

Correction

Four weddings, three funerals and a historic detective puzzle: a cautionary tale

Madeleine Gray

This article was originally published in the 2014 *Transactions* of the Anglesey Antiquarian Society and Field Club but did not appear in full.

This is the correct version, including all superscript numbering of endnotes.

‘Four weddings, three funerals and a historical detective puzzle: a cautionary tale’¹

The stone effigy in the porch of Beaumaris church will be familiar to most readers of these *Transactions*. Strictly speaking a semi-effigy, it depicts a woman in head-dress (possibly a coronet), flowing veil and wimple. A large circular brooch at her neck fastens part of the clothing, probably a fitted overtunic. Her hands (in tightly-fitted sleeves) are raised in prayer in the *orans* posture. Most of the body is concealed by an elaborately foliated design including fruit, stiff-leaf foliage and trefoils. At the base a wyvern holds the foot of the stem in its mouth. The effigy slab sits on a massive dugout stone coffin.

This carving has traditionally been understood to depict Siwan, wife of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, who died in 1237. Siwan (Joan in English) was the illegitimate daughter of King John of England. Her mother’s name is uncertain: she is sometimes said to have been Agatha daughter of Robert, Earl Ferrers,² though the Annals of Tewkesbury name her as ‘Regina Clemencia’ (Queen Clemence).³ Although she was born out of wedlock, she was of royal blood and could therefore be used as a counter in diplomatic manoeuvring. As part of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth’s alliance with John at the beginning of the thirteenth century she was offered to him as a wife.⁴ They were married in 1205. She was 15; he was in his thirties and already had several children by an earlier relationship. In spite of this unpromising beginning their relationship was close, and Siwan’s contacts in England and France were of immense importance to Llywelyn’s nation-building strategies. There was a difficult period in 1230 when she had an affair with an Anglo-Norman Marcher lord, William de Breos. Llywelyn had William hanged but he and Siwan subsequently managed to rebuild their relationship. When she died in 1237 Llywelyn was said to have been heartbroken. She was buried across the Menai Straits from his Abergwyngregyn court, and he founded the Franciscan friary of Llanfaes there in her honour.

It is the story of Siwan and de Breos which has captured the literary imagination: it forms the centre of Saunders Lewis’s play *Siwan*, Edith Pargeter (aka Ellis Peters)’s novel *The Green Branch* and Sharon Kay Penman’s novel *Here Be Dragons*. This has unfortunately distracted attention from her importance as a political figure behind the scenes in a crucial period of the Welsh struggle for independence. The romantic story also helps to explain why the Beaumaris carving has become one of Wales’s most iconic pieces of medieval art. It appears

on numerous websites and has been photographed and drawn for several academic publications. There are particularly good photographs on the castlewales web site;⁵ Colin Gresham drew it as the first item in his discussion of medieval stone carving in Wales, though his drawing does have elements of interpretation.⁶

The carving has always been described as the effigy of Princess Siwan. It caused some consternation, therefore, when doubt was cast on its identification. In a paper at the Church Monuments Society's Welsh symposium in Cardiff in the summer of 2012 (subsequently published in *Archaeologia Cambrensis*), Brian and Moira Gittos gave a reappraisal of Colin Gresham's work on tomb carvings in north Wales.⁷ In this they added a number of carvings to the corpus and challenged some of his dating and identifications. Specifically, they suggested that the style of the head-dress on the Beaumaris carving, with the wimple drawn under the chin to give a triangular shape to the face, cannot be found before the 1270s and could even be as late as the beginning of the fourteenth century. In a further paper at the Cambrian Archaeological Association conference in Llangollen in the spring of 2014 they developed this argument further. The biting wyvern, the style of the foliate decoration on the tomb, and particularly the stiff-leaf trefoils at the junction of the stems, are all characteristic of late thirteenth-century work in metal as well as stone.

While the style of the wimple is found into the fourteenth century, the Beaumaris carving is probably earlier rather than later, from the 1270s or the 1280s. By the end of the thirteenth century, female effigies in particular were being carved with the elegantly swaying contrapposto stance to be found on (for example) Eleanor of Castile's monument in Westminster Abbey. The posture of the Beaumaris effigy is straighter, though of course it is obscured by the covering of most of the body. The combination of coronet, veil, wimple and brooch is also indicative of a slightly earlier date: it appears (for example) on the effigies of Eleanor, wife of Henry II (d. 1204) and Isabella of Angoulême wife of John (d. 1246) at Fontevrault, and on the figures on the west front of Wells cathedral, which are also from the second quarter of the thirteenth century.⁸ Although these are earlier features, working on the principle that one dates an artefact by its most recent feature, the Beaumaris effigy cannot be earlier than the 1260s and is probably from the 1270s or the 1280s.

The tradition that the carving depicts Siwan is widespread but cannot be traced beyond the beginning of the nineteenth century. Stories of its history since the dissolution of the friary are confusing and contradictory. According to Charles Hand's article in *Archaeologia Cambrensis* for 1924, 'the cover was taken from the Friary in 1538 by Thomas Bulkeley and placed by him in the church' – but Hand gives no reference to substantiate that so it may be local tradition.⁹ An earlier article by J. O. Westwood said that the carving was found early in the nineteenth century face down in a ditch.¹⁰ According to an anonymous article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* quoting from the manuscript journals of Sir Richard Colt Hoare, who visited Beaumaris in 1810, it was for some time placed upright in the wall of the pew belonging to the Sparrow family in Beaumaris church. At that date the coffin was described as having been placed 'under a neat Gothic building' in the garden of Baron Hill.¹¹ A plaque made to accompany the coffin at Baron Hill and now on the wall above the tomb in its present location says the coffin was moved in 1808.

The difference in these accounts is probably explained by the fact that all the articles are reporting local tradition. According to Colt Hoare's unpublished journal (as quoted in the anonymous article in the *Gentleman's Magazine*), it was the local antiquarian Richard Llwyd (author of the poem *Beaumaris Bay*) who decided that the coffin and lid might belong together. They were measured and (he claimed) fitted exactly. In August of 1810 Richard Fenton noted that

the tomb of Princess Joan, Llewelyn's Consort, which had for many years officiated most disgracefully as a watering Trough for Horses, was taken from thence, which, with its lid,* lately discovered in the Church of Beaumaris, having on it an Effigy of a female, the face in sight and hands uplifted, the lower part overlaid with a profusion of florid sculpture, has been set up by Lord Bulkely at the termination of a walk in his pleasure grounds in a gothick Mausoleum erected for that purpose, with an inscription in Latin, English, and Welsh.

* Account of Llwyd's discovery of it, who told me he thought there was a coronet on her head, but that the moulding over which it partly extended was cut off.¹²

Llwyd's own description of the discovery dated it to 1812 (which must be a mistake) and said that it had been 'lost for 290 years', by which he might have meant that it had been visible but not identified for that time. (Unfortunately, he gave no details of how and where he found it.) He also suggested that, as the recess in which it was placed was locked, the effigy should be placed in an upright position so that it could be seen.¹³ It was at Baron Hill when Hand saw it but it was moved again to Beaumaris church in 1928 or 1929.

The earliest published reference to the actual coffin is in the 1775 *History of the Island of Anglesey*. This says 'On the road between Beaumaris and Llanfaes is a large stone trough, close by the sea, which is supposed by modern antiquaries to have been the coffin of the said Joane, King John's daughter'.¹⁴ Neil Fairlamb, rector of Beaumaris, has pointed out that, according to William Williams' 'Historia Bellomarisei, or the History of the Town and Burrough of Beaumaris' (c. 1669), a number of coffins were dug up on the site of Llanfaes Friary and reused as horse-troughs: there is really no reason to suppose that any particular coffin was Siwan's.¹⁵ Williams actually says that the coffins were 'of the same form with that of Llewelin ap Iorwerth's taken up at the Abbey of Nant Conway, now remaining in the Chapel of Llanrwst'. The Llanrwst coffin is much more elaborate than the Beaumaris one, a sophisticated piece of carving decorated with quatrefoils and tracery, with rivets which presumably once held bronze plaques. This raises the intriguing possibility that Siwan might have had a similarly elaborate coffin which has since been lost, and that the Beaumaris coffin is simply another of those found on the site.

There is also some doubt about the fit between carving and coffin. Stone coffins were pretty much standard sizes so the lids would have been standardized as well. And is the carving really a coffin lid? It is very elaborate for something intended to be buried. Elite funerals took a while to organize so the bodies were usually embalmed. This meant that it was possible to sink the coffin into the ground but with the lid showing. But the Beaumaris carving may not be a lid at all. It is difficult to be sure as the edges are damaged, but it looks as though there is no moulding along one side. It may have been a semi-effigy originally carved to fit in an alcove, probably sitting on a tomb chest but with the body buried below.

In view of the dating evidence, it seems extremely unlikely that the monument actually commemorates Siwan. Brian and Moira Gittos did suggest that it might have been a

retrospective monument, but this is also unlikely given the date. After Siwan's son Dafydd ap Llywelyn died in 1246 there would have been no-one able or willing to commemorate her: her only other known child, Elen, was married to an English landowner and died in 1253. The kingdom of Gwynedd passed to the other line of the family, Llywelyn ab Iorwerth's grandchildren by his earlier relationship. Dafydd's half-brother Gruffydd was Llywelyn's son by Tangwystl daughter of Llywarch Goch of Rhos. She is usually described as Llywelyn's mistress but they may have been informally married (the fourth wedding of this article's title). It is to say the least unlikely that Tangwystl's descendants would have commemorated her rival with a monument of this quality.

According to Fenton, Llwyd thought the head-dress on the carving was originally a crown or coronet, though the upper part is now missing. It may have been damaged in transit, though Hand suggests it may have been deliberately chiselled away to fix the clamps which hold the lid to the base. We are therefore looking for someone of royal status. Brian and Moira Gittos suggested that the effigy might commemorate Eleanor de Montfort, wife of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd. She was the daughter of the aristocratic rebel Simon de Montfort and his wife Eleanor, youngest daughter of King John of England (and was thus Siwan's niece). She was betrothed to Llywelyn when she was 13 to cement his alliance with her father against Henry III.¹⁶ Simon was killed at the battle of Evesham and Eleanor was forced to flee to France. A letter from Edward I to the Archbishop of Canterbury suggests it was on her initiative that she and Llywelyn were married by proxy in 1275, so that she could 'through the prince's power, spread the seed of malice which her father had conceived, something that she could not do on her own'.¹⁷ She set sail for Wales but was captured by English ships and taken to Windsor, where she was held for three years. Eventually Edward I allowed her to marry in person in 1278, following the settlement of the Treaty of Aberconwy. Llywelyn may have been aiming to emulate his grandfather in setting up a personal relationship with the English king through his female relations but the circumstances were different: Edward was not John and Eleanor was his cousin not his daughter. Eleanor was able to make a limited use of her family links to negotiate on her husband's behalf but Llywelyn was obliged to accept unfavourable terms in order to proceed with the marriage, and the alliance was probably a political mistake.¹⁸

Eleanor died in childbirth on 19 June 1282, leaving a daughter, Gwenllïan.¹⁹ The chronicles describe her burial at Llanfaes,²⁰ but this does not prove that the effigy is hers. In the spring of that year, Llywelyn's brother Dafydd had rebelled against Edward I, in alliance with the rulers of Powys Maelor and Deheubarth, placing Llywelyn in an impossible situation. Family honour demanded that he support his brother, but he no longer had the resources to mount an effective challenge. By June of 1282 Edward's army was attacking Wales on two fronts, through Gwynedd Is Conwy to Anglesey and through the south, and his marcher allies were supporting him on the border. It was a massively funded campaign, with crossbowmen from Gascony, ships commandeered from the south coast and provisions purveyed as far afield as Ponthieu and Ireland.²¹ Would Llywelyn have spent time and resources on a statement tomb when he needed every penny for defence?

The answer is that he just might. Beverley Smith has suggested that it was actually Eleanor's death that provoked Llywelyn into supporting his brother's rebellion:

Is it conceivable that, when he had accompanied her bier across the Menai Straits, in distress but with new-found resolve, Llywelyn ap Gruffydd entered into armed conflict for the last time? Is it possible that he went to war in the knowledge that, though at last he had a child of his body, his hopes for the future were finally shattered and that there was now nothing left for him but to put his weight behind the rebellion which his brother had begun?²²

There are plenty of counter-arguments to this. R. R. Davies, for example, suggested that while Llywelyn had 'little option but to join the revolt and to assume its leadership ... he had probably every inclination to do so'.²³ Nevertheless, if the effigy could be proved to be Eleanor's, it would add weight to Smith's suggestion.

Finally, it is of course possible that the effigy depicts Eleanor and that it was commissioned not by Llywelyn but by her cousin Edward. It was Eleanor's status as a member of the royal family which gave Edward the excuse for opposing her marriage in 1275 and insisting on concessions before she could marry Llywelyn in person in 1278. She was close enough to her cousin to be able to write to him on Llywelyn's behalf in the winter of 1281-2.²⁴

Commissioning a tomb for her would offer him the opportunity for another political

statement of control. The effigy is a much less accomplished piece of carving than the effigies of his sister-in-law Aveline de Forz, countess of Lancaster (d. 1274, though her effigy probably dates from the 1290s) and his wife Eleanor of Castile (d. 1290: both effigies are in Westminster Abbey and illustrated in Duffy's *Royal Tombs of Medieval England*).²⁵ Edward might have preferred (again for political reasons) to use a local craftsman, though we should beware of the simplistic assumption that 'local' necessarily means 'less accomplished'. However, choice of a local craftsman might explain some of the more old-fashioned elements in the carving, such as the positioning of the hands and the combination of veil, wimple and coronet.

There are other candidates. Of these, probably the most likely is Llywelyn's mother Senana. One of the most shadowy figures of a sparsely-documented period, she was descended from Owain Gwynedd.²⁶ She married Llywelyn ab Iorwerth's older son Gruffydd, probably fairly soon after his release from English custody in 1215, and bore him four sons including the rivals Llywelyn and Dafydd. She seems to have been particularly close to her youngest son Dafydd, and she last appears in the record in 1252, when she was at Dafydd's court in Llyn and witnessed a judgement by him as lord of Cymydmaen.²⁷

It was therefore exciting to read, in Andy Abram's chapter on monastic burial in Burton and Stober's *Monastic Wales*, that Senana was buried at Llanfaes. Abram went on to suggest, on the basis that Senana as well as Siwan and Eleanor was buried there, that Llanfaes may have been deliberately designed by the rulers of Gwynedd as a mausoleum for the women of the royal house, but that it may also have been chosen by the royal women themselves as a burial place deliberately set apart from the male dynastic burial place at Aberconwy.²⁸

Abram referenced Gwennyth Richards' Sydney Ph D thesis, 'From footnotes to narrative: Welsh noblewomen in the thirteenth century'.²⁹ The thesis added a date of 1263 for Senana's death: but crucially the only evidence cited for either the death or the burial was a Gwynedd County Council tourist leaflet, 'Princes of Gwynedd: The Môn Trail', published in 1996.³⁰ Extensive email enquiries established that the leaflet was part of a well-researched project that also produced a book and a video, but failed to identify the source for the statements about Senana. It proved more difficult to locate those responsible for the actual research and at one point the only way forward seemed to be to trawl through the modern

records in the Gwynedd Archives to see who was paid for it, in the hope that they might remember what their sources were. Then the editor of these Transactions, David Longley, tracked down a copy of the book in the Prichard Jones Institute Library in Newborough. *The Princes of Gwynedd: Courts, Castles and Churches* was published by Economic Development and Planning, Gwynedd County Council, in 1994, acknowledging help and research by John Davies, Gweneth Lilly, Tony Carr, Kathryn Prichard Gibson and Delyth Prys.

The book offers a sound overview of the history of the kingdom of Gwynedd, illustrated by quotation from documentary and poetic sources – but it also includes quotes from some of the historical novels about the period, and this is what seems to have led to the assertions about Senana's death and burial. The date of 1263 for her death and the claim that she was buried at Llanfaes actually come from Edith Pargeter's *The Dragon at Noonday*, part of the *Brothers of Gwynedd* series:

There was but one place then where the royal women of Gwynedd were fittingly laid to rest, and that was in the burial ground of Llan-faes, in Anglesey, that Llewelyn Fawr dedicated to the memory of his great consort, Joan, lady of Wales, and founded beside it the new house of Llan-faes for the Franciscan Friars, the closest of all the religious to the old saints of the pure church. There we bore the Lady Senena on a grey, still January day of the new year, twelve hundred and sixty-three, down from Aber over the salt flats and the wide sands of Lavan, and ferried her across to the Anglesey shore, there to rest after all her triumphs and tragedies.

The *Princes of Gwynedd* book makes the source clear, but it seems that whoever used the book as material for the production of tourist trail leaflets failed to realise that Edith Pargeter's work was fiction.

It is still possible that Senana was buried at Llanfaes. The date of 1263 would still be rather early for the Beaumaris effigy, but it could be a retrospective memorial, commissioned by Llywelyn or even by Dafydd. Alternatively, although she vanishes from the record after the 1250s, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, especially in a period when women in general are so sparsely documented. It is possible that she lived on until the 1270s and was then buried at Llanfaes. However, this must remain pure conjecture. Edith Pargeter's

historical instincts were often perceptive, and she has picked up on the same sense that Gwenyth Richards had that Senana was particularly close to her youngest son Dafydd; she seems to have reasoned back from Dafydd's defection to a narrative of family crisis following Senana's death, and that led to her locating the death in 1263. But this is not evidence, and certainly can not be used to argue forward again that it was her death that triggered the crisis. There are alternative explanations: Smith, for example, links Dafydd's defection with the dissension in the March in that year. Henry III put his son Edward in charge of dealing with the crisis and Smith suggests it may have been the young Edward's negotiating skills which 'turned' Dafydd.³¹ Nor can Pargeter's suggestion that Senana was buried at Llanfaes, and her description of the friary as '[the] one place then where the royal women of Gwynedd were fittingly laid to rest', be used as evidence for the establishment of Llanfaes as a mausoleum for the women of the royal house of Gwynedd.

Senana is not the only alternative candidate. The letters patent by which Henry V re-endowed Llanfaes Friary in 1414 mention several other key people buried there: as well as Siwan, the document mentions the son of the king of Denmark and Lord Clifford.³² Llywelyn ab Iorwerth's daughter Margaret was married to Walter III de Clifford: if he is the Clifford buried at Llanfaes it is just possible that she is there as well, and that as Llywelyn's daughter she was depicted wearing a coronet.

The strong local tradition that the effigy depicts Princess Siwan may be no more than an attempt to find an important person for what is clearly an important piece of carving. As Tummers says in his study of thirteenth-century effigies, names are all too often ascribed to effigies simply on the basis of their location:

The best known name of a certain person at a certain place and at a certain period is taken to be commemorated by an effigy which, without scientific basis, is considered to date from that period. And then the effigy is taken to be firmly dated, because it can be connected with a historical person.³³

On the other hand, local tradition can have its roots in fact, even when that fact has been embroidered and reappropriated. We have suggested that Edward could have commissioned the tomb from a local sculptor as a memorial to his cousin Eleanor. It is just

possible that the carving does depict Siwan but that it was commissioned by Edward: he was after all her nephew. Commissioning a memorial to the only woman who in English law could be regarded as Llywelyn ab Iorwerth's legitimate wife would have made an implicit statement about the end of the legitimate line of Gwynedd with Dafydd ap Llywelyn's death and the argument that Llywelyn and his brothers were from an illegitimate branch of the family and thus incapable of succeeding their grandfather.³⁴

This is all highly speculative. The debate over the identity of the effigy has been sharpened by the latest development in the afterlife of the monument. Even when the effigy was thought to be Princess Siwan, it was of obvious interest to those involved in the commemoration of a key period in Welsh history. Cymdeithas y Dywysoges Gwenllïan, the Princess Gwenllïan Society, has raised funds to commission virtual replicas of the Beaumaris effigy and the coffin at Llanrwst traditionally said to be that of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth: the current plan is that these will be part of an installation in Bangor Cathedral but that they will also be accessible on the internet. The possibility that the effigy could be that of Gwenllïan's mother or grandmother has of course made its virtual reconstruction of even more interest to the Society. The current evidence suggests that the effigy most probably commemorates Eleanor de Montfort, but that it could be Senana: that is what will appear on the interpretative material for the exhibition.

The process by which this provisional conclusion has been reached is an instructive one. It warns us that we need to look at historical artefacts carefully, that antiquarian literature can be illuminating but can also cloud the picture, and that the academic practice of recording, checking and verifying references is not pettifogging nitpicking but crucial to sound research. Above all, the story of the Beaumaris effigy reminds us of the need to look and to think for ourselves.

¹ This article is the product of the work of a number of people. I am particularly grateful to Neil Fairlamb, rector of Beaumaris, for introducing me to the carving and advising on antiquarian sources; to Brian and Moira Gittos for their challenge to the traditional identification and dating; to Janet Elson of Cymdeithas Gwenllïan, whose proposal for a virtual reconstruction of the effigy led me to look again at its identification; to Neil

Johnstone of Menter Mon for his information on the Princes of Gwynedd project in the 1990s; to Canon Tegid Roberts for his generous offer of help with the research; and to David Longley for tracking down the book which solved at least part of the mystery.

² In, for example, the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales and Monmouthshire, *An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments in Anglesey* (London: HMSO, 1937), p. cxxxi; Colin Gresham, *Medieval Stone Carving in North Wales* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1968), p. 63

³ H. R. Luard, ed., *Annales Monastici vol I ... Annales de Theokesberia (A.D. 1066-1263)* (London: Longman, 1864), p. 101. This is the identification suggested by Given-Wilson: C. Given-Wilson and A. Curteis, *The Royal Bastards of Medieval England* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), p.128.

⁴ On the background to the negotiations see A. D. Carr, 'Llywelyn ab Iorwerth', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 34 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 180-5, p. 181.

⁵ http://www.castlewales.com/joan_ap_llywelyn.html (accessed 16.09.14)

⁶ In *Medieval Stone Carving*, pp. 63-5; the drawing is on p. 64 and plate 1 is a photograph.

⁷ Brian and Moira Gittos, 'Gresham revisited: a fresh look at the medieval monuments of north Wales', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 161 (2012: published 2013), 357-88

⁸ *RCAHMW Anglesey*, pp. cxxxi-ii

⁹ Charles R. Hand, 'Llanfaes Friary and its Mystery Monuments', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 79 (1924), series 7, 125-88

¹⁰ J. O. Westwood, 'On certain peculiarities observable in some of the early monumental effigies in Wales', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 1847, 314-21, quote on p. 316

¹¹ *Gentleman's Magazine* vol xvii, January 1842; the journal was then in the library at Stourhead. It was sold in the 1880s and made its way to the Cardiff City Library, where it is now Cardiff MS 3.127. The reference in the journal to the location of the effigy in Beaumaris church was unfortunately omitted from M. W. Thompson's edition of extracts from the journals: *The journeys of Sir Richard Colt Hoare through Wales and England, 1793-1810* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1983)

¹² John Fisher, ed., *Tours in Wales (1804-1813) by Richard Fenton ...* (London: Bedford Press for the Cambrian Archaeological Association, 1917), p. 256; online at https://ia600309.us.archive.org/35/items/toursinwales180400fentrich/toursinwales180400fentrich_bw.pdf (accessed 12.09.14)

¹³ Richard Llwyd, *Beaumaris bay: the shores of the Menai, and the interior of Snowdonia* (Chester: J. Parry, 1832 p. 17, online at http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=UbyHAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false (accessed 15.09.14)

¹⁴ *A History of the Island of Anglesey*, published by James Dodsley in 1775, without the author's name, but later ascribed to the Reverend John Thomas (1736-1769) a native of Ynyscynhaearn in Eifionydd who in 1766 became rector of Llandegfan and Llansadwrn and Headmaster of Beaumaris Grammar School, Anglesey (information from Bangor University Archives catalogue of the Edwin Jackson papers at http://www.archiveswales.org.uk/anw/get_collection.php?inst_id=39&coll_id=10501&expand=); quote on p 24. Accessed 15.09.14

¹⁵ Cardiff Library MS 4.49, formerly in Fenton's collection and transcribed in the appendices to Fisher, ed., *Tours in Wales*, pp.275-306; the reference to the coffins is on p. 305

¹⁶ For Llywelyn's complex relationship with de Montfort and the possibility that he had agreed to marry Eleanor as early as 1264 see J. Beverley Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffydd, Prince of Wales* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1998), pp. 161-72, esp. p. 165.

¹⁷ Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffudd*, p.395: for the negotiations around the marriage see idem, 390-402, and for the actual wedding, 448-50..

¹⁸ For Eleanor's relationship with Edward, see Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffydd*, pp. 279, 497. Her correspondence with him is in J. Goronwy Edwards, ed., *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales* (Cardiff: University Press Board, 1935), pp 75-6.

¹⁹ The actual date is only given in the Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds: A. Gransden, *The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 1212-1301* (London: Nelson, 1964), p. 75.

²⁰ Thomas Jones, ed., *Brut y Tywysogyon, Peniarth MS. 20* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1941), p. 223; idem, trans., *Brut y tywysogyon; or, The chronicle of the princes.*

Peniarth ms. 20 version (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1952), p. 117 ; cf idem, ed. and trans., *Brut y tywysogyon; or, The chronicle of the princes. Red book of Hergest version* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955), pp. 262-5

²¹ For a summary of the campaign, see R. R. Davies, *Conquest, Co-existence and Change: Wales 1063-1415* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1987), pp. 348-53.

²² Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffydd*, p. 510

²³ Davies, *Conquest, Co-existence and Change*, pp. 348-9.

²⁴ Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffydd*, p. 497.

²⁵ Mark Duffy, *Royal Tombs of Medieval England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003, repr. The History Press, 2011), pp. 81-8)

²⁶ She was the daughter of Caradog ap Thomas ap Rhodri ab Owain Gwynedd and Efa ferch Gwyn ap Gruffydd: P. C. Bartrum, *Welsh Genealogies AD 300-1400* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1974), vol. 3 pp. 454-5

²⁷ Huw Pryce, ed., *The Acts of Welsh Rulers, 1120-1283* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2005), p. 454 and no. 440.

²⁸ A. Abram, 'Monastic Burial in Medieval Wales' in Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, eds, *Monastic Wales: New Approaches* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2013), pp. 103-15; the reference to Senana is on p. 110.

²⁹ University of Sydney Ph D thesis, 2005, available online at <http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/1097> (accessed 15.09.14); subsequently published as *Welsh Noblewomen in the Thirteenth Century* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009)

³⁰ Thesis p. 43; cf *Welsh Noblewomen* p. 40

³¹ Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffydd*, p. 154.

³² *Calendar of the Patent Rolls ... Henry V vol I. A.D. 1413-1416* (London: HMSO, 1910), p. 234, online

at https://dcms.lids.org/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE100763 (accessed 16.09.14).

³³ H. A. Tummers, *Early Secular Effigies in England* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), pp. 8, 19

³⁴ For Henry III's claim to hold the kingdom by escheat after Dafydd ap Llywelyn's death see Smith, *Llywelyn ap Gruffydd*, pp. 35, 56-7





