A Conversational Perspective of Binary and Ternary Exchanges in the Interactional Discourse

Yuyuan Guo

Abstract—**In contexts, romantic dialogue includes binary and ternary exchanges in connection with dilogues and trilogues. From a conversational perspective, interactional spaces that are occupied by two or three interlocutors mark interpersonal relationships, configurations of the exchange as well as types of the interaction. This study aims to discover structures of the triads in the three-participant conversation. The theoretical framework proposed by Kerbrat-Orecchioni and Traverso as well as the example of triads in Nothombian dialogues will be offered. In addition, the turn-taking system for conversation proposed by Sacks et al. will also be described in the analysis. Our analysis of triads in binary and ternary exchanges will open up possibilities and perspectives for the study of analysis of literary dialogues and analysis of discourse-in-interaction.**

Index Terms—**Conversation analysis, interactional discourse, dyad conversation and triad conversation, dilogue and trilogue, binary exchange and ternary exchange.**

I. INTRODUCTION

In literary texts appear these four categories: monologue, dilogue, trilogue and polylogue [1]. The reader can identifier the roles of participants in romantic dialogues. The monologue is performed by a single participant. The dilogue is characterized by two interlocutors who exchange according to the construction of turns. In the trilogue, there are three participants who divide the roles of interlocutor. As Kerbrat-Orecchioni defined in the introduction of *Le Trilogue* [2], the trilogue is a three-participant conversation. It is an original and fundamental interactional structure. And so on, the dilogue is a conversation of two participants. The polylogue, a conversation of more than three participants, is practiced in case of several participants in the exchanges.

II. INTERACTIONAL DISCOURSE, ROMANTIC DIALOGUE AND AUTHENTIC CONVERSATION

In terms of the constituents and criteria of the interaction, the model is initially presented by the Geneva school which includes four categories of units: "interaction" "exchange" "intervention" and "acts of language". Kerbrat-Orecchioni presented a model with two categories and five units: with regard to "dialogal units", they include "interaction" "sequence" and "exchange"; compared to "monologal units", they include only "intervention" and "acts of language".

Vion [3] concluded that the model consists of at least six units: "interaction" "module" "sequence" "exchange" "intervention" and "acts of language". In relation to the concept of exchange, the following notions will be mentioned: "communicative behavior and intervention" and "intervention and turns of talk".

Within the large family of fictional dialogues, romantic dialogue is particularly far removed from natural conversation. The romantic dialogue is realized in written form and embedded in the narrative. The analysis of discourse-in-interaction could be applied in the analysis of literary dialogues, including fictional or fictitious. Methodological questions refer to the degree of mimicry of literary dialogues. Literary dialogues mimic natural conversations. Many rules of conversation govern its local and global coherence and ensure respect for politeness which is part of a kind of psychological logic. These rules are mobilized in the interpretation of romantic dialogues which are not treated from this point of view other than natural conversations [4].

Conversation simulations and fictional discourses give us the opportunities to deal with literary dialogues: simulations and differences. Romantic dialogue and authentic conversation are two forms of alternative talk. The authentic conversation is a model of fictional dialogue. The words of the characters gradually detach themselves from the narrator's enunciation, while the dialogue formally detaches itself from the narrative. According to Durrer [5], formal research on novel dialogue includes several aspects: the degree of oralization[1]; the links between the word of the characters' and the non-fictional reference; the ways in which the characters' dialogues are represented and the characters' talks are restored; the participation of dialogues in the plot; the links between the narrative and the dialogue; the interactive dimension of dialogues; as well as the relationships between the characters as interlocutors.

III. CONFIGURATIONS OF THE EXCHANGES IN THE THREE-PARTICIPANT CONVERSATION

An exchange is defined by the "permanence of the interlocutors" "thematic coherence" and "pragmatic unity". Normally, at least, the exchange consists of two parts: initiative exchange and reactive exchange that can consist of gestures or mimics. According to Kerbrat-Orecchioni [6], in

---

[1] Durrer used this term in order to express the act of oralizing. In her book, the original term in French "le degr éd'oralisation du dialogue", it means an act of turning something written into something oral.

a duel conversation, the slightest exchange is representative of the participatory pattern of the conversation since each actor necessarily intervenes.

In the three-participant conversation, if the participants are always required to speak each in turn, there is no rule that orders the alternation. We try to understand how the participants in the trilogues organize the sharing of the interlocutive space, by describing different ways of managing exchanges. With regard to the structures of dialogue and the division of exchange, there are two interlocutive structures that are intertwined: a ternary structure A-B-C and a binary structure B-C. Under the A-B-C structure, the exchange includes "A" which is an initiative intervention, "B" that is a reactive intervention and "C" that is a reactive intervention. Under the B-C structure, the exchange includes only the initiative interventions of B and of C. Three possible configurations at the start of the exchange proposed by Traverso [7]:

A addresses both to B and to C. B and C are not able to respond simultaneously. It refers to an excellent configuration of the trilogue. This configuration creates an issue of sequences. There is a preferential allocutary among the two other parties B and C;

A speaks verbally to B. C is considered as third party. This term is used in an extremely restrictive sense to designate a definite participant, to whom the speaker does not address explicitly. C is nevertheless a recipient of B's intervention neither a designated allocutary;

In rare cases, two speakers build a conversation together, or a single speaker takes charge of the voices of two speakers. The clues that can be used to determine addresses point out that it is most often based on the constraints of chaining or on the content related to the knowledge shared between the participants.

The three cases, which are proceeded by distinguishing different types of the exchange, thus integrate the temporal parameter. Traverso proposed extremely simplified units to determine the different constituents in the structure: exchange is a minimal dialogue unit; intervention is a unit defined by its role in the exchange (initiative and reactive) and by the acts of language that it contains.

IV. Triads in the Three-Participant Conversation: Theoretical Framework Proposed by Kerbrat-Orecchioni and Traverso

As concerns a conversation of three interlocutors in different conversational places, this type of conversation works on the basis of an equality between the participants, who are supposed to leave out their institutional status during their meeting. Indeed, a trilogue which brings together A, B and C, presents not only the A-B-C triadic relationship, but also the duel relationships. Here are some configurations proposed by Kerbrat-Orecchioni:

If this is a case of A-B-dominant interaction and C is considered as a third party, the A-B dyad exists to the extent that C listens. A and B could have exchanged before C. Meanwhile, C was a third party in the interaction A-B, and C

projected another pattern of interlocution.

With respect to the case of B-C-dominant interaction, A is regarded as a third party, B and C are engaged in the acts of contact. A is the third party and B is the interlocutor of C. The B-C dyad exists to the extent that A is present. Meanwhile, B will be introduced at the end of the meeting of three.

Compared to A-C-dominant interaction, B is considered as a third party, A and C are engaged in the acts of separation. The A-C dyad exists only to the extent that B is present. A addressed to C in front of B, and A closed a conversational exchange and passed the relay to B. The presence of B is a mandatory.

According to Kerbrat-Orecchioni [8], the possibility is obvious: "*trio se scinde en un duo, flanqué d'un cavalier seul, trois se divise en deux + un* (trio splits into a duo, flanked by a single rider, three splits into two+one)". From this point of view, the question focuses on the number of participants. Kerbrat-Orecchioni offered us the cases ("consensual duo" and "confrontational duo") and the three possible functions of the third in the triads. The triad breaks down into an A-B dyad. The C is outside of this dyad. There's a conflict between A and B.

The only difference between the three cases above is C's attitude to this conflict: the mediator is disinterested. The third party exploits the conflict for its own benefit. One can theoretically encounter the following situations: no dyad is formed within the triad; or a dyad is formed, but not on a confrontational basis. The classification of the triads is as follows:

TABLE I: TYPOLOGY OF TRIADE

Triad	Classification
1) The triad is structured in 1+1+1, with the possibility of hierarchy.	Conflit-free or with conflict
2) The triad is organized in 2+1; The dyad is consensual or confrontational; C's role in relation to this dyad.	Consensus dyad: there is an alliance, even a coalition between A and B. The A-B alliance aims to serve C, to defend themselves against C or even to deliberately harm C. Dyade conflict: according to the position occupied by C, in relation to the conflict between A and B, C is victim of conflict, mediator or arbitrator.

A. Binary and Ternary Exchanges: A Theoretical Framework Proposed by Traverso

In a sequence of exchanges, there are two overlapping interlocutor structures: ternary structure and binary structure. The intervention is built by two interlocutors: initiative intervention and reactive intervention. The criterion of homogeneity of interlocutors allows us to consider that a sequence of exchanges has two distinct exchanges as follows: with regard to the ternary structure A-B-C, it consists of the initiative intervention of A and A's entire turn of talk; B's reactive intervention and C's reactive intervention. With respect to the AB structure, it includes the A initiative

intervention and B's reactive intervention.

As Traverso [9] had indicated, with regard to the typology of triade, we have two types: ternary exchanges and binary exchanges. The initiative intervention of the exchange is addressed to two interlocutors. The exchange takes place between a speaker and two allocutaries. In this sense, the exchange can be ternary or binary: each allocutary can produce a reactive intervention; or one of the allocutaries produces only a reactive intervention.

Ternary exchanges are more representative in trilogues. Each participant assumes one of the interventions; the two reactive interventions can be absolutely independent or more or less dependent, or totally independent: without the other, one can obtain a satisfactory exchange in the different conditions of completeness; in a relationship of dependency, the second intervention is somehow grafted onto the first and no longer capable of satisfying the exchange. These two extreme cases correspond to two different cutouts of the exchange. Each of the reactive interventions is a complete intervention. Meanwhile, each participant assumes a full and equal place in the interactional places:

TABLE II: TYPOLOGY OF REACTIVE INTERVENTIONS

(a) independent reactive interventions	(b) dependent reactive interventions
i: initiative intervention; r: the first reactive intervention; A: the second reactive intervention; E: evaluative intervention.	R intervention is not sufficient to meet the conditions of completeness, and only makes sense reported to r (the first reactive intervention). C's return is contingent on B's.

B. Ternary Exchange

As concerns ternary exchanges, there are two cases classified by Traverso: the case of two speakers to an allocutary and the case of one speaker and two allocutaries. In the case of the first case, this type of initiative intervention is built by two speakers. The two initiative interventions are co-directed, and the second intervention is complementary to the first intervention. Two participants expressed the same point of view at the same time. It refers to a coincidence. For the second case, it is an initiative intervention of the exchange. The initiative intervention in this type is plural. It is issued by one of these two speakers.

C. Binary Exchange

According to Traverso, in regard of a binary exchange, it relates to the initiative intervention of two interlocutors with a single reactive intervention. The absence of another reactive intervention is made noticeable by the presence of a plural marker in the initiative intervention. It can be more or less felt. In this sense, there are two principal cases: a reiteration of initiative intervention and a truncation. Traverso has proposed six models as follows [10]:

1) Independent reactive interventions

Each reactive intervention is a complete intervention. The order of their appearance could be reversed without the exchange and become unintelligible. One of them could be deleted and the exchange would remain consistent.

2) A speaker to an allocutary: Third party's act of judging or criticizing

The third party remains outside the construction of the exchange. A joint reactive intervention is both the reaction to initiative intervention and the source of enunciation. The intervention of the third party is focused on one of the two interlocutors under a common place:

TABLE III: MODEL 2: A SPEAKER TO AN ALLOCUTARY: THIRD PARTY'S ACT OF JUDGING OR CRITICIZING

Model
A——>B
B——>A
C——>A/B

3) A speaker to an allocutary: Exchange in relay

Interlocutor A addresses a question to B. B's reactive intervention is a reformulation of the question to C. This intervention by B is both initiative and reactive. C's intervention is also reactive by having a dual recipient. Interlocutor B is not obliged to repeat C's response to A:

TABLE IV: MODEL 3: A SPEAKER TO AN ALLOCUTARY: EXCHANGE IN RELAY

Model
A—>B
B—>C
C—>B/A

4) A speaker to an allocutary: intrusion

One participant takes the place of the party to whom the initiative intervention is addressed. In this type of intervention, the reconstruction of the exchange can be carried out by the third party. The third speaker C takes the turn of talk after the speaker A. The C speaker intervenes after the reactive intervention of speaker B. As a result of a hesitation of speaker B, speaker C follows up and finishes the outstanding intervention. This intrusion performs a cooperative interruption. In another case, as a result of the reluctance of the interlocutor, the third party follows up and finishes the intervention as a speaker transition which performs a cooperative interruption:

TABLE V: MODEL 4: A SPEAKER TO AN ALLOCUTARY: INTRUSION

Model (1)	Model (2)
A—>B	A—>B
C	B1—>A
A	C
B	B2

5) A speaker to an allocutary: Exchange oriented by moderator

In this type of exchange, one of the participants distributes the turn by taking on a role of facilitator. The participant who initiates the symmetrical exchange does not participate in the exchange of interpretations. The participant, who is in the position of distributor of turns, questions successively the other two parties. This kind of intervention emphasizes its position as a distributor of turns:

TABLE VI: MODEL 5: A SPEAKER TO AN ALLOCUTARY: EXCHANGE ORIENTED BY MODERATO

Model
A1
B1—>A
A2
B2—>C
C1
B3

6) A speaker to an allocutary: Exchanges in chains

Traverso had proposed two cases: the case of entrenchment and the case of the sequence. About the first case, the global exchange by sequence is a procedure of maintenance of the trilogue. The overall exchange is initially between A and B. The C is the third party. One of the interlocutors is looking for the C in order to integrate it into the exchange. In the second case, the embedded exchanges are used to integrate the third party into an initially dialogal exchange. This type of exchange consists of a first exchange with two participants and a second embedded exchange that integrates the third. The two initial interlocutors A and B develop an embedded exchange of a third-party current:

TABLE VII: MODEL 6: A SPEAKER TO AN ALLOCUTARY: EXCHANGES IN CHAINS

global exchange		
A <—>B	A <—>C or B<—>C	A <—>B/C or B <—>A/C

V. INTERRUPTIONS AND SELF-SELECTION IN BINARY EX-CHANGES: TRIAD IN NOTHOMBIAN DIALOGUE

In Nothomb's novels *Stupeur et Tremblements*[2] and *Ni d'Ève ni d'Adam*[3] appear a number of trilogues, especially relational and interactional triads. The young narrator Amélie, who is barely veiled double of the author, hired by

---

[2] *Stupeur et tremblements* is a satirical novel by Amélie Nothomb, first published in 1999, and translated into English version *Fear and Trembling* by Adriana Hunter in 2001. This novel is winner of the Grand Prix du Roman de l'Académie Française.

[3] *Ni d'Ève ni d'Adam* is an autobiographical novel by Amélie Nothomb which appeared on 2007 and published by the publishing company Éditions Albin Michel. This novel was nominated for the Prix Goncourt 2007 and the Prix Renaudot 2007. The film adaptation *Neither Eve nor Adam* was released in 2014.

---

the company Yumimoto, she hoped to prove herself in Japan that has fascinated her so much since she was a child. However, the subtlety of unspoken rules that govern this Japanese enterprise made her confused. The protagonist Amélie began to have vexations. *Ni d'Ève ni d'Adam* is an autobiographical novel which is partially concurrent with *Stupeur et Tremblemts*. The heroine Amélie had with a Japanese man in Tokyo. When they got along with each other, Japanese culture and Orientalist stereotypes became visible.

A. A Speaker to an Allocutary: Exchange with Moderator

In the scene below, Rinri takes over the role of moderator for the distribution of turn. This distribution by Rinri initiates the symmetrical exchange:

(Quand je m'assis dans la Mercedes, je me retournai pour saluer la jeune fille installée sur la banquette arrière. Sa beauté me stupéfia.)
Rinri : Amélie, voici Rika. Rika, voici Amélie.
(Elle me salua avec un sourire exquis. Son prénom me déçut, mais pas le reste de sa personne. C'était un ange.)
Rika : Rinri m'a beaucoup parlé de toi, dit-elle.
Amélie : Il m'a beaucoup parlé de toi aussi, inventai-je.
Rinri : Vous mentez toutes les deux. Je ne parle jamais beaucoup.
Rika : C'est vrai, il ne dit jamais rien (reprit Rika). Il m'a terriblement peu parlé de toi. C'est pourquoi je suis persuadé qu'il t'aime.
Amélie : En ce sens, il t'aime aussi.
Rika : Tu ne m'en veux pas si je te parle américain? En japonais, je fais trop de fautes.
Amélie : Ce n'est pas moi qui les remarquerais.
Rika : Rinri n'arrête pas de me corriger. Il me veut parfaite. (*Ni d'Ève ni d'Adam*, p.68)[4]

Indeed, the scene took place mainly between Amélie and Rika. In the position as a moderator, Rinri criticized Amélie and Rika. He expressed his point of view by acting as a moderator and a distributor of turn. His role of moderator consists in moderating the rivalry between Amélie and Rika:

TABLE VIII: EXCHANGE ORIENTED BY MODERATOR

Direction of turns
Rinri
Rika—>Rinri
Amélie—>Rika
Rinri
Rinka—>Amélie
Amélie
Rika

The constituents of a turn in conversation are organized into positions. In the excerpt above, we are also interested in turn beginnings. According to Schegloff [11], turn-initial position is a sequential important place that convey a certain relation between what the current speaker is going to say and what the previous speaker has just said. In the scene, the speaker Rinri designed his talk as a turn-initial position. This

---

[4] The original version of this extract has been changed in order to adapt to the conversation analysis. We respect the transcription conventions. Since it is an extract of fictional dialogue, the transcription style is lightly different from an authentic conversation.

kind of turn beginning was used to index a relationship between the position taken by Rinri and the positions of Améie and Rika were about to adopt.

B. A Speaker to an Allocutary: Intrusion

In this extract below, it is an act of judging by the third party in an initial dilogal exchange. The third party Améie remains outside the construction of the exchange between Mr. Omochi and Mr. Tenshi. The beginning of Tenshi's turn is interrupted by Améie. Améie's reaction is focused on the reactive intervention of Omochi:

Omochi: Vous n'avez jamais eu d'autre but que de saboter la compagnie!

(Les choses se passèrent très vite dans ma tête:[…] Je me jetai sous le flot grondant des cris du vice-président:)

Amélie: Monsieur Tenshi n'a pas voulu saboter la compagnie. C'est moi qui l'ai supplié de me confier un dossier. Je suis l'unique responsable.

([…] Monsieur Omochi resta un instant bouché avant de s'approcher de moi et de me hurler en pleine figure:)

Omochi: Vous osez vous défendre!

Améie: Non, au contraire, je m'accable, je prends tous les torts sur moi. C'est moi et moi seule qu'il faut châtier.

Omochi: Vous osez défendre ce serpent!

Amélie: Monsieur Tenshi n'a aucun besoin d'être défendu. Vos accusations à son sujet sont fausses.

(Je vis mon bienfaiteur fermer les yeux et je compris que je venais de prononcer l'irréparable.)

Omochi: Vous osez prétendre que mes paroles sont fausses? Vous êtes d'une grossièreté qui dépasse l'imagination !

Amélie: Je n'oserais jamais prétendre une chose pareille. Je pense seulement que monsieur Tenshi vous a dit des choses fausses dans le but de m'innocenter.

([…] mon compagnon d'infortune prit la parole. Toute la mortification du monde résonnait dans sa voix:)

Tenshi: Je vous en supplie, ne lui en veuillez pas, elle ne sait pas ce qu'elle dit, elle est occidentale, elle est jeune, elle n'a aucune expérience. J'ai commis une faute indéfendable. Ma honte est immense.

Omochi: En effet, vous, vous n'avez aucune excuse ! (hurla l'obèse.)

[…]

Omochi: Est-ce que par hasard vous remettriez en cause la qualité du travail de monsieur Saitama ?

Tenshi: Absolument pas. Mais monsieur Saitama ne parle pas français et ne connaît pas la Belgique. Il aurait rencontré beaucoup plus d'obstacles qu'Amélie-san.

Omochi: Taisez-vous. Ce pragmatisme odieux est digne d'un Occidental.

(Je trouvai un peu fort que cela soit dit sans vergogne sous mon nez.)

Améie: Pardonnez mon indignité occidentale. Nous avons commis une faute, soit. Il n'empêche qu'il y a un profit à tirer de notre méfait… (*Stupeur et Tremblements*, pp. 45-48)[5]

At the beginning of the extract above, the exchange is initially dilogal. It is about an interruption in a dilogal exchange. We can consider it as a form of intrusion. The third party Améie takes the place of the participant to whom the initiative intervention is addressed:

TABLE IX: INTRUSION OF THE TRIAD IN NOTHOMBIAN DIALOGUE

Direction of turns
Omochi—>Tenshi
Améie
Omochi
Tenshi

[5] The original version of this extract has been changed in order to adapt to the conversation analysis. We respect the transcription conventions. Since it is an extract of fictional dialogue, the transcription style is lightly different from an authentic conversation.

The interruption appears to be a product of the turn-taking system. It is considered as a potential source of impairment and also a hope of repairment. Turn beginnings could provide more evidence for the operation of turn-taking. The interruption occur when the beginning of a next turn starts before the previous speaker has come to completion.

In this extract above, we are also particularly interested in self-selection of Améie: Améie self-selected as next speaker, in other words, Améie interfered by self-selecting as Omochi's successor. It refers to an interruption and a self-selection: while the end of Omochi's turn is perceived, the potential next speaker Tenshi has no desire to take it. Améie became the next speaker by self-selection. In contexts, the participation of more than two parties may target a given transition relevance place. The participants orient a set of rules which organize the transition relevance place and the distribution of turns-a-talk: a next speaker may have been selected by the current turn. Any other party may self-select, if no speaker has been selected by the current turn.

This extract draws a highly structured and male-dominated Japanese enterprise. That is why in that context the third party Améie interfered by self-selecting as a next speaker in the word of her superior. This scene expresses the pyramidal hierarchical management conflict in a Japanese enterprise, and also reveals one of the characteristics of the traditional Japanese firm: the position of each employee is linked to a specific vocation. The precision of tasks and vocations extends to finer actions. That is why Mr Omochi cannot tolerate the violation of Améie. In this extract are well represented the difficulties of intercultural communication. We also find the interest in writing the Self and the Otherness. The notion of identity and that of otherness are represented to some extent from a confrontational perspective.

VI. CONCLUSION

The four levels are exploited in the conversation analysis: interaction, exchange, reply and act of language. Three issues are worth considering: the divergence between authentic conversation and romantic dialogue, the conversational models and oral notions that apply to romantic dialogue, the system of turn-taking which is related to the context. These characters come to be important elements in the analysis of literary dialogues.

In addition, the interactional phenomena may depend on the contextual particulars such as ethnic background, social or institutional settings, interpersonal relationships, which appear to affect the system of turn-taking. Therefore, two currents dominate the field of conversation analysis: on one hand, the structural approach that could identify discursive units and conversational activity; on the other hand, the approach of psycho-sociology communications.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] I. Doneux-Daussaint, "Le dialogue romanesque chez Marguerie Duras, un essai de pragmatique narrative," Thesis, Dept. Language Sciences, Uniersité Lumière Lyon 2, Lyon, France, 2001, p601.

[2] C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, "Introduction," in *Le Trilogue*, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & C. Plantin, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1995, pp. 11-13.

[3] R.Vion, *La Communication Verbale*, *Analyse des Interactions*, Paris: Hachette Supérieur, 1992, pp. 144-145.

[4] C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, *Le Discours en Interaction*, Paris: Armand Colin, 2005, p. 309.

[5] S. Durrer, *Le Dialogue Romanesque*, Genève: Droz, 1994, pp. 36-37.

[6] C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, "Introduction", in *Le Trilogue*, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & C. Plantin, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1995, p. 19.

[7] V. Traverso, "Gestion des échanges dans la conversation à trois participants", in *Le Trilogue*, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & C. Plantin, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1995, pp. 29-31.

[8] C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, "Introduction", in *Le Trilogue*, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & C. Plantin, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1995, pp. 15-16.

[9] V. Traverso, "Gestion des échanges dans la conversation à trois participants", in *Le Trilogue*, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & C. Plantin, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1995, pp. 32-33.

[10] V. Traverso, "Gestion des échanges dans la conversation à trois participants", in *Le Trilogue*, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni & C. Plantin, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1995, pp. 36-46.

[11] E. A. Schegloff, "Recycled turn beginnings," in *Talk and Social Organization*, G. Button & J. R.E. Lee, Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 1987, p. 72.

Y. Y. Guo have graduated from University of Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle and earned her doctor's degree in linguistics. She teaches in Beijing Language and Culture University. Her research focuses on discourse analysis, conversation analysis, gender studies, corpus linguistics and textometry. Her published work deals with the identity and otherness in the self-writing, analysis of conversation and interaction, corpus-based linguistic approaches to critical discourse analysis. Her previous publications applied in Nothomb's work: *la traversée culturelle du genre dans l'œuvre de Nothomb: communication sexuelle et interculturelle dans le discours romanesque nothombien*, in *La Traversée culturelle du genre* (Swiss: le GRAAL édition, 2018); *Au-delà des frontières: différentes instances de la voix du Moi dans le discours autobiographique nothombian*, in *Journal of philology and Intercultural Communication N°2 Crossing Borders* (Romania: Military Technical Academy Publishing House, 2017). Dr. Guo is undertaking two research projects on text statistics and corpus-based linguistic approaches to critical discourse analysis.