

Silex is made up of radiolarite (6 macroscopic type groups selected), spongiolite (= Lower Jurassic chert?) and many other uncertain categories, most of them probably also radiolarite (Table 1).

The gravel origin of the pieces (silex pebbles preferentially used) make the problem more complex. Both quartzite and silex artefacts have pebble cortex on part of their surface. Quartzite tend to have more (68% of total pieces have cortex on the surface of 20% on average each), while it is clearly less frequent on silex (36% of total pieces have cortex on the surface of 23% of the corticated pieces). Most of the silex bearing cortex could only be classified to “*uncertain*” silices, and the ratio of cortex on them is rather high (over 30%) (Table 2). It can show that part of the silex tools were made of blocks in primary, or at least, not gravel deposit, sources. Another explanation can be that the technology for the silex tools comprised a more complex “*chaîne opératoire*” and therefor the cortex appears only at the exterior decortication flakes.

Instead of conclusions...

At this stage, it is clearly too early for conclusions. Less than 2% of the total material has been studied. We can, however, formulate the questions more clearly.

First—can we locate the collecting spot(s) for Tata? Do the raw materials selected for tool-making come, all from secondary sources? What is the geological, primary origin of the individual raw material groups?

And, the big question for me—were the seemingly Bakony origin raw materials (Szentgál radiolarite, Úrkút-Eplény radiolarite, Spongiolite) local, did they have—probably eroded—outcrops in the Gerecse–Vértes mountain system? Or, did the rivers of the Early Pleistocene transport them? (from where). Also, with availability of special radiolarite types around Tata we may reconsider some statements concerning the prehistoric trade as well.

The actual state of art can be summarised in the form of two maps. On the first one (Map 1.), the exploitation of local (pebble) resources is indicated as suggested by previous studies. On the second map (Map 2.), I am suggesting other possible contact areas on the basis of published petroarchaeological data and my own observations. A more convincing answer to these problems is expected from the ongoing petroarchaeological studies.

T. BÍRÓ, KATALIN
(Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum)
1370 Budapest, Múzeum körút 14–16.
E-mail: tbk@hnm.hu