

Because of the highest frequency of such assemblages during the last interglacial, beginning around 125 Ky, D. Collins in 1969 and K. Valoch in 1977 suggested to create a cultural group in Central Europe named Taubachian (after Taubach in Germany),<sup>8</sup> to focus on the variability of these numerous assemblages dating for most of them to the OIS 5 and 4 (more than 40 listed sites). Although the different cultural names, used by researchers, such as Kiik-Koba Micromousterian, Micoquian Micromousterian or Pontinian in Italy, are often based on tool types or on geographical areas, technological analysis brings evidence of various traditions inside these microlithic assemblages, perhaps related to regional trends.<sup>9</sup>

The term "Taubachian" does not seem to describe the best way all the microlithic assemblages, dated to the OIS 5 and OIS 4, in this part of Europe and cannot be employed to designate a single lithic entity. The Taubach assemblage is not the best example of a microlithic assemblage.<sup>10</sup> However, largely described by K. Valoch by the excavations from Kůlna in the Czech Republic, the microlithic industries gather some common characteristics as the use of small pebbles of various rocks, contributing to a microlithic assemblage, the "non-Levallois" technology in most cases, the average size of the flakes of 3 cm or less, a lot of broken flakes.<sup>11</sup> The flat retouch is also lacking, as well as the bifacial tools. Side-scrapers, denticulates and notches are prevalent, associated with micro-choppers. Bones often show numerous retouches of compressors.<sup>12</sup>

These assemblages are often related to hot water springs (but also to caves and river banks), and the animal remains especially belong to one or two large herbivores (bovines, horses), associated with smaller animals in some cases. Among the fauna, there are also remains of large mammals such as elephants and rhinoceros. In some assemblages, these species are quite numerous, for example, *Cervus elaphus*, *Dicerorhinus mercki* (70% young) and *Bison priscus* in Taubach in a mixed forest context (110-116,000 BP by U/Th);<sup>13</sup> *Dicerorhinus mercki* and *Elephas antiquus* in Gánovce.<sup>14</sup> In Tata, the Mammoth is the dominant species.

Different hypothesis could explain these assemblages. Thus, do these assemblages represent distinctions in lithic traditions, differences in subsistence strategies or a large influence of the available raw materials?

<sup>6</sup> BURDUKIEWICZ et al. 1979., 1994.; MANIA 1988.; MANIA et al. 1980.; DOBOSI 1983a., 1988., 2003.; BURDUKIEWICZ 1993.

<sup>7</sup> DEREVIANKO et al. 1998.; RONEN et al. 1998.; MERDER et al. 1998.; RANOV 2001.; RANOV-DOBONOV 2003.

<sup>8</sup> VALOCH 1977, 1984.

<sup>9</sup> GÁBORI 1976.; STEPANCHUK 1994.; KUHN 1990-1991., 1995.; LIOUBINE 1998.

<sup>10</sup> BEHM-BLANKE 1960.; SCHÄFER 1981.

<sup>11</sup> SCHÄFER 1981.; VALOCH 1984.

<sup>12</sup> VALOCH 1984., 1988., 1995.

<sup>13</sup> BRUNNACKER et al. 1983.; MANIA 1988.

<sup>14</sup> LOZEK 1954.