

Mrs Meyerowitz ignores what was meant to be the central point of my article. Perhaps I should have emphasized it more. The reign-length data for the first eight Bono kings are unacceptable, not because they are too long (though this is true), but because they are *too regular*. A quantum of 30 odd years, varying slightly but averaging out at one third of a century, seemed obvious to me then and still seems obvious now.

Since Mrs Meyerowitz wrote her Communication, it has become possible to take the matter even further, for in January 1972 she very kindly presented the original of Mr Kofi Antubam's Tekyiman notes to the University of Birmingham. These show that Antubam had worked out his own chronology for the last thirteen Bono kings, and this differs at several points from Mrs Meyerowitz's. He took as his one fixed point a date of 1756 for the death of Ameyaw Kwaakye, the last Bono king. This he arrived at from a date of 1741 (which is wrong) for the death of the *Asantehene* Opoku Ware, because he had been told, by an Asante informant, that Ameyaw was a prisoner in Kumasi for fifteen years before he died. Antubam's own dates for the deaths of the last thirteen Bono kings were: 1600, 1614, 1623, 1638, 1644, 1654, 1664, 1669, 1684, 1700, 1706, 1726, 1756. Quantization is again obvious: 1600 ... 1638 ... 1669 ... 1700. What I wrote in 1970 concerning the first eight kings can now be seen to apply equally well here. The whole chronology is evidently factitious, and not simply that of the first eight kings, as I believed in 1970. It now appears to me that there is no traditional Bono-Manso chronology at all, and that both Mrs Meyerowitz and I have been misled.