western Central Asia, c. 3000-1500 BC*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.

Sabina Cveček is a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Global Fellow at the Field Museum in Chicago, IL and the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna, Austria. She holds a PhD from the University of Vienna's Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology (2021). Her research concerns contextualizing prehistoric households, kinship, and social organization in eastern Mediterranean from socio-cultural anthropological perspectives. Cveček is an elected Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute, a co-chair of the Archaeology and Gender in Europe (AGE) network of the European Association of Archaeologists (2023-2026), and a board member of the Marie Curie Alumni Association, North America Chapter. Cveček was also a visiting researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle/Saale (2023, 2019) and an IFK Junior Fellow (International Research Centre for Cultural Studies) in Vienna (2020/2021). Her recent publications include "Why Kinship Still needs Anthropologists in the 21st Century." *Anthropology Today* 40/1 (2024); "No Place Like Home for Metalworkers. Household-based Metal Production at Early Bronze Age Çukuriçi Höyük and Beyond." *History and Anthropology* 23/3 (2023); and "Çukuriçi Höyük 4: Household Economics in the Early Bronze Age Aegean." (2022, Austrian Academy of Sciences Press).

Barbara Horejs is the Scientific Director of the Austrian Archaeological Institute and has been head of the Department for Prehistory and West Asian/northeast African Archaeology since 2021 (ÖAW), following her directorship of the Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology between 2013 and 2020. She is an honorary professor at the universities of Tübingen and Vienna and a member of the German Archaeological Institute, the Bulgarian Institute of Archaeology, and the Austrian Academy of Sciences. She has published five monographs, edited a further thirteen books, and c. 120 articles, and acts as an editor for several international journals and book series. She managed international and interdisciplinary teams in archaeological fieldwork and material studies in Turkey, Greece, Iran, Bulgaria, and Serbia with a focus on the late Pleistocene and early-mid Holocene. She has been awarded ERC and FWF funding, among other grants. Her recent publications include: "New Multi-disciplinary Data from the Neolithic in

Serbia. The 2019 and 2021 Excavations at Svinjarička Čuka. *Archaeologia Austriaca* 106 (2022 – in cooperation with Aleksandr Bulatović, et al.); “Long and Short Revolutions towards the Neolithic in Western Anatolia and Aegean. *Documenta Praehistorica* 46 (2019); “Migrating and Creating Social Memories. On the Arrival and Adaptation of the Neolithic in Aegean Anatolia.” *Oriental and European Archaeology* 12 (2019).