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ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to examine the political, religious and diplomatic impact of Gustavus Adolphus during his reign as King of Sweden (1611-1632). My research begins with an overview of the House of Vasa, which was established by Gustavus’ grandfather, Gustav I, in 1523. After the overview in Vasa history, I then shift my focus to Gustavus’ life as a young ruler. In particular, there is a focus on his military and diplomatic strategies. The third section studies Sweden’s intervention in the Thirty Year’s War, from Gustavus’ early attempts to build an alliance among German Protestants to his death at the Battle of Lutzen in 1632. In the final chapter, there is an analysis of the overall impact of Gustavus Adolphus not only within Sweden, but also Europe as a whole.
"I am the King of Sweden! And this day I seal with my blood the liberties and religion of the German nation." – Gustavus Adolphus at the Battle of Lützen, November 1632

Introduction

The Thirty Years’ War was a brutal, enduring conflict that represented the height of religious tension in Western Europe. Now, nearly 400 years since it fairly insignificant beginnings (the Bohemian Revolt of 1618), The Thirty Years’ War still remains a topic of research among historians. Studying the Thirty Years’ War also requires an understanding of the Protestant-Catholic divide and the following Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Modern historians have discovered that there still remains a significant amount of religious tension in Europe. As the continent still face issues related to religion, nationalism and self-identity, the Thirty Years’ War can provide a fitting model to understand the motives of countries (or states) both 400 years ago and in a modern sense.

My research will largely focus on Sweden’s intervention in the Thirty Years’ War. To understand this move, from a political, social, and military viewpoint, it is important to understand the origins of the conflict. The Thirty Years’ War is primarily a religious conflict and can be traced to the Protestant Reformation and the establishment of Lutheranism, first in Germany and later in neighboring countries. The first attempt to end the conflict was with the Peace of Augsburg of 1555, which allowed the German states to choose to practice either Lutheranism or Catholicism. Despite attempts to appease both sides, numerous rulers in the German states continued to fight over territory. What was new, however, were the religious motives, which gave rulers like Gustavus a justification, especially to citizens, for warfare. No longer bound by an ulterior reasoning masked in ambiguity, both Protestant and Catholic leaders were religiously inspired to take up arms. But this war was as much about power as it was
religion. For Gustavus, and many other rulers, the Thirty Years’ conflict was the perfect opportunity to gain new territory. The Swedish Empire had recently grown with the re-acquisition of the disputed territory of Livonia, and was threatening to rule the Baltic. The ambition undying spirit of Gustavus ultimately paid off: military intervention in Germany was a success. Other Northern European powers, notably Denmark, did not fare as well, losing hegemonic control and diplomatic clout in the process. Despite the early death of Gustavus in 1632, Sweden left the Thirty Years’ War in 1635 as the greatest power in Northern Europe, and a friend of Northern Germany, France and the Netherlands. As Sweden entered its golden age, the spirit of King Gustavus Adolphus—the “Lion of the North” lived on. The goal of this paper is to highlight how Gustavus Adolphus changed the landscape of Swedish history as a military genius, religious leader, and brilliant diplomat. In the end, it was Gustavus’ remarkable efficiency as a ruler kept the Swedish Empire together while continually at war.

Historians have long debated why Sweden came to the aid of Protestant forces in Germany. A farewell speech at Stockholm on May 30, 1630 indicates that Gustavus Adolphus wanted to defend Protestantism, and although a deeply religious man, some scholars have questioned his underlying motives. The three primary motives often studied are: political, economic and military.

One of the most prominent 20th century historians to study Gustavus Adolphus’ was British historian Michael Roberts, whose research was first published in the 1950’s. In his article “The Political Objectives of Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, 1630-1632,” Roberts argued that intervention allowed Sweden to maintain its own growing empire and maintain power in
Scandinavia and the Baltic region. Furthermore, Gustavus Adolphus was able to use an extensive network of political alliances to form hegemonic control that shifted the balance of power in Sweden’s favor. The timing was also very important for Gustavus Adolphus. The German princes were struggling to find adequate support, and Gustavus knew that a well-timed intervention could reap benefits in the future.

Other historians have looked at Sweden’s intervention from an economic standpoint. Ernst Ekman, a Swedish-American historian, spent most his academic career studying Gustavus Adolphus. In his article “Three Decades of Research on Gustavus Adolphus” Ekman argues that Sweden’s intervention in Germany helped establish its trading power. In particular Ekman notes that Sweden sought to gain control of Baltic ports, which could have won if Sweden would have maintained its pre-Thirty Years’ War territory.

Ekman’s research was most prevalent in the 1960’s, and only recently have new scholars looked at Sweden’s intervention. Piirimae Partel, an Estonian historian whose research focuses on Sweden’s control of Baltic states, look at Gustavus Adolphus’ intervention from a military viewpoint. In his article “Just War in Theory and Practice,” Partel argues that Sweden did not take uphold the traditional method of intervention. While traditionally a country will intervene in a war for self-defense of humanitarian action, Partel reasons that Sweden used a theological justification that was meant to gain public support. As a result, Gustavus Adolphus was able to stir a religious case that helped establish his strong military and public aid.

---

Gustavus Adolphus’ campaign in Germany allowed the Swedish king to display his impressive military tactics as commander of the Swedish forces. Several military historians have studied Gustavus Adolphus’ tactics, which have often been called “revolutionary.” Richard Brzezinski, a military historian specializing in European warfare, has done extensive research on Gustavus Adolphus’ military tactics and has sought to understand with they were so decisive and effective. Brzenzinski credits Gustavus Adolphus as the “Father of Modern Warfare” for his military genius and innovations at the time and his influence on later great military generals like Napoleon.5

Gustavus Adolphus best demonstrated his military skill and power primarily at the Battle of Breitenfeld, which was fought in September of 1631. Interestingly, one of the earliest primary sources from the battle is a first hand account by a northern German soldier fighting alongside Gustavus Adolphus’ army. The young soldier, whose father was Dutch royalty, gave detailed accounts of both Gustavus Adolphus’ tactics and that of General Tilly’s. Several historians have since studied the Battle of Breitenfeld. Francis Bowman’s “Sweden’s War, 1611-32,” which was published in 1942 in the Journal of Modern History, was one of the earlier attempts for an American historian to research primary sources from the battle. Bowman’s work has inspired more recent historians like Louis Ciotola to primarily focus on Gustavus Adolphus’ military tactics and their implication for the rest of the Thirty Years’ War, the Swedish Empire, and Europe as a whole.6

1. A Vasa King

Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden during its Golden Era, descended from the House of Vasa. Gustav I, who ruled from 1523-1560, was the founder of what is generally considered Sweden’s most successful royal family. Often heralded the “father of Sweden,” Gustav Vasa⁷ (as he is known by historians), adopted a Moses-like mindset that liberated the Swedes via Protestantism, increased monarchical control, and adapted an expansionist foreign policy. As a diplomat, Gustav Vasa promoted a Swedish mercantile economy that became a major player in the Baltic region. In particular, Sweden gained a foothold in the Muscovy trade, which extended the trade of timber, pelts, and flax from Russia into Western Europe.⁸ Meanwhile, religious tensions in Germany moved to Sweden, where Gustav Vasa controlled a “gradual, pragmatic, and easy-going” Swedish Reformation that was “lacking in religious rancous or sectarian passion.”⁹ Gustav Vasa used the power of the monarchy to create a Protestant state and reduce the power of the Swedish Church. When Gustav Vasa took the throne, the church held 14,340 farms; by Gustav’s death in 1560, the church held no land, while the House of Vasa held 18,936 farms.¹⁰ In addition to land acquisition, Gustav advanced Protestantism by introducing the Vasa Bible, a full translation of Martin Luther’s text.

---

⁹ Ibid., 171-2
¹⁰ Ibid., 178-9
Using the title *summus espicopus*, Gustav Vasa declared that the “church was to be subject to, rather than coordinate with the state.”

At the death of Gustav Vasa in September, 1560, his son, Eric XIV, was crowned King of Sweden. Prospects were quite high for the new ruler to carry on the Vasa line, and establish Sweden’s power in the Baltic. Early in his reign, in 1561, Eric XIV acquired Estonia. However, Christian II, King of Denmark, was upset with Sweden’s expansionist foreign policy, and went to war with its northern neighbor. The Scandinavian Seven Year’s War (1563-1570), ultimately resulted in a stalemate, and was representative of Sweden and Denmark’s constant struggle for Baltic hegemony. Although successful early in his reign, Eric XIV displayed signs of mental instability and even insanity. Historians agree that Eric suffered from schizophrenia, which led to his dethronement in 1568. John III, another son of Gustav Vasa who had opposed Eric XIV, emerged as the Duke of Finland to take the Swedish throne. Eric XIV would remain in prison until his death in 1577, where it is believed he was poisoned with arsenic.

John III ruled for 24 years, from 1568-1592. This was a time of great turmoil, not only in Sweden, but throughout Scandinavia and the Baltic. The House of Vasa was constantly quarreling with Denmark, and John III again looked eastward and battled Russia for Livonia. In 1595, Sweden established its dominance in the Baltic by acquiring Swedish Livonia and Estonia. Now, with an important port at Riga, John III greatly expanded Sweden’s economic and military power in the region, only to be rivaled by Denmark. Much like Gustav Vasa, King John greatly changed

---

11 Ibid., 169
12 Livonia was a long disputed territory controlled by various Baltic and Eastern European great powers. Under Russian control during the reign of the Early Vasas, it was Erik XIV who first involved Sweden with the Livonian War (1558-1582). John III’s marriage to Catherine Jagiellon, a Polish princess, helped him claim Poland and Livonian territory. Upset with his brother’s dealings and newly claimed titles (which already included Duke of Finland), Erik XIV imprisoned John and forbade him to deal with any foreign countries. As Erik XIV’s insanity worsened, John was released from prison and claimed the Swedish throne.
the state’s involvement with the Swedish Church, a Lutheran establishment. As a Catholic, John III disapproved of Gustav’s Lutheran initiatives, and the citizens themselves were growing resistant to “royal direction.”\textsuperscript{13} The Swedish Church challenged royal supremacy and asserted its autonomy by the mid-1580’s. The death of John III in 1592 caused religious tensions among dissenting Lutherans, which led to the Swedish Civil War (1597-1598) that ended with the Treaty of Linkoping.\textsuperscript{14} However, the Swedish government was in a state of flux, and citizens responded with a revolution (1598-1600). During this period, there were two claims to the Swedish throne. Sigismund III was the son of John III, and also the King of Poland. His Catholic viewpoints clashed with Charles IX, the youngest son of Gustav Vasa. Historians generally uphold Sigismund III’s rule as King of Sweden from 1592-1599, when Sigismund III left for Poland and the Riksdag recognized Charles IX’s claim to the throne.\textsuperscript{15}

As the King of Poland, Sigismund III also claimed Sweden and Livonia, as a member of the House of Vasa. Charles IX, frustrated with Sigismund III’s resistance, implemented a surprise attack on Poland. However, Sweden’s army was inferior, and its lack of pikemen made it incapable of offering resistance to Polish cavalry charges. Although Charles IX maintained Livonia, his military weakness was evident. Although a son to Gustav, the founder of the House of Vasa, Charles IX did not come to power until he was much older—over 50 years old. At his death in 1611, Charles IX’s seventeen-year old son, Gustavus Adolphus, became King of Sweden. For young Gustavus, his main preoccupation would be to “remedy the defects which his father had struggled in vain.”\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[14] Ibid., 383
\item[15] Ibid., 390
\item[16] Ibid., 404
\end{footnotes}
2. Gustavus Adolphus as a Young Ruler

On December 9, 1594, Duke Charles and his German-born wife, Christina of Holstein, gave birth to a new son, whom they named Gustavus. At the time, the House of Vasa was in crisis. Sigismund unofficially maintained control and recognition of the Swedish throne, but was still without an heir. Just six months later, however, Sigismund had a child, named Wladislaw, with his consort queen, Anne of Austria. Charles, now with a potential heir, recognized the opportunity to dispose Sigisumund and the Polish-Vasa line. After a bloody civil war, Charles forced Sigismund to sail to Poland in 1599, but the Vasa hereditary wars were far from over. There was great uncertainty as to who would become the next Swedish king. Not until Charles IX’s long-due coronation 1607, did young Gustavus claim the future right to the crown.

During his childhood, Gustavus developed a strong understanding of his future royal responsibilities. King Charles hired Johan “Skytte” Schroderus, twenty-five year old peasant’s son and gifted intellectual, as Gustavus’ personal tutor. Despite his young age, Skytte proved to be an invaluable component’s of the prince’s daily life. Gustavus was expected to study history, in order to understand how “good and evil governments bear fruit after their kind,” according to Skytte. As a young statesman, Gustavus studied politics, law, and gave practice speeches in front of important

---

17 Image Source: http://www.knowledgerush.com/wiki_image/2/25/Gustavus_II_Adolphus.jpg
19 Ibid., 34
diplomats and state officials. Perhaps more impressive was Gustavus’ command of foreign
languages. At home in Stockholm Castle, Gustavus used German with his mother, Christina, who
was herself of Holstein-Gottorp royalty. Learning German before he could write Swedish, the
German language was in many ways Gustavus’ mother tongue. In addition to German and
Swedish, it is believed that Gustavus eventually gained native fluency in Latin, Dutch, French,
Italian; a strong understanding of Spanish, English, and Scotch (Gaelic); and a basic notion of
Polish, Russian, Spanish and Greek. Gustavus’ royal education also included extensive military
training, which would later become the hallmark of King Gustavus’ reign. Surprisingly, however,
was the lack of his religious education. King Charles, much like his father, Gustav Vasa, was a
proud Lutheran. Skytte, however, who was fascinated with German mysticism and disliked
“theological rationalism,” never even mentioned the Augsburg Confession, the primary
confession of faith in the Lutheran Church. Nonetheless, Gustavus would later study theological
in great detail, particularly after his many near-death experiences.

Beyond his well-rounded education, Prince Gustavus was an attractive young man in
search of a suitor. King Charles and Queen Kristina want their son to proudly carry on the Vasa
name by bearing the title “future king of Sweden” and marrying into a well-respected royal
family. Among possible suitors was Elizabeth, daughter of King James I of England. Not to be
confused with her well-known grandmother, Queen Elizabeth I, the young English princess was
known to have “considerable personal attraction.” However, the queen consort of England,
Anne of Denmark, was vehemently opposed to her daughter marrying a Swedish prince. With the
War of Kalmar (1611-1613) between Sweden and Denmark, King James began to look for other

20 Ibid., 35
21 Ibid., 55
Protestant suitors for Elizabeth. Frederick V—Elector of Palatine, King of Bohemia, and an instrumental leader at the beginning of the Thirty Year’s War—married Elizabeth in May, 1612.\(^{22}\)

As Gustavus began the search for a new suitor, King Charles’ health began to decline. At the time, Sweden was involved with a Danish-Norwegian border war to the south. The time could not have seemed worse for Gustavus to inherit the throne. With Gustavus and Axel Oxenstierna, the Lord High Chancellor, by his side, King Charles IX said his last words on October 30, 1611.\(^{23}\)

Charles’ death brought a curious question: was the young Swedish prince ready to rule Sweden? Oxenstierna, an experience diplomat who served as the king’s advisor on the Privy Council, temporarily took charge of governmental powers. Meanwhile, the Swedish Estates, the Riksdag, was debating the Succession Agreement of 1604, which declared that Gustavus could inherit the throne, but not until his 24\(^{th}\) birthday, in 1618.\(^{24}\) In January, 1612, the Riksdag formally recognized Gustavus as the head of government, with Oxenstierna serving as chancellor. However, Gustavus would not be formally be crowned King of Sweden until his 24\(^{th}\) birthday, according to an agreement reached by the Riksdag.

3. The Threat of War

The beginning of Gustavus’ reign was marked by warfare. The Swedish Empire was constantly in conflict with its southern neighbor, Denmark, which had now reached its apex. King Christian IV’s invasion of Oland, an island off the coast of Sweden, and advance into Ostergotland, the most southern Swedish province, left the young Swedish king with no other choice but to respond militarily. The Kalmar War was particularly bad timing for Sweden for several reasons. First, Charles IX’s war in Polish-Lithuania, which Queen Christina thought


\(^{24}\) Ibid., 47
unnecessary, was still far from over. In addition, Jan Karol Chodkiewicz commanded Sigismund III’s Commonwealth, and was threatening Sweden’s control of Livonia. This created a logistical nightmare, as Swedish troops scrambled to Oland and Ostergotland, while trying to maintain Sweden’s Baltic reach. Gustavus decided to personally command Swedish forces in the Kalmar campaign. After nearly drowning while leading a raid, the military leadership of the young Swedish king was in question. Furthermore, with dwindling food and supplies, and half a century of continuous warfare, Sweden was entering a dark period in its history. Gustavus, however, was determined to defeat his critics, and stopped a Danish attack on the important trading city of Jonkoping. With dwindling supplies and tired troops, the Danes averted a prolonged war with the Treaty of Knared. The results indicate that Denmark was the clear winner, despite not gaining any Swedish territory. However, Gustavus had to renounce all claims to Baltic lands, severing Sweden’s Atlantic trade route. Nonetheless, the War in Kalmar did provide some positive results. Despite Denmark gaining the upper hand in the battle for the Baltic region, no territory was gained. It was Sweden, not Denmark, which had the opportunity to swing the balance of power with a victory over Poland-Lithuania. As a result of the war, Denmark’s growth threatened the power of other nations in the region. The Dutch and the English, in particular, became committed allies of Sweden, through the brilliant diplomatic duo of King Gustavus and Axel Oxenstierna.

As a young ruler, Gustavus quickly learned the importance of diplomacy. The War in Kalmar tested the power and legitimacy of the Swedish Empire. On the verge of collapse, Gustavus managed to reunite the nation for a greater struggle against opposing forces. In terms of diplomatic strategy, Gustavus sought to eliminate the bi-polar balance of power in Scandinavia—shared by Sweden and Denmark—in favor of Swedish hegemony in the region. To be sure, it was

---

an ambitious task, and domestic concerns like poverty and religious tensions provided the
Swedish king with a growing number of critics. Nonetheless, Gustavus carried on his quest for
Swedish hegemony by renewing the war in Poland. Unlike the Kalmar War, which was primarily
cconcerned with power relations, the Polish-Swedish War was personal. Sigismund, with
Wladyslaw as his military arm, was threatening Swedish Livonia in the name of the House of
Vasa. Gustavus wanted to be successful where his father had failed, by destroying the Polish-
Vasa family line. With expectations for a naval alliance with the Netherlands, Sweden sent a
party of 400 men to Poland with the hope of capturing Riga, an important Baltic city.\textsuperscript{26} Poland,
which had been at war with Russia for over fourteen years, abandoned that struggle in January,
1619 with the Truce of Deulinie. No longer fearing a Polish attack via a Russian Baltic port,
Gustavus reasoned that Sigismund would abandon an attack through Livonia and to the Swedish
cost.

When there was talk of a potential Swedish-Russian alliance, Poland ended its fight
against Sweden with the Truce of Tolsburg. With brilliant diplomat skill, King Gustavus turned
to the last component of the “triple threat” (Poland, Russia, Denmark) he faced since taking the
Swedish throne. To the horror of Sigismund, and his Catholic allies, Gustavus negotiated \textit{détente}
with Christian of Denmark through a Protestant alliance.\textsuperscript{27} Using Protestantism as a diplomatic
tool intensely angered the Polish king and his Catholic allies. Sweden had now emerged as
perhaps the greatest power in Northern Europe, by settling wars in Denmark, Russia and Poland.
More importantly, however, Gustavus’ interest in a Protestant alliance set the stage for the Thirty
Years’ War—a conflict that used religion to settle the complex power struggles across Europe.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 164-5
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 174
4. The Search for a Queen

As tensions temporarily subsided across Northern Europe, Gustavus could now focus on more monarchical duties. For all his success as a military leader and diplomat, the young Swedish king was still without a potential wife. With the prospects for a suitable Protestant bride sorely lacking, Axel Oxenstierna, Johan Skytte, and the Gustavus’ mother, Christina, searched across Europe for a potential future bride. Interestingly, Gustavus was already maintaining correspondence with Ebba Brahe, daughter of Magnus Brahe, Lord high Steward and president of the supreme court. Ms. Brahe’s beauty and social skills were also noted to be particularly suited for royalty. A series of letters written by Gustavus, dated 1613-1615, reveals a promising relationship full of love and emotion. However, Gustavus’ mother, Christina, vehemently opposed her son’s youthful love affair, forcing the young king to continue his search elsewhere. The conflict between Gustavus, Ebba Brahe, and Christina has been greatly romanticized in fiction, poems and plays. What is certain, however, is that Christina went to great lengths to prevent her son from marrying Ms. Brahe. Tired from the affair, it would be several years until Gustavus was again ready for the marriage search.

After a very public dismissal of Ebba Brahe, Christina looked to Germany for a future Swedish queen. In 1615, Hieronymus von Birkholtz, a Swedish-German, approached Christina, arguing that the Elector of Brandenburg’s eldest daughter, Maria

---

29 Ibid., 59
Eleonora, would be a suitable partner for King Gustavus. It seems as if the Swedish House of Vasa had no particular interest in such a proposal until the death of Elector John Sigismund in 1619, not to be confused with the Polish king. The Elector’s death was of Sweden’s interest for several reasons. First, the heir-apparent, George William, was an anxious and inexperienced ruler. In addition, John Sigismund’s conversion from Lutheranism to Calvinism made Brandenburg a rare exception in the Lutheran-Catholic conflict. Gustavus saw the opportunity to turn Brandenburg into a Lutheran state via a strategic agreement, thus forming an important player in the Protestant alliance. Brandenburg’s location was of particular importance, as it bordered on Catholic Poland, which was continued to be ruled by Sigismund III. Although the Swedish-Polish War had ended with the Truce of Tolsburg, Gustavus realized the important location of Brandenburg in terms of a future conflict.

In the spring of 1620, Gustavus set off to Berlin, with the hopes of bringing Maria Eleonora to Stockholm as the queen-apparent. However, George William did not favor Gustavus as his sister’s future husband. Instead, he wished for Maria Eleonora to marry the Polish prince Wladyslaw, the son of Sigismund III. Nonetheless, Gustavus’ visit proved fruitful, and Christina appeared quite please with her son’s choice. Despite resistance from George William, Axel Oxenstierna arrived in Berlin to bring Maria back to Stockholm for a November 25, 1620 wedding. Although the political prospects of the marriage did not go as planned, Gustavus entered into German politics, and offered a further diplomatic blow to Sigismund and his brideless son, Wladyslaw. With a European-wide conflict brewing, Gustavus’ marriage to Maria Eleonora could not have been more appropriate.

---

32 Ibid., 178
33 Ibid., 180
5. The Beginnings of the Thirty Years’ War

The 1617 election of Ferdinand II caused turmoil in Bohemia, as there was a relatively large number of Protestants upset with the new king’s ultracatholicism. When Ferdinand’s board of regents denied the construction of several Protestant chapels, a crowd of angry critics stormed the Prague Castle, throwing three regents out a third-story window into a manure pit below. The Defenestration of Prague in May 1618, (where Bohemian Protestants rebelled against the new Catholic king), marks the start of the Thirty Years’ War. 34 John Rushworth, an English historian at the time, later described the incident in his account of the Thirty Years’ War:

On the 23d (sic.) of May the chief of the Evangelics went armed into the castle of Prague, entered the council chamber, and opened their grievances; but, enraged by opposition, they threw Slabata, the chief justice, and Smesansius, one of the council, and Fabricius, the secretary, form an high window into the castle ditch…Hereupon the assembly took advice to settle the towns and castle of Prague with new guards… 35

This humorous incident fortunately resulted in no causalities. However, it did bring the Protestant-Catholic divide to light, threatening a Protestant revolution across Bohemia. The death of Matthias, Holy Roman Emperor, in 1619 established Ferdinand as his successor, and furthered the power of the Catholic cause. During this period, many important alliances were formed. Sigismund III, a loyal Catholic, supported Ferdinand II, as did Maximilian of Bavaria, who resumed the Catholic League at the end of 1618. 36 Catholic Spain too became interested in the

34 Defenestration is defined as “the action of throwing out of a window.” The term, which was not used until 1620, was invented for the 1618 incident in Prague. Fenestra derives from the Greek verb phainen meaning “to show” and the Etruscan suffix –(s)tra. http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=defenestration
36 Michael Roberts, A History of Sweden: 1611-1632, Vol. 1 (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953): 184. The Catholic League was formed in 1609 by Maximilian I, Duke of Bavaria, to counteract the Protestant Union, which consisted of 12 German states, notably the Palatinate, Hesse-Kassel, and Brandenburg. As a diplomatic and military means to defend Catholicism in Europe, the Catholic League was directly opposed to Frederick V’s Protestant
conflict. Hoping to gain Protestant lands in the Alsace region, King Philip III of Spain allied with Ferdinand II and the Holy Roman Empire.

As the Catholic forces were strengthening across Europe, the Protestants sought to counteract with their own alliances. The growing Protestant movement in Bohemia ousted Ferdinand and elected Frederick V of the Palatinate to the Bohemian crown in 1619. Although Frederick’s election was a defeat for the Catholics, Gustavus Adolphus and other Protestant leaders, notably Christian IV of Denmark and Louis XII of France, were not pleased. As members of the Protestant Union, these Protestant rulers rejected Frederick V’s claim to the Bohemian throne with the Treaty of Ulm (1620). As a result, Ferdinand II handily defeated Frederick V at the Battle of White Mountain in November 1620, marking the first major battle of the Thirty Year’s War.\(^{37}\)

Gustavus, pleased with Denmark’s détente agreement, turned to the Netherlands for support. With the Dutch-Spanish truce expiring in 1621, King Gustavus capitalized on the diplomatic opportunity to form an alliance with Calvinist—but still Protestant—Holland. Prior to the Defenestration of Prague, there was a clear Lutheran-Calvinist-Catholic divide. However, Gustavus’ marriage, despite its controversy, lightened Lutheran-Calvinist relations, as Brandenburg was a Calvinist state. A Dutch alliance with Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange, would give the Protestant a well-trained, modern Dutch army and an experienced navy. However, fearing war with neighboring Spain, the Dutch opted to avoid intervention in Northern Germany. Without Dutch support, Gustavus knew the future of the Protestant Union was in question.

Eventually, Sweden did negotiate a Protestant alliance with the German states of Bremen,
Hamburg, and the Palantine.\textsuperscript{38} However, the current alliance simply was not enough to justify a Swedish intervention in Northern Germany. Additionally, there were concerns that a Swedish-led alliance would tend to underlying concerns, namely Swedish preoccupations with Poland and Denmark. The Dutch, in particular, question whether Gustavus’ main motive was not to restore Protestantism in Bohemia, but rather expand the growing Swedish Empire.

\textbf{6. The Polish Conflict, Continued}

In November, 1620, the Truce of Tolsburg expired, allowing Gustavus to refocus on the Polish conflict. King Sigismund II continued to claim the Swedish crown, which reflected a personal vendetta between the Polish and Swedish kings. For Gustavus, war was the only option to solve this issue, as it was a matter of pride and maintaining his father’s ruling line. As talk of a renewed Swedish-Polish conflict loomed, Gustavus gained new critics. In particular, James I of England questioned the necessity of war in Poland, arguing that the Truce of Tolsburg should be renewed. Despite the vocal backlash, Gustavus landed at Pernau, Livonia (modern-day Estonia) on July 1621, with over 14,000 troops.\textsuperscript{39} The primary objective was to capture Riga, a powerful and strategic port on the Baltic coast. The siege of Riga lasted three weeks, and was a disaster for Poland, who was already at war with the Ottoman Empire. Sigismund could not afford to stretch his troops in order to maintain two wars, but his pride in the Polish House of Vasa resulted in a prolonged conflict. However, Gustavus struggled to capture any more territory, and sailed to Sweden in the summer of 1622.

Without a truce, Poland threatened to invade the Swedish mainland. In retaliation, Gustavus boarded 4,000 sailors on 21 ships and set sail for Danzig, Poland in the spring of

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 199
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 201
1623.\textsuperscript{40} Requesting a meeting with Sigismund, Gustavus was determined to end the conflict once and for all. Although no diplomatic talks ever occurred, Gustavus had proven his point: Sweden would not back down until Sigismund renounced his claim to the House of Vasa. Through a display of naval might, Gustavus had quelled a potential Polish invasion of Sweden, with no visible response from Sigismund. Gustavus’ diplomatic strategy made Riga a sound success, and allowed Sweden to reclaim Livonia north of the Dvina River. Additionally, Sweden now controlled arguably the most important port on the Baltic, and gained an important trade and maritime route to Eastern Europe.

The capture of Riga and the re-establishment of Swedish Livonia threatened Danish hegemony in the Baltic. This period marks a nearly equal bipolar balance of power in the region between Sweden and Denmark. However, it was Gustavus, not Christian IV that experienced military and diplomatic success. At the Siege of Riga, Gustavus borrowed Dutch military tactics liked “massed batteries and creeping barrages,” and combined them with his own innovations, notably combining musketry with gunfire to “make the defenders keep their heads down.”\textsuperscript{41} Gustavus’ military innovation was something that Christian IV failed to accomplish when Denmark would later intervene in the Thirty Years’ War. But before Denmark could leave its footprint in the Protestant cause, it first had to secure a strategic alliance with the Northern German states, which was still several years on the horizon.

7. The Failure of the Swedish Protestant League

In 1623, the Protestant cause seemed all but dead, as General Johan Tzerclaes, Count of Tilly, ravaged across Germany as commander of the Catholic League. The Imperial forces, under
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the watchful eye of Ferdinand II, had a series of successes at the battles of Wimpffen and Hochst.\textsuperscript{42} The Palatinate, which was loosely held together by Frederick V, lost several of its key cities to the Imperial forces, including Mannheim, Heidelberg, and Frankenthal. Ambrosio Spinola, a Spanish general, lead a campaign to capture the Palatinate, which ended in victory for Spain in 1622. The Protestant caused was further crushed by General Tilly’s defeat of Christian of Brunswick at the Battle of Stadtlohn in August 1623. After the battle, nearly four-fifths of Christian’s 15,000 strong army had been wiped out. With no recognizable leader of the Protestant forces, skyrocketing desertion rates, and an army that was on the brink of extinction, Gustavus Adolphus recognized the opportunity to build a new Protestant League.

The Swedish Protestant league had three main objectives: to rid Sweden of Danish influence, to gain support from the Dutch, and to renew the Swedish-Polish War with aid from Protestant forces, expect Denmark.\textsuperscript{43} The first objective was primarily intended to shift the balance of power in the Baltic in favor of Sweden. Denmark maintained its military via Baltic tolls and war reparations from Sweden. Gustavus knew that a successful Danish-led Protestant alliance in Germany would be a fateful blow to the Swedish Empire. The new Protestant alliance, therefore, had to leave out Denmark entirely, and force Christian IV to question Danish intervention in Germany.

The second objective of Gustavus’ Swedish Protestant League was crucial: the Netherlands needed to abandon its war with Spain in favor of intervention in Germany. Gustavus knew he had to convince Maurice of Orange that the Thirty Years’ War was a justifiable cause,
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and could determine the fate of the United Provinces.⁴⁴ The Dutch struggle for independence from Spain was further complicated by Spain’s acquisition of the Palatinate. Gustavus hoped that the increased Spanish-Imperial presence in Germany would be enough to convince the Dutch to intervene. In an August, 1623 letter to Adolf Frederick of Mecklenburg, Gustavus explained how he wished to gain the support of Maurice of Orange and Frederick V (now exiled in the Netherlands). However, the Dutch did not take the bait, and instead focused on its war effort with Spain.

The final component of Gustavus’ alliance was perhaps the most controversial. The Swedish-Polish War was viewed as a personal conflict between Gustavus and Sigismund by outside powers. Naturally, there was little support for other Protestant forces to fight against the Polish Commonwealth. However, Gustavus justified the conflict from a different perspective based on geography. If the Swedish Protestant League invaded Poland, then the Thirty Years’ War could shift eastward, and out of Ferdinand’s sphere of influence. The so-called “Polish Diversion” was an ambitious theory that failed to gain support from other major Protestant powers, notably the Dutch. The second component of a renewed war with Poland focused on Sigismund as a Catholic leader, who was religiously motivated to destroy Protestantism, alongside Ferdinand II, Maximilian, and Philip IV of Spain. However, the Dutch and the Northern German Protestant states were not convinced by Gustavus’ “Polish Diversion” tactic. The lack of support ultimately resulted in no Swedish Protestant League, as Gustavus had hoped.

⁴⁴ The Dutch Republic was officially known as the Republic of the Seven United Provinces. In 1568, William of Orange revolted against Phillip II, and the Dutch Republic maintained independence from Spain. The conflict resulted in the Eighty Years’ War that ended in 1648 with the Peace of Munster. During the Thirty Years’ War, the Netherland’s war in Spain was complicated with Spain’s acquisition of the Palatinate. Furthermore, Frederick V, the former Palatinate leader, was exiled in The Hague, Netherlands.
On the contrary, Sweden’s attempt at a Protestant alliance motivated Denmark to step closer to intervention in the Thirty Years’ War.

8. Danish Intervention in the Thirty Years’ War

In June, 1624, Axel Oxenstierna helped negotiate a Swedish-Danish treaty that allowed King Gustavus to toll his own subjects in Danish waters. The treaty was an outstanding diplomatic success, and a bit of surprise. Only months earlier, Christian IV declared: “I will absolutely not allow him [Gustavus Adolphus] to become stronger in the Baltic than he is.” The Danish leader’s change of heart was most likely a result of a feared Danish-Swedish border battle, and a recognition of Sweden’s growing power. With intervention in Germany on the agenda, a renewed war with Sweden could threaten Danish hegemony, and give Gustavus the opportunity to expand his empire.

Denmark sought to champion the Protestant cause in 1625, after gaining financial support from France and England, and gathering a force of 20,000 mercenaries and 15,000 Danish soldiers. Christian IV had appointed himself leader of the Protestant forces, and used his title as Duke of Holstein and his son’s position as Bishop of Bremen to foster German support. In retaliation, Ferdinand II employed Albrecht von Wallenstein, a wealthy Bohemian nobleman, to lead the Imperial campaign against the Protestant forces. Hoping to provide a balance to Tilly’s campaign, Wallenstein raised an army of over 50,000 men. His success came early on with a victory over the German general Ernst von Mansfeld at the Battle of Dessau Bridge in April, 1626.
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Tilly, who was already stationed in Northern Germany and reveling in several years of Catholic League victories, decisively defeated Christian IV’s forces at the Battle of Lutter in August, 1626. With over 6,000 dead and 2,500 prisoners from Lutter alone, the Christian IV-Mansfeld alliance became a spiraling disaster. Wallenstein moved northward, looking to capture Denmark’s Jutland peninsula. However, Wallenstein lacked a naval fleet strong enough to capture the Danish mainland. Meanwhile, Sweden recognized the inherent weakness of the Danish campaign, and sought to revise its military policy before taking any action in the German states. Additionally, Gustavus was personally leading an expeditionary force across Poland, in an attempt to reclaim Livonia, and expel Sigismund III from the Polish throne. However, in a November, 1628 letter, Axel Oxenstierna overestimated the impact of the Danish campaign: “Denmark…I hold at this time, and for so long as she continues to make head against the Emperor, for nothing other than a bastion for Sweden, and the Danish fleet and army as the unpaid servants of my country.”

After Denmark laid siege to Stralsund in 1628, an important Northern German Baltic port in 1628, the country was facing defeat. However, Gustavus, who had renewed the Polish-Swedish war while Denmark intervened in Germany, was ready to ally with his bitter rival, if it meant keeping Scandinavia independent and the Protestant cause alive. In May, 1629, Wallenstein realized the impact of a potential Danish-Swedish alliance, and entered into negotiations with Christian IV. The result was the Treaty of Lubeck, which allowed Denmark to retain its territory, in exchange for abandoning its support for the Northern German Protestant states. With Denmark now removed from the Thirty Years’ War, the Catholic Imperial forces were firmly in control over the rebelling Protestant forces. Without outside aid, the Protestant German states could not
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maintain the costs associated with war against Wallenstein’s Imperial forces and Tilly’s Catholic League. It seemed apropos to negotiate a peace treaty, ending the Thirty Years’ War. However, Gustavus was still building his army, and waiting for his moment to rid Catholicism from the continent.

9. A Swedish King in a Foreign Land

The failed Danish campaign, the success of Count Tilly and General Wallenstein, and the increasing desertion of German troops were undoubtedly motivations for a Swedish intervention. But before Swedish troops could land in Germany, Gustavus first had to finish his war with Poland. The Truce of Altmark in September 1629 secured Swedish Livonia from the hands of Sigismund. Perhaps more importantly, Sweden retained the right to two-thirds of all shipping tolls at Polish-Lithuanian ports. Gustavus now had the financial means to finance an intervention on behalf of the Northern German Protestants. First, however, the Swedish king had to address his citizens, announcing his future military campaign. During his farewell speech at Stockholm harbor in May 1630, Gustavus declared:

I call on the all-powerful God to witness, by whose providence we are here assembled, that it is not by my own wish, or from any love of war, that I undertake this campaign. On the contrary, I have been now for several years goaded into it by the imperial party, not only through the action of their general in aiding with his army our enemies, the Poles, moreover, by our harassed brother-in-law [the elector of Brandenburg] to undertake this war, the chief object of which is to free our oppressed brothers in faith from the clutches of the pope, which, God helping us, we hope to do...The emperor has compelled me to resort to arms. He has insulted my person, assisted our enemies, persecuted our allies, our religious brethren, who sigh for deliverance. With the aid of God, they will not have sighed in vain.”

Gustavus’ call for military intervention in Germany was perhaps no surprise for a nation at nearly continuous warfare the past fifty years. In his speech, we can see Gustavus’ justification for

47 Ibid., 398
48 Ibid
warfare. Poland, who had received financial aid from Ferdinand’s Holy Roman Empire during the Swedish-Polish conflict, represented the evils of Catholicism. Additionally, Brandenburg, of which Gustavus was tied to via his marriage to Eleonora (hence the original text “brother-in-law”), had suffered devastating attacks at the hands of General Wallenstein, despite its attempts to stay neutral. Interestingly, Gustavus assumes that George William, the Elector of Brandenburg, would ally with the Protestant forces. However, there was a failure to recognize that Count Adam von Schwarzenberg, William’s chancellor, remained a devout Catholic and supporter of the Imperial forces. As Gustavus would later learn, Brandenburg—arguably one of the most powerful German states—was not a sure ally, and was a major cause for an initially cumbersome Swedish intervention.

On June 26, Gustavus’ army, which totaled 14,000 men, landed at Peenemünde, a German Baltic port, despite violent winds and a disappointing number of troops. The previous autumn, Gustavus had hoped to assemble an army of 75,000 in northern Germany, with an expeditionary force to Peenemünde numbering 45,000. As news of the Swedish king’s landing reached General Wallenstein, the German Imperial commander maintained “a field force of 35,000 and immediate reserves of 15,000 more.” However, the Swedish-led expedition’s main objective was to form strategic alliances with the German Protestant states. In order to justify his intervention as a foreign king, Gustavus had to convince Protestant leaders to support his campaign through diplomacy. As a skilled diplomat, who had negotiated countless treaties and truces with some of Sweden’s most bitter rivals, so there were great expectations for a grand
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Swedish-led Protestant alliance that would destroy the Imperial forces, and restore Protestantism across Europe.

Gustavus saw a greater challenge in convincing the public that he was not a foreign interloper, but rather a friendly figure that could save the Protestant cause. Broadsheets, which were small pamphlets often with a political message, were used as pro-Swedish propaganda. Often accompanied with an image or cartoon for the non-literate population, broadsheets shaped the public image of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, and commander of the Protestant forces. Records indicate that these broadsheets first appeared shortly after Gustavus’ landing at Peenemünde in 1630, peaked in 1632, and remained in circulation after Gustavus’ death in the autumn of 1632. Interestingly, there was little evidence of anti-Swedish broadsheets produced by the German Catholics, who had a well-established press. One historian reasons that this was due to the “self-imposed censorship growing out of a belief in the divine right of rulers,” of which criticism of rulers “was expressed very indistinctly, being routinely directed towards a ruler’s subordinates or towards group associated with him.” This indicates that German broadsheets during this period, which were intensely popular, portrayed a largely positive image of Gustavus, which was essential to forming trust and allegiance with the German public.

A popular image on the early German broadsheets in 1630 depicted Gustavus Adolphus upon a horse with a commander’s baton, indicating the Swedish king’s royalty and success as a leader. Additionally, Gustavus’ royal titles indicated his power, which can be seen on a 1630 broadsheet in Dresden: “A true image and portrait of the most serene, most powerful Prince and Lord, Lord Gustavus Adolphus, by the Grace of God, Christian King of the Swedes, Goths and
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Wends, Grand Duke of Finland, Duke of Estonia and Karelia, Lord over Ingermanland, etc.”

The numerous titles suggest two important details: that Gustavus is a Christian king fighting on behalf of Protestantism and that he demonstrates the capacity to rule a large Empire with geographic diversity.

Political and religious cartoons were a very effective category for German broadsheets during the Thirty Years’ War. Although religious satire was quite common in German, especially since the Protestant Reformation, political satire was rare pre-Thirty Years’ War. However, the politically charged nature of the War brought a reversal in broadsheet trends, when secularized political satire became immensely popular. Gustavus Adolphus changed the political scene in Germany. The Protestant German states, as one scholar notes, could “no longer cling to their anxious neutrality of former years, but were now engaged in a life-and-death struggle.” With a change in mindset, Protestant presses all across Germany targeted Ferndinand II, Count Tilly, and other notable Catholic leaders.

10. Destruction at Magdeburg

As pro-Swedish broadsheets started to widely circulate across Germany, Gustavus and his troops sought to establish strategic allies. Johan Adler Salvius was the principal Swedish diplomat in northern Germany. In a June 26, 1630 manifesto Salvius addressed many pertinent issues, including why King Gustavus did not take early action in Germany, as Denmark had done:
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…nor at that time did His Royal Majesty lack either a superb opportunity—for his residents requested it and his foreigners pushed him to it—or a just cause—for his friends were oppressed and his allies had most strenuously requested his aid and assistance.58

Salvius also tried to silence German critics of Sweden’s Empire, arguing that any threat against the Swedes is “mocking all the Baltic ports and the sea itself” and asking, “do they not impose upon him [Gustavus] through self defense…he might render a measure of justifiable defense?”59

Gustavus heavily relied on the diplomatic efforts of Salvius and his chancellor, Axel Oxenstierna, to guide Sweden into a Northern German alliance. Brandenburg, a presumed ally and friend of Sweden, would not budge in its neutrality. George William, often considered an incompetent ruler who did not achieve his father’s (John Sigismund) success, was swayed by his Catholic chancellor, Adam von Schwarzenberg. As Gustavus failed to gain the support of his brother-in-law, he turned to other German states. In a letter from Gustavus to Axel Oxenstierna written in 1631, the Swedish king outlines his political and military objectives in Germany. He notes that the “desired goal” is “the safety of our fatherland” which further includes stopping the “House of Austria” (Holy Roman Empire) from imposing its will and establishing “erroneous papal teachings implanted in the place of the Evangelical Religion.”60 In the same letter, Gustavus also notes that peace is not an option—it is an “intolerable accord” that would “leave us to waste uselessly great expenditures…and would give our enemies the opportunity…to do the same to us and to the crown of Sweden.”61 The fear of a complete Protestant failure that includes the capture of Sweden demonstrates the great fear of Catholic hegemony, even among one of the conflict’s greatest leaders.
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In terms of military action, Gustavus called for five armies: one to maintain Swedish lands and the Baltic Coast, two armies led by Swedish general Gustav Horn and Lord Teuffel of Brandenburg, a fourth army at the important city of Magdeburg, and a fifth Scottish-Anglo led force—led by the Hamilton brothers and Colonel Leslie, respectively—in Bremen and Brunswick. The most important army, however, consisted of the 3,000 soldiers prepared to “hold the Elbe” at independent city of Magdeburg, which was being utterly destroyed by Imperial forces.

The Sack (or Siege) of Magdeburg was the first major conflict addressed by the Swedish-led expedition. In November 1630, Count Tilly and General Gottfried Heinrich Graf zu Pappenheim, who had served alongside Tilly against Denmark, attacked Magdeburg. A wealthy city of some 30,000 inhabitants, Magdeburg was an independent city-state strategically located among the cornfields of northern Germany. Before setting sail to Peenemünde, Gustavus had indentified Magdeburg as a possible location for his headquarters, due to its prominence as a trade city rich in goods and services. The Imperial forces, recognizing the importance of Magdeburg, began the siege while Gustavus was concluding the Treaty of Stettin, which gave Sweden the legal guidelines to occupy Pomerania. Because the Swedish forces were still unable to gain the support of neighboring Brandenburg, Gustavus turned to the much smaller state of Pomerania to form the first Swedish-German alliance. The Sack of Magdeburg was a lengthy, and costly battle for its inhabitants, who refused to surrender to Tilly and Pappenheim. The siege lasted for over six months, and completely destroyed the city and the majority of its inhabitants. In a letter after the Fall of Magdeburg on May 20th, 1631, Pappenheim wrote, “I consider it cost
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the city more than 20,000 souls, and certainly no greater horrors and divine justice seen since the Destruction of Jerusalem. All of our soldiers have become rich men.”65 Otto von Guericke, a German scientist specializing in vacuums and a citizen of Magdeburg, wrote a detailed first-hand account of the destruction of his hometown:

Then was there naught but beating and burning, plundering, torture, rape and murder. Most especially was every enemy bent on securing much booty. When a marauding party entered a house, if its master had anything to give he might thereby purchase respite and protection for himself and his family till the next man, who also wanted something should come along. It was only when everything had been brought forth and there was nothing left to give that the real trouble commenced. Then, what with blows and threats of shooting, stabbing and hanging, the poor people were so terrified that if they had anything left they would have brought it forth if it had been buried in the earth or hidden away.66

The horrendous outcome at Magdeburg left Gustavus’ army frustrated with the cumbersome diplomatic relations that was ongoing with George William of Brandenburg, John George of Saxony, and William V of Hesse-Cassel, among others. Magdeburg, however, sent a shockwave of reality to the German Protestant leaders, who now witnessed the potential destruction of the Imperial forces. To the misfortune of the over 25,000 people killed at the Sack of Magdeburg, Gustavus now had a monumental event to encourage a Swedish-German alliance. However, Sweden’s failure to save Magdeburg from destruction weakened Gustavus’ military prestige, and sparked questions over the legitimacy of a Swedish-led alliance.67 Nonetheless, Gustavus remained the clear military leader of the Protestant cause. No one else could counter Tilly’s drive to ravage northern Germany, and establish Catholicism as the de facto religion.

65 Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller, The History of the Thirty Years’ War, (Charleston, SC: BiblioBazaar, 2007), 189-90.
11. Victory at Breitenfeld

The Sack of Magdeburg was a leading cause for several other German states to ally with the Swedish-Pomeranian alliance, including Mecklenburg, Leipzig, Hesse-Cassel, and Brandenburg. While the additional German support encouraged Gustavus to move towards the Imperial forces, John George reluctantly maintained Saxon neutrality. Gustavus knew that of all the northern German states, including his brother-in-law’s (George William of Brandenburg), Saxony could provide the troops, finances and supplies to topple the Imperial forces. John George, who was anxiously balancing Tilly’s and Gustavus Adolphus’ request for assistance, knew that Saxony could not remain neutral after the events at Magdeburg. In August 1631, John George sent a series of letters to Gustavus, and tried to ascertain Swedish military preparations against Count Tilly. Fearing a subservient role in the Swedish-led alliance, John George did not formally announce an appeal for Swedish aid until visiting Gustavus’ camp at the end of August. In early September, however, Gustavus’ army crossed the Elbe River and joined John George and his talented field marshal, Hans Georg von Arnim, at Düben, where military commanders immediately began drawing battle plans.

As the Swedish-Saxon led Protestant forces were preparing for battle, Tilly took up his position at Breitenfeld, with a force of over 35,000 soldiers, including Pappenheim’s cavalry division numbering over 12,000. On the other hand, Gustavus’ army numbered 24,000, with Saxon support providing an additional 18,000 troops. On the morning of September 7, 1631, the trumpets sounded at Breitenfeld, announcing the arrival of the Protestant forces. Sarient
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Maior Forbes, a Scottish mercenary soldier in the Swedish army, provided a first hand account (sic) to his father, a mere three days after the battle:

The Knigs Armie marched on the right hand of the Battle, and the Dukes on the left, and advanced in Battleray against out Ennemy; who began to playe dispitfully with his Ordinance upon us which we cared not much for, but advanced forward with our ordinance likewise playing before us. They seing us marching towards them, they advanced likewise towards us, and came so close one to an other that joyning battalions together, wee came to pushe of pike and disputed the buysinesse so longe, till it pleased God, that wee routed them, and gaue us the victorie, by putting the Ennemy to a retreate with the Kings owne Army, but the Dukes Army was vily beaten back, and began to make a shameful flight, so that wee were forced to send our horse men after these that were beaten, and to relieve the Dukes men with our foote, which doing, we putt all the Ennemy at last to flight, and followed the execution very hotely till it was darke night, & till wee could not see to persue them any further, for which victorie immortal thankes be given to God.73

Forbes’ account of the battle summarizes what was in actuality over “five hours of desperate fighting,” in which Swedish-Saxon troops repelled countless attacks by Pappenheim and Tilly.74

Pappenheim favored calvary charges, while Tilly’s infantry formed eighteen Spanish tercios. Adopted during the Spanish-Dutch wars, the tercios were a mixed military formation of about 3,000 pikemen and gunmen. Tilly’s tercios used a standard squar-like formation, with pikemen (infantry soldiers with large spears) in the center, and gunmen (also called arquebusiers) forming the outer structure.75 Tilly also made use of cavalry, which were position on both wings of the tercios, which was also standard fare for the time period. Gustavus Adolphus, however, used innovative military formation and tactics that ultimately led to a Protestant victory.

During his wars with Denmark and Poland, Gustavus routinely introduced new components to his army. As an avid traveler and diplomat, Gustavus used elements of some of Europe’s finest forces to create a unique, which created a distinct Swedish-fighting style that

73 Sarient Maior Forbes, A Letter sent from Sarient Maior Forbes from the King of Swethens army to his reverend father Mr. John Forbes, minister of the worshipful Company of Marchant Adventureres residing in Delft, touching the great Battle fought by Lypspick betweene the King of Swethen, the Duke of Saxons Army, and the Emperours Army, and that commanded by Generall Tilly, of the Catholique Leage the 7. Lf September, 1631, http://www.lukehistory.com/resources/satforbs.html (accessed April 14th, 2011).
would greatly impact modern warfare. Among his greatest accomplishments were Dutch-inspired linear formations in lieu of Spanish *tercios*, which were much more agile and mobile than Tilly’s units. Using six ranks of musketeers in the front and five ranks of pikemen in the rear, Gustavus’ linear line was unique with its salvo firing technique, which had the front three ranks fire at once.\(^ {76}\) This innovative firing technique had the front rank kneeling, the second rank crouching and the third rank standing, which simultaneously provided enough gunfire to quell cavalry charges.

Although the casualty count varies among sources, Breitenfeld was an overwhelming victory for the Protestant forces. Sarient Maior Forbes’ first hand account notes that over “10,000 bodies were slayne (sic) upon the place of battle, whereof the most of them were the ennemies (sic).”\(^ {77}\) British historian Michael Roberts wrote that there were “7,600 imperialist dead upon the field; 6,000 prisoners (all foot); 3,000 fled away to Leipzig…All in all, the casualties in Tilly’s army may amounted to 20,000 men; on the Swedish side to 2,100.”\(^ {78}\)

Gustavus Adolphus had defeated the mighty Imperial army, which had remained nearly impenetrable for almost thirteen years. Furious with Tilly’s disastrous defeat, Ferdinand II called up Albrecht von Wallenstein, who had retired from military service after his victorious campaign over Christian IV of Denmark. As Gustavus embarked on a southward campaign to reclaim Protestant Germany, the Imperial commanders did not make any substantial progress. For the first time since the start of the Thirty Years’ War, the Protestant forces achieved significant
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success. Gustavus Adolphus was no longer a foreign interloper—he was the savior of Lutheran

12. Death at Lützen

In November, 1632 General Wallenstein, frustrated with his lack of progress against the Swedish troops, decided to set up camp for the upcoming winter. Gustavus, however, saw an opportune time for a surprise attack, which he attempted on the morning of November 15th. Wallenstein, equipped with good scouts, anticipated the Swedish attack, and took a defensive position a few miles south of the Saxon village of Lützen. Meanwhile, Wallenstein called up Pappenheim’s cavalry regiments, as Gustavus requested more Saxon troops from John George. While waiting for both sides to arrive, the charges began, despite the thick fog and worsening weather. Gustavus began with a series of intense cavalry charge on Wallenstein’s weak left wing. However, Pappenheim soon formed his position, and countered with a charge, where he was fatally wounded from a Swedish cannonball. The fall of Pappenheim left his troops shaken and vulnerable to Swedish attacks. As the fog thickened, Gustavus led a charge on Tilly’s vulnerable left wing. As he was “caught up helplessly in the melee…an imperialist horseman fired a pistol in to his back; he fell heavily from the saddle” before a final shot through the head ended his life.”

Gustavus would never recover from that fateful wound at Lützen. The beloved commander of the Swedish forces was now dead, as he troops continued to fight. Despite heavy causalities nearing 5,000-6,000 men, Lützen ended with a Swedish victory, as Wallenstein “quitted the battlefield,
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and left his guns in his enemy’s hands.” However, the victory was insignificant in comparison to Gustavus’ death. All across Europe, leaders and citizens alike, mourned the death of what many considered a hero of the Protestant cause.

13. Aftermath

The tragic loss of Gustavus Adolphus raised some questions concerning Sweden’s future. As he was without a male heir to the throne, Axel Oxenstierna took control of the empire, assisted by Gustavus’ only surviving child, Christina, who was six years old at the time. Oxenstierna decided to uphold Gustavus’ Protestant cause in Germany, trusting the leadership of Field Marshal Gustav Horn, who had already proven himself in battle. Sweden continued to fight until the Peace of Prague in May 1635, which essentially brought an end to the civil war in Germany. The treaty granted autonomy to the Northern German states, and alliances with foreign powers were prohibited. Ferdinand II respected the terms of the Peace of Prague, but soon turned to the southern and western German states, which had been left out of the treaty. France, although a Catholic power and ally of Ferdinand II, wished to claim the Palatinate region to the Rhine River. This conflict led to the final state of the Thirty Year’s War, in which France declared war on Ferdinand and the Hapsburgs, who had gained a strategic alliance in Spain. Unable to combat a Habsburg-Spanish alliance, France called for a truce, which ended with the Peace of Westphalia in October, 1648. The Netherlands and Spain signed the Peace of Münster at Westphalia, ending the Eight Years’ War; while the Holy Roman Empire, Sweden and other allies signed the Treaty of Osnabrück, ending the Thirty Years’ War. The result of the treaty gave Sweden a well-endowed indemnity, Western Pomerania, Wismar, and the Prince-Bishops of Bremen and
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Verden, which secured Sweden’s role in German politics. The military genius, diplomatic skill, and effective ruling strategies of Gustavus were evident: Sweden was at the forefront of European politics.

**Conclusion**

Gustavus Adolphus provided the necessary leadership to carry Sweden to the status of a great power. No longer constrained by Denmark, Poland and Russia’s push for Northern European hegemonic control, Sweden emerged from the Thirty Year’s war as a great European power. It was Gustavus Adolphus who became a heroic figure for Sweden’s struggle to grow as an Empire, and support Protestantism throughout the continent. In his death, Protestant Europe would celebrate Gustavus’ brilliant diplomatic skills, military leadership, and religious enthusiasm. The legacy of the great Swedish leader would live. Indeed, in short time Gustavus Adolphus would be elevated to almost mythical status. He would be known as the “Golden King” for elevating Sweden to great power status and “The Lion of the North” for renowned military strategies. His symbolic death, however, has left some historians inflated his legacy. The wealth of poorly written biographers by Swedish-American clergymen reflects a desire to place Gustavus as a religious reformer, almost to the status of Martin Luther. Although Gustavus did impact Lutheranism in Sweden, and perhaps saved the course of Protestantism in Germany, there is little evidence for a Gustavian theology or religious reformation. Similarly, military historians have elevated Gustavus’s military strategies to God-like status. Again, it is important to consider that Gustavus borrowed Dutch tactics, and struggled at first to implement a successful German campaign. Nonetheless, Gustavus’ success earns him due credit. Thus, there is little wonder why many modern Swedes attribute Gustavus as their greatest ruler.
Primary Sources


This translated document was included in *The Thirty Years War: a documentary history*. This letter from a northern German ruler was sent to King Gustavus Adolphus and is dated February 24-March 5, 1632. Count Willhelm V was a strong ally of Adolphus during the Thirty Years War. The letter was written shortly after the Battle of Breitenfeld, which was a major turning point for the Protestant troops. In the letter, Landgrave Willhelm commends the Swedish intervention and expresses his desire to eliminate the Catholic League and Holy Roman Empire. This letter will serve as an excellent primary source because it involves correspondence between Gustavus Adolphus and his allies in Hessen-Cassel, which were important to his northern German campaigns.
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This is a primary source, and is a letter of correspondence. This letter contains an eyewitness account of the Battle of Breitenfeld, which was fought in September of 1631. In the letter, a young soldier recounts the battle to his father residing in the Netherlands. The soldier describes Gustavus Adolphus’ tactics and those of the opposition forces, which were led by General Tilly of the Holy Roman Empire. This letter is significant because it involves an eyewitness account of what is often considered King Gustavus Adolphus’ most important victory.


Although not all of the excerpts are relevant to Gustav Adolphus and his military campaigns, Robinson devotes a section of his chapter on the Thirty Years War, entitled the “Interventions of Gustavus Adolphus.” This collection contains Gustavus Adolphus’ farewell speech at Stockholm on May 30, 1630. The second useful source contains an account of the Battle of Magdenburg, which was written by a writer during the period.
**Secondary Sources**


Nils Ahnlund’s biography of Gustavus Adolphus is perhaps the best to date from a Swedish historian. Translated from Swedish by historian Michael Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus the Great* heavily focuses on Gustavus’ personal life. Ahnlund wonderful portrays the Swedish king’s struggle to maintain power as a ruler, military commander, and religious leader. There is also an emphasis on Gustavus’ interactions with Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna.


Francis Bowman’s “Sweden’s Wars, 1611-32” is a detailed historiography of Sweden’s early 17th century military engagements. The article begins with Gustavus Adolphus’ ascendance to the throne in 1611 and ends with his detail at the Battle of Lutzen in November, 1632. This secondary source is extremely helpful and is compiled by an excellent historian who worked through many excellent primary sources in German and Swedish. Furthermore, the article focuses on the major battles of Breitenfeld and Lutzen, which are significant to Gustavus’ display of revolutionary military tactics.


Richard Brzezinski’s work as a military historian is displayed through his account of Gustavus Adolphus’ military tactics. Brzezinski argues that Gustavus’ tactics earn him the title of “Father of Modern Warfare,” as he later influenced great military generals like Napoleon. The military focus of this work is particularly useful for understanding Protestant military tactics throughout Germany during the Thirty Years War.


Louis Ciotola’s article on the Battle of Breitenfeld is not the best work on the battle, but it nonetheless provides a solid overview of important details and key events. However, Ciotola, who is not a professional historian, lacks the academic credibility to elevate this article to become an excellent source. Nonetheless, this article is a solid overview of arguably Gustavus’ most important battle.

Coupe, W.A. “Political and Religious Cartoons of the Thirty Years' War.” *Journal of the*
W.A. Coupe’s article on political and religious cartoons in the Thirty Years War shows a public viewpoint of the war. In particular Coupe looks at the use and effectiveness of the broadside used religious satire, but rarely used political satire. Coupe argues that broadsides were effective and used by both Protestants and Catholics. This article was very informative and interesting, and is a useful source to describe public perception of Sweden’s intervention in Germany.


Ernst Ekman was perhaps one of the most accomplished historians in the field of Scandinavian history during the Thirty Years War. His historiography in the Journal of Modern History is a thorough summary of his life’s work studying Gustavus Adolphus. This is an excellent source that is extremely useful in my research. Ekman’s knowledge and research is immense, yet straightforward enough to comprehend.


Timothy Hagen’s article examines Gustavus Adolphus’ reception in England during the Thirty Years War. England, a neutral country during the war, had mixed perceptions of Gustavus, but generally favored the Protestant cause. Broadsheets and newspaper article were the major form of popular press that made the English public aware of Gustavus’ campaigns. This source is intriguing, interesting, and may be helpful in determining public perception of Gustavus Adolphus.


Tryntje Helfferich’s The Thirty Years War: A Documentary History is a more modern version of James Robinson’s Readings in European History. Published recently in 2009, it contains thirty-eight primary documents from the Thirty Years War. A number of these sources will be useful for my research, including William Watts’ The Swedish discipline, personal correspondence between Gustavus Adolphus and Axel Oxenstierna, and a first-hand account of the Battle of Breitenfeld. This is arguably the most comprehensive collection of primary sources available to scholars of the Thirty Years’ War.

Simon McKeown’s article is a case study of George Tooke, a former sailor in the Royal Fleet that fought against Spain. His later writings focused on the Thirty Years War and McKeown examines Tooke’s views of Gustavus Adolphus. This was an interesting and potentially useful article that presents an outside view of Gustavus Adolphus.


Paas’ article argues that the popularity of Gustavus Adolphus, even after his death, would not have been possible without the use of broadsheets. Initially, the broadsheets depicted Gustavus Adolphus as a foreign intruder. However, after his victories across Germany, Gustavus Adolphus was viewed as a military hero and a savior of the Protestant cause. This article is similar to W.A. Coupes’ article on religious and political cartoons.


Piirimae Piirimae is an Estonian historian and political scientist. The “Just War in Theory and Practice” is Piirimae’s PhD thesis from the University of Cambridge. Piirimae has a solid foundation and uses a combination of primary sources throughout Swedish history to justify Sweden’s cause for intervention during the Thirty Years War. Piirimae’s focus on military history is particularly helpful in understanding why Gustavus Adolphus felt compelled to fight against the Holy Roman Empire and the Catholic League.


Michael Robert’s article focuses on Gustavus Adolphus’ intentions during the Thirty Years War. In particularly, Robert’s analyzes the historiography of the subject. The central argument is that an expansion of the Swedish Empire would not have been possible without Swedish intervention in Germany. This article is interesting because it is part historical and part theoretical. It provides an interesting take on the goals and objectives of Gustavus Adolphus and his Swedish Empire.

_____.


Volume I of Michael Robert’s biography on Gustavus Adolphus is extremely thorough and detailed, and the information can be overwhelming at times. Nonetheless it is perhaps
the best English translation on Gustavus Adolphus.


Volume II begins where Robert’s left off in his first work. This work heavily focuses on Gustavus’ military campaign in Germany, and his diplomatic relations with other states, notably Denmark, Poland, the Netherlands and various German lands.


The *Early Vasas* provides a wealth of information for the Scandinavian history student. This work is particularly helpful for background information to the Vasa family, and their impact on Swedish history. The extensive length proves that much can be written about this well-known Swedish family. This work provided me with more than sufficient background information.


Johann von Schiller’s work, first published in 1846, was entitled *Geschichte des dreißigjährigen Kriegs* in the author’s native German. It provides a thorough interview of the war, and uses many excellent primary sources. In particular, Schiller focuses on the military campaigns, and brings to life the day-to-day operations of Gustavus’ army.
Appendix

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS

Figure 5, 1630 Saxon Broadsheet


Fig. 64—Wollenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 36.11.1 Geom. 2 [4], 51
Due to severe dynastic and religious strife during the 17th Century, boundaries were often subjected to sudden, major displacement. The extremely fragmented nature of Germany was another factor accounting for confusion over political borders. For clarity, boundaries depicted are very general and simplified; there has been no attempt to trace them precisely.

Figure 6, Swedish Intervention in Germany, 1630-1632
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Figure 7, Thirty Years’ War, 1618-1648
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Figure 8, Battle of Breitenfield, Opening Attacks


Figure 10, Battle of Lützen, Main Formations
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