CHAPTER 11

Aspects of the Printing Revolution

Elizabeth Eisenstein

Elizabeth Eisenstein is a historian whose book The Printing Press as an Agent of Change has been hailed by people in many disciplines as a landmark study of how a particular technology has influenced history.

In the late fifteenth century, the reproduction of written materials began to move from the copyist’s desk to the printer’s workshop. This shift, which revolutionized all forms of learning, was particularly important for historical scholarship. Ever since then historians have been indebted to Gutenberg’s invention; print enters their work from start to finish, from consulting card files to reading page proofs. Because historians are usually eager to investigate major changes and this change transformed the conditions of their own craft, one would expect the shift to attract some attention from the profession as a whole. Yet any historiographical survey will show the contrary to be true. It is symbolic that Clio has retained her handwritten scroll. So little has been made of the move into the new workshops that after five hundred years, the muse of history still remains outside. “History bears witness,” writes a sociologist, “to the cataclysmic effect on society of inventions of new media for the transmission of information among persons. The development of writing, and later the development of printing, are examples.” Insofar as flesh-and-blood historians who turn out articles and books actually bear witness to what happened in the past, the effect on society of the development of printing, far from appearing cataclysmic, is remarkably inconspicuous. Many studies of developments during the last five centuries say nothing about it at all.

There is, to be sure, a large, ever-growing literature on the history of printing and related topics. Several works that synthesize and summarize parts of this large literature have appeared. Thus Rudolf Hirsch surveys problems associated with “printing, selling, reading,” during the first century after Gutenberg. A more extensive, well-organized volume by Febvre and Martin, which skillfully covers the first three centuries of printing and was first published in a French series devoted to “the evolution of humanity,” has recently been translated into English. An even broader coverage, embracing “five hundred years,” is provided by Steinberg’s remarkably succinct semi-popular survey. All three of these books summarize data drawn from many scattered studies. But although the broader historical implications of these data are occasionally hinted at, they are never really spelled out. Like the section on printing in the New Cambridge Modern History, the contents of these surveys rarely enter into treatments of other aspects of the evolution of humanity.

According to Steinberg: “The history of printing is an integral part of the general history of civilization.” Unfortunately, the statement is
not applicable to written history as it stands, although it is probably true enough of the actual course of human affairs. Far from being integrated into other works, studies dealing with the history of printing are isolated and artificially sealed off from the rest of historical literature. In theory, these studies center on a topic that impinges on many other fields. In fact, they are seldom consulted by scholars who work in any other field, perhaps because their relevance to other fields is still not clear. "The exact nature of the impact which the invention and spread of printing had on Western civilization remains subject to interpretation even today." This seems to underestimate the case. There are few interpretations even of an inexact or approximate nature upon which scholars may draw when pursuing other inquiries. The effects produced by printing have aroused little controversy, not because views on the topic coincide, but because almost none has been set forth in an explicit and systematic form. Indeed, those who seem to agree that momentous changes were entailed always seem to stop short of telling us just what they were.

"Neither political, constitutional, ecclesiastical, and economic events, nor sociological, philosophical, and literary movements can be fully understood," writes Steinberg, "without taking into account the influence the printing press has exerted upon them." All these events and movements have been subjected to close scrutiny by generations of scholars with the aim of understanding them more fully. If the printing press exerted some influence upon them, why is this influence so often unnoted, so rarely even hinted at, let alone discussed? The question is worth posing if only to suggest that the effects produced by printing are by no means self-evident. Insofar as they may be encountered by scholars exploring different fields, they are apt to pass unrecognized at present. To track them down and set them forth—in an outline or some other form—is much easier said than done.

When authors such as Steinberg refer to the impact of printing on every field of human enterprise—political, economic, philosophical, and so forth—it is by no means clear just what they have in mind. In part at least they seem to be pointing to indirect consequences which have to be inferred and which are associated with the consumption of printed products or with changed mental habits. Such consequences are, of course, of major historical significance and impinge on most forms of human enterprise. Nevertheless, it is difficult to describe them precisely or even to determine exactly what they are. It is one thing to describe how methods of book production changed after the mid-fifteenth century or to estimate rates of increased output. It is another thing to describe how access to a greater abundance or variety of written records affected ways of learning, thinking, and perceiving among literate elites. Similarly, it is one thing to show that standardization was a consequence of printing. It is another to decide how laws, languages, or mental constructs were affected by more uniform texts. Even at present, despite all the data being obtained from living responsive subjects; despite all the efforts being made by public opinion analysts, pollsters, or behavioral scientists; we still know very little about how access to printed materials affected human behavior. (A glance at recent controversies on the desirability of censoring pornography shows how ignorant we are.) Historians who have to reach out beyond the grave to reconstruct past forms of consciousness are especially disadvantaged in dealing with such issues. Theories about unevenly phased changes affecting learning processes, attitudes, and expectations do not lend themselves, in any event, to simple, clear-cut formulations that can be easily tested or integrated into conventional historical narratives.

Problems posed by some of the more indirect effects produced by the shift from script to print probably can never be overcome entirely. But such problems could be confronted more squarely if other impediments did not stand in the way. Among the far-reaching effects that need to be noted are many that still affect present observations
and that operate with particularly great force upon every professional scholar. Thus constant access to printed materials is a prerequisite for the practice of the historian's own craft. It is difficult to observe processes that enter so intimately into our own observations. In order to access changes ushered in by printing, for example, we need to survey the conditions that prevailed before its advent. Yet the conditions of scribal culture can only be observed through a veil of print.

Even a cursory acquaintance with the findings of anthropologists or casual observations of preschool-age children may help to remind us of the gulf that exists between oral and literate cultures. Several studies, accordingly, have illuminated the difference between mentalities shaped by reliance on the spoken as opposed to the written word. The gulf that separates our experience from that of literate elites who relied exclusively on hand-copied texts is much more difficult to fathom. There is nothing analogous in our experience or in that of any living creature within the Western world at present. The conditions of scribal culture thus have to be artificially reconstructed by recourse to history books and reference guides. Yet for the most part, these works are more likely to conceal than to reveal the object of such a search. Scribal themes are carried forward, postprint trends are traced backward, in a manner that makes it difficult to envisage the existence of a distinctive literary culture based on hand copying. There is not even an agreed-upon term in common use which designates the system of written communications which prevailed before print.

Schoolchildren who are asked to trace early overseas voyages on identical outline maps are likely to become absent-minded about the fact that there were no uniform world maps in the era when the voyages were made. A similar absent-mindedness on a more sophisticated level is encouraged by increasingly refined techniques for collating manuscripts and producing authoritative editions of them. Each successive edition tells us more than was previously known about how a given manuscript was composed and copied. By the same token, each makes it more difficult to envisage how a given manuscript appeared to a scribal scholar who had only one hand-copied version to consult and no certain guidance as to its place or date of composition, its title or author. Historians are trained to discriminate between manuscript sources and printed texts; but they are not trained to think with equal care about how manuscripts appeared when this sort of discrimination was inconceivable. Similarly, the more thoroughly we are trained to master the events and dates contained in modern history books, the less likely we are to appreciate the difficulties confronting scribal scholars who had access to assorted written records, but lacked uniform chronologies, maps, and all the other reference guides which are now in common use.

Efforts to reconstruct the circumstances that preceded printing thus lead to a scholarly predicament. Reconstruction requires recourse to printed materials, thereby blurring clear perception of the conditions that prevailed before these materials were available. Even when the predicament is partly resolved by sensitive scholars who manage to develop a genuine "feel" for the times after handling countless documents, efforts at reconstruction are still bound to be frustratingly incomplete. For the very texture of scribal culture was so fluctuating, uneven, and multiform that few long-range trends can be traced. Conditions that prevailed near the bookshops of ancient Rome, in the Alexandrian Library, or in certain medieval monasteries and university towns, made it possible for literate elites to develop a relatively sophisticated "bookish" culture. Yet all library collections were subject to contraction, and all texts in manuscript were liable to get corrupted after being copied over the course of time. Outside certain transitory special centers, moreover, the texture of scribal culture was so thin that heavy reliance was placed on oral transmission even by literate elites. Insofar as dictation governed copying in scriptoria and literary compositions were "published" by being read aloud, even "book" learning was governed by reliance on the spoken
word—producing a hybrid half-oral, half-literate culture that has no precise counterpart today. Just what publication meant before printing or just how messages got transmitted in the age of scribes are questions that cannot be answered in general. Findings are bound to vary enormously depending on date and place. Contradictory verdicts are especially likely to proliferate with regard to the last century before printing—an interval when paper had become available and the literate man was more likely to become his own scribe.

Specialists in the field of incunabula, who are confronted by ragged evidence, are likely to insist that a similar lack of uniformity characterizes procedures used by early printers. To generalize about early printing is undoubtedly hazardous, and one should be on guard against projecting the output of modern standard editions too far back into the past. Yet one must also be on guard against blurring a major difference between the last century of scribal culture and the first century after Gutenberg. Early print culture is sufficiently uniform to permit us to measure its diversity. We can estimate output, arrive at averages, trace trends. For example, we have rough estimates of the total output of all printed materials during the so-called age of incunabula (that is, the interval between the 1450s and 1500). Similarly, we can say that the "average" early edition ranged between two hundred and one thousand copies. There are no comparable figures for the last fifty years of scribal culture. Indeed, we have no figures at all. What is the "average edition" turned out between 1400 and 1450? The question verges on nonsense. The term "edition" comes close to being an anachronism when applied to copies of a manuscript book.

As the difficulties of trying to estimate scribal output suggest, quantification is not suited to the conditions of scribal culture. The production figures which are most often cited, on the basis of the memoirs of a Florentine manuscript bookdealer, turn out to be entirely untrustworthy. Quattrocento Florence, in any case, is scarcely typical of other Italian centers (such as Bologna), let alone of regions beyond the Alps. But then no region is typical. There is no "typical" bookdealer, scribe, or even manuscript. Even if we set aside problems presented by secular book producers and markets as hopelessly complex and consider only the needs of churchmen on the eve of printing, we are still faced by a remarkable diversity of procedures. Book provisions for diverse monastic orders varied; mendicant friars had different arrangements from monks. Popes and cardinals often turned to the "multifarious activities" of the Italian cartolari; preachers made their own anthologies of sermons; semi-lay orders attempted to provide primers and catechisms for everyman.

The absence of an average output or a typical procedure poses a stumbling block when we try to set the stage for the advent of print. Let us take, for example, a deceptively simple summary statement which I made when first trying to describe the printing revolution. Fifteenth-century book production, I asserted, moved from scriptoria to printing shops. The assertion was criticized for leaving out a previous move from scriptoria to stationers' shops. In the course of the twelfth century, lay stationers began to replace monastic scribes. Books needed by university faculties and the mendicant orders were supplied by a "putting-out" system. Copyists were no longer assembled in a single room, but worked on different portions of a given text, receiving payment from the stationer for each piece (the so-called pecia system). Book production, according to my critic, had thus moved out of scriptoria three centuries before the advent of print.

The objection seems worth further thought. Certainly one ought to pay attention to the rise of the lay stationer in university towns and other urban centers during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The contrast between the free labor of monks working for remission of sins and the wage labor of lay copyists is an important one. Recent research has stressed the use of a putting-out system and has also called into question long-lived assumptions about the existence of lay scriptoria attached to stationers' shops. Thus one must be especially cautious about using the term scriptoria
to apply to conditions in the later Middle Ages—more cautious than I was in my preliminary version.

Yet, on the other hand, one must also be wary about placing too much emphasis on trends launched in twelfth-century Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and other university towns where copies were multiplied rapidly to serve special institutional needs. Caution is needed when extending university regulations designed to control copyists to the actual practices of university stationers—let alone to bookdealers serving nonuniversity clientele. That relatively clear thirteenth-century patterns get smudged by the late fourteenth century must also be kept in mind. During the interval between 1350 and 1450—the crucial century when setting our stage—conditions were unusually anarchic, and some presumably obsolete habits were revived. Monastic scriptoria, for example, were beginning to experience their "last golden age."

The existence of monastic scriptoria right down to and even beyond the days of early printing is most intriguingly demonstrated by a treatise which is often cited as a curiosity in books on early printing: Johannes Trithemius's De laude scriptorum. In this treatise, the Abbot of Sponheim not only exhorted his monks to copy books, but also explained why "monks should not stop copying because of the invention of printing." Among other arguments (the usefulness of keeping idle hands busy, encouraging diligence, devotion, knowledge of Scripture, and so on), Trithemius somewhat illogically compared the written word on parchment which would last one thousand years with the printed word on paper which would have a shorter life span. The possible use of paper (and scraped parchment) by copyists, or of skin for a special printed version, went unmentioned. As a Christian scholar, the abbot was clearly familiar with earlier writings which had set durable parchment against perishable papyrus. His arguments show his concern about preserving a form of manual labor which seemed especially suitable for monks. Whether he was genuinely worried about an increased use of paper—as an ardent bibliophile and in the light of ancient warnings—is an open question. But his activities show clearly that as an author he did not favor handwork over presswork. He had his Praise of Scribes promptly printed, as he did his weightier works. Indeed, he used one Mainz print shop so frequently that "it could almost be called the Sponheim Abbey Press."

Even before 1494, when the Abbot of Sponheim made his trip from scriptorium to printing shop, the Carthusians of Saint Barbara's Charterhouse in Cologne were turning to local printers to extend their efforts, as a doistered order bound by vows of silence, to preach "with their hands." As many accounts note, the same thing happened outside Cologne and not just among the Carthusians. A variety of reformed Benedictine orders also kept local printers busy, and in some cases monks and nuns ran monastic presses themselves. The possible significance of this intrusion of a capitalist enterprise into consecrated space is surely worth further consideration. Thus, to rule out the formula "scriptorium to printing shop" completely seems almost as unwise as to attempt to apply it in a blanket form. Even while acknowledging the significance of changes affecting twelfth-century book production, we should not equate them with the sort of "book revolution" that occurred in the fifteenth century. The latter, unlike the former, assumed a cumulative and irreversible form. The revival of monastic scriptoria during the century before Gutenberg was the last revival of its kind. . . .

The Rise of the Reading Public

Given the religious, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity of European readers, it is difficult to imagine just what figure Marshall McLuhan had in mind when he wrote about the "making of typographical man." By making us more alert to the possibility that the advent of printing had social and psychological consequences, McLuhan performed, in my view at least, a valuable service. But he also glossed over multiple interactions that
occurred under widely varying circumstances. Granted that the replacement of discourse by silent scanning, of face-to-face contacts by more impersonal interactions, probably did have important consequences, it follows that we need to think less metaphorically and abstractly, more historically and concretely, about the sorts of effects that were entailed and how different groups were affected. Even at first glance both issues appear to be very complex.

We will not pause for long over one complication that has recently attracted attention: namely, Paul Saenger’s demonstration that habits of silent reading developed during the Middle Ages. It is now clear that McLuhan and the scholars upon whom he relied overstated the oral character of medieval interchanges and mistakenly assigned to printing responsibility for introducing habits of silent scanning which had already developed among some literate groups in the age of scribes. But although printing did not introduce silent reading, it did encourage an increasing recourse to “silent instructors, which nowadays carry farther than do public lectures” (in the words of a sixteenth-century professor of medicine). To show that the habit predated Gutenberg does not diminish the significance of its becoming increasingly more pervasive and ever more elaborately institutionalized after the shift from script to print.

Even while insisting on this point, we shall need to be cautious about assuming, as did McLuhan and other authorities, that the spread of habits of silent scanning invariably diminished recourse to the spoken word. Although the textbook industry flourished, classroom lectures never died. Printed sermons and orations did not remove preachers from their pulpits or speakers from their podiums. To the contrary, priests and orators both benefited from the way their personal charisma could be augmented and amplified by the printed word.

The increased recourse to silent publication undoubtedly altered the character of some spoken words. Exchanges between members of parliament, for example, were probably affected by the printing of parliamentary debates. The printing of poems, plays, and songs altered the way “lines” were recited, composed, and sung. On the one hand, some “dying speeches” were fabricated for printing and never did get delivered; on the other, printed publicity enabled evangelists and demagogues to practice traditional arts outdoors before an expanded hearing public. A literary culture created by typography was conveyed to the ear, not the eye, by repertory companies and poetry readings. No simple formula will cover the changes these new activities reflect.

The same is true of how different groups were affected. Most rural villagers, for example, probably belonged to an exclusively hearing public down to the nineteenth century. Yet what they heard had, in many instances, been transformed by printing two centuries earlier. For the storyteller was replaced by the exceptional literate villager who read out loud from a stack of cheap books and ballad sheets turned out anonymously for distribution by peddlers. A fairly sleazy “popular” culture, based on the mass production of antiquated vernacular medieval romances, was thus produced well before the steam press and mass literacy movements of the nineteenth century. Yet the bulk of this output was consumed by a hearing public, separated by a psychological gulf from their contemporaries who belonged to a reading one.

The disjunction between the new mode of production and older modes of consumption is only one of many complications that need further study. Members of the same reading public, who confronted the same innovation in the same region at the same time, were nonetheless affected by it in markedly different ways. Trends pointing both to modernism and to fundamentalism, for example, were launched by Bible printing—as later discussion suggests. Pornography as well as piety assumed new forms. Book reading did not stop short with guides to godly living or practical manuals and texts, any more than printers stopped short at producing them. The same silence, solitude, and contemplative attitudes associated formerly with spiritual devotion also
accompanied the perusal of scandal sheets, "lewd Ballads," "merry books of Italie," and other "corrupted tales in Inke and Paper." Not a desire to withdraw from a worldly society or the city of man, but a gregarious curiosity about them, could be satisfied by silent perusal of journals, gazettes, or newsletters. Complaints about the "sullen silence" of newspaper readers in seventeenth-century coffeehouses point to the intrusive effects of printed materials on some forms of sociability.

As communion with the Sunday paper has replaced church-going, there is a tendency to forget that sermons had at one time been coupled with news about local and foreign affairs, real estate transactions, and other mundane matters. After printing, however, news gathering and circulation were handled more efficiently under lay auspices. As contemporaries observed, there were resemblances between coffeehouse and conventicle. But the pipe-smoking habitues of the former gave otherworldly concerns low priority. Such considerations might be noted when thinking about the "secularization" or "desacralization" of Western Christendom. For in all regions (to go beyond the eighteenth century for a moment) the pulpit was ultimately displaced by the periodical press, and the dictum "nothing sacred" came to characterize the journalist's career. Pitted against "the furious itch of novelty" and the "general thirst after news," efforts by Catholic moralists and Protestant evangelicals, even Sunday schools and other Sabbatarian measures proved of little avail. The monthly gazette was succeeded by the weekly and finally by the daily paper. More and more provincial newspapers were founded. By the last century, gossiping churchgoers could often learn about local affairs by scanning columns of newsprint in silence at home.

The displacement of pulpit by press is significant not only in connection with secularization but also because it points to an explanation for the weakening of local community ties. To hear an address delivered, people have to come together; to read a printed report encourages individuals to draw apart. "What the orators of Rome and Athens were in the midst of a people assembled," said Malesherbes in an address of 1775, "men of letters are in the midst of a dispersed people." His observation suggests how the shift in communications may have changed the sense of what it meant to participate in public affairs. The wide distribution of identical bits of information provided an impersonal link between people who were unknown to each other.

By its very nature, a reading public was not only more dispersed; it was also more atomistic and individualistic than a hearing one. To catch the contrast, Walter Ong suggests that we imagine a speaker addressing an audience equipped with texts and stopping at one point with the request that a textual passage be read silently. When the readers look up again, the fragmented audience has to be reassembled into a collectivity. Insofar as a traditional sense of community entailed frequent gathering together to receive a given message, this sense was probably weakened by the duplication of identical messages which brought the solitary reader to the fore. To be sure, bookshops, coffeehouses, reading rooms provided new kinds of communal gathering places. Yet subscription lists and corresponding societies represented relatively impersonal group formations, while the reception of printed messages in any place still required temporary isolation—just as it does in a library now. The notion that society may be regarded as a bundle of discrete units or that the individual is prior to the social group seems to be more compatible with a reading public than with a hearing one. The nature of man as a political animal was less likely to conform to classical models after tribunes of the people were transmuted from orators in public squares to editors of news sheets and gazettes.

Even while communal solidarity was diminished, vicarious participation in more distant events was also enhanced; and even while local ties were loosened, links to larger collective units were being forged. Printed materials encouraged silent adherence to causes whose advocates could not be found in any one parish and who addressed an
invisible public from afar. New forms of group identity began to compete with an older, more localized nexus of loyalties. Urban populations were not only pulled apart, they were also linked in new ways by the more impersonal channels of communication. The exchange of goods and services, real estate transactions, the provision of charity were all eventually affected. Personal attendance was increasingly supplemented by vicarious participation in civic functions and municipal affairs. Cheap versions of the magnificent prints which commemorated civic ceremonies, such as royal entries, enabled some stay-at-homes to experience "public" festivals.

The features of individual rulers and of members of their entourage came into sharper focus for scattered subjects in a given realm. The circulation of prints and engravings made it possible for a reigning dynasty to impress a personal presence on mass consciousness in a new way. The effect of duplicating images and portraits of rulers—which were eventually framed and hung in peasant hovels throughout Catholic Europe, along with saints and icons—has yet to be assessed by political scientists. The mass following of a single leader and the nationwide extension of his or her charismatic appeal, at all events, are possible by-products of the new communications systems which ought to be further explored.

Joseph Klait's study of Louis XIV's propaganda efforts describes how early modern rulers deliberately set out to exploit the new presses:

Princes who had employed the cumbersome methods of manuscript to communicate with their subjects switched quickly to print to announce declarations of war, publish battle accounts, promulgate treaties or argue disputed points in pamphlet form. Theirs was an effort . . . "to win the psychological war which prepared and accompanied the military operations" of rulers . . . The English crown under Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell made systematic use of both Parliament and press to win public support for the Reformation . . .

In France the regency of Louis XIII saw the last meeting of the Estates General before 1789; it also saw the founding of the first royally sponsored newspaper in Europe. The replacement of the volatile assembly by the controlled weekly Gazette is a concurrence symptomatic of the importance Cardinal Richelieu attached to print in his state-building objectives.

As these references to Richelieu and Thomas Cromwell suggest, even while making room for the heightened visibility of individual rulers, we also need to note how the powers of officials and bureaucrats were extended once government regulations became subject to the duplicative powers of print. The expansion of leviathan states, as might be expected, provoked countermeasures from parliaments and assemblies. Traditional tensions between court and country, crown and estates, were exacerbated by propaganda wars. A greater uniformity began to characterize provincial demands, with the circulation of model petitions and lists of grievances . . .

Recently some historians have begun to abandon, as fruitless, older debates about the "rise" of a new class to political power in early modern times. They seek to focus attention instead on the reeducation and regroupment of older governing elites—and have, thereby, precipitated new debates. Both lines of inquiry might be reconciled and fruitfully pursued if the consequences of printing received more attention.

**Selected Readings**

Febvre, Lucien, and Martin, H-J. *The Coming of the Book*, trans. David Gerard (London, 1976). First ed.: *L'Apparition du livre* (Paris, 1958). Readers competent in French should get the original 1958 French version, which is superior in every way (including its bibliography and index) to this recent English translation. The book (which was written almost entirely by Martin) is a masterful survey and has more comprehensive coverage than any other title on this list.

rare-book librarian who is especially knowledgeable about European book-selling and printing.


CHAPTER 12

Early Modern Literacies

Harvey J. Graff

Harvey J. Graff is professor of history and humanities at the University of Texas at Dallas and author of several acclaimed books on literacy, including The Literacy Myth and Literacy in History.

PRINT, REFORM, AND REFORMATION

In the history of the West, the Protestant Reformation is said to be one of the greatest positive forces toward the spread of literacy and schooling. It can easily be viewed as an educational reform movement: "The basic assumptions of the reformers were that one must start with the young, that indoctrination is necessary for religious and moral improvement . . . , that this indoctrination must be done in public schools. . . ." The Reformation involved factors far beyond the religious and theological. Its roots lay in the Middle Ages; economic, political, cultural, and social issues inextricably intertwined to give rise to a deep and bitterly divisive mass movement. Its conflicts lasted through much of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the reformation of social life was a long-term endeavor in Western society and culture, to which literacy was often central.

Ecclesiastical reform movements were the central cause of the Reformation, which was triggered by the "publication" of Martin Luther's ninety-five theses in 1518. Increasing dissatisfaction with the church and papacy resulted in a slow, but steady, development of active dissent in the first half of the sixteenth century.

The major reform movements that helped to shape the context for the Reformation shared a common concern with moral criteria and a common approach: except for the "Devoitio Moderna," the movements all looked to secular authorities for aid, took arguments and inspiration from the Bible, and appealed to the early church. They sought the reaffirmation of community, the reorganization of lay piety and religion, and the