RML Example 26: pto

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.

First Try at a PTO

pto_body="1"

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite

equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

PTO with a table inside

alignment	align alignment
bulletColor	bulletcolor bcolor
bulletFontName	bfont bulletfontname
bulletFontSize	bfontsize bulletfontsize
bulletIndent	bindent bulletindent
firstLineIndent	findent firstlineindent

fontName	face fontname font
fontSize	size fontsize
leading	leading
leftIndent	leftindent lindent
rightIndent	rightindent rindent
spaceAfter	spaceafter spacea
spaceBefore	spacebefore spaceb
textColor	fg textcolor color

A long PTO

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have

already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, a descriptively adequate grammar delimits the strong generative capacity of the theory. For one thing, the fundamental error of regarding functional notions as categorial is to be regarded as a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. A majority of informed linguistic specialists agree that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is necessary to impose an interpretation on the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the

dominance scope of a complex symbol. It may be, then, that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition appears to correlate rather closely with the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Analogously, the notion of level of grammaticalness may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate a general convention regarding the forms of the grammar.

2 PTO (inner split)

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have

RML Example 26: pto

ReportLab

already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

Inner Starts

On our assumptions, a descriptively adequate grammar delimits the strong generative capacity of the theory. For one thing, the fundamental error of regarding functional notions as categorial is to be regarded as a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. A majority of informed linguistic specialists agree that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is necessary to impose an in-

terpretation on the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. It may be, then, that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition appears to correlate rather closely with the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Analogously, the notion of level of grammaticalness may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate a general convention regarding the forms of the grammar.

Inner Ends

We have already seen that the natural general principle that will subsume this case cannot be arbitrary in the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a

complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition is to be regarded as the strong generative capacity of the theory. A consequence of the approach just outlined is that the descriptive power of the base component does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). By combining adjunctions and certain deformations, a descriptively adequate grammar cannot be arbitrary in the strong generative capacity of the theory.

This PTO does nothing

Many vast star fields in the plane of our Milky Way Galaxy are rich in clouds of dust, and gas. First and foremost, visible in the above picture are millions of stars, many of which are similar to our Sun. Next huge filaments of dark interstellar dust run across the image and block the light from millions of more stars yet further across our Galaxy.

Table Slice Continuation

THere is a common need to continue tables intelligently with a continuation trailer and header which visually match the table. This can be done by implementing the continuation header and trailer as separate table-lets. However, you will have to manually set their widths as there is no way for them to pick up the width of the table they occur in. See below...

Date	Comment	Debit	Credit	Total
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	100.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	99.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	98.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	97.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	96.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	95.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	94.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	93.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	92.00
-	*to be continued*			-

-	*Continued from previous page*			-
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	91.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	90.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	89.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	88.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	87.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	86.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	85.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	84.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	83.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	82.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	81.00
21/9/04	Parking		1.00	80.00
	Final Balance			**80.00**

At present RML has no understanding of table content, so there's no easy way to do running or interim totals. We'd probably need smarter tables which knew that columns were numeric, and a formula language or variable namespace. Not hard, but needs some thought to do it right!

ReportLab

Example 1

> **1.** Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning
>
> **2.** Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning
>
> **3.** Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning
>
> *-- these orders continue on following page --*

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

4. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

5. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

6. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

7. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

8. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

9. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

10. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

11. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

12. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

13. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

14. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

15. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

16. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

17. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

18. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

19. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

20. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

21. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

Example 2

1. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

2. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

3. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

4. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

5. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

6. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

breathing every morning

7. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask at 6 l/min, Titrate O2 to keep O2Sat >95% and pO2 >70mmHg, Continuous O2Sat monitor, Decrease O2 to room air, ABG Now and In 20min . make sure he's breathing every morning

8. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

9. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

10.Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

11. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

12. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

13. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

14. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

15. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

16. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

17. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

18. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

19. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

20. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

21. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

Example 3

1. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

2. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

3. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

4. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

5. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

6. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

7. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask
-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

8. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

9. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

10. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

11. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

12. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

13. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

14. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

15. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

16. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

17. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

18. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

19. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

-- these orders continue on following page --

-- these orders continued from preceding page --

20. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

21. Humidified O2 by Partial Rebreathing Mask

PTO block without trailer tag

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite

independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

PTO block with empty trailer tag

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary

extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

PTO block without header tag

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite

continuation footer

independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

PTO block with empty header tag

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary

continuation footer

extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.

To characterize a linguistic level L, this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Notice, incidentally, that the notion of level of grammaticalness does not affect the structure of the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Suppose, for instance, that a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds appears to correlate rather closely with an important distinction in language use. Presumably, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. We have already seen that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the strong generative capacity of the theory.