in the Sólyom-kút rock shelter.[15] The raw material is above all local (various flint) and the obsidian artefacts could come from a 80–90 km distance.

These kinds of assemlages seem to be independant. The Bábonyian (OIS 5) is supposed to be the origin of the Szeletian, especially observed in the north-east of Hungary, finding its roots inside the Micoquian.[16] The Jankovicien type would be dated from the last glacial time. The raw materials used are frequently porphyres and obsidian from the northeast of Hungary.

The assemblages from Diósgyőr-Tapolca show a main activity based on the debitage. Some bifacial tools on quartzporphyre plate blocs are similar to those observed in the babonyian levels. However, they are too rare to give evidence of a specific technological behaviour. These levels are consequently closer to the industries without bifacial points, for example the Taubachian, one of the types of lithic assemblages described in Hungary.

Described in 1969 by D. Collins and confirmed by the Kulna cave excavations lead by K. Valoch, the Taubachian gathers together microlithic industries.[17] These microlithic assemblages are dated for the most from the OIS 7–5 or the beginning of the OIS 4 and located in the central Europe.[18] Other kinds of these assemblages have been observed easter, but, according to the researchers, they belong to the Micoquian facies or other facies (Kiik-Koba for example). Older sites have yielded similar industries as Bilzingleben in Germany or Vértesszőlős in Hungary. The question of a microlithic tradition along time, with local trends, is not solved.[19] A lot of these sites are linked to travertins, deposits from water sources, favourable areas to animals and vegetation. The hypothesis for specific activities around water sources is often discussed but why to do so small? The bone remains indicate human actions on large herbivores. In this case, do we have evidence of original technical trends, proof of independant human groups ?

In Hungary, two sites belong to the microlithic industry group, Vértesszőlős (OIS 9) and Tata (OIS 5–4).[20] While Vértesszőlős assemblages show both large pebble tools and a debitage of very small pebbles, Tata assemblage indicates a large debitage on very small radiolarite pebbles and flint pebbles, all of them being local. The processing system is *"discoid"*, with various rules resulting in the same kinds of products.

[15] Mester 1995.

[16] Bosinski 1967.; Bosinski et al. 1995.; Ringer et al. 1995.; Mester 2000.

[17] Valoch 1984., 1988., 1995., 1996.; Stepanchuk 1994.; Golovanova et al. 1998.

[18] Lozek 1954.; Schwarcz et al. 1982., 1988.; Kaminska et al. 1993.

[19] Mania et al. 1980.; Dobosi 1983., 1988.; Kretzoi–Dobosi 1990.

[20] Vértes et al. 1964.