in the process of disseminating the ideas of the Further Reformation, as the above-mentioned Darnton model indicates.

The authors provide valuable insight into how dedicated publishers handled Pietistic manuscripts. In addition, this book serves as a tool for those who wish to further explore this subject. Just as Willem Teellinck, Godefridus Udemans, and Jodocus van Lodenstein were more important for the Further Reformation than others, so were their booksellers and publishers. Recent treatment of these theologians has opened the way for more focused attention on how their theology was made widely available through the publication of their works.

—Jan Willem Stolk, Independent Researcher


Already in 1739 the so-called “Daily Watchwords” (Lösungen) of the Moravians (Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine) were being read in not only “Herrnhut, Herrenhaag, Herendyk, Pilgerruh, Ebersdorf, Jena, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, London, Oxford, Berlin, Greenland, Sainte-Croix, Saint-Thomas, Saint-Jean, Barbados, Palestine, Surinam, and Savannah (Georgia), but also among the Moors in the Carolinas, the savages in Irene (Pennsylvania), the Hottentots (in Guinea), and many other places throughout the world” (161). In all these places there were Moravian settlements or missions. Presently disseminated in more than fifty languages, the Watchwords are a “mark of living ecumenism” (162), crossing denominational boundaries.

Peter Zimmerling, professor of Practical Theology in Leipzig, has published numerous studies, particularly on Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700–1760). In this book he traces the history of the calendars with biblical texts printed on them from 1728 to the present day. Through a procedure of drawing lots—the name—a prepared selection of Bible verses was used both for divine guidance and comfort in communities and for individual decision-making among the early Moravians. Their founder, Nicholas Zinzendorf, played a crucial role. The Watchword texts were intended to enable one to live each day with the Scriptures. Each day followers of this tradition would cast lots and choose a selection from the Old Testament, a didactic text from the New Testament, and a prayer or hymn-verse. Zimmerling calls this triad “a condensed liturgy of worship
for each day” (144). Zinzendorf, whom he describes as the “inventor” (11) of this applied Bible piety, conceived the individual verses as a guide to understanding all of Scripture. The passages chosen for a given day, person or group, or for special occasions, were not to take the place of the Bible, but rather to lead readers to it. The fact that the text of the Old and the New Testament illuminate each other and are supplemented by the voice of tradition, emphasized the “self-efficiency of Scripture” (142). From the beginning to the present day all further exegesis in published form was rejected. The importance of the Daily Watchwords in prayer and various forms of worship must not be underestimated. Their omission from meetings in many Protestant churches today would be unimaginable.

Zimmerling's book gives us a vivid picture of the 250-year history of this booklet, which has become the epitome of evangelical biblical piety. In eleven chapters the author reflects on the past, present, and future of the Watchwords. There is also a foreword by the Chairperson of the Provincial Board and, by way of “conclusion,” an article by the hymn-writer Detlef Block, as well as a concise bibliography. Two chapters illustrate the history of Zinzendorf and the early Moravians, who settled in and around Herrnhut, a little village east of Dresden. In explaining Zinzendorf’s conception of the Bible, Zimmerling outlines a “mini-theology of Watchwords” (123–38). Four chapters are devoted to the “history of the impact of the Watchwords.” Here, by way of survey, the author introduces select individuals and episodes from the early eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. Johann Christoph Blumhardt (1805–1880) and Count Hans von Lehndorff (1910–1987) are portrayed in some detail. Three other persons are presented in separate chapters, each in terms of their relationship to the Watchwords: Otto von Bismarck (1815–1898), Jochen Klepper (1903–1942), and Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906–1945). The latter two are widely known as authoritative figures in the time of National Socialism and their respective relationship to the Watchwords gives the reader a view into other aspects of their personal beliefs. As Zimmerling explored in other chapters, the period of Kirchenkampf was decisive in the diffusion of the Watchwords. On the basis of thorough research he shows that the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck made personal notes in editions of the Watchwords over many years.

Zimmerling’s conclusions, however, from which he constructs a profile of Bismarck’s “spirituality” (81), seem far-fetched. Zimmerling stresses the “authenticity” of Bismarck’s conversion (64, 67) and proceeds to his “turning to personal faith in God” (59), which he presents as proven fact. On the
basis of the notes in the Watchword booklets, Zimmerling draws far-reaching conclusions that the chancellor “was no ruthless power seeker” (73). While the extant sources attest to Bismarck’s reading of the Watchwords, Zimmerling’s conclusions are, in some cases, unsustainable. Likewise, he attempts to put Kleppers’s conception of Prussia in as favorable a light as possible.

In the chapter “Reasons for the Success of the Watchwords,” Zimmerling provides a condensed introduction to the procedure for the selection by lot and the emergence of other texts. Two further chapters (147–58; 159–66) offer various perspectives on the current and future significance of the Daily Watchwords. He also explores politicians of various parties in these chapters. In another chapter, “The Book of Watchwords—A Trusted Companion from School Days,” the author shares his own experiences with Watchword texts at decisive points in his life.

Zimmerling seeks to provide an overview in plain language of the history and significance of the Watchwords. However, the book possesses a number of weaknesses. The order of the chapters is somewhat haphazard and the choice of examples often eclectic. In his attempt to write clearly the author occasionally misses his goal; for example, his claim that the Watchwords were comparable to a “Maggi cube” containing, the “quintessence” of Scripture (129). It is regrettable that the author neglected the relatively recent work of Shirley Brückner, which contextualized the Moravian Brotherhood’s practice of drawing lots. While the Watchwords are unique in their own way, we must not forget that they were part of a long history of appropriating the Bible.

—Ruth Albrecht, Institut für Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Universität Hamburg