

**DOI:** <https://www.doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2023-63-04>

УДК 930(477.54)''1840/1894''929Nadler]:327(091)(436)''18''929Metternich

### **Serhii Lyman**

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

Svobody sq., 4, 61022, Kharkiv, Ukraine

E-mail: [s.lyman@karazin.ua](mailto:s.lyman@karazin.ua)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0371-7181>

## **THE FOREIGN POLICY OF KLEMENS VON METTERNICH IN THE WORKS OF V. K. NADLER (1840–1894)**

*The foreign policy activities of Klemens von Metternich, the main organizer of the Congress of Vienna, the true architect of the post-Napoleonic international order, and minister of foreign affairs and chancellor of the Austrian Empire, attracted the attention of many researchers, especially on the eve of his 250th birthday anniversary. The first monograph in Russian imperial historiography entirely devoted to Metternich's diplomacy was authored by the Kharkiv University professor V. K. Nadler (1840–1894); but this aspect of Nadler's scholarship is largely unknown today. The purpose of this article is to comprehensively analyze Nadler's works dealing with Klemens von Metternich's diplomatic legacy and its significance for the further development of the post-Napoleonic international order. The author employs the methods of historical and comparative analysis, systematization and generalization, and retrospective analysis. The article shows that, in addition to the specialized study on Metternich and the European Reaction (1882), Nadler partially*

**Як цитувати:** Lyman, S. The foreign policy of Klemens von Metternich in the works of V. K. Nadler (1840–1894). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія «Історія»*, вип. 63, 2023, с. 75-96. DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2023-63-04>

**How to cite:** Lyman, S. The foreign policy of Klemens von Metternich in the works of V. K. Nadler (1840–1894). *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series: History*, no. 63, 2023, pp. 75-96. DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2023-63-04>

© Lyman S., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

*devoted the multi-volume monograph Emperor Alexander I and the Idea of the Holy Alliance to the analysis of the foreign policy of the Austrian Empire in the first years of the Vienna System of international relations. Nadler tried to avoid exaggerating the role of the individual in history, in the best progressive tradition of the historiography of his day. However, to denote the new international order, Nadler usually used the name «Metternich's political system», thus stressing the crucial importance of the Austrian minister as the organizer of the Congress of Vienna, the guarantor of the implementation of its decisions, and the driving force behind the fight against any dissent in European countries. According to Nadler, while the Vienna international order initially developed precisely in the reactionary direction mapped out by Metternich, the Greek Revolution and the Adrianople Peace Treaty of 1829, which confirmed the autonomy of Greece, struck a real blow to the «Metternich system».*

**Keywords:** Klemens von Metternich, V. K. Nadler, international relations, foreign policy, diplomacy, Vienna Congress, Holy Alliance.

### **Statement of the problem**

May 15, 2023 will mark the 250th anniversary of the birth of the prominent political figure, minister of foreign affairs and chancellor of the Austrian Empire Klemens von Metternich (1773–1859). The main organizer of the Congress of Vienna and the true architect of the post-Napoleonic international order, which persisted under the name of the Vienna System of international relations for nearly a century (1815–1914), Metternich went down in history as a consistent supporter of legitimism, conservatism, and absolutism and the enemy of liberal tendencies, particularly revolutions. For almost forty years (1809–1848), he managed Austrian foreign affairs. In many respects, the new international order proved strong and resilient thanks to his efforts. It was a period of «relative peace» (Ghervas 2014), and the more harmonious interstate relations of the Vienna system allow us to use the term «European concert» (Black 2010, 5). The Congress of Vienna itself is seen as a «prototype of a united Europe» (Tsviatyi 2016, 167) by some modern researchers and as the main event in the history of diplomacy, which transformed diplomatic practice from bilateral to multilateral (Marleku, Emini 2016).

Metternich's upcoming 250th anniversary will certainly provoke the appearance of a large number of anniversary-related publications devoted to his diplomatic pursuits. It should be remembered, however, that various

aspects of his work and legacy already became the subject of fundamental research by 19th-century historians — contemporaries of the Vienna international order who witnessed first-hand its systemic weaknesses and strengths. Vasyl Karlovych Nadler (1840–1894), professor of the Imperial Kharkiv University, published the first monograph in Russian imperial historiography entirely devoted to the analysis of Metternich's diplomatic work. In addition to his book on Metternich and the European Reaction, he also authored a five-volume study of *Emperor Alexander I and the Idea of the Holy Alliance*, in which he paid considerable attention to the analysis of the activities of the head of the Austrian diplomatic corps. However, Nadler's contribution to the study of the foreign policy of the Austrian Empire under the leadership of Klemens von Metternich has been neglected by both domestic and foreign researchers.

### **Analysis of recent research and publications**

V. K. Nadler is known as a multifaceted researcher and brilliant lecturer (Lyman 1999; Kaplin 2003), a skilled administrator (Honcharuk, Novikova 2005), representative of advanced positivist historiosophy (Bohdashyna 2013, 294), and historian of the Western European, Slavic, and Arab Middle Ages (Kopylov 2005, 245-247, 280; Lyman 2009, 236-239, 251-254, 575). Nadler's student V. P. Buzeskul, in his sweeping work *General History and Its Representatives in Russia* (Buzeskul 1929, 125-129), particularly noted the diversity of his mentor's research interests. However, neither he nor any later student of the scholar's wide-ranging legacy dwelled in any depth on Nadler's investigations of Metternich's diplomatic activity, sometimes briefly stating that «his book for the general reader Metternich and the European Reaction gained the most popularity» (Kozlitin and others 1991, 94), even though the book in question was in fact a specialized academic study. It was not subject to similar criticism<sup>1</sup> as *Alexander I and the Idea of the Holy Alliance*<sup>2</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, O. E. Budnikova in her dissertation notes disagreements between V. K. Nadler, who viewed the personal and professional qualities of K. Metternich negatively, and A. D. Gradovsky, who considered the Austrian a gifted diplomat (Budnikova 2007, 15). A. D. Gradovsky published his work «The Mettarnich System» (1883) a year later than the publication of V. K. Nadler (Gradovskiy 1899).

<sup>2</sup> Since the end of the 19th century, there has been a not entirely objective historiographical tradition of attributing «tendentiousness» to the work «Alexander I and the Idea of the Holy Alliance». However the famous historian P. M. Milyukov in his review criticized V. K. Nadler mainly for depicting not so much the activities of Metternich as the events of the Patriotic War of 1812 (P. M. (Milyukov) 1887, 150).

even though it was dedicated not to a ruler of the Russian Empire, but to the most famous foreign diplomat. Unfortunately, neither is *Metternich and the European Reaction* well known abroad. For example, E. E. Kraehe, a student of Metternich's diplomacy, wrote, listing 19th-century experts on the subject: "Promising beginning of the study of Metternich was laid at the end of the 19th century, when European archives of that period were opened. This made it possible for such impartial scholars as Adolf Beyer, Eduard Wertheimer, August Fournier, Wilhelm Oncken, and Fedor von Demelitsch to produce monographs and publish documents that remain the basis of research on this topic to this day" (Kreye 2002). Our article will show that Nadler's name should also be on this list.

Considering the above, the *purpose* of our study is to comprehensively analyze Nadler's scholarly works devoted to Klemens von Metternich's diplomatic pursuits and their significance for the further development of the post-Napoleonic international order.

#### **V. K. Nadler and his scholarship**

A descendant of German immigrants, Vasyl Karlovych Nadler was born in 1840 in Kharkiv, in the family of a provisor who ran a pharmacy (Vyazigin 1908, 282). Certainly, the milieu of Kharkiv significantly influenced the national reflexes and beliefs of the local Germans. Given this, there is nothing peculiar in the fact that Vasyl Karlovych was an Orthodox Russian speaker and a consistent conservative.

As a child, the future scholar was brought up in the private boarding school of Tsobel. In 1857, he chose the Faculty of History and Philology of Kharkiv University for his studies (Mitryaev 1979, 247). The circle of his research interests was formed under the influence of his famous teacher, professor of the Department of General History M. N. Petrov (1826–1887). That was when their long-term cooperation began. Another university mentor and patron of Nadler was the renowned Slavist P. A. Lavrovsky. Under the influence of the latter, Vasyl Karlovych prepared a mandatory candidate essay «The Serbian People and Their Fate under the Rule of the Turks before the Beginning of the National Movement in the First Years of 19th Century» (1862) (Mitryaev 1979, 247). However, the young graduate of Kharkiv University did not continue with this research topic.

His subsequent scholarly interests were mainly related to the past of Central European states. After graduating from university in 1862, Nadler was retained at the Department of General History, preparing to receive a professorship (DAOO, ark. 65zv-65). He worked on his master's thesis «The Causes and First Expressions of Opposition to Catholicism in Czechia and Western Europe at the End of the 14th and Beginning of the 15th Century» for 2 years. The defense took place in 1864 at St. Petersburg University. Nadler could now get the position of associate professor at Kharkiv University's Department of General History. He remained the university's leading medievalist for a quarter of a century. In 1867, he defended his doctoral thesis, «Adalbert of Bremen — the Ruler of Germany in the Younger Years of Henry IV». In the following year, 1868, he became extraordinary, a year later — ordinary, and in 1890 — honored professor (DAOO, ark. 65zv-66, 71zv-72).

Nadler also showed himself a skilled administrator. From 1869 to 1875, he was the secretary, and from 1875 to 1891 — dean of the Faculty of History and Philology of Kharkiv University, and in 1877 he became the first chairman of the Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society (Protokol 1878, 100; Prilozheniya 1878, II). Nadler also headed the Faculty of History and Philology at the Imperial Novorossiya (Odesa) University, where he transferred in 1891. In 1893, he served as rector of this university (DAOO, ark. 71zv -73zv).

The trust given to him by the authorities was mutual. A consistent representative of the conservative wing of the academic intelligentsia in the Russian Empire, after the assassination of the Tsar in 1881 Nadler further intensified his criticism of constitutionalism. He described his compatriots' desire for constitutional rule as «deceptive and harmful illusions» that would not bring them any closer to freedom. “Freedom is necessary for everybody, but real freedom, not paper-constitutional freedom”, said Nadler. “It is necessary for free institutions to be created by the historical life of the people, so that they grow on people's soil, as they grew in England” (Nadler 1882, IX, XI).

Nadler was a brilliant lecturer. Those who heard him observed that he had «a wonderful memory and a rare gift of expression», «never wrote down his lectures and only delivered them by heart», and «was a complete master of his

material» (Buzeskul 1894; Buzeskul 1927, 2-3). In the words of one memoirist, «writing in “Nadler style” was a cherished dream of many» (Vyazigin 1894).

Nadler taught courses on various chapters of world history. While the history of the Middle Ages and its individual periods remained the main subject of his teaching, he also taught Roman, Russian, and modern history over the years (Obozreniya 1871, 3; Obozreniya 1880, 5; Vyazigin 1908, 284). This tendency persisted after his transfer to the Imperial Novorossiya University; here Nadler primarily taught the history of the Middle Ages, modern history, and recent history (19th century) (Honcharuk 2005, 368-369).

The broad geography of Nadler's lectures (Western Europe, Russia, Byzantium, the East) fully reflected his overall approach to history. Even at the dawn of his scholarly and pedagogical career, Nadler sharply criticized foreign and domestic scholars for limiting their attention to the history of Western European nations. Among other weaknesses of contemporary historiography, he identified the complete dominance of political history, weak coverage of the phenomena of social life, and neglect of the economy, trade, and material existence (Nadler 1864, 14-15). Despite this, international relations were one of his favorite research subjects.

While in the 1860s Nadler's research interests were mainly concerned with various aspects of the Middle Ages, from the 1880s on the scholar focused on the international relations of the first quarter of the 19th century. We see it as Nadler's response to the pressing events in contemporary Europe, where the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy was already being created before the eyes of those who still nurtured hope for the viability of the Union of the Three Emperors, and France and the Russian Empire, in order to preserve the political balance of the Vienna system, took steps to meet each other half-way. The origins of this Viennese system and the role in its creation of individual personalities, in particular Klemens von Metternich, could not help but interest Nadler, who, as already noted above, taught 19th-century history alongside that of the Middle Ages.

Metternich's diplomatic activity was studied by Nadler in two of his monographs. One of them is *Metternich and the European Reaction* (1882), and the other is *Emperor Alexander I and the Idea of the Holy Alliance*, five volumes of which were published from 1886 to 1892. The Kharkiv

researcher used a broad range of written sources — first and foremost, texts of international agreements, diplomatic correspondence, and memoirs of prominent statesmen, particularly Metternich himself (Memoires 1881).

The recognition of the pan-European significance of Metternich's diplomatic work is evident in how Nadler chose to call the international order that had taken shape as a result of the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815. The Kharkiv researcher did not use the name «Vienna System», under which it is known to modern researchers. In some cases, he referred to it as «the system of stabilism», in others — the «immovable» system, or the «Austrian» system, but most often — «the Metternich political system» (Nadler 1882, XIII, XIV, XV, 40, 70, 135, 151, 169, 208). Thus, the special role played in its creation by the main organizer of the Congress of Vienna was emphasized. The term «Metternich system» is also familiar to modern scholarship<sup>3</sup>; but, for instance, O. E. Budnikova takes it to mean the political principles of Metternich, as the main ideologist of the policy of conservatism, rather than the international order of the era (Budnikova 2007, 21).

In his two fundamental monographs, Nadler characterized Metternich in conflicting ways. On the one hand, the Kharkiv researcher recognized the Austrian diplomat as an «outstanding» statesman and the long-term leader of the European reaction (Nadler 1882, 6). On the other, and contrary to the historiographical tradition, which emphasizes Metternich's extremely important role at the Congress of Vienna, Nadler gave him a critical, almost contemptuous description: «attributing to himself successes and results achieved by others», Metternich «was only a liar and a braggart»; he behaved with «extreme frivolity», showed «meanness», «engaged in serious matters only in passing and episodically», and was never even a German patriot (Nadler 1892, 365, 420, 602, 641).

Nadler contrasted this unprincipled figure with the Russian emperor Alexander I, who was depicted as a «generous liberator of Europe», a talented politician and administrator, full of the spirit of «true Christian love and impartial pacifism», and a sovereign who in his Manifesto of August 30, 1814 on the occasion of the victory over Napoleon demonstrated that in his

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, E. P. Kudryavtseva admits that the Vienna system of international relations is often called the «Metternich system» in historiography (Kudryavtseva 2019, 47).

soul, «along with religious and mystical excitement, [there] reigned a liberal course of thought» (Nadler 1892, 355, 356, 457).

Nadler's high estimation of the policies (including foreign) of Alexander I did not prevent the scholar from admitting that the French minister Charles Talleyrand played the «first role» at the Vienna Congress: «The deep enmity that prevailed between the allies, inexperience and ineptitude of most of the representatives of the great powers gave him the opportunity to immediately take the position of the highest prominence in Vienna» (Nadler 1892, 364-365, 402). This thesis has been fully confirmed by modern scholarship (Hizhnyak 2011, 97).

However, Nadler belonged to those scholars who did not exaggerate the role of the individual in history. He rejected the idea that «nations are toys of the greats of this world» (Nadler 1882, 5). That is why Nadler believed that it was neither Metternich nor any other figure, but rather the «general mood» that permeated society at that time, that was the source of «the new powerful current that carried the entire European society at the end of the war for liberation» (Nadler 1882, 6). Nadler did not use the term «public opinion», but believed that the most influential politicians, contemporaries of the Vienna system's creation, in many ways served as conduits of this European public opinion, which expected «a program of new and better times from them, which was supposed to put an end to the terrible era of hatred and blood forever» (Nadler 1882, 7). According to Nadler's research logic, the initiator of the Holy Alliance Alexander I also expressed the opinions of a certain part of European society.

It was in these historical conditions that Metternich became «the head of the new political system», although the Austrian minister, according to Nadler, «was not a blind supporter of the old pre-revolutionary principles, but rather a pupil of the Napoleonic era» (Nadler 1882, 9,10). From this Napoleonic era, according to the Kharkiv researcher, Metternich took «that deep contempt for nations and their aspirations, that hatred for ideology, that disrespect for the historical rights of nations, institutions, and individuals, which distinguished him all his life»; that is why Nadler saw the widespread scholarly view that the Vienna System of international relations was supposed to restore the rights of European dynasties and the old pre-revolutionary order



as «absolutely groundless» (Nadler 1882, 9, 12). Even though the Congress of Vienna did restore many states and dynasties (Akt Venskogo kongressa 1830, 144-148), overall the «respect for the historical rights of sovereigns, states, and nations was not discussed in Vienna» (Nadler 1882, 12).

To back his thesis, the Kharkiv researcher outlined a full picture of the significant territorial changes following the decisions of the Vienna Congress (Nadler 1892, 368, 476-477): Italy was again fragmented after a short period of unification under Napoleon, and «the old law and the interests of the population» in Germany were trampled «even more decisively and more impudently» (Nadler 1882, 13). As an ethnic German himself, Nadler wrote with bitterness about the creation of the German Union based on the decisions of the Congress of Vienna (Akt Venskogo kongressa 1830, 161): «Instead of restoring the empire in a renewed form, Germany was transformed into an ugly union of 36 large and small states, a union devoid of any meaning and power» (Nadler 1882, 13). These and many other changes were cited to support the scholar's opinion that, although the Viennese «Metternich system» was supposed to establish «the balance of power in Europe on a firm basis» and guarantee it forever «against the new conquering aspirations of France», in general the Congress of Vienna adhered to this goal «purely outwardly», violated «natural interests and sacred rights», «carved countries up at its own discretion, tore nationalities apart, combined the incompatible and separated what was connected by nature itself» (Nadler 1882, 12-13). This critical assessment of European scholarship's established view of the outcome of the Congress of Vienna and the significance of the new system of international relations was complemented by a skillfully drawn picture of internal reaction in each European country, which served Metternich's vision. Strict censorship in the Austrian Empire and Vienna's de facto police supervision over Germany and a large part of Europe were supposed to forestall the emergence of a new culture of free thought and revolution. H. G. Insarov (Rakovsky), the author of the second book in the Russian imperial historiography entirely devoted to Metternich's activities, would later describe these developments and Metternich's role in them in a similar way (Insarov 1905).

Nadler did not deny that a period of reaction followed the Napoleonic catastrophe in Europe, but he considered the widespread scholarly view

that the monarchs of the anti-Napoleonic coalition, with their ministers and entourage, were the initiators of this reaction to be a «legend», not historical truth (Nadler 1882, 4). The idea of widespread post-Napoleonic reaction in Europe is somewhat inconsistent with the arguments of some modern authors that «despite the prevailing conservatism of the political elite involved in the formation of the Vienna system of international relations, the latter did not become a restraining factor for the liberal tendencies that were gaining momentum in Europe at the stage of bourgeois transformations... meeting the civilizational needs of the development of European countries» (Dudko 2013, 47-48).

An experienced researcher, Nadler thoroughly elucidated the interests of the victorious states at the Vienna Congress and revealed the essence of their contradictions. He believed that despite all such contradictions and Metternich's intrigues, Emperor Alexander I «continued to believe in the possibility of the future existence of a great European coalition», because «he was full of high noble feelings himself, so he assumed these feelings in others» (Nadler 1892, 381). Nadler's entire work is replete with similar statements, contrasting the plans of Alexander I with intentions of diplomats from other countries, particularly Metternich: according to the scholar, the emperor «came to the congress with the highest and most noble goals»; «the interests of European peace and the welfare of peoples came first for him» (Nadler 1892, 399).

Nadler saw the change in the relations between Talleyrand and Metternich as one of the main outcomes of the Congress of Vienna. Metternich began the congress as an opponent of Talleyrand, but gradually they reached an agreement on the important Polish-Saxon question. According to Nadler, as a result of the agreement between the two ministers, irreversible developments took place during the congress: «While before it had been possible to speak of the allies as opposed to France; now it became obvious that the erstwhile great coalition had completely disintegrated» (Nadler 1892, 418). Austria, England, and the defeated France came together in sharp diplomatic opposition to the plans of the Russian Empire and Prussia. In recent scholarship, stressing the deep geopolitical, socio-economic, and even confessional contradictions that divided the congress participants has become commonplace (Hizhnyak 2011, 94; Dudko 2013, 46).

The Holy Alliance, created at the initiative of Alexander I to support the «Metternich system», was considered by Nadler a completely natural phenomenon in the historical conditions in which it emerged and operated. It had an important practical significance for Europe (Nadler 1892, 642-643). The fact that the Vienna system of international relations is most often identified in historiography with the system of the Holy Alliance is also pointed out by modern researchers (Dodolev 2000, 34; Kudryavtseva 2019, 46).

Nadler attempted to solve important questions in his work, such as when exactly and under whose influence the idea of the Holy Union was conceived by Alexander I and what was Metternich's attitude towards it. According to the Kharkiv scholar, the emperor «came to his ideas completely independently», and the idea of such a union took final shape in Vienna and was voiced officially at the end of 1814 (Nadler 1892, 468-469). Alexander's message to the rulers of Austria, Prussia, and England dated December 31, 1814, aimed to «strengthen mutual relations between states» and «complete the work of internal pacification», since the emperor «supposed that international relations, like the internal policy of states, should be governed by the same principles of evangelical love and brotherhood» (Nadler 1892, 458). A modern American researcher from Harvard, S. Ghervas, interprets Alexander I's position in a similar way, noting that «the Russian view on peace in Europe proved by far the most elaborate», and «it is thus ironic that the “religious” treaty of the Holy Alliance liberated European politics from ecclesiastical influence, making it a founding act of the secular era of “international relations”» (Ghervas 2014). She notes that «the Holy Alliance was also imbued with an idea inspired by the Enlightenment: that of perpetual peace» (Ghervas 2014).

Nadler's frank idealization of Alexander I's intentions is expressed in the historian's statement that the emperor «did not connect any hidden thoughts or plans with the act of the Holy Alliance»; among other things, he had no plans to «suppress the legitimate desire of peoples to develop free institutions» (Nadler 1892, 634). This view is refuted by the subsequent course of historical events, including Alexander's position during the revolutions in Spain and Italy. Nadler tried to support it with his own interpretation

of the text of the Holy Union Treaty (Traktat Bratskogo Hristianskogo Soyuza 1830, 279-280) and analysis of other documents, including Alexander's Note dated March 25, 1816, as well as by citing Metternich's criticism and objections (Nadler 1892, 639-640). Nadler explained the Austrian minister's critical attitude by the fact that Metternich, «as a non-believing, empty, frivolous person», «did not recognize any ideas and, like Napoleon, treated ideology of any kind with deep contempt», but at the same time «tried to use it as a tool of reaction» (Nadler 1892, 641). In modern historiography, this position of Metternich is explained by his and his advisor F. Gentz's belief that «the tsar's warlike intentions were hidden under the mystical declarations of peace and brotherly love» (Parsamov 2017, 48).

The Kharkiv scholar rejected the idea that the Holy Alliance had no practical significance. On the contrary, argued Nadler, it was this alliance that became «the moral basis of that firm political connection on which peace and concord among European states rested for three whole decades» (Nadler 1892, 642-643). However, it is hardly possible to interpret the varied views of the leaders of European states on crucial events of this period in European history as agreement. Still, modern historiography concurs with Nadler that «the ideology of the Holy Alliance was at the basis of the Viennese form of existence of international powers» (Kudryavtseva 2019, 46).

Nadler admitted that the Holy Alliance proved to be only a temporary form of new international order. This is exactly how modern researchers see it as well (Ghervas 2014). But he believed that, «if the elements of enmity, discord, and turmoil finally prevailed over the elements of order and peace, then this sad fact only points to the terrible power exerted on the life of Europe by the spirit forever hostile to the high and pure principles of Christianity» (Nadler 1892, 643).

Since «the seal of Metternich's genius» marked all actions of the Congress of Vienna and «the spirit of Metternich hovered over it» (Nadler 1882, 11), Nadler, not entirely justifiably, placed on the Austrian minister the sole responsibility for combating any dissent in the countries of the Vienna System of international relations.

Metternich certainly showed initiative in the adoption of the infamous Carlsbad Decrees of 1819, which ordered all states and universities

of the German Union to suppress any liberal tendencies. However, he could count on a large number of like-minded people, allies, and helpers in the German states and beyond. Only because of this, and not at all thanks to the energy of Metternich alone, censorship became a reality even in universities and, in the words of Nadler, «a grave silence settled in the political life of Germany» (Nadler 1882, 37).

As an intellectual living in the Russian Empire, which by the time when both of his books dealing with the Vienna system were written had decisively taken the path of counter-reforms, Nadler explained the difference between his country's foreign policy designs and the imperial policy of Metternich somewhat tentatively. The Kharkiv scholar argued that Alexander I's ideal was «the peace and tranquility of Europe», which could be achieved «through a gentle, wise, and progressive regime» (Nadler 1882, 11). However, the aspirations of Metternich, as much the enemy of any revolution as Alexander I, had to «sooner or later prevail over the magnanimous but impractical tendencies of the Russian sovereign», and the latter had to conclude that the «system of order and peace» was «incompatible with progressive political development» and could exist only under the condition of «the complete dominance of the Metternich regime» (Nadler 1882, 10-11). Modern authors believe that the relations between Austria and Russia were strong thanks to Metternich, especially when the Austrian minister gave his full support to another Russian emperor, Nicholas I, for the sake of preserving the existing order and confronting «the demon of revolution» (Kudryavtseva 2019, 48).

Although Nadler was a contemporary of counter-reforms and had a negative attitude towards constitutionalism, he did not spare dark colors and critical expressions to describe that «wild», «senseless», «bloodthirsty», and «crazy» internal reaction and that «unheard of despotism» which flourished in the aftermath of the decisions of the Congress of Vienna in Austria, Germany, Italy, and Spain (Nadler 1882, 37, 42, 45, 52, 56). Thus, he recognized the inevitability of revolutionary developments in some of these countries.

We should note one more important aspect: although Nadler most often called the Vienna system of international relations the «Metternich system»,

he nevertheless admitted quite objectively that the chancellor's influence «was not equal in all European states» (Nadler 1882, 39).

According to Nadler, the Vienna system initially followed precisely the «reactionary» direction projected by Metternich. Modern researchers agree — particularly P. Y. Rakhshmir, who in a monographic study of the Austrian minister stressed that «thanks to Metternich's diplomatic art, Austria began to play a role in Europe that exceeded its real capabilities» (Rahshmir 2005, 243). In Nadler's view, the ascendancy of this system was assured while «the Bourbon restoration in France was developing in a reactionary direction, — while England was dominated by ardent Tories, the chancellor's age-old friends, — while, finally, Russia and Prussia were obedient to his whim» (Nadler 1882, 40). Real and dangerous challenges to this system (the Spanish Revolution of 1820–1823, or the Neapolitan Revolution of 1820–1821) tested both the leaders of the great powers and their armies, employed in suppressing revolutions after the Second Congress of the Holy Alliance in Troppau.

At the same time, we must acknowledge Nadler's objectivity as a researcher: he admitted that, by that time, Alexander I had «already definitively moved into the camp of reaction» (Nadler 1882, 71). The Kharkiv scholar had a sharp polemical exchange on this issue with the famous German historian G. Gervinus, who argued that at the Troppau Congress Alexander I resolutely opposed military involvement, advocated exclusively diplomatic forms of intervention, and changed his decision only after receiving news of the rebellion of the Semenov Regiment. «This whole story, in our opinion, is nothing more than a legend», wrote Nadler, who believed that the disagreements between Alexander I and Metternich began to smooth out as early as the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, and in Troppau the two were already essentially of one mind and together with Prussia «proclaimed the principle of intervention» (Nadler 1882, 76-77).

Despite the existence of many common interests between Austria and Russia, Nadler fairly objectively captured the essence of the contradictions within the «Metternich system», perceptible already in the first years of its existence. He specifically singled out the position of England, which, through the efforts of its foreign minister George Canning, distanced itself

from the continental states, primarily in the matter of military intervention in the countries of Southern Europe. At the beginning of 1824, England «finally withdrew from the Holy Alliance»; Canning even «betrayed» the alliance and «led England on a completely new path» (Nadler 1882, 103, 140, 187). But, according to Nadler, the Greek Revolution<sup>4</sup> and the Adrianople Peace Treaty of 1829, which confirmed the autonomy of Greece (Nadler 1882, 224, 229), dealt a real blow to the «Metternich system». This new situation, when the Greek question was «at the forefront» for Metternich and even overshadowed the events of the Spanish Revolution (Nadler 1882, 107), led to a political realignment in Europe. The public opinion among various social groups of the Old Continent and the sympathies of the entire Christian world supported the Greek struggle for national liberation. Metternich, who had for a long time suppressed any liberation movement in Europe, could not oppose the Greeks. «The aspirations of the European peoples turned out to be more powerful than the will of individuals», observed Nadler. «Metternich's fidgety activity continued for many years even after the Adrianople Peace Treaty, but no one gave it the same importance as before» (Nadler 1882, 228-229). However, the scholar's conclusion that Metternich's «era of reaction was coming to an end» because «new, better life for old Europe had dawned in the Greek East» (Nadler 1882, 229) still went too far. For example, a contemporary of Nadler and the author of the popular article «Metternich» D. I. Pisarev argued that the failure of Metternich's policy became evident as a result of the defeat of Austria in the Austro-Italian-French War of 1859 and the unification of Italy in 1861 (Pisarev 1909, 579).

### **Conclusion**

The first monograph in Russian imperial historiography entirely devoted to the diplomatic legacy of the Austrian minister of foreign affairs and chancellor Klemens von Metternich was authored by professor of the Imperial Kharkiv University V. K. Nadler. In addition to the book *Metternich and the European Reaction* (1882), the scholar also dealt with the foreign policy of the Austrian Empire in the first years of the Vienna system of international relations

---

<sup>4</sup> However, modern historiography emphasizes that Russia's refusal to support the Greek uprising in 1821 was a victory for Metternich (Kudryavtseva, 2019, 52).

in the multi-volume monograph *Emperor Alexander I and the Idea of the Holy Alliance*. Nadler usually referred to the post-Napoleonic international order as «Metternich's political system», thus emphasizing the importance of the Austrian minister as the organizer of the Vienna Congress, guarantor of the implementation of its decisions, and driving force behind the fight against any dissent in European countries. Although Nadler offered conflicting assessments of Metternich's professional qualities in his studies, the Kharkiv researcher firmly connected the pan-European reaction with his name. According to Nadler, the Vienna international order initially developed precisely in the reactionary direction mapped out by Metternich, and it was only the Greek Revolution and the Adrianople Peace Treaty of 1829, which confirmed the autonomy of Greece, that dealt a real blow to the «Metternich system». The differences between the foreign policy designs of Alexander I and the imperial policy of Metternich were presented by Nadler somewhat tendentiously, but, in the best progressive tradition of the historiography of his day, he tried to avoid exaggerating the role of the individual in history.

#### Список джерел та літератури / Sources and literature

Akt Venskogo kongressa. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiyskoy imperii, s 1649 goda*, Sankt-Peterburg, 1830, vol. 33 (1815–1816). Tsarstvovanie imperatora Aleksandra I, no. 25863, s. 144-178. (In Russian)

Акт Венского конгресса. *Полное собрание законов Российской империи, с 1649 года*. Санкт-Петербург, 1830, т. 33 (1815–1816). Царствование императора Александра I, с. 144-178.

Black, J. *A History of Diplomacy*. London, 2010.

Bohdashyna, O. M. *Pozytyvizm v istorychnii nauzi v Ukraini (60-ti rr. XIX — 20-ti rr. XX st.)*. Kharkiv, 2013. (In Ukrainian)

Богдашина, О. М. *Позитивізм в історичній науці в Україні (60-мі рр. XIX — 20-мі рр. XX ст.)*. Харків, 2013.

Budnikova, O. E. *Vzglyady i deyatel'nost' K. Metterniha v kontekste avstriyskogo konservatizma*; avtoref. diss... kand.. ist. nauk. Kursk, 2007. (In Russian)

Будникова, О. Е. *Взгляды и деятельность К. Меттерниха в контексте австрийского консерватизма*; автореф. дисс... канд.. ист. наук. Курск, 2007.



Buzeskul, V. P. Nekrolog V. K. Nadlera. *Harkovskie gubernskie vedomosti*, 1894, no. 86. (In Russian)

Бузекул, В. П. Некролог В. К. Надлера. *Харьковские губернские ведомости*, 1894. № 86.

Buzeskul, V. P. Iz istorii Harkovskogo universiteta vtoroy poloviny 70-h gg. *Naukovi zapysky naukovo-doslidnytskoi katedry istorii ukrainskoi kultury*. Kharkiv. 1927, no. 6, s. 1-14. (In Russian)

Бузекул, В. П. Из истории Харьковского университета второй половины 70-х гг. *Наукові записки науково-дослідницької кафедри історії української культури*. Харьков, 1927. № 6, с. 1-14.

Buzeskul, V. P. *Vseobshchaya istoriya i eYo predstaviteli v Rossii v XIX — nachale XX vv.* Leningrad, 1929, part 1, pp. 125-129 (In Russian)

Бузекул, В. П. *Всеобщая история и её представители в России в XIX — начале XX вв.* Ленинград, 1929, ч. 1, с. 125-129.

Derzhavnyi arkhiv Odeskoi oblasti (DAOO). F. 45. Op. 8 (1894). Spr. 16. *Formulyarnyy spisok o sluzhbe zasluzhennogo ordinarnogo professora imperatorskogo Novorossiyskogo universiteta V. K. Nadlera (kopiya)*. (In Russian)

Державний архів Одеської області (ДАОО). Ф. 45. Оп. 8 (1894). Спр. 16. *Формулярний список о службе заслуженного ординарного профессора императорского Новороссийского университета В. К. Надлера (копия)*.

Dodolev, M. A. *Venskiy kongress v istoriografii XIX i XX vekov*. Moskva, 2000. (In Russian)

Додолев, М. А. *Венский конгресс в историографии XIX и XX веков*. Москва, 2000.

Dudko, I. D. Videnska systema mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn z pohliadu postnapoleonivskykh i postbipoliarnykh chasiv. *IRKNEU [Institutional repository of Vadym Hetman Kyiv National University of Economics]*, 2013, s. 44-56, <http://ir.kneu.edu.ua/handle/2010/28884>. Data perehliadu: 02 bereznia 2022. (In Ukrainian)

Дудко, І. Д. Віденська система міжнародних відносин з погляду постнаполеонівських і постбіполярних часів. *IRKNEU*. 2013, с. 47-48, <http://ir.kneu.edu.ua/handle/2010/28884>. Дата перегляду: 02 березня 2022.

Ghervas, S. What was the Congress of Vienna? *History Today*. 2014, vol. 64, issue 9, <https://www.historytoday.com/archive/what-was-congress-vienna>. Accessed: 21 Oct. 2022.

Gradovskiy A. D. Sistema Metterniha. *Sobranie sochineniy*. Sankt-Peterburg, 1899, s. 545-613. (In Russian)

Градовский А. Д. Система Меттерниха. *Собрание сочинений*. Санкт-Петербург, 1899, с. 545-613.

Hizhnyak, I. A. *Sistemyi mezhdunarodnyih otnosheniy v istorii Novogo vremeni*. Kyiv, 2011. (In Russian)

Хижняк, І. А. *Системи міжнародних відносин в історії Нового часу*. Київ, 2011.

Honcharuk, T. H., Novikova, L. V. Nadler Vasyl Karlovych. *Profesory Odeskoho (Novorosiiskoho) universytetu. Biografichniy slovnyk*. Odesa, 2005, vol. 3, s. 367-370. (In Ukrainian)

Гончарук, Т. Г., Новікова Л. В. Надлер Василь Карлович. *Професори Одеського (Новоросійського) університету. Біографічний словник*. Одеса, 2005, т. 3, с. 367-370.

Inсаров, X. G. *Knyaz Metternih Ego zhizn i politicheskaya deyatelnost*. Sankt-Peterburg, 1905. (In Russian)

Инсаров, X. Г. *Князь Меттерних Его жизнь и политическая деятельность*. Санкт-Петербург, 1905.

Kaplin, A. D. (2003). V. K. Nadler — «istorik-povestvovatel», istorik-truzhenik. *Vira i rozum [Faith and Reason]*, 2003, no. 4, s. 333-336. (In Russian)

Каплин, А. Д. В. К. Надлер — «историк-повествователь», историк-труженик. *Vira i rozum*, 2003, № 4, с. 333-336.

Kopylov, S. A. *Problemy istorii slovianskykh narodiv v istorychnii dumtsi Ukrainy (ostannia tretyna XVII — pochatok XX st.)*. Kamianets-Podilskyi, 2005. (In Ukrainian)

Копилов, С. А. *Проблеми історії слов'янських народів в історичній думці України (остання третина XVII — початок XX ст.)*. Кам'янець-Подільський, 2005.

Kozlitin, V. D., Kundenko, S. P., Pahomov, V. F. ta in. *Izuchenie novoy i noveyshey istorii zarubezhnykh stran v Harkovskom universitete (1805–1990)*. *Vestnik Harkovskogo universiteta. Seriya: Istoriya [Bulletin of Kharkov University. Series: History]*, 1991, vyp. 357, s. 83-104. (In Russian)

Козлитин, В. Д., Кунденко, С. П., Пахомов, В. Ф. та ін. *Изучение новой и новейшей истории зарубежных стран в Харьковском университете (1805–1990)*. *Вестник Харьковского университета. Серия: История*, 1991, вып. 24, № 357, с. 83-104.

Kreye, E. E. *Politika Metterniha. Germaniya v protivoborstve s Napoleonom. 1799–1814*. Moscow, 2002. (In Russian)

Крейе, Э. Э. *Политика Меттерниха. Германия в противоборстве с Наполеоном. 1799–1814*. Москва, 2002.

Kudryavtseva, E. P. (2019). Dva kantslera: Metternih i Nesselrode. *Vestnik MGIMO-Universiteta [Bulletin of MGIMO-University]*, 2019, no. 1 (64), s. 45-58. (In Russian)

Кудрявцева, Е. П. *Два канцлера: Меттерних и Нессельроде*. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*, 2019, № 1 (64), с. 45-58.

Lyman, S. I. (1999). Z istorii nimetskoj diaspory v Kharkovi u XIX st.: prof. V. K. Nadler. *Skhid-Zakhid [East-West]*, 1999, vup. 2, s. 131-146. (In Ukrainian)

Лиман, С. І. З історії німецької діаспори в Харкові у XIX ст.: проф. В. К. Надлер. *Схід-Захід*, 1999, вип. 2, с. 131-146.

Lyman, S. I. *Idei v latah: Zapad ili Vostok? Srednevekove v otsenkah medievistov Ukrainyi (1804 – pervaya polovina 1880-h gg.)*. Harkov, 2009. (In Russian)

Лиман, С. И. *Идеи в латах: Запад или Восток? Средневековье в оценках медиевистов Украины (1804 – первая половина 1880-х гг.)*. Харьков, 2009.

Marleku, A., Emini, A. The Role of Congress of Vienna in the Emergence of Multilateralism. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Relationes Internationales*, 2016, vol. 9, no 1.

*Memoires, documents et ecrits divers, laisses par le prince de Metternich, chancelier de cour et d'etat, publies par son fils, le prince Richard de Metternich (1881)*. Paris, 1881. 8 vol.

P. M. (Milyukov, P. N.) *Novyy istorik 1812 goda. Russkaya mysl [Russian thought]*, 1887, no 2, s. 150. (In Russian)

П. М. (Милюков, П. Н.) *Новый историк 1812 года. Русская мысль*, 1887, № 2, с. 150.

Mitryaev, A. I. Nadler Vasiliy Karlovich. *Slavyanovedenie v dorevolutsionnoy Rossii: Biobibliograficheskiy slovar*. Moskva, 1979, s. 247-248. (In Russian)

Митряев, А. И. Надлер Василий Карлович. *Славяноведение в дореволюционной России: Биоблиграфический словарь*. Москва, 1979, с. 247-248.

Nadler, V. K. *Russkie istoricheskie rukovodstva i ih otnoshenie k nauke vsebschey istorii*. Harkov, 1864. (In Russian)

Надлер, В. К. *Русские исторические руководства и их отношение к науке всеобщей истории*. Харьков, 1864. (In Russian)

Nadler, V. K. *Metternih i evropeyskaya reaktsiya*. Harkov, 1882. (In Russian)

Надлер, В. К. *Меттерних и европейская реакция*. Харьков, 1882.

Nadler, V. K. *Imperator Aleksandr I i ideya Svyaschennogo soyuza*. Riga, 1892, t. 5. (In Russian)

Надлер, В. К. *Император Александр I и идея Священного союза*. Рига, 1892, т. 5.

*Obozreniya prepodavaniya predmetov v imperatorskom Harkovskom universitete na 1871–1872 uchebnyy god*. Harkov, 1871. (In Russian)

*Обозрения преподавания предметов в императорском Харьковском университете на 1871–1872 уч. г.* Харьков, 1871.

*Obozreniya prepodavaniya predmetov v imperatorskom Harkovskom universitete na 1880–1881 uchebnyy god*. Harkov, 1880. (In Russian)

*Обозрения преподавания предметов в императорском Харьковском университете на 1880–1881 уч. г. Харьков, 1880.*

Parsamov, V. S. Svyaschennyiy soyuz i ego interpretatoryi. *Rossiya i mir v XIX veke [Russia and the world in the 19th century]*, 2017, no. 4 (97), s. 45-60. (In Russian)

Парсамов, В. С. Священный союз и его интерпретаторы. *Россия и мир в XIX веке*. 2017, № 4 (97), с. 45-60.

Pisarev, D. I. Metternih. *Sochineniya [Compositions]*. Sankt-Peterburg. 1909, t. 1, s. 562-636. (In Russian)

Писарев, Д. И. Меттерних. *Сочинения*. Санкт-Петербург, т. 1, 1909, с. 562-636.

Prilozheniya k otchyotu o sostoyanii i deyatelnosti imperatorskogo Harkovskogo universiteta za 1877 god. *Zapiski imperatorskogo Harkovskogo universiteta*, 1878, t. 1, s. I-II. (In Russian)

Приложения к отчёту о состоянии и деятельности императорского Харьковского университета за 1877 год. *Записки Харьковского университета*, 1878, т. 1, с. I-II.

Protokol zasedaniy Soveta [Harkovskogo] universiteta 21 sentyabrya, 12 oktyabrya 1878 g. *Zapiski Harkovskogo universiteta*, 1878, t. 4, s. 91-102. (In Russian)

Протокол заседаний Совета [Харьковского] университета 21 сентября, 12 октября 1878 г. *Записки Харьковского университета*, 1878, т. 4, с. 91-102.

Rahshmir, P. Yu. (2005). *Knyaz Metternih: chelovek i politik*. Perm, 2005. (In Russian)

Рахшмир, П. Ю. *Князь Меттерних: человек и политик*. Пермь, 2005.

Traktat Bratskogo Hristianskogo Soyuza. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiyskoy imperii, s 1649 goda*. Sankt-Peterburg, 1830, t. 33 (1815–1816). Tsarstvovanie imperatora Aleksandra I. № 25943, s. 279-280. (In Russian)

Трактат Братского Христианского Союза. *Полное собрание законов Российской империи, с 1649 года*. Санкт-Петербург, 1830, т. 33 (1815–1816). Царствование императора Александра I. №25943, с. 279-280.

Tsivatyi, V. H. Yevropeiske vidlunnia i dorohovkazy Videnskoho konhresu: instytutsionalna ta polityko-dyplomatychni vytoky Yevropeiskoho soiyuzu (teoretyko-metodolohichniy aspekt). *Visnyk Mariupolskoho derzhavnogo universytetu [Bulletin of the Mariupol State University]*, 2016, vyp. 15, s. 162-170. (In Ukrainian)

Циватий, В. Г. Європейське відлуння і дороговкази Віденського конгресу: інституціональна та політико-дипломатичні витоки Європейського союзу (теоретико-методологічний аспект). *Вісник Маріупольського державного університету*, 2016, вип. 15, с. 162-170.

Vyazigin, A. S. Vospominaniya o V. K. Nadlere (nekrolog). *Harkovskie gubernskie vedomosti*, 1894, no. 86. (In Russian)

Вязигин, А. С. Воспоминания о В. К. Надлере (некролог). *Харьковские губернские ведомости*, 1894, № 86.

Vyazigin, A. S. Nadler Vasilij Karlovich. *Istoriko-filologicheskij fakultet Harkovskogo universiteta za pervyie 100 let ego suschestvovaniya (1805–1905)*. Harkov, 1908, s. 282–287. (In Russian)

Вязигин, А. С. Надлер Василий Карлович. *Историко-филологический факультет Харьковского университета за первые 100 лет его существования (1805–1905)*. Харьков, 1908, с. 282–287.

## **Сергій Лиман**

доктор історичних наук, професор

Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна

майдан Свободи, 4, 61022, Харків, Україна

E-mail: s.lyman@karazin.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0371-7181>

## **ЗОВНІШНЯ ПОЛІТИКА КЛЕМЕНСА ФОН МЕТТЕРНІХА У ПРАЦЯХ В. К. НАДЛЕРА (1840–1894)**

*Зовнішньополітична діяльність головного організатора Віденського конгресу, фактичного архітектора постнаполеонівського міжнародного порядку, міністра закордонних справ та канцлера Австрійської імперії Клеменса фон Меттерніха привертає увагу багатьох дослідників, особливо напередодні 250-річчя з дня його народження. Хоча автором першої вітчизняної монографії, повністю присвяченої аналізу дипломатії Меттерніха, був професор Харківського університету В. К. Надлер (1840–1894), його ім'я та значення в цій ролі майже не згадується в історіографії. Метою статті є всебічний аналіз наукових робіт В. К. Надлера, які безпосередньо були присвячені вивченню дипломатичної діяльності Клеменса фон Меттерніха, її особливостей та значення для подальшого розвитку постнаполеонівського міжнародного порядку. Методи, які застосовувалися для досягнення мети дослідження: історико-порівняльний аналіз, систематизація та узагальнення, ретроспективний метод. У статті доведено, що аналізу зовнішньої політики Австрійської імперії в перші роки існування Віденської системи міжнародних відносин, крім окремої книги «Меттерніх та європейська реакція» (1882), В. К. Надлер частково присвятив і багатомну монографію «Імператор Олександр I та ідея Священного Союзу». Хоча відмінності зовнішньополітичних планів Олександра I від імперської політики Меттерніха В. К. Надлер виклав децю тенденційно, проте він у найкращих прогресивних традиціях сучасної йому історіографії намагався не перебільшувати ролі особистості в історії. Втім,*

для позначення нового міжнародного порядку В. К. Надлер зазвичай використовував назву «політична система Меттерніха», що підкреслювало надзвичайно важливе значення австрійського міністра як організатора Віденського конгресу, гаранта виконання його рішень, головного ініціатора боротьби з будь-яким інакодумством у європейських країнах. У викладі В. К. Надлера Віденський міжнародний порядок спочатку розвивався саме в тому реакційному напрямі, який позначив Меттерніх, а справжнього удару «системі Меттерніха» завдала Грецька революція та Адріанопольський мирний договір 1829 р., що підтвердив автономію Греції.

**Ключові слова:** Клеменс фон Меттерніх, В. К. Надлер, міжнародні відносини, зовнішня політика, дипломатія, Віденський конгрес, Священний Союз.

*Текст надійшов до редакції 22.04.2023.*

*The text was received by the editors 22.04.2023.*

*Текст затверджено до друку 15.06.2023.*

*The text is recommended for print 15.06.2023.*