The geographic breadth of engagement, covering all known localities (excluding some uncertain assemblages) allows author to present some provocative conclusions. These were first talked about by Andreas Mayer at some HUGO Obermaier Gesellschaft conferences (specifically at the 54th Annual Meeting in Toulouse, 10 to 14 April 2012), where the author met with strong disapproval; author underwent a critical review of radiocarbon dates of Central European Magdalenian assemblages, which assigned C data not only from Epigravetian (Grubgraben, Stráňská skála IV) and Epiaurignatian sites (Langmannesdorf), but also for example. Ságvárién in Hungary. After calibration and proper rounding of data (cf. Table 8.1 and Fig. 8.5) constructs a bidirectional propagation model of the Magdalenian, just on the basis that in the east we do not find locations, which are chronologically younger: the first branch expands around 20,000 from the southwest of France gradually until the Rhine and Danube, at the same time the second (independent) branch spreads from the Carpathian region of Hungary in three separate ways – to Moravia, where the Magdalenian embeds at locations in Brno-Videšská and Brno-Stráňská skála IV, then from there to the Czech Republic and Poland. In one of these conception is Bohemia colonised from Poland or Moravia, as published by Sl. Vencl, but rather it is considered that Bohemia was settled from Thuringia.

Although we can legitimately question the outlined concept of the Magdalenian expansion, and also with regard to knowledge of archaeological material, it is necessary to allow the author a large amount of heuristic work, especially in terms of all basic sources gathered and presented on the Magdalenian era. With such global comparisons we can not be sufficiently capture in detail the nuances of individual sites, although the author drew from a large regional language literature (i.e. Not German, French or English).
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