

There should be a table on this page

These should have links.


<i>Name</i>	<i>Email</i>
<i>Robin</i>	<i>mailto:robin@reportlab.com</i>
xxx	

There should be a table on the next page

These should have links.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Email</i>
<i>Robin</i>	<i>mailto:robin@reportlab.com</i>
xxx	

## ***RML2PDF Test Suite - Test #9***



## **keepWithNext and paragraph splitting = #1.**

This tests the ability to make headings 'stick to' the paragraphs after them. The heading style used is supposed to be kept with the next paragraph, even if this involves flopping onto the next page. We have sized this text so that there is enough space for the heading below to fit into the top frame. However, its style has a *keepWithNext* attribute set to 1, so it should flop down into the bottom half. Cross your fingers....

## **This should be on the bottom half**

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.

## **keepWithNext and paragraph splitting - #2.**

This time the style has keepWithNext turned OFF. The paragraph below should be in the top half.

### **This should be on the top half**

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.