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I. Introduction

Language changes. During the process in which the content word, which has propositional content, undergoes gradual change so that it turns into grammatical form, the content word is weakened of its pronunciation as well as its detailed meaning. Furthermore, the expressive value of the word and word group also weaken. That is, words that have propositional content increase their frequency of use so that they gradually lose their expressive value, retreating into an expressionless grammatical form and while a new word is created in its stead. This is due to the cognitive-psychological law, physiological law, and linguistic law of the language using group, and is a consecutive phenomenon that continuously repeats itself, not ending temporarily. Also, it is a phenomenon that reflects the cognitive system of language using groups in individual language areas and their linguistic distinctness.

The Russian interrogative pronoun \( čto \) was a content word that connoted the
meaning 'request for information regarding unknown facts', but from a certain
time onward, it also came to play the role of function word involving
'conjunction' and 'comparison'. Let's look at the following three examples.

- Čto bylo dal'se?
  What happened next? (Karelin, Ja verju v goroskopy(I believe in horoscope).)
- Sergievskij. Mne ona predskazala, čto ja stanu deduškoj.
  She foretold me to become a grandfather. (Kočetkov, Tol'ko zatem(Only then).);
- Aleksandr L'vovič. ...a vy nam čto rodnoj syn?!
  ...Are you our blood son?! (Šiškin, Vsex ožidaet odna noč.
  (One Night Befalls Us All).).

The čto in the first sample sentence is a content word that has a detailed
propositional content. It is also an interrogative pronoun which acts as the
subject of the sentence, requires a case on the syntactic level, directly
participates in the composition of the interrogative utterance, and is given the
stress in the sentence. The čto in the second sample sentence is a conjunction
that materializes the contents of the main clause when connecting the main
clause and the subordinate clause in the subordinate complex sentence. The čto
in the third sample sentence helps the connection between the subject 'vy nam'
and the predicate 'rodnoj syn', and is also a comparative particle that
emphasizes the meaning of the subject through comparison. The čto in the
second and third sample sentences are conjunctions and particles that are
function words that do not have detailed propositional content, cannot become
sentence components, do not undergo declension, and do not receive a stress in
the sentence. The above three sample sentences show that čto is a homonym1)

1) The debate over whether čto is a homonym or a polysemy is still ongoing. However,
Russian dictionaries establish homonyms as different entries so that they are described
like n¹, n², n³, …, nⁿ. Čto is also described like čto čto¹, čto², …… čtoⁿ, the fact which
that belongs to the three speech part levels of interrogative pronoun, conjunction, and comparative particle, and the reason čto has become a multiple speech part word is due to a grammaticalization phenomenon. Even if the interrogative pronoun čto acquires the status of conjunction and comparative particle due to the grammaticalization phenomenon, the three morphemes of interrogative pronoun, conjunction, and comparative particle perform their respective roles while coexisting at the same period.

However, although the transference phenomenon of interrogative pronoun čto to conjunction is recognized by all, because there is still controversy surrounding the transference of conjunction čto to comparative particle, a more detailed and clearer research seems to be necessary. Based on this criticism, the paper will analyze the speech part transference phenomenon of conjunction čto to comparative particle, from the viewpoint of grammaticalization. Existing reveals that most Russian linguists recognize čto as a homonym.

2) The speech part transference of interrogative pronoun čto has unfolded in two directions. The first direction is transference from interrogative pronoun to interrogative particle, while the second direction is from interrogative pronoun to conjunction and comparative particle. The particle of the first and second direction belong to the same speech part level, but its function and meaning are different, which make it a different word. To emphasize this point, the čto that adds a nuance of interrogation to the utterance in the interrogative sentence will be designated as an interrogative pronoun, while the čto emphasizing the meaning of comparison in the simple sentence, designated as comparative particle. In sample sentences Sledovatel'. Čto, za kem?(Judge. What, whom?)(Karelin) and Den'gi čto voda(Money is like water)(proverb), the čto in the first sample sentence is an interrogative particle and the čto in the second sample sentence is a comparative particle. However, due to space restrictions, the paper will limit the discussion to the speech part transference related to the second direction. The phenomenon of grammaticalization dividing into several parts, that is, when a single grammatical form forms one or more grammaticalization chain, this is referred to as polygrammaticalization. According to the grammaticalization chain, grammaticalization forms a line, and this line does not need to be in a single line structure, and may form a complex structure in which several lines converge(Lee, 1998, p. 141).
grammaticalization research has been concentrated on morphophonemics or morphology while focusing on mainly the phoneme reduction phenomenon. As a result, research related to the grammaticalization phenomenon carried out in a condition with no change to the form such as in čto, as well as the phenomenon of a function word turning into another function word, has not received much interest from researchers. So, the study, as part of research regarding the language units surrounding the periphery of grammaticalization research, will contribute to widening the range of grammaticalization research.

In chapter two of this paper, the speech part transference arrow will show the process and characteristics of čto, transferring through conjunction → comparative particle. In chapter three, the characteristics of the middle category or hybrid category, which occur during the speech transference process of čto, will be analyzed in detail, based on the speech part transference arrow proposed in chapter two. This will reveal that a language unit in which the characteristics and functions of several speech parts function complexly has a wider distribution of usage than language units that have the inherent characteristics of a single speech part. Also in chapter four, the discussions of the paper will be put together and the next research task will be proposed. The paper selected the contemporary Russian discourse text extracted from the Russian National Corpus (RNC) and Maxim Moškov online library (Lib.Ru), as basic data.

II. Speech Part Transference Characteristics and Mechanism of Conjunction čto

The phenomenon of interrogative pronoun čto transferring into a conjunction and comparative particle may be called categorical transference. Categorical
transference is not a mechanical phenomenon occurring over a short period of time, but a pragmatic, cognitive phenomenon occurring over a long period of time, which occurs toward one direction sequentially. When the term before categorical transference is referred to as the 'originating word' and the term after categorical transference is referred to as the 'target word', there exists a middle category which retains with complexity the semantic, grammatic, and syntactic characteristics of the two words. This whole process may be expressed by the speech part transference arrow\(^4\) in figure 1.

As you see from the speech part transference arrow in figure 1, čto goes through a two stage speech part transference process involving interrogative pronoun→conjunction→comparative particle. When the terms of the speech part transference arrow are closer together, their degree of grammaticalization or meaning are more similar. A, B, C in the speech part transference arrow express the names of the speech parts, and the meaning of the originating word, during the process of grammaticalization, last a long time while leaving all grammaticalizers so that it has the semantic quality of lasting a long time even when a' and b' undergo grammaticalization.

The čto of stage A to the far left of the speech part transference arrow has

\[\text{Figure 1. word class transformation arrow}\]

3) The author uses the term categorical transference to emphasize the difference from the existing term decategorization.

4) The speech part transference arrow is an application of the speech part transference line(škala perexodnosti) of Babajceva(1991: 14).
no characteristics or functions of a conjunction, being a pure interrogative pronoun\(^5\) that is an originating word not undergone grammaticalization. The čto in stage B has no characteristics or functions of an interrogative pronoun but is a pure conjunction that only has the characteristics and functions of a conjunction, at which point, stage one speech part transference and grammaticalization of čto is completed.

The čto in the Bc stage has a greater proportion and functions of a conjunction than those of a particle, and the čto in the BC stage has the same proportion and functions of a conjunction and particle. The čto in both stages can be referred to as a conjunction particle. The čto in the bC stage has a greater proportion and function of a particle than those of a conjunction, so it may be referred to as a particle conjunction, and the čto in stage C has no remaining characteristic or function of a conjunction but only has the characteristic and function of a particle, being a pure particle which is a cohesive, reduced, grammatic form in which grammaticalization has been completed. By stage C, the speech part transference and grammaticalization of čto has been finished (this is finished from a synchronic aspect, grammaticalization is still going on from a diachronic aspect). Such naming is for establishing characteristics in the speech part level, and from a separate discourse level, the čto in stages B be named as a 'connection marker', a comparison marker for the čto in stages Bc~bC, and a discourse maker for the čto in stage C.

\(^5\) This paper adds the name 'pure' to terms that have characteristics of a single speech part, while terms that are hard to distinguish a noticeable speech part proportion due to hybrid of two speech parts are expressed by terms like 'conjunction pronoun', and 'conjunction particle', with the name of the speech part having the greater proportion located at the front. The use of such terms may be found also in SRG(2002: 382-383). However the reason the use of such terms is possible is that speech transference is carried out in a serial chain method rather, not a segmental method, so that a middle stage where the two speech parts coexist appears.
As can be seen in the speech part transference arrow of figure 1, the speech part identity of čto, changes in the direction of interrogative pronoun>conjunction>conjunction particle>particle conjunction>particle. The meaning of čto during speech part transference process changes in the direction of information request for resolving questions>appearance meaning through connection>appearance meaning through connection+comparative appearance meaning>comparative appearance meaning. Though there may be slight differences, over the transference process, the meaning of čto changes from an external propositional meaning to a internal evaluative meaning which projects the speaker's own viewpoint, from a less subjective perceptive, cognitive meaning to a more subjective emotive appearance meaning. Expressing the speaker's attitude or belief by projecting the speaker's own viewpoint to the propositional or external centered meaning is called subjectification.6)

III. Transference from Conjunction to Comparative Particle, and the Categorical Characteristics and Functions of each stage

Many Russian language researchers, rather than separately consider conjunction čto and comparative particle čto, regard it as a kind of conjunction. This chapter will establish the fact that conjunction čto and comparative particle čto are strictly language units that belong to strictly different groups by analyzing the syntactic, grammatic characteristics of comparative particle čto. Vinigradov(1972: 529) points out that a special particle group called 'connecting particle' which expresses the logical relationship between the

subject part and predicate part from among auxiliary words. Fedorov (1957: 129) includes comparative particle čto differentiated from the conjunction as a conjunction, but claims that comparative particle čto is a comparative maker and that it has very diverse characteristics that are different from the conjunction, from semantic, structural aspects. The reason the characteristics of the comparative maker are not uniform, like his claim, is that the transference from conjunction to particle is carried out gradually over a long period of time so that various types of constructions occur and coexist simultaneously. Thus, an 'optical illusion' occurs, by which the category of the comparative marker appears quite widely to language using groups. Such čto as comparative marker belong to the Be, CB, and bC stages in the speech part transference arrow, and the degree of syntactic separateness and comparability is distinctive to each other.

Of course, establishing the boundary between conjunction čto and comparative particle čto is not easy, but the main distinction between conjunction čto and comparative particle čto is location and function within the sentence. First of all, when conjunction čto is located between the main clause and subordinate clause in the subordinate complex sentence, comparative particle čto is located between the subject and predicate in the simple sentence (Jur'evna 2009: 127). 7) For the next function, when the function of conjunction čto is realizing the connection between the main clause and subordinate clause in the subordinate complex sentence, then the function of čto cannot be a sentence constituent.

7) The claim by Jur'evna (2009: 127) that comparative particle čto can be a sentence constituent will not be accepted. Only content words can be sentence constituents, but the comparative particle is a function word because its form is developed from the conjunction which is a function word. The developmental direction of grammaticalization is unidirectional, from content word to function word, and as backward development is impossible, comparative particle čto cannot be a sentence constituent.
comparative particle ĉto is to add varied comparative meaning to the overall utterance, which is a more important and fundamental than the connecting function. Also, when the relationship of language units that become connected because of conjunction ĉto bidirectional, the connection of comparative particle ĉto with words or words it tries to emphasize is unidirectional.

1. Characteristics and Functions of Pure Conjunction ĉto

Pure Conjunction ĉto is involved in stage B of the speech part transference arrow, and has completely lost its pronoun function, only performing the conjunction function which involves connecting the main clause and subordinate clause in the subordinate complex sentence. Pure conjunction ĉto does not inflect, cannot become a sentence constituent, and does not receive an intonation. Though it has lost a detailed propositional content, it adds various appearance meaning and nuances including comparison, degree, and stages to the utterance so that it materializes semantic content of the verb, noun, adjective, state noun, and pronoun in the main clause. Also, it helps the subordinate clause after ĉto play various roles including subject, object, and complement, in the sentence. On the other hand, scholars have different opinions regarding the semantic content of the conjunction, with Peškovskij(1956: 428) and A. A. Šaxmatov(2007: 505) claiming that the conjunction is a lexical group that has lost semantic content. On the other hand, Fedorov(1951: 153-168) claims that conjunction ĉto is a polysemy that has causal, consequential, comparative, and temporal meaning, which is supported by Vinogradov(1972: 556) and Ardentov(1973: 39). In fact, because the conjunction implies a diverse 'appearance meaning' though being a function word that has lost detailed propositional meaning, it has a 'potential
possibility' of changing into another function word such as a comparative particle. Pure conjunction čto can be divided into four types as sample sentences (1)–(4) according to what role the subordinate clause performs in the sentence.

(1) Nevažno, čto Zaokeanija zavalena izdeljami vysšego kačestva.
   It does not matter that Over-Oceania is overloaded with the high-quality goods. (Azarov, Parazitarij.(Parasitic).)

(2) Ėl'za očen' nedovol'na tem, čto ja mnogo rabotaju.
   Elza is very angry with the fact that I work much. (Leont'ev, Laskovaja komedija(The Gentle Comedy).)

(3) Ax, Mister Cinerknok naskol'ko universalen, čto kak ego ni oskorbljaj-vse k nemu podxodit?
   Oh, Mister Cinnerknok is so versatile that every insult fits him wellz? (Leont'ev, Laskovaja komedija(The Gentle Comedy).)

(4) Čto ja eë ne bojus', ibo mne pokazalos', čto v moej duše zažglac' Ljubov', a Ljubov'-èto iest' Bog...
   The reason why I'm not afraid of her, because Love has inflamed in my heart, and love is A God itself. (Azarov, Parazitarij.(Parasitic).)

First type of pure conjunction čto involves constructions like sample sentence (1), and because the clause after čto in this type can be divided into the 'subject subordinate clause' that acts as a subject and the 'object subordinate clause' which acts as an object, it can be called a 'noun subordinate clause'. The second type of pure conjunction čto involves constructions like sample sentences (2), and the subordinate clause after čto in these constructions is a 'predicate subordinate clause' that acts as a predicate in the sentence. The čto of sample sentences (2) materializes the contents of the adjective and noun in the main clause.

The third type of pure conjunction čto involves constructions like sample
sentences (3), and the subordinate clause after čto in sample sentences (3) is a 'situational subordinate clause' which acts as a situational word in the sentence. The čto in sample sentences (3) adds meaning of comparison and degree between the main clause and subordinate clause. Fourth type of pure conjunction čto involve constructions like sample sentences (4), and the subordinate clause after čto in sample sentences (4) is a 'complement subordinate clause' that acts as a complement, which may be changed with ‘potomu čto(because)’. The main clause and subordinate clause in sample sentences (4) have a causal relationship, with the main clause expressing effect, and the subordinate clause the cause. Therefore, if the main clause is reconstructed into ‘Čto(Počem) ja eë ne bojus’? (Why I'm not afraid of her?)’ in sample sentence (4), the subordinate clause can be reconstructed into ‘Potomu čto v moej duše zažglac' Ljubov’(Because Love has inflamed in my heart). If the main clause is reconstructed into a question utterance in such a way, the subordinate performs the function of answer to this. Because conjunction čto has such various appearance meanings, it is sufficiently possible that the semantic content fades even more and subsequently grammaticalized into another more grammatical function word.

2. Characteristics and Functions of Conjunction Particle čto: čto in the Bc Stage of the Speech Part Transference Arrow

Conjunction Particle čto which belongs to the Bc stage of the speech part transference arrow has considerably greater characteristics and proportion related to the conjunction than those of the particle. The constructions created by čto in this stage have a peripheral characteristic of a the subordinate complex sentence, so are similar in many ways to the constructions in stage B. The čto construction which belongs to this stage is missing a predicate, and the
subordinate clause may be modified into a comparative construction.\(^8\)

Subsequent to this stage, \(čto\) is included as the properties of the subject part or predicate part, and this construction becomes an incomplete sentence that has an overall comparative meaning. Conjunction particle \(čto\) in the Bc stage of the speech part transference arrow can be divided into two types according to its structural and semantic characteristics.

\(^{(5)}\) Oni identičny emu, imeli takoj že xudoščavyj sklad tela, \(čto\) i Èivil Èvi.

They were identical to him, they had the same lean constitution as Evil Evi.

(Kotašov, toržestvuščij razum(The Triumphant mind).)

\(^{(6)}\) Nekotorye iz nix byli počti v takom že položenii \(čto\) i Ol'ga.

Some of them were almost in the same position as Olga. (Sluckina, Sozvezdie l'va(The constellation of Leo).)

The first type of conjunction particle \(čto\) involves constructions like sample sentence (5) and (6), and the subordinate clause after \(čto\) is an incomplete sentence missing a predicate, in which the \(čto\) in these constructions may be changed to ‘kak(like)’. However, though \(čto\) is able to lead a subordinate clause in the form of an incomplete sentence, when changed to ‘kak(like or as)’, it must be reconstructed into a complete sentence as in ‘imeli takoj že xudoščavyj sklad tela, \(čto\) i Èivil Èvi(they had the same lean constitution as Evil Evi)’ and ‘v takom že položenii \(čto\) i Ol'ga(in the same position as Olga)’ because ‘kak’ necessarily requires a complete sentence. As can be seen in the two examples, the \(čto\) construction is more simple, more compressed, and reinforces more the vividness of the analogy than the \(kak\) construction.

\(^8\) S. O. Jur'evna, Functional homonyms, combined with homocomplex Čto, Ph.D. disseration, M., 2009, p. 130.
(7) Vdrug ja počuvstvoval, čto, kažetsja, čto-to nedopohjal, upustil.
Suddenly, I felt that I misunderstood and missed something. (Soxan', Bespomoščnyj mir (Helpless world).)

The second type of conjunction particle čto involves a construction with a ‘main clause+, čto+, subordinate clause’ structure as in sample sentence (7), and the čto in this construction supplements and expands the meaning of the predicate located in the main clause. In sample sentence (7) čto connects the main clause and the subordinate clause in the subordinate complex sentence, but because it is uttered separately from the subordinate clause, it has somewhat faded its connection function as a conjunction.

3. Characteristics and Functions of Conjunction Particle čto: čto in the BC stage of the Speech Part Transference Arrow

The čto in the BC stage of the speech part transference arrow has identical characteristics and a proportion of both conjunction and particle. The čto in this stage appears in a simple sentence, strengthening the meaning of the noun phrase through a meaning of comparison. Also, because it takes the form of the nominative or objective case to make the meaning lifelike, its connection to the predicate part is extremely weak. This characteristic may define the čto in this stage as a comparative particle, but because the simple sentence including čto may be changed to a complex sentence, it is defined as a conjunction.

(8) Nivy zrelye, čto kamyš gustoj, tixo dvižutsja...
Ripe grain fields are like thick reed, moving silently... (Nikitin, Rus'(Russia).)

(9) Vzjal knižku-tonsen'kaja, čto nastavlenie po granatometu.
I took a book. It was very thin like an instruction on a grenade launcher.
Conjunction particle čto of this stage involves constructions like sample sentence (8) and (9), and the čto in this construction, by more thoroughly expressing the nature and characteristics of the target of analogy by comparison, can reinforce and supplement the meaning of the noun phrase. The čto in sample sentence (8) is a device for emphasizing the characteristics of ‘Nivy(fields)’, and can be changed to ‘Nivy zrelye kak kamyš gustoj tixo dvižutsja...(Ripe grain fields are like thick reed, moving silently...)’. The čto in sample sentences (8) and (9) is a conjunction because it connects the agent of comparison in the noun phrase to the target of comparison in the predicate part, but it can be said to be a comparative particle in that it deliver a meaning of comparison to the overall utterance.

4. Characteristics and Functions of Particle Conjunction čto

Particle Conjunction čto has greater characteristics and a proportion of the particle than those of the conjunction, and belongs to the bC stage in the speech part transference arrow, with the čto construction of this stage being closer to a simple sentence.

(10) Golyj, čto svjatoj bedy ne boitsja.
     A Naked is like a Holy: he does not afraid of trouble. (proverb)

(11) A Koldobin oral čto est' moči.
     And Koldobin was shouting at the top of his voice. (Azarov, Parazitarij.(Parasitic).)

(12) Pover'te, u menja jazyk podvešen čto nado.
     Believe me, I'm a great talker. (Azarov, Parazitarij.(Parasitic).)
Particle conjunction čto involve constructions like sample sentences (10)–(12). The čto in sample sentence (10) emphasizes the characteristic of the subject and may be replaced with ‘podobno(like)’ so as to be reconstructed into ‘Goly podobno svjatemu bedy ne boitja(Naked is like a Holy does not afraid of trouble)’. However, when using čto, which, unlike ‘podobno(like)’, does not have a direct meaning of comparison, the vividness and effect of comparison is doubled. The čto in sample sentence (10) helps semantically and syntactically connect the two words composing the subject part, ‘golyj(naked) and ‘svjatoj(holy)’, and because the čto in sample sentences (11) and (12) reinforce the meaning of the predicate, it may be changed with ‘skolc 'ko(what)’, ‘kak vozmožno(as possible)’, and ‘očen'(very)’.

5. Characteristics and Functions of Pure Comparative Particle čto

Pure comparative particle čto belongs to the C stage in the speech part transference arrow and performs the role of connecting the subject and the predicate in the simple sentence. The simple sentence which includes pure comparative particle čto, by itself, already has a meaning of comparison, with the subject being the object of comparison and the predicate the target of comparison. The use of comparative particle čto is a prominent characteristic in Russian proverbs⁹), but is also found in genres like dramas, everyday conversation, and fables.

(13) Den'gi čto voda.
    Money is like water. (proverb)
(14) Ljudskoe sčast'e, čto voda v bredne.
    Human happiness is like water in a dragnet. (proverb)

(15) Duraka učit', čto mertvogo lečit'.
To teach a fool is to treat the dead. (proverb)

(16) Zakon, čto dyčlo.
- One law for the rich, and another for the poor.
- You can twist the law any way you wish. (proverb)

Pure comparative particle čto involves constructions like sample sentences (13)–(16), and the čto in these constructions are located in between the subject part and the predicate part so that they reinforce the meaning of the subject part through an expression of comparison. Such a usage of čto, while delivering a meaning and nuance of comparison to the overall utterance, is caused by the utterance strategy of the speaker who tries to maximize the utterance effect. Pure comparative particle čto has a similar area of meaning to interrogative adverb ‘kak(like)’, and also its rate of usage is not lower than ‘kak’, which is due to the fact that there remains traces that the meaning of čto and kak were not differentiated in ancient Russian.10)

IV. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to systematically analyze the speech part transference process of čto and also the phenomenon of speech part hybridism which occurs during this process. Furthermore, the study, by analysis, aimed at clarifying the semantic, grammatic, and syntactic characteristics of čto which belongs to a pure category and čto which belong to a middle category. In addition, the study also aimed at establishing the fact that this phenomenon cannot avoid being continued in the language life and social life of language

using groups because it is not a temporary mechanical phenomenon but something that has been carried out over a long period of time.

The analysis results of the paper revealed that čto underwent a two stage speech part transference process involving interrogative pronoun→conjunction→comparative particle, or in other words, multiple grammaticalization, and that there exists many hybrid categories including, conjunction pronoun, and conjunction particle, each having their own inherent semantic and structural characteristics. The paper attempted to analyze comparative particle čto, which has remained in the periphery of research, but was unable to reveal each and every characteristic of comparative particle čto. Therefore, a more in-depth and systematic research of comparative particle čto is necessary. And originally, speech part transference of čto unfolded in the two directions of transference of interrogative pronoun→interrogative particle, and transference of interrogative pronoun→conjunction→comparative particle. The paper drew the line at a discussion on the second direction of speech part transference, but argues that research must be conducted regarding the process conjunction→comparative particlece. Also, an overall and systematic analysis regarding grammaticalization or speech part transference of several words including čto which undergo a similar development.
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러시아 접속사 что의 비교소사 되기 과정 분석

염순천 (동국대)

본 논문의 목적은 что의 품사 전이 과정과 그 과정에서 발생하는 품사 혼종 현상에 대해 체계적으로 분석하는 것이었다. 그리고 이러한 분석을 통해 순수한 범주에 속하는 что와 중간 범주에 속하는 что의 의미, 문법, 통사적 특성을 규명하는 것이었다. 아울러 이것이 일회적, 기계적인 현상이 아니라 장기간에 걸쳐 이루어지는 현상으로 언론들의 언어생활, 사회생활이 지속되는 한 계속 이어질 수밖에 없는 현상임을 규명하는 것이었다.

본 논문에서는 что가 거친 의문대명사 →접속사 → 비교소사라는 2단계의 품사전이 과정 중 접속사사사 → 비교소사의 과정을 분석했다. 본 논문의 분석 결과 전이 과정에는 접속대명사, 접속소사 등의 혼종 범주가 존재하는 데 저마다의 고유한 의미적, 구조적 특성을 가지고 있음을 알 수 있었다. 이에 더하여 본 논문에서는 연구의 주변부에 머물러 있던 비교소사 что에 대한 분석을 시도했지만 비교소사 что의 면면을 모두 밝히지는 못했다.

또 본 논문에서는 접속사 что와 비교소사 что의 경계설정을 시도했는데 이것이 그리 쉬운 작업은 아니었다. 하지만 접속사 что와 비교소사 что의 주된 변별성은 문장에서의 위치와 기능임을 알 수 있었다. 먼저 문장에서 접속사 что는 종속복문에서 주절과 종속절 사이에 위치한다면 비교소사 что는 단문에서 주어와 술어 사이에 위치한다. 다음 기능에 있어, 접속사 что의 기능이 종속복문에서 주절과 종속절의 연결 관계를 실현하는 것이라면 비교소사 что의 기능은 다양한 비교 의미를 발화문 전체에 부가하는 것으로 연결 기능보다 비교 의미 전달 기능이 더 중요하고 기본적이다.
또 접속사 что에 의해 연결되는 언어 단위들의 관계가 양방향이라면 비교소사 что는 자신이 강조하는 어휘나 어휘 군과의 연결 관계가 단일방향적이다. 하지만 이는 비교소사 что에 대한 연구의 일부이기 때문에 비교소사 что에 대한 보다 심도 깊은 체계적인 연구가 필요해 보인다.

주제어: 문법화(Grammaticalization), 품사전이(Speech Part Transference), 품사전이화살표 (Transference Arrow), 접속사(Conjunction), 비교소사(Comparative Particle)
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