Thoughts after symposium in Torrlösa.

1) Original content of the Lorentz pedal towers.

The new idea that the Lorentz pedal department might have been divided into 'Bass / Treble' or bottom octave on one side, the tenor octave on the other, hence the front pipes from Octava 4´ bottom octave viz. Principal 8´ tenor octave, might seem interesting.

I for my part earlier have believed in a simple c / c# partition. I also have been in doubt about the placement of the pedal chests and the largest 16´/ 8´ pipes, which I earlier tended to believe must have been placed at a lower level than the front pipes in order to accomdate the very long pipes.

On the other hand I would think that the concave impost brackets (without decoration) could well be original from Brebosch, seeing the similarity with the original, corresponding impost brackets in Næstved (with decorations). But their position does not allow for a lower placement of the inner chests!

If my assumption about the Lorentz scaling of Gedact pipes is valid, the bottom C diameter of the pedal Gedact 16´ would be ca. 133 mm. This is not much, but with an appropriate cut up it will speak normal, however, not giving the organ much 'Gravität' (which was complained about the Lorentz organs one generation later). The same Frietzsch pipe in Malmö, Barduen 16´ bottom C, has a diameter of 148,3 mm - somewhat larger, but still not impressive...

But we cannot escape the problem of the highth of these bottom pipes! Now I have indicated in red outline the likely dimensions of the 16´ bottom C pipe on my reconstruction of the front pipe arrangement - provided this pipe was standing on the same level as the front pipes. As you will see, this is impossible and totally out of proportions! And because of the supposed original Brebosch impost brackets,

the chests could not be drastically lowered inside the case!

From the outset I have suspected, that the bottom octave of the largest pedal stops must have been accomodated at a low level, possibly behind the main case, which would have made it even more complicated to arrange for a stop action.

---

2) Could the Lorentz shape of the organ front have been drastically different from what Fogelberg set up in Torrlösa? I think No! As the new 3-D images well display, the casework could not have been radically higher or wider in the Helsingborg church where it was extremely squeezed in because the space is very restrictet there, but not so in Torrlösa where it ist standing much more independent.

Did Fogelberg make big modifications to the case and the front? I really do not think so!

Of course he would have had to dismantle all the casework and front details as much as possible for the transportation of the material by horse power. In that connection he had to cut and / or dispose of a number of tenons and pins. Originally the casework was the 'structur', that is the framework supporting the entire organ work - chests, mechanism, pipework - and had to be really strong.

In Torrlösa he built a 'new' organ, mainly supported by the gallery floor, and from thence the 'front' was nothing but an empty, decorative screen which did not have to support anything but itself!

Fogelberg did not have to bother about the structural solidity of this showcase - and the space on the Torrlösa gallery was much larger than in Helsingborg. Why should he have taken any measures and efforts to modify the front when putting it up? Do organbuilders normally invest a lot of unnecessary trouble and working hours just for fun? I believe not! He even did not have to re-establish all of the tenons and pins he had disposed of, he merely had to assure himself that the display screen would stand for itself and not be apt to fall down...

Thus I think we owe the woodworking ad-hoc connections of Brebosch and Lorentz case details to the Lorentz rebuild - sometimes a bit illogical from an

aesthetic viewpoint as they may seem - clearly they do not represent a coherent design, and from 1641 they probably never did!

A quite common practise in the 19.th Century when recycling old organ cases was to dispose of the impost brackets to be able to widen the lower part of the case in order to accomodate a much clumsier new pipework. In Helsingborg, Lorentz would have been forced to do this too, had he chosen to accomodate the largest pedal pipes at a low level because of the restricted highth under the masonry arch - but this would have blocked the access from behind to the console area! And - if by a miracle he could do that - is it likely then that Fogelberg when arriving in Torrlösa should have done the reverse thing: slimming the lower part of the empty, decorative front and introduce new concave impost brackets in the style of Brebosch? Surely not!

---

3) In my documentation tables from March 2000 I have no Lorentz front pipe numbers higher than 32, and feared that I could have overlooked something. Now on September 30. before the meeting, I rechecked the pipes which would have had theese high numbers (hypothetically 50 - 59) standing now in the middle tower. I found none! I have not been mistaken on that day in 2000, there simply are no high Lorentz numbers, so unfortunately we are deprived of the possibility to identify unambiguously the exact arrangement of bottom octave and tenor octave pipes in the pedal front, we can only make assumptions.

I think we must accept the shape of the organ as it stands to-day - seemingly no new light has been shed on the organ's visual appearance since 2007...

---

4) By the way, I really think that these considerations also support my earlier statement that Fogelberg could not have been responsible for the scrapping of the Rückpositiv (a statement which so far has been mostly ignored by others) - why should he take the trouble to exchange the dilapidated Brebosch tin front pipes with

still speaking Lorentz Rückpositiv front pipes at a time when all of the front was nothing but a dummy screen?

Mads Kjersgaard