

DOI 10.2478/doc-2023-0005

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Alexander Scherr

Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen, Germany

Alexander.scherr@anglistik-uni-giessen.de

The ‘Struggle for the Narrative’: Cooperation and Conflict in *Tiger King*’s Intermedial Universe

Article history:

Received 13 April 2023

Revised 24 May 2023

Accepted 30 May 2023

Available online 20 June 2023

Abstract: This article examines the disputed status of narratives in the Netflix documentary *Tiger King* (2020–2021), and the ways in which the series’ actors use media to bolster their particular version of a narrative. While

classic studies of intermediality have productively analyzed the relations between the multiple semiotic resources employed in narrative forms, I offer an approach to intermediality in documentary art that enriches the structuralist paradigm insofar as it calls additional attention to the various human actors that put the worldmaking power of media to use.

Assuming that in filmmaking the creation of a storyworld is a fundamentally cooperative, while also potentially conflictive, endeavor, I examine the Netflix hit show as a documentary in which narrative co-construction is particularly significant. The series introduces its audience to the strange world of 'big cat owners' in the United States – a world which is populated by dubious storytellers and full of conflicts of interests. *Tiger King's* 'hyperreal' world is saturated with media and images that are employed by its actors for storytelling purposes on a contested narrative territory. I argue that the actors' 'struggle for the narrative' resonates with the show's Darwinian themes and its interests in documenting a world in which the true predators are not the tigers but the human 'storytelling animals.' By examining how the various actors boost their own narratives while discrediting those of other players, I aim to illuminate the fine line between narrative co-construction and conflict in the show's intermedial storyworld.

Key words: documentary storytelling, intermediality, metamediality, *Tiger King*, co-construction vs. conflict

Intermediality in Documentary Film Art

To say that documentary films and series are intermedial is almost a truism. As a specific form of film art, any documentary is a 'multi-, poly- or plurimedial' artefact (cf. Rajewsky, 2004, p. 14) whose semiotic resources are, in the most general sense, visual and auditory. Viewers of a documentary may also be presented with images of newspapers or archival footage, and some documentaries, such as Ari Folman's *Waltz with Bashir* (2008), even employ animated sequences. In principle, then, it is possible to consider a given

documentary as an intermedial artefact in the sense that the narrative it tells emerges from an interplay of various material-semiotic resources. My general impression is that most classic studies of intermedial artworks, including Wolf (1999), Rajewsky (2002), Chrzanowska-Kluczevska (2019), and the contributions in Rippl (2015), would look at the documentary film in this way, studying it as a narrative medium with a complex semiotic surface. With regard to the focus of the present thematic issue on intermedial co-construction, these classic or 'structuralist' approaches would posit that it is the different semiotic carriers of meaning that contribute to the documentary's intermedial storyworld.¹

Notwithstanding the merits of the structuralist tradition in intermediality studies, my approach to narrative co-construction in documentary art differs in several respects from the classic framework. While analyzing the meaning-making potential of forms and media is always important, narratives in documentary films are not only the result of an interplay of material-semiotic resources but also of interactive processes between human agents. As I argue elsewhere (Scherr, 2023, forthcoming), a documentary usually begins as an open narrative project characterized by different, and sometimes conflict-ridden, intentions of various human actors. It is thus not only the makers of a documentary (the director/s and the film team) who creatively employ different medial resources for storytelling purposes; the social actors who feature in the documentary often have an agenda of their own and might likewise

¹ Another theoretical tradition would speak of the film as a 'multimodal' artefact (see Bateman & Schmidt, 2012; Thon, 2019). This tradition, too, would posit that the meaning of films (and other media) emerges from an interplay of medium-specific semantic resources (i.e., 'modes'). While theorists of multimodality are often interested in the same phenomena as scholars of intermediality, the history of the two disciplines is different and there is some disagreement as to how 'media' should be conceptualized (see Hallet, 2015).

try to impress their voice onto the narrative.² Significantly, then, the story of a documentary project is – for a long time – an *emerging* narrative, a work in progress, and it is not always clear from the beginning what resources and media the different agents (the filmmakers and the actors) will utilize to shape the narrative in a way that serves their respective interests. To use a phrase that is intentionally modelled after Darwin, one could say that there is something like a ‘struggle for the narrative’ in documentary projects – a contest during which different stakeholders try to ensure that the story gets told in a particular way.

In the present essay, my example for discussing the fine line between narrative co-construction and conflict in documentary art is the Netflix hit show *Tiger King* (2020–2021).³ The series has been considered as a representative of true crime documentaries à la *Making a Murderer* (2015–2018). However, it also has a strong Darwinian subtext that resonates with the way in which I have outlined the dynamics of cooperation and conflict in documentary film projects. More specifically, the show introduces its audience to the strange world of big cat owners in the United States – a world which is populated by dubious storytellers and full of conflicts of interests. Despite its focus on preying animals, *Tiger King* is not a nature documentary. The true predators are neither the tigers nor other wildlife showcased in the series but the human ‘storytelling animals’ who aim to bolster their particular version of a narrative while discrediting the stories of other players.

To be clear about one thing from the beginning: as a call for attention to animal rights, *Tiger King* is a modest success at best, and the show has

² Following an established convention in documentary studies, I will continue to refer to the real-life individuals depicted in documentaries as “social actors” (Nichols, 2001, p. 5), or simply as ‘actors.’ Actors in this sense must be distinguished from professional actors and theatrical performers. However, the authenticity of the performance is a matter of debate in several documentaries, including the series which will later be considered in this article: since the social actors who feature in a documentary project know they are being filmed, “[t]he degree to which people’s behavior and personality change during the making of a film can introduce and element of fiction into the documentary process” (Nichols, 2001, p. 6).

³ While the show was renewed for a second season in 2021, my discussion in this article will draw on examples from the first season only.

rightfully been critiqued from a human-animal studies perspective (Bauer, 2020). Nonetheless, what the series documents well is the 'hyperreal' world of big cat owners (see Baudrillard, 1983) – a world which is saturated with media and images that are employed for storytelling purposes on a contested narrative territory. The show might revolve around wildlife and human-animal relations, yet there is surprisingly little in *Tiger King* that is 'natural' or 'authentic.'

Although the finished series (after post-production) clearly bears the filmic voice of its directors, Eric Goode and Rebecca Chaiklin, the filmmakers are not the only media professionals involved in the making of *Tiger King's* narrative(s). Goode and Chaiklin make a point of foregrounding the series' cooperative aspects; they use different strategies to introduce their audience to a society of media users who are as adept at posing in front of a camera as they are at handling wildlife. *Tiger King* does not so much tell a narrative with absolute authority as examine the different narrative agendas of its real-life actors. We see these media experts participate in the making of several narratives, sometimes giving the Netflix filmmakers instructions on how to shoot a scene in a particular way; and we also see how they study (often suspiciously) and comment on the medial artefacts produced by other players in an attempt to assert control over the story.

As *Tiger King* thus explores the role of media in the making of marketable images, there is a close connection between intermediality and 'metamediality' – a relationship which is not at all uncommon according to Wolf (1999, p. 49): "in works in which intermediality appears repeatedly or in a conspicuous way the assumption is at least not far-fetched that there might be a connection: that intermediality here is coupled with a tendency towards meta-reflection on problems of mediality or fictionality and related questions." Indeed, we will see that *Tiger King* is acutely aware of the worldmaking power of narratives that, more often than not, straddle the boundaries between fictionality and nonfictionality. The meta-reflective qualities of the series thus relate to the involvement of media in the fabrication of such narratives, on the one hand, and to the various forms of interaction (be they collaborative or antagonistic) between its media-savvy actors, on the other hand.

Of Animals and Storytelling Animals: *Tiger King's* Intermedial Universe

I have indicated before that narrative co-construction is an important element in *Tiger King* insofar as the real-life actors depicted in the series form (temporary) alliances with other players in order to control the narrative. What *the* narrative is, however, is surprisingly difficult to explain as the agendas of the individual players are so different that discrediting other people's stories is just as important as promoting one's own image. One could thus argue that *Tiger King* is a documentary about ownership in two regards: as a show about big cat owners and animal-rights activists, it is a documentary about *animal* ownership. As a show about the power of narratives and images (produced and disseminated with the help of media), it is a documentary about *narrative* ownership.

These two points are related. Using C. B. MacPherson's term (1962), one could describe (most of) the key actors in the series as "possessive individualists": their sense of self rests on the fact that they own wild animals and other property, including the means of production they use for distributing profitable images and stories which they are not shy of marketing in a contested struggle for (economic) survival. In *Tiger King's* media-saturated world, representations constantly compete with other representations – so much so that the series is less a documentary of 'real life' in an abstract sense than of the ways in which media are instrumentalized to promote a compelling story (see Mäkelä et al., 2021). There is a metamedial quality to many scenes in that the camera frequently captures other media or shows us the media experts at work.⁴

The key player in the series is a man who goes by the stage name of 'Joe Exotic.' Joe is the owner of a private zoo in Wynnewood, Oklahoma, in which he keeps various specimen of wildlife, especially big cats. Various other facets

⁴ By 'metamediality,' I mean the self-reflexive situation that occurs when a medium references other media or calls attention to its own mediality (see Wolf, 1999, pp. 48–49; Rajewsky, 2002, p. 81; Hauthal et al., 2007).

of what appears to be an eventful biography are revealed in the course of the series. These events include that Joe has been married to various husbands and, for a while, was in a three-way relationship with two husbands at once (neither of whom, as it turns out, were actually gay, and one of whom took his life in Joe's park). Moreover, Joe ran for President of the United States in 2016 and for Governor of Oklahoma in 2018. At the point in time when *Tiger King* is narrated, Joe is in prison after having been convicted on various charges of animal abuse and for having ordered an attempt on Carole Baskin's life. Carole is the second protagonist in the series and Joe's nemesis: an animal rights activist, she runs a conservation reservoir called 'Big Cat Rescue' in Tampa, Florida, and has been in a number of feuds with Joe over the years. There is tellability to Carole's biography, too, for she is rumored to have been involved in the disappearance of her well-to-do second husband, whose money she inherited after he was declared legally dead. Much of the series revolves around the battle between Joe and Carole but other players enter the stage. There is Bhagavan 'Doc' Antle, a big cat trainer who owns a wildlife preserve in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina; Jeff Lowe, who will later assert control over Joe's zoo and is associated with organized crime; and Rick Kirkham, a documentary filmmaker who used to work for Joe and ran his YouTube channel Joe Exotic TV. Last but not least, there are a number of former employees at Joe's zoo who speak out in front of the camera, including the zoo's manager John Reinke, the animal keeper 'Saff' Saffery, Joe's ex-husband John Finlay, and the head zookeeper Erik Cowie.

This selective introduction to the show's characters and some of the key events may serve to underline that *Tiger King* presents the audience with astonishing content that would not have fitted into one documentary film and instead calls for a serial format. As one German reviewer has put it, the series is so larger than life that the most remarkable thing about it is "that it exists" (Mangold, 2020; my translation). Everything in *Tiger King* is so hard to believe that one almost feels it could not have been imagined as fiction. What the audience sees on the screen is a 'post-truth' society in which marketable stories with a strong emotional appeal have replaced a common trust in an intersubjectively shared reality (cf. Browse et al., 2019; Ryan, 2023). Media

play a significant role in this society for they assure that stories (about oneself or one's opponents) can be disseminated and go viral. *Tiger King's* inter- and metamedial qualities thus lie in the fact that the series makes a statement on the highly mediatized world in which we live by showing the audience how profitable stories are fabricated on tape, television, websites, YouTube, and other media.

This situation has implications for the work of the filmmakers and how they understand their own role as storytellers. In the first episode, entitled *Not Your Average Joe*, viewers get to witness how the production team visit Doc Antle's 50-acre preserve in South Carolina. As Antle drives the team to his house, he instructs them about how to film the introduction of his persona in what will later be the edited documentary: "Go to the front door and I'll open it and say, 'Hi. How you doing? Come in.'" The sequence will then be shot in the exact way in which Antle has ordered it. The filmmaker Goode responds by saying, "I like that Doc is better at directing than we are." The comment is revealing about the unusual way in which the main actors cooperate with the filmmakers: as media experts and professional fiction-makers, the actors require hardly any guidance on how to make a compelling film. Anticipating their own representation, it is them who instruct the producers of the documentary with the intention of influencing what gets told and how.

Joe appears in the show as the most creative storytelling animal of all and this also concerns the narratives he has produced about his opponent Carole Baskin in order to damage her image. One of the most ludicrous outcomes of his narrative art is revealed in season 1, episode 3 (*The Secret*), in which viewers see a music video about Carole that Joe once produced. The video, which is called *Here Kitty Kitty* and available on Joe's YouTube channel (JoeExoticTV, 2015), relates the rumors about the disappearance of Carole's second husband Don and alleges that Carole orchestrated it, going so far as to imply that she even fed Don's body to her tigers.⁵ To top things off, the video

⁵ This allegation is most explicitly articulated at the end of the song's second verse: "No bones, no remains but that won't change the fact / That Don sure ain't comin' back / But you can't prosecute, there's just no use / There's nothin' left but tiger tracks."

shows the audience a Carole body double who feeds pieces of meat to a tiger while Joe, dressed in a black country outfit, sings along to the action, acting as a narrator figure who provides an authoritative version of the events.

The relationship between nonfictionality and fictionality in the video is ambivalent. The clip's message is blatantly obvious but the art form of the music video, which falls under the protection of artistic freedom, provides Joe with a relatively secure platform on which he can launch his attacks against Carole in an attempt to seize narrative authority. It bears pointing out, in this context, that music videos are often situated in the borderland of the fictional and the factual. As Kobena Mercer (1986) demonstrates in her analysis of Michael Jackson's *Thriller* video, the form can be used by artists to negotiate their image – a narrative construct that is particularly effective when its 'reality' cannot be distinguished clearly from its 'fictionality' (as was the case with the image of Jackson's sexuality around the time when *Thriller* came out). In precisely this way, though with less subtlety, the music video is also used by Joe, who employs it to affect Carole's image negatively while bolstering his own image.

The fact that scenes from the music video are reproduced in the Netflix documentary underlines that the show frequently examines the narratives of media that already exist. This form of intermediality is not uncommon in the documentary film, which often resorts to archival material in addition to footage that is shot by the filmmakers "on the spot" (Nichols, 2001, p. 46). What is special about the Netflix series, though, is that it places almost every representation in a web of stories in which the authority of one narrative constantly clashes with another actor's version of events in a different medium. In this way, the truth status of the representations that are integrated within the show becomes an omnipresent metafictional and metamedial concern.

In keeping with its general approach to representation, *Tiger King* makes a point of clarifying that Joe's life was already a reality show before Goode and Chaiklin's intervention. The role of Rick Kirkham is interesting in this regard since Kirkham was actually the first documentary filmmaker who had a deal with Joe. There was an agreement that he would run Joe Exotic TV if Joe consented to Kirkham's doing his own reality show about the zoo. As Kirkham

explains in season 1, episode 4 (*Playing with Fire*): “Doing his little Internet shows was only my way of getting into the zoo, because I had a camera crew shooting a reality show behind the crews shooting his Internet show.” In the style of an infinite regress, *Tiger King* turns out to be a film project about another film project (which was itself a project about yet another film project). It is a documentary about a society that is always already ‘mediatized,’ meaning that there is no access to reality – not even to the supposedly ‘natural’ world of wildlife – that is not shaped through media and narratives (cf. Hepp & Krotz, 2014).

To explore how people use media to make stories, the Netflix documentary employs a making-of structure and often takes the audience behind the camera set. In so doing, it marks the shifts in narrative levels from the content fabricated by the actors to the behind-the-scenes negotiations of how scenes should be filmed.⁶ Joe, in particular, is a natural for conceptualizing his own filmic representations and so we repeatedly get to see him order how a scene be shot. Like so many twenty-first-century autobiographical storytellers (from vloggers to reality TV participants), he lives his life in the future tense, strategically considering how his actions need to be captured such that they will appear to his audience in a particular way. As Joe understands his own life as one big story and actively contributes to its making, Kirkham describes his own task during his time at the zoo in the following way: “All I did constantly was: ‘Roll the camera, roll the camera, roll the camera,’ to get all that shit on tape” (*Playing with Fire*).

There is a twist even to Kirkham’s story, which is revealed in the same episode. As the title *Playing with Fire* already indicates, narrative control is a form of power that is always precarious in *Tiger King*. Kirkham puts his cards on the table when he explains in one of the interview shots that he literally ‘owned’ Joe in the form of the representations he had on tape and which he had copyrighted in the contract both had made. The episode then goes on to relate that the recording studio in which this material was kept mysteriously

⁶ For the notion of ‘narrative levels,’ see Pier (2014).

burnt down. The arsonist was never tracked down, but there is suggestive footage in the episode that compromises Joe, exposing as it does the interest he had in the destruction of Kirkham's delicate material.

Again, we can see how ownership is negotiated on two levels in *Tiger King*. The documentary is, in a very literal sense, a show about copyright, which concerns the question of who owns the very media of which copies can be produced and sold.⁷ But it is also a meditation over the symbolic power through which storytellers can 'own' a narrative to gain a positive effect for their image, which is a way of generating capital in its own right. One of the show's key insights is that, in a neoliberal market society in which even wild animals can be kept, bred, and sold, the multiplication of fictions and stories through media is a profitable good regardless of their truth status. In the same way in which genes have to produce copies of themselves to survive in a Darwinian world (cf. Dawkins, 2006), narratives in the world of *Tiger King* have to go viral to benefit their producers.

All of this goes to show that the media society depicted in the Netflix documentary is founded upon the Darwinian principles of cooperation and competition. To emphasize how the human animals 'prey' on other animals (both human and non-human), the filmmakers invite comparisons between the big cats and the human protagonists by intercutting shots of humans with images of tigers. Even Carole, the animal rights activist, is not excluded from the metaphorization of humans as predators. The third episode (*The Secret*), for example, which targets the rumors around Carole and the legal death of her ex-husband, employs close-up shots of growling tigers and suggestively juxtaposes them with images of Carole, one of which shows her holding a tiger on a leash and controlling it in this way. The implied message crafted by the filmmakers is clear enough: Carole's role is highly ambivalent; doubts remain if she authentically cares about big cats, or if she is simply a more sophisticated storyteller than Joe.

⁷ Copyright issues are not only relevant to the question of who owns the filmic material. They also regulate how the zoo owners think about their animals, for the big cats are bred to be multiplied, which generates capital.

The juxtaposition of images of humans next to images of big cats serves to underline that the former are the real predators in an ongoing struggle for survival. In this Darwinian contest, stories and fictions can give individuals temporary advantages over other players, but they can also backfire. After all, Joe's lifelong dream of becoming famous is assured by *Tiger King's* overwhelming success with audiences worldwide and, at least in this sense, the show caters to the maintenance of his image. However, the success of this story cannot be separated from the way in which it ends for him: in a cage in the form of a prison cell. While his excessive use of narratives may have provided Joe with short-term advantages (raising the attractiveness of his zoo, etc.), the series demonstrates that a society in which medially crafted representations are entirely detached from their truth status is not sustainable in the long term and runs into serious problems. Again, we can see how the show combines metafictional concerns about the truth/fictionality of stories with metamedial concerns about the (social) media through which such narratives are produced and disseminated.

If anything in *Tiger King* can reliably be assumed as being authentic, it is the affection of some of Joe's former employees for the animals. In Saff, in particular, who does not seem to care too much about his image and who has chosen to live with disability, we find an actor who does not exploit storytelling to promote his own advantages. Saff's loyalty, as he declares in the after-show to the first season (*The Tiger King and I*), is with the animals and not, as one feels inclined to add, with the *storytelling* animals. In this way, Saff articulates awareness of the fact that what appears as 'authentic' or 'natural' can itself be a carefully crafted fiction, embedded in power structures.

Conclusion

This last observation is linked to a more general point that this article has made with regard to the role of intermediality and narrative co-construction in *Tiger King*. We generally tend to assume that documentary works use specific media (cameras, microphones, software, and other equipment) and the semiotic

resources of filmic language to provide their audiences with a creative, but nonetheless sincere and authentic, representation of real life. *Tiger King* challenges this assumption: it does not so much offer us an authoritative image of 'reality' with the help of media than explore the constitutive role of media in the making of compelling stories that are marketed as real and authentic. This interpretation of the Netflix documentary is in keeping with the way in which literary and media scholars have come to understand authenticity. In this view, (the impression of) authenticity is the *result* of mediated performances and not its opposite: "Promising the genuine and the immediate and by this, at least to some extent, an escape from mediated existence and experience, authenticity itself turns into a quality of mediation and is thus conditioned by what it seems to deny" (Funk et al., 2012, p. 10).

In *Tiger King*, authenticity, sincerity, and realness are notoriously contested issues. Narrative versions of the real (crafted and disseminated by gifted storytellers) are constantly in the making and conflict with other stories. Media play a key role in this Darwinian 'struggle for the narrative': the actors involved cooperate with other actors (and the Netflix filmmakers) when they have the chance to produce a favorable image of themselves but they also use media to contest and discredit the narratives of other players. *Tiger King* shows the audience a highly intermedial world and also possesses a strong metamedial quality due to its reflective stance on the worldmaking power of media. Ostensibly a show about wildlife, the series is at its most revealing when it documents the Darwinian competition between the human (storytelling) animals and the various media with which they promote their narratives.

References

Bateman, J., & Schmidt, K.-H. (2012). *Multimodal Film Analysis: How Films Mean*. New York: Routledge.

Baudrillard, J. (1983). *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Bauer, L. B. (2020). Of Animal Love and Abuse: Exploring Ambivalent Human-Animal Relationships in *Tiger King* (2020) during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *On_Culture: The Open Journal for the Study of Culture*, 9. Retrieved from <https://www.on-culture.org/journal/perspectives/animal-love-abuse/>.

Browse, S., Gibbons, A., & Hatavara, M. (2019). Real Fictions: Fictionality, Factuality, and Narrative Strategies in Contemporary Storytelling. *Narrative Inquiry*, 29(2), 245–267.

Chaiklin, R., & Goode, E. (Directors). (2020–2021). *Tiger King*. Netflix.

Chrzanowska-Kluczewska, E. (2019). Visual Narrativity and the Creation of a Text World – a Semiotic Study of Selected Cases of Transmediality. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 136(4), 287–296.

Dawkins, R. (2006). *The Selfish Gene*. 30th Anniversary edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Funk, W., Groß, F., & Huber, I. (2012). Exploring the Empty Plinth: The Aesthetics of Authenticity. In W. Funk, F. Groß, & I. Huber (Eds.), *The Aesthetics of Authenticity: Medial Constructions of the Real* (pp. 9–21). New Brunswick, London: Transcript.

Hallet, W. (2015). Non-verbal Semiotic Modes and Media in the Multimodal Novel. In G. Rippl (Ed.), *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music* (pp. 637–651). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hauthal, J., Nadj, J., Nünning, A., & Peters, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Metaisierung in Literatur und anderen Medien: Theoretische Grundlagen – Historische Perspektiven – Metagattungen – Funktionen*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Hepp, A., & Krotz, F. (Eds.). (2014). *Mediatized Worlds: Culture and Society in a Media Age*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

JoeExoticTV. (2015, September 17). *Here Kitty Kitty (Official Music Video)*. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ICgz9915wHw>.

Mäkelä, M., Björninen, S., Karttunen, L., Nurminen, M. Raipola, J., & Rantanen, T. (2021). Dangers of Narrative: A Critical Approach to Narratives of Personal Experience in Contemporary Story Economy. *Narrative*, 29(2), 139–159.

MacPherson, C. B. (1962). *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mangold, I. (2020, April 7). 'Tiger King': Große Katzen, große Egos. *Zeit Online*. Retrieved from <https://www.zeit.de/2020/16/tiger-ring-netflix-dokumentation-joe-exotic>.

Mercer, K. (1986). Monster Metaphors: Notes on Michael Jackson's "Thriller". *Screen*, 27(1), 26–43.

Nichols, B. (2001). *Introduction to Documentary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pier, J. (2014). Narrative Levels. In P. Hühn, J. C. Meister, J. Pier, & W. Schmid (Eds.), *Handbook of Narratology* (pp. 547–563). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Rajewsky, I. (2002). *Intermedialität*. Tübingen, Basel: Francke.

Rajewsky, I. (2004). Intermedialität – eine Begriffsbestimmung. In M. Bönnighausen, & H. Rösch (Eds.), *Intermedialität im Deutschunterricht* (pp. 8–30). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.

Rippl, G. (Ed.). (2015). *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ryan, M.-L. (2023). Playing Games With the Truth: Tabloid Stories, Urban Legends, Tall Tales, and Bullshit. In P. Dawson, & M. Mäkelä (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Narrative Theory* (pp. 205–217). New York: Routledge.

Scherr, A. (2023). Laissez-Faire Storytelling: Fictionality, Post-Factuality, and the Filmic Voice in Joshua Oppenheimer’s Documentary *The Act of Killing* (2012). *Style*, 57(3), forthcoming.

Thon, J.-N. (2019). Post/Documentary: Referential Multimodality in ‘Animated Documentaries’ and ‘Documentary Games.’ *Poetics Today: International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication*, 40(2), 269–297.

Wolf, W. (1999). *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.