

proved that Robert Owen and David ap Robert had murdered Edward ap David. He claimed, further, that the Justices had suggested to the jury that the evidence required a verdict of guilty - at least of manslaughter. The point of the Bill was that Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd and Ellis David ap Thomas, as jurors, had committed perjury. Hugh Nanney claimed that the two defendants and four other jurors were bribed to find the prisoners not guilty, and had forced the rest of the jury, "bringe farre meaner and simpler persones than themsellfs" to agree in acquitting the prisoners. When the rest of the jurors at first refused to be intimidated, the Bill continues, Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd and Ellis David ap Thomas kept them without food for two days until, "allmost starved and famished", they were forced "to yeald for safgard of theire lifes to agree for the acquittinge of the said prisoners." The jury, therefore, "in the one of the monethes of September or october last past", delivered a verdict of not guilty "to the great dislikinge of

the said Justices."¹.

The charge, therefore, is twofold: an attempt to prove, first, that Edward ap David was murdered by Robert Owen and David ap Robert, and, consequently that if this was true and the evidence presented at the Great Sessions was sufficient, then Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd and Ellis David ap Thomas were guilty of perjury. The Star Chamber acted, indeed, in a sense as a court of appeal through its hearing of perjury cases.²

-
1. The actual date must have been the 1st. September, as another trial - that of Robert Simon Owen, Lewis Simon Owen and John ap Humphrey - ^{on}the same charge at the same Great Sessions took place, after that of Robert Owen of Hengwrt and David ap Robert, in September, 1601. (Nannau MS.1165). In this later trial two of the accused were acquitted, but Robert Simon Owen "was indicted of manslaughter upon such evidens as then was geaven". (P.R.O. St. Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.11). The Great Sessions Justices were annoyed that they had not been found guilty of murder, and the jurors were subsequently bound by recognizances to appear before the Council in the Marches to answer for returning this verdict. (P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.5) Vide also P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/P/29/18 (February 1603) - where Robert Lloyd of Rhiwgoch, Sheriff of Merionethshire for 1601/2, was accused of impanelling "a favorable Jury" for the trial of Robert Simon Owen, Lewis Simon Owen and John ap Humphrey, in return for a bribe of £20, "by which Indirect meanes the said prisoners were likewise acquitted of the said Murder."
 2. Edwards, "Star Chamber Proceedings", Introduction, P.V.

The first accusation seems to be proved beyond any reasonable doubt. Apart from the evidence of the eye-witnesses, referred to above,¹ Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd himself could not deny that Robert Owen and David ap Robert were present at the bowling green at the time of the murder.²

Robert Owen's father, Edward Owen of Hengwrt, when he came to give evidence, could not deny his son's guilt other than by an attempt to blacken Hugh Nanney.³ He claimed that as the murder took place "upon the last daie of the Faier in dolgelley towne, beinge midsomer daie", there were "a great number of straingers and gentlemen, some of Shropshire, Montgomeryshire, Cardiganshire, Caernarvonshire" present at the scene of the crime. Hugh Nanney, however, had not produced any of these to give evidence at the Coroner's inquest, but only a few of his own disreputable tenants.

It was more difficult to prove (or disprove) the perjury charge. Basically it turned on the question of whether or not the evidence given at the

1. Vide Supra, PP. 246-9.

2. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/8/37.

3. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.13.

Great Sessions had been sufficient to prove Robert Owen and David ap Robert guilty of the murder of Edward ap David. This was, of course, a matter of opinion and led to a succession of accusations and counter-accusations. In the Bill of Complaint, Hugh Nanney had claimed that the defendants had starved and beaten the rest of the jury into subjection. This is in all probability simply the typical hyperbole employed in these Bills. In return it was claimed by the defendants that Hugh Nanney had forced the jury in the Coroner's inquest, to indict Robert Owen and David ap Robert. Robert Owen of Dolserau, uncle to Robert Owen of Hengwrt,¹ claimed that Hugh Nanney locked the members of the coroner's inquest in Llanfachreth Church. Their spokesman was a certain John ap Howel, and "he the said M^r Nanney therupon Rayled at the said John ap howell, Calling him by diverse lewde names as theuff and knave, declaringe he would hange him for theaufft if he would not finde the bill; And heard that the said John ap howell and the rest did not then agree, but that afterwards he was inforced to agree."² This John ap Howel was

1. Vide Pedigree Chart, P.371.

2. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.10.

himself produced as a witness for the defence in the Star Chamber. He agreed that Hugh Nanney had taken a high-handed attitude. He had used threatening words, "And that in some radge as one somewhat moved." But John ap Howel was an unsatisfactory witness for the defence. He deposed that he and the rest of the jury had indicted Robert Owen and David ap Robert of murder "because there were xiii en wittnesses that deposed herein And that he doth not knowe of any labore that the said Hughe Nanney hadd don to any of the said Jurie to indite the said prisoners of morther but accordinge to their evidence."¹.

The evidence is very difficult to disentangle. It consists of a confused mass of accusations and counter-accusations,² to which the obedient witnesses generally answered yes and no as required: Whereas Hugh Nanney claimed that the defendants, Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd and Ellis David ap Thomas, had arranged to be put on the Great Sessions Jury, they in their turn claimed that Hugh Nanney had persuaded the Coroner to impanell a partial jury for his inquest,

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.12.

2. Vide Interrogatories on behalf of Hugh Nanney, *ibid*, f.14;
Interrogatories for the defendants - *ibid*, f.9.

consisting mainly of Hugh Nanney's kinsmen. In any case, they added, Hugh Nanney was notorious as a Justice of the Peace who abused his powers, and as a great "laborer" of Juries. They claimed, moreover, that Hugh Nanney and the Coroner had served together under Sir James Croft, "late Comptroller of yo^r mat^s howsehold" and were still on friendly terms. Hugh Nanney claimed that the evidence presented to the jury at the Great Sessions was sufficient to prove the prisoners guilty; the defendants, of course, denied this. Both produced witnesses who agreed with their respective points of view. Hugh Nanney asked, suggestively, "doe you not veryly believe if other persons not beinge gents of blood or befriended in the countrey hade ben arraigned for the like cause upon the same Indictement and Evidence that they had bene by the saied defts and others of the enquest found guilty or not?" Hugh Nanney claimed, moreover, that the Justices at the Great Sessions were annoyed when the Jury returned a verdict of "not guilty", and he produced witnesses to support this. The defendants denied it, and they in their turn produced witnesses to support them.

A comparison of the two sets of witnesses furnishes some guidance through this maze of evidence. The list of witnesses who deposed on Hugh Nanney's behalf is far more impressive than that for the defence. The two most important witnesses for the defence were Robert Owen of Dolserau and Edward Owen of Hengwrt - Robert Owen of Hengwrt's uncle and father. The other defence witnesses included James Price of Ynysmaengwyn, who was foreman of the Jury at the Great Sessions. As such he was not likely to agree that the Jury had brought in an unjust verdict. The rest of the witnesses were of little account. A certain John Edwards of Llansantffraid simply gave his opinion that the evidence contained insufficient proof of the prisoners' guilt. This was all that another witness, Cadwaladr ap Robert of Llangower, deposed. We have seen that the only other witness produced - John ap Howel was not particularly helpful to the defence.

This is obviously an unsatisfactory collection of witnesses - especially when compared with those procured by Hugh Nanney Hên.

It is true that Edward Owen of Hengwrt questioned the integrity of some of them, but as father of one of the accused, his own integrity as a witness must remain in question. Hugh Nanney present^d first William ap Edward. Edward Owen accused him of being "a lewde base Fellowe dwellinge in the wautre mylne of the said Hugh Nanney / And beinge one suspected of breakinge atainter and stellinge of certen Cloth."¹. He was obviously included, however, as one who had actually witnessed the murder. Gruffydd ap Rees Vaughan of Pentre(co. Mer.) was another eye-witness. Gruffydd Nanney's testimony must of course be suspect, yet it is in all respects supported by that of other, more independent, witnesses. The next - John Wyn of Ceiswyn - was one of the several officials procured by Hugh Nanney. Sir John Lloyd, as he later became,² "did then supplie the place of the Queenes Attorney by the appoyntm^t aswell of the Justices of Assize, as also of Hughe Hughes Esqr. the late Queens Attorney

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.13. Vide Infra, P.271: William ap Edward was supposed to have stolen some clothes from a Fuller and Clothmaker in Llanelltyd in May 1604 - P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/221/24. This cannot have been his first offence, since Edward Owen's evidence was given the 17th. October, 1603.

2. He was knighted in 1624 - Griffith, P.221.

in that Com^o of Merioneth."¹. The other witnesses included a certain Hugh Owen of Llanegryn, an eye-witness, Owen Richards of Ffestiniog, the Coroner, and Rowland ap Elisse of Rhiwaedog, later Hugh Nanney's enemy.²

Two other eye-witnesses - Robert ap Edward, yeoman, of Nannau, and William ap Robert, yeoman, of Llanfachreth - gave evidence on the plaintiff's behalf. The value of their evidence was questioned by Edward Owen of Hengwrt - that of the former because he "of longe tyme dwelled in the howse of the said Hughe Nanney, and as yet doth dwell there", and that of William ap Robert because he was "brother of the said Edward ap David by one mother for they were both bastards."³. These accusations do not really affect the evidence given by these two witnesses; it does not stand alone, but is supported by the depositions of others who witnessed the murder.

This impressive list of witnesses concludes with the testimony of Thomas Philips of Harmaydge Graynes

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.18.

2. Vide Pedigree Chart, P.370, and Infra P.361.

3. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21, f.13.

in Shropshire, the pronotary at the Great Sessions trial, who furnished copies of the depositions taken from eye-witnesses.

Of the two groups of witnesses, surely the more trustworthy was that produced by Hugh Nanney. They provide ample evidence of the murder of Edward ap David - evidence which is not refuted by the defence. In view of this, it was surprising that the Jury of the Great Sessions returned a verdict of "not guilty."

The weakness of the position of Harry ap Ieuan Lloyd and Ellis David ap Thomas is reflected in their answers to Hugh Nanney's interrogation.¹ Harry ap Ieuan Lloyd can only give his opinion that Robert Owen and David ap Robert had not killed Edward ap David, although he admits they were present when he was assaulted. He claims he was slain by the two sons of John ap Humphrey "w^{ch} fledd for the saied facte." He claims that "five of the cosin germans" of Hugh Nanney Hên were included in the Coroner's inquest - surely not sufficient to prove Hugh Nanney guilty of

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/8/37.

"laboringe" the jury. He admits that it was given in evidence that Edward ap David had got Ursula with child, but, conveniently, "doth not remember that it was given in evidence that by reason hereof the sd Robert Owen and David ap Robert did beare malice to him." He is also forced to admit that at least one of the Justices remonstrated with him over the verdict brought by the Jury. This is a damaging confession, indeed, on the part of the defendant.

Unfortunately we do not know the verdict of the Court of Star Chamber, although the evidence seems to point to one in Hugh Nanney's favour. The Owen faction obtained their revenge, however, and the feud between the two families reached its peak in the Penrhos Common case.

In Hilary term 1604 Sir Edward Cooke, at that time the King's Attorney General and later Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, began an action in the Court of Exchequer against Hugh Nanney Hên, Gruffydd Nanney and two Englishmen - William Dale and John Smith.¹ They were charged with "takinge

1. Nannau MS. 1184; c.f. supra, Ch.5. PP.158-163.

carryeing away and convertinge to theire own use" thirty thousand oak trees on a common called Penrhos, above Nannau, which was claimed to be Crown land, between the 1st. March 1588 and the 20th. March 1603. Hugh Nanney and Gruffydd Nanney were found guilty of taking ten thousand of these oak trees. It was also found that each tree was worth three shillings and that the value of the whole amounted to £1,500. In Hilary term, 1605, therefore, the Nanneys were fined £1,500.^{1.}

In Easter term 1606, Hugh Nanney brought a writ of Error in the Exchequer^{2.}, and on the 20th. May in the same year opened an action in the Court of Star Chamber.^{3.} In his Bill of Complaint, Hugh Nanney Hên claimed that the action commenced against him and his son was brought by the malicious procurement of Henry Owen, the third son of John Lewis Owen of Llwyn, Robert Owen of Hengwrt and Richard Nanney, son of David Nanney. These three, with Rowland ap Elissee of Rhiwaedog, were produced as witnesses for the Crown at the trial. They deposed - corruptly, Hugh Nanney claimed - that Penrhos Common was the Queen's property at the time of

1. Nannau, MS. 1184.

2. Nannau, MS. 1174.

3. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/223/17.

the spoil, as part of the Forest of Snowdon, that it contained five hundred acres, measured one mile in breadth by one mile in length, and that the Nanneys had sold all the trees growing there to John Smith of Newcastle under Lyme (co. Staffs.), who, with William Dale and others, cut ten thousand of them and converted them to charcoal.

This, Hugh Nanney claimed, was false testimony and the witnesses had therefore committed perjury. Rowland ap Elissee had been produced as a witness on Hugh Nanney's behalf in 1602, in the case against Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd.¹ It appears that he was not at first a party to this Penrhos case against Hugh Nanney at the Exchequer, but was brought in later, having conceived some "displeasure" towards the Nanneys.² It is interesting to note that in this case Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd heads the list of witnesses who deposed on Hugh Nanney's behalf against Rowland ap Elissee and the other defendants.

The Star Chamber Bill and the Exchequer Writ of Error were "stayed", however, and "execution was granted" of the Exchequer verdict.³

1. Vide Supra, P. 157.

2. P.R.O. St. Ch. 1/223/17. Edmund Lloyd's testimony.

3. Nannau MS. 1178.

A jury was therefore impanelled of which Rowland ap Elissee was the foreman and David Nanney, father of Richard Nanney, and Lewis Owen, son of John Lewis Owen of Llwyn, were members. They extended the lands and possessions of the Nanneys, which amounted to £314 per annum. Meanwhile Hugh Nanney Hên was imprisoned "in Execution for the saied Recovery."¹.

On the 26th. March, 1607, the fine was granted to Sir Robert Brett of St. Martin's in the Fields, "one of the gent. ushers of his Mat^s privie chamber."². This Sir Robert Brett occupied a rather ambiguous yet important position in the case. From the answers of two of the defendants - Henry Owen and Rowland ap Elissey - dated the 20th. June, 1606, it appears that "Sir Robert Brett knight was a chief prosecutor of the saied informacon (at the Exchequer) at his owne costs and charges."³. Each of the defendants admits, moreover, that he was "produced as a witness to testifie on his Mat^s behalf and was so served in London in Michaelmas terme last by one.....⁴. Harvey a syrvt^t or dealer for

1. Nannau MS. 1174.

2. Nannau MS. 1184.

3. P.R.O.St.Ch. 8/223/17. Answer of Henry Owen.

4. A word is omitted here in the document.

the sd S^r Robt Brett."¹. These admissions support Hugh Nanney's contention, in a petition addressed to the King from the Fleet, that Sir Robert Brett, "in respect of his place in your maty^s service hopinge to optaine a graunt of the said recovery, had proceedings in the said suet in yo^r maty^s name."².

At first Hugh Nanney was detained in prison by the Sheriff of Merioneth, but in an undated petition to Thomas Earl of Dorset, Lord High Treasurer of England; he prayed that "yo^r suppliant beinge by proces removed here by the Sherife of the Countie of Merionith", Dorset, "will take order that yo^r suppliant be not comitted to the Fleete or to any other prison but remayne in the said sherifs chardge."³. Later, however, Hugh Nanney claims, "the said Rowland ap Elissey and the three other witnesses procured meanes by the said S^r Robt Brett to remove your suppliant to the Fleette."⁴.

1. P.R.O.St.Ch.8/223/17. Answer of Rowland ap Elissey.

2. Nannau MS. 1171. Undated.

3. Nannau ^{MS.} 1179.

4. Nannau ^{MS.} 1171.

Meanwhile Hugh Nanney had become involved in two other Star Chamber suits: two counter attacks by the Owen faction. Their discomfiture must have been great after the Edward ap David murder case. Indeed, one of the witnesses in the Penrhos Common case - Gruffyth ap Rees Vaughan of Llanelltyd - stated in 1609 that the two sons of John ap Humphrey, who fled after the murder of Edward ap David, were "as yet outlawed".¹ Hugh Nanney claimed they "are fledd beyond sea."²

The violence of this family feud was shown by a Bill of Complaint presented at the Star Chamber in 1606 by Henry Owen, son of John Lewis Owen of Llwyn.³ He claimed that on the 27th. December, 1603, the Nanneys destroyed the Owen family pew "in the Chancell of the parishe church of the said Towne of Dolgelley." He claimed that Hugh Nanney Hên and Gruffydd Nanney assembled a number of their kinsmen, including Edward Nanney, another of Hugh Nanney's sons, and their tenants at Hugh Nanney's house, and marched from there to Dolgelley, about three miles distant, to do some harm to John Lewis Owen. Then some of them "forcybly

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/223/17.

2. Nannau MS. 1170.

3. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/225/15.

brake downe the churche door" of the Parish Church, entered, and "with axes and other engins did breake hewe and cutt in peeces the said auncient pewe or seate of your said subiect and his said father and carried the posts and timber therof out of the said churche into the said Towne of Dolgelley And then and there brought the same into severall Ale-houses in the said Towne and burned the same tippelinge and drinkinge carrowes in excessive maner to the health of the said Hughe and Griffith Nanney their masters."

Then, in a further attempt to provoke John Lewis Owen, they went to his house, "railinge and useinge many scandalous speeches libells and songs." Then, at the time of divine service, they went again to the Church and "placed themselves in troupes in ryottous and unreverent sort in the chieffest seats or kneelinge places..... By reason whereof the said church beinge filled with the said troupes of disordered persons and theire weapons", none of the Owehs could attend the service. The rioters afterwards "continued in that ryottous and disordered sort still marchinge up and downe the said towne in warlike maner," until they departed "after sunne settinge", some to Hugh Nanney's

house and others to that of Gruffydd Nanney, "were they were rewarded cheerished and kindly wellcomed."

It is difficult to discover the truth of these charges, especially since an undated document survives in which Gruffydd Nanney petitioned the President of the Council of the Marches against Henry Owen and Lewis Owen, sons of John Lewis Owen of Llwyn, on a charge of cutting down the Nanney family pew in the north chancel of Dolgelley Parish Church on the night of Christmas Day.¹ It was to this suit that the Parson of Dolgelley, Hugh Price, referred, in evidence he delivered in 1609 on Hugh Nanney's behalf in the Penrhos Common case. He stated that Henry Owen bore hatred to the late Gruffydd Nanney, "because the said Gruffyth Nanney hadd then formerly preferred an enformacon before the Counsell in the Marches of Walles agaynst the defft Harie Owen for Certeyne abuses and misdemenors Comitted by the said defdt Harie in the parish church of dolgelley in breakinge and pullinge downe of a seate or pue of the said Gruffith Nanney."²

Accompanying Gruffydd Nanney's petition is an answer to a challenge issued by Lewis Owen.³

1. N.L.W. Peniarth 327, Pt. 1; Arch. Camb. 1864, P. 102; Vide Appendix, p. 303.
 2. P.R.O. St. Ch. 8/223/17.
 3. N.L.W. Peniarth, Pt. 1; Arch. Camb. 1864, P. 104; Vide Appendix, p. 324.

In this remarkable document, Gruffydd Nanney pledges to act with the utmost secrecy: "do not think that Gruff. Nanney's shirt shall knowe of our meeting". He promises "to be at the sea shore within full sea marke about half waye between barmouth and harlech, directly under the church of Llanddwy, upon friday nexte by viii of the clock in the morning, and there to stay an houre at the lest: the weapons that I will bringe with me shall be only a rapier and dager, the company myself alone."

Obviously the hatred was mutual, and possibly even mortal. Is it not possible that the Owens had cut down the Nanney pew on the 25th. December 1603 and that Nanneys had retaliated in kind two days later? Certainly the possession of a pew in the local Parish Church, in a prominent position, was one of the marks of a family's eminence.¹. These pews were highly

1. c.f. E.G. Jones, "A Llandegai Pew Dispute", Caerns. Hist. Soc. Trans. 1948, PP.109-10, for the evidence given by witnesses on behalf of Sir Rees Griffith of Penrhyn to the Court of the Council in the Marches in January 1575/6 concerning the Penrhyn seat in Llandegai Church. They recalled those special occasions, in the days when Penrhyn was at the height of its power, under Sir William Griffith, when Sir William, with his family and retinue came in a dignified procession down the aisle to gather in the ancestral pew on the south side of the chancel, and the Abbot of Aberconway sat in state with him.

Page 270 missing

The same Bill of Complaint of 1606 presented three further charges against the Nanneys. It was claimed that Hugh Nanney Hên and Gruffydd Nanney had, on Sunday 29th. June, 1603, seized Robert Owen of Hengwrt (a member of a Commission of Survey sent from the Exchequer to inquire into the spoil of Penrhos Common) while he was attending divine service in Dolgelley Parish Church and imprisoned him "untill the returne of the said Commission was past." Further, Edward Nanney was charged with assaulting Henry Owen "in Strand in your highnes County of Middlesex", and finally Gruffydd Nanney was accused of unlawfully collecting and receiving "Comorth" - "for the better maintenance of his estate."

The year 1606 saw the nadir of the Nanney fortunes. The action begun by Hugh Nanney's Bill of Complaint in the Star Chamber against Rowland ap Elisise, Robert Owen, Henry Owen and Richard Nanney was stopped, as was the Writ of Error he had brought in the Exchequer. Instead, his goods were impounded and he himself was imprisoned. Early in May 1606, Henry Owen brought his case against the Nanneys, concerning the Dolgelley Church

pew and other matters - a case which continued until the end of 1608. Edward Nanney was in prison, for his part in the disturbances at the Parish Church of Dolgelley, following the breaking of the Owen pew. On the 28th. May, 1606, more trouble had come their way with the presentation of a Bill of Complaint by David Nanney of Tyddyn Mawr (Hugh Nanney's cousin, and father of the Richard Nanney who was accused of perjury in the Penrhos Common case) against several Merioneth Justices of the Peace, including Hugh Nanney and Gruffydd Nanney, alleging misconduct in office. Gruffydd Nanney was accused of conspiring with John Vaughan of Caergai, his brother-in-law and fellow Justice, in gathering a riotous company of men who in May 1603 pulled down the house of a certain Morris ap Humphrey. Hugh Nanney Hên was accused of refusing to bind over to the next sessions a servant of his - William ap Edward¹ - on a charge of stealing, in May 1604, the clothes which David ap Rees of Llanelltyd, "a very honest poore man and using the trade of a Fuller and Clothmaker", had hung out to dry overnight.²

1. He had deposed for Hugh Nanney in the case against Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd (Supra P.148) c.f. also Supra, P.158...

2. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/221/24.

All these cases involved the Nanneys in great expense. As a witness in the Penrhos Common case put it: "ther fell great variance and suts in law betwen theym..... And a great deale of money spent about it."¹ In July 1606 a writ of attachment had been sent from Chancery to Sir William Maurice of Clenennau, the Sheriff of Merionethshire, against Gruffydd Nanney for non-payment of a £200 debt to Sir Thomas Myddelton, and a writ of sequestration was directed against him.²

Meanwhile Hugh Nanney was languishing in prison - we cannot tell when he was taken from the Sheriff's gaol to the Fleet. He was not friendless, however. We have noted elsewhere Sir Thomas Myddleton's letter to Gruffydd Nanney, in which he tried to help him and his father "prevent the extreeme malice of yor^r adversaries."³ On the 26th. September, 1606, thirty three of the gentry of Merionethshire sent a petition on Hugh Nanney's behalf to the Privy Council.⁴

1. P.R.O. St.Ch.8/223/17.

2. Nannau MS. 240.

3. Vide Supra, Ch.5. PP.165-6.

4. Nannau MS. 1175.

That he was not altogether without friends in high places is also shown by a note of business to be transacted at London, dated the 7th. May, 1608, when Hugh Nanney was presumably a free man again, which includes the cryptic note: "Item yeald thanks to the E of M and to S^r W.H.¹. and Mr. C. and to deale wth the Earle of Pembroke." Perhaps this refers to an undated "Coppi of a letter from Gr: Nan: to my lord Herbert,"² complaining that Richard Nanney (presumably the son of David Nanney), "pretendinge hymself to be your honors servant in lyvery", described by Gruffydd Nanney as "a Comon Brawler and very troublsom", had been extorting sums of £5. or more from several of his poorer neighbours by threats of actions in such expensive and far-distant courts as the Exchequer and Star Chamber."³

-
1. Is this William Howard, Lord of Effingham and Earl of Nottingham to whom the Forest of Snowdon descended through his wife, the daughter of Lord St. John of Bletshoe?
Vide Infra, P.281.....
 2. William Herbert, 3rd. Earl of Pembroke, 1580-1630 - "Bywgraffiadur", P. 329.
 3. N.L.W. Peniarth 327, Pt.1; Vide Appendix, P.327.

During his imprisonment, Hugh Nanney was busy writing petitions, pleading his hardship to Sir Lawrence Tanfield (Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer),¹ to Lord Ellesmere (Lord Chancellor),² to Thomas, Earl of Dorset (Lord Treasurer),³ to Robert, Earl of Salisbury⁴, to the Privy Council,⁵ and to the King himself.⁶ In these petitions Hugh Nanney first gave an account of the earlier developments in the case, and then continued with a plea for the mitigation of the hardships suffered by him and his family and other dependants. He refers, for example, to the fact "that all his livinge and mantenaunce is in his **Maty**^S hands and his body in prison Whereby he hath noe means nor libertie to follow his suet."⁷ He is, he states, "an old man above 60 years, having 37 children and childrens children, besides a great families of other his neigh kinsmen and houshold. All w^{ch} himself and his wief are turned to the wide worlde."⁸ Elsewhere he plays

1. Nannau MS. 1174.

2. Nannau MS. 1178.

3. Nannau MSS. 1179, 1180.

4. Nannau MSS. 1169, 1176.

5. Nannau MSS. 1168, 1170, 1173.

6. Nannau MSS. 1171, 1172; Vide Appendix, P. 315.

7. Nannau MS. 1170.

8. Nannau MS. 1178.

a similar tune, referring to his children and grandchildren "whoe were mantained some in the universities and many in diverse gramer scholes by the means of your suppliant only, Who nowe for want of Maintenance most needs be disolved and disappointed of their bringing up to your suppliants greatest grieff."¹.

One who was not disappointed, however, was Hugh Nanney's grandson, Hugh Nanney the Younger, who entered the Inner Temple in November, 1607.².

Perhaps the best comment on these petitions is that of the Earl of Dorset, scribbled at the foot of one of them: "This caus is in a Judicial cours and Court of the Exchequer unto w^{ch} I referre my petitioner/ for law and Justis can not procede by peticons but by the ordinary cours of Justice."³.

Hugh Nanney reverted to the ordinary course of Justice in 1609, when, on the 4th. February, he

1. Nannau MS. 1171.

2. "Students admitted to the Inner Temple 1547-1660", P.182.

3. Nannau MS. 1179.

re-opened the Star Chamber case with a Replication to the Answers, made in 1606, by Rowland ap Elissee and Henry Owen to the original Bill of Complaint.¹ He must have been out of prison by the 7th. May, 1608, when he made "A note of Remembrance to doe busnes at London", which included a memorandum "to comence an accon upon the case agaynst the periurers and to be well advised howe to lay downe the accon least the adversaries should have eny errors therin."² He seems to have come out of prison firmly resolved to do his utmost to avenge his wrong, for, as he stated in his Replication, the Exchequer trial and Commission were produced by Rowland ap Elissee and Henry Owen "with an intent to vexe and trouble the complt for the same", and poignantly adds: "as they have done sithence."³

His period in prison must have made him even more obstinate than before. In an undated letter written to Gruffydd Nanney, the writer (whose name is missing)⁴.

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/223/17.

2. Nannau MS. 1183.

3. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/223/17.

4. N.L.W. Peniarth 327, Pt.1. The letter is torn at the top and bottom right hand corners.

refers to a conversation he had in London at "the meremayd in Bredstreet.....at the table after supper" with a Sir Daniell Morton. The conversation turned to the affairs of "a welche gent" - Hugh Nanney Hên - and Sir Daniell Morton commented on his obstinacy: "Well sayd he S^r Robert Brett hathe offerd him by frends an easie composition and yett wolde but M^r Nanney houlds out w^{ch} will prove to his more hurt." Moreover, the writer continues, "he tould me that he wolde gladlie at my request do his best but (sayd he) Mr. Nanney will not come to try speech wth S^r Robert albehit that hit hath bine often times motioned but stands upon the triall of divors w^{ch} is but a detracting of time and nothing for his good."

The trial itself not only cost time - it must also have cost a great deal of money. Hugh Nanney was not concerned to deny taking the trees. He had already despaired of that. In a petition addressed to the King from prison, he had closed with a prayer "that your Matie will mitigate the said some of 1500 li to a reasonable porcon accordinge to the qualities of the said supposed offence, and to appoint a Convenient

stallments for the payment therof yerely."¹ When the trial reopened he attempted to show that the defendants had committed perjury by giving false evidence at the Exchequer trial. He questioned their statements as to the extent and area of Penrhos Common, and the number, quality and value of the trees growing there. He claimed that whereas they had deposed that Penrhos was Crown property and part of the Forest of Snowdon, in reality it had been granted by the Queen to Robert, Earl of Leicester, and that the property had descended on his death to the Earl of Warwick, his brother, and had gone on his death to the Lord St. John of Bletshoe, and was at that moment in the possession of the Lord of Effingham.

His argument here is difficult to follow. He is referring, presumably, to the grant to the Earl of Leicester on the 31st. March, 1575, of a Commission to survey the Forest of Snowdon and to inquire into any encroachments.² These encroachments were granted to

1. Nannau MS. 1171; Undated.

2. Edward Owen, "Catalogue of MSS. relating to Wales", Pt.1. P.51. Vide Emyr Gwynne Jones, "The Caernarvonshire Squires 1558-1625", PP.233 - 254, for an account of the opposition of the Caernarvonshire freeholders to this and other Commissions set up by Leicester and his successors to inquire into the encroachment on the Forest.

Leicester, and in his survey it was found that 12,769½ acres of Merionethshire fell within the limits of the Forest of Snowdon.¹ It is difficult to discover the original extent of the region which fell under the Crown's jurisdiction as part of the Forest of Snowdon. According to Leland "no part of Merionethshire lyith in Crege Ery!"² In 1558 the Forest was described simply as lying within the county of Caernarvon, yet in August 1561 Sir Henry Sidney addressed a warrant "to the Forester of the Queen's Forest of Snowdon in the Counties of Anglesey, Merioneth and Caernarvon."³

Whatever its original limits, by 1588 the Forest of Snowdon undoubtedly extended into Merionethshire. It had, indeed, been granted to Leicester in 1575. To attempt to distinguish between those lands granted to Leicester and those forming part of the Forest of Snowdon is impossible. Hugh Nanney tacitly admitted

1. B.M. Lamlowne MS. 27. ff. 187-206 b.

2. Leland, "Itinerary", ed. Toulmin Smith. P.27.

3. Emyr Gwynne Jones, op.cit. P.234.

that the Forest of Snowdon belonged to the Crown, and yet he claimed that the lands granted to Leicester (which, as we have seen, were in fact those forming part of the Forest of Snowdon) were not Crown property. His account of the devolution of these lands coincides with that of the Forest of Snowdon. In 1588 Leicester died, leaving his interest in the Forest to his brother Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick.¹ Warwick died in 1590² and left his interest to his wife who in turn sold them to Lord St. John, second Baron of Bletschoe.³ On his death in 1596, the lands descended to his daughter, the wife of William Howard, son of Charles Howard, Lord Effingham and first Earl of Nottingham.⁴ After him, the title to the encroachments apparently reverted to the Prince of Wales.⁵

In support of his claim, Hugh Nanney produced thirty-four witnesses. Several of these were yeomen living near the Common - men like William Thomas ap Edward, for example, who "did use to buye tymber

-
1. Emyr Gwynne Jones, *Op.cit.*, P.247.
 2. D.N.B. Vol.XVI., P.97.
 3. D.N.B. Vol. L. P.150.
 4. D.N.B. Vol. XXVlll., PP.1-6.
 5. Emyr Gwynne Jones, *op.cit.*, P.252.

in the grownds nere to the same wast or comons of Benrhose adioyninge / And by that means had occasion to vew and mark the same wast,"^{1.} and gave it as his opinion that the trees were not worth sixpence each. There was a general consensus of opinion on this, as there was on the area and extent of the ground. Richard Nayler, of Wellington, in Shropshire, the chief carpenter brought in by John Smith to build an Ironworks near Penrhos, who was probably an impartial witness, deposed that the timber on Penrhos was of such poor quality that it was of no use in building the works and could only be converted into charcoal.^{2.} The witnesses also include such presumably trustworthy characters as Edmund Price, Archdeacon of Merioneth, and Hugh Price, Parson of Dolgelley.

The witnesses agree on all the points of which they have any knowledge. Those qualified to do so agree with Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd of Hafodunos, a former enemy of Hugh Nanney Hên, that Penrhos was granted to Leicester, then to Warwick and then to Lord St. John of Bletshoe. Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd knows this "in

1. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/223/17.

2. Vide Supra, Ch.5., PP.158-163.

respect he this deponent himself and divers others purchased certaine other landes of the lord saint John beinge founde as incroached landes the same tyme as the said Benrhos was founde." His evidence is particularly valuable since he was a member of the Commission sent out from the Exchequer in 1603 to enquire into the supposed spoil.¹ He stated also that shortly after Penrhos was found "as incroached landes" by an Inquisition it "was found to conteyne two hundred and some odd acres (as appered by a book of survey as well of the said Benrhose (as of other landes, w^{ch} boocke this deponent had for certaine tyme in his custodie and w^{ch} he did peruse and reade."² Among the other witnesses, one other is worthy of note - Richard Nanney of Cefndenddwyr, a cousin of the Richard Nanney who was a defendant in the case.³

In their defence the defendants produced no more than eight witnesses, one of whom was David Nanney, father of the defendant Richard Nanney, and

1. P.R.O.St.Ch.8/225/15; Vide supra, P.245.

2. P.R.O. St.Ch. 8/223/17.

3. Vide Pedigree Chart, P.371.

therefore not particularly trustworthy. Their sole concern was to agree with everything put to them in the Interrogatories, emphasizing in particular the harmful effects of the spoil of the woods on the poor people living there.^{1.}

The answers of the witnesses for the defence were given on the 29th. September 1610. In November 1610 a compromise was reached between Sir Robert Brett and Hugh Nanney Hên, by which, following the mediation of friends, the original £1,500 fine was reduced to £800.^{2.} Finally, in 1614/5, Rowland ap Elissee was sentenced in Star Chamber for this perjury.^{3.} He was fined £100, imprisoned and sworne to good behaviour, displaced from the Commission of the Peace, and ordered to pay the complainant (Hugh Nanney) £100.^{4.}

Hugh Nanney's obstinacy, therefore, it may be claimed, was eventually justified - to some degree at least. But the cost was crippling. The Nanney

1. c.f. Supra, Ch.5, P.163.

2. Nannau MS.1185. The final deed was dated the 15th. February 1612 - Nannau MS.1187.

3. "Collectanea Juridica", Vol.1.1.P.76 (quoted by Edwards, "Star Chamber Proceedings", P.185).

4. B.M. Stowe MS.397, ff.30a - 31a.

annual income was but £300. This feud, which closed with the Penrhos Common case, had involved such colossal expenditure that when we remember Hugh Nanney's other expenses - in building the new mansion at Nannau and providing dowries for his five daughters and education for his sons - we can only be surprised that the debts he bequeathed to his heir, Hugh Nanney the Younger, on his death in 1623¹, amounted to no more than £1,022. 19. 10d.².

1. N.L.W. Peniarth 327 Pt. 111; Nannau MS.300.

2. Nannau MS. 317.

APPENDICES.

- APPENDIX I:** Documents to illustrate the
Nanney-Owen feud.
- APPENDIX II:** A Selection of Letters to and
from Hugh Nanney Hên and
Gruffydd Nanney.
- APPENDIX III:** Documents to illustrate the
official activities of the
Nanneys.
- APPENDIX IV:** A Selection of Estate and
Household Accounts.
- APPENDIX V:** Pedigrees.

APPENDIX 1.

- (A) The Murder of Edward ap David**
- (B) The Church Pew Dispute**
- (C) The Penrhos Common Dispute**

Appendix 1.

(A)

The Murder of Edward ap David.

Hugh Nanney's Bill of Complaint in the
Star Chamber versus Henry ap Ieuan Lloyd
and Ellis David ap Thomas.

P.R.O. St.Ch. 5/N/12/21.

To the Queenes Most Excellent Ma^{tye}/

Humble shewing Informeth unto yo^r Sacred
Highnes yo^r Loyall and obedient Subiect Hugh Nanney
of Nanney in the County of Merioneth Esqr. one of
yo^r ma^{ties} Iustics of the peace wth in yo^r Highnes
said Countie That wheras Robt. Owen Lewis Owen, Robt.
ap John ap humphrey, Edward ap John ap Humphrey and
David ap Robt. beinge wild uncivill and dissolute persones,
much Relyinge upon the kinred and alliance they had wth
the gent of the said Countie did for the space of
diverse yeares wthout Cause as yo^r said subiect supposeth
beare so intestine malice and mortall hatred to one
Edward ap David of Nanney in the said Countie of
Merioneth yoman pretendinge onlie as cause of there said
malice that he the said Edward ap David had sometymes
lived incontinentlie wth one Ursula A woman w^{ch} they

the said Robt. Owen, Lewis Owen, Robt. ap John ap Humphrey and Edward ap John ap Humphrey suppose to be a Freind of theres or of kinred or alliaunce to them or some one of them And by pretext or Colour therof they the said Robt. Owen, Lewis Owen, Robt. ap John ap Humphrey David ap Robt. and Edward ap John ap Humphrey and every of them did Continuallie wth great Care and diligence studie premeditat and practise howe they might kill and murder him the said Edward ap David, For the execucon of w^{ch} there most Execreable divilishe and abhominable purpose and intent proiecte and Complott they the said Robt. Owen, Lewis Owen, Robt. ap John ap Humphrey, David ap Robt. and Edward ap John ap Humphrey havinge notice that he the said Edward ap David had for some urgent occasion or busines appointed to be at the Towne of dolgelly in the said countie of Merioneth in or about the twentie fourth daie of June last past they the said Robt. Owen, Lewis Owen, Robt. ap John ap Humphrey, David ap Robert and Edward ap John ap Humphrey beinge all in most Riotous manner assembled and weaponed and havinge in there Companie othere vile and Evill disposed persones to the number of seaven or thereabouts to yo^r said Subiect as yet unknownen in like Riotous and unlawfull manner weaponed whom they the said Robt. Owen,

Lewis Owen, Robt. ap John ap Humphrey, David ap Robt.
 and Edward ap John ap Humphrey did bringe wth them
 for the more assurance^u to execute theire divilische
 execrable and abhominable intent and purpose proiect
 and Complott w^{ch} they and every of them have most
 wickedlie demised against the liffe of the said
 Edward ap David, And they the said Robt. Owen, Lewis
 Owen, Robt. ap John ap Humphrey, David ap Robt. and
 Edward ap John ap Humphrey wth other the said persones
 beinge all as afforsaid then and there in most Riotous
 manner assembled and weaponed for thend and purpose
 afforsaid did then and there Repaire and Come to the
 said Towne of dolgelley in or about the said twentie
 fourth daie of June last past in full purpose and
 Resolucon to kill and murder him the said Edward ap
 David Accordinge to w^{ch} there wicked and excreable
 Resolucon they the said Robt. Owen, Lewis Owen, Robt.
 ap John ap Humphrey, David ap Robt. and Edward ap
 John ap Humphrey accompanied wth other the Riotous
 persones all of them beinge weaponed in warlike
 manner as afforsaid did then and ther most unlawfullie
 assemble themsellfes togeather and for full execucon
 of there said divilische proiect and intent did likewise
 then and there assault wound and Cruellie murder
 hime the said Edward ap david of ther old prepensed and
 inveterat malice afforsaid conceaved by theme as

afforsaid of w^{ch} said Cruell and detestable murder
yo^r said subiect beinge then one of yo^r ma^ties
Iustices of the peace for the said Countie of
Merioneth and dwellinge neere the place where the
said murder was Comitted knowinge that diverse
murders of late befor that tyme Committed wthin
the said Countie many of yo^r said subiect did
escape unpunished to the greate dislike of yo^r
highnes, and yo^r honorable privie Counsell as by
sundrie there Honorable letters the same did appeare
In obedience of w^{ch} said letters and for the
performaunce of his dutye and othe he yo^r said
Subiect did wth all speed as soone as he had knowledge
of the said murder according to his dutie send furth
and direct his warrant^s for the apprehension of the
said murderers and did by all the meanes he lawfullie
Could devise endeavored to bringe the said murderers
(not wthstandinge that some of theime were of kinred
or allied to yo^r said subiect) to abide the iust
triall of the lawe, and to this end gave notice to
one Owen ap Richard beinge one of the Coroners of the
said Countie of Merioneth, of the said murder willinge
and advisinge hime for that diverse of the said
murderers were persones favored and of kinred and

allied to gent of the best sorte in the Countrey to
proceede wthout delaie to the impanellinge of a
substantiall inquest of freeholders that were persones
of good abilitie and welth such as did not Relie,
depend or stand in feare or dread of any the Freindes
of the said murderers to enquire of the death of him
the said Edward ap David upon the viewe of the bodie
of the said Edward and accordinglie he the said Owen
ap Ric beinge then Corroner of the said Countie of
Merioneth shortlie after the said murder Comitted as
aforsaid did dulle and lawfullie impanell a substantiall
iurie of freeholders persones of verie good abilitie
and Credit by w^{ch} Iury dulle and lawfullie taken and
impaneled upon viewe of the bodie of him the said
Edward ap David by him the said Owen ap Richard beinge
then Coroner for the said Countie of Merioneth they
the said Robt. Owen, Lewis Owen, Robt. ap John ap
Humphrey, David ap Robt. and Edward ap John ap Humphrey
were in or aboute the moneth of August last past upon
good preignant and apparaunt evidence duly lawfullie
and truelie Indicted befor him the said Owen ap
Richard then on of the Coroners for the said Countie
of Merioneth that they the said Lewis Owen, Robt. Owen,
Robt. ap John ap Humphrey, David ap Robt. and Edward
ap John ap Humphrey and others to the number of

seaven persones did of there fore thought and
 perpereted malice att the tyme and place afforsaid
 viz. in or aboute the twenty fourth daie of June
 last past Cruellie and willfullie murder him the
 said Edward ap David uppon w^{ch} Indictment the said
 Robt. Owen and David ap Robt. were araigned att yo^r
 highnes last great Sessions holden for the said
 Countie of merioneth ^{at Bala in the said Countie of Merioneth} befor Willm. Leighton and
 Richard Broughton Esqrs. then yo^r highnes Justices of
 yo^r highnes said great Sessiones to w^{ch} Inditement
 they the said Robt. Owen and David ap Robt. did
 severallie plead not guiltie and for the triall of
 them the said Robt. Owen and David ap Robt. persones
 araigned upon the said Indictement of murder on Harry
 ap Jeuan lloyd Esqr. one of her ma^{ties} Justices of the
 peace of the said Countie of Merioneth Moris ap John
 ap Ellis gent David Johnes gent Tudr Owen gent Ellis
 David ap Thomas gent Tudr ap Lewis ap Owen gent wth
 five others/ the names whereof yo^r said Subiectt
 Remembreth not, were then and ther dulle and lawfullie
 Accordinge to the due Course order and forme of yo^r
 Highnes Lawes of this yo^r ma^{ties} Realme Retorned and
 impanelled by the then sherife of yo^r ma^{ties} said
 Countie of merionethe and allso then and there sworne

and Charged, by yo^r Ma^ties said Justices of yo^r Highnes greate Sessions to enquire whithere that the said Robt. Owen, and david ap Robt. were guiltie of the said murder wherof they were Indited and then stood araigned for, And for evidence in the behalfe of yo^r Highnes against the said Robt. Owen and David ap Robt prisoners then and there Araigned for the said Cruell and detestable murderinge of him the said Edward ap David yo^r ma^ties Subiect in Rebellious manner as afforsaid, there were produced viva voce, diverse good Credible and sufficient wittnesses w^{ch} beinge then and there in due forme of lawe publiklie sworne and examined did geive directe and manifest Evidence to the said Jurie to prouue the said two persones then and there Araigned guiltie of the said murder Accordinge to the said enditement and likewise diverse and sundrye Credible persones well and dylie taken and examined after the said murder Comitted by the said persones as afforsaid befor yo^r said greate sessions by diverse of yo^r ma^ties Justices of the peace of the said countie of Merioneth were openlie and publiklie Redd then and there to the said Jurie in the said great sessions befor the said Justices of the said great Sessions w^{ch} said evidence and

deposicons wth out all doubt or scruple did make
 manifest and apparaunte that the said Robt. Owen and
 David ap Robt. then and there prisoners Araigned upon
 the said enditement of murder were guiltie of the said
 murder Accordinge to the forme and effect of the said
 enditem^t, by w^{ch} said evidence it did appeare that the
 said Robt. Owen and David ap Robt. did murder him the
 said Edward ap david of malice, w^{ch} for diverse yeares
 they did beare to the said Edward ap David for that
 they supposed that he the said Edward had begotten
 wth Child one Ursula the Cossen germaine of him the
 said Robt. Owen and for diverse yeare lived wth her
 incontinentlie, And the said Evidence then and there
 in the said great Sessions holden for the said Countie
 of Merioneth befor the said Justices of the said great
 Sessions beinge delivered to the said Jury, they yo^r
 ma^{ties} said Justices of yo^r highnes said greate
 sessions did then and there in open Courte yeald there
 oppinions to the said Jury that the said evidence then
 and there pronounced and Redd as afforsaid did verie
 preignantlie prove the said prisoners then and there
 araigned att the Barre befor the said Justices of the
 said greate Sessions holden for the said Countie of
 Merioneth to be guiltie of the said murder Accordinge

to the forme and effect of the said Inditem^t : And further yo^r ma^{ties} said Justices of yo^r highnes said great Sessions holden then and there for the said Countie of Merioneth did then and there exhorte and move the said Jury that if they the said Jury upon any doubt or Scruple, they afterwarde should conceive thought it not fitt to find the said prisoners arraigned guiltie of the said murder that they must and ought and Could do noe lesse but find them the said Robt. Owen and David ap Robt guiltie of manslaughter, But yt they the said Iustices of the said great Sessions then and there declared that in there opinions upon Consideracone of the said evidence that the said prisoners then and there arraigned upon the said enditement of murder were guiltie of the said murder wherof they were Indited accordinge to the forme and effect of the said enditement of murder: But yet so it is - yt may please yo^r sacred ma^{tie} that they the said Harry ap Ieuan Lloyd, moris ap John ap Ellis, David Johnes, Tudr Owen, Ellis David ap Thomas, Tudr Lewis ap Owen, beinge Corrupted and havinge receaved some bribes and rewardes or promise of some bribes and rewardes of the said prisoners or some others in there behalves did (aftere they were departed

from the Barre together wth the rest of the said
 Jury) Combyne and Confederat themselves and peremtorilie
 resolve evere to resiste the said evidence and neclect
 and Contemne the said oppinions of the said Justices
 and to finde the said prisoners not guiltie generallie
 and to that end and purpose they the said Harry ap
 Jeuan Lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones,
 Tuddr Owen, Ellis david ap Thomas, and Tuddr ap Lewis
 ap Owen, did effectuallie but most unlawfullie and
 Corruptlie deale wth the rest of the said Jury beinge
 farre meaner and simpler persones then themsellfs to
 yeald there voyces and agreement for the acquitinge of
 them the said prisoners not onlie of murder but allso
 of manslaughter promisinge that they the said Harry
 ap Jeuan lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones,
 Tuddr Owen, Ellis ap David ap Thomas and Tuddr ap
 Lewis ap Owen would not onlie save and keape them the
 rest of the said Jury indemnified of all losses and
 harmes w^{ch} they should sustaine by reasone of there
 agreem^t for the acquitinge of the said prisoners but
 allso procure them the rest of the said Jurye Recompence
 and.....(doct. torn) beinge in Comission of the peace
 for the said countie^{of} Merioneth and gent of very great
 account and revenues To w^{ch} motion of them the said

Harry ap Jeuan Lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones, Tudr Owen, Ellis David ap Thomas, and Tudr ap Lewis ap Owen, they the rest of the said Jurie would by noe meanes yeald unto in Respect of the said apparaunt evidence geiven att Barr and the opinions of the said Justices att large delivered in Court that they the said prisoners were guiltie of the said murther wherof they were arraigned but said that they were resolved and agreed to finde the said prisoners guiltie of willful murther accordinge to the said evidence and oppinions of the said Justices as by these severall othes they were bound to doe whereuppon they the said Harry ap Jeuan Lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones, Tudr Owen, Ellis David ap Thomas, and Tudr ap Lewis ap Owen, havinge secratly provided for themselfes some kinde of victualls preserves or some other druggs for ther sustenance, did by menacinge and threatninge wordes and termes declare and confidentlie affirme to the rest of the said Jurye that yf they the rest of the said Jurye would not yeald to acquite the said prisoners that it were better and lesste losse that the rest of the said Jurye should be famished rather then the said prisoners being gent of bloud should be Condemned to so ignominious a death. And accordinge to w^{ch} there threats and menaces they the

said Harry ap Jeuan Lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones, Tudr Owen, Ellis David ap Thomas, and Tudr ap Lewis ap Owen (they themselfes beinge provided of sustenance as befor said) did att lengthe **C**ompell the rest of the said Jury bothe by threats diverse blowes and strookes and allso they the rest of the said Jury beinge Could and hunger allmost starved and famished after two daies and two nightes resistance to yeald for safgard of there lifes to agree for the acquitinge of the said prisoners directlie against theire wills and consciences and against there evidence and therupon they the said Harry ap Jeuan Lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones, Tudr Owen, Ellis David ap Thomas, and Tudr ap Lewis ap Owen and the rest of the said Jurie (they the rest of the said Jurie beinge Compelled thereunto by the said Harry ap Jeuan Lloyd, Moris ap John ap Ellis, David Jones, Tudr Owen, Ellis David ap Thomas, and Tudr ap Lewis ap Owen as afforsaid) did verie Corruptlie fallslie and perniciously in open Court befor yo^r ma^{ts} said Iustices of the said great Sessions holden att the said Towne of Bala for the said Countie of Merioneth in the one of the monethes of September or october last past geive and delivere upp theire verdit that they the said Robt. Owen and David ap Robt. or either of

them were not guiltie, wherby they the said prisoners
 were not only acquitted of murder but allso of
 manslaughter to the great dislikinge of the said
 Justices of the said great Sessions and admiracon
 of the wholle presence: In Tender Consideracon wherof
 and for as much as the said murther, Corrupcon,
 practices, and periury and other misdemeanors are
 wicked and execrable and wickedlie Comitted by men of
 great account and revenues in the said Countie of
 Merioneth and for that diverse and many odious and
 abhominable murders have benne most wickedlie of late
 perpetrated and Comitted in yo^r ma^{ties} Countrey of
 North walles by dissolute Riotous and Rebellious
 persones who by Reasone of the greatnes of there freindes
 and alliaunce in the Countrey, have escaped punishment
 (notwthstandinge the sundrie letters of yo^r ma^{ts}
 most ho^{ble} privie Counsell directed to diverse the
 Cheffe magistrats of yo^r highnes said Countrey of North
 walles for the punishment of the same) by reasone of
 the Corrupcon and periury of Jurors non of w^{ch} said
 Jurors have as yet recieved punishment for ther
 Corrupcon and periury, by reasone wherof murders
 Corrupcon and periury and other lewde and wicked
 offences doe dalie increase in yo^r ma^{ts} said Countrey