

Slayage 10 November 2003 [3.2]

David Lavery and Rhonda V. Wilcox, Co-Editors

Click on a contributor's name in order to learn more about him or her.



A PDF copy of this issue (Acrobat Reader required) of *Slayage* is available here.

A PDF copy of the entire volume can be accessed here.

■ [Naomi Alderman and Annette Seidel-Arpaci](#), *Imaginary Para-Sites of the Soul: Vampires and Representations of 'Blackness' and 'Jewishness' in the Buffy/Angelverse.* [PDF Version \(Acrobat Reader Required\)](#)

■ [Anthony Bradney](#) (University of Leicester), *"I Made a Promise to a Lady": Law and Love in *BtVS*.* [PDF Version \(Acrobat Reader Required\)](#)

■ [Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Scarlet L. Wynns](#) (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), *Perceived Values and Social Support in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*.* [PDF Version \(Acrobat Reader Required\)](#)

■ [Carolyn Cocca](#) (SUNY Old Westbury), *"First Word 'Jail,' Second Word 'Bait'": Adolescent Sexuality, Feminist Theories, and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*.* [PDF Version \(Acrobat Reader Required\)](#)

1 [1.1]	2 [1.2]	3 [1.3]	4 [1.4]
5 [2.1]	6 [2.2]	7 [2.3]	8 [2.4]
9 [3.1]	10 [3.2]	11-12 [3.3-4]	
13-14 [4.1-2]	15 [4.3]		Archives

Recommended. Here and in each issue of *Slayage* the editors will recommend writing on *BtVS* available on the Internet.

■ [Cathleen Kaveny](#), *What Women Want: "Buffy," The Pope, and the New Feminists* (in *Commonweal*)

■ [Virginia Postrel](#), *Why Buffy Kicks Ass* (in [Reasononline](#))

■ [Ian Shuttleworth](#), *Bite Me, Professor* (in *The Financial Times*)

■ [Cynthia Fuchs](#), *Captain Forehead* (review of *AtS* Season Five) in



Naomi Alderman and Annette Seidel-Arpaci Imaginary Para-Sites of the Soul: Vampires and Representations of 'Blackness' and 'Jewishness' in the *Buffy/* *Angel*verse

(1) The role of the "other" in both *Angel* and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* is complicated and sometimes vexed. Vampires, in the *Buffy/Angel*verse, are "other" – in that, among other things and at its most extreme, it is apparently utterly "right" to kill them – but *Angel*, and latterly *Spike*, blur this distinction. What is the place of the "vampire with a soul," who slips in and out of images which have, historically, represented a dead(ly) form of the human "other"? What is that "soul," and how far does it really represent simply "conformity"? These questions are also of moment when considering the shows' panoply of demon and monster "others." What are these imaginary para-sites of the soul, - with soulless creatures preying on the "souled" - and what do they have in common with imagined "parasites" in history and the present? How do the shows represent Jewishness, Blackness, and what has come to be represented as normative "sameness"?

(2) The historical image of the vampire has echoed racist stereotypes about "the Jew" and "the foreigner" at different times. As we will see, there are striking parallels between the treatment of the vampire or demon "outsider" in *Angel* and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, and these stereotypes of the human "outsider." And, moving into the shows' treatment of their own human "others," we will find that there remains a certain uneasiness in the face of the "foreign" or "non-white," of which the treatment of vampires and demons is merely a symptom. Despite the show's (for a primetime TV series) rather impressive grappling with all sorts of "difference" and "otherness," when we look at the characters of *Angel/Angelus*, *Charles Gunn* and *Willow Rosenberg*, we will find a lingering preference against the "non-white" or "non-Christian," which subtly undermines the shows' message of individual empowerment. In *Angel* and *Buffy*, "multiculturalism" often means homogeneity, and "acceptance" of the "outsider" is often dependent on the erasure of their "otherness."

Vampires then and now

(3) Margaret L. Carter suggests an "overriding difference" "between the archetypal nineteenth-century image of the literary vampire, [. . .], and the vampire as portrayed in much of the fiction of the past two decades." She notes: "Although the vampire in a Victorian novel might exercise a magnetic attraction or even inspire sympathy, the implied author of such a novel always took it for granted that vampirism as such was evil. [. . .] In novels published in the United States since 1970, on the other hand, the vampire often appears as an attractive figure precisely *because* he or she is a vampire." Carter concludes therefore that "[t] his shift in fictional characterization reflects a change in cultural attitudes toward the outsider, the

alien other."

(4) It is hardly possible, though, to analyse the image of "the alien other" by making clear-cut distinctions between attraction and repulsion: a dominant culture will invariably represent and refer to its constructed "other" in ambivalent ways, simultaneously exoticising, idealising and degrading. It is interesting to note that Carter's analysis here leaves a time-gap; vampire literature appears to leap directly from the 19th century to the 1970s. Clearly, this time-gap coincides with a crucial period in the history of the European construction of otherness. 19th century images overlapped with, and were an integral part of, racism and antisemitism in its most murderous form in Europe up to 1945. Even today, racialised representations of Jews and "foreigners" or refugees sometimes evoke more or less open associations to vampirism.

(5) The literary and folk image of the nineteenth century vampire in Britain was, as H. L. Malchow, has shown, strongly connected to the racialised construction of "the Jew." This construction was directed, at that time, particularly against Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe. Jews in Europe were portrayed as "the other within" who nonetheless retained influence on the perception of the "other out there," "the cannibal," and vice versa. These "others" were centrally connected through allegedly consuming blood. Like the image of the vampire at that time, Malchow writes, "the Jew" can take a variety of forms. He can be both eternal threat and eternal victim, Judas and the Wandering Jew Ahasuerus, capitalist and sweated proletarian, masculine roué and feminized homosexual, white and black."

(6) There is no evidence that the producers of *Buffy* and *Angel* are aware of the connections between vampire myth and antisemitism. For instance, in the official *Monster Book*, the chapter "Vampires in Folklore and Popular Culture" makes no such link. And certainly these links have been more potent in European literature than in the American teen culture from which the *Buffy/Angelverse* springs. Nonetheless, cultural production – even while drawing on the liberating potential of vampires – often mirrors, or even reinforces centuries-old stereotypes brought, like the vampire myth itself, from the "old world" to the "new".

(7) Regine Rosenthal's analysis of the image of "the Wandering Jew" in fiction and its transfer from Europe to the US is illuminating. She notes that, "by the nineteenth century, the figure of the Wandering Jew is not only widely addressed in European poetry and fiction but has become an integral part of popular culture and literature in America." Rosenthal discusses examples of fiction drawing on the imagination of a "Wandering Jew," amongst them Eugène Sue's French novel *The Wandering Jew*, which was a bestseller in the US.

Vampires with souls

(8) What, then, do we make of *Angel*/*Angelus* emerging out of Hollywood at the turn of the 21st century? Having taken this brief journey through the racist use of vampire myth, what could be the role of this figure – the "vampire with a soul"?

(9) On examination, the "soul" of *Angel* is very similar to "knowledge," the curse of the "Wandering Jew," which is a figure invented by Christian/antisemitic myth. The "Wandering Jew" legend probably first emerged in around the year 600. In the story, a man in Jerusalem drove Jesus away from his doorstep when he wanted to rest while carrying the cross to Calvary. Christ cursed the man with the words "I go, but you will walk until I come again!"

(10) According to Hyam Maccoby, variations of the myth occur at different times. Wholly negative versions of the Wandering Jew legend, as Maccoby states, "lacked the positive hope of reconciliation. In those negative versions the sufferings of the Wandering Jew are seen merely as just punishment [. . .]. It was

this negative version that gave rise to the nineteenth-century anti-Semitic stereotype, taken up with enthusiasm by the Nazis, of the Jew as a "rootless cosmopolitan."

(11) However, there is a strong affinity in the coding of Angel, the "vampire with a soul," with the supposedly "positive" versions of the "Wandering Jew" legend. Maccoby writes that the cursed Jew Ahasuerus was "condemned to live until the Second Coming of Christ. He is always restless and cannot stay in one place for long. He longs for death, but cannot die; even if he throws himself into a river, the waters refuse to drown him. He has long ago repented of his sin, and become a convinced Christian."

(12) Angel's soul is first and foremost awareness and knowledge of his own 250-year history: his murders, his guilt, his curse and his need for suffering. And no one, in either series, longs more for death than Angel himself, as he desires to be human, and so longs for mortality. But as we know, he cannot die (and "die" must be read as "become human," as he can be "turned to dust"; an interesting issue, which we cannot address here in-depth), and for instance at the end of *Angel* Season 3, even "the waters refuse to drown him." For Angel – as for the "Wandering Jew" – there is at least hope in an old prophesy: he may become human again as reward for fighting "the good fight" for "the Powers That Be." Angel's "soul" as a "curse," his "knowledge" as his "curse," parallel the "Wandering Jew" of Christian imagining: possessing a soul has condemned Angel to wander, without being able to experience happiness, seeking redemption which is always just beyond his reach.

(13) Angelus is Angel's name when he appears *openly* in his evil form. These names clearly have religious significance, as well as demonstrating the ambivalence of the vampire, as "double-faced." The fact that vampires in *Angel* and *Buffy* can change their faces at will also links to images of "the Jew" and the "half-breed," who are allegedly able to "pass" and change their appearance accordingly.

(14) Angel is not the first vampire to be torn between "good" and "evil." Anne Rice's Louis, for example, faces a similar dilemma, and, like Angel, chooses to feed on non-human blood. Louis also kills other vampires, but, in a crucial distinction, Louis is motivated by revenge, whereas Angel has his "mission from the Powers." This mission is, with the help of his friends, to save souls and the world. This "angelisation" of Angelus has devastating implications for other (less assimilated, less civilised) vampires.

(15) Interesting for a reading of Angel/Angelus as a "positive" reincarnation of Ahasuerus is the romantic image: as Hyam Maccoby notes, Romantic writers (such as Sue), viewed the Wandering Jew "as one more example of the Romantic hero – a wandering hero, isolated from normal society." This reading is particularly striking when applied to Angel: "the Romantics might see the Wandering Jew as guilty of a real crime, but one that had heroic quality, since it introduced him to a new dimension of knowledge beyond the range of ordinary mankind."*

(16) There is a strong link to Christian imagination and mythology within *Angel*, with Christianity at the same time being viewed as "essentially Western" and "civilised." Hence a remorseful "vampire with a soul" serves "the Powers," which are represented for instance through "the Oracles" - signified as Greco-Roman, read "the cradle of Western civilisation." "The Powers," we assume, as they are "the good ones" are probably also associated with the Christian bibles and crosses that burn Angel's skin if he touches them. There is an even stronger development of that Christian line in *Angel* Season Three and in particular in the last episode: Angel is nailed into a coffin-like box by his own son Connor, which can be read as nailing to the cross of Jesus, and like Jesus, Angel is forgiving even at that very moment. Cordelia rises to the sky with a halo around her head, echoing Christian images of Virgin Mary. There is also a hell in *Angel*, to which the evil law firm Wolfram and Hart seems to have direct links, and an institution where sinners burn eternally, obviously part of the influence sphere of the benevolent "Powers That Be."

(17) At the end of *Buffy* Season Six, Spike becomes the second vampire to gain a soul. Joss Whedon, the

show's creator, has stated that he did not want Spike's experience to mirror Angel's. However, even a short way into Season Seven of *Buffy*, striking parallels began to emerge, which suggest the nature of the "soul" in the *Buffy/Angel*verse.

(18) The first of these parallels is the link between possessing a soul and loving Buffy, the blonde, WASP girl, who is both eternally desirable and utterly unattainable (for Angel because, by attaining her, he loses his soul, for Spike because, although she does sleep with him, Buffy repeatedly declares that she does not love him). There is certainly some similarity between this attractive-but-unreachable woman and the figure of the Virgin in Christianity. Buffy is the object of desire of both Angel and Spike – the person for whom they willingly accept the burden and pain of a "soul."

(19) And what is the content of the "soul"? We have already seen that, for Angel, the "soul" is knowledge, the "curse" of insight. But Spike's acquisition of a soul creates another important parallel. Both Angel and Spike, in acquiring a soul, become willing, and even eager, literally to embrace the cross.

(20) In "Angel" (1007), Angel and Buffy exchange a passionate kiss, which Buffy acknowledges was "painful." The viewer becomes aware that it was literally so for Angel, when we see that Buffy's crucifix has burned into his flesh. And in "Beneath You" (7002), Spike, newly "souled," drapes himself, semi-naked and Christlike, over a large cross in a church. The last image of the episode is of Spike's flesh slowly singeing, as he whispers "Can we rest now?," paralleling exactly the Wandering Jew's desire to achieve "rest" by the figurative embrace of Jesus Christ.

(21) While it is true that *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Angel* never acknowledge any religious significance to the cross, or, indeed, the soul, these images, taken with Angel's "redemptive mission" certainly lend weight to the idea that having a soul means becoming a Christian.

(22) Is the *Buffy/Angel*verse then a Christian world? This question is a complex one; to answer it fully is beyond the scope of this paper. Certain elements: the power of the cross, the subtle devaluing of non-Christian religion, the specific effects of the soul might suggest that it is. Other elements of the world's mythos would suggest that it is not, as would the active opposition of certain Christian groups to the shows and Joss Whedon's public assertions that he is an atheist. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the shows exist within a world which takes a great deal of inspiration from Christianity. After all, the cross is no more a necessary part of the vampire myth than a difficulty with running water: an element which the shows have discarded. In the light of this, it is interesting to consider why the cross has been retained in these "multicultural" shows. And, even if one accepts that Joss Whedon, as *auteur*, has total control over all elements of the shows' make-up, the fact of his atheism need not preclude the *Buffy/Angel*verse from having a religious foundation. It is the nature of culture to influence subtly even those who wish to reject it; atheists have no religion but for many, Christianity is the religion they don't have.

Havens of "tolerance"?

(23) A notion of "celebration of diversity" or "hybridity" is ever present in both *Angel* and *Buffy*. One example in *Angel* is the Karaoke bar "Caritas" owned by the mind-reading demon Lorne, also called "the Host," who came to LA from his "backward" dimension, Pylea, and who tells Angel that he loves Los Angeles, as "it is our place, 'cause nobody really belongs." The Host expresses here a positive - though questionable - notion of a "homeless" conscience in a supposedly post-national, post-everything world. "Caritas" is a sanctuary, rendered non-violent by a spell, where everyone is welcome. But The Host himself is made aware only too often that the dominant (human) society is not altogether hospitable. "Caritas" is, on one hand, a wonderful representation of a utopian place, in which different people come together in peace. On the other hand, the entire setting, the drinks and the songs, reflect a unifying "Western" culture. It looks like a bar. Demons from different dimensions sing 1970s pop. Multi-cultural society, it seems, is

celebrated by everyone behaving *alike*.

(24) Angel Investigations itself is often represented as a place of "tolerance" and understanding. Cordelia's oft-repeated slogan "We help the hopeless," seems a statement of equality and justice for all. The most striking instance of this is "Hero" (*AtS*, 1009) an episode which specifically examines, and condemns, images of racism in the form of Nazi-costumed demons obsessed with "racial purity" and wiping out the "unclean." Very clearly, these demons and their views are shown to be utterly wrong; Angel and his team move to combat them and save their innocent demon victims. It is interesting to note certain assumptions inherent in this episode, however. The "Nazis" must be defeated, of course. But the "Jews" in this situation, the demons, are incapable of doing it themselves, or even of assisting in the attempt. Frightened and cowed, they shuffle from one place to another on instructions, needing an outside agency to save them. The premise of *Angel* is, of course, that helping of the hopeless, but these drably-clad, downcast demons do seem peculiarly hopeless, particularly in contrast with more spirited "victims" – Jhiera in "She" (*AtS*, 1003)] for example, or Kate in "Lonely Hearts" (*AtS*, 1002). While Angel Investigations gives a message of "tolerance" by supporting all those in need, some seem to be more in need than others.

"Streetwise" and "authentic": Charles Gunn

(25) Many vampires, demons and monsters possess special bodily abilities, or "sensitivities" which humans don't have. Human characters on the show seem to rely much more on knowledge and abilities acquired by study or research.

(26) One of the few exceptions to that rule, and thus a representation of a human "other," is the character of Charles Gunn, who came from being a prominent member of a street gang to join Angel Investigations. Charles Gunn is, tellingly, addressed by his surname, equally tellingly, "Gunn." When Gunn is introduced, he seems, at times, to be viewed with suspicious fear and insecurity, in particular by Wesley and Cordelia. We witness the white imagination of "the black man" – what Judith Butler called "white paranoia" – in its daily normality, not stripped of its degrading power, but at least in "Judgment" (*AtS*, 2001) shown as "embarrassing" for Wesley and Cordelia, as they themselves seem to realise their internalised stereotypes.

(27) Charles is more than once said to be "very strong" and "dangerous," for instance by Holtz's vampire-fighters. They view Charles Gunn as a dangerous opponent, but think he might be vulnerable as they also consider him very "impulsive." In *Angel* Season Three Fred describes the role of each member of Angel Investigations to her parents, and here Gunn becomes "the muscle" of the team, a line which develops even further in Season 4: Charles himself bitterly acknowledges that he may not have to offer Fred the intellectuality with which Wesley is depicted, but rather indeed only "the muscle" Nevertheless – or therefore? – it is almost always Charles who has to give the anti-racist "speeches," hence remains a kind of "most authentic other," for instance in "Blind Date" (*AtS* 1021) at Wolfram & Hart:

"Did you just step on my foot? Is that my foot you just stepped on? Are you *assaulting* me, in this haven of justice? Somebody get me a lawyer, because my civil rights have seriously been violated. Oh, I get it. You all can cater to the demon. Cater to the dead man. But what about the *black man*?"

In "There's No Place Like Plrtz Glrb" (*AtS* 2022) Cordelia asks Charles to explain to the Groosalugg what freedom in Pylea might look like: 'It means saying people are free don't make 'em free. You got races that hate each other. You got some folks getting work they don't want, others losing the little they had. You're looking at social confusion, economic depression and probably some *riots*. Good luck!' Gunn is regularly expected to give these explanations, because no-one else could have any idea, let alone experience, of racism, injustice or political change. This is also very obvious in "The Thin Dead Line" (*AtS* 2014):

Charles: "I want you to roll the camcorder, wait for the cops to hassle us."

Anne: "How do you know they will?"

Charles: "Cos we'll be the ones 'walkin-while-black'."

(28) Charles Gunn figures as the streetwise "black macho guy" who acts before thinking, and images of "male strength" are inscribed onto his body. As he is African-American, the "danger" and "impulsiveness" are included in these inscriptions. In the show's version of progressive gender relations, the "shell" of the macho has to be cracked. This is a process which both *Angel* and *Buffy* tend to leave to women, but here it is, significantly, Fred the shy, fragile-seeming, "white" girl from Texas, who takes on the job. Her strengths are precisely the ones Charles allegedly lacks. While he is constructed as "authentic," someone whose knowledge and values come from a life on the street, not from books, she is the science and computer specialist of the team.

(29) Charles is only able to develop when he leaves his street fighting gang more and more behind him, as they have started to fight and kill demons only "for the fun of it." This image is typical of the portrayal of the black street gang whose violence is figured, speaking with Butler, "as 'senseless' or 'barbaric,' thereby mirroring 'the racist production of the visual field.'"

(30) *Angel* is set in Los Angeles, the LA of racist police brutality against Rodney King and the subsequent ascription of police violence onto King himself – he was seen to be "dangerous." Commentators writing about *Angel* have pointed out that the regular references to police brutality result from these experiences. It is therefore telling that not only Charles Gunn, but also his "gang," is represented in this way. Judith Butler writes about the ascription of "aggression" and "danger" by the jury's verdict in the later trial onto Rodney King himself, that it was "the phantasmatic production of 'intention'," that struck her most, an "intention inscribed in and read off Rodney King's frozen body on the street, his intention to do harm, to endanger. [. . .] According to this racist episteme, he is hit in exchange for the blows he never delivered, but which he is, by virtue of his blackness, always about to deliver." Boyd Tonkin notes that the "school and street gangs of above-ground LA became a trigger for national panic only when their Black and Latino variants grew conspicuously larger and tougher than the rest."

(31) In general, *Buffy* refuses to encode its infernal crews with a clear racial identity, a sign of its writers' self-aware approach to the real-world reverberations of caricature in genre art. But neither *Buffy* nor *Angel* escape the less outspoken "racial" encodings; the shows regularly characterise the "other" by the use of "cultural" difference, which is often just another euphemism for "racial."

(32) In this respect the relationship between *Angel* and Gunn is interesting. One wonders, for instance, if the appearance of Gunn in the series does not function to "whiten" the vampire with a soul. Cordelia repeatedly referred to *Angel* as "dark, handsome guy," and the first major "whitening" happens when Charles tells *Angel* "I don't need advice from some middle-class white dude," whom he suspects of "psycho-talk." There seems to be the most mistrust over a long time in the relationship between the two, which may mirror the often present mistrust amongst or between "others" – Gunn being here the rough black streetfighter - unable, in general, to verbalise his feelings! - and *Angel* representing another "other," if we look at his character either in connection with the antisemitic image of Jews as vampires, or, as he said to be Irish, in connection with the racialised images against Irish people. The tension between *Angel* and Wesley in "Spin the Bottle" (*AtS* 4006) is interesting here (within which everyone at *Angel Investigations* revert to a younger self after a spell goes wrong): Liam/*Angel* – after having insulted Wesley as "English pig" – makes a connection between Irish and African American experience through histories of being racialized and colonised and sides with Gunn at that point.

Willow Rosenberg: "Kinda gay," kinda Jewish?

(33) Willow is, nominally, a Jewish character, but she refers to herself as Jewish on a handful of occasions, and then only fleetingly. For example, in "Bad Eggs" (2012) Willow and Xander discuss a class assignment in which they are each to look after an egg as though it were a baby.

Xander: You gotta take care of the egg. It's a baby. You gotta keep it safe and teach it Christian values.

Willow: (looks at Xander) My egg is Jewish.

Xander: Then teach it that Dreidel song.

(34) Several points are worthy of note in this brief exchange. In the first place, it is hardly a ringing statement of positive self-awareness for Willow, in the first mention of her Jewishness, to state only that her "egg" is Jewish, rather than declaring that *she* is. In the second, we note that Willow is only drawn into an admission of her ethnicity by mention of Christianity. As we shall see, Willow's Jewishness often seems to exist in the show as a form of "non-Christian-ness." Thirdly, Xander's response points up another theme in the portrayals of Judaism and Christianity: while Christianity is a powerful force, with an underlying substrate of "values" and mystical objects, Judaism has "that Dreidel song." We wouldn't expect any more from Xander, the wisecracker, but Willow's response to his comment is also striking: she smiles, and the conversation moves on. Willow, it seems, is already learning to downgrade her Jewishness in the search for acceptance.

(35) In *Assimilation and American Jews* Lloyd P Gartner notes that "public school . . . is a general surrogate for Protestant denominational education. . . . Jews have vigorously fought this idea, which has been a source of periodic tension, especially during Christmas time." As we shall see, Willow's experience is typical in two ways: the milieu in which she finds herself is dominated by those Protestant "Christian values," and this tends to become a source of tension at Christmas time. Perhaps Willow's most assertive statement of her Jewishness occurs in the Christmas episode, "Amends" (3010). The Scooby gang are discussing their holiday plans:

Xander: You doing anything special?

Buffy: (shaking her head) Tree. Nog. Roast beast. Just me and Mom and hopefully an excess of gifts. (to Willow) What are you doing for Christmas?

Willow: (work with me, people) Being Jewish. Remember, people? not everyone worshipping Santa here.

(36) While we may applaud Willow for her stance against the prevailing Christian atmosphere, we are led, again, to wonder why Judaism is presented here purely as a negation of Christianity. While Buffy has her tree, her nog, her roast beast, her mother and her gifts, Willow, apparently, has simply not-Christmas. In one Christian worldview, Judaism is, indeed, simply "Christianity with some parts missing" (most notably Jesus). It is, however, a little surprising to find that *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, a nominally "multicultural" show, seems to subscribe to this view.

(37) More importantly, within the mythos of the show, Willow's position is vitally eroded by *Amends'* Christian message. Angel is plagued by visions from his past: victims whom, as Angelus, he brutally murdered, return to torment him. Over the course of the episode, it is revealed that these images have been summoned by a being known as The First, whom Giles describes as: "Evil, Absolute evil, older than men, than demons." The First tries to persuade Angel to "take" Buffy in order to lose his soul again, which would put an end to the haunting images. Angel struggles with himself and decides rather to commit suicide – by staying in the open until sunrise. At the climax of the episode, as the sun is about to rise, and

Buffy is desperately trying to coax Angel indoors, into safety, the sky remains dark, it begins to snow – the Christmas cliché – and Angel is saved.

(38) Despite attempts by the Christian Right, the Buffy mythos resists attempts at characterization in purely religious terms; it would be a mistake to identify this First absolutely with the Devil. However, it is worth reminding ourselves of the comments of Erickson in his essay “Sometimes you need a story: American Christianity, Vampires and Buffy”: “As Nietzsche says . . . it was Christianity that established the Devil in the world. . . . Does a demonic presence require at least an implied Christian one?”

(39) Within the context of this episode, the battle being waged is clearly at least partly a Christian one: the snow of Christmas defeats the wiles of Evil. Willow’s plea for the equality of non-Christian faiths is utterly undermined. While she is allowed her single declaration of otherness, the message of the episode is of the might of Christmas and hence of Christianity.

(40) The most striking instance in which Willow’s Jewishness is pointed up, only to be immediately negated, is in “Passion” (2017). In this episode, Angel has become evil, and is threatening the Scooby gang. As a vampire, he cannot go where he is not invited, and so a ritual of “disinviting” must be performed. The following exchange takes place in Willow’s home:

Willow: I’m going to have a hard time explaining this to my dad.

Willow produces a wooden cross, holds it up toward camera, and starts nailing on it with a hammer. Buffy looks on as Willow nails the last of four wooden crosses to the frame around her French windows.

Buffy: You really think this’ll bother him?

Willow: Ira Rosenberg’s only daughter nailing crucifixes to her bedroom wall? I have to go to Xander’s house just to watch *A Charlie Brown Christmas* every year.

Buffy: I see your point.

Willow: (smiles) Although, it is worthwhile just to see Xander do the Snoopy dance.

Buffy and Willow are then shown concealing the crosses behind the curtains – presumably to prevent Willow’s father from seeing them.

(41) Several aspects of this scene are noteworthy. Firstly, if we are to take Willow’s account at face value, her father clearly holds an extreme viewpoint. To object to one’s children “marrying out” may be one thing; to object to their watching *A Charlie Brown Christmas* is quite another. Secondly, Ira Rosenberg’s Judaism takes the form of anti-Christianity, rather than of, as far as we can tell, any positive Jewish practice. This would be typical of the portrayal of Judaism within the show. Thirdly, Willow is assimilating, losing even the lukewarm, nominal form of anti-Christian Judaism practised by her father.

(42) One would be tempted to feel that this reading belabours the point a little, were it not that this conversation takes place as Willow is nailing up crosses inside her bedroom, and then concealing them. This behaviour is distinctly reminiscent of Marranos, Jews who were forced to convert to Catholicism, but continued Jewish observance in secret. In his *History of the Marranos*, Cecil Roth describes Jews who, on Friday night “placed the Sabbath light, which they so religiously kindled, inside a pitcher, safe from prying eyes.”

(43) Willow has, in fact, become a reverse-Marrano: she appears to be Jewish, but has taken on Christian practices, hiding her paraphernalia. After a fashion, as we have seen, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Angel* have similar traits: they appear to be “multicultural” programmes, with characters of various backgrounds,

but the *Buffyverse* is, in many ways, a distinctly Christian, "white" place.

(44) Willow's Jewish identity is, to say the least, ambivalent. More striking, however, is how very infrequently that identity is mentioned at all. Gartner highlights a phenomenon in which Jews identify themselves in ways that do not touch upon their Jewishness:

To many scientists who are Jews, their identity as scientists makes Jewish interests and connections seem petty and superfluous. There are many who think similarly in the fields of art, music, medicine, and scholarship.'

Willow's identity is centred around her friends (as a member of the Scooby gang), her skills (as a computer expert and a powerful witch) and her sexuality (as we have been told more than once, she is "kinda gay"). Willow appears, however, to be rather less, even, than "kinda Jewish."

(45) What are we to make of this? On one hand: not too much. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* is not overly concerned with parentage: we never meet Cordelia's parents, or Oz's. Even Buffy's father rarely appears. And religion is not often discussed. Buffy may wear crosses and carry holy water, but her attitude to faith is perhaps best characterised by this exchange with a Christian missionary in "The Freshman" (4001):

Missionary: Have you accepted Jesus Christ as your personal saviour?

Buffy: You know, I meant to and then I just got really busy.

(46) On the other hand, though, certain characters *are* presented as having strong backgrounds or ethnic identities. Giles' Englishness, for example, is unquestionable; he talks about experiences he has had in England, uses specifically English words, eats English food (he and Spike share a fondness for Weetabix) and in "Tabula Rasa" (6008) when everyone loses their memory, Spike and Giles clearly "remember" that they "are English." Considering this, one is forced to question why Willow's Jewishness is quite so slippery and ephemeral.

(47) Bearing these thoughts in mind, we can return to the link between vampires and antisemitic myth. It is noteworthy that the only Scooby gang member (including Buffy, Willow, Xander, Giles, Oz, Tara, Cordelia, Anya and Jenny Calendar) to appear in our world as a vampire is Willow. It is also interesting that, of all the characters we see transformed into vampires, Willow's vampire alter ego is perhaps the closest to the original – it is, in fact, through Vamp Willow that we have our first hint that "regular Willow" may be gay. Could it be that the links between Jews and vampires, between images of "goodness" and "power" and images of Christianity continue to be present even in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*?

(48) Both series place a moving emphasis on individual possibilities of moral choice and responsibility, as opposed to "destiny." For instance, Angel tells Lindsey "You shouldn't believe everything that is foretold!" Even where prophecies are fulfilled, the understanding they give of the world is only partial: at the end of Buffy Season One, the prophecy that Buffy will die is fulfilled. However, the prophecy failed to foretell that she would be resuscitated by Xander using CPR. The notion of "destiny" in the form of foretold prophecies often seems to be only evoked to tell us that they can be overcome. This is a powerful message of individual freedom, independent of either mystical portents or constructed "group destinies," a message which is ambivalently developed further in particular in *Angel's* Season Four. And both *Buffy* and *Angel* take pride in their portrayal of "multiculturalism" - the Scooby gang, Angel Investigations and Caritas are portrayed as havens for the "misfit" or "outsider," where "tolerance" is king.

(49) Despite these elements, troubling undercurrents still exist. We hear of "breeds" and "half-breeds."

Literal "non-humans" come from "other dimensions," or from South America, "ancient Egypt," from Pakistan, the Middle East and so on: in other words, "from outside." And vampires do regularly come from England or Ireland, hence "from within." Various "tribes" of demons and monsters have "ancient" and weird cultural practices. "Doing good," for ex-demons, such as Angel, Anya and, latterly, Spike, is inextricably linked to becoming part of a new, acceptable group, and giving up old associations. The weird "tribes" and individuals in *Buffy* and *Angel* have to either drop their cultural habits and history to be assimilated, or remain "other" and face the ultimate sanction of the stake.

(50) And the "correct choices" promoted by both shows seem to be strongly in favour of "the West" or the "Christian West." Crucifixes and holy water save from danger, thereby erasing the histories of the non-Christian "other" in the "West" and relegating many demons, monsters and other "others" into the Western history archives about exotic, oriental, Eastern places, hence into "other dimensions." This leaves the non-WASP characters in *Angel* and *Buffy*, standing on ever-eroding ground, unable to access parts of their own cultural background for fear of being dubbed "evil," but unable fully to assimilate into the homogenous, white Christian world represented by Buffy. It seems that even shows that are produced with an ambition to deconstruct racialised "identities," may still reproduce them, unable to escape the internalised forces of the dominant culture.

Editors' note: As Mary Alice Money notes of *Angel* in *Fighting the Forces*, "romantics will be pleased that the Byronic hero is not dead. Just undead" (103).

Bibliography

- Auerbach, Nina. *Our Vampires, Our Selves*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1995.
- Butler, Judith. "Endangered/Endangering: Schematic Racism and White Paranoia." *Reading Rodney King, Reading Urban Uprising*. Ed. R. Gooding-Williams. New York and London: Routledge, 1993.
- Carter, Margaret L. "The Vampire as Alien in Contemporary Fiction." Gordon and Hollinger.
- Edwards, Lynne. "Slaying in Black and White." Wilcox and Lavery 85-97.
- Erickson, Gregory. "'Sometimes You Need a Story': American Christianity, Vampires, and *Buffy*." Wilcox and Lavery 108-19.
- Golden, Christopher, Stephen R. Bissette, and Thomas E. Sniegowski. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer: The Monster Book*. New York: Pocket Books/Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Gordon, Joan and Virginia Hollinger, eds. *Blood Read: The Vampire as Metaphor in Contemporary Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Helford, Elyce Rae, "My Emotions Give Me Power." Wilcox and Lavery 18-34.
- Kushner, Tony and Katherine Knox. *Refugees in an Age of Genocide: Global, National, and Local Perspectives During the Twentieth Century*. London: Frank Cass, 1999.
- Maccoby, Hyam. *The Sacred Executioner: Human Sacrifice and the Legacy of Guilt*. Thames and Hudson, 1982.
- Malchow, H. L. *Gothic Images of Race in Nineteenth-Century Britain* Stanford: Stanford U P, 1996.
- Rosenthal, Regine. "Inventing the Other: Ambivalent Constructions of the Wandering Jew/ess in Nineteenth Century American Literature." *Representations of Jews through the Ages*. Studies in Jewish Civilization no. 8. Ed. L. J. Greenspoon and B. F. Le Beau. Omaha, NB: Creighton U P, 1996.
- Roth, Cecil. *History of the Marranos*. New York: Hermon Press, 1974.
- Tonkin, Boyd. "Entropy as demon: Buffy in Southern California." *Reading the Vampire Slayer: An Unofficial Critical Companion to Buffy and Angel*. Ed. R. Kaveney. London and New York: I. B. Tauris and Co., 2001.
- Topping, Keith. *Hollywood Vampire*. London: Virgin, 2001.
- Vago, Bela, ed. *Jewish Assimilation in Modern Times*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1981.

Wilcox, Rhonda V. and David Lavery, eds. *Fighting the Forces: What's at Stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.



Anthony Bradney

"I Made a Promise to a Lady": Law and Love in *BtVS*

[1] As with the world at large, two things grip the central characters in *BtVS*, their search for love and their search for a law to direct their lives. From the moment that Buffy outlines her dating technique to Willow in the first programme, "Welcome to the Hellmouth" (1001) to the moment in the final episode when Buffy suggests redefining the rule that says that there should only be one Slayer ("Chosen," 7022), references to love and law run through the series. The critical literature on the series has regularly examined the role of love in *BtVS* (see, for example, DeKelb-Rittenhouse (2002) and Spah [2002]). Law has received less attention, the focus usually being on the larger concept of authority (see, for example, Buinicki and Enns (2001) and McClelland [2001]). The interaction between law and love in the series has so far escaped analysis. This article will seek to demonstrate that this is a loss because this interaction is another important example "of the shows' underlying implied discussion of feminism, religion, politics and so on" (Kaveney 3). Moreover, the discussion of this topic takes a different direction to that that is to be found elsewhere. In *BtVS*, in contrast to standard literary treatments such as *King Lear*, where the pursuit of law and the pursuit of love are seen as being inimical (Kahn), the two quests for love and law are increasingly linked as *BtVS* develops, so that in the end the pursuit of love and the pursuit of law become conjoined.

[2] Insofar as the critical literature has analyzed law in *BtVS* it has usually been seen as an absent figure. Buinicki and Enns, for example, argue that Buffy and Angel

operate as executioners who have been authorized by a sovereign power and have the right to decide who should die and who should live without need of lawyers, judges, or juries.

The evidence for this position seems to be clear. Law, seen in traditional terms as state law, is usually an irrelevance in *BtVS* and is never accepted by Buffy or the Scooby Gang on its own terms. Early in the first season Giles says that the police would not believe in the existence of vampires whilst Buffy observes of them, "[t]hey couldn't handle it [the supernatural] if they did come" ("The Harvest," 1002) (Early, 2002). As Clark and Millar have noted, the police are normally portrayed as being incompetent and easily thwarted, even when they act within their own jurisdiction. Thus, for example, in "Ted" (2011) the police fail to notice that the "man" that Buffy has "murdered" is in fact a robot whilst in "Becoming," Part 2 (2022) Buffy is easily able to escape capture by the police, a feat she later repeats with Faith in "Bad Girls" (3014).

[3] Despite their lack of faith in the police Buffy and the others do not completely ignore state law and accept that "the human world has its own rules" ("Villains," 6020). What they do not acknowledge is state law's hegemony. State laws demand total and unquestioning obedience. Ignorantia juris non excusat (ignorance of the law is no defence). Thus, normally, "the legal subject is to all intents and purposes a 'servant' of the law" (Goodrich 111). Buffy and the Scooby Gang, however, decide when state law's writ will run and when they must intervene. From the moment in the second episode of the first season, "The

Harvest" (1002), when Willow hacks into the city plans for Sunnydale, it is clear that they do not accept that they are the "servants" of state law and that this law will not always bind them. The pursuit of vampires and demons regularly involves them in a range of activity, from trespass through theft to assault, which is contrary to state law.

[4] In the main the critical literature on *BtVS* to date has emphasized the anarchistic elements of the programme. *BtVS*, it has been said, is about "young heroes . . . struggling against all the various authorities to which they are subject" (Clark and Miller). Thus Colonel Macnamara's description of Buffy and the Scooby Gang as anarchists ("New Moon Rising," 4019)* and thus Topping's category, "Authority Sucks," "a category for would-be anarchists everywhere" (Topping 3), in his episode guide *Slayer*. Yet, although it is true to say that state law is the law that Buffy and the Scooby Gang have least regard for, it would not be true to say that, because they are aware of its limitations, they have no regard for it at all. The acknowledgement that "the human world has its own rules" is real and not merely rhetorical. It leads Buffy to be willing to turn herself into the police when she thinks she has killed Katrina in "Dead Things" (6013) and it means that her initial reaction to Warren's murder of Tara is to let human law take its course ("Villains"). Nonetheless, at the same time, state law is regularly broken by Buffy and the Scooby Gang; their relationship with state law is thus a complex one.

[5] Theft provides a good example of the nuances of Buffy and the Scooby Gang's attitude towards state law. When Giles steals documents from the Watchers' Council library this occasions no adverse comment ("Bring on the Night," 7010). Similarly the theft of the Box of Gavrock from the Mayor of Sunnydale incurs no criticism, nor does Xander's theft of a police car ("Choices," 3019; "Two to Go," 6021). Buffy's attempt to steal a knife from a shop is, however, more problematic ("Bad Girls," 3014) whilst Dawn's kleptomania causes both Buffy and the Scooby Gang deep angst ("Older and Far Away," 6014) and Anya feels the necessity to excuse her acts of burglary by telling herself that they were the result of a spell ("Him," 7006). Theft is sometimes acceptable and even meritorious; sometimes it is not. The distinction drawn is between those thefts that are necessary because of the need to defeat vampires and demons and those that are not. Dawn's behaviour stems from personal traumas and has to be expiated by either returning the goods or paying for them ("Entropy," 6018), Anya's burglary spree is excusable, if at all, because of the magical effects of RJ's letterman jacket and Buffy's attempted theft, whilst ostensibly necessary because she needs weapons to fight the demon Balthazar, in fact results from her brief flirtation with Faith's nihilism and is thus inexcusable. The other thefts are, however, essential in furtherance of the battle with supernatural evil. The need to comply with state law has to be balanced against a greater good. When Willow takes things she needs for a spell from the Magic Box without paying for them Anya describes her actions as burglary whilst Willow seeks to justify them by claiming that her spell will help Buffy ("Triangle," 5011). Story lines that focus on the fight with vampires and demons serve to emphasise instances when it is necessary to break state law. Nonetheless, on a day-to-day basis, compliance with the dictates of state law is still an important matter in *BtVS*.

[6] A definition of law that encompasses more than state law will give an even deeper appreciation of the role of law in *BtVS*. Pluralistic legal systems exist in Sunnydale. Alongside state law there is the law that Buffy and the Scooby Gang enforce for much of the first three seasons; this is the law of the Watchers' Council, a law that has "existed longer than civilization" ("Graduation Day," Part 1, 3021). It would be a misconception to see this as merely being *like* law. Theorists such as Durkheim once conceived of law as being something that was and could only be an emanation of the state (Durkheim 68). However, more recently legal theorists have argued that different legal systems commonly exist alongside one another in contemporary societies. In addition to state law there is non-state law.

[N]on-state legal orders range from the interstices within, or areas beyond the reach of, state legal systems where custom-based norms and institutions continue to exert social control, to the rule-making and enforcing power of institutions like corporations and universities, to the normative order that exists within small social groups, from unions, to sports leagues, community associations, business associations, clubs and even the family. (Tamanaha 116)

Seen thus the law of the Watchers' Council is as much law as is the law of the state of California. Buffy and the Scooby Gang are therefore not, as McClelland has argued, dispensing vigilante justice. The nature of "justice" of this type is exemplified by the "irrational mass hysteria" (Breton and McMaster) that directs the actions of "Mothers Opposed to the Occult" in "Gingerbread" (3011). Instead, in applying the law of the Watchers' Council, they are doing something very different; they are working with a structure that is seeking to impose an established normative legal order.

[7] While she is working for the Watchers' Council, Buffy finds herself in a traditional, hierarchical, patriarchal, command structure. Although the existence of the Watchers' Council is not revealed until the third season ("Faith, Hope and Trick," 3003) the role of the Watcher as her "commander," the term that Wesley is later to use to describe the position in "Consequences" (3015), is clear from early on when Buffy obeys Giles' instruction to break a much-wanted date in order to join him in a hunt for the Anointed One ("Never Kill a Boy on the First Date," 1005). Giles is, at least in part and at least in principle, her line-manager. Although the programme departs from some of the conventional forms of the police series genre, not least in the emotional relationship that Buffy develops with her "commander" from early in the first season ("Never Kill a Boy on the First Date"), such that he both "instructs and nurtures" her (Owen 26), at this point in *BtVS* Buffy is a police officer and *BtVS* is a police series (Bradney). It is pertinent that in "What's My Line," Part 1 (2009) both her vocational aptitude test and Giles suggest Buffy consider law enforcement as a job once she leaves school. Law at this point is thus very much central to the lives of Buffy and the Scooby Gang.

[8] Buffy and the Scooby Gang demonstrate a similar ambivalence to the law of the Watchers' Council to that that they display towards state law. It exists and they acknowledge it but increasingly they rebel against it. Central to the law of the Council is the proposition "kill vampires and demons." Buffy finds herself unable wholly to obey this rule from very early on when she realizes that Angel, even though he is a vampire, will never hurt her ("Angel," 1007). As the series develops so the number of vampires and demons who cannot be killed grows either because Buffy has a short-term, tactical alliance with them, as in the case of Spike in "Becoming," Part 2 (2002), or because they are not evil, as in the case of Whistler in the same programme. The proposition "kill vampires and demons," the law of the Watchers' Council, and the proposition "kill some vampires and demons," the actual behaviour of Buffy and the Scooby Gang, are fundamentally different in quality, with the latter including an element of choice and discretion.

[9] From his first meeting with her, Giles notes Buffy's recalcitrant attitude towards authority ("Bad Girls," 3014). However Buffy's reluctance to obey orders, whether from her Watcher or from her school principal, is different in kind from her desire not to obey a law that tells her to kill Angel. The former represents a degree of rebelliousness to be expected in a programme about a "transgressive woman warrior" (Early 4). The latter, however, represents a rejection of the spirit of the law of the Watchers' Council. Just as Buffy and the Scooby Gang dispute state law's hegemony so they dispute the hegemony of the law of the Watchers' Council, claiming a right to choose when to obey the law and when to ignore it. Buffy refuses to be just "the instrument by which we [the Council] fight" ("Checkpoint," 5012). Thus when Wesley, acting on behalf of the Council, forbids the trade of the Box of Gavrock in exchange for Willow the trade nevertheless takes place ("Choices," 3019). When Buffy resigns from the Watchers' Council because it will not help save Angel's life, Wesley accurately describes her action as "mutiny" ("Graduation Day, Part 1," 3021). Yet in fact the hold the Council's law has had over her has always been much more precarious than might seem to have been the case; her resignation reveals but does not herald her mutiny against the laws of the Council.

[10] Buffy's rejection of the Watchers Council should not be misinterpreted. Just as Buffy is willing to obey much of state law so she frequently continues to follow the imperatives of the law of the Watchers' Council, even after her resignation from the Council. As Giles observes, "essentially their agenda is the same as ours: they want to save the world and kill demons" ("Checkpoint," 5012). But Buffy's willingness to obey the law of the Watchers' Council is limited by her awareness that it, like state law, rests on an inaccurate account of the world. State law ignores the existence of vampires and demons; the law of the Watchers'

Council depends on the proposition that all vampires and demons are evil. Buffy, and indeed the Scooby Gang, know this to be too simplistic. In a demon bar Buffy tells the Slayers in Training, "[r]emember. . . [t] here's not a being in here that wouldn't gladly rip your throat out" and then turns to greet her friend Clem, a loose-skinned demon, with a hug ("Potential," 7012); hers is an ethically complex world that resists "the sententious morality of black-and-white distinctions" (Pender 35). For this reason she also finds that she cannot accept the rules of the Initiative, which uncompromisingly divides the world into humans and Hostile Sub Terrestrials, believes the latter to be "just animals. . . plain and simple" and holds to the thesis "[d]emons bad, people good" ("Doomed," 4011; "New Moon Rising," 4019). Breaking Oz and Riley out of an Initiative prison underlines Buffy's rejection of their ethos ("New Moon Rising"). Buffy's later willingness to work once again with the Watchers' Council is on her own terms, terms that preclude any suggestion of obedience to the will of the Council or, in the final analysis, its law ("Checkpoint"). Similarly her later contact with the Initiative involves her co-operating with them to a limited extent but not being co-opted by them ("Out of My Mind," 5004; "As You Were," 6015; "The Killer in Me," 7013). Moreover, the insistence on the priority of individual discretion over blind obedience to the legal rule "kill vampires and demons" is not just limited to Buffy. When Buffy interprets the rule as applying to Anya, after Anya has once more become a vengeance demon, both Xander and Willow disagree, refuse to help Buffy and succeed in ensuring that the law is not applied ("Selfless," 7005).

[11] As Green and Yuen suggest, *BtVS* "can be viewed as a morality play". One theme in this play concerns the need to have the "existentialist determination to fight [evil]" (Wall and Zyred 59). It is this fight that Willow explicitly enlists herself in in "Choices" when she elects to go to university in Sunnydale (3019). But if evil is to be fought, how does one decide what is evil and how the fight is to be carried on? Law normally offers an answer to both these questions. For Buffy, however, the laws available to her exemplify what South has termed the technological society, "dominated by the rational deliberation about means, while forgetful of the need to consider ends" (South 94). Such a society is one that "dehumanizes humans" (South 98) and this process of dehumanization is something that Buffy resists even when, superficially, the fight against evil suggests that she should act otherwise. Significantly, when Wesley refuses to trade the Box of Gavrock for Willow's life, seeking to apply the law "kill vampires and demons," Buffy asks him "[a]re you made of human parts?" and, when Giles counsels the need to consider the matter rationally, Buffy says to him "[w]hy are you taking his [Wesley's] side" ("Choices," 3019). Rational deliberation about means is inappropriate, Buffy believes, when it is the end that should be considered. Giles and she are to have a similar conversation when the question of whether or not Dawn should be killed in order to save the world is raised ("The Gift," 5022). Moreover, Buffy not only rejects the notion that either state laws or the laws of the Watchers' Council can be the final determinant of what she does; she also rejects another obvious answer to the question, how does one determine the right course of action, when, in "Consequences" (3015), she refuses to accept Faith's suggestion that Slayers do not need the law because they are the law, that personal discretion is all there is. "There are limits to what we can do. There should be" Buffy tells Xander and Dawn in "Villains" (6020). Buffy both does not want and wants a law that is external to her. Yet, if Slayers are not the law, and if both state law and the law of the Watchers' Council offer only rules with provisional value, needing to be tested before they are obeyed, how are Buffy and the Scooby Gang to decide how to behave? What finally is the law?

[12] "Pangs" (4008) focuses on the difficulty of deciding what the law is. Faced with Hus, a vengeance spirit for the Chumash indians, the indigenous inhabitants of the Sunnydale area who were wiped out by colonial settlers, Buffy's first inclination is to kill him. Willow, however, contends that they ought to help Hus in his quest to redress the wrongs of the past; Hus, in her view, is yet another exception to the general rule "kill vampires and demons." The matter is debated throughout the episode with Buffy emphasising the legal nature of the decision that they are making by telling Xander that the choice of whether or not to kill Hus is "the question before the court." Although in the end Buffy kills Hus in self-defence this provides no general resolution to the question that the programme has explicitly raised, when should vampires and demons be killed?

[13] At the culmination of the second season Buffy, as she is later to say, "knew what was right" ("The Gift," 5022) and killed Angel in deference to the Council's law, obedient to her mission to save the world. Increasingly, however, her ambivalence about the Council's law leaves her unclear as to what the correct

course of action is. Her rejection of the Initiative's authoritarian ethos has taught her the negative lesson that "[y]ou can't beat evil by doing evil" ("First Date," 7014) but not any positive lesson about what it is that she should do. In "This Year's Girl" (4015) Buffy tells Riley that he cannot blindly obey the Initiative and must instead himself choose how he should fight vampires and demons, but in reality she is herself uncertain about her path. In seeking an answer to this question the centre of attention thus shifts over the seventh season of *BtVS* from the application of the law to an inquiry into what the law is. Even when not central to the plot of individual episodes this question of what she should do, what the law is, remains an important subtext. The answer to the question lies in love.

[14] Love, like law, is given an extended definition in *BtVS*. Unsurprisingly love in part is eros. It would be strange if a programme about adolescents and post-adolescents did not concern itself with eros. Buffy's relationship with Angel, Xander's entanglement with Anya, and Willow and Tara's love for each other are all about eros (although they are also about something other than eros). But love is more than just eros in *BtVS*, more than just "boyfriend love" ("Intervention," 5018); love is also agape.

[15] Friendship is a recurrent topic in *BtVS*. The need to make friends is seen as an intrinsic part of the human condition. Those who are friendless literally become invisible ("Out of Sight, Out of Mind," 1011; "Storyteller," 7016). Cassie Newton's certain knowledge of her own imminent demise causes her to lose interest in her classes, knowing that she has no future to be educated for, but it does not stop her starting a new friendship with Dawn ("Help," 7004). Friendship is its own end. In part, in *BtVS*, friendship is the ordinary attempt to find people to, as Cordelia puts it, "hang with" and "be accepted" ("Welcome to the Hellmouth," 1001). However, sometimes it can be more than that. The importance of Buffy and the Scooby Gang's reiteration of the fact that they love each other, particularly at moments of crisis, should not be underestimated. It is meant literally. It is at this point that friendship becomes agape. Agape, as well as eros, creates bonds, obligations and rights. What those obligations and rights are and how can they be acknowledged are perennial questions in *BtVS*.

[16] Spah's use of the concept of courtly love in analysing Spike's pursuit of Buffy provides a starting point for an account of the relationship between law and love in *BtVS*. As Spah notes

the key point to Courtly Love literature lies in revealing the power of love to ennoble the lover, to elevate him to a higher moral plane. (Spah 12)

Spike's passion for Buffy causes a change in his behaviour, at first because he hopes this will mean that Buffy will then reciprocate his feelings but later simply because his love requires that change. In "Triangle" (5011) Spike calls Buffy's attention to the fact that he is helping people who have been hurt by the troll, Olaf, rather than feeding on them, hoping to enhance his position in her eyes. However, when, seven episodes later, he refuses to tell Glory that Dawn is the key that she seeks, even though Glory tortures him, he does so because to do otherwise would "destroy her [Buffy]. I couldn't live her being in that much pain" ("Intervention," 5018). On this occasion he does not tell Buffy what he has done. It is love that commands his behaviour, not hope of any reward. In the final episode of season five his love for Buffy will mean that he joins the battle with Glory and tries to safeguard Dawn even though he expects to die in the fight ("The Gift," 5022). When Doc asks Spike why he, a vampire without soul, is protecting Dawn, Spike's answer is simply "I made a promise to a lady." Love has become part of the law determining how Spike should behave.

[17] Spike is not unique in letting love become part of their law. At the end of season five, Buffy saves the world by her suicide; an action prompted by her love for her sister, who must die if she does not ("The Gift," 5022). Season six culminates in a novel problem for Buffy and the Scooby Gang when Willow tries to bring about an apocalypse. The law "kill vampires and demons" is of no assistance in this situation. Buffy and the others struggle to prevent the end of the world whilst also saving Willow. Xander's final solution to the dilemma is repeatedly to remind Willow of his love for her ("Grave," 6022). Love determines how he behaves, forbidding any attempt to kill Willow. Similarly, though Buffy and Giles seek to stop Willow ending

the world, neither tries to kill her. Love limits their actions, preventing their behaving in the way they have done when faced with other attempts to create an apocalypse. In smaller ways as well love guides Buffy and the Scooby Gang. Love, whether agape or eros, leads Buffy to have the Initiative remove the chip from Spike's brain ("The Killer in Me," 7013). Love, both agape and eros, leads Willow and Xander to protect Anya from Buffy ("Selfless," 7005).

[18] The manner and degree to which love comes to act as law in *BtVS* should not be exaggerated. It is not that love becomes the only law. Jowett has drawn attention to the fact that love is not portrayed as an unconditional good in *BtVS*, citing Tara's condemnation of Quaismodo for loving selfishly and without a moral compass (Jowett 69). When Spike is first introduced into the series he undoubtedly loves Drusilla but that does not make his actions, even when they are in pursuance of that love, praiseworthy ("School Hard," 2003). His desire to kill Buffy is, in part, for example, prompted by the fact that doing so will please Drusilla. Love, to be good, must have the right context. It is therefore significant that the imperatives of state law and the dictum "kill vampires and demons" remain important through all seven seasons, providing an environment in which love can operate. Nevertheless, increasingly love supplies the test for these lesser forms of law at moments of crisis. When Buffy and the Scooby Gang find themselves in the position where they have to, in Bauman's words,

place our bet on that conscience which, however wan, alone can instill the responsibility for disobeying the command to do evil. . . (Bauman 250)

they place their bet on love. Love supplements and at times supplants the rigidities of state law and the law of the Watchers' Council. Buffy, in an alternative universe where she has never moved to Sunnydale and met either Giles or the Scooby Gang, is governed only by her obedience to the law of the Watchers' Council ("The Wish," 3009). Killing vampires is the only thing she thinks she is good at and, when she does meet Giles, she has no interest in his search for ways to make the world better. Buffy fights and dies and does not even notice Angel as he sacrifices his life for her. As Money writes

[h]ow does a human become less human? By disregarding love, by becoming inflexible, by operating as a machine without choice, knowledge, or wisdom. (Money 102)

Without love, Buffy is just a killer whose inclinations are legitimated by the Council's law. Outside of the alternative universe of "The Wish," Buffy's desire is to be both a Slayer and to be human. Thus Buffy refuses to let the Shadow Men infuse her with the energy of a demon in order to give her the power to fight the First Evil because to do so would make her "less human" ("Get it Done," 7015). Nor is this limited to Buffy. Riley too must learn to temper the rules of the Initiative with love, finding out that it is wrong to be "in a totally black and white space, people versus monsters. . . it ain't like that. . ." ("New Moon Rising," 4019), so that he can become human. Eventually his love for Buffy, eros that has become agape, will lead him to let Buffy decide whether or not Spike, Hostile 17 in Riley's eyes, should have his chip removed ("The Killer in Me," 7013).

[19] The connection made between [law and love in *BtVS* stands in marked contrast to some previous literary treatments of the subject. In *King Lear* Lear, like Buffy and the Scooby Gang, seeks to align law and love. His trial of his daughters at the beginning of the play enables each of them to plead the extent of their love for him and there then follows his judgment on that pleading. But, unlike *BtVS*, *King Lear* shows law and love as being separate and in conflict. Lear can be a king and rule by law or he can be a father and love and be loved but he cannot do both at the same time. His attempt to do so means that he fails both in law and in love.

[W]e realize in the course of the play that a fully realized love moves in dimensions of sympathy, forgiveness, and mercy that negate the distinctions of friend and enemy, as well as judge and wrongdoer, that are necessary to the legal order. Love stands outside of all political order. No program of law can bring love into the state. (Kahn 173)

Cordelia's love for Lear is of a different category of things to law. It cannot be expressed in the language of a trial. "What shall Cordelia speak? Love, and be silent" (Act I, Scene I, 62-63). What Goneril and Regan can plead as love is not in fact love. The attempt to bring love into law by dividing his property and lands between Goneril and Regan, whilst at the same time remaining King, leads to Lear's losing both his daughters and his crown.

Love and law cannot be brought into a unitary, harmonious order. Love will always move beyond law; law will always threaten love. (Kahn 169)

From the perspective of *King Lear* it is not surprising that, whilst Buffy and the Scooby Gang increasingly seek to marry law and love in *BtVS*, failures in love are a recurring theme of the series. *King Lear* teaches that Buffy and the Scooby Gang are in search of a chimera. However, powerful though *King Lear* is, there are alternative accounts of the interaction of law and love to the bleak message that is to be found in *Lear*; accounts that sit more easily with the series and add to its analysis.

[20] In *Living Lawfully: Love in Law and Law in Love* Ba•kowski writes of "the articulation of autonomy with heteronomy, freedom with regulation, love with law" (Ba•kowski 11) and goes on to say

[m]y argument is that this is not to be seen as the never ending oscillation from one to the other, of it being our fate to be pushed from one side to the other with no principle of choice. Instead, I want to argue that the articulations here should be seen, not as contradictories, but rather as tensions. They are worked out in a middle area which is risky and uncertain but one which we must inhabit if we are to live as the beings that are we, at the same time autonomous and heteronomous.

Rather than arguing that law and love are separate, irreconcilable spheres he suggests that "law and love both need each other, are both locked together" (Ba•kowski 103). What causes love may be unknown and even unknowable, but its consequences are susceptible to rational enquiry. "[A] mysterious explosion of love carries within it the bond of rules and rationality" (Ba•kowski 101). To love is to incur predictable obligations in behaviour; love brings law. Thus Buffy and the Scooby Gang use love not as an excuse to avoid thinking about their conduct, a justification for acting on impulse, but as an argument in a debate about their actions. For Xander, for example, their love for Anya means that Buffy and he should think of some way of dealing with Anya's work as a vengeance demon other than enforcing the law "kill demons" ("Selfless, 7005). Love limits and guides law. Buffy's refusal to engage in this debate, her insistence that on this occasion she knows how the law should be applied because she is the law, is a failure in both love and law; a failure in both because, in the end, Willow shows that there is a way to protect Anya's potential victims without killing Anya so that law and love can be combined. What Buffy and the Scooby Gang increasingly strive for in *BtVS* is a consciousness of both love and law and an attempt at Ba•kowski's "risky and uncertain" settlement of the tensions between the two. When Giles asks Buffy why she had the chip removed from Spike's brain, thus effectively loosing a vampire on the world and breaching the law "kill vampires and demons," Buffy initially gives her reason as being "instinct" ("First Date," 7014). However, a few moments later, she reasons that, since Spike has gained a soul, he has to be given a chance to be good of his own free will without being electronically muzzled by the chip. Love, whether agape or eros, has resulted in the articulation of an argument for limiting the application of the law. Later it will be Spike who, as Buffy's "champion," freely sacrifices his life to save the world, love having become part of his law, thus vindicating Buffy's judgment ("Chosen, 7022).

[21] Like Ba•kowski, Goodrich, in his consideration of love and law, challenges the notion that they are necessarily to be seen as being separate and hostile. In his analysis of the work of the medieval courts of love, courts established to determine disputes between lovers and putative lovers, he argues that, in these courts, "[a]n ethical dispute or differentiation of right and wrong was decided as a question of love" (Goodrich 30). Although Goodrich's account of these courts treats them as being on a par with and

operating alongside traditional state courts the normative standards of the courts of love were very different from those to be found in state courts (Goodrich 69). "[T]he courts of love place law face to face with an ethics of emotion and a phenomenology of relationship" (Goodrich 31). The courts of love, on this argument, did not simply apply traditional state legal categories and concepts to relationships of love but, instead, created new ways of legal thinking "adequate to the nature and metaphysics of such disputes" (Goodrich 52). It is this that makes them germane both to consideration of *BtVS* and *King Lear*.

[22] The problem in aligning law and love in *King Lear* arises not out of the innate hostility between the two but because of the type of law that is to be found in *Lear*. *Lear* emphasises the power of law. Law in *Lear* is coercion, the King's rule. When Lear loses the power to coerce, law is still about power, the power of whoever succeeds in usurping the power of the King. The trial of Gloucester in the third act of the play, which results in his having his eyes gouged out, has the same form as Lear's trial of his daughters at the beginning of the play. Judgments are imposed and the law pays no regard to the person who is the victim of the judgment. The violence and coercive nature of the law is merely more obvious in Gloucester's trial. The link between law and coercion and, indeed, between law and violence has been a common theme of Western jurisprudence. Hart, for example, identifies one of the key questions for jurisprudence as being how "law and legal obligation differ from, and *how they are related to*, orders backed by threats" (Hart 7, emphasis added). Cotterrell argues that "law is experienced as a matter of power" (Cotterrell 17), power being "an experience of having the ability to coerce" (Cotterrell 4). Finally, Cover suggests

[L]egal interpretation takes place in a field of pain and death. . . A judge articulates her understanding of a text, and as a result, somebody loses his freedom, his property, his children, even his life. (Cover 1601)

If law is coercive, still more if law is violent, then *King Lear* is correct and law and love are inimical. Love, whether agape or eros, is always about affection and intimacy; law, on the other hand, on this account, is aggressive and detached. Thus the vital question raised is: law may often be coercive, but must this always be so? Goodrich answers this question in the negative. Increasingly, as the series develops, so does Buffy.

[23] In the hands of Buffy, law appears to be uncompromisingly and inevitably violent: how else could it be for someone who is the Slayer? Vampires and demons die in virtually every episode of *BtVS*, executed in accordance with the law. Buffy herself underscores the apparent violence of her role when, in "Earshot" (3018), having persuaded Jonathan not to commit suicide, she remarks "it's nice to be able to help someone in a non-slaying capacity." However, in analysing the nature of law in *BtVS*, it is necessary to distinguish the actuality of the series, the description of what happens in each episode, from its reality. Vampire and demon deaths are the actuality of the series. In reality however, in all seven seasons of *BtVS*, vampires and demons do not, in the usual sense of the word, die.

[24] When vampires die in *BtVS*, "they desiccate into powder, leaving no messy residue or unpleasant trace of death" (Owen 27). The reality of death is rarely present in *BtVS*. When it is found, as in the death of Joyce, Buffy's mother, in "The Body" (5016), its usual absence makes its presence all that much stronger. Joyce's death is physically discreet, there are no marks of death on her body and the moment of death takes place off screen and, indeed, outside the time frame of the episode, but, nevertheless, psychically it is traumatic for those who live on, its effects being central to two episodes ("The Body"; "Forever," 5017) and a permanent, periodic referent for *BtVS* thereafter. Joyce is known both to those in *BtVS* and to the viewers. She figures in the first episode of *BtVS* and makes regular appearances in the series until her death. Whilst she is a minor character, her changing relationships with Buffy, Giles and the others are important arcs in the development of the series (Bowers, Williams). By contrast the vampires that Buffy disposes of are largely ephemeral, often lacking even a name, their death rarely being referred to in episodes after their demise. Their removal leaves no "messy residue" in either physical or emotional terms. The death of demons has greater physical presence in *BtVS*, since demons do not dust in death, but, like vampires, their characters and again their names are usually unknown to the viewer. The violence of the application of the law by Buffy consequently has a cartoon quality to it. And, as Willow says in "Goodbye Iowa" (4014), cartoons are not documentaries; they are not about things that happen. The style of "The

Body" separates it from other episodes of *BtVS*. "Music plays an important role at a number of different levels in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*" (Halfyard 1). "The Body" is unusual in *BtVS* in that it is an episode that has no music other than that that accompanies the opening and closing credits. Instead the emphasis in the episode is on silence and heightened real-life sounds. Equally, in a series that "without its jokes. . . would be little more than your average teen melodrama action horror hybrid" (Wilson 79), this is an episode without jokes and with precious little humour. "The Body" documents the consequences and impact of death in minute detail. Thus it serves to emphasise that death is one thing, a matter of reality, whilst the slaying of vampires and demons, though a constant feature of *BtVS*, is merely something that is part of the actuality of the episodes. Some of the other deaths on *BtVS* are likewise distanced from the slaying of vampires and demons. When Faith accidentally kills that the Mayor's secretary, Allan, "this man bleeds. The way the series deals with this event, in multiple episodes, highlights the seriousness and consequences of killing" (Wilcox 13). Similar points can be made about the death of Tara and its consequences at the end of season six.

[25] What in reality is violent in *BtVS* is not the slaying of vampires and demons, this being a parody of violence, but that which leads up to the slaying. It is the fact that the law is applied without thought of its effect on either those whom it applies to or those who apply it that means that, as Cover writes, "[l]egal interpretation takes place in a field of pain and death." It is this that changes as *BtVS* develops and it is this that changes the nature of the law and eventually allows for there to be an interplay between law and love.

[26] Notwithstanding her doubts about the law's application to Angel, Buffy's general attitude towards the law of the Watchers' Council in the early seasons of *BtVS* is almost mechanical in its approach. She finds vampires and demons and she slays them; she applies the law. Slaying at the beginning of *BtVS* is a reflex. Buffy knows little about those whom she slays; she usually does not even know their name. In many ways her behaviour in relation to the law is very similar to Faith's later attitude towards the orders of Mayor Filkins. When the Mayor orders Faith to kill Professor Lester she does so. When the professor asks why the Mayor wants him dead Faith says, "[n]ever thought to ask" ("Graduation Day," Part 1, 3021). Similarly at the beginning of *BtVS*, Buffy and indeed the Scooby Gang have few questions about why she is slaying; it is merely that vampires are, in Xander's words "not good" ("The Harvest," 1002), her concern, in the main, being about how the slaying can most effectively be done. How does "law and legal obligation differ from, and how. . . [are they] related to, orders backed by threats" asks Hart? At this point in the development of *BtVS* the relationship between Buffy's enforcement of law and Faith's administration of orders backed by threats is very close; the coercion that Cotterrell and Cover see as being central to the law is integral to both, and law is therefore a long way from love. However, as *BtVS* develops, so this changes.

[27] Wilcox has noted the importance of the First Slayer's insistence in "Restless" (4022) that Buffy slay alone and the equal importance of Buffy's resolve that she is not alone and her demand of the First Slayer, "give me back my friends" (Wilcox 9). Notwithstanding the legend that "[o]ne girl, in all the world" is the "Chosen One," Buffy is rarely alone in her pursuit of vampires and demons. Her friendship with Xander and Willow is established in the first episode of the series ("Welcome to the Hellmouth," 1001) and it is settled that they will participate in her slaying activities in the second episode ("The Harvest," 1002). What changes through the various seasons of *BtVS* is the way in which they interact with her.

[28] In the beginning Willow's description of herself and Xander as "the Slayerettes" in "Witch" (1003) underlines their subordinate role. Although they help Buffy, with their assistance at times being vital, at first, as Giles says, "when it comes to Battle, Buffy must be prepared to fight alone" ("School Hard," 2003). By the end of the third season though, they are themselves directly involved in slaying activities; "the Slayerettes" have become "the Scooby Gang" ("Graduation Day," Part 2, 3022). More importantly they have begun to discuss with each other why they are doing what they are doing. Thus, for example, Willow's decision to continue her education in Sunnydale when she leaves high school is because she wishes to emulate Buffy's attempts to "fight evil"; something she tells Buffy that Buffy does out of choice, not because it is her destiny ("Choices," 3019). The conjoining of Buffy, Giles, Xander and Willow into "We" in order to defeat Adam at the end of the fourth season ("Primeval," 4021), the discussion of whether or not to kill Hus in "Pangs" (4008) and Buffy's description of herself and the Scooby Gang as a "unit" in

""Checkpoint" (5012) are all examples of the increasing involvement of the Scooby Gang in Buffy's work.

[29] Notwithstanding Petrova's observation, citing the episode "Selfless" (7005), that "[t]he Slayer is the one who must maintain the difference between good and evil" and be willing to "cut all ties with family and friends," it is in fact Buffy's ability to connect with other people that gives her work its particular legal character. In the intimate space of friendship and love, law is decided. The emotionless, remote judge giving judgment from on high, the paradigm of law enforcement in traditional Western jurisprudence, is the antithesis of the application of law in the later seasons of *BtVS*. Like the courts of love described by Goodrich, Buffy and the Scooby Gang's encounter with law increasingly places them "face to face with an ethics of emotion and a phenomenology of relationship" where the contestability of law and the fact that it is decided not by any one individual but contested within the framework of a network of loving relationships changes the nature of the law that is being applied. *BtVS* has ceased to be about the summary execution of law and instead

a subtle pacifist-oriented sensibility has been woven into the ongoing Buffy narrative; in a fairly consistent manner, the Chosen One and her surrogate family, Giles and the Slayerettes, evince a tendency to eschew killing when possible and to solve problems non-violently. (Early, 2003, 61)

Buffy's slaying, when it does occur, is a "restrained, reluctant violence" (Tjardes 76) legitimated, at least in part, by the fact that those whom she loves approve of her actions.

[30] The culmination of the seventh season provides the final and most complete example of the conjoining of law and love in *BtVS*. For much of the series, in anticipation of the deaths that will be occasioned by the final battle with the First Evil and uncomfortable with what she has come to perceive as the superiority that her Slayer-status gives her, Buffy distances herself from those around her. Increasingly she claims a peremptory right to decide what happens ("Selfless," 7005; "Lies My parents Told Me," 7017; "Dirty Girls," 7018) and, in doing so, alienates those around her so that in the end she is expelled from her house by her sister and her friends ("Empty Spaces," 7019). She finds herself unable to successfully fight the First Evil's agent, Caleb, and she is separated from those whom she loves. Like Lear she has lost both love and law. However, unlike Lear, in Buffy's case this results from her failure to love, not from her attempt to have both. It is Spike's declaration of unconditional love, motivated not by any hope that it will be reciprocated but by a need to speak the truth,

[w]hen I say I love you, it's not because I want you, or because I can't have you. It has nothing to do with me. I love what you are, what you do, how you try. I've seen your kindness and your strength. I've seen the best and the worst of you and I understand with perfect clarity exactly what you are. You are a hell of a woman ("Touched," 7020)

that gives Buffy renewed strength and direction ("End of Days," 7021). As a result she is able to reconnect with her friends and formulate a plan to defeat the First Evil ("Chosen," 7022). Vital to her renewed acknowledgement of the importance of her love for her friends and theirs for her is the fact that she seeks their approval of her plan rather than seeking to impose it on them. She knows once again, as she has known in earlier seasons, that it is not for her to make law on her own and that if law is to be applied (and, in this instance, if the law about there being only one Slayer is to be changed) this will require the joint and willing efforts of everyone. Law and love have to be conjoined.

[31] In *Angel*, Angel demands that "w[e] live as though the world was what it should be, to show it what it can be" ("Deep Down," 4001). The application of law in *BtVS*, in the later seasons, conforms with this imperative. This particular morality play rejects a centuries-old dominant tradition of law as patriarchy and power in favour of a notion of law as intimacy and discretion. In doing so the series adds yet another level of complexity to its text. Levine and Schneider may be right in arguing that subtexts in the series such as this are not central to the success of *BtVS* in terms of audience figures, but this is not to the point. The

early success of Dickens may have lain in his ability to write soap operas and Shakespeare's original achievement may owe much to the sex, comedy and violence that pervade his plays, but the enduring attention that these works excite comes from the web of ideas and language that critics find within the texts: so it is with *BtVS*, and, as this article has sought to demonstrate, the interaction of law and love law plays a part in this.

Editors' Note: See Pasley 262-63.

Works Cited

Ba•kowski, Zenon. *Living Lawfully: Love in Law and Law in Love*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Postmodern Ethics* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993.

Bowers, Cynthia. "Generation Lapse: The Problematic Parenting of Joyce Summers and Rupert Giles." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage2/bowers.htm>.

Bradney, Anthony. "Choosing Laws, Choosing Families: Images of Law, Love and Authority in 'Buffy the Vampire Slayer'." *Web Journal of Current Legal Issues* 1 (2003)

Breton, Rob and Lindsey McMaster. "Dissing the MOO: Initiatives, Alternatives, and Rationality." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage1/bretonmcmaster.htm>.

Buinicki, Martin and Anthony Enns. "Buffy the Vampire Disciplinarian: Institutional Excess, Spiritual Technologies, and the New Economy of Power." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage4/buinickienns.htm>.

Clark, Daniel A., and P Andrew Miller. "Buffy, the Scooby Gang, and the Monstrous Authority: *BtVS* and the Subversion of Authority." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage3/clarkmiller.html>.

Cotterrell, Roger. *Law's Community: Legal Theory in Sociological Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Cover, Robert. "Violence and the Word." *Yale Law Journal* 95 (1986) 1601-1629.

DeKelb-Rittenhouse, Diane. "Sex and the Single Vampire: The Evolution of the Vampire Lothario and Its Representation in *Buffy*." *Wilcox and Lavery* 143-152.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labor*. New York: The Free Press, 1933.

Early, Frances. "The Female Just Warrior Reimagined: From Boudicca to Buffy." *Early and Kenndy* 55-65.

_____. "Staking Her Claim: Buffy the Vampire Slayer as Transgressive Woman Warrior." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2002): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage6/Early.htm>.

Early, Frances and Kathleen Kennedy, eds. *Athena's Daughters: Television's New Women Warriors*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003.

Goodrich, Peter. *Law in the Courts of Love: Literature and Other Minor Jurisprudences*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Greene, Richard and Wayne Yuen. "Why We Can't Spike Spike?: Moral Themes in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage2/greeneandyuen.htm>.

Halfyard, Janet. "Love, Death, Curses and Reverses (in F minor): Music, Gender, and Identity in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Angel*." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage4/halfyard.htm>.

Hart, Herbert. *The Concept of Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Jowett, Lorna. "Masculinity, Monstrosity and Behaviour Modification in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*." *Foundation* 84 (2002) 59-72.

Kahn, Paul. *Law and Love: The Trials of King Lear*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Kaveney, Roz. "'She Saved the World. A Lot': An Introduction to the Themes and Structures of *Buffy* and *Angel*." Kaveney 1-36.

Kaveney, Roz, ed. *Reading the Vampire Slayer*. London and New York: Tauris Parke Paperbacks, 2001.

Levine, Michael and Steven Schneider. "Feeling for Buffy: The Girl Next Door." South 294-308.

McClelland, Bruce. "By Whose Authority? The Magical Tradition, Violence, and the Legitimation of the Vampire Slayer." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2001): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage1/bmcclelland.htm>.

Money, Mary Alice. "The Undemonization of Supporting Characters in *Buffy*." Wilcox and Lavery. 98-107.

Owen, A Susan. "Vampires, Postmodernity and Feminism." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* no 2 (1997): 24-31.

Pasley, Jeffrey L. "Old Familiar Vampires: The Politics of the Buffyverse." South 254-67.

Pender, Patricia. "'I'm Buffy and You're. . . History' *The Postmodern politics of Buffy*." Wilcox and Lavery. 35-44.

Petrova, Erma. "'You cannot run from you darkness.' / 'Who says I'm running?': Buffy and the Ownership of Evil." *Refractory: a Journal of Entertainment Media* 2 (2003). <http://www.refractory.unimelb.edu.au/refractory/journalissues/index.htm>

South, James. "'All Torment, Trouble, Wonder and Amazement Inhabits Here': The Vicissitudes of Technology in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*." *Journal of American and Comparative Culture* 24 (2001) 93-102.

_____, ed. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer and Philosophy*. Chicago: Open Court, 2003.

Spah, Victoria. "Ain't Love Grand: Spike and Courtly Love." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* (2002): <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage5/spah.htm>.

Tamanaha, Brian. *A General Jurisprudence of Law and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Tjardes, Sue. "'If You're Not Enjoying It, You're Doing Something Wrong': Textual and Viewer constructions of Faith, the Vampire Slayer." *Early and Kenndy*. 66-77.

Topping, Keith. *Slayer: An Expanded and Updated Unofficial and Unauthorised Guide to Buffy the Vampire Slayer* London: Virgin Books, 2nd ed, 2001.

Wall, Brian and Michael Zyred. "Vampire dialectics: Knowledge, institutions and power." *Kaveney* 53-77.

Wilcox, Rhonda. "'Who Died and Made Her the Boss?': *Patterns of Mortality in Buffy*." *Wilcox and Lavery* 3-17.

Wilcox, Rhonda V. and David Lavery, eds. *Fighting the Forces: What's at Stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.

Williams, J.P. "Choosing Your Own Mother: *Mother-Daughter Conflicts Buffy*." *Wilcox and Lavery* 61-72.

Wilson, Steve. "'Laugh, spawn of Hell, laugh'." *Kaveney* 78-97.



Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Scarlet L. Wynns Perceived Values and Social Support in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*

[1]"In a broad sense all television educates. Values, attitudes, and behaviors are part of almost all programming, from cartoons to prime time adventure shows" (Schultze, 1986, p. 25). Indeed, the mass media, such as television, are the primary way people form their attitudes and values (Smythe, 1981). The goal of this study was to assess the values and types of social support people perceive as important in *BtVS*—the values and types of social support viewers are *learning* are important.

[2]*BtVS* teaches, although it is unclear exactly what. Articles in journals, such as *Slayage* and *Studies in Contemporary Culture*, and books, such as *Fighting the Forces: What's at Stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (Wilcox & Lavery, 2002), hint at what it is viewers of *BtVS* may learn about the contemporary world by watching the Buffyverse, but they fail to assess viewer perceptions directly to determine what it is viewers actually "see." For example, from critics' perspectives, *BtVS* teaches viewers that "female normalcy within that system [patriarchy] equals helplessness" (Barbaccia, 2001, paragraph 4), and that dreams dramatize internal attitudes, symbolically represent important interrelationships and, oracle-like, hint at events to come (Keller, 2002, p. 177). Viewers also learn about the dynamic of race relations (Edwards, 2002), and the problems manifest in mother-daughter and older woman-younger woman relationships (Williams, 2002). *BtVS* may even be useful in therapeutic sessions with adolescents in therapy (Schlozman, 2000). But, do viewers "see" what critics "see"?

[3]Values are an important place to start when assessing viewer perceptions because values serve as criteria for judgment, preference, and choice, and determine decisions in behavior—they underlay our knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes (Rokeach, 1968, 1979). Rokeach argued that 36 independent values sufficiently represent all human values, including 18 instrumental "to be" values and 18 terminal "to have" values. The 18 instrumental values are: (1) ambitious (hardworking, aspiring); (2) broadminded (open-minded); (3) capable (competent, effective); (4) cheerful (lighthearted, joyful); (5) clean (neat, tidy); (6) courageous (standing up for your beliefs); (7) forgiving (willing to pardon others); (8) helpful (working for the welfare of others); (9) honest (sincere, truthful); (10) imaginative (daring, creative); (11) independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient); (12) intellectual (intelligent, reflective); (13) logical (consistent, rational); (14) loving (affectionate, tender); (15) obedient (dutiful, respectful); (16) polite (courteous, well-mannered); (17) responsible (dependable, reliable); and (18) self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined). The 18 terminal values are: (1) a comfortable life (a prosperous life); (2) an exciting life (a stimulating, active life); (3) a sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution); (4) a world at peace (free of war and conflict); (5) a world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts); (6) equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all); (7) family security (taking care of loved ones); (8) freedom (independence, free choice); (9) happiness (contentedness); (10) inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict); (11) mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy); (12) national security (protection from the attack); (13) pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life); (14) salvation (saved, eternal life); (15) self-respect (self-esteem); (16) social recognition (respect, admiration); (17) true friendship (close companionship); and (18) wisdom (a mature understanding of life).

[4]Values imply behaviors related to social support. Social support, verbal and nonverbal encouragement people give and receive in different areas in their lives (Albrecht & Adleman, 1987), is a coping resource, a social fund from which people may draw in stressful situations (Thoits, 1995). Richman, Rosenfeld, and Hardy (1993) identified eight types of social support: (1) listening support (listening without giving advice or being judgmental); (2) emotional support (providing comfort and caring and being on the support recipient's side); (3) emotional challenge support (challenging the support recipient to evaluate her or his attitudes, values, and feelings); (4) task appreciation support (acknowledging the recipient's efforts and expressing appreciation for the work he or she does); (5) task challenge support (challenging the recipient's way of thinking about a task or an activity in order to stretch, motivate, and lead the person to greater creativity, excitement, and involvement); (6) reality confirmation support (seeing things the same way the recipient does and so confirming her or his perspective of the world); (7) tangible assistance support (providing the recipient with financial assistance, products, and or gifts); and (8) personal assistance support (providing services or help, such as running an errand or driving her or him somewhere).

[5]Rokeach's values seem intrinsic to behaviors that constitute social support. For example, attaching importance to being "loving" probably means providing others with emotional support and listening support; attaching importance to being "ambitious," "honest," and "responsible," and having "wisdom" may underlay and motivate the provision of task challenge support. Since values and social support seem to go hand-in-hand, perceptions of values and social support could be utilized to provide a more complete picture of viewers' understanding of *BtVS*.

[6]The research question that guided this study was: *What values and forms of social support are perceived by viewers as important in BtVS?*

METHOD

[7]Twenty-two respondents completed a survey (some via the Web and others in a paper-and-pencil format) that consisted of several demographic questions (e.g., age and sex) and two instruments. Responses were automatically coded from the completed Web surveys into text files that were then translated into a data file. Completed paper-and-pencil surveys were added to the data file by hand. Analysis of the data was accomplished using SPSS 11.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

[8]Respondents completed the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1979) to indicate the extent to which they perceived each of the 18 instrumental "to be" values and 18 terminal "to have" values to be important in *BtVS*. Each instrumental value was introduced with the phrase, *It is important to be* (ambitious, broadminded, etc.), and each terminal value was introduced with the phrase, *It is important to have* (a comfortable life, an exciting life, etc.), and respondents completed a scale that ranged from 1 (never or almost never represented on the show) to 5 (always or almost always represented on the show). The Rokeach Value Survey is one of the most utilized values instrument in the literature (Hague, 1993), and it is the most utilized quantitative instrument for studying values in television. A great deal of evidence is available supporting the validity and reliability of the instrument (see, e.g., Cohen, Chase, & Stahly, 1989; Horley, 2000; Rosenfeld & Schrag, 1985; Shen & Yuan, 1999).

[9]Respondents also completed the Social Support Survey (Richman et al., 1993) to indicate the extent to which they perceived characters in *BtVS* providing each of eight types of social support. The five-point scale ranged from "Never or almost never provide this type of support" to "Always or almost always provide this type of support." As with the Rokeach instrument, there is a great deal of evidence supporting the validity and reliability of the Social Support Survey (see, e.g., Hurst, Hale, Smith, & Collins, 2000; Richman et al., 1993; Rosenfeld & Richman, 1999).

[10]Overall, the sample had a high proportion of women (73%) and Euro-Americans (64%). The

respondents ranged in age from 18 to 64, with most in their middle 30s. Their level of education completed ranged from grade school to graduate school, with most being either high school or four-year college graduates.

Analysis

[11]To answer the research question, the terminal values, instrumental values, and social support means were rank-ordered from highest to lowest. For each ranking, means were compared using paired-sample *t* tests ($p < .01$), and the group of highest and lowest means were identified (i.e., means not different from each other while being different from the others).

RESULTS

[12]Table 1 presents the three rankings and means for each value and form of social support. For each ranking, the group of highest and the group of lowest means are boldfaced; values that almost were included in the group of highest instrumental values are italicized.

Table 1

Rank Ordered Means (Ascending) for BtVS (n = 22)

Rank	Instrumental Values	Mean	Terminal Values	Mean	Social Support Types	Mean
1	courageous	4.59	true friendship	4.41	emotional support	4.14
2	helpful	4.59	self-respect	4.23	task challenge	3.91
3	broadminded	4.32	exciting life	4.23	emotional challenge	3.91
4	<i>responsible</i>	4.27	wisdom	4.18	personal assistance	3.86
5	capable	4.23	sense of accomplishment	4.18	reality confirmation	3.73
6	ambitious	4.00	family security	4.14	listening support	3.14
7	forgiving	4.00	world at peace	3.68	task appreciation	3.05
8	independent	3.91	freedom	3.62	tangible assistance	2.41

9	imaginative	3.91	mature love	3.55
10	self-controlled	3.77	equality	3.45
11	loving	3.50	salvation	3.27
12	honest	3.50	national security	3.18
13	intelligent	3.41	inner harmony	3.18
14	logical	3.18	happiness	3.05
15	obedient	3.18	social recognition	3.00
16	cheerful	3.05	pleasure	2.95
17	polite	2.36	a world of beauty	2.68
18	clean	2.36	a comfortable life	2.36

[13]The analyses of the instrumental values revealed that the most important ones—not different from each other and different from the others—perceived by viewers were: It is important to be courageous, helpful, and broadminded (and possibly responsible and capable), and *not* important to be clean or polite. The analyses of the terminal values perceived by viewers were: It is important to have true friendship, self-respect, an exciting life, wisdom, a sense of accomplishment, and family security, and *not* important to have a comfortable life and a world of beauty (of nature and the arts).

[14]The analyses also revealed that five of the eight types of social support are provided by characters in *BtVS*: emotional support, task challenge support, emotional challenge support, personal assistance support, and reality confirmation. A type of support rarely provided is tangible assistance support.

DISCUSSION

[15]In 1981, Schrag, Hudson, and Bernabo published a study in which they used fantasy theme analysis to describe television shows that were part of a "humane collectivity," shows in which there was a "portrayal of humane sympathetic awareness of group and person as the basis for a meaningful and rewarding existence" (p. 3). In these shows, a viewer could see the importance of significant others, of alliance in action, and of characters gaining membership into personhood. Their humane collectivity and the values within it were later empirically validated using the Rokeach Value Survey (Rosenfeld & Schrag, 1985; Schrag & Rosenfeld, 1987). Shows in the collectivity—*M*A*S*H*, *Taxi*, *Barney Miller*, and *Lou Grant*—were perceived by viewers as depicting the values of honesty, helpfulness, cheerfulness, and true friendship, and not the values of cleanliness, social recognition, or a comfortable life.

[16]Although discussions of the humane collectivity centered around values, the bases of the humane collectivity were the behaviors portrayed on the shows, and those behaviors were arguably forms of social support. For example, alliance in action requires "members of the group to help one another attain mutual goals and fulfill mutual obligations" (Rosenfeld & Schrag, 1985), and could be indicative of task appreciation support, task challenge support, and tangible assistance support. Ultimately, all of the values important to the humane collectivity (honesty, helpfulness, cheerfulness, and true friendship) may be the same values that underlay the different forms of social support.

[17]*BtVS* has several values in common with shows in the humane collectivity: it is important to be helpful and to have true friendship, and it is unimportant to be clean or to have a comfortable life. But *BtVS* is not a throw-back to shows in the late 1970s; it is richer and, in many ways, offers viewers a world view—a Buffyverse—in which values and behaviors important for the new millennium are demonstrated. To survive now, 25 years after the humane collectivity, in addition to the importance of being helpful it also is important to be courageous and broadminded, and in addition to having true friendship it also is important to have self-respect, an exciting life, wisdom, a sense of accomplishment, and family security (whether in an immediate family, like the Summers family, or in a constructed family, such as the Scooby gang). The new millennium requires more. And the behaviors that make obvious this array of values are behaviors that provide others with the means of coping with the challenges of living everyday life or "saving the world—a lot."

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, T. L., & Adelman, M. B. (1987). *Communicating social support*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Barbaccia, H. G. (2001). Buffy in the "terrible house." *Slayage: The On-Line International Journal of Buffy Studies*, 4. Retrieved March 26, 2003, from <http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage4/barbaccia.htm>
- Cohen, G., Chase, C. J., & Stahly, G. B. (1989). Feminist and fundamentalist attitudes toward pornography control. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13, 97-112.
- Edwards, L. (2002). Slaying in black and white: Kendra as tragic mulatta in *Buff*y. In R. V. Wilcox & D. Lavery (Eds.), *Fighting the forces: What's at stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (pp. 85-97). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hague, W. J. (1993). Toward a systemic explanation of valuing. *Counseling & Values*, 38, 29-43.
- Horley, J. (2000). Value assessment and everyday activities. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 12, 67-73.
- Hurst, R., Hale, B., Smith, D., & Collins, D. (2000). Exercise dependence, social physique anxiety, and social support in experienced and inexperienced bodybuilders and weightlifters. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 34, 431-435.
- Keller, D. (2002). Spirit guides and shadow selves: From the dream life of Buffy (and Faith). In R. V. Wilcox & D. Lavery (Eds.), *Fighting the forces: What's at stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (pp. 165-177). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Richman, J. M., Rosenfeld, L. B., & Hardy, C. J. (1993). The Social Support Survey: A validation study of a clinical measure of the social support process. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 3, 288-311.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1979). *Understanding human values*. New York: Free Press.

Rosenfeld, L. B., & Richman, J. M. (1999). Supportive communication and school outcomes, part II: Academically "at-risk" low income high school students. *Communication Education, 48*, 294-307.

Rosenfeld, L. B., & Schrag, R. L. (1985). Empirical validation for the critical construct "humane collectivity." *Central States Speech Journal, 36*, 193-200.

Schlozman, S. C. (2000). Vampires and those who slay them: Using the television program *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* in adolescent therapy and psychodynamic education. *Academic Psychiatry, 24*(1), 49-54.

Schrag, R. L., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (1987). Assessing the soap opera frame: Audience perceptions of value structures in soap operas and prime-time serial dramas. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 52*, 362-376.

Schrag, R. L., Hudson, R. A., & Bernabo, L. M. (1981). Television's new humane collectivity. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45*, 1-12.

Schultze, Q. (1986). *Television: Manna from Hollywood? The best & worst on television -- & how to tell the difference*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Books.

Shen, J., & Yuan, B. (1999). Moral values of only and sibling children in mainland China. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied, 133*, 115-125.

Smythe, D. (1981). *Dependency road communications, capitalism, consciousness, and Canada*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Thoits, P. A. (1995). Stress, coping, and social support processes: Where are we? What next? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 35*, 53-79.

Wilcox, R. V., & Lavery, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Fighting the forces: What's at stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Williams, J. P. (2002). Choosing your own mother: Mother-daughter conflicts in *Buffy*. In R. V. Wilcox & D. Lavery (Eds.), *Fighting the forces: What's at stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (pp. 61-72). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.



Carolyn Cocca

"First Word 'Jail,' Second Word 'Bait'": Adolescent Sexuality, Feminist Theories, and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*

Wesley: "And you teach psychology?"

Cordelia: "I take psychology."

Giles: "She's a student."

Cordelia, "It's about time we got some fresh blood around here."

Wesley: "Fresh . . . yes . . . [Cordelia exits.] My, she's cheeky, isn't she?"

Faith: "Uh, first word 'jail,' second word 'bait.'"

"Consequences" (3015)

Buffy: "There's Oz over there. What are we thinking, sparkage?"

Willow: "He's nice. I like his hands."

Buffy: "Mm. Fixation on insignificant details is a definite crush sign."

Willow: "Oh, I don't know, though. He is a senior."

Buffy: "You think he's too old 'cause he's a senior? Please, my boyfriend had a bicentennial."

Willow: "That's true."

"Surprise" (2013)

I. Introduction

[1] A number of articles have debated whether or not Buffy Summers is a feminist heroine (e.g., Siemann, Pender, Daugherty, Playden), and have praised the show for its realistic portrayal of the problems of growing up and sexually maturing (e.g., Vint, Wilcox, Moss, Zacharek, Daugherty. See also Noxon and Whedon commentaries on Season 2 DVD, Petrie on Season 3 DVD, and Espenson on Season 4 DVD). None, however, has engaged with the ways in which seemingly conflicting feminist theories about teen sexuality can all be at play simultaneously in the series.*

[2] In the episodes before the main characters, particularly Buffy, turn 18 (i.e., 3012 "Helpless"), any sexual activity they engage in is theoretically illegal--it is statutory rape. Statutory rape laws differ across the states: each sets an age of consent, generally 16 or 18, and prosecutes sexual intercourse with an unmarried person under that age if one of the parties is a certain number of years older than the other. In California, the age of consent is 18, and one can be prosecuted as a felony-level perpetrator of statutory rape if he or she is 3 years older than the other; he can be prosecuted for a misdemeanor if he is not more than 3 years older.

[3] When reforming statutory rape laws in the 1970s and 1980s, feminists generally split into three camps in their disagreements about adolescent sexuality. In short, liberal feminists sought to restore some agency and formal equality to young women while also retaining the ability to safeguard them from sexual

coercion. They lobbied for gender-neutral language, which would treat males and females equally by protecting both as victims, and charging both as perpetrators (the laws until that time charged only males for having sex with underage females); and they lobbied for the age span provisions mandating that the perpetrator be a certain number of years older than the victim, with the assumption that those close in age were probably engaged in sex that was more likely to be consensual (see, e.g., Bienen, Fuentes). Radical feminists argued that for socially constructed reasons, males and females were simply not similarly situated in modern society; a female was always already the less powerful party in a heterosexual relationship. Gender neutral language, they worried, papered over this problem, and age span provisions presumed that males and females close in age are engaged in consensual activity when they may not be (see e.g., MacKinnon, Oberman). Sex radicals, sometimes referred to as pro-sex or libertarian feminists, were on the opposite side of the debate from the radical feminists. They acknowledged that statutory rape laws had a protective function, but were concerned that they punished potentially consensual sex, painted all young people as incapable of making decisions about their own bodies, and sent a message that nonmarital sex and female sexual agency were wrong and harmful (see, e.g., Duggan and Hunter, Rubin). **[1]**

[4] In this article, I examine the constructions of gender and sexuality on the show (with most emphasis on Buffy herself but also including other major characters) in light of these feminist debates. This analysis illustrates that the different interpretations of adolescent sexuality are not necessarily mutually exclusive but can coexist, and do coexist on *Buffy*.

II. Feminist Theories and Sex at Sunnydale High School

[5] Liberal feminists would assume that underage males and females are vulnerable and might be manipulated into activity that they might feel uncomfortable about or later regret. They would also assume that the larger the age difference, the more potential there would be for a sexual relationship to be unequal and problematic. In "Reptile Boy" (2005), Cordelia says that college guys are "cool," while the college guys of whom she speaks say that they "love high school girls" because they assume that they are naive. Writer David Greenwalt, in his commentary on that episode, describes their going to the frat party and lying about it as a "bad teenage decision." In "I Robot, You Jane" (1008), Buffy warns Willow not to necessarily trust Malcolm, Willow's new online friend to whom she is getting quite attached, but who is in actuality the demon Moloch: "This guy could be anybody. He could be weird, or crazy, or old." And in "Teacher's Pet" (1004), Xander says that he is substitute teacher Miss French's "absolute favorite guy in the universe" while Willow and Buffy express skepticism about her motives, "She's not what she seems." In each of these examples, the person who is the younger, and the one hoping to be involved with someone older than they, does not see the potential for manipulation that those around them see more clearly.

[6] Radical feminists would assume the same about the potential for manipulation, except that they would stress that the female party is always the more vulnerable. And they would also not assume that an age difference would necessarily matter; a male could manipulate a female even if they were the same age. For instance, in "Beauty and the Beasts" (3004), the gang is worried that Oz may be responsible for mauling deaths; Buffy is concerned that it is Angel, recently returned from a hell dimension. It turns out to be their classmate Pete, who not only is killing strangers but is psychologically and physically abusing his insecure girlfriend Debbie. But she continues to defend him and protect him to her utmost ability: "It's not his fault. It's me. I make him crazy. He does what he does because he loves me too much." The two are in the same class and therefore roughly the same age, but clearly he is manipulating and harming her.

[7] As a second example, Xander has sex with Faith, who is roughly the same age as the others although not in school ("The Zeppo," 3013). While it appears that Faith is the aggressor here, she can be looked at in a different way: as a vulnerable young woman, psychologically or perhaps even physically harmed in past relationships with men, who has learned to use sex as a tool or weapon. When Angel "captures" her in "Consequences" to talk to her about killing deputy mayor Alan Finch, he says he just wants to talk. She replies, "That's what they all say. Then it's, 'Just let me stay the night, I won't try anything.'" When the mayor first shows her the apartment he has rented for her, she is overwhelmed, jumping on the bed like a child ("Doppelgangland," 3016). She then sidles up to him and purrs, "Thanks, sugar daddy" as she puts her arms around him. But he pushes her away, saying that he is a "family man." **[2]** In this apartment and in her hotel room, she is almost always alone, and constructed as lonely.

[8] Sex radicals would assume that some if not all teens are capable of making rational sexual decisions, and that an age difference in and of itself is not necessarily cause for alarm. Faith may be a young woman who enjoys sex, and doesn't care how she is judged by others for talking about it and pursuing it, "Isn't it weird how slaying always makes you hungry and horny?" ("Faith, Hope, and Trick," 3003). Doug Petrie in the Season 3 overview says, "She gets to do all the things that Buffy would like to do but can't." One could read her behavior in "The Zeppo" as confident and self-assured: "A fight like that and no kill, I'm about ready to pop. . . . just relax . . . I'll steer you around the curves." Xander says later he thought they "had a connection," but as Buffy tells him, "She doesn't take the guys she has a 'connection' with very seriously. They're kind of a big joke to her" ("Consequences," 3015). Faith does appear to be affectionate with Xander for a minute, facing him and watching his face with a smile as he strokes her arm. Then she says, "That was great. I gotta shower" as she pushes him out the door.**[3]**

[9] Buffy and Willow, as teens, both talk to one another about their decision to have sex, in the contexts of their relationships with Angel and Oz respectively. Both of the males are older than the females, but neither necessarily acts older. For Willow, there seemed to be only positive effects from her first sexual encounter with Oz; it is made clear that it is not his first time and that she worries about this, but it is made similarly clear that Oz's feeling for her are very strong. For Buffy, though, there were negative consequences, discussed below.

III. Buffy in high school, college and beyond

[10] Angel. Buffy's encounter with Angel can be read through each of the lenses of feminist theory discussed above. Buffy is 16, about to turn 17, when she decides to have sex with Angel, who is 240+ ("Surprise"/"Innocence," 2013/2014). Due to the curse put on him by the gypsy relatives of Jenny Calendar, one moment of true happiness will cause him to lose his soul and become the remorseless torturer and killer he once was. This moment apparently occurs sometime during or after his sexual encounter with Buffy.**[4]**

[11] As Joss Whedon says himself in his commentary on episode 1007 "Angel," in which we discover Angel is a vampire, "He's 100% the wrong guy for Buffy. So naturally she can't get enough of him." She was much younger than him, and that coupled with him being a vampire and she a slayer "of course emphasized the dangers of sexual encounters, especially with an adult" (Wilcox 4). One could argue that while he certainly never pushed her toward sex in an obvious way, his constant presence and his hesitance about becoming involved with her might have made him even more alluring. Her feelings for him blind her and she uses poor judgment where he is concerned. Particularly after he returns from the hell dimension to which she sends him in "Becoming Part 2" (2022), she lies repeatedly to everyone about her whereabouts and about his existence. Willow says as much to her, more constructively than the others, when they confront her in the library, "I feel, that when it comes to Angel, you can't see straight. . . . This is serious. You need help." Giles is harsher: "You've jeopardized the lives of all you hold dear...Sadly, I must remind you that Angel tortured me for hours, for pleasure. . . . You have no respect for me" ("Revelations," 3007).

[12] After their sexual encounter, and his subsequent intentionally cruel treatment of her, she is devastated. What he says to her is what every person fears being said to him or her. "What, I took off. Like I really wanted to stick around after that...You've got a lot to learn about men, kiddo, although I guess you proved that last night. . . . Lighten up. . . . I should have known you wouldn't be able to handle it." When she tells him she loves him, he says with an artificial smile, "Love ya too. I'll call ya" ("Innocence," 2014). Later, he delivers the final verbal blow after physically knocking her to the ground, "You know what the worst part was? Pretending that I loved you." Over the next several episodes, he kills Willow's fish, leaves drawings of Buffy and her mother in the house, lets her mother know they slept together, kills Jenny Calendar and leaves her in Giles' bed, tortures Giles, and kills a number of other people as well. All of these events seem to point toward what the liberal feminists would fear--that the more powerful older person might harm the younger, as well as toward what the radical feminists would fear--that the more powerful male might harm the female.

[13] But one could simultaneously read the same encounter differently, without necessarily saying any of the above was false. These two people felt that they loved each other, and had a steadily-building relationship over the course of more than a year even as they tried to avoid it. Indeed, Angel felt that he loved her from before they met, when Whistler brought him to Los Angeles to see her ("Becoming Part 1," 2021). They worked together, saved each others lives, and trusted each other. The night of their sexual encounter, her seventeenth birthday, he had given her a claddagh ring to symbolize his devotion to her and had instructed her to wear it with the heart pointing toward her: "It means you belong to somebody. Like this." He holds up his own ring to show the heart pointing toward him.

[14] One could also argue that Buffy was particularly mature for her age, given all of her responsibilities as a slayer, and that vampires' personalities do not necessarily reflect their chronological age either. Willow says of Buffy, "She's 16 going on 40" because of the pressure on her, and Leon writes that the "slayers may be chronologically young, but they mature far more rapidly than their peers" (2). At the same time, vampires may not "fit into normal categories of teenager and adult" (Jenkins and Jenkins; Jenkins IV speaking, 13). In another disruption of gender stereotypes, it is Angel who is protesting what is about to happen, just as he protested entering a relationship with her in the first place. "I love you. I try not to but I can't stop . . . maybe we shouldn't." But Buffy silences him: "Don't. Just kiss me." Sex radicals might say of this encounter that her age and gender were immaterial, and that these were two people who were on an equal footing in their relationship, choosing together to engage in sex.

[15] Even after Angel first loses his soul, Giles remains supportive of Buffy, telling her "I know that you loved him. And he's proven on more than one occasion that he loves you." The two repeat that they love each other in "Becoming Part 2" (2022), right before she says "Close your eyes" and kills him. He returns in "Beauty and the Beasts" (3004) and by "Revelations" (3007) they have kissed. Later, in "Amends" (3010; and in "The Zeppo" 3013, albeit in a more melodramatic style), they again confess their feelings when Angel says, "I want you so badly. I want to take comfort in you, and I know it'll cost me my soul and part of me doesn't care." He asks what there is for him in this world and she replies, "What about me? I love you so much. . . ."

[16] In other words, all of these interpretations can be true at once. Daugherty writes, "Buffy's challenges, struggles, and relationships represent many of the hazards that face all women, especially those who are young and impressionable" (149). Yes, but it is also the case that Buffy is not necessarily always the more vulnerable party because she is younger and female; at some points she is and at others she is not.

[17] What about the decisions Buffy made once she turned 18? In theory and in legal practice, she became an adult--no longer protected by statutory rape laws.

[18] A number of writers commented on Angel's feeding on Buffy in "Graduation Day" 3022 as a representation of sex (e.g., DeKelb-Rittenhouse). Joss Whedon himself notes in the commentary on that episode that it was "one of our thinner metaphors for sex" and was meant to be "erotic." Buffy breaks a pitcher in her hand and kicks over a table as Angel drinks from her. One could read this encounter as something she goaded him into doing by hitting him until he "vamped out"; one could also say that she was not really "asking for it" and that he could have controlled himself. Saving him could be read as a well-thought-out and positive action for a greater good, for he was apparently sent back from the hell dimension for a reason. Or it could be read as her continued poor judgment where he is concerned--she is willing to kill another human (Faith) to save him, which goes against everything she believes. Buffy also might have been killed herself.

[19] Their relationship doesn't necessarily end when he leaves town at the end of this episode. In *Angel* episode A1008, "I Will Remember You," when he briefly becomes human, he and Buffy have the perfect day and do sleep together once again; this time with no immediately obvious repercussions. But when they encounter a demon, he realizes he's not as strong as he was and can't protect her, so he decides to undo the change in him by asking the Powers That Be to turn back time. He tells Buffy that she won't remember their day; she swears that she will; only he remembers it's happened when the day begins again. When she returns from the dead and he discovers that she is alive, he calls and she immediately goes to meet him ("Flooded," 6004). In "Selfless" (7015), speaking about how it might be necessary to kill Anya, she reminds

Xander, "I killed Angel . . . I loved him more than anything I had in this life and I put a sword through him because I had to." And in the Buffy series finale "Chosen" (7022) after fighting together, and kissing, Buffy says about a future with him, "I do sometimes think that far ahead . . . [but] it will be a long time coming. Years, if ever." He replies as he leaves, "I ain't getting any older." The door is left open between them.

[20] Parker was the first person Buffy slept with after arriving at college. Good-looking and apparently quite sensitive and "deep," he seems to be genuinely interested in her. But we find out later he is just interested in freshman girls because he thinks that there is little difference between them and a toilet, as both are things to be used. Writer Jane Espenson, in an interview from the Season 4 DVD, describes Parker as "the guy who doesn't call back"; Buffy waits in vain for him to do so after their encounter. She says to Willow about her night with Parker, "God, I'm such a fool" ("The Harsh Light of Day," 4003). Espenson said that her original lines for this scene were cut for time. She had had Buffy say, "I kept telling myself, look how much I'm over Angel. Look how I'm not even thinking about Angel. Look how I'm going out with this other guy and it's not about Angel. I should have realized that meant it was all about Angel." She is vulnerable, but not necessarily because she is a young teen. The last time we see Parker, in "Beer Bad," she in her regression-to-cavewoman state hits him over the head and knocks him out in retaliation for his treatment of her.

[21] Riley punches Parker when the latter brags about sleeping with Buffy, and at that moment realizes what his friends already know since he told them he thought she was "peculiar"--he is interested in her ("The Initiative," 4007). Riley asks his friends and fellow army men, "What kind of girl is gonna go out with a guy who's all Joe Normal by day and turns demon hunter at night?" In theory, someone like Buffy, who leads the same kind of life. Here is someone who like Angel is fighting the same good fight as Buffy, against demons threatening humans, but who unlike Angel is human and closer to her age (although he is still older than she). When Buffy talks about Riley to Willow, she says "I really like him, I think he cares about me, but I feel like something's missing." Willow volunteers, "He's not making you miserable?" ("Something Blue," 4009). Buffy says she has to "get away from that bad boy thing, but also says she feels that "real love and passion have to go hand in hand with pain and fighting" and asks "I wonder where I get that?" as she stakes a vampire. One could interpret this exchange as showing us that Buffy is entering a healthier relationship than that which she had with Angel (or as foreshadowing her future relationship with Spike). She and Riley have sex for the first time after fighting together in "The I in Team" (4013), and it is their passion that ignites the spirits in the frat house in "Where the Wild Things Are" (4018). As with Angel, they train and work together and it appears that gender and age differences may not necessarily be issues for these two particular people; that they respect each other as equals.

[22] But the relationship with Riley is doomed. He causes her pain different from that caused by Angel. Joss Whedon, in the commentary accompanying "Restless" (4022), says "Their relationship is not entirely stable" because Riley is "not in the same world" as Buffy. Her dream, in which she sees him in his government suit with his cold and rigid demeanor, is her "fear of what he could be." When she kneels on the floor and puts the mud from the bag on her face, she shows the "demon within and Riley can't seem to handle that." Similarly, says Whedon, this shows the clash between the "feminine" mysticism of the slayer versus the "masculine" government--because the Initiative, and to some extent Riley, don't truly understand the value and complexity of the former, it will fail. He does begin to question the military after Buffy is almost killed by Maggie Walsh and then Walsh in turn is killed. But he still remains loyal to them, and in the end goes back to them as she feared he would.

[23] Before each knows of the other's work, Buffy asks him, "You think that boys can take care of themselves and girls can't?" and Riley answers, "Yeah" as if he finds the answer completely obvious ("The Initiative," 4007). His black-and-white assumptions about gender and power feed into his feelings that she doesn't need him because she is the stronger and he is uncomfortable with that; his assumption is that she should need him and want to need him. As Vint points out, this is problematic for many adolescent girls as there may be some fear among boys about girls who compete with them, or even within society at large of such girls as threatening to an established "traditional" order. In a disruption of stereotypes of both gender and age, Riley feels like the weaker party in the relationship.

[24] As early as "Doomed" (4011), he tells her that she has to need other people, and if she weren't "so self-involved [she] would see that"; by "The Replacement" (5003), he tells Xander how much he loves her, but adds matter-of-factly, "She doesn't love me." It isn't long after this that he begins flirting with vampires because he feels that they (unlike Buffy) do need him and he allows them to bite him, although he kills at least one afterward ("Family" 5006-"Into the Woods" 5010). Finally, when shown (by Spike) what is happening, Buffy confronts him. Not persuaded that she loves him, Riley leaves.

[25] Just as Angel did before him, Riley decides to leave town, giving Buffy no say in the matter and no real chance to try to work things out with him--he exerts his power by ending their relationship. He had felt that she had more power vis-à-vis him and was uncomfortable with that. But she, younger and female, could be perceived as the more vulnerable party, who felt she gave him "body and soul" but it still was not enough for him. In a third point of view, this could be seen as a situation in which the two parties' genders and ages were immaterial and in which the two were basically equal in their love and in their insecurities. Again, one can interpret this relationship through the lenses of any or all of the three strains of feminist thought on gender and sexuality detailed above.

[26] It is Buffy's tortured relationship with Spike that becomes the focus of Seasons 6 and 7; some would say this was to the benefit of the show, while others would say it was to its detriment. In Season 4, after he had had the chip installed by the Initiative that would bring him intense pain whenever he tried to harm a human, he had worked with the Scooby Gang at times. After he realized he was in love with Buffy ("Out of My Mind," 5004), he began to work mostly for good, perhaps because he began to see the worth of their fight. Different from Angel who was motivated by his soul and his guilt to fight against dark forces, Spike could be constructed as choosing--against his soulless vampire nature--to do good. He withstands Glory's torture and does not reveal that Dawn is the key ("Intervention," 5018) and is increasingly trusted to take care of Dawn.

[27] Buffy felt that he was the only one who understood her and her alienation throughout season 6; until "Once More With Feeling" (6007) and the spell that forces her to sing what she is really thinking, he is the only one she tells about having been in a paradise and hating to be back in this world. She is able to show him a darker side of herself (a side more akin to the early Faith); he is the only one with whom she connects and for some moments that connection overcomes her feelings of numbness. Throughout season 6, he puts up with her verbal and physical abuse with the assumption that he will prove himself worthy of her. And after he regains his soul in "Two to Go/Grave" (6021/6022), he begins a redemptive journey that Buffy is quick to support--although sometimes she is the only one to support it.

[28] He does offer to leave town about halfway through season 7, but she says she is not ready for him to "not be here," and that she believes in him ("Never Leave Me," 7009). She seems to indicate that she loved him via a Freudian slip in "First Date" (7014) when she asks, "Why does everybody in this house think I'm still in love with Spike?" After the others kick her out of the house in favor of Faith's being their new leader, it is he who seems to reach her, telling her she is "the one" and holding her through the night to protect her ("Touched," 7020). In the following episode, "End of Days" (7021), he says it was the best night of his life; that he never felt so close to anyone. When he asks her, "Were you there with me?" she replies, "I was" and tells him that he gave her the strength to go out and find the scythe with which to face Caleb. Lastly, it is he in large part who saves the world in "Chosen" (7022) by wearing the amulet brought to them by Angel, that must be worn by a "champion." The implication is that if he were not such a champion, the amulet would not have its intended effect. She tells him as he dies that she loves him.

[29] However, Buffy had said in every season before this that she hated Spike. She, like the other Scoobies, never really trusted him, particularly as he did try to hurt and/or kill all of them at some point or another. He may have chosen to fight on the side of good before he had a soul, but one could also interpret his actions as having nothing to do with good and evil and everything to do with trying to impress Buffy. It is clear that he chose to re-obtain his soul for the purpose of showing her his devotion to her (just as he previously offered to kill Drusilla to show the same, in "Crush" 5014), and hoping that she would be with him again. On the featurette "Spike, Me" on the Season 4 DVD set, James Marsters speaks about his character and his age: "Spike is very immature. He's very young. . . [although] for a human being, he's

very old." As with Angel, his age can be interpreted with some flexibility.

[30] From the first of their sexual encounters in "Smashed/Wrecked" (6009/6010), Buffy was disgusted with herself for engaging in it; she knew that she was using him and felt sick about it. She begs Tara not to forgive her, saying "He's everything I hate, everything I'm supposed to be against" and is clearly uncomfortable with the things she allows him to do to her; in the same episode, she beats him until his face is bloody ("Dead Things," 6013). When Riley find them in bed together, accusing Spike of being "The Doctor" and trafficking in demon eggs, she defends him and is deflated when she realizes he is guilty. But he says defensively, "You know what I am. You've always known. You come to me just the same." It is after this that she breaks off their relationship, admitting that she wants him and that being with him makes things simpler, but "I'm using you... I can't love you... And it's killing me... I'm sorry, William" ("As You Were," 6015) There is no denying that he attempted to rape her after this ("Seeing Red," 6019). That he regretted it and was sorry are immaterial. He was using his physical power at that moment to try to force her into doing something she clearly did not want to do, in total violation of any trust or love that might have been between them. His muttering to himself that he was going to make her love him through this act was every feminist's nightmare of the conflation of sex and power and violence. As Buffy says tearfully after the fact, "Ask me again why I could never love you."

[31] As with Angel, her feelings for Spike certainly clouded her judgment. Even after this pivotal event, she not only accepts him in her life but supports him. It is obvious that he has been killing people, but she forgives him and keeps him in the house with them. It also appears that he is perhaps mad and being controlled by the First, but she still keeps him close by and trusts him, to the surprise and horror of the others (7009 "Never Leave Me"-7013 "The Killer in Me"). She decides that having his chip removed, under these circumstances, is the right thing to do because she feels that his soul will point him toward choosing not to hurt people. Along with Giles, who finds him to be a "liability" and who goes so far as to try to have Robin Wood kill him ("Lies My Parents Told Me," 7017), the other potential slayers sense that she is unreasonable where he is concerned. Anya notes bitterly in the same episode: "Spike has some kind of 'get out of jail free' card that doesn't apply to the rest of us." Indeed, Buffy feels that he is the "only one watching [her] back" ("Empty Places," 7019).

[32] In an interview after the end of the series, Marsters gave his interpretation of the last episode: "What the final episode did very well was admit that Buffy really is in love with Angel. That the sexual relationship she had with Spike was unhealthy. That it was unwise . . . Spike was evil" (Butler 1). Other writers on the show were similarly alarmed at fans' positive reaction to Spike and Buffy's relationship, saying on more than one occasion that the relationship was meant to be received as abusive. While in this relationship with Spike, it was apparently Buffy who was the more powerful party, one could also argue that she was not because it was her vulnerability and confusion that motivated her to seek him out even when she knew it to be harmful to her; also, he could have hurt her at any turn as he showed with the attempted rape.

[33] In sum, one could look at Buffy's sexual relationships with Angel, Riley, and Spike from a variety of points of view. Rather than subscribing to one particular branch of feminist theories about adolescent sexuality and about gender, they can all be at play in the complexities of the relationships portrayed. It may be that sexual decisions made by a teen (particularly by a female teen), or by someone who is younger than his or her sex partner, are rash and/or manipulated decisions, as liberal feminists would worry. But they may not be, sex radicals would argue. It may also be that females are generally the weaker party in any heterosexual relationship, as radical feminists would assert, but they may not be. By the same token, it may be that sexual decisions made by adults, male or female, are well-grounded, but they may not be.

IV. Willow and Oz in High School and College

[34] Willow and Oz merit mention here, because the writers and producers of the show purposely used the symbol of the werewolf as a metaphor for teen sexuality. In high school, the two are in a committed relationship and decide to have sex ("Graduation Day Pt. 2," 3022). They are both teens and he is about one year older than she (see quote from "Surprise," 2013 at the start of the paper), but the two are portrayed as equals and as sexual agents. Oz rebuffs her first attempts to seduce him, but Willow says, "He

said he was gonna wait until I was ready. Well, I'm ready" and Buffy replies with some foreshadowing, "It's nice, he's not just being an animal." Even after Oz sees her kissing Xander, he forgives her and their relationship starts up again ("Lover's Walk," 3008; "Amends," 3010). That they are teenagers, and of opposite sex, doesn't necessarily point to inequality. They continue to see each other, in a seemingly very supportive and positive relationship, as they enter college.

[35] But as Whedon says, the threat of "the wolf," as a metaphor for "uncontained raw male aggression and sexuality," is always lurking, as some feminists might fear. In the featurette "Oz: Revelations, A Full Moon" on the Season 4 DVD, Marti Noxon says "The whole notion of men who are beasts is a real theme in our show. . . . The tension between the desire to be in a committed, loving, safe union and to just run wild and free.....exists in both men and women, but it's even stronger in men. I feel like men feel like they can't always control it, like they have an animal inside them." She also says that the werewolf is a metaphor for not just male sexuality, but male teen sexuality. This very gendered notion of sexuality, and of male teen sexuality as uncontrolled, is akin to what radical feminists were arguing; that males are the more powerful party in heterosexual sexual relationships and are socialized to believe that their sexuality is difficult to contain. Indeed, females are sometimes made to feel guilty for not having intercourse when males interpret their behavior as "leading" them in that direction.

[36] In this frame, then, Oz cannot help but follow his nature, so we should not be surprised in "Wild At Heart" (4006) when he sleeps with Veruca, also a werewolf but one who embraces the animalistic sex drive that apparently goes along with it (in yet another disruption of gendered stereotypes of sexuality). Willow suspects something between them even before it happens. But she's even more suspicious when Oz rejects her overtures for sex; he does not want her to see the scratches all over his back that Veruca left the previous night. As Whedon says in the commentary to "Wild At Heart," "Whenever two people on Buffy have sex, the reason they shouldn't be having sex will walk into the room." And Willow does walk into the room, finding them together. Oz tries to say that he had to lock Veruca in with him so that she wouldn't hurt anybody, and that he doesn't remember what happens when he is a wolf. He feels he has no choice but to try to find out how to control the wolf inside him

[37] Like Angel (and Riley), Oz leaves town, leaving Willow no say in the matter (Callander 6). When he returns, thinking he can control his wolfish nature, he discovers that Willow is the only thing that breaks that control and brings it out in him (4019 "New Moon Rising"). This first occurs when he is talking to Tara in the hallway and smells Willow's scent on her; later in the Initiative after they have rescued him, he begins to change and tells Willow to get away so that the transformation will stop. He leaves town again, and she returns to Tara's room to resume their budding relationship.

[38] As with Buffy's relationships, one can read Willow's relationship with Oz in more than one way. Liberal feminists might say she was the vulnerable party because she was the younger party; radical feminists might say the same because of the "threat of the wolf," and sex radicals might say she was making well-considered decisions about someone she was very close to. But each of these aspects of a situation can be occurring at the same time. As Moss wrote, "Buffy displays the complexities of decisions that teenage girls must make, the tangled threat of their own sexuality they must learn to negotiate. Not content to be 'good' girls or 'bad' girls, the women of Buffy show teenaged sexuality to be the complex, sometimes strong, sometimes confused thing that it is, and it is the frankest dealing with such ever on television" (4).

IV. Conclusion

[39] A feminist analysis of gender and sexuality on *Buffy* does not necessarily have to subscribe to one theoretical pole or another. We should not essentialize all females as vulnerable and all age-differentiated relationships as harmful, not should we essentialize all females as empowered and all same-age relationships as harmless. Multiple interpretations are possible; multiple "truths" are possible. This type of analysis breaks us out of binaries of whether teen sexuality is "bad" or "good" as portrayed on the show and in general, whether Buffy is representative or disruptive of gendered stereotypes, whether she is destroyer or tool of patriarchy, whether she is coded male or female, etc. It also brings forth the complexities and fluidities of the many seemingly conflicting but coexistent facets of sexuality in general and adolescent sexuality in particular.

Editors' note: see Vivien Burr's essay on transgressive sexuality, "Ambiguity and Sexuality in the Buffyverse: A Sartrean Analysis," *Sexualities* 6.2 (2003).

Works Cited

Bienen, Leigh. 1980. "Rape III: National Developments in Rape Reform Legislation." *Women's Rights Law Reporter* 6, No. 3 (Spring/Summer): 170-213.

Butler, Karen. "James Marsters on Life After Buffy." *UPI International*, 6/11/03.

Daugherty, Anne Millard. "Just a Girl: Buffy as Icon." *Reading the Vampire Slayer: An Unofficial Critical Companion to Buffy and Angel*. Ed. Roz Kaveney. New York: Tauris Park, 2001. 148-65

DeKalb-Rittenhouse, Diane. "Sex and the Single Vampire: The Evolution of the Vampire Lothario and Its Representation in Buffy." *Wilcox and Lavery* 143-152.

Duggan, Lisa, and Nan Hunter, eds. 1995. *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Fuentes, Luisa. 1994. "Note: The Fourteenth Amendment and Sexual Consent: Statutory Rape and Judicial Progeny." *Women's Rights Law Reporter* 16: 139-152.

Jenkins III, Henry, & Henry G. Jenkins IV. "'The Monsters Next Door': A Father-Son Dialogue about *Buffy*, Moral Panic, and Generational Differences." *Red Noise: Buffy the Vampire Slayer and Critical Television Studies*. Ed. Lisa Parks and Elana Levine. Forthcoming from Duke University Press, 2003.

MacKinnon, Catharine. 1991. "Reflections on Sex Equality Under Law." *Yale Law Journal* 10: 1281-1328.

Mikosz, Philip and Dana Och. "Previously on Buffy the Vampire Slayer . . ." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* 5 (2002) [<http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage5/mikosz%20and%20och.htm>].

Moss, Gabrielle. "From the Valley to the Hellmouth: Buffy's Transition from Film to Television." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* 2 (2001) [<http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage2/moss.htm>].

Oberman, Michelle. 1994. "Turning Girls into Women: Reevaluating Modern Statutory Rape Law." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 85: 15-78.

Pender, Patricia. "'I'm Buffy and You're . . . History': The Postmodern Politics of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*." *Wilcox and Lavery* 35-44.

Playden, Zoe-Jane. "'What Are You, What's to Come': Feminisms, Citizenship and the Divine." *Reading the Vampire Slayer: An Unofficial Critical Companion to Buffy and Angel*. Ed. Roz Kaveney. New York: Tauris Park, 2001. 120-47.

Rubin, Gayle. 1984. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality" in Carole Vance, editor, *Pleasure and Danger*. Routledge. 267-319.

Siemann, Catherine. "Darkness Falls on the Endless Summer: Buffy as Gidget for the Fin de Siècle." Wilcox and Lavery 120-9.

Spicer, Arwen. "Love's Bitch but Man Enough to Admit It": Spike's Hybridized Gender." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* 7 (2002) [<http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage7/spicer.htm>].

Vint, Sherryl. "'Killing Us Softly'? A Feminist Search for the 'Real' Buffy." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* 5 (2002) (<http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage5/vint.htm>).

Wilcox, Rhonda V. "'There Will Never Be a 'Very Special' Buffy': Buffy and the Monsters of Teen Life." *Journal of Popular Film & Television* 27.2 (Summer 1999): 16-23. Rpt. in *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* 2 (2001) [<http://www.slayage.tv/essays/slayage2/wilcox.htm>].

___ and David Lavery, eds. *Fighting the Forces: What's at Stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Littlefield, 2002.

Zacharek, Stephanie. "Buffy's Will-to-power." *Salon.com* 28 Nov. 2001. [<http://dir.salon.com/sex/feature/2001/11/28/buffy/index.html>].

[1] Certainly, feminists in general are in agreement that all people should be treated equally, but are not in agreement as to what kinds of tactics should be used to achieve such a goal. The debates over adolescent sexuality were reflective of debates among these feminist factions on other issues at that time. The liberal feminists, well-represented in for instance the National Organization for Women, sought formal equality for women--i.e., to have anti-discrimination laws passed and to make laws on the books gender neutral--along with their other goals. Radical feminists felt that this concentration on the legal sphere and on formal equality would not promote the substantive equality of women, particularly in the realms of sexuality and family, but would merely paper over inequalities by assuming that women would be treated equally if the language of the laws was changed. Some in this group have been accused of asserting that men and women are so unequal that a woman's consent to heterosexual sex is not completely valid. The third group, who often called themselves sex radicals, were those who argued virulently with the radical feminists (whom they felt were not really radical, hence their using the term themselves) over pornography. When the radical feminists joined with religious conservatives to pass anti-pornography ordinances in midwestern cities, the sex radicals took them to task for reinscribing stereotypes of gender (i.e., that women are less powerful than men and are viewed as sex objects) into the new laws and for allying with those traditionally against feminist concerns. Strains of these debates remain among feminists today.

[2] When Faith and Buffy switch bodies in "Who Are You?" Faith uses the opportunity to have sex with Riley, asking him "What do you want to do to this body?" (4016). But his strong feelings for Buffy scare her; all she can think to ask him while he's trying to be physically close to her after the fact and tell her that he loves her, is "What do you want from her?" She stumbles away in confusion. It is apparently only

after Angel will not give up on her ("Five by Five/Sanctuary," A1018/A1019), and she chooses to redeem herself by going through her jail sentence and accepting responsibility for her actions that she begins to change. When she has sex with Robin Wood in "Touched" in season 7, her attitude toward it seems quite different and she appears ready to enter a relationship with him.

[3] One could also argue that Faith can be read as coded masculine due to her assertive sexual behavior and her "Get Some-Get Gone" attitude (apparently developed after realizing she was a "loser magnet" with past boyfriends; "Revelations," 3007), and Xander as coded feminine for his physical weakness in battle and his well-displayed insecurities. Joss Whedon notes in his commentary on "Restless" 4022 that Xander is a comfortador, not a conquistador because he's seeking comfort (not necessarily sex) from women. But this article is intended to disrupt such binaries, not only of gender (see Spicer, and Mikosz and Och), but of black-and-white readings of the characters' sexual relationships as well.

[4] I say this because it's usually assumed that the moment of true happiness was Angel's moment of orgasm but the episode doesn't actually tell us this. Instead, Angel wakes up in pain and stumbles outside while Buffy continues to sleep. If it were just an orgasm, it also would have occurred with Darla in Angel episodes "Epiphany/Reprise" (A2015/A2.16). It doesn't; she knows it; and she says the same thing Buffy says to him "Was it . . . was I . . . not good?" One could interpret the moment of happiness, therefore, as the sum package of his and Buffy's finally confessing that they love each other and then consummating that love. This is reflected in Angel episode A4010 "Awakening," when he does again lose his soul.