

# RML Example 29: Keepinframe



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 output and are distributed within our commercial package as test cases. Each should be self explanatory and stand alone.

## First Try at a keepInFrame

This will behave just like part of a story, as long as it all fits.

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.

## keepInFrame 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 keepInFrame, shrinks

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 keepInFrame (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 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 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.

### 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.

## **onOverflow = "truncate" in frame F1**

This will behave just like part of a story, as long as it all fits.

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

## **onOverflow = "overflow" in Frame F4**

This will behave just like part of a story, as long as it all fits.

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.

# RML Example 30: Keepinframe



## A new way to lay things out...

This tag lets us handle layouts like newsletters and factsheets in a much more natural style. In documents like this, one does not want stuff to leak out of the intended box into the next one. You wrap your content in `<keepInFrame>` tags and explicitly tell it where to go. The order of this page naturally goes top, upper, middle, bottomleft, bottomright, sidebar.

I drew this stuff third, out of the natural order. This should be in the upper frame, below the top.

I drew this stuff second, out of the natural order, putting it within a tag saying `<keepInFrame frame="sidebar" overflow="error">`. Havng done this, if I had too much content, there would an error warning me. I can put an ID in to identify it if I want. I can also specify other behaviours for full frames - shrink, truncate, overflow.

this goes in the middle frame.

and finally the bottom left.

this goes in the bottom right, and was drawn before the stuff on the left..

## The Nonsense Journal

We now overflow with rubbish etc etc and use onOverflow="shrink"

Suppose, for instance, that the natural general principle that will subsume this case is to be regarded as the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. On our assumptions, the notion of level of grammaticalness delimits the strong generative capacity of the theory. Furthermore, the fundamental error of regarding functional notions as categorial is to be regarded as an abstract underlying order. I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that most of the methodological work in modern linguistics raises serious doubts about the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Let us continue to suppose that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition does not affect the structure of a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test.

It must be emphasized, once again, that the earlier discussion of deviance raises serious doubts about a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the systematic use of complex symbols does not affect the structure of the strong generative capacity of the theory. To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is not quite equivalent to the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. On our assumptions, the fundamental error of regarding functional notions as categorial is to be regarded as nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. A consequence of the approach just outlined is that this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features raises serious doubts about the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon.

If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, the theory of syntactic features developed earlier delimits a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. By combining adjunctions and certain deformations, a case of semigrammaticalness of a different sort is not subject to an important distinction in language use. Note that this selectionally introduced contextual feature delimits the strong generative capacity of the theory. Analogously, a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds is not quite equivalent to an important distinction in language use. To characterize a linguistic level L, a case of semigrammaticalness of a different sort is, apparently, determined by a descriptive fact.

Clearly, the descriptive power of the base component is necessary to impose an interpretation on the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). Thus most of the methodological work in modern linguistics cannot be arbitrary in 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: this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features is unspecified with respect to nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. Nevertheless, this selectionally introduced contextual feature can be defined in such a way as to impose the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), a case of semigrammaticalness of a different sort is not quite equivalent to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon.

Note that this selectionally introduced contextual feature can be defined in such a way as to impose the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), the theory of syntactic features developed earlier is rather different from an important distinction in language use. On our assumptions, the descriptive power of the base component does not readily tolerate problems of phonemic and morphological analysis. Summarizing, then, we assume that most of the methodological work in modern linguistics does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. It must be emphasized, once again, that the systematic use of complex symbols is, apparently, determined by the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon.

A consequence of the approach just outlined is that the notion of level of grammaticalness is not to be considered in determining the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, the systematic use of complex symbols appears to correlate rather closely with nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. With this clarification, the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is not subject to a parasitic gap construction. Conversely, the systematic use of complex symbols is unspecified with respect to a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), the earlier discussion of deviance does not affect the structure of problems of phonemic and morphological analysis.

Clearly, the descriptive power of the base component is not subject to the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon. It appears that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction does not readily tolerate the traditional practice of grammarians. To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds is necessary to impose an interpretation on an abstract underlying order. Presumably, the notion of level of grammaticalness delimits a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. For one thing, the theory of syntactic features developed earlier cannot be arbitrary in an abstract underlying order.

To provide a constituent structure for T(Z,K), the systematic use of complex symbols does not readily tolerate nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. This suggests that the natural general principle that will subsume this case is not quite equivalent to the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). With this clarification, relational information is not subject to a general convention regarding the forms of the grammar. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition can be defined in such a way as to impose nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. On the other hand, the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is not quite equivalent to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I drew this stuff second, out of the natural order, putting it within a tag saying <keepInFrame frame="sidebar" overflow="shrink">. Of course, this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features can be defined in such a way as to impose an important distinction in language use. Nevertheless, the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). By combining adjunctions and certain deformations, the notion of level of grammaticalness is rather different from a descriptive fact. I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition is to be regarded as the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). A consequence of the approach just outlined is that this selectionally introduced contextual feature is not to be considered in determining irrelevant intervening contexts in selectional rules.

So far, the systematic use of complex symbols is necessary to impose an interpretation on nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. It must be emphasized, once again, that most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is rather different from the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Conversely, a descriptively adequate grammar can be defined in such a way as to impose a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, relational information does not affect the structure of the traditional practice of grammarians. Summarizing, then, we assume that most of the methodological work in modern linguistics appears to correlate rather closely with the strong generative capacity of the theory.