

KENOTIC EFFLUENT PANAPOTHEISM

*The System Stated: The Kenotic Act, Effluence, and the Outpouring of the
Divine*

Christopher E. Etter

Catharturgy Corpus · Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism · 2026

Abstract

This paper states, for the first time directly, the system that the Catharturgy Corpus has everywhere assumed and nowhere set out: Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism. Where the foundational papers establish the governing axiom and the formal architecture of Threeness, and the cosmological papers invoke an effluent, dimensionally conditioned creation continuous from its Creator, the present paper supplies the centre on which all of these depend — the kenotic act by which God creates, the effluence that is its mode, and the panapotheism that is its result. The three terms are defined and shown to be one doctrine. The kenotic act is the divine self-emptying understood not as withdrawal but as outpouring: God creates by pouring out, not by contracting to make room. Effluence is the mode of that outpouring — a flowing-forth that is continuous from its source, dimensionally conditioned as it descends, neither severed from God by a gap nor identical with God in substance. Panapotheism is the result: all things are from the outpouring of the divine energy, the divine spark dimensionally conditioned into the registers of creation, continuous from the Creator at every intersection. The paper distinguishes this outpouring kenosis lightly from the withdrawal-kenosis of the modern kenotic theologians and from the Lurianic tzimtzum, with which it shares the language of divine self-limitation but not the vector: where those models have God withdraw or contract to leave room for an other, the kenotic act of this system has God pour out, so that creation is the continuous effluence of the divine rather than what remains after a divine retreat. The kenotic act is shown to ground the axiom, the Threeness, the perpendicular and dimensional cosmology, and the cathartic work that is the system's name.

Keywords: Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism · KEP · Kenosis · Effluence · Panapotheism · Divine Outpouring · Self-Emptying · Dimensional Conditioning · Continuity at the Intersection · Tzimtzum · Catharturgy

I. The Unstated Centre

The Catharturgy Corpus is named for a system: Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism, the doctrine that all things proceed from the self-emptying outpouring of God. Yet across the foundational and cosmological papers the system itself has been everywhere assumed and nowhere directly stated. The axiom that nothing can limit God but itself is established; the formal architecture of Threeness is derived; the elemental registers and the perpendicular qualities of matter are developed; the bounded fractal of contained multiplicity declares its cosmology to be kenotic and effluent rather than a creation from nothing. But the paper that the others implicitly cite — the one that states what the kenotic act is, what effluence is, and what panapotheism positively asserts — has been missing. This paper supplies that centre.

The omission is not incidental, because the kenotic act is the mechanism on which the whole system turns. The continuity of creation from its Creator, asserted at the ceiling of the fractal; the dimensional conditioning by which the universe is substantially distinct yet continuous at the intersection; the rejection of creatio ex nihilo in favour of an effluent cosmology; the very possibility that the divine pattern is imaged throughout creation — all of these rest on the kenotic act as their ground. To state the system is therefore to state the act, and the three terms of its name are three aspects of one doctrine: the kenotic act, the effluent mode, and the panapotheist result.

II. The Kenotic Act: Outpouring, Not Withdrawal

Kenosis, in the Christian theological tradition, is the divine self-emptying. The word is drawn from the second chapter of the letter to the Philippians, where the Son is said to have emptied himself, taking the form of a servant. The kenotic theologians of the modern period — and behind them the broader tradition of reflection on divine self-limitation — extended this self-emptying from the incarnation to creation itself, proposing that God creates by a primordial act of self-emptying that precedes and makes possible the existence of anything other than God.

The system of this Corpus affirms that creation is a kenotic act, but specifies its vector in a way that distinguishes it decisively from the dominant modern accounts. In those accounts — most influentially in the kenotic creation-theology that draws on the Lurianic *tzimtzum*, the divine contraction by which the limitless *Ein Sof* withdraws from a region of itself to leave room for the world — the kenotic act is a withdrawal. God contracts, retreats, or self-limits in order to make room for a creation that is other than God, and creation occupies the space left by the divine retreat. The vector is inward and away: God withdraws, and the world exists in the vacated room.

The kenotic act of this system has the opposite vector. It is not withdrawal but outpouring. God does not contract to make room for an other; God pours out, and the outpouring itself is the creation. The divine self-emptying is not a retreat that leaves a vacancy but an effusion that fills — a giving-forth of the divine energy that becomes, as it is poured out and conditioned, the registers of creation. Where the withdrawal models have creation exist in the gap left by the divine retreat,

the outpouring model has creation exist as the continuous effluence of the divine giving. There is no vacated room and no gap; there is the outpouring and what the outpouring becomes.

This distinction is the hinge on which the system's cosmology turns, and it is why the Corpus rejects *creatio ex nihilo* and the withdrawal-kenosis alike. A creation from nothing places an absolute gap of being between Creator and creature. A withdrawal-kenosis places a vacated region between them, creation existing in the space God has retreated from. Both leave creation discontinuous from its source — separated by a gap in the one case, by a withdrawal in the other. The outpouring kenosis leaves no such separation: creation is continuous from the Creator because it is the Creator's own outpoured energy, dimensionally conditioned as it descends, joined to its source at every intersection. The kenotic act is the act of giving-forth, and creation is the gift still continuous with the giving.

The kenotic act of this system is outpouring, not withdrawal. God does not contract to make room for creation; God pours out, and the outpouring is the creation. Where the withdrawal-kenosis and the *tzimtzum* leave creation in the vacated room of a divine retreat, the effluent kenosis leaves creation continuous from its source — the divine energy poured forth and dimensionally conditioned, joined to the Creator at every intersection, never severed by a gap.

III. Effluence: The Mode of the Outpouring

If the kenotic act is the outpouring, effluence is its mode — the manner in which the outpouring proceeds and becomes the registers of creation. Effluence is a flowing-forth: a continuous emanative giving that proceeds from the source without departing from it, conditioned into distinct registers as it descends, yet never severed from the source from which it flows. The term was introduced in the Corpus to replace emergence as the named mechanism of the system: where emergence describes complex properties arising from the mere arrangement of lower components, with no continuity to any source beyond the arrangement, effluence describes the registers of creation flowing forth from the divine outpouring, continuous from their source and conditioned in their descent.

The crucial feature of effluence is that it preserves both continuity and distinction, which the rival accounts cannot hold together. Emanation in its strong classical form risks continuity without sufficient distinction — the world as a diluted continuation of the divine substance, sliding toward pantheism. Creation from nothing secures distinction at the cost of continuity — the world as a substance made from nothing, severed from God by a gap. Effluence holds both: the outpoured energy is continuous from its source, so there is no gap and no severance; but it is dimensionally conditioned as it is poured out, so that each register is substantially distinct, with substance indexed to its own dimension and bearing no cross-dimensional identity with the source. The divine spark is genuinely present in the creation as its energy, and the creation is genuinely distinct as the dimensionally conditioned register it has become. Effluence is the flowing-forth that is at once continuous and conditioned, joined and distinct.

This is why the dimensional-intersection account of the companion cosmology is the correct

articulation of effluence. The outpoured divine energy is continuous from its source, but it is conditioned into dimensional registers, and substance is dimensionally indexed — so the relation between the divine source and any created register, and between one register and another, is not sameness of substance nor a substance-gap but dimensional distinctness joined by continuity at the intersection, on the paradigm of body and soul. Effluence is the name of the act by which this is so: the divine energy flowing forth, conditioned into the registers, continuous from its source at the intersection where each register meets what is above and beyond it. The flowing-forth is the effluence; the dimensional conditioning is what makes the registers distinct; the continuity at the intersection is what keeps them joined to the source from which they flow.

IV. Panapotheism: The Result of the Outpouring

Panapotheism is the positive doctrine that results from the kenotic act and its effluent mode: that all things are from the outpouring of the divine energy. The term is to be distinguished from both pantheism and panentheism, with which it shares a prefix but not a doctrine. Pantheism identifies the world with God, collapsing the distinction. Panentheism holds that the world is in God, the divine containing and exceeding the world. Panapotheism — all-from-God, from the Greek apo, from or out of — holds that all things are from God: from the divine outpouring, the divine energy poured forth and conditioned into the registers of creation. The accent falls on the apo, the from: creation is neither identical with God nor merely contained in God but proceeds from God as the outpoured effluence of the divine energy.

The companion paper that argues panapotheism against panentheism establishes the contrast by way of the in-requires-out argument: that for the world to be in God, there must be a sense in which it is also from and of God's outpouring, since a containment that is not also a giving-forth leaves the contained world's being unaccounted. Panapotheism states the positive doctrine that the contrast points toward. All things are from the divine outpouring: the divine spark, dimensionally conditioned, constitutes the registers of creation, which are therefore continuous from their source as the outpoured energy of God and distinct from their source as the dimensionally conditioned registers they have become. The world is from God in the precise sense that it is God's own energy poured forth and conditioned — not God (against pantheism), not merely in God (beyond panentheism), but from God, the continuous effluence of the divine giving.

Panapotheism so understood is the result of which the kenotic act is the cause and effluence is the mode. God pours out (the kenotic act); the outpouring flows forth and is dimensionally conditioned (effluence); and the result is that all things are from the divine energy, continuous from their source and distinct as their registers (panapotheism). The three terms of the system's name are three moments of one doctrine: the act, the mode, and the result of the divine outpouring. Kenotic names the act as self-emptying; effluent names the mode as flowing-forth; panapotheism names the result as all-from-the-outpouring.

Kenotic names the act: the divine self-emptying as outpouring. Effluent names the mode: the flowing-forth that is continuous from its source and dimensionally conditioned in its descent. Panapotheism names the result: all things from the divine energy, continuous from the Creator

and distinct as the registers they have become. Three moments of one doctrine — the act, the mode, and the result of the divine outpouring.

V. The Kenotic Act as the Ground of the System

With the centre stated, its relation to the rest of the Corpus can be made explicit, for the kenotic act grounds each of the system's major commitments. It grounds the governing axiom that nothing can limit God but itself: the divine self-emptying is the one limitation God places upon the divine self, freely, in the act of pouring out — not a limit imposed from without, which the axiom forbids, but the self-limitation of the outpouring, which the axiom permits as God's own act upon God's own self. It grounds the Threeness: the outpouring is the act of a God who is the source of Threeness, and the constructive and relating forms by which the outpoured energy is structured and joined — the Dyadic and the Triadic — are the forms of the divine mind that pours itself forth. It grounds the perpendicular and dimensional cosmology: the outpoured energy is conditioned into perpendicular dimensional registers, continuous at their intersections, which is the dimensional-intersection account the cosmological papers develop. And it grounds the contained multiplicity and its fractal recurrence: the outpouring, structured by the constructive and relating forms, produces the unities-containing-multiplicity that recur across the registers of creation.

It grounds, too, the system's definition of evil, which follows directly from the outpouring. If all that has substance is the divine energy poured forth, then evil can have no substance of its own — for a substantial evil would be either a second ultimate standing outside the outpouring, which the axiom forbids, or a positive thing among the things poured forth, which would make the outpoured fullness of God the author of evil. Evil is therefore ontological absence: the privation of the fullness, the lack of the presence that the outpouring gives. The absence is real, as the cosmic expansion toward emptiness is real, but it is inert; its threat arises only in a free soul that clings to the absence rather than to the source, the clinging taking the concrete form of the mind's contraction onto a finite fixation at the expense of the fullness. So the kenotic act grounds both the goodness of all that is and the precise location of evil: everything poured forth is good as far as it has being, and evil is the soul's free turning from the fullness toward the absence. The full argument is given in the companion treatise on the definition of evil; what matters here is that the privation account is not an addition to the system but a direct consequence of its centre, since a theology of the divine outpouring can give evil no positive being without contradicting the outpouring itself.

Most of all, the kenotic act grounds the cathartic work that is the system's name. Catharturgy is the active work of purification — the labour by which the soul is purified and returned toward its source. If creation is the outpoured energy of God, continuous from its source and dimensionally conditioned, then the soul is the divine spark conditioned into the human register, continuous from its source at the intersection that the body and the neuroanatomy constitute. The cathartic work is the purification of that conditioned spark — the restoration of its right operation, the clearing of the privations that obscure its continuity from its source. The kenotic act gives the cathartic work its object and its possibility: there is something to purify because the divine energy

has been poured out and conditioned into the register of the soul, and the purification is possible because the conditioned spark remains continuous from the source toward which it is purified. The outpouring is the descent; catharturgy is the purifying return.

VI. The Light Distinction from the Kenotic Tradition

It remains to situate this system lightly against the existing kenotic theologies, without entering a full comparative analysis. The modern kenotic tradition is rich and varied. The kenotic Christologists developed the self-emptying of the Son in the incarnation, the Word divesting himself of glory while retaining his divine nature. Sergius Bulgakov extended kenosis across incarnation, Trinity, and creation, treating the divine self-emptying as a comprehensive principle of sacrificial love. Jürgen Moltmann, drawing explicitly on the Lurianic *tzimtzum*, proposed that God withdraws himself from himself to himself in order to make creation possible, so that the divine self-restriction precedes and grounds the creative act. Hans Urs von Balthasar made kenosis the very character of the divine love and of theosis. These accounts share with the present system the conviction that creation is bound up with divine self-emptying and that divine power operates by self-limitation rather than by coercion.

The present system parts from them on the vector of the kenotic act, and this is the one distinction worth marking clearly. The dominant strand of the modern kenotic creation-theology, in its *tzimtzum*-influenced form, is a kenosis of withdrawal: God contracts or retreats to make room for an other, and creation exists in the room thus vacated. The kenosis of this system is a kenosis of outpouring: God pours forth, and creation is the continuous effluence of the outpouring, not what remains in a vacated space. The difference is consequential. The withdrawal-kenosis tends toward a creation set at a distance from its source, existing in the room of the divine retreat; the outpouring-kenosis yields a creation continuous from its source, the divine energy poured forth and dimensionally conditioned, joined to the Creator at every intersection. The shared language of divine self-limitation conceals a divergence of direction: withdrawal makes room by retreating; outpouring makes creation by giving. This system is a theology of the divine giving-forth, and its kenosis is the self-emptying of a God who pours out rather than withdraws.

The engagement is deliberately light, and the comparison is offered for orientation rather than as a developed argument; a fuller comparative treatment would situate the outpouring-kenosis against each of these accounts in detail. What matters for the statement of the system is the single clarifying contrast: that among the family of kenotic theologies, this one is distinguished by the vector of its kenotic act, the outpouring that yields an effluent and continuous creation rather than the withdrawal that yields a creation in the vacated room.

VII. Conclusion: The System Stated

Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism is the doctrine that all things proceed from the self-emptying outpouring of God. Its three terms are three moments of one act: the kenotic act of divine self-

emptying, understood as outpouring and not as withdrawal; the effluent mode of that outpouring, the flowing-forth that is continuous from its source and dimensionally conditioned in its descent; and the panapotheist result, that all things are from the divine energy, continuous from the Creator and distinct as the registers they have become. The system creates not from nothing across a gap, nor from a divine withdrawal that leaves a vacated room, but from the outpouring of the divine energy that remains continuous with its source at every intersection.

This is the centre the Corpus has everywhere assumed, now stated. The axiom, the Threeness, the perpendicular and dimensional cosmology, the contained multiplicity and its fractal recurrence, and the cathartic work itself all rest upon the kenotic act — the divine giving-forth by which the registers of creation are poured out and conditioned, continuous from their source and distinct as themselves. The outpouring is the descent of the divine energy into the registers of creation; catharturgy is the purifying return of the conditioned spark toward the source from which it was poured. To state the system is to state the act: God pours out, the outpouring flows forth and is conditioned, and all things are from the divine energy — kenotic in its act, effluent in its mode, panapotheist in its result, and continuous, at every intersection, from the Creator who pours himself forth and is not diminished.

God pours out, and the outpouring is the creation. Kenotic in its act, effluent in its mode, panapotheist in its result: all things are from the divine energy, continuous from the Creator at every intersection and distinct as the registers they have become. The outpouring is the descent; the active work of purification is the return. This is the system the Corpus has everywhere assumed and here at last states — the theology of the God who creates by giving himself forth, and is not diminished in the giving.

References and Primary Sources

The Holy Bible. Philippians 2:5–11 (the kenosis of the Son); Genesis 1:2; Psalm 104:30.

Etter, Christopher E. *Nothing Can Limit God But Itself; Nothing and Threeness; Panapotheism versus Panentheism*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Etter, Christopher E. *The Dyad and the Triad; The Bounded Fractal of Contained Multiplicity; The Perpendicular Qualities of Matter*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Etter, Christopher E. *The Definition of Evil; From Non-Pluralism to Perpendicularity; Omniscience and Freedom; Of That Same Space*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Lamb of God*; and see ‘The Kenotic Theology of Sergius Bulgakov,’ *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58 (2005): 251–269.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *God in Creation*. London: SCM Press, 1985 (the *tzimtzum*-influenced kenosis of withdrawal).

von Balthasar, Hans Urs. Theo-Drama (on kenosis as the character of divine love and theosis).

Scholem, Gershom. Kabbalah. New York: Quadrangle, 1974 (the Lurianic tzimtzum, the divine contraction).

‘Humbled onto Death: Kenosis and Tsimtsum as Two Models of Divine Self-Negation.’
Philosophies 9, no. 5 (2024): 134 (for the kenosis–tzimtzum comparison).

Christopher E. Etter | Catharturgy Corpus | 2026