INTRODUCTION
Romuald’s cave is located on the southern slopes of the Lim channel in Istria, Croatia. It was recognized as potentially interesting archaeo logical site in the late 1970s when several researchers led small scale excavations in the cave. In the mid 20th century M. Malez conducted more extensive excavations of the site and unearthed various archaeological and palaeontological material dating from the Late Pleistocene to the Bronze and Iron Ages (Malez 1962, 1978, 1979). The Late Pleistocene finds included Upper Palaeolithic types of tools, faunal remains and two juvenile human teeth. In 2007 and 2008 D. Komšo (2008) led small scale excavations during which several Mousterian artefacts were found. In 2014 new excavations of the site started as part of the ARCHAEOGUM (Archaeological Investigations into Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene of the Lim Channel, Istria) financed by the Croatian Science Foundation. During the three years of work at the site, human skeletal material and artefacts from Bronze Age, as well as artefacts from Iron age were found (Janković et al. 2015). The middle sequences yielded several Upper Palaeolithic tool types, while the lower sequence yielded Mousterian artefacts and Pleistocene faunal remains dated to over 48 kya.

PALAEOLETHIC SKELETAL REMAINS FROM ROMUALD’S CAVE
Tooth no. 1: deciduous right second molar (idm) (Figure 3)
Discovered by M. Malez in 1962 in trench IV, layer 3 and reported as “right M1” (Malez 1962).
Tooth no. 2: deciduous left upper first molar (idm) (Figure 3)
Discovered by M. Malez in 1973 in trench IV, layer 3 and reported as “an upper premolar” (Malez 1975:509, although in Malez 1987:20 he mentions “two juvenile molars of a lower jaw”).

As both teeth come from the same layer and same excavation trench, he argued that they are most likely from the same individual (Malez 1978). This is likely, and based on tooth development and tooth wear (Schafer et al. 2009; Liveridge & Molleson 2004; Ubelaker 1979) we assess age at death between 2 and 4 years. Further, when the size proportions are examined between the two teeth, they both fall within the two standard deviations of the average size proportions for analogous teeth among a sample of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and recent Europeans.

LITHIC FINDS FROM ROMUALD’S CAVE
Lithic material from excavations by M. Malez consists of only two terracettes. In his publications, Malez (1962, 1975, 1978, 1981, 1987) refers to these as younger Aurignacian, early Gravenan, or Perigordian. Based on the typological and technological characteristics, artefacts can be ascribed to the Upper Palaeolithic, but more specific attribution can not be done. One of more interesting finds is a pierced deer (Cervus elaphus) (Malez 1968).

Technological and typological analysis of the material from Trench 1 and 2 was done, while analysis of material from Trench 3 is in progress. Parts of both trenches were previously excavated by Malez, who did not report any lithic finds. Technological and typological analyses used protocols described in by Karavanic (2004), Debénath & Dibble (1994), Inizan et al. (1999), and Bordes (1988). Excavations at Trench 1 yielded a total of 36 lithic finds, of which flakes are most frequent (N=22, 55,5%). One artefact shows the use of Levallois technology, while two are produced by blade technology. Of all the lithic finds, 22 are tools (60,11%) of which various types of sidescrapers are most common (N=15, see Table 2).

Excavations at Trench 2 yielded a total of 67 lithic finds. As in the material from Trench 1, flakes are most frequent (N=33, 49,25%, see Table 2). A total of 24 finds are tools (35,82%) of which sidescrapers are most abundant (N=18, 79,16%, see Table 2).

CONCLUSION
Excavations at Romuald’s cave show human use of the site at various times during prehistory (Middle and Upper Palaeolithic, Bronze and Iron Age). Analysis of finds from excavations by M. Malez and later work by D. Komšo and us, point to different use of space during Upper Palaeolithic and Middle Palaeolithic. While Upper Palaeolithic material is present mostly in the central part and back of the cave (Figure 1), our work in the first cave chamber (Figure 2) yielded mostly Mousterian types of tools. There is also a difference in raw material preference for production of lithics, as all Upper Palaeolithic types of tools were made on non-local stone (probably from Italy), while the Mousterian tools are made on the regionally available material. The quantity of the archaeological material suggests neither population stayed in the cave for a longer period. Lithic, faunal, geoaerological and geophysical work on material from Trench 3 is in progress and may help shed more light on various aspects of human use of the site during the Pleistocene.
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