Relic charcoal hearth soils: A neglected carbon reservoir. Case study at Marsiliana forest, Central Italy

Giovanni Mastrolonardo[a,b,c,*], Ornella Francioso[b], Giacomo Certini[c]

[a] Department BIOSystem Engineering - Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, University of Liege, Avenue Maréchal Juin 27, B-5030 Gembloux, Belgium
[b] Dipartimento di Scienze Agrarie, Università degli Studi di Bologna, V.le Fanin 40, 40127 Bologna, Italy
[c] Dipartimento di Scienze delle Produzioni Agroalimentari e dell'Ambiente (DISPAA), Università degli Studi di Firenze, Piazzale delle Cascine 28, 50144 Firenze, Italy

ABSTRACT

Charcoal production in forests is one of the oldest forms of forest exploitation. The legacy of such once widespread activity is a plethora of relic charcoal hearths (RCHs[1]), where soil shows a thick, black, charcoal-rich top horizon. Even where very common, such as in European forests, RCHs were rarely studied to assess their relevance as C reservoir. For this purpose, as a case study, we investigated some RCHs at Marsiliana, a typical Mediterranean oak forest from Central Italy.

We found that RCHs soils, in spite of representing < 0.5% of total surface, gave a substantial contribution in terms of C, i.e. 1.1% to 4.2% of total ecosystem C, including litter, the top 30 cm of soil, deadwood, aboveground and below-ground biomass. On average, soil C content in RCHs was eight times higher than the soil outside the RCHs. The environmental significance of RCHs soils appears still greater considering that, on average, 43% of their C stock was charcoal, a form of C highly recalcitrant to mineralization. These results would stress the importance of accounting for the contribution of RCHs in terms of soil C and giving an estimation of their charcoal content in future C inventories, both as macroscopic and microscopic particles in soil. This study support the necessity of safeguarding the anthropogenic soils of RCHs as a precious C reservoir as well as a memory of past land uses.

1. Introduction

Charcoal production is one of the oldest form of forest exploitation, starting in the Neolithic and continuing to the present (Ludemann, 2010; Schenkel et al., 1998). Charcoal was, and is still, used for cooking, heating, smelting and steel-making (Antal & Grønly, 2003). Usually, charcoal was directly made in forests by slowly burning in partially anoxic conditions wood piled in mounds (earth mounds) or amassed in pits (earth pits) and covered with leaves and earth at the very top (FAO, 1987; Schenkel et al., 1998). The legacy of such widespread, long-lasting activity is a plethora of abandoned charcoal production emplacements (kilns or, more properly, hearths), where the soil typically shows a thick, very dark charcoal-rich top horizon.

These relic charcoal hearths (hereafter called RCHs) are particularly common in Europe (Deforce et al., 2013; Ludemann, 2003) and are the subject of several studies. Most of such studies are based on anthracological and radiocarbon analyses of charcoal particles, aiming at reconstructing past forests composition and exploitation (e.g. Deforce et al., 2013; Ludemann, 2003). Some other studies deal with the

vegetation growing in relic charcoal hearths (e.g. Carrari et al., 2016a, 2016b; Hart et al., 2008; Mikan & Abrams, 1996). Works focused on soils developed in RCHs were few until last decade (e.g. Mikan & Abrams, 1995;Young et al., 1996). However, in recent years they increased much (e.g., Borchard et al., 2014; Criscuoli et al., 2014; Hardy et al., 2016, 2017; Heitkotter & Marschner, 2015; Hernandez-Soriano et al., 2016; Kerré et al., 2016, 2017; Raab et al., 2017), probably as a consequence of the current huge interest in biochar, i.e. pyrolysed biomass (char) designed to be added to soils as enhancer of fertility and sink of C.

Nevertheless, a crucial question remains not completely addressed: how much carbon do anthropogenic soils of RCHs store and how much of this carbon is charcoal? This question is even more significant taking into account that charcoal is known as one of the most recalcitrant forms of C in the environment, especially when it occurs as macroscopic fragments (De Lafontaine & Asselin, 2011). However, in spite of the apparent high content of macroscopic charcoal particles in these soils, most of the authors did not include this C fraction in the estimation of TOC. Some (e.g. Hardy et al., 2016; Heitkotter & Marschner, 2015) did

---

not distinguish charcoal C from the rest of C, while other authors (*e.g.* Borchard et al., 2014; Hardy et al., 2017; Hernandez-Soriano et al., 2016; Kerré et al., 2016, 2017) discarded macroscopic charcoal particles along with the rock fragments, so taking into account for analysis (and the C assessment) just the charcoal in the "fine earth" – the < 2 mm fraction of the soil.

Finally, the importance of RCHs as C reservoirs is usually neglected despite their common presence in many regions throughout the world. RCHs are disregarded by the inventories of terrestrial C sources and sinks drawn up by the UN's Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in the Kyōto Protocol.

The hypothesis of this study is that RCHs are important C reservoirs that would deserve to be accounted for in the inventories of terrestrial C pools at regional or local scale. For verifying such hypothesis, we quantified the total organic carbon (TOC) in some RCHs soils from the Marsiliana forest, a typical Mediterranean mixed oak forest where charcoal production was enduring and massive since at least the Middle Age (Costagliola et al., 2008). We determined the amount of charcoal, as both small particles in the fine earth and coarse particles in the skeleton. Finally, we made an estimate of the contribution of TOC from RCHs to the whole C stock of the forest, including biomass, dead wood, litter, and soil.

2. Materials & methods

2.1. Study area

The study area is the Marsiliana forest, in the Massa Marittima municipality, southern Tuscany, Central Italy. This forest is approximately 2600 ha wide, it is located a few km away from the sea, 150–200 m a.s.l., and experiences Mediterranean climate, with a mean annual temperature of 15.7 °C and a mean annual precipitation of 741 mm. The forest is a mature coppice dominated by evergreen oak (*Quercus ilex* L.) with ancillary presence of deciduous trees, such as *Quercus cerris* L., *Quercus pubescens* Willd, *Quercus suber* L., *Fraxinus ornus* L., *Acer monspessulanum* L., *Sorbus domestica* L., *Sorbus torminalis* L. The undergrowth is dense, dominated by *Erica arborea* L., *Arbutus unedo* L., *Phillyrea latifolia* L., and *Myrtus communis* L. The soil, which formed on a chaotic complex of scaly clays, marls, limestone, and sandstone, is loam-textured and shows an A-Bw-C sequence of horizons; it is a *Dystric Cambisol* according to the World Reference Base for Soil Resources (IUSS Working Group WRB, 2015).

The Marsiliana forest and the areas nearby were shaped through centuries by the activities related to charcoal production. Here charcoal was essential as source of energy and for metallurgy purposes (Mariotti Lippi et al., 2000). The region was extensively exploited for metal mining and smelting at least since the 1st Millennium BC under the Etruscans (Mariotti Lippi et al., 2000), or even back to the late Bronze Age (Costagliola et al., 2008 and the references therein). In the Middle Age and until the second half of the nineteenth century, the site was one of the most important centres for Fe processing (Costagliola et al., 2008). Once the mines were exhausted, charcoal production continued for domestic purposes for another century, until 1958. During that period, the forest was managed as a short-rotation coppice, cut every 15–18 years.

A 16.1 ha wide portion of the forest was selected for this study. It comprised two distinct areas in terms of aspect and forest structure: the north-oriented area (hereafter called No), about 6.4 ha wide, showing significantly taller, older, and larger evergreen oak trees than the south-oriented area (hereafter called So), about 9.7 ha wide and showing substantially similar forest composition but thicker and more tangled undergrowth (Table 1). In total, we found 35 relic charcoal hearths, 19 in No and 16 in So (Fig. 1; S1). They were easy to find because characterized by both a gap in the tree canopy and a thick, black, charcoal-rich topsoil. In spite of several decades since abandonment, at least, many of these RCHs were well preserved. All RCHs were geo-referenced, described, and mapped (Fig. 1; S1). The size of the RCHs and the thickness of their charcoal-rich top horizon were measured (S1). The latter in some cases appeared split into two, with a thin B horizon in between, which could reveal two distinct phases of charring.

2.2. Soil sampling

Four of the best-preserved RCHs were chosen for the study, two in No and two in So (Fig. 1). The choice was chiefly driven by the thickness of the black top horizon. In fact, the four selected hearths differed in the thickness of the charcoal enriched layer, so to see if such a feature could be related with some RCHs properties. The black top horizon of the selected RCHs was 13 and 24 cm thick in So, and 22 and 26 cm thick in No. The last one, below a thin Bwb horizon, had another charcoal enriched horizon 16 cm thick that, however, was not included in the sampling.

All RCHs had elliptical shape, although the woodpiles were usually built with a circular base. The elliptical shape of RCH was probably due to the procedure used for collecting the charcoal, *i.e.* dragging it away by rakes from two opposed sides of the pile across the slope (Carrari et al., 2017). We took three soil samples per RCH: one nearly from the centre of the ellipse, the other two ones along the axes, about one meter from the border of the RCH (Fig. 1). For sampling the RCHs, we removed the litter layer, and then we excavated pits approximately 20×20 cm wide and deep to the lower boundary of the black, charcoal-rich top horizon, so collecting 4 to 10 kg of soil from each pit. A single sample of "reference soil" (*i.e.*, apparently not involved by any operation related to the carbonisation process) was taken about twenty metres out of each RCH and to the same depth as the average thickness of the samples from the related RCH. In each pit, soil bulk density was determined by the "irregular hole method". Hence, the pits were filled with water poured in a graduate cylinder, using a nylon film to waterproof the walls of the pits, to measure their volume in the field. All the material from the pits was weighted after drying at 105 °C in the laboratory (Blake & Hartge, 1986). Ten samples of litter layer were randomly collected throughout the study area (five samples in No and five in So), from inside a 40×40 cm frame.

2.3. Samples analysis and macro-charcoal isolation

Soil and litter samples were oven-dried (60 °C) to constant weight. The soil samples were sieved to 2 mm to separate the fine earth (< 2 mm particles) from the skeleton. This latter was mostly composed by rock and charcoal fragments less than few cm in size. The skeleton was further separated into rock and charcoal fragments by combined floatation and hand picking. Both of them were finally dried (60 °C) to

Table 1
Main features of the north-oriented (No) and south-oriented (So) areas studied in the Marsiliana forest. Vegetation variables were inferred from the Forest Management Plan of Marsiliana, based on a field campaign performed in 2013. Double numbers refer to minimum and maximum of the range.

Study area	Surface	Hearths	Aspect	Slope	Age class of trees	Mean height of trees	Mean diameter of trees	Oak stools	Mean tree volume
	ha	n		%	years	m	cm	n ha^{-1}	m^3 ha^{-1}
No	6.4	19	NE	15–30	61–80	10–12	12–15	> 3.500	125–175
So	9.7	16	S-SE	5–20	21–30	6–10	5–10	> 3.500	50–100

Fig. 1. The investigated area at Marsiliana forest, located in southern Tuscany, Central Italy, divided in a north-oriented subarea (No) and a south-oriented one (So) (on the right), with the location of the relic charcoal hearths. The four sites in red are the sampled hearths. On the left, one of them (H_{26}), with marked the circumference and the two axes. The three sampled pits are visible. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

constant weight.

Total C in the fine earth was measured by dry combustion (by a CHNS-O mod. EA 1110, Thermo-Fisher) on about 5–15 mg of sample taken from a finely ground (ball-milled) aliquot. For determining the average C content of the coarse charcoal, three particles were randomly taken from each hearth's pit, mixed all together and pulverised. Three aliquots of the powder underwent analysis by dry combustion. The average C content of the litter layer was measured in triplicate on ground aliquots of the mix of all samples, from both No and So areas.

The total organic carbon (TOC) concentration of the RCH soil was expressed as grams of C per kg of bulk soil, hence including also the skeleton, so rich in charcoal particles. This choice based on the consideration that otherwise the substantial amount of C in form of coarse charcoal would be neglected, as the skeleton is usually discarded in soil analyses. Hence, the bulk soil TOC we refer to hereafter in the text is the sum of the OC in the fine earth – as both native uncharred OC and the < 2 mm charcoal fragments – and the OC in the coarser charcoal fragments.

2.4. Determination of charcoal in the fine earth (< 2 mm fraction)

There are several methods available in literature to evaluate the content of charcoal − here and after intended as pyrogenic carbon (PyC), a continuum of organic compounds ranging from partially charred biomass to soot (Bird & Ascough, 2012) – in soil, sediments and aerosol (Currie et al., 2002; Hammes et al., 2007; Roth et al., 2012). However, no one of them is able to account for the whole range of charcoal compounds and in fact the methods differ in terms of target region within this range (Currie et al., 2002; Hammes et al., 2007; Roth et al., 2012). We used the method proposed by Kurth et al. (2006) – in triplicate, for soils from both inside and outside the RCHs − because of its simplicity and good repeatability. This method, called "weak acid digestion" method, exploits the proneness of all organic materials except the charred ones to a H_2O_2 (30% w/w) + HNO_3 1 M treatment at 100 °C for 16–20 h, *i.e.* until evident effervescence in the solution ends, so indicating the completion of the digestion. The mass of organic carbon in the residue was assumed to be charcoal. However, Maestrini and Miesel (2017) have shown that this method unavoidably implies oxidation of some charcoal as well. Therefore, to have information about a more precise charcoal recovery, we built a calibration curve pulverising a mix of charcoal particles from all studied RCHs and combining it with pure quartz to obtain the following charcoal concentrations: 10, 20, 40, 60, 80 and 100%.

2.5. Forest carbon estimation

According to the Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (GPG-LULUCF) of the IPCC (Penman et al., 2003), forest ecosystems have five different C pools: i) above-ground biomass; ii) below-ground biomass; iii) deadwood; iv) litter; v) soil organic matter.

The sum of the above- and below-ground biomass, was estimated according to the following equation (Penman et al., 2003):

$$C_{biomass} = (V*D*BEF_2)*(1 + R)*CF \qquad (1)$$

where $C_{biomass}$ is tonnes of carbon in the whole biomass, V is the merchantable volume (m^3 ha^{-1}), D is the wood density (tonnes of dry matter m^{-3}), BEF_2 is the 'biomass expansion factor' for converting the merchantable volume into above-ground tree biomass (dimensionless), R and CF the root-to-shoot ratio and carbon-to-biomass ratios, respectively (dimensionless). The data of merchantable volume (V) was taken from the Forest Management Plan of Marsiliana, dated 2013. The other factors of Eq. (1), *i.e.* mean density (D), biomass expansion factor (BEF_2), root-to-shoot ratio (R), and carbon fraction (CF), were not available for Marsiliana. Hence, they were inferred from papers dealing with forests as similar as possible to the one studied here, *i.e.* an evergreen mixed coppice oak forest having a mean D of 0.72 Mg m^{-3} and BEF_2 of 1.45 (Vitullo et al., 2008). For the root-to-shoot ratio, we referred to a mixed coppice of evergreen oak, *Arbutus unedo,* and *Erica arborea*, with R = 0.45 (Gratani et al., 1980). The carbon fraction (CF) of biomass is a fairly constant value, 0.5 according to GPG-LULUCF (Penman et al., 2003). Finally, deadwood estimation based on the Italian National Forest Inventory (INFC, 2011).

Litter and soil C were measured. The latter was transformed from g C kg^{-1} to kg m^{-2} or Mg ha^{-1} through bulk density data.

2.6. Statistics

Data from all RCHs were treated with one-way ANOVA. To estimate a possible linear relationship between parameters, the Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated. The calibration of charcoal recovery after weak nitric acid digestion was done by a linear regression model. All statistical analyses were performed with *SigmaPlot 12.0* (Systat Software).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Charcoal hearths count and size

The No and So areas were quite different in terms of RCHs number and size, as well as thickness of charcoal-rich top horizon (see S1). In No, there were three RCHs per hectare. Their mean surface was $50.8 \pm 15.1 \, m^2$ (ranging from 25 to 77 m^2) and their charcoal-rich top horizon was 48.2 ± 18.2 cm thick (ranging from 22 to 72 cm). In So, there were two RCHs per hectare, with a surface of $30.5 \pm 7 \, m^2$ (ranging from 20 to 41 m^2) and a black top horizon 24.5 ± 10.8 cm thick (ranging from 11 to 41 cm). The higher values of these three variables in No are in line with the apparent higher productivity of this portion of the forest compared to the other one: in fact, the higher the available biomass, the higher the charcoal production.

Number and location of RCHs depend on both environmental factors − such as available biomass, slope, aspect, soil properties (Ludemann, 2003; Schmidt et al., 2016) – and human factors – such as charcoal demand and local guidelines (Schmidt et al., 2016). Therefore, RCHs density is site specific and may vary greatly from region to region. Apart from exceptional cases where RCHs were reported to amount up to 40 per hectare (Blondel, 2006), RCHs density of one or two, as in the Marsiliana forest, are usual throughout Europe (Deforce et al., 2013; Hardy et al., 2016; Ludemann, 2010; Pèlachs et al., 2009; Py-Saragaglia et al., 2017; Raab et al., 2015; Risbøl et al., 2013).

The thickness of the black, charcoal-rich top soil horizon is chiefly linked to the lifespan of the RCHs, the frequency of carbonization, and the load of woodpiles (Carrari et al., 2017). In the literature, values range from 10 to 80 cm, with mode at around 30 cm. For instance, in a survey in many forest environments in Tuscany, Italy, Carrari et al. (2017) found a mean value of the thickness of the charcoal-rich horizon of 26 cm, while in Wallonia, Belgium, Hardy et al. (2016) reported a mean value of 33.8 cm. In the Marsiliana forest, the average thickness of the top horizon was quite high in the No area, 48.2 cm, while in the So area it was much lower, 24.5 cm, which is close to the above cited values.

The mean surface area of the RCHs at Marsiliana is 30 and 50 m^2, in No and So, respectively, which falls within the range 27–56 m^2 reported by Carrari et al. (2017) for RCHs from all over Tuscany. As terms of references, Ludemann (2010) dealt with RCHs' size ranging between 50 and 113 m^2 in the German Black Forest, Pèlachs et al. (2009) with size between 64 and 95 m^2 in the Spanish Pyrenees, Raab et al. (2015) with size between 133 and 660 m^2 in Brandenburg, Hardy et al. (2016) with size between 50 and 78 m^2 in Wallonia, while the average size of the RCHs studied by Risbøl et al. (2013) in Southern Norway was 314 m^2. The relatively lower size of RCHs Carrari et al. (2017) and we measured in Tuscany compared to the above cited authors is likely due to the different supply-demand of charcoal, probably more concentrated over time in Central and Northern Europe, and to the lower productivity and/or shorter coppicing cycle in Mediterranean forests (Carrari et al., 2017; Deforce et al., 2013).

3.2. Charcoal in the fine earth: calibration of the weak nitric acid digestion method

The weak nitric acid digestion method showed good repeatability, the coefficient of variation for triplets of replicates being in the range 0.01–0.16 (data not shown). The calibration of the method revealed some intrinsic underestimation of charcoal (Fig. 2), which is consistent with the findings by Maestrini and Miesel (2017) on fresh charcoal formed at temperatures lower than 550 °C. Indeed, typically the temperatures inside the earth mounds are not higher than 450 °C (FAO, 1987). Moreover, the charcoal undergone an ageing process in soil could be more prone to oxidation compared to freshly produced charcoal (Cheng et al., 2014).

Consequently, the rough data obtained for charcoal-C in the fine

earth were adjusted according to the calibration curve, *i.e.* they were multiplied by the *a* factor of the function in Fig. 2.

3.3. Soil organic carbon stocks

Except for native uncharred C, the four RCHs analysed differed from each other in terms of all the investigated variables (*i.e.*, bulk density, fine charcoal-C, coarse charcoal-C, and TOC in fine earth and bulk soil). In particular, the RCHs with 24 cm thick top horizon in So (K_{24}) showed the highest values of TOC and total charcoal-C, both as fine and coarse fragments, compared to the other three RCHs (Table 2).

We did not find any significant correlation by the Pearson's test between the thickness of the charcoal-rich horizon and all the other investigated variables in RCHs (data not shown). In particular, contrary to our hypothesis, such thickness was not related to the concentration of the fine charcoal or the coarse one, or their sum. In addition, in the RCHs we did not find any apparent pattern in the spatial variability of the thickness of the charcoal-rich horizon or its charcoal content.

Total charcoal-C (*i.e.* the carbon from both coarse and fine charcoal fragments) ranged between 37% and 48% of TOC in RCHs (Table 2). On average, it amounted to 4.3–12.8 kg C m^{-2}, varying with the thickness of the charcoal-rich top horizon (13–26 cm). Criscuoli et al. (2014) reported much higher contributions from an alpine environment, *i.e.* 90% of TOC and 23.3 kg charcoal-C m^{-2} in a 19 cm thick top horizon. On the other hand, quite lower charcoal quantities in RCHs were measured by Borchard et al. (2014) in two forests in Germany − 4.1 and 6.7 kg C m^{-2} in a 20 cm thick top horizon − and Kerré et al. (2016) in a cropland from Belgium − 6.7 kg C m^{-2} in 23 cm thick top horizon − but in both cases charcoal in the skeleton was discarded. Actually, at our study site, the amount of coarse charcoal-C in RCHs was substantial, about 60% of total charcoal-C (calculated based on assessed average C content of coarse charcoal of 60.2%). This means that if we ignored the coarse fraction of charcoal, our results would have been similar to the ones by Borchard et al. (2014) and Kerré et al. (2016).

For each of the investigated features, we found very different values inside and outside the RCHs (Table 2). Soils inside the RCHs included less stones compared to the surroundings soils (24% *vs.* 51% of soil dry mass, respectively). Bulk density was about 26% lower inside than outside, on average, while total organic carbon (TOC) was about one order of magnitude higher inside than outside (119–151 *vs.* 11–25 g C kg^{-1} bulk soil). These differences were chiefly due to the massive presence of charcoal in RCHs, while out of them there were just minor concentrations of charcoal, limited to the fine fraction: 0.4–2.4 g charcoal-C kg^{-1} bulk soil. This finding supports no or minor drift of charcoal from the RCHs.

The difference in charcoal-C content, however, did not account entirely for the great difference in terms of TOC between the RCHs and the surrounding soil, which was due to native uncharred C as well. This latter in fact amounted to 67–78 g C kg^{-1} in RCHs (about 57% of TOC) and just to 11–22 g C kg^{-1} out of them (about 93% of TOC). Such marked difference could mean that charcoal have promoted accumulation of uncharred organic matter in RCHs and/or prevented its loss (*via* degradation or leaching). This hypothesis does not match the findings of Wardle et al. (2008), who dealt with charcoal-induced loss of forest humus in the mid-term, *i.e.* ten years, but is in agreement with the ones by several other authors in the long-term (Borchard et al., 2014; Hardy et al., 2017, Hernandez-Soriano et al., 2016, Kerré et al., 2016, 2017). In particular, Kerré et al. (2017) verified that charcoal in RCHs, in fields now cultivated with maize, actually favoured C accumulation and reduced the loss of dissolved C by adsorbing it. Hernandez-Soriano et al. (2016) suggested that charcoal might promote physical protection of uncharred organic matter within micro-aggregates. Borchard et al. (2014) found up to 3.4 times higher contents of native uncharred C in RCHs compared to the surrounding soil and advanced that charcoal entrapped native C into its pores, so ensuring protection from decay. However, we did not find a strict correlation

Fig. 2. Linear regression between charcoal-C from a mixture of pulverised charcoal particles added to pure quartz at different concentrations and charcoal-C measured after the weak nitric acid digestion method.

Table 2

Basic data of the investigated relic charcoal hearths (RCHs), the soil therein and the reference soils in the Marsiliana forest. Data for each RCH are mean values of three samples with related standard deviation. P and F values are relative to one-way ANOVA analysis between all hearths. P values in bold are smaller than 0.05.

Study area/Hearth	Thickness of top layer	Area	Bulk density	Native uncharred C	Fine charcoal-C	Coarse charcoal-C	Total charcoal-C	TOC in bulk soil	TOC in bulk soil	Total charcoal-C
	cm	m^2	$kg\,dm^3$	$g\,kg^{-1}$	$g\,kg^{-1}$	$g\,kg^{-1}$	$g\,kg^{-1}$	$g\,kg^{-1}$	$kg\,m^{-2}$	%
No area										
H_{22}	22.0	33	0.9	71.8	15.9	31.8	47.7	119.5	23.6	39.7
Standard dev.	2.6		0.0	7.1	6.2	3.7	9.9	13.9	3.8	3.9
Reference soil H_{22}	–	–	1.0	11.1	0.4	0.0	0.4	11.5	2.5	3.6
H_{26}	26.4	60.3	0.8	67.2	23.6	33.2	56.8	124.0	25.4	45.7
Standard dev.	3.3		0.0	1.7	1.5	4.3	5.8	4.2	3.6	3.1
Reference soil H_{26}	–	–	1.3	15.9	1.9	0.0	1.9	17.8	5.9	10.5
So area										
H_{13}	12.7	27.5	0.8	77.7	19.0	26.1	45.2	122.9	11.8	37.0
Standard dev.	1.3		0.1	11.7	1.4	3.5	4.9	9.3	2.5	4.9
Reference soil H_{13}	–	–	1.2	16.8	0.9	0.0	0.9	17.7	2.7	5.2
H_{24}	23.7	19.6	0.7	77.1	30.7	43.3	74.0	151.0	26.1	48.7
Standard dev.	4.3		0.0	2.3	6.8	9.0	15.9	11.5	3.5	5.1
Reference soil H_{24}	–	–	1.2	22.3	2.4	0.0	2.4	24.7	6.7	9.6
P value			**0.008**	0.293	**0.047**	**0.033**	**0.014**	**0.020**		
F value			8.18	1.476	4.170	4.862	6.684	5.935		

between native C and charcoal C in RCHs (data not shown), as other studies did (Borchard et al., 2014; Kerré et al., 2016). This could be due to a sort of "saturation effect" preventing further native SOC accumulation. In fact, Borchard et al. (2014) found that such an accumulation of native uncharred C stopped for charcoal-C content higher than 4–8 kg C m^{-2}.

3.4. Forest C pools

The merchantable volume (V) of timber was heterogeneous throughout the forest, as inferred from the Forest Management Plan of Marsiliana (Table 1). On average, V was 150 m^3 ha^{-1} in the No area and 75 m^3 ha^{-1} in So. This large difference was due to different forest productivities in the two aspects, but also to the younger age of the forest in So (Table 1). According to Eq. (1) biomass C was 113.5 and 56.8 Mg C ha^{-1} in No and So, respectively (Table 3).

Necromass C was estimated on the basis of the last Italian national forest inventory (INFC, 2011), which for this type of ecosystem

Table 3

Total organic C in the north-oriented (No) and south-oriented (So) areas in the Marsiliana forest and contributions of different C pools. The "Soil C in RCHs" (relic charcoal hearths) pool is further divided in three fractions: native uncharred C, fine charcoal C, and coarse charcoal C.

|	No area		So area	
	Mg C ha^{-1}	% of total	Mg C ha^{-1}	% of total
Forest TOC	177.1		139.3	
Biomass C	113.5	64.1	56.8	40.8
Soil C out of RCHs	49.6	28	75.4	54.1
Deadwood C	1	0.6	1	0.7
Litter C	5.4	3.1	4.6	3.3
Soil C in RCHs	7.5	4.2	1.5	1.1
Native uncharred C	4.3	2.4	0.9	0.6
Fine charcoal C	1.2	0.7	0.3	0.2
Coarse charcoal C	2.0	1.1	0.4	0.3

Fig. 3. Relative contribution of the different C pools (biomass C, as the sum of above- and below-biomass, soil C, deadwood C, litter C, and hearth soil C) of the forest in north-oriented (No) and the south-oriented (So) subareas (on the left) and distribution of the three components in the hearths' soil: native uncharred C, fine charcoal C, and coarse charcoal C (on the right).

reported 1 Mg C ha^{-1}. This value was applied to both No and So. Litter amounted to 15.2 ± 4.7 and 12.8 ± 4.4 Mg ha^{-1} in No and So, respectively, while the average C concentration in the litter was 35.7%. As a consequence, the litter C pool amounted to 5.4 and 4.6 Mg C ha^{-1} in No and So, respectively (Table 3).

According to the above cited forest national inventory (INFC, 2011) we took into account just the top 30 cm of mineral soil for calculating the soil C stock outside the RCHs. In such a calculation, the collective surface of RCHs was subtracted from the forest's total surface and the C stock of the RCHs was calculated separately for No and So. It was done multiplying the average TOC content for the average surface area of RCHs and for the average thickness of the charcoal-rich top horizon. Hence, in No, where RCHs had average surface of 50.8 m^2 and a top horizon 48.2 cm thick, they overall stored 2.5 Mg C, *i.e.* 7.5 Mg C ha^{-1} – there being on average three RCHs per hectare – while the rest of soil stored 49.6 Mg C ha^{-1} (Table 2). In So, RCHs, which had average surface of 30.5 m^2 and a top horizon 24.5 cm thick, overall stored 0.7 Mg C, *i.e.* 1.5 Mg C ha^{-1}, – there being on average two RCHs per hectare – while the rest of soil stored 75.4 Mg C ha^{-1} (Table 2).

Biomass and soil were the largest C reservoirs in the Marsiliana forest (Fig. 3). However, the No and So areas showed some major differences. In fact, in So soil stored 54% of total ecosystem C, while in No the soil contribution in terms of C was just 28%. The contribution of the litter-C to TOC was similar in No and So, about 3%, which was about 3 times higher than the estimated one of deadwood-C. The contribution of C in RCHs to total ecosystem C was substantially different in the two areas: 4.2% in No and 1.1% in So. Nonetheless, both of these values demonstrate that carbon in RCHs is a relevant pool that cannot be neglected in a C inventory.

Different forms of carbon have of course different residence time. Therefore, despite C inventories do not make any distinction in this regard, the positive contribution of RCHs as C stock is even more relevant, since charcoal has very long residence time in soil, even centuries or millennia (Schmidt & Noack, 2000). In the Marsiliana forest, such highly stable C fraction was one third of TOC in RCHs, *i.e.* 1.8% and 0.5% of ecosystem C in the No and So areas, respectively.

3.5. Significance and implications of the study

The results we obtained in the Marsiliana forest cannot be fully extended to other environments, because many factors vary from place to place and similar studies in other locations are needed. The latter have to comprise the quantification of the coarse charcoal, whose isolation from the rock fragments is neither much time consuming nor expensive.

Despite the variability of properties that hearth sites can show at local level, some features of RCHs at our study site, such as density and surface area, the thickness of the charcoal-rich horizon, and the charcoal-C stock, were not much different as a whole from the ones reported by other authors for Italy and other sides of Europe. Therefore, those forests where charcoal production was massive in the past − that is actually the case for many regions in Europe – should show a significant C stock in the RCHs. The relative contribution of such a stock to the whole C stock of the forest would show the same order of magnitude of that found at our study site, at least in those forests having comparable soil and biomass C stocks. In this regard, the mean above-ground biomass of Italian forests is 101 Mg ha^{-1}, which drops to 70 Mg ha^{-1} in the case of evergreen oak forests (INFC, 2011). These values are comparable to those of the Marsiliana forest, where the above-ground biomass amounted to 108 and 54 Mg ha^{-1} (calculated as the merchantable volume divided per the mean wood density) in No and So, respectively. Also, the soil C stocks in No and So – 75 and 50 Mg C ha^{-1}, respectively – are similar to the mean values reported by the national inventory (INFC, 2011) for the first 30 cm of soil in evergreen oak forests, *i.e.* 72 Mg C ha^{-1}, and in forests in general, *i.e.* 76 Mg C ha^{-1}.

4. Conclusions

This study proved that in the Mediterranean oak forest of Marsiliana, relic charcoal hearths are "hotspots" in terms of soil organic carbon, being even to eight times richer than the surrounding soils. A large part of soil C in the hearths is charcoal, which has long residence time, hence emphasising the positive role of these anthropogenic soils as C reservoirs. Moreover, our data suggest that charcoal promoted accumulation of native (uncharred) soil organic matter in hearths.

Although relic charcoal hearths occupied < 0.5% of the total surface of the forest, their overall contribution to the ecosystem carbon stock was definitely higher, 1.1% or 4.2% according to the aspect of the subarea investigated (north or south oriented). Such contributions are

of the order of magnitude of those of deadwood or litter. This highlights the need of taking into account charcoal hearths in local or regional inventories of terrestrial C pools.

The results of this study cannot be fully extended to other environments, being the occurrence, density, extent, thickness, and state of conservation of relic charcoal hearths site sensitive. As a consequence, future studies aimed at measuring these variables of relic charcoal hearths – as well as their charcoal content – in other sites from all around the world are welcome. They will serve to raise awareness that relic charcoal hearths deserve to be preserved as both a precious legacy of a fundamental activity of the past, throughout Europe and elsewhere, and a significant reservoir of C with long residence time in soil.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.11.036.

References

Antal, M.J., Grønli, M., 2003. The art, science, and technology of charcoal production. Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 42, 1619–1640.

Bird, M.I., Ascough, P.L., 2012. Isotopes in pyrogenic carbon: a review. Org. Geochem. 42, 1529–1539.

Blake, G.R., Hartge, K.H., 1986. Bulk density. In: Klute, A. (Ed.), Methods of Soil Analysis. Part I. Physical and Mineralogical Methods. Soil Science Society of America, Inc., Madison, WI, pp. 363–376.

Blondel, J., 2006. The "design" of Mediterranean landscapes: a millennial story of humans and ecological systems during the historic period. Hum. Ecol. 34, 713–729.

Borchard, N., Ladd, B., Eschemann, S., Hegenberg, D., Möseler, B.M., Amelung, W., 2014. Black carbon and soil properties at historical charcoal production sites in Germany. Geoderma 232–234, 236–242.

Carrari, E., Ampoorter, E., Verheyen, K., Coppi, A., Selvi, F., Ewald, J., 2016a. Former charcoal kiln platforms as microhabitats affecting understorey vegetation in Mediterranean forests. Appl. Veg. Sci. 19, 486–497.

Carrari, E., Ampoorter, E., Verheyen, K., Coppi, A., Selvi, F., 2016b. Former charcoal platforms in Mediterranean forest areas: a hostile microhabitat for the recolonization by woody species. iForest – Biogeosci. For. 9, 136–144.

Carrari, E., Ampoorter, E., Bottalico, F., Chirici, G., Coppi, A., Travaglini, D., Verheyen, K., Selvi, F., 2017. The old charcoal kiln sites in Central Italian forest landscapes. Quat. Int. 458, 214–223.

Cheng, C.-H., Lin, T.-P., Lehmann, J., Fang, L.-J., Yang, Y.-W., Menyailo, O.V., Chang, K.-H., Lai, J.-S., 2014. Sorption properties for black carbon (wood char) after long term exposure in soils. Org. Geochem. 70, 53–61.

Costagliola, P., Benvenuti, M., Chiarantini, L., Bianchi, S., Di Benedetto, F., Paolieri, M., Rossato, L., 2008. Impact of ancient metal smelting on arsenic pollution in the Pecora River Valley, Southern Tuscany, Italy. Appl. Geochem. 23, 1241–1259.

Criscuoli, I., Alberti, G., Baronti, S., Favilli, F., Martinez, C., Calzolari, C., et al., 2014. Carbon sequestration and fertility after centennial time scale incorporation of charcoal into soil. PLoS One 9, e91114.

Currie, L.A., Benner, B.A., Kessler, J.D., Klinedinst, D.B., Klouda, G.A., Marolf, J.V., et al., 2002. A critical evaluation of interlaboratory data on total, elemental, and isotopic carbon in the carbonaceous particle reference material, NIST SRM 1649a. J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. 107, 279.

De Lafontaine, G., Asselin, H., 2011. Soil charcoal stability over the Holocene across boreal northeastern North America. Quat. Res. 76, 196–200.

Deforce, K., Boeren, I., Adriaenssens, S., Bastiaens, J., De Keersmaeker, L., Haneca, K., et al., 2013. Selective woodland exploitation for charcoal production. A detailed analysis of charcoal kiln remains (ca. 1300–1900 AD) from Zoersel (northern Belgium). J. Archaeol. Sci. 40, 681–689.

FAO, 1987. Simple Technologies for Charcoal Making. Mechanical Wood Products Branch, Forest Industries Division, FAO Forestry Paper 41, Rome.

Gratani, L., Amadori, M., Veri, L., Bruno, F., Porri, M., 1980. Determinazione di un metodo di stima della biomassa nella macchia di Castelporziano (Lazio). Ann. Bot. 41, 131–151.

Hammes, K., Schmidt, M.W.I., Smernik, R.J., Currie, L.A., Ball, W.P., Nguyen, T.H.,

Louchouarn, P., et al., 2007. Comparison of quantification methods to measure fire-derived (black-elemental) carbon in soils and sediments using reference materials from soil, water, sediment and the atmosphere. Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles 21, GB3016.

Hardy, B., Cornelis, J.T., Houben, D., Lambert, R., Dufey, J.E., 2016. The effect of pre-industrial charcoal kilns on chemical properties of forest soil of Wallonia, Belgium. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 67, 206–216.

Hardy, B., Cornelis, J.-T., Houben, D., Leifeld, J., Lambert, R., Dufey, J., 2017. Evaluation of the long-term effect of biochar on properties of temperate agricultural soil at pre-industrial charcoal kiln sites in Wallonia, Belgium. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 68, 80–89.

Hart, J.L., Van De Gevel, S.L., Mann, D.F., Clatterbuck, W.K., 2008. Legacy of charcoaling in a Western Highland Rim Forest in Tennessee. Am. Midl. Nat. 159, 238–250.

Heitkötter, J., Marschner, B., 2015. Interactive effects of biochar ageing in soils related to feedstock, pyrolysis temperature, and historic charcoal production. Geoderma 245–246, 56–64.

Hernandez-Soriano, M.C., Kerè, B., Goos, P., Hardy, B., Dufey, J., Smolders, E., 2016. Long-term effect of biochar on the stabilization of recent carbon: soils with historical inputs of charcoal. GCB Bioenergy 8, 371–381.

Inventario Nazionale delle Foreste e dei Serbatoi Forestali di Carbonio (INFC 2005), 2011. Secondo inventario forestale nazionale italiano. Metodi e risultati. Ministero delle Politiche Agricole, Alimentari e Forestali; Corpo Forestale dello Stato. Consiglio per la Ricerca e la Sperimentazione in Agricoltura, Unità di ricerca per il Monitoraggio e la Pianificazione Forestale. In: Gasparini, P., Tabacchi, G. (Eds.), Edagricole-Il Sole 24 ore, Bologna, (653 pp).

IUSS Working Group WRB, 2015. World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014. Update 2015. International Soil Classification System for Naming Soils and Creating Legends for Soil Maps. World Soil Resources Reports No. 106. FAO, Rome.

Kerré, B., Bravo, C.T., Leifeld, J., Cornelissen, G., Smolders, E., 2016. Historical soil amendment with charcoal increases sequestration of non-charcoal carbon: a comparison among methods of black carbon quantification. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 67, 324–331.

Kerré, B., Willaert, B., Smolders, E., 2017. Lower residue decomposition in historically charcoal-enriched soils is related to increased adsorption of organic matter. Soil Biol. Biochem. 104, 1–7.

Kurth, V.J., MacKenzie, M.D., DeLuca, T.H., 2006. Estimating charcoal content in forest mineral soils. Geoderma 137, 135–139.

Ludemann, T., 2003. Large-scale reconstruction of ancient forest vegetation by anthracology – a contribution from the Black Forest. Phytocoenologia 33, 645–666.

Ludemann, T., 2010. Past fuel wood exploitation and natural forest vegetation in the Black Forest, the Vosges and neighbouring regions in western Central Europe. Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 291, 154–165.

Maestrini, B., Miesel, J.R., 2017. Modification of the weak nitric acid digestion method for the quantification of black carbon in organic matrices. Org. Geochem. 103, 136–139.

Mariotti Lippi, M., Giachi, G., Paci, S., Di Tommaso, P.L., 2000. Studi sulla vegetazione attuale e passata della Toscana meridionale (Follonica—Italia) e considerazioni sull'impatto ambientale dell'attività metallurgica etrusca nel VI—V secolo a.C. Webbia. 55. pp. 279–295.

Mikan, C.J., Abrams, M.D., 1995. Altered forest composition and soil properties of historic charcoal hearths in southeastern Pennsylvania. Can. J. For. Res. 25, 687–696.

Mikan, C.J., Abrams, M.D., 1996. Mechanism inhibiting the forest development of historic charcoal hearths in southeastern Pennsylvania. Can. J. For. Res. 26, 1893–1898.

Pèlachs, A., Nadal, J., Soriano, J.M., Molina, D., Cunill, R., 2009. Changes in pyrenean woodlands as a result of the intensity of human exploitation: 2,000 years of metallurgy in Vallferrera, northeast iberian peninsula. Veg. Hist. Archaeobotany 18, 403–416.

Penman, J., Gytarski, M., Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Kruger, D., Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., et al., 2003. Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme and Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Kanagawa, Japan.

Py-Saragaglia, V., Cunill Artigas, R., Métailié, J.P., Ancel, B., Baron, S., Paradis-Grenouillet, S., Lerigoleur, Émilie, Badache, N., Barcet, H., Galop, D., 2017. Late Holocene history of woodland dynamics and wood use in an ancient mining area of the Pyrenees (Ariège, France). Quat. Int. 458, 141–157.

Raab, A., Takla, M., Raab, T., Nicolay, A., Schneider, A., Rösler, H., et al., 2015. Pre-industrial charcoal production in Lower Lusatia (Brandenburg, Germany): detection and evaluation of a large charcoal-burning field by combining archaeological studies, GIS-based analyses of shaded-relief maps and dendrochronological age determination. Quat. Int. 367, 111–122.

Raab, T., Hirsch, F., Ouimet, W., Johnson, K., Dethier, D., Raab, A., 2017. Architecture of relict charcoal hearths in Northwestern Connecticut, USA. Geoarchaeology 32, 502–510.

Risbøl, O., Bollandsås, O.M., Nesbakken, A., Ørka, H.O., Næsset, E., Gobakken, T., 2013. Interpreting cultural remains in airborne laser scanning generated digital terrain models: effects of size and shape on detection success rates. J. Archaeol. Sci. 40.

Roth, P.J., Lehndorff, E., Brodowski, S., Bornemann, L., Sanchez-García, L., Gustafsson, Ö., Amelung, W., 2012. Differentiation of charcoal, soot and diagenetic carbon in soil: method comparison and perspectives. Org. Geochem. 46, 66–75.

Schenkel, Y., Bertaux, P., Vanwijnsberghe, S., Carre, J., 1998. An evaluation of the mound kiln carbonization technique. Biomass Bioenergy 14, 505–516.

Schmidt, M.W.I., Noack, A.G., 2000. Black carbon in soils and sediments: analysis, distribution, implications, and current challenges. Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles 14, 777–793.

Schmidt, M., Mölder, A., Schönfelder, E., Engel, F., Fortmann-Valtink, W., 2016. Charcoal kiln sites, associated landscape attributes and historic forest conditions: DTM-based investigations in Hesse (Germany). For. Ecosyst. 3, 8.

Vitullo, M., De Lauretis, R., Federici, S., 2008. La contabilità del carbonio contenuto nelle foreste italiane. Silvae 9, 91–104.

Wardle, D.A., Nilsson, M.-C., Zackrisson, O., 2008. Fire-derived charcoal causes loss of forest humus. Science 320, 629.

Young, M.J., Johnson, J.E., Abrams, M.D., 1996. Vegetative and edaphic characteristics on relic charcoal hearths in the Appalachian mountains. Vegetatio 125, 43–50.

Graphical abstract:

Supplementary material 1. Coordinates (datum WGS84), thickness of the charcoal enriched layer and surface of the relic charcoal hearths (RCHs) found in the north- and south-oriented study areas (No and So, respectively) at Marsiliana forest. The two latter variables were not recorded for RCHs not well preserved.

Area / RCH n.	Coordinates	Thickness of top layer cm	Surface m^2
No area			
1	N43.04384 E10.81111	35	35
2	N43.04303 E10.80952	nd	nd
3	N43.04454 E10.80862	72	77
4	N43.04373 E10.80895	40	55
5	N43.04355 E10.80960	67	68
6	N43.04427 E10.80905	22	33
7	N43.04462 E10.80900	28	34
8	N43.04460 E10.80925	63	44
9	N43.04422 E10.80802	70	62
10	N43.04460 E10.81005	67	57
11	N43.04417 E10.81040	69	42
12	N43.04397 E10.80967	39	57
13	N43.04403 E10.80882	24	25
14	N43.04352 E10.81107	45	59
15	N43.04255 E10.81075	34	32
16	N43.04388 E10.81117	46	60
17	N43.04429 E10.81084	32	57
18	N43.04415 E10.80833	nd	nd
19	N43.04338 E10.81039	69	67
So area			

1	N43.04464 E10.80613	22	33
2	N43.04147 E10.81058	19	34
3	N43.04139 E10.80880	18	29
4	N43.04404 E10.80724	38	25
5	N43.04352 E10.80748	13	27
6	N43.04318 E10.80773	19	36
7	N43.04058 E10.80948	15	41
8	N43.04208 E10.80880	41	33
9	N43.04258 E10.80832	11	20
10	N43.04265 E10.80770	24	20
11	N43.04347 E10.80842	27	35
12	N43.04183 E10.81087	35	38
13	N43.04085 E10.81070	37	25
14	N43.03938 E10.81038	11	23
15	N43.03972 E10.80907	39	40
16	N43.04469 E10.80580	nd	nd