

RESEARCH · VERIFICATION

# The John Long Method: One True Word in Every Name

*John F. Long · MPA, Roger Williams University. Founder, Zestigram, Inc.*

Adapted for publication: July 2026

## ***TL;DR***

What if you could get a truer read on yourself, and on every person in your life, from the one piece of raw material each of them has carried since birth: the letters of their name? Every full name contains hundreds of real, verifiable words. I built a method for finding them, ranking them, and choosing the one that fits the actual life. It is not numerology and it is not prophecy. It is a portrait practice. The word is chosen, the fit is recognized, and the recognition is the point. This paper documents the method, separates it from the traditions it resembles, and shows what happens when you run it on a family line nine centuries deep. Like everything else I publish, it is a verification problem: claim nothing the letters cannot support, checked one at a time.

## **What if I told you**

Every name is a sealed envelope. Most people carry theirs for a lifetime without opening it.

What if I told you there was a way to better understand who you are, and who the people in your life are to you, their role, their function, their register, through nothing but the letters they have carried since the day they were named?

You would say that sounds like a horoscope. Fair. Stay with me, because the difference is the whole paper.

A friend of mine always wanted to be a lawyer, and became one. His name spells COUNSEL.

My neighbor to the north, the man whose property touches mine, his name spells ADJOINS.

A judge I know, his name spells SACHEM, the old New England word for the chief who decides for his people.

My mother's maiden name spells CAROLLER. Her full married name, five names long, spells it again. The one who sings. The name insists.

Every one of those is verified, letter by letter. None is invented. And once I had seen a dozen of them, I stopped treating them as coincidences and started treating them as a practice. This paper documents the practice.

## The method

Take a person's full name. Find every real word that can be spelled from its letters. A word qualifies only if every letter it needs is present in the name, in sufficient count. Check every candidate letter by letter, so nothing is invented. Rank the verified words longest first. Then choose the one that fits the person's actual life.

That word stands beside them. One word, one person.

The field of recreational linguistics has a term for the output: an aptanagram, an anagram whose meaning fits its source (Morice, 2001). The classic is Madam Curie yielding "radium came." What has not existed, as far as I can find, is a system:

verification rules, a ranking order, selection principles, and application at the scale of a whole bloodline and a living community. The system is what I am naming.

This paper sits beside my civic work for one reason: both are verification problems. The other papers ask who verifies time, ground, voice, and money. This one asks something smaller and closer: what can be verified about a name. The answer is the same in every case. Trust nothing that cannot be checked letter by letter, and claim nothing the checking cannot support.

Six rules govern it.

**Verify everything.** A word counts only if the letters are actually there. Hallucinated anagrams are the one fatal failure, so every word is checked letter by letter before it is spoken.

**The longest word leads.** Long words are rare and specific. Short words fit anyone. When a ten letter word falls out of a name and fits the person, it lands with weight.

**One totem, several supporting words.** The longest fitting word is the mainsail, the one that names the core. But a person is rarely one thing, and names usually hold several long words of near-equal length. The runners-up are the supporting cast. The totem defines. The supporting words complete. Reading them together is the interpretation.

**Truest, never darkest.** Every long name holds grim words and bright words in roughly equal measure. The method takes the word that honestly fits the life, and when two fit, the more generous one. The living and the young always get their brightest word.

**The name you feed sets the ceiling.** More letters, more words. A middle name or maiden name can unlock the word that was unreachable without it. The full name gives the truth more room.

**Names change, and the method respects that.** A married name stays unless the person shed it on purpose. To know who someone was in high school, run the name they carried then. A self-chosen name, one the person authored and the world uses, carries the most signal of all.

## This is not gematria

People have searched names for meaning for thousands of years, and honesty requires placing this method against that lineage before claiming anything new.

The Kabbalists held that a name encodes the soul. Gematria converts letters to numbers and reads significance in the sums. The modern heir to that tradition, the Bible Code, claimed predictive messages hidden in the Torah through equidistant letter sequences (Drosnin, 1997). The claim did not survive scrutiny: mathematicians extracted the same "predictions" from Moby-Dick and War and Peace, because any sufficiently rich text yields patterns when the rules are chosen after the fact (McKay, Bar-Natan, Bar-Hillel, & Kalai, 1999). The feeling of discovered meaning in random data has a clinical name, apophenia (Conrad, 1958), and a well-mapped psychology (Shermer, 2011).

I know that literature, and I am not writing against it. I am writing beside it, on the other side of a fork.

The John Long Method differs on two axes. First, it is semantic, not numeric. No letter values, no sums, no math. Only words, real words in your own language, spelled from your own letters. Second, and decisive: it claims authorship, not revelation. Gematria says the code was planted and fate can be read out. I say the words are simply there, thousands in any full name, and the method is a disciplined way of finding them, verifying them, and choosing the one that fits. The choosing is a human act.

A portrait painter selects every stroke and still captures a real likeness. The selection does not make the likeness false. It makes it a portrait.

The literary tradition understood this. The Oulipo writers composed meaning out of letter constraint on purpose; Perec wrote a whole novel without the letter E. Nabokov hid his own name inside his characters. Renaissance poets rearranged a patron's name into a fitting phrase and called it tribute. That is the lineage this method belongs to. Composition, not divination.

There is one more shelf in the library, and it is the surprising one: peer-reviewed psychology. Researchers have long studied whether people grow into their names. The name-letter effect shows people unconsciously prefer the letters of their own names (Nuttin, 1985). Pelham, Mirenberg, and Jones (2002) found that people gravitate toward careers, places, and even spouses that resemble their names, a phenomenon they called

implicit egotism: more dentists named Dennis, more Louises in Louisiana, than chance predicts. Simonsohn (2011) challenged those findings, and the debate is live. I take no side in it here. I note only that the question underneath my method, whether we come to represent the words we carry, is not fringe. It sits in the flagship journal of social psychology, argued by serious people, unresolved.

## Why it lands

Run the people you know, and the right word does not sit on the page. It clicks.

The click deserves an exact accounting, because it is where every practice like this either becomes honest or becomes a trick. The word lands because the life is real and you have witnessed it. The better you know someone, the harder the true word hits. Run a total stranger and the list stays flat, because there is no life to match against. The accuracy is not magic. It is recognition, and recognition requires a witness.

That is a feature, not a confession. A method that works only in the presence of real knowledge of a real person is a method that measures something true: how well the chooser sees the subject. The portrait is only as good as the painter's eye. The method trains the eye. You cannot choose the true word for someone without looking at them more closely than you ever have.

That may be the quietest and largest thing it does. It makes you study your people, one at a time, and find the most generous true thing that can be said about each of them.

## Limitations

Three, stated plainly. The method works only on lives the chooser knows; run a stranger and the list stays flat. The chooser selects the fitting word from many candidates, so the fit reflects the chooser's judgment as much as the name. And the method makes no falsifiable predictions; it describes, it does not forecast. I consider none of these fatal. They are the boundaries of a portrait practice, stated so no one mistakes it for a measurement.

## Run the famous

It works on names everyone knows, because everyone knows the lives.

Abraham Lincoln spells ANCHORMAN. The steady one who held a breaking union together.

George Washington spells GENERATIONS. The father of them.

Martin Luther King spells RETHINKING. The man who made a nation rethink itself.

Albert Einstein spells ETERNITIES. The man who rewrote time.

Elon Reeve Musk spells KEROSENE. Rocket fuel.

Tristram Coffin, the man who led the founding of Nantucket in 1659, spells TRANSFORM.

Verified, all of them, letter by letter. They were always there.

## The descent

The method scales, and this is where it stops being a party trick and becomes an instrument.

Run a family, oldest to youngest, one verified word per documented ancestor, and the words stack into a line. I ran mine: eighty-six documented people across nine and a half centuries, from the Norman root through four Mayflower passengers, the Nantucket founders, a Revolutionary fracture, the Irish refilling, down to the living generation. The full stack is published in the Long Family Archive. Its spine reads in three words.

GOSPEL, at the founder. My great-grandfather: state representative, businessman, the one who delivered the family to good ground. His name is the most letter-locked in the archive, and it yields almost nothing except the good news itself.

CONSIGNOR, at me. The keeper of the passage, entrusted to carry what is not his and hand it on whole. I am a realtor; I move the most valuable thing most people ever own from one set of hands to the next. And I keep the family archive, to hand to my daughter.

GERMINATOR, at her. The one who makes things grow. Her word is left unresolved on purpose. She is young, and the young get their brightest word, open, future-facing.

What was received. Who carries it. What it becomes.

The stack reads like destiny, and here is the sentence that keeps the whole method clean: it reads like destiny because it was composed to. The history is real. The arc is authored. That is not a weakness. That is what a portrait is.

## What it is for

People spend their lives circling three questions. Who am I? Where have I come from? Where am I going?

The John Long Method does not answer the third. Nothing honest can. But it gives real bearings on the first two.

Run your own name and read the list, longest first. Somewhere in it is a word that stops you. Sometimes it is your work. Sometimes it is your nature. Sometimes it is the thing you have always been drawn to and never had a word for. When my friend the lawyer saw COUNSEL, he was not learning something new. He was recognizing something he had always known, spelled in letters he had carried since birth.

Here is my interpretation, and I state it plainly as mine. The letters of your name can be rearranged, and there are real words inside them. I believe we come to represent those words in the world; we grow into the things we are named. I cannot prove that, and I will not pretend to. It is not science and it is not scripture. It is my method and my reading, offered the way a portrait painter offers a portrait: made from real material, chosen by a human hand, true in a way you recognize when you see it.

Every name is a sealed envelope. Yours has been in your pocket your whole life.

Open it.

## References

Conrad, K. (1958). *Die beginnende Schizophrenie: Versuch einer Gestaltanalyse des Wahns*. Thieme.

Drosnin, M. (1997). *The Bible code*. Simon & Schuster.

Eckler, A. R. (1996). *Making the alphabet dance: Recreational wordplay*. St. Martin's Press.

McKay, B., Bar-Natan, D., Bar-Hillel, M., & Kalai, G. (1999). Solving the Bible Code puzzle. *Statistical Science*, 14(2), 150–173.

Moore, L. (1986). *Anagrams*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Morice, D. (2001). *The dictionary of wordplay*. Teachers & Writers Collaborative.

Nuttin, J. M. (1985). Narcissism beyond Gestalt and awareness: The name letter effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(3), 353–361.

Pelham, B. W., Mirenberg, M. C., & Jones, J. T. (2002). Why Susie sells seashells by the seashore: Implicit egotism and major life decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(4), 469–487.

Shermer, M. (2011). *The believing brain: From ghosts and gods to politics and conspiracies*. Times Books.

Simonsohn, U. (2011). Spurious? Name similarity effects (implicit egotism) in marriage, job, and moving decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(1), 1–24.

Long, J. F. (2026). *The One-Word Descent: A verified anagram-portrait of the Long family line*. Long Family Archive. [longfamilyarchive.com](http://longfamilyarchive.com)

*Companion work: the [Long Family Archive](http://Long Family Archive) is the documented family line this method was first applied to, and the public proof of the verification standard described above.*

*John F. Long is the founder of Zestigram, Inc., a Rhode Island corporation building verification infrastructure for genealogy, identity, and applied trust systems. Contact via [zestigram.com](http://zestigram.com).*

---

## ABOUT THE WRITER

John F. Long writes from Newport County on the South Coast of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. MPA, Roger Williams University. Two years of doctoral coursework in Educational Leadership and Policy at UMass Dartmouth. The practice underneath the writing is real estate ([johnlong.realestate](http://johnlong.realestate)) and verification infrastructure ([longfamilyarchive.com](http://longfamilyarchive.com)). The writing sits at [johnlong.io](http://johnlong.io) as the canonical surface for the body of work on citizenship and its material preconditions.

The body of work is structured as a quartet of citizenship surveys (time, ground, voice, currency), with [The Periscope](#) as the catalyst essay, [The Map](#) as the compressed survey, [The Absent Presence](#) as the meta-frame, and two applied notes: [Acting in the Cracks](#) (prescription) and [The Obvious Child](#) (demonstration). The full reading order is at [/the-index](#).

Reader correspondence is welcomed; see [On Correspondence](#).