Dear readers,

We wish to share two announcements regarding the *Slayage* journal.

First: For the first time since the death of founding editor David Lavery, we are announcing new members of the Editorial Board. We are happy to note that the following scholars have agreed to join us: Jefri Bussolini (CUNY), Janet (Steve) Halfyard (Royal Conservatoire of Scotland), Ananya Mukherjea (CUNY), and James Rocha (Fresno State).

Second: For the fourth time, we are re-naming the journal, changing the subtitle but retaining the main title of *Slayage*. Below you will find a statement meant to clarify the journal’s new goals as well as explain the name:

Buffy died twice; this journal has now been re-born three times. Its newest name and different incarnation is as *Slayage: The International Journal of* Buffy+. As some of you will recognize, the title harks back to the original journal title of 2001 (*Slayage: The Online International Journal of* Buffy *Studies*) as well as the text that started us. The name *Buffy* recalls the significance of scholarly examinations of feminism, but *Slayage* is much more. The “plus” is meant to be a sign of inclusivity, both for scholars and texts.

The plus-mark is meant to invite analyses of not only *Angel*, *Firefly*, *Dollhouse*, etcetera, but also the work of all the creators involved with those texts: Amy Acker, Christophe Beck, Charisma Carpenter, Stephen DeKnight, Jane Espenson, Nathan Fillion—not to mention Sarah Michelle Gellar, Ron Glass, Summer Glau, Marita Grabiak, David Greenwalt, Diego Gutierrez, and all the alphabetical others, including Joss Whedon.

The “plus” is also meant to reference all the works that are genealogically connected to *Buffy*. How much of *Buffy* is there in David Greenwalt and Jim and Lynn Kouf’s *Grimm*? And is there nothing of Marti Noxon’s Buffy in Noxon’s Camille Preaker of *Sharp Objects*? And ought we to say (as well as Gillian Flynn’s) Amy Adams’ Camille Preaker? What about Amy Adams’ unnerving performance of another Southerner in *Buffy* (“Family,” 5.6)? Does Christophe Beck’s music for *WandaVision* have no relation to his music for *Buffy*? The connections might be intertextual (e.g. *Veronica Mars*, *Maharakshak Devi*, *Supernatural*) or they might simply be the creators themselves. We posit that there will be a bond of cutting-edge quality among such works.

The “plus” specifically alludes to LGBTQIA+, too, one of the important touchstones of the original series. The complexities of queerness are part of the intriguingly nuanced nature of many of these texts. The Tara/Willow storyline was both groundbreaking and, with Tara’s death, ultimately controversial. Scholarship explored this subject from many angles; the response to this LGBTQIA+ storyline is an illustration that our analyses should be scholarly critiques, not just hagiography. The journal was established to provide a venue for writing about good work, but good works are not perfect, and scholarship should strive to see clearly. This journal will not publish articles about texts that would be a waste of viewers’ or readers’ time; on the other hand, it will continue to not only praise but also problematize those texts about which it does publish. LGBTQIA+ texts and scholars have been an important part of this clear-sighted assessment, and *Slayage* would be strengthened by further contributions in light of contemporary scholarship. How do we now see Dru and Darla? Does Felicia Day’s Mag of *Dollhouse* connect at all with her Charlie in *Supernatural*? Is asexuality visible anywhere in these texts? How might current scholars address the presentation of J. August Richards’ Gunn in the light of his coming out as a gay man? Intersectional scholarship should be encouraged.

That last example leads to another point. Importantly, the “plus” is meant to refer to the need to counteract a “minus”—that is, the scarcity of Latinx and Black, Indigenous, Person of Color representations in *Buffy* (the Original Sin of the *Buffy* text) as well as problematic representations in that and related texts. Since Kent Ono’s 2000 essay “To Be a Vampire on *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*,” scholars have been examining these matters. (See the Oxford University Press Online Bibliographies on *Buffy* and on Whedon.) However, a great deal remains to be done—again, not just on *Buffy* but also on related texts. We can revive Kendra in our scholarly discussions, but we should not stop there. What can we say about Monica Owusu-Breen? What about the multiple roles of Maurissa Tancharoen? What about Gina Torres and Harry Lennix? And who will speak about these matters? Will you?

Back in 2001, David Lavery wrote that the journal would continue “for as long as interest warrants.” With this new name and new focus, we reiterate that pledge.