DUMMY-SUBJECT *MAN* CONSTRUCTIONS IN THAI: A STUDY OF FORMS AND FUNCTIONS

Unchalee Singnoi Wongwattana

Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University, Thailand

ABSTRACT

The investigation of the dummy subject *man,* a non-referential pronoun in Thai, has historically received limited scholarly attention, and therefore, lacks a comprehensive analysis encompassing its diverse forms, structures, functions, and their interrelation. This article aims to explore the clausal constructions and the form-function mappings associated with the dummy subject *man* in Thai. Employing a qualitative approach, this study analyzes a variety of data extracted from contemporary informal and colloquial written narratives. The analysis was conducted within the framework of functional-typological grammar, which elucidates the interaction between grammatical structures and communicative functions. The findings reveal that the dummy subject *man* occurs across a range of constructions, encompassing both basic and non-basic clause types. Basic clauses exhibit both simple and complex structural patterns. Simple clauses feature intransitive, transitive, and copular verbs. Complex basic clauses manifest as extrapositional pronoun structures. Non-basic clauses include existential-presentational, topic-comment, and cleft constructions. Functionally, basic clauses express lexical-semantic features pertaining to environmental or meteorological phenomena, physical or mental states, activities or actions, spatial distances or related implications, temporal references, and epistemic-valuative-difficulty assessments. Non-basic clauses fulfill discourse-pragmatic functions within two primary domains: information structuring and pragmatic emphasis, such as topic introduction, topic reintroduction, and the presentation of contradictory beliefs. The results of this study not only identify a broader array of structures and functions compared to previous research but also offer a more comprehensive description of clausal constructions featuring the dummy subject *man*, thereby contributing to a more nuanced understanding of this linguistic phenomenon.

Keywords: Thai; dummy subject; constructions; forms and functions

1. INTRODUCTION

A dummy subject like the pronoun 'it' in English is non-referential, referring to no explicit noun phrase that denotes an entity. It merely fills the formal subject role of a clause. The essence or content is only in the predicate part. Consider the following brief excerpt from an English short story for children in (1) as an example.

(1) ***It was lovely summer weather in the country***, *and the golden corn, the green oats, and the haystacks piled up in the meadows looked beautiful. The stork walking about on his long red legs chattered in the Egyptian language, which he had learnt from his mother. The cornfields and meadows were surrounded by large forests, in the midst of which were deep pools.* ***It was, indeed, delightful to walk about in the country.*** *...*

Li and Thompson (1976, p. 467) suggested that topic-prominent languages do not employ dummy subjects, as their sentence structures do not require subject-verb agreement in the same way as subject-prominent languages. In a subject-prominent language like English, Givón (2001, p. 118) suggests that a dummy-subject clause has a communicative function to express a conditional state or event, such as the weather, which has the content of the sentence in the verb or predicate and therefore does not require the meaning from the subject. Since Thai is considered a topic-prominent language by notable scholars, such as Burusphat (1989), Hoonchamlong (1991), and Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005), it is unlikely that Thai is good at presenting dummy-subject clauses. Instead, there are numerous clauses with the dummy-subject *man* in Thai, especially in informal and colloquial usage. This raises an important theoretical question; if these elements do not serve a strict grammatical function, what communicative or pragmatic role do they play? One answer might be that they have been influenced by English through translations of novels and short stories, as suggested in Chutisilp (1984).

Formally, the third person pronoun *man* typically refers to non-humans such as animals and things as well as people who do not need to be honored (Royal Institute, 2013, p. 853). It has been expanded to a larger semantic unit that is so wide that its meaning scope is difficult to determine. For instance, consider a Facebook post in (2) where the pronoun *man* is not likely to refer to the speaker 'I' as its antecedent because of the semantic incongruity – it is unlikely that anyone would consider themselves to fit the above definition.

(2)   ทำไม**มัน**หิวอย่างนี้ กินเยอะก็ยังหิว (Facebook post)

t^hammaj	**man**	hǐw	jà:ŋ	ní:	kin	já?	kɔ̂:	jaŋ	hǐw
why	it	be.hungry	like	this	eat	a lot	even	still	be.hungry

'Why am I so hungry? I ate a lot but I'm still hungry.'

While dummy-subject clauses have gained worldwide attention, they have received little attention in the Thai language. There are only a small number of past studies on the dummy-subject *man* in Thai, such as Indrambarya (2011) and Kaenmuang (2022), both of which extensively examined its lexical or verbal contexts and semantic changes in terms of referentiality over time. That is, while Indrambarya (2011), based on Lexicase Dependency Grammar, found that the dummy subject *man* can appear with several "impersonal verbs" in informal and colloquial usages, Kaenmuang (2022) examined it semantically across eras and offered certain types of its antecedent forms, ranging from the shortest text to an unidentified scope.

Since the past studies on the dummy subject *man* in the Thai language have been limited to the context of verbs and semantic change over time, the nature of its clausal constructions (forms and functions) has not yet received the attention it deserves. Motivated in part by the past studies, we will explore clausal constructions in which the dummy subject *man* operates. We attempt to answer the following questions. How many types of clause forms/structures does the dummy-subject *man* appear in and what are their characteristics? And what is the communicative function of each clause type, whether it is semantic or pragmatic, or what does each clause type communicate? Obtaining these syntactic and functional aspects in an interactive manner will lead to a better understanding of dummy-subject *man* constructions in Thai that is of benefit to the Thai syntax or linguistics.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretically, the analysis was conducted based on a functional-typological linguistics perspective proposed by Givón (2001). Regarding the framework, the analysis makes use of a variety of sources of information aimed at understanding the core formal properties of syntactic structures, such as constituency, hierarchy, grammatical relations and semantic roles. At the same time, the communicative (propositional-semantic as well as discourse-pragmatic) underpinning of grammatical universals are elucidated and underscored. In addition, the interplay between grammar and communication is outlined.

Simple clauses in this grammatical framework are main, declarative, affirmative, active clauses. They are the most frequent clause-type in people's discourse and thus unmarked syntactic constructions. While the simple clause type serves as the reference point for grammatical description, other clause types are seen as

variations. Describing the various types of simple clauses is tantamount to describing the various types of verbs, or predications (states, events, and actions) used in language. To illustrate, aside from the simple clause *The man saw Jane*, clause types such as *The man didn't see Jane; Jane was seen; It was the man who saw Jane; There is a man who saw Jane; Jane, the man saw* (*but the other woman he didn't*); *Jane, the man saw her* and *The man saw her, Jane* are considered structural variants that share, more or less, the same propositional semantic theme. They include negation, passive, cleft, existential-representative, Y-movement or topicalization, left-dislocation and right-dislocation clauses respectively. The various types are different grammatical packaging of propositional-semantic contents in different discourse-pragmatic functional domains. In short, although grammar is coded or located wholly in the phrase or clause, its functional scope is not primarily about the propositional information within the clause in which it resides. Rather, it is mainly about the coherent relations between the propositional (clause) and its wider discourse context.

In this view, the constructions that contain a non-referential or dummy subject such as *it* and *there* in English involve both simple clauses and variants. Consider the classic examples from Givón (2001) in (3), where a simple clause with the dummy subject (non-referential pronoun) *it* expresses a natural condition.

(3)   ***It****'s hot in here.*
        Non-basic clauses are cleft and existential-representative clauses, as respectively shown in (4).

(4)   a. ***It*** *was Joe who lent me a bike (rather than Mary)*
        b. ***There*** *is a man who wants to see you.*

3. RELATED WORK

Recently, quite a number of relevant studies, e.g., Soon et al. (2001), Ng and Cardie (2002), Byron and Gegg-Harrison (2004), Boyd et al. (2005), Gundel et al. (2005), Ng (2005), Bergsma et al. (2008), Yaneva et al. (2018), etc., used machine learning approaches with experimental or empirical data gathered from a large corpus. They attempt to determine whether a pronoun in a text refers to a preceding noun phrase or is instead non-referential. The speech genre analyzed in these papers was that of unplanned conversation, which was quite casual in most transcripts. The findings are that several pronouns were vague in reference, and some references to higher-order entities were very vague. A few pronouns were difficult to classify as either non-referent/pleonastic or referential. They focus on some problematic subclasses of pronouns refer to either entities of various degrees of abstractness that were introduced by or implied in previous discourse, or as non-referential or pleonastic pronouns. As for the pronoun it, past studies report that it refers to a fact, proposition event, activity, situation, reason or other 'higher order'/abstract entities. Certain cases of it were classified as non-referential or pleonastic. Past studies consistently show three types of non-referential it, such as cleft pronouns, extraposition pronouns and atmospheric pronouns, as restrictively exemplified by Gundel et al. (2005, p. 9) in (5).

(5)   a. *Was **it** Trich who told me she was pregnant?*
        b. *I just think **it**'s so damn weird we're here.*
        c. ***It** rained during the dry season.*

According to Asher (1993), certain studies have incorporated such implicit or indirect references into the concept of dummy subject and acknowledge that dummy subject still has referential meaning while others do not.

In Thai, the two investigations mentioned above are worth discussing in the analysis of the dummy subject *man*. In Indrambarya (2011), a syntactic analysis identified the non-referential *man* as distinct from referential ones and its co-occurrence with Thai verbs, based on the lexicase dependency grammar that considers the language co-occurrence as an important factor. Analysis data is from informal sources, such as newspapers, TV news, talk shows, etc. The result shows that the non-referential pronoun *man* can appear with "true impersonal verbs" and "pseudo-impersonal verbs" in informal and colloquial usage. Consider the examples from Indrambarya (2011) in (6). True impersonal verbs in this study include emergence/occurrence verbs, as shown in (6a), and verbs indicating degrees of time, temperature, possibility, accessibility and ease, as in (6b). Pseudo-impersonal verbs indicate feeling or psychological state, rather than action, as in (6c).

(6)   a. *ตอนแรก ๆ **มัน**เกิดที่อยุธยา*

tɔ:n	rê:krê:k	***man***	kə̀:t	tʰî:	ʔàʔjúttʰaja:
part	first	NRP	happen	at	Ayutthaya

'At first, it happened at Ayuthaya.'

b. *กว่าจะถึงบ้าน **มัน**จะดึกมาก*

kwà:	tɕà?	tʰɨ̌ŋ	bâ:n	**man**	tɕà?	dɯ̀k	mâ:k
more	IRR	arrive	home	NRP	will	be.late.at.night	much

'By the time (we) get home, it will be very late.'

c. ***มัน**กะไม่ถูกนะ*

man	kà?	mâj	tʰù:k	ná?
NRP	estimate NEG	touch	PRT	

'I couldn't figure where it is.'

In Kaenmuang (2022), the non-referential subject *man* is semantically examined to find out how the loss of this referential meaning occurred. The research was conducted by analyzing data across eras, from the late Thonburi period to the present. The results show that the types of antecedent forms that the pronoun *man* refers to can be divided into 8 scope types, ranging from the shortest text to longer texts until it is difficult to identify the scope of the antecedent form. They are 1) noun phrases, 2) clausal nominalizations, 3) verb phrases, 4) clauses, 5) texts, 6) non-specific connotations or genericity, 7) contextual meaning related or stimulated, and 8) non-referential subjects. Additionally, the study points out that the non-referential subject man appears in two clause types, namely, evaluative and existential, respectively exemplified by Kaenmuang (2022, p. 39), as in (7).

(7)   a. *ในทางการเมือง**มัน**เป็นไปได้ทั้งหมดเพราะพวกนี้ก็เคยอยู่พรรคเดียวกันมาทั้งนั้น*

naj	tʰa:ŋ	ka:nmɨaŋ	**man**	pen	paj	dâ:j	tʰáŋ	mòt	pʰrɔ́?
in	way	politics	NRP	COP	go	able	both	all	because

pʰûak	ní:	kʰə:j	jù:	pʰák	diaw		kan	tʰáŋ	nán
group	this	use.to	COP	party	be.single	RECP	both	that	

'Politically, it's all possible because these people used to be in the same party.'

b. *เอ้า ใช้ฟืนแบบนั้นจะติดได้ไง **มัน**ต้องมีเชื้อไฟดิ*

ʔâw	tɕʰáj	fɨ:n	bɛ̀:p	nán	tɕà?	tìt	dâ:j	ŋaj	**man**
hey	use	firewood	like	that	will	light	able	how	NRP

tɔ̂ŋ	mi:	tɕʰɨ́afaj	di?
must	exist	fuel	PRT

'Hey, how can you use firewood like that? There must be fuel.'

From the discovery of the gradual path of change of the pronoun *man*, this research has concluded that it is not very consistent with the idea that the non-referential subject *man* in Thai is a result of translating directly from English structures. The present work suggests that it is caused by contact with English in the cases where English makes Thai grammatical units more complex. There emerged nominalization in Thai (see, e.g., (8b) below), as Prasithrathsint (1997) commented, that were derived from translations from English. These complex structures and units are the connectors that make the referent form of the pronoun expanded from a noun phrase to a larger linguistic unit until it is so wide that its boundaries are almost indeterminate. It is highly abstract and finally becomes a non-referential pronoun that is found more in the present than in the past.

However, Kaenmuang et al. (2025) posit that Thai lacks dummy subjects, based on an analysis of one thousand instances of *man* extracted from the Thai National Corpus. Their claim implies that the types of antecedent forms to which the pronoun *man* refers do not extend beyond the seventh scope type identified in Kaenmuang (2022). The rationale provided is that the referentiality of the subject pronoun *man* exists on a continuum, ranging from semantic referentiality with an explicit and highly concrete antecedent to pragmatic referentiality with an implicit antecedent of lower referent concreteness. By contrast, our analysis of naturalistic everyday language usage indicates that, consistent with Gundel et al. (2005) and other aforementioned studies, the pronoun *man* does occur as a dummy subject in Thai. This is evidenced by its function as the subject in pragmatically driven clause types such as cleft, extraposition, and atmospheric constructions, as exemplified above, where the subjects are non-referential. Furthermore, recognizing that grammatical changes are often gradual and thus exhibit inherent overlap rather than discrete categorization (Givón, 2001), we propose that the phenomenon observed represents the grammaticalization of *man* from a referential to a non-referential pronoun.

4. METHODOLOGY

Suggested by the past studies, our data – clauses carrying the non-referential pronoun *man* – were collected from both informally written and colloquial narratives that are currently produced, such as novels/fictions, short stories and fairy tales, whether translated or not, that represent conversations in a variety of settings, for a total of 20 books. The books were selected based on a publication period not exceeding 20 years. The dataset also includes website threads and Facebook posts, which are more informal and colloquial, for a total of 200 posts. As for website threads and Facebook posts, they were randomly selected from the same period regardless of engagement metrics (e.g., likes, shares, comments), author demographics, or specific linguistic features – to obtain information that is in everyday language usage.

Individual instances were identified and included in the analysis using the classification of antecedent forms proposed in Kaenmuang (2022) as filtering criteria. That is, the five explicit forms – ranging from noun phrase, nominalization, verb phrase, clause and text, as respectively shown in (8), – which are not problematic in reference, were excluded from our analysis.

(8)　　a.　noun phrase:
เรื่องเกี่ยวกับสัปเหร่อ มันนานมาก (short story)

rîaŋ	*kìawkàp*	*sàppàʔrà:*	*man*	*na:n*	*mâ:k*
story	about	undertaker	it	be.long	very

'As for the story about the undertaker, it is so long ago.'

b.　nominalization:
การอาศัยอยู่ในฮอนโนลูลูอย่างถาวร มันดูน่าเร้าใจน้อยกว่าการพักที่โรงแรมคาฮาลาเสียอีก (novel)

ka:n	*ʔa:sǎj*	*jù:*	*naj*	*hɔnno:lu:lu:*	*jàŋ*	*tʰǎ:wɔ:n*	*man*	*du:*
NMLZ	live	live	in	Honolulu	like	be.permanent	it	seem

nâ:ráwtɕaj	*nɔ́:j*	*kwà:*	*pʰák*	*tʰî:*	*ro:ŋrɛ:m*	*kʰa:ha:la:*	*sǐaʔì:k*
exciting	less	than	stay	at	hotel	Kahara	even.more.so

'Living in Honolulu is less exciting than staying at the Kahara Hotel.'

c.　verb phrase:
จะมัวลับอาวุธก่อนออกศึกนั้น มันไม่ทัน (fairy tale)

tɕàʔ	*mua*	*láp*	*ʔa:wút*	*kɔ̀:n*	*ʔɔ̀:k*	*sìk*	*nán*	*man*	*mâj*	*tʰan*
will	be.busy	sharpen	weapon	before	leave.for	war	TOP	it	NEG	in.time

'Sharpening your weapons before battle is not in time.'

d.　clause:
แกเลยมาบอกฉันว่าแกท้อง มันเป็นเหตุบังเอิญ (novel)

kɛ:	*lə:j*	*ma:*	*bɔ̀:k*	*tɕʰǎn*	*wâ:*	*kɛ:*	*tʰɔ́:ŋ*	*man*	*pen*
3SG	so	come	tell	1SG	COMP	3SG	be.pregnant	it	COP

hè:t	*baŋʔə:n*
event	by.accident

'Thus, she told me she was pregnant. It was by accident.'

e.　text:
สุนัขล่าเนื้อตัวหนึ่งในช่วงวัยเยาว์และเต็มเปี่ยมไปด้วยพละกำลังไม่เคยยอมจำนนให้กับสัตว์ตัวใดในป่า ได้เผชิญหน้าไล่ล่าหมูป่าตัวหนึ่งในวัยชรา มันตะครุบหมูป่าที่หูอย่างกล้าหาญ แต่มิอาจจับมันไว้ได้ เนื่องจากฟันที่ผุกร่อนของมัน ดังนั้น หมูป่าจึงหนีไปได้ในที่สุด นายของมัน เมื่อตามมาพบเข้า ได้ต่อว่ามันอย่างรุนแรง สุนัขล่าเนื้อจึงกล่าวว่า "มันหาใช่ความผิดของข้า จิตวิญญาณของข้ายังดีเช่นเคย แต่ข้ามิอาจช่วยความอ่อนแอของข้าได้ต่างหาก ข้าควรจะได้รับการสรรเสริญในสิ่งที่ข้ามี มากกว่าจะถูกตำหนิในสิ่งที่ข้าเป็น (fairy tale)

… *tɛ̀:*	*míʔ*	*ʔà:t*	*tɕàp*	*man*	*wáj*	*dâ:j*	*nîaŋtɕà:k*	*fan*	*tʰî:*
but	NEG	can	hold	it	keep	able	because	teeth	REL

pʰùʔkrɔ̀n	*kʰɔ̌:ŋ*	*man*	*daŋnán*	*mǔ:*	*pà:*	*tɕiŋ*	*nǐ:*	*paj*	*dâ:j*
be.decayed	of	it	so.that	pig	wild	so	escape	go	able

naj	*tʰî:*	*sùt* …	"*man*	*hă:tɕʰâj*	*kʰwa:m*	*pʰìt*	*kʰɔ̆:ŋ*	*kʰâ:* …
in	at	last	it	NEG	NMLZ	wrong	of	1SG

'A hound, who was young and whose strength had never yielded to any beast of the forest, encountered an old boar and chased him. He seized him boldly by the ear but could not retain his hold because of the decay of his teeth, so the boar escaped. His master, quickly coming up, fiercely abused the dog. The hound then said, "It was not my fault, master: my spirit was as good as ever, but I could not help my infirmities. I rather deserve to be praised for what I have been, than to be blamed for what I am.'

The two types – genericity and contextual meaning related or stimulated types – which are implicit and problematic (since they require inference from contexts), as respectively illustrated in (9) – were therefore included in our analysis.

(9)　　a. แล้วผมยังปรุงผักบุ้งกินด้วย **มัน**หอมเต้าเจี้ยวครับ และไม่มีกลิ่นคาวของเนื้อสัตว์ใด ๆ (short story)

… *man*	*hɔ̆:m*	*tâwtɕîaw*	*kʰráp* …
NRP	smell.good	fermented.soybeans	PRT

'And I also cooked morning glory to eat. I can smell fermented soybeans. And there is no smell of any meat.'

b. มันคับขันมากขึ้นทุกที ม่านตาเกิดไม่เคลื่อนไหว และอาการเริ่มรุนแรงขึ้นเรื่อย ๆ ขณะที่พวกเขาเข็นเข้าห้องผ่าตัด (novel)

man	*kʰápkʰăn*	*mâ:k*	*kʰɨ̂n*	*tʰúk*	*tʰi:*	*mâ:nta:*	*kà:t*	*mâj*
NRP	be.urgent	very	up	every	time	pupil	happen	NEG

kʰlĭanwǎj	*lɛ́ʔ*	*ʔa:ka:n*	*rî:m*	*runrɛːŋ*	*kʰɨ̂n*	*rîajrîaj*
move	and	symptoms	begin	be.severe	up	continuously

kʰàʔnàʔtʰî:	*pʰûak*	*kʰăw*	*kʰĕn*	*rót*	*kʰâw*	*hɔ̂ŋ*	*pʰà:tàt*
while	group	3PL	push	vehicle	enter	room	operate

'It was getting more and more urgent. Her pupils were not moving, and the symptoms were getting worse as they wheeled her into the operating room.'

The pronoun *man* in (9a) can be interpreted that it is being used to refer to a non-specific meaning, that is, anyone who cooks the same dish will experience the same smell. In (9b), although no referent is given, it can cataphorically refer to the critical crisis of the female patient. These two types of vague or unclear reference which are problematic and serve as a bridge to the non-referential subject *man* are included in the notion of dummy subject in our analysis. This is in line with Asher (1993) and other studies which propose that the dummy subject still has a referential meaning, although it is an indirect reference.

As for the non-referential subject form, it has no antecedent and it is not possible to infer what is being referred to, for example (10).

(10)　　ฉันไม่อยากให้**มัน**หมดปีนี้ เพราะรู้ดีว่าเมื่อเวลาผ่านไป มกราคมผ่านไป กุมภาพันธ์ และก็เริ่มเข้าหน้าร้อน จะต้องมีบางอย่างเกิดขึ้นแน่ ๆ (novel)

tɕʰăn	*mâj*	*jà:k*	*hâj*	*man*	*mòt*	*pi:*	*ní:* …
* *tɕʰăn*	*mâj*	*jà:k*	*hâj*	*we:la:*	*mòt*	*pi:*	*ní:*
1SG	not	want	COMP	time	end	year	this

'I don't want that this year to end because I know that as the days pass, as January becomes February and February becomes summer, certain things will happen.'

In (10), the quasi-subject *man* in the embedded clause is non-referential or has no antecedent. Even though *pi:* 'year' is time or a period, it cannot be used in place of the pronoun *man* in such a clause. According to Wongwattana (2022, p. 59), to prove that the pronoun *man* is non-referential, it can be absent, as in (11).

(11)　　ฉันไม่อยากให้หมดปีนี้...

tɕʰăn	*mâj*	*jà:k*	*hâj*	*mòt*	*pi:*	*ní:* …
1SG	NEG	want	COMP	end	year	this

'I don't want that this year to end…'

Our analysis of construction types, structures and functions is based on the function-typological framework previously discussed. At first, clauses with the dummy-subject *man* are classified into main types, such as basic and non-basic clauses. Each type is further divided into different structures. In each clause structure, communicative functions are examined in terms of the semantic or pragmatic domain.

5. RESULTS

The results show that the dummy-subject *man* appears in both of two main clausal types or forms, namely, basic and non-basic clauses. By functions, the basic clause type displays a variety of lexical-semantic features while the non-basic clause type exhibits discourse-pragmatic features such as information structuring and pragmatic emphasis. The characteristics of the two clause types with the dummy subject *man* are discussed in detail below.

5.1 Clause types and structures

The types of clauses in which the dummy subject *man* occur are divided into basic and non-basic clauses or variants, regarding functions.

5.1.1 Basic clause type

Basic clauses in this analysis refer to clause structures that show lexical-semantic functions (rather than discourse-pragmatic features discussed in the non-basic type below). Therefore, they include active, affirmative/negative and declarative/non-declarative clauses. In the basic clause type, the dummy subject *man* exhibits vague reference in the two problematic forms, genericity and contextual meaning related or stimulated types. Basic clauses can be found in both simple and complex structures.

5.1.1.1 Simple structure

Based on the predicate-argument structure, a simple basic clause essentially consists of an intransitive verb, transitive verb with an object, or copular verb with a nominal predicate, as shown in Figure 1. Note that typical copular verbs in Thai include *pen, $k^h\dot{i}$:, jù:, tɕâj* (originally referring to 'alive', 'equal', 'stay' and 'right' respectively) and ZERO (Wongwattana, 2015a).

Figure 1: Structure of simple basic clauses with the dummy subject *man*

Examples are provided in (12a), (12b) and (12c) respectively below.

(12)   a. *ไมมันเงียบงี้* (Facebook post)

maj	***man***	*ŋîap*	*ŋí:*
why	NRP	quiet	like.this

'Why is it so quiet?'

b. *ทำบุญปีใหม่มันต้องไม่งมงาย **มัน**ต้องไม่หลับหูหลับตา มันจะต้องลืมหูลืมตาสว่างไสว แจ่มแจ้งขึ้น* (Facebook post)

man	*tɔ̂:ŋ*	*mâj*	*làphǔlàpta: …*
NRP	must	NEG	close.one's.eyes.and.ears

'Making merit for the New Year must not be superstitious. It must not be blind. It must be open-minded, bright, and clear.'

c. ***มัน**คือช่วงฤดูร้อนจัด หลายเดือนหลังจากที่ฉันอยากอยู่ลำพังเพื่อให้เขากลับมา…* (novel)

man	*k$^h\dot{i}$:*	*tɕʰûaŋ*	*rɪ́ʔdu:*	*rɔ́:n*	*tɕàt…*
NRP	COP	period	season	hot	very

'It was deep into the summer, some months after the night when I needed to be alone so that he could come back, …'

5.1.1.2 Complex structure

The dummy subject *man* also occurs in a more complex structure like clausal-subject clauses. According to Givón (2001), a clausal subject may appear syntactically as a full-fledged clause in the characteristic subject position, as in (13a), or in the position normally reserved for clausal complements. When the second pattern appears, the dummy subject *man* most commonly occupies the syntactic subject position, one that should be considered as co-referential with the clausal complement, as in (13b), which was drawn from Pramunwong (2006, p. 132), a translated novel included in our data. Differently speaking, it is used as an anticipatory subject, with the real subject to which it refers appearing later in the clause. It is what Gundel et al. (2005) call extraposition pronoun. This latter structure is preferred in less formal contexts or speaking.

(13)   a. *ที่จะซื้อของทำอาหารค่ำดูจะดึกเกินไป*

$t^h\hat{i}$:	$t\varepsilon\grave{a}?$	$s\acute{i}$:	$k^h\check{ɔ}$:ŋ	$t^h am$	$?a$:$h\check{a}$:$k^h\hat{a}m$	du:	$t\varepsilon\grave{a}?$	$d\grave{i}k$	$k\partial$:$npaj$
NMLZ	will	buy	thing	make	dinner	look	will	be.late.at.night	too

'Shopping for dinner seems too late.'

b. ***มัน****ดูจะดึกเกินไปที่จะซื้อของทำอาหารค่ำ* (Novel)

man	du:	$t\varepsilon\grave{a}?$	$d\grave{i}k$	$k\partial$:$npaj$	$t^h\hat{i}$:$t\varepsilon\grave{a}?$	$s\acute{i}$:	$k^h\check{ɔ}$:ŋ	$t^h am$	$?a$:$h\check{a}$:$k^h\hat{a}m$
NRP	look	will	be.late.at.night	too	COMP	buy	thing	make	dinner

'It seems too late to shop for dinner.'

5.1.2 Non-basic clause type

The non-basic clause type is a clear case where the dummy pronoun *man* could be identified as non-referential on purely syntactic grounds, based on the predicate-argument structure of the clause. The type includes existential-representative, topic-comment and cleft clauses.

5.1.2.1 Existential-representative clauses

As described in Wongwattana (2017, p. 27, 2022, p. 355), existential-representative clauses in Thai are subjectless and typically coded by the existential-representative verb 'exist', which has no lexical-semantic content due to semantically bleaching, before a noun phrase. It is most common for the noun phrase to carry a modifier such as a relative clause, locative phrase, etc. Consider an example provided in Wongwattana (2022, p. 359), as shown in (14).

(14)   ***มี****กระทาชายคนหนึ่งที่มีอาชีพตัดฟืน*

mi:	$kr\grave{a}?t^h a$:$t\varepsilon^h a$:j	$k^h on$	$n\grave{i}ŋ$	$t^h\hat{i}$:	mi:	$?a$:$t\varepsilon^h\hat{i}$:p	$t\grave{a}t$	$f\ddot{i}$:n
exist	man	CLF	one	REL	have	career	cut	firewood

'There was a man who was a woodcutter by profession.'

As a non-referential pronoun, the dummy subject *man* can occur before the existential-representative verb, resulting in the complete structure shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Structure of existential-representative clauses with the dummy subject *man*

The evidence is shown in (15).

(15)   ***มัน****จะมีเพื่อนอยู่คนนึงที่เติมเบียร์ให้ตลอดแต่ไม่เติมให้ตัวเอง* (Facebook post)

man	$t\varepsilon\grave{a}?$	mi:	$p^h\ddot{i}an$	$j\grave{u}$:	$k^h on$	$n\grave{i}ŋ$	$t^h\hat{i}$:	$t\partial$:m	bia
NRP	will	exist	friend	be	CLF	one	REL	fill	beer

$h\hat{a}j$	$t\grave{a}?l\grave{ɔ}$:t	$t\grave{\varepsilon}$:	$m\hat{a}j$	$t\partial$:m	$h\hat{a}j$	$tua?e$:ŋ
give	always	but	NEG	fill	give	oneself

'There will always be a friend who will fill your beer but will not fill his own.'

5.1.2.2 Topic-comment clauses

Wongwattana (2022, p. 347) offers that a topic-comment clause is a format which consists of two main parts in the order topic-comment. The topic appears as a noun phrase optionally marked with a morpheme, while the comment is a matter related to the topic, just like taking the name and shortened content of a story into the size of a clause. Wongwattana (2022, p. 348) provides an example as illustrated in (16).

(16)　　*การเขียนเรื่องเมื่อวัยเด็ก**นั้น**แสนสุขสนุกสนานมาก*

ka:n	kʰǐan	rîaŋ	mîa	waj	dèk	**nán**	sě:n	sùk	sà?nùksà?nǎ:n	mâ:k
NMLZ	write	story	as	age	child	TOP	so	be.happy	fun	very

'Writing about my childhood was so much fun and joy.'

Our data suggest that the dummy subject *man* can occupy the subject position of the comment clause, as a non-referent pronoun. The structure of topic-comment clauses with the dummy subject *man* can be shown in Figure 3.

TOPIC	+	*man*	+	PREDICATE

Figure 3: Structure of topic-comment clauses with the dummy subject *man*

For example, consider the following topic-comment clauses with the dummy subject *man* in (17), where the topic part can be ranged from the smallest grammatical form like a noun or pronoun to bigger ones like a noun phrase and nominalized form, respectively.

(17)　　a. *เรา **มัน**เก่าแล้ว* (Facebook post)

raw	**man**	kàw	lɛ́:w
1PL	NRP	be.old	already

'We are not fresh anymore.'

b. *คนแก่ **มัน**น่าเบื่ออย่างนี้เองแหละ* (short story)

kʰon	kɛ̀:	**man**	nâ:bìa	jà:ŋ	ní:	?e:ŋ	lɛ̀?
people	old	NRP	boring	type	this	oneself	PRT

'Old people, this is boring like this.'

c. *ความล้มเหลว **มัน**ลุกขึ้นมาใหม่ได้* (Facebook post)

kʰwa:m	lómlěw	**man**	lúk	kʰɨn	ma:	màj	dâ:j
NMLZ	fail	NRP	rise.up	up	come	again	able

'Failure, you can rise up again.'

In (17a), it is not likely that the pronoun *man* refers to the speaker appearing in the form of the inclusive first-person plural pronoun 'us.' In (17b), that *man* refers to the elderlies is inappropriate. In (17c), the pronoun *man* in the comment part cannot be semantically related to the nominalized topic since the predicate *lúk kʰɨn* 'rise up' needs an agent, which is animate, if occurring.

5.1.2.3 Cleft clauses

Wongwattana (2015b, p. 75) offers that cleft clauses in Thai are also subjectless in that their copular verbs need no subject both syntactically and semantically. The non-referential pronoun *man* helps place focus on a particular element of the clause. The focus element is a nominal predicate which is modified by a relative clause. Consider an example provided in Wongwattana (2015b, p. 77), as in (18).

(18)　　*เป็นมนุษย์ ไม่ใช่เทพเจ้า ที่แตกร่างออกเป็นสอง* (novel)

pen	má?nút	mâj	tɕʰâj	tʰê:ppʰá?tɕâ:w	**tʰî:**	tè:k	râ:ŋ	pen	sɔ̌:ŋ
COP	person	NEG	COP	God	REL	break	body	COP	two

'It is man, not the God, who splits in two.'

Similarly to the first two clause types, the pronoun *man* can be found as the dummy subject of a cleft clause, resulting in the complete structure of cleft clauses in Thai as shown below in Figure 4.

man	+	COP	+	NOUN PHRASE	+	RELATIVE CLAUSE

Figure 4: Structure of cleft clauses with the dummy subject *man*

The evidence is shown in (19)

(19)   **มันเป็น**หลังคา**ที่พูด** ไม่ใช่แก (fairy tale)

man	**pen**	lăŋkʰa:	**tʰîː**	pʰûː	mâj	tɕʰâj	kɛː
NRP	COP	roof	REL	speak	NEG	COP	2SG

'It is the roof that's talking, not you.'

5.2 Functions of dummy-subject *man* constructions
Dummy-subject *man* constructions display both lexical-semantic and discourse-pragmatic functions.

5.2.1 Lexical semantic functions
In the forms of vague inference, basic clauses with the dummy subject *man* exhibit different lexical-semantic features, various facets of the state, event or action, relevant to clausal structures or verb types such as intransitive, transitive, copular and extraposition. These features include environmental or meteorological phenomena, physical or mental states, activities or actions, spatial distance or related implications, temporal references and epistemic-valuative-difficulty assessments. The correlation between structures and functions of clausal constructions with the dummy subject *man* is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Lexical-semantic functions of basic clause types with the dummy subject *man* in relation to clause structures

	Intransitive	Transitive	Copular	Extraposition
Environmental or meteorological phenomena	✓			
Physical or mental states	✓			
Activities or actions	✓	✓		
Spatial distances or related implications			✓	
Temporal references			✓	
Epistemic-valuative-difficulty assessments				✓

5.2.1.1 Environmental or meteorological phenomena
Intransitive clauses with the dummy subject *man* code states or events involving mostly environmental or meteorological phenomena, as illustrated in (20a) and (20b), respectively.

(20)   a. **มัน**มืด (fairy tale)

man	mîːt
NRP	be.dark

'It was dark.'

b. ทำไมสมัยนี้**มัน**ร้อนแปลก ๆ (website thread)

tʰammaj	sà?măj	níː	**man**	rɔ́ːn	plɛ̀ːkplɛ̀ːk
why	era	this	NRP	be.hot	strangely

'Why is it so strangely hot these days?'

5.2.1.2 Physical or mental states
It is also common that intransitive clauses typically indicate a variety of people's physical or mental states, as respectively exemplified in (21a) and (21b).

(21)   a. **มัน**จะเหนื่อย ถ้าเราไม่ปล่อย (Facebook post)

man	tɕàʔ	nìaj	tʰâ:	raw	mâj	plɔ̀:j
NRP	will	be.tired	if	1PL	NEG	let.go

'We will be tired if we don't let go.'

b. *ในป่า**มัน**เหงาจริงๆ* (short story)

naj	pà:	**man**	ŋǎw	tɕiŋtɕiŋ
in	forest	NRP	be.lonely	really

'It's really lonely in the forest.'

5.2.1.3 Activities or actions

Regarding either intransitive or transitive types, it can exhibit people's activities or actions. The subjects are conscious participants in the event either with or without actively initiating it, as in (22).

(22)   a. ***มัน**นอนไม่ได้เนี่ย* (website thread)

man	nɔ:n	mâj	dâ:j	nîaʔ
NRP	sleep	NEG	be.able	PRT

'I can't sleep.'

b. *ไม่มีอะไรที่จะได้ดังใจในทุกเรื่อง **มัน**ทำบุญและทำใจ เมื่อถึงเวลาเดี๋ยวก็มาเอง* (Facebook post)

...**man**	tʰam	bun	lɛʔ	tʰam	tɕaj ...
NRP	make	merit	and	make	mind

'Nothing will go as you wish in every matter. We must make merit and make peace with it. When the time is right, it will come.'

c. *เราเองก็ว่าเราเข้มแข็งประมาณหนึ่ง แต่พอ**มัน**เจอเรื่องแย่ ๆ ร้าย ๆ หลายเรื่อง ...* (website threads)

... tὲ:	pʰɔ:	**man**	tɕɔ:	rîaŋ	jɛ̂:jɛ̂:	rá:jrá:j	lǎ:j	rîaŋ...
but	when	NRP	encounter	matter	bad	evil	many	matter

'I myself think that I am fairly strong, but when encountering many bad things, ...'

5.2.1.4 Spatial distance or related implications

Based on our data analysis, transitive clauses can also exhibit distance with the verb *tɕʰáj* 'use/take'. However, the meaning extends metaphorically beyond mere spatial distance to include time and other conceptual domains, as illustrated in (23).

(23)   *มันใช้เวลาเพียง 20 นาที* (fairy tale)

man	tɕʰáj	we:la:	pʰiaŋ	jî:sìp	na:tʰi:
NRP	take	time	only	20	second

'It takes only 20 minutes.'

5.2.1.5 Temporal references

As for copular clauses, they typically represent time, whether it is a point of time measured in hours (and minutes past midnight or noon), a period, a season and so on, as exemplified in (24).

(24)   a. ***มัน**เป็นเวลา 11 นาฬิกา* (fairy tale)

man	pen	we:la:	sìpʔèt	na:líʔka:
NRP	COP	time	11	o'clock

'It was eleven o'clock.'

b. ***มัน**ถึงเวลาละ* (novel)

man	tʰɨ̌ŋ	we:la:	láʔ
NRP	COP	time	PRT

It's about time.

c. **มัน**คือช่วงฤดูร้อนจัด หลายเดือนหลังจากคืนที่ฉันอยากอยู่ลำพัง (novel)

man	*kʰɨ:*	*tɕʰûaŋ*	*rɨ́ʔdu:*	*rɔ́:n*	*tɕàt …*
NRP	COP	period	season	hot	very

'It was deep into the summer, some months after the night when I needed to be alone.'

5.2.1.6 Epistemic-evaluative-difficulty assessments

The extraposition pattern typically displays the epistemic (e.g., *be true*, *be likely*, etc.), evaluative (e.g., *be good*, *be terrific*, etc.) or difficulty (e.g., *be difficult*, *be easy*, etc.) scope of meanings, as respectively illustrated in (25).

(25)   a. **มัน**ดูเหมือนว่าเขาจะใช้คอมพิวเตอร์ในอินเทอร์เน็ตคาเฟ่ในการแฮกข้อมูล (novel)

man	*du:*	*mɪ̌an*	*wâ:*	*kʰǎw*	*tɕàʔ*	*tɕʰá:j*	*kʰɔmpiwtə̂*	*naj*	*ʔintə:nèt*
NRP	look	like	COMP	3SG	will	use	computer	in	internet

kʰa:fê:	*naj*	*ka:n*	*hɛ̂k*	*kʰɔ́:mu:n*
cafe	in	NMLZ	hack	information

'It looks like he used a computer in an internet cafe to hack into information.'

b. **มัน**น่ารื่นรมย์อยู่ไม่น้อยที่จะนั่งอ้อยอิ่งดูโน่นนี่พลางจิบน้ำชาอุ่น ๆ (novel)

man	*nâ:rɨ̂:nrom*	*jù:*	*mâj*	*nɔ́:j*	*tʰî:tɕàʔ*	*nâŋ*	*ʔɔ̂:j ʔìŋ*	*du:*	*nô:n*
NRP	be.pleasure	PROG	NEG	be.little	COMP	sit	slowly	look	that

du:	*nî:*	*pʰla:ŋ*	*tɕìp*	*ná:mtɕʰa:*	*ʔùnʔùn*
look	this	while	sip	tea	worm

'It is quite pleasant to sit and watch things while sipping on a warm cup of tea.'

c. ผมไม่คิดว่า**มัน**จะเป็นไปได้ที่จะสร้างทุเรียนที่ไม่มีกลิ่น (short story)

pʰǒm	*mâj*	*kʰít*	*wâ:*	*man*	*tɕàʔ*	*penpajdâ:j*	*tʰî:tɕàʔ*	*sâ:ŋ*	*tʰú?rian*
1SG	NEG	think	COMP	NRP	will	be.able	COMP	create	durian

tʰî:	*mâj*	*mi:*	*klìn*
REL	NEG	have	smell

'I don't think it's possible to create a durian that has no smell.'

5.2.2 Discourse-pragmatic functions

The non-basic clause types – existential-presentative, topic-comment and cleft clauses – with the dummy subject *man* have changed from their corresponding simple clauses to carry propositional-semantic contents in different discourse-pragmatic functional domains. They are found to perform certain functions within two main scopes, that is, information structuring (marked topic) and pragmatic emphasis (contrastive focus). Speaking specifically these regular pragmatically driven clauses introduce topics to discourses, reintroduce or maintain topics, and present contradictory beliefs. These functions are distributed among different clause types, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Functions of non-basic clause types with the dummy subject *man*

	Topic introduction	Topic reintroduction	Contradictory-believe presentation
Existential-representative	✓		
Topic-comment		✓	
Cleft	✓		✓

5.2.2.1 Topic introduction

In the function of topic introduction, existential-presentative clauses with the dummy subject *man* are typically used to introduce important new information or referents mentioned for the first time in the discourse. The new information is usually the topic of the following content. Consider the Facebook post in (26), where the new information 'a scent from him…' is introduced with an existential-presentative clause with the dummy subject *man*, and then it acts as the topic of the rest of the excerpt which is about the scent.

(26) **มันจะมีกลิ่นของเขาเหมือนอะโรมาเทอราพี** *ทำให้เราหลับ เคลิบเคลิ้ม พอกอดเขาแล้วง่วง แล้วใจเย็น เขาจะมีสารอะไรอย่าง หนึ่ง* (Facebook post)

man	tɕàʔ	mi:	klìn	kʰɔ̌:ŋ	kʰǎw	mǎn	ʔàʔro:ma:tʰə:ra:pi: ...
NRP	will	exist	scent	of	3SG	like	aromatherapy

'There will be a scent from him which is like aromatherapy. The scent makes me fall asleep and get drowsy. Whenever I hug him, I feel sleepy and calm. He has a certain' essence.

In addition, the cleft type can also perform this function in the beginning of a discourse. Thus consider the Facebook post in (27). It begins with a cleft clause with the dummy subject *man* that carries the topic of the post, 'the care that we give from the heart'.

(27) **มันเป็นความใส่ใจที่เรามอบให้จากใจจริง** *การใส่ใจลูกค้าไม่ว่าจะเรื่องเล็ก ๆ น้อย ๆ เป็นสิ่งที่มองข้ามไม่ได้ พอทราบว่าลูกค้า บ้านพักทานเจ สิ่งที่พอตระเตรียมได้เราจึงรังสรรค์เมนูง่าย ๆ ผักสามสี ผักกาดขาวลวกน้ำร้อนกำลังพอดี แครอทลวกสีสันสวยงาม ฟักทองนึ่งและอบหอม ๆ และมันเผาร้อน ๆ หวังว่าลูกค้าจะมีความสุขกับเช้าวันนี้นะครับ* (Facebook post)

man	pen	kʰwa:m	sàjtɕa	tʰî:	raw	mɔ̂:p	hâj	tɕà:k	tɕaj	tɕiŋ ...
NRP	COP	NMZ	take.care	REL	1PL	offer	give	from	heart	real

'It is the care that we give from the heart. Caring for customers, even in small matters, is something that cannot be overlooked. When we knew that the guests of the guesthouse were vegetarians, we created a simple menu with tri-color vegetables, Chinese cabbage blanched in hot water just right, colorful blanched carrots, fragrant steamed and baked pumpkin, and roasted sweet potatoes. We hope that the customers will be happy with this morning.'

5.2.2.2 Topic reintroduction

The topic-comment clause type is typically used for topic reintroduction. Particularly, the function to maintain the topic in the content or narrative context after it has been introduced for some time. For example, the Facebook post shown in (28) begins with the topic 'leaving your comfort zone...'. This topic has been out of the focus of attention for a while and is being brought back into the discourse again with a topic-comment clause carrying the dummy subject *man*.

(28) **การออกจากคอมฟอร์ตโซน**หรือการลองสิ่งใหม่ ๆ เป็นสิ่งที่น่าตื่นเต้นและน่าสนุกมาก ๆ แต่ถ้าการเติบโตในเวลาที่ตัวเองไม่ได้ เตรียมพร้อม หรือเราเลือกไปในสถานการณ์ที่ไม่เหมาะสม หรือไปกับคนที่ไม่ได้เกื้อกูลการเติบโตของเรา การเติบโตก็อาจจะทิ้ง แผลเอาไว้ในใจได้ง่าย ๆ **การออกจากคอมฟอร์ตโซน มันเหนื่อยได้** มันบีบคั้นได้ แต่มันไม่ควรต้องพาตัวเองไปเจอบาดแผลนะ (Facebook post)

ka:n	ʔɔ̀:k	tɕà:k	kʰɔmfɔ̀:t	so:n ...	ka:n	ʔɔ̀:k	tɕà:k	kʰɔmfɔ̀:t	so:n	man
MNLZ	get.out	from	comfort	zone	MNLZ	get.out	from	comfort	zone	NRP

nìaj	dâ:j ...
be.tired	able

'Leaving your comfort zone or trying something new is very exciting and fun. But if we grow up at a time when we are not prepared, choose to go into an inappropriate situation, or go with people who do not support our growth, growth can easily leave scars in our hearts. Leaving the comfort zone can be tiring. You can be stressed. But you shouldn't have to expose yourself to scars.'

5.2.2.3 Contradictory-believe presentation

Among those non-basic clause types with the dummy subject *man*, it is the cleft type which is typically used as a device to present contradictory or opposite beliefs. In this use, a cleft clause typically carries some given information from the previous content. Thus consider (29), for example.

(29) *ลูกแพะขี้เล่นตัวหนึ่ง ถูกทิ้งไว้บนหลังคามุงหญ้าคาของโรงเรือนเลี้ยงแกะโดยคนเลี้ยงสัตว์ เพื่อป้องกันอันตรายแก่มัน ลูกแพะ กำลังเดินอยู่บนขอบของ**หลังคา** ขณะที่มันมองเห็นหมาป่าตัวหนึ่ง มันก็เริ่มหัวเราะเยาะเย้ยหมาป่า ทำหน้าบิดเบี้ยวใส่ และด่าทอ หมาป่าตามอำเภอใจ "ฉันได้ยินแก" หมาป่าพูดขึ้นมา "และอย่างน้อยฉันไม่ได้โกรธเคืองแกในสิ่งที่แกพูดหรือทำ เมื่อแกอยู่บนนั้น **มันเป็นหลังคาที่พูด ไม่ใช่แก*** (fairy tale)

... lǎŋkʰa: ...	man	pen	lǎŋkʰa:	tʰî:	pʰû:t	mâj	tɕʰâj	kɛ:
roof	NRP	COP	roof	REL	speak	NEG	COP	2SG

'A frisky young kid had been left by the herdsman on the thatched roof of a sheep shelter to keep him out of harm's way. The kid was browsing near the edge of the roof, when he spied a wolf and began to jeer him, making faces and abusing him to his heart's content. "I hear you," said the wolf, "and I haven't the least grudge against you for what you say or do. When you are up there it is the roof that's talking, not you."

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In summary, the dummy subject *man* has been found to appear in a variety of clausal constructions. They can be divided into basic and non-basic clause types which exhibit different forms of references. Basic clauses show the vague references of the dummy subject *man*. By structure, the basic type can be further classified into simple and complex clauses. Simple clauses can carry either intransitive, transitive or copular verbs. Complex clauses are found as an alternative syntactic pattern of clausal-subject clauses, called an extraposition form, which is used in more casual contexts. The non-basic type includes variants such as existential-representative, topic-comment, and cleft each of which exhibits a particular structure.

The basic and non-basic clause types serve different functional domains in communication. The basic clause type expresses lexical-semantic properties, including environmental or meteorological phenomena, physical or mental states, activities or actions, spatial distances or related implications, temporal references, and epistemic-valuative-difficulty assessments. The non-basic type displays discourse-pragmatic functions within two domains, namely, information structuring (marked topic) and pragmatic emphasis (contrastive focus), such as topic introduction, topic reintroduction/maintenance, and contradictory-believe presentation.

The current study is not consistent with the previous studies in Thai as it provides an account for clausal constructions with the dummy subject *man* by presenting them in the form of mapping between structures and functions which were determined separately in those studies. By conducting research from such a constructional perspective, we are allowed to propose a more comprehensive presentation of the clausal types and structures with the dummy subject *man*, which leads to a better understanding. Furthermore, our findings show that, in addition to the existential-presentative type that has already been addressed in past studies such as Kaenmuang (2022), clause types like topic-comment and cleft also carry the dummy subject *man*.

Along with structural considerations, our functional considerations have also yielded new findings, which are not presented in previous works. That is, our determination of basic clause types reveals a larger number of semantic domains than those found in Indrambarya (2011), which are limited to existential verbs and verbs indicating degrees of time, temperature, feelings, possibilities, accessibilities and ease (the last three groups are referred to as epistemic-valuative-difficulty in our analysis). This means that semantic domains, such as people's physical conditions, activities or actions, and distance or related applications are particular findings in our analysis. This may be because our dataset includes more informal and colloquial texts such as website threads and Facebook posts.

Furthermore, our study supports Kaenmuang (2022) in that clausal constructions with the dummy subject *man* have also been developed on their own, rather than being influenced solely by translation from English. From our literature review, certain communicative functions such as people's physical or mental conditions and activities or actions found in our analysis do not exist in English. Therefore, clausal constructions with the dummy subject *man* deserve to be considered a unique grammatical category in the Thai language.

ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person pronoun
2	second person pronoun
3	third person pronoun
CLF	classifier
COMP	complementizer/complement
COP	copula
IRR	irrealis
NEG	negative/negation
NMLZ	nominalizer/nominalization
NRP	non-referential pronoun
PL	plural
PROG	progressive

PRT	particle
RECP	reciprocal
REL	relative
SG	singular
TOP	topic

REFERENCES

Asher, N. (1993). *Reference to abstract objects in discourse: A philosophical semantics for natural language metaphysics*. Kluwer Academic.

Bergsma, S., Lin, D., & Goebel, R. (2008). Distributional identification of non-referential pronouns. In J. D. Moore, S. Teufel, J. Allan, & S. Furui (Eds.), *Proceedings of ACL-08: HLT* (pp. 10–18). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://aclanthology.org/P08-1002.pdf

Boyd, A., Gegg-Harrison, W., & Byron, D. (2005). Identifying non-referential it: A machine learning approach incorporating linguistically motivated patterns. In E. Ringger (Ed.), *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Feature Engineering for Machine Learning in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 40–47). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://aclanthology.org/W05-0406.pdf

Burusphat, S. (1989). Thai language: Topic focused language. *Journal of Language and Culture, 8*(1), 11–17. [in Thai]

Byron, D., & Gegg-Harrison, W. (2004). Eliminating non-referring noun phrases from coreference resolution. In A. Branco, T. McEnery, & R. Mitkov (Eds.), *Proceedings of DAARC* (pp. 21–26). Edições Colibri.

Chutisilp, P. (1984). *A sociolinguistic study of an additional language: English in Thailand* (Publication No. 8502107) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/sociolinguistic-study-additional-language-english/docview/303295591/se-2

Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An introduction volume I*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (2005). Pronouns without NP antecedents: How do we know when a pronoun is referential? In A. Branco, T. McEnery, & R. Mitkov (Eds.), *Anaphora processing: Linguistic, cognitive and computational modelling* (pp. 351–364). John Benjamins Publishing. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/NancyHedberg2/publication/289838375_Pronouns_Without _NP_Antecedents/links/585d 6b7808ae329d61f692df/Pronouns-Without-NP-Antecedents.pdf

Hoonchamlong, Y. (1991). *Some issues in Thai anaphora: A government and binding approach* (Publication No. 9128917) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/some-issues-thai-anaphora-government-binding/docview/304008264/se-2

Indrambarya, K. (2011, May 12). On the non-referential subject/man/'it' in Thai [Paper presentation]. *The 21st Annual Conference of Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*. Bangkok, Thailand.

Iwasaki, S., & Ingkaphirom, P. (2005). *A reference grammar of Thai.* Cambridge University Press.

Kaenmuang, J. (2022). Semantic change in referentiality of the pronoun /man/ in Thai. *Vacana Journal, 10*(1), 28–52. http://rs.mfu.ac.th/ojs/index.php/vacana/article/view/327 [in Thai]

Kaenmuang, J., Piyamahapong, P., & Pittayaporn, P. (2025). Mān on the referentiality continuum in Thai. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society, 18*(1), 1–18. http://hdl.handle.net/10524/52535

Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A. (1976). Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic* (pp. 457–489). Academic Press.

Ng, V. (2005). Supervised ranking for pronoun resolution: Some recent improvements. In A. Cohn (Ed.), *Proceedings of AAAI-05: Twentieth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 1081–1086). Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence. https://aaai.org/papers/01081-AAAI05-171-supervised-ranking-for-pronoun-resolution-some recent-improvements/

Ng, V., & Cardie, C. (2002). Identifying anaphoric and non-anaphoric noun phrases to improve coreference resolution. In S. Tseng (Ed.), *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics* (pp. 730–736). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://aclanthology.org/C02-1139/

Pramunwong, P. (Trans.). (2006). *The year of magical thinking*. Matichon. [in Thai]

Prasithrathsint, A. (1997). The emergence and development of abstract nominalization in standard Thai. In A. S. Abramson (Ed.), *Southeast Asian linguistics studies in honor of Vichin Panupong* (pp. 179–190). Chulalongkorn University Press.

Royal Institute. (2013). *Royal institute dictionary 2011*. Nanmeebooks. [in Thai]

Soon, W. M., Ng, H. T., & Lim, D. C. Y. (2001). A machine learning approach to coreference resolution of noun phrases. *Computational Linguistics, 27*(4), 521–544. https://aclanthology.org/J01-4004.pdf

Wongwattana, U. S. (2015a). Complexities of Thai copular constructions. *Journal of Southeast Asian Linguistics Society, 8*, 97–120. http://hdl.handle.net/1885/95200

Wongwattana, U. S. (2015b). Communicative functions and syntax of clause variations in Thai: A case of contrastive focus constructions. *Journal of Language and Linguistics, 33*(2), 70–91. [in Thai]

Wongwattana, U. S. (2017). An analysis of communicative roles and syntactic aspects of variant clauses, the case of marked-topic constructions. *Journal of Humanities, Naresuan University, 14*(3), 15–34. https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jhnu/article/view/172187 [in Thai]

Wongwattana, U. S. (2022). *Communicative Thai grammar: An analysis in the functional-typological approach*. Naresuan University Press. [in Thai]

Yaneva, V., Ha, L. A., Evans, R., & Mitkov, R. (2018). Classifying referential and non-referential it using gaze. In E. Riloff, D. Chiang, J. Hockenmaier, & J. Tsujii (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 4896–4901). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://aclanthology.org/D18-1528.pdf