

Parents met in Saigon esp mother side travels to east a lot, great great grandmother is Japanese. Her daughter spent most her lifetime in China - born there, lived there, married there. Mother met father while travelling in Saigon in 1954, which was why they had to leave the country, got married 2 weeks before the fall of dien bien phu. Father studied law and became a banker, raised in Dijon, the family owned both vineyard and the house in Chambolle. The big biz was in fact producing liquor - all kinds of aperitif - esp Absinthe, cassis, fortified wines, all bitter aperitif quinine etc. popular in 1920s, much less in fashion after the war. After war he decided to leave Dijon and take another direction for his career, a good decision was to sell the liquor biz and keep the vineyard. Father was born in the 1920s, lived through the war as a young man, and leased a vineyard to Faiveley (1950-1977, then to Bruno Clair till 1984) and right after the war left Burgundy. Late 20s the spirits family had purchased vineyards in Chambolle. 5 generation domaine created by great great grandfather Frederic, who created the 1st spirit business - very successful - the vineyard and the house were purchased later ~1860s - early 1900s, when it was an arguable choice to invest in vineyards due to phylloxera that destroyed the vineyards as most of the purchased happened after the phylloxera contamination, which is why for low price we bought the vineyards. The oldest bottle I had of Domaine JF Mugnier is 1915 - had in 10 years ago (2005?) - very good, surprisingly good condition. Most of time people think Bordeaux can age longer and better than Burgundy, I am really not really sure. I have many wines from 1930s that are incredibly young and fresh like babies. Obviously not every vintage/wine, but the best wines can age 100+ years.

LD: You make white wine now in the north in Nuits-St-Georges 1er Cru Clos de La Maréchale, but for a long time it wasn't made then it was made because you found some old bottles of white? Yes, the bottling was not done in Chambolle but in Dijon where all the facilities for the spirits and I suspected there are stocks of wine held in Dijon. It was only when they sold the biz in Dijon did they bring back some of the stocks to Chambolle - my cellar. So I don't have the whole range of wines/vintages, only the best wines they wanted to drink, in good quantities. So I had only one Clos de La Marechale 1943 - I had a bottle last Sunday with a visiting friend. It is not as exciting as it was 10 years ago - but after 70 years in my cellar, it was still excellent and fresh and expresses clearly a vineyard that's capable of wines that can age.

Family purchased Clos de la Marechale in NSG in Premeaux in 1902, a bit later than the Chambolle property, a sizable monopole ~10 hectares, largest 1er cru in Burgundy. Good to have large plots unlike most of the Burgundy where you small plots here and there sharing a few rows with neighbors on both sides. A large vineyard is in fact more difficult but easier to work and gives more consistent results year after year because different sections (separately?) will react differently to the weather every year and the quality is more consistent.

Father left Dijon to travel the world for other careers and leased the vineyard in Chambolle and NSG to Faiveley starting 1950 - long term - and towards the end of his life (1980), he got the vineyards back in 1977. 1977 was the end of the contract when terms have to be re-negotiated. The French law protects the farmer against the owner and the owner is not in a position to impose his conditions. Guy Faiveley (grandfather of Erwan) at the time was also a doctor?? in law of my father, they are friends from university. The renegotiation was about the renewal of the legal obligations of the contract, part of the domaines which was a piece 0.5 hectare of Clos Vougeot would become Faiveley's property and Clos de la Marechale's contract would be renewed for another 25 years. And my father was free on the Chambolle Musigny vineyard - a smart arrangement as Chambolle includes the most precious part including Musigny, Bonne Mares, more manageable not too big an investment - and a smart way to get back into the biz of making wine. He hired a registeur who made the wine and sold to negoc, as father still had a job in Paris. In 1977, my sister was 18 years old at school in Paris and father had a shop in Paris, couldn't move back to Chambolle to control the domaine do relied on one of his school friends who was Bernard Clair, Bruno Clair's father, appointed the manager for the domaine. Vinified in Chambolle by BC, sold to Jadot. Making wine in Chambolle then was a big investment as we had no equipment, takes a long time to pay for the work and expenses in the vineyard. By the time you had something to sell, you had to keep the biz working and keep the wines you made for three years before selling the wines - requires a lot of money that we didnt have so we were not able to invest quickly so we had to sell to negoc it was our only/easy option. Jadot's Chambolle La Amoureuusses???

1980/1981 mostly likely Mugnier fruit. Father passed in 1980 when I was middle east. Studied civil engineering and finished in 1979. Spent 5 years off shore on projects as a designer/construction engineer almost all in non wine drinking countries. First project in Norway when no one was drinking wine and alcoholic beverage was heavily taxed - people were preparing their own beverage from powder wine and alcohol. Next was in California, etc. Then took a sabbatical after realizing my family had this precious property and didn't take enough care of it, without knowing anything about wine except that I had participated in a few harvests in California for a few days 1980-1984. Little experience with wine drinking except at family table on Sunday tables as a kid. So definitely needed to learn - so I spent a year in Chambolle during sabbatical and by the end of it, it was clear I was not going back to engineering. What prompted the change? Total control of what you do, rewarding. Applying engineering to winemaking, two lives intersected in someway? Tried as much tech and science but soon realize it wouldn't work as the biggest difference is that

the quality of wine can not be defined in a couple of parameters, not even on a linear scale (this wine better than that), in fact a statistical question - not absolute answer and subjective. We do our best to make the best possible wines but best is not enough. What is really important is that each wine must have a personality of its own, different from any other wine, exactly the opposite in the industries. Went back during 1984 harvest with Bernard Clair, who told me what he did for years, but I had to find my own ways after all. Started in 1985, with BC who was very precious. BC retired in 2003 and passed away a few years ago.

First harvest 1985, very good quality grapes. Did what Donald (BC's vineyard working for years) had been doing, thought simple: harvest grapes, bring to fermentation vats, wait until it starts, when it ends empty the tank, press the grape skins, transfer to barrels. Frustrating looking back how it was and how good the wines were. Registered with me: it does not take a great winemaker to make a great wine, winemaking is very simple and natural when the grapes are of great quality. The grand cru vineyards are easiest to work, never freeze (except 2016), less affected by diseases - mildew, rot, etc. The greatest wines can require very little action from the winemaker, process can be kept very simple and natural. Most difficult is not making one great vintage/wine in a life, rather making good wines very year regardless of the weather/grape quality: the reason why I am most proud of the difficult vintages when I was able to make good wines. Greatest wines may have been made just by chance.

Vineyards/crus: my style must have changed, as I am doing things very different than old times. Sometimes I am surprised when people tell me that my 1985, 1986, or, 1988, were clearly my style, which I clearly changed. Sometimes I find it hard to associate my style with the way I made the wines, the details of processing my grapes. I changed from whole clusters to destemming, from hot maceration to cooler, shorter to longer, etc. it seems that there is common style that resisted all these changes. Not a mystic man no interest in esoteric things but came to term with it - must be something spiritual into the wine that dictates the style independent of treatment. Holds most truly for Musigny and Les Amoureuses perhaps they have stronger characters than characteristics from the winemaker. Like a Musigny was a parcel was sold to Drouhin whom you had been a neighbor with and Drouhin Musigny from 1988 all of the wine in terms of fruit, texture, there appears some resemblance to Mugnier Musigny, possibly because of the same vine material on both sides of the slope both planted in early 1900s (or the aspect on the slope). Appears still the case the resemblance but now the vine materials are different since Faiveley replanted the vineyard (we had no control over it). Got Marechale back in 2004 in NSG - large parcel, biggest monopole, so had to scale up (domaine X 3.5 in one day), infra changes after 20 years. Needed big space, built new fermenting room, cellar, hire a new team of 7 in 2004. Now had full control over staff of vineyard. Changed many things: pruning system - we use two systems on old vines (30+), modified the Guyot to long cane system which gives better exposure of leaves to sun, and younger vines are pruned with cordon de Guyot in all the vineyards by the same team. More debudding, and leaf removing to have a neat trellis. To have more space between shoots so that winds can flow more easily between leaves and clusters to prevent moisture thus disease. There was a period when we had to do green harvesting in most of the years: much more work, shows in wines - clarity. These methods were used in Chambolle as well, Clos de la Marechale was new, you can see the difference in wines around 2004. Green harvesting was done during earlier years now more debudding, as it's not satisfactory and I hate to do it, it's completely un-natural. It's just sometimes we really had to do it since we know if the crop is too big some grapes will not ripen properly so had to remove excess. Clearly there's a sign of vine imbalance in the vineyard: either too vigorous vines or soils too rich. Happy to see that after 2009 we had naturally low small crops. Problem now the truce will steal?? Less quantity every year. The balance in vineyard moved from excessive vigor to too little vigor. Everything we do in the vineyard takes a long time to take effect and in a way we've started our vines in 2000s and only seeing its effects now not bringing enough fertilizers to the vines. Stopped fertilizing, herbicides (early just a few years after 1985), pesticide. My philosophy is that if it's not necessary it shouldn't be done, have the expression of my vine as natural as possible. It works very well in the cellar - the less the better, not the case in the vineyard as to produce great grapes takes a lot of work. You can not let your grapes grow naturally the way they want, we have to stress them, prune them, sever leaves, a lot of work.

Took back Marechale and developed a second bottling under the old name, a village bottling where some higher yielding and young vines of Marechale went to. **2004 was the first vintage of Clos de la Marechale**, it was a challenge - wanted to get the best possible wine to offer. So decided to make a selection: not all the grapes can fit into one tank so necessarily there will be several cuvees from the same vineyard. Made a selection before bottling and used the best cuvee to make Clos de la Marechale. The other ones were bottled under the older historic name **Clos des Fourches**. The name of Clos de la Marechale only appeared in the end of 19th century, before known as CdF. It doesn't quite work that way: only best grapes to Clos de la Marechale and lesser to Clos de Fourches. So I arranged the blends from initial 9 cuvees to have two different styles than two different labels of quality. I wanted to make a CdIM that's serious structured long lived with intensity and CdF more attractive easy wine for early drinking. Only produced Clos des Fourches in a few vintages: 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008 the last vintage. All grapes went into CdIM bottling since after 2008 as more

even quality from the vineyard because young vines are 10 years older not much different than old vines and the fact we came to know the vineyard much better - every plot of the vineyard - and adapted vineyard work specific to each plot so much better quality and I found the best cuvee is always the blend of all of them. Why are there multiple monopoles in Premeaux in NSG? Dates back to beginning of 19th century when some of the monopoles were created by one man who managed to purchase small plots here and there and united them. Clos de la Marechale is bigger than others, already a monopole in 1820s appeared on the first map of Burgundy vineyard which is Cadas Neopolion?? in 1827, and it showed Clos de la Marechale exactly as it is now - same walls same house in the middle. But my neighbor Clos Arlot was considered much later around 1860s or 1670s.

Premeaux is a special sector in NSG which is an extended village from Vosne-Romanee in the north to Clos de la Marechale in the south, which is the last vineyard. The Premeaux sector in the south is totally different: we neighbors tasted a range of Premeaux monopole vineyard wines many times and interestingly showed very differently of NSG. In 19th century's books esp Lavalley's book in 1955, Clos des Fourches was mentioned as the finest in NSG when finesse was more precious than concentration. Lavalley said Clos des Fourches grapes were selling at the same price as Clos Vougeot.

Different parts of Marechale: north part planted to Chardonnay along the northside way. Three reasons: first, this is the part closest to Clos Arlot, esp the white vines of Clos Arlot and Clos Arlot Blanc is an absolutely delicious wine which I love. If it's great there it wouldn't be bad on my side of the wall. Second the soil is sandier lighter whiter than other parts of Marechale, appears more suited to Chardonnay. Third, it was planted to a very poor selection of Pinot Noir, grafting Chardonnay vines onto these was a way to get rid of the poor Pinot vines. Regarding other parts of Marechale, the soils and subsoils are relatively consistent, which surprised me as I learnt over time. When you look at it you'd think its very different than Chambolle where slopes are deeper more movement in terrain, whereas Marechale is very flat with little slope. You'd think it had deep soil with clay but in fact the clay is superficial and the bedrock is close to surface 50-60 cm under the surface, very close to what we have in most Chambolle-Musigny. Solid limestone with clay subsoil. Type of limestone interesting: orlytic?? **limestone softer and porous**, can retain water during drought. The upper layer is calcareous de rawshen?? usually used to make floor tile, very dense, not porous at all, can resist frost if used outside, well appreciated for any type of consurgen??. Inner is soft, retains water, important for quality of water. A sign of a great terrior is that it drains away excessive water during rain but also retains enough water during periods of droughts to feed the vines. That kind of subsoil is very interesting from this view. That kind of profile covers ~3/4-7/8 of Marechale. There's only a small part on southeast corner where we have deep soil - clay in some parts and sand+stone in others, that's where ancient streams used to flow.

How do wines age? It's been a progress. Now the wines age more consistently, more linearly, predictable. Don't go through steep ups and downs during first few years. Probable reasons are we get riper grapes, handle with more care, softer winemaking. We don't extract rough tannins as we used to 20/30 years ago.

Influences? In 1990s one of the great words to express great wines was concentration. Everyone was trying to make deeper wines darker color, lots of structure. Suddenly a reaction against lean sometimes diluted wines produced in 1980s, sometimes in 70s. We certainly needed some movement/changed then. I tried to some extend maybe didn't succeed. I didn't try too much to make deep wines. Used to punchdown more: in the first year did a lot of punchdown, high fermentation temperatures I progressively softened my winemaking. But in 1990s my wines were considered light and pale, certainly not the most fashionable. Feeling comfortable with my winemaking. I can accept that my wine didn't have all the qualities but it had enough to make it interesting. I am not a leader but certainly not a follower, like to do my own way. I learnt to make my wines mostly by trial and error. Done my own experiments. In early years I could change from one extreme to another opposite extreme the next year, from cold fermentation to hot maceration, whole clusters to 100% destemming, tried all directions. I am amazed when I try my old wines that it does not change so much the style over time, probably the terrior and vines are stronger than winemaker.

Vineyards: Bonne Mare + the vineyard next to it, Musigny + the vineyard next to it? My plots are in fact next to each other 200m away which in Burgundy is a long distance. Amoureuuses and Musigny are close neighbors and I used to see them as big bro/mother + child, but I realized its more complicated: location is the same the soils not very different - same profile with minor differences, the differences between the vineyards are sometimes smaller than the differences can be observed within the same vineyard so it's difficult to explain the difference between the wines with what we know of the soil. So the wines should be very similar but I find them very different: flavors can be similar - palates common but the structures are very different: Musigny very intense, deep, seamless texture whereas Amoureuuses is the opposite vibrant a succession of a different impression. Grand cru character to be **full of one thing but nuanced** like in Chambertin, La Tache, not the parcel's different as there are differences in La Tache but when it hits your palate - unified? Musigny on palate is certainly unified completely integrated, impressive, gives a hint of it's potential for aging/future greatness. Amoureuuses is the opposite: completely expressive, open, immediate successions of different sensations, vibrant, shines more than Musigny but doesn't have the same tight integrated texture. Musigny is greater but it doesn't mean Amoureuuses isn't great it has something Musigny doesn't, it has emotion, related to the kind of

fragility in wine, subtle flavors that comes one after the other, the time you picked up one flavor it's gone. Musigny is the opposite, its here, its stable. When you taste two young wines, the emotion is def on the Amoureuses side. That's why at the cellar tasting they are served next to each other whereas Bonne Mares goes before, different than what most people do putting the grand crus together. Usual practice: village, 1er cru, grand cru. I prefer to have a geological order easier to perceive the terrior logically. Usual order: Le Fuees, Bonne Mares, Amoureuses, Musigny, north to south order. The neighbors are tasted side by side Bonne Mares with Le Fuees, and Amoureuses with Musigny, similarities and differences can be better perceived. Also a vine age thing? Bonne Mares vines not as old as Musigny vines. In 1985 when I took over I quickly realized I was not satisfied with the quality of the vines in Bonne Mares so pulled out a large section - half. So Bonne Mares are mostly from young vines 1990s-2000s, almost 30 years now the oldest vines in Bonne Mares are 35 years old, makes a big difference. I've seen the quality, density, texture of wines improved in recent years very clearly. Young vines from Musigny went to Chambolle village? I don't regularly replant as a general rule esp Musigny. There is a small section in Musigny replanted in 1997 and young vines declassified Chambolle. In (my) Bonne Mares both soil types are present: terra blanche (top part) and terra rough (bottom part) of Bonne Mares. BM is my smallest vineyard, only 3-4 barrels a year so it's too small to vinify separately and it wouldn't mean much as vine ages and materials are different. Mature winemaking style: consistent way to approach vines year after year. My wines are made strictly the same way in winemaking across vineyards across quality levels - unusual in Burgundy. It's tempting for a winemaker to show skills to adapt to specificity of any vineyards in the winemaking: one could think that this plot produces grapes with less tannins thus there must be more extraction to balance the wine and less is needed in the other wine. I think its a mistake. I think its more interesting to let terrior speak without interfering so that there's chance for the winemaker to ruin the natural balance of the grapes. One of the first questions I asked myself when I started making wine: extract more in ripe or not ripe vintages? Rationales in both directions: in ripe vintages the quality of tannins is supposedly good so possible to extract more, but there's less need to extract more as there's more in the grapes. Took me a long time before making up my mind: the same way in each vintage. There was one vintage that threw me a loop on this question: 2003 the extremely hot weather, grapes were dried on the vine, sugar was high, acidity was low, totally reasonable to think you had to make wine in a totally different way than usual. Oenologist had been pushing hard for a change and many growers changed completely: picked much earlier, shorter fermentation, acidified wines. And I find now these wines are not balanced, and the ones who had enough serenity to wait for more reasonable date of harvest when the weather cools down and rain. Those who fermented the grapes as normal wrt duration and extraction no addition made the best most balanced wines. It worked in 2003 then it should work in any vintage. Since then I decided to make wines the same way very vintage with prudent evolution year after year since it's normal to try to improve but more of a slow trend rather than a revolution now I am very careful in any changes to my winemaking.

The way the fruit carries changes not in texture, not in flavor but how juicy or how much lift there it to the fruit with the vintage? There's a Mugnier style that shows regardless of vintage. What is really interesting in my wines is what I can not control, from the terrior, the place, the climate, the weather. It comes from nature and is/will be always more complex and better balanced more harmonious than whatever comes from technology I use to make the wine. Wine is contrary to an engineering project. I am the contrary to a perfume maker with a project with a style/recipe. I dont have a project with my wines I don't want them taste like something else. I see them as living beings with personalities of their own. Making wines for me is more like raising children or gardener who does not design the flowers but just take the seeds plant them there let them grow and protect them to help them develop into most beautiful flowers but he can not decide the shape of the flowers. And I am happy with the vision, which is one you can only experience after years of experience. Young winemakers have to do all the experiments in all possible ways, it's only then can you reach a point when you made a decision on what to do, what not do, and what wine to make. Winemaking is subtraction, going back to the vineyard. Not too much extraction, soft process, to extract the most delicate, no rough tannins. I don't do too many rackings, usually two: one after one year in the barrels, the second one six months after before bottling. Light toast on French wood, I don't use much new oak, which should not be noticeable in the wines, not intereted in wood - which can be attractive but not what I want to show as I am in charge some of the most precious vineyards in the world and want to express my wines as what's there in the vineyard not what I can buy whatever anyone can buy from coopers.