these ones could be used by hand, as a butchery knive, or fixed in a wooden handle, as a projectile.[56] The retouches are not always the utilized part of the artefact and the flat retouch can be a "shaping" retouch to fix more easily the stone artefact. Consequently, we can imagine that the frequent retouched backed flakes, the unifacial, bifacial or partial points, or the rough bladelets and flakes could be fixed separately or together in a wooden handle, as studies on Mesolithic or Neolithic assemblages suggest. Remains of bitumen on points have been discovered in the site of Umm-el-Tell (Syria), suggesting a usual preparation of hafted points.[57] The common characteristics of the microlithic assemblages with other ones with large flakes could indicate a similar range of use of the artefacts. However, the frequency and the size of the small artefacts could also indicate another relation to the tool kit, requiring flakes in large number, side-scrapers and points in various quantity according to either the activities or the habits.

The many clues for wood use by Neanderthal groups can also be a potential direction of research. These small artefacts could be yet tools to prepare wooden tools, especially when the environmental context is composed of large forest patches. The results of the microwear analysis in Grotta Breuil, yielding a microlithic assemblage related to the Pontinian (Italy), indicate a large number of cutting edges having worked wood.[58] Sharp cutting edges seem to be very efficient to work wood, as well as denticulates, as attested by various ethnographic examples.[59] Sites which yielded organic tools often show an association between wooden artefacts and various stone tools such as partial or total points with uni- or bifacial retouches or side-scrapers on thick flakes (for example, Schöningen or Lehringen, Germany).[60] This association can be seen as functional. In other cases, organic implements are associated with small stone tools (points or side-scrapers on thick and cortical flakes) and large pebble tools (for example, Bilzingsleben in Germany).[61] The production on the Tata site provided very small flakes (10-30 mm long), some micro-choppers (10 to 30-40 mm long) and only some large pebbles. The wooden tools could be complementary to smaller tools in stone for the activities. The Abric Romaní discoveries also show that the wood has not always been used to haft stone tools, but also to organize actions in daily life.[62] Moreover, the great quantity of compressors in assemblages with numerous small artefacts (for example, Bilzingsleben, Vértesszőlős, Kůlna or Tata) indicate a large variety of raw materials used by these humans, and then the likely necessity of using of hard surfaces perhaps to prepare small stone artefact edges.

[56] Beyries–Walter 1996.; Plisson–Beyries 1998.; Shea 1998.

[57] Boëda et al. 1996.

[58] Lemorini 2000.

[59] Leroi-Gourhan 1973.

[60] Thieme–Veil 1985.; Thieme 1999.

[61] Mania 1988b.

[62] Carbonell–Castro-Curel 1992.