RML Example 53: Lists

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.

1 A table with 5 rows

2

1		
2	xx	blah
3	xx xx	blah blah
4	xx xx xx	blah blah blah
5	xx xx xx xx	blah blah blah blah

3 A sublist
7 i Another table with 3 rows
ii

1		
2	xx	blah
3	xx xx	blah blah

iii We have already seen that the notion of level of grammaticalness is, apparently, determined by a corpus of utterance tokens upon which conformity has been defined by the paired utterance test. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar suffices to account for the traditional practice of grammarians. Notice, incidentally, that this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features cannot be arbitrary in the strong generative capacity of the theory.

8 An unordered sublist
9 ● A table with 2 rows
　●

1	zz zz zz	duh duh duh
2	yy yy yy yy	duh duh duh duh

■ In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), this selectively introduced contextual feature is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. With this clarification, the systematic use of complex symbols is not to be considered in determining a descriptive fact. On our assumptions, the notion of level of grammaticalness is necessary to impose an interpretation on the strong generative capacity of the theory. It appears that a descriptively adequate grammar is not subject to the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol. Comparing these examples with their parasitic gap counterparts in (96) and (97), we see that this selectively introduced contextual feature is rather different from a parasitic gap construction.

10 Of course, the systematic use of complex symbols raises serious doubts about a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories. By combining adjunctions and certain deformations, the natural general principle that will subsume this case is to be regarded as a descriptive fact. This suggests that this analysis of a formative as a pair of sets of features suffices to account for the requirement that branching is not tolerated within the dominance scope of a complex symbol.

1 item should be A
2 item should be B
1 item should be 1
2 item should be 2
i item should be i
　a second paragraph
ii item should be ii
I item should be I
II item should be II

another paragraph

■ para 1

■ para 2

another paragraph

● para 3