

FROM OUR PRESIDENT

St Machar's Cathedral
Lent 1982

My dear Friends,

The Council has decided that the material which comes to you within these covers deserves, at least on this first occasion, some presidential preface and that the policy initiated at this time requires some explication.

You will have noted the Editor's black-edged paragraphs in the November 1981 number of Liturgical Review and we will all share his regret at the cessation of publication and the termination of trading. Let me assure you that the Council explored all possible ways of economising and all possible ways, and some improbable ways, of increasing our membership but in the end it became abundantly clear that publication of Liturgical Review and with it our very happy association with the Scottish Academic Press must come to an end. The fact is that with quite incredible patience the Press have supported the Society and encouraged us in all our endeavours and with quite remarkable magnanimity have allowed themselves to incur losses of several thousands of pounds on Liturgical Review. We could not let it go on! And we cannot overstate our gratitude to the Scottish Academic Press.

It is however important to set this circumstance in perspective. Publication of journals like Liturgical Review and its predecessor The Annual has not always been a part of the programme of the Society and it is not to be supposed that it is of the essence of the Society's life and work. The Society began in 1865: the Annual did not appear until 1928. We look back to those first 60 years now with infinite gratitude: we remember the hectic liturgical activity and the clear sense of purpose which the Society possessed. We have now to our considerable credit another almost sixty-year phase of publication of essays, book reviews etc. There is no reason why we should not look forward to phase three even though it is economic factors that seem to have pushed us into it.

In fact some on the Council probably feel as I do a sense of liberation because of what has happened. These financial worries were somewhat inhibiting; we had no room for manoeuvre. We could not easily popularise Liturgical Review: we equally could not afford to produce anything more for the Society. It looks as if we can now do something for the Society and function again more as a Society. We hope to be able to send you material three times in the year. Many of us bless the memory of Dr. Lamb for many splendid articles he wrote in times past reviewing briefly all the best of recent liturgical literature. We should like to think we might achieve something like that again.

Happily our scholarly interests as represented by the essays that appeared in Liturgical Review may not be seriously neglected. We shall have Occasional Papers. In addition several of our members are closely identified with the Scottish Journal of Theology and they can be depended upon to do all they can to influence the editorial policy of that Journal in a way that favours our cause.

I see our main contribution in the years ahead a liturgical contribution complementary to that of the Church's Public Worship and Aids to Devotion Committee. It is worth remembering that the revision of the Book of Common Order took ten years and that the Committee is now engaged on the Ordinal! We cannot expect that Committee to help us further in developing the models they have provided for us. The honour of God demands that we do develop the models and with your help the Society may be the instrument of such work, and achieve thereby a future not unworthy of its past.

Your affectionate President,

Andrew Stewart Todd,