

“DND how extremely full the dish the waiter served me is!”

d) The meaning of DND does not stay embedded under semantic operators ((5a)) and it is a speaker commitment ((5b-c)).

(5) a. La Júlia creu que el Pere va arribar tard perquè Déu n’hi do quant de trànsit hi havia.

“Julia believes that Peter was late because DND how much traffic there was.”

b. # però, de fet, no em vaig immutar per la quantitat de trànsit que hi havia.

“but, actually, I was not emotional about the amount of traffic there was.”

c. # però, de fet, jo sé que no hi havia pas gaire trànsit aquell dia.

“but, actually, I know that there was not a lot of traffic that day.”

PROPOSAL We propose that the lexical meaning of DND resembles that of *surprise*, as shown in (6) (a version of the one proposed in Sharvit (2002:103)).

(6) $[[\text{surprise}]]^{H/K}(w)(Q)(a) = 1$ iff AMAZING(a)(w) $\supseteq \cap \{p: p \in Q(w) \text{ and } w \in p\}$ where:

(i) AMAZING(a) is a proper subset of NONEXP(a);

(ii) NONEXP(a) is the complement of the set of worlds compatible with a's expectations and a superset of AMAZING(a), and

(iii) Q is a Hamblin/Karttunen-style question intension.

More specifically, DND involves a weaker condition on its arguments, namely (7):

(7) $[[\text{DND}]](w)(Q)(a) = 1$ iff NONEXP(a)(w) $\supseteq \cap \{p: p \in Q(w) \text{ and } w \in p\}$

In addition, $[[\text{DND}]]$ and $[[\text{surprise}]]$ are ordered on a scale of unexpectedness, in the same way as <quite/pretty, very>. Thus, these items are subjected to a conversational implicature: each element entails the elements lower on the scale and conversationally implicates the negation of the elements higher on the scale. Thus, $[[\text{DND}]]$ conversationally implicates that the degree of unexpectedness conveyed by $[[\text{surprise}]]$ has not been reached, which explains the facts in (3).

Furthermore, we assume, following Castroviejo (2007), that *tan*+ADJ in (4a) and *extremadament* in (4b) are non-restrictive modifiers, which are, hence, not interpreted at the regular descriptive meaning, but in the domain where conventional implicatures are computed. Consequently, all wh-clauses denote sets of alternatives, irrespectively of whether they are used as questions or exclamatives when they stand alone as matrix clauses. Given this assumption, the contrast in (4) follows straightforwardly: *tan*+ADJ involves high degree of ADJ-ness, which is not incompatible with the denotation of DND, whereas the conventional implicature according to which the speaker claims that the dish is extremely full is incompatible with the conversational implicature that DND generates. Note also that (4b) is evidence for a previously unnoticed fact: conventional implicatures are unable to cancel a conversational implicature, as opposed to assertions, which do have this ability as shown in (3c). Finally, although DND has a literal meaning and expresses an assertion, it is always interpreted as involving an expressive meaning. Therefore, it also conveys a conventional implicature, which explains the facts in (5).

CONCLUSION We have provided an economic analysis for DND which treats it as an emotive predicate and which, at the same time, does not have an extreme degree requirement on its argument. This has interesting consequences for an analysis of exclamatives that does not differ from that of wh-interrogatives.

ABELS, K. (2005) Remarks on Grimshaw's clausal typology. E. Maier, C. Bary and J. Huitink (eds.) Proceedings of SuB 9; D'AVIS, F.J. (2002) On the interpretation of wh-clauses in exclamative environments. Theoretical Linguistics (28): 5-31; CASTROVIEJO, E. (2006) A degree-based account of wh-exclamatives. E. Puig-Waldmüller (ed.) Proceedings of SuB 11; CASTROVIEJO, E. (2007) When manner adverbs cannot be interpreted restrictively. Colloque de Syntaxe et Sémantique à Paris; MAYOL (2007) Catalan 'Déu n'hi do' and Levels of Meanings in Exclamatives. Proceedings of the 26th WCCFL. Cascadilla Press; SANCHO, P. 2003. “Anàlisi contrastiva interdialectal de la fraseologia: El cas de déu-n'hi-do, ausa(d)es/a gosa(d)es i espaiet”. In *Catalan Review*, 17(2), 151-17; SHARVIT, Y. (2002). "Embedded Questions and 'De Dicto' Readings", *Natural Language Semantics* 10:97-123; ZANUTTINI, R. and P. PORTNER. 2003. “Exclamative clauses: at the syntax-semantics interface”. *Language* 79: 39-81.