

How effectively does  
pavel ivanov use  
language to persuade  
his her audience?

[Linguistics](#), [Language](#)



The film review about the movie 'I now pronounce you Chuck ; Larry' written by Pavel Ivanov is well suited to its audience who the writer describes as the 'Adam Sandler crowd', although Ivanov does indicate that audiences who get pleasure from comical films, would probably enjoy the blatant crude humour in this movie for example the 'dropped soap in the shower routine' Ivanov's implied meaning is that those who'd laugh at this type of humour have no taste and lack intelligence, as this 'type of humour' has intentionally been put into the movie as it is the 'most lucid strategy' to win over audiences

One of the purposes of the review is to denigrate the movie as an unintelligent film for those who are dim-witted, as it is full of 'primitive weaponry of toilet humour' and 'gay-cliché?? jokes', but at the same time Ivanov maintains a neutral stance by complimenting the movie on some of its achievements 'subverts the gambit of any other 'serious' gay movie'. The lexis used in the review is overall formal, with some elements of colloquialism such as 'the icing on the cake'.

You can read also Audience Adaptation Paper

He uses such conversational style lexis to amuse and engage his audience. Ivanov establishes himself with the first person singular pronoun 'I' to identify with readers as someone who has seen the movie thus immediately capturing the readers' interest and trust. He directly addresses his readers by using the second person singular pronoun 'you' Ivanov uses this device to draw in his readers in to the review as well as deliver a personal message to them about the film.

The writer applies a subordinate clause to give additional information about the movie to the audience. By combining the sentence with a relative clause, Ivanov's text becomes more fluent to readers. 'Interesting thing this movie does is that while staying within the constraints of a broad comedy, it subverts the typical gambit of any other serious gay film' this is also a compound sentence as it adds detail of the movie and gives it a justification it also gives it a rationale, and makes a simple sentence more compelling and informative.

He describes his disbelief in the plot of the movie by using a comparative sentence 'instead of seeing a homosexual feigning happiness in a straight marriage' he then adds supplementary information about the movie he's writing about ('think, the hours or normal') here Ivanov displays his skepticism as to why someone would want to watch a movie with such a bizarre plot 'straight men come from a bastion of heroic manliness- the New York fire fighting service' this is ironic as you expect straight men to be fire fighters.

Ivanov uses double modifiers to describe a famous actor in the movie as 'bizarrely bankable' by using the lexis 'bizarrely' Ivanov expresses to his audiences his disbelief in why this actor is so 'bankable' although Ivanov could also be amazed about the actors performance that not only can he do funny and serious but that he can do the two simultaneously in the movie as he addresses a serious message to the audience that 'bias is bad' and still keep it comic.

In the opening paragraph Ivanov uses the adjective 'energetic' and follows it up with the post-modifier 'crassness' Ivanov's constant emphasis on the vulgarity of the movie, leads the readers to consider whether they would watch such an offensive film at all, thus reinforcing Ivanov's earlier point that the movie is not worth watching as it is aimed at unintelligent audiences, and that the only basis one should watch the movie ought to be for 'academic interest'.

Ivanov describes a ridiculous scene in the movie 'a three legged hippo doing ballet' his implication being that such strange humour is not only typical but it is what has made him a household name in comedies 'still an Adam Sandler movie' The text contains lots of exophoric references ('Big daddy, happy Gilmore') which have been put in parenthesis to add supplementary information. " Larry (Kevin James)" parenthesis is commonly used in the text by Ivanov to signify to audiences the formality of the review.

The writer uses many anaphoric references one example is 'the set up is contrived as they come, but this is part of the joke'. What both lexis 'the set up and 'this' share is that - they have the same reference. On the whole Ivanov is successful in keeping track of the various people and things he mentions in his review by building a reference chain this makes Ivanov's writing more coherent to audiences. The example given above is also a dependant clause as it cannot stand by it self it needs it an independent clause to make the sentence complete.

Ivanov constantly reminds audiences of the crudity of the movie, but he changes his strategy this time by picking out bits of the film that he feels his readers would be alarmed by 'feel Alex's breasts. ' This displays Ivanov's desperation as he is trying everything to persuade the readers not to watch the movie. The key purpose that Pavel Ivanov has written the review is to persuade audiences not to watch the movie, his underlining reason being that it would 'offend you' rather than 'amuse you'.

I suppose he is successful in convincing readers not to watch the movie, one effective regular feature I can identify Ivanov uses in his review is the first person singular pronoun 'I' he uses this to his advantage as he introduces himself to his readers as a reliable impartial critic, which is clearly not the case as he regularly belittles the movie and the individuals it is aimed at.

This might make some readers feel uneasy as they do not count themselves part of the 'Adam Sandler crowd' consequently readers contemplate on whether it is worth watching this movie at all this. Ivanov's unrelenting pressurising of readers makes him successful in achieving his target.