

THE DYAD AND THE TRIAD

Construction and Relation as the Two Forms of the Divine Mind, and the Threeness of Contained Multiplicity

Christopher E. Etter

Catharturgy Corpus · Kenotic Effluent Panapotheism · 2026

Abstract

This paper proposes a formal distinction between two Pythagorean numerical forms and their Trinitarian correspondents that resolves several open problems in the Catharturgy Corpus at once. The Dyad — the form of the Logos — is the form of one-plus-one as additive combination: the operation by which any complex singular abstraction whatsoever is constructed. The Dyad therefore contains, as a generative space, the infinity of possible abstractions, each of which is a unity however internally elaborate. The Triad — the form of the Holy Spirit — is the form not of a further iteration within a unity but of relation between completed unities: one complex abstraction together with another complex abstraction requires an irreducible third, the relating context in which the two can stand as distinct and comparable.

Construction within a unity is Dyadic; relation between unities is Triadic. This distinction, it is argued, is the formal-mathematical sharpening of the divided-brain account (the left hemisphere constructs abstraction, the right hemisphere supplies context), gives a generative mechanism for the contained multiplicity of the angelic choirs (the Dyad generates the latent many; the Triad is the context in which the many are relationally real), and clarifies the Augustinian psychological analogy of the Trinity (the Father as the undivided mind, the Son as the mind's self-knowledge constructed as the Word, the Spirit as the mind's self-relation reconciling the whole). The Triadic principle operates at three registers — as universal form, as the relation of living beings, and as the Holy Spirit's proper work reconciling living beings to the Father — and the paper is careful to distinguish the form imaged everywhere from the Person acting in the order of life.

Keywords: Dyad · Triad · Pythagorean Form · Logos · Holy Spirit · Trinity · Threeness · Abstraction and Context · Divided Brain · Augustine · Contained Multiplicity · Reconciliation · KEP · Catharturgy

I. The Governing Axiom and the New Question

The Catharturgy Corpus holds, as a governing axiom, that the Trinity is the source of Threeness and not its instance: the divine three is not an example of an abstract number three that precedes it, but the very source from which threeness as such derives. Alongside this, the Corpus has identified the Pythagorean Dyad as the form of the Logos and the Triad as the form of the Holy Spirit — so that the numerical forms are themselves grounded in the divine Persons, the Dyad imaging the Son and the Triad imaging the Spirit, rather than the Persons being instances of prior numbers.

This paper asks a question that has not been posed in this form: what, precisely, is the Dyad the form of, and what is the Triad the form of, such that they correspond to the Son and the Spirit specifically? The answer proposed is that the Dyad is the form of construction — the building of any complex unity by additive combination — and the Triad is the form of relation — the holding of two completed unities in the context that lets them stand in relation. This single distinction, between construction within a unity and relation between unities, is shown to do unifying work across the Corpus: it sharpens the divided-brain account, supplies a mechanism for the contained multiplicity of the choirs, and clarifies the Trinitarian psychology of the divine Persons.

II. The Dyad as the Form of Construction

The Dyad is the form of one-plus-one. Taken not as a static pair but as an operation — the operation of additive combination — the Dyad is the form by which any complex singular abstraction whatsoever is constructed. Given the operation of combination, one may build arbitrarily complex unities: each combination yields a more elaborate structure, and each such structure remains a single thing, a unity, however internally intricate. The Dyad does not merely produce two; it produces the capacity to build, by iterated combination, the entire space of possible complex abstractions.

This is the precise sense in which the Dyad contains all abstractions. It contains them not as a list of completed objects but as a generative space: the form of combination, applied without limit, can construct any abstraction whatever. Every concept, every category, every elaborated representation that the mind can form is a complex unity built by combination — and so is latent in the Dyadic form. The Logos, as the source of the Dyadic form, is therefore the Word through whom all things are made in a newly precise sense: the Logos is the source of the very form of construction by which any intelligible unity comes to be. To make is to combine into a unity; the form of that making is the Dyad; the source of that form is the Son.

The crucial feature of the Dyadic output is that it is always singular. However complex the abstraction the Dyad constructs, the result is one thing — a unity. The Dyad builds within a unity; it elaborates the internal structure of a single intelligible object. It does not, by itself, produce a relation between two completed objects, because combination folds its inputs into a new single whole rather than holding them apart as distinct relata. This is the limit of the Dyadic form, and it

is precisely this limit that the Triad answers.

The Dyad is the form of construction: the operation of combination by which any complex singular abstraction is built, and therefore the generative space containing all possible abstractions. Its output is always a unity — it builds within a single intelligible whole. The Logos is the source of this form, the Word through whom all intelligible unities are made.

III. The Triad as the Form of Relation

To compare, relate, or contextualise two complex abstractions is not a further iteration of the Dyadic operation. Combining two abstractions by the Dyadic operation would fold them into a third, more complex single unity — it would build, not relate. But to hold one complete complex abstraction alongside another complete complex abstraction, as two distinct things standing in relation, requires something the Dyad cannot provide: a relating context in which the two completed unities can be distinct, comparable, and related without being folded into one. That relating context is the irreducible third. The Triad is the form of one abstraction, plus another abstraction, plus the context that holds them in relation.

This is why the Triad is categorically different from a third iteration of the Dyad. The naive reading treats threeness as one-plus-one-plus-one — three applications of the same combinatory operation. But the Triadic form is not three iterations of combination; it is two completed unities together with the relating context that is their relation. The third term is not another instance of the first kind of thing — not another abstraction to be combined — but the context in which two of the first kind can stand in relation at all. This is the structural reason the Trinity is three and rests at three: a relation between two terms requires exactly one relating context to hold them, and that closes the structure. Threeness is the minimal and complete form of relation-between-unities.

It must be stated carefully what is being claimed about the Spirit here, lest the Triad be reduced to a mere logical operator. The claim is not that the Spirit is simply the third thing one happens to need whenever two abstractions are compared. The claim, in keeping with the governing axiom, is that the Triad is the source of relation-between-unities as such — that the very possibility that two completed unities can stand in relation anywhere is grounded in the divine relating-context that the Spirit is. The Spirit is not like the comparison-enabling third; the Spirit is the source and ground that there is such a thing as relation-between-unities at all. The formal Triad imaged in every comparison is an instance whose source is the Spirit, exactly as every constructed unity is an instance whose source is the Logos. The form is universal; the Person is its source, not its function.

The Triad is the form of relation: two completed unities together with the relating context that is their relation — the irreducible third that is not a further abstraction but the ground in which abstractions stand related. The Spirit is the source of this form, the divine relating-context that is the ground of all relation-between-unities, not merely a third term among terms.

IV. The Two Forms and the Divided Brain

This formal distinction is the mathematical sharpening of the divided-brain account that runs throughout the Neurological Qabalah. The left cerebral hemisphere — the Logos hemisphere, the Dyadic — constructs complex abstractions by combination: it builds the categorical unity, the elaborated representation, the single intelligible object however internally complex. This is the Dyadic operation realised in neural function: the left hemisphere builds within a unity, producing the determinate abstraction. The right cerebral hemisphere — the Spirit hemisphere, the Triadic — supplies context: it holds the abstraction in relation to the whole, to other abstractions, to the living field. This is the Triadic form realised in neural function: the right hemisphere provides the relating context in which the constructed abstraction can stand in relation to others.

The consequence is precise and not merely analogical. An abstraction constructed by the left hemisphere does not, on its own, stand in relation to anything; it is a complete unity, internally elaborated but relationally inert. It requires the right hemisphere's contextual function to exist in relation — to be held against the whole, compared with others, situated in the living field. The Dyad builds the abstraction; the Triad supplies the context in which it is relationally real. This is the abstraction-versus-context distinction that the Corpus has carried at the neurological level, now exhibited as the Dyad-versus-Triad distinction at the formal-mathematical level. The two hemispheres are the constructive and the relating forms of one mind, as the Son and the Spirit are the constructive and the relating forms of one divine mind.

V. The Three Registers of the Triadic Principle

The Triadic principle must be spoken of at three distinct registers, and distinguishing them prevents serious category errors — in particular the error of collapsing the Holy Spirit into the bare fact of physical relation.

The first register is the formal Triad: relation-between-unities as such. This is imaged wherever completed unities stand in relation — in the comparison of abstractions, in the contextual binding of any two distinct things, and, in the parallel order of the physical creation, in the contained internal structure of an unbroken gauge symmetry. At this register the Triad is present as form imaged, not as the Person acting. The form is universal.

The second register is the Triad in the order of living beings: relationship proper. Only living beings stand in relationship rather than mere relation — the holding of a living other in relation, the empathic and contextual reception of persons. This is the level at which the right hemisphere's broad social-relational reception operates (the apprehension of the living other, distinct from the abstract comparison of concepts), and it is the level at which the proper work of the Spirit begins, because relationship, unlike bare relation, can be entered, broken, and restored.

The third register is the Holy Spirit's proper and salvific work: the reconciling, forgiving, and reintegrating of living beings back to the Creator across breach. This is the Person acting at the

summit of the order of life. The Spirit's nature is universal, uniting, rebalancing, reconciling, forgiving, and reintegrating — and these are not arbitrary attributes but precisely what the Triadic form becomes when its object is living beings capable of falling out of relation. Uniting and reintegrating are the relating of the many back to the whole; rebalancing and reconciling are the restoration of right relation; forgiving is the reconciling of a living being to the Creator across a breach — the Triadic relating-context applied to a relationship that has been broken, the reintegration of what was severed.

The caution this threefold distinction enforces is deliberate. The formal Triad is present at the first register — which is what licenses speaking of the gauge structure and of physical context in Triadic terms — but it is present there as form imaged, not as the Person acting. One should not say that the Holy Spirit relates every particle; that would dissolve the Person into a physical force and evacuate the personal, salvific character that is the Spirit's proper nature. The form is universal; the Person's proper work is the reconciliation of the living back to their source. The Spirit's universality is in its nature and in the form it is the source of, not in a literal relating of every physical thing.

The Triadic principle operates at three registers: the formal Triad imaged wherever unities stand in relation; the Triad of relationship in the order of living beings; and the Holy Spirit's proper work reconciling living beings to the Father across breach. The form is universal; the Person acts in the order of life. To forgive is the Triadic context restoring a relationship that was broken — reintegration across the breach.

VI. Contained Multiplicity and the Choirs

This distinction supplies the generative mechanism that the account of the angelic choirs as gauge structures required. That account held that each choir is a unity containing its multiplicity within itself, constitutively and without a temporal break, imaging the divine pattern of unity-containing-multiplicity. What it lacked was a mechanism: how does a unity contain a multiplicity that is real rather than merely potential?

The Dyad and the Triad together supply it. The Dyadic form contains the infinity of possible abstractions as a generative space — the many are latent in the form of construction. But the latent many do not, by the Dyadic form alone, stand in relation to one another; construction folds its inputs into unities and does not hold them apart as distinct relata. It is the Triadic form — the relating context — that lets the contained many stand as distinct and relationally real. The multiplicity is contained by the Dyadic generation and made relationally real by the Triadic context. This is precisely contained multiplicity with a mechanism underneath it: the choir contains its many (Dyadic generation) and that many is real-in-relation (Triadic context), without any breaking event, because both forms are constitutive of the unity at once.

So the choir images not merely a static unity-containing-multiplicity but the dynamic interplay of the two divine forms: the Logos generating the contained many, the Spirit supplying the context in which the many are distinctly real. The infinite abstractions latent in the Logos require the Triadic

context to exist in relation to one another — to be, in the full sense, distinct things rather than undifferentiated generative potential. Simple separation yields innate multiplicity precisely because the Dyadic form already contains the many and the Triadic form already supplies their relation: the unity is, from the first, a constructed-and-related plurality, contained and real, imaging the two forms of the divine mind.

VII. The Two Forms and the Divine Consciousness

The distinction finally clarifies how the Trinity may be spoken of in terms of consciousness without compromising the three. It is tempting, given the binary of construction and relation, to speak of the Trinity as the two halves of a divine consciousness — the Logos and the Spirit, the building and the relating. But this formulation threatens the three, because two halves names only the Son and the Spirit and leaves the Father unaccounted, or reduces the Father to a whole of which the others are mere parts. The disciplined form preserves the three: the Trinity is not two halves but two operations of one divine consciousness, with the Father as the consciousness itself.

On this reading the Dyad and the Triad are the formal sharpening of the Augustinian psychological analogy of the Trinity. The Father is the undivided divine mind. The Son is the mind's self-knowledge — the abstraction the mind forms of itself, constructed by the Dyadic operation as a complex unity, which is the Word: the mind knowing itself produces the Word as the constructed self-abstraction. The Spirit is the mind's self-relation — the relating context that holds the mind and its self-knowledge together, the Triadic form by which knower and known stand in relation, which Augustine names love: the mind loving itself is the relating bond between the mind and its self-knowledge. The Son is Dyadic because self-knowledge is the construction of an abstraction; the Spirit is Triadic because self-love is the relation holding two completed unities — the mind and its self-image — together.

This advances the Augustinian analogy rather than merely restating it. Augustine identifies memory, understanding, and will, or the mind, its self-knowledge, and its self-love, as the psychological image of the Trinity; the present account specifies the formal structure of why these are three and not two or four. They are three because self-knowledge is a constructed unity (Dyadic, the Son), self-relation is the relating context between the mind and that unity (Triadic, the Spirit), and the mind itself is the undivided consciousness in which both operations occur (the Father). The binary of construction and relation lives within the trinity of mind, self-knowledge, and self-relation, rather than competing with it. Where the account merely restates Augustine, it does so to ground the new claim; where it advances him, it is in supplying the Dyadic and Triadic forms as the formal reason for the threeness of the psychological image.

The direction of the Spirit's work, finally, is given structurally rather than decoratively by this account. If the Spirit's proper work is the reconciling of living multiplicity back to the Creator, then the Father is the source to which reconciliation returns — the undivided origin and the term. The Son, source of the Dyadic form, is the constructive Word through whom the created unities are made; the Spirit, source of the Triadic form, is the relating bond who reconciles those living unities back to the Father. The Father is origin and term; the Son is the constructive Word; the

Spirit is the reconciling bond. The two operations — construction and reconciliation — originate in and return to the Father, one divine life expressing itself as the building of unities and the relating of those unities back to their source.

The Trinity is not two halves of a divine consciousness but two operations of one divine consciousness, with the Father as the consciousness itself: the Son the mind's self-knowledge constructed as the Word (Dyadic), the Spirit the mind's self-relation reconciling the whole (Triadic), the Father the undivided mind in which both occur. Construction and relation are the two forms of the one divine life, originating in and returning to the Father.

VIII. Conclusion

The distinction between the Dyad as the form of construction and the Triad as the form of relation — between building within a unity and relating between unities — resolves several open problems of the Corpus at once. It specifies what the Dyad and the Triad are the forms of, and why they correspond to the Son and the Spirit: the Son is the source of the form by which any complex unity is constructed, and the Spirit is the source of the form by which completed unities stand in relation. It exhibits the divided-brain account as the neurological realisation of this formal distinction: the left hemisphere constructs abstraction, the right hemisphere supplies the context in which abstraction is relationally real. It supplies the mechanism of contained multiplicity that the choir-as-gauge-structure account required: the Dyad generates the latent many, the Triad makes them relationally real, and the unity is from the first a constructed-and-related plurality. And it sharpens the Augustinian psychology of the Trinity by giving the formal reason for its threeness: self-knowledge constructed as a unity, self-relation as the relating context, and the undivided mind in which both occur.

Three disciplines have been observed throughout, and they are what keep the account defensible. The Spirit has not been reduced to a logical operator: the Triad is the source of relation-between-unities, not merely a third term among terms. The Spirit has not been dissolved into physical relation: the formal Triad is imaged universally, but the Person's proper work is the reconciliation of living beings to the Father, and the Spirit is not said to relate every particle. And the three have not been compromised by the binary of construction and relation: the Trinity is two operations of one consciousness with the Father as the consciousness, not two halves of a divided one. Within these disciplines the claim stands: the Dyad and the Triad are the two forms of the divine mind, construction and relation, the Word and the bond — and the Threeness of the Trinity is the source, not the instance, of the threeness by which any contained multiplicity is at once constructed and related, generated and reconciled, made and held.

The Dyad is the form of construction, the Triad the form of relation; the Son the source of the one, the Spirit the source of the other, the Father the undivided mind in which both are one life. The many are constructed by the Word and related by the bond, generated and reconciled, made and held — and the Trinity is the source of the Threeness by which this is so, not its instance. To build is Dyadic; to relate is Triadic; to be one mind in which building and relating are a single life is the Trinity itself.

References and Primary Sources

Augustine of Hippo. *De Trinitate* (On the Trinity), esp. Books IX–X (the psychological analogies: mind, knowledge, love; memory, understanding, will).

Etter, Christopher E. *Nothing and Threeness*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Etter, Christopher E. *Nothing Can Limit God But Itself*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Etter, Christopher E. *The Choir as Gauge Structure*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

Etter, Christopher E. *The Neurological Qabalah; The Asymmetric Brain*. Catharturgy Corpus, 2026.

McGilchrist, Iain. *The Master and His Emissary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. *The Celestial Hierarchy*. Trans. Luibheid. Paulist Press, 1987.

Pythagorean and Neoplatonic sources on the Monad, Dyad, and Triad (Iamblichus, *The Theology of Arithmetic*; Nicomachus of Gerasa, *Introduction to Arithmetic*).