

Whereas here singing is a communal affair, in Zdjelar's most recent video *Shoum* (2009), singing is an individual act of, as she put it, "translation one's experience of listening into uttering". This video focuses on an "infantile" practice of learning without understanding. A middle-aged person (the subtlety of Zdjelar's approach lies in her ability to hide the identity of her protagonist while simultaneously showing his age and social status by occasionally revealing fragments of his face and hands) from Belgrade is filmed in the process of decoding the lyrics of supposedly, his favourite musical hit from his youth in the 1980s: the song "Shout" by the British new wave/new romantic pop band Tears for Fears. He does not speak any English, so he transfers what he hears into his own "vocabulary", based on his capacity to vocally interpret and reproduce what is being heard. In order to grasp and memorize the lyrics, he writes down what he comprehends as the English language. Errors and distortions of the lyrics create an amusing "new language" so instead of "shout, shout, let it all out, these are the things I can do without..." he puts down "šaum, šaum, lejdi o lav, pizat d pizat du ju raund..." and continues in this manner until the whole song has been transcribed. In the end, he sings his version of the lyrics according to what he put down on paper.

The intended meaning of the song, its cultural context and its specific character are lost to make space for a "private language". According to Wittgenstein, a private language is not a language, as language is, first of all, a binding social phenomenon which is "translatable". Private language *in principle* can only be understood by one person, and it must be unlearnable. Yet it must appear that the speaker is able to make sense of it. One of the crucial and controversial paradoxes stated in Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* is that "no course of action could be determined by a rule, because any course of action can be made out to accord with the rule." This paradox is very important for the "private language" controversy, as the rule according to which we speak a certain language can be constructed and not given, so in this sense, a private language can be constructed according to a rule which is made up in this process. As Wittgenstein concludes, "what this shows is that there is a way of grasping a rule which is *not* an *interpretation*, but which is exhibited in what we call 'obeying the rule' and 'going against it' in actual cases".

The private translation of the *Shout* lyrics is not based on any interpretation. Everything what we may learn about this song gets lost in this "translation". Everything which is to be found in both domains crucial for any textual analysis: *intention*, as well as *interpretation*. However, during the video we do not witness only an attempt to reproduce the original text in meaningless sounds/words, but also the formation of rules according to which the final version of the conversion is made up. This is when we, as viewers, tend to fill in some gaps, i.e. tend to speculate upon the logic of the conversion. "Let it all out" becomes "lady o'love" and then "lady o'live" and finally "lady o'ram". "And what is *ram*?", the protagonist asks himself, as if everything else were made up according to some sense (or *rule*), but this word somehow sticks out, as if not fixed yet. Or we may get interested in how the line "You shouldn't have to jump for joy" becomes first "You shouldn't have to shoot and show and finally something like "You shouldn't have to shoot and joke". However, it is the "Gestalt" principles which direct our "form-forming" capabilities according to holistic and self-organizing tendencies. The "Gestalt" principles of *emergence* (recognizing the whole but not the particular parts which constitute the whole), *reification* (the

whole of the experienced sensation/information is substituting missing elements in the sensory stimulus) and *multistability* (the tendency of ambiguous perceptual experiences to pop back and forth unstably between two or more alternative interpretations) are operational in both the ability of the protagonist to constitute the rule for his system of transcribing and our own ability to translate it back into standard English. There is no communication breakdown, language as a "binding social phenomenon" shapes our motivation not to give up on the potential of "translatability".

Branislav Dimitrijević (taken from the catalogue of the 50th October Salon)