

# THE ROUND OAK

## Makes a complete and sweeping knock-out of all Base Burners. One and all flee before it like a mouse before a panther. No one will think of buying anything but a Round Oak Heating Stove

Who knows what it will do, and the small expense it will do it with. The rich are using them in their private houses, and are putting their base burner in the coal house, or disposing of them for what they can get. The poor people glow with delight because it is the first time in their lives that they could get a stove that will keep a fire all night, and keep a steady fire; with a stove and a fuel that is within reach of their means. 76 have been sold this fall for heating stores, offices, hotels, churches, etc. The highest recommendation ever given to a stove, can meritoriously be given THE ROUND OAK. Will do the same work with soft coal that a base burner will with hard coal, and heats a third more room with hard coal than any base burner will. It is only sold in Omaha by

# W. F. STOETZEL, 1621 Howard Street

### AN INTERESTING QUESTION.

Men or Women?—Which Are the Trust or Most Unselfish Friends.

DISCUSSED BY ELLA WHEELER.

Opinions of Some Wives and Maidens—Men More Ready, But Women More Lasting in Their Friendships.

(Written for the Bee—Copyrighted.)

In a room full of ladies I heard this question discussed in all its bearings not long ago, and a great many interesting anecdotes and experiences were related. The majority of unmarried women expressed quite unanimously an opinion in favor of the men. The married ladies were less outspoken, but the greater number of them were not enthusiastic in their faith in man's friendship for women. Their skepticism might be attributed to various causes. Perhaps they knew the genus homo better than their single sisters did. Perhaps they did not think it wise to encourage the damsels in their dangerous even if true theory.

Many an unmarried girl is blind to the virtues of women because she has not time to study them. Her horizon is bounded by masculine forms, and she is quite content to have it so. By and by, when she concentrates her attention and interest on one man, and the others disappear like setting stars at the rise of the sun, why then she notices the beauty and fragrance of these human flowers—women.

I heard one young lady, who had fought a single-handed battle with the world and achieved success, declare that the question was not even open to discussion in her mind.

"I think no one is a better judge of the matter," she said, "than a woman who has made her own way in life. I received appreciation and encouragement from men, when women gave me only indifference or neglect. Men predicted my success, while women feared I would fail. Men praised what they termed my courage, while women criticized what they termed my boldness."

Another lady declared that she would invariably go to a man were she in need of friendship or protection in time of trouble.

"If I were placed in a compromising situation, for instance," she said, "and wished to confide in some one, and had only my own words to prove my innocence, do you think I would trust myself to the mercy of a woman? No, indeed. And if I had done wrong and needed a confessor and counselor, surely I would go to a man. Women are too cruel to their own sex."

At this juncture she remarked that a man would always protect a woman against every man but himself. He would defend her from the censorious comments of the world quicker than another woman would—and then spoil it all by compromising her name himself.

Hereupon a happy-looking married lady expressed her opinion.

"You have all given your theories," quoth she. "Now listen to my experience. No girl ever possessed more gentleman friends than I. My career as a self-made and self-supported one also. I, too, found men far kinder with praise and encouragement than women were. Men proffered advice and aid, while women gave it if asked. Yet as time advanced I found men far more selfish in their friendships than women. The interest of my most platonic male friends noticeably lessened after my marriage, and in several cases turned into enmity, while women regarded me with increased favor.

"Men whose respect and admiration, unmixt with any tender sentiment, would have swung I had won did not hesitate to shrug their shoulders and sneer when I made an excellent marriage, and no longer needed their occasional advice. I really think a man's friendship for an unmarried woman is always, even if unconsciously to himself, selfish. While she belongs to no one he imagines she belongs in some degree to himself, and rejoices in her prosperity. When she belongs to another man all this ceases. Women are less enthusiastic in the beginning, but their friendship wears better."

"I don't know how it is in the matter of friendship," a young lady interposed, "but I know when I go into a large establishment shopping I always receive better attention and more courtesy from the salesmen than from the sales-girls. If I desire to be directed to another department in the store, I always prefer to ask a man, as he is more willing and affable in his manner."

A young girl who had once published a little book and sold it on the street to passers-by said: "Men are far kinder-hearted than women. Women looked at me as if I were doing some dreadful and improper act; men looked at me with sympathy and interest. In any time of distress women look at you as if you were lying to them; men wait until they catch you in a lie, and then tell you of it. They forget and forgive a wrong, too, far sooner than women do." Hereupon I remarked that once upon a time I asked a favor of a gentleman in the presence of two ladies. The gentleman expressed the deepest sympathy and the most genuine regret that he could not assist me. Both ladies volun-

tarily offered the aid which I had not thought of appealing for to them.

I think if you can once remove all idea of possible rivalry from a woman's mind she makes a better friend than any man living. Tell a woman your successes, and she will share them; but tell her your sorrows and failures, and she is moved to befriend you.

On the contrary, tell a man of your successes and you win his admiring regard; while if you tell him of your troubles you weary him.

One lady said she thought men were more prompt and agreeable, as a rule, than our own sex in their manner of bestowing favors, and it was because they were educated to business methods. A woman often wounded her feelings from a lack of kind impulses, but merely from her awkwardness in dealing with any matter outside of parlor or kitchen. A married lady said she quite coincided with the last speaker in regard to the business methods of the sterner sex. Thereupon she related her somewhat unusual experience.

"I was an artist," she said, "and my studio was in the same building in which an elderly professional gentleman occupied an office. He obtained an introduction to me, and became greatly interested in my work. He never once indulged in the least sentiment toward me. His social and business standing was excellent, he was unusually intellectual, and I quite prized his friendship and valued his advice and criticism. Sixty-seven years of age and the exposure and brutality to which he was subjected have since resulted in his death. Owing to the fact that I have a little money and Surrante's friends knowing it, I have been expecting the levying of an assessment."

I left Roma five days ago under the guard of six armed men, who escorted me as far as Pena Station, on the Mexican National railway. By Associated press dispatches of this morning I see that the expected demand has been made upon me since my departure, also upon Senor De Onacio Garcia, of Rio Grande city. They want \$15,000 from him and \$4,000 from me. My part of it, at least, they are not likely to get. The government has of course promised the aid of the state troops, but I don't see the good that they can do, owing not only to the difficulty of the country and Surrante's secure hiding place, but the fact that nearly all of the poorer classes are in league with the band and purpose to hide the money, if they can. I estimate that some twenty-five men belong to the gang.

"Surrante is a magnificent rascal, who spends his ill-gotten gains very freely, and is uniformly kind to the poor. They have learned his ways, and invested him with a good deal of romance, and many of them serve him and are ready to join him at any moment. I have no hesitancy in predicting a desperate battle in the region within the month, and I am by no means sure that Surrante will get away. He has been extending his operations into Mexico, and I understand that authorities and soldiers on the other side of the river are on the qui vive. He may be caught between the two fires and he may not. He is a very smart man."

When I pondered over all I had heard, and placed my own personal experiences along with the other testimony, my conclusions might be classified something as follows:

1. Men are more enthusiastic and ready to espouse the cause of woman than her sister women are.

2. Women, when their interest is finally won, are more lasting in their friendships.

3. There is an instinctive rivalry between women, which until it is overcome by the bonds of sympathy, is a bar to true, unselfish friendship.

4. There is an instinctive attraction between men and women which is a bar to safe and unselfish friendship.

5. Men expect more in return for their favors than women do.

6. Men are far more agreeable to approach in any matter requiring courtesy and politeness.

7. Women are far safer and more reliable friends in the long run, noticeably decreases after a woman marries.

8. The friendship of men noticeably strengthens after a woman marries.

9. A good and efficient man is a better friend and advisor than a weak woman.

10. A good and efficient woman is a better friend and advisor than a weak man.

11. There is no rule which governs the matter.

ELLA WHEELER WILCOX.

### TEXAS BRIGANDAGE.

#### A Lone Star Man's Account of the Border Outrages.

A special dispatch to the Globe Democrat says: Not since the days of the Cortan raid, years and years ago, has the Texas side of the lower Rio Grande existed under such a reign of terror as now. Brigandage reigns supreme. Business is paralyzed, and United States mails get through when they can. Ranchmen stay close at home, and labor in the fields even is accompanied by unusual hazards and in no man's house is a light to be seen after dark. County officials have telegraphed the state government for aid. Governor Ross himself does not know what to do. Sheriffs and United States marshals are powerless and the bandits are once more, in fact, as they were once in song and in story, "The Kings of the Border." Senor Manuel Guerra, a merchant who is rated at \$20,000, and who has shops in both Roma and Rio Grande City, Starr county, is on his way to New York. He was seen by a reporter and gave the following account of the trouble: "You must first understand," he said, "the conditions of the country. It is hilly. The Rio Grande runs through one long ravine, densely covered with chaparral and cactus. It is sparsely settled and it offers a shelter impregnable to hundreds of desperadoes. They have always infested the country to a greater or less extent. If they killed a man in Mexico they stepped across into Texas. If in Texas they stepped across into Mexico. They had a practically unlimited field in which to work. Hitherto they have been disorganized. Now they are under a leader who is at once the most competent and dangerous man on the frontier of either country. His name is Antonio de Surrante. He is

young, handsome, educated, a most daring and unscrupulous scoundrel. He is a native of this country and knows it well. He has risen to fame in the past three months through methods peculiar to his own. He has not gone in for highway, mail or train robbery. He has learned the methods of Italian brigands, and follows them exactly. His system includes capture, violent mistreatment and heavy ransom or death. His first victim was Senor Berreno. This gentleman was found near his home, knocked down, beaten, bound hand and foot, and tied on a horse, then driven for a day and night through the brush. During all this time he was blindfolded and given neither water nor food. On the arrival at the robbers' headquarters, of whose location he is entirely ignorant, he was held for twenty-one days, until I myself paid the \$1,000 ransom demanded for his release. He was half starved, kicked, lashed and burned daily during all this time, and was in hourly dread of losing his teeth, it being a favorite threat of Surrante to extract them all, and send them as presents to his friends. I paid the money because I knew it was a matter of life or death with him. It has since been refunded me. Berreno was seventy years of age and the exposure and brutality to which he was subjected have since resulted in his death. Owing to the fact that I have a little money and Surrante's friends knowing it, I have been expecting the levying of an assessment."

I left Roma five days ago under the guard of six armed men, who escorted me as far as Pena Station, on the Mexican National railway. By Associated press dispatches of this morning I see that the expected demand has been made upon me since my departure, also upon Senor De Onacio Garcia, of Rio Grande city. They want \$15,000 from him and \$4,000 from me. My part of it, at least, they are not likely to get. The government has of course promised the aid of the state troops, but I don't see the good that they can do, owing not only to the difficulty of the country and Surrante's secure hiding place, but the fact that nearly all of the poorer classes are in league with the band and purpose to hide the money, if they can. I estimate that some twenty-five men belong to the gang.

"Surrante is a magnificent rascal, who spends his ill-gotten gains very freely, and is uniformly kind to the poor. They have learned his ways, and invested him with a good deal of romance, and many of them serve him and are ready to join him at any moment. I have no hesitancy in predicting a desperate battle in the region within the month, and I am by no means sure that Surrante will get away. He has been extending his operations into Mexico, and I understand that authorities and soldiers on the other side of the river are on the qui vive. He may be caught between the two fires and he may not. He is a very smart man."

When I pondered over all I had heard, and placed my own personal experiences along with the other testimony, my conclusions might be classified something as follows:

1. Men are more enthusiastic and ready to espouse the cause of woman than her sister women are.

2. Women, when their interest is finally won, are more lasting in their friendships.

3. There is an instinctive rivalry between women, which until it is overcome by the bonds of sympathy, is a bar to true, unselfish friendship.

4. There is an instinctive attraction between men and women which is a bar to safe and unselfish friendship.

5. Men expect more in return for their favors than women do.

6. Men are far more agreeable to approach in any matter requiring courtesy and politeness.

7. Women are far safer and more reliable friends in the long run, noticeably decreases after a woman marries.

8. The friendship of men noticeably strengthens after a woman marries.

9. A good and efficient man is a better friend and advisor than a weak woman.

10. A good and efficient woman is a better friend and advisor than a weak man.

11. There is no rule which governs the matter.

ELLA WHEELER WILCOX.

### WELL-DRILLED ANTS.

Youth's Companion: "Ants appear to have for their motto, 'In union there is strength.' They set the best regulated human committees made in this respect, maintaining a wonderful degree of drill and discipline, by means of which they are enabled to accomplish tasks which before hand seem quite out of the question. A traveler in Central America witnessed the following instance of this trait:

The ants, which were of a very minute size, carried a dead, full-grown scorpion up the wall of our room from the floor to the ceiling, and thence along the ceiling to a window, and then to a considerable distance, where, at last, they brought it safely into their nest in the interior of the wood.

During the latter part of this achievement, they had to bear the whole weight of the scorpion, together with their own in their inverted position, and in this way to move along the beam. The order was so perfect that we could not detect the slightest deviation from an absolute symmetry, either in the arrangement of the little army of workmen, or in their movements.

No corps of engineers could be drilled to a more absolute perfection in the performance of a mechanical task. According to a rough calculation, there must have been 30 or 400 of these intelligent little creatures at work.

Besides those engaged in the labor of transportation, no others were seen. A single one was sitting on the sting at the end of the scorpion's tail, as if stationed there to overlook and direct the whole proceeding, and, at the rest, without an exception, were at work.

Food makes Blood and Blood makes Beauty. Improper digestion of food necessarily produces bad blood, resulting in a feeling of fullness in the stomach, acidity, heartburn, sick headache, and other dyspeptic symptoms. A closely confined life causes indigestion, constipation, biliousness and loss of appetite. To remove these troubles there is no remedy equal to Prickly Ash Bitters. It has been tried and proven to be a specific.

### WITH THIS RING I THEE WED

The Curious Bits of History Attached to the Wedding-Ring.

#### ORIGIN OF AN HONORED CUSTOM.

The Uses of the Ring—An Interesting Sketch in the Popular Science Monthly by D. R. McAnally.

Of all the ornaments with which vanity, superstition, and affection have decorated the human form, few have more curious bits of history than the finger-ring. From the earliest times the ring has been a favorite ornament, and the reason for this general preference shown for it over other articles of jewelry are numerous and cogent. Ornaments whose place is on some other portion of the apparel, or in the hair, must be laid aside with the clothing or head-dress, are thus easily lost and often not at once missed. Pins, boucles, buckles, clasps, buttons, all sooner or later become defective in some part, and are liable to escape from an owner unconscious of the defect in the mechanism. The links of a necklace in time become worn, and the article is taken off to be mended; the spring or other fastening of a bracelet is easily broken, and the bracelet vanishes. With regard to ornaments fastened to parts of the body, the ear must be bored, the nose pierced, the cheeks or lips be slit, and, even after these surgical operations are completed, the articles used for adornment are generally inconvenient, and sometimes, by their weight or constriction, are extremely painful.

In striking contrast with decorations on the clothing, in the hair, or on the neck and arms, or pendant from the ears, lips and nose, is the finger-ring, the model of convenience. It is seldom lost, for it need not be taken off; requires no preparatory mutilation of the body, is not painful, is always in view, and is not so easily lost as the garter, or the ring, or the purpose for which it is worn.

The popularity of the ring must, therefore, be in large measure due to its convenience, and that this good quality has been learned and imitated by the Hebrews, who introduced the ring as an ornament to Tubal-Cain, the "inventor of every artificer in brass and iron." The barbaric lover, in choosing a token for his mistress, was doubtless actuated, like the lover of today, by the wish to be kept in remembrance, and the proverbial saying: "Out of sight, out of mind," being as true in savage as in civilized times, he sought for a memento which should be always in view, and never borrowed the custom from his lost—which, in short, should become a part of herself, mately reminding her of him, and presenting a silent remembrance when her affections went astray. For the purposes of a love-gift he sought for something which was not subject to civil officers, it was an emblem of office, and to ecclesiastics an indispensable portion of the episcopal costume. It was once worn by physicians to prevent contagion, and by patients to cure disease, the timorous wore it as a charm against evil spirits, and the ambitious clung to it as a talisman, giving the wearer success over his enemies. But as a love-token, and a symbol of marriage, the use of the ring is so general, and of so long standing, as to dwarf into insignificance its employment in all other directions.

At what period it came into play as a recognized factor in the marriage ceremony it is impossible to say. The Hebrews used it in very early ages, and probably borrowed the custom from the Egyptians, among whom the wedding-ring was known—a circle, in the language of hieroglyphics, being the symbol of eternity, and the embodiment of the circle readily symbolizing the eternal nature of the bond of matrimony. The Greeks used wedding-rings, so did the Romans, both putting them on the fore-finger—by the way, a practice followed by the medieval painters, many of whom represent the virgin's ring on her forefinger. In the case where the popular estimate of a woman is low, the use of the wedding ring has not been common, though occasionally the favorite wife of an oriental monarch would receive from her master a ring as a mark of his favor. The conclusion, therefore, is safe that, with increase of respect for the institution of marriage, came also increased respect for and use of the ring as a token of the alliance.

During a part of the middle ages this respect showed itself in a peculiar way, custom demanding that the wedding ring should cost as much as the bridegroom could afford to pay; and there are records in Germany and France, during the fourteenth and fif-

teenth centuries, of many large investments made in this direction by grooms eager to conciliate their brides and be in fashion. The revolution made the ring what we now have: a plain gold circlet; though, by a compromise, the ring may be as costly as fancy dictates or means permit.

The materials of which wedding rings have been composed are as diverse as the nations which have used the ring. The British museum has rings of bone and of hard wood, found in the Swiss lakes; on one of the bone rings is traced a heart, giving antiquaries reason to believe that the ring was a pledge of affection, if not a wedding ring. The same museum has rings from all parts of the earth—of bone, ivory, copper, brass, lead, tin, iron, silver, gold, and some of a composite of several of these metals. One ivory ring, from an Egyptian tomb, bears two clasped hands, an iron ring, having the design of a hand holding a heart, once graced the hand of a Roman matron; while the inscriptions on many others make it certain that they were wedding rings.

The use of many different materials in the construction of these wedding rings does not indicate capricious changes of fashion, for it should be remembered that museums and collections of antiquities comprise specimens of many ages and of widely separated lands, but there is no doubt that fashion has sometimes had an influence in determining the style and material of the ring. For instance, during the latter part of the sixteenth century a fashion for some time prevailed in France of making

THE WEDDING RING consist of several links fastened together in such a way as to seem but one. Sometimes there were three, two links having graven hands and the third a heart, the union of the three in the proper position bringing the hands over the heart. During the palmy days of astrology there was quite a fashion in Germany of the wedding rings engraved with astronomical and astrological characters, the horoscopes of both the contracting parties being sometimes inscribed in the circles and set in diamonds, the being also the golden age of the quack doctor, wedding rings were often made with a cavity to contain medical preparations or charms to preserve or restore health or avert evil.

The custom of setting European rings in a flame, a practice become common in France, Germany and England, of wearing rings the settings of which was a tiny fragment of wood from the true cross, and many of these rings are still preserved in the cabinets and museums of Europe. Ash-hoop rings were, in the seventeenth century, very popular among the Spanish peasants as a cure for epilepsy; and such a ring, made, it was said, from the hoof of the ass which carried Christ into Jerusalem, was used in a wedding in a country church near Madrid in 1811!

But when the ring was not plain, precious stones of some kind constituted the settings; and when the selection of the stone was in question, the dominance of fashion in the absolute. In the fourteenth century, a fanciful Italian writer on the mystic arts set forth the virtues of the various gems, indicating also the month in which it was proper to wear particular stones in order to secure the best result. The idea took, and for some time it was the fashion in several Italian cities to have the precious stone of the ring determined by the month in which the bride was born. If in January, the stone was a garnet, if in February, a sapphire, and so on. In the twelfth century, the custom of wearing rings was introduced into the west by the crusaders, and the custom of wearing rings was introduced into the west by the crusaders, and the custom of wearing rings was introduced into the west by the crusaders.

But when the ring was not plain, precious stones of some kind constituted the settings; and when the selection of the stone was in question, the dominance of fashion in the absolute. In the fourteenth century, a fanciful Italian writer on the mystic arts set forth the virtues of the various gems, indicating also the month in which it was proper to wear particular stones in order to secure the best result. The idea took, and for some time it was the fashion in several Italian cities to have the precious stone of the ring determined by the month in which the bride was born. If in January, the stone was a garnet, if in February, a sapphire, and so on. In the twelfth century, the custom of wearing rings was introduced into the west by the crusaders, and the custom of wearing rings was introduced into the west by the crusaders.

Blessing the ring gives it no small share of sanctity, and old missals contain explicit directions as to the manner in which the ceremony must be carried out. In the church service as performed in the villages of England, the ring is frequently placed in the missal, the practice being, no doubt, a relic of the blessing once thought indispensable. The German peasant women of the first husband, even after a second marriage, and a recent book of German travels mentions a peasant wearing, at one time, the wedding-rings of four "late lamented." An inheritance is known of a woman of German birth, who after the death of her husband in a western state, had the misfortune to lose her ring. She at once bought another, had it blessed, and wore it instead of the former, deeming it unwise to be without a wedding ring. Among the same class of people, stealing a wedding ring is thought to bring evil on the thief, while breaking the emblem of marriage is a sure sign of speedy death to one or both of the contracting parties.

What the Professor Found. San Francisco Argonaut: Recently at a certain college examination a certain professor determined that he would make it impossible for any copying to take place under his supervision. Accordingly he kept a sharp watch upon the candidates. At last he noticed a man look from side to side to satisfy himself that no one observed him,

while in some districts of Spain and Portugal, three rings are placed, one at a time, on the

FINGERS OF THE BRIDE, as the words "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is pronounced.

Fashion has also determined, not only the style of the wedding ring, but the finger on which it is to be worn; and so capriciously has custom varied, that the style of matrimony has traveled from the thumb to the fourth finger, where it now reposes. In the time of Elizabeth, it was customary, both in England and on the continent, for ladies to wear rings on the thumb, and several of her rings now shown in the British museum from their size, must have been thumb-rings. That the practice of wearing thumb rings extended to the case of married ladies and their wedding rings, is amply attested, not only by allusions in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In the time of Charles II., the ring seems to have found lodgment on the forefinger, sometimes on the middle finger, occasionally on the third finger also, and, by the time George I. came to the throne, the third finger was recognized as the proper place for it, not universally, however, for William Jones in his treatise on rings, declares that even in contemporary literature, but by the portraits of matrons of that age, a great many, where the hands are shown, displaying the wedding ring on the left thumb. In