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.

Demonstration of left and right alternating pages.

We start off using our standard cover page template. We then put a template into the story which alternates left and right. The templates have mock staple-holes and other furniture so you can see which is which.

For this exercise we defined four page templates - cover, left, right and plain - and use a tag like this in a nextTemplate instruction to set up the cycle:

```
<setNextTemplate name="left,right"/>
```

ReportLab

This should be on a left-side page, with alternating templates until countermanded.

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.

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.

A page template for the right side of a book

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.

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.

A page template for the left side of a book

ReportLab

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.

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.

A page template for the right side of a book

ReportLab

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.

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.

A page template for the left side of a book

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.

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.

A page template for the right side of a book

This should back on a plain page. More Chomsky...

Note that the descriptive power of the base component is not subject to the levels of acceptability from fairly high (e.g. (99a)) to virtual gibberish (e.g. (98d)). However, this assumption is not correct, since most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is, apparently, determined by an abstract underlying order. Nevertheless, a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds does not affect the structure of a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories. Note that most of the methodological work in modern linguistics raises serious doubts about a parasitic gap construction. To characterize a linguistic level L, the systematic use of complex symbols is to be regarded as an abstract underlying order.

Use a tag like this in a nextTemplate instruction to set up the cycle left,right,right,.....:

```
<setNextTemplate name="left,*,right"/>
```

the print button for eBusiness

Evaluation copy ofReportLab PLUS. Contact ReportLab (www.reportlab.com) to purchase.

ReportLab

This should be on a left-side page, followed by right until countermanded.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by

the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect

the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same

time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a

A page template for the right side of a book

parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

A page template for the right side of a book

I suggested that these results would follow from the assumption that the appearance of parasitic gaps in domains relatively inaccessible to ordinary extraction is to be regarded as a parasitic gap construction. In the discussion of resumptive pronouns following (81), a subset of English sentences interesting on quite independent grounds may remedy and, at the same time, eliminate the traditional practice of grammarians. If the position of the trace in (99c) were only relatively inaccessible to movement, a descriptively adequate grammar does not affect the structure of the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar. Suppose, for instance, that any associated supporting element is, apparently, determined by the strong generative capacity of the theory. On our assumptions, most of the methodological work in modern linguistics is unspecified with respect to a stipulation to place the constructions into these various categories.

This should back on a plain page. More Chomsky...

We have already seen that most of the methodological work in modern linguistics suffices to account for the extended c-command discussed in connection with (34). It must be emphasized, once again, that the speaker-hearer's linguistic intuition is not to be considered in determining an abstract underlying order. Thus any associated supporting element is to be regarded as a general convention regarding the forms of the grammar. However, this assumption is not correct, since the theory of syntactic features developed earlier is unspecified with respect to nondistinctness in the sense of distinctive feature theory. Furthermore, the natural general principle that will subsume this case is, apparently, determined by the ultimate standard that determines the accuracy of any proposed grammar.