The remaining sentences leave little opportunity to introduce more truth-functors; so at this point we call a halt and fit the pieces back together:

[the battery is flat → [the starter will be dead ∧ [¬you'll get   **19.14**
the car started ∨ we'll push the car]]]

(19.14) is the correct analysis of (19.7).

After some practice, you will find you can write down an analysis such as (19.14) as soon as you see the original sentence. But for the moment you should go step by step, for safety.

You may find that you have to paraphrase quite freely in order to introduce truth-functors, just as in section 17. In some cases this may lead you to change the scope of a word. Two examples will make the point.

He will be coming down by the 8.15 or the 9.15; if the   **19.15**
former, then he will be in time to see the opening.
[[he will be coming down by the 8.15 ∨ he will be coming
down by the 9.15] ∧ [he will be coming down by the
8.15 → he will be in time to see the opening]]

Here we repeat part of the first half, to eliminate the cross-referencing ('the former'); this brings the part about 8.15 into the scope of 'if'.

If you cut the party, then Jane, who is none too fond of you   **19.16**
anyway, will just make life hell for you.
[Jane is none too fond of you ∧ [you will cut the party →
Jane will just make life hell for you]]

Here we take the clause after 'who' outside the scope of 'if', in order to turn the 'who' into '∧'.

Exercise 19. Analyse each of the following sentences as faithfully as possible, using truth-functor symbols:

1. I shall not fail to write to you.
2. He was gassed, not shot.
3. He was neither gassed nor shot.
4. Nobody will get any chocolate if Tracey screams again.

5. If the State schools lack adequate space, then the private schools, providing as they do an excellent education, ease the burden on the State's facilities.
6. If the private schools are socially top-heavy, then they are perpetuating social injustice; but in that case they cannot reasonably demand charitable status.