**Appendix 2.** *Key traits recorded in the round barrow relationships database.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Trait** | **Example** | **Details** |
| Broad later monument type | Cremation, field system, settlement | Based on criteria enshrined in Historic England’s Monument Type Thesaurus.1 Where possible, monument types were grouped interpretatively (e.g. ‘occupation site’ was used rather than pit, post-hole, etc.) |
| Broad date | Later Bronze Age, Iron Age |  |
| Specific date | ad 150–275 | Where known |
| Relationship between later activity and round barrow2 | Spatial | Within 50 m |
| Physical | Cutting into the round barrow |
| Destructive |  |
| Formal | Positioned carefully relative to the round barrow |
| Material | Items deposited in the round barrow round barrow material—e.g. cremated human bone—occurring in associated later features |
| Other | Funerary and ritual activity |
| Wider associations3 | The fen edge, an adjacent Neolithic long barrow |  |
| Strength of association | 1–3 | 1) *Strong* connections (e.g. a Roman inhumation burial cut directly into a round barrow)  2) *Ambiguous* but potentially meaningful relationships (e.g. a later Bronze Age field system located in the same broad area as a barrow cemetery, following the alignment of both the cemetery and the nearby fen edge, but not referencing any of the monuments directly)  3) Weak connections (e.g. a ‘ritual’ deposit in a pit located within 50 m of a round barrow but associated more directly with a sunken-featured building) |

**Notes to Appendix 2**

1 The ‘monument types’ and ‘monument classes’ referred to in this study relate to ‘types’ and ‘classes’ of archaeological activity at a broad level (e.g. the ‘types’ round house, salt production site, artefact scatter, etc., or the ‘classes’ agriculture and subsistence, domestic, etc.) as they are recorded in regional HERs and in the NRHE, rather than to ‘types’ or ‘classes’ of prehistoric monuments (e.g. bell barrow, pond barrow etc.).

2 Although they were almost certainly relevant, it was not possible within the scope of this study to consider visual relationships between round barrows and later activities (e.g. Chester-Kadwell 2009, 149).

3 This responds to the recognition that it is often difficult to tell whether it was the presence of the existing monument or broader factors that influenced the activity under consideration (e.g. Chester-Kadwell 2009, 131).