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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

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.
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

---

1I 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.
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 prefld 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). Still, it is unusual for sentence adverbials to have a special interpretation in the prefld.

(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. *(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 prefld-philic expressions are exclamatory: they express the speaker’s attitude to the content of the clause. As such, they have to be in the prefld. 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. *Klar* with the interpretation ‘clearly’ has developed from the manner adverbial reading through extension of the scope to the whole proposition. *Klar*, with the interpretation ‘of course’ has developed from *klar* as an independent exclamatory utterance, as in (4).

(4) **Klar!** Erling hat das Problem verstanden. *(klarexc)*
   *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. *Klar* is considerably improved when preceded by the modifier *ganz* ‘quite’ but is also found alone.
or understanding (cf. Matlock 1989: 220). *Klar*₁ (*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.’

*Klar*₁ 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 *klar*₁ and *klar*₃: 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.
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: *klar*₂ and *klar*₃

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 *klar*₂ and *klar*₃ relate to indirect inference-based evidence, but there is a difference in the status of the communicated information. *Klar*₂ 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)). *Klar*₃ signals that the information is assumed to be already familiar to speaker and hearer – usually based on shared knowledge (cf. (3c)). *Klar*₃ is dealt with in the next section.

2.2.1. *Klar*₃

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 *klar*₃, and the question is why *klar*₃ 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
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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.’

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
   ‘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. Klar 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
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6 Tages-Anzeiger, 8.9.09, 33. (Giger 2011: 49, ex. 8a).
8 Giger’s (2011: 58-59) analysis of Swiss German explicitly does not cover klar. He considers it a sentence adverbial and argues that the interpretation as ‘of course’ is not restricted to the prefield (see footnote 12).
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 

klar 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 

kläar 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 klar 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 getrunken.
      KLAR has he headache he has yesterday drunk
      ‘Of course he is having a headache. He has been drinking yesterday.’
      KLAR has he headache he can his head hardly move
      ‘Of course he is having a headache. He can hardly move his head.’

Klar is obligatorily in the prefield. Emphasis is on the proposition already being accessible in the CG, and the proposition is the topic under discussion. Klar 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, klar is understood as an affirmative answer. In (13), A is obviously not aware that Peter is due to come. By using klar, 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 klar 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. Zafiou (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.

In monological texts klar 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. Zafiou (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.
“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.”

‘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. Klar2
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’. 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).

Example (15) illustrates klar2 where klar has a meaning different from klars. Klar2 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. Klar2 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. Klar2 means ‘You can tell!’ and is used to convince the hearer. The difference between klar2 and klar3 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?*
B1: Sie haben ganz klar eine Halsentzündung.
    you have quite Klar a tonsillitis
    ‘You are clearly suffering from tonsillitis.’
B2: # Klar haben Sie eine Halsentzündung.
    KLAR have you a tonsillitis
    ‘Of course you are suffering from tonsillitis.’

The answer in B1 is felicitous: the doctor says that there is clear evidence that the symptoms are caused by tonsillitis. The answer in B2 is awkward, even condescending: the doctor suggests that the patient should be very well aware already. In B1 the patient is not assumed to know already; it is not expected.
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9 NKU08/JAN.06545 Nordkurier, 25.01.2008; Nur wenig Lust auf Schnäppchenjagd (DeReKo).
10 Klar2 does not seem to occur in the prefield. Example (6) only allows the reading of klar as klar1 or klar3. 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).

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 clearly be too late tomorrow.’ (Deviant on evidential reading)
   b. Klar wird Peter morgen zu spät kommen.
   ‘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 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_

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).
(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 *klar*3 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
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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 Zehle 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. Klarexc 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 klar3 as ‘of course’ points to the conclusion that klar3 has developed from the exclamatory use of klar. Frey (2006: 244) even mentions the exclamatory flavour as a characteristic of clauses with prefessional expressions such as klar3. Moreover, speakers sometimes appear to conceive of klar3 as external to the clause, as if it were an independent utterance. Though in the prefessional, klar3 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
‘Of course he made pranks too. Boys are like that, aren’t they?’

If klar3 has developed from klarexc, we should expect klarexc to occur earlier than klar3. This seems to be the case. Table 1 shows the occurrences of klarexc (including the phrase Na klar! ‘of course’) and klar3 distributed in decades in the Kernkorpus.20 Klarexc is common already from 1930 with a rise in the 1990s. Klar3 emerges in the 1990s coinciding with a rise of klarexc.

17 A search was conducted for the string ist WORD0-2 klar daß in the time span 1700-1799. It should be noted that 11 occurrences are from the same author.
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 prefessional 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\textsubscript{exc} and klar\textsubscript{3} in the Kernkorpus (1900-1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>klar\textsubscript{exc}</th>
<th>klar\textsubscript{3}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-99</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first example of klar\textsubscript{3} dates from 1949.

(25) » Klar traben wir im Kreise, das liegt -«\textsuperscript{21}

‘Of course we are not moving forward, that’s because -’

But how is klar\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{exc}, used as a response, is a bridging context because klar\textsubscript{exc} alternates with the synonymous sentence adverb natürlich ‘naturally’. If the response is analysed as a reduced clause, there is a difference between klar\textsubscript{exc} and natürlich. Klar\textsubscript{exc} is a predicative with a dass-clause, while natürlich is an adverb in the prefield of a declarative clause. Klar\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{2} in (26). This latter interpretation is the bridge to the present-day use of klar\textsubscript{3} as a sentence adverbial in the prefield.

(26) A: Peter is coming today.
   B\textsubscript{1}: Natürlich kommt Peter heute
          naturally comes Peter today
       ‘Naturally!’
   B\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{3} could extend to these other expressions.

Dürscheid & Hefti (2006: 140) point to another possible syntactic bridging context in Standard

\textsuperscript{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 (27B1) 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 reanalyzed to occupy the prefield of the second clause, as in B2, and to form a declarative clause.

(27) A: Peter hasn’t come yet.
   B1: Klar, ist er doch krank.

   $\rightarrow$


   ‘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 B1 is that Peter is not going to come. What is expected in B2 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 (27B2)). $Doch$ 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 (27B2) – 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-phile 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.
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