### Diagnostic Artifact Data:

#### Projectile Point Types
- Koenis-Crispin
- Perkiomen
- Clovis
- Hardaway-Dalton
- Susquehanna
- Palmer
- Kirk (notch)
- Piscataway
- Kirk (stem)
- Calvert
- Le Croy
- Selby Bay
- Morrow Mtn
- Guiford
- Brewerton
- Otter Creek

#### Prehistoric Sherd Types
- Shepard
- Keyser
- Marcey Creek
- Popes Creek
- Townsend
- Yeocomico
- Damers Otr
- Coulbourn
- Minguanan
- Monongahela
- Selden Island
- Watson
- Sullivan Cove
- Susquehannock
- Accokeek
- Mockley
- Shenks Ferry
- Wolfe Neck
- Clemson Island
- Moyaone
- Vinette
- Page
- Potomac Cr
- 280

#### Historic Sherd Types
- Ironstone
- Staffordshire
- Stoneware
- English Brown
- Astbury
- Jackfield
- Whiteware
- English Grey
- Borderware
- Mottled
- Tin Glazed
- Breckfield
- Mn Mottled
- Whiteware
- Caughnall
- Borderware
- North Devon
- Porcelain
- Bosworth
- Pearlware
- ander
- Carolina
- Jackfield
- Pearlware

### Other Artifact & Feature Types:

#### Prehistoric Artifacts
- Other fired clay
- Human remain(s)
- Modified faunal
- Unmod faunal
- Oyster shell
- Floral material
- Uncommon Obj.
- Other

#### Historic Artifacts
- Tobacco related
- Activity item(s)
- Human remain(s)
- Faunal material
- Misc. kitchen
- Floral material
- Misc. 

### Lithic Material
- Jasper
- Chalcedony
- European flint
- Chert
- Ironstone
- Basalt
- Rhyolite
- Argilite
- Unknown
- Quartz
- Steatite
- Other
- Quartzite
- Sandstone
- Silt sandstone

### Dated features present at site
- F16 - deep midden; F17A - post-lined trench; F18 - stain w/ corn cobs; F20 - shallow pit; F28 - basin-shaped pit; F34 - palisade trench; F43 - stain

### Radiocarbon Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Age (BP)</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1:</td>
<td>830 +/- 70 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2:</td>
<td>380 +/- 70 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3:</td>
<td>160 +/- 50 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 4:</td>
<td>650 +/- 80 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 5:</td>
<td>280 +/- 50 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 6:</td>
<td>470 +/- 60 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 7:</td>
<td>260 +/- 50 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 8:</td>
<td>16730 +/- 130 years</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 9:</td>
<td>18160 +/- 110 years</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sample 1: B-87251: from Feature 16 on the edge of the Luray (Keyser) phase village; associated with Page sherds
- Sample 2: B-87249: from Feature 17A and lying within the Luray (Keyser) phase village; associated with Keyser sherds
- Sample 3: B-87250: from Feature 18; associated with corn cobs, ambiguous material culture, and nearby Page sherds
- Sample 4: B-87252: from Feature 20 on the southern edge of the site, associated with Page sherds
- Sample 5: B-87246: from Feature 28 and associated with a rolled copper trade bead and a Keyser cord-marked rimsherd
- Sample 6: B-87248: from Feature 34; associated with the Luray (Keyser) phase village palisade and Keyser sherds
- Sample 7: B-94164: paleosol located 1.4 m below the surface
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number:</th>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Brief Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18AG3</td>
<td>Herman Barton Village</td>
<td>Middle Woodland occupation; Late Woodland/Contact Period village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional radiocarbon results available

Other name(s): Barton
**Phase II and Phase III Archeological Database and Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number:</th>
<th>18AG3</th>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Herman Barton Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description:</td>
<td>Middle Woodland occupation; Late Woodland/Contact Period village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Description:**

The Herman Barton Village Site was one of the first aboriginal village sites to be investigated in western Maryland. The site is situated on a borod, low terrace area overlooking the north branch of the Potomac northeast of Rawlings in rural Allegany County. Aerial photos of the site show a circular shaped area of darker soils where the site is located. On the surface, this dark zone is marked by a heavy concentration of ceramics, shell, bone, and lithic debris. The Barton site lies at the foot of the Allegheny Front and soils in this area include mainly Pope fine sandy loams and Philo silt loams.

In the mid 20th century, the site was surface collected by a local resident named John Domenic. Domenic’s collection was photographed and copies of the images are available in the MHT site files for Barton. The images reveal that the collection included a “bird stone”, a “turtle”, and a metal “lizard”.

In 1960, Henry Wright conducted test excavations at the site consisting of a 1.524 X 3.05 meter (5 x 10 foot) strata cut in the riverbank. The trench was dug in 1.27 cm (5 inch) arbitrary levels within natural soil horizons. An aboriginal feature and artifact concentrations were located within the strata cut to a depth of 76.2 cm (30 inches) below surface. Sterile clay was reached at that level. Changes in ceramic types with depth generally show the occurrence of higher percentages of shell-tempered pottery in the upper levels, and limestone-tempered pottery in the lower levels. For instance, Level 6, the lowest level, contained the highest percentage of limestone-tempered pottery along with the greatest variety in surface treatment. The artifact collection from the 1960 excavations is curated at the Smithsonian Institution.

Two features were encountered in Wright’s strata cut, but details were not provided in his report. The ceramics encountered in the cut consist of 803 sherds, including at least 14 rimsherds. Fifty-seven of these sherds are shell-tempered, 576 are limestone tempered, 52 are tempered with miscellaneous igneous rock, 3 are sand-tempered, 35 are sandstone tempered, and 82 have mixed tempering agents. The vast majority of these have cordmarked exteriors. One prehistoric pipe fragment and 49 “burnt clay pellets” were also recovered.

The flaked lithic assemblage consists of 6 triangular points and 2 flakes. Six grinding stones were excavated. Nine mortar fragments or nutting stones were recovered, along with 1 anvilstone and 1 hammerstone. Twenty-two limestone fragments (fire-cracked rock?) were also reported. The only faunal artifact reported is a perforated deer toe bone. And the historic assemblage consisted of 8 iron fragments and 1 piece of coal.

In 1987, a limited Phase II survey was conducted at the site, which was subsequently expanded into a large, multi-year project carried out by personnel and students at Towson University. The Maryland Historical Trust holds an easement on the property (which is owned by the Archaeological Conservancy), and periodic update reports have been provided to the MHT easement committee and the conservancy.

The 1987 research project consisted of auger borings and a single 1 X 1 m test unit. Additional test excavations were then carried out from 1993 - 1995 along the margins of the site to ascertain the extent of the various prehistoric components represented. Excavations from 1993 - 1998 were conducted with the expressed purpose of defining the extent of prehistoric occupations and their relation to an adjacent Luray (Keyser) phase village. In 2000, a number of deep test excavations began to be carried out to reveal the sub-plowzone components at the site. In 2003, the Archaeological Conservancy purchased the site with the assistance of the MHT, and a broad excavation effort was initiated to better define the boundaries of the various site occupations and to determine where some of the more significant archeological deposits were located. At present (June 2014) investigations are still underway, however, a preliminary report on the prehistoric occupations was submitted to the MHT in 1997 and an update report was provided to the MHT easement committee and the Archaeological Conservancy in 2002.

Several test units consisting of a 1 X 1 m, 2 X 2 m, and 5 X 5 m have been utilized throughout the site during the various Towson University investigations, with a preference for the 2 X 2 m excavation unit. Excavation methods include screening of excavated soils through hardware mesh. In general, test units were excavated in 10 cm arbitrary levels below the plowzone where deeper testing was conducted. However, the majority of excavations were terminated at the base of the plowzone where features were revealed and subsequently excavated. Plowzone soils were sifted through hardware mesh as well, but only diagnostic artifacts, decorated sherds, rim sherds, tools, and worked bone were retained in excavation unit areas in the later years of excavation, whereas these areas were fully sampled in the early years of work by Towson. The recovered body sherds, flakes, and other unremarkable materials recovered during later years of work were returned to the same unit when backfilling occurred.

Where appropriate, diagnostic artifacts and selected tools were piece plotted (with 3 dimensional coordinates) to provide precise horizontal and stratigraphic controls. Features and postmolds were photographed, maps were created, and profiles were made of the contents were sifted through hardware mesh. The remaining half was removed for flotation processing. Large portions of Susquehannock features were sifted through 1/8 inch mesh to recover trade beads, metal fragments, shell sherds, and other small artifacts that would normally have fallen through standard ¼ inch hardware mesh. Flotation samples were sometimes taken from soils adjacent to features to provide contextual information for interpretation of feature function.

All units were backfilled upon completion. After the 2003 acquisition by the Archaeological Conservancy, fired ceramic tiles were placed at the base of excavated units prior to backfilling. The tiles were inscribed with the notation “The Archaeological Conservancy” and the date of the backfilling. Efforts were made to prevent erosion after backfilling which required visits to the site after two to three months to ensure that no damaging surface erosion had taken place through settling. Any apparent surface damage was addressed through placement of additional soil and vegetation cover over damaged areas.

In general, a central palisaded area (thought to be a Keyser/Luray focus village) and areas to the north where there appears to be a significant Contact period occupation (a Susquehannock village) are the major components of the site. However, some evidence of earlier (a Late Woodland Phase village, and sporadic Archaic and even possible Paleoindian components have been identified. The various reports provide quantifiable data for some test units while only providing brief overviews of the artifact recovered from others. Thus, artifact talties provided below, and those provided in the tables above are low-end estimates.

Twenty-two features (not including postmolds) were mapped prior to 1997, most were excavated, and samples were retained for flotation analysis (although results have not been published). These include several pits, hearths, trenches, middens, and stains. Numerous postmolds/holes were excavated, including a palisade (with associated trench) that surrounds the Luray/Keyser focus occupation. Several of these features were radiocarbon dated and are detailed above. The ceramic assemblage reported for work conducted prior to 1997 included at least 40 shell tempered sherds (3 rims), 310 limestone sherds (11 rims), 2 chert tempered sherds, and 32 unidentified crumbs. The vast majority of these have been identified as Page ceramics, followed by Keyser sherds. A large quantity of additional sherds (especially Page cordmarked pottery) are not enumerated but are reported. In addition, some fragments among the above mentioned are part of a Schultz incised (Susquehannock) vessel. A single Carpenter Cord-on-cord (Clemson Island variant) rimsherd was recovered.

Lithics reported from the Wall investigations are as follows: at least 115 flakes (15 of which are utilized or retouched), 26 small pieces of debitage/shatter, 1 triangular point, 3 chert bifaces, 2 early-stage bifaces, 1 chert core, and 1 tested chert cobble. Nearly all of the reported flakes were chert. Fire-cracked rock is also reported.

Contact period trade goods were found with some frequency, mostly at or near the surface. Numerous 17th thru 18th century beads, at least 1 copper bangle,
Subsequent work at the site is less well-documented than research conducted prior to the 1997 interim report, but four synthetic reports on the site are planned.

In general, the Towson University work at Barton has revealed it to be a multi-component prehistoric and Contact period site, forming a significant part of what has come to be called the “Barton Complex.” The Barton Complex is a cluster of archaeological sites situated on two river terraces on the Potomac River’s North Branch. The site complex spans a 12,000 year time frame from Paleoindian (Clovis) to early Historic times, i.e. the period of initial European contact with inhabitants of the region. Evidence of the latter includes finds of European glass trade beads, copper and brass ornaments, and Susquehannock pottery.

Excavations by Towson have revealed: 1) middens and bell-shaped pits associated with Contact Period (Susquehannock) occupation towards the northern end of the site, with evidence for a palisade, 2) a Late Woodland (Keyser phase, ca. AD 1450) village enclosed by a palisade trench (roughly 100m across), 3) earlier Late Woodland (Page phase) unenclosed settlements distributed across the upper terrace, 4) indications of Middle Woodland occupation on the lower terrace, and 5) much deeper Archaic and possibly Paleoindian period occupation.

Geophysical surveys were conducted at the Barton Site over two weeks in the spring of 2009. This timing provided access to the field prior to the planting of a new crop. However, corn stalks from the previous season were still present. In some areas of the field these were up to 0.5m in height and had a negative impact on the geophysical survey. Not only do they slow down the rate of data collection by making walking and moving of the survey lines more difficult, where tall enough they buffer the base of the magnetometer sensors during data collection. This can affect the quality of the results by both introducing random noise into the data and causing the instrument to be in the wrong place when a reading is recorded. To minimize these effects, the tallest corn stalks were squashed down where possible, and some traverses were repeated if the buffeting was particularly bad.

Magnetometer data were downloaded using ArcheoSurveyor and then processed using Geoplot 3.00. After processing, the geophysical data were imported into ArcView to allow these data to be integrated and analyzed with reference to subsequent ground-truthing results, as well as previous excavation evidence.

The magnetometer survey revealed four clear enclosed (palisaded) areas, with evidence for at least three more sections of palisade. The southern end of the upper terrace, faint suggest that of a small stockade were detected. This feature was by no means certain, but the weak anomalies would enclose an area approximately 30 x 20 m. If this small enclosure is in fact cultural in origin, it is possible that it may relate to an earlier Mason Island complex farmstead. Over the course of a few centuries, such farmsteads evolved into much larger villages. This enclosure could therefore represent an earlier phase of settlement that was subsequently replaced by one or more of the larger palisades identified at the site. A large area of palisade enclosure was identified in the southern portion of the site. This palisade seems to have been constructed from posts inserted into individual holes. There are indications that it may have been a double palisade. Only the southern and eastern sides can be clearly identified, but it was approximately 70m long by 52m wide, and encompassed an area of around 0.29 hectares or 0.73 acres. It is interesting to note that these dimensions would be very close to the excavated Mason Island site at Cresapton (18AG119). No palisade was delineated at that site, but a straight section of trench was recorded on the west side of the village. Two excavation trenches placed within this enclosure--but without knowledge of its existence--have uncovered evidence for Mason Island phase settlement at Barton. Augering of five anomalies in this area have also confirmed the presence of charcoal-rich anthropogenic deposits, fire-cracked rock, and pit features below around 0.3 m and extending below 0.85 m.

This newly discovered palisade appears to have been constructed in fairly straight sections, roughly 20m long with angles between them. No entrance can be identified and it may have been open on the eastern side. However, this is where the top of the terrace has been plowed-out and any traces may have been lost. There is some suggestion of structural remains within the enclosure, but it is not possible to identify specific buildings with any confidence based on the current results. This palisade may have formed an extension to the next enclosure do the north, although it is not possible to tell from the geophysical data alone.

Immediately north of the southern palisade are the clear linear responses associated with a palisade trench (now referred to as the “Middle Palisade”). Although less well-defined on its southeastern side, probably due to truncation of the remains by plowing, this enclosure measures 59 m x 59 m and also covers an area of around 0.29 hectares or 0.71 acres. The palisade is composed of both straight and curved sections and there is clear evidence for an entrance on the northwest side. As with the southern palisade, it is unclear whether the side along the top of the terrace was also enclosed. The magnetic anomalies that form this palisade trench are more intense than those of the palisades on either side, and this may be related to factors such as length of occupation, manner of destruction, or degree of preservation. Further investigation using more intrusive methods would be required to understand this. The magnetometer was able to detect the presence of the Keyser phase palisade previously identified through excavation by Towson. It was believed to measure around 110m across and the magnetometer work confirmed a size for the enclosure of 108 m NE-SW by at least 95m NW-SE. However, the remote sensing work augmented the excavation evidence by revealing that the Keyser phase village is enclosed by a double palisade trench. Three of the four previous excavation trenches had revealed the inner palisade, however there was no way to know this from the excavation results alone. The report shows results from these excavations laid over the magnetometer data, which demonstrates excellent correlation between the two.

It is difficult to discern the course of the two palisade trenches in the eastern half of the enclosure, again possibly due to plow damage, and it is unclear whether this enclosure was round and bounded by a palisade on all sides or roughly semi-circular in plan and open to the river. It is therefore not possible to give accurate measurements for the internal area, but it is likely that this settlement covered around 0.88 hectares or 2.2 acres. No clear evidence for any entrance was detected.

Despite evidence of a palisade on the eastern side of the Susquehannock occupation area (identified through years of previous excavation), there was no clear indication for a palisade in the magnetometer data. Suggestions of linear trends are visible around 50 m into the field, however these are by no means
conclusive. Depending on the date of the paleochannel to the west of this area, it is possible that this Contact Period settlement took advantage of natural boundaries to the east (the Potomac River) and west (a pond). Not only are the linear magnetic responses due to plowing fairly intense around the area where the Susquehannock palisade was excavated, they follow roughly the same alignment, making it impossible to identify any possible continuation of this feature. A much thicker plow layer in this part of the site may complicate the interpretation.

Several other sections of palisade as well as house patterns were identified. The character of magnetic anomalies is noticeably different on the lower terrace in the southeastern corner of the magnetic survey area. Instead of the well-defined responses seen along the upper terrace, the anomalies are generally weaker and more broadly defined in this area. The shape of a magnetic anomaly in profile is a good indication of the depth of the source, with a response becoming broader and less intense for more deeply buried features. Test excavations on this lower terrace revealed very little cultural material in the upper 0.5-0.6 m of soils, with evidence for Middle Woodland features below this. It was, therefore, deemed likely that these anomalies are due to archeological deposits of a similar depth and age. Two of these anomalies are larger and more intense, suggesting magnetic enhancement through burning. These could be due to deposits containing burnt soil and fire-cracked rock, however, they could also indicate the locations of structures that have burnt down. Five anomalies were targeted for augering on this lower terrace. They all revealed that no anthropogenic material was present in the upper 0.5 m of soil, with charcoal generally being recovered below a depth of around 0.8 m. The magnetometer results therefore indicate that there may be little archaeological material in the top 0.5-0.8 m of soil on this lower terrace, which is extremely useful information if excavation units are placed to investigate these Middle Woodland deposits.

Decades of research at the Barton site (18AG3) reveal a multi-component prehistoric and Contact period site, revealing potentially 12,000 years of human occupation in western Maryland. Intact cultural features, evidence of multiple (and spatially discrete) village areas, and deep chronology make this site one of the most important in the state, only a fraction of which has been fully excavated. It should be considered a significant archeological resource.