

While in the eastern part of Europe, the microlithic assemblages are linked with various kinds of sites and fauna in relation to the environmental context, in Central Europe, they are more often associated with hot water springs. Some lucky discoveries could explain it, such as the excellent preservation of remains in the travertine deposits. However, in spite of the current knowledge about sites in this geographical area, this specific location could notice a type of settlement for human groups with a microlithic tradition. It may have provided evidence of original human settlements in favourable areas for animals and vegetation.⁶³ Mobile human groups could find easy prey regardless to the environment.

Recent biochemical analyses on animal bones suggest that Neanderthals often preferred herbivores, mostly living in open areas, even if sites (in Spain) provide evidence of small prey hunting such as birds.⁶⁴ Furthermore, human settlements in northern Europe always provide occupation in a middle forest context, neither in a large woodland environment and nor in a cold one.⁶⁵ Neanderthals would not like total forest environment. Actually, most of the microlithic sites in the Central Europe basins, according to the palynological studies and the faunal remains analysis, indicate that the landscape could be a patchwork of both forests and open areas.⁶⁶ In this kind of context, Neanderthals could have found a favourable environment for their subsistence and especially a high density of mammals easily available near the water springs. An open landscape was certainly favouring the mobility of the Neanderthal groups. However, the scale of this mobility is impossible to estimate, even if assemblages include some long distance area stones. Researchers suggest that the discovery of these rocks indicates the territory size. Nevertheless, exchanges among human groups or mobile isolated humans could as well explain the movement of such strange objects.⁶⁷ Ethnographic studies show that objects move more than humans. From more than 100 km, the long distance area rocks in Kůlna are totally different from the whole lithic assemblage by their shaping, which, in contrary, looks like those of the Tata artefacts. Relations among groups inside Central Europe basins, through geographical gates, are not still demonstrated but artefact exchanges or collecting of extraordinary objects in an extend territory have to be discussed to survey the microlithic assemblages in a spatial point of view. The Tata bifacial points would be, in this case, evidence of traditions and not just functional needs.

The role of anthropogenic and non-anthropogenic factors are now well understood for some of these sites, according to the fauna analysis. Most animal remains are probably the result of a hunting or a human scavenging in the surroundings. Evidence for hunting is plentiful. Some of the Kůlna bones (*Cervus elaphus*) show human cut-

⁶³ AUGUSTE et al. 1998.; MONCEL 2001b.

⁶⁴ BOCHERENS et al. 1997.

⁶⁵ ROEBROEKS-TUFFREAU 1999.

⁶⁶ VALOCH 1988.

⁶⁷ MONCEL-NERUDA 2000.; MONCEL 2001c.