7.3.s. Summary

The quantifier phrases *not every* and *not only* can be taken to mark negations of generalizations stated with *every* and *only*; they therefore cite the existence of counterexamples. Similarly, though less naturally, words like *some* and *a* can be taken to mark the negations of generalizations stated with *no* (although *a* may sometimes be used to the same effect as *every*).

Although some sentences containing both quantifier phrases and words marking connectives cannot be analyzed as truth-functional compounds, many can. It is clear how to do this when the sign for a connective is used to combine separate generalizations, but the analysis may be more problematic in other cases. For example, *every* X *and* Y can be understood to indicate a conjunction of generalizations but so does *no* X *or* Y. A claim of either sort can be analyzed as a single generalization, but its restricting predicate must use disjunction (i.e., it amounts to the quantifier phrase *everything that is* X *or* Y). This recalls, and can be traced to, the properties of conjoined conditionals with a common consequent. Something similar happens when *or* appears in the quantified predicate of a negative generalization.

In sentences where *any* and *every* are alternatives that convey different meanings, the use of *any* can be understood to indicate a generalization whose scope is wider than some other operation, and the use of *every* will indicate a generalization whose scope is narrower than that same operation.