



Bible Review Aussie Style

The title is a bit of a misnomer since only one of the five reviews is Aussie, but it is the one we are featuring. From the other reviews we have just gleaned a number of comments that show how others see the EHV. The leading geographical region for non-Lutheran reviews of the EHV is the American South.

One surprise for me was how many different features someone reviewing the quality of a printed volume must pass judgment on—not five or six as I expected, but fifteen to twenty, many of which I never even think about. Do any of you know the right name of that little striped cord at each end of the back piece of the book cover? Reviewers do.

Here are *some* of the features noted by an evaluator of the EHV basic print Bible:

The EHV is a Lutheran translation. My hardback copy has text printed in a single column, formatted into paragraphs. The 10 point font is attractive and sharp, while the line spacing is more than adequate. On the other hand, the ink appears dark gray rather than black, and the text is not line-matched. But the soft, wavy paper is perhaps the worst aspect of this edition. The Deuterocanonical books are not included. The words of Christ are NOT in red. Pronouns that refer to the Divine Persons are not capitalized. Headings are placed in the text, and some of these direct the reader to parallel passages. In this review, I read four short selections to give you a sense for the character and style of the EHV.

The surprising thing is that these format reviews of the EHV are so positive—not that the NPH volume does not have a good layout— but because many of the things that some purchasers of the EHV complain about, such as font size, seem fine to professionals who review many Bibles. The two main things they express doubt about are the paper and the darkness of the ink. When an open EHV and an open CSB are viewed side by side, the verdict is that the CSB and EHV compare very favorably. Comments about the EHV include “nice spread-out look,” “traditional but innovative:” (I am not sure if that is a compliment or if *innovative* is a synonym for “not main stream” or “quirky”). The end verdict of the review was ANOTHER GREAT TOOL.

One problem we face is that many of the reviewers never heard of NPH or the Wartburg Project, and some did not have a physical copy of the EHV in hand. So then why did they review the EHV? In most cases it was that one of their regular followers requested a review. In one case, a reviewer who described himself as a Pentecostal King James guy reviewed the EHV because one of the teachers at his church was using the EHV in class.

How did they review the EHV without a print copy? The answer is that they find the material on our website to be a very valuable resource for reviewing the EHV.

How do they regard the fact that the EHV is a Lutheran Bible? Two of them mentioned that they did not feel any sectarian or biased slants in the translation. Another took note of our claim to be a Bible *by* Lutherans *for* everyone, but said he felt some places where the EHV might have had a Lutheran feeling. It seems that by and large the only people who feel that non-Lutherans won't consider using a "Lutheran" Bible are some Midwestern Lutherans.

These are just some random gleanings from several reviews. All of the reviews seemed fair and open-minded. The following link take you to the Aussie review by Steve. It is about twenty minutes long.

https://youtu.be/k_Y3EId-FqY?si=PoYjfGdPJkvREJ55https://youtu.be/k_Y3EId-FqY?si=PoYjfGdPJkvREJ55

