

for a larger range of activities and perhaps a more developed hunting in Tata than in the Kůlna cave or the open air site of Předmostí II.⁷⁴ The bifacial points or the flat retouch on the blank butt would have been more efficient to haft them. Nevertheless, the idea of a different tradition can no longer be discarded, as the rare bifacial tools in Kůlna suggest. Furthermore, technological studies in the recent years have focussed on the danger to closely associate a flaking method, such as the discoidal method, with a specific activity such as a large hunting and butchery processing.⁷⁵ Each flaking method, especially the laminar processing method, is able to produce efficient blanks to treat animal corpses. The toolmakers actually selected among their technical abilities the best processing systems, or several ones, to meet the needs of the human group during a settlement. In Tata, the debitage method used, similar to those in Kůlna, Předmostí II and even Vértesszőlős, certainly attests a large range technological behaviour over space and time, whatever the climatic changes.

At least, some assemblages show that large herbivores with cut marks and evidence of hunting are associated in Central Europe during the OIS 5 and 4 with humans, using in particular microlithic assemblages. The frequent occurrence of these human occupations in water spring locations is most likely evidence of deliberate behaviour of some European Neanderthal groups who knew the extraordinary richness of life and natural resources around the springs. These groups used small pebbles in various rocks and made small tools. Activities could be varied and butchery activities cannot only be related to these settlements in regard to the tool type, the blank variety and, especially, the number of bones broken for the marrow. It is another technological world, intentionally microlithic, with certainly another conception of the tool kit.⁷⁶

MARIE-HÉLÈNE MONCEL

Laboratoire de Préhistoire Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle

Institut de Paléontologie Humaine

1 rue R. Panhard, 75013 Paris France

E-mail: moncel@mnhn.fr

⁷⁴ MONCEL-SVOBODA 1998.

⁷⁵ TUFFREAU 1993.; MONCEL et al. 1998.; GENESTE-JAUBERT 1999.; MONCEL 2001a.

⁷⁶ This work was supported by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in France through a research project. Many thanks to Professor Dobosi from the National Hungarian Museum in Budapest, Hungary, for her help, discussion and interest to this study. Many thanks also to Professor K. Valoch, from the Anthropos Institute in Brno, in the Czech Republic, and Professor J. Svoboda, from the Science Academy in the Czech Republic, for all their help and their great knowledge on Central Europe.