

TETYANA V. PETRYK

VERBAL MEANS OF ADDRESSER REPRESENTATION IN CHANNELING DISCOURSE

COBISS: 1.01

Besedna sredstva začetnikovega predstavljanja v kanaliziranem diskurzu

Prispevek je nadaljevanje objav, posvečenih analizi kanaliziranega diskurza. Kanaliziranje se šteje za poseben diskurz, ki ima v jedru predstavljanje začetnika diskurza. Opravljena raziskava dokazuje, da se avtor vzpostavlja z zaimki *jaz* in [*midva* ter] *mi* v ustreznih vlogah ter s podobnimi egocentričnimi izrazi samopredstavljanja.

Ključne besede: kanalizirani diskurz, začetnik, naslovnik, osebni zaimki, samopredstavljanje

This article continues a series of publications by the author dedicated to channeling discourse analysis. The article addresses the problem of channeling as a separate type of discourse and focuses on the means of its addresser presentation. The research testifies to the fact that the author is introduced with the help of the pronouns *I* and *we* with their respective functions as well as through egocentric expressions of self-presentation.

Keywords: channeling discourse, addresser, addressee, personal pronouns, self-presentation

1 INTRODUCTION

Twentieth-century society, especially in the second half of the century, showed a tendency to express vivid interest in everything connected with sacred, mysterious phenomena such as ancient knowledge, spiritual development, and the place of human beings in the hierarchy of the universe. This interest gave rise to the movement called *New Age*, with its bewildering variety of manifestations. Its foundations were laid by western esoteric traditions during the Renaissance, which developed through the nineteenth century, alongside increasing secularization, and finally into the present state with its beliefs that are often termed *New Age religion* (Hanegraaff 1996). Among the most important counterparts of the *New Age* belief system, researchers single out the practices of channeling as a “type of communication between the spiritual and material world” (Laderman – Leon 2014: 272) that are sweeping the United States and Europe. Channeling is defined as “the communication of information to or through a physically embodied human being from a source that is said to exist on some other level or dimension of reality than the physical as we know it, and that is not from the normal mind (or self) of the channel” (Klimo 1987: 2), transmitting information that a human being receives mentally or

physically from a personality source outside the conscious mind (Hastings 1991:4), and information from sources other than their normal selves (Hanegraaff 1998:23).

Channeling used to be called by various other names: *mediumship*, *spirit possession*, *automatic writing*, *clairaudience*, and so on. In the nineteenth century, this procedure was called *spiritualism*, and nowadays it has acquired a new name and is termed *channeling*. The basic difference between classical spiritualism and channeling is that the former presupposes a trance state of the channel or medium, whereas the latter includes a number of phenomena that do not involve a trance at all, “notably the case of inner dictation, in which the medium hears a voice dictating messages which (s)he writes down in a fully conscious state” (Hanegraaff 1998: 24). Also, contrary to the spiritualism of the nineteenth century, which emphasized direct contact with alleged deceased humans (Hastings 1991), “New Age channels receive information from enlightened masters, sometimes called ‘Mahatmas’” (Laderman – Leon 2014: 272). There also exists an approach defining channeling as “articulated revelations” and a strong tendency to claim “that all revelations of the past are to be regarded as channeling” (Hanegraaff 1998: 26) thus classifying under this term the prominent revelations that channeled God’s mercy to humankind and gave birth to such worldwide religions as Christianity, Islam, and Judaism: “[The] term channeling . . . is current, but the process has been called prophecy, oracle, revelation, spiritual communication, possession, and the inspiration of the muses. The Biblical tradition in Judaism and Christianity says that the prophets received and spoke the words of God. Today, there are many individuals who speak words that are said to come from disembodied teachers on other levels of reality. The process, though not necessarily the content, appears to be the same” (Hastings 1991: xi).

The complete range of channeled sources is rather broad, including one entity type (ascended masters, angels, extraterrestrials, historical personalities, God / the “Ultimate Source”, etc.) as well as group entities (Hanegraaff 1998: 23) such as the Assembly of Light or the Michael group. Therefore one can state that channeling is a means of communication with any conscious entity that is not endowed with a human body and needs to use a human being as a kind of “channel” between two worlds in order to be able to express itself, or its thoughts and ideas, or to transmit information (Petryk 2013: 42).

2 CHANNELING AS A DISCOURSE

- 2.1 Channeling is a widespread phenomenon nowadays, encountered in a vast number of printed books, records, and live channelings: Jane Roberts with her Seth teaching series, J. Z. Knight with the Ramtha series, Helen Schucman and her spirit guide “Jesus” as the authors of the bestselling *A Course in Miracles*, and Edgar Cayce, whose spirit guides produced thousands of pages of information on New Age medicine, are among the best known (Ankerberg – Weldon 1996: 86–89; Brown 1997: 193–194). As Jon Klimo, a transpersonal psychologist, states, “since 1986 channeling has reached into

the grassroots. It has entered the popular vocabulary. Channeling now is part of current mainstream consensus reality” (Klimo 1998: xix). Therefore it seems evident that channeling discourse deserves thorough research insight into the phenomenon from the linguistic point of view concerning such aspects as channeled speech styles (which may reveal how the language personality of the entity verbalizes itself and interaction of the channel’s mind with that of the entity), comparative analysis of the speech patterns of different channels that claim to be working with the same entity (which will help distinguish the stylistic features of the channel from those coming from the entity), pragmatic analysis of the intentions of the entities (all channelings are intended, usually aiming at giving teachings and instructions), and the tactics and strategies applied by the entities to reach the communicative perlocutive effect.

- 2.2 Concerning the definition of channeling as a separate type of discourse, I should mention first of all that it belongs to the group of discourses termed sacred (including religious, esoteric, occult, and mystic discourses); namely, to esoteric discourse. Each of them has its key concept (in religious discourse this is faith, in esoteric discourse it is spirit or spirituality, in occult discourse it is magic, and in mystic discourse it is mystics) that subordinates the key concept of the sacred discourse, which is the sacred mystery. The basis of such a classification is constituted by thematic similarity (all sacred discourses represent a kind of communication with higher worlds) and the hierarchical subordination of the key concept: the higher self of a human is a part of universal spirit; cognition of one’s own higher self is the way to the spirit or spirituality; cognition of one’s own higher self helps in learning the sacred mystery (for more details, see Petryk 2014).

Channeling discourse is both the process (the instance of communication itself) and the result (the text written by a channeling-writer or the record). The channeling-writer (or channeler/channel) is “a person who conveys thoughts or energy from a source believed to be outside the person’s body or conscious mind; . . . one who speaks for nonphysical beings or spirits” (*Merriam-Webster Dictionary*). The channeler may be a passive “translator” or an “instrument” controlling the style of the channeling discourse. Concerning the classification of discourses into oral or written, these terms may be applied to the product of channeling discourse: in a voice other than his own, the channeler reproduces the spirit’s speech (i.e., oral message) or automatically types or writes down the information dictated. As for the very process of the spirit communicating the information to the channeler, one more type of communication is involved: mental. The information appears in the channeler’s head either in the form of some “sounds” that no one else is able to hear, or in the form of “thought packages” and “idea groups” (Carroll 1993: 13), and so it is not possible to term such communication as acoustic or visual in the generally accepted sense of these words. Therefore the two subtypes of channeling discourse may be defined as mental-oral and mental-written; the product of these processes (a text or audio record) is a kind of synthesis of the mental-communicative activity of the two beings: a human

channeler and a spirit (or several spirits at a time; Petryk 2013: 43). “The speech of channels through whom an ‘entity’ or some other alternate personality claims to speak is often strangely accented and noticeably distinct from the channel’s normal speech” (Kautz 2003: 287).

One of the most fruitful in his teachings is Kryon, who has been communicating his messages since 1988 through Lee Carroll and later through David Brown. My analysis is aimed at a detailed description of all of the means of the author’s representation (or restoration) in Kryon’s channelings through Lee Carroll: namely, pronominal units and egocentric statements.

3 PRONOMINAL MEANS OF ADDRESSER REPRESENTATION

The analysis of the pronominal organization of Kryon’s channelings shows that the addresser of this type of discourse uses personal pronouns (first-person, both singular and plural) for his self-presentation and self-identification.

- 3.1 The personal pronoun *I* is usually used to denote the narrator, storyteller, or author of a work. In the case of fiction, the narrator is a part of a fictional (imaginary) world and is differentiated from the author (who is a part of the real world). When it comes to non-fiction, one observes a complete merger of the author and the narrator because they are one and the same person (Genette 1993: 78–88). In the case of channeling, the second (non-fiction) pattern is observed: the author and the narrator titles are ascribed to the disembodied mind-consciousness (spirit, non-physical being); in my case, this is *Kryon*. He usually uses the pronoun *I* at the very beginning of the channeling in order to introduce and self-identify himself: “Greetings! I am Kryon, of magnetic service” (Carroll 1993: 13). Such an explicit statement of one’s “authorship” is conditioned by the communicative aim of the addresser: it is an authoritative claim that all of the suggested statements are true because the addresser does not hide behind the contextually milder nominations that would give him the opportunity to shift the responsibility onto somebody else. On the contrary, every time Kryon emphasizes that everything he is speaking about is beneficial for humanity and that this is his solemn function, to serve humankind: “I am of magnetic service, and exist solely for the purpose of service to you—who are dearly loved and exalted among entities . . . I am here to respond to your works . . .” (Carroll 1994: 14). Such statements containing the first-person singular pronoun repeatedly occur within the structure of nearly every channeling.

Sometimes there appears the phrase “I AM Kryon” at the end of the message, which, to a certain extent, is associated with the epistolary genre, creating an impression that one is reading a letter from a friend named Kryon: “all who know who you are and congratulate you for your perseverance to have read this message and have taken its communication seriously. I AM Kryon” (Carroll 1993: 38). This is one of the communicative tactics that creates intimacy between the

addresser and the addressee because it is built on the identification of the addresser as an old acquaintance or a close relation.

In addition to the nominative case of the pronoun, I also observe its object case and the possessive adjective *my*: “Believe **me**, the entire Universe knows of the situation you call planet Earth. With **my** changes, you can have increased power . . .” (Carroll 1994: 14).

In all of the cases mentioned above, the pronoun *I* is used in a “representative” function: “I” (Kryon) is a representative of a certain group “we” (inclusive “we”): “This is difficult, for **I** deal with human beings who are single-digit dimensional creatures, and Spirit deals in multiple dimensions” (Kryon 1997).

The other cases of using the pronoun *I* (in this case, *I* is contextually opposed to the generative *you*) are the instances in which Kryon contrasts himself with:

- (a) Humanity in general (in such contexts, the pronouns mark the differences between two entities: Kryon as a spiritual disembodied creature and a human as a physical object): “It is now that we meet each other on the road; and although **you** may look at **me** in awe as **I** represent Spirit, **I** am the one who looks at **you** in awe and tells **you** again and again that **I** am from the Love source . . . and **you** are loved dearly!” (Carroll 1995: 20);
- (b) A certain separately taken person; the reader himself or herself (here Kryon acts as a representative of a magnetic service of the universe): “As **you** read these words, please understand a few things: (1) My word ‘**you**’ refers to the entity whose eyes are reading this sentence. (2) I know who **you** are” (Carroll 1995: 16); “**You** are known to me individually because we have met before” (Carroll 1995: 16).

3.2 The pronoun *we* does not have a definite referent and is an example of a polysemous unit that covers not only the categories of three persons, but also all of the possible combinations within the category of person (Wales 1996: 63). Sylvain Dieltjens and Priscilla Heynderickx state that the use of the first-person plural pronoun to some extent shifts the author from the foreground and makes the statement less subjective because in such cases *we* can be treated as an impersonal pronoun (2003: 7), a kind of generalizing, ambiguous *we*. They also differentiate between the inclusive and exclusive usage of the first-person plural pronoun: when it is used exclusively, the addressee does not belong to the group mentioned in the context; in the inclusive usage, one perceives the addressee as its counterpart.

In her review of works on the classification of the secondary meanings of the pronoun *we*, Martina Temmerman presents the following meanings:

- (1) Author’s “we,” when the author is a separate person (often used in academic discourse) or a group of authors;
- (2) Inclusive “we” (the author and the reader);
- (3) Generative “we” (humankind, people in general);

- (4) Playful “we” (refers to the reader or listener and usually used in dialogues between a doctor and a patient or a teacher and a pupil);
- (5) “We” referring to the third person (it may be exemplified by the sentence *We don't look happy today* [secretary about her boss]) (Temmerman 2008: 291–292).

3.2.1 Concerning the use of the first-person plural pronoun in Kryon’s channelings, one can single out both inclusive and exclusive usage. In the cases of exclusive usage, Kryon contrasts himself and the reader as the creatures belonging to different planes of existence (the identical contrast is observed in cases of the representative usage of the pronoun *I* mentioned above). The addresser appears as a social personality representing a certain group of individuals (in this case, the higher entities from the parallel plane of existence) and thus performing his certain social mission. Certainly, the addresser also reveals his own personality, but the discourse material makes it completely evident that this particular spiritual creature (Kryon) acts, first of all, as a representative of a large group of like creatures to which humanity (as the creatures presently embodied) does not belong: “My entity is **one of service**. There are many kinds of entities, but the number is always the same. **We** are constant, and reflect the whole at all times. **We** are all linked together. **We** are the great ‘I AM’ as your scriptures call God. When I send the message ‘**I AM Kryon**,’ there is a communication that **I belong to the whole**, and my signature is **Kryon. We are God**” (Carroll 1993: 16).

In Kryon’s channelings, *we*-exclusive quite often demonstrates its subtype as *we*-corporative, when the communicants belong to different communicative groups and the addresser appears to be in the role of the addressee’s servant, helping to solve his problems. This is expressed explicitly with the help of the lexeme “servant” as a direct nomination (“The truth is that you sit before your **servant** Kryon!” Carroll 1995: 17) and through the lexemes and word combinations *to serve, my service, to be of service*: “The Kryon has a splendid shape and many colors, and some of you have even seen them. They tell of my **service** to the Universe, and of the various places I have been doing the work that I specialize in” (Carroll 1995: 18), “There is great honor in their eyes, for they **serve** you completely” (Carroll 1995: 42).

3.2.2 The inclusive usage of the pronoun *we* positions Kryon and all of the spiritual entities in their unity with humans because outside of this terrestrial embodiment everyone is an eternal immortal spirit, thus belonging to a large community: “You are each high entities of your own who have agreed to be exactly where you are before you ever got where you are. **We** are all collective in spirit, even while you are on Earth, veiled from truth” (Carroll 1993: 16–17); “**We** are collective, but the power source is singular. This means that **we** all share a common oneness that is the power” (Carroll 1993: 34). And everyone has a certain color palette in his

or her energy body, helping to differentiate between them as souls: “Each of **us** has this exact attribute as an entity of the Universe. **Our** shape and **our** colors tell those around **us our** ‘names’ and **our** service . . . And so it is also that each time you descend into humanoid form on any planet, you earn a badge of color that intermingles with the ones you already carry” (Carroll 1995: 18–20).

Inclusive *we* is often accompanied by a further detailing that, though *we* (spiritual entities and humans) are identical by origin (*we* all come from the same source: God), our mission in the Universe is not identical because humanity has its own special mission whereas the other entities are simply “serving” humanity in this endeavor: “There are many kinds of entities, but the number is always the same. **We** are constant, and reflect the whole at all times. **You** are a very important part of the whole, and **you** are very special. **You** have elected to be the ones to bring the frequency of the whole to a higher level” (Carroll 1993: 15); “Those such as myself who are **in service** have elected to work **for the rest of you**. There are many more of **us in service** than those of **you in lesson**, and there are many, many kinds of service . . . **All of them are assigned for service to you** directly” (Carroll 1993: 16). Pointing out his divine essence, his origin from the Source, Kryon raises human beings to the same high status by assuring them that they belong to the same family with the common “home”: “**We** are God. You are a piece of God, and you have the power to become as high on your side of the veil as you were before you came . . .” (Carroll 1993: 16); “We know you by name, and have placed before you a loving message from home” (Carroll 1995: 41), “Now we are here to tell you a secret, dear ones—something you may have never truly recognized. All of the love that you have had for God—for Spirit—for these entities in all of your life, is simply an absolute direct mirror of your own love for yourself” (Carroll 1997: 20).

In the contexts with *we*-inclusive, one observes the same communicative tactic as with the *I* pronoun: the tactic that creates intimacy between the addresser and the addressee because it is built on the identification of the addresser as an old acquaintance or close relation (everyone knows him but, of course, on the level of the “Higher Self”): “For I am Kryon, and know you . . . and you know me. If these words, or those of past writings seemed to feel like ‘home’ to you, then it is because your higher self has intuitively recognized the writing of a friend” (Carroll 1994: 14–15), “You are known to me individually because we have met before. There is no entity on this planet who has not seen me” (Carroll 1995: 16).

The pronoun *we* in the channelings of different other spiritual entities is used not only in the functions described above, but also to present the *we*-narration itself, when there is a plural addresser or polyphony. In polyphonic narration there also exists the possibility of differentiating between the various functions of the first-person plural pronoun. As William H. Kautz states, “The pronouns ‘we’ and ‘us’ instead of ‘I’ and ‘me,’ etc., are common, suggesting, as it is often claimed by the entity, that ‘it’ is a collective of entities rather than a single one. Again, this plural form adds authority to the speech” (Kautz 2003: 288).

4 SELF-PRESENTATION AS A SEMANTIC-COGNITIVE MEANS OF ADDRESSER REPRESENTATION

- 4.1 In modern scientific paradigms, self-presentation is defined as the process of one's own introduction to others in a way that facilitates the realization of the addresser's goal in a certain communicative situation. The psychological basis of the addresser's self-presentation in any kind of discourse is the intentional structure in which the addresser's focus is directed onto himself (self-identification and self-characterization) as well as onto the addressee (influence). If self-presentation helps in achieving the communicative aim, it is numerously expressed in the discourse and usually in direct explicit form. Hoffman was among the first scholars that studied this problem in detail and defined self-presentation as the process when an individual controls the impression produced by him aiming at the control of other people's behavior, especially their response to the actions he performs (Hoffman 2000). Through beneficial self-presentation, the addresser can achieve idealization of his personality and qualities. In Kryon's channelings, the directioning of the attention onto oneself not only presents the addresser in a beneficial light but also helps his identification with the addressee.
- 4.2 Channeling discourse produced by Kryon is characterized by egocentric statements; that is, the addresser's personality is partially presented in his own statements about himself. As Chakhoyan and Dedikova state, the egocentric statements of the addresser can be connected with his communicative or thinking activity; that is, his attitude towards the facts of objective reality. They may also describe all of the other types of the addresser's activity. Therefore it is possible to divide the statements of the addresser about himself or herself into two large classes: relative and descriptive egocentric statements, or EC-statements (Chakhoyan – Dedikova 1990: 74).

Among the descriptive EC-statements in the discourse messages and assertive statements analyzed are dominating. Identifying himself as a representative of the spiritual creatures, Kryon singles out his specific features and functions, peculiar only to him because he belongs to magnetic service, whereas the other creatures' task is to help humanity balance their planet transition period (under "balancing" one understands the process more commonly known as "enlightenment"): "I am Kryon, of magnetic service" (Carroll 1993: 13), "Others are here in service to help you with the procedures of balance, and the details you will need" (Carroll 1993: 21), "Many of you are calling this balance 'enlightenment'" (Carroll 1993: 17).

Among the descriptive EC-statements, one also finds information about Kryon's essence, age, name, the duration of his "service," and the particular features of this "service." Kryon is not and never was a human being ("I have never been a human or anything else but Kryon"; Carroll 1993: 15). He calls himself Kryon,

although this is not his real name; the real name is a “thought package” (“My name is a ‘thought group’ or ‘energy package’ that surrounds me and is recognizable by all other entities”; Carroll 1993:14) that includes three counterparts: a tone, a light frequency (light and color), and a form, but human beings are not endowed with the ability to perceive and understand all of this: “Most of my name package is out of the range of any of your human senses. There is really much more to my name than the sound, and I would really like you to be able to ‘feel’ it; but you are unable at this time” (Carroll 1993: 14). Therefore Kryon transmitted only the tone of his name in the form of a “thought package” and the channeler (Lee Carroll) rendered it with the help of the sounds of English most similar to it. This testifies to the observation made by William H. Kautz “that the energies or entities that communicate through channels do not have personalities, names and voices of their own, and they seem to create these features as they communicate through the channel’s mind. If this is indeed true, then it would be natural for them to fashion personalities, names and speech styles as comfortable, reassuring and conducive of respect as they can. Surely this is what any of us would do if we wanted to communicate an important message, but had no suitable body, personality or language of our own and had to work through a willing intermediary” (Kautz 2003: 288).

As mentioned above (see Section 3.2.1), in his channelings Kryon often uses the lexeme *to serve* and its derivatives; this happens because he defines his global essence of existence as that of service in all the possible senses, and this service takes place not only on Earth but in all the other worlds that function as some kind of school on the path of the soul’s evolution: “My entire purpose is to serve in a specified capacity the ‘schools’ throughout the universe where the entities such as yourselves are located” (Carroll 1993: 15). Kryon’s task on Earth, according to his words, was the creation of the magnetic grid that is responsible for the mental and physical health of humans, as well as the shifting of the grid’s poles, which is already happening for the third time in the planet’s history: (“I have created the magnetic grid system of your planet. I have been here two other times since, for major global adjustment. This is my third adjustment, and my fourth and final visit”; Carroll 1993, chapter 27). His responsibilities also include informing humanity concerning these events “And my work here is not only to facilitate the magnetics to allow for your growth, but to give you loving information about what is happening” (Carroll 1995: 22). Here one finds explicit information about the date of Kryon’s fourth (and last) arrival on Earth: “I arrived in 1989 to start my work” (Carroll 1993: 33), the period the pole shifting will take place in: “My process will take ten to twelve Earth years to accomplish. From now through the year 2002 will be the gradual change. Around the year 1999 you should know exactly of what I am speaking” (Carroll 1993: 29), and an indirect indication of Kryon’s age, which is estimated in eons of Earth time: “The creation of your grid system took eons of Earth time” (Carroll 1993: 27).

5 CONCLUSIONS

Having examined several books by Lee Carroll, who has been channeling Kryon for more than ten years, I can conclude that this discourse can be classified under the generalizing term “sacred discourse”; namely, its subtype of esoteric discourse. Channeling discourse in general and Kryon’s in particular is characterized by anthropocentric features because it is rendered through a human channel, it is aimed at providing information about humanity and for humanity, and, although it is produced by a creature other than a human being, it reveals features characteristic of human-produced discourse. The addresser of this type of discourse is a disembodied spiritual creature of the higher multidimensional plane of existence. Among the means of the author’s restoration in the text, one finds direct explicit nominations through the first-person singular and plural personal pronouns. The pronoun *I* has several functions: it creates intimate relations with the addressee (similar to those of close friends), it shows that the author takes all of the responsibility for the information rendered onto himself (not hiding behind the mask), it authoritatively claims that all of the statements suggested are true, it positions the addresser as a representative of a certain group (a “representative” function), and it helps contrast the addresser with the addressee-separate personality or with the addressee-humankind in general.

The functions of *we* may be summarized as follows: in its exclusive usage, it contrasts the author and the reader as creatures belonging to different planes of existence; and in its inclusive usage it positions Kryon and all the spiritual entities in their unity with humanity, raises human beings to Kryon’s high status of the same nature with the common origin/source, and helps create intimate relations with the addressee.

Self-presentation tactics are another means of the author’s “embodiment” in Kryon’s texts that explicitly characterize the addresser concerning his nature, age, basic functions, and aims.

The analysis carried out in this article is not exhaustive concerning the means of the addresser’s presentation in channeling discourse because the researcher’s attention intentionally skipped certain phenomena (such as discursive markers) because the amount of the material does not correspond to the article’s limitations and requires separate insight into the problem under discussion, in this way offering a prospect for further research. I can also outline a number of other prospects for research on channeling discourse in terms of linguistics: (a) a separate analysis of channeling discourse as such concerning the addresser’s language personality and its manifestation at the level of text; pragmatic intentions, tactics, and strategies of the addresser; the typology of the addressee and the conditions of the successful communicative (perlocutive) effect; classification of channelings and the speech genres they employ, and so on; (b) a contrastive analysis presupposing comparative research on channeling discourse and

other types of esoteric discourses (meditative, authors' esotericism) or sacred discourses (i.e., religious, occult, etc.); and c) comparative research on channeling discourse and other types of discourses that it reveals similarity with (i.e., political discourse, so-called "self-help" literature, etc.).

LITERATURE

- Ankerberg – Weldon 1996** = John Ankerberg – John Weldon, *Encyclopedia of New Age Beliefs*, Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 1996.
- Brown 1997** = Michael F. Brown, *The Channeling Zone: American Spirituality in an Anxious Age*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Carroll 1993** = Lee Carroll, *Kryon—The End Times (New Information for Personal Peace)*, Del Mar, CA: The Kryon Writings, Inc., 1993.
- Carroll 1994** = Lee Carroll, *Kryon—Don't Think like a Human (Channeled Answers to Basic Questions)*, Del Mar, CA: The Kryon Writings, Inc., 1994.
- Carroll 1995** = Lee Carroll, *Kryon—Alchemy of the Human Spirit (A Guide to Human Transition into the New Age)*, Del Mar, CA: The Kryon Writings, Inc., 1995.
- Carroll 1997** = Lee Carroll, *Kryon—Partnering with God*, Del Mar, CA: The Kryon Writings, Inc., 1997.
- Chakhoyan – Dedikova 1990** = Л. П. Чахойян – О. Е. Дедикова, Личность адресанта в высказываниях о самом себе, *Язык, дискурс и личность: Межвуз. сб. науч. тр.*, Тверь: Твер. гос. ун-т, 1990, 73–79.
- Dieltjens – Heynderickx 2003** = Sylvain Dieltjens – Priscilla Heynderickx, The Indefinite "We" (Het "wij"-gevoel / Le "nous" indefini)—Sender and Receiver References in Top-Down Communication: A Text Type-Based Approach, *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication* 33 (2003), № 1, 3–27.
- Genette 1993** = Gérard Genette, *Fiction and Diction*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1993.
- Hanegraaff 1998** = Wouter J. Hanegraaff, *New Age Religion and Western Culture: Esotericism in the Mirror of Secular Thought*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1998.
- Hastings 1991** = Arthur Hastings, *With the Tongues of Men and Angels: A Study in Channeling*, Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1991 (Henry Rolfs Book Series of the Institute of Noetic Sciences).
- Hoffman 2000** = И. Гоффман, *Представление себя другим в повседневной жизни*, Москва: Директ-Медиа, 2000.
- Kautz 2003** = William H. Kautz, *Opening the Inner Eye: Explorations on the Practical Application of Intuition in Daily Life and Work*, New York: iUniverse Inc., 2003.
- Klimo 1987** = John Klimo, *Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources*, Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher Inc., 1987.
- Klimo 1998** = John Klimo, *Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources*, Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1998.
- Kryon September 97** = Kryon, *The Golden Tray*, available at http://www.kryon.com/k_27.html, accessed August 25th, 2016.
- Laderman – Leon 2014** = Gary Laderman – Luis D. Leon, *Religion and American Cultures: Tradition, Diversity, and Popular Expression*, 2nd edition, Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2014.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary** = *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, available at: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/channeler>, accessed August 25th, 2016.
- Petryk 2013** = T. V. Petryk, Discourse Typology: Channeling Discourse, in: *Development of Scientific Thought in the 21st Century: Problems and Perspectives: Proceedings of the 2nd International Scientific Conference: April 10, 2013*, 42–44.
- Petryk 2014** = Т. В. Петрык, Ченнелінг у системі сакральних дискурсів: когнітивний аспект, Вісник ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка, Серія: Філологічні науки, 2014, № 6 (289), 72–80.

Temmerman 2008 = Martina Temmerman, "Today, We're All Danes," Argumentative Meaning of the 1st and 2nd Person Pronouns in Newspaper Editorials on the Muhammad Cartoons, *L'analisi Linguistica e Letteraria* (special issue: *Word Meaning in Argumentative Dialogue*) 16 (2008), № 1, 289–303.

Wales 1996 = Katie Wales, *Personal Pronouns in Present-Day English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

POVZETEK

Besedna sredstva začetnikovega predstavljanja v kanaliziranem diskurzu

Kanaliziranje pomeni sporazumevanje med breztelesnim bitjem in ljudmi skozi človeka v vlogi komunikacijskega kanala. Potek in zapis kanaliziranja se imenujeta kanalizirani diskurz z duhovnimi bitji kot njegovim začetnikom.

Članek obravnava pojav Krionovih kanaliziranj v zvezi z besednimi sredstvi avtorjevega predstavljanja v diskurzu. Zaimki *jaz* in [*midva* ter] *mi* se štejejo za redno sredstvo začetnikovega neposrednega vstopa in predstavljanja, njegove povezanosti z naslovnikom pa tudi sredstvo kontrastiranja z njim. Vključna in izključna raba zaimka *mi* se motrita v luči skupnih in ločevalnih lastnosti njunih vlog. Avtorjeve egocentrične izjave se štejejo za nadaljnje sredstvo začetnikovega predstavljanja (oziroma samopredstavljanja) v analiziranem diskurzu ob njihovi vlogi izrecne oznake narave, starosti, osnovne vloge in namenov začetnika.