

UNITED WISDOM

The Chemistry of an Encounter and What We Know About Compatibility

Relationships

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-01-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Chemistry of an Encounter and What We Know About Compatibility

Epigraph

> *“In deed and truth.” — 1 John 3:18, a brief World English Bible fragment, with display capitalisation. A Christian perspective on action and truthfulness; no partner test, compulsory self-sacrifice or instruction to endure harm.*

What this article is about

An encounter sometimes feels special immediately. Conversation flows, staying longer appeals, and an ordinary detail becomes memorable as though an entire future story were already attached. This experience can be called chemistry without claiming to have measured a biological process or discovered a reliable compatibility signal. Attraction is actually experienced, but participation in a particular shared life is another question. One evening’s tone may match while important conditions remain unknown: available time, desired relationship format, attitudes towards obligations or willingness for a particular joint action. Naming the difference does not diminish the meeting.

This article proposes neither questionnaire-based partner selection nor rejection of strong feeling nor a guaranteed correct decision after enough dates. It considers what a contact establishes and which question still needs an answer. Compatibility here is no medical measure or single unchanging couple rating. It concerns particular participation conditions within a chosen question. Someone may consider a difference important without proving every relationship universally impossible. Another meeting may also be wanted where voluntary and safe. Attraction, information, agreement and personal choice should not automatically replace each other.

Imagine a fictional scene. Anton and Lena met on a walk with a small group. They quickly found shared conversation about music and were reluctant to leave. Anton imagined spending most weekends together. Days later Lena proposed a brief Wednesday meeting and said the coming weekends were occupied. The earlier ease seems inconsistent with this answer to Anton. This is no actual client case or evidence of a hidden cause. A pleasant evening, imagined future meeting frequency and another’s particular proposal can be distinguished without immediately concluding that someone deceived or that feeling was unreal.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. What one evening establishes

Anton knows that talking to Lena interested him. Some participation, topics and a desire to continue remain in memory. If Lena said she enjoyed the evening, that is her account. These materials establish no agreement about weekends or matching understandings of a relationship. Each has its scope. Joy need not be reduced to nothing for its limits to be named. The subject can remain precise: I wanted this conversation, while further format remains unagreed. That leaves room for experience and an actual answer without automatically making the first a promise of the second.

Even vivid bodily experience reveals no complete account of another's life. Obligations, plans and limits may never have entered the conversation. A hidden cause requiring discovery does not necessarily follow. Unknowns can be acknowledged. Lena named occupied weekends; Anton knows no full circumstances and gains no right to collect private information without permission. The available meeting option matters now. Every restriction's motive need not be established completely before the restriction itself is heard and compared with what I currently want.

Attraction proves no mismatch false. It can coexist with inconvenient schedules, different interest in an event or distinct intentions. Equally, a mismatch need not be trivial because an evening was vivid. Its importance depends on a particular question and participants' conditions. If Anton needs another relationship format, he can notice this. He need neither declare Lena unsuitable for everyone nor prove chemistry inevitably misleading. Available material may suffice for one personal choice while other questions about a person and possible later contact remain open.

II. Naming attraction does not explain it

Chemistry conveniently names experience in everyday language but establishes no mechanism automatically. This article measures no hormones, states no compulsory attraction duration and derives no relationship from a single biological process. Anton may recognise distinctive ease while its causes remain complex or unknown. They need not be invented for the event to matter. Attraction can be stated separately from what the next step needs. A name should not create false certainty that an inner process is already explained and its intensity therefore reliably determines future shared participation.

In the selected maxim, La Rochefoucauld names the difficulty of defining love. This is a historical literary perspective, not a classification of current relationships. Its account of possession creates no entitlement to another, and surrounding generalisations diagnose no person. The short fragment concerns a general name's limits rather than a single attraction cause.

A familiar word can coexist with a specific question. What appealed here: conversation, attention, shared activity or a yet-unknown possibility? An answer may be partial. Every factor need not be listed or every person scored. Anton noticed talking about music; that can describe one episode. Adding an expectation of frequent meetings creates another supposition. Named joy differs from an added future without requiring each thought's origin to be explained. Attraction can continue even where someone chooses another available format or declines an unsuitable continuation.

III. Prediction before meeting has limits

Joel, Eastwick and Finkel's 2017 work used machine learning in two speed-dating studies. Advance self-reports partly predicted general tendencies to desire and be desired, but not particular-pair interest beyond those tendencies. The official indexed abstract was read here, not the full analysis. This proves no universal impossibility of prediction, assesses no fictional scene and promises no future compatibility from strong attraction.

One model's limitation should not be confused with permission to trust every impression. Incomplete answers from preliminary data do not make emotion a universal selection instrument. Different materials address different questions. Preferences name desires, meeting supplies experienced contact, and subsequent conversation may clarify intention. None must replace everything else. Anton can value conversational ease and ask about available continuation without making a scientific forecast from two facts. This article offers editorial status distinctions rather than a new algorithm overcoming the research's limitations.

An exact compatibility percentage or success probability should not be assigned privately. No reliable statistics, measurement conditions or individual prediction exist here for this couple. A convincing number may conceal something simply unknown. An important condition can be named in words: a format is wanted, intention needs asking about, or available time actually differs. This note guarantees nothing but retains a decision's subject. Important professional questions have their own basis; a private attraction table replaces none of that and becomes no diagnostic scale through neat presentation or a long item list.

IV. Compatibility concerns particular participation

People can talk well about music while preferring different uses of time. Agreement in one subject and difference in another need constitute neither a contradiction nor a complete relationship verdict. The compatibility subject should be named: one meeting, contact frequency, a trip or an important agreement. Anton imagines weekends; Lena offers Wednesday. Whether this option suits both is now the question, rather than proving an entire future from one week’s calendar. If a wider format already matters for personal choice, it can be named separately instead of agreement being extracted from a pleasant conversation.

Compatibility requires no identical preferences everywhere. Different tastes may permit particular shared action, while matching tastes guarantee none. The same music can be loved without a concert time being agreed. Different music can accompany a mutually suitable evening. These examples prove neither that differences always benefit nor that similarities never matter. They preserve scale. Conditions, resources and actual answers matter for a task. An overall assessment through attractive similarity should not settle an unagreed part, while a different preference need not automatically close every participation possibility.

Some conditions really are significant. Someone can want a particular relationship type, decline uncertainty about an important question or consider a circumstance incompatible with personal choice. This article demands no reduction of those conditions for chemistry or continued contact until every prospect is disproven. A personal boundary matters with incomplete knowledge too. Declining need not become a verdict on another’s worth. An unsuitable format can be named and another step chosen. Choice need not await a universal assessment making every future possibility fully known and eliminating every chance of regret.

My attraction, another’s account of interest and a mutually selected action also differ. Even if Lena wants another meeting, that establishes neither Anton’s exact desire nor matching decision speeds. Each may understand the opportunity differently. Mutuality needs neither identical experiences nor symmetrical disclosure of every detail. Action needs sufficient conditions for both rather than proof of equal inner intensity. Comparing feelings through one general word can leave a practical subject unnamed: what each currently proposes and what the other actually agreed to.

V. An agreement supplies another kind of material

Lena might agree to Wednesday at a particular place. This is new: an agreement beyond an impression. It has a time, subject and conditions for change. If the meeting happens, particular shared action is experienced. An entire future remains unconfirmed, but part of the question is answered better than by imagined weekends. Anton can notice how a proposal is discussed alongside attraction’s intensity. Every gesture need not be monitored during a date. One important episode can be revisited afterwards where it actually affects a decision.

One meeting’s agreement implies no relationship of another scope. Both may want continuation while understanding it differently. An important difference needs available discussion or personal choice with an unknown. Lena should not be assigned an unstated obligation merely because she came and talked warmly. An actual promise nevertheless retains significance. Incomplete future knowledge makes no real agreement optional. Distinguishing statuses should improve precision rather than becoming a convenient way to cancel every obligation retrospectively through uncertainty about feelings.

Changed terms need their own material too. Lena can propose rescheduling; Anton can decline the new time. Proposed agreement changes differ from actual breach, circumstances and consequences. No general rule makes postponement proof of absent interest or always irrelevant. Consider the particular event. Unknown motives should not be invented. If a fact already suffices for choice, a complete personality explanation need not arrive first. Inner feeling, external event and available action can be named together without one becoming the sole cause or final justification for everything that follows.

VI. Attraction cancels neither refusal nor harm

A strong desire to meet creates no consent. It gives silence no wanted meaning and authorises no continued contact after refusal. Anton can retain attraction while Lena has her own limit. Both events may coexist. This article specifies no duration for inner response and demands no immediate feeling disappearance. It preserves action’s external boundary. An unpleasant answer can be experienced without becoming grounds for pressure, tracking, covert information collection or renewed attempts ignoring someone’s already expressed wish not to participate further.

Humiliation, coercion, important breaches or danger require no completed compatibility assessment before needed support and protective decisions. Chemistry certifies no safety. This article assesses no individual case and requires no dangerous conversation to obtain a clearer portrait. Needed local help and professional expertise have their own basis. Inner expectation can be considered separately without cancelling actual harm or responsibility. In

important medical, legal and other matters, personal observation replaces no corresponding work or prescribed assistance through private relationship interpretation.

A test should not be manufactured to reveal authentic compatibility. Making someone wait, provoking jealousy or breaking agreements changes the situation rather than simply uncovering hidden truth. Its response becomes no complete reliable portrait. Information can be sought through ordinary permitted interaction where appropriate and voluntary. Another can retain private material. Incomplete access creates neither a duty to continue nor permission to acquire information without consent. Available facts and personal conditions may already matter for choice without requiring every part of another person to be finally understood.

VII. New knowledge need not destroy feeling

Anton may learn that Lena wants further meetings under another schedule. This possible continuation establishes no cause. New material can preserve the evening’s significance while changing imagined frequency. The beginning need not be rewritten as deception for failing to confirm imagined weekends. An actual contradiction to earlier words nonetheless matters and should be addressed. Revision guarantees no more favourable view. It may clarify a difference or preserve an unknown. Feeling and clarification can coexist without making every piece of material lead to a predetermined desired conclusion.

Information sometimes adds interest. A previously unimagined shared format can emerge. Not every mismatched answer will become a useful opportunity. Anton may not want this format, and Lena may offer no alternative. Neither need becomes wrong thereby. Conditions need comparing rather than turning every difference into a compulsory development lesson. Sufficient knowledge for a current choice may be selected without pursuing complete psychological explanation or continuing unsuitable contact to prove personal openness to experience.

Acquaintance offers no promise that a person will never make a mistake. A decision may have been proportionate to the material available at the time, while new circumstances appear later and require another consideration. That does not make the initial feeling false, and it does not justify omitting an important check where that check was necessary and available. What was known then, learned later and needs deciding now should be distinguished. Reconstructed episodes need no invented exact words or frequencies. Memory limits should be stated. A small note can organise attention without guaranteeing an accurate relationship archive or confidently assigning an entire later outcome to one encounter.

VIII. A question has its own deadline

An entire shared life need not be decided before the next meeting. Some wider questions may remain open where ordinary conversation suits both. Openness nevertheless cancels no necessary current terms. Wednesday cannot be agreed and then silently treated as rescheduled to weekends because attraction was strong. An actual arrangement has its time; a wider contact-format question can be discussed separately. This avoids demanding complete clarity where a limited decision suffices while also avoiding replacement of needed agreement by hope that closeness supplies identical understanding of upcoming actions.

A question already important for continuation can be named without extensive interrogation. Anton can ask about the desired contact format. Lena can answer, decline discussion or remain uncertain herself. Each affects available choice without establishing a concealed personality cause. Conversation guarantees no matching conditions. An unknown may remain, leaving someone to decide whether present uncertainty suits. Neither perpetual tolerance nor elimination at every cost is required. Significant personal terms remain alongside another’s right not to make a promise they cannot yet confirm.

Self-inquiry can stop when it becomes an endless search for a final forecast. The needed subject may already be named while further thought adds no accessible material. This diagnoses no excessive-thinking disorder. A particular format’s limit can be noticed and rest, another conversation or suitable work chosen. Stopping does not prove resolution, but continuing is no compulsory measure of serious feeling. External deadlines and actual obligations remain. Action needed now awaits no perfect knowledge of attraction’s causes or the universal couple type that might emerge from an encounter.

A particular question may need information another does not wish to share. Anton might need meeting frequency while Lena is unready to discuss a wider format. That unknown is actual rather than necessarily a hidden game. A decision unavailable without an answer or an unsuitable current option can be named without compelling disclosure. Missing information matters for choice while proving no deliberate concealment from a bad motive. A full private account cannot be demanded to remove personal doubt. A sufficient conversational subject and the available answer’s limits are considered together while both retain choice about further participation.

IX. Consider one next step

For a voluntary small trial, choose an ordinary safe episode. Name experience, actual knowledge, an important open question and currently possible action. This is editorial rather than a validated compatibility assessment. No scores, provocation or promised correct choice are needed. Anton could retain conversational joy, Wednesday’s proposal and unagreed weekends. He can then choose this meeting or clarify another subject. Approximate memory needs a limit label. Private correspondence becomes no necessary material merely because further participation is emotionally important.

After action, consider information gained and unknowns remaining. Relief or a final decision need not follow. An arrangement may become clearer or a significant difference emerge. The format should not receive credit for the entire contact outcome: another’s answer and circumstances matter independently. Notes can stay private; examination can be shortened or stopped. Difficulty permits appropriate support, and significant professional questions need corresponding expertise. No small trial’s outcome cancels refusal, actual harm, safety or actions that were necessary independently of self-inquiry’s success.

X. Preserve joy and the subject of choice

Attraction can matter without occupying the place of all knowledge. It concerns experienced contact rather than signing an agreement for two people. Anton can enjoy the first encounter and hear Lena’s proposal as stated. Continuation can be wanted while a condition is clarified; declining or keeping a wider question open also remains possible. Compatibility in particular action needs its own material. Not every decision requires a complete portrait, while a vivid impression makes no unknown known. Feeling and actual participation retain room without any promise of eliminating the future’s uncertainty.

The Christian text, literary maxim and contemporary initial-interest research establish no common partner-selection law. Their functions differ. Experience, information and agreement can simply be distinguished. An encounter may remain vivid without having to prove an entire future life. Someone becomes known in permitted interaction, with their own voice and right to decline. Personal choice remains possible with incomplete knowledge. The practical result is modest: what this meeting meant to me, what it established and which next step fits both people’s actual conditions become clearer.

What this means in practice

Separately name attraction, available information, an actual agreement and an open question. Feeling need neither be cooled nor converted into a compatibility percentage. For one ordinary safe step, identify what matters now and whether it can be learned through permitted contact. Another’s answer confirms no entire imagined relationship format. Similarity replaces no action agreement; difference judges no whole personality. Significant personal conditions remain. Approximate memory is labelled without fabricated words or frequency, and new information is considered under its actual status.

Create no jealousy, conflict, waiting period or covert test to check attraction. Strong feeling cancels neither refusal nor privacy nor harm. Danger needs corresponding action and local help; significant professional matters require relevant expertise. The format can stop, unknowns remain, another voluntary meeting be selected or unsuitable participation declined. A proportionate choice needs no complete person knowledge and promises no infallible outcome. Practical clarity concerns the present subject: what I felt, know, need to ask and can actually do without replacing another’s answer with my hope.

Key quotation

> *“Difficult to define love.” — François de La Rochefoucauld, Maxims, no. 68, a brief fragment of J. W. Willis Bund and J. Hain Friswell’s translation, with display capitalisation. A limited literary perspective; its continuation about possession creates no entitlement to another.*

Connections between traditions

• **La Rochefoucauld:** limits of a general definition; a historical maxim establishes no biology or couple forecast.

• **1 John 3:18:** a Christian perspective on action and truthfulness, requiring no risk, enduring harm or testing someone.

• **Joel, Eastwick and Finkel, 2017:** prediction limits for initial interest in particular studies, not a complete long-term relationship forecast.

• **Editorial approach:** experience, information, participation conditions and agreement distinguished while retaining joy, unknowns and choice.

Sources

1. François de La Rochefoucauld. Reflections; or Sentences and Moral Maxims, no. 68. Project Gutenberg 9105. J. W. Willis Bund and J. Hain Friswell translation, title page 1871; PG released 1 October 2005, updated 29 January 2013. The maxim, surrounding 347–373 and metadata were read; editorial notes distinguished. Not the whole book or French critical text. Rights UNKNOWN; source text neither imported nor embedded.

2. 1 John 3:18. World English Bible, chapter 3. Complete short chapter and public-domain text notice read. Russian fragment editorial rather than branded Russian WEB. Religious verdicts and self-sacrifice are no practice recommendations. Source text neither imported nor embedded nor used for training.

3. Samantha Joel, Paul W. Eastwick and Eli J. Finkel. Is Romantic Desire Predictable? Machine Learning Applied to Initial Romantic Attraction. Psychological Science, 2017, 28(10), 1478–1489; online 30 August 2017. PubMed, PMID 28853645; DOI 10.1177/0956797617714580. Complete official indexed abstract read in search; direct opening empty. Full paper, methods and data unread. Rights UNKNOWN; no direct quotations, and source text neither imported nor embedded.

Tags

encounter chemistry, attraction, compatibility, relationships, acquaintance, experience, information, agreement, choice, unknowns, interest, hope, next step, conditions, time, answer, refusal, voluntary participation, boundaries, safety, responsibility, promise, memory, private notes, understanding, similarity, difference, La Rochefoucauld, John, initial interest

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.