On obligatorily fronted adverbials in German – the case of *klar* 'of course'

Bjarne Ørsnes, Copenhagen Business School

Abstract: In German, almost any kind of constituent can occupy the first position, the prefield, of a declarative clause. Either a constituent is moved there from a base position within the clause or it is filled by a semantically void pronoun. Nevertheless, some expressions such as expressive adverbials rarely occur in the prefield. Meinunger (2022) refers to such expressions as 'prefield-phobic'. But the opposite is also the case: some expressions only occur in the prefield and not in other positions of the clause or with a different interpretation. An example of such a 'prefield-philic' expression is the evidential sentence adverb *klar*, lit. 'clear'. In the prefield it means 'of course' (*Klar weiß ich das!* 'Of course I know'), while it means 'clearly' in other positions of the clause (*Er hat es ganz klar gewusst.* 'He has clearly known'). The article describes these uses and suggests that there are two sentence adverbs of *klar* with different histories. One means 'clearly' and has developed from the manner adverbial *klar* by extension of the scope. The other means 'of course' and has developed through reanalysis of the adjective *klar* used as an independent exclamatory utterance (*Klar!* 'of course') into a sentence adverb. The analysis is supported by diachronic evidence and appears to carry over to other prefield-philic expressions.

1. Introduction[1]

In German, almost any kind of constituent can begin a declarative sentence. A constituent is moved to the prefield, the first position before the finite verb, from its base position within the clause for information structural reasons (Zifonun et al. 1997: 1639 *ff.*) or simply to provide a filler for the first position. The constituent in the prefield can even be a semantically void pronoun. Some expressions dislike the prefield and prefer to stay within the clause. Meinunger (2022) refers to such expressions as 'prefield-phobic' and gives expressive adverbials like *echt* 'really' as an example.

(1) ?? Echt   hat Peter ein Auto gekauft.
      really has Peter a   car   bought
      '(Intended:) Peter has really bought a car.'

Yet, the opposite is also the case. Some expressions are so fond of the prefield that they do not even occur in the middle field (after the finite verb). In the terminology of Meinunger (2022), they can be said to be 'prefield-philic'. An example is the noun phrase *kein Wunder* 'no wonder' as an adverbial (Frey 2006: 243).

(2) a.   Kein Wunder bekommt Erling eine Festschrift.
        no   wonder gets   Erling a   Festschrift
        'It's no wonder that Erling gets a Festschrift.'
    b. * Erling bekommt kein Wunder eine Festschrift.[2]
        Erling gets   no   Wonder a   Festschrift

A special case of 'prefield-philia' includes expressions which occur both in the prefield and in the middle field but with different interpretations. An example is adverbial *klar*, lit. 'clearly'. In the middle field, *klar* occurs in two adverbial functions. As a manner adverbial it describes that something happens in a clear way. In (3a) the understanding of the problem itself is clear. As an evidential

---

[1]I wish to thank Jörg Asmussen, Esther Jahns, Robin Schmaler and Wolf Schmaler for much help with the data, the reviewer for very helpful comments and the proof-reader for improving my English. All remaining errors are my sole responsibility.

[2] (2b) is possible with *kein Wunder* as a parenthetical.

          Research article

sentence adverbial, it means that there is clear evidence for the claim. In (3b) you can tell that Erling has understood the problem – he is asking the right questions for example. When *klar* is in the prefield as a sentence adverbial, it means that the communicated information is (or ought to be) familiar to both speaker and hearer; it means 'of course'. In (3c) it is expected that Erling has understood the problem. *Klar* does not occur in the middle field with this interpretation (Reis & Wöllstein 2010: 153; Coniglio 2022: 15).[3] Still, it is unusual for sentence adverbials to have a special interpretation in the prefield.

(3) a. Erling hat das Problem **klar** verstanden. (*klar₁*)
Erling has the problem KLAR understood
'Erling has understood the problem clearly.'

 b. Erling hat ganz **klar** das Problem verstanden.[4] (*klar₂*)
Erling has quite KLAR the Problem understood
'Erling has clearly understood the problem.'

 c. **Klar** hat Erling das Problem verstanden. (*klar₃*)
KLAR has Erling the problem understood
'Of course Erling has understood the problem.'

Frey (2006: 244) suggests that prefield-philic expressions are exclamatory: they express the speaker's attitude to the content of the clause. As such, they have to be in the prefield. But why is *klar* only sometimes exclamatory and how does the interpretation as 'of course' emerge? I will suggest that there are two sentence adverbs of *klar* with different histories. *Klar₂* with the interpretation 'clearly' has developed from the manner adverbial reading through extension of the scope to the whole proposition. *Klar₃* with the interpretation 'of course' has developed from *klar* as an independent exclamatory utterance, as in (4).

(4) **Klar!** Erling hat das Problem verstanden. (*klar_exc*)
KLAR Erling has the problem understood
'Of course! Erling has understood the problem.'

The analysis explains the special interpretation of *klar₃* and is supported by diachronic evidence. It points to another path in the development of sentence adverbials, and it describes the different uses of *klar* which are only sporadically reflected in current grammars and dictionaries (Giger 2011: 57).

2. The readings of adverbial *klar*
2.1. Klar as a manner adverbial: klar₁
The core meaning of the adjective *klar* is 'clear'. Something characterised as *klar* is transparent or pure usually based on a visual but also on an auditive impression: *klares Wasser* 'clear water' or *klarer Gesang* 'clear singing'. In an abstract sense, something characterised as *klar* is conceptually transparent or pure – i.e. easy to understand or easy to perceive due to the absence of disturbing factors: *ein klarer Gedanke* 'a clear thought' or *ein klarer Fehler* 'a clear mistake'. There is a metaphorical shift from what can be seen or heard to what is perceived cognitively – to knowledge

---

[3] The related sentence adverb *klarerweise,* lit. 'in a clear way' is characterised as 'rare' in DWDS (https://www.dwds.de/wb/klarerweise, accessed on 3/6/2023). It has 28 occurrences in the Kernkorpus but none in the Kernkorpus 21. It appears in the middle field in 86% of the cases. App. 50% of these seem to be used as 'of course', but the exact interpretation is sometimes difficult.

[4] *Klar₂* is considerably improved when preceded by the modifier *ganz* 'quite' but is also found alone.

or understanding (cf. Matlock 1989: 220). *Klar₁* (*klar* used as a manner adverbial to characterise a verbal action) has the same meanings: In example (5) Peter's speaking was easy to hear or it was easy to understand.

(5)   Peter   hat klar   gesprochen.
        Peter   has KLAR spoken
        'Peter has spoken clearly.'

Klar₁ can hold the prefield position, although this is considered marked in German and only licensed under certain conditions (Axel-Tober & Müller 2017: 27). In example (6), *klar* is ambiguous between *klar₁* and *klar₃*: either the universities are standing out clearly (manner) or the universities are standing out as expected (sentence adverbial as in (3c)).

(6)   Klar   stechen   Unis   wie   Stanford, das MIT oder Harvard   hervor.[5]
      KLAR   stand   universities   like   Stanford, MIT or Harvard   out
      'Universities like Stanford, the MIT or Harvard stand out clearly. (*manner*)'
      'Of course universities like ... stand out. (*sentence adverbial)*'

2.2. Klar as a sentence adverbial: klar₂ and klar₃

From the meaning of *klar* as cognitively clear there is only a small step to the use of *klar* as an evidential adverbial specifying that the speaker has evidence in support of a claim (cf. Axel-Tober & Müller 2017: 11). This use of *klar* is based on the well-known metaphor 'knowing is seeing' (cf. Matlock 1989: 220): what we know or understand is portrayed as what we see, cf. *mir ist klar, dass* ... 'I know that ...', lit. 'to me is clear that ...'. When a proposition is described as clear, the information of the proposition is accessible (cf. Axel-Tober & Müller 2017: 40): nothing prevents us from seeing, i.e. concluding, that the state of affairs (SoA) is obtaining.

Willett (1988) proposes a taxonomy of kinds of evidence. Direct evidence pertains to what the speaker can hear or see for herself, while indirect evidence pertains to what has been reported by others or what the speaker can figure out for herself either through inference from observable evidence ('results') or from a 'mental construct' ('reasoning') (Willett 1988: 57). Both *klar₂* and *klar₃* relate to indirect inference-based evidence, but there is a difference in the status of the communicated information. *Klar₂* signals that the communicated information is assumed to be new to the hearer and that it is based on clear, typically observable evidence (cf. (3b)). *Klar₃* signals that the information is assumed to be already familiar to speaker and hearer – usually based on shared knowledge (cf. (3c)). *Klar₃* is dealt with in the next section.

2.2.1. Klar₃

In (7) *klar* appears in front of the finite verb with the interpretation 'of course', and (7) can be paraphrased as *es ist klar, dass* ... 'it is clear/obvious that ...'. Example (7) illustrates *klar₃*, and the question is why *klar₃* has to be in the prefield.

(7)   Klar   komme ich   heute.
      KLAR come   I   today
      'Of course I will be there today.'

Swiss German has a similar construction with an evaluative adjective followed by a complement

---

[5] Die Zeit, 05.01.2000, Nr. 2 (Kernkorpus 21).

clause (here a subject clause) with the finite verb in the first position as in (8) (Dürscheid & Hefti 2006; Giger 2011).

(8) Gut, gibt es einen wie Oliver Kahn.[6]
    great is there someone like Oliver Kahn
    'Great that there is someone like Oliver Kahn.'

Swiss German allows complement clauses with the finite verb in the first position in copula constructions as in (9) (Giger 2011: 49).

(9) Und es ist super, gibt es die Unia, die diesen Vertrag für uns ausgehandelt hat.[7]
    and it is great is there the Unia who negotiated this contract for us
    'It is great that there is someone like Unia who negotiated this contract for us.'

In Giger's (2011) analysis, the construction in (8) is like (9) with *es ist* missing. Thus, *gut* is not in the prefield of the *gibt es*-clause – it is external to the clause as a predicative preceding its extraposed complement.[8] Dürscheid & Hefti (2006: 142) suggest an alternative analysis where *gut* in (8) is in the prefield. It is a predicative adjective which has 'mutated' into a sentence adverbial (adjectives can be used as adverbials without formal marking in German), and it must be in the prefield to indicate sentential scope. As far as (7) from Standard German is concerned, Reis & Wöllstein (2010: 154) show that *klar* is indeed in the prefield based on its intonational integration (see also Coniglio 2022: 15). They also suggest that *klar₃* diachronically could originate outside the clause. The present analysis presents a possible scenario for exactly this, combining ideas from both Dürscheid & Hefti (2006) and Giger (2011).

    In (7) *klar₃* means *natürlich* 'naturally' or *selbstverständlich* 'of course'. Adverbs like *naturally* and *of course* are characterised as expectation adverbs in Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer (2007: 172 *ff.*): the speaker emphasises the truth of a proposition p, and p is expected. While *klar₃* confirms the truth of p, it does not necessarily mean that p is expected. Expectation can be cancelled in a subsequent clause as in (10a) where the speaker is puzzled about Peter winning the award. *Klar₃* is used as 'I know!'. Also, *klar₃* can be used about established facts, as in (10b). No expectation is involved, *klar₃* signals 'as we all know'.

(10) a. A: *OK, but Peter nevertheless DID win the award*!
        B: Klar hat Peter den Preis gewonnen, aber warum?
           KLAR has Peter the award won but why
           'Of course Peter won the award, but why?'
    b. Klar wurde Goethe 1749 geboren!
       KLAR was Goethe 1749 born
       'Of course Goethe was born in 1749!'

Common to *klar₃* in (7) and (10) is that the speaker assumes the communicated information to already belong to or to follow from knowledge shared by speaker and hearer as also noted for *of course* and its equivalents in other languages (Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 236; Schrickx

---

2014: 288; Haumann & Killie 2019: 216). The paraphrase 'it goes without saying' captures this. The knowledge shared by speaker and hearer is often referred to as the Common Ground (CG) (Stalnaker 2002), so *klar₃* signals that the communicated information is assumed to be part of or to follow from the CG. The CG serves as evidence for the claim (Haumann & Killie (2019: 196) speak of 'general knowledge or reasoning'). Expectation follows from this characterisation: if a proposition follows from the CG, the SoA it describes is expected to obtain. It is possible to predict or expect that something will be the case from already available information. If we know that Peter has been drinking the night before, we expect him to have a headache as in B₁ in (11). Even if *klar₃* is most common with inference from existing knowledge, it is also used with situationally given (observable) evidence. In B₂ in (11) the speaker infers from Peter's behaviour that he must have a headache (Peter can hardly move his head). Informants accept such examples, but some are a little hesitant about B₂ and prefer *klar₃* as used in B₁. What B₁ and B₂ have in common, however, is that the speaker signals that the hearer could or should have figured out that Peter is indeed having a headache: it should have been in the CG.

(11) A: *I wonder, if Peter is having a headache.*
      B₁: Klar hat er Kopfschmerzen. Er hat   gestern   gesoffen.
          KLAR has he headache   he has yesterday drunk
          'Of course he is having a headache. He has been drinking yesterday.'
      B₂: Klar hat er Kopfschmerzen. Er kann seinen   Kopf   kaum bewegen.
          KLAR has he headache   he can   his   head   hardly move
          'Of course he is having a headache. He can hardly move his head.'

Klar₃ is obligatorily in the prefield. Emphasis is on the proposition already being accessible in the CG, and the proposition is the topic under discussion. *Klar₃*-clauses serve as confirmations. In (12) B's response is understood as 'I know!' or 'I should have known!'. B does not have to know already, but he should have known in hindsight.

(12) A: *Peter is coming tonight.*
      B: Klar   kommt er.
         KLAR comes   he
         'Of course he is coming.'

As an answer to a yes/no-question, *klar₃* is understood as an affirmative answer. In (13), A is obviously not aware that Peter is due to come. By using *klar₃*, B suggests that A should have figured that out based on shared knowledge. Perhaps Peter would never miss an opportunity for free drinks.

(13) A: *Is Peter coming tonight?*
      B: Klar   kommt er.
         KLAR comes   he
         'Of course he is coming.'

In monological texts *klar₃* has a special rhetoric effect. The information is presented as already belonging to the CG of the speaker and an imagined hearer and to be under discussion. Zafiu (2018: 117) refers to this use as rhetorical concession in her analysis of Romanian *desigur* 'of course' (see also Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 177, 183; Schrickx 2014: 288). In (14) the speaker concedes to the widely observed inclination to look out for discounts, before presenting a contrasting statement (introduced with *aber* 'but') to the effect that she does not really search for them.

(14) "Klar   achte   ich dabei   auch auf Rabatte, aber gezielt   sehe ich nicht
      KLAR   look out I   thereby also for discounts but   specifically look I   not
      danach" sagt sie, "schließlich kann man nicht immer mit der Mode gehen."[9]
      for it   says she after all   can you not   always with the trend   follow
      'Of course I also look out for discounts but I don't look for them specifically, she says,
      after all you cannot always follow the trend.'

2.2.2. Klar$_2$

It appears to be somewhat controversial whether *klar* can occur in the canonical position of sentence adverbials at the front of the middle field. Giger (2011: 58-59) argues that it can, while Reis & Wöllstein (2010: 153-154) seem to suggest that it cannot. Example (15) shows that *klar* does occur as a sentence adverbial at the front of the middle field (it precedes the subject) but is considerably improved when modified by *ganz* 'quite'.[10] Note that (15) can be paraphrased as *es ist klar der Fall, dass ...* 'it is clearly the case that ...' which is a characteristic of sentence adverbials (Zifonun et al. 1997: 1122).

(15)   Hier hat klar   das Jugendamt   versagt.[11]
       here has clearly the youth welfare office   failed
       'The youth welfare office has clearly failed here.'

Example (15) illustrates *klar$_2$* where *klar* has a meaning different from *klar$_3$*.[12] *Klar$_2$* signals that the information is new and that there is clear evidence for it. The hearer is supposed to add the proposition to the CG; it is not assumed to be contained in it already. *Klar$_2$* alternates with *deutlich* 'clearly' which suggests that it is typically used with situationally given, observable evidence. Wolf (2015: 139) speaks of 'publicly available evidence'. In (15) the speaker appeals to a particular incident to support the claim that the youth welfare office has failed. *Klar$_2$* means 'You can tell!' and is used to convince the hearer.[13] The difference between *klar$_2$* and *klar$_3$* is illustrated in the following situation where a patient describes his symptoms to a doctor.

(16)   A: *I have a sore throat. Could it be tonsillitis?*
       B$_1$:   Sie   haben ganz klar   eine Halsentzündung.
             you   have quite KLAR a   tonsillitis
             'You are clearly suffering from tonsillitis.'
       B$_2$: # Klar haben Sie   eine Halsentzündung.
             KLAR have you a   tonsillitis
             'Of course you are suffering from tonsillitis.'

The answer in B$_1$ is felicitous: the doctor says that there is clear evidence that the symptoms are caused by tonsillitis. The answer in B$_2$ is awkward, even condescending: the doctor suggests that the patient should be very well aware already. In B$_1$ the patient is not assumed to know already; it is not expected.

---

[9] NKU08/JAN.06545 Nordkurier, 25.01.2008; Nur wenig Lust auf Schnäppchenjagd (DeReKo).
[10] *Klar$_2$* does not seem to occur in the prefield. Example (6) only allows the reading of *klar* as *klar$_1$* or *klar$_3$*. In the Kernkorpus, *ganz klar* is only found in the prefield as a manner adverbial or as a predicative. This awaits further study.
[11] L09/AUG.00095 Berliner Morgenpost, 01.08.2009, S. 3; "Integrative Schulen bringen für alle Vorteile" (DeReKo).
[12] Giger (2011: 59) claims that *klar* in the middle field also means *selbstverständlich* 'of course'. This is possibly a difference between Standard German and Swiss German.
[13] I am grateful to the reviewer for this clarification.

The difference between *klar₂* and *klar₃* is also illustrated when used about future events. Latin has two adverbs covering the meanings of *klar₂* and *klar₃*. *Videlicet* 'clearly' (from *vidēre* 'to see') roughly corresponds to *klar₂* and *scilicet* 'of course' (from *scire* 'to know') to *klar₃*. Schrickx (2014) observes that *videlicet* 'clearly' is rarely used with future verb forms, while *scilicet* 'of course' is. Her explanation is that it is difficult to state that something happening in the future is 'evident from the context' (p. 291). It is easier to anticipate what is likely to happen, from what you already know (p. 291). *Klar₂* and *klar₃* behave similarly, though judgements are subtle. Example (17a) is difficult to contextualize on a reading where *klar₂* refers to clear evidence in the immediate context: being late in the future does not show in a person's behaviour. Example (17a) is not ruled out though. *Klar₂* lends itself to an epistemic interpretation as a truth-emphasizer with the meaning 'definitely', i.e. the evidential component is very weak (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 103).[14] Example (17b), with *klar₃*, is impeccable since it is possible to predict someone's late arrival from shared knowledge, e.g. about the person's schedule.

(17) a. ?# Peter wird ganz klar   morgen   zu spät kommen.
          Peter will quite KLAR tomorrow too late   come
          'Peter will clearly be too late tomorrow.' (Deviant on evidential reading)
      b.   Klar wird Peter morgen   zu   spät kommen.
            KLAR will Peter tomorrow too   late   come
            'Of course Peter will be too late tomorrow.'

2.3. The relation between the adverbial readings of klar
Klar₂ and *klar₃* have different interpretations. *Klar₂* is clearly related to *klar₁* (the manner adverbial reading). If a verbal action is sensorily or cognitively clear, the SoA is clearly obtaining (Simon-Vandenbergen & Aijmer 2007: 166). Also, it is common for sentence adverbials to develop from manner adverbials (Axel-Tober 2016; Axel-Tober & Müller 2017 among others). In an ambiguous context such as the one in (18), *ganz klar* can modify the verb or the whole sentence. The scope of *klar* is extended to the whole proposition.

(18) Peter hat ganz klar   gesprochen
      Peter has quite KLAR spoken
      'Peter has spoken very clearly. (*manner*) / 'Peter has clearly spoken. (*sentence adv.*)'

The semantics of *klar₃* is not obviously related to the manner adverbial reading. That a verbal action is sensorily or cognitively clear does not imply that it is known or expected. So where does this reading come from?

3.   The origin of the 'of course'-reading: *klar_exc*
Common to the expressions found as prefield-philic adverbials is that they can be used in isolation as exclamatory utterances – as responses or comments on other statements. They share this property with evaluative adjectives like *schön* 'great' (Günthner 2009[15]).

---

[14] Schrickx (2014) characterises *Clearly I want a cup of coffee* as strange since you need no evidence for your own wishes (289, ex. (4b)). The corresponding German *Ich möchte ganz klar einen Kaffee* is possible on the interpretation 'I definitely want a cup of coffee'. Again, the evidential component is very weak. A hypothesis is that the epistemic reading of *klar₂* emerges when *klar₂* is based on evidence only accessible to the speaker. The hearer cannot reconstruct the inference or the evidence.
[15] Günthner (2009: 153,163) mentions *klar* but considers it an evaluative adjective.

(19) A: *Peter will be there.*
    B: Kein Wunder! / Klar! / Gewiss! / Schön!
       no   wonder   KLAR certain   great
       'No wonder! / Of course! / Of course! / Great!'

Used as exclamations, some of the adjectives have lexicalised interpretations, and *klar_exc* (*klar* as an utterance) is interpreted as 'of course' (*gewiss* 'certain' is another example). In (20a) *klar_exc* means that the speaker already knows or should know. In (20b) *klar_exc* is an affirmative – and polite – answer ('yes!') implying that the hearer should know that B is always prepared to help A. In monological use, as in (20c), *klar_exc* is a comment by the speaker on her own contribution to the effect that that this is common knowledge. These are the same readings uncovered for *klar₃* in (12) to (14).

(20)   a. A: *Peter will be there.*
          B: Klar!
              KLAR
              'Of course!'
      b. A: *Will you pick me up?*
          B: Klar!
              KLAR
              'Of course!'
      c. Klar: Haß   ist immer die Kehrseite von Begierde.[16]
          KLAR hatred is always the flip side of desire
          'Of course: hatred is always the flip side of desire.'

The reading as 'of course' appears to originate in the use of *klar* as a predicative. All the exclamations in (21) behave like predicatives of the form *es ist PRED, dass* 'it is PRED that', but *es ist* 'it is' is missing. Zifonun et al. (1997: 440) analyse the exclamatory use as elliptical copula-clauses.

(21) Kein Wunder / Klar / Gewiss / Schön, dass Peter kommt!
      no   wonder KLAR certain   great   that Peter comes
      'No wonder / Obvious / Obvious / Great that Peter is coming!'

This is important since *klar* as a predicative has 'of course' as one of its readings, as illustrated in (22).

(22) *A and B are walking in a snow landscape. A says:*
     a. ??# Hier liegt Schnee.
          here is   snow
          'There is snow here.'
     b.   Es ist klar,   dass hier Schnee   liegt.
          it is   KLAR that here snow   is
          'Of course there is snow here.'

A's utterance in (22a) is odd in the context. The claim ought to be wholly uninformative to B. However, the very same claim with predicative *klar* in (22b) is not uninformative. The proposition is ascribed the property of being clear, and this becomes relevant with the interpretation that the

---

[16] Pilgrim, Volker Elis: Manifest für den freien Mann - Teil 1, Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt 1983 [1977], p. 101 (Kernkorpus).

presence of snow is expected, i.e. it ought to be in the CG already. In (22b) *klar* is part of the communicated information (Krifka 2023; Wolf 2015: 162).

Predicative *klar* is used to describe logical conclusions as early as the eighteenth century. In the Historische Korpora, 13 out of 16 occurrences from the period 1700-1799 stem from mathematical texts like (23).[17]

(23) Hieraus ist nun klar, daß wann ein Bruch mit seinem Nenner multipliciret wird, der
       Zehler desselben das Product anzeigen werde.[18]
       'From this is now KLAR, that when a fraction is multiplied with its denominator, its
       numerator will give the product.'

The author has meticulously shown what happens when the numerator of a fraction is multiplied with its denominator and shown that the result is the numerator of the original fraction. In (23) the author draws the conclusion, and *hieraus ist klar* 'from this is clear' can be paraphrased as 'it follows from this/as anyone can figure out'. This use of *klar* lies at the heart of 'of course': it follows from what we know. *Klar_{exc}* lexicalises the interpretation as 'of course'. As an answer to a directive speech act, like the one in (20b), this interpretation is the most appropriate. It is awkward – and impolite – to suggest that complying with a request follows from inference from clear evidence rather than from one's own will (see also Schrickx 2014: 292).

4. From utterance to sentence adverbial

The interpretation of *klar_3* as 'of course' points to the conclusion that *klar_3* has developed from the exclamatory use of *klar*. Frey (2006: 244) even mentions the exclamatory flavour as a characteristic of clauses with prefield-philic expressions such as *klar_3*. Moreover, speakers sometimes appear to conceive of *klar_3* as external to the clause, as if it were an independent utterance. Though in the prefield, *klar_3* is sometimes separated from the clause with a comma, as also observed for Swiss German in Giger (2011: 57-58).

(24) Klar, hat er auch Streiche gemacht. Aber so sind Jungs doch.[19]
       KLAR has he also pranks made   but so are boys PART
       'Of course he made pranks too. Boys are like that, aren't they?'

If *klar_3* has developed from *klar_{exc}*, we should expect *klar_{exc}* to occur earlier than *klar_3*. This seems to be the case. Table 1 shows the occurrences of *klar_{exc}* (including the phrase *Na klar!* 'of course') and *klar_3* distributed in decades in the Kernkorpus.[20] *Klar_{exc}* is common already from 1930 with a rise in the 1990s. *Klar_3* emerges in the 1990s coinciding with a rise of *klar_{exc}*.

---

[17] A search was conducted for the string *ist WORD^{0-2} klar daß* in the time span 1700-1799. It should be noted that 11 occurrences are from the same author.

[18] Euler, Leonhard: Einleitung zur Rechen-Kunst. Bd. 1. St. Petersburg, 1738 (Historische Korpora).

[19] NKU02/NOV.06301 Nordkurier, 20.11.2002; Schockzustand nach Mordnachricht (DeReKo).

[20] The Historische Korpora does not contain any unambiguous instances of *klar* as an utterance or as a sentence adverbial in the prefield before 1900. For the Kernkorpus a search was conducted for capitalized *Klar* and the phrase *Na klar*. The occurrences were analysed by the author.

Table 1: Occurrences of klar$_{exc}$ and klar$_3$ in the Kernkorpus (1900-1999)

	klar$_{exc}$	*klar$_3$*
1900-09	0	0
1910-19	2	0
1920-29	2	0
1930-39	27	0
1940-49	5	1
1950-59	22	1
1960-69	20	1
1970-79	21	4
1980-89	20	0
1990-99	61	13

The first example of *klar$_3$* dates from 1949.

(25)   » Klar traben wir im Kreise, das liegt -«[21]
          KLAR walk   we in circles that is because
          'Of course we are not moving forward, that's because -'

        But how is *klar$_{exc}$* reanalysed as a sentence adverbial in the prefield? Reanalysis is likely to take place in a bridging context, i.e. a context which is open to two interpretations (Haumann & Killie 2019: 191 among others). *Klar$_{exc}$*, used as a response, is a bridging context because *klar$_{exc}$* alternates with the synonymous sentence adverb *natürlich* 'naturally'. If the response is analysed as a reduced clause, there is a difference between *klar$_{exc}$* and *natürlich*. *Klar$_{exc}$* is a predicative with a *dass*-clause, while *natürlich* is an adverb in the prefield of a declarative clause. *Klar$_{exc}$* becomes ambiguous because it can be interpreted in analogy to *natürlich*, i.e. it can be understood as an adjective but also as a sentence adverbial in the prefield, as in B$_2$ in (26). This latter interpretation is the bridge to the present-day use of *klar$_3$* as a sentence adverbial in the prefield.

(26)   A: *Peter is coming today.*
        B$_1$: Natürlich ~~kommt Peter heute~~
           naturally comes Peter today
           'Naturally!'
        B$_2$: ~~es ist~~ Klar, ~~dass~~ ~~Peter~~ ~~heute~~ ~~kommt~~   /   Klar   ~~kommt~~ ~~Peter~~ ~~heute~~
           it is KLAR   that Peter today comes   KLAR   comes Peter today
           'Of course!'

It is striking that most of the prefield-philic expressions are evidential-epistemic expressions like *kein Wunder* 'no wonder', *ein Wunder* 'a wonder' and *gewiss* 'of course'. This suggests that the bridging context proposed for *klar$_3$* could extend to these other expressions.
        Dürscheid & Hefti (2006: 140) point to another possible syntactic bridging context in Standard

---

[21] Niebelschütz, Wolf von: Der blaue Kammerherr, Stuttgart u. a.: Dt. Bücherbund [1991] [1949], p. 825 (Kernkorpus).

German, where the exclamatory utterance is followed by an adverbial clause with an empty prefield. The clause following *klar$_{exc}$* in (27B$_1$) is a causal clause of a special kind: it has the finite verb in the initial position, and it contains the modal particle *doch*. The clause explains why the speaker says *Klar!* thereby suggesting that the hearer should already know that Peter is not going to come. It serves to remind the hearer of a piece of familiar information not currently activated (Pittner 2007: 79) – in this case, that Peter is ill. *Klar$_{exc}$* can be reanalysed to occupy the prefield of the second clause, as in B$_2$, and to form a declarative clause.

(27) A: *Peter hasn't come yet.*
    B$_1$: Klar, ist er doch krank.   →   B$_2$: ? Klar ist er doch krank.
         KLAR is he PART ill
         'Of course, he is ill remember.'   'Of course he is ill.'

The problem with this bridging context is that the reanalysis has far-reaching semantic consequences. The scope of *klar* changes. What is expected in B$_1$ is that Peter is not going to come. What is expected in B$_2$ is that Peter is ill. A reanalysis is only possible if this new interpretation makes sense in the context. At the same time, the particle *doch* is not semantically compatible with *klar$_3$* (hence the '?' in (27B$_2$)). *Doch* is used to remind the hearer of an SoA (seemingly) not present in the hearer's mind (Pittner 2007: 80), while *klar$_3$* is a comment on an SoA already under discussion. These conflicting demands on the status of the SoA in (27B$_2$) – as activated and unactivated at the same time – make it implausible as a bridging context on its own.

      Truly ambiguous syntactic contexts are difficult to find since the reanalysis is associated with a radical semantic reanalysis. Still, it is striking that many exclamatory expressions co-occur with exactly this kind of causal clause. Possibly such contexts reinforce a reanalysis originally triggered by the use of the adjectives as responses. Breban and Davidse (2016: 239) suggest a similar reinforcement in their analysis of *very*.

5. Conclusion

The questions raised in the introduction centred on why *klar* is only sometimes exclamatory and where the particular reading as 'of course' comes from. In the present analysis, the answer to the first question is that there are two sentence adverbs *klar* (both related to the adjective *klar*). *Klar$_2$* has developed from *klar* as a manner adverbial, while *klar$_3$* seems to have developed from *klar* as an exclamatory utterance. The reading as 'of course' stems from the exclamatory use, where *klar* is a property predicated of a proposition in the immediate context. The analysis also provides an explanation for Frey's (2006) observation that prefield-philic expressions are exclamatory: they originate as exclamatory utterances. The particular bridging context puts *klar* in the prefield, and, at the same time, the prefield is the canonical position for exclamatory expressions (Frey 2006: 244). Prefield-philia seems to be the result of a particular diachronic development combined with a particular semantic contribution.

6. Corpora

Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache (2022): Deutsches Referenzkorpus / Archiv der Korpora geschriebener Gegenwartssprache 2022-I (Release vom 08.03.2022). Mannheim: Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache. www.ids-mannheim.de/DeReKo (DeReKo)

Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (DWDS)
- Historische Korpora (1465-1998): https://www.dwds.de/d/korpora/dtaxl
- Kernkorpus (1900-1999): https://www.dwds.de/d/korpora/kern
- Kernkorpus 21 (2000-2010): https://www.dwds.de/d/korpora/korpus21

References

Axel-Tober, Katrin (2016). 'Satzadverbiale im Deutschen: synchrone und diachrone Fragen bei einem 'scheints' alten Thema'. In Neri, Sergio, Roland Schuhmann & Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.), *"dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu" – Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 23-33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29091/9783954906420

Axel-Tober, Katrin & Kalle Müller (2017). 'Evidential adverbs in German - Diachronic development and present-day meaning'. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 7(1): 9-47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/jhl.7.1-2.02axe

Breban, Tine & Kristin Davidse (2016). 'The history of *very*: the directionality of functional shift and (inter)subjectification'. *English Language and Linguistics*, 20(2): 221-249. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/s1360674315000428

Coniglio, Marco (2022). 'On the adverbial origin of German modal particles'. In Artiagoitia, Xabier, Arantzazu Elordieta & Sergio Monforte (eds.), *Discourse Particles: Syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and historical aspects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 13-40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/la.276.01con

Dürscheid, Christa & Inga Hefti (2006). 'Syntaktische Merkmale des Schweizer Standard- deutsch. Theoretische und empirische Merkmale'. In Dürscheid, Christa & Martin Businger (eds.), *Schweizer Standarddeutsch. Beiträge zur Varietätenlinguistik.* Tübingen: Narr. 131-161.

Frey, Werner (2006). 'Contrast and movement to the German prefield'. In Molnár, Valéria & Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus.* Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton. 235-264. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110922011.235

Giger, Nadio (2011). 'Gut, gibt es einen wie Oliver Kahn: Zum Phänomen rechtsextraponierter Verberstnebensätze im Schweizerhochdeutsch'. In Kümmel, Martin J. (ed.), *Sprachvergleich und Sprachdidaktik. Beiträge zu den 19. GeSuS-Linguistiktagen, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2.–4. März 2010*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac. 43-65. (= PHILOLOGIA - Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungsergebnisse, Band 161)

Günthner, Susanne (2009). ''Adjektiv + *dass*-Satz''-Konstruktionen als kommunikative Ressourcen der Positionierung'. In Günthner, Susanne & Jörg Bücker (eds.), *Grammatik im Gespräch - Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter. 149-185. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110213638

Haumann, Dagmar & Kristin Killie (2019). 'Bridging contexts in the reanalysis of *naturally* as a sentence adverb: A corpus study'. In Bech, Kristin & Ruth Möhlig-Falke (eds.), *Grammar-Discourse-Context: Grammar and usage in Language Variation and Change*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter. 191-220. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110682564-007

Krifka, Manfred (2023). 'Layers of assertive clauses: propositions, judgements, commitments, acts'. In Hartmann, Jutta M. & Angelika Wöllstein (eds.), *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich/Propositional Arguments in Cross-Linguistic Research*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag. 116-183. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24053/9783823394105

Matlock, Teenie (1989). 'Metaphor and the Grammaticalization of Evidentials'. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 215-225. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v15i0.1751

Meinunger, André (2022). 'Pre-field phobia – About formal and meaning-related prohibitions on starting a German V2 clause'. *The Linguistic Review*, 39(4): 699-742. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2022-2102

Pittner, Karin (2007). 'Common Ground in Interaction: The Functions of Medial *Doch* in German'. In: Anita Fetzer & Kerstin Fischer (eds.), *Lexical Markers of Common Grounds*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 67-87. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9780080466316_006

Reis, Marga & Angelika Wöllstein (2010). 'Zur Grammatik (vor allem) konditionaler V1-Gefüge im

Deutschen'. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 29(1): 111-179. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsw.2010.004

Schrickx, Josine (2014). 'Latin commitment-markers - *scilicet* and *videlicet*'. In Cantarini, Sibilla, Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.), *Certainty-uncertainty – and the Attitudinal Space in Between*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 285-296. (=Studies in Language Companion Series 165). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.165.16sch

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie & Karin Aijmer (2007). *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty: A Corpus-Based study of English Adverbs*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter Mouton. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198928

Stalnaker, Robert (2002). 'Common Ground'. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25(5-6): 701-721. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1020867916902

Willett, Thomas (1988). A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language*, 12(1): 51-97. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.12.1.04wil

Wolf, Lavi (2015). *Degrees of Assertion*. Doctoral dissertation. Negev: Ben Gurion University of the Negev.

Zafiu, Rodica (2018). 'Epistemic and evidential markers in the rhetorical context of concession'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 128: 116-127. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.07.008

Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Band I-III. Berlin,New York: de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110872163