

# A Cross-Cultural Study of Discourse Coherence: Unique Coherence Mechanisms in Chinese Literary Texts and Their Cultural Motivations

Kepler (Hefan Tang)

Chinese Language and Literature, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China

Tanghf040625@163.com

**Abstract.** In the context of deepening globalization, the importance of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural communication has become increasingly prominent. As a key criterion for both language comprehension and translation quality, discourse coherence faces theoretical and practical challenges posed by cultural differences. Most current coherence theories are based on English corpora and fail to account for the implicit coherence mechanisms widely found in Chinese literature. Drawing on Kehler's theory of coherence, Asher and Lascarides' Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT), and other relevant models, this study analyzes Chinese and English literary texts, including *Honglou Meng* and *Pride and Prejudice*, to explore differing strategies for constructing coherence. Through comparative analysis of ellipsis, imagistic linkage, and topic shift in Chinese texts, the study highlights the limitations of English-based models in explaining coherence in Chinese discourse. It argues that Chinese coherence relies heavily on shared knowledge and metaphorical structures rooted in high-context culture, whereas English discourse coherence depends on explicit logical relations and grammatical connectives. The study proposes a strategy of "cultural coherence transformation" for translation and advocates for the incorporation of cultural pragmatics into coherence theory to build a more cross-culturally applicable analytical framework.

**Keywords:** Literature; Linguistics; Discourse Coherence; Pragmatics; Cross-Cultural Comparison.

## 1. Introduction

In an era of increasing globalization, cross-cultural communication has become a crucial issue in international discourse, diplomatic dialogue, language teaching, and literary translation. As a core factor in both language comprehension and discourse generation, discourse coherence directly affects semantic accuracy and aesthetic representation across cultures. However, prevailing theories of coherence are largely developed from English-language corpora and struggle to adequately account for coherence phenomena in Chinese literary discourse. For instance, in *Coherence, Reference, and the Theory of Grammar*, Kehler systematically categorizes coherence relations into resemblance, cause-effect, and contiguity. While this model effectively captures most English texts, it lacks explanatory power for implicit coherence phenomena in Chinese discourse, such as ellipsis, semantic leaps, and imagistic associations. [1-4]

Generally, Chinese texts rely more on context, high-context cultural assumptions, and symbolic narrative to build coherence, whereas English texts typically develop coherence through explicit logical structure and linear organization. This contrast presents a challenge for translators: how can one express the same semantic meaning using different coherence mechanisms? How can translations better align with the cultural background of the target audience?

In response to these questions, this study pursues two primary objectives: (1) to compare and analyze the similarities and differences in discourse coherence between Chinese and English literary texts and to identify coherence relations unique to Chinese texts; and (2) to explore how linguistic structure and cultural cognitive patterns influence coherence construction and to discuss the implications for translation strategies and cross-cultural communication. [5-9]

## 2. Literature Review

This study is grounded in theories of discourse coherence, with particular reference to Kehler's (2002) categorization of coherence relations into three main types: Cause-Effect (e.g., Explanation, Result), Resemblance (e.g., Contrast, Parallel), and Contiguity (e.g., Narration, Occasion). Kehler's framework offers a systematic account of how explicit linguistic markers interact with semantic logic in English texts, and it is well suited to inflectional languages that rely on rich formal indicators and clear structural patterns. However, because the model is based largely on English data, it is not equipped to explain implicit coherence mechanisms frequently observed in Chinese discourse, such as ellipsis, topic progression, and culturally embedded metaphor.

To address these limitations, this study also draws on the work of Hunter and Thompson (2022), who argue that coherence is not merely a matter of logical relations but is also deeply shaped by discourse structure and communicative function—specifically, by understanding who is speaking to whom and for what purpose. From this pragmatic perspective, coherence is a cooperative process rooted in shared contextual knowledge and interactional goals. This approach provides helpful observations about Chinese discourse, where ellipsis, flexible word order, and imagistic linkage are prevalent and where meaning often emerges from the interplay between context and speaker intention.

Additionally, Edward Hall's theory of high-context and low-context cultures contributes a cultural-linguistic perspective to this research. Hall (1976) argues that high-context cultures (e.g., Chinese) encode much of their meaning in contextual, cultural, and relational knowledge, relying heavily on implicit communication. In contrast, low-context cultures (e.g., English-speaking cultures) favor explicit information conveyed through logical structure, connectives, and syntactic organization. These cultural orientations contribute to rise to fundamental differences in how coherence is constructed and interpreted in Chinese and English texts. The present study adopts this framework to analyze the heterogeneity of coherence strategies across the two languages, emphasizing their cultural and pragmatic motivations. [10-14]

Furthermore, Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT), developed by Asher and Lascarides, offers a formal structural perspective on discourse coherence. According to SDRT, discourse consists of Elementary Discourse Units (EDUs) and the relations between them, such as narration or explanation. A key mechanism in SDRT is the Right Frontier Constraint, which holds that new discourse units must attach to the current "right frontier" of the discourse structure to maintain coherence. This structural rule ensures that discourse remains incrementally comprehensible and logically cohesive. In comparing Chinese and English texts, this study uses SDRT to analyze how coherence relations are structurally organized—particularly in contrasting Chinese ellipsis and non-linear logic with English's linear syntactic constraints. However, it is also acknowledged that SDRT's formal principles, such as the Right Frontier Constraint, may not easily accommodate discourse features commonly found in Chinese, such as unmarked connections, imagistic transitions, and semantic indeterminacy.

In summary, this study integrates Kehler's model of coherence relations, Hunter and Thompson's pragmatic structure theory, Hall's cultural context framework, and SDRT's formal discourse model to construct a multidimensional approach for analyzing cross-cultural coherence. This integrated framework considers both the explicit structural features of language and the implicit workings of culture and pragmatics, aiming to uncover the deeper differences in coherence construction between Chinese and English literary texts.

## 3. Methodology and Results

This study adopts a qualitative comparative approach based on discourse coherence theory and cultural linguistics. By selecting representative works from Chinese and English literature, it systematically analyzes differences in coherence construction between the two language systems and summarizes unique coherence relations in Chinese texts as well as their cultural-pragmatic motivations.

### 3.1 Unique Coherence Phenomena in Chinese Texts

#### (1) Ellipsis and Contextual Compensation

Chinese discourse frequently relies on ellipsis to achieve coherence, particularly in dialogue, narration, and internal monologue. The omission of discourse elements—whether subjects, connectives, or even event sequences—does not hinder comprehension; rather, meaning is reconstructed by the reader through pragmatic inference and shared cultural knowledge. This practice reflects both the high-context nature of Chinese communication and a stylistic preference for conciseness and subtlety.

For instance, in *Honglou Meng*, there is a scene in which Madam Zhou delivers hairpins to the girls:

周瑞家的道：“各位都有了，这两枝是姑娘的了。”黛玉冷笑道：“我就知道，别人不挑剩下的也不给我。”周瑞家的听了，一声儿不言语。宝玉便问道：“周姐姐，你作什么到那边去了？”

(Translation: *Madam Zhou said, “Everyone has theirs. These two are for you.” Daiyu gave a sneer. “I knew it—if no one else picks leftovers, they wouldn’t be given to me either.” Hearing this, Madam Zhou said nothing, not a word. Baoyu then asked, “Sister Zhou, what were you doing over there just now?”*)

At first glance, this dialogue appears disjointed: Daiyu’s sarcastic comment seems unprovoked, Madam Zhou remains silent, and Baoyu abruptly changes the topic. However, when interpreted within the cultural context of Chinese social norms and interpersonal subtleties, the coherence becomes clear. Daiyu perceives the unequal treatment and responds with irony; Madam Zhou, recognizing the implied accusation, remains silent to avoid confrontation; Baoyu senses the awkwardness and tactfully changes the topic to ease tension. From the perspective of SDRT, although the surface lacks explicit relational markers, the underlying structure involves an Explanation relation (Daiyu’s sarcasm and Madam Zhou’s silence), followed by a Narration relation (Baoyu’s topic shift), which functions as pragmatic compensation and emotional mitigation.

In contrast, a similar narrative function in *Pride and Prejudice* is achieved through explicit syntax and overt logical connectors:

*Mr. Bingley had soon made himself acquainted with all the principal people in the room; he was lively and unreserved, danced every dance, was angry that the ball closed so early, and talked of giving one himself at Netherfield. Such amiable qualities must speak for themselves. What a contrast between him and his friend! Mr. Darcy danced only once with Mrs. Hurst and once with Miss Bingley, declined being introduced to any other lady, and spent the rest of the evening walking about the room, speaking occasionally to one of his own party. (Chapter 3)*

Here, multiple behaviors are described through clear syntactic structures and connective devices—such as “and,” “only,” “declined,” and “spent.” The contrast between Bingley’s enthusiasm and Darcy’s aloofness is explicitly established through a parallel listing of actions and emotions. Each clause is grammatically anchored, maintaining coherence through clear referents and logical sequence. In SDRT terms, relations such as Contrast, Narration, and Result are overtly marked, leaving minimal burden on the reader to infer underlying connections.

#### (2) Imagistic Linkage and Metaphorical Progression

In the tradition of Chinese narrative, imagery is not merely ornamental but often functions as a driving force in discourse progression. Imagistic sequences carry narrative weight, guiding emotional and cognitive transitions and establishing coherence through symbolic associations rather than formal logic.

For example, in Chapter 20 of *Border Town*, the following passage appears:

翠翠看看屋前悬崖并不崩坍，故当时还不注意渡船的失去。但再过一阵，她上下搜索不到这东西，无意中回头一看，屋后白塔已不见了。一惊非同小可，赶忙向屋后跑去，才知道白塔业已坍倒，大堆砖石极凌乱的摊在那儿。翠翠吓慌得不知所措，只锐声叫她的祖父。祖父不起身，也不答应，就赶回家里去，到得祖父床边摇了祖父许久，祖父还不作声。原来这个老年人在雷雨将息时已死去了。

(Translation: Cuicui looked at the cliff in front of the house—it had not collapsed, so she didn't think much of the missing ferry. But after a while, she still couldn't find it. Looking around, and then turning her head by chance—the white pagoda behind the house was gone. The shock was immense. She rushed to the back—there it was, a heap of bricks and rubble lying in a mess. Startled and panicked, she called out sharply for her grandfather. He did not get up. Nor did he respond. She ran back home. By the bed, she shook him for a long time. Still no response. It turned out, this old man had passed away as the storm came to an end.)

In this sequence, the imagery of the “cliff,” the “ferry,” and the “white pagoda” form a progressive chain that implicitly guides the reader from external perception to internal transformation. At first, the cliff is stable, creating a baseline of psychological security. The ferry's sudden disappearance symbolizes the breakdown of routine and social connection. Finally, the collapse of the white pagoda, an object symbolizing familial guardianship—marks a turning point, foreshadowing the grandfather's death and the unraveling of the old order. Though the passage lacks any overt conjunctions, coherence is maintained through the spatial progression (front → vertical scan → rear), emotional escalation (calm → confusion → alarm), and symbolic resonance, which together form a cohesive narrative arc.

Within the SDRT framework, this sequence could be understood as a chain of “Narration → Contrast → Result”, albeit realized through visual and cultural cues rather than formal linguistic structure. The lack of explicit discourse markers is offset by the reader's engagement with cultural symbolism and narrative implication.

By contrast, in Melville's *Moby-Dick*, imagery is typically used for philosophical exposition rather than narrative propulsion:

*The whiteness of the whale... at once the most meaning symbol of spiritual things, nay, the very veil of the Christian's Deity. (Chapter 42)*

Here, “whiteness” is a metaphysical symbol meant to provoke reflection and convey thematic ambiguity. From a discourse perspective, it functions more as an elaboration or background relation within SDRT: it provides insight into why the whale is fearsome, but it does not directly advance the plot or influence character action. The imagery is suspended above the narrative, offering an interpretive lens rather than structural momentum.

Thus, while English literary imagery often serves thematic or philosophical purposes, Chinese literary texts more frequently use imagery to construct implicit coherence and propel the story forward. In *Border Town*, the “white pagoda” and “ferry” carry simultaneous symbolic and structural functions, integrating perception, emotion, and plot development. Translating such imagery into English without disrupting its coherence function requires more than lexical substitution—it demands an awareness of how images anchor cultural logic and narrative rhythm.

### (3) Vague Reference and Topic Shifting

A defining characteristic of Chinese discourse is the frequent use of vague referents and abrupt topic shifts to maintain cohesion. Even in the absence of clear anaphoric markers or explicit connectives, readers are often able to reconstruct coherence through context, shared knowledge, and cultural familiarity. This “low-explicitness, high-dependency” mode of coherence appears anomalous under Western frameworks such as SDRT, yet it forms an essential part of the narrative aesthetics of Chinese literature.

Consider the following passage from Chapter 4 of Lu Xun's *The True Story of Ah Q*, which depicts Ah Q's use of "spiritual victory":

他赢了又赢，铜钱变成角洋。角洋又变成金圆券。金圆券无用，还是铜钱实在。终于被打，还挨了秀才的竹杠。

(Translation: *He kept winning—again and again. Copper coins turned into silver. Silver became banknotes. Banknotes were worthless—copper coins were more real. In the end, he got beaten. Even got caned by a scholar.*)

This five-sentence sequence omits repeated reference to the subject "he" and features verbs that are not linked by formal logic but rather by an implicit emotional and psychological trajectory: from triumph to delusion to defeat. The reader relies on the cultural context of Ah Q's "spiritual victory" mindset to interpret these seemingly disjointed actions as part of a coherent emotional cycle—victory, illusion, disillusionment, and humiliation. These shifts in topics do not follow a linear cause-and-effect pattern and lack explicit marker, yet coherence emerges through cultural narrative conventions and inferred emotional logic.

In contrast, English literary narratives—such as in *The Great Gatsby*—tend to maintain strict control over referential clarity and syntactic progression. Consider this passage describing Gatsby's disillusionment:

*He had lost the old warm world, paid a high price for living too long with a single dream. He must have looked up at an unfamiliar sky... A new world, material without being real, where poor ghosts, breathing dreams like air, drifted fortuitously about... (Chapter 8)*

Despite its poetic expression, this passage adheres to conventional sentence boundaries and grammatical cues ("He had lost...", "He must have looked up..."). Referential ambiguity is carefully constrained within the limits of syntactic clarity. Even in metaphorical or introspective contexts, coherence is maintained through linear narrative progression and conformity to the Right Frontier Constraint of SDRT.

In comparison, the Ah Q passage contains five Elementary Discourse Units (EDUs) that do not conform to SDRT's right-frontier principle; instead, they attach in a nonlinear, emotionally recursive manner around the central theme of "spiritual victory." In *The Great Gatsby*, however, each EDU clearly attaches to its predecessor in a linear chain of Narration and Result, maintaining strict structural coherence.

These differences reflect a broader divergence in coherence construction across languages: Chinese frequently relies on associative reasoning, cyclical logic, and implicit emotional resonance, while English typically adheres to linear logic and explicit syntactic organization. Such contrasts present both theoretical challenges for discourse modeling and practical challenges for translation.

### 3.2 Cultural and Pragmatic Motivations Behind Unique Chinese Coherence Mechanisms

The unique coherence mechanisms found in Chinese discourse are not merely structural deviations; they are deeply embedded in the cultural and pragmatic fabric of the language. As demonstrated in earlier examples from *Honglou Meng* and *Border Town*, many patterns of coherence in Chinese texts cannot be adequately accounted for by dominant Western models such as Kehler's coherence relations or SDRT. These patterns reflect systematic, culturally conditioned strategies of meaning-making. The following three dimensions represent core cultural-pragmatic motivations underlying these coherence phenomena.

#### (1) Influence of High-Context Culture

According to Edward T. Hall's (1976) theory of high- and low-context cultures, the Chinese linguistic and cultural system typifies a high-context culture. In such cultures, communication depends heavily on shared background knowledge, interpersonal roles, and contextual assumptions. As a result, language tends to exhibit "low explicitness" and "high dependency," with omissions of subjects, logical markers, agents, and even event sequencing being commonplace.

This is observable in everyday conversations such as:

A: 你中午吃了吗? (*Had lunch?*)

B: 吃了, 和他一起的。 (*Yeah, with him.*)

A: 哪里? (*Where?*)

B: 老地方。 (*The usual place.*)

Here, pronouns like “他”(he) and “老地方”(the usual place) are not clarified, yet mutual understanding is easily achieved due to shared context. In linguistic terms, this is known as pragmatic ellipsis, where coherence is constructed through contextual restoration rather than explicit inter-sentential devices.

The same mechanism is prevalent in literary texts. For instance, in *Honglou Meng*, the sentence “宝玉听了, 只管点头” (“Baoyu listened and kept nodding”) omits the source of the speech. However, the previous context makes the referent clear to readers. In translation, such ellipses often require explicit reconstruction. For example: “After listening to what she said, Baoyu kept nodding his head.” Here, “what she said” has no direct counterpart in the original, but is added to satisfy English expectations of clarity and explicit logic. While such additions may improve surface clarity, they risk undermining the atmospheric subtlety and aesthetic openness of the Chinese original.

In this way, coherence strategies shaped by high-context culture challenge both the universality of Western discourse models and the adequacy of traditional translation approaches. The ellipsis-compensation mechanism is not merely a linguistic convenience but a manifestation of cultural cognition and discourse economy.

## (2) Culturally Embedded “Imagistic Thinking”

Another core mechanism of coherence in Chinese discourse is metaphorical or imagistic progression. This is not limited to figurative language, but reflects a cognitive style in which sequences of imagery and symbols generate semantic continuity and narrative momentum.

This style is also found in everyday expressions. For example:

“天一凉, 桂花就开了, 小时候的味道又回来了。” (“As soon as the weather cools, the osmanthus blossoms, and the taste of childhood returns.”)

There is no strict causal relation between the weather cooling, the blooming of osmanthus, and the return of childhood memories. Instead, coherence is built through cultural associations and sensory resonance. The sequence “early autumn → scent of osmanthus → childhood” forms an emotionally and culturally coherent pattern, grounded in shared aesthetic experience.

English discourse, by contrast, tends to privilege formal logic and causality even when using figurative language. Metaphors are often bounded, context-specific, and do not typically serve as structural drivers of discourse progression.

Moreover, imagistic coherence in Chinese literature often shapes the discourse skeleton rather than merely decorating it. In *Fortress Besieged*, for example, Fang Hongjian's engagement with his fiancée is metaphorically linked to the titular “besieged fortress”—a structure that unifies the entire narrative. The symbolic pattern “desire before acquisition → disillusionment after possession”

operates not as an explicit relation but as a deep metaphorical thread, difficult to map onto standard SDRT relations like explanation or elaboration.

Thus, “imagistic thinking” in Chinese discourse represents a culturally driven coherence mechanism with high contextual density, metaphorical saturation, and aesthetic intentionality. It poses unique challenges for both theoretical modeling and culturally sensitive translation.

### (3) Typological Features of the Chinese Language

Finally, the distinct coherence strategies in Chinese are also shaped by typological features of the language. As a classic analytic isolating language, Chinese lacks morphological inflections (e.g., for tense, number, or case) and relies instead on word order, context, and pragmatic cues to organize discourse.

Consider the following sequence:

“他走进来。桌上放着一封信。门还开着。”(*“He came in. There was a letter on the table. The door was still open.”*)

No conjunctions or relational markers are present. The relationship between events—entering the room, seeing the letter, and noticing the open door—is inferred through sequential logic and contextual implication. A Chinese reader naturally interprets the scenario as a cohesive series of events with causal and temporal relations.

In English, however, such a sequence would typically be rendered as “As he walked in, he noticed a letter on the table; the door had not yet been shut.” Here, connectives like “as” and tense markers like “had not yet been” are necessary to ensure coherence. The English language’s inflectional structure and syntactic conventions prioritize explicit encoding of discourse relations, leaving less room for the kind of context-dependent inference common in Chinese.

This typological asymmetry also affects translation. Free-standing or “floating” sentences in Chinese often form a coherent whole via thematic or imagistic association, but in English must be transformed into linear, syntactically connected structures. This transformation, while ensuring clarity, may diminish the rhythmic cadence and implicit logic of the original Chinese discourse.

In summary, Chinese coherence mechanisms are deeply intertwined with high-context communication styles, imagistic cognitive traditions, and the analytic nature of the language. These mechanisms pose theoretical challenges to coherence models based on Western linguistic systems while also opening new avenues for understanding translation, cross-cultural discourse, and linguistic diversity.

## 4. Discussion

By comparing the discourse coherence structures of selected Chinese and English literary texts, this study has revealed multiple distinctive coherence mechanisms in Chinese literature that defy easy classification under dominant English-based theoretical models such as Kehler’s (2002) coherence relations or SDRT. These findings have important implications for translation practice, cross-cultural communication, and the development of discourse theory.

(1) Implications for Translation: Fidelity Is Not Literalness—Cultural Coherence Must Be Respected

The analysis demonstrates that Chinese literary texts frequently rely on implicit coherence mechanisms such as contextual ellipsis, metaphorical association, and imagistic progression. In many English translations, these mechanisms are either made explicit or structurally reconstructed to conform to the expectations of low-context cultures. This process indicates that fidelity in translation cannot simply mean literal correspondence; rather, it must encompass the preservation of culturally embedded coherence patterns.

Translators need to recognize that what constitutes coherence in one language may not function similarly in another. A culturally sensitive translation approach—what this study terms “cultural coherence transformation”—requires the translator to re-encode the original discourse logic in a way that resonates with the target culture while preserving its narrative rhythm and aesthetic integrity.

### (2) Implications for Cross-Cultural Understanding: Coherence Reflects Cultural Coding

Coherence is not a culturally neutral phenomenon. It is a mirror of a language’s cognitive patterns, communicative norms, and aesthetic values. This study shows that Chinese literary texts often build coherence through context, ellipsis, and symbolic associations, whereas English texts tend to rely on formal logic, syntactic markers, and explicit intersentential linkage.

These contrasting coherence strategies reflect broader differences in thought patterns: English favors linearity, explicitness, and analytical reasoning, while Chinese emphasizes context, emotional rhythm, and associative logic. Understanding these differences can enhance our ability to interpret and appreciate literature across cultures and contribute to more effective intercultural communication.

### (3) Implications for Discourse Theory: Culture and Pragmatics Must Be Integrated

While theories such as Kehler’s coherence taxonomy and SDRT have provided robust models for analyzing English texts—especially those with high structural regularity and clear logical connections—they are less effective when applied to Chinese texts that feature “context-compensatory,” “imagistic-progression,” or “aesthetically-driven” coherence.

The present analysis of *Fortress Besieged*, *Honglou Meng*, and other works shows that many Chinese passages lack explicit connective markers and follow non-linear event sequences. Their coherence depends on culturally informed cognitive schemas and pragmatic inferences that fall outside the scope of traditional models. These observations call for a revision of existing discourse theories to include variables such as “cultural frames,” “metaphoric-pragmatic chains,” and other mechanisms of implicit coherence.

In sum, future models of discourse coherence must move beyond purely structural or semantic approaches to incorporate the dynamic roles of culture and pragmatics. A shift from monolingual, logic-based frameworks to intercultural, function-sensitive models will increase the explanatory power of discourse theory and improve its applicability to diverse linguistic systems.

## 5. Conclusion

This study, drawing on representative Chinese and English novels, applies the theory of coherence and Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT) to examine differences in coherence construction across discourse systems. Through both microstructural and macrostructural analyses, the study finds that Chinese literary texts frequently employ unique mechanisms such as ellipsis, imagistic linkage, and unmarked topic shifts to achieve coherence. These patterns often do not conform to the standard coherence categories of cause-effect, resemblance, or contiguity, and are frequently subject to explicit restructuring in English translation, which can compromise the original discourse aesthetics and cultural pragmatics.

More importantly, these coherence mechanisms are not random or stylistic anomalies; they are rooted in deep cultural and pragmatic motivations. The reliance on shared knowledge and implicitness stems from the high-context nature of Chinese communication; the prominence of imagery and metaphor reflects a culturally specific narrative mode shaped by aesthetic values; and the flexible sentence structure arises from the analytic and isolating typology of the Chinese language. Together, these factors constitute a distinct paradigm of coherence in Chinese literature—one driven by context, imagery, and pragmatics—rather than the Western paradigm, which centers on logic, structure, and explicitness.

This contrast presents both challenges and opportunities. For translators, it requires a shift away from a literalist view of fidelity toward a more culturally attuned strategy of “coherence transformation.” For discourse theorists, it invites the expansion of coherence models to include



cultural-pragmatic dimensions. For readers and scholars engaged in cross-cultural literary interpretation, it offers a framework for deeper appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Future research can extend these insights to other literary genres such as poetry, prose, or drama, exploring the distributional tendencies of coherence strategies in different styles. It may also be fruitful to develop an integrated cross-cultural model of coherence that incorporates linguistic typology, pragmatic context, and cultural cognition. Such a model would enhance the descriptive power of coherence theory and promote a more inclusive, globally relevant approach to discourse analysis.

## References

- [1] Cao, Xueqin. (1982). *Hong lou meng* [Dream of the Red Chamber]. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House.
- [2] Shen, Congwen. (2002). *Bian cheng* [Border Town]. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House.
- [3] Lu, Xun. (1958). *Na han* [Call to Arms]. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House. (Original work published 1923)
- [4] Austen, J. (2003). *Pride and prejudice*. London: Penguin Classics.
- [5] Fitzgerald, F. S. (2000). *The Great Gatsby*. New York: Scribner.
- [6] Melville, H. (1992). *Moby-Dick; or, The Whale*. New York: Modern Library.
- [7] Ye, Feisheng, & Xu, Tongqiang. (2001). *Yuyanxue gangyao* [Outline of Linguistics]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- [8] Qian, Zhongshu. (1991). *Weicheng* [Fortress Besieged]. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House. (Original work published 1947)
- [9] Qian, Z. (2004). *Fortress Besieged* (Trans. Jeanne Kelly & Nathan K. Mao). New York: New York Review Books.
- [10] Kehler, A. (2002). 'Coherence, Reference, and the Theory of Grammar'. CSLI, Stanford, CA.
- [11] Kehler, A. (2019), 'Coherence relations.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Event Structure*, R. Truswell (ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [12] Hunter, J. & K. Thompson (2022), 'On the role of relations and structure in discourse interpretation'. In *Linguistics meets Philosophy*, D. Altshuler(ed.), Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Asher, N. & Lascarides, A. (2003). *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Hall, E. T. (1976), 'Beyond Culture'. Anchor Books.