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 ε-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 ε-TEX, you say, among other things, ". . . bi-directional typesetting . . . " Is ε-TEX the TEX for right-to-left typesetting? This is perplexing. And what is the meaning of "additional control over expansions, rescanning tokens," etc.? Should ε-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 `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.

Thanks and all the best,

Rama Porrat
The Hebrew University of
  Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel
`rama@cc.huji.ac.il`

Letters

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, ε-TEX. I don't know if I am an exception, but the fact is that it is practically im-