

THE RING AND THE RULE OF HANDS

*Cleaning, the ring beneath the cage, and what belongs to whom
Binding on both of them equally — for adults 18 and over*

I. THE CLEANING AND THE HEALTH CHECK

The device comes off on a set day, at a set hour, and it comes off for her reasons rather than his. What happens then is not merely washing. It is the health check, and it is the single most important recurring duty in this arrangement, because a device worn continuously sits against skin that cannot be seen while it is on.

She looks, in good light, and she looks properly. Not a glance while he showers — an inspection, unhurried, with him standing where she can see everything:

- Colour. Everything should be its ordinary colour. Persistent redness, any blue or grey tone, or skin that stays pale where it should not, ends the wearing until it has resolved.
- Temperature and sensation. Anything cool to the touch, or any numbness, tingling, or reduced feeling, means the fit is wrong. This is not something to monitor for a few more days; it is a stop.
- The skin itself. Chafing, breaks, raw patches, anything weeping, any swelling that does not settle within an hour of removal, or a smell that suggests infection.
- The fit. Marks that are still visible an hour after removal mean the ring is too tight, whatever anyone hoped when it was bought.

Then it is washed — both the device and him — with plain soap and warm water, dried completely, and nothing put back on damp skin. Any of the findings above and it stays off, and if any of them persists beyond a few days it is a doctor rather than a waiting game. She may find this the least ceremonial duty in the library. It is also the one that determines whether he still has healthy tissue in ten years, and nothing on any other page outranks it.

She may decline to put it back on. He may never decline to take it off when she says.

II. THE RING BENEATH

The base ring is the constant. It is worn beneath the cage as a matter of course, and it is what remains when the cage cannot be — skin that needs to recover, a medical procedure, an illness or a hospital stay, travel where the cage would be discovered, a stretch of heavy work where friction would injure him. The cage is the part that comes and goes. The ring does not.

The base ring of the device is worn alone. This is deliberate and it is the whole point of this section: removal of the cage is not release. The ring stays on, sitting where it always

sits, doing nothing to him physically and everything to him otherwise. He is uncaged and still owned, and the difference between those two facts is the entire lesson.

A word on fit, since the ring is now doing the work alone. It sits snug and never tight — close enough that it does not move about, loose enough that it is forgotten. If it ever leaves marks that are still visible an hour after removal, or produces any coolness, numbness, colour change or swelling, the size is wrong and it comes off until a correct one is obtained. A ring that is right is a ring he stops noticing, which is precisely what allows it to be worn for years.

III. THE TWO RINGS

He wears two rings and they say different things to different people.

The ring on his hand is public. It announces to a room that he is married, and every stranger reads it correctly and completely. It is the whole of what the world is entitled to know.

The ring at his base is hers. Nobody sees it, nobody suspects it, and it says the thing the public ring only gestures at — that he is not merely married but held; that the arrangement is not an idea they discuss but a fact he carries. He is never without it. It does not come off for work, for sport, for travel, or for company, and the only hands that remove it are hers.

One ring tells the world he is taken. The other tells him.

IV. OUT OF THE CAGE IS NOT OUT OF THE COVENANT

This section exists because the failure it describes is predictable, and both of them should see it coming rather than discover it.

When the cage is off — for cleaning, for recovery, for travel, for any reason she has granted — nothing else changes. He has not been given his body back. He has been trusted with it, temporarily, for a stated purpose, and the purpose does not include him. Everything the Articles say about his ownership applies exactly as it applied yesterday, and it applies harder, because it now depends on him rather than on steel.

So the misuse of an uncaged interval is not a small failure. It is not equivalent to a lazy afternoon or a fumbled introduction. It is a breach in the proper sense, because it is an act against the ownership itself — a man taking for himself the very thing he has given away, at the one moment he was trusted not to. It is answered under the Annex on Breach and not under the ordinary ledger, and it is answered whether or not he is caught, because he will report it. If he will not report it, the arrangement has a much larger problem than an uncaged evening.

And it says something specific about him, which is worth him hearing plainly: it is selfish in the exact way this whole arrangement was built to train out of him. Not wicked —

selfish. He took a private pleasure at the cost of something they made together, because it was available and she was not looking. That is the appetite the covenant exists to point somewhere better, and the correct response is neither shame nor drama but a genuine consequence and a return to the standard.

V. THE RULE OF HANDS — BINDING ON BOTH

Here is the rule, and it is not his rule. It is theirs, and it binds her precisely as it binds him.

Neither of them takes their own pleasure alone. Their bodies are not their own private property to spend privately; each belongs to the other, and satisfaction is something given by the other rather than taken from oneself. This is the plainest expression of what the Articles claim, and a version that applied only to him would be an arrangement about controlling a man rather than a covenant between two people.

The reasoning is the same for both. What is taken alone is spent — it resolves, it discharges, and what discharges stops pointing anywhere. What is kept accumulates and stays directed at the other person. A wife who quietly attends to herself is doing exactly what a husband who quietly attends to himself is doing: draining the reservoir the marriage runs on, and doing it in secret. Weakness creeps in through the same door for both of them, and it creeps in unnoticed precisely because it is private and small.

So: it is declared, not concealed. Wanting is reported rather than resolved. Either of them may say plainly that they need attention, and the other answers it — that is what the rule is for, and a house that enforces the prohibition without honouring the request has understood only half of it.

VI. WHEN ONE OF THEM IS CAUGHT

If one of them is discovered — or, far better, confesses — the partner does not look away and does not leave the room. The obligation runs the other direction: they watch. All of it, from where it was interrupted through to the finish, with the one who was caught continuing under the other's eye rather than being permitted to stop and be spared.

The purpose is precise. What made the act a betrayal was that it was private; so the correction is that it stops being private. The thing done in secret is finished in front of the person it was stolen from, and the pleasure that was taken alone is completed under the ownership it was taken from. Nothing is hidden, nothing is left to be imagined, and the wall the secret was built behind is dismantled by the same act that built it.

It is watched without commentary, without mockery, and without cruelty. This is not humiliation for its own sake and the difference matters: the one watching is reclaiming something, not gloating. Where it tips into contempt it has stopped doing its work, and On Discipline and Abuse governs here as everywhere.

And when it is finished — that is when the correction begins.

VII. THE TWO ANSWERS

Either answer may follow, at the discretion of the one who was wronged, and both are real.

The first: the ordinary correction

Over the lap, hand and implement, in the ordinary way and to the ordinary law — the safe target, the warm-up, the colour read, the stop signs. For him this runs under the Annex; for her it runs under When She Falls Short and its gates. Nothing about the offence changes the anatomy.

The second: continuation

The other answer is not to stop. The climax happens, and the stimulation continues straight through it — no pause, no interval, no asking — into the sharp oversensitivity that follows, for as long as the one in charge chooses. It is the more searching of the two answers by some distance. Where a spanking is paid and finished, this is felt at the moment of the very pleasure that caused the offence, which is precisely the point: it attaches a cost to the thing that was stolen rather than to the person who stole it.

For him, one is permitted and then it does not stop — the first is his, and everything after it is hers. For her, the shape is the same in the other register: past the third or fourth, it stops being pleasure and becomes something else entirely, and that crossing is where the correction actually lives.

The form of words — orders are not permissions

This house has argued from its first page that vagueness is what destroys marriages, and nowhere in the whole library does that principle come down to a single sentence more sharply than here. Two entirely different classes of thing may be said during this stage, and a man who confuses them has not misheard — he has repeated his original offence inside its own correction.

An order addresses the act. Continue. Carry on. Keep going. Don't stop. Again. These tell him what his hands are to do, or what he is to go on submitting to, and they concern the doing of the thing and nothing else. They say precisely nothing about release. A woman saying carry on is telling him to remain where he is; she is not opening a door, and it is not ambiguous unless he decides it is.

A permission addresses the release, and it is one formula only, spoken in full and in these words: I give you permission to orgasm. Nothing else in the language of the house grants it. Not being told to continue. Not being praised. Not her evident pleasure or her encouragement or the sounds she is making. Not the fact that she has not stopped him —

and above all not her silence, because silence is the absence of permission and therefore its refusal. If the sentence has not been said, the answer is no.

The burden this places on him is deliberate and it is not light: he must hold on through instruction, through encouragement, through her taking obvious pleasure in what he is doing, without reading any of it as consent. That is the discipline. Anyone can wait for a closed door to open. What is being trained here is a man who does not walk through a door merely because nobody happened to be standing in front of it.

And it protects her as much as him, which is the part worth them both noticing. With one formula and one only, he never has to guess and she never has to be misread. She may be as warm, as encouraging, as loud and as generous as she likes without any of it being taken for a licence — she is not obliged to police her own delight to keep him honest. The line is in the words, not in her manner, so her manner is free.

She says it, or she does not. She may withdraw it after granting it, and it lapses the moment she says stop or hold. Everything above applies identically to her: an instruction to keep going is not a permission to finish, and the same formula is what grants it in her direction. And where the formula is deliberately withheld across a whole evening while she orders him to continue throughout — that is not a failure of communication. That is the entire lesson, executed exactly as written.

Why this corrects, when nothing about it changes

A couple new to this will reasonably ask how something can be a correction when it looks identical to a pleasure, and the answer is worth understanding rather than taking on trust — because it is the only consequence in this library where the instrument never changes at all.

Every other correction announces itself. A paddle is plainly not a caress; the body reads it as consequence from the first stroke. Here there is no implement, no force, and no change of hand. She goes on doing precisely what she was doing a moment ago, at the same pace, in the same manner — and it becomes unendurable, not because she altered anything, but because he did. The switch is thrown inside him. The correction is administered by his own physiology, and all she supplies is the refusal to stop.

That is what makes it teach. The consequence is not attached to some unrelated part of him; it is attached to the exact appetite that caused the offence, at the exact site of it, in the exact act he chose. He took a pleasure that was not his to take, and the pleasure itself is what turns on him. Nothing is imported. He is not being made to pay for it somewhere else — he is being kept inside it until it stops being what he wanted.

And the timing does the rest. He finished in front of her, which was the first half of it; then she takes over and reproduces the whole thing, every part of it, and goes on reproducing it — and somewhere in that he crosses from wanting it to enduring it to wishing, with a sincerity he will not have expected, that he had never begun. That is the association a correction exists to build, and no paddle can build it, because a paddle

teaches him to avoid a paddle. This teaches him to want the offence less. It is the difference between a debt paid and a lesson learned, and it is why she should not hurry it.

She goes on until she judges he has it — and here is the turn that completes the lesson: not until he climaxes again. If a second arrives it changes nothing on its own, because it is not his to take either. He does not get to end his own correction by finishing, any more than he got to begin it by finishing. It is permitted, if it is permitted, because she says so, and it is denied by the same authority — so a man who reaches for it as an exit finds the exit is hers as well. By then he is generally in no state to be strategic about anything, which is the condition the stage is aiming at: not pain, but a thorough undoing, at the hands of the person he stole from.

For her the shape is identical and the road is simply longer. She does not arrive at the same place in seconds; she is carried there across several, with the character shifting under her by degrees until it arrives at the same destination — the same wish that she had not started it, arrived at from further away. She is not spared the lesson by having the greater capacity. She is only given more time to see it coming, and being made to watch it approach is its own kind of teaching.

It runs both ways, and it does not run evenly

The rule of hands binds both of them, so the answer to breaking it does too. Whichever of them was wronged administers it, and either may be the one receiving — a wife who took her pleasure privately answers for it exactly as he would, in the same manner, under the same law. Neither of them holds this as a power over the other; they hold it as a pair of matched obligations, and a house that applied it in one direction only has not understood the rule it is enforcing.

But it does not land evenly, and both of them should know that before the first time rather than discovering it. Her capacity here is considerably the greater. Past the first she can be carried through a second and a third with the character of it shifting gradually — sharper, more difficult, but still recognisably pleasure — and it is generally around the third or fourth that it crosses into something else. That crossing is gradual enough to be read, and to be stopped at.

His is not. The refractory sensitivity that follows a man's climax arrives within seconds and arrives at full strength; there is no gentle gradient to read. One is his, and anything continued past it turns almost immediately into something that is no longer pleasure by any description — an intimate torture, and it deserves that name plainly rather than a euphemism. It is quiet, it is invisible, it leaves nothing to see, and it is very largely overlooked in every written account of these arrangements, which is precisely why it belongs in this one. A woman who has only ever experienced her own version of continuation will substantially underestimate what she is doing to him, and should take his word for it the first time without requiring him to prove it.

So the practical rule follows from the physiology rather than from anyone's preference: for her, a ceiling counted in orgasms, with the crossing watched for and honoured. For him, a ceiling counted in seconds or in a small number of strokes, agreed in advance, and shorter than either of them expects to need. His halt word will come faster than hers and it means precisely the same thing when it does.

Beyond correction — continuation as ownership

It would be a mistake to file this only under punishment, and the couple should understand it properly, because it is one of the clearest lessons in pleasure and control the arrangement contains. Continuation needs no offence behind it. It can be done for no reason but that she chooses to, on an ordinary evening with nothing owed, and used that way it is arguably the most complete statement of ownership in this library — more so than the steel, which only prevents.

The reason is in the mechanics. Everywhere else, his pleasure is denied and hers is taken; both are matters of permission, and permission still leaves the body its own. Here the body is overruled. The climax arrives — the one moment a person is most certainly and most privately their own — and it does not end the encounter, because ending it was never theirs to decide. There is no pause, no interval, no returning to themselves and being asked whether they would like to go on. The hand simply does not stop, and in that unbroken second the lesson lands with a completeness that no negotiation could produce: that even this belongs to someone else.

Done this way it is not cruelty and should not feel like it. It is closer to being kept — held past the point where one would ordinarily be released, by someone who has the standing to do exactly that. Both of them tend to find it the most intense thing they do, and both should expect it to be disproportionately affecting for what it is: brief, requiring nothing, and leaving no mark.

Every line of the law below applies identically whether it follows an offence or nothing at all. An expression of ownership with no rules around it is not ownership; it is carelessness with someone who has agreed to be careless with.

The law governing continuation

This is the section that keeps the answer honest rather than harmful, and it is not negotiable:

- The halt word governs absolutely and is expected to be used. A correction that cannot be stopped is not a correction this library recognises, and here more than anywhere the one receiving it must know that the word works — tested early, honoured instantly, never punished, never priced, never remembered against them.
- Hands and mouth, with lubricant, always. Dry friction on oversensitive tissue causes chafing, abrasion and small tears within minutes, and those take days to heal and can become infected. Anything mechanical is far harder to judge and is not a beginner's instrument here.

- It stops for pain as distinct from oversensitivity, for numbness, for any soreness that persists afterward, for genuine distress rather than protest, and for any bleeding or rawness whatever.
- A ceiling is set in advance and written in the Schedule — an agreed number, or an agreed length of time, decided while both of them are calm and not adjusted in the moment by the one administering it.
- Never while either of them is impaired, and never in temper. This answer more than any other can be delivered in anger while looking like discipline, and both of them should watch for it.

And it is finished when it is finished. Not referred to again, not raised in an argument next month. A failure answered is a failure closed — that law has run through every page of this library and it runs through this one.

VIII. AFTERWARD

Care closes what it opens, in both directions and without exception. Warmth, water, holding, and time; and it is said plainly that it is over and nothing is held against them. Where continuation was the answer, the aftercare matters more rather than less — that experience can leave someone genuinely shaken in a way a spanking does not, and being held afterwards is what distinguishes a correction from something unkind.

Then the honest question the following day, asked by both: was anything about that more than either of us wanted. Both answer. The one who administered it answers too, and a partner who finds they enjoyed it more than they should have is obliged to say so — which is not a failure, but the most useful safeguard on the page.

His body is hers and hers is his. Neither of them spends privately what belongs to the other.

A guide only. Not medical advice. For consenting adults, 18 and over. The health check outranks every ceremony in this library. The halt word belongs to both of them equally, governs every line above, and its use is never punished. Persistent numbness, discolouration, coolness or swelling under any device is a doctor's matter, not a household one.