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* * *

The Chinese "commercial revolution" of the eleventh century was accompanied by a number of important technical developments. In the iron industry, the last major advances in blast furnace design were made. Water power was widely used for the blast, and coal and coke began to take the place of charcoal for the fuel. New blast furnace structures came into use, in some cases foreshadowing early European designs and those known from the traditional Chinese iron industry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This article reviews the available evidence on the construction and operation of iron blast furnaces in the Song and Yuan periods, with special reference to the use of mineral fuel.

Blast Furnace Excavations

Excavations of ironworks sites of the Song and Yuan periods have been reported in seven Chinese provinces.2 Of these a few are reported in sufficient detail to give us some idea of how blast furnaces in this period were built, and how they differed from what is known from periods before and after.3

1 E-mail address: DWag@alum.mit.edu; web-site: http://staff.hum.ku.dk/dbwagner.


3 For blast furnaces of the Han period see Wagner 2001a; for the traditional Chinese blast furnaces of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries see Wagner 1984; 1985; 1997.
A very large blast furnace, 6 m high, from the Song period is still standing today near Handan, Hebei. The photograph in Figure 1 was published, with a short description, in a newspaper in 1959, and has often been reproduced. In the Song this was Cizhou, a major iron-producing prefecture; statistics preserved in the Song huiyao jiaoqiao indicate that in AD 1078 Cizhou and the adjacent prefecture Xingzhou between them supplied more than 75 per cent of all quota deliveries of iron to the state.

I have heard that a major investigation of this furnace has recently been completed. Until a report is published we have very little to go on, but it seems to be rather like some of the traditional Chinese blast furnaces which are known from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Perhaps we see in Figure 1 the internal stone shaft of a furnace like that shown in Figures 2–3, without its wooden frame and tamped-earth fill. Nearby, in Anyang and Lin Counties, Henan, several other large blast furnaces have been investigated, but the results have not yet been published in detail.

**Blast Furnaces Built into Hillsides**

Song and Yuan remains of a curious type of blast furnace, built directly into a hill to obviate the need for a strong outer construction, have been reported in Henan, Jiangxi, and Heilongjiang. The only ones which so far have been described in adequate detail are some twelfth-century sites in Acheng County, Heilongjiang. Though virtually nothing is known about the place from written sources, this was clearly a major iron-production region of the Jin or

---

4 Chen Yingqi in *Guangming ribao* 光明日報, 13 December 1959. This was in a period of paper shortage in China, in which the export of newspapers was stopped, and I have not been able to find a copy in any European library.

5 E.g. Liu Yuncai 1978: 23, fig. 8; Wagner 1985: 47, fig. 24.

6 In Cizhou, 1,971,001 jin 斤; in Xingzhou, 2,173,201 jin; total quota deliveries to the state, 5,501,097 jin (ca. 1,180 + 1,300 out of 3,300 metric tonnes). See *Song huiyao jiaoqiao* 宋會要輯稿, *Shihuo* 資貨, 33: 13a, 27b; cf. Hartwell 1963: 180. Hartwell believes that these figures represent an in-kind tax of 10 per cent which was collected from one of several sectors of the iron industry. Under this assumption and several other he calculates that total annual iron production in Northern Song China was on the order of 125,000 English tons (ca. 115,000 metric tonnes, 1.2 kg per capita). Though this figure seems quite credible, Hartwell’s method is seriously flawed, as Yoshida Mitsukuni has argued, and his calculation is not reliable (Yoshida 1966: 517–23; repr. 1972: 364–70; see also Eberstein 1974: 54–55; Vogel & Theisen-Vogel 1991: 10–11, fn. 21; Wagner 2001b: 194).


Jürched state. A survey found a very large mine site, remains of housing estimated to be adequate for 1,000 workers, and more than 50 iron smelting sites spread out up to about 10 km from the mine. As the authors of the report suggest, the ironworks were no doubt spread so far from the mine in order to make more efficient use of forest resources for fuel.

Figures 4–6 show three blast furnaces found at one of the sites. This type seems to be best suited to the loess regions, with their cloven topography. At a level place above a sheer cliff a few metres high a shaft was dug, 2–3 m in depth. From the side of the cliff a horizontal tunnel was dug to the shaft and reinforced with granite slabs. The whole was lined with smaller stones, mortared with clay, then plastered with a refractory clay. A second tunnel was often dug under the bottom, probably to allow heat to escape and to alleviate cracking of the furnace bottom. In furnace operation the high heat has baked the surrounding untouched loess soil to a hard red layer up to a half metre thick.9

Presumably the shaft was completed with a stone wall at the point where the tunnel reached it, with holes provided for the blast and for tapping slag and molten iron. This wall, the weakest part of the furnace and subjected to the highest temperatures, would have been replaced often, while the rest needed only to be relined occasionally with a new layer of refractory clay.

In the Heilongjiang furnaces the height is always about 2–3 m, with a rectangular shaft having cross-sectional dimensions ranging from 50 to 80 cm. These are very small, and perhaps had the same operating characteristics as the later "dwarf" furnaces, such as those of Dabieshan.10 They would be best suited to small-scale production in isolated regions, and it is a surprise to see them in use in a large-scale iron-production region like that in Heilongjiang; perhaps future research into the channels by which technology was transferred between the Song and the Jin will produce an explanation.

At an ironworks site near Anyang, Henan, believed to have been in operation from the Song through the Ming period, three much larger blast furnaces of the same type have been excavated. These are 2.4 – 4 m in diameter, and the incomplete remaining height of each is about 4 m.11 We must hope that more will be published on these in the near future.

---

This type of blast furnace appears to be mentioned, very briefly, in the famous seventeenth-century technical compendium *Tiangong kaiwu*. This is the suggestion of Li Xiaoping (1995: 110). The sentence in question can be translated,

... The [iron smelting] furnace is often made in a pit at the side of a mountain; or else it is encompassed using a framework of heavy timbers ...

其爐多傍山穴为之，或用巨木匡圍。12

Some published translations ignore the mention of a pit (*xue* 穴) here.13 One translator gives instead, "It is generally located near the mine, and sometimes made with a frame of heavy timbers ...".14 This is a possible translation, and takes the "pit" into account, but in the light of the archaeological material Li Xiaoping’s interpretation fits better into the context.

### Evidence for the Use of Mineral Fuel in Iron Smelting

The Northern Song period saw a crisis in the supply of wood for fuel and the widespread use of mineral coal. It was used both in domestic heating and in industry, including the iron industry.15

There are some signs to indicate that coal may have been used in iron smelting as early as the fourth century AD, when the Buddhist traveler Daoan reported of a place in modern Xinjiang:

At a mountain 200 li 里 north of Quci 屈茨16 there is at night a blazing light, in the daytime only smoke. People take the stone coal (*shitan* 石炭) of the mountain to smelt the iron of the mountain, reliably filling the needs of the Thirty-Six States [i.e. the Western Region].17

14 Li Chiao-ping 1980: 351.
16 Modern Kucha (Kuche 庫車), Xinjiang; see Feng Chengjun & Lu Junling 1980: 55.
But this is the only mention before the Song, when we suddenly have many references. Both the fuel crisis and the new use of coal in iron smelting are clear in a famous poem, "Stone coal", by Su Shi 蘇軾18

Earlier there was no stone-coal in the city of Pengcheng. It was only in the twelfth month of the first year of Yuanfeng [January, 1079] that someone was sent to investigate in the southwest of the prefecture [Xuzhou 徐州]. North of Baituzhen 白土鎮 they smelt iron with it and make extraordinary weapons "to pierce rhinoceros hide".

[The city:]
Didn’t you see her,
Last winter, when travellers were stopped by the rain and snow,
And city-dwellers’ bones were torn by the wind?
With a half-bundle of damp firewood, "bearing her bedding at dawn".19
At twilight [again] she knocked on the gate, but no one wanted her trade.

[The coal mine:]
Who would have thought that in those mountains lay a hidden treasure,
In heaps, like black jade, ten thousand cartloads of coal.
Flowing grace and favour, unknown to all.

[The blast furnace:]
The stinking blast – zhenzhen 隆隆 – disperses;
Once a beginning is made, [production] is vast without limit.
Ten thousand men exert themselves, a thousand supervise.
Pitching ore into the roiling liquid makes it even brighter,
Burning jade in the molten metal, its vigorous potency.

[The region:]
In the Southern Mountains, chestnut forests can now breathe easy;
In the Northern Mountains, no need to hammer the hard ore.

19 The woman is selling her body to obtain firewood. The phrase bao qin chou 抱衾裯 comes from Xiaoxing 小星, "Little stars", ode no. 21 of the Book of Odes. Two concubines, "carrying in their arms their coverlets and chemises", stand in the early dawn, watch the stars disappear, and compare their lot to that of their lord’s principal wife. See Karlgren 1950: 12–3; Karlgren 1942–6: 104. In the next line qiao men 敲門, "knocking on the gate", can also mean "dowry".
They will cast you a sword of a hundred refinings,  
To chop a great whale of a bandit to mincemeat.

彭城舊無石炭，元豐元年十二月，始遣人訪獲於  
州之西南，白土鎮之北，以冶鐵作兵，犀利勝常云。  
君不見前年雨雪行人斷，城中居民風裂肝，溫薪  
半束抱衾裯，日莫敲門無處換。豈料山中有遺  
寶，磊落如壑萬車炭。  
流膏迸乳無人知，陣陣腥風自吹散。恨苗一發浩  
無際，萬人鼓舞千人看。投泥潑水愈光明，爛玉  
流金是精悍。  
南山栗林漸可息，北山頑礦何勞鑄。為君鑄作百煉  
刀，要斬長鯨爲萬段。

There is other text-based evidence as well,20 but this poem inspires confidence  
that the author had actually seen a blast furnace fuelled with coal or coke, heard  
the zhenzhen of the bellows, smelled the sulphurous smoke, and seen the  
glowing molten metal being tapped.21  

There is also evidence from chemical analyses of artefacts: high sulphur  
levels, which strongly suggest the use of coal in smelting, are found in numerous  
iron artefacts of the Song period.22  

More definite evidence is provided by radiocarbon dating of the carbon in  
three cast-iron artefacts of the Song and Yuan periods.23 These give dates of  
11,540, 12,400, and 13,840 years b.p. (before present) respectively. Clearly  
these much-too-early dates indicate that some of the fuel used in the production  
of the artefacts was mineral coal (with effectively infinite age). Qiu Shihua and  
Cai Lianzhen calculate that the blast furnace in which the iron was produced was  
charged with a mixture of three-tenths charcoal and seven-tenths coal.24 This is  

---

20 See e.g. Hartwell 1963: 61–72; Hartwell 1967a: 118ff; Wang Ling 1982; Hua  
21 It is perhaps possible that he had merely heard a vivid description, but in any case  
the blast furnace is instantly recognisable.  
quite possible, but it must be remembered that another furnace was also involved: a cupola furnace was in all probability used to remelt the pig iron from the blast furnace in order to cast the artefacts. It is at any rate certain that mineral fuel was used in at least one of the furnaces. The sources above, together with consideration of the organisation and economics of iron production in the period (discussed in Wagner 2001b), suggest that mineral coal was very likely to have been used in the large-scale blast furnaces. Cupola furnaces use far less fuel than blast furnaces, and remelting and casting was probably done in smaller-scale local foundries. These would have been more likely to use charcoal, a much more convenient fuel, as long as local ecological conditions permitted.

The question to be asked now is what problems were involved in the change from charcoal to coal, and how these problems were solved. There is no straightforward way of answering this question, for we do not have, for any period, the sort of technical evidence – written or archaeological – which is needed. But we shall see that in any case the problems were not all purely technical.

One way of using coal in iron smelting is the crucible smelting process, used in Shanxi in recent centuries. At present, however, there is no reliable textual evidence of the use of this process as early as the Song, and no material evidence at all.

On the other hand, since there is no doubt that coal or coke was used in blast furnaces, we can learn something by looking briefly at the transition from charcoal- to coke-fuelled blast furnace operation in Britain and America from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century.

26 A number of writers have assumed that crucible smelting was the earliest iron smelting process used in China, but there has never been any real evidence for this view. Needham 1958: 14; Wertime 1961: 48; Hartwell 1963: 71–2; Hartwell 1967a: 119.
Digression: The Early Use of Mineral Fuel in English Iron Smelting

The first economically successful use of coal in iron smelting in the West was by Abraham Darby at Coalbrookdale, in Shropshire. Here, at the Ironbridge Gorge Industrial Museum (a marvellous open-air museum covering many acres), visitors today can see the remains of Darby’s blast furnace, with a sign informing them that on this spot, in 1709, the Industrial Revolution began.

Before Darby a number of other entrepreneurs had attempted to use coal or coke in iron smelting. One simple method which may have been used very early on was to mix small amounts of coal or coke into the charcoal charged into the blast furnace.28

The first person to claim success in smelting iron with mineral fuel alone was Dud Dudley (1599–1684), in his Metallum Martis of 1665. The consensus of metallurgical historians today appears to be that he did succeed in producing iron with coal; but he was certainly not an economic success, presumably because his iron was of inferior or unreliable quality.29

Another early pioneer was Prince Rupert (Rupprecht von der Pfalz, 1619–82), a cousin of Charles I and a member of the Royal Society.30 His experiments with the use of coal in iron smelting were reported by Erik Odhelius (1661–1704), one of Sweden’s most important metallurgists, who visited England in 1686 and 1691–2.31 Odhelius’ manuscript report on the European metals industries is still extant, but has never been published. Brief extracts from his description of Rupert’s experiments are found in Emanuel Swedenborg’s De

28 Birch (1967: 26) notes an agreement of 1728 among Yorkshire ironmasters which explicitly takes such a practice into account. He sees this only as providing for "a possibility for the future", but the wording of the agreement makes it seem more like a well-known existing practice.

29 On the recent more positive view of Dud Dudley, see especially Morton 1966; Morton and Wanklyn 1967. Negative evaluations are e.g. Ashton 1925; Mott 1935; Gale 1979: 16–18; Gille 1946: 101.

30 Patrick Morrah’s biography of Prince Rupert has a chapter on his scientific and technical accomplishments (1976: 387–99), with numerous references to archival sources, but he does not mention the iron smelting experiments. Other biographies, including that in the Dictionary of National Biography; barely mention the technical side of his career. It is interesting to note that in the English Civil War, Dud Dudley held a commission in the regiment of Rupert’s brother, Prince Maurice (DNB, 6: 100; Morton & Wanklyn 1967: 62).
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Ferro of 1734 and in the report of a Swedish Royal Commission in 1744. The latter reads:

More than 50 years ago, in the blast furnaces of Sussex, Prince Robbert [i.e. Rupert] attempted to smelt iron ore with stone coal, but he was unsuccessful, for the furnace became fouled with tar, and the iron was so brittle from sulphur that it was necessary to give up. Later, at the Coalebrooksdal [sic] works, the art of blast furnace operation with stone coal as if it were charcoal has been fully accomplished. However there have still been problems: first, that the stone coal does not draw [i.e. smelt] as much as half the ore that charcoal does, or rather, the proportion of the iron which it steals through its large sulphur content; and, second, that the iron which remains cannot be used in the forge, except in a small quantity together with good iron, if it is to be useful. On the other hand it is said to lend itself fairly well to all kinds of foundrywork.

Time will tell whether this art can be brought to a higher level. The Commission believes, however, that it is not really possible, because of the great enmity between iron and sulphur which cannot be removed against their nature.

It is curious that Rupert’s experiments should have been conducted in Sussex, where charcoal was plentiful and coal not available; but in the seventeenth century it was here (in the forested region known as The Weald) that most of England’s blast furnaces were located. Presumably the choice of venue was determined by the presence of a cooperative ironmaster.

Prince Rupert’s trouble with tar fouling the blast furnace suggests that he used raw bituminous coal rather than coke, and the same may have been the case in Dud Dudley’s earliest experiments. Use of raw coal can also lead to serious problems of "scaffolding", in which parts of the furnace burden adhere to the

---

32 Swedenborg 1734, § 12, p. 158; 1762: 96–7; Sjögren 1923: 190.
33 See fn. 43 below.
34 The Commission’s complete report on the European iron industry is published in Anon. 1918; the passage translated here is on p. 135.
36 Riden 1994: 16. Peter King informs me that, while this statement concerning the number of blast furnaces is probably correct, the iron industry of The Weald was in decline by the 1670’s and was of little importance in the eighteenth century (personal communication, 10 March 2000).
furnace wall and build up, then suddenly fall, sometimes with disastrous results.  

Bituminous coal is (to make a long story very short) a polymer of large and complex hydrocarbons, typically about 75 per cent carbon. The "coking" of bituminous coal is (like the charring of charcoal) a process of pyrolysis (destructive distillation) which can provide useful organic distillates (coal tar) as well as the coke, which is typically over 90 per cent carbon. Traditionally coke was made by a process very like the charring of charcoal, and both processes were seen as "the burning away of impurities". In the respective modern processes the pyrolysis uses a less expensive and more manageable heat source than the coal or wood being distilled.

Coke is preferred to bituminous coal in both domestic and industrial applications because it "burns clean": the combustion products do not smell of sulphur, and do not contain heavy hydrocarbons which muck up furnaces and flues and pollute the air.

Anthracite, or "smokeless coal", is a kind of coal in which the geological processes which turn vegetable matter into coal have proceeded much farther, so that it contains over 90 per cent carbon and not more than a per cent or two of hydrogen. It cannot be coked, and for most purposes does not need to be. Because of its very low reactivity it is difficult to use in a blast furnace.

Coke was used in England in a variety of applications – including copper- and lead-smelting – from the early seventeenth century, and it appears to be certain that Abraham Darby used coke rather than coal in his blast furnace. Coke is less reactive than charcoal, and therefore requires a higher temperature in the blast furnace. This in turn means greater fuel consumption and a larger volume of blast. The coke-fuelled furnace burden is less permeable, so that a greater blast pressure is also required. The greater fuel consumption shows up clearly in Darby’s account books, and the need for greater blast volume and

---

39 This introduction to the chemistry of coal is based especially on Grayson 1985: 285–9; Mott 1936; Percy 1861: 78–107, 144ff; Pitt & Millward 1979; Rehder 1987; 1998; Rosenqvist 1974: 223–7; Rostoker & Bronson 1990: 66–9.
40 Yates 1974.
41 Mott 1959a; Rehder 1987; 1998.
42 Technical studies of blast-furnace operation (summarised in Wagner 1997: 22–3) indicate that there is a "zone of relatively constant temperature" midway up the furnace shaft. The equilibrium temperature for the reactions which proceed in this zone is directly dependent on the reactivity of the fuel. In modern blast furnace practice high temperatures are desirable, and efforts are made to control the reactivity of the fuel.
43 Rehder (1987; 1998) gives a lucid discussion of these points, in part based on records of nineteenth-century blast furnace operations which often shifted back and forth among different fuel types as prices changed. Here the fuel and air requirements using coke were each almost twice the requirement when charcoal was used.
pressure can be seen in the considerable efforts made at Coalbrookdale to increase the available water power.

The remark about foundrywork in the Swedish report points up the most important reason for Abraham Darby’s success: he was an honest Quaker, and a better businessman than Dud Dudley and the others. He did not make extravagant claims for his iron, but used it in the humble applications for which it was suited. His pig iron undoubtedly contained too much sulphur to be an appropriate raw material in wrought iron production, but it is likely to have been an excellent iron for making castings. The higher temperature in the blast furnace led to a higher silicon content in the iron, so that it became possible to make thin grey-cast iron products. And it happens that the local ore contains a good deal of manganese, which combines with sulphur and renders it harmless in cast iron. Darby’s ironworks became famous for the production of large thin-walled iron pots; they were superior in use to thicker pots and were much more economical, because they used less, and cheaper, iron.

On the other hand the "red shortness" (brittleness at high temperatures) caused by sulphur in wrought iron and steel is not affected by manganese, and the production of wrought iron required pig iron with low sulphur. The solution to the problem – more limestone in the blast furnace charge – was and is simple enough in principle, but took some time to discover and longer to exploit. Limestone (CaCO$_3$) has two functions in a modern blast furnace: as a flux, adjusting the melting point of the slag to a practicable temperature, and as a desulphuriser, removing sulphur to the slag through the reaction S + CaO + C = CaS + CO. The quantity of limestone used in early blast furnaces was normally too small to have much effect on sulphur, but that was unimportant in charcoal-fuelled blast furnaces. At some time it was discovered that more limestone could help with the sulphur problem in coke-fuelled blast furnaces, but the amounts required raised the melting point of the slag considerably. The essential problem in removing sulphur from pig iron was thus the attainment of still higher temperatures in the blast furnace. The use of coke had already raised the temperature of the furnace, but not yet enough. Abraham Darby’s pig iron was not used as raw material for wrought iron production until after the installation of a Newcomen steam engine to increase the water power for the blast furnace, making much higher temperatures possible.\footnote{Wagner 1997: 22–3.} \footnote{Rehder 1987: 42–3; 1998: 31–2.}
Mineral Fuel in Song–Yuan Iron Smelting

What does this digression into 18th-century Shropshire tell us of the technical possibilities available to Song and Yuan blast furnace operators? As the radiocarbon studies suggest, they may have mixed some coal or coke into the charcoal charged into the blast furnace. This would have meant a saving of charcoal and some reduction of overall fuel reactivity, leading to an increase in operating temperature and a modest increase in the silicon and sulphur contents of the pig iron produced.

A nineteenth-century blast furnace in southern Hunan (just south of Leiyang 李陽) which seems to have been fuelled with raw bituminous coal is described by von Richthofen. It was 6 m high, with a sandstone shaft, wooden outer frame, and stamped earth in between. The bellows was driven by three men. Richthofen's description of the physical appearance of the fracture of the pig iron produced suggests that it was probably fairly high in sulphur; nevertheless the pig iron was fined to wrought iron, which was sold.

This example shows that a blast furnace of a type known from the Song period could be operated with bituminous coal as fuel, though we do not know how the technical problems, discussed above, were solved. The mention in Su Shi’s poem of the "stinking blast" (xingfeng 露風) suggests the smell of hydrogen sulphide, an indication perhaps that coal rather than coke was used in this blast furnace – though we should not base too much reasoning on a single line in a poem.

Rostoker and Bronson (1990: 66), discussing the same question, point to some traditional Chinese blast furnaces which were wide-mouthed and shallow. In such furnaces, they suggest, the problems of aggregation and scaffolding would have been much less severe than in the more usual type of blast furnace. They refer specifically to an illustration of a seventeenth-century blast furnace given by Song Yingxing 陳應星 in his Tiangong kaiwu 天工開物. The text does not tell us what fuel was used here, but it is interesting that Song Yingxing never mentions coke, and may not have known of it. On the other hand a very

47 Some similar furnaces, in operation in Hunan and Sichuan in 1958, are shown in Figures 2–3.
49 Hartwell (1963: 69) suggests that Song Yingxing describes the making of coke from coal in chapter 11 of Tiangong kaiwu (Zhong Guangyan 1978: 288–92). Perhaps this hypothesis is inspired by the fact that the passage entitled "Coal" (meitan 煤炭) occurs in a chapter on "Calcining" (fanshi 煉石), but it is difficult to sustain when one
similar early twentieth-century blast furnace in central China, shown here in Figure 7, was fuelled with coke, and many other traditional blast furnaces of somewhat similar shape were fuelled with charcoal.

The use of coke for various purposes was known from early times in China. The earliest reference to it is from the early fourth century AD, and Hartwell points to two clear references to its use in the Song specifically in iron smelting. Coke was also the fuel used in a number of traditional Chinese blast furnaces in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and it seems likely that this was the commonest fuel for those Song blast furnaces which did not use charcoal.

... The Song blast furnaces which we know of were large shaft furnaces, sometimes with an unusual construction, but with a familiar internal form, and the lessons learnt in our discussion of English coke-fuelled blast furnaces should hold for these. The transition from charcoal to coal or coke would have required higher temperatures and, therefore, a larger fuel consumption and greater blast volume and pressure. This may have been a major reason for the new emphasis on water power in iron smelting in the Song. Those furnaces which were constructed by digging into the ground must have had much better thermal insulation than the free-standing furnaces with which we are more familiar, and this may have reduced the blast requirement to some extent.


50 Lux 1912.
52 Letter from Lu Yun to his brother, Taiping yulan, ch. 605: 5a, translated by Peter J. Golas in Needham 1999: 193–4; see also Read 1940: 125–6.
55 It has sometimes been suggested that the coking process may have been forgotten after the Song, perhaps because Song Yingxing does not mention it (Elvin 1975: 91); but various entirely traditional methods were in use in the early twentieth century, and there is no reason to suppose that the process was forgotten and reinvented. Cf. Lux 1912; Woo 1906.
The pig iron produced probably contained a high level of sulphur, unless the effectiveness of limestone as a desulphuriser was understood and applied. But this use of limestone would have necessitated even higher temperatures, and an even more powerful blast. With human-powered bellows, or with the light undershot water-wheels which seem to have been the rule in Song China, it seems doubtful that the necessary temperatures for desulphurisation were reached. It is important to keep in mind that I am guessing here: the question cannot be answered with confidence until slag analyses become available from relevant blast furnace sites.

Sulphur levels even as low as 0.1 per cent make wrought iron or steel almost unusable. Therefore, if effective desulphurisation was not practised in the coal- or coke-fuelled blast furnace, their product was probably not used as raw material for making wrought iron, but was used in foundrywork.

In an iron foundry, on the other hand, the higher silicon content which we should expect in pig iron from a coal- or coke-fuelled blast furnace would normally be an advantage, reducing bubbles in the casting and making a grey-cast structure more likely. The higher sulphur content would not necessarily be a disadvantage. If there is approximately twice as much manganese as sulphur in the iron, the two combine to form harmless microscopic inclusions of manganese sulphide (MnS) (e.g. Angus 1976: 20). Even without manganese, the only important effect of sulphur in cast iron is to encourage a white-cast structure, which is very hard and brittle. In many applications, white-cast iron is fully acceptable or even superior to grey-cast.57

We do not know whether the Song iron smelters ever used wide-mouthed shallow blast furnaces like the one illustrated in Tiangong kaiwu, or the one in Figure 7, and in any case we know next to nothing about the technical characteristics of such furnaces. They are so different from modern blast furnaces that we cannot assume that any of our modern knowledge of blast furnace operation holds, regarding temperatures, blast requirements, or the silicon and sulphur contents of the pig iron produced. In this situation of double ignorance there is nothing to do but to leave the question of this type of furnace on one side and hope for future enlightenment.

57 Massari 1938; Rostoker et al. 1984; Wagner 1993: 345.
Concluding Remarks

A charcoal iron industry does not inevitably cause deforestation. This depends very much on the long-term strategies of the ironmasters, and the extent to which they are able to defend their forest resources from other users of fuel; there are numerous examples in Chinese history of successful forest conservancy over generations.58 The problem in all charcoal iron production is that, even with the best possible forest management, there is a definite upper limit on sustainable iron production per unit area of forest land. To produce more, it was necessary either to start up elsewhere or to find an alternative fuel. Both alternatives seem to have been tried in response to increasing demand in the Song: iron production increased in the heavily-forested south, and coal came into use in the north. The details of these developments are not clear from available sources, but in broad outline this seems to be what occurred.

If it is true, as I have suggested above, that pig iron from coal- or coke-fuelled blast furnaces was not suitable for conversion to wrought iron, then the new fuel could not replace charcoal, but could serve as a supplement in the production of cast-iron products to fill a growing demand. A shift seems to be visible in the Song and Yuan away from the use of cast iron implements in favour of the use of wrought iron,59 but in a time of population growth and expanding and intensifying agriculture, there surely remained a considerable market for cheaper cast-iron implements. Demand must have been growing for numerous other cast-iron products as well, for example pots of all sizes, from ordinary cooking pots to enormous salt-boiling cauldrons. Iron coins, too, were made of high-sulphur cast iron.60 I have been focusing here on the 11th century; a century later the precipitation method of copper production demanded large quantities of cheap iron, which could no doubt have been supplied by coal- or coke-fuelled blast furnaces.61

59 For example the iron artefacts found in a Yuan shipwreck are mostly of wrought iron, except a few for which cast iron is technically a more appropriate material. Zhu Jinsheng 1978; Anon. 1978a.
60 Analyses of 39 Song iron coins reported by Michael L. Wayman in a forthcoming article show sulphur contents from 0.15 to 2.05 per cent. Even the lowest of these is remarkably high. On the iron coinage of the Song period see e.g. Hartwell 1967b; L. S. Yang 1952: 27–9.
61 Peter J. Golas in Needham 1999: 370–86.
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