

## The impact the collapse of the Habsburg Monarchy

By Michaela and Prof. Dr. Karl Vocelka (Article from: “Wine in Austria: The History”)

The end of the First World War in 1918 produced profound consequences for Central Europe, affecting every sphere of activity within the region, ranging from high-level political decisions to the everyday lives of the inhabitants. The outcome of the ‘great seminal catastrophe of this (20<sup>th</sup>) century’ (George F. Kennan) had long-term consequences, which endure to the present day. The Second World War of 1939–1945, the Cold War that persisted in Europe until 1989, as well as the creation and expansion of the European Union are all inseparable from developments that occurred during and immediately after the Great War. A significant influence was also exerted – in an international context – on viticulture in Austria, which provides us with our current subject. This was brought about by a new world order of nation states, including the establishment of the Republic of German-Austria on 12 November 1918, on territory formerly ruled by the Habsburg Monarchy.

Although the dissolution of the multinational Habsburg Empire had begun before the end of the war, a final line was not drawn until two peace agreements were concluded in the Parisian suburbs in 1919. The borders of the new Republic of Austria were set out in the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye on 10 September 1919.<sup>1</sup> The country’s border with Hungary was established by the subsequent Treaty of Trianon in 1920.<sup>2</sup> The victorious powers forbade the planned union with Germany and prohibited use of the name *German-Austria*. Many of Austria’s German-speaking areas now came under the rule of neighbouring countries.

The new demarcation in Central Europe, which caused Austria’s borders to be redrawn and conceded territory to adjacent states, also had an impact on viticulture. This issue was, however, accorded very little consideration at the time. Article 227 of the Treaty of St.-Germain, for example, makes only one explicit reference to wine. It states that Austria ‘is obliged to respect any law defining or regulating the right to any regional appellation concerning wine or spirits’

---

<sup>1</sup> State Law Gazette No. 303/1920,

<https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=1000044>, cf. Ackerl, Isabella/Neck, Rudolf (Eds.): Saint-Germain 1919 (Vienna 1989) Article 27.

<sup>2</sup> Romsics, Ignác: Der Friedensvertrag von Trianon [*The Peace Treaty of Trianon*] (Herne 2005), <http://www.versailer-vertrag.de/trianon/index.htm>.

and that ‘the importation, exportation, manufacture, distribution, sale or offering for sale of products or articles bearing regional appellations inconsistent with such law or adjudication shall be prohibited by the Austrian Government.’<sup>3</sup>

The peace agreements concluded after the First World War gave rise to the division of Tyrol. The southern part of the state (today South Tyrol or Alto Adige) was awarded to Italy despite the fact that most of its population was German- or Ladin-speaking, meeting a demand laid down by Italy when it entered the war on the side of the Entente Powers in 1915.<sup>4</sup> Austria thus lost one of the monarchy’s traditional winegrowing regions. Wine production in the Vintschgau, in the area surrounding Meran/Merano, in the Überetsch district, in the environs of Terlan/Terlano, near Lake Kaltern, in the Eisack Valley and in the Bozen/Bolzano region supplied (and continues to supply) high-quality white wines (Pinot Grigio, Chardonnay, Weissburgunder, Sauvignon Blanc and Gewürztraminer). There are also fine reds (indigenous grape varieties include Vernatsch and Lagrein; Kalterersee and St. Magdalener are well-known wines).<sup>5</sup>

Although claimed by the SHS-State (the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) and despite the fact that it was partially inhabited by Slovenes, “Unterkärnten” (Lower Carinthia) remained with Austria following a plebiscite which took place on 10 October 1920.<sup>6</sup> However, since there was virtually no viticulture in Kärnten at the time, this border issue is of no significance to our presentation.

The demands made by the SHS State regarding Styria turned out to have a far greater material influence on winegrowing. The disputed region was and remains home to a number of important wine villages (which are nowadays located in Slovenia) such as Jeruzalem, for example, which was founded by knights returning from the Crusades in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. It is situated between winegrowing regions surrounding Friedau/Ormož and Luttenberg/Ljutomer, which were already

---

<sup>3</sup> State Law Gazette No. 303/1920, Article 227.

<sup>4</sup> Extensive literature is available on this subject, such as Gruber, Alfons: *Geschichte Südtirols. Streifzüge durch das 20. Jahrhundert [History of South Tyrol. Forays through the 20<sup>th</sup> century]* (Bozen/Bolzano 5<sup>th</sup> edition 2011).

<sup>5</sup> Huyn, Hans/Frass Hermann (Eds.): *Weinland Südtirol [Wine region of South Tyrol]* (Stuttgart et al. 1985).

<sup>6</sup> Fräss-Ehrfeld, Claudia: *Geschichte Kärntens 1918–1920. Abwehrkampf-Volksabstimmung-Identitätssuche [History of Carinthia 1918-1920. Defensive struggle- Referendum- Search for an identity]* (Klagenfurt 2000).

well known and highly prized prior to 1918. Gorca, which lies around sixty kilometres to the south of the Austrian-Slovenian border, is one further well-established wine village in *Štajerska Slovenija*, where Furmint and Sauvignon Blanc are the favoured varieties.<sup>7</sup> Today, Slovenia produces around one million hectolitres of wine, two thirds of it white.

The so-called “Untersteiermark” (Lower Styria) – the area between the lower part of the Mur River and the upper stretch of the Save – was lost by Austria to the SHS State (from 1929 Yugoslavia) as a result of the Treaty of St.-Germain.<sup>8</sup> Although the region was largely inhabited by Slovenes, German-speaking populations predominated in towns such as Marburg/Maribor and Pettau/Ptuj. Because ethnic divisions had proved to be extremely unclear and an approach based on national principles could not be adopted, watersheds were initially used to define borders. Indeed, the same procedure was also followed with regard to Italy. ‘The intention, therefore, was not to use division according to language to create a political border. The confluence of the two languages did not permit any line to be drawn that was appropriate to the actual situation. Wherever such a border was created, some landowners would find their property located on both sides.’<sup>9</sup>

Some municipalities, such as Glanz, Leutschach and Schlossberg, were initially claimed by and awarded to the SHS State. The crucial determination was made in August 1919 and involved ‘painstaking work on a farmstead-by-farmstead basis [...] to define the border in all places where it was not delineated by the River [Mur]. Many dramatic – and frequently traumatic – family stories are told about this border demarcation.’<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. <https://www.gross.at/>, <http://www.suedsteiermarkwissen.com/der-grenztisch/>.

<sup>8</sup> Much of the literature on this topic is ideologically suspect. Perhaps the best source is Heppner, Harald (Ed.): *Slowenen und Deutsche im gemeinsamen Raum: neue Forschungen zu einem komplexen Thema [Slovenes and Germans in a common space – new research into a complex topic]* (Munich 2002).

<sup>9</sup> Konrad, Helmut: *Die schmerzhafteste Teilung der Steiermark [The painful division of Styria]*, in: *Kleine Zeitung* of 8 March 2018 ([https://www.kleinezeitung.at/oesterreich/5384523/1918\\_Die-schmerzhafteste-Teilung-der-Steiermark](https://www.kleinezeitung.at/oesterreich/5384523/1918_Die-schmerzhafteste-Teilung-der-Steiermark)).

<sup>10</sup> Konrad (see note 9)

About 30,000 hectares of vineyards formerly located in Styria were ceded to the SHS State as a result of the division of Austria and Slovenia.<sup>11</sup> However, many Styrian winegrowers also possessed vineyards on the other side of the border. During the inter-war years, the high import duties placed on agricultural products provided a particular challenge for these dual owners. In the Second World War, Slovenian Štajerska was once again designated as »Untersteiermark« by the National Socialist rulers. Slovenian names were Germanised in an attempt to create cultural hegemony. 50,000 people became forced labourers, and many Slovenes living in the region were murdered in concentration camps.<sup>12</sup> Understandably, the prevailing mood at the border after 1945 was less than cordial. Nevertheless, contacts between residents and winegrowers on both sides remained intact. Weingut Dveri-Pax, located near Luttenberg/Ljutomer in the Drava Valley/Podravje in the northeast of Slovenia, has a particularly long tradition of relations with Styria. This estate has its origins in Jahringhof Manor, which was bequeathed to the church by the nobleman Rudolf Wittenswald between 1130 and 1135 and was later awarded to the Benedictine Monastery of Admont by the Bishop of Salzburg. Its vineyards in the regions of Maribor, Jeruzalem, Radgona and Kapela, which have been expanded to cover approximately seventy hectares by acquisitions made over the course of the centuries, are all in modern-day Slovenia. Nevertheless, production still takes place in accordance with the Admont tradition, and the wine is marketed by the monastery.<sup>13</sup>

The fact that cross-border viticulture remained largely possible was also determined by the prevailing situation at the border, which was different in many respects from the circumstances at the Hungarian border that will be described in detail below. In 1949, Yugoslavia broke away from the Eastern Block under the leadership of Tito (Josip Broz 1892–1980) and began to pursue an ‘independent route’ towards socialism. The consequence of this for our study is that Slovenia’s border with Styria became a partially permeable – if heavily guarded – barrier, rather than an impenetrable Iron Curtain. The Gleichenberg Agreement of 1953 provided an important step forward in this regard by solving the problem of ‘dual owners’ with possessions on both Austrian and Yugoslavian soil. Restitutions to 400 Austrians and 50 Yugoslavians were made on

---

<sup>11</sup> Siegel, Simon: *Trink- und Tischkultur [Drinking and dining culture]*, in: Schwarzkogler, Ileana (Ed.): *Weinkultur [Wine culture]* (Gamlitz Exhibition Catalogue) (Graz 1990) pp. 375–379, here p. 378.

<sup>12</sup> <http://tv.orf.at/unseroesterreich/steiermark106.html>.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.dveri-pax.com/de/weingut-dveri-pax>.

the basis of this treaty.<sup>14</sup> It permitted dual landholders, who then comprised some forty growers with an area of approximately fifty hectares under vines<sup>15</sup>, to process imported grapes in Austria and to label the final product as Styrian Qualitätswein. No changes were made to this agreement following the end of communism and Slovenia's accession to the EU in 2004. In 2015, however, a demand was made that wine made from Slovenian grapes should be labelled as 'Wine from the EU' and that traditional Styrian bottles should no longer be used. In 2014, the Lower House of the Austrian Parliament hurried to anticipate a decision by drawing up a draft resolution proposal that would continue to provide contractual certainty for the 'use of the Styrian brand and approval number for wine produced from Slovenian grapes'.<sup>16</sup> The issue was indeed discussed by Parliament, but any decision was ultimately postponed in a meeting on 4 May 2016.<sup>17</sup>

Greater success in resolving the matter was achieved at the ministerial level. As early as 2003, work began to collect data on dual owners. This produced a list of 260 names across all spheres of agriculture. The *Winegrowers' Association of Styrian Dual Owners* was founded in 2012. This body was commissioned by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, the Environment and Water Management to draw up a register of all dual owners and their parcels in Slovenia. It worked in conjunction with the Slovenian Minister of Agriculture and the EU Commission to develop a proposed solution for a 'cross-border protected designation of origin for Styria'. This suggestion was, however, rejected by Styria's Regional Wine Committee, and even the reaction of the EU Commission was sceptical. The ministry then joined forces with the Slovenian Ministry of Agriculture in 2016 to present an agreement creating the designation 'Transfrontier Varietal Wine'.<sup>18</sup>

At the same time, the 'right of dual owners to indicate historic dual Styrian-Slovenian ownership on labels' was enshrined in Austrian Wine Law.<sup>19</sup> Styria's Chamber of Agriculture designed a

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Geltend-SicheldorfeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10004046>.

<sup>15</sup> Source: Verein der historischen Doppelbesitzer, as of May 2019

<sup>16</sup> [https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A/A\\_00429/fnameorig\\_350918.html](https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A/A_00429/fnameorig_350918.html);  
[https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A/A\\_00429/index.shtml](https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A/A_00429/index.shtml);  
[https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A/A\\_00429/fnameorig\\_350918.html](https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A/A_00429/fnameorig_350918.html).

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A-LF/A-LF\\_00001\\_00371/index.shtml#S\\_015\\_04052016](https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/A-LF/A-LF_00001_00371/index.shtml#S_015_04052016).

<sup>18</sup> Memo of the Ministry of Agriculture regarding the vote on Zl. LE.2.2.11/xxx-II/7/18 of 18 August 2018.

<sup>19</sup> Federal Law Gazette, BGBl., II No. 184, of 23 July 2018.

logo for this purpose, which has been available to dual owners since the 2018 harvest (current vintage).

Upon receiving a further enquiry, the European Commission offered no possibility that the protected designation of origin »Steiermark« could be used with respect to the individual status of parcels involved. It did, however, express contentment with the model ‘Transfrontier Varietal Wine’.<sup>20</sup>

A number of examples will now be presented to illustrate the situation. The winegrower Martinecz possesses vineyards both in the area surrounding Klöch in Styria and in the winegrowing region of Gornja Radgona in Slovenia. Both harvests are used to vinify white wines (Welschriesling, Weissburgunder, Muskateller and »Heckenklescher« [»Uhudler«]).<sup>21</sup> The vineyards of Weingut Silly in Gabersdorf, which has long been a family enterprise, are located on both sides of the border: in Plač in Slovenia in the area bordering Steiermark, and on the Südsteiermark Wine Trail. Since 2009, the estate has also owned vines on the Grassnitzberg in Styria.<sup>22</sup> Weingut Luttenberger in Seibersdorf has vineyard sites in Police/Pöllitschberg in Slovenia. From 2016, new parcels have been planted in Lang in Styria, in the Leibnitz district.<sup>23</sup> The wine estate in Mureck run by Jakob and Elias Dorner is also worthy of mention, among the many growers who pursue transfrontier viticulture. Their vineyards are actually located only a few kilometres from Mureck on the other side of the banks of the River Mur in Neuberg/Novi Vrh in the Windische Hills.<sup>24</sup>

As briefly mentioned above, the border drawn with **Hungary** after 1918 was of a different nature than the demarcation with Slovenia. On 22 November 1918, the Provisional National Assembly of the newly formed republic laid claim to the western Hungarian and primarily Germanophone municipalities of Pressburg/Pozsony, Wieselburg/Moson, Ödenburg/Sopron and Eisenburg/Vas, which according to the legitimation ‘belonged to German-Austria geographically, economically

---

<sup>20</sup> Memo of the Ministry of Agriculture regarding the vote on Zl. LE.2.2.11/xxx-II/7/18 of 18 August 2018.

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.buschenschank-martinecz.com/weinbau/>.

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.puresleben.at/weingut-steiermark/suedsteirische-weinstrasse/>.

<sup>23</sup> <http://buschenschank-luttenberger.at/weine/>.

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.weingut-dorner.at>

and nationally'.<sup>25</sup> In the Treaty of Trianon, an agreement between two nations that had been on the losing side in the war, this area was separated to become **Burgenland**, the ninth Austrian federal state. On 14 December 1921, a plebiscite was held in the region surrounding Ödenburg/Sopron and eight neighbouring municipalities. The manipulated results saw 72.8% of voters in the town itself opt to become Hungarian. Despite the fact that the remaining eight jurisdictions voted to be part of Austria, the whole area was subsequently ceded to Hungary.<sup>26</sup> This meant that the border between Austria and Hungary was not finally settled until 1921. The social and personal consequences for the population were, however, slight. A lively trade in smuggling mitigated the impact made by the new dividing line.<sup>27</sup>

Individual measures were instigated during the period of uncertainty that preceded the final determination of the border, even while disputes with Hungary were still unresolved. Some of these proved favourable for winegrowers in the newly emerging federal state, whereas others were less advantageous. On 30 March 1921, for example, the Hungarian Government under Horthy altered the arrangements relating to viticulture tax. This was raised to 84 Kronen per hectolitre, and severe fines were provided for failure to report wine quantities. Nevertheless, this ordinance was only to affect the growers of Burgenland for a short period of time.<sup>28</sup> On 4 August 1922, over a year later when the situation had been stabilised, an agreement was reached regarding the gathering of the harvest (including grapes) for the Austrian districts of Jennersdorf, Güssing, Oberwart, Oberpullendorf, Mattersdorf, Eisenstadt and Neusiedel and in the Hungarian

---

<sup>25</sup> Ernst, August: *Geschichte des Burgenlandes [History of Burgenland]* (Munich 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1991) p. 187.

<sup>26</sup> Ernst, August: *Geschichte des Burgenlandes [History of Burgenland]* (Vienna 1991), Fogarassy, László: Die Volksabstimmung in Ödenburg (Sopron) und die Festsetzung der österreichisch-ungarischen Grenze im Lichte der ungarischen Quellen und Literatur [*The plebiscite in Ödenburg (Sopron) and the stipulation of the Austria-Hungary border in the light of Hungarian sources and literature*], in: *Südostforschungen* 35 (1976) pp. 150–182 and Swanson, John C.: The Sopron Plebiscite of 1921. A Success Story, in: *East European Quarterly* 34 (2000/2001) pp. 81–94.

<sup>27</sup> Seger, Martin/Beluszky, Pal (Eds.): *Bruchlinie Eiserner Vorhang. Regionalentwicklung im österreichisch-ungarischen Grenzraum (Südburgenland/Oststeiermark – Westungarn) [The Iron Curtain fault line. Regional development in the Austrian-Hungarian border region (South Burgenland/East Styria – West Hungary)]* (Studien zu Politik und Verwaltung 42, Vienna inter alia 1993) pp. 238 ff.

<sup>28</sup> Burgenland State Archive Eisenstadt; Supplementary Archive Facsimile 34, J II 1/8.

counties of Zala, Sopron and Moson. This determined that a ‘permit [...] [is] not required for the export of these products’.<sup>29</sup>

Although internal trade links with significant winegrowing regions in the Hungarian part of the monarchy, such as Ödenburg, Villány, Kunság, Eger and Tokaj-Hegyalja, were lost following the redrawing of the border, the acquisition of Burgenland meant that Austria also gained a number of important viticultural districts. During the time of the monarchy, the territory of the present Burgenland still belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary and seemed to offer good benefits as a winegrowing region. Writing in 1889, the oenologist Robert Schroer stated: ‘Good wines are commercially available at not too high a price in the winegrowing region Neusiedlersee. There are even white wines of the very best quality – we will mention the wines of Rust, especially Ruster Ausbruch, one of Hungary’s finest wines’. The author continued, ‘One thing that causes great damage to the wine trade is that the winegrowers drink a good proportion of their wines themselves.’<sup>30</sup>

Ownership of wine estates in West Hungary/Burgenland was dominated by the nobility – although they tended to show little interest in viticulture – and by the ‘royal free cities’ of the Hungarian crown (Ödenburg, Eisenstadt, Rust). 93 out of 2,798 communities were involved in the production of wine. These were organised into four quality categories. Wines from Ödenburg and Rust belonged to the first class. Second class producers were found in Oggau, Gschiess (an old name for the municipality now known as Schützen am Gebirge), Oslip, St. Margarethen, Deutsch-Kreutz, Mörbisch, St. Andrä am Zickensee, Eisenstadt and the Esterházy estates, Neckenmarkt and in the villages of Győr-Moson county that were ceded to Hungary – Kroisbach/Fertőrákos, Holling/Fertőboz and Wolfs/Balf (today a district of Sopron). Nine of the twelve winegrowing communities included in the top two classes thus became part of Austria.<sup>31</sup> Fifteen of the nineteen wine villages in category three are now located in Burgenland. These are Steinbrunn (formerly Stinkenbrunn), Gross-Höflein, Klein-Höflein, Loipersbach, St. Georgen am

---

<sup>29</sup> Burgenland State Archive Eisenstadt; Supplementary Archive Facsimile 26, E 2, Zl. 175/1922 L.G.B.

<sup>30</sup> [Schroer, Robert: Der Weinbau und die Weine Österreich-Ungarns \[Viticulture and the wines of Austria-Hungary\]](#) (Vienna 1889) p. 41.

<sup>31</sup> Fürst, Carl: Versuch über den Weinbau und Weinhandel der Oedenburger Gespannschaft im Königreiche Ungarn [*Treatment of viticulture and the wine trade in the County of Ödenburg in the Kingdom of Hungary*] (Ödenburg 1847) pp. 9 ff.



Leithagebirge, Breitenbrunn, Purbach, Trausdorf an der Leitha (formerly Trauersdorf), Klingebach, Haschendorf, Grosspetersdorf, Nebersdorf and Lutzmannsburg. Burgenland is even more significantly represented amongst the forty-eight winegrowing areas in the fourth class (some of which are no longer identifiable). Only eleven of these became part of Hungary. Those remaining included Hornstein, Wimpassing, Leithaprodersdorf, Müllendorf, Zillingthal, Neudörfel, Pöttsching, Wiesen, Forchtenau, Mattersdorf, Walbersdorf, Pöttelsdorf, Rohrbach, Marz, Siegendorf, Zagersdorf, Wulkaprodersdorf, Krensdorf, Zemendorf, Drassburg, Baumgarten, Schattendorf, Ritzing, Kobersdorf, Groß-Zinkendorf, Schützen am Gebirge, Stoob, Raiding, Unterfrauenheid, Steinberg-Dörfel (once two villages), Oberloisdorf, Frankenu-Unterpullendorf, Kloster am Spitz in Purbach, Mannersdorf an der Rabnitz, Strebersdorf, Kroatisch Geresdorf, Kroatisch Minihof, Nikitsch, Oberzagersdorf and Unterzagersdorf. The significance of this wine region was also underscored by the presence of two vine nurseries in Ödenburg, operated by the wine merchant Samuel Boor and by a winegrowers' cooperative, offering eighty-nine different grape varieties.<sup>32</sup>

The drawing of new borders could, however, not occur without conflict. One well-researched example is the history of the villages of Luising and Hagensdorf. The original intention was that Luising should be ceded to Hungary, irrespective of the fact that its inhabitants were Germanophones. The two villages had close ties in many respects, shared a school and church, and a separation would have placed a large number of fields and vineyards on either side of the border. After much to-and-fro the decision was made that Luising should also become part of Austria. According to Article 29 of the Treaty of St.-Germain, the complicated provisions set out for the final demarcation of the Austrian frontier were to be monitored by an internationally staffed boundary commission. The Hungarians attempted to use a letter of reply contained within the Treaty of Trianon to influence placement of the border-line in their favour.<sup>33</sup> To some extent, the Luising conflict was a precursor to (or part of) the struggle between Hungarian guerillas and the Austrian »B-Gendarmerie« to gain control over Burgenland.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Fürst, p. 64.

<sup>33</sup> Ernst, p. 150.

<sup>34</sup> Schlag, Gerald: Die Kämpfe um das Burgenland 1921 [*Struggle for Burgenland 1921*] (Vienna 1983).

Once the border had been drawn, the situation for Austrian citizens was highly disadvantageous. An Austrian wishing to travel to Hungary was required to pay a visa fee that was between six and seven times higher than that charged to a Hungarian headed to Austria. Hungarians with land-holdings in Austria could also import their produce to Hungary without any requirement to pay duties, while Austrians were charged duty on their goods by the customs authorities.<sup>35</sup>

Improvements to the structure of the wine industry took place in Burgenland during the period following 1922. Instead of the wide range of Hungarian grape varieties, attention now shifted to the production of quality wine. This trend was strengthened by the establishment of a viticulture college in Rust in 1933. Areas under cultivation also quadrupled between 1912 and 1936.<sup>36</sup>

Burgenland was not merely important to winegrowing in Hungary during the period of the monarchy; a significant part of the wine trade and the export business also passed through the region. A particular role was played in this regard by Eisenstadt and the Wolf family, who resided in the town. This family (originally called Austerlitz) originated from the Jewish community in Vienna. They had arrived in Eisenstadt in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, where Joachim Austerlitz decided to adopt his middle name Wolf as a new surname. Joachim also established Weinhandlung Wolf, which was later to gain renown as the wholesaler Leopold Wolf's Söhne. The company exported Hungarian wines to metropolitan Vienna and to other lands of the Crown such as Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia – and in the latter not just to the Austrian part, but the Prussian part as well. It also traded with southern Germany. In addition, the Wolf family earned a great deal of money from exports to France when the catastrophic outbreak of phylloxera caused a scarcity of supply around 1880.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Ernst, August: Der Anschluss der Gemeinde Luising an Österreich [*The annexation of the municipality of Luising to Austria*] (1923), in: Burgenländische Heimatblätter 35 (1973) pp. 145–163.

<sup>36</sup> Brettl, Herbert: Weinbau [*Viticulture*] in: Brettl, Herbert/Prieler, Peter (Eds.): Agrarland Burgenland. 90 Jahre Burgenländische Landwirtschaftskammer 1927-2017 [*90 years of the Burgenland Chamber of Agriculture 1927-2017*] (Eisenstadt 2017) pp. 320–367, in particular pp. 335, 337, 339.

<sup>37</sup> Gold, Hugo: Gedenkbuch der untergegangenen Judengemeinden des Burgenlandes [*Commemorative book for the lost Jewish communities of Burgenland*] (Tel Aviv 1970) and Szorger, Dieter: Sándor Wolf (1871-1946) Gründer des Landesmuseums, [*Sándor Wolf (1871-1946) founder of the State Museum*] in: Burgenland. 90 Jahre – 90 Geschichten [*Burgenland. 90 years – 90 stories*] (Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten aus dem Burgenland [*Academic Research from Burgenland*] 137, Eisenstadt 2011) pp. 190 ff.



The most significant member of the family lived to see the creation of Burgenland and remained highly active in the wine trade thereafter. Sándor Wolf (1887–1946) was also a noted art collector and came to prominence as the founder of the Burgenland State Museum, to which he gifted the former Leinner Building in the Rusterstrasse in Eisenstadt, along with his entire collection, which by 1930 comprised some 6,000 objects. Sándor Wolf was forced to flee in 1938 because of his Jewish origins and went to Israel, where he died in 1946, whilst planning his return home.<sup>38</sup>

The Iron Curtain, which was later to descend on Austria's eastern border and prevented any kind of small-scale international interaction, was to have a far more extreme effect than the slightly porous demarcations that were drawn up post-1921.<sup>39</sup> The climate of the Hungarian winegrowing region bordering on this physical barrier, which was named after the town of Ödenburg, is influenced both by the Pannonian Plain and the heat reservoir of Lake Neusiedl. 1,900 hectares of vineyards were under cultivation during the period of the socialist dictatorship. Both red wines (Blaufränkisch, Cabernet Franc, Cabernet Sauvignon and Pinot Noir) and white wines such as Grüner Veltliner, Sauvignon Blanc and Chardonnay were produced within the scope of a centralist planned economy. Naturally, most sales took place in the East. After the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, joint concepts were developed for the marketing of high-end wines. The main parties involved were cooperatives in Deutschkreutz, Horitschon, Lutzmannsburg and Neckenmarkt and the State Winery in Sopron, Hungary.<sup>40</sup> Just two examples of the joint ventures entered into by Hungarian and Austrian wine producers will be cited at this point.<sup>41</sup> The Garger

---

<sup>38</sup> <https://landesmuseum-burgenland.at/ueber-uns/museumsgruender-sandor-wolf/>

<sup>39</sup> Seger, Martin/Beluszky, Pal (Eds.): Bruchlinie Eiserner Vorhang. Regionalentwicklung im österreichisch-ungarischen Grenzraum (Südburgenland, Oststeiermark - Westungarn) [*The Iron Curtain fault line. Regional development in the Austrian-Hungarian border region (South Burgenland, East Styria – West Hungary)*] (Studien zu Politik und Verwaltung [*Studies in Policy and Administration*] 42, Graz inter alia 1993); Tschida, Barbara: Die österreichische Staatsgrenze im Burgenland. Entstehung, Eiserner Vorhang, Zusammenwachsen im Vereinten Europa [*The Austrian state border in Burgenland. Origins of the Iron Curtain, growing together in a united Europe*] (master's dissertation, Vienna 2008).

<sup>40</sup> Greif, Franz: Regionalpolitik an gemeinsamer Grenze. Das Beispiel Österreich-Ungarn [*Regional policy on a joint border. The example of Austria-Hungary*] (Schriftenreihe der Bundesanstalt für Agrarwirtschaft [*Publication series of the Federal Institute for Agriculture*] 73, Vienna 1993) p. 93.

<sup>41</sup> A detailed study of Sopron is provided in Kücsán, József: Ödenburg und der Wein zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts [*Ödenburg and wine at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century*], in: Forscher – Gestalter – Vermittler. Festschrift Gerald Schlag [*Researcher – Designer – Teacher. Festschrift*

family, who are descended paternally from Grossdorf/Vaskeresztes in Hungary, cultivate vines from the Hungarian part of the Eisenberg to produce a Blaufränkisch called *Nador* (in Latin, *palatinus regnie Hungarie*), first released with the 2013 vintage.<sup>42</sup> Weingut Weninger is based in Horitschon in **Mittelburgenland**, where its biodynamic viticulture yields primarily red wine. In 1992, the Weninger family joined forces with the Hungarian winemaker Attila Gere to found Weingut Weninger & Gere in the winegrowing region Villány. Output is 80,000 bottles of red wine per year, 80% of which is sold in Hungary. A further estate was set up in a prime location in Balf, part of Ödenburg, in 1997 under the name of Weninger & Pincészet. 60% of the 80,000 bottles produced there is sold in Hungary, while the rest goes to Austria, Germany and Switzerland.<sup>43</sup>

In comparison to Styria and Burgenland, the borders redrawn in 1919 exerted only a small influence on winegrowing in **Lower Austria**. The border demarcation in the north of Lower Austria between the federal state and Czechoslovakia, which was declared independent in the USA on 18 October 1918 and founded in Prague on 28 October 1918 (considered to be a victor country), reflected the historic borders of the Kingdom of Bohemia without according due consideration to ethnic issues. This meant that German-speaking minorities remained in the Republic of Czechoslovakia.<sup>44</sup> In almost all cases, the border demarcation was shifted and established in favour of Czechoslovakia. The village of Schrattenberg near Poysdorf, for example, lay directly on the new state border. However, winegrowing on the frontier was pursued primarily for personal consumption and was not materially affected by the new situation. Similar circumstances regarding the way in which vines and grape varieties (mainly white wine) were cultivated prevailed in the border zone between Moravia and Austria. Operations were dominated by municipal viticulture (Retz in Austria and Znaim/Znojmo, Nikolsburg/Mikulov and Auspitz/Hustopeče in Moravia) as well as by a great number of small growers. Nevertheless, cultivation of fruits and vegetables had been supplanting viticulture, which had become unprofitable in the area, more and more ever since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This meant that implications

---

*Gerald Schlag*] (Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten aus dem Burgenland [*Academic Research from Burgenland*] 105, Eisenstadt 2001) pp. 225–238

<sup>42</sup> [http://www.nadorwine.com/download/nador\\_pressemappe\\_2014.pdf](http://www.nadorwine.com/download/nador_pressemappe_2014.pdf).

<sup>43</sup> [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weingut\\_Weninger](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weingut_Weninger); <https://www.weninger.com/>.

<sup>44</sup> Hoensch, Jörg K.: *Geschichte der Tschechoslowakei [History of Czechoslovakia]* (Stuttgart inter alia 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 1992).

for oenology in the neighbouring Austrian region were minor.<sup>45</sup> However, the drawing of the border frequently brought significant losses in its wake for small farmers on the Czechoslovakian side whose market was located in Austria. By the same token, the Austrian side also lost its most important agricultural training facility in Feldsberg/Valtice.<sup>46</sup>

In this area too, the long interruption of contacts at the border did not come to an end until the Iron Curtain was raised in 1989. Relations were normalised following the accession of the Czech Republic and Slovakia to the European Union in 2004. The same process took place with regard to Hungary and Slovenia, and more joint projects were initiated. These simultaneously provide symbols for the international linking of trade and industry in general and the wine sector in particular, within the framework of the European Union.



### **Prof. Dr. Karl Vocelka**

Karl Vocelka received his doctorate from the Philosophy Department of the University of Vienna, obtaining his post-doctoral habilitation in the field of Austrian history. His research interests include the social and cultural history of Central Europe and the history of the Habsburgs.

<sup>45</sup> Landsteiner, Erich: *Der Wein und die Grenze. Weinbau und Weinhandel im mährisch-niederösterreichischen Grenzraum [Wine and the frontier. Viticulture and the wine trade in the border area between Moravia and Austria]*, in: *Kulturen an der Grenze. Waldviertel – Weinviertel – Südböhmen – Südmähren [Cultures on the border. Waldviertel – Weinviertel – South Bohemia – South Moravia]* (Vienna-Waidhofen/Thaya 1995) pp. 147-152, here pp. 148 ff., cf. also Landsteiner, Erich: *Weinbau und Gesellschaft in Ostmitteleuropa [Viticulture and society in Eastern Central Europe]* (doctoral dissertation Vienna 1992) and Frolec, Václav: *Die Weinbaukultur in Mähren im Kontext der europäischen Entwicklung [Winegrowing culture in Moravia within the context of European development]*, in: *Ethnologica Slavica* 17 (1985) pp. 13–51.

<sup>46</sup> Puscala, Gerhard: *Österreichisch-tschecho-slowakische Grenzverhandlungen 1919-1923. Zur Festlegung der österreichischen Staatsgrenze gegenüber der Tschechoslowakei im Raum von Niederösterreich [Austrian-Czechoslovakian border negotiations 1919-1923. On the stipulation of the Austrian state border to Czechoslovakia in the Lower Austria region]* (doctoral dissertation Vienna 1986) p. 69.