

did not give up His divine attributes, He did not give up His power, He did not give up His knowledge. He gave up His standing, the reputation, the position in which everyone would have had to recognize Him as the Lord of glory. These were people who were convinced by the arguments that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but they said, "What Jesus said has nothing to do with it because He had emptied Himself." Now, nobody who believes in the deity of Christ would say that He so emptied Himself that He knew nothing except what an ordinary person would know. He could not be the Savior if He emptied Himself to that extent. Certainly anyone who believed in His deity would have to believe that He did retain some spiritual knowledge that was beyond that of ordinary people. They could not say He emptied Himself of all of His knowledge. What they said was that He emptied Himself of His divine knowledge of matters aside from His own direct sphere of mission. That would be their view. But it was one of the reasons the Kenosis theory did not last; it was impossible to define with accuracy what He emptied Himself of. They say He emptied Himself, therefore He did not know this. Well, what did He empty Himself of? There is no definite defining anywhere, and if something so important as that is taught in scripture, we would expect it to be explained more fully somewhere. In the context the word seems to mean He emptied Himself of the glorious standing which would make it obvious that He was the Lord of glory. The King James Version says, "He made Himself of no reputation." As I have said, I think that is too weak. It does not mean that people had not heard anything significant about Him; it means that when people saw Him they did not suddenly say, "Look, that is the Lord of glory. That is the Creator of the universe!" They would certainly have said that if they had seen Him in His heavenly state, but