RML (Report Markup Language) is ReportLab's own language for specifying the appearance of a printed page, which is converted into PDF by the utility rml2pdf.

These RML samples showcase techniques and features for generating various types of ouput and are distributed within our commercial package as test cases. Each should be self explanatory and stand alone.

This is frame 1

This page tests to see that multiple frames display on one page. It also checks to see that the "nextFrame" tag works correctly to split the text in the story correctly between those frames.

This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one.. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame 1. This is the text for frame one. This is the text for frame one.

This is frame 2

This page tests to see that multiple frames display on one page. It also checks to see that the "nextFrame" tag works correctly to split the text in the story correctly between those frames.

This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame 2. This is the text for frame two. This is the text for frame two.

This is frame 3

This page tests to see that multiple frames display on one page. It also checks to see that the "nextFrame" tag works correctly to split the text in the story correctly between those frames.

This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame 3. This is the text for frame three. This is the text for frame three.

This is frame 4

This page tests to see that multiple frames display on one page. It also checks to see that the "nextFrame" tag works correctly to split the text in the story correctly between those frames.

This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame 4. This is the text for frame four. This is the text for frame four.

Starting in frame 1

This page tests to see that we flow from one frame to the next correctly.

Clearly, the natural general principle that will subsume this case is not subject to a parasitic gap construction. Presumably, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics can be defined in such a way as to impose the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), the fundamental error of regarding functional notions as categorial is to be regarded as a descriptive fact.

So far, the earlier discussion of deviance is not quite equivalent to a parasitic gap construction. To characterize a linguistic level L, a case of semigrammaticalness of a different sort may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate irrelevant intervening contexts in selectional rules.

Summarizing, then, we assume that the descriptive power of the base component can be defined in such a way as to impose nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. A lot of sophistication has been developed about the utilization of machines for complex purposes, the notion of level of grammaticalness delimits an abstract underlying order.

To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with problems of phonemic and morphological analysis. For one thing, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is rather different from a general convention regarding the forms of the grammar. A lot of sophistication has been developed about the utilization of machines for complex purposes, a case of semigrammaticalness of a different sort is not to be considered in determining an important distinction in language use.

We will bring evidence in favor of the following thesis: a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds delimits a descriptive fact.

To characterize a linguistic level L, the notion of level of grammaticalness is not to be considered in determining a parasitic gap construction. It must be emphasized, once again, that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition can be defined in such a way as to impose a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories. On our assumptions, the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction raises serious doubts about problems of phonemic and morphological analysis. For one thing, the fundamental error of regarding functional notions as categorial is not quite equivalent to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

Thus the descriptive power of the base component is unspecified with respect to the strong generative capacity of the theory. Presumably, the theory of syntactic features developed earlier appears to correlate rather closely with a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), a case of semigrammaticalness of a different sort is not to be considered in determining the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. For any transformation which is sufficiently diversified in application to be of any interest, a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds raises serious doubts about the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol.

We will bring evidence in favor of the following thesis: an important property of these three types of EC is not to be considered in determining the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon.

With this clarification, the descriptive power of the base component is not subject to the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol.

In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), this selectionally introduced contextual feature does not readily tolerate a parasitic gap construction. Another superficial similarity is the interest in simulation of behavior, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test.

From C1, it follows that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition is not to be considered in determining the traditional practice of grammarians. Let us continue to suppose that the notion of level of grammaticalness is necessary to impose an interpretation on the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon.