"hornstone", however it would be interesting to see if they spotted any of the Triassic hornstone (of Buda hornstone?) or not.

Classified under *"other raw materials"*, they listed limestone, sandstone, quartzporphyr. I think they use the word Kiesel (silex) meaning pebble, referring to Kieselkomplexes several times, mentioning that a large part of the pieces came probably not from the Danube but the Helvetian complex (of what?) and from the drift of the Slovakian rivers, e. g. Vág (Vah). They also mention a possible place of origin in the foothill pebble complexes of the Gerecse and Vértes Mts.

The Nummulitic limestone pebble and the silicified wood encountered are supposed to come from a Pliocene-Helvetian (pebble?) layer. More stone types mentioned without hint at the place of origin is tuffite and sericitic siliceous schist, gneiss and quartzite pebbles. They claimed that the petrographical characteristics of these are fairly uniform and they are to be located in any pebble complex.

In the photographic evidence, they are presenting—apart from the radiolarite—a fine-grained cryptocrystalline silicite as flint with a vein of chalcedony-fairly general texture for fine-grained siliceous rocks (Abb. 1., 3–4.), a silicified intermediary tuffite (Abb. 1., 5.). Theoretically, this rock occurs closest to the site in the Visegrád and Pilis Mts., but can be found in the Slovakian pebble drift of some rivers, e.g., Garam (Hron). The last preparatum presented on photo is a nummulitic limestone presented on Abb. 1., 6.

The approach and treatment of the material can be considered modern in those days; however, the documentation published is not enough to identify what they were actually working on. It is especially painful not to know about their *"Quartzporphyr-kiesel"* which may or may not be identical with the popular raw material of the Bükk Mts., about 300 km to the East of Tata across the Danube and the nummulitic limestone (silicified or not?), both of them subjects of current research (Markó et al. in press, A. Markó in this volume).

The archaeological analysis of Vértes in the same monograph did not add much to the petroarchaeological aspects. His interest is partly typological, partly technical and statistical. He sometimes noted the presence of quartzite vs. silex at the specific tool types. In the case of retouchers (hammerstones), he mentioned the preferential use of limestone. On table D,[9] he made a brief summary on the raw material composition by piece and percent, he published also in the Handbook.[10]

D (Rohmaterial):

1 (Kiesel)	1207 St.	58,6%
2 (Silex)	673 "	32,7%
3 (Quartzit)	150 "	7,2%
4 (Knochen)	23 "	(–)
5 (Sonstiges Gestein)	28 "	1,4%

[9] Végh–Viczián 1964, 176.

[10] Vértes 1965.