We agree with Dr. Bowman’s response that none of those commenting on the Williams and Bowman proposal contradicts or even addresses the principal argument. Their (Drs. Bruce, Brandt & Holthuis) comments and opinions are of interest in providing additional background information and history of the problem, but do nothing to refute the proposal of the application.

Since they have introduced auxiliary issues, we will state a primary point even though it is technically irrelevant. The *Lironeca* spelling would have the positive
effect of preserving the intent of the original author (which is beyond dispute see BZN 51: 224, para. 4), while the Livoneca spelling would have the negative effect of promoting a misspelling or misprint. We trust the ruling will preserve reality with Lironeca, not the surrealism of the Livoneca spelling.