provides the environment in association to these small products. It is possible indeed that at a time of a temperate period, the meat supply was more limited. The human groups could develop a special food behaviour, explaining the kinds of lithic blanks, even other kinds of lithic assemblages existed during the same period in the same area. In this context, various traditions can as well explain the variations than activities. The more abundant bifacial points in Tata and a few bifacial tools in Kůlna will be signs of regional trends inside a vast technological family.

However, the men's behaviour in their choice of small tool making cannot simply be explained by only one factor like environment, food needs, site locations, physical characteristics and availability of raw materials. Customs have to be considered.

The reduction sequences show numerous common points among the assemblages. Most cores belong to a same processing system, based on two opposite flaking surfaces. This system can also be described as a suitable treatment of the volume of small pebbles, their cortical faces and their morphology. Quadrangular pebbles are the most common, and a possible choice by the toolmakers. It is easier to begin a flaking from flat surfaces than convex ones. The round and oval pebbles are in great majority reserved first for the pebble tools. This specific use of the pebble shape is also observed on some cubic cores with a few scars on each cortical faces. The kind of flaking can be regarded to the large discoidal group, and the products are for the most small, except for Taubach.[45] Except this characteristic, Taubach is not a specific case in technological point of view as it has been suspected in the past.

Flakes and tools on flakes are the common artefacts for all these assemblages but some bifacial tools and some small bifaces have maybe a greater sign that we suspect today.[46]

We see the same processing rules and the same kinds of tools in Předmostí II.[47] In Gánovce, the assemblage is poor but we can also observe a large use of quartzite and quartz points carry bifacial retouches which are rare in Bojnice. Radiolarite was available but, despite its exceptional quality, it was not easily used on a large scale in Czech Republic and Slovakia (preference for quartz, more durable edges on quartz?).

Recent analysis in Pontinian assemblages in Italy, dating to the OIS 4, shows various flaking methods, different from Central Europe (double percussion method, pebble slice method, two opposite surface cores).[48] A variety on the same scale is also observed among Italian sites of the Pontinian as among Central European sites of Tata, Kůlna and Taubach-Weimar. Thus, through the processing system studies, technological traditions appear among microlithic assemblages, not due to the raw materials. On the other hand, they are closely related to some assemblages located in the same area and using large pebbles for the debitage, for example Érd in Hungary.[49] Do we have then evidence of large regional trends within various traditions in

[45] Schäfer 1981.

[46] Valoch 2000.

[47] Svoboda 1994.; Moncel–Svoboda 1999.

[48] Kuhn 1995.; Bietti–Grimaldi 1996.

[49] Gábori-Csánk 1968.