There’s still something missing... 

I have just read [Michel Goossens’] Opening Words in TUGboat 16, no. 4 (December 1995). Thanks for [the] nice article.

Let me point out a few things.

I am most thankful for the \LaTeX{} 3 group, and for the work of bringing together all variants. However, there still are other developments that you mention — Omega, \epsilon-\TeX{}. I don’t know if I am an exception, but the fact is that it is practically im-

possible for me to devote much time to installing various new systems and try them, and users want one \TeX{} and one \LaTeX{}. So I must admit I did not install Omega or \epsilon-\TeX{}.

Omega is said to include a multi-language environment... etc., but we still do not have right-to-left capabilities inherent in the official \TeX{}, and this is essential for a right-to-left language. About \epsilon-\TeX{}, you say, among other things, “... bi-directional typesetting...” Is \epsilon-\TeX{} the \TeX{} for right-to-left typesetting? This is perplexing. And what is the meaning of “additional control over expansions, re-scanning tokens,” etc.? Should \epsilon-\TeX{} be used instead of \TeX{}? And if so, how about bringing together all variants?

We are still quite “backwards” in having a \LaTeX{} which works well in a bi-directional environment. We have an old \texttt{hebrew.sty} which only works, far from perfectly, with \LaTeX{} 2.09. As long as right-to-left capabilities are not an integral part of \TeX{} and \LaTeX{}, some major part is missing for us.
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